THE JACOBIAN CONJECTURE: APPROXIMATE ROOTS AND INTERSECTION NUMBERS
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Abstract. We translate the results of Yansong Xu into the language of [5], obtaining nearly the same formulas for the intersection number of Jacobian pairs, but with an inequality instead of an equality.
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Introduction
The Jacobian Conjecture (JC) in dimension two stated by Keller in [11] says that any pair of polynomials \( P, Q \in L := K[x, y] \), with \([P, Q] := \partial_x P \partial_y Q - \partial_y Q \partial_x P \in K^\times\), defines an invertible automorphism of \( L \). If this conjecture is false, then we can find a counterexample such that the shape of the support of the components \( P := f(x) \), \( Q := f(y) \), is contained in rectangles \((0, 0), m(a, 0), m(a, b), (0, 0), n(a, 0), n(a, b), (0, b)\), such that \( m(a, b) \) is in the support of \( P \) and \( n(a, b) \) is in the support of \( Q \). In a recent paper [14] Yangsong Xu gives two formulas for the intersection number of possible counterexamples, which we call \( I_M \) and \( I_m \). If the formulas were true, we would be able to discard many infinite families of possible counterexamples to the Jacobian conjecture described in [8].

When we translated the result and the proofs of [14] into the language of [5], we obtained the same formula for \( I_M \), but for \( I_m \) we obtained only an inequality, consequently we cannot discard the infinite families as desired.

Hence, the main result of the present article is the translation of the concept of approximate roots into our language (see [5], also [6] and [8]), which requires a dictionary from Moh’s language to our language. It is interesting on its own, and the modified formulas could help understand some features of Moh’s methods.

Along this paper we will freely use the notations of [5].
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1 General lower side corners

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(P, Q) \in L^{(l)}$ be an $(m, n)$-pair (see [5, Definition 4.3]). In this section we take $(\rho, \sigma) \in \{(0, -1), (1, 1)\}$ such that
\[
\frac{1}{m} \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = \frac{1}{n} \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(Q) =: (a/l, b) \quad \text{and} \quad a/l > b > 0
\]
(assuming that such a direction exists). Note that $\rho > 0$. Assume that $u_P := \lambda v_{\rho, \sigma}(P) > 0$. Then the points $(a/l, b)$ and $(c/l, d) := \frac{1}{m} \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(P)$ must satisfy certain conditions. Our purpose in this section is to analyse them.

**Proposition 1.1.** Under the above assumptions, $[\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(Q)] = 0$.

**Proof.** By [5, Proposition 1.13] it suffices to prove that $v_{\rho, \sigma}(P) + v_{\rho, \sigma}(Q) > \rho + \sigma$. If $\rho + \sigma \leq 0$, then this is true, since $v_{\rho, \sigma}(Q) = \frac{a}{m} v_{\rho, \sigma}(P) > 0$; while if $\rho + \sigma > 0$, then since $\frac{a}{m} > b \geq 1$ and $\rho > 0$, we have
\[
v_{\rho, \sigma}(P) + v_{\rho, \sigma}(Q) = (m + n) \left(\rho \frac{a}{m} + \sigma b\right) > (m + n) b (\rho + \sigma) > \rho + \sigma,
\]
as desired. \qed

**Proposition 1.2.** Under the above assumptions, if $\rho + \sigma > 0$, then $\rho | l$ and there exist $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{K}$, such that $\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = \lambda x^{u_P/\rho} (z - \mu)^{mb}$, where $z := x^{-\sigma/v y}$.

**Proof.** By [5, Theorem 2.6] there exists a $(\rho, \sigma)$-homogeneous element $F \in L^{(l)}$ such that
- $v_{\rho, \sigma}(F) = \rho + \sigma$,
- $[F, \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P)] = \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P)$,
- $\text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(P) \sim \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(F)$ or $\text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(F) = (1, 1)$,
- $\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(P) \sim \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(F)$ or $\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(F) = (1, 1)$.

If $\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = m(a/l, b) \sim \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(F)$, then there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(F) = \lambda (a/l, b)$. So
\[
\rho + \sigma = v_{\rho, \sigma}(F) = \rho \frac{a}{l} + \lambda \sigma b > \lambda (\rho + \sigma) \implies 0 < \lambda b < 1,
\]
which is impossible, since $\lambda b = v_{0, 1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(F)) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consequently $\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(F) = (1, 1)$, and hence $\text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(F) = (1 + \sigma/\rho, 0)$, by [5, Proposition 2.11(2)]. Thus $\rho | l$ and $\text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(P) \sim \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(F)$, which implies $v_{0, 1}(\text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(P)) = 0$. Write
\[
F = x^T y^d f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = x^T y^d p(z) \quad \text{with} \quad p(0) \neq 0 \neq f(0).
\]
Note that $v = d = 0$, $\rho c/|l| = u_P$, $v_{0, 1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(P)) = mb$ and $f(z) = \lambda_1 (z - \mu)$ for some $\lambda_1, \mu \in \mathbb{K}$. By [5, Proposition 2.11(1)] we have $\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = \lambda x^{u_P/\rho} (z - \mu)^{mb}$, for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$, which concludes the proof. \qed

By [5, Proposition 2.1(2)] (which applies thanks to Proposition 1.1) we know that there exist $\lambda_P, \lambda_Q \in \mathbb{K}$ and a $(\rho, \sigma)$-homogeneous element $R \in L^{(l)}$, such that
\[
\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = \lambda_P R^n \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(Q) = \lambda_Q R^n.
\]
Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ and $R_0 \in L^{(l)}$ be a $(\rho, \sigma)$-homogeneous element such that $\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = \lambda R_0^h$ with $h$ maximum (consequently $m \mid h$ and we can assume that $R = R_0^{h/m}$ and $\lambda_P = \lambda$). Arguing as in [6, Corollary 2.6] we obtain that there exist $i \geq 0$ and a $(\rho, \sigma)$-homogeneous element $G \in L^{(l)}$ such that $[G, R] = R^i$. Let $\rho / l, \sigma / l, d \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a/l > b > d \geq 0$ and $a > c > 0$. Assume also that $b - d < a/l - c/l$ (we do not assume the existence of $P$ and $Q$ at this point). It is well known that for each $(r/l, s) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{Z}(1, 1)$ there exists a unique $(\vartheta, \varsigma) \in \mathcal{W}_{r,s}$, which we
denote by $\text{dir}(r/l, s)$, such that $v_{\rho, c}(r/l, s) = 0$. Set $(\rho, \sigma) := \text{dir}((a/l, b) - (c/l, d))$ and note that $(0, -1) < (\rho, \sigma) < (1, -1)$. We will analyse the existence of $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\rho, \sigma)$-homogeneous elements $R, G \in L^{(i)}$, such that

$$v_{\rho, \sigma}(R) > 0, \quad [G, R] = R^i, \quad (a/l, b) = \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(R) \quad \text{and} \quad (c/l, d) = \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(R). \quad (1.1)$$

Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ be minimal with $\ell v_{\rho, \sigma}(R) + \rho + \sigma > 0$. By [6, Proposition 3.12], we know that if there exist $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R, G \in L^{(i)}$ satisfying (1.1), and such that

$$R \not= \lambda z^b h^j(z) \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \in K^{\times}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad z := x^{-\frac{\rho}{c}}y \quad \text{and all linear polynomial} \quad h,$$

then there exists $\vartheta, \vartheta' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\vartheta \leq N_1, \quad \vartheta' < \ell \vartheta \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho, \sigma) = -\text{dir}\left(\vartheta', \left(\frac{c}{d}, d\right) + \vartheta(1, 1)\right), \quad (1.3)$$

where $N_1 := \gcd(a - c, b - d)$, or

$$d > 0, \quad \vartheta \mid N_2, \quad \vartheta' < \ell \vartheta \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho, \sigma) = -\text{dir}\left(\vartheta', \left(\frac{c}{d}, d\right) + \vartheta(1, 1)\right), \quad (1.4)$$

where $N_2 := \gcd(c, d)$. By [6, Remark 3.13]

$$\frac{\vartheta}{\vartheta'} = \frac{\rho a/l + \sigma b}{\rho + \sigma}.$$  

Hence

$$s := \frac{\rho a + \sigma b}{\gcd(\rho l + \sigma l, \rho a + \sigma b)} \bigg|_{\vartheta},$$

and so we can take (and we do it) $\vartheta = s$ in (1.3) and (1.4).

We suspect that the existence of $\vartheta$ and $\vartheta'$ satisfying the conditions in (1.3) or in (1.4) is sufficient for the existence of $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and two $(\rho, \sigma)$-homogeneous elements $R, G \in L^{(i)}$, such that the conditions in (1.1) and (1.2) are satisfied (with $(c/l, d) := \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(R)$), but at the moment we have no proof.

**Remark 1.3.** Since $N_2 < b$, if $s = b$, then necessarily $b \leq N_1$. So, by [6, Proposition 3.12(2)] there exists a linear factor with multiplicity $b$, which contradicts (1.2). Consequently $s < b$.

**Remark 1.4.** By [6, Theorem 3.4] in (1.1) we can assume that $i$ is minimum such that

$$v_{\rho, \sigma}(R)(i - 1) + \rho + \sigma \geq 0,$$

or, equivalently, that $i = \left[1 - \frac{\rho + \sigma}{v_{\rho, \sigma}(R)}\right]$.

