

TEST IDEALS IN MIXED CHARACTERISTIC: A UNIFIED THEORY UP TO PERTURBATION

BHARGAV BHATT, LINQUAN MA, ZSOLT PATAKFALVI, KARL SCHWEDE, KEVIN TUCKER, JOE WALDRON, JAKUB WITASZEK

ABSTRACT. Let X be an integral scheme of finite type over a complete DVR of mixed characteristic. We provide a definition of a test ideal which agrees with the multiplier ideal after inverting p , can be computed from a sufficiently large alteration, agrees with previous mixed characteristic BCM test ideals after localizing and completing at any point of residue characteristic p (up to small perturbation), and which satisfies the full suite of expected properties of a multiplier or test ideal. This object is obtained via the p -adic Riemann-Hilbert functor.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 2 |
| 2. Preliminaries | 9 |
| 3. A review of perverse sheaves | 14 |
| 4. A summary of the Riemann-Hilbert functor and related results | 28 |
| 5. Singularities over the perfectoid \mathcal{O}_C - the RH-subsheaves | 30 |
| 6. Singularities over a DVR | 41 |
| 7. Test ideals and modules of pairs | 54 |
| 8. Test ideals of non-principal ideals | 66 |
| Appendix A. Characteristic zero analog of our result | 85 |
| Appendix B. Alternative approach to a part of Section 6 | 87 |
| Appendix C. Further questions | 94 |
| References | 95 |

Bhatt was supported by NSF Grant DMS #1801689 and #1840234, NSF FRG Grant #1952399, a Packard Fellowship, and the Simons Foundation.

Ma was supported by NSF Grant DMS #2302430, NSF FRG Grant DMS #1952366, a fellowship from the Sloan Foundation, and by a grant from the Institute for Advanced Study School of Mathematics.

Patakfalvi was partially supported by the following grants: grant #200020B/192035 from the Swiss National Science Foundation, ERC Starting grant #804334.

SchweDE was supported by NSF Grant #2101800, NSF FRG Grant #1952522 and a Fellowship from the Simons Foundation.

Tucker was supported by NSF Grant DMS #2200716.

Waldron was supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation #850684.

Witaszek was supported by NSF Grant No. DMS-#2101897.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. In characteristic zero algebraic geometry, it is enormously useful to study the singularities of algebraic varieties by considering resolutions of singularities. In characteristic $p > 0$ however, even when a resolution is known to exist, looking solely at birational maps is insufficient to deduce properties of singularities, due to a lack of vanishing theorems. Instead, it turns out to be more fruitful to study properties of the Frobenius morphism, or more generally, of all finite covers or even all alterations. To wit, we call a commutative Noetherian ring R a *splinter* if every finite ring extension $R \hookrightarrow S$ splits as a map of R -modules; this is an important class of singularities in characteristic p algebraic geometry¹.

While the definition of a splinter makes perfect sense in mixed characteristic, relatively little was known about this notion until quite recently. The breakthrough was André’s proof of Hochster’s direct summand conjecture ([And18]), showing that regular rings are splinters. Based on this and the related works [And20, Bha18, Gab18], the second and the fourth author built the theory of BCM singularities ([MS21], see also [PRG21]), which with conjunction with the result of the first author on the Cohen-Macaulayness of the absolute integral closure R^+ ([Bha20]), allowed for a thorough study of splinters.

In this paper, we are interested in measuring the failure of a ring R to be a splinter. To quantify this, note that a finite extension $R \subseteq S$ splits if and only if the evaluation-at-1 map $\mathrm{Hom}_R(S, R) \rightarrow R$ surjects. Tautologically then, the ideal

$$(1.0.1) \quad \bigcap_{\text{finite } R \subseteq S} \mathrm{Image} \left(\mathrm{Hom}_R(S, R) \xrightarrow{\text{evaluation at } 1} R \right) = \bigcap_{\text{finite } R \subseteq S} \mathrm{Tr}_{S/R}(\omega_{S/R}) \subset R$$

equals R exactly when R is a splinter; in general, we regard this ideal as a measure of the failure of R to be a splinter. A priori, the infinite intersection appearing above is quite difficult to control. Nonetheless, one of the goals of this paper is to prove some finiteness properties of this infinite intersection, such as those discussed next, by accessing it topologically via the p -adic Riemann–Hilbert functor.

1.2. The motivating question. To formulate statements and obtain objects that work uniformly in all characteristics, it is convenient to replace finite maps with alterations in the index set of the intersection in (1.0.1) above². With this replacement, we shall study the following fundamental question about mixed characteristic singularities:

Question 1 (Localization of alteration-test ideal). *Let $X = \mathrm{Spec} R$ with R Noetherian normal and Gorenstein. Define*

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}(R) = \bigcap_{f: Y \rightarrow X} \mathrm{Image} \left(\mathrm{Tr}_{Y/X} : H^0(X, f_* \omega_{Y/X}) \rightarrow R \right),$$

¹Indeed, in characteristic $p > 0$, R being a splinter is conjecturally the same as R being *strongly F -regular*, and this equivalence is known when R is \mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein by [Sin99] cf. [BST15, CEMS18]. Strongly F -regular singularities are arguably the most important class of singularities coming out of tight closure theory [HH90]. They are also known to correspond to KLT singularities in characteristic zero ([HW02, Har98, MS97, Smi00, HY03, Tak04]) and are thus important in birational geometry.

²It is known that replacing finite covers with alterations in (1.0.1) does not change the intersection in geometric situations in positive or mixed characteristic, see [BMP⁺23, Corollary 4.13], but it is essential to include birational maps in characteristic zero.

where the intersection runs over all alterations of X ³. Is it true that

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(R) = \text{Image} \left(\text{Tr}_{Y/X} : H^0(X, f_*\omega_{Y/X}) \rightarrow R \right)$$

for a single sufficiently large alteration $f: Y \rightarrow X$?

Note that a positive answer would, in particular, show that $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R[1/g]) = \tau_{\text{alt}}(R)[1/g]$ for all $g \in R$, i.e., the formation of $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R)$ commutes with localization.

Let us briefly provide some context for this question. In mixed characteristic, the ideal $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R)$ appeared in [BMP⁺23, TY23, HLS22] among other places; the fact that its formation is not known to commute with localization (and then completion at a maximal ideal) has been a major obstacle.⁴ Note that localization does not commute with infinite intersections in general. In equal characteristic zero, this intersection stabilizes since $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R)$ is the multiplier ideal, and is in fact computed by any single resolution of singularities. In characteristic $p > 0$, a resolution is not enough even if it exists, but there is still a single sufficiently large alteration which computes it by [Smi94, BST15], cf. [HH92, HL07, CEMS18, DT23].

A primary goal of our article is to provide a positive answer to Question 1 “up to small p -perturbation”, as made precise next.

1.3. The main results. In order to state the main theorem, we first fix a system of compatible p -power roots $\{p^{1/p^e}\}_{e \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ of p within a fixed algebraic closure of the fraction field of R – in the end, the resulting object will be independent of such choices. We need to define a p -perturbed alteration variant of $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R)$ for $0 < \epsilon = 1/p^e \ll 1$ (the choice of $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ is irrelevant by Noetherianity):

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R) := \bigcap_{f: Y \rightarrow X} \text{Image} \left(H^0(X, f_*\omega_{Y/X}) \xrightarrow{p^\epsilon} H^0(X, f_*\omega_{Y/X}) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{Y/X}} R \right),$$

where $X := \text{Spec } R$ and the intersection is taken over alterations such that $p^\epsilon \in \mathcal{O}_Y$. We emphasize that although the above p -perturbation may look technical, in most applications it is completely harmless. One should note that building in small perturbation is the key part of tight closure theory – *test elements* are small perturbations – and of course statements up to small p -perturbation are common applications of almost ring theory [Fal02, GR03, GR04]. This perturbation lets us prove that the intersection stabilizes for f sufficiently large.

Theorem A (Theorem 6.9, Corollary 6.11, Corollary 6.16). *Let R be a normal Gorenstein domain of finite type over a complete DVR V of mixed characteristic. Then for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$, there exists an alteration $f: Y \rightarrow X = \text{Spec } R$ with $p^\epsilon \in \mathcal{O}_Y$ such that*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R) = \text{Image} \left(H^0(X, f_*\omega_{Y/X}) \xrightarrow{p^\epsilon} H^0(X, f_*\omega_{Y/X}) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{Y/X}} R \right).$$

In particular, $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R[1/g]) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R)[1/g]$ for every $g \in R$, and furthermore $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R)[1/p]$ agrees with the multiplier ideal $\mathcal{J}(R[1/p])$. Its formation also commutes with completion at a maximal ideal: $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R) \cdot \widehat{R} = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\widehat{R})$.

³More precisely, in this and all such intersections that appear in this paper, we always mean the following: choose a geometric generic point of X (i.e., an algebraic closure of $K(R)$), and intersect over all alterations of X equipped with a lift of this point.

⁴A variant of $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R)$ has been defined in [HLS22] for quasi-projective varieties by passage to the affine cone; this commutes with localization essentially by fiat but its behavior after completion at a stalk was unclear.

To prove this theorem, our main idea is to interpret $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R)$ intrinsically in terms of the intersection cohomology complex (with \mathbf{Z}_p -coefficients) of $\text{Spec}(R[1/p])$ via the p -adic Riemann-Hilbert functor [BL]; this is a mixed characteristic counterpart of the fact (reviewed in Appendix A) that the multiplier ideal sheaf on a complex variety is naturally encoded in the Hodge filtration on the intersection cohomology \mathcal{D} -module provided by Saito's theory of Hodge modules; see Section 1.5 for a more detailed summary of the proof.

By incorporating small perturbations along arbitrary divisors and not just $\text{div}(p)$, we provide a comprehensive theory of a test ideal sheaf $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X)$. This notion can be generalized to pairs and even triples $(X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$, see Section 7 and Section 8, where Δ is a \mathbf{Q} -divisor such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, \mathfrak{a} is an ideal sheaf, and $t \in \mathbf{Q}_{\geq 0}$. In that setting, for any sufficiently large Cartier divisor $G > 0$ on X (a test element analog), and $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$, we can define

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X} (f_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - f^*(K_X + \Delta + \epsilon G) - tM))$$

where $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a sufficiently large alteration such that $\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$, where M , tM and $f^*(K_X + \Delta + \epsilon G)$ are Cartier. In particular, the intersection over such Y stabilizes (Theorem 8.30, Corollary 8.33, cf. Proposition 8.28).

In this context, we are able to show that $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ satisfies the full suite of properties one expects from multiplier ideals in characteristic zero or test ideals in characteristic $p > 0$.

Theorem B (Properties of test ideals, Corollary 7.22, Corollary 8.34, Theorem 8.35). *Suppose X is normal, integral, flat, and of finite type over a complete DVR of mixed characteristic. Suppose additionally that Δ is a \mathbf{Q} -divisor such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ are ideal sheaves and $s, t \geq 0$ are rational numbers.*

Then the ideal sheaf $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ is coherent and satisfies the following properties.

- (a) (Multiplier ideals): *Inverting p , it becomes the multiplier ideal: $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O}_{X[1/p]}, \Delta|_{X[1/p]}, \mathfrak{a}^t[1/p])$.*
- (b) (Smooth pullback): *If $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is smooth, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_Y, f^* \Delta, (\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_Y)^t) = f^* \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$.*
- (c) (Finite maps): *If $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a finite surjective map, then for $K_Y + \Delta_Y = f^*(K_X + \Delta)$ we have that $\text{Tr}_{Y/X} (\tau(\mathcal{O}_Y, \Delta_Y, (\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_Y)^t)) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$.*
- (d) (Restriction) *If H is a normal Cartier divisor on X , then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) \cdot \mathcal{O}_H \supseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_H, \Delta|_H, (\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_H)^t)$.*
- (e) (Skoda): *If $t \geq \dim(X)$, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \mathfrak{a} \cdot \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathfrak{a}^{t-1})$.*
- (f) (Summation): *$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, (\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b})^t) = \sum_{t_1+t_2=t} \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathfrak{a}^{t_1} \mathfrak{b}^{t_2})$, where $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$.*
- (g) (Subadditivity): *If X is nonsingular, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathfrak{a}^t) \cdot \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathfrak{b}^s)$.*
- (h) (Effective global generation): *Suppose A is a globally generated ample Cartier divisor and L is such that $L - K_X - \Delta$ is big and nef, then for all $n \geq \dim X_{p=0}$,*

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(L + nA)$$

is globally generated by $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta, \mathcal{O}_X(L + nA)) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(L + nA))$.

- (i) (Perturbation): *$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon D, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ for any Cartier divisor $D \geq 0$ and $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$.*
- (j) (Unification): *$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ agrees with and unifies previous mixed characteristic test ideals up to small perturbation [MS21, BMP⁺23, HLS22, ST21, Rob22, Mur23] (cf.*

[Bha20]). Hence, for $x \in X_{p=0}$ and if $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, then using notation of the references:

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{c}^t) \cdot R = \tau_B(R, \Delta|_R, (\mathfrak{c}R)^t)$$

for all sufficiently large perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebras B . Furthermore,

$$H^0(X, \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) \otimes \mathcal{L}^n) = \mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta + \epsilon G; \mathcal{L}^n)$$

for X projective, \mathcal{L} ample, $n \gg 0$, some (test element-like-)divisor $G \geq 0$, and every $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, where \mathbf{B}^0 is defined as in [BMP⁺23, TY23].

For variants and generalizations of these results in other contexts, see Theorem 6.13, Theorem 6.17, Proposition 7.10, Proposition 7.14, Theorem 8.9, Theorem 8.7, Corollary 8.14, Theorem 8.25. In positive characteristic for F -finite schemes, $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ agrees with the usual test ideal detecting strongly F -regular singularities [BST15]. In mixed characteristic, after localization and completion, it detects perfectoid BCM-regular singularities in the sense of [MS21, ST21, Rob22, Mur23] as implied by (Unification) above.

The unification property above is quite useful. Indeed, for some variants of test ideals we had subadditivity, and for others we had Skoda and effective global generation, and so by showing that our ideal agreed with previously defined ones, those properties formally work on our ideal as well. We believe that some of the above properties (for instance the summation formula) were not known for any mixed characteristic test ideal variant.

Remark 1.1 (Adding roundings). In our work, based on the theory of multiplier ideals [Laz04, Nad90, Nad89] cf. [EV92, Lip94], it is natural to consider

$$\bigcap_{\pi: Y \rightarrow X} \mathrm{Tr}_{W/X} \left(f_* \mathcal{O}_W(\lceil K_W - f^*(K_X + \Delta + \epsilon G) - tM \rceil) \right)$$

where the intersection runs over normal alterations $\pi : W \rightarrow X$ where $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_W = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$ is a line bundle. However, any such alteration $W \rightarrow X$ is dominated by one where $K_X + \Delta + \epsilon G$ and tM pull back to Cartier divisors. Since we are rounding up ($\lceil - \rceil$), it follows that one may restrict the intersection to such Y . We thus avoid roundings in this paper as the intersections are the same.

Throughout most of the article we work with $\tau(\omega_X)$ and variants for pairs and triples, as this formulation is more convenient for our purpose, see the discussion of strategy below, noting that if $\Delta = -K_X$ then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \tau(\omega_X)$. Note $\tau(\omega_X)$ is called the (*parameter*) *test module* in positive characteristic and the *Grauert-Riemenschneider sheaf* in characteristic 0.

1.4. Other applications. We discuss some additional applications.

Openness of splinter loci. Let R be a normal Noetherian domain. Suppose that $R_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is a splinter for $\mathfrak{q} \in X_{p=0}$, where $X = \mathrm{Spec} R$. Is $R[1/f]$ a splinter for some $f \notin \mathfrak{q}$? This is known to be true in characteristic $p > 0$ by [DT23]. In what follows we answer this question for \mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein p -almost splinters in mixed characteristic (see Section 7.3 for details).

Corollary (Theorem 7.27). *The p -almost splinter locus is open for normal \mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein domains of finite type over a complete DVR of mixed characteristic.*

We expect a similar statement for the splinter locus itself, but our methods, which need the p -perturbation, cannot handle this case yet.

Multiplier ideals via finite covers. Suppose (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a Gorenstein local domain of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$ essentially of finite type over a complete DVR V of mixed characteristic. Define $\tau_{\text{fin}}(R) = \bigcap_{\text{finite } R \subseteq S} \text{Tr}_{S/R}(\omega_{S/R})$ as in (1.0.1), where S runs over finite extensions of R contained in a fixed choice of R^+ . As a consequence of our main result, we obtain the following.

Corollary (Corollary 7.16). *With notation as above, $\tau_{\text{fin}}(R)[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(R[1/p])$. In particular, the multiplier ideal in characteristic zero can be computed from finite covers in mixed characteristic.*

Note that this Corollary implies that the infinite intersection defining $\tau_{\text{fin}}(R)$ cannot stabilize since the multiplier ideal is not equal to $R[1/p]$ for any normal but non-KLT $R[1/p]$.

Non-archimedean Monge-Ampère (MA) equations. The paper [FGK22] obtained results on solutions of non-archimedean MA equations in mixed characteristic assuming resolutions of singularities and subadditivity of $+$ -test ideals (see [FGK22, Theorem 1.2]). As far as we understand, our theory of $+$ -test ideals is now sufficient for their applications (see e.g. Theorem B (subadditivity) and Remark 8.36), and so their result is now contingent on resolutions of singularities only.

1.5. Idea of the proof. In what follows we explain the idea of the proof of Theorem A. Let X be a normal integral scheme of finite type over a complete DVR V of mixed characteristic. For simplicity, we shall work with the sheaf

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X) = \bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \text{Image} \left(f_* \omega_Y \xrightarrow{p^\epsilon} f_* \omega_Y \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{Y/X}} \omega_X \right)$$

with intersection taken over alterations. This sheaf, called a *test module* (or in characteristic zero the *Grauert-Riemenschneider sheaf* or *multiplier module*), agrees with $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\mathcal{O}_X) \otimes \omega_X$ when X is Gorenstein (cf. [GR70, Smi94, Smi95, Bli04]). We will show that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ is coherent (i.e. satisfies localization), as this is easier to explain than the existence of a single alteration which calculates it. Note, with some work however, a strong enough version of the former implies the latter for formal reasons (cf. Lemma 8.29).

The main difficulty in showing that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ is coherent is that infinite intersections of modules do not commute with localization in general; or, in other words, an infinite intersection of coherent sheaves may not be quasi-coherent. To circumvent this problem, we find an intrinsic definition of $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ that is visibly coherent using methods inspired by topology. Specifically, we shall read-off this Grauert-Riemenschneider sheaf from the intersection complex⁵ $\text{IC}_{X[1/p]} \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(X[1/p], \mathbf{Z}_p)$ which is a constructible complex of sheaves on the characteristic 0 variety $X[1/p]$. What allows for accessing the algebro-geometric object $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ in mixed characteristic using the topological object $\text{IC}_{X[1/p]}$ living in characteristic 0 is the p -adic Riemann–Hilbert functor from [BL], as we explain next.⁶

⁵The intersection complex originates from the theory of intersection cohomology introduced by Goresky and MacPherson in the topological setting and Deligne algebraically. Specifically, they generalized the usual singular cohomology $H^i(X, \mathbf{C})$ constructing intersection cohomology $I^p H^i(X, \mathbf{C}) := \mathbb{H}^{i-\dim(X), \text{IC}_X}$. This cohomology theory agrees with $H^i(X, \mathbf{C})$, when X is smooth, but is much better behaved when X is singular (for example, it always satisfies Poincaré duality if X is compact).

⁶It is perhaps initially surprising that one can detect mixed characteristic phenomena using characteristic 0 objects. However, note that it has been understood for a long time in p -adic Hodge theory that cohomology

Remark 1.2. The p -adic Riemann–Hilbert functor from [BL] can be regarded as an analog of a functor provided by Saito’s theory of mixed Hodge modules over \mathbf{C} . To make this analogy clear, in [Appendix A](#) below, we explain how to read off the multiplier ideal of a complex algebraic variety from the intersection complex with \mathbf{C} -coefficients using the framework of Hodge modules ([Theorem A.3](#)); this procedure, which is well-known to experts, is the complex geometric motivation leading to (1.2.1) below.

For simplicity of exposition, we work over $V = \mathbf{Z}_p$; let X/V be a flat projective scheme. The p -adic Riemann-Hilbert functor is easiest to work with over a perfectoid base, so we shall first solve our problem after base change to a perfectoid extension V_∞ of V , and then trace the solution down to V . For definiteness, let us take $V_\infty := (\mathbf{Z}_p[p^{1/p^\infty}])^{\wedge p}$, and set $X_\infty := X \otimes_V V_\infty$. In this setup, [BL] provides a functor:

$$\mathrm{RH} : D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(X_\infty[1/p], \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{acoh}}^b(X_\infty),$$

assigning to a complex of \mathbf{Z}_p -constructible sheaves on the characteristic zero fiber $X_\infty[1/p]$, a complex of (p -)almost coherent sheaves on X_∞ ; the latter are quasi-coherent sheaves on X_∞ that enjoy a strong finiteness property: they are coherent up to multiplication by p^ϵ for any $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. Note that almost coherence only makes sense because we adjoined all the roots of p in V_∞ . The functor RH enjoys many nice properties; for our purposes, let us note that $\mathrm{RH}(\mathbf{Z}_p)$ equals to the perfectoidification $\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty, \mathrm{perfd}}$ as in [BS22], and RH commutes with proper pushforward as well as p -completed direct limits.

With that being said, one can define the analog of $\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ in this context as:

$$(1.2.1) \quad \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}} := \mathrm{Image}(\psi : H^0 \mathrm{RH}(\mathrm{IC}_{X_\infty[1/p]}) \rightarrow \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}),$$

where the intersection complex is defined with \mathbf{Z}_p coefficients (see [Theorem A.3](#) in characteristic zero). Note that there are no infinite intersections involved here, and in fact this object is visibly almost coherent (as almost coherent sheaves form an Abelian category). To explain the relation to alterations, it is easier to work with the dual variant; in the dual form, the key result is the following.

Theorem C ([Proposition 5.11](#)). *Assume X_∞ is integral, and let $\pi : X_\infty^+ \rightarrow X_\infty$ be an absolute integral closure. Pick a closed point $x \in X_{p=0}$ and let \mathfrak{m} be the corresponding maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Image}(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty^+})) = \mathrm{Image}(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\mathrm{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p))),$$

up to p -almost mathematics, where $d = \dim(X)$ and $j : U \rightarrow X_\infty[1/p]$ is an inclusion of any regular dense open affine subscheme.

Before sketching the proof, let us explain the relevance of this theorem to describing $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}$ in terms of alterations. First, the map in the theorem is induced by the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty, \mathrm{perfd}} = \mathrm{RH}(\mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow \mathrm{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p),$$

where the second map is the standard map. One can then check that if we replace $j_* \mathbf{Z}_p$ by $\mathrm{IC}_{X_\infty[1/p]}[-\dim(X_\infty[1/p])]$ in the statement of the theorem, the right hand side does not

theories with \mathbf{F}_p or \mathbf{Z}_p coefficients on a characteristic zero variety carry information on the geometry of reductions mod p or integral models.

change⁷. Using duality, one then learns from the theorem that $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ almost equals

$$\bigcap_{f:Y \rightarrow X_\infty} \text{Image} \left(f_* \omega_{Y/V_\infty} \rightarrow \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty} \right),$$

where the intersection runs over all finitely presented finite covers of X_∞ dominated by X^+ ; this provides the desired relationship of $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ to finite covers, and the passage to alterations can be accomplished using a cohomology killing result from [Bha20].

Sketch of the proof. It is enough to construct a map

$$(1.2.2) \quad \text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}^+$$

and show that it is almost injective on the d -th local cohomology.

Since $\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}^+$ is perfectoid (up to p -completion), $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}^+ = \text{RH}(\pi_* \mathbf{Z}_p)$. Given that the fraction field of $\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}^+$ is algebraically closed, one can check that $\mathbf{Z}_p = j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p$ for an open inclusion $j' : U' \rightarrow X_\infty^+[1/p]$ based changed from $j : U \rightarrow X_\infty[1/p]$ under $X_\infty^+ \rightarrow X_\infty$ ([Bha20, Theorem 3.11], cf. Theorem 4.3). Thus $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}^+ = \text{RH}(\pi_* j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p)$, and so we can construct (1.2.2) by applying RH to the map

$$j_* \mathbf{Z}_p \rightarrow \pi_* j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p.$$

This map is injective (up to a shift) in the category of perverse sheaves.⁸ Now, a key property of the p -adic Riemann-Hilbert functor, called perverse left t -exactness, turns injections of perverse sheaves into almost injections of local cohomology modules under applying $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\text{mRH}}$:

$$H_{\text{m}}^d(\text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d])) \hookrightarrow H_{\text{m}}^d(\text{RH}(\pi_* j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d])) = H_{\text{m}}^d(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}^+),$$

which concludes this sketch of the proof. \square

The above discussion gives a satisfactory finitistic approach to the test module (1.2.1) for projective schemes over V_∞ . It remains to descend this solution down to V . The main difficulty here is that $\mathbf{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_p[p^{1/p^\infty}]$ is only integral and not finite; as such, there is no naturally defined trace map. Nonetheless, our key idea is to construct a map $\mathbb{T} : V_\infty \rightarrow V$ to play the role of a trace map in the descent from V_∞ down to $V = \mathbf{Z}_p$. Noting that $\mathbf{Z}_p[p^{1/p^\infty}]$ is a free \mathbf{Z}_p -module with basis p^α for $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p]$ and $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, one may simply take \mathbb{T} to be the (completion of) the unique map determined by setting

$$\mathbb{T}(p^\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha = 1 - 1/p^e \text{ for some } e \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and observe that the restriction $\mathbb{T}|_{V_e}$ is a trace map for each of the finite extensions $\mathbf{Z}_p \rightarrow V_e := \mathbf{Z}_p[p^{1/p^e}]$, i.e. a generator for $\text{Hom}_V(V_e, V)$ as a V_e -module. Similar constructions are possible for arbitrary DVRs in mixed characteristic, see Section 6.

Thus, we can prove the following – which also demonstrates independence of the choice of the auxiliary map \mathbb{T} above.

⁷This follows from the perverse left t -exactness of Bhatt-Lurie's Riemann-Hilbert functor and the fact that $\text{IC}_{X_\infty[1/p]}[-\dim(X_\infty[1/p])] = j_* \mathbf{Z}_p \rightarrow j_* \mathbf{Z}_p$ is injective in the category of perverse sheaves (up to a shift) by definition.

⁸We prove this using [Bha20, Theorem 3.11], see Theorem 4.3. However, this result should not come as a surprise. Intuitively, if we replace $\pi : X_\infty^+ \rightarrow X_\infty$ by a finite cover $\pi : Y_\infty \rightarrow X_\infty$ and make U smaller, we have that $U' \rightarrow U$ is étale, in which case $j_* \mathbf{Z}_p \rightarrow \pi_* j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p$ just splits.

Theorem D (see the Proof of [Theorem 6.5](#)). *With notation as above,*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X) = \mathbb{T}((p^{1/p^\infty}) \cdot \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}).$$

Note that, while the construction of $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ on X_∞ relies heavily on the use of almost mathematics, multiplying by (p^{1/p^∞}) yields an honest sheaf. In particular, $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ is coherent as it is a quasi-coherent subsheaf of the coherent sheaf ω_X . Thus, the shadow of almost mathematics in the non-Noetherian world of almost coherent sheaves on X_∞ persists as a small p -perturbation in the definition of $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ on the Noetherian scheme X .

Acknowledgements. Various subsets of the authors worked on this while visiting the American Institute of Mathematics at an AIM square in 2023, while visiting Luminy in 2023, and while visiting the various authors home institutions, the IAS, Michigan, Princeton, Utah, in 2022 and 2023. The authors thank Jacob Lurie and Shunsuke Takagi for valuable conversations. They also thank Walter Gubler for comments on a previous draft.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let R be a domain. We denote by R^+ the *absolute integral closure* of R (that is, the integral closure of R in an algebraic closure of $K(R)$). This object is unique up to isomorphism. Specifically, $R^+ = \bigcup_{R \subseteq S} S$, where the union is taken over all finite extensions $R \subseteq S$ contained in the fixed algebraic closure $\overline{K(R)}$ of $K(R)$.

2.1. Grothendieck and local duality. In this subsection, we briefly review Grothendieck and local duality. Recall that any complete Noetherian local ring (R, \mathfrak{m}) has a dualizing complex ω_R^\bullet , since such an R is a quotient of a regular ring ([\[Sta, Tag 032A\]](#), [\[Sta, Tag 0A7I\]](#), [\[Sta, Tag 0A7J\]](#)). We always choose ω_R^\bullet to be normalized in the sense of [\[Har66\]](#), that is $H^{-i}\omega_R^\bullet = 0$ for $i > \dim R$ and $H^{-\dim R}\omega_R^\bullet \neq 0$. If $\pi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is a finite type morphism, then we define

- (a) The normalized dualizing complex ω_X^\bullet to be $\pi^!\omega_R^\bullet$ and the dualizing sheaf ω_X to be $H^{-\dim X}(\omega_X^\bullet)$.
- (b) The relative dualizing complex $\omega_{X/R}^\bullet$ to be $\pi^!R$ and the relative dualizing sheaf $\omega_{X/R}$ to be $H^{-\dim X + \dim R}(\omega_{X/R}^\bullet)$.

Note that, if R is Gorenstein, then the relative dualizing complex is a dualizing complex (but it is not normalized unless R is a field) and we have $\omega_X \cong \omega_{X/R}$. In [Section 6](#), we will be frequently working in the scenario that $R = V$ is a complete DVR and X is finite type over R , see [Notation 6.2](#). In [Section 3](#) and [Section 5](#), we will also encounter the dualizing complexes for certain p -adic formal schemes, and we refer to [Notation 3.21](#) for more details in that setting.

Back in the case of a Noetherian complete local ring (R, \mathfrak{m}) , fix $E = E_R(R/\mathfrak{m})$ to be an injective hull of the residue field. This provides an exact Matlis duality functor $(-)^{\vee} := \text{Hom}_R(-, E)$ which induces an anti-equivalence of categories of Noetherian R -modules with Artinian R -modules [\[Sta, Tag 08Z9\]](#); by exactness, Matlis duality extends to the derived category as well, and we continue to denote it by $(-)^{\vee}$. In particular, since E is injective, we may harmlessly identify $\text{Hom}_R(-, E)$ and $\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_R(-, E)$. Since we work with normalized dualizing complexes, we have an isomorphism $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(\omega_R^\bullet) \simeq E$ [\[Sta, Tag 0A81\]](#). Using this isomorphism and the complete-torsion equivalence ([\[Sta, Tag 0A6X\]](#)) shows the following

compatibility of Grothendieck and Matlis duality: for any $K \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(R)$, the following natural maps give isomorphisms

$$\mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_R^\bullet) \simeq \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(K), \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(\omega_R^\bullet)) \simeq \text{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(K), E) = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(K)^\vee.$$

As R is complete and $\text{Hom}_R(-, E)$ induces an anti-equivalence of Noetherian and Artinian R -modules, this yields

$$(\mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_R^\bullet))^\vee \simeq \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(K)$$

for $K \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(R)$. For more details see for instance [Har67, Har66, BH93] and [Sta, Tag 0A81].

If X is a scheme and $x \in X$ is a (not necessarily closed) point, and $K \in D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)$, we will use $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x)$ to denote the local cohomology functor: if $R = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_x$, and $M = K_x$, then this is the same as $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(M)$.

Remark 2.1. We record the following form of duality over a non-Noetherian base in a relative setting. This follows from the Noetherian case and is not used directly in our paper (but it lurks behind some arguments). Let V_0 be a DVR with uniformizer ϖ and let R_0 be a finitely generated ϖ -torsion free V_0 -algebra. Let $\{V_j\}$ be a directed system of DVRs flat over V_0 and let $V := \widehat{\lim}_j V_j$ where the completion is ϖ -adic (note V is typically non-Noetherian as we will be taking roots of ϖ). Let $R_j = R_0 \otimes_{V_0} V_j$, $R = R_0 \otimes_{V_0} V$, and let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of R_0 . We consider the relative dualizing complex $\omega_{R/V}^\bullet := \omega_{R_0/V_0}^\bullet \otimes_{V_0} V$, for which we have that

$$E := E_{R/V} := \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(\omega_{R/V}^\bullet) = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(\omega_{R_0/V_0}^\bullet) \otimes_{V_0} V = H^1(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(\omega_{R/V}^\bullet))[-1] = (E_{R_0} \otimes_{V_0} V)[-1].$$

Note that $E[1]$ is in general not an injective module over R . On the other hand, for $K \in D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(R)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(K), E) &= \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(R), E) \\ &= \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(R), E)) \\ &= \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, (\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}\omega_{R/V}^\bullet)^{\wedge \mathfrak{m}}) \\ &= \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, (\omega_{R/V}^\bullet)^{\wedge \mathfrak{m}}) \\ &= \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_{R/V}^{\bullet \wedge \mathfrak{m}}) \end{aligned}$$

where $(-)^{\wedge \mathfrak{m}}$ denotes derived \mathfrak{m} -completion. Moreover, if $K = K_j \otimes_{R_j} R$ where $K_j \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(R_j)$, then we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_{R/V}^\bullet), E) &= \mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_{R/V}^\bullet), \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}\omega_{R/V}^\bullet) \\ &= \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}\mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_{R/V}^\bullet), \omega_{R/V}^\bullet) \\ &= \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(K) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows since $\mathbf{R} \text{Hom}_R(K, \omega_{R/V}^\bullet) \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(R)$, and the third equality follows from local duality over R_j .

2.2. Perfectoid rings and almost mathematics. We will freely and frequently use the language of perfectoid rings as in [BMS18, Section 3]. Fix a prime number p . A ring S is *perfectoid* if it is ϖ -adically complete for some element $\varpi \in S$ such that ϖ^p divides p , the Frobenius on S/pS is surjective, and the kernel of Fontaine's map $\theta: W(S^b) \rightarrow S$ is principal. One can always choose ϖ such that it admits a compatible system of p -power

roots $\{\varpi^{1/p^e}\}_{e=1}^\infty$ in S ([BMS18, Lemma 3.9]) and we will always assume this. In our context, it is often the case that either $p = 0$ in S or p is a nonzerodivisor in S . If S has characteristic p , then a perfectoid ring is the same as a perfect ring, see [BMS18, Example 3.15]. On the other hand, if S is p -torsion free, then S is perfectoid if and only if it is p -adically complete and the Frobenius map $S/\varpi \rightarrow S/\varpi^p$ is bijective, see [BMS18, Lemma 3.10]. If $\varpi = p^{1/p}$ (e.g., S is an algebra over R^+ for a Noetherian complete local domain R), then this definition is compatible with the definition given in [And20, 2.2] or [MS21, Definition 2.2]. Perfectoid rings are always reduced.

We record two main examples of perfectoid rings that will be relevant in this paper, see [BIM19, Example 3.8] for more details.

- Example 2.2.** (1) $(\mathbf{Z}_p[p^{1/p^\infty}])^{\wedge p}$ is a perfectoid valuation ring (see Proposition 6.1 below for a more general construction).
(2) Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian complete local domain of residue characteristic $p > 0$. Both the p -adic completion $(R^+)^{\wedge p}$ and the \mathfrak{m} -adic completion $(R^+)^{\wedge \mathfrak{m}}$ of the absolute integral closure of R are perfectoid.

We will also freely use some basic language of almost mathematics following [GR03]. Recall that an almost mathematics setup is a pair (V, \mathfrak{m}_V) , where \mathfrak{m}_V is an ideal such that $\mathfrak{m}_V^2 = \mathfrak{m}_V$, and for our purpose we always have \mathfrak{m}_V is flat. Let M be an almost V -module, we have $!$ -realization $M_! := M \otimes_V \mathfrak{m}_V$ and $*$ -realization $M_* := \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{m}_V, M)$. We will frequently fix a perfectoid ring S (e.g., a perfectoid valuation ring) and work with the almost mathematics setup $(S, (\varpi^{1/p^\infty}))$ in later sections.

2.3. +-stable sections (\mathbf{B}^0). One of the key problems in positive characteristic birational geometry is the fact that Kodaira vanishing fails in general. To address this problem, one introduces the space of Frobenius stable sections $S^0(X, M) \subseteq H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(M))$, where M is a Weil divisor, which behaves as if Kodaira vanishing was valid for them. Motivated by the work in [BST15], we introduced in [BMP⁺23] (cf. [TY23]) the space of +-stable sections in mixed characteristic.

Definition 2.3 ([BMP⁺23, Definition 4.2], [TY23]). Let

- X be a normal and integral scheme proper over a Noetherian complete local domain (R, \mathfrak{m}) such that R/\mathfrak{m} has characteristic $p > 0$,
- $\Delta \geq 0$ be a \mathbf{Q} -divisor on X ,
- M be a \mathbf{Z} -divisor on X with $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_X(M)$.

Fix an algebraic closure $\overline{K(X)}$ of $K(X)$. We define

$$\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{M}) := \bigcap_{\substack{f: Y \rightarrow X \\ \text{finite}}} \text{Image} \left(H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + [f^*(M - K_X - \Delta)])) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} H^0(X, \mathcal{M}) \right)$$

where the intersection is taken over all finite maps $f: Y \rightarrow X$ with Y integral and $K(Y)$ contained in the fixed algebraic closure $\overline{K(X)}$ of $K(X)$. If $\Delta = 0$, then we use the notation: $\mathbf{B}^0(X; \mathcal{M}) := \mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{M})$.

If $(-)^{\vee}$ denotes Matlis duality on R , then we also have that

$$(2.3.1) \quad \mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{M}) = \text{Image} \left(H^d \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\pi^{-1}\mathfrak{m}}(X, \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow H^d \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\pi^{-1}\mathfrak{m}}(X^+, \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X^+}(\rho^* \Delta)) \right)^{\vee}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{X^+}(\Delta)$ is the colimit of the $\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*\Delta)$ running over $f : Y \rightarrow X$ with $f^*\Delta$ integral.

When $M - (K_X + \Delta)$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, then we proved in [BMP⁺23, Corollary 4.13] that $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{M})$ is equal to

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{alt}}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{M}) := \bigcap_{\substack{f: Y \rightarrow X \\ \text{alteration}}} \text{Image} \left(H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + [f^*(M - K_X - \Delta)])) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} H^0(X, \mathcal{M}) \right)$$

where the intersection runs over all alterations $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from a normal integral schemes such that $K(Y)$ is contained in the fixed algebraic closure $\overline{K(X)}$ of $K(X)$.

Finally, in the case when X is a disjoint union of normal schemes of the same dimension, we define $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{M})$ to be the direct sum of \mathbf{B}^0 for each connected component of X .

2.4. Different notions of test ideals. A central goal of this paper is to unify various existing definitions of test ideals in mixed characteristic. In what follows we recall some of these definitions. Unless otherwise stated, we work in the following setting.

Setting 2.4. Assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a complete Noetherian local domain such that R/\mathfrak{m} is of characteristic $p > 0$. We fix an algebraic closure $\overline{K(R)}$ of the fraction field $K(R)$. Let Δ and D be \mathbf{Q} -divisors on $\text{Spec}(R)$ so that $K_R + \Delta$ and D are \mathbf{Q} -Cartier.

BCM-test ideals. We first recall that an R -algebra B is said to be a (*balanced*) *big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebra* if B is an R^+ -algebra, $B \neq \mathfrak{m}B$, and every system of parameters $x_1, \dots, x_d \in R$ is a regular sequence on B , *i.e.* x_i is a non-zero-divisor in $B/(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ for every i (*cf.* [BMP⁺23, Section 2.2]). We now recall the definition of BCM-test ideals introduced by the second and the fourth author in [MS21].

Definition 2.5. Working in [Setting 2.4](#), suppose first that D is effective. Fix a big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebra B and take $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and $f \in R$ such that $D = \frac{1}{m}\text{div}(f)$. Following [MS21, Definition 6.2], define

$$\tau_B(\omega_R, D) := \left(\text{Image}(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \xrightarrow{f^{1/m}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(B)) \right)^\vee \subseteq \omega_R,$$

where the map is induced by $R \hookrightarrow B \xrightarrow{f^{1/m}} B$, and $(-)^{\vee}$ denotes Matlis duality. When D is not-effective, we pick a Cartier divisor $E \geq 0$ such that $D + E \geq 0$, and define $\tau_B(\omega_R, D) := \tau_B(\omega_R, D + E) \otimes_R R(-E)$. Taking $D = K_R + \Delta$, we can then define:

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

When $\Delta \geq 0$, we have that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \xrightarrow{f^{1/m}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(B)$ naturally factors through $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\omega_R)$, and thus $\tau_B(R, \Delta) \subseteq R$ (see [MS21, Lemma 6.8 and Definition 6.9]).

Finally, with notation as above, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_R, D) &:= \bigcap_B \tau_B(\omega_R, D), \text{ and} \\ \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(R, \Delta) &:= \bigcap_B \tau_B(R, \Delta), \end{aligned}$$

where the intersection is taken over all perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebras B , whose existence is guaranteed by André's work [And20]. It is proved in [MS21, Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 6.10] that $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_R, D)$ (resp. $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(R, \Delta)$) is equal to $\tau_B(\omega_R, D)$ (resp. $\tau_B(R, \Delta)$) for all sufficiently large perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebras B .

+test ideals. Motivated by [BST15], one can define test ideals using finite maps.

Definition 2.6. Again working in Setting 2.4, suppose first that D is effective and write $mD = \text{div}(f)$ for some $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and $f \in R$. Define

$$\tau_+(\omega_R, D) := \bigcap_{\substack{R \subseteq S \\ \text{finite}}} \text{Image} \left(\omega_S([-f^*D]) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_R \right),$$

where the intersection is taken over all finite extensions $R \subseteq S$ contained in the fixed algebraic closure $\overline{K(R)}$ of $K(R)$. This agrees with $\mathbf{B}^0(\text{Spec } R, \Delta; \omega_R)$, and the definition is once more extended to non-effective D by setting $\tau_+(\omega_R, D) = \tau_+(\omega_R, D + E) \otimes_R R(-E)$ for a Cartier divisor $E \geq 0$ with $D + E \geq 0$. Taking $D = K_R + \Delta$, we can then define

$$\tau_+(R, \Delta) := \tau_+(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta);$$

when $\Delta \geq 0$, we have that $\tau_+(R, \Delta) \subseteq R$.

If $D \geq 0$, then $\tau_+(\omega_R, D)$ can also be calculated using local cohomology

$$\tau_+(\omega_R, D) = \left(\text{Image}(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \xrightarrow{f^{1/m}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R^+)) \right)^\vee;$$

see [BMP⁺23, Lemma 4.8(a)] for details. Moreover, the p -adic completion $B = (R^+)^{\wedge p}$ of R^+ is a perfectoid and (balanced) big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebra by [Bha20], and for arbitrary \mathbf{Q} -divisors D and Δ we have

$$\tau_+(\omega_R, D) = \tau_B(\omega_R, D) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_+(R, \Delta) = \tau_B(R, \Delta)$$

with $B = (R^+)^{\wedge p}$ by [BMP⁺23, Theorem 2.5].

Remark 2.7. Finally, $\tau_+(\omega_R, D)$ is also equal to:

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_R, D) := \begin{cases} \bigcap_{\substack{f: Y \rightarrow X \\ \text{alteration}}} \text{Image} \left(H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + [f^*(-D)])) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_R \right) & \text{if } D \geq 0; \\ \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_R, D + E)(-E) & \text{for a sufficiently effective } E \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

where the intersection runs over all alterations $f : Y \rightarrow X := \text{Spec}(R)$ from normal integral schemes such that $K(Y)$ is contained in the fixed algebraic closure $\overline{K(R)}$ of $K(R)$. Equivalently, $\tau_+(R, \Delta) = \tau_{\text{alt}}(R, \Delta) := \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta)$. The latter statement follows from [BMP⁺23, Corollary 4.13].

Note that when working with non-local rings, one usually cannot detect singularities using only finite maps (since this is not possible for characteristic zero rings), and so our ultimate definition of a test ideal will be based on $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R, \Delta)$.

Hacon-Lamarche-Schwede test ideals. The above definitions were only introduced in the setting of local rings. The first attempt to give a meaningful definition of a global version of mixed characteristic test ideals in the general setting has been undertaken in [HLS22] by Hacon, Lamarche, and the fourth author. We recall their construction in this subsection, starting with the case when X is projective, after which we consider the quasi-projective case.

Setting 2.8. Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a complete Noetherian local domain such that R/\mathfrak{m} is of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a projective normal integral scheme over $\text{Spec}(R)$. Let \mathcal{L} be a very ample line bundle on X , let Δ be a \mathbf{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, and let D be a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier \mathbf{Q} -divisor on X .

