

# DYNAMICS OF THE SEGRE VARIETIES OF A REAL SUBMANIFOLD IN COMPLEX SPACE

M. S. BAOUENDI, P. EBENFELT, AND LINDA PREISS ROTHSCHILD

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  be a smooth ( $C^\infty$ ) real submanifold of codimension  $d$  with  $0 \in M$ . We choose smooth real-valued functions  $r = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$ , with differentials  $dr_1, \dots, dr_d$  linearly independent at  $0$ , so that  $M$  is defined by  $r = 0$  near the origin. If the complex differentials  $\partial r_1, \dots, \partial r_d$  are also linearly independent at  $0$ , then  $M$  is called *generic* (near the origin). If  $M$  is a real-analytic, generic submanifold, there is a family of complex submanifolds of  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , called the Segre varieties associated to  $M$ , which carry a great deal of information about the local geometry of  $M$ . The Segre varieties have been used by many mathematicians to study mappings between generic submanifolds. (See the end of this introduction for some specific references.) In this paper, we shall consider an algebraic substitute for these varieties for the case of smooth manifolds by introducing a formal mapping which, in the real-analytic case, parametrizes the Segre varieties. Our main objective is to study iterations of this mapping and relate these iterations to the local CR geometry of the manifold.

If  $r$  is a local defining function of a smooth generic submanifold  $M$  as above, then we denote by  $\rho_j(Z, \bar{Z})$  the Taylor series of  $r_j$  at  $0$ . We write  $\rho = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d)$ . We consider  $\rho_j(Z, \zeta)$  as a formal power series in the  $2N$  indeterminates  $(Z, \zeta)$ . We shall denote the ring of such power series with complex coefficients by  $\mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$ . By a formal mapping  $F: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^p, 0)$ , we shall mean a  $p$ -tuple  $F(x) = (F_1(x), \dots, F_p(x))$ , where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ , of formal power series  $F_j \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  without constant terms. The rank of  $F$ ,  $\text{Rk } F$ , is defined as the rank of the Jacobian matrix  $\partial F / \partial x$  regarded as a  $\mathbb{K}_x$ -linear mapping  $\mathbb{K}_x^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_x^p$ , where  $\mathbb{K}_x$  denotes the field of fractions of  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$ . Hence  $\text{Rk } F$  is the largest integer  $s$  such that there is an  $s \times s$  minor of the matrix  $\partial F / \partial x$  which is not  $0$  as a formal power series in  $x$ .

Let  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$ , where  $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N)$ ,  $t = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , and  $n = N - d$ , be a formal mapping  $(\mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^n, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^N, 0)$  such that

$$(1) \quad \rho(\gamma(\zeta, t), \zeta) = 0, \quad \text{rk } \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial t}(0, 0) = n.$$

The existence of such  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$  is a consequence of the formal implicit function theorem and the fact that  $\partial_Z \rho_1, \dots, \partial_Z \rho_d$  are linearly independent at  $0$ . We shall call a

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32H02.

formal mapping  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$  satisfying (1) a *Segre variety mapping* for the germ of  $M$  at 0. Recall that if  $M$  is real-analytic, in which case we may assume that the formal series  $\rho_j(Z, \zeta)$  are convergent, then the Segre variety of  $M$  at  $p$ , for  $p$  near 0, is the complex  $n$ -dimensional submanifold defined by the equation  $\rho(Z, \bar{p}) = 0$ . Hence, in this case,  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$  satisfying (1) can be chosen to be convergent, and the mapping  $t \mapsto \gamma(\zeta, t)$ , for  $t$  near  $0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , parametrizes the Segre variety of  $M$  at  $\bar{\zeta}$ .

We define a sequence of formal mappings  $v^j: (\mathbb{C}^{nj}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^N, 0)$ , called *the iterated Segre mappings* of  $M$  at 0 (relative to  $\gamma$ ), inductively as follows:

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} v^1(t^1) &:= \gamma(0, t^1), \\ v^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) &:= \gamma(\bar{v}^j(t^1, \dots, t^j), t^{j+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $M$  is said to be of *finite type* at 0 (in the sense of Kohn [K72] and Bloom–Graham [BG77]) if the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_M$  generated by the  $(1, 0)$  and the  $(0, 1)$  vector fields tangent to  $M$  span  $\mathbb{C}T_0M$ , the complexified tangent space of  $M$  at 0 (see e.g. [BER99a], Chapter I). The following is one of the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  be a smooth generic submanifold of codimension  $d$  with  $0 \in M$ , and let  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$  be a Segre variety mapping of  $M$  at 0. Let  $v^j$ ,  $j \geq 1$ , be the iterated Segre mappings of  $M$  at 0 relative to  $\gamma$ . Then the rank  $\text{Rk } v^j$  is an increasing function of  $j$  and is independent of the choice of the holomorphic coordinates  $Z$ , the defining function  $r$ , and the Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$ . In addition, there exists an integer  $k_0$ ,  $1 \leq k_0 \leq d + 1$ , such that  $\text{Rk } v^j = \text{Rk } v^{j+1}$  for  $j \geq k_0$ , and if  $k_0 > 1$ , then  $\text{Rk } v^j < \text{Rk } v^{j+1}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k_0 - 1$ . Moreover, the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $M$  is of finite type at 0.
- (ii)  $\text{Rk } v^{k_0} = N$ .

For  $p \in M$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{g}_M(p)$  the subspace of  $\mathbb{C}T_pM$  obtained by evaluating the vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}_M$  at  $p$ . We shall prove the following result, which is more general than the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  be a smooth generic submanifold of codimension  $d$  through the origin, with  $\gamma$ ,  $v^j$ , and  $k_0$  as in Theorem 1.1. Let  $e = 2N - d - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}_M(0)$ . Then,*

$$(3) \quad \text{Rk } v^{k_0} = N - e.$$

We also have the following result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  be a smooth generic submanifold of codimension  $d$  through the origin, with  $\gamma$ ,  $v^j$ , and  $k_0$  as in Theorem 1.1, and  $e$  as in Theorem 1.2. Then there exist formal power series  $f_1, \dots, f_e \in \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$  such that*

- (i)  $df_1(0), \dots, df_e(0), dr_1(0), \dots, dr_d(0)$  are linearly independent, where  $r_1, \dots, r_d$  are defining functions for  $M$  near 0.

(ii)  $f_k \circ v^j = 0$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, e$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ .

We would like to point out that if  $M$  is a real-analytic generic submanifold, then one can choose the Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$  to be holomorphic in a neighborhood of 0. Hence, the iterated Segre mappings  $v^j$  are holomorphic. Also, in this case, the power series  $f_1, \dots, f_e$  in Theorem 1.3 may be chosen to be convergent near 0. The real submanifold in  $M$  defined by  $f_1 = \dots = f_e = r_1 = \dots = r_d = 0$  is the *local CR orbit* of 0 in  $M$ , and the complex submanifold in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  defined by  $f_1 = \dots = f_e = 0$  is its *intrinsic complexification*. (The reader is referred e.g. to [BER99a], Chapter I, for the definition of the intrinsic complexification of a real-analytic CR submanifold, and to [BER99a], Chapter IV, for the definition of the local CR orbit.)

A smooth real submanifold  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ , defined locally near  $p_0 \in M$  by  $r_1 = \dots = r_d = 0$ , is said to be *CR* (near  $p_0$ ) if the rank of the complex differentials  $\partial r_1, \dots, \partial r_d$  is constant on  $M$  (near  $p_0$ ). A real-analytic CR submanifold is generic as a real submanifold of its intrinsic complexification (see [BER99a], Corollary 1.8.10), and hence Theorems 1.1–1.3 also imply directly results for real-analytic CR submanifolds. A merely smooth CR submanifold need not be contained in any proper complex submanifold, however, a formal version of such an inclusion may be given in this case. (See §2 and Remark 5.4.) Analogs of Theorems 1.1–1.3 can be formulated in this context, but we shall not do so here.

As mentioned above, in the real-analytic case, the use of Segre varieties for the study of mappings of hypersurfaces and generic submanifolds has a long history. In particular we cite here the work of Webster [W77], Diederich-Webster [DW80], Baouendi-Jacobowitz-Treves [BJT85], Diederich-Fornaess [DF88], Baouendi-Rothschild [BR88], Forstneric [F89], Huang [H94].

The iterated Segre mappings  $v^j$  in the real-analytic case were introduced, with a special choice of coordinates (so-called canonical coordinates) and a special choice of Segre variety mapping in [BER96]. In that paper, the image of the mapping  $v^j$  was called the  $j$ th Segre set, and the existence of an integer  $k_0$  such that (3) holds was established. Also, for  $M$  merely smooth, the existence of the integer  $k_0$  such that (i) implies (ii) in Theorem 1.1 can be deduced from [BER96] by again using the special canonical coordinates mentioned above (see [BER99b] and [BER99c]). However, the results in Theorem 1.1, even in the case where  $M$  is real-analytic, are sharper than those mentioned above. We should emphasize here that the proofs in this paper are new, even in the real-analytic case, and the approach here is more elementary than that in [BER96]; in particular, the proofs in this paper do not assume the existence of canonical coordinates. The results in Theorems 1.1–1.3 above follow from a more general statement, Theorem 2.3 below, concerning formal manifolds. All the results are thus reduced to questions about ideals and their derivations in the ring of formal power series.

The iterated Segre mappings, in the real-analytic and algebraic cases, have played a crucial role in recent work on mappings between generic submanifolds. We mention here work of Zaitsev [Z97]–[Z99], joint work of the first and third authors with Zaitsev [BRZ00], Mir [Mi00a]–[Mi00b], as well as work of the authors [BER96], [BER98], [BER99b], [BER99c]. We should also mention the work of Christ–Nagel–Stein–Wainger [CNSW99] in which the ranks of iterated real mappings are related to curvature and finite type conditions in a very different context. Finally, we note that in the real-analytic case another approach to the construction of a sequence of mappings  $v^j$  for which the identity (3) holds for some  $k_0$  was given by Merker [Me99].

