

In the rest of the section let's do an AFG over k given by

$f(\alpha\beta) = 0$, $\deg f \geq 2$, which is simultaneously given by
 $w_0(u, v) = 0$ where $w_0 = u g(x, y) + f(x) + \delta$, $\delta \in k[x]$, $g \in k[y]$
 $\deg g \geq 2$, mult $\delta \geq 2$, mult $g \geq 1$, $g \in \text{Aff}_2(k)$, $w_0 = (\mathcal{T}^{-1})^*(f)$,
and $(u, v) = \mathcal{T}(x, y) = (\sigma^*(x)(\alpha\beta), \sigma^*(y)(\alpha\beta))$.

If f is smooth at $y \in V_k(k)$ and $A = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2 \\ a_1 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \in GL_2(k)$
for $a_1 = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(y)$, $a_2 = \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(y)$, then \mathcal{T} could be given by
 $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{V}_A^{-1}$ by the Proposition S.7. (! beware: I changed numbers in corollary!)

Comment: It is very important we can change polynomial giving L over k to the polynomial of "w-type" which works from an even smooth point of V_f (! we do not need $\overset{\text{any}}{\text{change}}$ $m \rightarrow f$ as there are no requirements concerning f !). It allows us to compute $V_p(l(\alpha\beta))$ for an arbitrary line f after using machinery of S.8 & S.9 when P is the unique $\in \mathbb{P}_{LK}$ from S.8 & S.9. In the aim of the rest of the section α $\in \mathbb{P}_{LK}$ are now P from S.8/9.

To show that $P_\alpha \in \mathbb{P}_{LK}$ are now P from S.8/9.

T&N Let $p \in k[x]$, $p \in k$. Recall that multiplicity (of the root)
 κ of (the polynomial) p is $\kappa \geq 0$ for which $(x-\kappa)^{\kappa}/p \in \mathbb{P}$.

Comment We have noticed that multiplicity of 0 of $f(x)$ is exactly mult P , now we need a general observation. We aim to shift "everything" to the point $0 = (0, 0)$ and to compute with usual multiplicities.

Observation Let $p, q \in k[x]$, $g \in k[x, y]$, $x \in k$, $\alpha \neq \gamma_x \in \text{Aff}_1(k)$

- (1) multiplicity of g of p is $\kappa \Leftrightarrow$ mult $\mathcal{T}_{-\gamma_x}^*(p) = \kappa$
- (2) if $s(p) = 0$, $g(x) = g(-x, s(x)) \Rightarrow$ multiplicity of g of $g(x) \geq$ mult g .

Proposition S.9 Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in V_k(k)$, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y_2}(y) \neq 0$, $l, m \in k$ such that $\gamma_2 = l\gamma_1 + m$. Then $\exists! P \in \mathbb{P}_{LK}$ for which $\{\alpha - \gamma_1, \beta - \gamma_2\} \subseteq P$ and

$$V_P(\beta - l\alpha - m) = \text{multiplicity of } \gamma \text{ of the polynomial } f(x) = f(x, 1x + m).$$

Comment: The condition $\gamma_2 = l\gamma_1 + m$ means that γ is an element of the line $V_{y_2 - l y_1 - m}(k)$, so we do not describe how to measure V_P at points of lines (note less the rule as easy to test & algorithms!)

Proof: Denote $A = A_{\mathbb{K}}(R)$ the tangent of f at \mathbf{x} , $a_1 := \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(y), a_2 := \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x) \neq 0$

$$\Rightarrow A = a_1(x-y_1) + a_2(y-y_2) = a_2(y + \frac{a_1}{a_2}x - (y_2 + \frac{a_1}{a_2}y_1))$$

Put $\hat{A}(x) = A(x, 1x+y_1) \in K[x] \Rightarrow \deg \hat{A}(x) \leq 1 \& \hat{A}(y_1) = A(x_1, 1y_1+y_1) = A(y_1, y_1) = 0$

\Rightarrow either $\hat{A} = c(x-y_1)$ for some c or $\hat{A} = 0$.

(*) We claim: $\hat{A} = 0 \Leftrightarrow 1x+y_1 + \frac{a_1}{a_2}x - (y_2 + \frac{a_1}{a_2}y_1) = 0 \Leftrightarrow A = a_2(y-y_2)$

$a_2 \neq 0 \Rightarrow A \neq 0$ i.e. for mod $\hat{A} \stackrel{S.8}{\nmid} \exists! P \in L_K: V_P(\alpha-y_1) > 0, V_P(\beta-y_2) > 0$

$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \in GL_2(K)$; put $T := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

$\{x-y_1, \beta-y_2\} \subseteq P \Leftrightarrow$

Comment: $T^*(y) = a_1(x-y_1) + a_2(y-y_2) \in A$

(from S.7(B) we also used in the proof of S.8)

Compare $f(x, y) = T^*(w_0) = T^*(x+sy+y_1) = h(x-y_1) + A(x, y)(g(x-y_1, A(x, y))+1)$

Substitute $w_0 = 1x+y_1: f(x) = f(x, 1x+y_1) = h(x-y_1) + \hat{A}(x)(g(x-y_1, \hat{A}(x))+1)$

Case (a) if $A = a_2(y-y_2)$ $\Rightarrow \hat{A}(x) = h(x-y_1)$ & (*) as $\hat{A} = 0$

$\Rightarrow V_P(\beta-y_2) = V_P(w) = \text{mult}_P(x) \stackrel{S.8 \& S.5}{=} \text{multiplicity of } y_1 \text{ of } \hat{f}$