In the case $b = 2$ we can establish necessary and sufficient conditions on $a, l$ for the existence of $c \in \mathbb{N}, \; d \in \{0, 1\}$ and two $(\rho, \sigma)$-homogeneous elements $R, G \in L^{(i)}$ satisfying the conditions of (1.1), if we assume that $R$ satisfies (1.2). This additional condition corresponds to the existence of split roots (see Definition 2.7). Before we establish the result we note that

$$(0, -1) < (\rho, \sigma) < (1, -1) \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho, \sigma) = -\text{dir}\left(\frac{a - c}{l}, b - d\right) \sim (lb - ld, c - a)$$

implies $c < a$ and $b - d < a/l - c/l$.

**Proposition 1.5.** Let $a, l \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $a/l > 2$ and set $b := 2$. Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in (0, -1), (1, -1]\}$ be a direction, and let

$$\vartheta := \frac{\rho a + \sigma b}{\gcd(\rho l + \sigma l, \rho a + \sigma b)}.$$

The following assertions are equivalent:
(1) There exist \( c \in \mathbb{N}, d \in \{0, 1\} \) and two \((\rho, \sigma)\)-homogeneous elements \( R, G \in L^{(l)} \) satisfying the conditions in (1.1) and (1.2).

(2) There exist \( c \in \mathbb{N} \) and two \((\rho, \sigma)\)-homogeneous elements \( R, G \in L^{(l)} \) satisfying the conditions in (1.1) and (1.2) with \( d = 1 \).

(3) \( \vartheta = 1 \), \( v_{\rho, \sigma}(a/l, 2) > 0 \) and there exist \( c \in \mathbb{N} \) such that
\[
(\rho, \sigma) = -\text{dir}\left(\frac{a - c}{l}, 1\right) = -\text{dir}\left(t' \left(\frac{c}{l}, 1\right) + (1, 1)\right),
\]
for some \( 0 < t' < l \), where \( l \in \mathbb{N} \) is minimal with \( t v_{\rho, \sigma}(a/l, 2) + x + \sigma > 0 \).

(4) There exists \( \Delta \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( l < \Delta < a/2 \) such that \( a - 2\Delta \mid \Delta - l \).
Moreover, \((\rho, \sigma) \sim (l, -\Delta)\).

Proof. 1) \( \Rightarrow \) 2) Suppose \( d = 0 \) and write
\[
R = \lambda x^\frac{c}{l} (z - \alpha_1)(z - \alpha_2) \quad \text{with} \quad z := x^{-\frac{c}{l}} y.
\]
Note that by (1.2) we have \( \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \). Note also that \( pa/l = 2\sigma + pa/l \), and hence \( u = (2\sigma + pa)/\rho \). Moreover since \( b - d = 2 \),
\[
(2l, c - a) \cdot \left(\frac{a}{l} - \frac{c}{l}, b - d\right) = 2(a - c) - (c - a)(b - d) = 0,
\]
and consequently \((\rho, \sigma) \sim (2l, c - a)\). Finally, since \( d = 0 \) necessarily (1.3) is satisfied. We claim that \( 2|a - c \). In fact,
\[
0 = (2l, c - a) \cdot \left(t' \left(\frac{c}{l}, 0\right) + \vartheta(1, 1)\right) = 2ct' + (c - a)\vartheta,
\]
which implies \( 2|a - c \), because otherwise \( 2 \mid \vartheta \leq N_1 = \gcd(a - c, 2) = 1 \). Set \( \Delta := (a - c)/2 \) and consider the automorphism \( \varphi \) of \( L^{(l)} \) defined by \( \varphi(x^{1/l}) := x^{1/l} \) and \( \varphi(y) := y + \alpha_1 x^{-\Delta/l} \). Using that \((\rho, \sigma) \sim (l, -\Delta)\) it is easy to check that
\[
\varphi(R) = \lambda x^\frac{c}{l} (z - (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)).
\]
By [5, Proposition 3.10], we know that \([\varphi(G), \varphi(R)] = \varphi(R)'\) and an easy computation shows that \( \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(R)) = (a/l, b) \) and \( \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(R)) = ((a - \Delta)/l, 1) \). So, replacing \( R \) by \( \varphi(R) \) yields \( d = 1 \).

2) \( \Rightarrow \) 3) Since \( d = 1 \), we have \( N_1 = N_2 = 1 \). Hence, \( \vartheta = 1 \) and equality (1.5) is satisfied for some \( 0 < t' < l \). Moreover it is clear that
\[
v_{\rho, \sigma}\left(\frac{a}{l}, 2\right) = v_{\rho, \sigma}(R) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho, \sigma) = -\text{dir}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(R) - \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(R)) = -\text{dir}\left(\frac{a - c}{l}, 1\right).
\]

3) \( \Rightarrow \) 4) Since
\[
(l, c - a) \cdot \left(\frac{a}{l} - \frac{c}{l}, 1\right) = 0,
\]
we have \((\rho, \sigma) \sim (l, -\Delta)\), where \( \Delta := a - c \). Thus, by (1.5),
\[
0 = (l, -\Delta) \cdot \left(t' \left(\frac{a - \Delta}{l}, 1\right) + (1, 1)\right) = t' a - 2t' \Delta + l - \Delta,
\]
which implies that \( a - 2\Delta \mid l - \Delta \), as desired. Since \((\rho, \sigma) \sim (l, -\Delta)\) and \( v_{\rho, \sigma}(a/l, 2) > 0 \), we have
\[
a - 2\Delta = (l, -\Delta) \cdot \left(\frac{a}{l}, 2\right) = \frac{l}{\rho} (\rho, \sigma) \cdot \left(\frac{a}{l}, 2\right) > 0,
\]
and so \( \Delta < a/2 \). Finally, the computation \( l - \Delta = \frac{l}{\rho} (\rho + \sigma) < 0 \) shows that \( \Delta > l \).
We set $R := x^{a/\Delta} z(1 + z) = x^\tau y(1 + z)$ and $G := \frac{l}{2\Delta - a}g(z)$, satisfy

\[
\left( \frac{a}{l_1}, 2 \right) = \text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(R), \quad \left( \frac{\ell_1}{l_1}, 1 \right) = \text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(R), \quad v_{\rho,\sigma}(R) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [G, R] = R^{k_1 + 1},
\]

as we want. \hfill \square

\section{Two formulas for the Intersection number}

Recall that the intersection number of two bivariate polynomials $P$ and $Q$ is defined by $I(P, Q) := \deg_x(\text{Res}_y(P, Q))$, where $\text{Res}_y(P, Q)$ denotes the resultant of $P$ and $Q$ as polynomials in $y$. In [14], the author defines for a Jacobian pair $(P, Q)$ the polynomial $P_\xi := P(x, y) - \xi$, where $\xi$ is a generic element of the field $K$, and gives two different formulas for $I(P_\xi, Q)$, one in terms of the major roots in [14, Theorem 5.1] and the other in terms of the minor roots in [14, Theorem 4.7]. We will prove the first formula using our language in Theorem 3.15, and instead of the equality in inequalities (0, -1) < $(\rho, \sigma) < (1, -1)$ hold. Let $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $k_1(a - 2\Delta) = \Delta - l$ and let $g(z)$ be a polynomial such that $g'(z) = z^k(1 + z)^k$. A straightforward computation shows that

\[
R := x^{a/\Delta} z(1 + z) = x^\tau y(1 + z)
\]

and $G := \frac{l}{2\Delta - a}g(z)$, where $g(z) = z^k(1 + z)^k$. Consequently expressions like $\mathcal{P}$ hold. Let

\[
\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}(\rho, \sigma, \xi) := \mathcal{P}(\rho, \sigma, \xi, \mathbb{Z}),
\]

where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the resultant of $P$ and $Q$ in $y$. We will first define approximate roots, final major roots and final minor roots using our language.

\subsection{Approximate $\pi$-roots}

In this section we will consider a polynomial $P \in L$, which is monic in $y$. For $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we will consider the following algebras:

\[
L = K[x, y] \subseteq K[x^\pm 1, y] \subseteq K((x^{-1/l}))[y] \subseteq K[\pi((x^{-1/l}))[y]],
\]

where $\pi$ is a variable (“symbol” in [14]). We also will use the subring $L^{(l)} := K[\pi][x^{\pm 1/l}, y]$ of $K[\pi((x^{-1/l}))[y]$. Note that $\deg_x = v_{1, 0}$ is well defined in $K[\pi((x^{-1/l}))[y]$.

Unless otherwise indicated, we will consider the elements $P$ of the above mentioned algebras as polynomials in $y$ with coefficients in one of the algebras $K[[x]], K[x^\pm 1/l, y], K[\pi((x^{-1/l})), \ldots$. Consequently expressions like $P(\tau), P(\alpha), \ldots$, will denote $P$ with $y$ replaced by $\tau$, $P$ with $y$ replaced by $\alpha$, etc.

By the Newton-Puiseux Theorem (see [4, Corollary 13.15, page 295]) there exist $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in K((x^{-1/l}))$ such that

\[
P = \prod_{i=1}^{M} (y - \alpha_i).
\]

We set $\mathcal{R}(P) = \{\alpha_i : i = 1, \ldots, M\}$.

\begin{definition}
Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)$ and write $\alpha = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} a_j x^j$ with $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. The $\pi$-approximation of $\alpha$ up to $x^{j_0}$ is the element

\[
\tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \in K[\pi, x^\pm 1].
\]

Note that $\deg_x(\tau - \alpha) = j_0$.
\end{definition}
Definition 2.2. Let \( \tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \in K[\pi, x^{\pm \frac{1}{l}}] \). We set
\[
D^\alpha_\tau := \{ \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P) : \tau \text{ is the } \pi\text{-approximation of } \alpha \text{ up to } x^{j_0} \}.
\]
If \( \alpha \in D^\alpha_\tau \) we say that \( \tau \) approximates \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{j_0} \).