The authors are grateful to Dmitri Zaitsev for showing us a simple proof of Nagano’s theorem, which was adapted to the formal case in the proof of Proposition 5.1.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES AND REFORMULATION OF THE MAIN RESULTS FOR FORMAL MANIFOLDS

In this section, we shall give some preliminary material on formal manifolds and their mappings. As in the introduction, we let  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$  denote the ring of formal power series in  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ , and  $\mathbb{K}_x$  the field of fractions of  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$ . An ideal  $I \subset \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  is called a *manifold ideal* if, for some choice of generators  $f_1, \dots, f_d$  of  $I$ , the vectors  $\partial f_1/\partial x(0), \dots, \partial f_d/\partial x(0)$  are linearly independent in  $\mathbb{C}^k$ . (Observe that any other minimal set of generators of  $I$  must have  $d$  elements whose differentials at the origin are linearly independent.) If this condition is satisfied we say that the manifold ideal  $I$  has codimension  $d$  and dimension  $k - d$ . (This terminology agrees with that of Krull dimension for manifold ideals.) We shall say that the manifold ideal  $I$  defines a *formal manifold*  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  of dimension  $k - d$  and codimension  $d$  and write  $I = \mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$ . To motivate this terminology, we observe that if the generators  $f_1, \dots, f_d$  of  $I$  can be taken to be convergent, then the equations  $f_1(x) = \dots = f_d(x) = 0$  define a complex submanifold  $\Sigma$  through the origin in  $\mathbb{C}^k$  (of codimension  $d$ ) such that the ideal of germs at 0 of holomorphic functions vanishing on  $\Sigma$  is generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_d$ . If  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  are formal manifolds and  $\mathcal{I}(\Sigma_2) \subset \mathcal{I}(\Sigma_1)$ , then we shall say that  $\Sigma_1$  is contained in  $\Sigma_2$  and write  $\Sigma_1 \subset \Sigma_2$ .

Recall that a formal mapping  $F: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^p, 0)$  is a  $p$ -tuple  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_p)$  of formal power series in  $x$  that vanish at 0. Any formal mapping induces a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear ring homomorphism  $\phi_F: \mathbb{C}[[y]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ , where  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_p)$ , defined by  $\phi_F(f) = f \circ F$  for all  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ . Conversely, any  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear ring homomorphism  $\phi: \mathbb{C}[[y]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  is of the form  $\phi = \phi_F$  for a uniquely determined formal mapping  $F: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^p, 0)$ . A formal mapping  $H: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$  is called a *formal change of coordinates* if the  $k \times k$  matrix  $\partial H/\partial x(0)$  is invertible. (This is equivalent to  $\phi_H$  being a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear ring isomorphism.) We note that if  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  is a formal manifold of codimension  $d$ , then there exists a formal change of coordinates  $x' = H(x)$  so that  $\mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$  is generated by  $x'_1, \dots, x'_d$ .

Let  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{C}^k$ ,  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^p$  be formal manifolds, and  $F: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^p, 0)$  a formal mapping. We shall say that  $F$  maps  $\Lambda$  into  $\Sigma$ , and write  $F(\Lambda) \subset \Sigma$ , if  $\phi_F(\mathcal{I}(\Sigma)) \subset \mathcal{I}(\Lambda)$ . In particular, if  $\Lambda = \mathbb{C}^k$  (so that  $\mathcal{I}(\Lambda) = (0)$ ), then

$$F(\mathbb{C}^k) \subset \Sigma \iff f \circ F = 0, \forall f \in \mathcal{I}(\Sigma).$$

Recall that  $\text{Rk } F$  denotes the rank of the  $\mathbb{K}_x$ -linear mapping  $\mathbb{K}_x^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_x^p$  defined by the  $p \times k$  matrix  $\partial F / \partial x$ . If  $F(\mathbb{C}^k) \subset \Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^p$  and  $\text{Rk } F = \dim \Sigma$  (where  $\dim \Sigma$  denotes the dimension of the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$ ), then we shall say that  $F$  is a *formal subparametrization* of  $\Sigma$ . If, in addition,  $\dim \Sigma = k$  and  $\text{rk } \partial F / \partial x(0) = k$ , then we shall say that  $F$  is a *formal parametrization* of  $\Sigma$ . The proof of the following proposition is elementary (using e.g. [BER99a], Proposition 5.3.5) and is left to the reader.

**Proposition 2.1.** *If  $F: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^p, 0)$  is a formal subparametrization of a formal manifold  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^p$  then*

$$\mathcal{I}(\Sigma) = \{f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]] : f \circ F = 0\}.$$

The following is a direct consequence of the formal implicit function theorem.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $F, G: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^p, 0)$  be formal mappings and  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^p$  a formal manifold of dimension  $k$ . If  $F$  and  $G$  are parametrizations of  $\Sigma$ , then there exists a formal change of coordinates  $H: (\mathbb{C}^k, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^k, 0)$  such that  $F \circ H = G$ .*

A *formal vector field*  $X$  in  $\mathbb{C}^k$  is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear derivation of the ring  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$ ,  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ . Any formal vector field  $X$  has a unique representation in the form

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^k a_j(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}, \quad a_j \in \mathbb{C}[[x]].$$

We shall write  $\text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$  for the  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$ -module of all formal vector fields in  $\mathbb{C}^k$ . If  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  is a formal manifold, we say that a formal vector field  $X$  is *tangent* to  $\Sigma$  if  $Xf \in \mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$ .

For the results described in the introduction, we shall need to focus on the situation where  $x = (Z, \zeta)$ ,  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_N)$  and  $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N)$ , and consider those formal changes of coordinates in  $\mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  which are of the form

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{H}(Z, \zeta) = (H(Z), \bar{H}(\zeta)),$$

where  $\underline{H}: (\mathbb{C}^N, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^N, 0)$  is a formal change of coordinates and  $\bar{H}(\zeta)$  denotes  $\overline{H(\bar{\zeta})}$ . We define a conjugate linear isomorphism  $\sigma: \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$  by  $\sigma(f(Z, \zeta)) = \bar{f}(\zeta, Z)$ . Observe that  $\sigma^2 := \sigma \circ \sigma$  equals the identity and that all formal changes of variables of the form (4) commute with  $\sigma$ , i.e.  $\phi_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \sigma = \sigma \circ \phi_{\mathcal{H}}$ . (Indeed, the formal changes of variables  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $\mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  of the form (4) are precisely those for which  $\phi_{\mathcal{H}}$  commute with  $\sigma$  and preserve the subring  $\mathbb{C}[[Z]] \subset \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$ .)

We shall say that  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$  is *real* if  $\sigma(f) = f$ . Hence if  $f$  is a convergent power series, then  $f$  is real if and only if  $Z \mapsto f(Z, \bar{Z})$  is a real-valued function in

a neighborhood of 0 in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ . A manifold ideal  $I \subset \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$  is called *real* if  $\sigma(I) \subset I$ . (Equivalently, we say that a formal manifold  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  is real if its ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M})$  is real.) One can easily check that  $I$  is real if and only if there are real generators for  $I$ . The motivation for this terminology is that if  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d$  are real generators for a real manifold ideal  $I$  which are also convergent, then the equations  $\rho_1(Z, \bar{Z}) = \dots \rho_d(Z, \bar{Z}) = 0$  define a real-analytic submanifold of codimension  $d$  near 0 in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  be a formal real manifold of codimension  $d$  and  $\rho = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d)$  a vector of generators of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M})$ . We say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is *CR* if

$$\text{rk}_{\mathbb{K}_{Z, \zeta}} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \bar{Z}}(Z, \zeta) = \text{rk} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \bar{Z}}(0, 0).$$

Here  $\partial \rho / \partial \bar{Z}$  is considered as a  $d \times N$  matrix with coefficients in  $\mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$  and  $\mathbb{K}_{Z, \zeta}$  is the field of fractions of that ring. We say that the formal real submanifold  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  is *generic* if  $\text{rk} \partial \rho / \partial \bar{Z}(0) = d$ . Observe that the definitions above are independent of the choice of generators  $\rho_j$ , and that any formal generic manifold is necessarily CR.

If  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  is a formal CR manifold, then it can be shown (cf. Remark 5.4) that  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$  is a manifold ideal in  $\mathbb{C}[[Z]]$  of dimension  $N - d + \text{rk} \partial \rho / \partial \bar{Z}(0)$ . The formal manifold  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  whose ideal is  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$  is called the *intrinsic complexification* of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Observe that  $\mathcal{M}$  is generic if and only if  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{C}^N$ .

A *formal (1, 0)-vector field* is a formal vector field in  $\mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  of the form

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^N a_j(Z, \zeta) \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_j}, \quad a_j \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]].$$

Similarly, a *formal (0, 1)-vector field* is one of the form

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^N a_j(Z, \zeta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta_j}, \quad a_j \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]].$$

If  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  is a formal CR manifold, then a formal (0, 1)-vector field tangent to  $\mathcal{M}$  is called a *CR vector field* on  $\mathcal{M}$ . We denote by  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}$  the Lie algebra of formal vector fields generated by all the formal (0, 1) and (1, 0)-vector fields tangent to  $\mathcal{M}$ . One can easily check that  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is also a  $\mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$ -module. If  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}(0) = \dim \mathcal{M}$ , then we say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is of *finite type*. (Here  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}(0)$  is the complex vector space spanned by the vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}$  evaluated at 0.)

