

Singularities and the art of logarithmic stack maintenance

Or:
resolving singularities in Vistoli's workshop

Dan Abramovich
Joint work with Michael Temkin and Jarosław Włodarczyk

Brown University

University of Pisa
June 4, 2018

On machines

Machines are great,

On machines

Machines are great, if they have a purpose

On machines

Machines are great, if they have a purpose



Resolution of singularities

Definition

A resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$ is a proper birational map inducing an isomorphism over the smooth locus of X .

Theorem (Hironaka 1964)

A variety X over a field of characteristic 0 admits a resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$, so that the exceptional locus $E \subset X'$ is a simple normal crossings divisor.

Resolution of singularities

Definition

A resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$ is a proper birational map inducing an isomorphism over the smooth locus of X .

Theorem (Hironaka 1964)

A variety X over a field of characteristic 0 admits a resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$, so that the exceptional locus $E \subset X'$ is a simple normal crossings divisor.

Always characteristic 0 ...

Resolution of singularities

A variety X over a field of characteristic 0 admits a resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$, so that the exceptional locus $E \subset X'$ is a simple normal crossings divisor.

- In particular a smooth quasiprojective variety X^0 has a smooth projective compactification X with $D = X \setminus X^0$ a SNCD.

Resolution of singularities

A variety X over a field of characteristic 0 admits a resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$, so that the exceptional locus $E \subset X'$ is a simple normal crossings divisor.

- In particular a smooth quasiprojective variety X^0 has a smooth projective compactification X with $D = X \setminus X^0$ a SNCD.
- The pair (X, D) is logarithmically smooth, so log geometry should fit naturally.
- Actually in the standard proofs the divisor is a bit of a headache.

Resolution of singularities

A variety X over a field of characteristic 0 admits a resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$, so that the exceptional locus $E \subset X'$ is a simple normal crossings divisor.

- In particular a smooth quasiprojective variety X^0 has a smooth projective compactification X with $D = X \setminus X^0$ a SNCD.
- The pair (X, D) is logarithmically smooth, so log geometry should fit naturally.
- Actually in the standard proofs the divisor is a bit of a headache.
- **No stacks?!**

Resolution does hold for stacks

Theorem (Temkin)

An excellent algebraic stack X over a field of characteristic 0 admits a resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$.

- This is a consequence of resolution for varieties and schemes, **functorial** for smooth (actually regular) morphisms.

Resolution does hold for stacks

Theorem (Temkin)

An excellent algebraic stack X over a field of characteristic 0 admits a resolution of singularities $X' \rightarrow X$.

- This is a consequence of resolution for varieties and schemes, **functorial** for smooth (actually regular) morphisms.
- Włodarczyk showed that if one seriously looks for a resolution **functor**, one is led to a resolution.
- Still I want to show that **stacks** are part of the solution.

Log smooth schemes and log smooth morphisms

Log smooth schemes and log smooth morphisms

- A variety X with divisor D is **toroidal** or **log smooth** if étale locally it looks like a toric variety X_σ with its toric divisor $X_\sigma \setminus T$.
- Étale locally it is defined by equations between monomials.
- One records the open $U = X \setminus D$ rather than the divisor.
- (To be honest, the log structure $\mathcal{M} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ associated to this open.)
- A morphism $X \rightarrow Y$ is **toroidal** or **log smooth** if étale locally it looks like a toric morphism.
- The inverse image of a monomial is a monomial.

Resolution of families

- Let's try to simplify singularities of a family $X \rightarrow B$.

Question

When are the singularities of a morphism simple?

Resolution of families

- Let's try to simplify singularities of a family $X \rightarrow B$.

Question

When are the singularities of a morphism simple?

- If $\dim B = 1$ the simplest one can have is $t = \prod x_i^{a_i}$,
- and if one also allows base change, can have $t^k = \prod x_i$, or even $t = \prod x_i$.

Resolution of families

- Let's try to simplify singularities of a family $X \rightarrow B$.

Question

When are the singularities of a morphism simple?

- If $\dim B = 1$ the simplest one can have is $t = \prod x_i^{a_i}$,
- and if one also allows base change, can have $t^k = \prod x_i$, or even $t = \prod x_i$.
- Either way, it is a log smooth morphism of log smooth schemes.
- After base change, it is an integral and saturated morphism: flat with reduced fibers.

Resolution of families: higher dimensional base

Question

When are the singularities of a morphism simple?