Briefly speaking, the idea of [HLS22] is that one expects any reasonably defined test ideal $\tau(X, \Delta)$ to satisfy: $H^0(X, \tau(X, \Delta) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(nL)) = \mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X(nL))$ for an ample line bundle $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_X(L)$ and $n \gg 0$. We leverage this equality to define $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(X, \Delta)$.

Definition 2.9 ([HLS22, Definition 4.3, 4.14, 4.15, Section 6.1]). We work in the situation of [Setting 2.8](#). First we assume that $\Gamma \geq 0$ is a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier \mathbf{Q} -divisor. In this case, let $\mathcal{N}_i \subseteq \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i$ be the subsheaf of $\omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i$ generated by $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Gamma; \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i) \subseteq H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i)$. Then we have that $\mathcal{N}_i \otimes \mathcal{L}^{-i} \subseteq \omega_X$ is a subsheaf and is stable when $i \gg 0$. One then defines

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma) := \mathcal{N}_i \otimes \mathcal{L}^{-i} \text{ for } i \gg 0.$$

It was shown in [HLS22] that $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ does not depend on the choice of \mathcal{L} . When Γ is a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier divisor $\lambda \operatorname{div}(f)$, we write $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, f^\lambda)$ for $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \lambda \operatorname{div}(f))$. When Γ is not necessarily effective, we pick a Cartier divisor $E \geq 0$ such that $\Gamma + E \geq 0$ and define $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ as $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma + E)(-E)$. Finally, we define $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) := \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta)$.

Now suppose additionally that $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$ is an ideal sheaf and $t \geq 0$ is a rational number. Let $f : Z \rightarrow X$ be a projective birational map from a normal scheme dominating the blowup of \mathfrak{c} (for example, the normalized blowup) and write $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(-M)$. Suppose \mathcal{L} on X is ample. For each $i \geq 0$, define \mathcal{N}_i to be the subsheaf of $\omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i$ globally generated by $\mathbf{B}^0(Z, tM + f^*\Gamma; \omega_Z \otimes f^*\mathcal{L}^i) \subseteq H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i)$.

As before, we define

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}^t) := \mathcal{N}_i \otimes \mathcal{L}^{-i}$$

for $i \gg 0$. As above, it is independent of the choice of \mathcal{L} .

In the case when X is only a quasi-projective normal integral scheme over $\operatorname{Spec}(R)$, one can define $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(X, \Delta)$ by considering a compactification of X and restricting the above definition to X . It was shown in [HLS22, Section 5] that this is independent of the compactification and we refer to [HLS22, Definition 5.10] for more details.

3. A REVIEW OF PERVERSE SHEAVES

We start by giving a brief introduction for non-experts to perverse t -structures for varieties over a field, both in the setting of (quasi) coherent sheaves, as well as constructible sheaves with coefficients $K = \mathbf{Z}/n$. In the rest of this section, we will discuss perverse t -structures:

- for quasi-coherent sheaves on formal schemes \mathcal{X} over a perfectoid ring \mathcal{O}_C .
- for constructible sheaves on the generic fibre \mathfrak{X}_C with \mathbf{Z}_p -coefficients.

3.1. Review: perverse coherent sheaves and perverse constructible sheaves. We give a quick exposition on perverse sheaves, for simplicity, we assume X is a finite type separated scheme over a field in this subsection, and we work in the bounded derived category D^b , see [Gab04] for more general results (for general Noetherian schemes and regarding unbounded derived category). We will work with the middle perverse t -structure.

Definition 3.1. For $K \in D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)$, we say that

- (1) $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(X)$ if and only if $K_x \in D^{\leq -\dim \overline{\{x\}}}$ for all $x \in X$,
- (2) $K \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(X)$ if and only if $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\geq -\dim \overline{\{x\}}}$ for all $x \in X$.

This defines a t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)$ so that

$$\text{Perv}_{\text{qcoh}}(X) := D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)^{\heartsuit} = {}^p D^{\leq 0}(X) \cap {}^p D^{\geq 0}(X)$$

is an Abelian category. Furthermore, the t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)$ above restricts to a t -structure on $D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$, which we call the perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$ and we have

$$\text{Perv}_{\text{coh}}(X) := D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)^{\heartsuit} = D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)^{\heartsuit} \cap D_{\text{coh}}^b(X).$$

Finally, for $K \in D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)$, we define its perverse cohomology

$${}^p H^i(K) := ({}^p \tau^{\leq 0})({}^p \tau^{\geq 0})(K[i]) \in \text{Perv}_{\text{qcoh}}(X).$$

First, we point out that condition (1) above can be checked by local cohomology (see also [Remark 3.18](#) and [Remark 3.19](#)):

Lemma 3.2. *With notation as above, we have $K \in {}^p D^{\leq 0}(X)$ if and only if for all $x \in X$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})}$.*

Proof. First of all, we note that $K \in {}^p D^{\leq 0}(X)$ if and only if $\dim \text{Supp } H^i(K) \leq -i$.⁹ It is clear that this condition implies that $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})}$ for all $x \in X$: this comes down to the standard fact that over a Noetherian local ring (R, \mathfrak{m}) , any R -module M with $\dim \text{Supp}(M) \leq j$ has $H^{>j} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(M) = 0$.

Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})}$ for all $x \in X$. If $\dim \text{Supp } H^i(K) > -i$ for some i , then we choose a minimum such i (which is at worst $-d$ since the condition is vacuous for $i < -d$) and choose a point $y \in \text{Supp } H^i(K)$ such that

$$\dim(\overline{\{y\}}) = \dim \text{Supp } H^i(K) > -i.$$

Since $\dim \text{Supp } H^j(K)_y \leq -j$, and by our choice of i and y we have that

$$\dim \text{Supp } H^j(K)_y \leq -j - \dim \overline{\{y\}} < i - j \text{ for all } j < i, \text{ and } \dim \text{Supp } H^i(K)_y = 0.$$

Using the standard fact again, it follows that $H^i \mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(K_y) \cong H^i(K)_y \neq 0$ which contradicts the assumption $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(K_y) \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{y\}})}$. \square

Remark 3.3. By [Lemma 3.2](#), a complex $K \in \text{Perv}_{\text{coh}}(X)$ if and only if

$$\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x)[- \dim \overline{\{x\}}] \in \text{Coh}(X)$$

for all $x \in X$. Therefore, up to shift, *perverse complexes* are closely related to *maximal Cohen-Macaulay complexes* at the stalks¹⁰, see [\[IMSW21\]](#). In fact, for a coherent sheaf K , $K[\dim(X)]$ is perverse if and only if K_x is a maximal Cohen-Macaulay $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ -module for all $x \in X$.

⁹Since we are not assuming $K \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$, $\text{Supp } H^i(K)$ might not be closed, and we define the dimension of this support as Krull dimension, i.e., $\dim \text{Supp } H^i(K) = \sup\{\dim(\overline{\{y\}})\}$ where $y \in \text{Supp } H^i(K)$.

¹⁰Note that, there is a non-triviality condition on maximal Cohen-Macaulay complexes which may not be satisfied for all perverse complexes. For example, if X is equidimensional, then ω_X^\bullet is always perverse under our definition, but $\omega_{X,x}^\bullet[- \dim \overline{\{x\}}]$ may not be maximal Cohen-Macaulay in the sense of [\[IMSW21\]](#) by the main example in [\[MSW21\]](#).

By Matlis and local duality, the perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$ is the Grothendieck-dual of the usual t -structure on $D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$. More precisely, define $\mathbf{D}: D_{\text{coh}}^b(X) \rightarrow D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$ via

$$\mathbf{D}(M) := \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}(M, \omega_X^\bullet).$$

We have the following characterization.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose X is equidimensional and $K \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$. Then*

- (a) $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(X)$ if and only if $\mathbf{D}(K) \in D^{\geq 0}$,
- (b) $K \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(X)$ if and only if $\mathbf{D}(K) \in D^{\leq 0}$.

In particular, $K \in \text{Perv}_{\text{coh}}(X)$ if and only if $\mathbf{D}(K)$ is concentrated in degree 0.

Proof. This follows from [Definition 3.1](#), [Lemma 3.2](#), and local duality (note that, equidimensionality of X is used to guarantee that $\omega_{X,x}^\bullet[-\dim \overline{\{x\}}]$ is a normalized dualizing complex for $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$). \square

Remark 3.5.

- (a) Since connectiveness of coconnectiveness of $\mathbf{D}(K)$ can be checked after localization at closed points, to show $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(X)$ (resp. $K \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(X)$), we only need to show $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\leq 0}$ (resp. $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\geq 0}$) for all closed points $x \in X$.
- (b) [Lemma 3.4](#) does not hold for quasi-coherent sheaves: in fact, $\mathbf{D}(M)$ may not be a quasi-coherent sheaf. This is a crucial source of difficulties in the next subsections.
- (c) It follows from [Lemma 3.4](#) that $H^{-i}(\mathbf{D}(M)) = \mathbf{D}({}^pH^i(M))$ when X is equidimensional.

Example 3.6. Let $i: Z \hookrightarrow X$ be a closed immersion and suppose X, Z are equidimensional. Then we have

- (a) $i_*\mathcal{O}_Z[\dim(Z)]$ is perverse if Z is Cohen-Macaulay;
- (b) $i_*\omega_Z^\bullet$ is perverse, in particular, ω_X^\bullet is perverse.

We next recall the definition of the perverse t -structure on the derived category of constructible \mathbf{Z}/n -sheaves for the étale topology, where $n \in \mathbf{N}$ is invertible in X . We note that everything also holds true for other coefficients such as \mathbf{Q} or \mathbf{C} , if X is defined over the complex numbers and we work in the analytic topology. We refer to [\[BBD82\]](#) for more details and proofs (therein the coefficients are set to be equal to $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_l$, but as stated on page 101, the result holds for coefficients \mathbf{Z}/n as well).

Definition 3.7. For $K \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$, we say that

- (1) $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$ if and only if $K_x \in D^{\leq -\dim \overline{\{x\}}}$ for all geometric points $i: \overline{x} \rightarrow X$,
- (2) $K \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$ if and only if $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\geq -\dim \overline{\{x\}}}$ for all geometric points $i: \overline{x} \rightarrow X$.

Here $K_x = i^*K$ and $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) = i^!K$. This defines a t -structure on $D_{\text{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$ so that

$$\text{Perv}_{\text{cons}}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n) := D_{\text{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)^\heartsuit = {}^pD^{\leq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n) \cap {}^pD^{\geq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$$

is an Abelian category. We define perverse cohomology in the constructible setting similarly, that is, for $K \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(X)$,

$${}^pH^i(K) := {}^p\tau_{\leq 0} {}^p\tau_{\geq 0}(K[i]) \in \text{Perv}_{\text{cons}}(X).$$

Remark 3.8. Note that, $i^!K \cong \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{sh}), K_x)$ and we will use the latter notation in the sequel (see [Theorem 3.28](#)). Alternatively, let $Z \subseteq X$ be the irreducible closed subscheme of X whose generic point is x , then $i^!K$ can be computed as $i^*\mathbf{R}\Gamma_Z(K)$, where $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_Z(-)$ is the sheaf version of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_Z(-)$.¹¹ To see this, note that $i : \bar{x} \rightarrow X$ can be factored in two ways: $\bar{x} \xrightarrow{a} Z \xrightarrow{b} X$ and $\bar{x} \xrightarrow{c} \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{sh}) \xrightarrow{d} X$. In general, for a closed immersion $f: Y \rightarrow X$, $f^!(K) = f^*\mathbf{R}\Gamma_Y(K)$ and for an (ind-)étale morphism g , $g^! = g^*$. Using these two facts, $i^! = a^!b^!$ is computed by $i^*\mathbf{R}\Gamma_Z(K)$, while $i^! = c^!d^!$ is also computed by $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{sh}), K_x)$.

Example 3.9.

- (a) If $i: Z \hookrightarrow X$ is a closed immersion, then $i_*\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(Z)] \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}$ (in particular, $\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(X)] \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}$). If X, Z are both smooth, then $i_*\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(Z)]$ is perverse (in particular, $\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(X)]$ is perverse when X is smooth).
- (b) In general, the *intersection complex* IC_X is always perverse when X is integral, where

$$\mathrm{IC}_X := \mathrm{Image}(j_!\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(X)] \rightarrow j_*\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(X)])$$

for an open embedding $j: U \hookrightarrow X$ of a smooth affine variety U . Here we are using Artin's vanishing which states that $j_!\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(X)]$ and $j_*\mathbf{Z}/n[\dim(X)]$ are perverse as U is smooth affine (see [Remark 3.11\(h\)](#) below).

Remark 3.10. We caution the readers that the analog of [Lemma 3.2](#) for perverse t -structure of constructible \mathbf{Z}/n -complexes is false. For example, if X is a smooth curve over \mathbf{C} and let $i: x \rightarrow X$ be a closed point. Then we know that $H^2(i^!\mathbf{Z}/n) \neq 0$ (see [[Mil13](#), Proposition 14.3 and Remark 14.4]). Now we have $\mathbf{Z}/n[1] \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}$ but $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathbf{Z}/n[1])_x) \notin D^{\leq 0}$.

We have Verdier duality $\mathbf{D}: D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}/n) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$, which is defined via

$$\mathbf{D}(M) = \mathbf{R}\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(M, \omega_{X,\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}),$$

where $\omega_{X,\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}} = f^!k$ for the projection $f: X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(k)$. In contrast to the setting of coherent sheaves, we have $\mathbf{D}({}^pD^{\leq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)) = {}^pD^{\geq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$ and $\mathbf{D}({}^pD^{\geq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)) = {}^pD^{\leq 0}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$. In particular, Verdier duality induces a self duality:

$$\mathbf{D}: \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{cons}}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n) \rightarrow \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{cons}}(X, \mathbf{Z}/n).$$

We next record some fundamental properties of constructible sheaves and the six-functor formalism in the following remark.

Remark 3.11. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of schemes of finite type over a field of characteristic zero. Let $M \in D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$ and $N \in D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}/n)$. We consider derived functors $f_*, f_!, f^*, f^!$ between $D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}/n)$ and $D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}/n)$. Then

- (a) $\mathbf{D}(f_*M) = f_!\mathbf{D}(M)$ and $\mathbf{D}(f^*N) = f^!\mathbf{D}(N)$ (this follows from Verdier duality, see for example [[Bha15](#), Corollary 17.16]).
- (b) If dimension of the fibers of f are at most d , then ([[BBD82](#), 4.2.4]):
 - $f_!$ and f^* are of cohomological amplitude at most d ,
 - $f^!$ and f_* are of cohomological amplitude at least $-d$.

In particular, if $d = 0$, then $f_!, f^*$ are t -right exact, while $f^!, f_*$ are t -left exact.
- (c) If f is affine, then $f_!$ is left t -exact [[BBD82](#), Theorem 4.1.2].
- (d) If f is proper, then $f_! = f_*$ ([[BBD82](#), p. 108]).

¹¹That is, étale locally, it is the the fiber of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X, -) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}\Gamma(X \setminus Z, -)$.

- (e) If f is finite, then $f_! = f_*$ is t -exact (by (b), (c), (d)).
- (f) If f is smooth of relative dimension d , then $f^! = f^*[2d](d)$ ([BBD82, p. 108]).
- (g) If f is an open immersion, then $f^! = f^*$ and these are t -exact (by (b), (f)).
- (h) If f is an affine open immersion, then f_* and $f_!$ are t -exact (by (a), (b), (c)).

Remark 3.12. In what follows, we will implicitly use the fact that given a perverse structure on a derived category, it is uniquely characterized by the coconnective (or equivalently, the connective) part. This follows from the exact triangle ${}^p\tau^{\leq 0}(K) \rightarrow K \rightarrow {}^p\tau^{\geq 1}(K) \xrightarrow{+1}$.

3.2. Review: integral perverse coherent sheaves. In this section, we give a quick exposition of the theory of perverse quasi-coherent sheaves on finitely presented flat p -adic formal schemes \mathcal{X} over a perfectoid valuation ring. Our main goal is to gain access to the notion of perverse almost coherent sheaves, which one could simply define as Grothendieck duals of usual almost coherent sheaves. It will however be quite convenient to define the perverse t -structure on the entirety of $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$ before passing to the subcategory of almost coherent objects. Consequently, we first construct (Theorem 3.14) the perverse t -structure without Grothendieck duality by relying on results of Gabber [Gab04] and then give the promised description via duality on almost coherent objects (Proposition 3.22). The presentation borrows from [BL], and omitted details can be found there.

Notation 3.13 (p -adic formal schemes and their quasi-coherent derived categories). Let \mathcal{O}_C be the ring of integers of a perfectoid extension C/\mathbf{Q}_p . Let $\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C$ be a finitely presented flat p -adic formal scheme of relative dimension d , i.e., \mathcal{X} is qcqs and for each affine open $\text{Spf}(R) \subset \mathcal{X}$, the ring R is p -complete and p -torsionfree with R/p finitely presented over \mathcal{O}_C/p and having Krull dimension d .

We shall write $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$ for the quasi-coherent derived category of \mathcal{X} ; recall that this is defined as the full subcategory of $D(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}})$ spanned by derived p -complete complexes K with the property that $K/p \in D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}_{p=0}) \subset D(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}/p)$. When $\mathcal{X} = \text{Spf}(R)$ is affine, the global sections functor yields an equivalence $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}) \simeq D_{p\text{-comp}}(R)$; in this case, the global sections functor $\mathbf{R}\Gamma(\mathcal{X}, -)$ is simply the forgetful functor $D_{p\text{-comp}}(R) \rightarrow D(\text{Ab})$ (which does not commute with colimits).

Since \mathcal{O}_c is a perfectoid valuation ring, $(\mathcal{O}_C, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_C})$ is an almost mathematics setup. We write $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})^a$ for almost variant of $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$, i.e., the quotient of the latter by its full subcategory of almost zero complexes. Let $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X}) \subset D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})^a$ be the full subcategory spanned by bounded almost coherent complexes. Note that objects in $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$ only live in the almost world; we shall occasionally use the $!$ -realization to view them as honest complexes. We refer to [Zav22] for an exposition of the theory of almost coherent sheaves.

Let us explain the shape of the perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$. The analog for $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}_{p^n=0})$ is classical and can be immediately deduced from general results in [Gab04]. To pass to the limit, the main idea is to use the complete-torsion equivalence to transport the perverse t -structure on p^∞ -torsion complexes (resulting, essentially, from the previous sentence) to one on p -complete complexes.

Theorem 3.14 (Perverse quasi-coherent complexes). *There is a perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$ characterized by either of the following conditions:*

- (a) $K \in {}^pD_{\text{qcoh}}^{\leq 0}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$.
- (b) $K \in {}^pD_{\text{qcoh}}^{\geq 0}(\mathcal{X})$ if any of the following equivalent conditions are satisfied:

- i. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x) \in D^{\geq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$.
- ii. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x/p) \in D^{\geq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})}$.

Here $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)$ is the local cohomology complex of K with respect to (p) computed in the big derived category $D(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}})$ of all $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules on \mathcal{X} , i.e., $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K) = (K[1/p]/K)[-1]$, where $K[1/p] = K \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}}^L \mathbf{Z}[1/p]$. Note that the inclusion $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}) \subset D(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}})$ does not preserve colimits, and in fact $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)$ typically does not lie in $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Remark 3.15 (Why use $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)$?). The main reason we prefer to write $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x$ in the statement of the theorem is that the functor $K \mapsto \mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x$ commutes with filtered colimits, unlike the functor $K \mapsto K_x$. In particular, the compatibility of the t -structure with filtered colimits ([Remark 3.16](#)) is obvious from the above definitions in terms of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)$, but less obvious otherwise.

Another advantage of using $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)$ is the interpretation of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x)$: to define $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M_x)$, one can work locally to assume x is a closed point of $\mathcal{X} = \text{Spf}(R)$ and M_x corresponds to a complex of R -modules, so $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M_x)$ is the local cohomology complex. Interpreted this way, in the statement of [Theorem 3.14](#), we could replace each occurrence of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x$ by K_x since applying $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x$ annihilates the cone of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x \rightarrow K_x$ as p acts invertibly on this cone (on a p -adic formal scheme \mathcal{X} , any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is already a point of characteristic p , i.e., p lies in the ideal sheaf of x). However, at least when $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a closed point, one can also define $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(-)$ as the fiber of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma(\mathcal{X}, -) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}\Gamma(\mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}, -)$. Under this definition, $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(M))$ and $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M)$ are usually *not* the same for $M \in D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$: the latter object, being derived p -complete as it is the fiber of two derived p -complete complexes, is exactly the derived p -completion of the former. In the sequel, what we need is $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(M))$ and this is another reason we use $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)$ – since then there are no ambiguities of these two interpretations of $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(-)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.14. We first explain the equivalence between the two conditions appearing in (2). The complex $M = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x)$ is a p^∞ -torsion complex with $M/p = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x/p)$, so the claim follows from a general fact: for a p^∞ -torsion complex M , we have $M \in D^{\geq 0}$ if and only if $M/p \in D^{\geq -1}$.

To construct the t -structure, assume first that $\mathcal{X} = \text{Spf}(R)$ is affine. We shall construct a perverse t -structure on $D(R)$ using [[Gab04](#)], and apply it to induce one on $D_{p\text{-comp}}(R)$ via the complete-torsion equivalence. To implement this strategy, we first recall some basic properties of $\text{Spec}(R)$.

- The scheme $\text{Spec}(R/p)$ is topologically Noetherian, i.e., the topological space $\text{Spec}(R/p)$ is Noetherian: in fact, $(R/p)_{\text{red}}$ is a finitely presented algebra over the residue field of \mathcal{O}_C .
- The scheme $\text{Spec}(R[1/p])$ is Noetherian of Krull dimension equal to $\dim(\text{Spec}(R/p))$: this is a standard fact in the basic theory of affinoid algebras [[BGR84](#)].
- The space $\text{Spec}(R)$ is topologically Noetherian: this follows from the previous two properties.
- For any p -torsionfree quotient $S = R/J$, the ring S is a topologically finitely presented \mathcal{O}_C -algebra (that is, it is finitely presented modulo p , see [[BL93](#), Proposition 1.1 (c)]), and hence $\text{Spec}(S)$ enjoys the same properties as the ones listed above.

Using these properties, we construct a perversity function. Specifically, define a function $p : \text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ by setting $-p(x) + 1$ to be the dimension of the closure of $\{x\}$ in the fibre

of $\mathrm{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_C)$ containing x . We claim that this is a strong perversity function in the sense of [Gab04, §1], i.e., for each integer n , the sets

$$\mathrm{Spec}(R)_{\geq n} = \{x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R) \mid p(x) \geq n\}$$

are ind-constructible and closed under specialization. In fact, it suffices to show just the latter: any set closed under specialization can be written as a union of closed sets (by taking closures of the points within the set), and any closed set is constructible by topological Noetherianity. The closedness under specialization is clear for specializations entirely contained in a single fibre of $\mathrm{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_C)$, so fix a specialization $x \rightsquigarrow y$ with $x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R[1/p]) \subset \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ and $y \in \mathrm{Spec}(R/p) \subset \mathrm{Spec}(R)$. The closure $\overline{\{x\}} \subset \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ has the form $\mathrm{Spec}(S)$ for a topologically finitely presented \mathcal{O}_C -flat quotient S of R by the properties recalled above; in particular, we have $\dim(\mathrm{Spec}(S[1/p])) = \dim(\mathrm{Spec}(S/p))$. As the closure of x in $\mathrm{Spec}(R[1/p])$ equals $\mathrm{Spec}(S[1/p])$ while the closure of y in $\mathrm{Spec}(R/p)$ is contained in $\mathrm{Spec}(S/p)$, we conclude that $-p(x) + 1 \geq -p(y) + 1$, as wanted.

Thanks to the previous paragraph and the results of [Gab04, Remark 6.1 (6)], we obtain a t -structure on $D(R)$ characterized as follows:

- $K \in {}^p D^{\leq 0}(R)$ if and only if for any $x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)$, we have $K_x \in D^{\leq p(x)}$.
- $K \in {}^p D^{\geq 0}(R)$ if and only if for any $x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\geq p(x)}$.

We remark that the definition in [Gab04, §1] also requires that $K \in D^+$ for $K \in {}^p D^{\geq 0}$; in our case, as the function p is bounded, this follows from the condition appearing above and [Gab04, Lemma 3.1].

The exact same conditions as above (with $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ replaced by $\mathrm{Spec}(R[1/p])$) also induce a perverse t -structure on $D(R[1/p])$ by similar reasoning, and the localization functor $D(R) \rightarrow D(R[1/p])$ is t -exact. It follows that the kernel $D_{p\text{-nilp}}(R) \subset D(R)$ of this localization also inherits a perverse t -structure. Note that for checking perverse (co)connectivity of $K \in D_{p\text{-tors}}(R)$, the conditions appearing above only need to be checked for $x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)_{p=0} \subset \mathrm{Spec}(R)$: the complex K_x vanishes if $x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R) - \mathrm{Spec}(R)_{p=0} = \mathrm{Spec}(R[1/p])$. Transporting this t -structure along the complete-torsion equivalence $D_{p\text{-tors}}(R) \simeq D_{p\text{-comp}}(R)$, then yields a perverse t -structure on $D_{p\text{-comp}}(R)$. Unwinding definitions, this t -structure is characterized as follows:

- $K \in {}^p D_{p\text{-comp}}^{\leq 0}(R)$ if and only if for any $x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)_{p=0}$, we have $(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K))_x \in D^{\leq p(x)}$.
- $K \in {}^p D_{p\text{-comp}}^{\geq 0}(R)$ if and only if for any $x \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)_{p=0}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x) \in D^{\geq p(x)}$.

As these are exactly the conditions appearing in [Theorem 3.14](#), we win in the affine case.

The case of a general \mathcal{X} can be proven by glueing together the statement for affine \mathcal{X} shown above; we omit the details. \square

Remark 3.16 (Compatibility with filtered colimits). The categories ${}^p D^{\leq 0}$ and ${}^p D^{\geq 0}$ appearing in [Theorem 3.14](#) contain and are stable under filtered colimits in $D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$. Consequently, the functor of taking perverse cohomology sheaves commutes with filtered colimits.

Remark 3.17 (Passage to the almost category). The t -structure on $D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$ constructed in [Theorem 3.14](#) induces one on the full subcategory of almost zero objects with the inclusion of the latter being t -exact. Consequently, one also obtains a perverse t -structure on the almost category $D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})^a$.

Remark 3.18 (Local cohomology is perverse t -exact). For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the functor $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow D(\text{Ab})$ given by $K \mapsto \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x)$ is t -exact for the perverse t -structure on the source and the $(-\dim(\overline{\{x\}}) + 1)$ -shift of the standard t -structure on the target. To check this, by the condition in (b)(i), it suffices to show t -right exactness, i.e., that $K \mapsto \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x)$ carries ${}^pD^{\leq 0}$ into $D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$.

Now the condition $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}$ implies that

$$(3.18.1) \quad \text{Supp}(H^i(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K))) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid H^i(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x) \neq 0\} \subset \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid \dim(\overline{\{x\}}) \leq 1 - i\}.$$

Set $M := H^i(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K))$ and consider $\text{Supp } M \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{p=0}$, we claim that

$$\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M_x) \in D^{\leq \dim(\text{Supp } M) - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}.$$

By filtering M by the approximations to it, this can be reduced to checking that: if $Z \subset \mathcal{X}_{p=0}$ is a closed subscheme with $\dim(Z) \leq j$, then $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathcal{O}_Z) \in D^{\leq j - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}$ for all points $x \in \mathcal{X}_{p=0}$. This is a well known fact, and so the claim follows.

In particular, by (3.18.1) we see that

$$\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(H^i(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K))_x) \in D^{\leq 1 - i - \dim(\overline{\{x\}})},$$

and so $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(H^i(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x)[-i]) \in D^{\leq 1 - \dim(\overline{\{x\}})}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x) \in D^{\leq 1 - \dim(\overline{\{x\}})}$, as required.

Remark 3.19. In fact, the converse of the Remark 3.18 is also true. More precisely, we have that

- (a) $K \in {}^pD_{\text{qcoh}}^{\leq 0}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x) \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$.
- (b) $K \in {}^pD_{\text{qcoh}}^{\geq 0}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x) \in D^{\geq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$.

In particular, the perverse quasi-coherent sheaves are simply those $K \in D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_x)$ is supported in degree $-\dim \overline{\{x\}} + 1$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The proof of the “if” direction of (a) (which is the only thing that remains to prove) is very similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2 (with $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)$ in place of K and with a shift of $-\dim \overline{\{x\}}$ by 1) and we leave the details to the interested readers.

Example 3.20 (The case of a point). Specializing to the case $\mathcal{X} = \text{Spf}(\mathcal{O}_C)$, we obtain a perverse t -structure on $D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathcal{O}_C)$. As $\text{Spf}(\mathcal{O}_C)$ has a single point, this t -structure is simply obtained by transporting a shift of the standard t -structure on $D_{p\text{-tors}}(\mathcal{O}_C)$ along the complete-torsion equivalence. One checks that it has the following intrinsic characterization: given $K \in D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathcal{O}_C)$, we have

- $K \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}$ exactly when $K \in D^{\geq 0}$ and $H^0(K)$ is p -torsionfree.
- $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}$ exactly when $K \in D^{\leq 1}$ and $H^1(K)$ is p^∞ -torsion.

In fact, since p^∞ -torsion p -complete objects have bounded p^∞ -torsion by the Banach open mapping theorem, the condition on $H^1(K)$ in the second item above can be replaced with “ $p^c \cdot H^1(K) = 0$ for some $c \geq 1$ ”.

We next recall the definition and some basic stability properties of perverse coherent sheaves on \mathcal{X} .

Notation 3.21 (Coherent dualizing sheaves). Write $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}^\bullet$ for the normalized dualizing complex of $\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C$. This means that $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}^\bullet \in D^{\geq -d}$ and the $-d$ -th cohomology is nonzero,

where d is the dimension of $\mathcal{X}_{p=0}$. Suppose $\mathcal{X}_{p=0}$ is equidimensional, then since $\mathcal{X}_{p=0}$ is finitely presented over \mathcal{O}_C/p , local rings of $\mathcal{X}_{p=0}$ at closed points are also of dimension d by the dimension formula. In particular, for any closed point $x \in \mathcal{X}_{p=0}$, the object $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\omega_{\dot{\mathcal{X}}/\mathcal{O}_C}/p)$ is concentrated in degree 0. More generally, for $x \in \mathcal{X}_{p=0}$ an arbitrary point, $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\omega_{\dot{\mathcal{X}}/\mathcal{O}_C}/p)_x)$ is concentrated in degree $-\dim \overline{\{x\}}$ and $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(\omega_{\dot{\mathcal{X}}/\mathcal{O}_C}_x))$ is concentrated in degree $-\dim \overline{\{x\}} + 1$. In particular, $\omega_{\dot{\mathcal{X}}/\mathcal{O}_C}$ is a \mathbf{p}^+ -perverse sheaf.

The formal scheme \mathcal{X} is coherent, so there is a standard t -structure on $D_{\text{coh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$. Write $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(-) = \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}}(-, \omega_{\dot{\mathcal{X}}/\mathcal{O}_C})$ for the resulting Grothendieck duality on $D_{\text{coh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$ and similarly write $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}_{p^n=0}}(-) = \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}/p^n}}(-, \omega_{\dot{\mathcal{X}}/\mathcal{O}_C}/p^n)$ for the resulting Grothendieck duality on $D_{\text{coh}}^b(\mathcal{X}_{p^n=0})$ (cf. [Sta, Tag 0A7T]). Thus, we have

$$(3.21.1) \quad \mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(-)/p^n \simeq \mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}_{p^n=0}}(-/p^n),$$

i.e., the formation of Grothendieck duals commutes with reduction modulo p^n (see [Sta, 0A6A(4)]). On the other hand, given $M \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(\mathcal{X}_{p^n=0})$, the objects $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ and $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}_{p^n=0}}(M)$ differ by a shift. The functor $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(-)$ induces an autoequivalence of $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$ that we shall also call Grothendieck duality.

Proposition 3.22 (Perverse almost coherent sheaves). *The perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})^a$ restricts to one on $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, the induced t -structure is the Grothendieck dual of the standard t -structure, i.e., we have*

- (a) $K \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}$ if and only if $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) \in D^{\leq 0}$ (or equivalently $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(K)/p \in D^{\leq 0}$).
- (b) $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}$ if and only if $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(K) \in D^{\geq 0}$.

Here we remind the readers that, since we are working in the almost category, $D^{\leq 0}$ (resp., $D^{\geq 0}$) should be interpreted in the almost category, i.e., those complexes that are almost concentrated in non-positive (resp., non-negative) cohomological degree.

Proof. The equivalence in the parenthetical in (a) is immediate from derived p -completeness. For the rest, note that as $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an auto-equivalence of $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$, the conditions described in the proposition clearly describe a t -structure on $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$. To prove the proposition, it then suffices to identify the coconnective parts. Since once this is done, the connective parts are also identified by the exact triangle ${}^p\tau^{\leq 0}(K) \rightarrow K \rightarrow {}^p\tau^{\geq 1}(K) \xrightarrow{+1}$ applied to both t -structures (see Remark 3.12). Specifically, we need to show that

$$\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(K)/p \stackrel{(3.21.1)}{=} \mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}_{p=0}}(K/p) \in D^{\leq 0}$$

if and only if $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x/p) \in D^{\geq -\dim \overline{\{x\}}}$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ (see Theorem 3.14(b)(ii)). But this is an almost coherent analog of the following standard result in commutative algebra applied to K/p : if R is a Noetherian ring admitting a dualizing complex ω_R^\bullet normalized to ensure $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(\omega_R^\bullet)$ is in degree 0 for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} , then $\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_R(-, \omega_R^\bullet)$ identifies $D_{\text{coh}}^{\leq 0, b}(R)$ with the full subcategory of $D_{\text{coh}}^b(R)$ spanned by complexes K with $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K_x) \in D^{\geq -d(x)}$ for all $x \in \text{Spec}(R)$, where $d(x)$ is the dimension function determined by ω_R^\bullet (i.e., $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\omega_R^\bullet)_x)$ is concentrated in degree $-d(x)$). We omit the details here, and refer to [BL] for a proof. \square

Example 3.23 (Perversity of the structure sheaf). We have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}[d] \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}$: indeed, this assertion is dual to saying that $\omega_{\dot{\mathcal{X}}/\mathcal{O}_C}^\bullet \in D^{\geq -d}$, which is a standard property of the normalized

dualizing complexes. Alternately, this follows from the definition in [Theorem 3.14](#) (1), the description $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(\mathcal{O}_X[d]) = \operatorname{colim}_n \mathcal{O}_X/p^n[d-1]$, and the fact that $d \geq \dim(\overline{\{x\}})$ for all $x \in X$.

The first argument also shows that $\mathcal{O}_X[d]$ is perverse coherent exactly when $\omega_{X/\mathcal{O}_C}^\bullet$ is concentrated in degree $-d$, i.e., X is Cohen-Macaulay over \mathcal{O}_C .

For future reference, we observe that since containment in ${}^p D^{\leq 0}$ can be checked locally on X , the containment $\mathcal{O}_X[d] \in {}^p D^{\leq 0}$ formally yields that $D_{\text{qcoh}}^{\leq -d}(X) \in {}^p D_{\text{qcoh}}^{\leq 0}(X)$.

Remark 3.24 (Finite pushforwards). If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a finite morphism of finitely presented flat p -adic formal \mathcal{O}_C -schemes, then $f_* : D_{\text{acoh}}^b(X) \rightarrow D_{\text{acoh}}^b(Y)$ commutes with Grothendieck duality on $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(-)$ and is t -exact for the usual t -structure. Consequently, f_* is also t -exact for the perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(-)$.

More generally, the same reasoning shows that for any proper map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between finitely presented flat p -adic formal \mathcal{O}_C -schemes, the pushforward $f_* : D_{\text{acoh}}^b(X) \rightarrow D_{\text{acoh}}^b(Y)$ is t -right exact for the perverse t -structure: indeed, the dual statement is that f_* is t -left exact for the standard t -structure, which is clear.

Remark 3.25 (Smooth pullback). If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a smooth morphism of relative dimension r between finitely presented flat p -adic formal \mathcal{O}_C -schemes, then $f^*(-)[r]$ is t -exact for the perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(-)$: indeed, conjugating by Grothendieck duality, this amounts checking that $f^!(-)[-r]$ is t -exact for the standard t -structure, which follows from the smoothness of f thanks to the formula $f^!(-) = f^*(-) \otimes \omega_{X/Y}[r]$.

3.3. Review: perverse \mathbf{Z}_p -sheaves. In this section, let C be any field where p is invertible. Let Y/C be a variety of dimension d . We recall some basic definitions and properties of perverse \mathbf{Z}_p -sheaves on Y . Most references on perverse sheaves focus on the case of \mathbf{Z}/p^n or \mathbf{Q}_p -coefficients (primarily as one obtains a self-dual theory in these cases). However, working with \mathbf{Z}_p -coefficients is important for our purposes: we cannot invert p as that would lose valuable torsion information, and we cannot work modulo a fixed power of p as we ultimately want to define invariants of singularities for p -torsionfree \mathbf{Z}_p -schemes. Moreover, it is quite convenient for our applications (especially those that rely on the absolute integral closure) to work with all complexes, instead of merely the constructible ones. Consequently, we explain ([Theorem 3.28](#)) how to construct the perverse t -structure on all \mathbf{Z}_p -complexes using results of Gabber [[Gab04](#)]. Using this t -structure, we also explain the shape for \mathbf{Z}_p -coefficients of certain standard results and constructions for \mathbf{Z}/p^n -coefficients, e.g., one has non-self dual IC-sheaves in this setting ([Definition 3.38](#)). We emphasize that we need to work with p -complete objects as opposed to merely constructible ones, since the sheaves $\pi_* \mathbf{Z}_p/p^n$ for $\pi : X^+ \rightarrow X$ (which are key for our applications) are *not* constructible.

Notation 3.26 (Étale derived categories). Write $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p) \subset D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z})$ for the full subcategory spanned by (derived) p -complete objects, i.e., those $K \in D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z})$ such that the natural map $K \rightarrow \mathbf{R}\lim_n K/p^n$ is an isomorphism. The natural maps give an equivalence $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p) = \lim D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ provided we work with stable ∞ -categories (see [[GL14](#), Proposition 4.3.9]). The “local cohomology at p functor” ($K \mapsto \operatorname{colim} K/p^n[-1]$) and the “derived p -completion functor” ($K \mapsto \mathbf{R}\lim K/p^n$) induce mutually inverse equivalences $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p) \simeq D_{p\text{-tors}}(Y, \mathbf{Z})$, where the latter denotes the full subcategory of $K \in D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z})$ with $K[1/p] = 0$. As explained above, this perspective is often helpful as objects in $D_{p\text{-tors}}(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ can be written as filtered colimits of constructible objects in $D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ for varying n . For example, $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(\mathbf{Z}_p) = \mathbf{Q}_p/\mathbf{Z}_p[-1]$.

Remark 3.27. We remind the readers that the “constant sheaf” $\mathbf{Z}_p \in D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ denotes $\mathbf{R}\lim_n \mathbf{Z}/p^n$ calculated on the étale site. In fact, to compute $\mathbf{R}\lim_n \mathbf{Z}/p^n$ in $D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z})$, one needs to take an injective resolution I_n^\bullet of \mathbf{Z}/p^n (in the category of étale sheaves) and then compute the homotopy fiber of $\prod_n I_n^\bullet \rightarrow \prod_n I_n^\bullet$ where the map is the identity minus the natural map induced by $I_n^\bullet \rightarrow I_{n-1}^\bullet$. Alternatively, one can view \mathbf{Z}/p^n as local systems on the pro-étale site of Y , then $\mathbf{R}\lim_n \mathbf{Z}/p^n = \lim_n \mathbf{Z}/p^n$ is a sheaf on $Y_{\text{proét}}$ which we also denoted by \mathbf{Z}_p by abusing notation, see [BS15, Proposition 3.1.10]. More precisely, for any $U \in Y_{\text{proét}}$, the value of \mathbf{Z}_p on U is the continuous functions from U to \mathbf{Z}_p where \mathbf{Z}_p is given the p -adic topology. We then have $\mathbf{R}\lim_n \mathbf{Z}/p^n \in D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z})$ is equal to $\mathbf{R}\nu_* \mathbf{Z}_p$ where $\nu : Y_{\text{proét}} \rightarrow Y_{\text{ét}}$, see [BS15, Example 5.2.2].

Write $D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p) \subset D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ for the usual constructible derived category, i.e., $K \in D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ such that $K/p \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p)$ is constructible in the usual sense. Write $\omega_Y^{\text{ét}} \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ for the Verdier dualizing complex of Y , normalized to ensure that for any closed point $y \in Y$, the object $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(\omega_Y^{\text{ét}}/p)$ is concentrated in degree 0¹²; write $\mathbf{D}_Y^{\text{ét}}(-) = \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}_Y(-, \omega_Y^{\text{ét}})$ for the resulting Verdier duality on $D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$.

We shall use the standard middle perverse t -structure $({}^p D^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n), {}^p D^{\geq 0}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n))$ on $D(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ with heart $\text{Perv}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$. Note that this t -structure restricts to a self-dual one on $D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ with heart given by the category $\text{Perv}_{\text{cons}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ of perverse constructible sheaves.

The reduction mod p^n functor $D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z}/p^{n+1}) \rightarrow D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ is not t -exact for the middle perverse t -structure, so it does not (at least in an obvious way) induce a t -structure on the limit $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$. However, its right adjoint (aka the restriction of scalars functor) $D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z}/p^n) \rightarrow D(Y_{\text{ét}}, \mathbf{Z}/p^{n+1})$ is t -exact for the middle perverse t -structures. Consequently, by passage to the limit, one can define perverse truncation functors on $D_{p\text{-tors}}(Y, \mathbf{Z})$, and then also on $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ by transport of structure along the complete-torsion equivalence. This analysis is formalized next:

Theorem 3.28 (Perverse \mathbf{Z}_p -complexes). *There is a \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure on $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ characterized by either of the following conditions:*

- (a) $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+} D^{\leq 0}$ if and only if $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_y := \mathbf{R}\Gamma(\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{Y, \bar{y}}^{\text{sh}}), \mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)) \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{y\}})+1}$ for every geometric point $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ supported at $y \in Y$.
- (b) $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+} D^{\geq 0}$ if and only if any of the following equivalent conditions are satisfied:
 - i. $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_y) := \mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{Y, \bar{y}}^{\text{sh}}), \mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_y) \in D^{\geq -\dim(\overline{\{y\}})+1}$ for all geometric points $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ supported at $y \in Y$.
 - ii. $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(K_y/p) := \mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{Y, \bar{y}}^{\text{sh}}), K_y/p) \in D^{\geq -\dim(\overline{\{y\}})}$ for all geometric points $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ supported at $y \in Y$.
 - iii. $K/p \in {}^p D^{\geq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$.

Proof. First, we explain the equivalence between the conditions appearing in (b). The equivalence (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) is definitional. For (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii), observe that the complex $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_y)$ is p^∞ -torsion with $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K)_y)/p = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(K_y/p)$; the equivalence then follows by the general statement that for a p^∞ -torsion complex M , we have $M \in D^{\geq 0}$ if and only if $M/p \in D^{\geq -1}$.

¹²Unlike the coherent story, as $\omega_Y^{\text{ét}}$ is p -complete, this also means that $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(\omega_Y^{\text{ét}})$ is concentrated in degree 0.

We now construct the t -structure. Consider the function $q : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ given by $q(y) = -\dim(\overline{\{y\}}) + 1$. The function q is a finite bounded strong perversity function in the sense of [Gab04, §1]. Consequently, by [Gab04, §6], there is a t -structure \mathfrak{q} on either $D(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ or $D(Y, \mathbf{Z}[1/p])$ characterized as follows:

- $M \in {}^{\mathfrak{q}}D^{\leq 0}$ if and only if $M_{\bar{y}} \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{y\}})+1}$ for every geometric point $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ supported at $y \in Y$.
- $M \in {}^{\mathfrak{q}}D^{\geq 0}$ if and only if $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_y(M_y) \in D^{\geq -\dim(\overline{\{y\}})+1}$ for every geometric point $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ supported at $y \in Y$.