We extend the domain of definition of the involution  $\sigma$  to include formal vector fields as follows

$$\sigma(X)f := \sigma(X(\sigma(f))), \quad f \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]].$$

It is easy to check that if  $X = \sum_{j=1}^N a_j \partial/\partial Z_j + b_j \partial/\partial \zeta_j$ , then

$$\sigma(X) = \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma(a_j) \partial/\partial \zeta_j + \sigma(b_j) \partial/\partial Z_j.$$

In particular, if  $X$  is a formal  $(0, 1)$ -vector field, then  $\sigma(X)$  is a formal  $(1, 0)$ -vector field (and conversely). Moreover, if  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  is a formal real manifold and  $X$  is a formal vector field tangent to  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $\sigma(X)$  is tangent to  $\mathcal{M}$ . Hence, if  $\mathcal{M}$  is a formal CR manifold, and  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a formal real manifold to which all the formal CR vector fields on  $\mathcal{M}$  are tangent, then all vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}$  are also tangent to  $\mathcal{O}$ .

If  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  is a formal generic manifold, then we define the Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$  and the iterated Segre mappings  $v^j$  exactly as given by (1) and (2) in the introduction. If  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  is a smooth generic submanifold through the origin, then we associate to it a formal generic manifold  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  as follows. Let  $r_1, \dots, r_d$  be smooth defining functions for  $M$  near 0 and  $\rho_1(Z, \bar{Z}), \dots, \rho_d(Z, \bar{Z})$  their Taylor series at 0. The formal generic manifold  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  is defined to be that associated to the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$  generated by the formal power series  $\rho_1(Z, \zeta), \dots, \rho_d(Z, \zeta)$ . Observe that  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}$  consists of the formal vector fields obtained taking the Taylor expansions of the coefficients of the smooth vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}_M$ . In particular,  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}(0) = \dim \mathfrak{g}_M(0)$ . Hence, Theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 are consequences of the following more general result.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  be a formal generic manifold of codimension  $d$ , and let  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$  be a Segre variety mapping of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $v^j$ ,  $j \geq 1$ , be the iterated Segre mappings of  $\mathcal{M}$  relative to  $\gamma$ . Then, the rank  $\text{Rk } v^j$  is an increasing function of  $j$  and is independent of the choice of the formal holomorphic coordinates  $Z$ , the formal power series  $\rho_j$ , and the Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$ . In addition, there exists an integer  $k_0$ ,  $1 \leq k_0 \leq d + 1$ , such that  $\text{Rk } v^j = \text{Rk } v^{j+1}$  for  $j \geq k_0$ , and if  $k_0 > 1$ , then  $\text{Rk } v^j < \text{Rk } v^{j+1}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k_0 - 1$ . Moreover, the following holds.*

- (i) *There exists a unique formal CR manifold  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{M}$ , with  $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{O} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}(0)$ , such that all the formal CR vector fields on  $\mathcal{M}$  are tangent to  $\mathcal{O}$ . Moreover, if  $e = 2N - d - \dim \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}(0)$ , then there exist  $f_1, \dots, f_e \in \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$  such that  $f_1, \dots, f_e, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_d$  generate the manifold ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ .*
- (ii) *Let  $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  be the formal complex manifold defined by the ideal  $I(f_1, \dots, f_e) \subset \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$ . Then  $v^j(\mathbb{C}^{jn}) \subset \mathcal{W}$  for all  $j \geq 1$ .*
- (iii)  *$\text{Rk } v^{k_0} = \dim \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}(0) + d - N = \dim \mathcal{W}$ .*

We should point out that, in general, the rank of the  $N \times jn$  matrix

$$\frac{\partial v^j}{\partial (t^1, \dots, t^j)}(0)$$

is strictly less than  $\text{Rk } v^{k_0}$  for all  $j$ . However, we have the following.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  be a formal generic manifold of codimension  $d$ , and let  $\gamma$ ,  $v^j$ , and  $k_0$  be as in Theorem 2.3. Then there exists a formal manifold  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^{2nk_0}$ , with  $n = N - d$ , of dimension  $nk_0$  such that*

$$v^{2k_0}(\Sigma) = \{0\},$$

and for any formal parametrization  $F: (\mathbb{C}^{nk_0}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{2nk_0}, 0)$  of  $\Sigma$ ,

$$\text{rk}_{\mathbb{K}_s} \left( \frac{\partial v^{2k_0}}{\partial (t^1, \dots, t^{2k_0})} (F(s^1, \dots, s^{k_0})) \right) = \text{Rk } v^{k_0},$$

where  $s = (s^1, \dots, s^{k_0}) \in \mathbb{C}^{nk_0}$ .

In the case where  $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  is a real-analytic submanifold, say of finite type at 0, Theorem 2.3 asserts that the image of  $v^{k_0}$  contains an open subset of  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , but not necessarily an open neighborhood of 0. However, Theorem 2.4 asserts that the image of  $v^{2k_0}$  contains an open neighborhood of 0 in  $\mathbb{C}^N$ .

The proof of Theorem 2.3 will be given in §§3–8. The proof of Theorem 2.4 is given in §8.

### 3. INCREASE OF THE RANK OF THE ITERATED SEGRE MAPPINGS

In this section we begin the proof of Theorem 2.3. We start by showing that  $\text{Rk } v^j$  is an increasing function of  $j$ , i.e.  $\text{Rk } v^{j+1} \geq \text{Rk } v^j$ . We shall restrict ourselves to the case where  $j$  is odd; the even case is similar and left to the reader. By iterating the definition (2) of  $v^j$ , we obtain

$$(5) \quad v^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) = \gamma(\bar{\gamma}(\dots \gamma(\bar{\gamma}(0, t^1), t^2), \dots, t^j), t^{j+1}).$$

Hence, setting  $t^1 = 0$  and using the fact that  $\gamma(0, 0) = 0$ , we have

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} v^{j+1}(0, t^2, \dots, t^{j+1}) &= \gamma(\bar{\gamma}(\dots \gamma(\bar{\gamma}(0, 0), t^2), \dots, t^j), t^{j+1}) \\ &= v^j(t^2, \dots, t^{j+1}). \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion  $\text{Rk } v^{j+1} \geq \text{Rk } v^j$  follows immediately from (6).

We shall now prove that if, for some integer  $k_0$ ,  $\text{Rk } v^{k_0} = \text{Rk } v^{k_0+1}$ , then  $\text{Rk } v^j = \text{Rk } v^{k_0}$  for all  $j \geq k_0$ . In view of (2) and (6), this statement is a consequence of the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $A: (\mathbb{C}^r \times \mathbb{C}^s, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$  and  $F: (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^N, 0)$  be formal mappings, and set  $B(x) = A(x, 0)$ , where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ . If  $\text{Rk } A(x, y) = \text{Rk } B(x)$ , then  $\text{Rk } F(z, A(x, y)) = \text{Rk } F(z, B(x))$ . Here,  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$  and  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_s)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $B^j(x, y_1, \dots, y_j) = A(x, y_1, \dots, y_j, 0, \dots, 0)$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, s-1$ . Clearly, if  $\text{Rk } A(x, y) = \text{Rk } B(x)$ , then  $\text{Rk } A(x, y) = \text{Rk } B^j(x, y_1, \dots, y_j)$  for each  $j = 1, \dots, s-1$ . A simple induction argument shows that it suffices to prove the proposition when  $s = 1$ , which we shall assume for the remainder of the proof of Proposition 3.1. The Proposition will be a consequence of the following lemma.



**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $A, B$  be as in Proposition 3.1 with  $s = 1$ . If  $\text{Rk } A(x, y) = \text{Rk } B(x)$ , then there exists a formal mapping  $\phi: (\mathbb{C}^r \times \mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^r \times \mathbb{C}, 0)$  such that  $\text{Rk } \phi(u, t) = r + 1$ , where  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_r)$ , and*

$$(7) \quad A(\phi(u, t)) = A(\phi(u, 0)) = B(u).$$

We now show that Proposition 3.1 follows from Lemma 3.2, whose proof will be given below. Set  $H(z, x, y) = F(z, A(x, y))$  and  $G(z, u, t) = F(z, A(\phi(u, t)))$ . Observe that the formal mapping  $\psi: (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^r \times \mathbb{C}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^r \times \mathbb{C}, 0)$ , where  $\psi(z, u, t) = (z, \phi(u, t))$  satisfies  $\text{Rk } \psi(z, u, t) = n + r + 1$ . Hence, since  $G = H \circ \psi$ , it follows that  $\text{Rk } H(z, x, y) = \text{Rk } G(z, u, t)$ . Also, by Lemma 3.2,  $G(z, u, t) = F(z, A(\phi(u, t))) = F(z, B(u))$ , which proves Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* Let  $p = \text{Rk } A(x, y) = \text{Rk } B(x)$ , and hence  $p \leq r$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\partial B / \partial x_j \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]^m$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{K}_x$  and hence  $\partial A / \partial x_j \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]^m$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , are also linearly independent over  $\mathbb{K}_{x, y}$ . We write  $x = (x', x'')$ , with  $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_p)$ , and e.g.  $\partial A / \partial x'$  for the  $m \times p$  Jacobian matrix of  $A$  with respect to  $x'$ . Consider the  $\mathbb{K}_{x, y}$ -linear system

$$(8) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \partial A / \partial x' & \partial A / \partial x'' & \partial A / \partial y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a' \\ a'' \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $a' \in \mathbb{K}_{x, y}^p$ ,  $a'' \in \mathbb{K}_{x, y}^{r-p}$ , and  $b \in \mathbb{K}_{x, y}$ . We take  $a''(x, y) = 0$ ,  $b(x, y) = 1$  and solve (8) for  $a'$ , which is possible since the rank of  $\partial A / \partial x'$  is  $p$ . Moreover, if we denote by  $k_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , indices such that  $\Delta := \det(\partial A_{k_j} / \partial x_i)_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$  with  $\Delta(x, 0) \neq 0$ , then the solution  $a'$  is of the form

$$(9) \quad a'(x, y) = \frac{c(x, y)}{\Delta(x, y)},$$

where  $c \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]^p$ . Write

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{X} = \Delta(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \sum_{j=1}^p c_j(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j},$$

where  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_p)$  is given by (9). Observe that the coefficients of  $\mathcal{X}$  are in  $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ ,  $\mathcal{X}A(x, y) = 0$ , and  $\Delta(x, 0) \neq 0$ . We define  $\phi(u, t)$ ,  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_r)$ , to be the formal flow of  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e. the solution of the initial value problem