- If $\dim B > 1$ Karu [1999] showed that $t = \prod x_i^{a_i}$ cannot be achieved.

Resolution of families: higher dimensional base

Question

When are the singularities of a morphism simple?

- If $\dim B > 1$ Karu [1999] showed that $t = \prod x_i^{a_i}$ cannot be achieved.
- The best one can hope for, after base change, is a **semistable** morphism:

Definition (AK 2000)

A log smooth morphism, with B smooth, is *semistable* if locally

$$\begin{aligned}t_1 &= x_1 \cdots x_{l_1} \\ &\vdots \\ t_m &= x_{l_{m-1}+1} \cdots x_m\end{aligned}$$

The semistable reduction problem

Conjecture

Let $X \rightarrow B$ be a dominant morphism of varieties.

- (i) There is an **alteration** $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and a modification $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is semistable.
- (ii) If the geometric generic fiber $X_{\bar{\eta}}$ is smooth, such $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ can be found with $X_{\bar{\eta}}$ unchanged.

The semistable reduction problem

Conjecture

Let $X \rightarrow B$ be a dominant morphism of varieties.

- (i) There is an **alteration** $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and a modification $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is semistable.
- (ii) If the geometric generic fiber $X_{\bar{\eta}}$ is smooth, such $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ can be found with $X_{\bar{\eta}}$ unchanged.

Known results:

- (ii) is known for families of curves in mixed characteristics [de Jong 1997]...
- (ii) is known for B a curve in characteristic 0 [KKMS 1973]

The semistable reduction problem

Conjecture

Let $X \rightarrow B$ be a dominant morphism of varieties.

- (i) There is an **alteration** $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and a modification $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is semistable.
- (ii) If the geometric generic fiber $X_{\bar{\eta}}$ is smooth, such $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ can be found with $X_{\bar{\eta}}$ unchanged.

Known results:

- (ii) is known for families of curves in mixed characteristics [de Jong 1997]. . .
- (ii) is known for B a curve in characteristic 0 [KKMS 1973]
- (i) is known for families of threefolds in characteristic 0 [Karu 2000]
- One wants (ii) in order to compactify smooth families.

Toroidalization and weak semistable reduction

Back to characteristic 0

Theorem (Toroidalization, \aleph -Karu 2000, \aleph -K-Denef 2013)

There is an *modification* $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and a modification $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is log smooth and flat.

Theorem (Weak semistable reduction, \aleph -Karu 2000)

There is an *alteration* $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and a modification $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is log smooth, flat, with reduced fibers.

Toroidalization and weak semistable reduction

Back to characteristic 0

Theorem (Toroidalization, \aleph -Karu 2000, \aleph -K-Denef 2013)

There is an *modification* $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and a modification $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is log smooth and flat.

Theorem (Weak semistable reduction, \aleph -Karu 2000)

There is an *alteration* $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and a modification $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is log smooth, flat, with reduced fibers.

- The key is toroidalization.
- Passing from weak semistable reduction to semistable reduction is a purely combinatorial problem [\aleph -Karu 2000],
- proven by Karu for families of threefolds, and
- whose restriction to rank-1 valuation rings is proven in a preprint by [Adiprasito-Liu-Pak-Temkin].

Functoriality

- To reach (ii), Włodarczyk says we need to work functorially.
- We do this functorially for any log base change and for **log**-smooth morphisms (Temkin).

Functoriality

- To reach (ii), Włodarczyk says we need to work functorially.
- We do this functorially for any log base change and for **log**-smooth morphisms (Temkin).

Main result (K-temkin-Włodarczyk)

Let $X \rightarrow B$ be a dominant log morphism.

- ▶ There are log modifications $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is log smooth and flat;
- ▶ this is compatible with log base change $B' \rightarrow B$;
- ▶ this is compatible, up to base change, with **log** smooth $X'' \rightarrow X$.

Functoriality

- To reach (ii), Włodarczyk says we need to work functorially.
- We do this functorially for any log base change and for **log**-smooth morphisms (Temkin).

Main result (K-temkin-Włodarczyk)

Let $X \rightarrow B$ be a dominant log morphism.

- ▶ There are log modifications $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is log smooth and flat;
- ▶ this is compatible with log base change $B' \rightarrow B$;
- ▶ this is compatible, up to base change, with **log** smooth $X'' \rightarrow X$.

- The result would be of sufficient interest even for $X'' \rightarrow X$ smooth.
- Temkin observed that this stronger functoriality leads us to the result.

