MACLANE-VAQUIÉ CHAINS OF VALUATIONS ON A POLYNOMIAL RING

ENRIC NART

Abstract. Let \((K, \nu)\) be a valued field. We review some results of MacLane and Vaquié on extensions of \(\nu\) to valuations on the polynomial ring \(K[x]\). We introduce certain MacLane-Vaquié chains of residually transcendental valuations, and we prove that every valuation \(\mu\) on \(K[x]\) is a limit of a finite or countably infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain. This chain underlying \(\mu\) is essentially unique and contains arithmetic data yielding an explicit description of the graded algebra of \(\mu\) as an algebra over the graded algebra of \(\nu\).

Introduction

Let \((K, \nu)\) be a valued field. In a pioneering work, S. MacLane studied the extensions of the valuation \(\nu\) to the polynomial ring \(K[x]\) in one indeterminate, in the case \(\nu\) discrete of rank one [3, 4].

MacLane proved that all extensions of \(\nu\) to \(K[x]\) can be obtained as a certain limit of chains of augmented valuations:

\[
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_{i-1}, \gamma_{i-1}} \mu_i \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} \mu_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\cdots}
\]

involving the choice of certain key polynomials \(\phi_i \in K[x]\) and elements \(\gamma_i\) belonging to some extension of the ordered group of \(\nu\).

M. Vaquié generalized MacLane’s theory to arbitrary valued fields [7], although he assumed finite rank for certain auxiliary results. In order to deal with non-discrete cases, Vaquié introduced a new process of limit-augmentation of valuations. Also, he used the graded algebra \(G_\mu\) attached to a valuation \(\mu\) on \(K[x]\) as a crucial tool for a proper resolution of the problem.

A different approach to this problem was developed by F.J. Herrera Govantes, W. Mahboub, M.A. Olalla Acosta and M. Spivakovsky [1, 2].

This paper surveys the main result of MacLane-Vaquié without assuming any restriction on the rank of the valuations.

We consider MacLane-Vaquié chains of mixed augmentations, in which each node is either an ordinary or a limit-augmentation of the previous node, and satisfies certain technical condition (Definition 4.5). A MacLane-Vaquié chain is complete if the initial valuation \(\mu_0\) admits key polynomials of degree one.

The main result, Theorem 4.8, states that any valuation \(\mu\) on \(K[x]\) falls in one, and only one, of the following cases.
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(1) It is the last valuation of a complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chain.

\[ \mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r = \mu. \]

(2) It is the stable limit, \( \mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \rho_i \), of a continuous countably infinite chain of ordinary augmentations of the last valuation \( \mu_r \) of some complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chain:

\[ \mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_r} \mu_r = \rho_0 \longrightarrow (\rho_i)_{i \geq 1}. \]

(3) It is the stable limit, \( \mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mu_i \), of a complete countably infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain.

\[ \mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} \mu_i \longrightarrow \cdots \]

We say that \( \mu \) has finite depth \( r \), quasi-finite depth \( r \), or infinite depth, respectively.

This reinterpretation of the MacLane-Vaquié theorem leads to some original results.

In section 5, we prove that, in each case, the underlying MacLane-Vaquié chain of \( \mu \) is essentially unique (Theorems 5.8, 5.10, 5.11). In particular, the depth of \( \mu \) is an intrinsic datum.

The results of this section yield an explicit description of the totally ordered set

\[ (-\infty, \mu)_{\Lambda} = \{ \rho : K[x] \to \Lambda_{\infty} \mid \rho \text{ valuation, } \rho < \mu \}, \]

for any embedding of the group of values of \( \mu \) into some ordered group \( \Lambda \).

In section 6, we obtain an explicit description of the structure of the graded algebra \( G_{\mu} \), as an algebra over the graded algebra \( G_v \), in terms of arithmetic data supported by the underlying MacLane-Vaquié chain of \( \mu \).

Finally, in section 7, we obtain a short proof of another result of Vaquié [8]. If \( \mu \) has non-trivial support, it yields an extension of \( v \) to a finite field extension \( L/K \). If \( (K, v) \) is henselian, the defect of \( \mu/v \) can be computed in terms of some data of the MacLane-Vaquié chain underlying \( \mu \).

1. **Key polynomials over valued fields**

Let \( (K, v) \) be a valued field, and denote by

\[ m \subset \mathcal{O} \subset K, \quad k = \mathcal{O}/m \]

the maximal ideal, valuation ring and residue class field of the valuation \( v \).

Let \( \Gamma = v(K^*) \) be the value group, and denote \( \Gamma_{\mathbb{Q}} = \Gamma \otimes \mathbb{Q} \) the divisible hull of \( \Gamma \).

Consider an extension of \( v \) to the polynomial ring \( K[x] \) in one indeterminate. That is, for some embedding \( \Gamma \hookrightarrow \Lambda \) into another ordered abelian group, we consider a mapping

\[ \mu : K[x] \to \Lambda_{\infty} \]

whose restriction to \( K \) is \( v \), and satisfies the following two conditions:

1. \( \mu(fg) = \mu(f) + \mu(g), \quad \forall f, g \in K[x]. \)
2. \( \mu(f + g) \geq \min\{\mu(f), \mu(g)\}, \quad \forall f, g \in K[x]. \)

The **support** of \( \mu \) is the prime ideal

\[ p = p_{\mu} = \mu^{-1}(\infty) \in \text{Spec}(K[x]). \]
The value group of $\mu$ is the subgroup $\Gamma_\mu \subset \Lambda$ generated by $\mu(K[x] \setminus \mathfrak{p})$.