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(u, t) = X(\phi(u, t)), \quad \phi(u, 0) = (u, 0),$$

where  $X(x, y)$  denotes the vector of coefficients of  $\mathcal{X}$ . The fact that  $\Delta(x, 0) \neq 0$  implies that  $\text{Rk } \phi(u, t) = r + 1$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}A = 0$ , it is easy to verify that the identity (7) holds. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.2 and hence that of Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

In summary, we have shown in this section that

$$(11) \quad n = \text{Rk } v^1 \leq \text{Rk } v^j \leq \text{Rk } v^{j+1} \leq N, \quad \forall j \geq 1.$$

Moreover, there exists an integer  $k_0$ ,  $1 \leq k_0 \leq d+1$ , such that

$$(12) \quad \text{Rk } v^j < \text{Rk } v^{j+1}, \quad 1 \leq j < k_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Rk } v^{k_0} = \text{Rk } v^j, \quad j \geq k_0.$$

#### 4. INDEPENDENCE OF RANK ON CHOICE OF SEGRE VARIETY MAPPING

In view of (11) and (12), to complete the proof of the first part of Theorem 2.3, it suffices to show that  $\text{Rk } v^j$  is independent of the choice of the Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$ . For this, we introduce, for each positive even integer  $2m$ , the formal manifold  $\mathfrak{S}_{2m} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2mN}$  whose ideal in  $\mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta^1, Z^1, \dots, Z^{m-1}, \zeta^m]]$ , where  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_N)$ ,  $Z^j = (Z_1^j, \dots, Z_N^j)$ ,  $\zeta^j = (\zeta_1^j, \dots, \zeta_N^j)$ , is generated by

$$(13) \quad \rho(Z, \zeta^1), \rho(Z^1, \zeta^1), \rho(Z^1, \zeta^2), \rho(Z^2, \zeta^2), \dots, \rho(Z^{m-1}, \zeta^m), \rho(0, \zeta^m),$$

where  $\rho = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d)$  are formal defining functions of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Similarly, for positive odd integers  $2m+1$ , we define  $\mathfrak{S}_{2m+1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{(2m+1)N}$  to be the formal manifold whose ideal in  $\mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta^1, Z^1, \dots, Z^{m-1}, \zeta^m, Z^m]]$  is generated by

$$(14) \quad \rho(Z, \zeta^1), \rho(Z^1, \zeta^1), \rho(Z^1, \zeta^2), \dots, \rho(Z^m, \zeta^m), \rho(Z^m, 0).$$

The formal manifold  $\mathfrak{S}_k \subset \mathbb{C}^{kN}$  has dimension  $kn$ . It is called the  $k$ th Segre manifold of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Also, denote by  $\pi_1^k: (\mathbb{C}^{kN}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^N, 0)$  the projection on the first factor, e.g.

$$\pi_1^{2m+1}(Z, \zeta^1, Z^1, \dots, \zeta^m, Z^m) = Z.$$

Fix a choice of Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$ . Define, for positive even integers  $2m$ , the formal mapping  $T^{2m}: (\mathbb{C}^{2mn}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{2mN}, 0)$  by

$$(15) \quad T^{2m}(t^1, \dots, t^{2m}): = (v^{2m}(t^1, \dots, t^{2m}), \bar{v}^{2m-1}(t^1, \dots, t^{2m-1}), \dots, \bar{v}^1(t^1)),$$

and  $t^j = (t_1^j, \dots, t_n^j)$ . Similarly, for positive odd integers  $2m+1$ , define the formal mapping  $T^{2m+1}: (\mathbb{C}^{(2m+1)n}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{(2m+1)N}, 0)$  by

$$(16) \quad T^{2m+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{2m+1}): = (v^{2m+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{2m+1}), \bar{v}^{2m}(t^1, \dots, t^{2m}), \dots, v^1(t^1)),$$

Observe, by (2) and the definition (1) of the Segre variety mapping, that each  $T^k$  in fact maps  $\mathbb{C}^{kn}$  into  $\mathfrak{S}_k$ , i.e.  $f \circ T^k = 0$  for each  $f$  in the ideal of  $\mathfrak{S}_k$ . Moreover, as is easy to verify from the fact that the rank of  $\partial\gamma/\partial t(0)$  is  $n$ , the rank of  $\partial T^k/\partial(t^1, \dots, t^k)(0)$  equals  $kn$  which is also the dimension of  $\mathfrak{S}_k$ . Hence,  $T^k$  is a parametrization of the formal manifold  $\mathfrak{S}_k$ . In addition, we have  $v^k = \pi_1^k \circ T^k$ .

Now, denote by  $\tilde{\gamma}$  another choice of Segre variety mapping, and by  $\tilde{v}^k, \tilde{T}^k$  the corresponding mappings defined as above using  $\tilde{\gamma}$  instead of  $\gamma$ . For the same reasons as above, the mapping  $\tilde{T}^k: (\mathbb{C}^{kn}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{kN}, 0)$  is a parametrization of the

formal manifold  $\mathfrak{S}_k$ , and  $\tilde{v}^k = \pi_1^k \circ \tilde{T}^k$ . Since both  $T^k: (\mathbb{C}^{kn}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{kN}, 0)$  and  $\tilde{T}^k: (\mathbb{C}^{kn}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{kN}, 0)$  are parametrizations of  $\mathfrak{S}_k$ , there exists a formal invertible mapping  $F^k: (\mathbb{C}^{kn}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{kn}, 0)$  such that  $\tilde{T}^k = T^k \circ F^k$ . Thus,  $\tilde{v}^k = v^k \circ F^k$  and the fact that  $\text{Rk } \tilde{v}^k = \text{Rk } v^k$  is a consequence of the chain rule. This completes the proof of the statement in Theorem 2.3 that  $\text{Rk } v^k$  is independent of the choice of  $\gamma$ .

## 5. CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTIES OF THE FORMAL CR MANIFOLD $\mathcal{O}$

To construct the formal CR manifold  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{M}$  in Theorem 2.3 (i), we shall need the following, which may be regarded as a formal version of Nagano's theorem (see e.g. [BER99a], Theorem 3.1.4) for real analytic vector fields. As mentioned in the introduction, the inductive proof given here is based on a suggestion by D. Zaitsev.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a Lie algebra of formal vector fields in  $k$  indeterminates  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  and assume that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is also a  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$  module. Then there exists a unique formal manifold  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  with  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Sigma = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}(0)$  such that any  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  is tangent to  $\Sigma$ . Moreover, if  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  is any other formal manifold such that all formal vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}$  are tangent to  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Sigma \subset \Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* We shall prove the proposition by induction on  $k$ . If  $k = 1$ , then the proposition holds with either  $\Sigma = \{0\}$  or  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}$ , depending on whether or not all vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}$  vanish at 0. Now assume that the proposition holds for  $k$ ; we shall prove it for  $k + 1$ . If all the  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  vanish at 0, then again  $\Sigma = \{0\}$  is the only formal manifold satisfying the conclusion of the proposition. If not, without loss of generality, and after making a formal change of coordinates, we may assume that the vector field  $X_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$  is in  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

Consider the Lie subalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{g}$  of all formal vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}$  of the form  $\sum_{j=2}^{k+1} a_j(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ . It is easy to see that any  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  may be written uniquely in the form  $X = a(x)X_1 + X'$  with  $a(x) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  and  $X' \in \mathfrak{g}'$ . We write  $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_{k+1})$  and consider the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}''$  of formal vector fields in the indeterminates  $x'$  obtained from  $\mathfrak{g}'$  by replacing  $x_1$  by 0. By the inductive hypothesis, there is a formal manifold  $\Sigma' \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  to which all the vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}''$  are tangent and such that  $\dim \Sigma' = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}''(0)$ . Let  $w_i(x') \in \mathbb{C}[[x']]$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , be generators of the manifold ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\Sigma')$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^{k+1}$  be the formal manifold whose manifold ideal is generated by the  $w_i(x')$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , regarded as elements of  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$  (independent of  $x_1$ ). Then all the vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}$  are tangent to  $\Sigma$  and  $r = k + 1 - \dim \mathfrak{g}(0)$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* We shall first show that any  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  is tangent to  $\Sigma$ . For  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  and  $X_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$  as before, we shall use the notation  $(\text{ad } X_1)X = [X_1, X]$ . Since any  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  can be written in the form  $X = a(x)X_1 + X'$  with  $X' \in \mathfrak{g}'$ , and

since the  $w_j$  are independent of  $x_1$ , it suffices to show that any vector field in  $\mathfrak{g}'$  is tangent to  $\Sigma$ . For this we expand  $(X'w_j)(x_1, x')$  as a power series in  $x_1$  and obtain

$$(17) \quad (X'w_j)(x_1, x') = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (Y_p w_j)(x') \frac{x_1^p}{p!},$$

where  $Y_p$  is the vector field in  $\mathfrak{g}''$  given by

$$Y_p := ((\text{ad } X_1)^p X')|_{x_1=0}.$$

Since  $Y_p \in \mathfrak{g}''$  it is tangent to  $\Sigma'$  and, hence, we have

$$(Y_p w_j)(x') = \sum_{i=1}^r c_{ijp}(x') w_i(x'),$$

for some  $c_{ijp} \in \mathbb{C}[[x'']]$ . Hence,  $X'$  is tangent to  $\Sigma$  by (17). It remains to show that  $r = k + 1 - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}(0)$ . Since all the vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}$  are tangent to  $\Sigma$ , we have  $r \leq k + 1 - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}(0)$ . The opposite inequality follows from the assumption that  $r = k - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}''(0)$  and the fact that  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}''(0) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{g}(0) - 1$ .  $\square$