Functoriality

- To reach (ii), Włodarczyk says we need to work functorially.
- We do this functorially for any log base change and for **log**-smooth morphisms (Temkin).

Main result (K-temkin-Włodarczyk)

Let $X \rightarrow B$ be a dominant log morphism.

- ▶ There are log modifications $B_1 \rightarrow B$ and $X_1 \rightarrow (X \times_B B_1)_{\text{main}}$ such that $X_1 \rightarrow B_1$ is log smooth and flat;
- ▶ this is compatible with log base change $B' \rightarrow B$;
- ▶ this is compatible, up to base change, with **log** smooth $X'' \rightarrow X$.

- The result would be of sufficient interest even for $X'' \rightarrow X$ smooth.
- Temkin observed that this stronger functoriality leads us to the result.
- A surprise is awaiting.

$\dim B = 0$: log resolution via principalization

- To resolve singularities, one embeds X in a **log** smooth $Y \dots$

$\dim B = 0$: log resolution via principalization

- To resolve singularities, one embeds X in a **log** smooth $Y \dots$
- \dots which can be done locally.
- Functoriality says choices do not matter.

$\dim B = 0$: log resolution via principalization

- To resolve singularities, one embeds X in a **log** smooth $Y \dots$
- \dots which can be done locally.
- Functoriality says choices do not matter.
- One reduces to **principalization** of \mathcal{I}_X .

Theorem (... N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a log smooth Y . There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with Y' logarithmically smooth, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

$\dim B = 0$: log resolution via principalization

- To resolve singularities, one embeds X in a **log** smooth $Y \dots$
- \dots which can be done locally.
- Functoriality says choices do not matter.
- One reduces to **principalization** of \mathcal{I}_X .

Theorem (... N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a log smooth Y . There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with Y' logarithmically smooth, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

- This is done by **order reduction**,
- achieved by blowing up **admissible centers**.

Example 1

- Consider $Y_1 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[u, x]$ and $D = \{u = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (u^2, x^2)$.
- If one blows up (u, x) the ideal is principalized:
 - ▶ on the u -chart $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[u, x']$ with $x = x'u$ we have $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'_1} = (u^2)$,
 - ▶ on the x -chart $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[u', x]$ with $u' = xu'$ we have $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'} = (x^2)$,
 - ▶ which is exceptional hence monomial.
- This is in fact the only functorial **admissible** blowing up.

Example 2

- Consider $Y_2 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x]$ and $D = \{v = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (v, x^2)$.

Example 2

- Consider $Y_2 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x]$ and $D = \{v = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (v, x^2)$.
- **Example 1 is the pullback of this via $v = u^2$.**
- Functoriality says: we need to blow up an ideal whose pullback is (u, x) .

Example 2

- Consider $Y_2 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x]$ and $D = \{v = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (v, x^2)$.
- **Example 1 is the pullback of this via $v = u^2$.**
- Functoriality says: we need to blow up an ideal whose pullback is (u, x) .
- This means we need to blow up $(v^{1/2}, x)$.

Example 2

- Consider $Y_2 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x]$ and $D = \{v = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (v, x^2)$.
- **Example 1 is the pullback of this via $v = u^2$.**
- Functoriality says: we need to blow up an ideal whose pullback is (u, x) .
- This means we need to blow up $(v^{1/2}, x)$.
- What is this? What is its blowup?

Kummer ideals

Definition

- A **Kummer monomial** is a monomial in the Kummer-étale topology of Y (like $v^{1/2}$).

Kummer ideals

Definition

- A **Kummer monomial** is a monomial in the Kummer-étale topology of Y (like $v^{1/2}$).
- A **Kummer monomial ideal** is a monomial ideal in the Kummer-étale topology of Y .

Kummer ideals

Definition

- A **Kummer monomial** is a monomial in the Kummer-étale topology of Y (like $v^{1/2}$).
- A **Kummer monomial ideal** is a monomial ideal in the Kummer-étale topology of Y .
- A **Kummer center** is the sum of a Kummer monomial ideal and the ideal of a log smooth subscheme.
- Locally $(x_1, \dots, x_k, u_1^{1/d}, \dots, u_\ell^{1/d})$.

Kummer ideals

Definition

- A **Kummer monomial** is a monomial in the Kummer-étale topology of Y (like $v^{1/2}$).
- A **Kummer monomial ideal** is a monomial ideal in the Kummer-étale topology of Y .
- A **Kummer center** is the sum of a Kummer monomial ideal and the ideal of a log smooth subscheme.
- Locally $(x_1, \dots, x_k, u_1^{1/d}, \dots, u_\ell^{1/d})$.