As the formation of both $*$ and $!$ stalks for objects in $D(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ commutes with filtered colimits, the localization functor $D(Y, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow D(Y, \mathbf{Z}[1/p])$ is clearly t -exact, so its kernel $D_{p\text{-tors}}(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ also inherits a t -structure \mathfrak{q} characterized as above. Transporting this t -structure along the complete-torsion equivalence $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p) \simeq D_{p\text{-tors}}(Y, \mathbf{Z})$ then yields the desired t -structure. \square

Example 3.29 (The case of a point). Assume $Y = \text{Spec}(C)$, so $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ identifies with the p -complete objects $D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathbf{Z}_p)$ in the derived category of \mathbf{Z}_p -modules. As Y has a single point, the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure on $D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathbf{Z}_p)$ is obtained by transporting the standard t -structure along the complete-torsion equivalence. In particular, it can be described as follows:

- $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}$ exactly when $K \in D^{\leq 1}$ and $H^1(K)$ is p^∞ -torsion.
- $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\geq 0}$ exactly when $K \in D^{\geq 0}$ with $H^0(K)$ being p -torsionfree.

Remark 3.30 (Compatibility with filtered colimits). The categories ${}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}$ and ${}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\geq 0}$ appearing in [Theorem 3.28](#) are stable under filtered colimits in $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$. Consequently, the functor of taking \mathfrak{p}^+ -cohomology sheaves commutes with filtered colimits.

Proposition 3.31 (Perverse constructible \mathbf{Z}_p -sheaves). *The \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure on $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ restricts to a \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ characterized by either of the following conditions:*

- (a) $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\geq 0}$ if and only if $K/p \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$ (or equivalently $\mathbf{D}_Y^{\text{ét}}(K)/p \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$).
- (b) $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}$ if and only if $K/p^n \in {}^pD^{\leq 1}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ for all (or equivalently any) $n \geq 1$ and such that ${}^pH^1(K/p^n)$ is annihilated by p^c for some fixed c independent of n .

In particular, given $K \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$, if $K/p \in \text{Perv}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$, then $K \in \text{Perv}^+(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$.

Remark 3.32. Suppose that $K \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ is such that $K/p \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$. Then $K/p^n \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ for every $n \geq 1$. This is immediate from the exact triangles:

$$K/p \rightarrow K/p^n \rightarrow K/p^{n-1} \xrightarrow{+1}$$

and the long exact sequence of perverse cohomology as the restriction of scalars functor $D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^{n-1}) \rightarrow D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ is t -exact for the middle perverse t -structure. The same argument shows that if $K/p \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$, then $K/p^n \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ for every $n \geq 1$. In particular, if $K/p \in \text{Perv}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$, then $K/p^n \in \text{Perv}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$.

In the proofs in this section we shall use that applying natural functors such as $f^!$, f^* , $f_!$, f_* to objects in $D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathbf{Z}_p)$ commute with derived restriction mod p , because this is simply tensoring by $\mathbf{Z}_p \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{Z}_p$.

Proof of Proposition 3.31. The existence of a t -structure characterized by (a) or (b) is already [BBD82]; see also [BH22, §4.2] for a relatively recent exposition. To identify this t -structure with the one induced from Theorem 3.28, it suffices to note that the coconnective parts are the same (see Remark 3.12), that is (a) holds, which is clear by (iii)(b) of Theorem 3.28. The last sentence is immediate from (a), (b), and Remark 3.32. \square

Warning 3.33 (Non-self duality). Unlike its mod p^n counterpart, the perverse t -structure from Proposition 3.31 is not self-dual. In fact, applying $\mathbf{D}_Y^{\text{ét}}$ to the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure gives the so-called \mathfrak{p} -perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$, characterized by the following: $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\leq 0}$ exactly when $K/p \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$.

Despite the above warning, many of the basic results on perverse sheaves with \mathbf{Z}/p^n -coefficients extend to \mathbf{Z}_p -coefficients.

Remark 3.34 (Acyclicity of finite pushforwards). If $f : Y' \rightarrow Y$ is a finite morphism, then $f_* : D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y', \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ is t -exact for the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure.

To prove this, we will show that if $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}(Y', \mathbf{Z}_p)$, then $f_*K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$. The case of ${}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\geq 0}(Y', \mathbf{Z}_p)$ is analogous but simpler. By the above assumption and Proposition 3.31 we have that $K/p^n \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\leq 1}(Y', \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ and ${}^{\mathfrak{p}}H^1(K/p^n)$ is annihilated by p^c for some fixed c independent of n . Since f_* is t -exact for the middle perverse t -structure (see Remark 3.11), we also have that $f_*K/p^n = f_*(K/p^n) \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\leq 1}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ and ${}^{\mathfrak{p}}H^1(f_*(K/p^n)) = f_*{}^{\mathfrak{p}}H^1(K/p^n)$ is annihilated by the same p^c . Thus, $f_*K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ by Proposition 3.31 again.

Remark 3.35 (Artin vanishing with \mathbf{Z}_p -coefficients). If $j : U \rightarrow W$ is an affine étale morphism, then the functors $j_!, j_* : D_{\text{cons}}^b(U, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\text{cons}}^b(W, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ are t -exact for the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure.

To prove this, we first note that by the Artin vanishing for \mathbf{Z}/p^n coefficient, we know that j_* and $j_! : D_{\text{cons}}^b(U, \mathbf{Z}/p^n) \rightarrow D_{\text{cons}}^b(W, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ are both t -exact for the middle perverse t -structure (Remark 3.11). Suppose $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\geq 0}$, then $K/p \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\geq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$. Thus $(j_*K)/p = j_*(K/p) \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\geq 0}(Y, \mathbf{F}_p)$, and so $j_*K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\geq 0}$ (by Proposition 3.31). If $K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}$, then $K/p^n \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\leq 1}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ and ${}^{\mathfrak{p}}H^1(K/p^n)$ is annihilated by p^c for some c independent of n . It follows that $(j_*K)/p^n = j_*(K/p^n) \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\leq 1}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$ and that ${}^{\mathfrak{p}}H^1((j_*K)/p^n) = {}^{\mathfrak{p}}H^1(j_*(K/p^n)) = j_*{}^{\mathfrak{p}}H^1(K/p^n)$ is annihilated by p^c . Therefore $j_*K \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}$ (again, by Proposition 3.31). This proves the t -exactness of j_* for the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure (the same argument shows that j_* is also t -exact for the \mathfrak{p} -perverse t -structure). Now for $j_!$, simply notice that $j_! = \mathbf{D}_W^{\text{ét}} j_* \mathbf{D}_U^{\text{ét}}$ and so the t -exactness of $j_!$ for the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse (resp. \mathfrak{p} -perverse t -structure) follows from the t -exactness of j_* for the \mathfrak{p} -perverse (resp. \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure).

Example 3.36 (The constant sheaf is perverse). If Y is smooth, then $\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse by the last sentence of Proposition 3.31. Note that $\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is also self-dual (ignoring Tate twists), so $\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is also \mathfrak{p} -perverse in the sense of Warning 3.33. Without smoothness assumptions on Y , we always have $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+}D^{\leq 0}$: this follows as $\mathbf{Z}/p^n[d] \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}}D^{\leq 0}(Y, \mathbf{Z}/p^n)$.

To define IC-sheaves, we need the following observation.

Lemma 3.37. *Suppose Y is smooth of dimension d . For any closed subset $Z \subset Y$ of dimension $\leq d - 1$, the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaf $\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ (Example 3.36) has no non-trivial subobject or quotient object supported on Z .*

Proof. Write $i : Z \rightarrow Y$ for the defining closed immersion. To rule out subobjects supported on Z , it suffices to show that $i^! \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+} D^{\geq 1}$ since $i^!$ is left t -exact (Remark 3.11). Using Proposition 3.31 (1), this amounts to checking that $\mathbf{D}_Z^{\acute{e}t}(i^! \mathbf{Z}_p[d])/p \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}} D^{\leq -1}$. But using the self-duality of $\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ resulting from the smoothness of Y , we have

$$\mathbf{D}_Z^{\acute{e}t}(i^! \mathbf{Z}_p[d])/p = i^* \mathbf{D}_Y^{\acute{e}t}(\mathbf{Z}_p[d])/p = i^* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]/p = \mathbf{F}_p[d],$$

so the claim follows as $\dim(Z) < d$.

Similarly, to rule out quotient objects supported on Z , we must show that $i^* \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \in {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+} D^{\leq -1}$ since i^* is right t -exact; this is immediate from Proposition 3.31 (b) and does not use the smoothness of Y . \square

Definition 3.38 (The IC-sheaf with integral coefficients). If $j : U \subset Y$ is a dense affine open immersion with U_{red} smooth, then we define the \mathfrak{p}^+ -intersection cohomology complex as

$$\text{IC}_{Y, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+ = \text{Image}(j_! \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]) \in D_{\text{cons}}^b(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p)^\heartsuit,$$

where we implicitly use Remark 3.35 to make sense of the above expression. One checks that this object is canonically independent of U by Lemma 3.37.

As the \mathfrak{p} and the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structures are different, the IC-sheaf defined above need not be self-dual in general. Specifically, applying duality to $j_! \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ preserves the map, but the images are taken in a different perverse structure, and so they need not be equal.

Example 3.39. If Y is smooth, then $\text{IC}_{Y, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+ = \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$. Indeed, by Lemma 3.37, we have that $\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ has no non-trivial subobject supported on $Y - U$, and so the natural map $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is injective in the category of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves. In particular, the factorization

$$j_! \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$$

yields an injective map $\text{IC}_{Y, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ which is an isomorphism on U . Since $\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ has no non-trivial quotient objects supported on $Y - U$, this map $\text{IC}_{Y, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is in fact an isomorphism.

We shall repeatedly use the canonical map relating the shifted constant sheaf with the IC-sheaf.

Proposition 3.40 (The fundamental class in intersection cohomology). *There is a unique morphism*

$$\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow \text{IC}_{Y, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+$$

on Y characterized by the requirement that its formation commutes with passing to open subsets and that it equals the identity over $(Y_{\text{red}})_{\text{sm}}$. Moreover, in the factorization

$$\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+} \tau^{\geq 0} \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \simeq {}^{\mathfrak{p}^+} H^0(\mathbf{Z}_p[d]) \rightarrow \text{IC}_{Y, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+$$

induced by the last sentence of Example 3.36, the second map is a surjection of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves.

Proof. To construct this map, we may assume Y is reduced. Choose $j : U \hookrightarrow Y$ a sufficiently small dense affine open with U smooth. Then we have a natural map $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$. We first show that this map naturally factors as $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow \text{IC}_{Y, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+ \rightarrow j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$; this also immediately

shows the uniqueness. To see this note that the quotient $Q = j_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]/\mathrm{IC}_{Y,\mathbf{Z}_p}^+$ is a \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaf on Y supported on $Z = Y - U$, so the map $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow Q$ factors canonically as

$$\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \xrightarrow{a} i_*i^*\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \xrightarrow{b} Q.$$

But as we have seen in the second half of [Lemma 3.37](#) that $i_*i^*\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \in \mathfrak{p}^+D^{\leq -1}$ (here we used the fact that i_* is t -exact, see [Remark 3.11](#)). Thus the map b is 0 and so we have the factorization as wanted.

To see surjectivity, following the above construction, it suffices to show that the composition $j_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow \mathrm{IC}_{Y,\mathbf{Z}_p}^+$ is the natural (surjective) map appearing in the definition of $\mathrm{IC}_{Y,\mathbf{Z}_p}^+$ as an image. By adjunction, it suffices to check the claim after applying j^* , where it is clear. \square

4. A SUMMARY OF THE RIEMANN-HILBERT FUNCTOR AND RELATED RESULTS

In this section, we recall some results that will appear in [\[BL\]](#) and will be used below¹³.

Notation 4.1. Fix a perfectoid extension C/\mathbf{Q}_p . We adopt the following convention: fraktur fonts refer to schemes over \mathcal{O}_C , while the corresponding calligraphic and roman fonts refer to the p -completion over \mathcal{O}_C . Thus, if \mathfrak{X} is a \mathcal{O}_C -scheme, then \mathfrak{X} is its p -adic formal completion (and hence a p -adic formal \mathcal{O}_C -scheme). We will write \mathfrak{X}_C to denote its generic fibre.

Theorem 4.2 (The Riemann-Hilbert functor). *Let \mathfrak{X} be a finitely presented flat \mathcal{O}_C -scheme. There is a naturally defined exact coproduct preserving lax symmetric monoidal functor*

$$\mathrm{RH} : D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathfrak{X})^a$$

with the following features:

(a) *Almost coherence: For constructible $F \in D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{Z}_p)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{RH}(F) \in D_{\mathrm{acoh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}) \subset D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathfrak{X})^a.$$

If $\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C$ is proper, then formal GAGA gives $D_{\mathrm{acoh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}) \simeq D_{\mathrm{acoh}}^b(\mathfrak{X})$, so we can then regard the p -localization of $\mathrm{RH}(-)$ as an exact functor

$$\mathrm{RH} : D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Q}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{coh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}_C).$$

(b) *The value on the constant sheaf: There is a natural isomorphism.*

$$\mathrm{RH}(\mathbf{Z}_p) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X},\mathrm{perfd}} \in D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathfrak{X})^a.$$

Moreover, if \mathfrak{X} is proper with \mathfrak{X}_C smooth and $j : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C$ is an open immersion whose complement D is an SNC divisor (possibly empty), then we have a (non-canonical) decomposition

$$\mathrm{RH}(j_*\mathbf{Q}_p) \simeq \bigoplus_i \Omega_{(\mathfrak{X}_C, D)/C}^i(-i)[-i] \in D_{\mathrm{coh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}_C),$$

where $\Omega_{(\mathfrak{X}_C, D)/C}^i$ is the sheaf of i -forms with logarithmic poles along D . Such decompositions can be chosen compatibly for any finite diagram of such pairs $(\mathfrak{X}, j : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C)$.

¹³While the natural geometric context for [\[BL\]](#) is that of p -adic formal schemes and their rigid-analytic generic fibres, in the interest of keeping the exposition more accessible, we have tried to formulate statements entirely in the language of schemes; this leads to certain properness assumptions in [Theorem 4.2](#).

Moreover, if \mathfrak{X} and j are defined over a discretely valued subfield $K \subset C$, there is a unique such decomposition compatible with Galois actions; it is functorial in the descent to K .

- (c) *Pullback compatibility:* Via the first isomorphism in (b), we obtain an induced co-product preserving lax symmetric monoidal exact functor

$$\mathrm{RH} : D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{qc}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}, \mathrm{perfd}})^a.$$

This functor is symmetric monoidal and commutes with arbitrary pullbacks.

- (d) *Proper pushforward compatibility:* If $f : \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ is a proper map of finitely presented flat \mathcal{O}_C -schemes with generic fibre f_C , then there is a natural isomorphism $\mathrm{RH} \circ \mathbf{R}f_{C,*} \simeq \mathbf{R}f_* \circ \mathrm{RH}$ of functors $D_{p\text{-comp}}(Y, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{qc}}(\mathcal{X})^a$.
- (e) *Duality:* The functor $\mathrm{RH} : D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$ intertwines Verdier duality on the source with Grothendieck duality on the target.
- (f) *Perverse t -structures:* the functor $\mathrm{RH} : D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})^a$ is:
- t -right exact for the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure on the source and the standard t -structure on the target.
 - t -left exact for the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structures on the source and the perverse t -structure on the target.

In applications of [Theorem 4.2](#), it is convenient to have a large supply of perverse sheaves. In practice, these are provided by classical techniques in perverse sheaf theory (e.g., Artin vanishing or the decomposition theorem) as well as the last assertion of the following result.

Theorem 4.3 (Absolute integral closures, [[Bha20](#), Theorem 3.11]). *Let X be an integral scheme. If $\pi : X^+ \rightarrow X$ is an absolute integral closure, then the constant sheaf \mathbf{F}_p and \mathbf{Z}_p on X^+ are $*$ -extended from the generic point (and hence from any non-empty open subset). If X is a d -dimensional variety over a field of characteristic $\neq p$, then $\pi_*\mathbf{F}_p[d]$ is ind-perverse and $\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse.*

Proof. The first conclusion for \mathbf{F}_p follows from [[Bha20](#), Proposition 3.10], which implies the conclusion for \mathbf{Z}_p : to prove $\eta_*\mathbf{Z}_p \cong \mathbf{Z}_p$ in $D_{p\text{-comp}}(X^+, \mathbf{Z}_p)$ where $\eta : U \rightarrow X^+$, it is enough to check this modulo p by derived Nakayama. The second conclusion for $\pi_*\mathbf{F}_p[d]$ is contained in [[Bha20](#), Theorem 3.11] (we recalled the argument in [Remark 4.4](#) below), and for $\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$, note that our definition of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse \mathbf{Z}_p -complexes is stable under colimit, the result then follows from the \mathbf{F}_p -coefficient case via [Proposition 3.31](#). Alternatively, one can also deduce it from the first conclusion and Artin vanishing with \mathbf{Z}_p -coefficient (see [Remark 3.35](#)). \square

Remark 4.4. For our applications in later sections, we often deal with the situation that \mathcal{O}_C is perfectoid and is the p -adic completion of a Henselian valuation ring \mathcal{O}_C^{nc} , and we have an integral scheme \mathfrak{X} over \mathcal{O}_C that is based changed from an integral scheme over \mathcal{O}_C^{nc} , i.e., $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}^{nc} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C$. We can apply [Theorem 4.3](#) to $X = \mathfrak{X}[1/p](= \mathfrak{X}_C)$ and we have $\mathrm{RH}(\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p) = \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}^+}$ (in the almost category) by property (b) and (d) of [Theorem 4.2](#), where \mathfrak{X}^+ denotes the p -adic completion of \mathfrak{X}^+ (which is perfectoid).

However, for our applications, we also need a version for the p -adic completion of $(\mathfrak{X}^{nc})^+$. More precisely, we consider the map

$$\pi : (\mathfrak{X}^{nc})^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{nc} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C = \mathfrak{X}$$

and by abusing notations we will also use π to denote the corresponding maps after inverting p and after p -adic completion. Then we have:

- (a) $\pi_*\mathbf{F}_p[d]$ is ind-perverse and $\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse.
- (b) $\mathrm{RH}(\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p) = \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{(\mathcal{X}^{nc})^+}$, where $(\mathcal{X}^{nc})^+$ denotes the p -adic completion of $(\mathcal{X}^{nc})^+$.

By the same argument as in [Theorem 4.3](#), part (a) above for $\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ follows from the statement for $\pi_*\mathbf{F}_p[d]$, and the latter follows from the same proof as in [[Bha20](#), Theorem 3.11] and we give some details. First, $\pi_*\mathbf{F}_p[d]$ is the colimit of the ind-object $\{f'_*\mathbf{F}_p[d]\}$ where $f' : \mathfrak{X}' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C} \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ runs over all finite cover $\mathfrak{X}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{nc}$. We choose a dense affine open $j : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{nc}$ such that $U[1/p]$ is smooth over $\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}[1/p]$ and $\mathfrak{X}' \times_{\mathfrak{X}^{nc}} U[1/p] \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{nc}[1/p]$ is finite étale (and thus remains finite étale after base change to $\mathcal{O}_C[1/p]$). It follows that $j_*(f'_*\mathbf{F}_p[d])|_{U \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C[1/p]}$ ¹⁴ is perverse by Artin vanishing [[BBD82](#), Corollary 4.1.3]. It is then enough to observe that there exists a map $\mathfrak{X}'' \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}'$ such that the pullback: $f'_*\mathbf{F}_p[d] \rightarrow f''*\mathbf{F}_p[d]$ factors through $j_*(f'_*\mathbf{F}_p[d])|_{U \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C[1/p]}$. This can be checked after taking a colimit by compactness of constructible complexes, and thus follows from the fact that the constant sheaf \mathbf{F}_p on $(\mathcal{X}^{nc})^+[1/p]$ is $*$ -extended from its generic point by [[Bha20](#), Proposition 3.10], and this remains true after a base change from $\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}[1/p] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C[1/p]$ (since this is a field extension of characteristic 0). Part (b) above follows from the general lemma below and by noting that the p -adic completion of $(\mathcal{X}^{nc})^+$ is the same as the p -adic completion of $(\mathcal{X}^{nc})^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C$ (and it is perfectoid).

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose $\pi : \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ is an integral map such that the p -adic completion of \mathfrak{Y} is perfectoid. Then we have $\mathrm{RH}(\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p)$ almost agrees with the structure sheaf of the p -adic completion of the structure sheaf of \mathfrak{Y} .*

Proof. As \mathfrak{Y} is integral over \mathfrak{X} , we can write \mathfrak{Y} as a cofiltered limit $\varprojlim_i \mathfrak{Y}_i$ of finite covers of \mathfrak{X} . Set $Y_i = \mathfrak{Y}_i[1/p]$ to be the generic fibre, so $Y = \varprojlim_i Y_i$. The RH functor commutes with p -completed direct limits, so it takes $\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p$ so the direct limit of RH applied to the constant sheaf \mathbf{Z}_p on each Y_i . The latter gives (almost) the perfectoidization of the structure sheaf of \mathfrak{Y}_i . As perfectoidization commutes with p -completed direct limits, we get that $\mathrm{RH}(\pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p)$ is the perfectoidization of the structure sheaf of \mathfrak{Y} . But the latter coincides with the p -adic completion of \mathfrak{Y} by hypothesis. \square

5. SINGULARITIES OVER THE PERFECTOID \mathcal{O}_C - THE RH-SUBSHEAVES

Notation 5.1. Continue with the notation and conventions from [Notation 4.1](#). Fix a finitely presented flat \mathcal{O}_C -scheme \mathfrak{X} , with \mathcal{X} denotes its p -adic formal completion¹⁵ and \mathfrak{X}_C denotes its scheme-theoretic generic fibre. Write $d = \dim(\mathfrak{X}_C) = \dim(\mathcal{X}_{p=0})$. As before, we write $\omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}^\bullet$ for the normalized dualizing complex; we also write $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C} := H^{-d}(\omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}^\bullet)$ for the dualizing sheaf.

¹⁴Again, we are abusing notations a bit and we still use j (resp., f') to denote the corresponding map after the base change $- \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C[1/p]$ (resp., after inverting p).

¹⁵The existence and use of the \mathcal{O}_C -scheme \mathfrak{X} algebraizing the p -adic formal scheme \mathcal{X} is a crutch: it allows us to use étale sheaf theory on the scheme-theoretic generic fibre \mathfrak{X}_C instead of contemplating Zariski-constructible sheaves on the adic generic fibre \mathcal{X}_η of \mathcal{X} in the sense of [[BH22](#)]. This is sufficient for our purposes and allows us to avoid some technicalities. Nonetheless, we expect that all constructions/results discussed in this section go through without assuming \mathcal{X} admits an algebraization \mathfrak{X} . In particular, the object $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathrm{RH}}$ ought to only depend on \mathcal{X} and not the algebraization \mathfrak{X} .

In this section, we introduce the main objects: the RH structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}}$ and its dual ω_x^{RH} . These objects are variants of the structure sheaf and the dualizing sheaf that measure the singularities and are defined in terms of the Riemann-Hilbert functor (and will consequently only be *almost* coherent, rather than coherent). They are defined in [Section 5.1](#). We then study properties of this construction, including behavior under finite maps ([Section 5.3](#)), alterations ([Section 5.4](#)) and smooth maps ([Section 5.2](#)). Using these basic properties, we explain two alternative constructions of these sheaves without any reference to étale sheaf theory. First, [Proposition 5.11](#) explains a direct construction of $\mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}}$ in terms of the absolute integral closure (thus giving it an arithmetic flavor). On the other hand, [Theorem 5.19](#) explains how to approximately compute ω_x^{RH} and $\mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}}$ in terms of sufficiently large alterations (giving it a geometric flavour). Using this last construction, we deduce that base changing ω_x^{RH} with p -inverted agrees with what is known as the Grauert-Riemenschneider sheaf or the multiplier submodule in classical algebraic geometry ([Corollary 5.22](#)).

Remark 5.2. We emphasize that throughout this whole section, we often work in the almost category, for instance, when we say $\omega_x^{\text{RH}} \rightarrow \omega_{x/\mathcal{O}_C}$ is an injection of almost coherent sheaves (see [Definition 5.6](#) below), the injection should be interpreted as an almost injection. In later sections we will use !-realization and view $(\omega_x^{\text{RH}})_!$ as an honest subsheaf of ω_{x/\mathcal{O}_C} .

5.1. The definition. To explain the definition, recall that we have canonical maps

$$\mathcal{O}_x \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{x, \text{perfd}} = \text{RH}(\mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow \text{RH}(\text{IC}_{\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+[-d]),$$

where the second map is the fundamental class from [Proposition 3.40](#). Now $\mathcal{O}_x \in {}^pD^{\leq d}$ by [Example 3.23](#) while $\text{RH}(\text{IC}_{\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+[-d]) \in {}^pD^{\geq d}$ by [Theorem 4.2](#) (f), so the above map factors uniquely as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_x &\rightarrow {}^p\tau^{\geq d}\mathcal{O}_x \\ &\simeq {}^pH^d(\mathcal{O}_x)[-d] \\ &\xrightarrow{c_x} {}^pH^0(\text{RH}(\text{IC}_{\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+))[-d] \\ &\simeq {}^p\tau^{\leq d}\text{RH}(\text{IC}_{\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+[-d]) \\ &\rightarrow \text{RH}(\text{IC}_{\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+[-d]), \end{aligned}$$

where the unlabelled maps are the canonical truncation maps. Using the map c_x , we obtain:

Definition 5.3 (The Riemann-Hilbert structure sheaf). The object

$$\mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}} := \text{Image} \left(\underbrace{{}^pH^d(\mathcal{O}_x)}_{{}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_x[d])} \xrightarrow{c_x} {}^pH^0(\text{RH}(\text{IC}_{\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+)) \right)[-d] \in \text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\mathcal{X})[-d]$$

is the RH structure sheaf on \mathcal{X} .

Remark 5.4 (Alternate description). Choose a dense affine open subset $j : U \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C$ with U_{red} smooth over C (necessarily of dimension d). Then the canonical map $\text{IC}_{\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p}^+ \rightarrow j_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is an injection of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves by [Definition 3.38](#). Using [Theorem 4.2](#) (f), one then finds the following alternate description of $\mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}}$:

$$\mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}} \simeq \text{Image} \left({}^pH^d(\mathcal{O}_x) \xrightarrow{\text{can}} {}^pH^0(\text{RH}(j_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d])) \right)[-d] \in \text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\mathcal{X})[-d].$$

The downside to this description is that it is not canonical: there are many possible choices of U . On the other hand, it is perhaps easier to use than [Definition 5.3](#) as it avoids contemplating the IC-construction.

Remark 5.5 (Insensitivity to nilpotents). If $i : \mathcal{X}_{\text{red}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ is the inclusion of the reduced locus, then we have a natural isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} \simeq i_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{red}}}^{\text{RH}}$. Indeed, by [Remark 3.24](#) and [Remark 3.34](#), the functor i_* is t -exact for the \mathbf{p}^+ -perverse t -structure on constructible sheaves and the perverse t -structure on almost coherent sheaves; the claim now follows from the topological invariance of the étale site as well as the surjectivity of ${}^p H^d(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}) \rightarrow {}^p H^d(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{red}}})$ (which can be checked using the last sentence in [Example 3.23](#)).

By construction, the map ${}^p H^d(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}}[d]$ is a surjection of perverse almost coherent sheaves. Dualizing it thus gives a sheaf:

Definition 5.6 (The Riemann-Hilbert canonical sheaf). The RH dualizing sheaf (or just the RH sheaf) on \mathcal{X} is defined as

$$\omega_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} := \mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}}[d]) \in D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X}).$$

Note this is indeed a sheaf: in fact, dualizing the surjection ${}^p H^d(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}}[d]$ in $\text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\mathcal{X})$ gives an injection $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} \rightarrow \omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}$ of almost coherent sheaves on \mathcal{X} ([Proposition 3.22](#)), so we can regard $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}}$ as an almost coherent subsheaf of the dualizing sheaf $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}$.

5.2. Smooth pullback.

Proposition 5.7 (Smooth pullback). *If $f : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a smooth map with p -completion $f : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ of relative dimension r , then the natural map gives an isomorphism*

$$f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}^{\text{RH}}$$

of quotients of ${}^p H^{d+r}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'})[-d-r]$ in $\text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\mathcal{X}')[-d-r] \subset D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X}')$.

In the proof below, we shall write

$$f^* : D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}') \quad \text{and} \quad f_{\text{perfd}}^* : D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{perfd}}) \rightarrow D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}', \text{perfd}})$$

for the pullback functors (left adjoint to the evident pushforward functors); thus, we have $f_{\text{perfd}}^*(-) = f^*(-) \widehat{\otimes}_{f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{perfd}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}', \text{perfd}}$. We shall use crucially that the refined RH functor

$$\text{RH} : D_{p\text{-comp}}(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{perfd}})$$

commutes with arbitrary pullback (see [Theorem 4.2](#) (c)).

Proof. We may assume f is smooth of relative dimension r , so \mathcal{X}' has relative dimension $d+r$ over \mathcal{O}_C . Recall from [Remark 3.25](#) that the shifted pullback functor $f^*[r] : D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X}')$ is t -exact with respect to the perverse t -structure. Choose a dense affine open immersion $j : U \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C$ with U_{red} smooth. As f is smooth, the pullback $j' : U' \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}'_C$ is also a dense affine open immersion with U'_{red} smooth. Consequently, we can compute the RH structure sheaves using U and U' . Moving shifts around, we learn that

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} := \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}[d]) \xrightarrow{\text{can}} {}^p H^0(\text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p)[d]) \right) [-d]$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}^{\text{RH}} := \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}[d+r]) \xrightarrow{\text{can}} {}^p H^0(\text{RH}(j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p)[d+r]) \right) [-d-r].$$

By the perverse t -exactness of $f^*[r]$, the first formula above pulls back to show

$$f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} = \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}[d+r]) \xrightarrow{\text{can}} {}^p H^0(f^* \text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p)[d+r]) \right) [-d-r].$$

Consequently, it suffices to show that the natural map

$$f^* \mathrm{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p)[d+r] \rightarrow \mathrm{RH}(j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d+r]) \simeq f_{\mathrm{perfd}}^* \mathrm{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d+r])$$

is injective on ${}^p H^0(-)$, where we used the pullback compatibility of

$$\mathrm{RH} : D_{\mathrm{cons}}^b(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}})$$

in the last isomorphism above. This can be checked locally on \mathfrak{X}' , so we may assume both \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{X}' are affine. In fact, as all our constructions are compatible with étale localization, we may then reduce by induction to the case $\mathfrak{X}' = \mathfrak{X} \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_C)} \mathbf{G}_m$. In this case, the claim follows from the following stronger assertion applied to $M = \mathrm{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p)$:

(*) For any $M \in D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}})$, the map

$$\eta_M : f^* M \rightarrow f_{\mathrm{perfd}}^* M := f^* M \otimes_{f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}', \mathrm{perfd}}$$

admits a left-inverse (i.e., is split) in $D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}', f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}})$.

The assertion (*) immediately reduces to the case $M = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}}$ itself: we have $\eta_M = \eta_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}}} \otimes \mathrm{id}_{f^* M}$. Thus, we must show that $f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}', \mathrm{perfd}}$ admits a left-inverse in $D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X}', f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathrm{perfd}})$. Since $\mathfrak{X}' = \mathfrak{X} \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_C)} \mathbf{G}_m$, this reduces to the following assertion: for any p -complete \mathcal{O}_C -algebra R , the map

$$R_{\mathrm{perfd}}[x^{\pm 1}]^\wedge := R_{\mathrm{perfd}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_C} \mathcal{O}_C[x^{\pm 1}]^\wedge \rightarrow R[x^{\pm 1}]_{\mathrm{perfd}}^\wedge \simeq R_{\mathrm{perfd}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_C} \mathcal{O}_C[x^{\pm 1}]_{\mathrm{perfd}}^\wedge$$

admits an $R_{\mathrm{perfd}}[x^{\pm 1}]^\wedge$ -linear splitting. It suffices to solve this problem when $R = \mathcal{O}_C$: the general case then follows by tensoring with R_{perfd} . Thus, we must check that

$$\mathcal{O}_C[x^{\pm 1}]^\wedge \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C[x^{\pm 1}]_{\mathrm{perfd}}^\wedge$$

admits a $\mathcal{O}_C[x^{\pm 1}]^\wedge$ -linear splitting. This can be checked using the standard presentation of $\mathcal{O}_C[x^{\pm 1}]_{\mathrm{perfd}}^\wedge$ coming from the almost purity theorem:

$$\mathcal{O}_C[x^{\pm 1}]_{\mathrm{perfd}}^\wedge \simeq \widehat{\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p]} \left(\mathcal{O}_C x^i \xrightarrow{\underline{\epsilon}^{i-1}} p^{1/p^\infty} \mathcal{O}_C x^i \right)},$$

where $\underline{\epsilon} \in \mathcal{O}_C^\flat$ is a compatible system of p -power roots of unity (normalized so that $\underline{\epsilon}^{1/p^n}$ maps to a primitive p^n -th root of 1 in \mathcal{O}_C); in particular, the differential appearing above is 0 for $i \in \mathbf{Z}$. \square

Remark 5.8 (Smooth pullback: dual form). In the situation of [Proposition 5.7](#), if f is smooth, then we have a natural identification $f^* \omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\mathrm{RH}} \otimes \omega_{\mathcal{X}'/\mathcal{X}} \simeq \omega_{\mathcal{X}'}^{\mathrm{RH}}$ of almost coherent subsheaves of the dualizing sheaf of \mathcal{X}' . To see this, write d and $d+r$ for the relative dimensions of $\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C$ and $\mathcal{X}'/\mathcal{O}_C$ respectively. Keeping track of shifts, applying Grothendieck duality $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{X}'}(-)$ to the isomorphism in [Proposition 5.7](#) gives a natural identification $f^!(\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\mathrm{RH}}[d]) \simeq \omega_{\mathcal{X}'}^{\mathrm{RH}}[d+r]$ compatible with the isomorphism $f^! \omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C} \simeq \omega_{\mathcal{X}'/\mathcal{O}_C}$. The rest follows as $f^!(-) \simeq f^*(-) \otimes \omega_{\mathcal{X}'/\mathcal{X}}[r]$, since f is smooth of relative dimension r .

5.3. Finite pushforward.

Proposition 5.9 (Finite pushforward functoriality). *Let $f : \mathfrak{X}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ be a finite surjective morphism with p -completion also denoted $f : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, so $f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}^{\text{RH}}[d]$ is a perverse almost coherent sheaf (Remark 3.24). Then there is a unique map $\alpha_f : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}^{\text{RH}}$ in $\text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\mathcal{X})[-d]$ rendering the following diagram commutative in $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_f \\ f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'} & \longrightarrow & f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}^{\text{RH}}. \end{array}$$

Moreover, the map α_f is an injection of perverse almost coherent sheaves.

Proof. Write $d = \dim(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_C)$. Let us first explain the uniqueness. Example 3.23 gives a unique factorization of the top horizontal map as

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}} \xrightarrow{\text{can}} {}^p\tau^{\geq d}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}} \simeq {}^pH^d(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}})[-d] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{RH}},$$

with the last map being a surjection of perverse sheaves placed in cohomological degree d . Applying the same analysis to \mathcal{X}' and using the t -exactness of f_* , the uniqueness assertion in the proposition is immediate.

For existence, we can make choices, so choose $j : U \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C$ a dense affine open immersion such that the preimage $j' : U' \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}'_C$ is also a dense affine open immersion and such that both U_{red} and U'_{red} are smooth and the map $U'_{\text{red}} \rightarrow U_{\text{red}}$ is a finite étale cover. As f_* is perverse t -exact, functoriality then gives a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^pH^d(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}) & \longrightarrow & {}^pH^d(\text{RH}(j_*\mathbf{Z}_p)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ f_*{}^pH^d(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}) & \longrightarrow & f_*{}^pH^d(\text{RH}(j'_*\mathbf{Z}_p)) \end{array}$$

of perverse almost coherent sheaves on \mathcal{X} .

Taking the induced map on images (and using t -exactness of f_* once more) then gives the desired map α_f (cf. Remark 5.4).

It remains to explain why α_f is injective. Following the construction above, it suffices to show that the right vertical map in the square above is injective. The perverse t -exactness of f_* and the finite pushforward compatibility of RH allow us to rewrite the target as

$$f_*{}^pH^d(\text{RH}(j'_*\mathbf{Z}_p)) \simeq {}^pH^d(f_*\text{RH}(j'_*\mathbf{Z}_p)) \simeq {}^pH^d\text{RH}(f_*j'_*\mathbf{Z}_p).$$

We are therefore reduced to showing that the map $j_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow f_*j'_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves induces an injection on applying ${}^pH^0\text{RH}(-)$. Now RH is perverse t -left exact (Theorem 4.2 (f)), so it suffices to show that $j_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow f_*j'_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is an injection of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves on \mathfrak{X}_C . As j_* is t -exact (Remark 3.35), it suffices show that $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow g_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is injective on U , where $g : U' \rightarrow U$ is the map induced by f . This assertion can be checked étale locally on U ; but g is a finite étale cover, so we may then reduce to the case where g is split (i.e., $U'_{\text{red}} = \sqcup_{i=1}^n U_{\text{red}}$ with g being the obvious map), in which case the claim is clear as the map $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow g_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ even has a left-inverse. \square

Remark 5.10 (Dual form of finite pushforward compatibility). In the situation of [Proposition 5.9](#), one has a dual statement that is often useful: there is a unique map $\beta_f : f_*\omega_{\mathfrak{X}'}^{\text{RH}} \rightarrow \omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}$ of almost coherent sheaves rendering the following diagram commutative in $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f_*\omega_{\mathfrak{X}'}^{\text{RH}} & \longrightarrow & f_*\omega_{\mathfrak{X}'/\mathcal{O}_C}^{\bullet}[-d] \\ \downarrow \beta_f & & \downarrow \\ \omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}} & \longrightarrow & \omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}^{\bullet}[-d], \end{array}$$

where the map on the right is the Grothendieck trace map. Moreover, the map β_f is a surjection of almost coherent sheaves.

Proposition 5.11 (Describing $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}$ via the absolute integral closure). *Let \mathfrak{X} be a finitely presented integral \mathcal{O}_C -scheme with absolute integral closure $\pi : \mathfrak{X}^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$. Then we have a natural identification*

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}[d] = \text{Image} \left({}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}^+}[d]) \right)$$

of perverse quotients of ${}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d])$.

Proof. Choose a smooth dense affine open $j : U \subset \mathfrak{X}_C$ with preimage $j^+ : U^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C^+$ in the absolute integral closure. Consider the maps

$$j_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow \pi_*j_*^+\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \xleftarrow{\cong} \pi_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]$$

in $D(\mathfrak{X}_C, \mathbf{Z}_p)$, where the last isomorphism comes from the first part of [Theorem 4.3](#). Following the strategy of proof of [Proposition 5.9](#), it suffices to show the first map has cone in ${}^pD^{\geq 0}$ (i.e., the first map is an injection of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves). As j_* is t -exact, it suffices to show that cone $(\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow (\pi|_U)_*\mathbf{Z}_p[d]) \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(U, \mathbf{Z}_p)$. By definition of the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure ([Theorem 3.28](#)(b)(iii)), this is equivalent to showing cone $(\mathbf{F}_p[d] \rightarrow (\pi|_U)_*\mathbf{F}_p[d]) \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(U, \mathbf{F}_p)$. But $\mathbf{F}_p[d]$ is a simple perverse sheaf as U is smooth and the map is obviously nonzero; thus, the map is injective on all perverse cohomology sheaves, and we are reduced to checking that $(\pi|_U)_*\mathbf{F}_p[d] \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}$, which follows from the second part of [Theorem 4.3](#). \square

Remark 5.12. Suppose we are in the scenario of [Remark 4.4](#), i.e., \mathcal{O}_C is the p -adic completion of a Henselian valuation ring \mathcal{O}_C^{nc} and $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}^{nc} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C$ is integral. Then we also have a natural identification

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}[d] = \text{Image} \left({}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_{(\mathfrak{X}^{nc})^+}[d]) \right)$$

of perverse quotients of ${}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d])$, where $(\mathfrak{X}^{nc})^+$ denotes the p -adic completion of $(\mathfrak{X}^{nc})^+$. This follows from the same argument as in the proof of [Proposition 5.11](#) by choosing $U \subseteq \mathfrak{X}_C$ such that U is base changed from a smooth dense open affine of $\mathfrak{X}^{nc}[1/p]$ and replacing the use of [Theorem 4.3](#) by [Remark 4.4](#).

5.4. Behavior under alterations.

Proposition 5.13. *Let $f : \mathfrak{X}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ be an alteration between integral \mathcal{O}_C -schemes with p -completion $f : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Then there is a unique surjection*

$$\text{Image} \left({}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \xrightarrow{f^*} {}^pH^0(f_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}'}[d]) \right) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}[d]$$

in $\text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\mathcal{X})$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & {}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_x[d]) \\
 & \swarrow & \searrow \\
 & \text{can} & \\
 \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_x[d]) \xrightarrow{\text{can}} {}^p H^0(f_* \mathcal{O}_{x'}[d]) \right) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}}[d],
 \end{array}$$

Proof. Choose $j : U \subset \mathfrak{X}_C$ a sufficiently small dense affine open such that U is smooth and the induced map $U' = f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$ is finite étale; write $j' : U' \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}'_C$ for the pullback of j to \mathfrak{X}'_C . This choice gives rise to the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{O}_x[d] & \longrightarrow & \text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 f_* \mathcal{O}_{x'}[d] & \longrightarrow & f_* \text{RH}(j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d])
 \end{array}$$

By the recipe in [Remark 5.4](#), the image of ${}^p H^0(-)$ of the top horizontal map is exactly $\mathcal{O}_x^{\text{RH}}[d]$. By the commutative diagram above, it then suffices to show that ${}^p H^0(-)$ of the right vertical map is injective. As RH commutes with f_* and is t -left exact for the perverse t -structures ([Theorem 4.2](#) (6)), it suffices to show that $j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow f_* j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ has cone in $\mathfrak{p}^+ D^{\geq 0}$; in fact, we shall prove this map is an injection of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves. We may rewrite $f_* j'_* \mathbf{Z}_p$ as $j_* g_* \mathbf{Z}_p$, where $g : U' \rightarrow U$ is the map induced by f . As j is an affine étale map, the functor j_* is t -exact for the \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse t -structure ([Remark 3.35](#)), so it suffices to show that the canonical map $\mathbf{Z}_p[d] \rightarrow g_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d]$ is an injection of \mathfrak{p}^+ -perverse sheaves. But this follows from the same argument as in [Proposition 5.9](#): since g is a finite étale cover, locally on the base, g splits into a finite disjoint union of copies of the identity map. \square

Remark 5.14 (Dual form of alteration compatibility). Continue with notation as in [Proposition 5.13](#). The dual version of the proposition asserts that we have a containment

$$\omega_x^{\text{RH}} \subset \text{Image} \left(H^{-d}(f_* \omega_{x'/\mathcal{O}_C}) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} H^{-d}(\omega_{x/\mathcal{O}_C}) = \omega_{x/\mathcal{O}_C} \right)$$

as subsheaves of the dualizing sheaf ω_{x/\mathcal{O}_C} . Noting that f_* is t -left exact for the standard t -structure as well as $\omega_{x'/\mathcal{O}_C} \in D^{\geq -d}$, we learn that

$$\omega_x^{\text{RH}} \subset \text{Image} \left(R^0 f_* \omega_{x'/\mathcal{O}_C} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{x/\mathcal{O}_C} \right)$$

as subsheaves of the dualizing sheaf ω_{x/\mathcal{O}_C} . Intuitively, this says that a volume form lying in ω_x^{RH} lifts to every alteration of \mathfrak{X} ; we shall see later ([Corollary 5.20](#)) that this property characterizes ω_x^{RH} .

5.5. Describing ω_x^{RH} via alterations. For any alteration $f : \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$, we saw in [Remark 5.14](#) that there was a natural inclusion

$$\omega_x^{\text{RH}} \subset \text{Image}(R^0 f_* \omega_{y/\mathcal{O}_C} \rightarrow \omega_{x/\mathcal{O}_C})$$

of subsheaves of ω_{x/\mathcal{O}_C} . We shall now show that this inclusion approximates an almost isomorphism as we vary over all possible such \mathfrak{Y} 's.

Notation 5.15 (The category of pointed alterations). With notation as in [Notation 5.1](#), assume additionally that \mathfrak{X} is integral (whence the same holds for \mathfrak{X}_C). Fix an algebraic closure $\overline{K(\mathfrak{X}_C)}$ of the function field $K(\mathfrak{X}_C)$, giving a geometric generic point $\eta_{\mathfrak{X}}$ of \mathfrak{X} . Let \mathcal{P} denote the category of geometrically pointed alterations of \mathfrak{X} , i.e., all pairs $(f_{\mathfrak{Y}} : \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}, \eta_{\mathfrak{Y}})$, where $f_{\mathfrak{Y}}$ is an alteration of integral \mathcal{O}_C -schemes and $\eta_{\mathfrak{Y}}$ is a lift of the geometric generic point of \mathfrak{X} along $f_{\mathfrak{Y}}$; note that \mathcal{P} is a poset. As in [Notation 5.1](#), we shall write $\mathfrak{Y} = \widehat{\mathfrak{Y}}$ and \mathfrak{Y}_C for the p -adic formal completion and scheme-theoretic generic fibre of $\mathfrak{Y} \in \mathcal{P}$ respectively.