The valuation $\mu$ induces a valuation on the residue field $K(\mathfrak{p})$, field of fractions of $K[x]/\mathfrak{p}$. Denote the maximal ideal, valuation ring and residue class field of this valuation on $K(\mathfrak{p})$, by

$$m_\mu \subset O_\mu \subset K(\mathfrak{p}), \quad k_\mu = O_\mu/m_\mu.$$  

Note that $K(0) = K(x)$, while for $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$ the field $K(\mathfrak{p})$ is a monogene finite extension of $K$. Thus, $\mu$ represents an extension of $v$ to a monogene field extension $K(\theta)/K$, where $\theta$ may be algebraic or transcendental over $K$.

The extension $\mu/v$ is commensurable if $\Gamma_\mu/\Gamma$ is a torsion group. In this case, there is a canonical embedding

$$\Gamma_\mu \hookrightarrow \Gamma_\mathbb{Q}.$$  

All valuations with non-trivial support are commensurable over $v$.

1.1. Graded algebra of a valuation. Let $\mu$ be a valuation on an integral domain $A$. For any $\alpha \in \Gamma_\mu$, consider the abelian groups:

$$P_\alpha = \{ g \in A \mid \mu(g) \geq \alpha \} \supset P_\alpha^+ = \{ g \in A \mid \mu(g) > \alpha \}.$$  

The graded algebra of $\mu$ is the integral domain:

$$\text{gr}_\mu(A) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Gamma_\mu} P_\alpha/P_\alpha^+.$$  

There is a natural initial term mapping $H_\mu: A \to \text{gr}_\mu(A)$, given by $H_\mu(0) = 0$ and

$$H_\mu(g) = g + P_{\mu(g)}^+ \in P_{\mu(g)}/P_{\mu(g)}^+,$$

if $g \neq 0$. For all $g, h \in K[x]$ we have $H_\mu(gh) = H_\mu(g)H_\mu(h)$ and

$$H_\mu(g + h) = H_\mu(g) + H_\mu(h), \quad \text{if} \quad \mu(g) = \mu(h) = \mu(g + h).$$

The next definitions translate properties of the action of $\mu$ on $A$ into algebraic relationships in the graded algebra $\text{gr}_\mu(A)$.

**Definition 1.1.** Let $g, h \in A$.

We say that $g, h$ are $\mu$-equivalent, and we write $g \sim_\mu h$, if $H_\mu(g) = H_\mu(h)$.

We say that $g$ is $\mu$-divisible by $h$, and we write $h \mid_\mu g$, if $H_\mu(h) \mid H_\mu(g)$ in $\text{gr}_\mu(A)$.

1.2. Key polynomials. Consider a valuation $\mu$ on $K[x]$, extending $v$.

There is a natural embedding of graded algebras

$$G_v := \text{gr}_v(K) \hookrightarrow G_\mu := \text{gr}_\mu(K[x]).$$

If $\mu$ has non-trivial support $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$, there is a natural isomorphism of graded algebras

$$(1) \quad G_\mu = \text{gr}_\mu(K[x]) \simeq \text{gr}_\mu(K(\mathfrak{p})),$$

where $\bar{\mu}$ is the valuation on $K(\mathfrak{p})$ induced by $\mu$.

In particular, every non-zero homogeneous element of $G_\mu$ is a unit, if $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$.

**Definition 1.2.** Let $g, h \in K[x]$.

We say that $g$ is $\mu$-irreducible if $H_\mu(g)G_\mu$ is a non-zero prime ideal.

We say that $g$ is $\mu$-minimal if $g \nmid_\mu f$ for all non-zero $f \in K[x]$ with $\deg(f) < \deg(g)$.

The property of $\mu$-minimality admits a relevant characterization.
Lemma 1.3. [6, Prop. 2.3] Let $\phi \in K[x]$ be a non-constant polynomial. Let

$$f = \sum_{0 \leq s} a_s \phi^s, \quad a_s \in K[x], \quad \deg(a_s) < \deg(\phi)$$

be the canonical $\phi$-expansion of $f \in K[x]$. Then, $\phi$ is $\mu$-minimal if and only if

$$\mu(f) = \min\{\mu(a_s \phi^s) \mid 0 \leq s\}, \quad \forall f \in K[x].$$

In this case, $\phi \not|_\mu f$ if and only if $\mu(f) = \mu(f_0)$.

Definition 1.4. A MacLane-Vaqué key polynomial for $\mu$ is a monic polynomial in $K[x]$ which is simultaneously $\mu$-minimal and $\mu$-irreducible.

A key polynomial is necessarily irreducible in $K[x]$.

The set of key polynomials for $\mu$ is denoted $\text{KP}(\mu)$.

For any $\phi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$, we denote by $[\phi]_\mu \subset \text{KP}(\mu)$ the subset of all key polynomials which are $\mu$-equivalent to $\phi$.

If $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$, the degree $\deg(\mu)$ is the minimal degree of a key polynomial for $\mu$.

By the isomorphism of (1), only valuations with trivial support may have key polynomials.

Lemma 1.5. [6, Lem. 2.5, Prop. 6.6] Let $\phi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$, and let $\chi \in K[x]$ be a monic polynomial such that $\phi |_\mu \chi$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:

1. $\deg(\chi) = \deg(\phi)$.
2. $\chi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$.