Apologies: we did not use the infinite root stack.

Blowing up Kummer centers

Proposition

Let \mathcal{J} be a Kummer center on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a universal proper birational $Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that Y' is logarithmically smooth and $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ is an invertible ideal.

Blowing up Kummer centers

Proposition

Let \mathcal{J} be a Kummer center on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a universal proper birational $Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that Y' is logarithmically smooth and $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ is an invertible ideal.

Example 0

$Y = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v]$, with toroidal structure associated to $D = \{v = 0\}$, and $\mathcal{J} = (v^{1/2})$.

Blowing up Kummer centers

Proposition

Let \mathcal{J} be a Kummer center on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a universal proper birational $Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that Y' is logarithmically smooth and $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ is an invertible ideal.

Example 0

$Y = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v]$, with toroidal structure associated to $D = \{v = 0\}$, and $\mathcal{J} = (v^{1/2})$.

- There is no log scheme Y' satisfying the proposition.

Blowing up Kummer centers

Proposition

Let \mathcal{J} be a Kummer center on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a universal proper birational $Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that Y' is logarithmically smooth and $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ is an invertible ideal.

Example 0

$Y = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v]$, with toroidal structure associated to $D = \{v = 0\}$, and $\mathcal{J} = (v^{1/2})$.

- There is no log scheme Y' satisfying the proposition.
- There is a **stack** $Y' = Y(\sqrt{D})$, the **Cadman–Vistoli root stack**, satisfying the proposition!

Example 2 concluded

- Consider $Y_2 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x]$ and $D = \{v = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (v, x^2)$ and $\mathcal{J} = (v^{1/2}, x)$.

Example 2 concluded

- Consider $Y_2 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x]$ and $D = \{v = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (v, x^2)$ and $\mathcal{J} = (v^{1/2}, x)$.
- associated blowing up $Y' \rightarrow Y_2$ with charts:
 - ▶ $Y'_x := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, v, v'] / (v'x^2 = v)$, where $v' = v/x^2$ (nonsingular scheme).
 - ★ Exceptional $x = 0$, now monomial.
 - ★ $\mathcal{I} = (x^2, v)$ transformed into (x^2) , invertible monomial ideal.
 - ★ Kummer ideal $(x, v^{1/2})$ transformed into **monomial ideal** (x) .

Example 2 concluded

- Consider $Y_2 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x]$ and $D = \{v = 0\}$.
- Let $\mathcal{I} = (v, x^2)$ and $\mathcal{J} = (v^{1/2}, x)$.
- associated blowing up $Y' \rightarrow Y_2$ with charts:
 - ▶ $Y'_x := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, v, v'] / (v'x^2 = v)$, where $v' = v/x^2$ (nonsingular scheme).
 - ★ Exceptional $x = 0$, now monomial.
 - ★ $\mathcal{I} = (x^2, v)$ transformed into (x^2) , invertible monomial ideal.
 - ★ Kummer ideal $(x, v^{1/2})$ transformed into **monomial ideal** (x) .
 - ▶ The $v^{1/2}$ -chart:
 - ★ stack quotient $X'_{v^{1/2}} := [\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[w, y] / \mu_2]$,
 - ★ where $y = x/w$ and $\mu_2 = \{\pm 1\}$ acts via $(w, y) \mapsto (-w, -y)$.
 - ★ Exceptional $w = 0$ (monomial).
 - ★ (x^2, v) transformed into invertible monomial ideal $(v) = (w^2)$.
 - ★ $(x, v^{1/2})$ transformed into invertible monomial **ideal** (w) .

$\dim B = 0$: restatement

Theorem (N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with Y' a **logarithmically smooth stack**, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

$\dim B = 0$: restatement

Theorem (N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with Y' a *logarithmically smooth stack*, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

- Working in Vistoli's workshop prepared me for this.

$\dim B = 0$: restatement

Theorem (N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with Y' a *logarithmically smooth stack*, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

- Working in Vistoli's workshop prepared me for this.
- This is done by *order reduction*, using *logarithmic derivatives*.

$\dim B = 0$: restatement

Theorem (N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with Y' a *logarithmically smooth stack*, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

- Working in Vistoli's workshop prepared me for this.
- This is done by *order reduction*, using *logarithmic derivatives*.

Definition

Write $\mathcal{D}^{\leq a}$ for the sheaf of *logarithmic* differential operators of order $\leq a$.