Comment: we use the branching
of $K(\alpha, \beta) = L$ in $K(\alpha, w) = L$ from beginning

case (b) if $A + a_2(y-y_2) \Rightarrow \hat{A} = c(x-y_1)$ for some $c \in K^*$ by (*)

$\Rightarrow \hat{f}(x) = h(x-y_1) + c(x-y_1) \cdot \underbrace{(g(x-y_1, c(x-y_1)+1))}_{(x-y_1)^2 / h(x-y_1)}$

y_1 is not a root of \hat{f}

$\Rightarrow V_P(\beta-y_2) = 1 = \text{multiplicity of } y_1 \text{ of } \hat{f} \quad \square$

Example S.10 Let $f = y^2 + xy + x^5 + 32 \in \mathbb{R}[x, y]$

by 4.9. f is absolutely irreducible \Rightarrow not decomposable

Put $\alpha := x + (\beta), \beta := y + (f) \in \mathbb{R}[\alpha, \beta]$, then $L = \mathbb{R}(\alpha, \beta)$ is a AFF over \mathbb{R} gives $f(\alpha, \beta) = 0$

$(-2, 2) \in V_f(\mathbb{R})$ because $f(-2, 2) = 4 - 4 - 32 + 32$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} &= y + 5x^4 \Rightarrow \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(-2, 2) = 2 + 80 = 82 \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} &= 2x + y \Rightarrow \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(-2, 2) = 4 + (-2) = 2 \end{aligned} \quad \Rightarrow A = A_{(-2, 2)}(R) = 82x + 2y + 160$$

Put $\Delta := \frac{1}{2} \det(A(\alpha, \beta)) = \beta + 41\alpha + 80$, by S.9 $\exists! P \in L_K: \delta(-2, \beta-2) \subseteq P$

Compute $V_P(\Delta)$ by S.9: $\hat{f}(x) = f(x, -41x - 80)$

Comment: Computation of \hat{f} , substitution to $\hat{f} = x^5 + 40.41x^2 - 80.81x + 80^2 + 32$
 \hat{f} and compute the multiplicity of \hat{f} and compare with $V_P(\Delta)$

$V_P(\Delta) = 2 \Leftrightarrow \hat{f}(-2) = 0 = \hat{f}'(-2) \& \hat{f}''(-2) \neq 0$

T&N Let $\mathfrak{p} \in A^3(k)$: $\mathfrak{p} \in V_{\mathfrak{p}}(k) \Rightarrow (\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} = (x_{\mathfrak{p}}, y_{-\mathfrak{p}_2})$

Denote by $R_{\mathfrak{p}} := k[x, y]_{(\mathfrak{p})}$ - the localization of $k[x, y]$ at \mathfrak{p}
 $= \left\{ \frac{a}{b} \in k(x, y) \mid a, b \in k[x, y], b(x) \neq 0 \right\}$

($I_{\mathfrak{p}}$) denotes the maximal ideal of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$; $(I_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \left\{ \frac{a}{b} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid a \in I_{\mathfrak{p}} \right\}$

$w_{\mathfrak{p}} : R_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow L$ as defined by the rule $w_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) = \frac{a(x)}{b(x)}$

we will usually write $\frac{a}{b}(x)$ instead $w_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)$ (d.e. $\frac{a}{b}(x) := w_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)$)

Denote $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} := \{ \text{PGL} \mid \exists r \in R_{\mathfrak{p}} : w_{\mathfrak{p}}(r) \in S \}$ If r is fixed we will write

$$P_{\mathfrak{p}} = \{ \text{PGL} \mid \exists r \in (I_{\mathfrak{p}}) \quad w_{\mathfrak{p}}(r) \in S \} \quad \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} = P_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ and } P_{\mathfrak{p}} = \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

Let $\text{Dom}_{\mathfrak{p}} : \text{Dom}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\alpha) = \{ \mathfrak{p} \in V_{\mathfrak{p}}(k) \mid \alpha \in \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} \}$

Comment: Our aim is to prove that
 $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ are VR since $P_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ are smooth.

Comment: We need the definition of $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $P_{\mathfrak{p}}$ preferably. Other ones serve as tools for proving the properties of $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ & $P_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Observation: In the notation introduced above

(1) $w_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is well defined using isomorphisms (technical exercise)

(2) $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} = w_{\mathfrak{p}}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})$, $P_{\mathfrak{p}} = w_{\mathfrak{p}}((I_{\mathfrak{p}}))$

(3) $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ as a local ring with the maximal ideal $P_{\mathfrak{p}}$,
 $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} = k + P_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\dim_k \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}/P_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$ (as \mathfrak{p} is a nonempty image of the local

(4) if $\alpha = w_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)$ where $a_i, b_i \in k[x, y]$ b_i are irreducible

$\Rightarrow V_{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \text{Dom}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\alpha) = \{ \mathfrak{p} \in V_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \alpha \notin \Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} \} \subseteq V_{\mathfrak{p}, h_1, h_2}$ \therefore is a finite set §44.
 $h_i \notin (\mathfrak{p})$ as $h_i(\mathfrak{p}) = 0$

(5) $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}} = \Omega_{(0,0)}$ and $P_{\mathfrak{p}} = P_{(0,0)}$

Comment: Useful technical exercise. It says we can shift $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to $\Omega_{(0,0)}$ where it's easier to recognize multiples of roots