Moreover, if these conditions are satisfied, then $\phi \sim_\mu \chi$.

Lemma 1.6. [6, Prop. 3.5] If $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$, a non-zero homogeneous element $H_\mu(f)$ is a unit in $\mathcal{G}_\mu$ if and only if $f \sim_\mu a$, for some $a \in K[x]$ with $\deg(a) < \deg(\mu)$.

In this case, $H_\mu(f)$ is algebraic over $\mathcal{G}_\nu$ and $\mu(f)$ belongs to $\Gamma_\mathbb{Q}$.

Theorem 1.7. [6, Thm. 3.9] Let $\phi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$. For any monic $f \in K[x] \setminus K$, we have

$$\mu(f)/\deg(f) \leq \mu(\phi)/\deg(\phi),$$

and equality holds if and only if $f$ is $\mu$-minimal.

Definition 1.8. A key polynomial $\chi$ for $\mu$ is said to be proper if there exists some $\phi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$ of minimal degree such that $\chi \not\sim_\mu \phi$.

For any positive integer $m$, consider the subset

$$\Gamma_{\mu,m} = \{\mu(a) \mid 0 \leq \deg(a) < m\} \subset \Gamma_\mu.$$

Lemma 1.9. [6, Lem. 2.11, Cor. 6.4] For any key polynomial $\chi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$, the subset $\Gamma_{\mu,\deg(\chi)}$ is a subgroup of $\Gamma_\mu$ and $\langle \Gamma_{\mu,\deg(\chi)}, \mu(\chi) \rangle = \Gamma_\mu$.

Moreover, if $\chi$ is a proper key polynomial, then $\Gamma_{\mu,\deg(\chi)} = \Gamma_\mu$.

1.3. Description of $\text{KP}(\mu)$. Consider the subring of homogeneous elements of degree zero

$$\Delta = \Delta_\mu = \mathcal{P}_0/\mathcal{P}_0^+ \subset \mathcal{G}_\mu.$$

There are canonical injective ring homomorphisms:

$$k \hookrightarrow \Delta \hookrightarrow k_\mu.$$
Notation. For any commutative ring $A$ we denote by $A^*$ the multiplicative group of the units of $A$. We denote the algebraic closure of $k$ in $\Delta$ by

$$\kappa = \kappa(\mu) \subset \Delta.$$ 

This is a subfield such that $\kappa^* = \Delta^*$.

Theorem 1.10. [6, Thm. 4.4] The set $\text{KP}(\mu)$ is empty if and only if all homogeneous elements in $G_\mu$ are units. Equivalently, $\mu/v$ is commensurable and $\kappa = \Delta = k_\mu$ is an algebraic extension of $k$.

Theorem 1.11. [6, Thm. 4.2] Suppose $\mu/v$ incommensurable. Let $\phi \in K[x]$ be a monic polynomial of minimal degree satisfying $\mu(\phi) \notin \Gamma_Q$. Then, $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$, and $\text{KP}(\mu) = [\phi]_\mu$. In particular, all key polynomials for $\mu$ are improper.

In this case, $\kappa = \Delta = k_\mu$ is a finite extension of $k$.

Definition 1.12. If $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$, the relative ramification index of $\mu$ is defined as:

$$e := e_{\text{rel}}(\mu) := (\Gamma_\mu : \Gamma_{\mu, \deg(\mu)}).$$

By Lemma 1.6 $\Gamma_{\mu, \deg(\mu)} \subset \Gamma_Q$. Hence, if $\mu/v$ is incommensurable, Theorem 1.11 shows that $e = \infty$.

If $\mu/v$ is commensurable, Lemma 1.12 shows that $e$ is the least positive integer such that $e\mu(\phi) \in \Gamma_{\mu, \deg(\mu)}$, where $\phi$ is any key polynomial for $\mu$ of minimal degree.

Theorem 1.13. [6, Thms. 4.5, 4.6] Suppose $\mu/v$ commensurable and $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in K[x]$ be any polynomial of degree less than $m$ with $\mu(a) = e\mu(\phi)$, and let $u = H_\mu(a) \in G^*_\mu$. Then,

$$\xi = H_\mu(\phi)^e u^{-1} \in \Delta$$

is transcendental over $k$ and satisfies $\Delta = \kappa[\xi]$.

Moreover, the canonical embedding $\Delta \hookrightarrow k_\mu$ induces an isomorphism $\kappa(\xi) \simeq k_\mu$.

These comensurable extensions $\mu/v$ admitting key polynomials are called residually transcendental valuations on $K[x]$.

The pair $\phi, u$ determines a (non-canonical) residual polynomial operator

$$R = R_{\mu, \phi, u} : K[x] \rightarrow \kappa[y],$$

whose images are monic polynomials in the indeterminate $y$ [6, Sec. 5].

This operator yields a factorisation, up to units, of any homogeneous element $H_\mu(f) \in G_\mu$ as a power of the prime element $q = H_\mu(\phi)$, times an element $R(f)(\xi) \in \Delta$ of degree zero [6, Thm. 5.3]:

$$H_\mu(f) = eq^s R(f)(\xi), \quad s = \text{ord}_q H_\mu(f), \quad e \in G^*_\mu.$$

Theorem 1.14. [6, Prop. 6.3] Suppose that $\mu/v$ is commensurable and $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\phi$ be a key polynomial for $\mu$ of minimal degree $m$. A monic $\chi \in K[x]$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$ if and only if either

1. $\deg(\chi) = m$ and $\chi \sim_\mu \phi$, or
2. $\deg(\chi) = me \deg(R(\chi))$ and $R(\chi)$ is irreducible in $\kappa[y]$.

