Astérisque

## MORIHIKO SAITO Supplement to "Gauss-Manin system and mixed Hodge structure"

*Astérisque*, tome 101-102 (1983), p. 320-331 <a href="http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AST\_1983\_101-102\_320\_0">http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AST\_1983\_101-102\_320\_0</a>

© Société mathématique de France, 1983, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la collection « Astérisque » (http://smf4.emath.fr/ Publications/Asterisque/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

## $\mathcal{N}$ umdam

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques http://www.numdam.org/ Supplement to "Gauss-Manin system and mixed Hodge structure"

by Morihiko Saito

This note is a supplement to "Gauss-Manin system and mixed Hodge structure"(cited as [Sa]), which is submitted for publication in Proceedings of the Japan Academy. In this supplement, we discuss the following questions, which we could not discuss in full detail in the paper:

- 1) the necessity of a unipotent base change in the formulation of the result of Scherk and Steenbrink (e.g., counterfirst examples to the formulation of Scherk, Steenbrink and Pham, cf.[Ph]),
- 2) the diffference between the limit Hodge filtration of Schmid (which is obtained using a unipotent base change) and the limit of Hodge filtration which is obtained without a base change.

§1. The main point of the paper [Sa] is the following: in the formulation of the result of Scherk and Steenbrink, it is necessary to take a unipotent base change. We give two examples in which first the formulation of Scherk, Steenbrink and Pham as stated in [Ph] does not apply.

(1.1) First we review the notations in [Sa],[SS] and [Ph].

Let  $f: \mathbb{C}^{n+1}, o \to \mathbb{C}, o$  be a holomorphic function with an isolated singularity, and let  $f: X \to S$  be a Milnor fibration so that  $H_X := R^n f_* \mathbb{C}_X|_{S^*}$  is a local system on  $S^* = S - \{0\}$ . There is a natural extension  $\mathscr{A}$  of  $H_X$  to the origin as a locally free  $\mathcal{O}_S$ -Module with a regular singular connection  $\nabla$ , such that the eigenvalues of  $\operatorname{res}(t\nabla_{d/dt})$  are in (-1,0]. ( $\checkmark$  is denoted by  $\checkmark_X$ . in [Sa,(1.3)].) There is another extention  $\mathscr{K}_X^{(\circ)}$ , which we call the Brieskorn lattice.  $\mathscr{K}_X^{(\circ)}$  is a locally free  $\mathscr{O}_S$ -Module with a a regular singular connection such that  $\mathscr{K}_{X,\circ}^{(\circ)} \cong \Omega_{X,\circ}^{n+1} / \operatorname{df}_{\land} \operatorname{d\Omega}_{X,\circ}^{n-1}$ . It is known that there is a natural inclusion  $\mathscr{H}_{X,\circ}^{(\circ)} \lneq \checkmark$  (by Malgrange), which is  $\mathscr{O}_S$ -linear, preserves the connection and induces an isomorphism on  $S^*$ .  $\mathscr{K}_{X,\circ}^{(\circ)}$  is also a free  $\mathfrak{C}\{\{\partial_t^{-1}\}\}$ module of rank  $\mu$ , where  $\mathfrak{C}\{\{\partial_t^{-1}\}\} = \{\sum_{i\geq 0} a_i \partial_t^{-1}: \sum a_i r^i / i! < \infty$  $\overset{\mathfrak{I}}{}_{r>0}\}$  and  $\partial_t = \nabla_{d/dt}$  (Malgrange, Pham).

The Gauss-Manin system  $\int_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{e}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is defined as an integration of system (cf. [Ph],[Sa]).  $\int_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{f}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{X}}$  contains  $\mathscr{A}$  and  $\mathscr{H}_{\mathbf{X},o}^{(o)}$ naturally, and it is a holonomic system on S such that  $\mathrm{DR}(\int_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{f}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathrm{R}^{n} \mathbf{f}_{*} \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (\int_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{f}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is denoted by  $\mathscr{H}_{\mathbf{X}}$  in [Sa].)

Let  $X_{\infty} := X^* \times_{S}^* U$  be a base change of  $X^*$  by the universal covering  $p: U \rightarrow S^*$ . We set  $H_{\infty} := H^n(X_{\infty}, C)(\simeq \Gamma(U, \rho^* H_X))$ , i.e.,  $H_{\infty}$  is the set of multivalued horizontal sections of  $H_X$ .