Note that the element \( \hat{\alpha}_i = \sum_j b_j x^j \in \mathcal{R}(P) \) belongs to \( D^\alpha_\tau \) if and only if \( \deg_x(\hat{\alpha}_i) \leq j_0 \), where \( \hat{\alpha}_i := \alpha_i - \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j \), i.e., if and only if \( a_j = b_j \) for all \( j > j_0 \).

Definition 2.3. We say that \( \tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \in K[\pi, x^{\pm \frac{1}{l}}] \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) if there exists \( \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P) \) such that \( \pi \) approximates \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{j_0} \). We say that \( j_0 \) is the order of \( \tau \).

Notation 2.4. Let \( \tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \) be a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \). We denote by \( \varphi_\tau \) the automorphism of \( L^{(l)}(\pi) \) given by \( \varphi_\tau(\pi^{1/l}) := \pi^{1/l} \) and \( \varphi_\tau(y) := y + \sum_{j > j_0} a_j y^j \).

Remark 2.5. Let \( \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P) \). Assume that \( \tau \) approximates \( \alpha \) up to \( j_0 \) and \( \tau_1 \) approximates \( \alpha \) up to \( j_1 \). If \( j_0 > j_1 \), then \( D^\alpha_\tau \subseteq D^{\alpha_{\tau_1}} \).

In the sequel, for each \( j \in \frac{1}{l} \mathbb{Z} \), we let \( \text{dir}(j) \) denote the unique direction \((\rho, \sigma)\) such that \( \rho > 0 \) and \( j = \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \). Moreover, given a polynomial \( \tau = \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \), we set \( z := x^{-\sigma/l} y \), where \((\rho, \sigma) = \text{dir}(j_0)\).

The following proposition shows that our definition of \( \pi \)-root coincides with the one given in [12, Definition 1.3], with \( x^{-1} \) replaced by \( t \).

Proposition 2.6. Let \( \tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \) and let \( f_{P, \tau}(\pi) \in K[\pi] \) be the polynomial determined by the equality
\[
P(\tau) = f_{P, \tau}(\pi) x^{\lambda_\tau} + \text{terms with lower order in } x,
\]
where \( \lambda_\tau := \deg_x(P(\tau)) \in \frac{1}{l} \mathbb{Z} \). Set \( \varphi := \varphi_\tau \) and \((\rho, \sigma) = \text{dir}(j_0)\). We have
\[
|D^\alpha_\tau| = \deg(f_{P, \tau}) = v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P))),
\]
and
\[
\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P)) = x^{\lambda_\tau} f_{P, \tau}(z).
\]
Consequently \( \tau \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) if and only if \( \deg(f_{P, \tau}) > 0 \).

Proof. Let \( \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}} : L^{(l)}_{\pi} \to L^{(l)}_{\pi} \) be the evaluation of \( y \) in \( \pi x^{j_0} \). So, \( \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(y) := \pi x^{j_0} = \pi x^{j_0} \) and \( \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(x^{j/l}) := x^{j/l} \). Note that \( P(\tau) = \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(\varphi(P)) \). Since \( \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}} \) is \((\rho, \sigma)\)-homogeneous,
\[
\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(\varphi(P))) = \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P))).
\]
On the other hand, since \( \rho l \),
\[
\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P)) = x^{j/l} g(z) \quad \text{for some } r \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } g(z) \in K[z].
\]
Using that \( \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(z) = \pi \), from this we obtain
\[
\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(\varphi(P))) = x^{j/l} g(\pi).
\]
Note that
\[
P(\tau) = \text{ev}_{x^{j_0}}(\varphi(P)) = x^{j/l} g(\pi) + \text{terms with lower order in } x,
\]
because \( v_{\rho, \sigma}(x^j) = j \rho < \rho r/l = v_{\rho, \sigma}(x^{j/l}) \) if and only if \( j < r/l \). So \( f_{P, \tau}(\pi) = g(\pi) \), \( \lambda_\tau = r/l \), and equality (2.9) becomes equality (2.8). Since \( \deg(z(\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P))) = \deg_{\rho}(\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P))) \), we also have \( \deg(f_{P, \tau}) = v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P))) \). Consequently, in order to conclude the proof, it suffices to prove that \( |D^\alpha_{\tau}| = v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P))) \). Note that
\[
v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P))) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(y - \alpha_i))) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(y - \alpha_i)),
\]
where \( \hat{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i - \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j \). But

\[
\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(y - \hat{\alpha}_i) = \begin{cases} (0,1) & \text{if } \deg_y(\hat{\alpha}_i) \leq \sigma/\rho = j_0, \\ (\deg_y(\hat{\alpha}_i),0) & \text{if } \deg_y(\hat{\alpha}_i) > \sigma/\rho = j_0. 
\end{cases}
\]

So

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{M} v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(y - \hat{\alpha}_i)) = \# \{ \alpha_i \in \mathcal{R}(P) : \deg_y(\hat{\alpha}_i) \leq j_0 \} = |D_r^P|,
\]

as desired. \( \square \)

**Definition 2.7.** We say that a \( \pi \)-root \( \tau \) of \( P \) is a final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) if \( f_{P,\tau}(\pi) \) has no multiple roots and \( \deg_{\pi}(f_{P,\tau}(\pi)) > 1 \), where \( f_{P,\tau}(\pi) \) is defined by equality (2.6).

**Remark 2.8.** Let \( \tau \) be a final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \). Since the support of \( f_{P,\tau} \) has more than one point, from equality (2.8) it follows that \((\rho,\sigma) \in \text{Dir}(\varphi_\tau(P))\).

**Proposition 2.9.** Let \( \tau := \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \) be a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) and let \( \lambda \in K \). Consider the automorphism \( \varphi_1 : L(1) \to L(1) \) given by \( \varphi_1(x^{1/l}) := x^{1/l} + \varphi_1(y) := y + \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{j_0}. \)

Assume that \( \varphi_1(P) \) is not a monomial and set \((\rho',\sigma') := \text{Pred}_{\varphi_1(P)}(\rho,\sigma) \) (see [5, Definition 3.4]), where \((\rho,\sigma) := \text{dir}(j_0)\). If \( \rho' > 0 \), then set \( j_1 = \frac{\rho'}{\rho}, \) else take any \( j_1 \in \frac{\rho}{\rho} \mathbb{Z} \) with \( j_1 < j_0 \). In both cases set \((\rho_1,\sigma_1) := \text{dir}(j_1)\).

If \( \pi - \lambda \) has multiplicity \( r > 0 \) in \( f_{P,\tau}(\pi) \), then

\[
\tau_1 := \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{j_0} + \pi x^{j_1}
\]

is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) and \( |D_{\tau_1}^P| = r \) (note that \( j_1 < j_0 \)). Moreover,

\[
(\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in [\text{Pred}_{\varphi_1(P)}(\rho,\sigma),(\rho,\sigma)]. \tag{2.10}
\]

**Proof.** Write \( \varphi_1 = \tilde{\varphi} \circ \varphi \), where \( \varphi \) is as in Proposition 2.6, \( \tilde{\varphi}(y) = y + \lambda x^{j_0} \) and \( \tilde{\varphi}(x) = x \). By equality (2.8) and the fact that \( \tilde{\varphi} \) is \((\rho,\sigma)\)-homogeneous and \( \tilde{\varphi}(z) = z + \lambda \), we have

\[
\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_1(P)) = \tilde{\varphi}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))) = \tilde{\varphi}(x^{\lambda + \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))}) = x^{\lambda + \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))} = x^{\lambda + \rho + \sigma} g_1(z),
\]

for some \( g_1(z) \in K[z] \) with \( g_1(0) \neq 0 \). By construction, \((\rho_1,\sigma_1) \in [\text{Pred}_{\varphi_1(P)}(\rho,\sigma),(\rho,\sigma)]\); and so, by Proposition 2.6, we have

\[
r = v_{0,1}(\text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_1(P))) = v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi_1(P))) = |D_{\tau_1}^P|,
\]

as desired. \( \square \)

**Corollary 2.10.** Let \( \tau := \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \) be a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) and let \( \lambda \in K \). If \( \pi - \lambda \) does not divide \( f_{P,\tau}(\pi) \), then there exists no root \( \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P) \) such that \( \deg_x(\alpha - \lambda x^{j_0} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j) < j_0 \).

**Proof.** Let \( f_{P,\tau}(\pi) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} (\pi - \lambda_i)^{m_i} \). By Proposition 2.9 for each \( i \) there exists \( \tau_1(i) \) and \( m_i \) roots in \( D_{\tau_1(i)}^P \subset D_r^P \), for which \( \text{Coeff}_{x^{j_0}} = \lambda_i \). Since

\[
|D_{\tau_1(i)}^P| = \deg(f_{P,\tau}(\pi)) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} m_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |D_{\tau_1(i)}^P|,
\]

and the sets \( D_{\tau_1(i)}^P \) are pairwise disjoint, we obtain \( D_r^P = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} D_{\tau_1(i)}^P \). Consequently, the coefficient of \( x^{j_0} \) in each element of \( D_r^P \) is a root of \( f_{P,\tau} \). Since \( \lambda \) is not a root of \( f_{P,\tau} \), this finishes the proof. \( \square \)
Remark 2.11. The proof of the corollary shows that if the multiplicity of \( \pi - \lambda \) in \( f_{P,\tau}(\pi) \) is \( r \), then any \( \pi \)-root \( \tau_2 \) of \( P \) which begins with \( \lambda x^j + \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j \) satisfies \( |D_P^{\tau_2}| \leq r \).