To finish the proof of Proposition 5.1, we must show that the formal manifold  $\Sigma$  provided by Lemma 5.2 is unique, and if  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{C}^k$  is as in the statement of Proposition 5.1 then  $\Sigma \subset \Lambda$ . Let  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathbb{C}[[x_1, x']]$  be generators of the manifold ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\Lambda)$ . Since  $X_1$  is tangent to  $\Lambda$ , it follows that  $X_1^j f_l \in \mathcal{I}(\Lambda)$  for  $l = 1, \dots, m$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . Let  $I''$  be the ideal in  $\mathbb{C}[[x'']]$  generated by  $f_1(0, x'), \dots, f_m(0, x')$ . Note that  $X_1 f_l(0, 0) = \partial f_l / \partial x_1(0, 0) = 0$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, m$ , and hence  $I''$  is a manifold ideal of the same codimension as  $\mathcal{I}(\Lambda)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{g}$  is tangent to  $\mathcal{I}(\Lambda)$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}''$  is tangent to  $I''$ . By the induction hypothesis, the manifold ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\Sigma')$  is unique and  $I'' \subset \mathcal{I}(\Sigma')$ . Thus,  $X_1^j f_l \in \mathcal{I}(\Lambda)$  implies that there are  $c_{ijl} \in \mathbb{C}[[x'']]$  such that

$$(18) \quad X_1^j f_l(0, x') = \sum_{i=1}^r c_{ijl}(x') w_i(x').$$

Now, since

$$(19) \quad f_l(x_1, x') = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} X_1^j f_l(0, x') \frac{x_1^j}{j!}$$

we conclude, by substituting (18) in (19), that  $f_l \in \mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$  for  $l = 1, \dots, m$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{I}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$ . This also proves the uniqueness of  $\Sigma$ , since if the dimensions of  $\Lambda$  and  $\Sigma$  were the same, then necessarily  $\Lambda = \Sigma$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  be the formal manifold obtained by applying Proposition 5.1 to the Lie algebra (and  $\mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$  module)  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . Observe that  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{M}$  since all the vector fields in  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{M}}$  are tangent to  $\mathcal{M}$ . We shall call  $\mathcal{O}$  the *formal CR orbit* of 0 in  $\mathcal{M}$ . (We shall show in §8 that in fact  $\mathcal{O}$  is a formal real CR manifold.)

We shall continue the proof of Theorem 2.3. Since  $\partial_Z \rho_1(0, 0), \dots, \partial_Z \rho_d(0, 0)$  are linearly independent, we may assume after renumbering the coordinates, that  $Z = (z, w)$ , with  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ ,  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_d)$ , and the  $d \times d$  matrix  $\partial \rho / \partial w(0, 0)$  is invertible. Hence, by the formal implicit function theorem, the ideal of  $\mathcal{M}$  is generated by  $w_j - Q_j(z, \zeta)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , where the  $Q_j(z, \zeta)$  are formal power series in  $n + N$  indeterminates without constant terms. If we write  $\zeta = (\chi, \tau)$  with  $\chi = (\chi_1, \dots, \chi_n)$ ,  $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_d)$ , then the reality of  $\mathcal{M}$  implies that we may also take  $\tau_j - \bar{Q}_j(\chi, z, w)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , as generators of the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M})$ . Consequently we also have the identity

$$(20) \quad Q(z, \chi, \bar{Q}(\chi, z, w)) = w,$$

where  $Q = (Q_1, \dots, Q_d)$ .

As a basis for the  $(0, 1)$  and  $(1, 0)$  vector fields tangent to  $\mathcal{M}$ , we choose

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_j &:= \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi_j} + \sum_{l=1}^d \bar{Q}_{l, \chi_j}(\chi, z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_l}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j &:= \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} + \sum_{l=1}^d Q_{l, z_j}(z, \chi, \tau) \frac{\partial}{\partial w_l}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  be a formal generic manifold whose ideal is generated by  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be the formal CR orbit of 0 in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $e := 2N - d - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}$ . Then there are  $f_1, \dots, f_e \in \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$  such that the formal manifold ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$  is generated by  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d, f_1, \dots, f_e$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove the proposition using the special choice of coordinates  $Z = (z, w)$ ,  $\zeta = (\chi, \tau)$  made above. Thus, we may assume that  $\rho_j(Z, \zeta) = \tau_j - \bar{Q}_j(\chi, z, w)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . Since  $\mathcal{O}$  is a formal manifold of codimension  $d + m$  and  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ , there are  $g_1, \dots, g_e \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$  such that  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$  is generated by  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d, g_1, \dots, g_e$ . By using the special form of the  $\rho_j$  (i.e. substituting  $\bar{Q}_j(\chi, z, w)$  for  $\tau_j$ ), we may assume that  $g_j$  is independent of  $\tau$ , that is,  $g_j = g_j(z, w, \chi)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, e$ . Since the  $\mathcal{L}_j$  are tangent to  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_j g_l = \partial g_l / \partial \chi_j$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq e$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , we obtain

$$(22) \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial \chi_l}(z, w, \chi) = A_l(z, w, \chi)g(z, w, \chi), \quad l = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_e)$  and the  $A_l$  are  $(e \times e)$ -matrices whose entries are in  $\mathbb{C}[[z, w, \chi]]$ . Let  $u^1, \dots, u^e \in \mathbb{C}[[z, w, \chi]]^e$  be a fundamental system of solutions for the system of differential equations given by (22) with  $l = 1$ . Denote by  $U(z, w, \chi)$  the  $(e \times e)$ -matrix in which the  $u^j$  are columns. Since  $g$  is a solution of the system (22) (in particular with  $l = 1$ ) there exists  $c^1 \in \mathbb{C}[[z, w, \chi]]^e$ , where  $\chi = (\chi_1, \chi')$ , such that  $g = U c^1$ . Since  $U$  is invertible, we have  $c^1(z, w, \chi') = (U(z, w, \chi))^{-1} g(z, w, \chi)$  and, hence, each component of  $c^1(z, w, \chi')$  is in  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ . Moreover,  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d, c_1^1, \dots, c_e^1$

generate  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ . Proceeding this way to eliminate  $\chi_2, \dots, \chi_n$ , we finally obtain  $c^n \in \mathbb{C}[[z, w]]^e$  such that  $f_l(z, w) = c_l^n(z, w)$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, e$ , satisfy the conclusion of Proposition 5.3.  $\square$

**Remark 5.4.** By combining the linear algebra argument in the proof of [BER99a], Theorem 1.8.1, with the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.3 above, one can show the following. If  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_d$  generate the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M})$  of a formal CR manifold  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$ , then there are  $\tilde{\rho}_1, \dots, \tilde{\rho}_{d-e} \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$ ,  $f_1, \dots, f_e \in \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$ , where  $e = d - \text{rk } \partial\rho/\partial Z(0)$ , such that  $\tilde{\rho}_1, \dots, \tilde{\rho}_{d-e}, f_1, \dots, f_e$  also generate  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M})$ . Moreover, the rank of  $\partial\tilde{\rho}/\partial Z(0)$  equals the rank of  $\partial\rho/\partial Z(0)$  and, hence, the rank of  $\partial f/\partial Z(0)$  is  $e$ . The formal manifold  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^N$  whose ideal is generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_e$  is the intrinsic complexification of  $\mathcal{M}$  defined in §2.

We have now proved the properties of  $\mathcal{O}$  announced in Theorem 2.3 (i) with the exception of the claim that  $\mathcal{O}$  is CR. This will be done in §8.

## 6. RANK OF MAPPINGS $\Theta^j, \Phi^j$ INTO $\mathcal{O}$

To prove statement (iii) of Theorem 2.3, we shall construct special mappings  $\Theta^j, \Phi^j$  into  $\mathcal{O}$  and use these mappings to compute the rank of  $v^j$ . We shall proceed using a special choice of Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$ . We use the formal coordinates  $Z = (z, w)$  and  $\zeta = (\chi, \tau)$  introduced in §5. Given any Segre variety mapping  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$ , we may decompose it as

$$\gamma(\zeta, t) = (\mu(\zeta, t), \nu(\zeta, t)),$$

with  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$  and  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d)$ . It follows that

$$\nu(\zeta, t) = Q(\mu(\zeta, t), \zeta),$$

and hence necessarily  $\text{rk}(\partial\mu/\partial t(0, 0)) = n$ . We now make the choice of  $\gamma(\zeta, t)$  corresponding to  $\mu(\zeta, t) = t$ , i.e.

$$(23) \quad \gamma(\zeta, t) = (t, Q(t, \zeta)) = (t, Q(t, \chi, \tau)).$$

We need the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $\gamma$  be given by (23). Then for any integer  $j \geq 2$ , the following holds:*

$$(24) \quad v^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j-1}, t^j, t^{j+1})|_{t^{j+1}=t^{j-1}} = v^{j-1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j-1}).$$

*Proof.* By (2) and (23), it follows that the iterated Segre mapping  $v^j$  is of the form

$$(25) \quad v^j(t^1, \dots, t^j) = (t^j, \nu^j(t^1, \dots, t^j)),$$

where

$$(26) \quad \nu^j(t^1, \dots, t^j) = Q(t^j, \bar{v}^{j-1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j-1})).$$

In particular, we obtain

$$(27) \quad v^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) = (t^{j+1}, Q(t^{j+1}, t^j, \bar{Q}(t^j, t^{j-1}, \nu^{j-1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j-1}))))).$$

The identity (24)) is an immediate consequence of (20). This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1.  $\square$