We have an isomorphism  $H_{\infty} \stackrel{\sim}{\rightarrow} \stackrel{\sim}{\mathcal{A}_{0}} / t \stackrel{\sim}{\mathcal{A}_{0}}$ , by  $u \rightarrow exp$ (-log t log M /  $2\pi\sqrt{-1}$ ) u, where M is the monodromy of  $H_{X}$  and the eigenvalues of log M are in [0,1). Here we regard  $\mathscr{A}$  as a subsheaf of  $j_{*}(\mathcal{O}_{S}^{*}\otimes H_{X})$ , where  $j:S^{*} \rightarrow S$  is an inclusion. (1.2) The formulation of Scherk, Steenbrink and Pham (cf.[Ph]) asserts the following.

Let  $\{F_{\operatorname{St}}^{\, \cdot}\}\,$  be the Hodge filtration of Steenbrink on  $\,H_{\!\infty}$  , then we have

(1.2.1)  $F_{St}^{p} = \partial_{t}^{n-p} \mathcal{H}^{(o)} \cap \mathscr{S}_{o} / \partial_{t}^{n-p} \mathcal{H}^{(o)} \cap t\mathscr{S}_{o} (\subset \mathscr{I}_{o} / t\mathscr{I}_{o} \cong H_{\infty})$ for any p, where we set  $\mathcal{H}^{(o)} := \mathcal{H}^{(o)}_{X,o}$  and take intersections in  $\int_{f}^{\bullet} \mathcal{O}_{X}$ .

By a result of Steenbrink,  $\{F_{St}^{\star}\}$  is compatible with the monodromy decomposition  $H_{\infty} = \Theta_{\lambda} H_{\infty, \lambda}$ , where  $H_{\infty\lambda} = \{u \in H_{\infty} : u \in H_{\infty} \}$  $(M-\lambda)^{n+1} u = 0$ }. First we give an example for n = p = 1that  $\mathcal{H}^{(\circ)}$  /  $\mathcal{H}^{(\circ)}$   $\wedge$  ts not compatible with the decomposition (hence (1.2.1) does not hold.)

(1.3) Example 1. 
$$f = x^5/5 + y^5/5 + x^3y^3/3$$
.

This is the first example in which b-function changes under a  $\mu$ -constant deformation (i.e., b(s) = (s+1)  $\Pi_{i=2}^{8}(s + i/5)$  for a=0, and b(s) = (s+1)  $\Pi_{i=2}^{7}$ (s + i/5) for a $\neq 0$  (by T. Miwa).) We assume now  $a \neq 0$ .

We have a  $C\{\{\partial_t^{-1}\}\}$ -basis  $\{w_{i,j} = x^{i-1}y^{j-1}dx_{A}dy\}_{i,j=1,\cdots,4}$ of  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(0)} = \sum_{i=0}^{1} (\partial_t t)^i \mathcal{H}^{(0)}$  be the saturation of  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ . Then we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(\circ)} = \sum_{(i,j)\neq(4,4)} \mathfrak{e}_{\{\{\partial_t^{-1}\}\}w_{ij}} + \mathfrak{e}_{\{\{\partial_t^{-1}\}\}\partial_t w_{44}}$$

Set

of

$$v^{o} := \sum_{j=1}^{3} \mathfrak{c} \{ \{ \mathfrak{d}_{t}^{-1} \} \}_{w_{jj}} + \mathfrak{c} \{ \{ \mathfrak{d}_{t}^{-1} \} \}_{\mathfrak{d}_{t}^{w_{44}}} ,$$

$$v^{k} := \sum_{i-j \equiv k \pmod{5}} \mathfrak{c} \{ \{ \mathfrak{d}_{t}^{-1} \} \}_{w_{ij}} \quad \text{for } k=1, \cdots, 4 .$$

We can verify that for k=0,...,4,  $V^k$  is an  $\mathcal{E}(0)$ -submodule of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(o)}$  ( $\mathcal{E}(0) \doteq \mathfrak{c}\{t\}\{\{\partial_{+}^{-1}\}\}\)$  For there is a decomposition

$$\mathfrak{C}\{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\}d\mathbf{x}\wedge d\mathbf{y} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{4} \{ \sum_{i-j \equiv k \pmod{5}} a_{ij} \mathbf{x}^{i-1} \mathbf{y}^{j-1} d\mathbf{x}_{\wedge} d\mathbf{y} \}$$
 of  $\Omega_{X,0}^{2}$  which induces the one on  $\mathscr{H}^{(0)}$  such that the action of t and  $\vartheta_{t}^{-1}$  are compatible with it.