Remark 2.12. Let \( \alpha := \sum_{j \geq j_0} a_j x^j \in K((x^{-1/\ell})) \), \( j_0 \in \mathbb{Z} \), \( \tau := \sum_{j \geq j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \) and \( (\rho, \sigma) := \text{dir}(j_0) \). Define \( T := \sum_{j \leq j_0} a_j x^j \). Since

\[
P(\alpha) = ev_{y=T}(\varphi_\tau(P)),
\]
we have \( \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P(\alpha)) = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(ev_{y=\lambda x^{j_0}}(\varphi_\tau(P))) \), whenever the right hand side of the equality is nonzero.

**Proposition 2.13.** Let \( \alpha = \sum_{j \geq j_0} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{j_0} + \sum_{j \leq j_0} a_j x^j \) and set \( \tau := \sum_{j \geq j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \). If \( f_{P,\tau}(\lambda) \neq 0 \), then \( \lambda_{P,\tau} = \deg_x(P(\tau)) = \deg_x(P(\alpha)) \).

**Proof.** By Remark 2.12, equality (2.8) and the fact that \( ev_{y=\lambda x^{j_0}} \) is \( (\rho, \sigma) \)-homogeneous, we have

\[
\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P(\alpha)) = \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(ev_{y=\lambda x^{j_0}}(\varphi_\tau(P))) = ev_{y=\lambda x^{j_0}}(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_\tau(P))) = \lambda_{P,\tau}.\]

Therefore

\[
\deg_x(P(\alpha)) = \deg_x(\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P(\alpha))) = \lambda_{P,\tau} = \deg_x(P(\tau)),
\]
as desired. \( \square \)

### 3 Approximate roots for Jacobian pairs

For the rest of the section we let \((P_0, Q_0)\) denote a Jacobian pair in \( L \) satisfying the conditions required in [5, Corollary 5.21], which in particular means that \((P_0, Q_0)\) is a minimal pair and a standard \((m,n)\)-pair for some coprime integers \( m, n > 1 \). By [5, Proposition 4.6(3)], there exist \( a < b \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \text{en}_{1,0}(P_0) = m(a, b) \) and \( \text{en}_{1,0}(Q_0) = n(a, b) \). So, by [5, Corollary 5.21(4)], we know that \( \ell_{1,1}(P_0) = \lambda x^a y^b \) and \( \ell_{1,1}(Q_0) = \lambda' x^a y^b \) for some \( \lambda, \lambda' \in K^\times \). Replacing \( P_0 \) by \( \frac{1}{a} P_0 \) and \( Q_0 \) by \( \frac{1}{b} Q_0 \), we can assume that \( \lambda = \lambda' = 1 \). Let \( \psi \) be the automorphism of \( L \) defined by \( \psi(y) := y \) and \( \psi(x) := x + y \), and set \( P := \psi(P_0) \) and \( Q := \psi(Q_0) \) (see Figure 1).

Since \( \psi \) is \((1,1)\)-homogeneous,

\[
\ell_{1,1}(P) = \psi(\ell_{1,1}(P_0)) = (x + y)^m a y^b \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{1,1}(Q) = \psi(\ell_{1,1}(Q_0)) = (x + y)^m a y^b.
\]

(3.11)

Hence, \( P \) and \( Q \) are monic polynomials in \( y \) and moreover, a straightforward computation shows that

\[
\text{en}_{1,0}(P) = m(a, b) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{en}_{1,0}(Q) = m(a, b).
\]

(3.12)

**Remark 3.1.** In the sequel we will establish several results about \( P \), but, since by [5, Proposition 4.6] we know that \((Q, P)\) is an \((n,m)\)-pair, the same results are valid mutatis mutandis for \( Q \).

**Proposition 3.2.** Let \( \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P) \) and let \( \tau \) be the \( \pi \)-approximation of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{j_0} \). Assume that \( \lambda_\tau := \deg_x(P(\tau)) > 0 \), and take \( \psi \) and \((\rho, \sigma)\) as in Proposition 2.6. The following facts hold:

1. If \( f_{P,\tau} \) has multiple roots, then \( [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(\tau)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(\tau))] = 0 \).
2. If \( [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(\tau)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(\tau))] = 0 \), then there exists \( \beta \in \mathcal{R}(Q) \) such that \( \deg_x(\alpha - \beta) < j_0 \).

**Proof.** Write \( \tau := \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j + \pi x^{j_0} \). By Proposition 2.9 there exists \( j_1 < j_0 \) such that

\[
\tau_1 := \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{j_0} + \pi x^{j_1}
\]
is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \). Now we prove the statements (1) and (2).
for each point of \( \text{Supp}(\phi) \), the line that passes through that point and through the origin. The minimum (\( \alpha \) belongs to (3.11) and (3.12).

Let \( \rho \) be a direction (\( \rho \) divides \( \ell(\phi(P)) \)). Consequently \( (z - \lambda)^k \) divides \( \ell(\phi(P)) \). Since \( \ell(\phi(P)), \ell(\phi(Q)) \in K \), this implies that \( \ell(\phi(P)), \ell(\phi(Q)) = 0 \). Therefore, by Proposition 2.6 we know that \( \tau \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q \). From this it follows immediately that for any \( \alpha \in D_{\tau_1}^P \) and \( \beta \in D_{\tau_2}^P \), the inequality \( \deg_x(\alpha - \beta) < j_0 \) holds, as desired.

Remark 3.3. Let \( \alpha = \sum a_j x^j \in \mathcal{R}(P) \). Assume that \( j_0 > j_1 \), \( \tau \) approximates \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{j_0} \) and \( \tau_1 \) approximates \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{j_1} \). Then \( \lambda_\tau > \lambda_{\tau_1} \). In fact, setting \( (\rho, \sigma) := \text{dir}(j_0) \) and \( (\rho_1, \sigma_1) := \text{dir}(j_1) \), equality (2.8) and [5, Proposition 3.9] show that

\[
v_{\rho, \sigma}(x^{j_1}) = v_{\rho, \sigma}(\phi(P)) = v_{\rho, \sigma}(\phi(1)(P)) \geq v_{\rho, \sigma}(\text{en}_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(\phi(1)(P))),
\]

where \( \phi = \psi \) and \( \phi_1 := \phi_{(1)} \). Moreover, a direct computation using that \( (\rho, \sigma) > (\rho_1, \sigma_1) \), \( v_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(\phi_1(1)) = v_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(x^{\lambda_{\tau_1}}) \) and \( v_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(\phi_1(1)) > v_{\rho, \sigma}(\text{en}_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(\phi_1(1))) \), shows that

\[
v_{\rho, \sigma}(\text{en}_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(\phi_1(1))) > v_{\rho, \sigma}(x^{\lambda_{\tau_1}}).
\]

Since \( \rho > 0 \), this proves that \( \lambda_\tau > \lambda_{\tau_1} \).

Proposition 3.4. Let \( \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P) \). There exists \( j_0 \) such that \( \lambda_\tau = 0 \) for the \( \pi \)-approximation \( \tau \) of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{j_0} \).

\[
\tau = \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi t^{j_0}
\]

Figure 1. The shapes of \( P_0 \) according to [5, Corollary 5.21(4)] and of \( P \) according to (3.11) and (3.12).
of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^j_0 \), satisfies \( \lambda_\tau = 0 \). In fact, we have
\[
0 = v_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi_0(P)) = v_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi_\tau(P)) = v_{p_0, \sigma_0}(x^{\lambda_\tau}) = \rho_0 \lambda_\tau,
\]
where the second equality follows using [5, Proposition 3.9] and the third equality, from (2.8).

\[\square\]

**Proposition 3.5.** Let \( \tau := \sum_{j=1}^k a_j x^j + \pi x^j_0 \) be a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \), and let \((\rho, \sigma), \lambda_\tau\) and \( \varphi \) be as in Proposition 2.6. If \( \tau \) is also a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q \) and \( \lambda_\tau \geq 0 \), then
\[
en_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(Q)) = \frac{n}{m} en_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P)) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|D^2_{\rho}|}{|D^2_{\tau}|} = \frac{n}{m}.
\]

**Proof.** Write \( \text{Dir}(\varphi(P)) \cap [(\rho, \sigma), (1, 1)] = \{(\rho, \sigma) = (\rho_0, \sigma_0) < (\rho_1, \sigma_1) < \cdots < (\rho_k, \sigma_k) = (1, 1)\} \)
Take \( \alpha \in D^P_\tau \) and \( 0 \leq i \leq k \). Let \( j_i := \frac{m}{\rho_i} \) and let \( \tau_i \) be the \( \pi \)-approximation of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^i_0 \). Set \( \lambda_\tau := \deg_x(P(\tau_i)) \) and \( \varphi_i := \varphi_{\tau_i} \). Since
\[
[\ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)), \ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))] \in K,
\]
if \([\ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)), \ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))] \neq 0\), then \( v_{0,1-1}(\ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)), \ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))) = 0 \) and then, by [5, Proposition 1.13],
\[
0 = v_{0,1-1}(\ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)), \ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))) \leq v_{0,1-1}(\ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P))) + v_{0,1-1}(\ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))) - (-1 + 0),
\]
which implies that
\[
v_{0,1-1}(st_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P))) + v_{0,1-1}(st_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))) \geq -1,
\]
or, equivalently,
\[
v_{0,1}(st_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P))) + v_{0,1}(st_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))) \leq 1.
\]
This implies that \( i = 0 \). Hence, if \( i > 0 \), then \([\ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)), \ell_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q))] = 0\), and since by Remark 3.3 we know that \( \lambda_\tau > 0 \), we have
\[
v_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)) = v_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q)) = \rho_i \lambda_\tau > 0,
\]
where the first equality follows from [5, Proposition 3.9] and the second one from (2.8). Now, an inductive argument using (3.11), [5, Remark 3.1] and that \( en_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)) = st_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)) \)
for \( i = k, \ldots, 1 \), proves that
\[
v_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q)) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad st_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(Q)) = \frac{n}{m} st_{\rho_i, \sigma_i}(\varphi(P)), \quad \text{for} \quad i = k, \ldots, 1.
\]
for \( i = k, \ldots, 1 \). Hence
\[
en_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi(Q)) = \frac{n}{m} en_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi(P)) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v_{0,1}(en_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi(Q)))}{v_{0,1}(en_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi(P)))} = \frac{n}{m}.
\]
This finishes the proof, since \( \frac{|D^2_{\rho}|}{|D^2_{\tau}|} = \frac{v_{0,1}(en_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi(Q)))}{v_{0,1}(en_{p_0, \sigma_0}(\varphi(P)))} \) by Proposition 2.6 and \((\rho_0, \sigma_0) = (\rho, \sigma)\). \[\square\]

In [14] the author chooses a generic element \( \xi \in K \) and analyses the roots of \( P_\xi = P + \xi \). Instead of speaking of a generic element \( \xi \), we will assume (adding eventually to \( P \) an element \( \xi \in K \)) that for any \( \pi \)-root \( \tau \) of \( P \) with \( \lambda_\tau = 0 \) we have

1. \( f_{P, \tau} \) has no multiple roots.
2. \( f_{P, \tau} \) and \( f_{Q, \tau} \) have no common roots (are coprime).