We set, for  $j \geq 1$ ,

$$(28) \quad \Theta^j(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) := (v^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^j, t^{j+1} + t^{j-1}), \bar{v}^j(t^1, \dots, t^j))$$

and, for  $j \geq 2$ ,

$$(29) \quad \Phi^j(t^1, \dots, t^j) := (v^{j-1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j-1}), \bar{v}^j(t^1, \dots, t^j)).$$

Also, we define

$$(30) \quad \Theta^0(t^1) := (v^1(t^1), 0), \quad \Phi^1(t^1) := (0, \bar{v}^1(t^1)).$$

Observe, by using (2), that, for each  $j \geq 1$ ,  $\text{rk } \partial v^{j+1} / \partial t^{j+1}(0) = n$ . Hence, it follows from the definition (28) of  $\Theta^j$ , that

$$(31) \quad \text{Rk } \Theta^j = \text{Rk } v^j + n, \quad j \geq 1,$$

and similarly,

$$(32) \quad \text{Rk } \Phi^j = \text{Rk } v^{j-1} + n, \quad j \geq 1.$$

It follows from §2 that  $\Theta^j(\mathbb{C}^{(j+1)n}) \subset \mathcal{M}$ , for  $j \geq 1$ , and  $\Phi^j(\mathbb{C}^{jn}) \subset \mathcal{M}$ , for  $j \geq 2$ . By Lemma 6.1, we have, for  $j \geq 2$ ,

$$(33) \quad \Theta^j(t^1, \dots, t^j, 0) = \Phi^j(t^1, \dots, t^j).$$

Also, by observing that  $\text{Rk } \Theta^j = \text{Rk } \tilde{\Theta}^j$ , where

$$(34) \quad \tilde{\Theta}^j(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) := \Theta^j(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1} - t^{j-1}) = (v^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^j, t^{j+1}), \bar{v}^j(t^1, \dots, t^j)),$$

it is not difficult to see that  $\text{Rk } \Theta^j = \text{Rk } \Phi^{j+1}$ , for any  $j \geq 0$ . A straightforward calculation shows that, for any  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[Z, \zeta]]$ , any integer  $j \geq 0$ , and for  $l = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_l^{j+1}}(f \circ \Theta^j)(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) &= ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_l f) \circ \Theta^j)(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t_l^{j+1}}(f \circ \Phi^{j+1})(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) &= ((\mathcal{L}_l f) \circ \Phi^{j+1})(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the  $\mathcal{L}_j$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j$  are the formal vector fields given by (21).

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  denotes the formal CR orbit of  $\mathcal{M}$  (as defined in §5). The following hold.*

- (i)  $\Theta^j(\mathbb{C}^{(j+1)n}) \subset \mathcal{O}$  and  $\Phi^{j+1}(\mathbb{C}^{(j+1)n}) \subset \mathcal{O}$ , for  $j = 0, 1, \dots$

(ii) *There exists  $k_0$ ,  $1 \leq k_0 \leq d + 1$ , such that*

$$(36) \quad \text{Rk } \Theta^{k_0+1} = \text{Rk } \Phi^{k_0+1} = \dim \mathcal{O}.$$

*Proof.* By iterating (35), we obtain, for any multi-index  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ ,

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t^{j+1}} \right)^\alpha (f \circ \Theta^j)(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) &= ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\alpha f) \circ \Theta^j)(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}), \\ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t^{j+1}} \right)^\alpha (f \circ \Phi^{j+1})(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}) &= ((\mathcal{L}^\alpha f) \circ \Phi^{j+1})(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, applying (37) with  $j = 0$ , we conclude that, for each multi-index  $\alpha$ ,

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t^1} \right)^\alpha (f \circ \Theta^0)(0) &= ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\alpha f) \circ \Theta^0)(0), \\ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t^1} \right)^\alpha (f \circ \Phi^1)(0) &= ((\mathcal{L}^\alpha f) \circ \Phi^1)(0). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}_l, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_l$  are tangent to  $\mathcal{O}$ , we deduce that

$$(\partial/\partial t^1)^\alpha (f \circ \Theta^0)(0) = (\partial/\partial t^1)^\alpha (f \circ \Phi^1)(0) = 0$$

for all  $f \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$  and all multi-indices  $\alpha$ . Hence,  $f \circ \Theta^0 = f \circ \Phi^1 = 0$ , which proves that  $\Theta^0(\mathbb{C}^n) \subset \mathcal{O}$  and  $\Phi^1(\mathbb{C}^n) \subset \mathcal{O}$ .

Assume that  $\Theta^j(\mathbb{C}^{(j+1)n}) \subset \mathcal{O}$  and  $\Phi^{j+1}(\mathbb{C}^{(j+1)n}) \subset \mathcal{O}$ , for all  $j = 0, 1, \dots, j_0 - 1$ . We shall prove it for  $j = j_0$ . By applying (37) with  $j = j_0$ , we conclude, using also (33), that for  $f \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ ,

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t^{j_0+1}} \right)^\alpha (f \circ \Theta^{j_0})(t^1, \dots, t^{j_0}, 0) &= ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\alpha f) \circ \Theta^{j_0})(t^1, \dots, t^{j_0}, 0) \\ &= ((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\alpha f) \circ \Phi^{j_0})(t^1, \dots, t^{j_0}) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the inductive hypothesis and the fact that the  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j$  are tangent to  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ . Hence,  $f \circ \Theta^{j_0}$  is independent of  $t^{j_0+1}$ . Consequently,

$$f \circ \Theta^{j_0}(t^1, \dots, t^{j_0+1}) = f \circ \Theta^{j_0}(t^1, \dots, t^{j_0}, 0) = f \circ \Phi^{j_0}(t^1, \dots, t^{j_0}),$$

which is 0 by the inductive hypothesis. A similar argument, using instead the identity

$$(40) \quad \Phi^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j-1}, t^j, t^{j+1})|_{t^{j+1}=t^{j-1}} = \tilde{\Theta}^{j-1}(t^1, \dots, t^j),$$

which follows from (24), shows that  $f \circ \Phi^{j_0+1} = 0$  for  $f \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ . This completes the proof of (i) of Proposition 6.2.

To prove (ii) let  $k_0$  be defined as in (12). By using (11), (12), (31), and (32) we first observe that

$$\text{Rk } \Theta^j < \text{Rk } \Phi^j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Rk } \Theta^j = \text{Rk } \Phi^j, \quad j \geq k_0 + 1.$$



In light of part (i), (33), and (35), the conclusion (36) of (ii) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 6.3 below with  $\Phi := \Phi^{k_0+1}$  and  $\Theta := \Theta^{k_0+1}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^m$  be a formal manifold and  $\Phi: (\mathbb{C}^p, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ ,  $\Theta: (\mathbb{C}^p \times \mathbb{C}^q, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$  formal mappings such that the following hold.*

- (i)  $\Phi(x) = \Theta(x, 0)$ ,  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_p)$ ;
- (ii)  $\Theta(\mathbb{C}^p \times \mathbb{C}^q) \subset \Sigma$ ,  $\Phi(\mathbb{C}^p) \subset \Sigma$ ;
- (iii)  $\text{Rk } \Phi = \text{Rk } \Theta$ ;
- (iv) *There are formal vector fields  $X_1, \dots, X_k, Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  on  $\mathbb{C}^m$  tangent to  $\Sigma$ , formal vector fields  $\hat{X}_1, \dots, \hat{X}_k$  on  $\mathbb{C}^p$ , and  $\hat{Y}_1, \dots, \hat{Y}_k$  on  $\mathbb{C}^p \times \mathbb{C}^q$  such that for every  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ ,  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ ,*

$$(41) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{X}_j(f \circ \Phi) &= (X_j f) \circ \Phi, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \\ \hat{Y}_j(f \circ \Theta) &= (Y_j f) \circ \Theta, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \end{aligned}$$

*and the vector space obtained by evaluating at 0 the elements of the Lie algebra generated by  $X_1, \dots, X_k, Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  has dimension  $\dim \Sigma$ .*

*Then necessarily  $\text{Rk } \Phi = \text{Rk } \Theta = \dim \Sigma$ .*

## 7. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6.3

For the proof of Proposition 6.3, we first make some preliminary reductions. Since  $\Sigma$  is a formal manifold through the origin, we may choose the variables  $y_1, \dots, y_m$  in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  so that the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\Sigma)$  is generated by  $y_{s+1}, \dots, y_m$ , where  $s = \dim \Sigma$ . Let us write  $y = (y', y'')$ , where  $y' = (y_1, \dots, y_s)$  and  $y'' = (y_{s+1}, \dots, y_m)$ . Similarly, we decompose the mappings  $\Theta = (\Theta', \Theta'')$  and  $\Phi = (\Phi', \Phi'')$ , where e.g.  $\Theta' = (\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_s)$  and  $\Theta_j = y_j \circ \Theta$ . It is easy to see that condition (ii) of the proposition is equivalent to

$$\Theta''(x, t) = 0, \quad \Phi''(x) = 0, \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_p), \quad t = (t_1, \dots, t_q).$$

Moreover, a formal vector field

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^s a_j(y', y'') \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} + \sum_{j=s+1}^m b_j(y', y'') \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}$$

is tangent to  $\Sigma$  if and only if each  $b_j(y', 0) = 0$ . Let us write

$$X' = \sum_{j=1}^s a_j(y', 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}.$$

Also, for  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[y', y'']]$ , we write  $\tilde{f}(y') := f(y', 0)$ . Then we have for  $X$  as above tangent to  $\Sigma$ ,

$$(Xf) \circ \Theta = (X' \tilde{f}) \circ \Theta', \quad (Xf) \circ \Phi = (X' \tilde{f}) \circ \Phi'.$$

Hence, if there exists a formal vector field  $\hat{X}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^p$  such that  $\hat{X}(f \circ \Phi) = (Xf) \circ \Phi$  for all  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ , then (since  $f \circ \Phi = \tilde{f} \circ \Phi'$ ) it follows that  $\hat{X}(\tilde{f} \circ \Phi') = (X'\tilde{f}) \circ \Phi'$ . Similarly, if there exists a formal vector field  $\hat{Y}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^p \times \mathbb{C}^q$  such that  $\hat{Y}(f \circ \Theta) = (Xf) \circ \Theta$  for all  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ , then  $\hat{Y}(\tilde{f} \circ \Theta') = (X'\tilde{f}) \circ \Theta'$ . Thus, by identifying  $\Sigma$  with  $\mathbb{C}^s$ , it suffices to prove Proposition 6.3 in the special case  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}^m$ .