Hence there is a decomposition  $\mathscr{A} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{4} \mathscr{A}^{i}$  (resp.  $H_{\chi} =$  $\oplus$  H<sup>i</sup><sub>x</sub>, resp. H<sub>m</sub> =  $\oplus$  H<sup>i</sup><sub>m</sub>) as locally free  $O_{s}$ -Modules with connection (resp. as local systems, resp. as vector spaces with monodromy action) such that  $V^{i} = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(o)} \wedge \mathcal{A}^{i}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A}^{i}$  is an extension of  $H_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\mathbf{i}}$ , resp.  $H_{\infty}^{\mathbf{i}} = \Gamma(\mathbf{U}, \rho^* H_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\mathbf{i}}))$ .

The action of  $\partial_t t$  on  $V^{\circ} / t V^{\circ}$  is given by the following matrix.

	wll	<sup>∂</sup> t <sup>w</sup> 44	<sup>₩</sup> 22	<sup>₩</sup> 33
wll	2/5	0	0	0
<sup>∂</sup> t <sup>₩</sup> 44	<b>-</b> a/15	3/5	0	0
<sup>₩</sup> 22	*	*	4/5	0
<sup>₩</sup> 33	×	* *	*	6/5

This implies

 $w_{33} \equiv 0 \qquad (\text{mod } t \mathscr{U})$   $w_{22} \equiv t^{-1/5} \otimes u_{4} \qquad (\text{mod } t \mathscr{U})$   $\partial_{t} w_{44} \equiv t^{-2/5} \otimes u_{3} \qquad (\text{mod } t \mathscr{U} + \mathfrak{C} w_{22})$   $w_{11} \equiv t^{-3/5} \otimes u_{2} - (a/3)t^{-2/5} \otimes u_{3} \qquad (\text{mod } t \mathscr{U} + \mathfrak{C} w_{22})$   $(w_{11} = t^{-3/5} \otimes u_{2} - (a/3)t^{-2/5} \otimes u_{3} \qquad (\text{mod } t \mathscr{U} + \mathfrak{C} w_{22})$ 

where  $\{u_i\}_{i=1,\dots,4}$  is a basis of  $H_{\infty}^{O}$  such that  $Mu_i = \exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1} i/5) u_i$ .

Thus we have  $(\mathcal{H}^{(0)}/\mathcal{H}^{(0)} \wedge t \mathcal{A}_{0}) \wedge H_{\infty}^{0} = \mathfrak{C} u_{4} + \mathfrak{C}(u_{2} - (a/3)u_{3}),$ hence  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}/\mathcal{H}^{(0)} \wedge t \mathcal{A}_{0}$  is not compatible with the monodromy decomposition, because we have  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)} = \mathfrak{G}_{1} \mathcal{H}^{(0)} \wedge \mathcal{A}^{1}.$ 

<u>Remark</u>. We have  $F_{St}^{l} \wedge H_{\infty}^{o} = Cu_{2} + Cu_{4}$ , because we have

$$t^{3}\pi^{*}w_{11} \equiv 1 \otimes u_{2} \pmod{t}$$

where  $\pi: \tilde{S} \to S$  is a 5-fold covering such that  $\pi^* t = t^5$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  (=  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_X$  in [Sa]) is an extention of  $\pi^* H_X$  as in (1.1) (cf.[Sa(3.2)]).

(1.4) Example 2.