Moreover, two key polynomials $\chi, \chi'$ are $\mu$-equivalent if and only if $R(\chi) = R(\chi')$. 

1.4. Depth zero valuations.

**Definition 1.15.** Let $\Gamma \hookrightarrow \Lambda$ be an embedding of ordered groups. Let $\phi_0 = x + a \in K[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree one, and let $\gamma_0 \in \Lambda_{\infty}$.

Consider the valuation $\mu = \mu(\phi_0, \gamma_0)$ on $K[x]$ defined as

$$\mu \left( \sum_{0 \leq s} a_s (x + a)^s \right) = \text{Min} \left\{ v(a_s) + s\gamma_0 \mid 0 \leq s \right\}.$$

We say that $\mu$ is a depth zero valuation.

If $\gamma_0 < \infty$, the polynomial $\phi_0$ is a key polynomial for $\mu_0$. It is easy to check that

$$(3) \quad \mu(x + a, \gamma) = \mu(x + a, \gamma_* ) \iff v(a - a_*) \geq \gamma = \gamma_* .$$

2. Ordinary augmentation of valuations.

Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $K[x]$ extending the valuation $v$ on $K$.

Let $\Gamma \mu \hookrightarrow \Lambda$ be an embedding of ordered groups, and let us identify $\Gamma \mu$ with its image in $\Lambda$. Consider a $\Lambda$-valued valuation whose restriction to $K$ coincides with $v$,

$$\mu' : K[x] \rightarrow \Lambda_{\infty}.$$ We say that $\mu \leq \mu'$ if

$$\mu(f) \leq \mu'(f), \quad \forall f \in K[x].$$

In this case, there is a canonical homomorphism of graded $\Gamma_v$-algebras:

$$G_{\mu} \rightarrow G_{\mu'}.$$ For all non-zero $f \in K[x]$, this homomorphism assigns

$$H_{\mu}(f) \mapsto \begin{cases} H_{\mu'}(f), & \text{if } \mu(f) = \mu'(f), \\ 0, & \text{if } \mu(f) < \mu'(f). \end{cases}$$

**Definition 2.1.** We say that $\mu$ is maximal if it admits no proper enlargements. In other words, $\mu \leq \mu'$ implies $\mu = \mu'$.

The next observation is well known. It follows from Propositions 2.4 and 2.5.

**Lemma 2.2.** A valuation $\mu$ is maximal if and only if $\text{KP}(\mu) = \emptyset$.

Suppose that $\mu$ is not maximal. MacLane defined a concrete augmentation procedure, based on the choice of an arbitrary key polynomial $\phi$ for $\mu$, to which we may assign an arbitrary value $\gamma > \mu(\phi)$ [3].

**Definition 2.3.** Take $\phi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$. Let $\Gamma_\mu \hookrightarrow \Lambda$ be an embedding of ordered groups, and choose $\gamma \in \Lambda_{\infty}$ such that $\mu(\phi) < \gamma$.

The augmented valuation of $\mu$ with respect to these data is the mapping

$$\mu' : K[x] \rightarrow \Lambda_{\infty}$$

assigning to any $f \in K[x]$, with canonical $\phi$-expansion $f = \sum_{0 \leq s} f_s \phi^s$, the value

$$\mu'(f) = \text{Min}\{ \mu(f_s) + s\gamma \mid 0 \leq s \}.$$ We use the notation $\mu' = [\mu; \phi, \gamma]$. Note that $\mu'(\phi) = \gamma$.

The following proposition is extracted from [7, sec. 1.1] and [6, sec. 7].
Proposition 2.4.
(1) The mapping $\mu' = [\mu, \phi, \gamma]$ is a valuation on $K[x]$. If $\gamma < \infty$, it has trivial support. If $\gamma = \infty$, the support is $\phi K[x]$.
(2) It satisfies $\mu \leq \mu'$. Moreover, for a non-zero $f \in K[x]$, we have $\mu(f) = \mu'(f) \iff \phi \nmid \mu f$.

In this case, $H_{\mu'}(f)$ is a unit in $G_{\mu'}$.
(3) If $\gamma < \infty$, then $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu'$, of minimal degree.
(4) If $\phi$ is a proper key polynomial for $\mu$, then

$$\Gamma_{\mu'} = \begin{cases} \langle \Gamma_\mu, \gamma \rangle, & \text{if } \gamma < \infty, \\ \Gamma_\mu, & \text{if } \gamma = \infty. \end{cases}$$

The next proposition plays a crucial role. A proof may be found in [7, Thm. 1.15].

Proposition 2.5. Let $\mu, \mu^*$ be two extensions of $v$ to $K[x]$, taking values into a common ordered group. Suppose that $\mu < \mu^*$, and let $\phi \in K[x]$ be a monic polynomial with minimal degree satisfying $\mu(\phi) < \mu^*(\phi)$. Then, $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$ and $\mu < [\mu; \phi, \mu^*(\phi)] \leq \mu^*$.

For any non-zero $f \in K[x]$, the equality $\mu(f) = \mu^*(f)$ holds if and only if $\phi \nmid \mu f$.