This is possible, since, by (2.8), in the case \( \lambda_\tau = 0 \) adding \( \xi \) to \( P \) is the same as adding \( \xi \) to the univariate polynomial \( f_{P, \tau}(\cdot) \). We also can and will assume that \((0, 0) \in \text{Supp}(P) \cap \text{Supp}(Q)\).
Remark 3.6. Assume that \( \tau \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) with \( \lambda_\tau < 0 \). Then, by Proposition 2.9, Remark 2.5 and item (1), we have \( |D_\pi^P| = 1 \). Moreover, we also have \( |D_\pi^Q| = 0 \). In fact, take \( \alpha \in D_\pi^P \). By Proposition 3.4 there exists \( j_1 \) and a \( \pi \)-approximation \( \tau_1 \) of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{j_1} \), such that \( \lambda_{\tau_1} = 0 \). By Remark 3.3 necessarily \( j_1 > j_0 \), where \( j_0 \) is the order of \( \tau \). Let \( \lambda \) be the coefficient of \( \alpha \) at \( x^{j_1} \). Then \( \tau = \lambda \alpha + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda}1 = \frac{\lambda \alpha}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \) \( f_{P,\tau_1} \) and so, by item (2), \( \tau \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q \). If \( \tau_1 \) is not a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q \), then clearly \( |D_\pi^Q| = 0 \). Otherwise, by Corollary 2.10 applied to \( \tau_1 \) and \( Q \), we also have \( |D_\pi^Q| = 0 \).

Remark 3.7. From the first assertion in the previous remark it follows that for any final \( \pi \)-root \( \tau \) of \( P \) we have \( \lambda_\tau \geq 0 \).

Notation 3.8. Let \( \alpha = \sum_j a_j x^j \in \mathcal{R}(P) \) and set \( \delta_\alpha := \min\{\deg_x(\alpha - \beta) | \beta \in \mathcal{R}(Q)\} \).

Remark 3.9. The \( \pi \)-approximation of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{\delta_\alpha} \) is also a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q \).

Proposition 3.10. ([14, Lemma 4.2]) Set \( \tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{\delta_\alpha} \). Then \( \tau \) is a final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \).

Proof. Since clearly \( \tau \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \), we only must prove that \( \tau \) is a final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \), i.e., that \( \deg(f_{P,\tau}) > 1 \) and that \( f_{P,\tau} \) has no multiple roots. By Remark 3.6 we know that \( \lambda_\tau \geq 0 \). By item (1) above the same remark we also know that when \( \lambda_\tau = 0 \), the polynomial \( f_{P,\tau} \) has no multiple roots. If \( \lambda_\tau > 0 \), then \( f_{P,\tau} \) also does not have multiple roots. In fact, otherwise by Proposition 3.2 there exists \( \beta \in \mathcal{R}(Q) \) such that \( \deg_x(\alpha - \beta) < \delta_\alpha \), contradicting the definition of \( \delta_\alpha \). Finally, by Proposition 3.5 we know that \( m \) divides \( |D_\pi^P| = \deg(f_{P,\tau}) \) and so \( \deg(f_{P,\tau}) > 1 \), which concludes the proof. \( \Box \)

3.1 Major and minor final \( \pi \)-roots

Definition 3.11. A final \( \pi \)-root \( \tau \) of \( P \) is called a \textit{minor final} \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) if \( \lambda_\tau = 0 \), and it is called a \textit{major final} \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) if \( \lambda_\tau > 0 \). The set of minor final \( \pi \)-roots of \( P \) is denoted by \( P_m \) and the set of final major \( \pi \)-roots of \( P \) is denoted by \( P_M \).

Note that
\[ \mathcal{R}(P) = \bigcup_{\tau \in P_m \cup P_M} D_{\tau}^P, \]

since, by Proposition 3.10 every root \( \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P) \) is associated with a final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) (that we will call the \( \textit{final} \ \pi \text{-root of } P \text{ associated with } \alpha \)) and by Remark 3.7 we know that \( \lambda_\tau \geq 0 \).

Note also that if \( \tau \neq \tau_1 \) are final \( \pi \)-roots, then \( D_{\tau}^P \cap D_{\tau_1}^P = \emptyset \). In fact, assume by contradiction that \( \alpha \in D_{\tau}^P \cap D_{\tau_1}^P \), and assume for example that \( \delta_\tau < \delta_{\tau_1} \), which means that \( \tau \) is a better approximation of \( \alpha \). Then, since the multiplicity of any factor of \( f_{P,\tau_1} \) is one, by Remark 2.11 we have \( |D_{\tau}^P| \leq 1 \), which contradicts the fact that \( \tau \) is a final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \).

Remark 3.12. Given a final \( \pi \)-root \( \tau \) of \( P \) take \( \alpha \in D_{\tau}^P \). Then, by Proposition 3.10, the \( \pi \)-approximation of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{\delta_\alpha} \) is a final \( \pi \)-root, and, since \( D_{\tau}^P \cap D_{\tau_1}^P = \emptyset \) for any other final \( \pi \)-root \( \tau_1 \) of \( P \), necessarily \( \tau \) is the \( \pi \)-approximation of \( \alpha \) up to \( x^{\delta_\alpha} \), and so \( \delta_\tau = \delta_\alpha \).

Proposition 3.13. Let \( \tau \) be a final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \), let \( \varphi := \varphi_\tau \) and set \( \lambda_\varphi^P := \deg_x(Q(\tau)) \). The following facts hold:

1. If \( \tau \) is a minor final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \), then
   a) \( \lambda_\varphi^P = 0 \),
   b) \( \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) = 0 \),
   c) \( \delta_\sigma < -1 \).

2. If \( \tau \) is a major final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \), then
   a) \( \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P)) \neq 0 \),
   b) \( \tau \) is a major final \( \pi \)-root of \( Q \),
Theorem 3.15. Set $I_M = \sum_{\tau \in P_M} |D^P_\tau| \lambda_\tau^Q$. Then $I_M = I(P, Q)$.

3.2 Intersection number and major roots

Lemma 3.14. Let $\tau$ be a final $\pi$-root of $P$. Then $\lambda_\tau^Q := \deg_x(Q(\tau)) = \deg_x(Q(\alpha))$ for $\alpha \in D^P_\tau$.

Proof. We assert that $f_{P,\tau}(z)$ and $f_{Q,\tau}(z)$ have no common roots. In fact, assume on the contrary that $z - \lambda$ is a common factor. If $\tau$ is a major final root, then
\[ z - \lambda \mid [\lambda, f_{P,\tau}(z), \lambda_\tau^Q f_{Q,\tau}(z)] = [\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))] \in K^x, \]
a contradiction; whereas, if $\tau$ is a minor root, then the choice of $\xi$ guarantees that $f_{P,\tau}$ and $f_{Q,\tau}$ have no common roots.

Note that if the coefficient of $z^0$ in $\alpha$ is $\lambda$, then $f_{P,\tau}(\lambda) = 0$, since otherwise $\pi - \lambda$ does not divide $f_{P,\tau}(\pi)$ and Corollary 2.10 leads to a contradiction. Hence, by the assertion $f_{Q,\tau}(\lambda) \neq 0$, and so, by Proposition 2.13, we have $\deg_x(Q(\tau)) = \deg_x(Q(\alpha))$ as desired.

Proof. By Remarks 3.9 and 3.12, any final $\pi$-root $\tau$ of $P$ is also a $\pi$-root of $Q$. We will use this fact in the proofs of (1)a) and (2)b).

(1) By Proposition 3.5, since $\lambda_\tau \geq 0$, we have $m \deg_{x,\tau}(\varphi(Q)) = n \deg_{x,\tau}(\varphi(P))$, and so
\[ \rho \lambda_\tau^Q = \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(Q)) = \frac{n}{m} \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(P)) = \frac{n}{m} \rho \lambda_\tau^P = 0, \]
where the first and third equality follow from (2.8). This implies that $\lambda_\tau^Q = \deg_x(Q(\tau)) = 0$, proving a). Moreover, by [5, Proposition 2.11] the vanishing of $\nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(Q))$ and $\nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(P))$ implies that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))] = 0$, proving item b). Now assume by contradiction that $\frac{\sigma}{\rho} = \delta_\tau > -1$, which implies that $\rho + \sigma \geq 0$. Then, by [5, Proposition 1.13], we have
\[ 0 = \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(Q), \varphi(P)) \leq \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(Q)) + \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(P)) - (\rho, \sigma) = -(\rho + \sigma) \leq 0, \]
so we have equality and, again by [5, Proposition 1.13], we have $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))] \neq 0$. But this contradicts item b) and thus proves $\delta_\tau < -1$, which is c).