Let  $f: \mathbf{c}^2, \mathbf{o} \neq \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{o}$  be a holomorphic function such that  $\{f=0\}$  is an irreducible and reduced curve. We show that  $F_{St}^1 \neq \mathcal{H}^{(o)} / \mathcal{H}^{(o)} \wedge t_{\mathcal{N}_0}$  if f is not quasi-homogeneous. Proof) By a result of Lê and A'Campo, the local monodromy is semisimple and  $H_{\omega,1} = \{0\}$ . Suppose  $F_{St}^1 = \mathcal{H}^{(o)} / \mathcal{H}^{(o)} \wedge t_{\mathcal{N}_0}$  holds. There is a basis  $\{u_j\}_{j=1}, \dots, \mu$  of  $H_{\infty}$  such that  $F_{St}^1 = \sum_{j=1}^{\mu/2} \mathbb{C}u_j$  and  $Mu_j = \exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\alpha_j)u_j$ , for  $F_{St}^1$  is compatible with the monodromy decomposition. We may assume that  $-1 < \alpha_j < 0$   $(1 \le j \le \mu/2), 0 < \alpha_j < 1 (\mu/2 < j \le \mu)$  and  $\alpha_j + \alpha_{\mu+1-j} = 0$  by the duality of exponents.

We set  $v := t^{\alpha j} \otimes u_j \in \mathcal{A}$  for  $j=1, \dots, \mu$  and  $V := \sum_{j=1}^{\mu} \mathfrak{C}_{\{t\}v_j} \subset \mathcal{A}$ . V is a free  $\mathcal{O}_S$ -Module containing  $\mathcal{H}_X^{(o)}$ , because of  $F_{St}^1 = \mathcal{H}^{(o)} / \mathcal{H}^{(o)} \wedge t \mathcal{A}_o$ .

Let  $\{\gamma_i(t)\}_{i=1}, \dots, \mu$  be a multivalued horizontal basis of  $\bigsqcup_{t \in S} H_1(X_t, c)$  and  $\{w_j\}_{j=1}, \dots, \mu$  be a  $\mathcal{O}_S$ -basis of  $\mathcal{H}_X^{(o)}$ . Then  $(\det(\int_{\gamma_i(t)} v_j))^2$  and  $(\det(\int_{\gamma_i(t)} w_j))^2$  are both nowhere vanishing holomorphic functions on S, due to the duality of exponents and a lemma of Kyoji Saito.

Then we have  $V = \mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ , for there is a basis  $\{e_i\}$  of V such that  $\{t^{m_i}e_i\}$  is a basis of  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}(m_i \ge 0)$ .

It is clear that  $\mathcal{H}^{(o)} = V$  is saturated (i.e.,  $t\partial_t V \subset V$ ). Hence f is quasihomogeneous by a result of Kyoji Saito. Q.E.D.

Remark. In general, we can show the following.

Let  $f: \mathfrak{c}^2, \mathfrak{o} \to \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{o}$  be a holomorphic function with an isolated singularity. We assume that the local monodromy of f is semisimple. Then  $\mathcal{H}^{(\mathfrak{o})}/\mathcal{H}^{(\mathfrak{o})} \cap t \mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{o}}$  is compatible with the monodromy decomposition, if and only if f is quasihomogeneous.

<u>Problem</u>. For n=1, does the subspace  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}/\mathcal{H}^{(0)}\wedge t\mathcal{I}_{0}$  of  $H_{\omega}$  determine the local moduli of f in the family of  $\mu$ -constant deformation? In general, does  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)} \subset \mathcal{J}$  determine the local moduli of f in the  $\mu$ -constant family?

## GAUSS-MANIN SYSTEM AND MIXED HODGE STRUCTURE

\$2. The examples in \$1 mean that the proof of the formulation the first version of, of Scherk, Steenbrink and Pham such as stated in [Ph] is not complete. This contradiction comes from the following.

(2.1) Let  $(H_{Z}, \mathcal{F}^{*})$  be a polarizable variation of Hodge structure of weight n on  $S^{*}$ : i.e.,  $H_{Z}$  is a local system on  $S^{*}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}^{*}$  are holomorphic subbundles of  $\mathcal{O}_{S}^{*} \otimes H_{Z}$  such that  $\partial_{t} \mathcal{F}^{p} \subset \mathcal{F}^{p-1}$ , and there is a bilinear form  $H_{Z} \otimes H_{Z} \rightarrow Z$  such that they induce a polarized Hodge structure on  $H_{C,t}$  for  $\forall t \in S^{*}$ . Here  $H_{C} = R^{n} \overline{f}_{*} C_{Y} | S^{*}$  and  $\overline{f} : Y \rightarrow S$  is a compactification of a Milnor fibration  $f : X \rightarrow S$ , cf. [Sa,(1.1)].