Furthermore, if we are in the scenario of [Remark 4.4](#), i.e., \mathcal{O}_C is the p -adic completion of a Henselian valuation ring \mathcal{O}_C^{nc} and $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}^{nc} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C$ is integral, then we let $\mathcal{P}^{nc} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ denote the subcategory of those \mathfrak{Y} that come from \mathfrak{X}^{nc} , i.e., all pairs $(f_{\mathfrak{Y}} : \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}, \eta_{\mathfrak{Y}})$ as above such that $\mathfrak{Y} = \mathfrak{Y}^{nc} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C$ for some alteration \mathfrak{Y}^{nc} of \mathfrak{X}^{nc} .

We shall use the following notion to tame certain infinite intersections that will appear:

Definition 5.16 (Almost pro- and ind- constancy). A pro-object $\{M_i\}$ in stable \mathcal{O}_C -linear ∞ -category \mathcal{C} (such as almost derived ∞ -category $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})^a$) is called *almost pro-zero* if for every $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_C}$, the pro-object $\{M_i\}$ is pro-isomorphic to an ϵ -torsion¹⁶ pro-object. Similarly, an ind-object $\{M_i\}$ in \mathcal{C} is called *almost ind-zero* if for every $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_C}$, the ind-object $\{M_i\}$ is ind-isomorphic to an ϵ -torsion ind-object.

For objects in the heart of a t -structure, being almost pro-zero is equivalent to the following: for each $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}$ and each index i , there exists a map $M_j \rightarrow M_i$ in the pro-system such that $\text{Image}(M_j \rightarrow M_i)$ is annihilated by ϵ . Similarly, being almost ind-zero is equivalent to the condition: for each $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}$ and each index i , there exists a map $M_i \rightarrow M_j$ in the ind-system such that $\text{Image}(M_i \rightarrow M_j)$ is annihilated by ϵ . More generally, for objects that are bounded with respect to a t -structure, being almost pro-zero or almost ind-zero is equivalent to the same condition on its cohomology groups.

A pro-object $\{M_i\}$ in \mathcal{C} is called *almost pro-constant* if one can find a map $\{M\} \rightarrow \{M_i\}$ of pro-objects from a constant pro-object with almost pro-zero cone. An ind-object $\{M_i\}$ in \mathcal{C} is called *almost ind-constant* if one can find a map $\{M_i\} \rightarrow \{M\}$ to a constant ind-object with almost ind-zero cone.

Remark 5.17. We caution the readers that, in the definition of almost ind-constancy (resp. almost pro-constancy), it is important that the map goes to (resp. from) the constant system $\{M\}$. If we swap $\{M\}$ and $\{M_i\}$, then we get a strictly stronger condition. For instance, if we have $\{M\} \rightarrow \{M_i\}$ of ind-objects whose cone is almost ind-zero, then M is almost isomorphic to the colimit of $\{M_i\}$, and we obtain that $\{M_i\} \rightarrow \{\text{colim } M_i\}$ has an almost ind-zero cone and thus $\{M_i\}$ is almost ind-constant under our definition. On the other hand, suppose $\varpi \in \mathfrak{m}$ admits a compatible system of p -power roots, then the system $\{M_i\} = \{(\varpi^{1/p^i})\}$ is almost ind-constant (take $M = \mathcal{O}_C$), but one cannot find M such that the cone of $\{M\} \rightarrow \{M_i\}$ is almost ind-zero.

Given a Noetherian scheme, an ind-object in coherent sheaves has coherent colimit if and only if it is an essentially constant ind-object. We need a variant of this observation for the almost coherence.

Lemma 5.18. *Let $\{M_i\}$ be an ind-object in $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X})$. Assume the following:*

¹⁶This refers to an \mathcal{O}_C/ϵ -linear object of \mathcal{C} .

- (1) There exists $N \gg 0$ such that $M_i \in D^{[-N, N]}$ for all i .
- (2) There exists some integer $m > 0$ and an index i_0 such that for all $j \geq i_0$ the cone of any map $M_{i_0} \rightarrow M_j$ in the diagram is annihilated by p^m .
- (3) The colimit $\operatorname{colim}_i M_i$ is almost coherent.

Then $\{M_i\}$ is almost ind-constant.

Note that condition (2) is necessary: as we are working on a p -adic formal scheme, colimits involve an implicit p -completion. For example, the diagram

$$\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{p} \dots$$

has 0 colimit in $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathcal{X})$, and hence verifies (1) and (3) but is not almost ind-constant.

Proof. By replacing $\{M_j\}$ with $\{M_j/M_{i_0}\}$ and possibly enlarging m , we may assume that $\{M_i\}$ is a diagram in $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathcal{X}_{p^m=0})$; in particular, as $\mathcal{X}_{p^m=0}$ is a scheme (instead of merely a p -adic formal scheme), colimits are computed at the level of underlying sheaves. Passing to fibres of the map to the direct limit, we may assume $\operatorname{colim}_i M_i = 0$. Filtering by cohomology sheaves, we may then also assume that each M_i is in degree 0. In this case, it suffices to prove the following statement:

- (*) Suppose R is a finitely presented (and hence coherent) \mathcal{O}_C -algebra. Let $\{M_i\}$ be a filtered diagram of almost coherent R -modules with 0 direct limit. Then $\{M_i\}$ is almost ind-zero.

Fix some $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_C}$. We want to show that the inclusion $\{M_i[\epsilon]\} \rightarrow \{M_i\}$ is an ind-isomorphism, i.e., for each M_i , there exists some map $M_i \rightarrow M_j$ in the system with image contained in $M_j[\epsilon]$. As M_i is almost coherent, we can find a finitely generated R -submodule $M \subset M_i$ with $\epsilon \cdot M_i/M = 0$. As $\operatorname{colim}_i M_i = 0$ and M is finitely generated, we can find a map $M_i \rightarrow M_j$ in the system carrying M to 0. But then $M_i \rightarrow M_j$ factors as $M_i \rightarrow M_i/M \rightarrow M_j$, so the image must be ϵ -torsion as M_i/M is so. \square

Theorem 5.19 (Almost stabilization of the image of the Grothendieck trace). *The pro-object*

$$\{\operatorname{Image} \left(R^0 f_{y,*} \omega_{y/\mathcal{O}_C} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{Tr}} \omega_{X/\mathcal{O}_C} \right)\}_{\mathcal{P}}$$

is almost pro-constant with limit ω_X^{RH} . Similarly, the ind-object

$$\{\operatorname{Image} ({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_X[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{y,*} \mathcal{O}_y[d]))\}_{\mathcal{P}}$$

is almost ind-constant with colimit $\mathcal{O}_X^{\text{RH}}[d]$.

Proof. We put aside the question of describing the limiting values until the end of the proof; it will fall out of the argument. Next we note that the two almost constancy statements in the theorem are Grothendieck dual to each other, so it suffices to prove either one. In what follows, we will check the ind-constancy of the second system.

Thus, we must verify the hypotheses (1), (2) and (3) from [Lemma 5.18](#). In fact, (1) is clear as the cohomological amplitude of the Grothendieck dual of $f_{y,*} \mathcal{O}_y[d]$ is bounded independently of \mathcal{Y} .

We now verify hypothesis (2) in [Lemma 5.18](#). Let $f_{\mathfrak{Y}}: \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ be an alteration such that \mathfrak{Y}_C is regular and such that there exists a dense open affine $j: U \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{Y}_C$ with $U \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C$ étale and $E := \mathfrak{Y}_C - U$ is an SNC divisor on \mathfrak{Y}_C (such a \mathfrak{Y} exists by the existence of log

resolution of singularities of the generic fiber \mathfrak{X}_C). We need to show that for any further alteration $\mathfrak{Z} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$,

$$(5.19.1) \quad \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}}[d]) \right) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{\mathfrak{Z},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Z}}[d]) \right)$$

has kernel annihilated by a fixed power of p (that is independent of \mathfrak{Z}).

Let $k : V \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_C$ be a dense open regular affine subset. By [Proposition 5.9](#), we know that

$$(5.19.2) \quad \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d])) \right) \cong \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{\mathfrak{Z},*} \text{RH}(k_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d])) \right)$$

and by the argument in [Proposition 5.13](#), the displayed object in (5.19.2) is a common quotient of both sides of (5.19.1). Thus it is enough to show that the canonical map

$$(5.19.3) \quad \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}}[d]) \right) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(\text{RH}(f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} j_* \mathbf{Z}_p[d])) \right)$$

has kernel annihilated by a fixed power of p . By the almost coherency of the displayed objects on both sides of (5.19.3), it is enough to show that (5.19.3) becomes an isomorphism after inverting p . For this, it is enough to show the stronger statement that the natural map

$$(5.19.4) \quad f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}} \rightarrow \text{RH}(f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} j_* \mathbf{Z}_p) \simeq f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Z}_p)$$

is split injective after inverting p , where we used [Theorem 4.2](#) (d). But after inverting p , we have

$$(5.19.5) \quad f_{\mathfrak{Y}_C,*} \text{RH}(j_* \mathbf{Q}_p) \cong f_{\mathfrak{Y}_C,*} \left(\bigoplus_{i=0}^d \Omega_{(\mathfrak{Y}_C, E)}^i[-i] \right)$$

by [Theorem 4.2](#) (b) and (d). Since (\mathfrak{Y}_C, E) is log smooth, we know that $\Omega_{(\mathfrak{Y}_C, E)}^0 \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}_C}$. Thus after inverting p , the map in (5.19.4) is the inclusion of a direct summand, as wanted.

We now verify hypothesis (3) in [Lemma 5.18](#). Write $\mathcal{P}^{\text{fin}} \subset \mathcal{P}$ for the full subcategory spanned by those alterations $\mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ that are actually finite. We know from [[Bha20](#), Theorem 4.19 (1)] that

$$\text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}^{\text{fin}}} f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}_C} \simeq \text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}} f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}_C} \in D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathfrak{X}).$$

As the functor of applying ${}^p H^0(-)$ or taking images both commute with filtered colimits for the perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\mathfrak{X})$ ([Remark 3.16](#)), we then learn that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}} \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}}[d]) \right) \\ & \simeq \text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}^{\text{fin}}} \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}}[d]) \right) \\ & \simeq \text{Image} \left({}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[d]) \rightarrow {}^p H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}^+}[d]) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}[d], \end{aligned}$$

where the last identification comes from [Proposition 5.11](#). As all hypotheses in [Lemma 5.18](#) are verified, we obtain the promised almost ind-constancy. Finally, we note that this argument also gives the desired identification of the limiting values, proving the entire theorem. \square

Corollary 5.20 (Almost stabilization of the image of the Grothendieck trace: explicit form).
In what follows we work in the almost category.

(a) We have

$$\bigcap_{\mathfrak{Y} \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Image} \left(R^0 f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \omega_{\mathfrak{Y}/\mathcal{O}_C} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C} \right) = \omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}$$

as subsheaves of $\omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}$.

(b) The intersection in (1) is almost finite, i.e., for each $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_C}$, there exists some $\mathfrak{Y} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that the cokernel of the inclusion

$$\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}} \subset \text{Image} \left(R^0 f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \omega_{\mathfrak{Y}/\mathcal{O}_C} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C} \right)$$

from [Proposition 5.13](#) is annihilated by ϵ .

Proof. [Theorem 5.19](#) gives (a) on taking limits, while (b) simply spells out almost proconstancy in the case of interest. \square

Remark 5.21. Suppose we are in the scenario of [Remark 4.4](#), i.e., \mathcal{O}_C is the p -adic completion of a Henselian valuation ring \mathcal{O}_C^{nc} and $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}^{nc} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C$ is integral. Then both [Theorem 5.19](#) and [Corollary 5.20](#) hold if we replace \mathcal{P} by \mathcal{P}^{nc} (see [Notation 5.15](#)). More precisely, we have

$$\bigcap_{\mathfrak{Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{nc}} \text{Image} \left(R^0 f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \omega_{\mathfrak{Y}/\mathcal{O}_C} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C} \right) = \omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}$$

in the almost category, and for each $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_C}$, there exists some $\mathfrak{Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{nc}$ (i.e., $\mathfrak{Y} = \mathfrak{Y}^{nc} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_C^{nc}} \mathcal{O}_C$) such that the cokernel of the inclusion

$$\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}} \subset \text{Image} \left(R^0 f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \omega_{\mathfrak{Y}/\mathcal{O}_C} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C} \right)$$

from [Proposition 5.13](#) is annihilated by ϵ . To prove these statements, it is enough to show the analog of [Theorem 5.19](#) for \mathcal{P}^{nc} (the analog of [Corollary 5.20](#) follows immediately). Now all we need to observe is that in the proof of [Theorem 5.19](#), we can replace the use of [Proposition 5.11](#) by [Remark 5.12](#), and that [[Bha20](#), Theorem 4.19 (1)] holds for $\mathcal{P}^{nc, \text{fin}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{nc}$ as well.

Corollary 5.22 (The characteristic 0 localization). *Assume $\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C$ is proper, so we can identify $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}) \simeq D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathfrak{X})$ via formal GAGA. Then the generic fibre functor*

$$D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}) \simeq D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}) \xrightarrow{\text{invert } p} D_{\text{coh}}^b(\mathfrak{X}_C)$$

carries $\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}$ to the classical Grauert-Riemenschneider canonical sheaf $\omega_{\mathfrak{X}_C}^{\text{GR}} = \mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{X}_C, \omega_{\mathfrak{X}_C})$.

Proof. [Theorem 5.19](#) and resolution of singularities implies that we can find an alteration $f_{\mathfrak{Y}} : \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ of integral \mathcal{O}_C -schemes such that \mathfrak{Y}_C is smooth and such that the inclusion

$$\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}} \subset \text{Image} \left(R^0 f_{\mathfrak{Y},*} \omega_{\mathfrak{Y}/\mathcal{O}_C} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C} \right)$$

of subsheaves of $H^{-d}(\omega_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C}^\bullet)$ has cokernel annihilated by p . In particular, inverting p and using GAGA, we learn that

$$\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}}[1/p] = \text{Image} \left(R^0 f_{\mathfrak{Y}_C,*} \omega_{\mathfrak{Y}_C/C} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{\mathfrak{X}_C/C} \right).$$

But \mathfrak{Y}_C is smooth and $\mathfrak{Y}_C \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C$ is an alteration; it follows from the classical algebraic geometry that the right side above agrees with $\omega_{\mathfrak{X}_C}^{\text{RH}}$, as wanted. \square

Remark 5.23. By using [Corollary 5.22](#), we can algebraize the construction of the RH sheaves: for any integral finitely presented $\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_C$, there is a unique object $\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}} \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(\mathfrak{X})$ enjoying the analog of the properties discussed in [Section 5.3](#), [Section 5.4](#), [Section 5.2](#) and [Section 5.5](#) at the level of schemes, i.e., without passage to p -adic formal completions. Specifically, we can compactify \mathfrak{X} to $\overline{\mathfrak{X}}$ and define $\omega_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\text{RH}} := \omega_{\overline{\mathfrak{X}}}^{\text{RH}}|_{\mathfrak{X}}$. This definition is independent of the choice of the compactification by Beauville-Laszlo gluing [[BL95](#)], see [[Sta](#), Tag 0BNI] and [[Bha16](#), Section 5], because on the generic fiber it agrees with the multiplier ideal sheaf (cf. the beginning of the proof of [Theorem 6.13](#)).

6. SINGULARITIES OVER A DVR

The goal of this section is to descend the results of the previous section to the Noetherian case. Throughout this section we let (V, ϖ, k) be a complete DVR of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let (V, ϖ, k) be a complete DVR of mixed characteristic. Then there exists an inclusion of complete valuation domains*

$$(V, \varpi, k) \rightarrow (V_{\infty}, \varpi^{1/p^{\infty}}, k^{1/p^{\infty}})$$

such that

(a) *There are complete DVRs $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$ which are finite free over V , and forming a direct system, so that we can define*

$$V_{\infty}^{\text{nc}} := \text{colim}_{i \in I} V_i.$$

(b) *$V_{\infty} := \widehat{V_{\infty}^{\text{nc}}}$ is perfectoid.*

(c) *There exists a V -module homomorphism $V_{\infty} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}} V$ such that $\mathbb{T}|_{V_i}$ generates $\text{Hom}_V(V_i, V)$ as a V_i -module for all $i \in I$.*

(d) *For each i , there exists a V_i -linear splitting $\mathbb{T}_i : V_{\infty} \rightarrow V_i$ of the natural inclusion such that $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}|_{V_i} \circ \mathbb{T}_i$.*

Proof. To begin the construction, fix a p -basis $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in J}$ of k by [[Sta](#), [Lemma 07P2](#)], and fix lifts $\tilde{\lambda}_{j \in J}$ of each λ_j to V . Note that if k is already perfect, this set is empty. Let I be the set of pairs (Σ, e) where $\Sigma \subset J$ is a finite subset and $e \in \mathbb{N}$, which forms a partially ordered set with $(\Sigma_1, e_1) \leq (\Sigma_2, e_2)$ if and only if $\Sigma_1 \subseteq \Sigma_2$ and $e_1 \leq e_2$.

For each $(\Sigma, e) \in I$, define

$$V_{(\Sigma, e)} := \frac{V[y_e, x_{j, e} \mid j \in \Sigma]}{(x_{j, e}^{p^e} - \tilde{\lambda}_j, y_e^{p^e} - \varpi)}$$

Set ϖ^{1/p^e} and $\tilde{\lambda}_j^{1/p^e}$ to be the images of y_e and $x_{j, e}$ in $V_{(\Sigma, e)}$, respectively. We now claim that $V_{(\Sigma, e)}$ is a DVR, which we check inductively for a fixed e by adjoining the p^e -th roots one at a time. Assume that $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Suppose we have already shown that

$$U_m := \frac{V[x_{j, e} \mid j \leq m]}{(x_{j, e}^{p^e} - \tilde{\lambda}_j)}$$

is a DVR with residue field $k(\lambda_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, \lambda_m^{1/p^e})$. Then $U_{m+1} := U_m[x_{m+1, e}]/(x_{m+1, e}^{p^e} - \tilde{\lambda}_{m+1})$. Then the minimal polynomial of λ_{m+1} over $k(\lambda_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, \lambda_m^{1/p^e})$ is $x^{p^e} - \lambda_{m+1}$ since the λ_i form

a p -basis. Therefore $x_{m+1,e}^{p^e} - \tilde{\lambda}_{m+1}$ is irreducible over U_m since its image is irreducible in $k(\lambda_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, \lambda_m^{1/p^e})[x]$ and so U_{m+1} is a domain. Since it is a finite domain extension of the *complete* DVR V , we know that U_{m+1} is local. To show that U_{m+1} is a DVR, it is enough to show that the maximal ideal is principal, which is the case since $U_{m+1}/(\varpi)$ is the field $k(\lambda_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, \lambda_m^{1/p^e}, \lambda_{m+1}^{1/p^e})$, hence (ϖ) is the maximal ideal as required. Now by induction we see that

$$U_n := \frac{V[x_{j,e} \mid j \leq n]}{(x_{j,e}^{p^e} - \tilde{\lambda}_j)}$$

is a DVR with residue field $k(\lambda_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, \lambda_n^{1/p^e})$. Finally $V_{(\Sigma,e)} \cong U_n[y]/(y^{p^e} - \varpi)$ is a domain since $y^{p^e} - \varpi$ is irreducible by Eisenstein's criterion. It is a DVR since the maximal ideal is (ϖ^{1/p^e}) because

$$V_{(\Sigma,e)}/(\varpi^{1/p^e}) \cong U_n/\varpi \cong k(\lambda_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, \lambda_n^{1/p^e}).$$

Note that $V_{(\Sigma,e)}$ is a free V -module on the basis

$$\mathcal{B}_{(\Sigma,e)} := \{\varpi^{\frac{b}{p^e}} \Pi_i \tilde{\lambda}_i^{\frac{a_i}{p^e}} \mid 0 \leq a_i, b \leq p^e - 1\}.$$

Given $(\Sigma_1, e_1) \leq (\Sigma_2, e_2)$, we have a mapping $V_{(\Sigma_1,e_1)} \rightarrow V_{(\Sigma_2,e_2)}$ determined by sending $\varpi^{1/p^{e_1}} \mapsto (\varpi^{1/p^{e_2}})^{p^{e_2-e_1}}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_j^{1/p^{e_1}} \mapsto (\tilde{\lambda}_j^{1/p^{e_2}})^{p^{e_2-e_1}}$ for $j \in \Sigma_1$, and the $V_{(\Sigma,i)}$ form a directed system with respect to the partial order given above. We may view $V_\infty^{\text{nc}} := \text{colim}_{(\Sigma,e)} V_{\Sigma,e}$ as a union as all of the maps in the system are injective, and moreover since $\mathcal{B}_{(\Sigma_1,e_1)} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{(\Sigma_2,e_2)}$ if $(\Sigma_1, e_1) \leq (\Sigma_2, e_2)$ it also follows that V_∞^{nc} is also a free V module with basis given by $\bigcup_{(\Sigma,e)} \mathcal{B}_{(\Sigma,e)}$. Since each $V_{\Sigma,e}$ is a DVR, it follows that V_∞^{nc} is a (non-discrete) valuation domain with maximal ideal (ϖ^{1/p^∞}) which is Henselian by [Sta, 0A04].

Now define $\mathbb{T}^{\text{nc}} \in \text{Hom}_V(V_\infty^{\text{nc}}, V)$ to be the unique mapping specified on the basis above by the following formula.

$$\mathbb{T}^{\text{nc}}(\varpi^c \Pi_i \tilde{\lambda}_i^{d_i}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c = \frac{p^e-1}{p^e} \text{ for some } e \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ and } d_i = 0 \ \forall i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, we claim that

$$\text{Hom}_V(V_{(\Sigma,e)}, V) = \Phi_{(\Sigma,e)} \cdot V_{(\Sigma,e)}$$

where

$$\Phi_{(\Sigma,e)}(\varpi^{\frac{a}{p^e}} \Pi_i \tilde{\lambda}_i^{\frac{b_i}{p^e}}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = p^e - 1 \text{ and } b_i = 0 \ \forall i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

To see this it is sufficient to show that the projection onto every basis vector can be written in this way, and the projection onto the $\varpi^{\frac{a}{p^e}} \Pi_i \tilde{\lambda}_i^{\frac{b_i}{p^e}}$ component can be obtained as

$$\Phi_{(\Sigma,e)} \left(\left(\varpi^{\frac{p^e-a}{p^e}} \Pi_i \tilde{\lambda}_i^{-\frac{b_i}{p^e}} \right) \cdot - \right)$$

for some a and b_i . Here we use that $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ are units since $V_{(\Sigma,e)}$ is local and their images in the residue field are non-zero.

Now we show that $\mathbb{T}^{\text{nc}}|_{V_{(\Sigma,e)}}$ is a unit-multiple of $\Phi_{(\Sigma,e)}$. Observe that

$$\mathbb{T}^{\text{nc}}|_{V_{(\Sigma,e)}}(-) = \Phi_{V_{(\Sigma,e)}} \left((1 + \varpi^{1/p^{e-1}-1/p^e} + \varpi^{1/p^{e-2}-1/p^e} + \dots + \varpi^{1/p-1/p^e}) \cdot - \right)$$

and notice that $1 + \varpi^{1/p^{e-1}-1/p^e} + \varpi^{1/p^{e-2}-1/p^e} + \dots + \varpi^{1/p-1/p^e}$ is a unit.

Finally, apply the p -completion functor to \mathbb{T}^{nc} to obtain $\mathbb{T} : V_\infty \rightarrow V$, noting that V_∞^{nc} and hence $V_{(\Sigma, e)}$ inject into V_∞ since V_∞^{nc} is ϖ -adically separated.

For fixed (Σ', e') we define $\mathbb{T}_{(\Sigma', e')}^{\text{nc}} : V_\infty^{\text{nc}} \rightarrow V_{(\Sigma', e')}$. First note that $V_{(\Sigma', e')}$ is a free V module with basis

$$\left\{ \varpi^{\frac{b}{p^{e'}}} \prod_i \tilde{\lambda}_i^{\frac{a_i}{p^{e'}}} \mid 0 \leq b, a_i \leq p^{e'} - 1 \right\}.$$

Also V_∞^{nc} is a free $V_{(\Sigma', e')}$ module whose basis elements are given by

$$\left\{ \left(\varpi^{\frac{1}{p^{e'}}} \right)^{\frac{b}{p^e}} \prod_{i \in \Sigma'} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_i^{\frac{1}{p^{e'}}} \right)^{\frac{a_i}{p^e}} \prod_{j \notin \Sigma'} \tilde{\lambda}_j^{\frac{c_j}{p^e}} \mid e \in \mathbf{N}, 0 \leq b, a_i, c_j \leq p^e - 1 \right\}.$$

Note that the given basis of V_∞^{nc} over V is the product of the elements of the two bases given above.

Now define the map by

$$\mathbb{T}_{(\Sigma', e')}^{\text{nc}} \left(\left(\varpi^{\frac{1}{p^{e'}}} \right)^{\frac{b}{p^e}} \prod_{i \in \Sigma'} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_i^{\frac{1}{p^{e'}}} \right)^{\frac{a_i}{p^e}} \prod_{j \notin \Sigma'} \tilde{\lambda}_j^{\frac{c_j}{p^e}} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } b = p^e - 1 \text{ for some } e \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}, \\ & a_i = 0 \ \forall i \text{ and } c_j = 0 \ \forall j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here $\mathbb{T}_{(\Sigma', e')}^{\text{nc}}$ is $V_{(\Sigma', e')}$ -linear by construction since we extended it from a $V_{(\Sigma', e')}$ -basis, and in particular it is a splitting since it sends the basis vector 1 to 1. Furthermore, we can see that it satisfies $\mathbb{T}^{\text{nc}} = \mathbb{T}^{\text{nc}}|_{V_{(\Sigma', e')}} \circ \mathbb{T}_{(\Sigma', e')}^{\text{nc}}$ by noting that the images of the V -basis of V_∞^{nc} are the same under both maps, which are both V -linear. Now obtain the splitting of the statement by taking the p -completion, and noting that each $V_{(\Sigma, e)}$ is already complete. \square

Below we summarize the notation used in this section. We emphasize that this notation differs from the one used in the previous section.

Notation 6.2. Throughout the rest of this section, unless otherwise indicated, we set

- (a) X to be an integral scheme flat over $\text{Spec}(V)$ of relative dimension d (thus $\dim X = d + 1$);
- (b) $X_e := X \otimes_V V_e$, $X_\infty^{\text{nc}} = X \otimes_V V_\infty^{\text{nc}}$, and $X_\infty := X \otimes_V V_\infty$;
- (c) $\pi : X_\infty \rightarrow X$ to be the natural projection;
- (d) \widehat{X}_∞ to be the p -adic formal scheme associated to X_∞ ;
- (e) $\mathbb{T} : V_\infty \rightarrow V$ and $\mathbb{T}_e : V_\infty \rightarrow V_e$ to be the maps in [Proposition 6.1](#).

In particular, X_∞ plays the role of \mathfrak{X} and \widehat{X}_∞ plays the role of \mathfrak{X} from the previous sections.

We further set $\omega_{X/V}^\bullet$ be the relative dualizing complex over V , i.e., such that the lowest nonvanishing cohomology degree of $\omega_{X/V}^\bullet$ is $-d$, and we set $\omega_{X_e/V_e}^\bullet := \omega_{X/V}^\bullet \otimes_V V_e$ and $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet := \omega_{X/V}^\bullet \otimes_V V_\infty$, which are relative dualizing complexes of X_e and X_∞ over V_e and V_∞ , respectively. We will abuse notations a bit and also use \mathbb{T} to denote the induced map

$$\mathbb{T} : \pi_* \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty} = \pi_* (\omega_{X/V} \otimes_V V_\infty) \rightarrow \omega_{X/V}.$$

We summarize the following results from [Section 5](#), applied in the setup of [Notation 6.2](#).

Theorem 6.3. *With notation as in [Notation 6.2](#). Suppose $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is proper and X_∞ is integral. Then there exists a quasi-coherent, almost coherent subsheaf $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ of $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}$ such that*

(a) In the almost category, $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ can be identified with

$$\bigcap_{f: Y_\infty \rightarrow X_\infty} \text{Tr}(f_* \omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty})$$

where Y_∞ runs over all alterations of X_∞ in a fixed algebraic closure $\overline{K(X_\infty)}$ of the fraction field $K(X_\infty)$ of X_∞ such that $Y_\infty \cong Y_e \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty$ for some e and some alteration Y_e of X_e .

(b) For every $m > 0$, there exists an alteration $f: Y_\infty \rightarrow X_\infty$ as above (i.e., $Y_\infty \cong Y_e \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty$ for some e and some alteration Y_e of X_e) such that the cokernel of

$$\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}} \rightarrow \text{Tr}(f_* \omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty})$$

is annihilated by $p^{1/m}$.

(c) $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}[1/p]$ agrees with the Grauert-Riemenschneider canonical sheaf / multiplier submodule $\omega_{X_\infty[1/p]}^{\text{GR}} = \mathcal{J}(X_\infty[1/p], \omega_{X_\infty[1/p]})$ (note that $X_\infty[1/p]$ is a proper scheme over the characteristic zero field $V_\infty[1/p]$).

Proof. By [Definition 5.6](#) applied to $\mathcal{O}_C = V_\infty$, $\mathfrak{X} = X_\infty$ and $\mathfrak{X} = \widehat{X}_\infty$, we have an almost coherent subsheaf $\omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}} \subseteq \omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}$ (on the formal scheme \widehat{X}_∞). Since $X_\infty \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V_\infty)$ is proper, by formal GAGA, we know that $\omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ corresponds to an almost coherent subsheaf of $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}$ (in the almost category). Let $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ be the !-realization of that sheaf. We have

$$\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}} = (\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}})^a = (\varpi^{1/p^\infty}) \otimes \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$$

is a quasi-coherent, almost coherent, (honest) subsheaf of $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}$. Since V_∞ is the p -adic completion of V_∞^{nc} and $X_\infty = X_\infty^{\text{nc}} \otimes_{V_\infty^{\text{nc}}} V_\infty$, (a) and (b) both follow from [Remark 5.21](#): every alteration Y_∞^{nc} of X_∞^{nc} satisfies $Y_\infty^{\text{nc}} = Y_e \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty^{\text{nc}}$ for some $e \gg 0$ and some alteration Y_e of X_e since $V_\infty^{\text{nc}} = \varinjlim_e V_e$. Finally, (c) follows from [Corollary 5.22](#). \square

Definition 6.4. With notation as in [Notation 6.2](#), suppose $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is proper and X_∞ is integral. Then we define

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) := \mathbb{T}(\pi_* \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}).$$

We emphasize that the image of a quasi-coherent sheaf under a qcqs map is quasi-coherent (see [\[Sta, Tag 01XJ\]](#)). In particular, $\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})$ is a coherent sheaf on X since it is a quasi-coherent subsheaf of a coherent sheaf $\omega_{X/V}$.

Theorem 6.5. *With notation as in [Definition 6.4](#), there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that for every $e \geq e_0$, and every alteration $Y \rightarrow X$ with $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_Y$, we have that*

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) \subseteq \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V}).$$

Furthermore, for every $e \geq e_0$, there exists an alteration $Y_e \rightarrow X$ with $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_{Y_e}$ such that for every further alteration $Y \rightarrow Y_e$ with composition $f: Y \rightarrow Y_e \rightarrow X$, we have that

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V}).$$

In particular, for every $e \geq e_0$

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) = \bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V}).$$

Proof. We do this in two steps. First, we show that there exists e_0 such that for all $e \geq e_0$ and all alterations $f_e : Y \rightarrow X_e$ over X_e , we have that $\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})$ is contained inside $\text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_*\varpi^{1/p^e}\omega_{Y/V})$. To see this, we form the base change $f_\infty : Y_\infty := Y \times_{V_e} V_\infty \rightarrow X_\infty := X_e \times_{V_e} V_\infty$. Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(f_*\omega_{Y/V_e}) \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty & \xlongequal{\quad} & (f_\infty)_*\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
f_*\omega_{Y/V_e} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & \omega_{X_e/V_e} & & \downarrow \\
\cong \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
f_*\omega_{Y/V} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & \omega_{X_e/V} & & \downarrow \\
& & \downarrow \text{Tr} & & \downarrow \\
& & \omega_{X/V} & & \downarrow \\
& & \uparrow \text{Tr}_{Y/X} & & \downarrow \\
& & & & \omega_{X/V}
\end{array}$$

$\mathbb{T}|_{V_e}$ \mathbb{T}

Here the two upper unlabeled vertical arrows are simply $\mathbb{T}_e : V_\infty \rightarrow V_e$ base changed to Y and X respectively, and the isomorphism is chosen to make the composition

$$\omega_{X_e/V_e} \cong \omega_{X_e/V} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{X_e/X}} \omega_{X/V}$$

equal to the map induced by \mathbb{T}_{V_e} : this is possible since both the $\text{Tr}_{X_e/X}$ and \mathbb{T}_{V_e} generate $\text{Hom}(\omega_{X_e/V}, \omega_{X/V})$ (see [Proposition 6.1](#)). The rest of the diagram commutes by [Proposition 6.1](#) and basic properties of the trace map.

By [Definition 6.4](#) and the Noetherianity of $\omega_{X/V}$, we know that there exists e_0 such that

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) = \mathbb{T}(\pi_*(\varpi^{1/p^e})\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}})$$

for all $e \geq e_0$. We fix this e_0 throughout the rest of the proof. For any $e \geq e_0$, notice that $(\varpi^{1/p^e})\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}} \subseteq (\varpi^{1/p^e})\text{Tr}((f_\infty)_*\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty})$ by [Theorem 6.3](#). By the commutative diagram above we have that

$$(6.5.1) \quad \tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) \subseteq \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_*\varpi^{1/p^e}\omega_{Y/V}).$$

for all $e \geq e_0$. This completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

Next we will show the existence of Y_e for any fixed $e \geq e_0$. We first prove the following.

Claim 6.6. *For any $e \geq e_0$, we have*

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) = \mathbb{T}\left(\pi_*\left((\varpi^{1/p^e})\text{Tr}((f_\infty)_*\omega_{Y_\infty/X_\infty})\right)\right)$$

for some alteration $Y_\infty \rightarrow X_\infty$ such that $Y_\infty = Y' \otimes_{V_{e'}} V_\infty$ where $f' : Y' \rightarrow X_{e'}$ is an alteration for some $e' \geq e$.

Proof of Claim. By [Theorem 6.3](#), we know that there exists an alteration $Y_\infty \rightarrow X_\infty$ (and we may assume $Y_\infty = Y' \otimes_{V_{e'}} V_\infty$ where $Y' \rightarrow X_{e'}$ is an alteration for some $e' \geq e$) such that

$$(\varpi^{1/p^{e+1}})\text{Tr}((f_\infty)_*\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty}) \subseteq \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) &= \mathbb{T}(\pi_*(\varpi^{1/p^{e+1}})\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}) \\
&\supseteq \mathbb{T}(\pi_*(\varpi^{1/p^e}) \text{Tr}((f_\infty)_*\omega_{Y_\infty/X_\infty})) \\
&\supseteq \mathbb{T}(\pi_*(\varpi^{1/p^e})\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}) \\
&= \tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})
\end{aligned}$$

where the first and last equality follows by our choice of e_0 , the first containment follows by our choice of Y_∞ and the second containment follows by [Theorem 6.3](#). Thus we have equality throughout and the Claim follows. \square

At this point, for any $e > e_0$, we consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(f'_*\omega_{Y'/V_{e'}}) \otimes_{V_{e'}} V_\infty & \xlongequal{\quad} & (f_\infty)_*\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
f'_*\omega_{Y'/V_{e'}} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & \omega_{X_{e'}/V_{e'}} \\
\downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\
f'_*\omega_{Y'/V} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} & \omega_{X_{e'}/V} \\
\downarrow \text{Tr}_{Y'/X} & & \downarrow \text{Tr} \\
\omega_{X/V} & & \omega_{X/V}
\end{array}$$

$\mathbb{T}|_{V_{e'}}$ \mathbb{T}

Here Y_∞ and Y' (and hence e') are constructed from [Claim 6.6](#), the two upper unlabeled vertical arrows are induced by $\mathbb{T}_{e'} : V_\infty \rightarrow V_{e'}$ base changed to Y' and X respectively (in particular, they are split surjective by [Proposition 6.1](#)), and the isomorphism is chosen to make the composition

$$\omega_{X_{e'}/V_{e'}} \cong \omega_{X_{e'}/V} \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{X_{e'}/X}} \omega_{X/V}$$

equal to the map induced by $\mathbb{T}_{V_{e'}}$: this is possible since both $\text{Tr}_{X_{e'}/X}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{V_{e'}}$ generate $\text{Hom}(\omega_{X_{e'}/V}, \omega_{X/V})$ (see [Proposition 6.1](#)). The rest of the diagram commutes by [Proposition 6.1](#) and basic properties of the trace map.

It follows from the commutative diagram above and [Claim 6.6](#) that

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) = \mathbb{T}(\pi_*(\varpi^{1/p^e}) \text{Tr}((f_\infty)_*\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty})) = \text{Tr}_{Y'/X}(f'_*\varpi^{1/p^e}\omega_{Y'/V}).$$

Set $Y_e := Y'$. For any further alteration $f: Y \rightarrow Y_e = Y'$, we immediately see that

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) = \text{Tr}_{Y'/X}(f_*\varpi^{1/p^e}\omega_{Y'/V}) \supseteq \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_*\varpi^{1/p^e}\omega_{Y/V}).$$

The reverse containment is [\(6.5.1\)](#) and we have proven the desired result. The last statement follows immediately since the intersection stabilizes as we have shown above. \square

Remark 6.7. Now suppose X is normal, integral, proper and flat over $\text{Spec}(V)$. We claim that, up to replacing V by another DVR, we may assume that X_∞ is integral. To this end, observe that $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a normal, finite domain extension of V and hence $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a complete DVR of mixed characteristic. Therefore, upon replacing V by $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, we may assume $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is such that X_∞ is integral: it is enough to show that $X_\infty[1/p]$

is integral, but we know that $X_\infty[1/p] = X[1/p] \otimes_{V[1/p]} V_\infty[1/p]$ is normal ([Sta, Tag 038N]) and we have

$$H^0(X_\infty[1/p], \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty[1/p]}) \cong V_\infty[1/p] \otimes_{V[1/p]} H^0(X[1/p], \mathcal{O}_{X[1/p]}) = V_\infty[1/p]$$

is a field. Thus $X_\infty[1/p]$ is normal and connected, and thus integral.

Definition 6.8. Let $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ be a separated, finite type, and flat morphism of schemes such that X is integral. We define

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) := \bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V})$$

where $f: Y \rightarrow X$ runs over all alterations taken inside a fixed algebraic closure $\overline{K(X)}$ of the fraction field of X such that $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_Y$. Here the intersection is taken in the category of sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.

Note that, a priori, $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ is only a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_X -modules. Our next result will show that it is actually a coherent subsheaf of $\omega_{X/V}$ for $e \gg 0$.

Theorem 6.9. Under *Definition 6.8*, we have

- (a) Up to isomorphisms, $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ depends only on X and the \mathbf{Q} -Cartier divisor $\frac{1}{p^e} \text{div}(\varpi)$ (i.e., it does not depend on the choice of V).
- (b) There exists $e_0 > 0$ such that $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) = \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^{e'}})$ for all $e, e' \geq e_0$, and for all $e \geq e_0$, there exists an alteration $Y_e \rightarrow X$ with $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_{Y_e}$ such that for every further alteration $Y \rightarrow Y_e$ with composition $f: Y \rightarrow Y_e \rightarrow X$, we have that

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V}).$$

In particular, $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) \subseteq \omega_{X/V}$ is a coherent sheaf.

Proof. First, we assume additionally that $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is proper. Let $W = H^0(X^N, \mathcal{O}_{X^N})$ where X^N denotes the normalization of X . By [Remark 6.7](#) and [Theorem 6.5](#), we know that there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that for all $e > e_0$,

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X^N/W}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) = \tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X^N/W}) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/W})$$

for every alteration $f: Y \rightarrow X^N$ that factors over some fixed alteration $Y_e \rightarrow X^N$. If we fix an isomorphism $W \cong \omega_{W/V}$, then the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \omega_{Y/W} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \omega_{Y/V} \\ \downarrow \text{Tr} & & \downarrow \text{Tr} \\ \omega_{X^N/W} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \omega_{X^N/V} \end{array}$$

shows that

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X^N/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) \cong \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V}) \cong \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/W}) \cong \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X^N/W}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$$

for every alteration $f: Y \rightarrow X^N$ that factors over some fixed alteration $Y_e \rightarrow X^N$. In particular, this shows that up to isomorphisms $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X^N/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ does not depend on the choice of V : if we have $X^N \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V')$ is proper and flat for another complete DVR V' ,

then $W = H^0(X^N, \mathcal{O}_{X^N})$ is a finite DVR extension over V' and so after fixing an isomorphism $W \cong \omega_{W/V'}$, the same argument as above shows that

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X^N/V'}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) \cong \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X^N/W}, \varpi^{1/p^e}).$$

Next, notice that in the intersection defining $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$, we may clearly restrict to alterations $Y \rightarrow X$ that factor through X^N . It follows that

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) \cong \text{Tr}_{X^N/X}(\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X^N/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})).$$

Therefore, both parts (a) and (b) for X follow from the already established result for X^N .

Finally, for a general X as in the theorem, we let $X' \rightarrow X$ be a compactification of X . Then since every alteration $Y \rightarrow X$ can be compactified to an alteration $Y' \rightarrow X'$, we know that $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) = \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X'/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})|_X$. Now both parts (a) and (b) follow from the already established result for X' (as $X' \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is proper). \square

Definition 6.10. Let $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ be a separated, finite type, flat morphism of schemes such that X is integral. We set

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) := \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) \text{ for all } e \gg 0.$$

By [Theorem 6.9](#), this is well-defined, independent of the choice of V (up to isomorphisms) and $e \gg 0$. Moreover there exists a fixed $e_0 > 0$ such that for every $e > e_0$, there exists an alteration $Y_e \rightarrow X$ such that for all further alterations $f: Y \rightarrow Y_e \rightarrow X$, we have that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V})$. Note that we choose the notation τ_{alt}^a to emphasize that this is a ϖ -almost version of the alteration (i.e., there is always a (ϖ^{1/p^∞}) -perturbation built into this definition).

The following properties of $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})$ are immediate consequences.

Corollary 6.11. *With notation as in [Definition 6.10](#), we have*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(X[1/p], \omega_{X[1/p]})$$

where the right hand side is the multiplier submodule (i.e., the Grauert-Riemenschneider canonical sheaf) of $X[1/p]$. More generally, if $X = \text{Spec } R$ is affine, the formation of τ_{alt}^a commutes with arbitrary localization.

Proof. We may choose $e > 0$ and $f: Y \rightarrow X$ an alteration such that

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V})$$

by [Theorem 6.9](#). Enlarging Y if necessary we may assume that $Y[1/p]$ is nonsingular (in fact, it suffices to assume it factors through a nonsingular variety). Inverting p we notice that the right hand side above becomes the multiplier submodule by a slight modification of [[BST15](#), Theorem 8.1].

For the statement about commuting with arbitrary localization, note that any alteration which stabilizes the intersection for $\tau^a(\omega_{X/V})$ will also stabilize at each stalk. The statement follows. \square

Corollary 6.12. *Suppose that $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is a finite surjective map between separated integral schemes of finite type and flat over $\text{Spec}(V)$, with induced trace map $\text{Tr}_{Y/X}: f_* \omega_Y \rightarrow \omega_X$. Then*

$$\text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{Y/V})) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}).$$

Proof. By [Theorem 6.9](#), we may choose $e \gg 0$ and an alteration $g : Z \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{Z/X}((f \circ g)_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Z/V}) = \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{Z/Y}(g_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Z/V}) = \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{Y/V}).$$

Since $\mathrm{Tr}_{Y/X} \circ \mathrm{Tr}_{Z/Y} = \mathrm{Tr}_{Z/X}$, the result follows. \square

6.1. Behavior under smooth maps. In this subsection we study the behavior of $\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})$ under smooth morphisms of schemes.