(2) By Remarks 3.9 and 3.12, we know that $\tau$ is a $\pi$-root of $Q$ and, that for any $\alpha \in D^P_\tau$,
\[ \delta_\tau = \min\{\deg_x(\alpha - \beta) | \beta \in R(Q)\}. \]
Hence, by Proposition 3.2, we have $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))] \neq 0$, which proves a). Moreover, by Proposition 3.2 with $P$ and $Q$ interchanged, $f_{Q,\tau}$ has no multiple roots. On the other hand, by Proposition 3.5, we have
\[ |D^P_\tau| = \frac{n}{m} |D^P_\tau| > 1, \]
and so $\tau$ is a final $\pi$-root of $Q$. Again by Proposition 3.5 and equality (2.8), we have
\[ \rho \deg_x(Q(\tau)) = \rho \lambda_\tau^Q = \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(Q)) = \frac{n}{m} \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(P)) = \rho \frac{n}{m} \rho \lambda_\tau^P = \rho \frac{n}{m} \deg_x(P(\tau)), \]
and so $\deg_x(Q(\tau)) = \rho \frac{n}{m} \deg_x(P(\tau)) > 0$, which finishes the proof of b) and c). It remains to check that $\delta_\tau > -1$. Assume by contradiction that $\frac{\sigma}{\rho} = \delta \leq -1$. Then $\rho + \sigma \leq 0$, and so
\[ \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(Q)) + \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(P)) - (\rho + \sigma) \geq \rho \lambda_\tau^P \left(1 + \frac{n}{m}\right) > 0 = \nu_{\rho,\tau}(\varphi(P), \varphi(Q)), \]
which, by [5, Proposition 1.13], implies that $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(Q)), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi(P))] = 0$. This contradicts item a) finishing the proof of item d). \qed
Proof. It is well known that $\text{Res}_y(P, Q) = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)} Q(\alpha)$. Hence, 
\[
I(P, Q) = \deg_x \prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)} Q(\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)} \deg_x(Q(\alpha)) = \sum_{\tau \in P_m \cup P_M} \sum_{\alpha \in D^P_\tau} \deg_x(Q(\alpha)).
\]
By Lemma 3.14,

\[
I(P, Q) = \sum_{\tau \in P_m \cup P_M} \sum_{\alpha \in D^P_\tau} \deg_x(Q(\alpha)) = \sum_{\tau \in P_m} |D^P_\tau| \lambda_\tau^Q + \sum_{\tau \in P_M} |D^P_\tau| \lambda_\tau^Q = \sum_{\tau \in P_M} |D^P_\tau| \lambda_\tau^Q,
\]

since $\lambda_\tau^Q = 0$ if $\tau \in P_m$. □

**Definition 3.16.** A root $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)$ is called a minor root, if the associated final $\pi$-root $\tau$ is a minor final $\pi$-root, and it is called a major root, if $\tau$ is a major final $\pi$-root.

**Proposition 3.17.** Let $\tau$ be an approximate $\pi$-root of $P$ of order $j_0 \leq 0$ with $\lambda_\tau \geq 0$ and let $(\rho, \sigma) := \text{dir}(j_0)$. If $v_{1,-1}(\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_\tau(P))) > 0$, then any root $\alpha \in D^P_\tau$ is a minor root.

**Proof.** The hypotheses guarantee that $(\varphi_\tau(P), \varphi_\tau(Q))$ and $(\rho, \sigma)$ satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 1.1 (for instance $(\rho, \sigma) \in \{[0,-1], [1,0]\}$, because $j_0 \leq 0$). If $v_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_\tau(P)) = \rho \lambda_\tau = 0$, then $\tau$ is a minor final $\pi$-root and the result is true. Else $v_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_\tau(P)) = \rho \lambda_\tau > 0$, since $\lambda_\tau \geq 0$. Take $\alpha \in D^P_\tau$. By Proposition 3.13 it suffices to prove that $\delta_\alpha < -1$. By Propositions 1.1 and 3.2 we have $\delta_\alpha < \delta_\tau = j_0$, so the result is clear when $\delta_\alpha \leq -1$. Assume that $\delta_\alpha > -1$. In this case $\rho + \sigma > 0$, and using Proposition 1.2 and equality (2.8) we conclude that $f_{P,\tau}(z) = z(-\mu)^{mb}$ for some $\zeta, \mu \in K^\times$, where $b := \frac{1}{m} v_{0,1}(\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(\varphi_\tau(P))) = \frac{|D^P_\tau|}{m}$ (see Proposition 2.6). Hence, by Proposition 2.9 there exists $j_1 < j_0$ such that for the $\pi$-root 
\[
\tau_1 := \sum_{j=1}^k a_j x^j + \mu x^{j_0} + \pi x^{j_1},
\]
we have $D^P_{\tau_1} = D^P_\tau$. If $j_1 \leq -1$, then we finish the proof immediately applying the above argument with $\tau$ replaced by $\tau_1$, since $\lambda_{\tau_1} \geq 0$ (in fact, if $\lambda_{\tau_1} < 0$, then by Remark 3.6, we have $|D^P_{\tau_1}| = 1$, which is impossible because $bm = |D^P_\tau|$). Assume now that $j_1 > -1$ and set $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) := \text{dir}(j_1)$. By Proposition 1.2 we know that $\rho_1 | l$, and so $j_1 \in \frac{1}{l} \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, if $j_0 = -\frac{k}{l}$ for some $0 \leq k \leq l$, then $-j_1 \in \{\frac{-k}{l}, \frac{-2k}{l}, \ldots, \frac{-lk}{l}\}$, so after repeating the same procedure a finite number times, we arrive at $\delta_\alpha < j_1 \leq -1$, as desired. □

**Proposition 3.18.** Let $a, b$ satisfying equalities (3.11). There exist $ma$ minor roots $\alpha$ of $P$ with $\deg_x(\alpha) = 1$ and leading term $-x$, and $mb$ roots $\beta$ of $P$ with $\deg_x(\beta) \leq 0$.

**Proof.** Take $\tau_0 := \pi x^0$. Then $j_0 = 0$, dir($j_0$) = (1,0) and $\varphi_{\tau_0} = \text{id}$. By the first equality in (3.12), we have
\[
\text{en}_{\rho_0}(\varphi_{\tau_0}(P)) = \text{en}_{1,0}(P) = m(a, b),
\]
and by Proposition 2.6, we have $|D^P_{\tau_0}| = mb$. Since $\deg_x(\beta) \leq j_0 = 0$ for all $\beta \in D^P_\tau$, this yields $mb$ roots with $\deg_x(\beta) \leq 0$. On the other hand, by Proposition 2.9 with $\tau = \pi x, \lambda = -1$ and $\varphi_1(y) = y - x$, there exists $j_1 < 1$ such that the $\pi$-root $\tau_1 := -x + \pi x^{j_1}$ satisfies $|D^P_{\tau_1}| = ma$, since $f_{P,\tau}(z) = (z+1)^{ma} z^{mb}$, and so the multiplicity of $\lambda = -1$ is $ma$. Moreover, by (2.10) and the first equality in (3.11),
\[
\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi_1(P)) = \text{st}_{1,1}(\varphi_1(P)) = m(b, a),
\]
and then $v_{1,-1}(\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\varphi_1(P))) > 0$. So, every root $\alpha \in D^P_{\tau_1}$ is a minor root. □

**Definition 3.19.** Following [14], the minor roots in Proposition 3.18 are called top minor roots.
Proposition 3.20. Let \( \alpha \in R(P) \) be a major root, let \( \tau \) be the associated (major) final \( \pi \)-root and let \( (\rho, \sigma) := \text{dir}(\delta_\alpha) \). Then \( \left( \frac{1}{m} \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi_{\tau}(P)), (\rho, \sigma) \right) \) is a regular corner of type I of \( (\varphi_{\tau}(P), \varphi_{\tau}(Q)) \) (see [5, Definition 5.5] and the discussion above [5, Remark 5.9]).

Proof. Item (3) of [5, Definition 5.5] holds by hypothesis, item (1) holds by the very definition of \( \pi \)-root, Proposition ?? and [5, Theorem 2.6(4)], and item (2) holds by Remark 2.8. Moreover, Proposition 3.13(2)a) proves that \( \left( \frac{1}{m} \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi_{\tau}(P)), (\rho, \sigma) \right) \) is of type I. \( \square \)

Proposition 3.21. Let \( j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_k \in \frac{1}{7}\mathbb{Z} \) and let \( (\rho, \sigma) := \text{dir}(j_0) \). Consider the automorphism \( \varphi \) of \( L^{(i)} \) defined by

\[
\varphi(x^{1/l}) := x^{1/l} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(y) := y + \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i x^{j_i}.
\]

Let \( A = ((a/l, b), (\rho, \sigma)) \) be a regular corner of \( (\varphi(P), \varphi(Q)) \). The following facts hold:

1. \( \tau := \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i x^{j_i} + \pi x^{b_i} \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) and of \( Q \).
2. If \( A \) is of type Ib, then \( \tau \) is a final major \( \pi \)-root of \( P \) and \( Q \),

\[
|D_{\tau}^{P}| = mb \quad \text{and} \quad |D_{\tau}^{Q}| = nb.
\]

Moreover, if \( \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(Q)) = (k/l, 0) \) for some \( 1 \leq k < l - a/b \), then \( \lambda_{\rho}^{Q} = \frac{k}{l} \).