Corollary 2.6. If $\mu < \mu^*$, let $\Phi_{\mu, \mu^*} \subset \text{KP}(\mu)$ be the subset of monic polynomials $\phi$ of minimal degree satisfying $\mu(\phi) < \mu^*(\phi)$. Then, $\Phi_{\mu, \mu^*} = [\phi]_{\mu}$, for any $\phi \in \Phi_{\mu, \mu^*}$.

This class of key polynomials for $\mu$ is unchanged by further augmentations of $\mu^*$:

$$\mu < \mu^* \leq \tilde{\mu} \implies \Phi_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}} = \Phi_{\mu, \mu^*}.$$  

Proof. For any $\phi \in \Phi_{\mu, \mu^*}$, $\chi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$, Proposition 2.5 and Lemma 1.5 show that

$$\chi \in \Phi_{\mu, \mu^*} \iff \phi \mid_\mu \chi \iff \chi \sim_\mu \phi.$$ 

If $\mu < \mu^* < \tilde{\mu}$, let $\Phi_{\mu, \mu^*} = [\phi]_{\mu}$, $\Phi_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}} = [\chi]_{\mu}$. Since

$$\mu(\phi) < \mu^*(\phi) \leq \tilde{\mu}(\phi),$$

Proposition 2.5 shows that $\chi \mid_\mu \phi$. Thus, $\chi \sim_\mu \phi$, by Lemma 1.5.

Corollary 2.7. Suppose that $\mu < \mu^*$, and let $\Phi_{\mu, \mu^*} = [\phi]_{\mu}$. Then,

(1) The kernel of the homomorphism $G_\mu \to G_{\mu^*}$ is the prime ideal $H_\mu(\phi)G_{\mu}$.
(2) All non-zero homogeneous elements in the image of $G_\mu \to G_{\mu^*}$ are units.
(3) If $\text{KP}(\mu^*) \neq \emptyset$, then $\deg(\mu) \leq \deg(\mu^*)$.

Proof. Let $\rho = [\mu; \phi, \mu^*(\phi)]$, and let $H_\mu(f)$ be an homogeneous element in $G_{\mu}$.

This element is mapped to zero in $G_{\mu^*}$ if and only if $\mu(f) < \mu^*(f)$, and this is equivalent to $\phi \mid_\mu f$ by Proposition 2.5. This proves (1).

By Proposition 2.5, $\mu < \rho \leq \mu^*$, and $G_\mu \to G_{\mu^*}$ is the composition of the canonical homomorphisms $G_\mu \to G_\rho \to G_{\mu^*}$.

The element $H_\mu(f)$ is not mapped to zero in $G_{\mu^*}$ if and only if $\mu(f) = \rho(f) = \mu^*(f)$, and this is equivalent to $\phi \mid_\mu f$ by Proposition 2.5. In this case, the image of $H_\mu(f)$ under the composition $G_\mu \to G_\rho \to G_{\mu^*}$ is

$$H_\mu(f) \hookrightarrow H_\rho(f) \hookrightarrow H_{\mu^*}(f).$$
By Proposition 2.4, $H_{\rho}(f)$ is a unit in $G_\rho$. Thus, $H_{\mu^*}(f)$ is a unit. This proves (2).

Since $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$, we have $\deg(\mu) \leq m := \deg(\rho)$.

By the minimality of $m$, any non-zero $a \in K[x]$ with $\deg(a) < m$ has $\mu(a) = \mu^*(a)$. Thus, $H_{\mu^*}(a)$ is a unit in $G_{\mu^*}$ by item (2), and $a$ cannot be a key polynomial for $\mu^*$. Therefore, $m \leq \deg(\mu^*)$ if $\text{KP}(\mu^*) \neq \emptyset$. This proves (3). \qed

We end this section with another relevant consequence of Proposition 2.5.

**Theorem 2.8.** Let $\mu: K[x] \to \Lambda\infty$ be a valuation extending $\nu$. The set

$$(-\infty, \mu)_\Lambda = \{\rho: K[x] \to \Lambda\infty \mid \rho \text{ valuation extending } \nu, \rho < \mu\}$$

is totally ordered.

This result is proved in [5, Thm. 3.9] for the group $\Lambda = \Gamma_\mathbb{Q}$, but the proof is valid for any ordered group $\Lambda$.

### 3. LIMIT AUGMENTATIONS

**Lemma 3.1.** Consider a countably infinite chain of ordinary augmentations

$$(4) \quad \rho_0 \xrightarrow{\chi_1, \beta_1} \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\chi_2, \beta_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{} \rho_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\chi_i, \beta_i} \rho_i \xrightarrow{} \cdots$$

If $\rho_i(f) = \rho_{i+1}(f)$ for some $f \in K[x]$, $i \geq 0$, then $\rho_j(f) = \rho_i(f)$ for all $j \geq i$.

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.4, $H_{\rho_{i+1}}(f)$ is a unit in $G_{\rho_{i+1}}$. Hence, $\chi_{i+2} \notin \rho_{i+1} f$, and Proposition 2.4 shows that $\rho_{i+1}(f) = \rho_{i+2}(f)$. The argument may be iterated. \qed

**Definition 3.2.** Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $K[x]$ with trivial support.

A continuous MacLane chain of $\mu$ (abbreviated ML-chain) is an infinite chain of augmentations as in (4) satisfying the following conditions.

1. $\mu = \rho_0$.
2. The key polynomials $\chi_i$ have the same degree for all $i \geq 1$.
3. $\chi_1$ is a proper key polynomial for $\mu = \rho_0$.
4. $\chi_{i+1} \notin \rho_i \chi_i, \quad \forall i \geq 1$.