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  can be extended to the origin as subbundles  $\mathcal{F}$ of  $\mathcal{J}$ , where  $\mathcal{J}$  is an extension of  $H_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \otimes H_{\mathbb{Z}}$  as in (1.1). But the limit filtration  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}|_{t=0}$  of  $H_{\mathbb{C},\infty} \simeq \mathcal{T}/t\mathcal{T}$  is different from the filtration  $F_{\infty}^{\cdot}$  of Schmid, which is obtained using a unipotent base change by Steenbrink.  $(H_{\mathbb{C},\infty} := \Gamma(U,\rho^*H_{\mathbb{C}}), cf.(1.1))$ (2.2) First we show the existence of the extension  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\cdot}$ .

We fix the coordinates t and z of S and U such that  $S = \{|t| < 1\}, U = \{\text{Im } z > 0\}$  and  $\rho^* t = \exp(2\pi \sqrt{-1} z)$ .

A natural isomorphism  $H_{C,\infty} = \Gamma(U,\rho^*H_C) \stackrel{\sim}{\rightarrow} (\rho^*H_C)_z$  induces a Hodge filtration  $F_z^{\cdot}$  on  $H_{C,\infty}^{\cdot}$ , which depends holomorphically on z. As we have  $F_{z+1}^{\cdot} = M^{-1}F_z^{\cdot}$  for  $\forall z \in U$ ,  $\exp(z \log M) F_z^{\cdot}$  are filtrations on  $H_{C,\infty}^{\cdot}$  which depend only on  $t = \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1} z)$ .

Let  $M = M_s M_u$  be the Jordan decomposition of M and set N:= log  $M_u$  (N is nilpotent). As  $M_s$  has a finite order e (cf. [Sc,(6.1)]), exp(z N)  $F_z$  depends on  $f := \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1} z/e)$ .

The Theorem of Schmid [Sc, 6.16] assures that there exists

a limit  $F_{\infty}^{\cdot} = \lim_{\mathbb{Im} z \to \infty} \exp(zN) F_{z}^{\cdot}$  in the flag manifold of  $H_{\mathbb{C},\infty}^{\bullet}$ , such that the Hodge filtration  $\{F_{\infty}^{\cdot}\}$  and the monodromy filtration  $\{W.\}$  determine a mixed Hodge structure on  $H_{\overline{K},\infty}^{\bullet}$ .

Using this theorem we show the existence of  $\hat{\mathfrak{F}}$ .

If we choose an  $\mathcal{O}_{S}$ -basis of  $\mathcal{T}$ , the subbundles  $\mathcal{F}$  determine a holomorphic map  $\Phi: S^* \to \operatorname{Flag}(\mathfrak{C}^m)$ , and the existence of  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  is equivalent to the extension of  $\Phi$  on S.

Let  $\{u_{ij}\}_{i=1}, \dots, \ell, j=0, \dots, r_{i-1}$  be a basis of  $H_{C,\infty}$  such that  $-N/(2\pi\sqrt{-1}) u_{ij} = u_{i,j-1} \quad (u_{i,-1}:=0), M_{s}u_{ij} = \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1} a_{i}/e)$  $u_{ii} \quad (a_{i} \in [0,e-1]).$ 

Then  $\{v_{ij} = \exp(-\log t \log M/2\pi\sqrt{-1}) u_{ij}\}_{ij}$  (resp.  $\{\tilde{v}_{ij} = \exp(-\log \tilde{t} eN/2\pi\sqrt{-1}) u_{ij}\}_{ij}$ ) is a  $\mathcal{O}_{S}$ -(resp.  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{S}}$ -) basis of  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$  (resp.  $\tilde{\tilde{\mathcal{J}}}$ ), where the eigenvalues of log M are in [0,1). We remark that in general we have  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} \neq \pi^* \mathcal{J}$ , i.e., there is a natural inclusion  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} < \pi^* \mathcal{J}$  such that  $\pi^* v_{ij} = t^{-a_i} \tilde{v}_{ij}$ .

Using these basis,  $\mathcal{F}^{\cdot}(\operatorname{resp.} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\cdot}:=\pi^{*}\mathcal{F}^{\cdot})$  can be identified with a holomorphic map  $\phi: S^{*} \to \operatorname{Flag}(H_{\mathbb{C},\infty})$  (resp.  $\tilde{\phi}:\tilde{S}^{*} \to \operatorname{Flag}(H_{\mathbb{C},\infty})$ ) such that  $\phi(t) = \exp(z \log M) F_{z}^{\cdot}$  (resp.  $\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{t}) = \exp(zN) F_{z}^{\cdot}$ ), for  $t = \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1} z)$  (resp.  $\tilde{t} = \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1} z/e)$ ).