For the proof of Proposition 6.3 in the case  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}^m$ , we shall need some notation and preliminary results. As before, we let  $\mathbb{K}_x$  denote the field of fractions of the ring  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$  of formal power series in the variables  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and consider  $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$  as a subring of  $\mathbb{K}_x$ . Recall that if  $F: (\mathbb{C}^p, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$  is a formal mapping, then  $\text{Rk } F$  denotes the rank of its Jacobian, i.e. the rank of the linear mapping  $J_F: \mathbb{K}_x^p \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_y^m$ , where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_p)$  and  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ , defined by the  $m \times p$ -matrix

$$(42) \quad J_F := \begin{pmatrix} F_{1,x_1} & \cdots & F_{1,x_p} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ F_{m,x_1} & \cdots & F_{m,x_p} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Recall that we denote by  $\varphi_F: \mathbb{C}[[y]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  the homomorphism induced by  $F$  and defined, for  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ , by  $\varphi_F(f) := f \circ F$ . (Note that e.g. the first equation of (41) can then be written  $\hat{X}_j(\varphi_\Phi(f)) = \varphi_\Phi(X_j f)$ .)

The proof of Proposition 6.3 in the case  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}^m$  rests on the following four lemmas. We shall use the notation and conventions previously introduced. Recall in particular that  $\text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$  denotes the set of all formal vector fields in  $x$ .

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $F: (\mathbb{C}^p, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$  be a formal mapping,  $X \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$ ,  $Y \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[y]])$  with*

$$(43) \quad \begin{aligned} X &= \sum_{j=1}^p a_j(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}, \quad a_j \in \mathbb{C}[[x]], \\ Y &= \sum_{j=1}^m b_j(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}, \quad b_j \in \mathbb{C}[[y]], \end{aligned}$$

and  $c \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ ,  $c \neq 0$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X(\varphi_F(f)) = c \varphi_F(Yf)$  for all  $f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ .
- (ii)  $X(\varphi_F(f_j)) = c \varphi_F(Yf_j)$  for  $f_j(y) := y_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .
- (iii)  $J_F a' = b \circ F$ , where

$$a' := \begin{pmatrix} a_1/c \\ \vdots \\ a_p/c \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{K}_x^p, \quad b := \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_m \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]^m \subset \mathbb{K}_y^m.$$

Moreover, any of the equivalent conditions (i), (ii), (iii) implies that the formal vector field  $Y$  is tangent to the ideal  $\ker \varphi_F$ .

*Proof.* The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) is clear. The opposite implication follows by an inductive argument based on the facts that  $\varphi_F$  is a homomorphism, and  $X$  and  $Y$  are derivations. For instance, we have, for  $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ ,

$$X(\varphi_F(fg)) = X(\varphi_F(f))\varphi_F(g) + \varphi_F(f)X(\varphi_F(g)).$$

A similar identity holds for  $\varphi_F(Y(fg))$ . The details are left to the reader.

The equivalence (ii)  $\iff$  (iii) follows by simply writing (ii) in terms of the components  $F_j = \varphi_F(y_j)$  of  $F$ . The last statement of Lemma 7.1 is a direct consequence of (i).  $\square$

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $F: (\mathbb{C}^p, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$  be a formal mapping,  $X_1, X_2 \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$ ,  $Y_1, Y_2 \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[y]])$  and suppose that there are  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ ,  $c_j \neq 0$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , such that*

$$(44) \quad X_j(\varphi_F(f)) = c_j \varphi_F(Y_j f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]], \quad j = 1, 2.$$

*Then, there are  $X' \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$  and  $c' \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  with  $c' \neq 0$ , such that*

$$(45) \quad X'(\varphi_F(f)) = c' \varphi_F([Y_1, Y_2]f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]],$$

*where  $[ , ]$  denotes the usual commutator of vector fields.*

*Proof.* A simple computation (which is left to the reader) shows that (45) holds with  $c' = (c_1 c_2)^2$  and

$$(46) \quad X' = c_1 c_2 [X_1, X_2] + c_2 (X_2 c_1) X_1 - c_1 (X_1 c_2) X_2.$$

$\square$

The main idea in the proof of Proposition 6.3 is to reduce it to the following.

**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $F: (\mathbb{C}^p, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$  be a formal mapping, and  $X_1, \dots, X_k \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$ ,  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[y]])$ . Suppose that there are  $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ ,  $c_j \neq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , such that*

$$(47) \quad X_j(\varphi_F(f)) = c_j \varphi_F(Y_j f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]], \quad j = 1, \dots, k,$$

*and such that the vector space obtained by evaluating at 0 the elements of the Lie algebra generated by  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  has dimension  $m$ . Then  $\text{Rk } F = m$ .*

*Proof.* Among  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  and all their repeated commutators, we can pick out, by the assumption in the lemma,  $Y'_1, \dots, Y'_m \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[y]])$  such that  $Y'_1, \dots, Y'_m$  evaluated at 0 span  $T_0^{1,0} \mathbb{C}^m$ . By Lemma 7.2, we may assume that there are  $X'_1, \dots, X'_m \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_m \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ ,  $c_j \neq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , such that

$$(48) \quad X'_j(\varphi_F(f)) = c_j \varphi_F(Y'_j f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]], \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Let us write

$$(49) \quad Y'_j = \sum_{l=1}^m b_{lj}(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_l}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

By assumption the vectors

$$(50) \quad b_j(y) := \begin{pmatrix} b_{1j}(y) \\ \vdots \\ b_{mj}(y) \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

evaluated at 0 span  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . It is not difficult to see that this fact implies that  $\varphi_F(b_1), \dots, \varphi_F(b_m) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]^m \subset \mathbb{K}_x^m$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{K}_x$  (and hence span  $\mathbb{K}_x^m$ ) since they are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{C}$  when evaluated at 0. On the other hand, by Lemma 7.1 and (48), these vectors are all in the image of the Jacobian  $J_F$ , considered as a linear map from  $\mathbb{K}_x^p$  to  $\mathbb{K}_x^m$ . Hence  $\text{Rk } F = m$  and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

The last lemma needed for the proof of Proposition 6.3 in the case  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}^m$  is the following.

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $F: (\mathbb{C}^p, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$  be a formal mapping. Then the vector subspace  $J_F(\mathbb{K}_x^p) \subset \mathbb{K}_x^m$  is the span over  $\mathbb{K}_x$  of the subset  $J_F(\mathbb{C}[[x]]^p) \subset \mathbb{K}_x^m$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $a^1, \dots, a^r \in \mathbb{K}_x^p$  be such that  $J_F a^1, \dots, J_F a^r \in \mathbb{K}_x^m$  form a basis for  $J_F(\mathbb{K}_x^p)$ . By multiplying the  $a_j$  by suitable power series (clearing the denominators), we obtain  $\tilde{a}^1, \dots, \tilde{a}^r \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]^p$  and  $J_F \tilde{a}^1, \dots, J_F \tilde{a}^r \in \mathbb{K}_x^m$  still form a basis for  $J_F(\mathbb{K}_x^p)$  since  $J_F$  is linear over  $\mathbb{K}_x$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 6.3 with  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}^m$ .* The main step in the proof is to show that there are formal vector fields  $\hat{Y}'_1, \dots, \hat{Y}'_k$  on  $\mathbb{C}^p$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ ,  $c_j \neq 0$  for all  $j$ , such that

$$(51) \quad \hat{Y}'_j(f \circ \Phi) = c_j(Y_j f) \circ \Phi, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{C}[[y]], \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

To prove this, we write  $t = (t_1, \dots, t_q)$  and denote by  $\eta: \mathbb{C}[[x, t]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  the homomorphism defined by  $\eta(g)(x) := g(x, 0) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$  for  $g \in \mathbb{C}[[x, t]]$ . By abuse of notation, we also denote by  $\eta: \mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[x]]^m$  the mapping given by applying  $\eta$  to each component. By (i) of Proposition 6.3, for any  $a \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]^p$ , we have  $\eta(J_\Theta a') = J_\Phi a$ , where

$$(52) \quad a'(x, t) := \begin{pmatrix} a_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ a_p(x) \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q}.$$

Hence, we conclude that  $J_\Phi(\mathbb{C}[[x]]^p) \subset \eta(J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q}))$ , and therefore by Lemma 7.4

$$(53) \quad J_\Phi(\mathbb{K}_x^p) \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}_x} \eta(J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q})).$$

On the other hand, observe that if  $v^1, \dots, v^r \in \mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^m$ , with  $\eta(v^1), \dots, \eta(v^r) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]^m$  linearly independent over  $\mathbb{K}_x$ , then  $v^1, \dots, v^r$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{K}_{x,t}$ . Therefore we have

$$(54) \quad \dim \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}_x} \eta(J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q})) \leq \dim \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}_{x,t}} (J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q})).$$

Hence, by using (53), (54), Lemma 7.4, and the assumption that  $\text{Rk } \Theta = \text{Rk } \Phi$ , we obtain

$$(55) \quad \dim J_\Phi(\mathbb{K}_x^p) \leq \dim \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}_x} \eta(J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q})) \leq \\ \dim \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}_{x,t}} (J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q})) = \dim J_\Theta(\mathbb{K}_{x,t}^{p+q}) = \dim J_\Phi(\mathbb{K}_x^p).$$