$\dim B = 0$: restatement

Theorem (N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a logarithmically smooth Y . There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with Y' a **logarithmically smooth stack**, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

- Working in Vistoli's workshop prepared me for this.
- This is done by **order reduction**, using **logarithmic derivatives**.

Definition

Write $\mathcal{D}^{\leq a}$ for the sheaf of **logarithmic** differential operators of order $\leq a$. The **logarithmic order** of an ideal \mathcal{I} is the minimum a such that $\mathcal{D}^{\leq a}\mathcal{I} = (1)$.

The monomial part of an ideal

Definition

$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I})$ is the minimal monomial ideal containing \mathcal{I} .

The monomial part of an ideal

Definition

$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I})$ is the minimal monomial ideal containing \mathcal{I} .

Proposition (Kollár, N-T-W)

In characteristic 0, $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{D}^\infty(\mathcal{I})$. In particular $\max_p \log \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}) \neq 1$.

The monomial part of an ideal

Definition

$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I})$ is the minimal monomial ideal containing \mathcal{I} .

Proposition (Kollár, N-T-W)

In characteristic 0, $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{D}^\infty(\mathcal{I})$. In particular $\max_p \log \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}) \neq 1$.

Proposition (Kollár, N-T-W)

Let $Y_0 \rightarrow Y$ be the normalized blowup of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I})$. Then $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I})\mathcal{O}_{Y_0} = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y_0})$ is an invertible monomial ideal, and so $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y_0} = \mathcal{I}_0 \cdot \mathcal{M}$ with $\max_p \log \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}_0) < \infty$.

$\dim B = 0$: sketch of argument

- In characteristic 0, if $\log \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = a < \infty$, then $\mathcal{D}^{\leq a-1}\mathcal{I}$ contains an element x with derivative 1.

$\dim B = 0$: sketch of argument

- In characteristic 0, if $\log \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = a < \infty$, then $\mathcal{D}^{\leq a-1}\mathcal{I}$ contains an element x with derivative 1.
- Carefully applying induction on dimension to an ideal on $\{x = 0\}$ gives **order reduction**:

Proposition (N-T-W)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a logarithmically smooth Y with

$$\max_p \log \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = a.$$

There is a functorial logarithmic morphism $Y_1 \rightarrow Y$, with Y_1 logarithmically smooth, such that $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y_1} = \mathcal{M}\mathcal{I}_1$ with \mathcal{M} an invertible monomial ideal and

$$\max_p \log \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}_1) < a.$$

Arbitrary B

Main result (N-T-W)

Let $Y \rightarrow B$ a logarithmically smooth morphism of logarithmically smooth schemes, $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ an ideal. There is a log morphism $B' \rightarrow B$ and functorial log morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with $Y' \rightarrow B'$ logarithmically smooth, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

- This is done by **relative order reduction**, using **relative logarithmic derivatives**.

Arbitrary B

Main result (N-T-W)

Let $Y \rightarrow B$ a logarithmically smooth morphism of logarithmically smooth schemes, $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ an ideal. There is a log morphism $B' \rightarrow B$ and functorial log morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$, with $Y' \rightarrow B'$ logarithmically smooth, and $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ an invertible monomial ideal.

- This is done by **relative order reduction**, using **relative logarithmic derivatives**.

Definition

Write $\mathcal{D}_{Y/B}^{\leq a}$ for the sheaf of **relative** logarithmic differential operators of order $\leq a$. The **relative logarithmic order** of an ideal \mathcal{I} is the minimum a such that $\mathcal{D}_{Y/B}^{\leq a}\mathcal{I} = (1)$.

The new step

- $\text{relord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{D}_{Y/B}^\infty \mathcal{I}$ is a nonunit monomial ideal **along the fibers**.
- Equivalently $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{D}_{Y/B} \mathcal{M}$ is not the unit ideal.

The new step

- $\text{relord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{D}_{Y/B}^\infty \mathcal{I}$ is a nonunit monomial ideal **along the fibers**.
- Equivalently $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{D}_{Y/B} \mathcal{M}$ is not the unit ideal.

N-T-W

Let $Y \rightarrow B$ a logarithmically smooth morphism of logarithmically smooth schemes, $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ an ideal with $\mathcal{D}_{Y/B} \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}$. There is a log morphism $B' \rightarrow B$ with saturated pullback $Y' \rightarrow B'$, and $\mathcal{M} \mathcal{O}_{Y'}$ a monomial ideal.