Using Plücker coordinates, we can regard  $\Phi(\text{resp. }\tilde{\Phi})$  as  $\Phi = (\phi_0(t):\cdots:\phi_k(t)):S^* \rightarrow P^k$  (resp.  $\tilde{\Phi} = (\tilde{\phi}_0(\tilde{t}):\cdots:\tilde{\phi}_k(\tilde{t})):\tilde{S}^* \rightarrow P^k)$ , where  $\phi_i$  (resp.  $\tilde{\phi}_i$ ) are holomorphic functions on  $S^*$  (resp.  $\tilde{S}^*$ ). Moreover, there are holomorphic functions  $g_i$  on  $\tilde{S}$  such that  $\phi_i(\pi(\tilde{t})) = g_i(\tilde{t}) \ \tilde{\phi}_i(\tilde{t})$ , because we have  $\pi^* v_{ij} = \tilde{t}^{-a_i} \ \tilde{v}_{ij}$  and vector budles on  $S^*$  are trivial.

By the result of Schmid,  $\tilde{\Phi}$  can be extended to the origin holomorphically. Hence there is a nowhere vanishing holomorphic function h on  $\tilde{S}^*$  such that  $h \cdot \tilde{\phi}_i$  and  $h \cdot \pi^* \phi_i$  are holomorphic at the origin. Let  $h(f) = \sum_{j=0}^{e-1} h_j(\pi(f)) f^j$  be a decomposition of h such that  $h_j$  are holomorphic functions on S<sup>\*</sup>. Then  $h_j \cdot \phi_j$  are extended to the origin, and also is  $\phi$ . Q.E.D.

(2.3) The reason why  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}'|_{t=0} \neq F_{\infty}$  is obvious from the proof. If  $\tilde{\Phi} = \Phi \circ \pi$ , they coincide, but this does not hold in general.

<u>Example</u> 3. Let  $H_{\mathbb{Z}}$  be a local system on  $S^*$ , having a multivalued basis  $\{e_1, e_2\}$  such that  $M e_1 = e_2$ ,  $M e_2 = -e_1 - e_2$ , where M is the monodromy of  $H_{\mathbb{Z}}$ . $(M^3=1)$  We define a skew symmetric bilinear form <,> on  $H_{\mathbb{Z}}$  by  $\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = 1$ , and a Hodge subbundle  $\mathcal{F}^1 := \mathcal{O}_S * v \subset \mathcal{O} \otimes H_{\mathbb{Z}}$  by  $v := g(t) \otimes e_1 + h(t) \otimes e_2$ , where  $g(t) := -a t^{-1/3} + \zeta t^{-2/3}$ ,  $h(t) := a \zeta t^{-1/3} - t^{-2/3}$ ,  $\zeta^3 = 1$ , Im  $\zeta > 0$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $a \neq 0$  and |a| << 1.

It is easy to see that they form a polarized variation of Hodge structure of weight 1. (We set  $\mathcal{F}^{\circ} := \mathcal{O} \otimes H_{\mathbb{Z}}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}^{2} := \{0\}$ .) For example,  $\sqrt{-1} \langle v, \bar{v} \rangle = -2 \text{ Im g} \bar{h} > 0$  comes from Im  $\zeta > 0$ and |a| << 1.

We define another basis  $\{u_1, u_2\}$  of  $H_{\mathbb{C},\infty} = \Gamma(U, \rho^*H_{\mathbb{C}})$  by  $u_1 := -e_1 + \zeta e_2$ ,  $u_2 := \zeta e_1 - e_2$  such that  $M u_1 = \zeta u_1$ ,  $M u_2 = \zeta^{-1} u_2$  and  $v = a t^{-1/3} \otimes u_1 + t^{-2/3} \otimes u_2$ . Then we have

$$\begin{split} \varphi(t) &= \mathbb{C} \left( a u_1 + u_2 \right) \left( \langle H_{\mathbb{C},\infty} \right) & \text{for } \forall t \in S^*, \\ \tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{t}) &= \mathbb{C} \left( a \tilde{t} u_1 + u_2 \right) \left( \langle H_{\mathbb{C},\infty} \right) & \text{for } \forall \tilde{t} \in \tilde{S}^*. \end{split}$$
Hence  $\varphi(0) &= \mathbb{C} \left( a u_1 + u_2 \right) \neq \tilde{\varphi}(0) = \mathbb{C} u_2 \quad (\exists \neq 0). \end{split}$  \$3. Some remarks.