Proof. (1) By items (1) and (3) of [5, Definition 5.5], we know that \( A = \frac{1}{m} \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P)) \) and that \( b \geq 1 \). Hence, by equalities (2.7) and (2.8), we conclude that \( \text{deg}(f_{P, \tau}) > 0 \) and so \( \tau \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P \). Since by [5, Corollary 5.7] and Remark 3.1 the equality \( A = \frac{1}{m} \text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(Q)) \) holds, and \( (Q, P) \) is an \( (n, m) \)-pair, \( \tau \) is also a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q \).

(2) The two expressions for \( A \) obtained in the proof of item (1), combined with the equality (2.7) and the corresponding equality for \( Q \), yield the equalities in (3.13). Since \( A \) is of type Ib,

\[
[l_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(P)), l_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(Q))] \neq 0,
\]

and so, by Proposition 3.2(1), the polynomial \( f_{P, \tau} \) has no multiple roots. Moreover, using again equality (2.7) and equality (3.13) we obtain that \( \text{deg}(f_{P, \tau}) = mb > 1 \). This proves that \( \tau \) is a major final \( \pi \)-root of \( P \), and then, by Proposition 3.13(2)b), also of \( Q \). Finally, assuming that \( \text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(Q)) = (k/l, 0) \), equality (2.8) for \( Q \) implies that \( \rho \lambda_{\rho}^{Q} = v_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi(Q)) = \rho \frac{k}{l} \), from which the last assertion follows, since \( \rho \neq 0 \). \( \square \)

Example 3.22. Consider the family \( F_1 \) of [8], corresponding to an \( (m, n) \)-pair \((P_0, Q_0)\) as in [5, Corollary 5.21]:

\[
A_0 = (4, 12), \quad A'_0 = (1, 0), \quad A_1 = (7, 4, 3), \quad k = 1, \quad m = 2j + 3 \quad \text{and} \quad n = 3j + 4. \tag{3.14}
\]

Then \((P_0, Q_0)\) has the shape given in Figure 2. In fact, by (3.14), the edge from \( A_0 \) to \( A'_0 \) is determined. So we only must prove that

\[
(\rho, \sigma) := \text{Succ}_{P_0}(1, 0) = \text{Succ}_{Q_0}(1, 0) = (-2, 1)
\]

and that \( \frac{x}{m} \text{en}_{-2, 1}(P) = (0, 4) \). By [5, Corollary 5.21(4)] we know that \((-1, 1) < (\rho, \sigma) < (-1, 0)\). Moreover, by the second equality in [8, (2.13)] we have

\[
q_0 = \frac{4}{\gcd(v_{4, -1}(4, 12), 4 - 1)} = \frac{4}{\gcd(4, 3)} = 4.
\]

On the other hand, at the beginning of [6, Subsection 2.4] we see that

\[
\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(F_0) = \frac{1}{q_0 m} \text{en}_{0, \sigma}(P_0),
\]
and therefore, by [5, Corollary 7.2], there exists a \((\rho, \sigma)\)-homogeneous element \(R\) such that \(\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = R^{4m}\). This is only possible if \((\rho, \sigma) = (-k, 1)\) for some \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), with \(k \geq 2\). But \(k \geq 3\) leads to \(v_{\rho, \sigma}(P_0) \leq 0\) and then \(\deg_y(P_0(0, y)) \leq 0\), which contradicts [13, Proposition 10.2.6]. So \(k = 2\) and hence

\[
\frac{1}{m} \text{en}_{-2,1}(P) = 4 \text{st}_{-2,1}(R) = (0, 4),
\]

as desired. Since \(P := \psi(P_0)\) and \(Q := \psi(Q_0)\), where \(\psi(y) = y\) and \(\psi(x) = x + y\) (see the beginning of Subsection 3), the shape of \(P\) is as in Figure 3, and \(P\) is a monic polynomial in \(y\) of degree \(16m\). Write \(\ell_{4, -1}(P) = x^m g(z)^m\), where \(z = x^{3/4} y\). By [6, Theorem 2.20(6)] and the fact that \(v_{1, -1}(A'_0) > 0\), we know that \((A_0, (\rho, \sigma)) = ((4, 12), (4, -1))\) is a regular corner of type IIb.

**Figure 2.** Shape of \((P_0, Q_0)\)

**Figure 3.** Shape of \(P_{\xi}\)
of \((P, Q)\). Hence, by item (8) of the same theorem, \(v_{0,1}(A_1) = \frac{3m}{n}\), where \(m\) is the multiplicity of \(z - \lambda\) in \(p_0(z) := g(z)^m\). Since \(v_{0,1}(A_1) = 3\), by [6, Remarks 3.8 and 3.9] we have
\[
g(z) = \lambda_0(z^4 - \lambda_1^4)^3,
\]
for some \(\lambda_0, \lambda_1 \in K^\times\). It follows that
\[
\ell_{4,-1}(P_\xi) = \lambda_0 x^m(z - \lambda_1)^3 m(z - i\lambda_1)^3 m(z + \lambda_1)^3 m(z + i\lambda_1)^3 m,
\]
and so we have four final major \(\pi\)-roots
\[
\tau_0 := \lambda_1 x^{1/4} + \pi x^\delta, \quad \tau_1 := i\lambda_1 x^{1/4} + \pi x^\delta, \quad \tau_2 := -\lambda_1 x^{1/4} + \pi x^\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_3 := -i\lambda_1 x^{1/4} + \pi x^\delta,
\]
where \(\delta = \sigma/\rho\), with \((\rho, \sigma) := \text{dir}(m(\frac{3}{4}, 3) - (\frac{3}{4}, 1))\). Here \(A_1 = (\frac{3}{4}, 3)\) is the same final corner (see [6, Definition 2.18]) for all major final roots, corresponding to the regular corner \((A_1, (\rho, \sigma))\) of type Ib) of each of the four \((m,n)\)-pairs \((\varphi_{\tau_i}(P), \varphi_{\tau_i}(Q))\). By the first equality in (3.13), there are 3\(m\) roots of \(P\) associated to each of these major roots, and by Proposition 3.18, the remaining 4\(m\) roots of \(P\) are minor roots. Now we compute
\[
I_M = \sum_{\tau \in P_M} |D_{\tau}^P| \lambda_{\tau}^Q = 3 \sum_{j=0}^3 |D_{\tau_j}^P| \lambda_{\tau_j}^Q = 4 \cdot mb \cdot \frac{k}{l} = 4 \cdot m \cdot 3 \cdot \frac{1}{4} = 3m = 3(2j + 3).
\]
3.3 Intersection number and minor roots

For the sake of brevity in the sequel we write $P_x, Q_x, P_y$ and $Q_y$ instead of the partial derivatives $\partial_x P, \partial_x Q, \partial_y P$ and $\partial_y Q$, respectively.

Lemma 3.23. Let $(P, Q)$ be as above, $(\rho, \sigma)$ be a direction with $\rho \neq 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)$. Write $\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = x^n g(z)$ with $z := x^{-\sigma/\rho} y$. The following facts hold:

1. If $\deg(g) > 0$, then $\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P_y) = x^{n-\sigma/\rho} g'(z)$.
2. $\alpha$ is a minor root if and only if $\deg_x(Q(\alpha)) = 0$.
3. Let $\beta \in \mathcal{R}(P_y)$. There exists $\tau \in P_m$ such that $\beta \in D_\tau^P$ if and only if $\deg_x(P(\beta)) = 0$.
4. If $\alpha$ is a minor root, then $\deg_x(P_y(\alpha)) = -\delta_\alpha$.
5. Let $\tau \in P_m$ and assume that $f_{P_x, \tau}$ and $f_{Q_y, \tau}$ are coprime. Then $\deg_x(Q_y(\beta)) = -\delta_\tau$ for all $\beta \in D_\tau^P$.
6. Let $\tau \in P_m$ and assume that $f_{P_x, \tau}$ and $f_{Q_y, \tau}$ are not coprime. Then there exists $\beta \in D_\tau^P$, such that $\deg_x(Q_y(\beta)) < -\delta_\tau$.

Proof. (1) This follows from the fact that the morphism $\partial_y$ satisfies $\partial_y(x^iy^j) = jx^iy^{j-1}$ for $j > 0$, and so

$$v_{\rho, \sigma}(\partial_y(x^iy^j)) = v_{\rho, \sigma}(x^iy^j) - \sigma.$$  

Hence $\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\partial_y P) = \partial_y \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P)$ when $\partial_y \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) \neq 0$, and so

$$\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P_y) = \partial_y(x^n g(z)) = x^{n-\sigma/\rho} g'(z),$$

because $\deg(g) > 0$.

(2) By items (1)a) and (2)c) of Proposition 3.13, we know that $\alpha$ is a minor root if and only if $\lambda_{P_y}^2 = 0$ for the $\pi$-root $\tau$ associated to $\alpha$. This proves (2), since $\lambda_{P_y}^2 = \deg_x(Q(\alpha))$ by Lemma 3.14.

(3) Define

$$\delta_\beta := \min\{\deg_x(\alpha - \beta) | \alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)\}.$$  

Write

$$\beta = \sum_{j > \delta_\beta} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{\delta_\beta} + \sum_{j < \delta_\beta} a_j x^j$$

Then $\tau := \sum_{j > \delta_\beta} a_j x^j + \pi x^{\delta_\beta}$ is a $\pi$-root of $P$. Since $0 < |D_\tau^P| = |D_\beta^P| - 1$, by Remark 3.6 we know that $\lambda_{D_\tau^P}^2 \geq 0$. Take $\alpha \in D_\beta^P$ and let $\tau_1$ be the final $\pi$-root of $P$ associated with $\alpha$. We have $\delta_\alpha \leq \delta_\beta$ (since $\delta_\beta \leq \delta_\alpha$ implies $|D_\beta^P| = 1$), hence $\lambda_{\tau_1} \leq \lambda_\tau$ and so $\lambda_{\tau_1}^2 = 0$ if and only if $\tau = \tau_1$ is a final minor $\pi$-root of $P$.