We therefore conclude again using (53) that

$$(56) \quad J_\Phi(\mathbb{K}_x^p) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}_x} \eta(J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q})).$$

Now we write

$$(57) \quad Y_j = \sum_{l=1}^m b_l^j(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_l}, \quad b_l^j \in \mathbb{C}[[y]], \quad j = 1, \dots, k,$$

and

$$(58) \quad b^j(y) := \begin{pmatrix} b_1^j(y) \\ \vdots \\ b_m^j(y) \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

By Lemma 7.1 ((i)  $\implies$  (iii)) and the second equation of (41), we have  $b^j \circ \Theta \in J_\Theta(\mathbb{C}[[x, t]]^{p+q})$ , and hence, by (56) and (i) of Proposition 6.3,  $\eta(b^j \circ \Theta) = b^j \circ \Phi \in J_\Phi(\mathbb{K}_x^p)$ . By clearing denominators and again applying Lemma 7.1 ((iii)  $\implies$  (i)), it follows that there are  $\hat{Y}'_1, \dots, \hat{Y}'_k \in \text{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]])$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]$ ,  $c_j \neq 0$ , such that (51) holds. In view of the first equation of (41), the conclusion of Proposition 6.3 for  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}^m$  now follows by applying Lemma 7.3 with  $F = \Phi$ .  $\square$

## 8. CONCLUSION OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3; PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

The statements concerning the properties of the iterated Segre mappings  $v^j$  preceding (i), (ii), and (iii) of Theorem 2.3 have been proved in §3 and §4. Property (i) has been proved in §5, except for the fact that  $\mathcal{O}$  is CR, which will be proved below. We shall now prove statement (ii) of Theorem 2.3. Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be as in (ii) and  $g \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{W}) \subset \mathbb{C}[[Z]]$ . We must show that  $g \circ v^j = 0$  for each  $j \geq 1$ . This follows immediately from Proposition 6.2 (i) since  $g$ , considered as a power series in  $(Z, \zeta)$  which is independent of  $\zeta$ , is also in  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$  and hence  $g \circ v^j = g \circ \Theta^{j-1} = 0$ .

To prove (iii), we use (32) and (36) to obtain

$$(59) \quad \text{Rk } v^{k_0} = \text{Rk } \Phi^{k_0+1} - n = \dim \mathcal{O} - n.$$

Recall from (i) and (ii) that  $\dim \mathcal{O} = \dim \mathfrak{g}_M(0)$  and  $\dim \mathcal{W} = N - e = \dim \mathfrak{g}_M(0) + d - N$ . Hence (iii) follows from (59).

To complete the proof of Theorem 2.3, it remains only to show that the formal manifold  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$  is a CR submanifold of  $\mathbb{C}^N$ , i.e. that the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$  is real and  $\text{rk } \partial R / \partial Z(0)$  equals the rank of  $\partial R / \partial Z$  over the field of fractions  $\mathbb{K}_{Z, \zeta}$ . Here,  $R(Z, \zeta) = (\rho_1(Z, \zeta), \dots, \rho_d(Z, \zeta), f_1(Z), \dots, f_e(Z))$  is a set of generators for the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ . To show reality, we let  $g \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ . Recall that

$$\sigma(g)(Z, \zeta) := \bar{g}(\zeta, Z).$$

We must show that  $\sigma(g) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$ . Observe that, for each  $j \geq 0$ ,

$$\sigma(g)(\Phi^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1})) = \overline{g(\tilde{\Theta}^j(\bar{t}^1, \dots, \bar{t}^{j+1}))}.$$

In view of Proposition 6.2 (i), we have

$$g(\tilde{\Theta}^j(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1})) = 0$$

and, hence,

$$\sigma(g)(\Phi^{j+1}(t^1, \dots, t^{j+1})) = 0.$$

Since  $\text{Rk } \Phi^{k_0+1} = \dim \mathcal{O}$  by (36), the conclusion  $\sigma(g) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{O})$  follows from Proposition 2.1. The fact that the formal real submanifold  $\mathcal{O}$  is CR is now a direct consequence of the fact that  $\mathcal{M}$  is generic (and hence CR) and the fact that the remaining generators  $f_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, e$ , are independent of  $\zeta$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* We first note that the conclusion of the theorem is independent of the choice of the Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$ . This can be seen by using the notation of §4 and observing that  $v^{2k_0} = \pi_1^{2k_0} \circ T^{2k_0}$ , where  $T^{2k_0}$  is a parametrization of the formal manifold  $\mathfrak{S}_{2k_0}$ . Hence it suffices to prove Theorem 2.4 using the special choice of Segre variety mapping  $\gamma$  introduced in (23) in §6. Let  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}^{2n_{k_0}}$  be the formal manifold whose ideal is generated by  $t^1$  and  $t^{2k_0-j} - t^{2+j}$ , for  $j = 0, \dots, k_0 - 2$ . The conclusion in Theorem 2.4 is now a consequence of the definition of  $k_0$  in Theorem 2.3 and of Lemma 4.1.3 in [BER99b].  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [A69] Artin, M.: Algebraic approximation of structures over complete local rings. *Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math.* **36**, 23–58, (1969).
- [A68] Artin, M.: On the solutions of analytic equations. *Invent. Math.* **5**, 277–291, (1968).
- [BER99a] Baouendi, M.S.; Ebenfelt, P.; and Rothschild, L.P.: *Real Submanifolds in Complex Space and Their Mappings*. Princeton Math. Series **47**, Princeton Univ. Press, 1999.
- [BER99b] Baouendi, M.S.; Ebenfelt, P.; and Rothschild, L.P.: Rational dependence of smooth and analytic CR mappings on their jets. *Math. Ann.* **315**, 205–249, (1999).

- [BER99c] Baouendi, M.S.; Ebenfelt, P.; and Rothschild, L.P.: Convergence and finite determination of formal CR mappings, to appear in *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/math.CV/9904085>, (1999).
- [BER98] Baouendi, M. S.; Ebenfelt, P.; Rothschild, L.P.: CR automorphisms of real analytic manifolds in complex space. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **6**, 291–315 (1998).
- [BER97] Baouendi, M.S.; Ebenfelt, P.; and Rothschild, L.P.: Parametrization of local biholomorphisms of real-analytic hypersurfaces, *Asian J. Math.* **1**, 1–16, (1997).
- [BER96] Baouendi, M.S.; Ebenfelt, P. and Rothschild, L.P.: Algebraicity of holomorphic mappings between real algebraic sets in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  *Acta Math.* **177**, 225–273 (1996).
- [BHR96] Baouendi, M.S.; Huang, X.; and Rothschild, L.P.: Regularity of CR mappings between algebraic hypersurfaces. *Invent. Math.* **125**, 13–36, (1996).
- [BJT85] Baouendi, M. S.; Jacobowitz, H.; and Treves, F.: On the analyticity of CR mappings. *Ann. of Math.* **122**, 365–400, (1985).
- [BR88] Baouendi, M. S.; Rothschild, L. P.: Germs of CR maps between real analytic hypersurfaces. *Invent. Math.* **93**, 481–500, (1988).
- [BRZ00] Baouendi, M.S.; Rothschild, L.P. and Zaitsev, D. : Equivalences of real submanifolds in complex space. (preprint 2000) <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/math.CV/0002186>.
- [BG77] Bloom, T.; and Graham, I.: On type conditions for generic real submanifolds of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . *Invent. Math.* **40**, 217–243, (1977).
- [CNSW99] Christ, M.; Nagel, A.; Stein, E.M.; Wainger, S.: Singular and maximal Radon transforms: analysis and geometry. *Ann. of Math.* **150**, 489–577, (1999).
- [DF88] Diederich, K. and Fornæss, J. E.: Proper holomorphic mappings between real-analytic pseudoconvex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . *Math. Ann.* **282**, 681–700, (1988).
- [DW80] Diederich, K. and Webster, S. M.: A reflection principle for degenerate real hypersurfaces. *Duke Math. J.* **47**, 835–843, (1980).
- [F89] Forstnerič, F: Extending proper holomorphic mappings of positive codimension. *Invent. Math.* **95**, 31–61, (1989).
- [H94] Huang, X.: On the mapping problem for algebraic real hypersurfaces in the complex spaces of different dimensions. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **44**, 433–463, (1994).
- [K72] Kohn, J.J.: Boundary behavior of  $\bar{\partial}$  on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds of dimension two. *J. Differ. Geom.* **6**, 523–542, (1972).
- [Me99] Merker, J.: Vector field construction of Segre sets using flows of vector fields. <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/math.CV/9901010> (1999).
- [Mi00a] Mir, N.: Formal biholomorphic maps of real analytic hypersurfaces *Math. Research Lett.* **7**, 343–359, (2000).
- [Mi00b] Mir, N.: On the convergence of formal mappings *Comm. Anal. Geom.* (to appear)(2000).
- [N66] Nagano., T.: Linear differential systems with singularities and an application to transitive lie algebras. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **18**, 398–404, (1966).
- [W77] Webster, S.M. : On the mapping problem for algebraic real hypersurfaces *Invent. Math.* **43**, 53–68, (1977).
- [Z99] Zaitsev, D.: Algebraicity of local holomorphisms between real-algebraic submanifolds of complex spaces. *Acta Math.*, **183**, 273–305, (1999).
- [Z97] Zaitsev, D.: Germs of local automorphisms of real-analytic CR structures and analytic dependence on  $k$ -jets. *Math. Res. Lett.*, **4**, 823–842, (1997).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 0112, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO, LA  
JOLLA, CA 92093-0112

*E-mail address:* `sbaouendi@ucsd.edu`, `lrothschild@ucsd.edu`,  
`ebenfelt@math.kth.se`