The constant number $m = \deg(\chi_i)$, for all $i \geq 1$, is called the stable degree of the continuous MacLane chain.

For all $i \geq 1$, $\chi_i$ is a key polynomial for $\rho_i$ of minimal degree by Proposition 2.4 and a proper key polynomial for $\rho_{i-1}$ by conditions (3) and (4).

A polynomial $f \in K[x]$ is stable (with respect to the given continuous ML-chain) if there exists $i \geq 0$ such that $\rho_i(f) = \rho_{i+1}(f)$. By Lemma 3.1, $\rho_i(f) = \rho_j(f)$ for all $j \geq i$. We denote by $\mu_\infty(f)$ this stable value of $f$.

We say that $\mu_\infty$ is the stability function of the continuous ML-chain. This function depends on the continuous ML-chain, and not only on $\mu$.

**Lemma 3.3.** Consider a continuous MacLane chain of $\mu$ with stable degree $m$.

1. For all $i \geq 0$, $\Gamma_{\rho_i} = \Gamma_{\mu}$.
2. All polynomials of degree less than $m$ are stable.
3. $\Gamma_{\mu}$ coincides with the set of stable values of all stable polynomials.
4. All key polynomials $\chi_i$ are stable.
Proof. By Lemma \ref{lem:gamma}, $\Gamma_{\beta_i, m} = \Gamma_{\beta_i}$, for all $i \geq 0$. Also, $\Gamma_{\beta_i, m} = \Gamma_{\beta_{i-1}, m}$ for all $i \geq 1$, by Proposition \ref{prop:gamma}. Therefore, for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\beta_i = \rho_i(\chi_i) \in \Gamma_{\beta_i} = \Gamma_{\beta_i, m} = \Gamma_{\beta_{i-1}, m},$$

so that $\Gamma_{\beta_i} = \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{i-1}, m}, \beta_i \rangle = \Gamma_{\beta_{i-1}, m} = \Gamma_{\beta_i}$. Hence, $\Gamma_{\beta_i} = \Gamma_{\mu}$, for all $i \geq 0$.

Any $a \in K[x]$ with $0 \leq \deg(a) < m$ satisfies $\rho_0(a) = \rho_1(a)$ by Proposition \ref{prop:gamma} since $\chi_1 \not\mid \rho_0 a$. Thus, the group $\Gamma_{\mu} = \Gamma_{\mu, m}$ contains only stable values of stable polynomials. Conversely, every stable value of a stable polynomial belongs to some $\Gamma_{\beta_i} = \Gamma_{\mu}$.

Finally, $\rho_i(\chi_i) = \rho_{i+1}(\chi_i)$ for all $i \geq 1$ by Proposition \ref{prop:gamma} since $\chi_{i+1} \not\mid \rho_i \chi_i$. \hfill $\Box$

Definition 3.4. If all polynomials in $K[x]$ are stable, then $\mu_\infty$ is a valuation on $K[x]$ with trivial support. We say that

$$\mu_\infty = \lim_{i \to \infty} \rho_i$$

is the stable limit of the continuous ML-chain.

Hypothesis. We assume from now on that $(\rho_i; \chi_i, \beta_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is a continuous ML-chain of $\mu = \rho_0$, admitting non-stable polynomials.

We denote by $m = \deg(\chi_i)$, $i \geq 1$, the stable degree of the continuous ML-chain.

Let us fix a monic non-stable $\phi \in K[x]$, having minimal degree among all non-stable polynomials. By Lemma \ref{lem:deg}, $\deg(\phi) \geq m$.

Since the product of stable polynomials is stable, $\phi$ is irreducible in $K[x]$.

Lemma 3.5. Let $f \in K[x]$ be a non-zero polynomial, with canonical $\phi$-expansion $f = \sum_{0 \leq s} f_s \phi^s$. Then, there exist indices $s_0$, $i_0$ such that

$$\rho_i(f) = \rho_i(f_{s_0} \phi^m) < \rho_i(f_s \phi^s), \quad \forall s \neq s_0, \forall i \geq i_0.$$ 

Proof. Since all coefficients $f_s$ have degree less than $\deg(\phi)$, they are all stable. Let us take $i_1$ sufficiently large so that

$$\rho_i(f_s) = \mu_\infty(f_s), \quad \forall s \geq 0, \forall i \geq i_1.$$ 

For every index $i \geq i_1$, let

$$\delta_i = \min\{\rho_i(f_s \phi^s) \mid 0 \leq s\}, \quad I_i = \{s \mid \rho_i(f_s \phi^s) = \delta_i\}, \quad s_i = \min(I_i).$$

For any index $s$ we have

$$\rho_i(f_s \phi^s) = \mu_\infty(f_s) + s_i \rho_i(\phi) \leq \rho_i(f_s \phi^s) = \mu_\infty(f_s) + s_i \rho_i(\phi).$$

Since $\phi$ is not stable, $\rho_i(\phi) < \rho_j(\phi)$, for all $j > i$. Thus, if we replace $\rho_i$ with $\rho_j$ in (5), we get a strict inequality for all $s > s_i$, because the left-hand side of (5) increases by $s_i(\rho_j(\phi) - \rho_i(\phi))$, while the right-hand side increases by $s(\rho_j(\phi) - \rho_i(\phi))$.