Theorem 6.13. *Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a smooth map of separated integral schemes finite type and flat over $\mathrm{Spec}(V)$. Then*

$$f^* \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \omega_{Y/X} \cong \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{Y/V}).$$

Proof. We first assume that X_∞ and $Y_\infty := Y \otimes_V V_\infty$ are both integral. Let \widehat{X}_∞ be the p -adic completion of X_∞ . By [Corollary 5.22](#) and [Remark 5.23](#), we know that $\omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}} \in D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$ and $\mathcal{J}(X_\infty[1/p], \omega_{X_\infty[1/p]}) \in D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(X_\infty[1/p])$ have the same image inside $D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}_{\infty, \eta})$.¹⁷ By Beauville–Laszlo patching [[BL95](#)], see [[Sta](#), Section 0BNI] and [[Bha16](#), Section 5], we know that there exists a unique quasi-coherent sheaf $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}$ on X_∞ such that

- (a) The p -adic completion of $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}$ agrees with $\omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}$.
- (b) $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}[1/p] \cong \mathcal{J}(X_\infty[1/p], \omega_{X_\infty[1/p]})$.

Furthermore, this $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}$ agrees with the one appearing in [Theorem 6.3](#) when $X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(V)$ is proper by uniqueness of the Beauville–Laszlo patching and the formal GAGA. Similarly, we have a quasi-coherent sheaf $\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}$ that satisfies the analogous (a) and (b) above.

Since $f_\infty : Y_\infty \rightarrow X_\infty$ is smooth, by [Remark 5.8](#) we have that

$$\omega_{\widehat{Y}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}} \cong f_\infty^* \omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{Y}_\infty}} \omega_{\widehat{Y}_\infty/\widehat{X}_\infty}.$$

It is also well-known that $\mathcal{J}(Y_\infty[1/p], \omega_{Y_\infty[1/p]}) \cong f_\infty^* \mathcal{J}(X_\infty[1/p], \omega_{X_\infty[1/p]}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{Y_\infty[1/p]}} \omega_{Y_\infty/X_\infty}[1/p]$. Therefore we know that

$$\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}} \cong f_\infty^* \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{Y_\infty}} \omega_{Y_\infty/X_\infty}$$

At this point, we let $f' : Y' \rightarrow X'$ be a compactification of $Y \rightarrow X$ (note that $Y' \rightarrow X'$ is not necessarily smooth, but both Y'_∞ and X'_∞ are integral by our assumption). By [Theorem 6.9](#) and [Theorem 6.5](#), we know that

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X'/V}) = \tau_{\mathrm{RH}}(\omega_{X'/V}) = \mathbb{T}(\pi_* \omega_{X'_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}).$$

Thus after we restrict to the open subsets $X \subseteq X'$ and $X_\infty \subseteq X'_\infty$ respectively, we have

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \cong \mathbb{T}_X(\pi_* \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}}).$$

Similarly, we also have $\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{Y/V}) \cong \mathbb{T}_Y(\pi_* \omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty}^{\mathrm{RH}})$. Here we use $\mathbb{T}_X, \mathbb{T}_Y$ to emphasize that these maps are defined from $\pi_* \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty} \rightarrow \omega_{X/V}$ and $\pi_* \omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty} \rightarrow \omega_{Y/V}$ respectively. But note that both \mathbb{T}_X and \mathbb{T}_Y are obtained out of a base change $\mathbb{T} : V_\infty \rightarrow V$. Since $(f^* \omega_{X/V}) \otimes_V V_\infty = f_\infty^*(\omega_{X/V} \otimes_V V_\infty)$, it is easy to see that

$$(f^* \mathbb{T}_X) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \omega_{Y/X} : (f^* \omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \omega_{Y/X} \rightarrow (f^* \omega_{X/V}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \omega_{Y/X}$$

¹⁷Here $\widehat{X}_{\infty, \eta}$ denote the rigid generic fiber of the formal scheme \widehat{X}_∞ : if $\widehat{X}_\infty = \mathrm{Spf}(A)$, then we have an identification $D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}_{\infty, \eta}) = D_{\mathrm{qcoh}}(\widehat{A}[1/p])$.

is identified with $\mathbb{T}_Y : \omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty} \rightarrow \omega_{Y/V}$ (by the behavior of relative canonical sheaf under smooth pull back). Under this identification, we clearly have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{Y/V}) &= \mathbb{T}_Y(\pi_*\omega_{Y_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}) \\
&= \mathbb{T}_Y(\pi_*(f_\infty^*\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{Y_\infty}} \omega_{Y_\infty/X_\infty})) \\
&= (f^*\mathbb{T}_X)(f^*\pi_*\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \omega_{Y/X} \\
&= f^*\mathbb{T}_X(\pi_*\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \omega_{Y/X} \\
&= \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \omega_{Y/X}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof when both X_∞ and Y_∞ are integral.

Now we handle the general case. Let X^N be the normalization of X . After replacing V if necessary, we may assume that $X^N \otimes_V V_\infty$ is integral: for instance, one can take X' to be a compactification of X^N and set $V = H^0(X^N, \mathcal{O}_{X^N})$, see [Remark 6.7](#). Note that $Y \times_X X^N$ and $X^N \otimes_V V_e$ are integral for all e . We next claim the following.

Claim 6.14. *There exists $e \gg 0$ such that each irreducible component of $(Y \times_X X^N) \otimes_V V_e$ remains integral after base change from V_e to V_∞ .*

Proof of Claim. First we note that since V_∞^{nc} is henselian valuation ring, by [\[GR03, 5.4.54\]](#), there is an equivalence of categories $(V_\infty^{nc}[1/p])_{\text{fét}} \cong (V_\infty[1/p])_{\text{fét}}$ (this easily implies there is a bijection between finite field extensions of $V_\infty^{nc}[1/p]$ and $V_\infty[1/p]$). It follows that $V_\infty^{nc}[1/p]$ is separably closed (equivalently, algebraically closed) inside $V_\infty[1/p]$: otherwise, let K be a nontrivial finite field extension of $V_\infty^{nc}[1/p]$ inside $V_\infty[1/p]$, the injection $K \otimes_{V_\infty^{nc}[1/p]} K \hookrightarrow K \otimes_{V_\infty^{nc}[1/p]} V_\infty[1/p]$ then implies that $K \otimes_{V_\infty^{nc}[1/p]} K$ is a field which is a contradiction. By [\[Sta, Tag 037P\]](#), we know that there is a bijection between the irreducible components of $(Y \times_X X^N) \otimes_V V_\infty^{nc}$ and those of $(Y \times_X X^N) \otimes_V V_\infty$ (note that all schemes involved are p -torsion free so irreducible components are in bijection with irreducible components after inverting p). Since $V_\infty^{nc} = \varinjlim_e V_e$, there exists $e \gg 0$ such that there is a bijection between irreducible components of $(Y \times_X X^N) \otimes_V V_e$ and those of $(Y \times_X X^N) \otimes_V V_\infty^{nc}$. \square

Finally, we come back to the proof of the theorem. We consider the following base change diagram (each square is cartesian)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\tilde{Y} & \longrightarrow & (Y \times_X X^N) \otimes_V V_e & \longrightarrow & Y \times_X X^N & \longrightarrow & Y \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\tilde{X} := (X^N \otimes_V V_e)^N & \longrightarrow & X^N \otimes_V V_e & \longrightarrow & X^N & \longrightarrow & X
\end{array}$$

where $\tilde{X} := (X^N \otimes_V V_e)^N$ denotes the normalization of $X^N \otimes_V V_e$. Note that all vertical maps are smooth by base change. By [Claim 6.14](#), each irreducible component of $(Y \times_X X^N) \otimes_V V_e$ remains integral upon base change to V_∞ , thus the same is true for each irreducible component of \tilde{Y} (since \tilde{X} and $X^N \otimes_V V_e$ are generically the same). Since \tilde{X} is normal and $\tilde{Y} \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ is smooth, we know that \tilde{Y} is normal and hence $\tilde{Y} = \coprod_{i=1}^n \tilde{Y}_i$ such that $\tilde{Y}_i \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty$ is integral for all i (in particular, each \tilde{Y}_i is smooth over \tilde{X} and $\tilde{Y} \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty$ is a disjoint union

of integral schemes $\tilde{Y}_i \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty$). Consider the cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{Y} = \coprod_{i=1}^n \tilde{Y}_i & \xrightarrow{g} & \tilde{X} \\ b \downarrow & & \downarrow a \\ Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X. \end{array}$$

It is well-known that the trace map of b can be identified with the pull back of the trace map of a , under the following identifications:

$$\begin{aligned} b_* \omega_{\tilde{Y}/V} &\cong b_*(g^* \omega_{\tilde{X}/V} \otimes \omega_{\tilde{Y}/\tilde{X}}) \\ &\cong b_*(g^* \omega_{\tilde{X}/V} \otimes b^* \omega_{Y/X}) \\ &\cong b_* g^* \omega_{\tilde{X}/V} \otimes \omega_{Y/X} \\ &\cong f^* a_* \omega_{\tilde{X}/V} \otimes \omega_{Y/X} \\ &\xrightarrow{f^* \text{Tr}_a} f^* \omega_{X/V} \otimes \omega_{Y/X} \cong \omega_{Y/V}. \end{aligned}$$

This induces the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} b_* \omega_{\tilde{Y}/V} \cong b_* \prod_{i=1}^n \omega_{\tilde{Y}_i/V} & \longleftarrow & b_* \prod_{i=1}^n \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{\tilde{Y}_i/V}, p^\epsilon) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & b_*(g^* \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{\tilde{X}/V}, p^\epsilon) \otimes b^* \omega_{Y/X}) \\ \downarrow \text{Tr}_b & & \downarrow \text{Tr}_b & & \downarrow \cong \\ & & & & f^* a_* \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{\tilde{X}/V}, p^\epsilon) \otimes \omega_{Y/X} \\ & & & & \downarrow f^* \text{Tr}_a \\ \omega_{Y/V} & \longleftarrow & \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{Y/V}) & \cdots \cdots \cdots & f^* \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes \omega_{Y/X} \end{array}$$

Here the isomorphism on the top row follows from the already established case (since $\tilde{X} \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty$ and all $\tilde{Y}_i \otimes_{V_e} V_\infty$ are integral and τ_{alt} is independent of the choice of V , see [Theorem 6.5](#)) and the two surjections follow from [Corollary 6.12](#). After the identification of Tr_b with $f^* \text{Tr}_a$, one sees that the dotted arrow in the diagram above is an isomorphism, which is the desired result. \square

6.2. The completed stalks. After completing at a point $x \in X_{p=0}$, we want to compare $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})$ with those test modules already defined for complete local rings, see [Section 2.4](#) for the domain case.

Definition 6.15. Suppose R is a Noetherian complete equidimensional reduced local ring of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$. Recall that for a fixed rational number $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in R$ we have a +-test module

$$\tau_+(\omega_R, f^\lambda) = \tau_+(\omega_R, \lambda \text{div}(f)) := \bigcap_S \text{Tr}_{S/R}(f^\lambda \omega_S) =: \mathbf{B}^0(\text{Spec}(R), \lambda \text{div}(f); \omega_R) \subseteq \omega_R$$

where the intersection runs over all normal rings $S \supseteq R$ finite over R where some $f^\lambda \in S \subseteq K(R^+) = \overline{K(R)}$, see [\[BMP⁺23, Proposition 4.17\]](#). The choice of f^λ does not matter.

Corollary 6.16. *Let $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ be a separated, finite type, and flat morphism of schemes such that X is integral. Let $x \in X_{p=0}$ and let $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$ be the completion of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ at its maximal ideal. Then*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} = \tau_+(\omega_R, p^{1/p^e})$$

for all $e \gg 0$.

Proof. We set $\omega_R = \omega_{X,x} \otimes R$. Suppose first that X is normal. In that case, R is a domain. It is enough to show that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} = \tau_+(\omega_R, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ for all $e \gg 0$ since $\text{div}(p)$ is a multiple of $\text{div}(\varpi)$. There exists e_0 such that $\tau_+(\omega_R, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ is constant for all $e > e_0$ (by Noetherianity of R). We fix an $e > e_0$ such that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V})$ for some alteration $f : Y \rightarrow Y_e \rightarrow X$ as in [Theorem 6.9](#). By [\[BMP⁺23, Proposition 4.29\]](#) (see [Section 2.4](#)) we have

$$(6.16.1) \quad \tau_+(\omega_R, \varpi^{1/p^e}) = \bigcap_{Z'} \text{Tr}_{Z'/\text{Spec}(R)}(f'_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Z'})$$

where the intersection runs over alterations with fixed geometric generic point $\overline{K(X)} \supseteq K(X)$ and where $f' : Z' \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is base changed from an alteration $Z_x \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ and hence comes from an alteration $f : Z \rightarrow X$.

However, the intersection $\bigcap_Z \text{Tr}_{Z/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Z/V})$ stabilizes (is equal to $\text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V})$ for Y as above) and so the intersection also stabilizes after flat base change to R (since all the alterations in [\(6.16.1\)](#) come from alterations over X). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} &= \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V}) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} \\ &= \text{Tr}_{Y'/\text{Spec}(R)}(f'_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y'}) \\ &= \bigcap_{Z'} \text{Tr}_{Z'/\text{Spec}(R)}(f'_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Z'}) \\ &= \tau_+(\omega_R, \varpi^{1/p^e}), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof in the normal case.

In general, let $n : X^N \rightarrow X$ denote the normalization. Base changing to R , we obtain $R \rightarrow \prod S_i$ where each S_i is a complete normal local domain. Note that for any normal alteration $f : W \rightarrow X$, $\text{Tr} : f_* \omega_W \rightarrow \omega_X$ factors through $n_* \omega_{X^N} \hookrightarrow \omega_X$. Furthermore, the alteration which computes $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X^N/V})$ base changes to the one that computes each $\tau_+(\omega_{S_i}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ as above. By [Corollary 6.12](#) and [\[BMP⁺23, Lemma 4.18\]](#), the same alteration computes $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})$ and also $\tau_+(\omega_R, \varpi^{1/p^e})$. \square

6.3. Comparison with the test module due to Hacon-Lamarche-Schwede. In this subsection, we compare $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})$ with the version of test module introduced and studied in [\[HLS22\]](#) when $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is projective (or quasi-projective).

Theorem 6.17. *With notation as in [Definition 2.9](#), we have*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, 1/p^e \text{div}(p))$$

for all $e \gg 0$.

Proof. It is enough to show that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ for all $e \gg 0$ since $\text{div}(p)$ is a multiple of $\text{div}(\varpi)$. By [Theorem 6.9](#), we know that for all $e \gg 0$, we have

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) = \bigcap_Y \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V})$$

where Y runs over all alterations such that $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_Y$ (note that the right hand side in fact stabilizes as in [Theorem 6.9](#)). By [\[HLS22, Proposition 4.11\]](#), we have

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) \subseteq \mathrm{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Y/V})$$

for all Y such that $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_Y$, thus $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e}) \subseteq \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})$.

It remains to show that $\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ for all $e \gg 0$. Let \mathcal{L} be a very ample line bundle on X and let $S = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^i)$ be the section ring of X with respect to \mathcal{L} . By [\[HLS22, Proposition 4.7\]](#), we know that $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ is the sheaf associated to the graded S -module $\bigoplus_{i > 0} \mathbf{B}^0(X, \frac{1}{p^e} \mathrm{div}(\varpi); \omega_{X/V} \otimes \mathcal{L}^i)$. By [\[BMP+23, Proposition 5.5\]](#) (note that we need a pair version with $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \frac{1}{p^e} \mathrm{div}(\varpi); \omega_{X/V} \otimes \mathcal{L}^i)$ in place of $\mathbf{B}^0(X; \omega_{X/V} \otimes \mathcal{L}^i)$, which follows from the same argument there), we have a graded isomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{i > 0} \mathbf{B}^0(X, \frac{1}{p^e} \mathrm{div}(\varpi); \omega_{X/V} \otimes \mathcal{L}^i) \cong \left[\bigcap_T \mathrm{Tr}_{T/S}(\varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_T) \right]_{>0}$$

where T runs over all graded finite domain extensions of S such that $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in T$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_{T/S}: \omega_T \rightarrow \omega_S$ is the trace map. On the other hand, by [Theorem 6.9](#), we know that for all $e \gg 0$, we have that

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{S/V}) = \bigcap_Z \mathrm{Tr}_{Z/\mathrm{Spec}(S)}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_{Z/V})$$

where $f: Z \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(S)$ runs over all alterations of $\mathrm{Spec}(S)$ such that $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_Z$. In particular, we have that

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{S/V}) \subseteq \bigcap_T \mathrm{Tr}_{T/S}(\varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_T).$$

where T runs over all graded finite domain extensions of S such that $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in T$ as above. Finally, we note that there is an open affine cover $\{U_j\}$ of X such that $Z_j := \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{U_j}[t, t^{-1}])$ is an open affine cover of $\mathrm{Spec}(S) - V(S_+)$. By [Theorem 6.13](#), we have

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{Z_j/V}) \cong g_j^* \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{U_j/V}) \otimes \omega_{Z_j/U_j} (\cong \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{U_j/V})[t, t^{-1}])$$

where $g_j: Z_j \rightarrow U_j$. It follows that we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{Z_j/V}) & \xlongequal{\quad} & \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{S/V})|_{Z_j} \xrightarrow{\quad} & \left(\bigoplus_{i > 0} \mathbf{B}^0(X, \frac{1}{p^e} \mathrm{div}(\varpi); \omega_{X/V} \otimes \mathcal{L}^i) \right)|_{Z_j} \\ \parallel & & \parallel & \parallel \\ g_j^* \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{U_j/V}) \otimes \omega_{Z_j/U_j} & \xlongequal{\quad} & g_j^* \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})|_{U_j} \otimes \omega_{Z_j/U_j} & g_j^* \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})|_{U_j} \otimes \omega_{Z_j/U_j} \end{array}$$

where the right vertical identification follows from [\[HLS22, Proposition 4.7\]](#): $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ is the sheaf associated to the graded S -module $\bigoplus_{i > 0} \mathbf{B}^0(X, \frac{1}{p^e} \mathrm{div}(\varpi); \omega_{X/V} \otimes \mathcal{L}^i)$. It follows from the diagram above that

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})|_{U_j} \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})|_{U_j}.$$

Since $\{U_j\}$ covers X , $\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ as wanted. \square

7. TEST IDEALS AND MODULES OF PAIRS

Our goal in this section is to generalize the results from [Section 6](#) to pairs (X, Γ) where Γ is a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier \mathbf{Q} -divisor, and also similarly to define test *ideals* $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta)$ where Δ is a \mathbf{Q} -divisor so that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier. In particular, this will assign test ideals $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X)$ when X is \mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein that agree with previous definitions. All these ideals will incorporate small perturbations that are necessary for our proofs to work.

Unless otherwise stated, we work in the following setting.

Setting 7.1. Let (V, ϖ, k) be a complete DVR of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$ and let X be a finite type, normal, integral scheme over $\text{Spec}(V)$ such that $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } V$ is flat (equivalently, surjective). We take Γ to be a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier \mathbf{Q} -divisor on X .

Remark 7.2. In this section we will often refer to [Section 6](#) in which X was assumed to be separated as sometimes it was necessary to consider proper compactifications. However, this does not cause any problems, as all our results are local, so we can always restrict to open affine subsets in which case separatedness is automatic. We shall implicitly do this over and over again in the proofs below, without stating this explicitly.

Convention 7.3. Throughout this section, if $Y \rightarrow X$ is finite surjective with Y normal and integral, we continue to use $\text{Tr}_{Y/X} : K(Y) \rightarrow K(X)$ to denote the trace map. We will often simply write Tr instead of $\text{Tr}_{Y/X}$ when $Y \rightarrow X$ is clear from the context.

Moreover, we will write $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_X, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ for $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{X/V}, \varpi^{1/p^e})$ from [Definition 6.8](#), and $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$ for $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V})$ from [Definition 6.10](#) – which is justified as these objects are independent of the choice of V (see [Theorem 6.9](#) and [Definition 6.10](#)).

For convenience of the reader, we summarize the results from [Section 6](#) that we will use in this section.

- (a) For all $e \gg 0$, we have $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X) = \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_X, \varpi^{1/p^e})$. Moreover, there exists an alteration $Y_e \rightarrow X$ with $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_{Y_e}$ such that for all further alterations $Y \rightarrow Y_e$ with composition $f : Y \rightarrow Y_e \rightarrow X$, we have $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_X, \varpi^{1/p^e}) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_Y)$. ([Theorem 6.9](#))
- (b) For $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a finite surjective map such that Y is normal and integral, we have $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X}(f_* \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_Y))$. ([Corollary 6.12](#))
- (c) $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)[1/p] \cong \mathcal{J}(X[1/p], \omega_{X[1/p]})$, and for all $x \in X_{p=0}$ with $R := \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, we have $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} = \tau_+(\omega_R, p^{1/p^e})$ for all $e \gg 0$. ([Corollary 6.11](#) and [Corollary 6.16](#))
- (d) If $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is projective, then we have $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, p^{1/p^e})$ for all $e \gg 0$, where the latter is defined in [Section 2.4](#). ([Theorem 6.17](#))

Strictly speaking, the assumption on normality in (b) is unnecessary, but it will be needed when we generalize this result to the case of pairs.

Definition 7.4. In the situation of [Setting 7.1](#), choose $\psi : Y \rightarrow X$ a finite surjective map such that $\psi^*\Gamma$ is Cartier. We define

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma) := \text{Tr}_{Y/X} \left(\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_Y(-\psi^*\Gamma) \right).$$

It follows from [Corollary 6.12](#) that this is independent of the choice of $\psi : Y \rightarrow X$. Moreover, when $\Gamma \geq 0$, we have that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma) \subseteq \omega_X$. If $X = \text{Spec } R$ is affine and $\Gamma = t \text{ div } f$ for some $f \in \text{Spec } R$ and $t \in \mathbf{Q}_{\geq 0}$, then we write

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_R, f^t) := \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, t \text{ div } f)$$

for the corresponding submodule of ω_R .

Remark 7.5. Similarly, given a \mathbf{Q} -divisor Δ such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, we define

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) := \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta).$$

It follows from the projection formula that if $\Gamma = \Gamma' + H$ for some Cartier divisor H , then

$$(7.5.1) \quad \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma') \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X(-H).$$

In most cases this implies that we may reduce the proofs of the results below to when $\Gamma \geq 0$, in which case $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ is a subsheaf of ω_X . We first observe the following result on the completed stalks of $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ (recall the definition of τ_+ for complete local rings from [Definition 2.5](#) and [Definition 2.6](#)).

Corollary 7.6. *In the situation of [Setting 7.1](#), let $x \in X_{p=0} \subseteq X$ and $R := \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$. Then we have*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes R = \tau_+(\omega_R, \epsilon \operatorname{div}(p) + \Gamma|_R)$$

for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that X is affine and $\Gamma \geq 0$. Choose $f : Y \rightarrow X$ a finite surjective map for which $f^*\Gamma$ is Cartier. Write $f^*\Gamma = \operatorname{div}(h)$ for $h \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$. Pick $y \in Y$ such that $f(y) = x$, and set $S := \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}}$. We get a corresponding extension of rings $R \subseteq S$.

By [Corollary 6.16](#) we have that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_Y)_y \cdot S = \tau_+(\omega_S, p^{1/p^e})$ for $e \gg 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes R &= \operatorname{Tr}_{Y/X} (h \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_Y)) \otimes R \\ &= \operatorname{Tr}_{S/R} (h \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_Y)_y \cdot S) \\ &= \operatorname{Tr}_{S/R} (\tau_+(\omega_S, 1/p^e \operatorname{div}(p) + f^*\Gamma|_S)) \\ &= \tau_+(\omega_R, 1/p^e \operatorname{div}(p) + \Gamma|_R), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is [Definition 7.4](#) and the last equality follows immediately from the definition of τ_+ (see [Definition 2.6](#)). □

7.1. Perturbation. Unfortunately, we do not know the answer to the following question:

Question 7.7. *For any effective Cartier divisor D on X , is it true that*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon D) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X)$$

for all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$?

We bypass this by building in perturbations. First we recall a special case of a lemma of Gabber-Liu-Lorenzini.

Lemma 7.8 ([\[GLL15, Theorem 8.1\]](#)). *Suppose $X \rightarrow \operatorname{Spec}(V)$ is flat, projective and X is integral. Then there exists a finite surjective map $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_V^n$. Hence, there exists a Cartier divisor $G \geq 0$ on \mathbb{P}_V^n such that h is étale outside of $h^{-1}G$.*

We next recall the following well-known result in our context.

Lemma 7.9 ([BS22, Remark 3.11]). *Suppose A is a Noetherian complete regular local ring of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$. Then there exists a perfectoid A -algebra A_∞ that is a p -completed filtered colimit of finite regular extensions of A . In other words,*

$$A_\infty = (\operatorname{colim}_e A_e)^{\wedge p}.$$

such that each A_e is a Noetherian complete regular local ring finite over A .

In particular A_∞ is faithfully flat over A and admits a map $A_\infty \rightarrow \widehat{R^+}$. Moreover, if B is any perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebra, then the induced map $A_\infty \rightarrow B$ is p -complete faithfully flat.

Proof. Let $C(k)$ be a coefficient ring for A (so $C(k)$ is a complete unramified DVR of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$), we can form a filtered system of complete unramified DVR $C(k')$ where k' runs over all finite inseparable extensions of k , whose completed colimit is $W(k^{1/p^\infty})$ (by a very similar construction as in Proposition 6.1 without adjoining p -power roots of the uniformizer).

If A is unramified, then $A \cong C(k)[[x_2, \dots, x_d]]$. In this case we consider the filtered system $C(k')[[p^{1/p^e}, x_2^{1/p^e}, \dots, x_d^{1/p^e}]]$ and set A_∞ be the p -completed colimit. If A is ramified, then we have $A \cong C(k)[[x_1, \dots, x_d]]/(p - f)$ where $f \in (x_1, \dots, x_d)^2$. In this case we consider the filtered system

$$C(k')[[x_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, x_d^{1/p^e}]]/(p - f).$$

Note that each item in this filtered system is a complete regular local ring (the maximal ideal is generated by $x_1^{1/p^e}, \dots, x_d^{1/p^e}$). The p -completed filtered colimit A_∞ is perfectoid (see [BS22, Remark 3.11] or [Shi16, Section 3] for more details). Furthermore, as all elements of R^+ admit compatible systems of arbitrary p -power roots, each A_e can be mapped to R^+ (each A_e is finite over A) inducing $\operatorname{colim}_e A_e \rightarrow R^+$ and hence A_∞ maps to $\widehat{R^+}$. Thus A_∞ maps to every perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebra. Finally, since each A_e is a regular local ring and B is big Cohen-Macaulay, $A_e \rightarrow B$ is faithfully flat for all e and thus $A_\infty \rightarrow B$ is p -complete faithfully flat. \square

Proposition 7.10. *Suppose $W \rightarrow V$ is finite type with W integral regular and suppose we have a finite surjective $h : X \rightarrow W$ and an effective divisor G on W such that h is étale outside of $h^{-1}G$. For example, via Lemma 7.8, for X projective we can take $W = \mathbb{P}_V^n$. Fix $1 \gg \epsilon_0 > 0$ so that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^\alpha(\omega_X, \epsilon h^*G)$ is constant for all $\epsilon_0 \geq \epsilon > 0$ (which exists since X is Noetherian). Then for all $x \in X_{p=0}$ and $R := \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, we have*

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^\alpha(\omega_X, \epsilon h^*G) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} = \tau_B(\omega_R).$$

In particular, the left hand side above is independent of the choice of h and G .

Proof. Begin by setting $a = h(x) \in W$ and $A = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{W,a}}$ and suppose that $g \in A$ is a local defining equation for G . Note that A is a complete regular local ring (it is possibly ramified, indeed even V might be a ramified DVR). Note also that $(h_* \mathcal{O}_X)_a \cdot A$ is a product of complete local rings, one of which is R . It follows that $A[g^{-1}] \subseteq R[g^{-1}]$ is étale.

By Corollary 7.6, we already know that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^\alpha(\omega_X, \epsilon h^*G) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} = \tau_+(\omega_R, p^{\epsilon'} g^\epsilon)$ for $1 \gg \epsilon' > 0$. By assumption, this remains unchanged after shrinking ϵ and ϵ' further, so we moreover have that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^\alpha(\omega_X, \epsilon h^*G) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} = \tau_+(\omega_R, p^\epsilon g^\epsilon)$ for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$. Thus it suffices to prove the following claim.

Claim 7.11. *Suppose $A \subseteq R$ is a finite extension of Noetherian complete local domains of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$ such that A is regular. Additionally suppose that $0 \neq g \in A$ is such that $A[g^{-1}] \subseteq R[g^{-1}]$ is étale. Then*

$$\tau_+(\omega_R, p^\epsilon g^\epsilon) = \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_R)$$

for all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$.

Proof of Claim. In the proof below, we replace g by pg , and remove the p^ϵ , a harmless reduction in notation. The key computations can be found in [CLM⁺23, Lemma 5.1.6] and [MS21, Proposition 5.7]. Following the notation in the former reference, consider

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 &:= \{ \eta \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \mid (g^{1/p^\infty})\eta = 0 \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R^+) \} \\ M_3 &:= \{ \eta \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \mid (g^{1/p^\infty})\eta = 0 \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(B) \text{ for some perfectoid BCM } R^+\text{-algebra } B \} \\ M_4 &:= \{ \eta \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \mid \eta \mapsto 0 \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(B) \text{ for some perfectoid BCM } R^+\text{-algebra } B \}. \end{aligned}$$

By [MS21, Proposition 5.7], it suffices to show that $M_2 = M_4$. We will establish this by comparing them with M_3 . First of all, it is clear that $M_2, M_4 \subseteq M_3$. By [MS21, Lemma 5.6], we have $M_3 \subseteq M_4$ and thus $M_3 = M_4$. Note also that by [MS21, Theorem 4.9] we may fix a single B that so that M_3 and M_4 may be computed with respect to that single B .

It remains to show that $M_3 \subseteq M_2$. This argument proceeds essentially identically to the argument in [CLM⁺23, Lemma 5.1.6, Proof of $M_3 \subseteq M_1$] and we point out the differences. Let S denote the integral closure of R in the Galois closure of $K(R)/K(A)$. By Lemma 7.9, we have $A \rightarrow A_\infty$ where A_∞ is perfectoid that is a p -completed filtered colimit of finite regular extensions of A , and that $A_\infty \rightarrow B$ is p -complete faithfully flat. We set

$$R_{\text{perfd}}^{A_\infty} = (R \otimes_A A_\infty)_{\text{perfd}} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\text{perfd}}^{A_\infty} = (S \otimes_A A_\infty)_{\text{perfd}}$$

Following the argument of [CLM⁺23, Lemma 5.1.6, Proof of $M_3 \subseteq M_1$] verbatim at this point, we deduce that if $\eta \in M_3$ (that is $(g^{1/p^\infty}) \otimes \eta = 0 \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(B) = B \otimes H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)$) then

$$(g^{1/p^\infty}) \otimes \eta = 0 \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R_{\text{perfd}}^{A_\infty}) = R_{\text{perfd}}^{A_\infty} \otimes H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R).$$

Since A_∞ maps to \widehat{R}^+ , we know that $R_{\text{perfd}}^{A_\infty} = (R \otimes_A A_\infty)_{\text{perfd}}$ maps to \widehat{R}^+ by the universal property of the perfectoidization functor. Thus we have $(g^{1/p^\infty}) \otimes \eta = 0 \in \widehat{R}^+ \otimes H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)$, that is, $(g^{1/p^\infty})\eta = 0 \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R^+)$ as desired. \square

The claim completes the proof. \square

Definition 7.12 (Perturbation-friendly test module). We work in the situation of Setting 7.1. Cover X by open quasi-projective (for instance affine) $X_i \subseteq X$. We let \overline{X}_i be a projective compactification of X_i define

$$\tau(\omega_{X_i}) := \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_{\overline{X}_i}, \epsilon' h_i^* G_i)|_{X_i}.$$

for $1 \gg \epsilon' > 0$, where h_i and G_i are as in Proposition 7.10 (i.e., $h_i : \overline{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_V^n$ is finite surjective and étale outside $h_i^{-1}G_i$). By Proposition 7.10, the $\tau(\omega_{X_i})$ are independent of the choices of h_i and G_i and they agree on the overlaps $X_i \cap X_j$ – they are all coherent subsheaves of ω_X , and hence they glue to make the *mixed characteristic test module*: $\tau(\omega_X)$.

Recall that Γ is a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier \mathbf{Q} -divisor on X . We pick $f : Z \rightarrow X$ a finite surjective map with Z normal integral such that $f^*\Gamma$ is Cartier. We define the *mixed characteristic test*

module of (X, Γ) to be

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \text{Tr} \left(f_* \tau(\omega_Z) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \mathcal{O}_Z(-f^* \Gamma) \right).$$

Once again, this definition is independent of the choice of Z , using the transformation rules for finite maps [Corollary 6.12](#).

We first show that $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ can be computed on a single sufficiently large alteration when X is quasi-projective, which is an alternate way to conclude independence of the choice of Z above.

Theorem 7.13. *In the situation of [Setting 7.1](#) assume that $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } V$ is quasi-projective. Then there exists an effective divisor G^0 on X so that for every Cartier divisor $G \geq G^0$ on X and every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G), the following holds.*

There exists an alteration $\pi_\epsilon : Y_\epsilon \rightarrow X$ with $\pi_\epsilon^ \epsilon G$ and $\pi_\epsilon^* \Gamma$ Cartier such that for every further normal alteration $Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$ with composition $\pi : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon \rightarrow X$ we have that*

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon G + \Gamma) = \text{Tr} \left(\pi_* \omega_Y(-\pi^* \Gamma - \epsilon \pi^* G) \right).$$

Proof. We first deal with the case when $\Gamma = 0$. We may assume $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is projective. Let $G' > 0$ and $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$ be as in [Proposition 7.10](#) (cf. [Lemma 7.8](#)), so that for $\epsilon' > 0$ sufficiently small we have $\tau(\omega_X) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon' h^* G')$ by [Definition 7.12](#). Fixing such an ϵ' , by [Definition 7.4](#), if $\phi : Z \rightarrow X$ is such that $\phi^* \epsilon' h^* G'$ is Cartier, then

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon' h^* G') = \text{Tr}(\phi_* \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_Z) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(-\phi^* \epsilon' h^* G')).$$

Now by [Theorem 6.9](#), there is some e_0 , such that for every $e \geq e_0$ there is an alteration $Y_e \rightarrow Z$ with $\varpi^{1/p^e} \in \mathcal{O}_{Y_e}$ such that for every alteration $\psi : Y \rightarrow Z$ which factors through Y_e we have

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_Z) = \text{Tr}(\psi_* \varpi^{1/p^e} \omega_Y).$$

Now set $G^0 = h^* G' + \text{div}(\varpi)$, and choose ϵ_{G^0} to satisfy $\epsilon_{G^0} < 1/p^{e_0}$ and $\epsilon_{G^0} < \epsilon'$. For any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_{G^0}$, choose $e \geq e_0$ such that $1/p^{e+1} < \epsilon < 1/p^e$, and choose Y_e that dominates Y_e and Y_{e+1} . Then for any alteration $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ over Y_e we have

$$\text{Tr} \left(\pi_* \omega_Y \left(-\pi^* \frac{1}{p^e} G^0 \right) \right) \subseteq \text{Tr} \left(\pi_* \omega_Y (-\pi^* \epsilon G^0) \right) \subseteq \text{Tr} \left(\pi_* \omega_Y \left(-\pi^* \frac{1}{p^{e+1}} G^0 \right) \right).$$

Both modules on the outside are equal to $\tau(\omega_X)$ by construction.

Now for any $G \geq G^0$, note that we can find $G'' \geq G'$ on \mathbb{P}_V^n so that $G^1 := h^* G'' + \text{div}(\varpi) \geq G$. The arguments above yielding ϵ_{G^0} and Y_e are also valid for G^1 ; choose ϵ_0 to be the minimum of ϵ_{G^0} and the new ϵ_{G^1} . For every $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, we can further replace Y_e by a larger alteration so that it satisfies the desired conclusion for both G^0 and G^1 simultaneously. Hence we conclude by noting that:

$$\tau(\omega_X) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon G^0) \supseteq \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon G) \supseteq \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon G^1) = \tau(\omega_X)$$

$$\tau(\omega_X) = \text{Tr} \left(\pi_* \omega_Y(-\pi^* \epsilon G^0) \right) \supseteq \text{Tr} \left(\pi_* \omega_Y(-\pi^* \epsilon G) \right) \supseteq \text{Tr} \left(\pi_* \omega_Y(-\pi^* \epsilon G^1) \right) = \tau(\omega_X).$$

This completes the case of $\Gamma = 0$.

Finally, we handle the general case. Choose a finite map $\phi : Z \rightarrow X$ such that $\phi^* \Gamma$ is Cartier. Then

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \text{Tr}(\phi_* \tau(\omega_Z) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(-\phi^* \Gamma))$$

Set $h' = h \circ \phi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_V^n$. We may enlarge G' so that h' is étale outside $(h')^{-1}G'$ as well, and run the above argument for trivial boundary on Z , noting that the divisors G^0 and G^1 produced on Z are pulled back from X . Therefore, applying the result for trivial boundary on Z also produces the required ϵ_0 and the required alterations over X . \square

We list the properties of this test module.

Proposition 7.14. *We work in the situation of [Setting 7.1](#). The following hold.*

- (a) *If $\Gamma \leq \Gamma'$ then $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \supseteq \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma')$.*
- (b) *If D is Cartier then $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma + D) = \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(-D)$.*
- (c) *$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma)[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(\omega_{X[1/p]}, \Gamma|_{X[1/p]})$.*
- (d) *For any finite surjective map $f : X' \rightarrow X$, $\mathrm{Tr}(f_*\tau(\omega_{X'}, f^*\Gamma)) = \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma)$.*
- (e) *For any projective birational map $f : X' \rightarrow X$, $f_*\tau(\omega_{X'}, f^*\Gamma) \supseteq \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma)$.*
- (f) *Suppose X is quasi-projective. Then there exists $G^0 \geq 0$, such that for all Cartier divisors $G \geq G^0 \geq 0$ on X , we have that $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G + \Gamma)$ for all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G).*
- (g) *Suppose X is quasi-projective, $x \in X_{p=0}$, and $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$. Then there exists $G^0 \geq 0$ such that for all Cartier divisors $G \geq G^0 \geq 0$ on X , we have that*

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes R = \tau_+(\omega_R, \Gamma|_R + \epsilon G|_R)$$

for all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G).

- (h) *Suppose $x \in X_{p=0}$ and $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$. Then*

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes R = \tau_{\mathbf{B}}(\omega_R, \Gamma|_R).$$

- (i) *For any Cartier divisor $D > 0$ on X , we have that*

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \tau(\omega_X, \epsilon D + \Gamma)$$

for all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on D).

- (j) *For any smooth $f : Y \rightarrow X$ we have that*

$$f^*\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes \omega_{Y/X} = \tau(\omega_Y, f^*\Gamma)$$

Proof. (a) and (b) follow easily from the definition (or can be deduced from various other properties below).

For (c), simply observe that $\mathcal{J}(\omega_{X[1/p]}, \Gamma|_{X[1/p]})$ can be computed from a sufficiently large alteration, cf. [\[BST15, Proof of Theorem 8.1\]](#), and apply [Theorem 7.13](#).

We next prove (d) and (e) simultaneously. Let $G_{0,X}$ and $G_{0,X'}$ be the effective Cartier divisors on X and X' that satisfy the conclusion of [Theorem 7.13](#) for X and X' respectively. Fix a Cartier divisor $G \geq G_{0,X}$ such that $f^*G \geq G_{0,X'}$ and fix $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ (depending on G) so that this data satisfies the conclusion of [Theorem 7.13](#) for G on X and f^*G on X' respectively. Take Y_ϵ and Y'_ϵ as in [Theorem 7.13](#) and fix an alteration Y that dominates both Y_ϵ and Y'_ϵ . Consider

$$\pi : Y \xrightarrow{\pi'} X' \xrightarrow{f} X.$$

It follows from [Theorem 7.13](#) that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \mathrm{Tr}_{Y/X}(\pi_*\omega_Y(-\epsilon\pi^*G - \pi^*\Gamma)), \text{ and}$$

$$\tau(\omega_{X'}, f^*\Gamma) = \mathrm{Tr}_{Y/X'}(\pi'_*\omega_Y(-\epsilon\pi^*G - \pi^*\Gamma)).$$

In particular, applying f_* to the surjection

$$\pi'_*\omega_{Y'}(-\epsilon\pi'^*G - \pi'^*\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_{Y'/X'}} \tau(\omega_{X'}, f^*\Gamma),$$

we obtain the top row in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_*\omega_Y(-\epsilon\pi^*G - \pi^*\Gamma) & \xrightarrow{f_*\text{Tr}_{Y/X'}} f_*\tau(\omega_{X'}, f^*\Gamma) & \hookrightarrow K(X') \\ & \searrow \text{Tr}_{Y/X} & \downarrow \text{Tr}_{X'/X} \\ & & \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \hookrightarrow K(X) \end{array} .$$

Now if f is finite, then $f_*\text{Tr}_{Y/X'}$ is surjective and the diagram shows that $\text{Tr}(f_*\tau(\omega_{X'}, f^*\Gamma)) = \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ (viewed as subsheaves of $K(X)$) which proves (d), while if f is projective birational, then $K(X') = K(X)$ (i.e., $\text{Tr}_{X'/X}$ is an isomorphism) and the diagram shows that $f_*\tau(\omega_{X'}, f^*\Gamma) \supseteq \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma)$ which proves (e).

Now we prove (f). We may assume that X is projective, and we first consider the case that $\Gamma = 0$ (which is the key case). By [Definition 7.12](#), we can fix a Cartier divisor $G' \geq 0$ such that for all Cartier divisors $G'' \geq G'$, we have $\tau(\omega_X) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon''G'')$ for all $0 < \epsilon'' \ll 1$. Set $G^0 := G' + \text{div}(p)$ and we will show that G^0 satisfies the conclusion of (f) (with $\Gamma = 0$). Fix a Cartier divisor $G \geq G^0$, we need to show that $\tau(\omega_X) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G)$ for all $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. Note that, since $G - \text{div}(p) \geq G^0 - \text{div}(p) = G'$, by our choice of G' , we know that

$$(7.14.1) \quad \tau(\omega_X) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon(G - \text{div}(p))) \text{ for all } 0 < \epsilon \ll 1.$$

Next, we note that by Noetherianity of X , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(7.14.2) \quad \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \alpha \text{div}(p) + \beta(G - \text{div}(p))) \text{ is constant for all } 0 < \alpha, \beta \leq \delta.$$

At this point, by (7.14.1) and (7.14.2), we fix $0 < \epsilon \ll \delta$ so that we have $\tau(\omega_X) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon(G - \text{div}(p)))$. Choose a finite cover $f: W \rightarrow X$ such that $\epsilon f^*(G - \text{div}(p))$ is Cartier on W . We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\omega_X) &= \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon(G - \text{div}(p))) \\ &= \text{Tr}(f_*\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_W) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_W} \mathcal{O}_W(-\epsilon f^*(G - \text{div}(p)))) \\ &= \text{Tr}(f_*\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_W, \epsilon' \text{div}(p)) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_W} \mathcal{O}_W(-\epsilon f^*(G - \text{div}(p)))) \\ &= \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon' \text{div}(p) + \epsilon(G - \text{div}(p))) \\ &= \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon \text{div}(p) + \epsilon(G - \text{div}(p))) \\ &= \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G) \end{aligned}$$

for all $0 < \epsilon' \ll \epsilon$ where the first equality follows by our choice of ϵ , the second equality follows from [Definition 7.12](#), the third equality follows from [Theorem 6.17](#), the fourth equality follows from [[HLS22](#), Theorem 4.21], the fifth equality follows from $\epsilon' \ll \epsilon \ll \delta$ and (7.14.2). This completes the proof when $\Gamma = 0$.

Finally, we can take a finite cover $\pi: X' \rightarrow X$ such that $\pi^*\Gamma$ is a Cartier divisor on X' . By the already established $\Gamma = 0$ case applied to X' , we find a Cartier divisor $G'^0 \geq 0$ on X' . Note that by the argument in the $\Gamma = 0$ case, we may as well assume that $G'^0 = \pi^*G^0$ where $G^0 \geq 0$ is a Cartier divisor on X . It follows that for all Cartier $G \geq G_0$ on X , $\tau(\omega_{X'}) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X'}, \epsilon\pi^*G)$ for all $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. By [Definition 7.12](#),

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \text{Tr}(\pi_*\tau(\omega_{X'}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X'}} \mathcal{O}_{X'}(-\pi^*\Gamma)),$$

and by [HLS22, Theorem 4.21],

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G + \Gamma) = \mathrm{Tr}(\pi_* \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_{X'}, \epsilon \pi^* G) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X'}} \mathcal{O}_{X'}(-\pi^* \Gamma)).$$

Putting these together we see that $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G + \Gamma)$ for all $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ as desired.