We claim that $\lambda_{\tau_1}^2 = \deg_x(P(\beta))$. In fact, $f_{P_x, \tau}(\lambda) \neq 0$ since otherwise, by Proposition 2.9, there exists $j_1 < \delta_\beta$ such that the $\pi$-approximation of $\beta$ up to $j_1$ is a $\pi$-root of $P$, contradicting the minimality of $\delta_\beta$. Hence, by Proposition 2.13 we have $\deg_x(P(\beta)) = \lambda_{\tau_1}^2 \geq 0$. Hence, if $\deg_x(P(\beta)) = 0$, then $\beta \in D_\tau^P$ and $\tau \in P_m$. On the other hand, if $\beta \in D_{\tau_2}^P$ for some $\tau_2 \in P_m$, then $\delta_{\beta} \leq \delta_{\tau_2}$, hence $0 \leq \lambda_\tau \leq \lambda_{\tau_2} = 0$, and so $0 = \lambda_{\tau_2}^2 = \deg_x(P(\beta))$, as desired.

(4) Let $\tau := \sum_{j > \delta_\alpha} a_j x^j + \pi x^{\delta_\alpha}$ be the minor final $\pi$-root of $P$ associated with $\alpha$. Write

$$\alpha = \sum_{j > \delta_\alpha} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{\delta_\alpha} + \sum_{j < \delta_\alpha} a_j x^j$$

Since $f_{P_x, \tau}(\lambda) = 0$ and $f_{P_x, \tau}$ has no multiple roots, we have $f_{P_x, \tau}(\lambda) \neq 0$. But by item (1) we have $f_{P_x, \tau} = f_{P_x, \tau'}$ and so, by Proposition 2.13, we obtain $\lambda_{\tau_1}^{P_y} = \deg_x(P_y(\tau)) = \deg_x(P_y(\alpha))$. Using again item (1) we have $\lambda_{\tau_1}^{P_y} = \lambda_\tau - \sigma/\rho$, and since $\lambda_\tau = 0$, the result follows immediately.
(5) Write \( \tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{h_0} \) and let \( \beta \in D^P_{\tau} \). Write
\[
\beta = \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{h_0} + \sum_{j < j_0} a_j x^j.
\]

Since by Corollary 2.10 we know that \( f_{P_y, \tau}(\lambda) = 0 \), and \( f_{P_y, \tau} \) is coprime with \( f_{Q_y, \tau} \), we have \( f_{Q_y, \tau}(\lambda) \neq 0 \). Hence, by Proposition 2.13, we obtain \( \lambda_{Q_y} = \deg_x(Q_y(\tau)) = \deg_x(Q_y(\beta)) \) and by item (1) we have \( \lambda^Q_{\tau} = \lambda^Q - \sigma/\rho \), and since \( \lambda^Q \neq 0 \), the result follows immediately.

(6) Write \( \tau := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \pi x^{h_0} \). Let \( \lambda \in K \) such that \( f_{Q_y, \tau}(\lambda) = 0 = f_{P_y, \tau}(\lambda) \). By Proposition 2.9 there exist \( j_1, j_2 < j_0 \) such that \( \tau_1 := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{h_0} + \pi x^{j_1} \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( P_y \) and \( \tau_2 := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{h_0} + \pi x^{j_2} \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q_y \). Take \( j_3 := \max\{j_1, j_2\} \) and so \( \tau_3 := \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{h_0} + \pi x^{j_3} \) is a \( \pi \)-root of \( Q_y \) and \( P_y \). Take \( \beta \in D^P_{\tau_3} \). Then
\[
\beta = \sum_{j > j_0} a_j x^j + \lambda x^{h_0} + \sum_{j < j_0} a_j x^j,
\]
and set \( T := \lambda x^{h_0} + \sum_{j < j_0} a_j x^j \). Then
\[
Q_y(\beta) = ev_{y=\tau}(\varphi_\tau(Q_y)) = ev_{y=\lambda x^{h_0}}(f_{P_y, \rho}(\varphi_\tau(Q_y))) + R = x^{\lambda^Q_{\tau}} f_{Q_y, \tau}(\lambda) + R
\]
for some \( R \) with \( v_{\rho, \sigma}(R) < v_{\rho, \sigma}(\varphi_\tau(Q_y)) \). Since \( f_{Q_y, \tau}(\lambda) = 0 \), we obtain
\[
\rho \deg_x(Q_y(\beta)) = v_{\rho, \sigma}(Q_y(\beta)) < \rho \lambda^Q_{\tau}.
\]
Since by item (1) we know that \( \lambda^Q_{\tau} = \lambda^Q - \sigma/\rho \), and since \( \lambda^Q = 0 \) we have
\[
\deg_x(Q_y(\beta)) < -\sigma/\rho,
\]
as desired. \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.24.** For any \( \alpha \in K((x^{-1/l})) \) we have
\[
Q_y(\alpha) \frac{d}{dx} P(\alpha) - P_y(\alpha) \frac{d}{dx} Q(\alpha) \in K^\times
\]

**Proof.** \( \square \)

**Theorem 3.25.** Set \( I_m = 1 - \sum_{\tau \in P_m} (\delta_\tau + 1) \). Then \( I_m \leq I(P, Q) \). We also have
\[
I(P, P_y Q) = \deg(P) - \sum_{\tau \in P_m} |D^P_\tau|(1 + \delta_\tau).
\]

**Proof.** It suffices to prove (3.15) and
\[
I(P, P_y) \leq \deg(P) - 1 - \sum_{\tau \in P_m} (|D^P_\tau| - 1)(\delta_\tau + 1).
\]

In fact, equalities (3.15) and (3.16) yield
\[
I(P, Q) = I(P, P_y Q) - I(P, P_y) = 1 - \sum_{\tau \in P_m} (\delta_\tau + 1),
\]
as desired. Proof of equality (3.15). By Lemma 3.24, for each \( \alpha \in R(P) \) we have \( P_y(\alpha) \frac{d}{dx} Q(\alpha) \in K^\times \). Moreover, by Lemma 3.23(2), if \( \alpha \) is a major root, then \( \deg_x(P_y(\alpha) Q(\alpha)) = 1 \). On the other hand, if \( \alpha \) is a minor root, then by Proposition 3.13(1a), Lemma 3.14 and Lemma 3.23(4), we have
\[
\deg_x(P_y(\alpha) Q(\alpha)) = \deg_x(P_y(\alpha)) = -\delta_\alpha = -\delta_\tau,
\]
where $\tau$ is the minor final $\pi$-root associated with $\alpha$. Using this facts we obtain

$$I(P, P_y Q) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(P)} \deg_x(P_y(\alpha)Q(\alpha))$$

$$= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} \sum_{\alpha \in D^P_{\tau}} \deg_x(P_y(\alpha)Q(\alpha)) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} \sum_{\beta \in D^P_{\tau}} \deg_x(P_y(\beta)Q(\beta))$$

$$= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} |D^P_{\tau}|(-\delta_{\tau}) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} |P_{\tau}| - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} |D^P_{\tau}|$$

$$= \deg(P) - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} |D^P_{\tau}|(1 + \delta_{\tau}),$$

where the first equality is obtained as in the proof of Theorem 3.15.

Proof of inequality (3.16). By Lemma 3.24, for each $\beta \in \mathcal{R}(P_y)$, we have $Q_y(\beta)\frac{d}{d\beta}P(\beta) \in K^\times$. Define

$$P_{y,m} := \{ \beta \in \mathcal{R}(P_y) : \text{there exists a minor final $\pi$-root $\tau$ of $P$, such that $\beta \in D^P_{\tau}$} \}.$$ Then, by Lemma 3.23(3), if $\beta$ is not in $P_{y,m}$, then $\deg_x(Q_y(\beta)P(\beta)) = 1$. On the other hand, if $\beta$ is in $P_{y,m}$, then by items (3), (5) and (6) of Lemma 3.23, we have

$$\deg_x(P(\beta)Q_y(\beta)) = \deg_x(Q_y(\beta)) \leq -\delta_{\tau},$$

where $\tau$ is the minor final $\pi$-root associated with $\beta$. Using this facts we obtain

$$I(P_y, PQ_y) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{R}(P_y)} \deg_x(P(\beta)Q_y(\beta))$$

$$= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} \sum_{\beta \in D^P_{\tau}} \deg_x(P(\beta)Q_y(\beta)) + \sum_{\beta \in P_{y,m}} \deg_x(P(\beta)Q_y(\beta))$$

$$\leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} |D^P_{\tau}|(-\delta_{\tau}) + \deg(P_y) - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} |D^P_{\tau}|$$

$$= \deg(P) - 1 - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} |D^P_{\tau}|(1 + \delta_{\tau})$$

$$= \deg(P) - 1 - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{P}_m} (|D^P_{\tau}| - 1)(1 + \delta_{\tau}).$$

Since, by the Jacobian condition,

$$\text{Res}_{y}(P_y, Q_y) \text{Res}_{y}(P_y, P_x) = \text{Res}_{y}(P_y, Q_y P_x) = \prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{R}(P_y)} Q_y(\beta)P_x(\beta) = 1,$$

we have $I(P_y, Q_y) = 0$, and so (3.17) yields inequality (3.16). \qed
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