Therefore, either $I_j = \{s_i\}$, or $s_j = \min(I_j) < s_i$.

For $i_0 = j$ sufficiently large, we must have

$$I_i = \{s_0\}, \quad \forall i \geq i_0,$$

because the set of indices $s$ is finite. \hfill $\Box$

Definition 3.6. For any $f \in K[x]$, we say that $f$ is $\mu_\infty$-divisible by $\phi$, and we write $\phi \mid_{\mu_\infty} f$, if there exists $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi \mid_{\rho_i} f$ for all $i \geq i_0$. 

Lemma 3.7. For any $f \in K[x]$ with canonical $\phi$-expansion $f = \sum_{0 \leq s} f_s \phi^s$, the following conditions are equivalent:

(1) $f$ is stable.

(2) There exists $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\rho_i(f) = \rho_i(f_0) < \rho_i(f_s \phi^s), \quad \forall s > 0, \forall i \geq i_0.$$ 

(3) $\phi \mu_{\mu_0} f$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, there exist indices $s_0$ and $i_0$ such that $\rho_i(f_s) = \mu_\infty(f_s)$ for all $s$, and

$$\rho_i(f) = \rho_i(f_{s_0} \phi^{s_0}) = \mu_\infty(f_{s_0}) + s_0 \rho_i(\phi) < \rho_i(f_s \phi^s), \quad \forall s \neq s_0, \forall i \geq i_0.$$ 

Since $\phi$ is non-stable, $\rho_i(\phi)$ grows strictly with $i$. Hence, condition (1) is equivalent to $s_0 = 0$, which is in turn equivalent to condition (2).

If $\rho_i(f) = \rho_{i+1}(f)$, we have necessarily $\phi \mu_{\mu} f$ because $\rho_i(\phi) < \rho_{i+1}(\phi)$. Thus, (1) implies (3).

On the other hand, $s_0 > 0$ in (6) implies $\phi \mu_{\mu} f$. Thus, (3) implies (2). \hfill $\square$

Notation. Let $\Gamma_\mu : \Lambda$ be an embedding of ordered groups, and choose $\gamma \in \Lambda_\infty$ such that $\rho_i(\phi) < \gamma$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $\mu' = [\mu_\infty; \phi, \gamma]$ the mapping

$$\mu' : K[x] \longrightarrow \Lambda \cup \{\infty\}$$

assigning to any $f \in K[x]$, with $\phi$-expansion $f = \sum_{0 \leq s} f_s \phi^s$, the value

$$\mu'(f) = \text{Min}\{\mu_\infty(f_s) + s\gamma \mid 0 \leq s\}.$$ 

Note that $\mu'(\phi) = \gamma$.

Our next aim is to show that $\mu'$ is a valuation. The triangular inequality is obvious. It follows immediately from the triangular inequality for all $\rho_i$.

The proof of $\mu'(fg) = \mu(f) + \mu(g)$ requires an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 3.8. Let $a, b \in K[x]$ be polynomials of degree less than $\deg(\phi)$. If $ab = c + d\phi$ is the $\phi$-expansion of $ab$, then $\mu'(ab) = \mu'(c) < \mu'(d\phi)$.

Proof. Since $\deg(a), \deg(b) < \deg(\phi)$, the polynomials $a$ and $b$ are stable. Hence, $ab$ is stable too. By Lemma 3.7 there exists $i_0$ such that

$$\mu_\infty(c) = \rho_i(c), \quad \mu_\infty(d) = \rho_i(d), \quad \rho_i(ab) = \rho_i(c) < \rho_i(d\phi), \quad \forall i \geq i_0.$$ 

Hence, $\mu'(ab) = \mu'(c) = \mu_\infty(c) < \mu_\infty(d) + \rho_i(\phi) < \mu_\infty(d) + \gamma = \mu'(d\phi)$. \hfill $\square$

Proposition 3.9.

(1) The mapping $\mu' = [\mu_\infty; \phi, \gamma]$ is a valuation on $K[x]$.

It has trivial support if and only if $\gamma < \infty$.

(2) For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\rho_i \leq \mu'$. Moreover, for $f \in K[x], f \neq 0$,

$$\exists i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \rho_i(f) = \mu'(f) \iff \phi \mu_{\mu_0} f \iff f \text{ is stable}.$$ 

In this case, $H_{\mu'}(f)$ is a unit in $\mathcal{G}_{\mu'}$.

(3) If $\gamma < \infty$, then $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu'$, of minimal degree.

(4) If $\gamma < \infty$, the value group is $\Gamma_{\mu'} = \langle \Gamma_{\mu}, \gamma \rangle$. If $\gamma = \infty$, then $\Gamma_{\mu'} = \Gamma_{\mu}$. 