For (g), letting G^0 be chosen as in Theorem 7.13, for $G \geq G^0 + \mathrm{div}(p)$ and $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ we have

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes R = \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon(G - \mathrm{div}(p)) + \Gamma) \otimes R = \tau_+(\omega_R, \epsilon G|_R + \Gamma|_R)$$

where the second equality uses Corollary 7.6.

For (h) we may assume that X is affine and hence we may assume that Γ is effective. Pick $f : Y \rightarrow X$ finite with $f^* \Gamma$ is Cartier. Let h and G be as in Proposition 7.10 (i.e., $h : \bar{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_V^n$ is finite surjective and étale outside $h^{-1}G$); also set $h' = h \circ f$ and enlarge G to assume h' is also étale outside $(h')^{-1}G$. Choose $y \in Y$ to be a point lying over x . Let $S = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}}$ and we see that $R \subseteq S$ is finite. For $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) \otimes R &= \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_X, \epsilon h^* G + \Gamma) \otimes R \\ &= \tau_+(\omega_R, \epsilon \mathrm{div}(p) + \epsilon h^* G|_R + \Gamma|_R) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{S/R}(\tau_+(\omega_S, \epsilon \mathrm{div}(p) + \epsilon (h')^* G|_S + f^* \Gamma|_S)) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{S/R}(\tau_{\mathbf{B}}(\omega_S) \otimes_S S(-f^* \Gamma|_S)) \\ &= \tau_{\mathbf{B}}(\omega_R, \Gamma|_R) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses Corollary 7.6, the third equality uses [MS21, Theorem 6.17], the fourth equality follows from Claim 7.11, and the last equality again uses [MS21, Theorem 6.17].

For (i), it is harmless to assume that X quasi-projective. The result then follows from (f) since we may increase G . Alternately, it can be deduced from Theorem 7.13 by increasing G , or one may deduce it from (h) and the fact that it holds for $\tau_{\mathbf{B}}$ ([MS21, Theorem C]) plus the fact that these sheaves are coherent on a Noetherian X .

Finally, for (j), we may assume that both X and Y are quasi-projective. It suffices to prove this for étale maps and $X \times \mathbb{A}^m \rightarrow X$ (adjoining variables).

Thus suppose first that $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is étale. Let $\bar{f} : \bar{Y} \rightarrow X$ denote the integral closure of X in $K(Y)$. Finally, we pick G^0 so that both G^0 , and $\bar{f}^* G^0$ satisfy Theorem 7.13 on X and \bar{Y} respectively. Pick $G \geq G^0$ and $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$. We pick a sufficiently large alteration $X_\epsilon \rightarrow \bar{Y} \rightarrow X$ so that for all further alterations $\pi_X : X' \xrightarrow{\pi_{\bar{Y}}} \bar{Y} \rightarrow X$, we have that

$$(7.14.3) \quad \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \mathrm{Tr}_{X'/X} \pi_{X*} \mathcal{O}_{X'}(K_{X'} - \pi_X^*(\Gamma + \epsilon G)), \text{ and}$$

$$(7.14.4) \quad \tau(\omega_{\bar{Y}}, \bar{f}^* \Gamma) = \mathrm{Tr}_{X'/\bar{Y}} \pi_{\bar{Y}*} \mathcal{O}_{X'}(K_{X'} - \pi_X^*(\Gamma + \epsilon G))$$

Notice that $X' \times_X Y$ is normal and hence a disjoint union of irreducible components W_1, \dots, W_n with closures $\bar{W}_1, \dots, \bar{W}_n$. Each \bar{W}_i dominates X' and hence X_ϵ . It follows that applying $f^*(-) \otimes \omega_{Y/X}$ yields (7.14.4) restricted to Y , which is what we wanted.

It suffices to prove the result for $f : Y = X \times \mathbb{P}^m \rightarrow X$ and hence we may assume that X is projective over V . For convenience of the reader we provide the following diagram, the construction of which is gradually explained below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
Y'' := X'' \times \mathbb{P}_V^m & \xrightarrow{f''} & X'' & & \\
\downarrow \beta \lrcorner & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\
Y' := X' \times \mathbb{P}_V^m & \xrightarrow{f'} & X' & & \\
\downarrow v' \lrcorner & & \downarrow u' & & \\
Y := X \times \mathbb{P}_V^m & \xrightarrow{f} & X & & \\
& & \searrow h & & \\
& & \mathbb{P}_V^n \times \mathbb{P}_V^m & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{P}_V^n.
\end{array}$$

Choose $u' : X' \rightarrow X$ a finite map such that $(u')^*\Gamma$ is Cartier. Form the base change $f' : Y' = X' \times \mathbb{P}^m \rightarrow X'$. On X' , using a map $h_{X'} : X' \xrightarrow{u'} X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_V^n$, we can find a Cartier G^0 on X' pulled back from \mathbb{P}_V^n outside of which $h_{X'}$ is étale. Base changing with \mathbb{P}_V^m we have that

$$h_{Y'} : Y' \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_V^n \times \mathbb{P}_V^m$$

also a finite surjective map to a nonsingular scheme, which is étale outside of f'^*G^0 . Choose $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ that works for both $G := G^0$ and $G_Y := f'^*G^0$. Finally, set $u'' : X'' \xrightarrow{\alpha} X' \rightarrow X$ a further finite cover such that

$$(u'')^*\Gamma + \alpha^*\epsilon G$$

is Cartier. We then have that

$$(7.14.5) \quad \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma) = \mathrm{Tr}_{X''/X}(u'')_* \left(\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X''}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X''}} \mathcal{O}_{X''}(-(u'')^*\Gamma - \alpha^*\epsilon G) \right).$$

Setting $Y'' = X'' \times \mathbb{P}_V^m$ with associated $v'' : Y'' \xrightarrow{\beta} Y' \rightarrow Y$ we see likewise that

$$(7.14.6) \quad \tau(\omega_Y, f^*\Gamma) = \mathrm{Tr}_{Y''/Y}(v'')_* \left(\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{Y''}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{Y''}} \mathcal{O}_{Y''}(-(v'')^*f^*\Gamma - \beta^*\epsilon f'^*G) \right).$$

The result then follows from [Theorem 6.13](#) once we observe that the formation of trace commutes with base change and hence applying $f^*(-) \otimes \omega_{Y/X}$ to (7.14.5) yields (7.14.6). \square

Remark 7.15. We emphasize that any effective Cartier divisor G^0 as in the statements of [Definition 7.12](#), [Theorem 7.13](#), and [Proposition 7.14](#) is valid as long as its support contains the fibre over ϖ , and if we fix $\phi : Z \rightarrow X$ with $\phi^*\Gamma$ is Cartier, we have that $\mathrm{Supp} \phi^*G^0$ contains the ramification of the induced $Z \xrightarrow{\phi} X \xrightarrow{h} \mathbb{P}_V^n$.

We conclude with a corollary pointing out that the multiplier ideal in characteristic zero can be computed from *finite covers* in mixed characteristic and localizing. Suppose R is a Noetherian domain of essentially finite type over a complete DVR of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$ such that p is in the Jacobson radical (for instance if R is local of mixed characteristic). Define

$$\tau_{\mathrm{fin}}(\omega_R) = \bigcap_{S \supseteq R} \mathrm{Tr}(\omega_S)$$

where S runs over finite extensions of R contained in a fixed choice of R^+ . We define $\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}(\omega_R)$ analogously, running over alterations, as in the introduction.

Corollary 7.16. *With notation as above, $\tau_{\mathrm{fin}}(\omega_R)[1/p] = \tau_{\mathrm{alt}}(\omega_R)[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(\omega_{R[1/p]})$.*

Proof. Note we have

$$\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_R)[1/p] \subseteq \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_R)[1/p] \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\omega_{R[1/p]})$$

where $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_R)$ is defined as in the introduction (cf. [Proposition 7.14 \(a\)](#)). Hence, all three are equal which proves the second equality in the statement of [Corollary 7.16](#). Since $\tau_{\text{fin}}(\omega_R)[1/p] \supseteq \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_R)[1/p]$ it follows that $\tau_{\text{fin}}(\omega_R)[1/p] \supseteq \mathcal{J}(\omega_{R[1/p]})$.

Next pick a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in R$. By assumption $p \in \mathfrak{m}$. Let \widehat{R} denote the \mathfrak{m} -adic completion of R . Since $R \rightarrow \widehat{R}$ has geometrically regular fibers as R is excellent, it follows that

$$\mathcal{J}(\omega_{R[1/p]}) \otimes_{R[1/p]} \widehat{R}[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(\omega_{\widehat{R}[1/p]})$$

since a resolution base changes to a resolution. Now, on the other hand we have that

$$\tau_{\text{fin}}(\omega_R) \otimes_R \widehat{R} \subseteq \bigcap_{S \supseteq R} \text{Tr}(\omega_S \otimes_R \widehat{R})$$

since the intersection can only become bigger after completion. The right side is equal to $\tau_{\text{fin}}(\omega_{\widehat{R}}) = \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{\widehat{R}})$ by [[BMP⁺23](#), Proposition 4.29]. Furthermore $\tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{\widehat{R}})[1/p] \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\omega_{\widehat{R}[1/p]})$ as the left side is an intersection over things that compute the right after inverting p . Hence

$$\tau_{\text{fin}}(\omega_R) \otimes_R \widehat{R}[1/p] \subseteq \tau_{\text{alt}}(\omega_{\widehat{R}})[1/p] \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\omega_{\widehat{R}[1/p]}) = \mathcal{J}(\omega_{R[1/p]}) \otimes_{R[1/p]} \widehat{R}[1/p].$$

Since this holds for all \widehat{R} (running over all maximal ideals) and since the map $R_{\mathfrak{m}} \rightarrow \widehat{R}$ is faithfully flat, we see that

$$\tau_{\text{fin}}(\omega_R)[1/p] \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\omega_{R[1/p]}).$$

This completes the proof. \square

7.2. Test ideals. So far we have only defined test modules. We can now define test ideals as well.

Setting 7.17. Let (V, ϖ, k) be a complete DVR of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$ and let X be a finite type, normal, integral scheme over $\text{Spec}(V)$ such that $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } V$ is flat (equivalently, surjective). We take Δ to be a \mathbf{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier.

Definition 7.18. We work in the setting of [Setting 7.17](#). We define the *test ideal* of (X, Δ) to be the fractional ideal:

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) := \tau(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta).$$

When $\Delta \geq 0$, this is an ideal and not simply a fractional ideal.

It follows directly from the definitions and previous results that this test ideal agrees with those previously defined:

Corollary 7.19. *Let (X, Δ) be as in [Setting 7.17](#), and assume additionally that $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is quasi-projective. Furthermore, fix a point $x \in X_{p=0}$ and let $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$. Then there is a Cartier divisor $G^0 \geq 0$ on X such that for any Cartier divisor $G \geq G^0$ and any $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ (depending on G), we have:*

- (a) $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon G) := \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta + \epsilon G)$.
- (b) $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon G)$
- (c) $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) \cdot R = \tau_+(R, (\Delta + \epsilon G)|_R)$
- (d) $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) \cdot R = \tau_{\mathbf{B}}(R, \Delta|_R)$
- (e) $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta)[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O}_{X[1/p]}, \Delta|_{X[1/p]})$

(f) For all Cartier $D \geq 0$, $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon D)$ for all $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$.

Proof. These are translations of the previous results to the case of $\Gamma = K_X + \Delta$. Specifically:

- (a) This follows immediately from the definition of $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta)$.
- (b) This follows from [Proposition 7.14\(f\)](#).
- (c) This follows from [Proposition 7.14\(g\)](#).
- (d) This follows from [Proposition 7.14\(h\)](#).
- (e) This follows from [Proposition 7.14\(c\)](#).
- (f) This follows from [Proposition 7.14\(i\)](#).

□

Theorem 7.20. *With notation as in [Setting 7.17](#) the test ideal $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta)$ satisfies the following properties.*

(a) *Restriction: Suppose H is a normal Cartier divisor on X such that H and Δ have no common components in support. Then*

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) \cdot \mathcal{O}_H \supseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_H, \Delta|_H).$$

(b) *Finite maps: If $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a finite surjective map, then*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\tau(\mathcal{O}_Y, f^*\Delta - \mathrm{Ram})) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta).$$

(c) *Smooth maps: If $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a smooth map, then*

$$f^*\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_Y, f^*\Delta)$$

(d) *Birational maps: If $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a projective birational map, then*

$$f_*\tau(\mathcal{O}_Y, f^*(K_X + \Delta) - K_Y) \supseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta).$$

(e) *Subadditivity: If X is regular, then*

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_1 + \Delta_2) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_1)\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta_2).$$

Proof. By using [Proposition 7.14 \(h\)](#), the first follows from the corresponding local results for $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}$, see [[MST⁺22](#), Proposition 2.10 and Theorem 3.1], or from [[HLS22](#), Lemma 4.20 and Theorem 4.23]. The second, third and fourth follows from [Proposition 7.14 \(d\), \(j\), \(e\)](#). The subadditivity follows since it holds for complete local rings from the argument of [[MS18](#), Theorem 4.4], as carried out in [[Mur23](#), Theorem 6.18], *cf.* [[HLS22](#), Section 8.3], all of which are based on an argument of Takagi in characteristic $p > 0$ [[Tak06](#), Theorem 2.4]. □

Next we show that this test ideal can be computed from a single alteration in the following sense.

Corollary 7.21. *In the situation of [Setting 7.17](#) assume that X is quasi-projective. Then there exists an effective Cartier divisor G^0 on X so that every Cartier divisor $G \geq G^0$ on X , we have the following.*

There exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon_0 > \epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\pi_\epsilon : Y_\epsilon \rightarrow X$ with $\pi_\epsilon^(\epsilon G + (K_X + \Delta))$ Cartier, such that for every further normal alteration $Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$ with composition $\pi : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\pi_\epsilon} X$ we have that*

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \mathrm{Tr}(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*(K_X + \Delta) - \epsilon\pi^*G))$$

Proof. This follows from [Theorem 7.13](#) applied to $\Gamma = K_X + \Delta$. □

Finally we note a global generation result which immediately follows from the corresponding result in [HLS22].

Corollary 7.22. *In the situation of [Setting 7.17](#) we assume that X is projective over V and $\Delta \geq 0$. Let M be a Cartier divisor such that $M - K_X - \Delta$ is big and nef, and let A be a globally generated ample Cartier divisor. If $n_0 = \dim(X_{p=0})$, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(nA + M)$ is globally generated by $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X(nA + M))$ for all $n \geq n_0$.*

Proof. We first reduce to the case that $M - K_X - \Delta$ is ample. Indeed, as $M - K_X - \Delta$ is big and nef, there exists an effective Cartier divisor D such that $M - K_X - \Delta - \epsilon D$ is ample for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$. But for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon D)$ and $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta; \mathcal{O}_X(nA + M)) \supseteq \mathbf{B}^0(X, \Delta + \epsilon D; \mathcal{O}_X(nA + M))$, and so it suffices to prove the result with Δ replaced by $\Delta + \epsilon D$.

The corollary then follows from [HLS22, Corollary 6.2] applied to $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon G)$ where $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ and G is the divisor which appears in [Corollary 7.19](#). Indeed, we have that $M - K_X - \Delta - \epsilon G$ remains ample for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ and we know that $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon G)$ by [Corollary 7.19](#)(b). \square

7.3. Openness of p -almost splinter locus. Last we study the question of whether the splinter locus is open.

Definition 7.23. Fix a prime number $p > 0$. Let R be a Noetherian domain all of whose primes have residue field of characteristic 0 or p . We say that R is a *p -almost splinter* if and only if there exists a rational number $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ such that for every finite extension of rings $R \subseteq S$ such that $p^\epsilon \in S$, we have that the map $R \xrightarrow{p^\epsilon} S$ splits as a map of R -modules. The *p -almost splinter locus* is the set of primes $Q \in \text{Spec } R$ such that R_Q is a p -almost splinter.

Note that if R is normal, then $R[1/p]$ is normal in characteristic zero and so is a splinter. Hence the non- p -almost splinter locus is always a subset of $V(p) \subseteq \text{Spec } R$.

Setting 7.24. In this subsection, we fix R to be a normal \mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein domain of finite type and flat over a complete DVR V of mixed characteristic $(0, p > 0)$. Take $X = \text{Spec } R$.

Lemma 7.25. *With notation as in [Setting 7.24](#), if $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R) = R$, then R is a p -almost splinter.*

Proof. Fix $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and let $R \subseteq S$ be a finite extension such that $p^\epsilon \in S$. Recall that $\omega_{S/R} = \text{Hom}_R(S, R)$ is reflexive. By assumptions, $\tau_{\text{alt}}(R, p^\epsilon) = R$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, and if $R \hookrightarrow S$ is a finite extension, then $\text{Spec } S \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ is an alteration. Hence

$$\text{Image} \left(\text{Tr}_{S/R} : \omega_{S/R} \xrightarrow{p^\epsilon} R \right) = \text{Image} \left(\text{Hom}_R(S, R) \xrightarrow{\text{evaluation at } p^\epsilon} R \right)$$

is equal to R , and so $\text{Hom}_R(S, R) \xrightarrow{\text{evaluation at } p^\epsilon} R$ is surjective. This implies that $R \xrightarrow{p^\epsilon} S$ splits. \square

Lemma 7.26. *Let R be a complete Noetherian local domain. Then $\tau_+(R, p^\epsilon) = R$ for all rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ if and only if R is a p -almost splinter.*

Proof. Recall that $\omega_{S/R} = \text{Hom}_R(S, R)$, for a finite extension $R \subseteq S$, is reflexive. Then we have that:

$$\tau_+(R, p^\epsilon) = \bigcap_{\text{finite } R \subseteq S} \text{Tr}_{S/R}(\omega_{S/R}) = \bigcap_{\text{finite } R \subseteq S} \text{Image} \left(\text{Hom}_R(S, R) \xrightarrow{\text{evaluation at } p^\epsilon} R \right),$$

where the intersection is taken over all finite ring extensions $R \subseteq S$ such that $p^\epsilon \in S$. Thus the statement follows from the fact that $R \xrightarrow{p^\epsilon} S$ splits if and only if $\text{Hom}_R(S, R) \xrightarrow{\text{evaluation at } p^\epsilon} R$ is surjective. \square

Theorem 7.27. *For R as in [Setting 7.24](#), the p -almost splinter locus is open. Specifically if $R_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is a p -almost splinter for $\mathfrak{q} \in X_{p=0}$, then $R[1/g]$ is a p -almost splinter for some $g \notin \mathfrak{q}$.*

In the proof we use the notation $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R)$ from [Remark 7.5](#). All of its properties follows from that of $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(\omega_R)$ from [Section 6](#).

Proof. Observe that the \mathfrak{q} -completion $\widehat{R}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is a p -almost splinter as can be seen immediately from [\[BMP⁺23, Proposition 4.29\]](#).

First, we prove that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{q}$. To this end, suppose by contradiction that $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R) \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$. This immediately contradicts the following equalities for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$:

$$\widehat{\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R)}_{\mathfrak{q}} \stackrel{(1)}{=} \tau_+(\widehat{R}_{\mathfrak{q}}, p^\epsilon) \stackrel{(2)}{=} \widehat{R}_{\mathfrak{q}},$$

where (1) follows from [Corollary 6.16](#), and (2) follows from [Lemma 7.26](#).

Thus we can assume that there exists $g \in \tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R)$ such that $g \notin \mathfrak{q}$. Since $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R)$ is stable under localization, $\tau_{\text{alt}}^a(R[1/g]) = R[1/g]$. Thus $R[1/g]$ is a p -almost splinter by [Lemma 7.25](#). \square

Remark 7.28. For R as in [Setting 7.24](#) and any $0 \neq g \in R$, the results in this section, with the same proof as above, also show that the analogously defined pg -almost splinter locus of R is open as well.

8. TEST IDEALS OF NON-PRINCIPAL IDEALS

There are multiple ways to define test ideals associated to ideals \mathfrak{a}^t raised to formal exponents $t \geq 0$. Our goal in this section is to show that they all (almost) agree and hence that theorems we prove about one can be transferred to another.

We work first in the complete local case.

8.1. The complete local case. The following subsection is independent from the work done earlier in the paper.

Setting 8.1. Suppose (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a complete Noetherian local domain with residue field of characteristic $p > 0$. Suppose $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq R$ is an ideal and $t \geq 0$ is a rational number. We also fix a set $\{g_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ (typically a generating set).

More generally $\mathfrak{a}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{a}_m$ are ideals and $t_1, \dots, t_m \geq 0$ are rational numbers. In that case we may also consider subsets $\{g_{1,\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda_1} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_1, \dots, \{g_{m,\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_m$ (typically generating sets).

We set B to be a perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebra (for instance $\widehat{R^+}$).

Our first definition uses all the elements of the ideal \mathfrak{a} (and the powers of \mathfrak{a}).

Definition 8.2 ([\[MS18, ST21, Rob22, Mur23\]](#), cf. [\[HY03\]](#)). Define $\tau_B^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ to be the sum

$$\sum \tau_B(\omega_R, f^s)$$

where the sum runs over $f \in \mathfrak{a}^n$ and rational numbers $s \geq t/n$ for various integers n . We similarly define

$$\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \sum \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_R, f^s),$$

this is equal to $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ for all B sufficiently large by [MS21, Proposition 6.4].

More generally, for mixed test ideals, we define $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ to be

$$\sum \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_R, f_1^{s_1} \cdots f_m^{s_m})$$

where the sum runs over $f_i \in \mathfrak{a}_i^{n_i}$ and rational numbers $s_i \geq t_i/n_i$ for various integers $n_i > 0$. We similarly have $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$. The superscript “elt” is shorthand for *element-wise*.

Finally, if $\Delta \geq 0$ is a \mathbf{Q} -divisor such that $K_R + \Delta = \frac{1}{l} \text{div}(h)$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier (for some $h \in R$), then we define

$$\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) := \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_R, h^{1/l} \mathfrak{a}^t)$$

and likewise with $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$.

This is not exactly the definition as given in the above sources but it is easily seen to coincide up to perturbing the coefficients. The one given in the above sources is typically phrased in terms of local cohomology.

Our next definition is obtained by choosing a set of generators of $\mathfrak{a} = (g_\lambda)$.

Definition 8.3 ([MS18, ST21, Rob22, Mur23]). Define $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^t)$ to be the sum

$$\sum \tau_{\mathcal{B}}\left(\omega_R, \prod g_\lambda^{s_\lambda}\right)$$

where the sum runs over finite formal products $\prod g_\lambda^{s_\lambda}$ such that the (finitely many nonzero) s_λ are nonnegative rational numbers with $\sum_\lambda s_\lambda \geq t$. We further define

$$\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^t) := \sum \tau_{\mathcal{B}}\left(\omega_R, \prod g_\lambda^{s_\lambda}\right),$$

this is equal to $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^t)$ for all B sufficiently large again by [MS21, Proposition 6.4]. Note that for sets $\{g_\lambda\}$ with only one element, this clearly coincides with our earlier definitions of $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_R, g^t)$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, g^t)$.

More generally, if $\Gamma = s \text{div } g \geq 0$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, we define $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, \Gamma, [g_{1,\lambda}]^{t_1} \cdots [g_{m,\lambda}]^{t_m})$ to be

$$\sum \tau_{\mathcal{B}}\left(\omega_R, g^s \left(\prod g_{1,\lambda}^{s_{1,\lambda}}\right) \cdots \left(\prod g_{m,\lambda}^{s_{m,\lambda}}\right)\right)$$

where again we run over finite formal products for finite sets of nonnegative rational numbers (finitely many nonzero) $s_{i,\lambda} \geq 0$ with $\sum_\lambda s_{i,\lambda} \geq t_i$. We similarly define the test modules $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_{1,\lambda}]^{t_1} \cdots [g_{m,\lambda}]^{t_m})$. If Δ is such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, we can also define $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(R, \Delta, [g_{1,\lambda}]^{t_1} \cdots [g_{m,\lambda}]^{t_m})$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{elt}}(R, \Delta, [g_{1,\lambda}]^{t_1} \cdots [g_{m,\lambda}]^{t_m})$ in the way analogous to **Definition 8.2**. Non-effective Γ or Δ can be handled by adding an effective Cartier divisor and then untwisting to obtain a fractional ideal (or fractional submodule of ω_R).

Finally, there is a third notion which appeared in [HLS22].

Definition 8.4. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X = \text{Spec}(R)$ be a projective birational map from a normal Y factoring through the blowup of \mathfrak{a} (for instance, we can let Y denote the normalized blowup of \mathfrak{a}). Write $\mathcal{O}_Y(-M) = \mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathcal{O}_Y$ for some Cartier divisor M . We define $\tau_{\mathcal{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ to be

$$\mathbf{B}^0(Y, tM; \omega_Y) \subseteq H^0(Y, \omega_Y) \subseteq \omega_R.$$

This is independent of the choice of Y by [BMP⁺23, Lemma 4.19].

More generally, for mixed test ideals, if $f : Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ as above factors through all the blowups of the \mathfrak{a}_i and we write $\mathfrak{a}_i \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M_i)$, and Γ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier then we define $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \Gamma, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ to be

$$\mathbf{B}^0(Y, f^* \Gamma + t_1 M_1 + \cdots + t_m M_m; \omega_Y) \subseteq H^0(Y, \omega_Y) \subseteq \omega_R.$$

Finally, if Δ is such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, then we can define

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) := \mathbf{B}^0(Y, tM + \pi^*(K_X + \Delta); \omega_Y) \subseteq \omega_R.$$

The ideal $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ is defined similarly.

Remark 8.5. The generalization to $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \Gamma, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m}) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, (g)^s \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ is superficial. Indeed, suppose for each i we write $s = a/b, t_i = a_i/b$ for integers a_i and a common denominator b , it is straightforward to see that

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m}) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{1/b})$$

where $\mathfrak{a} = g^a \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1 b} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m b}$ (an honest ideal).

All of these definitions have various advantages. For instance $\tau(\omega_S, [g_\lambda]^t)$ is easily seen to satisfy summation-type theorems, and subadditivity for this variant can be found in [Mur23] or [MS18], cf. [Tak06] when R is regular. On the other hand, if R is regular or even BCM-regular in the sense of [MS21], it is easy to see that

$$\mathfrak{a}^{[t]} = (g_\lambda)^{[t]} \subseteq \tau(R, [g_\lambda]^t).$$

We explicitly highlight some key properties of $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ as several will be useful shortly.

Proposition 8.6. *With notation as in Definition 8.4:*

- (a) If $t \leq t'$ then $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) \supseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t'})$.
- (b) If $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$ then $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{b}^t)$.
- (c) $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \bar{\mathfrak{a}}^t)$, where $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}$ is the integral closure (likewise for mixed and ideal variants).
- (d) If $\pi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ is any normal alteration with $\mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathcal{O}_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(-G)$ and such that tG is Cartier, then

$$\tau(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) \subseteq \text{Tr} \left(H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z(K_Z - tG)) \right).$$

Proof. Properties (a) and (b) follow from [BMP⁺23, Lemma 4.7]. (c) follows since $\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_Y = \bar{\mathfrak{a}} \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$. (d) follows since

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \mathbf{B}^0(Y, tM; \omega_Y) = \bigcap_{Z \rightarrow Y} \text{Image} \left(H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z(K_Z - tG)) \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}} H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y)) \right)$$

where the intersection runs over normal alterations $Z \rightarrow Y$. □

Another particularly important property for $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ is Skoda's theorem. We give a complete proof here since it is proved in [HLS22] only for the case of a single ideal \mathfrak{a} .

Theorem 8.7. *Suppose (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a complete Noetherian reduced local domain with a positive characteristic residue field. Suppose $\mathfrak{a}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{a}_m \subseteq R$ are ideals and $t_1, \dots, t_m \geq 0$ are rational*

numbers. Suppose further that t_1 is greater than or equal to the number of generators of \mathfrak{a}_1 , then

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m}) = \mathfrak{a}_1 \cdot \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1-1} \cdot \mathfrak{a}_2^{t_2} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m}).$$

When R is normal and $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, the analogous result holds for the test ideal $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$.

Proof. For ease of notation, we show that

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s) = \mathfrak{a} \cdot \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t-1} \mathfrak{b}^s)$$

for $t \geq \dim R$ as we can reduce to this case via the observation of [Remark 8.5](#) (cf. [Remark 8.8](#)). Set $X := \text{Spec } R$.

Fix a normal birational map $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $\mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$ and $\mathfrak{b}\mathcal{O}_Y(-N)$ are line bundles. The effective divisors M and N are fixed throughout the proof. We now follow the argument of [\[HLS22\]](#), which itself is a modification of arguments from [\[ST14, Laz04, EL93\]](#). The point is we use Bhatt's vanishing for $\pi_+ : Y^+ \rightarrow X$ (where Y^+ is the absolute integral closure of Y) instead of Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing on a resolution in characteristic zero, or Frobenius plus Serre vanishing in characteristic $p > 0$.

Pick generators $s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathfrak{a}$ which then also generate $\mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$. Set $V = R^{\oplus \binom{n}{i}}$ to be the free R -module on the s_i . We have an exact Skoda/Koszul complex on Y

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{n-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow 0$$

where $\mathcal{F}_i = \wedge^i V \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(iM)$. We tensor this complex with \mathcal{O}_{Y^+} and note it stays exact since it is locally a resolution of a free module. Since $-tM$ and $-tN$ pull back to Cartier divisors on some finite cover $\kappa : W \rightarrow Y$, we write $\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(-tM - sN) := \mu^* \mathcal{O}_W(-\kappa^* tM - \kappa^* sN)$ to denote the pullback of the corresponding sheaf via $Y^+ \xrightarrow{\mu} W$. We twist by $\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(-tM - sN)$ and apply $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}}(-, \mathcal{O}_{Y^+})$ to obtain the following exact complex:

$$0 \leftarrow \mathcal{G}_n \leftarrow \mathcal{G}_{n-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \mathcal{G}_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{G}_0 \leftarrow 0$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_i := \wedge^i V \otimes \mathcal{O}_{Y^+}((t-i)M + sN)$$

Note $-\kappa^*((t-i)M + sN)$ is big and semi-ample for $i = 0, \dots, n$. Hence

$$0 = H^j \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}} \mathbf{R}\Gamma(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_i) = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^j(\mathbf{R}(\pi_+)_* \mathcal{G}_i) =: H_{\mathfrak{m}}^j(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_i)$$

for $j \neq d = \dim R$ by [\[Bha20\]](#) in the form of [\[BMP⁺23, Corollary 3.7\]](#) (the right term is a slight abuse of notation). It follows that

$$0 \leftarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_n) \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_1) \leftarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_0) \leftarrow 0$$

is also exact and most crucially $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_0) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_1)$ injects.

Since M, N are effective, we have canonical maps $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_0$ and $V \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$. Consider the following diagram:

$$(8.7.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} V \otimes H_m^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) & \longleftarrow & H_m^d(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{im}_2 & \longleftarrow & \text{im}_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_m^d(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_1) & \longleftarrow & H_m^d(Y^+, \mathcal{G}_0) \end{array}$$

where the middle row consists of images of the canonical maps. Let E denote an injective hull of the residue field of R , then by local and Grothendieck duality, and (2.3.1),

$$\text{Hom}_R(\text{im}_1, E) = \mathbf{B}^0(Y, tM + sN; \omega_Y) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s)$$

and likewise $\text{Hom}_R(\text{im}_2, E) = V \otimes \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t-1} \mathfrak{b}^s)$. Hence the Matlis dual of the middle horizontal map is the map

$$V \otimes \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t-1} \mathfrak{b}^s) \rightarrow \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s)$$

which is thus surjective. But V is the free vector space on the s_i and so we have just shown that

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s) = \mathfrak{a} \cdot \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t-1} \mathfrak{b}^s)$$

as desired.

The ideal case may be reduced to the test module case since if $K_R + \Delta = \frac{1}{n} \text{div}(h)$ then

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m}) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m} (h)^{1/n}).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 8.8. By passing to a finite étale extension of R and replacing \mathfrak{a}_1 with a reduction (a smaller ideal with the same integral closure), we may always assume that \mathfrak{a}_1 is generated by $\leq \dim R$ elements, see [HLS22, Proposition 3.10]. Hence, instead of assuming that $t_1 \geq$ (number of generators of \mathfrak{a}_1) we may alternately assume that $t_1 \geq \dim R$ in the statement of [Theorem 8.7](#).

We include a direct and alternative proof of the subadditivity property for $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}$ which mimics the strategy of [IMSW21, Proof of Theorem 4.3]. Note that when (R, \mathfrak{m}) is complete and regular (or more generally complete and Gorenstein), $\omega_R = R$ and we will write $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ for $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t)$.

Theorem 8.9. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a complete regular local ring of residue characteristic $p > 0$. Let \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{b} be two ideals. Then for all rational numbers $s, t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s \mathfrak{b}^t) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s) \cdot \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t).$$

Proof. Let $\pi: Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ be a projective birational map with Y normal that factors through the blowup of $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$. Let $\mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-G)$ and $\mathfrak{b}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)$. Note that these are both big and semi-ample on Y . Let Y^+ denote the absolute integral closure of Y . We will use the following notations ($d = \dim(R)$):

$$0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s} = \ker \left(H_m^d(R) \rightarrow H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG)) \right)$$

$$0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{b}^t} = \ker (H_m^d(R) \rightarrow H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(tH)))$$

$$0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t} = \ker (H_m^d(R) \rightarrow H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG + tH)))$$

We know from [HLS22] and [BMP⁺23] that $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \text{Image} (H_m^d(R) \rightarrow H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_Y(sG)))^\vee$. Since $H_m^d(R) = E$, the injective hull of the residue field of R , by Matlis duality we know that

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s) = \text{Ann}_R 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s} \text{ and } 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s} = 0 :_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s),$$

and similarly

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) = \text{Ann}_R 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{b}^t} \text{ and } 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{b}^t} = 0 :_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t),$$

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t) = \text{Ann}_R 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t} \text{ and } 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t} = 0 :_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t),$$

With notation as above, it is enough to show that $0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s} : \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) \subseteq 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t}$. Because if this is true, then since $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t) = \text{Ann}_R 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t}$, it follows that

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t) \cdot (0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s} : \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t)) = 0$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t) &\subseteq \text{Ann}_R(0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s} : \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t)) \\ &= \text{Ann}_R((0 :_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s)) : \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t)) \\ &= \text{Ann}_R(0 :_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s)\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t)) \\ &= \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{a}^s) \cdot \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) \end{aligned}$$

Now we prove $0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s} : \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) \subseteq 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s\mathfrak{b}^t}$. Suppose $\eta \in H_m^d(R)$ is such that $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t)\eta \in 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s}$. This means the image of $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t)\eta$ vanish in $H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG))$, i.e., we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Image of } \eta \text{ in } H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG)) &\in \text{Hom}(R/\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t), H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG))) \\ &\cong H^0(\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}(R/\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t), H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG)))) \\ &\cong H^0(\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}(R/\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t), \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} E)) \\ &\cong H^0(\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}(R/\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t), E) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG)) \\ &\cong H^0(\text{Ann}_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG)) \end{aligned}$$

where the isomorphism on the third line follows from Bhatt's vanishing [Bha20, Theorem 6.28] (see [BMP⁺23, Corollary 3.7], which implies that $H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG))$ is the first non-vanishing cohomology of $\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} E$, and it sits in degree 0) and the isomorphism on the fourth line follows from [Fox77, Proposition 1.1 (4)] (here we used R is regular so that $\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG)$ is isomorphic to a bounded complex of flat modules). Note that if we tensor the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{b}^t} & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(R) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(tH)) \\ & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ann}_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & E \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(tH) \end{array}$$

with $\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG)$ (the right vertical map exists again by Bhatt's vanishing explained above), then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ann}_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG) &\rightarrow E \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(tH) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG) \\ &\rightarrow E \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG + tH). \end{aligned}$$

is the zero map (the second map exists by [Sta, Tag 0FKU]). Therefore, we have $\mathrm{Image}(\eta) \in H^0(\mathrm{Ann}_E \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \mathfrak{b}^t) \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG))$ maps to zero in $H^0(E \otimes_R^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG + tH)) \cong H_m^d(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{Y^+}(sG + tH))$, that is, $\eta \in 0_{H_m^d(R)}^{\mathfrak{a}^s \mathfrak{b}^t}$ as wanted. \square

We now return to the problem of comparing our various notions of τ . We first note that we have the following containments:

$$\tau_B^{\mathrm{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^t) \subseteq \tau_B^{\mathrm{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) \subseteq \tau_{R^+}^{\mathrm{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t),$$

where the last containment follows from [HLS22, Remark 6.4]. The analogous containments also hold for mixed test modules $\tau(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ as well as the test ideal variations.

Our goal is to show these containments are equalities after slight adjustments (assuming the g_λ generate \mathfrak{a}). The key argument follows, which should be viewed as a variant of the summation formula for multiplier ideals [Mus02, Tak06, JM08].

Proposition 8.10. *Suppose that $(g_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda) = \mathfrak{a}$. Then for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ we have that*

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t+\epsilon}) = \tau_{R^+}^{\mathrm{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon}).$$

The analogous statement also holds for mixed test modules and mixed test ideals.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\{g_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\} = \{g_1, \dots, g_v\}$ is finite and t is rational. Fix $\epsilon' > 0$ such that $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t+\epsilon})$ is constant for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon'$ and such that $\tau_{R^+}^{\mathrm{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon})$ is also constant for such ϵ . Such an ϵ' exists by Noetherianity.

Let $S \supseteq R$ be a finite normal extension such that $\{g_\lambda^{1/N}\} \subseteq S$ for N so that $N\epsilon' \geq 2v$ which implies $N(t+\epsilon') - v \geq N(t+\epsilon'/2)$. We may also assume that $Nt, N\epsilon'/2 \in \mathbf{Z}$. Consider the ideal $\mathfrak{a}_N = (g_1^{1/N}, \dots, g_v^{1/N}) \subseteq S$. It follows easily that $\overline{\mathfrak{a}_N^N} = \overline{\mathfrak{a}S}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t+\epsilon'}) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}(\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_S, (\mathfrak{a}S)^{t+\epsilon'})) && (\mathbf{B}^0 \text{ under finite maps, [BMP}^+23, \text{Lemma 4.18]}) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}(\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_S, (\mathfrak{a}_N)^{N(t+\epsilon')})) && (\text{integral closure agnostic } \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}((\mathfrak{a}_N)^{N(t+\epsilon')-v} \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_S, (\mathfrak{a}_N)^v)) && (\text{Skoda theorem, [HLS22, Theorem 6.6]}) \\ &\subseteq \mathrm{Tr}((\mathfrak{a}_N)^{N(t+\epsilon'/2)} \tau_{R^+}(\omega_S)) && (\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_S, (\mathfrak{a}_N)^v) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_S) = \tau_{R^+}(\omega_S)) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\sum g_1^{a_1/N} \cdots g_v^{a_v/N} \tau_{R^+}(\omega_S)\right) && (\sum a_i = N(t+\epsilon'/2), a_i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}) \\ &= \sum \tau_{R^+}(\omega_R, g_1^{a_1/N} \cdots g_v^{a_v/N}) && (\mathbf{B}^0 \text{ under finite maps, [BMP}^+23, \text{Lemma 4.18]}) \\ &\subseteq \tau_{R^+}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon'/2}). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. The statement for mixed test modules and mixed test ideals follows similarly. \square

Theorem 8.11. *Suppose (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a Noetherian complete local domain and $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq R$ is an ideal. Pick a finite generating set $(g_\lambda) = \mathfrak{a}$. Suppose that $A \subseteq R$ is a Noether-Cohen normalization (i.e., $A \rightarrow R$ is a finite extension such that A is complete and regular). Then there exists $d_0 \in A$ such that for every $d \in R$ divisible by d_0 and for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on d) the following ideals are equal.*

- (a) $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_\lambda]^t)$
- (b) $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, \mathbf{a}^t)$
- (c) $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^\epsilon [g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon})$
- (d) $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^\epsilon \mathbf{a}^{t+\epsilon})$
- (e) $\tau_{R^+}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^\epsilon [g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon})$
- (f) $\tau_{R^+}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^\epsilon \mathbf{a}^{t+\epsilon})$
- (g) $\tau_{\mathbb{B}^0}(\omega_R, d^\epsilon \mathbf{a}^{t+\epsilon})$

The analogous result also holds for mixed test modules.

Proof. First of all, we notice that (a)=(c) and (b)=(d) for all d and $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, because for all $0 \neq g \in R$, $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}(\omega_R, f^s) = \tau_{\mathbb{B}}(\omega_R, f^s g^\epsilon)$ for all $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ by [MS21, Proposition 6.4] (by Noetherianity these test ideals are equal to a finite sum of test ideals for principal divisors, and so we only need to apply op.cit. a finite number of times). Also, for any d and ϵ , we clearly have (e) \subseteq (f) \subseteq (g) and Proposition 8.10 implies that they are equal for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ when applied to the mixed pair $(\omega_R, d^0 \mathbf{a}^t)$. Also, note that we have (c) \subseteq (d) \subseteq (f) = (e) for all d and $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, where the last equality is what we have already shown. Therefore, it only remains to show that (e) \subseteq (c) for the specified choice of d in the statement of theorem.

We begin by explaining how to choose d_0 . Let $0 \neq h \in A$ be such that $A[1/h] \rightarrow R[1/h]$ is étale. For each g_λ , let $0 \neq h_\lambda \in A$ be a multiple of g_λ . Set $d_0 := ph \prod_\lambda h_\lambda$.

Next, we fix a d that is a multiple of d_0 and consider

$$\tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^\alpha [g_\lambda]^{t+\beta}) \text{ and } \tau_{R^+}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^\alpha [g_\lambda]^{t+\beta})$$

for various $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Note that there exists ϵ_0 such that both these families are constant for all $0 < \alpha, \beta \leq \epsilon_0$ (by Noetherianity). Fix this ϵ_0 and fix $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon_0$. We can write

$$\tau_{R^+}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_0} [g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon_0}) = \sum_j \tau_{R^+}^{\widehat{}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_0} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}})$$

where the right hand side is a finite sum for various finite collections of $\{s_{j,\lambda}\}_\lambda$ such that $\sum_\lambda s_{j,\lambda} \geq t + \epsilon_0$. At this point, we examine each single $\tau_{R^+}^{\widehat{}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_0} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}})$. Let S be the normalization of $R[d^{\epsilon_1} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}}]$ inside R^+ . Note that $A[1/d] \rightarrow S[1/d]$ is étale by our choice of d_0 and d . Now we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{R^+}^{\widehat{}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_0} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}}) &= \text{Tr}_{S/R} \left((d^{\epsilon_1} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}}) \cdot \tau_{R^+}^{\widehat{}}(\omega_S, d^{\epsilon_0 - \epsilon_1}) \right) \\ &\subseteq \text{Tr}_{S/R} \left((d^{\epsilon_1} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}}) \cdot \tau_{R^+}^{\widehat{}}(\omega_S, d^\epsilon) \right) \\ &= \text{Tr}_{S/R} \left((d^{\epsilon_1} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}}) \cdot \tau_{\mathbb{B}}(\omega_S) \right) \\ &= \tau_{\mathbb{B}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_1} \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_{j,\lambda}}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\epsilon \ll 1$, where the first and last equality follows from [MS21, Theorem 6.17], the second to last equality follows from Claim 7.11 since $A[1/d] \rightarrow S[1/d]$ is finite étale and d is a multiple of p .

Finally, taking a sum, we see that

$$\tau_{R^+}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_0}[g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon_0}) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_1}[g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon_0}) = \tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, d^{\epsilon_0}[g_\lambda]^{t+\epsilon_0})$$

where the last equality follows from our choice of ϵ_0 . Thus, by our choice of ϵ_0 again, we have (e) \subseteq (c) for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ as we desired. \square

Remark 8.12. It is worth remarking that the d_0 constructed above is quite explicit. Indeed, repeating the proof, if $A[h^{-1}] \subseteq R[h^{-1}]$ is étale and $h_\lambda \in A$ is a multiple of g_λ , then we take

$$d_0 := ph \prod_{\lambda} h_\lambda.$$

In view of [Theorem 8.11](#), we make the following definition.

Definition 8.13. With notation as above if $(g_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda) =: \mathfrak{a} \subseteq R$, we define

$$\tau(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^t)$$

to be the common submodule of ω_R from [Theorem 8.11](#). The mixed test modules, denoted $\tau(\omega_R, \Gamma, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$, are defined similarly (or by combining the Γ and $\mathfrak{a}_i^{t_i}$ into a single \mathfrak{a}^t). Likewise if R is normal, then

$$\tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) := \tau(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \tau(\omega_R, h^{1/n} \mathfrak{a}^t)$$

where $\text{div}(h) = n(K_R + \Delta)$. The mixed test ideals $\tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}_1^{t_1} \cdots \mathfrak{a}_m^{t_m})$ are defined analogously.