(3.1) The use of the Gauss-Manin system  $\int \mathcal{O}_X$  in the formulation of the result of Scherk-Steenbrink was first claimed by F. Pham (cf. [Ph]). One might think that  $\int \mathcal{O}_X$  and  $\int \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}] = \mathscr{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathfrak{O}_X[t^{-1}]$ would produce the same filtration, because we are considering the limit of the filtration on  $S^* = S - \{0\}$ . But this is not true, because the fundamental short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{g}} \longrightarrow \int^{\mathfrak{O}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{g}} \longrightarrow \int^{\mathfrak{O}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{g}} \longrightarrow 0$$

does not split as  $\mathscr{O}_{g}$ -Modules in general, and we have an inclusion  $\int \mathscr{O}_{Y} \zeta \int \mathscr{O}_{Y} \otimes_{\mathfrak{G}} \mathscr{O}_{g}[t^{-1}] (cf. [Sa (2.5), (3.5)]). (The above exact$ sequence was found independently by F. Pham (cf.[Ph 4.1]).)(3.2) The rest of the proof of Theorem (3.2) in [Sa] is almostthe same as Lemma 2 in [Va]. It is possible to prove thetheorem without using it. For we can show the following. Let $<math>\overline{Y} \neq Y$  be a modification which is isomorphic on  $S^*.(\overline{Y} \text{ is smooth})$ Then  $\int \mathscr{O}_{Y}$  is a direct factor of  $\int \mathscr{O}_{\overline{Y}}$  as a filtered complex (cf.[Sa]').

(3.3) Let R be the residue of  $t\partial_t: \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(\circ)} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(\circ)}$ . Then exp(-2 $\pi\sqrt{-1}$  R) and the monodromy M are conjugate to each other as matrices for n = 1 (i.e., {f=0} is a plane curve). Combined with the result of Malgrange (Springer Lect. Note, 459, p. 115, Theorem (5.4)), we have the following. Let b(s) = (s+1)  $\Pi_1(s+\alpha_1)^{m_1}$  be the b-function of f, and let a(s) =  $\Pi_j(s-\lambda_j)^{r_j}$  be the minimal polynomial of the monodromy. Then we have  $r_j = \max\{m_i: \exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\alpha_i) = \lambda_j\}$  for n = 1.

In fact, let  $\{u_{ij}\}_{ij}$  be a basis of  $H_{\infty}$  such that  $\{u_{ij}\}_{j=1,...,l_1}$  is a basis of  $\operatorname{Gr}_i^W H_{\infty}$  for i = 0,1,2, where W is the weight filtration [St]. Since F and W are compatible with the monodromy decomposition, we may assume that  $u_{ij} \in F^1 H_{\infty}$  for  $i=1, j>l_1/2$  or i=2, and  $M_s u_{ij} = \exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1})$   $\alpha_{ij}$ )  $u_{ij}$  with  $\alpha_{ij} \in (-1,0]$ , where  $M = M_s M_u$  is the Jordan decomposition. Since  $N = \log M_u$  acts on  $H_{\infty}$  as the morphism of type (-1,-1), we have  $N u_{ij} = 0$  for  $i\leq 1$ , and we may assume that  $-N/(2\pi\sqrt{-1}) u_{2j} = u_{0j}$  for  $j\leq l_0$  and  $N u_{2j} = 0$ (hence  $\alpha_{2i} = 0$ ) for  $j>l_0$ .