Our results imply Takagi's summation formula in mixed characteristic [[Tak06](#)], cf. [[Mus02](#), [JM08](#)].

Corollary 8.14 (cf. [[Tak06](#)]). *Suppose (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a Noetherian complete local domain, Γ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier, and $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \subseteq R$ are ideals. Then*

$$\tau(\omega_R, \Gamma, (\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b})^t) = \sum_{t_1+t_2=t} \tau(\omega_R, \Gamma, \mathfrak{a}^{t_1} \mathfrak{b}^{t_2})$$

where the $t_i \geq 0$. The analogous result also holds for larger sums $\tau(\omega_R, (\mathfrak{a}_1 + \cdots + \mathfrak{a}_m)^t)$.

Proof. By taking a finite extension, we may assume that $\Gamma = 0$. Writing $\mathfrak{a} = (g_1, \dots, g_v)$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (g_{v+1}, \dots, g_w)$ we see

$$\tau(\omega_R, (\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b})^t) = \tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_1, \dots, g_w]).$$

Similarly, for mixed test modules,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t_1+t_2=t} \tau(\omega_R, \mathfrak{a}^{t_1} \mathfrak{b}^{t_2}) &= \sum_{t_1+t_2=t} \tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_1, \dots, g_v]^{t_1} [g_{v+1}, \dots, g_w]^{t_2}) \\ &= \tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_1, \dots, g_w]^t) \\ &= \tau(\omega_R, (\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b})^t). \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the definition of $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}^{\text{elt}}(\omega_R, [g_1, \dots, g_w]^t)$. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 8.15. The essential part of this argument is the proof of [Proposition 8.10](#). It is not difficult to see that this argument, or slight variants thereof, proves that the summation formula is a formal consequence in any multiplier/test ideal theory that allows small perturbations in the coefficients, has Skoda’s theorem, and satisfies transformation rules under finite maps.

Remark 8.16. [Theorem 8.11](#) answers a variant of [[MS18](#), Question 9.1], and also a question contained in [[HLS22](#), Remark 6.4] (in the local case). More specifically, in [[MS18](#), Definition 3.1 and 3.5], there are four versions of mixed characteristic test ideals defined using perfectoid algebras that are constructed via André’s flatness lemma (see [[And18](#), Section 2.5], [[Bha18](#), Section 2], [[BS22](#), Theorem 7.14]), and [Theorem 8.11](#) shows that, if one uses a sufficient large perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay R^+ -algebra B , then all four notions agree. If one uses the original construction in [[MS18](#)], then at least the perturbed element-wise defined $\tau([f_1, \dots, f_n]^t)$ and the $\tau(\mathfrak{a}^t)$ defined via perturbed blowups are the still the same (when f_1, \dots, f_n is a generating set of \mathfrak{a}). This can be proved by a similar argument as in [Theorem 8.11](#) by observing that adjoining compatible system of p -power roots to A_∞ via André’s construction maps to \widehat{R}^{+18} and noting that one can take $d = 1$ since $R = A$ is regular in [[MS18](#)]. We do not carry out the details here because we think that the test ideal defined via \widehat{R}^+ or B is better behaved (and seems the “correct” definition).

We summarize what we know about $\tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s)$ in the complete local case.

Corollary 8.17 (Summary of results in the complete local case). *Suppose R is a Noetherian complete local normal domain of residue characteristic $p > 0$, $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ are ideals and $\Gamma = K_R + \Delta$ is a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier divisor. Then $\tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s) = \tau(\omega_R, \Gamma, \mathfrak{a}^s \mathfrak{b}^t)$ satisfies the following.*

- (a) *The summation formula in the form of [Corollary 8.14](#).*
- (b) *Skoda’s theorem in the form of [Theorem 8.7](#).*
- (c) *The restriction theorem: if R is \mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein and $R/(f)$ is normal, then $\tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) \cdot R/(f) \supseteq \tau(R/(f), \Delta|_R, (\mathfrak{a}R/(f))^t)$.*
- (d) *Perturbation: $\tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^{t+\epsilon})$ for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$.*
- (e) *Singularity measurement: $\tau(R, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$ agrees with R after localizing at all points on the complement of $(\text{Spec } R)_{\text{sing}} \cup \text{Supp } \Delta \cup V(\mathfrak{a})$.*
- (f) *Subadditivity when R is regular and $\Gamma = 0$, in the form of [Theorem 8.9](#).*

Proof. These are straightforward consequences of what we have already done.

- (a) This follows from [Corollary 8.14](#).
- (b) This follows from [Theorem 8.7](#).
- (c) This follows from the main result of [[MST⁺22](#)] after reduction to the principal case (say via summation).
- (d) Perturbation is definitional.
- (e) Singularity measurement follows from [[MST⁺22](#), Theorem 4.1] after writing the ideal as a sum of test ideals of principal ideals $\tau(R, \Delta, f^s)$ (for instance, using summation).
- (f) For subadditivity, if the relevant $G = \text{div}(g)$, then for $1 \gg \epsilon = 2/N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(R, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, \epsilon G, \mathfrak{a}^t \mathfrak{b}^s) &= \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, (g\mathfrak{a}^N)^{t/N} (g\mathfrak{b}^N)^{s/N}) \\ &\subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, (g\mathfrak{a}^N)^{t/N}) \cdot \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(R, (g\mathfrak{b}^N)^{s/N}) = \tau(R, \mathfrak{a}^t) \cdot \tau(R, \mathfrak{b}^s). \end{aligned}$$

¹⁸Actually the perfectoid algebra constructed in [[MS18](#)] only admits a p -almost map to \widehat{R}^+ , but this is not an issue since in the test ideal definition in [[MS18](#), Section 3], we built in the small p -perturbation.

via [Theorem 8.9](#). The argument of [\[MS18, Mur23\]](#) cf. [\[Tak06\]](#), can also be adapted to work if one uses [Theorem 8.11](#). □

8.2. Global versions of test modules of non-principal ideals.

Setting 8.18. Suppose (V, ϖ) is a Noetherian complete DVR of residue characteristic $p > 0$ and X is an integral quasi-projective scheme over V . We fix \mathfrak{c} an ideal sheaf on X and take a finite set Λ and Cartier divisors C_λ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{O}_X(-C_\lambda) = \mathfrak{c}$. We take $t \in \mathbf{Q}_{\geq 0}$ and a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier divisor Γ on X .

In all the proofs below we can immediately replace X by a projective compactification.

Definition 8.19. With notation as in [Setting 8.18](#), we define

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t) := \sum_{\sum s_\lambda \geq t} \tau(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda C_\lambda),$$

where the sum is taken over tuples of non-negative rational numbers $(s_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ such that $\sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda \geq t$. As we will see in [Remark 8.22](#), this definition is independent of the choice of C_λ .

Remark 8.20. Similarly we can define

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}^t) = \sum_{\sum s_\lambda \geq t} \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma + \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda C_\lambda)$$

for a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier \mathbf{Q} -divisor Γ . More generally, let $\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_m$ be ideal sheaves on X . For $1 \leq j \leq m$, pick divisors $C_{\lambda,j}$ on X indexed by $\lambda \in \Lambda_j$ such that $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} \mathcal{O}_X(-C_{\lambda,j}) = \mathfrak{c}_j$. Let $t_1, \dots, t_m \in \mathbf{Q}$. Then we define

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}_1^{t_1} \dots \mathfrak{c}_r^{t_r}) := \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sum_{\sum s_{\lambda,j} \geq t_j} \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} s_{\lambda,j} C_{\lambda,j})$$

where the sums are taken over tuples of non-negative rational numbers $(s_{\lambda,j})_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j}$ such that $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} s_{\lambda,j} \geq t_j$. Since t_j are chosen to be rational this definition reduces to $\tau(\omega, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ for an appropriately chosen \mathfrak{c} , and so it will satisfy all the properties and results listed below in this subsection.

Recall from [Proposition 7.14 \(i\)](#) that for every $(s_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ such that $\sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda \geq t$ we can find $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda C_\lambda) = \tau(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda} (s_\lambda + \epsilon) C_\lambda)$$

In particular, we get that:

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t) = \sum_{\sum s_\lambda > t} \tau(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda C_\lambda),$$

By Noetherianity, $\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ is a sum of $\tau(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda C_\lambda)$ for some finite number of tuples $(s_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ such that $\sum s_\lambda > t$. Moreover, since localization commutes with finite sums, we get that $\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ is a coherent sheaf on X by [Theorem 7.13](#).

Lemma 8.21. For all $x \in X_{p=0}$ and $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, we have that

$$(8.21.1) \quad \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t) \otimes R = \tau(\omega_R, \Gamma|_R, (\mathbf{c}R)^t),$$

where the right hand side is the universal test ideal from [Definition 8.13](#) (noting that if $\Gamma|_R = s \operatorname{div}(g)$ then $\tau(\omega_R, \Gamma|_R, (\mathbf{c}R)^t) := \tau(\omega_R, (gR)^s(\mathbf{c}R)^t)$).

Proof. This follows by definition of $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t)$, by [Proposition 7.14 \(h\)](#), and by [Theorem 8.11](#) (equality between (a) and (b)). \square

Remark 8.22. It is easy to see that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathbf{c}^t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \left(\sum_{\substack{C \text{ Cartier} \\ \mathcal{O}_X(-C) \subseteq \mathbf{c}^n}} \tau(\omega_X, (t/n)C) \right),$$

and so, in particular, $\tau(\omega_X, \mathbf{c}^t)$ is independent of the choice of C_λ . Indeed, it is enough to show this equality after restricting to $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$ for every $x \in X_{p=0} \subseteq X$. Write $C_\lambda|_R = \operatorname{div}(g_\lambda)$ for $g_\lambda \in R$. Since the right hand side of the above displayed equality is a finite sum by Noetherianity again, we reduce to checking that:

$$\sum_{\sum s_\lambda > t} \tau(\omega_X, \prod_\lambda g_\lambda^{s_\lambda}) = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \sum_{f \in \mathbf{c}^n} \tau(\omega_R, f^{\frac{t}{n}}),$$

which follows from the content of [Definition 8.13](#).

Remark 8.23. Let \mathcal{L} be an ample line bundle on X , and let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ is a proper birational map from a normal Y factoring through the blowup of \mathbf{c} with M the Cartier divisor so that $\mathcal{O}_Y(-M) = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathcal{O}_Y$, and \mathcal{N}_i is the subsheaf of $\omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i$ generated by $\mathbf{B}^0(Y, tM; \omega_Y \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{L}^i) \subseteq H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^i)$. Following [[HLS22](#), Section 6.1] define

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \mathbf{c}^t) = \mathcal{N}_i \otimes \mathcal{L}^{-i} \quad \text{for } i \gg 0.$$

To prove the key result in this subsection ([Theorem 8.25](#)), we need the following lemma.

Lemma 8.24. With assumptions as in [Setting 8.18](#), let $x \in X_{p=0}$ and $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$. Then

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t) \otimes R \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \Gamma|_R, (\mathbf{c}R)^t).$$

Proof. After reducing to the case that $\Gamma \geq 0$ if necessary, we may incorporate Γ into \mathbf{c} and so assume that $\Gamma = 0$. We choose a proper birational map $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ and M as in [Remark 8.23](#). Now, $\mathbf{B}^0(Y, tM; \omega_Y \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{L}^i)$ is the intersection of the images of

$$H^0(Z, \omega_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(-t\nu^*M) \otimes \nu^* \pi^* \mathcal{L}^i) \rightarrow H^0(Y, \omega_Y \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{L}^i)$$

for alterations $\nu : Z \rightarrow Y$ with Z normal. Those images admit maps to the images of

$$H^0(Z_R, \omega_{Z_R} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{Z_R}(-t\nu^*M) \otimes \nu^* \pi^* \mathcal{L}^i|_{Z_R}) \rightarrow H^0(Y_R, \omega_{Y_R} \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{L}^i|_{Y_R}).$$

where Z_R and Y_R are the base changes to the complete local ring R . Of course, on R , \mathcal{L} is trivial, and the intersection of the latter images becomes $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \mathbf{a}^t)$ by [[BMP⁺23](#), Proposition 4.29]. The desired containment follows. \square

In what follows, suppose $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ a birational map from a normal Y factoring through the blow up of \mathbf{c} and write $\mathbf{c}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$. We define:

$$(8.24.1) \quad \mathbf{B}^0(X, \Gamma + \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^t; \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^n) := \mathbf{B}^0(Y, \pi^* \Gamma + \epsilon G + tM, \omega_Y \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{L}^n)$$

viewed as a submodule of $H^0(Y, \omega_Y \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{L}^n) \subseteq H^0(X, \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^n)$.

Theorem 8.25. *With assumptions as in [Setting 8.18](#), there exists an effective Cartier divisor G^0 on X such that for every divisor $G \geq G^0$ and every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G):*

$$(8.25.1) \quad \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma + \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^t).$$

As a consequence, for X projective over V , $\Gamma \geq 0$, and \mathcal{L} ample, we have that

$$H^0(X, \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t) \otimes \mathcal{L}^n) = \mathbf{B}^0(X, \Gamma + \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^t; \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^n)$$

for $n \gg 0$.

Proof. We may assume that $\Gamma = 0$ by reducing to the effective case and then absorbing Γ into a power of \mathbf{c} . Recall that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathbf{c}^t) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \tau\left(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda\right),$$

where $(s_\lambda^{(1)})_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, \dots, (s_\lambda^{(r)})_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ are some tuples of non-negative rational numbers such that the finite sums $\sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} > t$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Claim 8.26. *There exists an effective Cartier divisor G^0 such that for every $G \geq G^0$, for every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G) and for every $1 \leq i \leq r$:*

$$\tau\left(\omega_X, \sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda\right) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}\left(\omega_X, \epsilon G + \sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda\right).$$

Proof of Claim. For every $1 \leq i \leq r$ we take an effective Cartier divisor G_i^0 , containing all the C_λ in its support, such that the following holds. For every $G \geq G_i^0$ and every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G) the statement of [Proposition 7.14 \(f\)](#) is satisfied for $\Gamma = \sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda$.

Then we define G^0 to be a Cartier divisor such that $G^0 \geq G_i^0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$ (for example $G^0 = \sum_{i=1}^r G_i^0$). Then given $G \geq G^0$ we have that $G \geq G_i^0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, and so the statement of the claim is satisfied for every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G). \square

We fix a divisor G^0 , a divisor $G \geq G^0$, and $\epsilon > 0$ as in [Claim 8.26](#). By making ϵ smaller, we may assume that $\sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} > t + \epsilon$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. It suffices to show that:

$$(8.26.1) \quad \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \tau\left(\omega_X, \sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda\right) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^{t+\epsilon})$$

since we know that $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^t) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^{t+\epsilon})$ (by Noetherianity, and by making ϵ smaller, we may assume that $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^{t+\epsilon}) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon' G, \mathbf{c}^{t+\epsilon'})$ for $0 < \epsilon' \ll \epsilon$, which is then equal to $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^t)$ by absorbing the difference into ϵG which contains all C_λ in its support).

First we prove that the left hand side of [\(8.26.1\)](#) is contained in the right hand side. Specifically, we need to argue that

$$(8.26.2) \quad \tau\left(\omega_X, \sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda\right) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^{t+\epsilon})$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. To this end, observe that:

$$\tau\left(\omega_X, \sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda\right) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}\left(\omega_X, \epsilon G + \sum_\lambda s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda\right)$$

by [Claim 8.26](#). Then the containment [\(8.26.2\)](#) follows from the inclusion

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{b}) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathbf{a})$$

for $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ applied to $\mathfrak{b} = \mathcal{O}_X(-\sum s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda)$ and $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{c}^{t+\epsilon}$. Here, \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{a} are formal rational powers of ideals, and so the inclusion $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ means that $\mathfrak{b}^n \subseteq \mathfrak{a}^n$ for a natural number n divisible enough.

Second, we prove the other containment in (8.26.1). To this end, it is enough to show it after restricting to $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$ for all closed points $x \in X_{p=0}$. That is, we need to prove that:

$$(8.26.3) \quad \underbrace{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \tau(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda)}_{\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t)} \otimes R \supseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathfrak{c}^{t+\epsilon}) \otimes R.$$

This is a consequence of:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t) \otimes R &= \sum_{\sum s_\lambda \geq t} \tau(\omega_X, \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda C_\lambda) \otimes R \stackrel{(1)}{=} \sum_{\sum s_\lambda \geq t} \tau(\omega_R, \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda C_\lambda|_R) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \epsilon' G|_R, \mathfrak{c}^{t+\epsilon'}) \\ &\supseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \epsilon G|_R, \mathfrak{c}^{t+\epsilon}) \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\supseteq} \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathfrak{c}^{t+\epsilon}) \otimes R, \end{aligned}$$

where (1) follows from Lemma 8.21, (2) follows from Theorem 8.11 for $0 < \epsilon' \ll \epsilon$ (the equality between (a) and (g)), and (3) follows from Lemma 8.24. Here we also implicitly used that the perturbation boundary G^0 on X restricted to R (i.e. $G^0|_R$) is sufficient as the perturbation boundary for R (see Remark 7.15 and Remark 8.12).

The final statement follows since, after reducing to the case where $\Gamma \geq 0$, $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma + \epsilon G, \mathfrak{c}^t) \otimes \mathcal{L}^n$ is the subsheaf of $\omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^n$ generated by $\mathbf{B}^0(X, \Gamma + \epsilon G, \mathfrak{c}^t, \omega_X \otimes \mathcal{L}^n)$ for $n \gg 0$ by definition. \square

Remark 8.27. In the statement of the above theorem, as well as in the proposition before, we can make the choice of G^0 more precise. Suppose $\phi : Z \rightarrow X$ is such that each $\phi^* s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda$ is Cartier (note there are finitely many $s_\lambda^{(i)} C_\lambda$). It follows that any G^0 will work as long as its support contains the ϖ -special fiber, its support contains the $\text{Supp } C_\lambda$, and if $\text{Supp } \phi^* G^0$ contains the ramification locus of the induced $Z \xrightarrow{\phi} X \xrightarrow{h} \mathbb{P}_V^n$ (cf. Remark 7.15).

Proposition 8.28. *Suppose X is integral quasi-projective over V , \mathfrak{c} is an ideal sheaf, Γ is a \mathbf{Q} -divisor, and $t \geq 0$ is a rational number. There exists an effective Cartier divisor G^0 such that for every Cartier $G \geq G^0$, we have that for $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G):*

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}^t) = \bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \text{Tr}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*(\epsilon G + \Gamma) - tM))$$

where the intersection is over all normal alterations $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$ is a line bundle, and where tM , $\pi^*\Gamma$, and $\pi^*\epsilon G$ are Cartier.

Moreover, for every $x \in X_{p=0}$ and $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, we have that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}^t) \otimes R = \bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \text{Tr}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*(\epsilon G + \Gamma) - tM) \otimes R).$$

We emphasize that the above statement is quite subtle as we are taking the intersection in the category of sheaves (and not the category of quasi-coherent sheaves). In particular, the fact that the right hand side of the first displayed equation is quasi-coherent is not clear at this point and is only a consequence of the above proposition. In the proof we shall use the following fact: if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ is an inclusion of \mathcal{O}_X -sheaves and the stalks $\mathcal{F}_x = \mathcal{G}_x$ agree for every $x \in X$, then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$. Since completion is faithfully flat, it is enough to check the equality of stalks after tensoring by $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that X is projective over V and, by incorporating Γ into some power of \mathfrak{c} , that $\Gamma = 0$. Pick G^0 as in [Remark 8.27](#). Take any $G \geq G^0$ and pick $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ such that $\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ by [Theorem 8.25](#). Now, the inclusion \subseteq follows from

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, \mathfrak{c}^t) \subseteq \mathrm{Tr}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^* \epsilon G - tM))$$

for every $Y \rightarrow X$ as above, where the last inclusion follows by [[HLS22](#), Section 6.1].

We next prove the inclusion \supseteq . On $X[1/p]$, the left side $\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t)[1/p]$ is $\mathcal{J}(\omega_{X[1/p]}, (\mathfrak{c}[1/p]^t))$ by the summation formula [[Tak06](#)] and [Proposition 7.14 \(c\)](#), whereas the right side stabilizes in characteristic zero to be the multiplier ideal. Hence, as before, it is enough to show this after restricting to R , where $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$ for an arbitrary point $x \in X_{p=0}$. To this end, we argue as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \mathrm{Tr}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^* \epsilon G - tM)) \right) \otimes R &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\subseteq} \left(\bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \mathrm{Tr}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^* \epsilon G - tM)) \otimes R \right) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{=} \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \epsilon G|_R, \mathfrak{c}^t) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\subseteq} \tau(\omega_R, \mathfrak{c}^t) \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{=} \tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t) \otimes R, \end{aligned}$$

where (1) follows from the definition of $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \epsilon G, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ (see [Definition 8.4](#)), (2) follows from the equality

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \epsilon' G|_R, \mathfrak{c}^t) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_R, \epsilon'' G|_R, \mathfrak{c}^{t+\epsilon''}) = \tau(\omega_R, \mathfrak{c}^t)$$

for $0 < \epsilon'' \ll \epsilon' \ll \epsilon$ which is the content of [Definition 8.13](#) (and the fact that the difference between $\mathfrak{c}^{t+\epsilon''}$ and \mathfrak{c}^t may be incorporated into $\epsilon' G|_R$), and (3) is [Lemma 8.21](#). Here, in (2) we implicitly used again that the perturbation boundary G^0 on X restricted to R (i.e. $G^0|_R$) is sufficient as the perturbation boundary for R .

Finally, the second part of the proposition is equivalent to (\dagger) being an equality of R -modules, which is a consequence of the above proof. \square

Lemma 8.29. *Let X be a Noetherian scheme, and \mathcal{F} a coherent sheaf on X . Suppose that $\{\mathcal{G}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a collection of coherent subsheaves of \mathcal{F} so that, for any two $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$, there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $\mathcal{G}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_1} \cap \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_2}$. Let $\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{G}_\lambda$, where the intersection is taken as subsheaves of \mathcal{F} . If \mathcal{G} happens to be coherent, and moreover for all $x \in X$ we have that*

$$(8.29.1) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_x = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (\widehat{\mathcal{G}_\lambda})_x$$

for the (\mathfrak{m}_x -adically) completed stalks, then there exists $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$ such that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $\mathcal{G}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0}$. In other words, the intersection defining \mathcal{G} stabilizes.

Proof. As \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}_λ are coherent for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, the subsets $Z_\lambda = \text{Supp}(\mathcal{G}_\lambda/\mathcal{G})$ are closed. By Noetherianity, we may choose $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$ so that Z_{λ_0} is minimal among Z_λ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$. By way of contradiction, assume Z_{λ_0} is non-empty and pick $x \in Z_{\lambda_0}$ which is the generic point of an irreducible component. Thus, $(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0})_x/\mathcal{G}_x$ has finite length and in particular is \mathfrak{m}_x -power torsion, hence unaffected by \mathfrak{m}_x -adic completion. Using the descending chain condition on submodules of

$$0 \neq (\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0})_x/\mathcal{G}_x = \widehat{(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0})_x/\mathcal{G}_x} = \widehat{(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0})_x}/\widehat{\mathcal{G}_x},$$

it follows that $\widehat{(\mathcal{G}_\lambda)_x}/\widehat{\mathcal{G}_x}$ are constant for all $\mathcal{G}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0}$ sufficiently small. In other words, there is some $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$ with $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_1} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0}$ so that $\widehat{(\mathcal{G}_\lambda)_x} = \widehat{(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_1})_x}$ for all $\lambda \subseteq \Lambda$ with $\mathcal{G}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_1}$. Using (8.29.1), we then have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}_x} = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \widehat{(\mathcal{G}_\lambda)_x} = \widehat{(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_1})_x} \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad 0 = (\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_1})_x/\mathcal{G}_x = \widehat{(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_1})_x}/\widehat{\mathcal{G}_x}$$

so that $x \notin Z_{\lambda_1}$ and $Z_{\lambda_1} \subsetneq Z_{\lambda_0}$ is a proper subset, contradicting the minimality of Z_{λ_0} . Thus, we must have that $Z_{\lambda_0} = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{G}$. If $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $\mathcal{G}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0}$, this gives

$$\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{G},$$

and so equality holds throughout as well. \square

Theorem 8.30. *Under the assumptions of [Setting 8.18](#), let $\vartheta : Z \rightarrow X$ be the normalized blowup of \mathfrak{c} so that $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(-F)$ for a Cartier divisor F . Then there exists an effective Cartier divisor G^0 so that for every Cartier $G \geq G^0$ and every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G) the following holds.*

There exists $\pi_\epsilon : Y_\epsilon \rightarrow Z$ with $\pi_\epsilon^\vartheta^*(\epsilon G + \Gamma)$ and π_ϵ^*tF Cartier, such that for every further alteration $\pi : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\vartheta \circ \pi_\epsilon} X$ where we write $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$ we have that*

$$(8.30.1) \quad \text{Tr}(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*(\epsilon G + \Gamma) - tM)) = \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}^t).$$

Furthermore, if $X = \text{Spec } R$, where R is the completion of a mixed characteristic normal local domain of essentially finite type over a mixed characteristic DVR V , then $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ as defined in [Definition 8.13](#) is also computed by a single alteration in the same way.

Proof. Again, we may reduce to the case that $\Gamma = 0$ by absorbing it into a power of \mathfrak{c} . Pick G^0 as in [Remark 8.27](#). Take any $G \geq G^0$ and pick $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ such that $\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ satisfies the conclusion of [Proposition 8.28](#). Now let Λ be the index set of all alterations as in the statement of the theorem. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and the corresponding alteration $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ with $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$ define

$$\mathcal{G}_\lambda := \text{Tr}(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*\epsilon G - tM)), \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{G} := \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{G}_\lambda.$$

Here, $\mathcal{G} = \tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{c}^t)$ by [Proposition 8.28](#). Now the theorem follows from [Lemma 8.29](#) provided that we can verify that its assumptions are satisfied.

Specifically, we need to show that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathbf{c}^t) \otimes R = \bigcap_{Y \rightarrow X} \text{Tr}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^* \epsilon G - tM) \otimes R).$$

for every $x \in X$ and $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, where the left hand side is equal to $\tau(\omega_R, \mathbf{c}^t)$ by [Lemma 8.21](#). When x has residue characteristic zero, this is classical. When $x \in X_{p=0}$, this follows from the second part of [Proposition 8.28](#) concluding the proof of the main part of the theorem.

The final statement is simply an combination of the main part of the theorem with [Lemma 8.21](#), cf. [Proposition 8.28](#). \square

Theorem 8.31. *With notation as above, let \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} be ideal sheaves, and let $t, s \in \mathbf{Q}$. We have the following properties:*

- (a) *For any Cartier divisor D and $0 < \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 \ll 1$ (depending on the data of $X, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$, and D), we have*

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{b}^t) = \tau(\omega_X, \epsilon_1 D + \Gamma, \mathbf{b}^{t+\epsilon_2} \mathbf{c}^{\epsilon_3}).$$

- (b) *If $\mathbf{b} \subseteq \mathbf{c}$ and $s \geq t$, then $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{b}^s) \subseteq \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t)$.*
(c) *$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{a}^{nt}) = \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, (\mathbf{a}^n)^t)$ for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$.*
(d) *$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t)[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(\omega_{X[1/p]}, \Gamma|_{X[1/p]}, (\mathbf{c}[1/p])^t)$.*
(e) *If $t \geq \dim(X)$, then $\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{c}^s) = \mathbf{b} \cdot \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{b}^{t-1} \mathbf{c}^s)$.*
(f) *$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c})^t) = \sum \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{b}^{t_1} \mathbf{c}^{t_2})$ where the sum runs over $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$ with $t_1 + t_2 = t$.*
(g) *Suppose that $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a finite surjective map, then $\text{Tr}(f_* \tau(\omega_Y, f^* \Gamma, (\mathbf{c} \mathcal{O}_Y)^t)) = \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t)$.*
(h) *Suppose that $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a smooth map, then $\tau(\omega_Y, f^* \Gamma, (\mathbf{c} \mathcal{O}_Y)^t) = f^* \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t) \otimes \omega_{Y/X}$.*

Proof.

- (a) This follows from the Noetherian stabilization in the proof of [Theorem 8.25](#).
(b),(c) These follow directly from the definition of $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}$, or can also be seen using [Theorem 8.30](#) or [Remark 8.22](#).
(d) Choosing an alteration dominating a log resolution over the locus of points with residue characteristic zero, this follows immediately from [Theorem 8.30](#).
(e) Using [Lemma 8.21](#), this follows from [Theorem 8.7](#) on account of [Remark 8.8](#).
(f) After passing to a finite cover to trivialize Γ , this follows from [Corollary 8.14](#).
(g) This follows immediately from, for example, [Theorem 8.30](#).
(h) This follows from the definition of τ via summation ([Definition 8.19](#)) and the principal case ([Proposition 7.14 \(j\)](#)). \square

8.3. Global versions of test ideals of non-principal ideals. We now move to define test ideals.

Definition 8.32. With notation as in [Setting 8.18](#), assume in addition that X is normal, and suppose that Δ is a \mathbf{Q} -divisor such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier. Then we define the test

ideal $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t) = \tau(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t)$. For a sequence of ideal sheaves $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_r$, we also define mixed test ideals

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^{t_1} \dots \mathbf{c}^{t_r}) := \tau(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta, \mathbf{c}^{t_1} \dots \mathbf{c}^{t_r}).$$

When $\Delta \geq 0$ we note that this is a genuine ideal, not just a fractional ideal.

We now collect together various properties satisfied by our test ideals. First we point out it can be computed from a single alteration as an immediate consequence of [Theorem 8.30](#) by setting $\Gamma = K_X + \Delta$.

Corollary 8.33. *With notation as in [Definition 8.32](#) and where $X \rightarrow V$ is quasi-projective, let $\vartheta : Z \rightarrow X$ to be the normalized blowup of \mathbf{c} so that $\mathbf{c}\mathcal{O}_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(-F)$ for a Cartier divisor F . Then there exists an effective Cartier divisor G^0 so that for every Cartier $G \geq G^0$ and every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G) the following holds.*

There exists $\pi_\epsilon : Y_\epsilon \rightarrow Z$ with $\pi_\epsilon^ \vartheta^*(\epsilon G + K_X + \Delta)$ and $\pi_\epsilon^* tF$ Cartier, such that for every further alteration $\pi : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\vartheta \circ \pi_\epsilon} X$ where we write $\mathbf{c}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$ we have that*

$$(8.33.1) \quad \mathrm{Tr}(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*(\epsilon G + K_X + \Delta) - tM)) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t).$$

Furthermore, if instead $X = \mathrm{Spec} R$, where R is the completion of a mixed characteristic normal local domain of essentially finite type over a mixed characteristic DVR V , then $\tau(R, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t)$ as defined in [Definition 8.13](#) is also computed by a single alteration in the same way.

It also behaves as expected after localization and completion as a direct consequence of [Lemma 8.21](#). It also agrees with $\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t)$ up to small perturbation [Theorem 8.25](#). Simply apply the previous results after setting $\Gamma = K_X + \Delta$.

Corollary 8.34. *With notation as in [Definition 8.32](#), for all $x \in X_{p=0}$ and $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, we have that*

$$(8.34.1) \quad \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t) \cdot R = \tau(R, \Delta|_R, (\mathbf{c}R)^t),$$

where the right hand side is the complete local universal test ideal from [Definition 8.13](#).

Furthermore, there exists an effective Cartier divisor G^0 on X such that for every divisor $G \geq G^0$ and every $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G):

$$(8.34.2) \quad \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon G, \mathbf{c}^t).$$

We list some other useful properties below.

Theorem 8.35. *With notation as above, let \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} be ideal sheaves, and let $t, s \in \mathbf{Q}$. We have the following properties:*

- (a) *For any Cartier divisor D and $0 < \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 \ll 1$ (depending on the data of $X, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$, and D), we have*

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{b}^t) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon_1 D, \mathbf{b}^{t+\epsilon_2} \mathbf{c}^{\epsilon_3}).$$

- (b) *If $\mathbf{b} \subseteq \mathbf{c}$ and $s \geq t$, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{b}^s) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t)$.*

- (c) *$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{a}^{nt}) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, (\mathbf{a}^n)^t)$ for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$.*

- (d) *$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t)[1/p] = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O}_{X[1/p]}, \Delta|_{X[1/p]}, (\mathbf{c}[1/p])^t)$.*

- (e) *If $t \geq \dim(X)$, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{c}^s) = \mathbf{b} \cdot \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{b}^{t-1} \mathbf{c}^s)$.*

- (f) $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c})^t) = \sum \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{b}^{t_1} \mathbf{c}^{t_2})$ where the sum runs over $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$ with $t_1 + t_2 = t$.
- (g) If X is regular, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathbf{b}^s \mathbf{c}^t) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathbf{b}^s) \cdot \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathbf{c}^t)$.
- (h) Suppose that $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a finite surjective map, then $\text{Tr}(f_* \tau(\mathcal{O}_Y, \Delta_Y, (\mathbf{c}\mathcal{O}_Y)^t)) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t)$, where $K_Y + \Delta_Y = f^*(K_X + \Delta)$.
- (i) Suppose that $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a smooth map, then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_Y, f^* \Delta, (\mathbf{c}\mathcal{O}_Y)^t) = f^* \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta; \mathbf{c}^t)$.
- (j) Suppose that $H \subseteq X$ is a normal Cartier divisor such that H and Δ have no common components in support, then

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathbf{b}^t) \cdot \mathcal{O}_H \supseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_H, \Delta|_H, (\mathbf{b}\mathcal{O}_H)^t).$$

Proof. Subadditivity (g) follows from [Corollary 8.34](#) and [Corollary 8.17](#). The rest are immediate from [Theorem 8.31](#) and [Theorem 7.20](#). \square

Remark 8.36 (Test ideals of linear series). One other sort of test ideal appeared in [\[HLS22\]](#). Suppose X is normal and projective over V . Suppose D is a Cartier divisor on X and $t \geq 0$ is a rational number. Then they defined

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma, t||D||) = \sum_{F \in |mD|} \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma + \frac{t}{m}F)$$

for m sufficiently divisible. Let \mathbf{b}_m denote the base ideal of $|mD|$. We claim that there exists a $G^0 \geq 0$ such that for each $G \geq G^0$ and all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G)

$$(8.36.1) \quad \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma + \epsilon G, t||D||) = \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{b}_m^{t/m})$$

for m sufficiently divisible.

We quickly show this (assuming $\Gamma = 0$ for simplicity of exposition). Indeed, the containment

$$\tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \Gamma + \epsilon G, t||D||) \subseteq \tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{b}_m^{t/m})$$

is clear since if $F \in |mD|$ then $\mathcal{O}_X(-F) \subseteq \mathbf{b}_m$. On the other hand, $\mathbf{b}_m^n \subseteq \mathbf{b}_{mn}$, and so $\tau(\omega_X, \mathbf{b}_m^{t/m})$ increases as m becomes more divisible and hence it must stabilize (fix that m). Now,

$$\sum_{F \in |mD|} \mathcal{O}_X(-F) = \mathbf{b}_m$$

and so for some sufficiently large n

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathbf{b}_m^{t/m}) = \sum_{\substack{F_1, \dots, F_w \\ \in |mD|}} \sum_{\substack{s_1 + \dots + s_w \\ = t/m}} \tau(\omega_X, s_1 F_1 + \dots + s_w F_w).$$

The sum is finite and so we may assume all relevant $s_j = t \frac{a_j}{mn}$ are rational numbers where we can pick $a_j, n \in \mathbf{Z}$. Note then $t/m = \sum s_j = \frac{t}{mn} \sum a_j$. Hence each

$$s_1 F_1 + \dots + s_w F_w = \frac{t}{nm} (a_1 F_1 + \dots + a_w F_w) = \frac{t}{nm} F$$

for $F = a_1 F_1 + \dots + a_w F_w \in |nmD|$. But then we have that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathbf{b}_m^{t/m}) = \sum_{F \in |nmD|} \tau(\omega_X, \frac{t}{nm} F)$$

which is also a finite sum and so we may find such a G^0 , so that for G and ϵ as above, that

$$\tau(\omega_X, \mathfrak{b}_m^{t/m}) = \sum_{\substack{F_1, \dots, F_l \\ \in |nmD|}} \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G + \frac{t}{nm} F_i) \subseteq \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\omega_X, \epsilon G, t||D||)$$

which completes the proof.

Suppose now that A is a globally generated ample divisor, and $\Gamma = K_X + \Delta$. If $L - (K_X + \Delta) - tD$ is big and nef, then we immediately see that

$$(8.36.2) \quad \tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta, \mathfrak{b}_m^{t/m}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(nA + L) = \tau_{\mathbf{B}^0}(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \epsilon G, t||D||) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(nA + L)$$

is globally generated for $n \geq n_0 := \dim X_{p=0}$ (still assuming m sufficiently divisible). Indeed, this ideal is a sum of ideals of the form $\tau(\mathcal{O}_X, \Delta + \frac{t}{nm} D_{nm})$ for effective $D_{nm} \sim nmD$. Hence, since each $L - (K_X + \Delta + \frac{t}{nm} D_{nm})$ is big and nef, we can simply apply [Corollary 7.22](#) and note that a sum of globally generated sheaves is globally generated.

APPENDIX A. CHARACTERISTIC ZERO ANALOG OF OUR RESULT

In what follows we explain how to recover the multiplier ideal sheaves from the intersection complex. Let X be an algebraic variety of dimension d defined over \mathbf{C} . We fix an embedding of X into a smooth ambient variety Y , and define a \mathcal{D}_X -module to be a \mathcal{D}_Y -module supported on X .

First, we recall the characteristic zero Riemann-Hilbert correspondence generalizing the correspondence between local systems and vector bundles with integrable connections:

$$\text{RH}: D_{\text{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{C}) \xrightarrow{\cong} D_{\text{rh}}^b(X, \mathcal{D}_X).$$

Here the left hand side denotes the derived category of \mathbf{C} -constructible sheaves while the right hand side denotes the derived category of regular holonomic \mathcal{D}_X -modules. Moreover, $D_{\text{cons}}^b(X, \mathbf{C})$ admits a subcategory of perverse sheaves $\text{Perv}_{\text{cons}}(X, \mathbf{C})$ (see [Section 3](#)) for which the functor RH restricts to:

$$\text{RH}: \text{Perv}_{\text{cons}}(X, \mathbf{C}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Mod}_{\text{rh}}(\mathcal{D}_X),$$

where $\text{Mod}_{\text{rh}}(\mathcal{D}_X)$ denotes the category of regular holonomic \mathcal{D}_X -modules. Also, note that this functor admits a shift by d with respect to the usual Riemann-Hilbert between local systems and vector bundles with integrable connections, for example, $\text{RH}(\mathbf{C}) = \mathcal{O}_X[-d]$.

In the p -adic situation, the analog of RH incorporates additional Galois action structure. However, in characteristic zero, additional structure, namely Hodge filtration, must be introduced by hand. This is achieved by ways of Hodge modules which are triples $(V, M, F_{\bullet}M)$ consisting of a \mathcal{D}_X -module M with filtration $F_{\bullet}M$ and a perverse \mathbf{Q} -sheaf V such that $\text{RH}(V \otimes \mathbf{C}) = M$, subject to various conditions. In what follows, by abuse of notation, we denote the *trivial Hodge module* $(\mathbf{Q}_X[d], \mathcal{O}_X, F_{\bullet}\mathcal{O}_X)$ with a trivial filtration by $\mathbf{Q}_X[d]$.

In practice, one often works with the split de Rham complex. Specifically, we have a functor (the reader should be warned that this notation is non-standard):

$$\text{RH}^{\text{Higgs}} : D_{\text{HM}}^b(X) \rightarrow D^b(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$$

between the derived category of Hodge modules and the usual derived category of coherent sheaves. In the case when X is smooth this functor is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(V, M, F_{\bullet}M) &:= \mathrm{GR}_{\bullet}\mathrm{DR}(M) = \bigoplus F_k\mathrm{DR}(M)/F_{k-1}\mathrm{DR}(M), \text{ where} \\ \mathrm{DR}(M) &:= (M \rightarrow M \otimes \Omega_X^1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M \otimes \Omega_X^d) \in D^{[-d,0]}(X, \mathbf{C}) \text{ and} \\ F_k\mathrm{DR}(M) &:= (F_kM \rightarrow F_{k+1}M \otimes \Omega_X^1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow F_{k+d}M \otimes \Omega_X^d) \in D^{[-d,0]}(X, \mathbf{C}). \end{aligned}$$

For example,

$$(A.0.1) \quad \mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{Q}_X[d]) = \mathcal{O}_X[d] \oplus \Omega_X^1[d-1] \oplus \cdots \oplus \Omega_X^d[0].$$

By performing this operation on the ambient space Y , this construction generalizes to the case when X is not necessarily smooth. We emphasize that the p -adic Riemann-Hilbert correspondence discussed in this paper is a direct analog in mixed characteristic of $\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}$ and not of the classical RH functor!

One can define a duality functor $\mathbf{D}: D_{\mathrm{HM}}^b(X) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{HM}}^b(X)$ on Hodge modules which restricts to Verdier duality on constructible sheaves. Moreover, there is the Grothendieck duality functor $\mathbf{D}: D^b(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow D^b(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ such that

$$\mathbf{D}(-) = \mathbf{R}\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(-, \omega_X^{\bullet}).$$

Functor $\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}$ satisfies the following properties:

- it interchanges Grothendieck duality and Hodge module duality

$$\mathbf{D}\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(M) \simeq \mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{D}M),$$

- it is compatible with proper pushforwards, specifically for $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ proper,

$$\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{R}\pi_*M) \simeq \mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(M).$$

Moreover, as its p -adic analog, one can check that this functor is left t -exact for perverse t -structures on both sides, but we will not need that in this subsection.

For simplicity, we state the characteristic zero analog of the main result of this paper, only for Grauert-Riemenschneider sheaves, but one can extend the definition to all multiplier ideals sheaves. From now on we assume that X is normal.

Definition A.1. We define the *Grauert-Riemenschneider sheaf*

$$\mathcal{J}(X, \omega_X) = \pi_*\omega_Y$$

for a resolution of singularities $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$.

One can check that this definition is independent of the choice of the resolution. When X is Gorenstein, this agrees with the multiplier ideal sheaf.

One of the most important examples of perverse sheaves is the intersection complex $\mathrm{IC}_X \in \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{cons}}(X, \mathbf{Q})$. This constructible complex underlies a Hodge module which, by abuse of notation, we denote by the same symbol IC_X . This Hodge module is self-dual, that is $\mathbf{D}(\mathrm{IC}_X) = \mathrm{IC}_X$.

Remark A.2. To state the following theorem, we need to introduce a couple of maps. Firstly, the map $\mathbf{Q}_X[d] \rightarrow \mathrm{IC}_X$ of Hodge modules induces by applying $H^0\mathbf{DRH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}$:

$$\psi': H^0\mathbf{DRH}(\mathbf{Q}_X[d]) \leftarrow H^0\mathbf{DRH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathrm{IC}_X) = H^0\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathrm{IC}_X).$$

Secondly, assuming for now that X is smooth and using (A.0.1), we get the map $\mathcal{O}_X[d] \rightarrow \mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{Q}_X[d])$. Then by applying Grothendieck duality $H^0\mathbf{D}(-) = H^0\mathbf{R}\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(-, \omega_X^\bullet)$, we obtain:

$$\psi'' : \omega_X \leftarrow H^0\mathbf{DRH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{Q}_X[d]).$$

In general, since ω_X is S_2 , we can define this map on the smooth locus and extend to X by reflexivity. Finally, we define $\psi : H^0\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathrm{IC}_X) \rightarrow \omega_X$ as the composition $\psi'' \circ \psi'$.

Theorem A.3. *For a normal algebraic variety X over \mathbf{C} , the following holds:*

$$\mathcal{J}(X, \omega_X) = \mathrm{Image}(\psi : H^0\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathrm{IC}_X) \rightarrow \omega_X).$$

Proof. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be a resolution and $Z := \pi(\mathrm{Exc}(\pi))$. First, we observe that by the decomposition theorem for Hodge modules:

$$\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathrm{IC}_Y = \mathrm{IC}_X \oplus M,$$

where $M \in D_{\mathrm{HM}}^b(X)$ is supported on Z .

Second, by (A.0.1), the fact that $\mathrm{IC}_Y = \mathbf{Q}_Y[d]$ since Y is smooth, and the compatibility of RH with proper pushforward, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} H^0\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathrm{IC}_Y) &= H^0\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathrm{IC}_Y) \\ &= H^0\mathbf{R}\pi_*(\mathcal{O}_Y[d] \oplus \cdots \oplus \omega_Y[0]) = \pi_*\omega_Y \oplus \text{a sheaf supported on } Z. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above and using torsion-freeness of ω_X we finally get:

$$\mathrm{Image}(\psi) = \mathrm{Image}(H^0\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{R}\pi_*\mathrm{IC}_Y) \rightarrow \omega_X) = \mathrm{Image}(\pi_*\omega_Y \rightarrow \omega_X). \quad \square$$

We do not know how to prove [Theorem A.3](#) using purely complex geometric methods but not the decomposition theorem. On the other hand, in the p -adic setting, the decomposition theorem for perverse sheaves is false. Instead, our proof uses the fact that the p -adic Riemann-Hilbert correspondence is left t -exact for the perverse t -structures (see [Section 4](#)).

Remark A.4. For the sake of this paper, it is easier to work with the dual variant of [Theorem A.3](#) which may be stated as:

$$\mathcal{O}_X^{\mathrm{GR}} = \mathrm{Image}(\phi : {}^pH^0(\mathcal{O}_X[d]) \rightarrow {}^pH^0(\mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathrm{IC}_X)))$$

where $\mathcal{O}_X^{\mathrm{GR}} := \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{J}(X, \omega_X))$, and ϕ defined as the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_X[d] \rightarrow \mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathbf{Q}_X[d]) \rightarrow \mathrm{RH}^{\mathrm{Higgs}}(\mathrm{IC}_X).$$

APPENDIX B. ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO A PART OF [SECTION 6](#)

In the introduction we mention that one can infer the localization of the test ideal in the Noetherian case directly from [Theorem C](#) without the discussion of almost constant systems of alterations (as in [Lemma 5.18](#) and [Theorem 5.19](#)). We explain this alternative approach in the appendix. Specifically, we give a different proof of [Corollary 6.16](#)¹⁹, namely that

$$\tau_{\mathrm{alt}}^a(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} = \tau_+(\omega_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}}, p^{1/p^e})$$

for $e \gg 0$, which does not rely on [Section 5.4](#) and [Section 5.5](#). This equality would be clear by [Theorem C](#), properties of the trace map, and local duality, if $X_\infty \rightarrow X$ was finite and not just integral, and so our key idea is to study a weaker version of local duality for

¹⁹In fact, the remaining results in [Section 6](#) can be deduced from [Corollary 6.16](#).

non-Noetherian X_∞ by ways of the map \mathbb{T} (cf. [Lemma B.6](#) and [Definition B.8](#)). The non-Noetherian case of local duality is also discussed in [Remark 2.1](#), but the statement therein requires the sheaf on X_∞ to be pulled-back from a finite level, which is not the case in our setting. We hope the methods found in this appendix will be of use to others.

We continue to use the notation as in [Notation 6.2](#), and we assume additionally that $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is proper and we will eventually focus on the key case that X_∞ is integral (so we will actually show that $\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} = \tau_+(\omega_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}}, p^{1/p^e})$ for $e \gg 0$). Let \widehat{X} be the p -adic completion of X and let \widehat{X}_∞ be the p -adic completion of X_∞ . We will use the perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$ from [Section 3](#) (more precisely [Theorem 3.14](#) applied to $\mathcal{X} = \widehat{X}_\infty$) and we use the following similarly defined perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X})$ (recall that $K \in D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X})$ if K is derived p -complete and $K/p \in D_{\text{qcoh}}(X_{p=0})$):

- $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X})$ if and only if for any $x \in \widehat{X}$, we have $(\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p K)_x \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$
- $K \in {}^pD^{\geq 0}(\widehat{X})$ if and only if for any $x \in \widehat{X}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p K)_x) \in D^{\geq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$

Note that we are using the perversity function $-\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1$ instead of $-\dim(\overline{\{x\}})$ because we are working in the *relative* setup. Note that, if K is the p -adic completion of an object K' in $D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(X)$, then for any $x \in X_{p=0}$, $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p K)_x) = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(K'_x)$ so we will sometimes drop the $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(-)$ when K is clear from the context.

We say that M is a perverse quasi-coherent sheaf and write $M \in \text{Perv}_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X})$, if M is in the heart of this t -structure. We set $\text{Perv}_{\text{coh}}(\widehat{X}) := \text{Perv}_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}) \cap D_{\text{coh}}^b(\widehat{X})$ and $\text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty) := \text{Perv}_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty) \cap D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\widehat{X}_\infty)$. Since $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is proper, by formal GAGA we have $D_{\text{coh}}^b(X) \cong D_{\text{coh}}^b(\widehat{X})$ and $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\widehat{X}_\infty) \cong D_{\text{acoh}}^b(X_\infty)$. Thus we can view $\text{Perv}_{\text{coh}}(\widehat{X}) \subseteq D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$ and $\text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty) \subseteq D_{\text{acoh}}^b(X_\infty)$.

Let $\omega_{\widehat{X}/V}^\bullet$ and $\omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet$ be the relative dualizing complexes (these are just the p -adic completions of $\omega_{X/V}^\bullet$ and $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet$ respectively). We then define, for $M \in D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X})$ and $N \in D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$,

$$\mathbf{D}_X(M) := \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}}(M, \omega_{\widehat{X}/V}^\bullet) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N) := \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}}(N, \omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet).$$

In general, $\mathbf{D}_X(M)$ and $\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)$ may not lie in $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X})$ or $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$. However, when we restrict to coherent or almost coherent objects, then we have $\mathbf{D}_X: D_{\text{coh}}^b(\widehat{X}) \rightarrow D_{\text{coh}}^b(\widehat{X})$, which is an auto-equivalence, and $\mathbf{D}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}: D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\widehat{X}_\infty) \rightarrow D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\widehat{X}_\infty)$, which is an almost auto-equivalence.

The next lemma follows from the same argument as in [Section 3](#) and we omit the details.

Lemma B.1. *With notation as above, we have $K \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X})$ if and only if for all $x \in \widehat{X}$, we have $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p K)_x) \in D^{\leq -\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1}$. Moreover, suppose $M \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(\widehat{X})$ and $N \in D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\widehat{X}_\infty)$. Then we have*

- (a) $M \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X})$ (resp. ${}^pD^{\geq 0}(\widehat{X})$) if and only if $\mathbf{D}_X(M) \in D^{\geq 0}(\widehat{X})$ (resp. $D^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X})$);
- (b) $N \in {}^pD^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$ (resp. ${}^pD^{\geq 0}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$) if and only if $\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N) \in D^{\geq 0}(\widehat{X}_\infty)^a$ (resp. $D^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X}_\infty)^a$).

Lemma B.2. *With notation as above, if $K \in \text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$, then $\pi_* K! \in \text{Perv}_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X})$.*

Proof. For $x \in X_{p=0}$ (the underlying topological spaces $X_{p=0}$ and $X_{\infty,p=0}$ are the same), we know that $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p \pi_* K)_x)$ is almost concentrated in degree $-\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1$ by [Remark 3.19](#) and thus $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p \pi_* K!)_x) = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathbf{R}\Gamma_p \pi_* K)_x)!$ lives honestly in degree $-\dim(\overline{\{x\}})+1$. The result follows from the definition of perverse t -structure on $D_{\text{qcoh}}(\widehat{X})$ and [Lemma B.1](#). \square

Observe that for a quasi-coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} on X one has that $\mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_e}, \mathcal{F})$. Unfortunately, this is not true anymore if we replace X_e by X_∞ , but we can construct a morphism between these spaces using the map \mathbb{T} from [Proposition 6.1](#).

Definition B.3. Let \mathcal{F} be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X . Define a map

$$\psi_{\mathbb{T}}: \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, \mathcal{F})$$

as follows. Let \mathbb{T}_X be the \mathcal{O}_X -linear map $\text{id} \otimes \mathbb{T} : \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} = \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_V V_\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$, and for local sections $r \in \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$, set

$$\psi_{\mathbb{T}}(r \otimes f) = (r' \mapsto \mathbb{T}_X(rr')f),$$

where r' is a local section of \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} . It is straightforward to check that $\psi_{\mathbb{T}}$ is \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} -linear.

Lemma B.4. *Let \mathcal{F} be a quasi-coherent sheaf on X which is p^∞ -torsion. Then $\psi_{\mathbb{T}}: \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, \mathcal{F})$ is pure (and thus injective) as a map of \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} -modules.*

Proof. Consider the following commutative diagram encapsulating the key property of \mathbb{T} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} & \xrightarrow[\simeq]{\psi_{\mathbb{T}}|_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F}}} & \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_e}, \mathcal{F}) \\ \downarrow \text{nat} & & \uparrow \text{nat} \\ \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} & \xrightarrow{\psi_{\mathbb{T}}} & \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, \mathcal{F}). \end{array}$$

First, we argue that the upper map is an isomorphism. Indeed, after identifying $\text{Hom}_V(V_e, \mathcal{F})$ with $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_e}, \mathcal{F})$ via adjunction, $\psi_{\mathbb{T}}|_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F}}$ can be factored as

$$\mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} = V_e \otimes_V \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{v \otimes s \mapsto \mathbb{T}(v \cdot _) \otimes s} \text{Hom}_V(V_e, V) \otimes_V \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\phi \otimes s \mapsto \phi(-) \cdot s} \text{Hom}_V(V_e, \mathcal{F})$$

where

- v is a local section of V_e and s is a local section of \mathcal{F} ,
- the first arrow is an \mathcal{O}_{X_e} -linear isomorphism by [Proposition 6.1](#) (c), and
- the second arrow can be seen to be an isomorphism using that V_e is a free V -module and checking \mathcal{O}_{X_e} -linearity separately.

Thus, the composition $a_e := \psi_{\mathbb{T}} \circ \text{nat}$,

$$a_e: \mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, \mathcal{F})$$

from the top left to the bottom right is a split injective map of \mathcal{O}_{X_e} -modules. These maps are compatible as e varies, and we claim that the map $\psi_{\mathbb{T}}: \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, \mathcal{F})$ in the statement is the direct limit of the a_e . We have

$$\varinjlim_e (\mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes \mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes \mathcal{F}$$

where the second isomorphism comes from the fact that all sections of \mathcal{F} are p^n -torsion for some n . Rewriting the map in the statement as

$$\varinjlim_e (a_e \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e}} \text{id}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}})$$

then shows that $\psi_{\mathbb{T}}$ is a direct limit of split injective \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} -linear maps, and $\psi_{\mathbb{T}}$ is pure as a map of \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} -modules. \square

Remark B.5. In general, the map in [Lemma B.4](#) does not split as a map of \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} -modules (in fact, it does not even split as a map of V_∞ -modules). To see this, take \mathcal{F} to be E , the injective hull of the residue field of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. Then $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, E)$ is an injective \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} -module by adjunction and thus an injective V_∞ -module since \mathcal{O}_{X_∞} is flat over V_∞ . If the map in [Lemma B.4](#) splits as a map of V_∞ -modules, then $\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E \cong V_\infty \otimes_V E$ is an injective V_∞ -module. But this is not true in general. Take $X = \mathbb{P}_V^1$ and $x \in X$ a closed point with $\mathcal{O}_{X,x} \cong V[z]_{(\varpi, z)}$. Then

$$E \cong H_{(\varpi, x)}^2(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}) \cong \bigoplus^{\mathbf{N}} V[1/\varpi]/V$$

as V -modules and thus $V_\infty \otimes_V E \cong \bigoplus^{\mathbf{N}} V_\infty[1/\varpi]/V_\infty$ as V_∞ -modules. If the latter is an injective V_∞ -module, then $V_\infty[1/\varpi]/V_\infty$ is a Σ -injective V_∞ -module in the sense of [\[Bec72\]](#). It follows that $V_\infty[1/\varpi]/V_\infty$ is a direct sum of injective hulls of $V_\infty/\mathfrak{m}_{V_\infty}$ by [\[Bec72, Theorem 1.9\]](#) (since it is ϖ -power torsion). But this is not true since $\text{Hom}_{V_\infty}(V_\infty/\mathfrak{m}_{V_\infty}, V_\infty[1/\varpi]/V_\infty) = 0$.

The following lemma shows that although local duality breaks in general for quasi-coherent sheaves on X , we are still able to get some partial results in the context of X_∞ .

Lemma B.6. *Suppose $N \in D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\widehat{X}_\infty)$ (and we view it as an object of $D_{\text{acoh}}^b(X_\infty)$ via formal GAGA). Let $x \in X_{p=0}$ and let E denote the injective hull of the residue field of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. Then there exists a sequence of maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(N_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] &\xrightarrow{\simeq^a} \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E) \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{RHom}(-, \psi_{\mathbb{T}})} \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, E)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, E). \end{aligned}$$

where the first map is an almost isomorphism and the second map is almost pure in the derived category, i.e., it is a filtered direct limit of almost split monomorphisms. In particular, the induced map

$$H^{i+1-\dim \overline{\{x\}}} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(N_x) \rightarrow H^i \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, E)$$

is almost pure and hence almost injective for all i .

Proof. We first construct the map

$$\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(N_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E).$$

It is enough to find a bi-linear map

$$\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(N_x) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}} \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E)([\dim \overline{\{x\}} - 1]).$$

Note that we have $\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x = \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}(N, \omega_{\dot{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet)_x \rightarrow \mathbf{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}(N_x, (\omega_{\dot{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet)_x)$, and that $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\omega_{\dot{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet)_x) \simeq (\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E)[\dim \overline{\{x\}} - 1]$ (here the additional shift by 1 comes from the fact that $\omega_{\dot{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet$ is the relative dualizing complex). Thus we may pick the sought-for map

to be the one induced by the natural evaluation $\eta \otimes \psi \mapsto (\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\psi))(\eta)$, where $\eta \in \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(N_x)$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{R}\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(N_x, (\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^\bullet)_x)$.

Next, let us check the map constructed above is an almost isomorphism. This assertion can be checked after derived reduction mod p as both sides have p^∞ -torsion cohomology.²⁰ Thus we may assume N is annihilated by p (i.e., N comes from $D_{\mathrm{acoh}}^b(X_\infty/p)$). Now since N is almost coherent, for any $\epsilon \in (\varpi^{1/p^\infty})$, we can find $N_\epsilon \in D_{\mathrm{coh}}^b(X_\infty)$ such that

$$N_\epsilon \rightarrow N \rightarrow C_\epsilon \xrightarrow{+1}$$

where C_ϵ is annihilated by ϵ . Furthermore, we may actually assume $N_\epsilon \in D_{\mathrm{coh}}^b(X_\infty^{nc})$ since N is annihilated by p . But then $N_\epsilon \cong N_e \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e}} \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty^{nc}} \cong N_e \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e}} \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}$ for some $e \gg 0$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((N_\epsilon)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] &\cong \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((N_e)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e}} \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \\ &\cong \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_e}(N_e)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_e}} \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \\ &\cong \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N_\epsilon)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E) \end{aligned}$$

where the first and third isomorphism are flat base change and the second isomorphism follows from local duality on X_e and the identification of the injective hull of $\mathcal{O}_{X_e, x}$ with $\mathcal{O}_{X_e} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E$. We then consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((N_\epsilon)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N_\epsilon)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(N_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E) \longrightarrow \mathrm{cone}(f) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((C_\epsilon)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(C_\epsilon)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E) \end{array} .$$

Since C_ϵ is annihilated by ϵ , chasing this diagram we find that $\mathrm{cone}(f)$ is annihilated by ϵ . As this is true for all $\epsilon \in (\varpi^{1/p^\infty})$, we know that $\mathrm{cone}(f)$ is almost zero and hence the map f is an almost isomorphism.

Finally, it remains to show that the map

$$\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} E) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{RHom}(-, \psi_K)} \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}, E))$$

is almost pure in the derived category (in the sense stated in the lemma). The map ψ_K itself is pure by [Lemma B.4](#): we can write ψ_K as a filtered direct limit of split inclusions of modules. To show that $\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, \psi_K)$ is almost pure in the derived category, it is then enough show that $\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(\mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, -)$ commutes with filtered direct limits in $(D^{b, \geq 0})^a$. But we can check this after derived mod p since the complexes involved are all p^∞ -torsion, and then we can approximate N by coherent complexes as before and note that $\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_\infty}}(N', -)$ commutes arbitrary coproducts in $D^{b, \geq 0}$ for any coherent complex N' (which is classical). We leave the details to the readers. \square

²⁰To see this, note that if we have $K_1 \rightarrow K_2$ in D^b such that they both have p^∞ -torsion cohomology, then we know that $K_i = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(K_i) = \mathbf{R}\Gamma_p(\widehat{K}_i)$, where $\widehat{(-)}$ denotes derived p -completion. Now if $K_1/p \cong K_2/p$ then $\widehat{K}_1 \cong \widehat{K}_2$ by derived Nakayama and thus $K_1 \cong K_2$ as wanted.

Remark B.7. (a) To keep the simplicity of notations, we omitted the obvious pushforward by the affine morphism π_* in the statement and proof of [Lemma B.6](#).

(b) The proof above features filtered colimits in the derived category. Literally interpreted in the triangulated category setting, this does not give a sensible object. To obtain the notion of filtered colimits for which passing to cohomology is exact, one can work with ∞ -categories. Alternate approaches include dg-categories, or a 1-categorical substitute such as the notion of homotopy colimits over suitable diagram categories, e.g., see [[Sta](#), Tag 0A5K] for colimits over the poset \mathbf{N}). We will elide this issue in the sequel.

Definition B.8. Let $N \in D_{\text{acoh}}^b(\widehat{X}_\infty)$. We define a map

$$\Psi_{\mathbb{T}}: \pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_X(\pi_* N)$$

in $D(\widehat{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}})$ as the composition

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N) &= \pi_* \mathbf{R} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}}(N, \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}} \omega_{\widehat{X}/V}^\bullet) \\ &\xrightarrow{\psi_{\mathbb{T}}} \pi_* \mathbf{R} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}}(N, \mathbf{R} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}, \omega_{\widehat{X}/V}^\bullet)) \\ &= \mathbf{R} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}}(\pi_* N, \omega_{\widehat{X}/V}^\bullet) = \mathbf{D}_X(\pi_* N), \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_{\mathbb{T}}$ is the map induced from [Definition B.3](#).

Discussion. Suppose we have a map $g: M \rightarrow \pi_* N$ in $D_{\text{qcoh}}^b(\widehat{X})$ where $M \in {}^p D_{\text{coh}}^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X})$ and $N \in \text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$. Consider the induced map

$$\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)! \rightarrow \pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N) \xrightarrow{\Psi_{\mathbb{T}}} \mathbf{D}_X(\pi_* N) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{D}_X(g)} \mathbf{D}_X(M).$$

The source of this map is a quasi-coherent sheaf on \widehat{X} and the target of this map lives in $D_{\text{coh}}^{\geq 0}(\widehat{X})$ by [Lemma B.1](#). Thus we have a natural induced map $\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)! \rightarrow H^0(\mathbf{D}_X(M))$ from a quasi-coherent sheaf to a coherent sheaf on \widehat{X} , call the image of this map T , which is a coherent sheaf on \widehat{X} . We then obtain natural maps

$$M \rightarrow {}^p H^0(M) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_X(T)$$

where the second map is a surjection in $\text{Perv}_{\text{coh}}(\widehat{X})$ by [Lemma B.1](#). Note that, by formal GAGA we can view $M \in D_{\text{coh}}^b(X)$ and $N \in D_{\text{acoh}}^b(X_\infty)$ (i.e., the p -adic completion of M and N gives the corresponding object on the formal scheme). Now for all $x \in X_{p=0}$, we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x({}^p H^0(M)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{D}_X(T)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] \\ \downarrow & & \parallel & & \parallel \\ \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* N)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] & & H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M_x) & & \text{Hom}(T_x, E) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* N)_x)_*[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] & \xlongequal{\quad} & H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* N)_x)_* & & \text{Hom}((\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x)!, E) \\ & & \searrow & & \parallel \\ & & & & \text{Hom}(\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, E)_* \end{array}$$

Here we have

- (a) The identification $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* N)_x)_*[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] = H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* N)_x)_*$ follows from $N \in \text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$ and the $*$ -realization (which turns almost to honest).
- (b) The identification $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x({}^p H^0(M)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] = H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M_x)$ follows from the local cohomology characterization of the perverse t -structure (see [Lemma B.1](#)).
- (c) The surjection $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x({}^p H^0(M)_x) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{D}_X(T)_x)$ (note they both live in one cohomology degree $1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}$) follows from the surjection ${}^p H^0(M) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_X(T)$ in $\text{Perv}_{\text{coh}}(\widehat{X})$.
- (d) The identification $\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathbf{D}_X(T)_x)[1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}] = \text{Hom}(T_x, E)$ is by local duality.
- (e) The injection $\text{Hom}(T_x, E) \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}((\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x)!, E)$ is by Matlis duality.
- (f) The identification $\text{Hom}((\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x)!, E) = \text{Hom}(\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, E)_*$ is by Hom-tensor adjointness.
- (g) The key injection $H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* N)_x)_* \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}(\pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(N)_x, E)_*$ follows from [Lemma B.6](#) and the $*$ -realization (which turns almost to honest).

Chasing this diagram, it follows that for all $x \in X_{p=0}$, we have an identification

$$\text{Hom}(T_x, E) \cong \text{Image}(H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(M_x) \rightarrow H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* N)_x)_*).$$

We apply the discussion above to $M = \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}[d] \in {}^p D_{\text{coh}}^{\leq 0}(\widehat{X})$ and $N = \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}^{\text{RH}}[d] \in \text{Perv}_{\text{acoh}}(\widehat{X}_\infty)$ (see [Definition 5.3](#)), with the natural map induced by $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}} \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty} \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ to obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}^{\text{RH}}[d])! & \longrightarrow & \pi_* \mathbf{D}_{X_\infty}(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}^{\text{RH}}[d]) & \xrightarrow{\Psi_{\mathbb{T}}} & \mathbf{D}_X(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}^{\text{RH}}[d]) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{D}_X(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}[d]) \\ & & & & & & \downarrow \\ & & & & & & \omega_{\widehat{X}/V} \cong H^0 \mathbf{D}_X(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}[d]) \\ \parallel & & & & & & \\ \pi_*(\omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}})! & \longrightarrow & & & & & \omega_{\widehat{X}/V} \cong H^0 \mathbf{D}_X(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}[d]) \end{array}$$

We leave it to the readers to check that the bottom map is precisely the map induced by \mathbb{T} defined in [Proposition 6.1](#) (once we identify $(\omega_{\widehat{X}_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}})!$ with $\omega_{X_\infty/V_\infty}^{\text{RH}}$ and $\omega_{\widehat{X}/V}$ with $\omega_{X/V}$ under formal GAGA). It follows by [Definition 6.4](#) that the T in the discussion above corresponds to $\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})$ and we have a natural identification

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}(\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})_x, E) &\cong \text{Image} \left(H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}[d])_x) \rightarrow H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}_\infty}^{\text{RH}}[d])_x)_* \right) \\ \text{(B.8.1)} \quad &\cong \text{Image} \left(H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}[d])_x) \rightarrow H^{1 - \dim \overline{\{x\}}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{(\widehat{X}_\infty^{\text{nc}})^+}[d])_x)_* \right) \\ &\cong \text{Image} \left(H^{\dim \mathcal{O}_{X,x}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}) \rightarrow H^{\dim \mathcal{O}_{X,x}}\mathbf{R}\Gamma_x((\pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X_\infty^+})_x)_* \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the isomorphism on the second line follows from [Remark 5.12](#) (and the $*$ -realization to get an honest injection instead of an almost injection).

Theorem B.9. *Suppose $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(V)$ is proper, flat, such that X is normal and X_∞ is integral. Then for every $x \in X_{p=0}$ with $R := \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, we have*

$$\tau_{\text{RH}}(\omega_{X/V}) \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} = \tau_+(\omega_R, p^{1/p^e}) = \mathbf{B}^0(\text{Spec}(R), \frac{1}{p^e} \text{div}(p); \omega_R)$$

for all $e \gg 0$.

Proof. The second equality follows from the definition recalled in [Definition 6.15](#). Since we are working over the complete local domain R (as X is normal), to check the first displayed equality, by Matlis duality and the fact that $\operatorname{div}(p)$ is a multiple of $\operatorname{div}(\varpi)$, it is enough to show that for all $e \gg 0$,

$$\tau_{\mathrm{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})_x^\vee = \mathbf{B}^0(\operatorname{Spec}(R), \frac{1}{p^e} \operatorname{div}(\varpi); \omega_R)^\vee$$

where $(-)^\vee := \operatorname{Hom}(-, E)$ denotes Matlis duality. Let $(S, \mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, so $R = \widehat{S}$. By [\(B.8.1\)](#), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathrm{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})_x^\vee &\cong \operatorname{Image} \left(H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S) \rightarrow H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}((S \otimes_V V_\infty^{nc})^+)_* \right) \\ &\cong \operatorname{Image} \left(H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S) \rightarrow H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S^+)_* \right) \\ &\cong \operatorname{Image} \left(H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S) \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}((\varpi^{1/p^\infty}), H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S^+)) \right) \\ &\cong \operatorname{Image} \left(H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S) \rightarrow \varprojlim (H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S^+) \xleftarrow{\cdot \varpi^{1-1/p}} H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S^+) \xleftarrow{\cdot \varpi^{1/p-1/p^2}} \dots) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the isomorphism on the second line follows from the fact that $S \otimes_V V_\infty^{nc}$ is a domain integral over S , so it has the same absolute integral closure with S , the isomorphism on the third line follows by the definition of $(-)_*$, and the isomorphism on the fourth line follows from the identification $(\varpi^{1/p^\infty})S^+ \cong \varprojlim (S^+ \xrightarrow{\cdot \varpi^{1-1/p}} S^+ \xrightarrow{\cdot \varpi^{1/p-1/p^2}} \dots)$.

Note that, under this identification, the map in the last line above sends an element $\eta \in H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S)$ to $(\varpi\eta, \varpi^{1/p}\eta, \varpi^{1/p^2}\eta, \dots)$ in the inverse limit. Since $H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S)$ is Artinian, we know that

$$\operatorname{Image} \left(H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S) \xrightarrow{\cdot \varpi^{1/p^e}} H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S^+) \right)$$

stabilizes for $e \gg 0$. So the above image for $e \gg 0$ coincides with the image of $H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S)$ inside the inverse limit. On the other hand, by [\[BMP⁺23, Lemma 4.8 and Proposition 4.29\]](#), we have that

$$\mathbf{B}^0(\operatorname{Spec}(R), \frac{1}{p^e} \operatorname{div}(\varpi); \omega_R)^\vee = \operatorname{Image} \left(H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S) \xrightarrow{\cdot \varpi^{1/p^e}} H^{\dim(S)} \mathbf{R}\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(S^+) \right).$$

Therefore we have $\tau_{\mathrm{RH}}(\omega_{X/V})_x^\vee = \mathbf{B}^0(\operatorname{Spec}(R), \frac{1}{p^e} \operatorname{div}(\varpi); \omega_R)^\vee$ for $e \gg 0$ as desired. \square

APPENDIX C. FURTHER QUESTIONS

We do not know if the p -perturbation and the ϵG perturbation in this paper is necessary (cf. [Question 7.7](#)). Explicitly, we do not know, or have an approach, to the following question.

Conjecture C.1 (cf. [\[Smi94\]](#)). *Suppose that X is normal integral and finite type over a complete mixed characteristic DVR V , and Γ is a \mathbf{Q} -Cartier \mathbf{Q} -divisor. Then*

$$\tau(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathfrak{c}^t) = \operatorname{Tr}_{Y/X} (\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^* \Gamma - tM))$$

for some sufficiently large alteration $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ with $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-M)$ and tM and $\pi^*\Gamma$ Cartier?

Even if we cannot answer the above question, based on the theory of test elements [\[HH90\]](#), we hope that the following holds.

Question C.2. Suppose X is \mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein and quasi-projective over V . Suppose $G^0 > 0$ is a Cartier divisor such that $\mathcal{O}_X(-G^0) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{O}_X)$, then does that G^0 satisfy [Corollary 7.21](#)? In other words, for any $G \geq G^0$ and $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G), do we have that

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Tr}_{Y/X} (\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*(K_X + \epsilon G)))$$

for some sufficiently large alteration $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $\pi^*(K_X + \epsilon G)$ is Cartier. One can ask the same question for pairs and triples $(X, \Delta, \mathbf{c}^t)$.

Another natural way to try to generalize this paper is to replace the complete DVR V with a complete Noetherian local domain (R, \mathfrak{m}) . We hope to address this in a future work.

Conjecture C.3. Suppose X is quasi-projective over a Noetherian complete²¹ local ring R . Then for some $G^0 \geq 0$, all Cartier $G \geq G^0$ and all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G), the intersection over sufficiently large alterations $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$

$$\bigcap_{\pi:Y \rightarrow X} \text{Tr}_{Y/X} (\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^* \epsilon G))$$

stabilizes. We expect the same stabilization with pairs (ω_X, Γ) and triples $(\omega_X, \Gamma, \mathbf{c}^t)$.

One should also expect that the adjoint-variant of the test ideal [\[MST⁺22\]](#), cf. [\[Tak08, Tak13, HLS22\]](#) can also be defined by a single alteration. Suppose X is normal, integral and quasi-projective over a mixed characteristic complete DVR V and D a prime divisor on X . For each alteration $Y \rightarrow X$ with fixed $K(Y) \subseteq K(X^+) = \overline{K(X)}$, compatibly pick D_Y a prime divisor dominating D (this is the data of a valuation on $K(X^+)$ extending the DVR corresponding to D).

Conjecture C.4. With notation as above, suppose Δ is a \mathbf{Q} -divisor without common components with D , and $K_X + \Delta + D$ is \mathbf{Q} -Cartier. Then for every sufficiently large effective Cartier divisor G without common components with D , and all $1 \gg \epsilon > 0$ (depending on G), and all normal alterations $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ (depending on ϵG), the intersection

$$\text{adj}^D(\mathcal{O}_X, D + \Delta) = \bigcap_{\pi:Y \rightarrow X} \text{Tr}_{Y/X} (\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \pi^*(K_X + \Delta + D + \epsilon G) + D_Y))$$

stabilizes and hence, after inverting p , agrees with the adjoint ideal in characteristic zero.

Furthermore, for each closed point $x \in X$ with $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$, we have that $\text{adj}^D(\mathcal{O}_X, D + \Delta) \cdot R$ agrees with the adjoint ideal defined in [\[MST⁺22\]](#) for sufficiently large perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay algebras. Finally, up to small perturbation, it also agrees with the adjoint ideal defined in [\[HLS22\]](#).

REFERENCES

- [And18] Y. ANDRÉ: *La conjecture du facteur direct*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **127** (2018), 71–93. [3814651](#)
- [And20] Y. ANDRÉ: *Weak functoriality of Cohen-Macaulay algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **33** (2020), no. 2, 363–380. [4073864](#)
- [BL95] A. BEAUVILLE AND Y. LASZLO: *Un lemme de descente*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **320** (1995), no. 3, 335–340. [1320381](#)
- [Bec72] I. BECK: *Σ -injective modules*, J. Algebra **21** (1972), 232–249. [357499](#)

²¹or even excellent with a dualizing complex

- [BBD82] A. A. BEĀLINSON, J. BERNSTEIN, AND P. DELIGNE: *Faisceaux pervers*, Analysis and topology on singular spaces, I (Luminy, 1981), Astérisque, vol. 100, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982, pp. 5–171.
- [Bha15] B. BHATT: *Perverse sheaves*, Notes taken by T. Murayama, available at <https://www.math.purdue.edu/~murayama/MATH731.pdf>, 2015.
- [Bha16] B. BHATT: *Algebraization and Tannaka duality*, Camb. J. Math. **4** (2016), no. 4, 403–461. 3572635
- [Bha18] B. BHATT: *On the direct summand conjecture and its derived variant*, Invent. Math. **212** (2018), no. 2, 297–317. 3787829
- [Bha20] B. BHATT: *Cohen-Macaulayness of absolute integral closures*, arXiv:2008.08070.
- [BH22] B. BHATT AND D. HANSEN: *The six functors for Zariski-constructible sheaves in rigid geometry*, Compos. Math. **158** (2022), no. 2, 437–482. 4413751
- [BIM19] B. BHATT, S. B. IYENGAR, AND L. MA: *Regular rings and perfect(oid) algebras*, Comm. Algebra **47** (2019), no. 6, 2367–2383. 3957103
- [BL] B. BHATT AND J. LURIE: *A p -adic Riemann-Hilbert functor: \mathbf{Z}/p^n -coefficients*, In preparation.
- [BMP+23] B. BHATT, L. MA, Z. PATAKFALVI, K. SCHWEDE, K. TUCKER, J. WALDRON, AND J. WITASZEK: *Globally \pm -regular varieties and the minimal model program for threefolds in mixed characteristic*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **138** (2023), 69–227. 4666931
- [BMS18] B. BHATT, M. MORROW, AND P. SCHOLZE: *Integral p -adic Hodge theory*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **128** (2018), 219–397. 3905467
- [BS15] B. BHATT AND P. SCHOLZE: *The pro-étale topology for schemes*, Astérisque (2015), no. 369, 99–201. 3379634
- [BS22] B. BHATT AND P. SCHOLZE: *Prisms and prismatic cohomology*, Ann. of Math. (2) **196** (2022), no. 3, 1135–1275. 4502597
- [Bli04] M. BLICKLE: *Multiplier ideals and modules on toric varieties*, Math. Z. **248** (2004), no. 1, 113–121. MR2092724 (2006a:14082)
- [BST15] M. BLICKLE, K. SCHWEDE, AND K. TUCKER: *F -singularities via alterations*, Amer. J. Math. **137** (2015), no. 1, 61–109. 3318087
- [BGR84] S. BOSCH, U. GÜNTZER, AND R. REMMERT: *Non-Archimedean analysis*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 261, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984, A systematic approach to rigid analytic geometry. 746961
- [BL93] S. BOSCH AND W. LÜTKEBOHMERT: *Formal and rigid geometry. I. Rigid spaces*, Math. Ann. **295** (1993), no. 2, 291–317. 1202394
- [BH93] W. BRUNS AND J. HERZOG: *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 39, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR1251956 (95h:13020)
- [CLM+23] H. CAI, S. LEE, L. MA, K. SCHWEDE, AND K. TUCKER: *Perfectoid signature, perfectoid Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity, and an application to local fundamental groups*, arXiv:2209.04046.
- [CEMS18] A. CHIECCHIO, F. ENESCU, L. E. MILLER, AND K. SCHWEDE: *Test ideals in rings with finitely generated anti-canonical algebras*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **17** (2018), no. 1, 171–206. 3742559
- [DT23] R. DATTA AND K. TUCKER: *Openness of splinter loci in prime characteristic*, J. Algebra **629** (2023), 307–357. 4583731
- [EL93] L. EIN AND R. LAZARSELD: *Global generation of pluricanonical and adjoint linear series on smooth projective threefolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **6** (1993), no. 4, 875–903. 1207013 (94c:14016)
- [EV92] H. ESNAULT AND E. VIEHWEG: *Lectures on vanishing theorems*, DMV Seminar, vol. 20, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992. MR1193913 (94a:14017)
- [Fal02] G. FALTINGS: *Almost étale extensions*, no. 279, 2002, pp. 185–270, Cohomologies p -adiques et applications arithmétiques, II. 1922831
- [FGK22] Y. FANG, W. GUBLER, AND K. KÜNNEMANN: *On the non-archimedean Monge-Ampère equation in mixed characteristic*, arXiv:2203.12282.
- [Fox77] H.-B. R. FOXBY: *Isomorphisms between complexes with applications to the homological theory of modules*, Math. Scand. **40** (1977), no. 1, 5–19. 447269
- [Gab04] O. GABBER: *Notes on some t -structures*, Geometric aspects of Dwork theory. Vol. I, II, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin, 2004, pp. 711–734.

- [Gab18] O. GABBER: *Observations made after the MSRI workshop on homological conjectures*, <https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=https://www.msri.org/workshops/842/schedules/23854/documents/3322/assets/31362>.
- [GLL15] O. GABBER, Q. LIU, AND D. LORENZINI: *Hypersurfaces in projective schemes and a moving lemma*, *Duke Math. J.* **164** (2015), no. 7, 1187–1270. 3347315
- [GR03] O. GABBER AND L. RAMERO: *Almost ring theory*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1800, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [GR04] O. GABBER AND L. RAMERO: *Foundations for almost ring theory*, arXiv:0409584.
- [GL14] D. GAITSGORY AND J. LURIE: *Weil’s conjecture for function fields*, <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/tamagawa.pdf>.
- [GR70] H. GRAUERT AND O. RIEMENSCHNEIDER: *Verschwindungssätze für analytische Kohomologiegruppen auf komplexen Räumen*, *Invent. Math.* **11** (1970), 263–292. MR0302938 (46 #2081)
- [HLS22] C. HACON, A. LAMARCHE, AND K. SCHWEDE: *Global generation of test ideals in mixed characteristic and applications*, arXiv:2106.14329, to appear in *Algebr. Geom.*
- [Har98] N. HARA: *A characterization of rational singularities in terms of injectivity of Frobenius maps*, *Amer. J. Math.* **120** (1998), no. 5, 981–996. MR1646049 (99h:13005)
- [HW02] N. HARA AND K.-I. WATANABE: *F-regular and F-pure rings vs. log terminal and log canonical singularities*, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **11** (2002), no. 2, 363–392. MR1874118 (2002k:13009)
- [HY03] N. HARA AND K.-I. YOSHIDA: *A generalization of tight closure and multiplier ideals*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **355** (2003), no. 8, 3143–3174 (electronic). MR1974679 (2004i:13003)
- [Har66] R. HARTSHORNE: *Residues and duality*, *Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck*, given at Harvard 1963/64. With an appendix by P. Deligne. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, No. 20, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966. MR0222093 (36 #5145)
- [Har67] R. HARTSHORNE: *Local cohomology*, *A seminar given by A. Grothendieck*, Harvard University, Fall, vol. 1961, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967. MR0224620 (37 #219)
- [HH90] M. HOCHSTER AND C. HUNEKE: *Tight closure, invariant theory, and the Briançon-Skoda theorem*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **3** (1990), no. 1, 31–116. MR1017784 (91g:13010)
- [HH92] M. HOCHSTER AND C. HUNEKE: *Infinite integral extensions and big Cohen-Macaulay algebras*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **135** (1992), no. 1, 53–89. 1147957 (92m:13023)
- [HL07] C. HUNEKE AND G. LYUBEZNIK: *Absolute integral closure in positive characteristic*, *Adv. Math.* **210** (2007), no. 2, 498–504. 2303230 (2008d:13005)
- [IMSW21] S. B. IYENGAR, L. MA, K. SCHWEDE, AND M. E. WALKER: *Maximal Cohen-Macaulay complexes and their uses: a partial survey*, *Commutative algebra*, Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021, pp. 475–500. 4394418
- [JM08] S.-Y. JOW AND E. MILLER: *Multiplier ideals of sums via cellular resolutions*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **15** (2008), no. 2, 359–373. 2385647
- [Laz04] R. LAZARSFELD: *Positivity in algebraic geometry. II*, *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*, vol. 49, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004, *Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals*. MR2095472 (2005k:14001b)
- [Lip94] J. LIPMAN: *Adjoint ideals in regular local rings*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **1** (1994), no. 6, 739–755, With an appendix by Steven Dale Cutkosky. MR1306018 (95k:13028)
- [MS18] L. MA AND K. SCHWEDE: *Perfectoid multiplier/test ideals in regular rings and bounds on symbolic powers*, *Invent. Math.* **214** (2018), no. 2, 913–955. 3867632
- [MS21] L. MA AND K. SCHWEDE: *Singularities in mixed characteristic via perfectoid big Cohen-Macaulay algebras*, *Duke Math. J.* **170** (2021), no. 13, 2815–2890. 4312190
- [MST⁺22] L. MA, K. SCHWEDE, K. TUCKER, J. WALDRON, AND J. WITASZEK: *An analogue of adjoint ideals and PLT singularities in mixed characteristic*, *J. Algebraic Geom.* **31** (2022), no. 3, 497–559. 4484548
- [MSW21] L. MA, A. K. SINGH, AND U. WALTHER: *Koszul and local cohomology, and a question of Dutta*, *Math. Z.* **298** (2021), no. 1-2, 697–711. 4257105
- [MS97] V. B. MEHTA AND V. SRINIVAS: *A characterization of rational singularities*, *Asian J. Math.* **1** (1997), no. 2, 249–271. MR1491985 (99e:13009)

- [Mil13] J. S. MILNE: *Lectures on étale cohomology (v2.21)*, Available at www.jmilne.org/math/, 2013.
- [Mur23] T. MURAYAMA: *Uniform bounds on symbolic powers in regular rings*, arXiv:2111.06049.
- [Mus02] M. MUSTAŢĂ: *The multiplier ideals of a sum of ideals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **354** (2002), no. 1, 205–217 (electronic). 1859032 (2002k:14006)
- [Nad89] A. M. NADEL: *Multiplier ideal sheaves and existence of Kähler-Einstein metrics of positive scalar curvature*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **86** (1989), no. 19, 7299–7300. 1015491 (90k:32061)
- [Nad90] A. M. NADEL: *Multiplier ideal sheaves and Kähler-Einstein metrics of positive scalar curvature*, Ann. of Math. (2) **132** (1990), no. 3, 549–596. 1078269 (92d:32038)
- [PRG21] F. PÉREZ AND R. R. G.: *Characteristic-free test ideals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B **8** (2021), 754–787. 4312323
- [Rob22] M. ROBINSON: *Big Cohen-Macaulay test ideals on mixed characteristic toric schemes*, J. Commut. Algebra **14** (2022), no. 4, 591–602. 4509410
- [ST21] K. SATO AND S. TAKAGI: *Arithmetic and geometric deformations of f -pure and f -regular singularities*.
- [ST14] K. SCHWEDE AND K. TUCKER: *Test ideals of non-principal ideals: computations, jumping numbers, alterations and division theorems*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **102** (2014), no. 5, 891–929. 3271293
- [Shi16] K. SHIMOMOTO: *An application of the almost purity theorem to the homological conjectures*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **220** (2016), no. 2, 621–632. 3399381
- [Sin99] A. K. SINGH: *\mathbf{Q} -Gorenstein splinter rings of characteristic p are F -regular*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **127** (1999), no. 2, 201–205. 1735920 (2000j:13006)
- [Smi94] K. E. SMITH: *Tight closure of parameter ideals*, Invent. Math. **115** (1994), no. 1, 41–60. MR1248078 (94k:13006)
- [Smi95] K. E. SMITH: *Test ideals in local rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **347** (1995), no. 9, 3453–3472. MR1311917 (96c:13008)
- [Smi00] K. E. SMITH: *The multiplier ideal is a universal test ideal*, Comm. Algebra **28** (2000), no. 12, 5915–5929, Special issue in honor of Robin Hartshorne. MR1808611 (2002d:13008)
- [Sta] T. STACKS PROJECT AUTHORS: *Stacks Project*.
- [Tak04] S. TAKAGI: *An interpretation of multiplier ideals via tight closure*, J. Algebraic Geom. **13** (2004), no. 2, 393–415. MR2047704 (2005c:13002)
- [Tak06] S. TAKAGI: *Formulas for multiplier ideals on singular varieties*, Amer. J. Math. **128** (2006), no. 6, 1345–1362. MR2275023 (2007i:14006)
- [Tak08] S. TAKAGI: *A characteristic p analogue of plt singularities and adjoint ideals*, Math. Z. **259** (2008), no. 2, 321–341. MR2390084 (2009b:13004)
- [Tak13] S. TAKAGI: *Adjoint ideals and a correspondence between log canonicity and F -purity*, Algebra Number Theory **7** (2013), no. 4, 917–942.
- [TY23] T. TAKAMATSU AND S. YOSHIKAWA: *Minimal model program for semi-stable threefolds in mixed characteristic*, J. Algebraic Geom. **32** (2023), no. 3, 429–476. 4622257
- [Zav22] B. ZAVYALOV: *Almost coherent modules and almost coherent sheaves*, arXiv:2110.10773.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IAS/PRINCETON AND UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, PRINCETON AND ANN ARBOR, NJ AND MI, USA

Email address: bhargav.bhatt@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN, USA

Email address: ma326@purdue.edu

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE (EPFL), LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND

Email address: zsolt.patakfalvi@epfl.ch

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT, USA

Email address: schwede@math.utah.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, CHICAGO, IL, USA
Email address: `kftucker@uic.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MI, USA
Email address: `waldro51@msu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FINE HALL, WASHINGTON ROAD, PRINCETON, NJ, USA
Email address: `jwtaszek@princeton.edu`