We set 
$$v_{ij} = \exp(-\log t \log M / 2\pi \sqrt{-1}) u_{ij}$$
  
=  $\begin{cases} t^{\alpha_{ij}} u_{ij} & \text{for } i \leq 1 \text{ or } i = 2, j > \ell_0 \\ t^{\alpha_{2j}} u_{2j} + t^{\alpha_{2j}} (\log t) u_{0j} & \text{for } i = 2, j \leq \ell_0 \end{cases}$ 

so that 
$$\{v_{ij}\}$$
 is a  $C\{\{\vartheta_t^{-1}\}\}$ -basis of  $\mathcal{A}$ .  
By [Sa,(3.2)], there is an element  $w_{ij} \in \mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ , such that  
 $\tilde{t}^{-e\alpha} ij \pi^*(v_{ij} - w_{ij}) \in \tilde{t} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$  for  $u_{ij} \in F^1 H_{\infty}$   
and  $\tilde{t}^{-e\alpha} ij \pi^*(v_{ij} - \vartheta_t w_{ij}) \in \tilde{t} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$  for  $u_{ij} \notin F^1 H_{\infty}$ ,  
where  $\pi: \tilde{S} \to \tilde{t} \mapsto t = \tilde{t}^e \in S$  is a unipotent base change and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$   
is the canonical extension for  $\pi^* H_X$ . Hence

For example, let  $v = \sum v_i$  be an element of  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(o)}$ , such that  $(t\partial_t - \alpha_i)^2 v_i = 0$  and  $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . We may assume that  $(t\partial_t - \alpha_i) v_i = 0$  for  $i \geq 2$  by the induction hypothesis, where  $v = \sum v_i$  is the expansion of  $w_{2j}$   $(j \leq l_0)$  modulo  $\partial_t^{-1} \mathcal{H} + \sum \alpha_{2j} \cdot \alpha_{2j} \mathcal{C} v_{2j}$ . Then  $v_i$  and  $(t\partial_t - \alpha_i) v_i$  are contained in  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(o)}$ , because we have the following identity:

det	ŗı,	0	,	1,	•	•	•	,	1	١
	α <sub>l</sub> ,	1	,	α <sub>2</sub> ,	•	•	•	,	α <sub>k</sub>	
	α <sub>1</sub> <sup>2</sup> ,	2a <sub>l</sub>	,	α <sub>2</sub> <sup>2</sup> ,	•	•	•	5	α <sup>2</sup> k	
		•		•	•				•	
	•	•		•		•			•	
	•	•		•			•		•	
	α <sup>k</sup> 1,	kαl <sup>k-</sup>	1,	α <sup>k</sup> 2,	•	•	•	,	$\alpha_k^k$	j

 $= \pm \Pi_{i < j} (\alpha_{i} - \alpha_{j}) \Pi_{i > 1} (\alpha_{i} - \alpha_{1}).$   $\underbrace{\text{with } \underline{m \leq \ell_{1}/2}}_{\text{Thus }} \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(o)} \text{ has a basis } \{v_{0j}\} \bigcup \{v_{1j}\}_{j > m} \bigcup \{v_{2j}\} \bigcup \{\partial_{t}^{-1} v_{1j}\}_{j \leq m}$ (by changing  $\{u_{1i}\}$  if necessary), which gives the desired result.

In general, we have that  $\partial_t^{-n} \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{H}^{(\circ)}$ , which implies that  $f^{n+1} \in [\mathcal{O} \partial f/\partial x_1]$ . But I do not know whether  $\exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}R)$  is conjugate to M for  $n \geq 2$ .

## REFERENCES

- [Ph] F. Pham, Structure<sup>S</sup> de Hodge mixtes associées à un germe de fonction à point critique isolé (preprint).
- [Sa] M. Saito, Gauss-Manin system and mixed Hodge structure. (to appear in Proc. Japan Acad., Vol.58, Ser.A, No.1 pp.29-32, 1982).
- [SS] J. Scherk and J. Steenbrink, On the mixed Hodge structure on the cohomology of the Milnor fiber (preprint).
- [Sc] W. Schmid, Variation of Hodge structure: the singularities of the period mapping. Inv. math., 22, 211-319 (1973).
- [St] J. Steenbrink, Mixed Hodge structure on the vanishing cohomology. Proc. Nordic Summer School, Oslo (1976).
- [Va] A. Varchenko, The asymptotics of holomorphic forms determine a mixed Hodge structure. Soviet Math. Dokl., <u>22(3)</u> 772-775 (1980).

[Sa]' M. Saito, Hodge filtrations on Gauss-Manin systems (preprint).

Morihiko Saito

Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences Kyoto University Kyoto 606 JAPAN

(Home Institute)

Dept. of Math. Faculty of Sciences University of Tokyo Tokyo 113 JAPAN

Jan. 21, 1982