Proof. (1) Let \(a, b \in K[x]\) of degree less than \(\deg(\phi)\), and let \(ab = c + d\phi\) be the \(\phi\)-expansion of \(ab\). By Lemma 3.8

\[
\mu'(ab) = \mu'(c) = \mu_\infty(c) = \mu_\infty(ab) = \mu_\infty(a) + \mu_\infty(b) = \mu'(a) + \mu'(b).
\]

Now, let \(f = \sum_{0 \leq s} f_s \phi^s,\ g = \sum_{0 \leq t} g_t \phi^t\), be the canonical \(\phi\)-expansions of two nonzero polynomials. From the expression

\[
f g = \sum_{s,t} f_s g_t \phi^{s+t},
\]

we deduce trivially

\[
\mu'(fg) \geq \min \left\{ \mu'(f_s g_t \phi^{s+t}) \mid s, t \geq 0 \right\} = \min \left\{ \mu'(f_s \phi^s) + \mu'(g_t \phi^t) \mid s, t \geq 0 \right\} = \mu'(f) + \mu'(g).
\]

Let \(I\) be the set of indices \(s\) such that \(\mu'(f) = \mu'(f_s \phi^s)\), and let \(J\) be the set of indices \(t\) such that \(\mu'(g) = \mu'(g_t \phi^t)\). In order to prove the equality \(\mu'(fg) = \mu'(f) + \mu'(g)\), it suffices to show that

\[
\mu'(F) = \mu'(f) + \mu'(g), \quad \text{for } F = \sum_{s \in I, t \in J} f_s g_t \phi^{s+t},
\]

because all dropped terms have greater \(\mu'\)-value.

Let \(s_0 = \min(I), t_0 = \min(J)\). Consider the \(\phi\)-expansion \(f_{s_0} g_{t_0} = c + d\phi\). The monomial of minimal degree in the \(\phi\)-expansion of \(F\) is \(c_{\phi^{s_0+t_0}}\). By Lemma 3.8

\[
\mu'(f) + \mu'(g) = \mu'(f_{s_0} \phi^{s_0}) + \mu'(g_{t_0} \phi^{t_0}) = \mu'(f_{s_0} g_{t_0} \phi^{s_0+t_0}) = \mu'(c_{\phi^{s_0+t_0}}) \geq \mu'(F).
\]

Hence, \(\mu'(F) = \mu'(f) + \mu'(g)\). This proves that \(\mu'\) is a valuation.

The statement about the support of \(\mu\) is obvious.

(2) Let \(f = \sum_{0 \leq s} f_s \phi^s\) be the \(\phi\)-expansion of a nonzero \(f \in K[x]\). By Lemma 3.5 there exist indices \(s_0\) and \(i_0\) such that \(\rho_i(f_s) = \mu_\infty(f_s)\) for all \(s\), and

\[
\rho_i(f) = \rho_i(f_{s_0} \phi^{s_0}) < \rho_i(f_s \phi^s), \quad \forall s \neq s_0, \forall i \geq i_0.
\]

By definition, \(\mu'(f) = \mu'(f_s \phi^s)\) for some \(s\). Therefore, \(\mu'(f) < \rho_i(f)\) for some \(i \geq i_0\) implies:

\[
\mu'(f_s \phi^s) < \rho_i(f_{s_0} \phi^{s_0}) \leq \rho_i(f_s \phi^s).
\]

This is equivalent to \(s_0 \gamma < s \rho_i(\phi)\), which is a contradiction.

Hence, \(\rho_i \leq \mu'\) for all \(i \geq i_0\). Since \(\rho_j \leq \rho_i\) for all \(j < i\), the inequality \(\rho_i \leq \mu'\) holds for all \(i \geq 0\).

By the same argument, the equality \(\mu'(f) = \rho_i(f)\) leads to \(s \gamma \leq s \rho_i(\phi)\), which is equivalent to \(s = s_0 = 0\). By Lemma 3.7 this holds if and only if \(\phi \nmid_{\mu_\infty} f\), or equivalently, if and only if \(f\) is stable.

Finally, Corollary 2.7 shows that \(H_{\mu'}(f)\) is a unit if \(\rho_i(f) = \mu'(f)\) for some \(i \geq 0\).

(3) Suppose \(\gamma < \infty\). By the very definition of \(\mu'\), the polynomial \(\phi\) is \(\mu'\)-minimal by Lemma 1.3. In particular, \(\phi \nmid_{\mu'} 1\), so that \(H_{\mu'}(\phi)\) is not a unit in \(G_{\mu'}\).

On the other hand, item (2) shows that \(H_{\mu'}(f)\) is a unit for all polynomials \(f\) of degree less than \(\deg(\phi)\). Hence, our monic polynomial \(\phi\) has minimal degree among all polynomials whose image in \(G_{\mu'}\) is not a unit. By [20 Thm 3.2+Prop. 3.5], \(\phi\) is a key polynomial for \(\mu'\), of minimal degree.

(4) This item follows from Lemma 3.3 and the definition of \(\mu'\). \(\square\)
Lemma 3.10. If $\deg(\phi) = m$, then $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$ and the valuation $\mu' = [\mu_\infty; \phi, \gamma]$ coincides with the ordinary augmentation $[\mu; \phi, \gamma]$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.5, $\Phi_{\mu, \mu'} = [\chi_1]_\mu$, because

$$\mu(\chi_1) < \beta_1 = \rho_1(\chi_1) = \mu_\infty(\chi_1) = \mu'(\chi_1),$$

and all polynomials $a$ with $\deg(a) < m$ satisfy $\mu(a) = \rho_1(a) = \mu_\infty(a) = \mu'(a)$.

Since $\mu(\phi) \leq \rho_1(\phi) < \mu'(\phi) = \gamma$, Proposition 2.5 shows that $\chi_1 |_\mu \phi$. Hence, $\chi_1 \sim_\mu \phi$ and $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$, by Lemma 1.5.

Then, $\mu' = [\mu; \phi, \gamma]$ because both valuations coincide on $\phi$-expansions. \qed

Definition 3.11. If $\deg(\phi) > m$, we say that $\mu' = [\mu_\infty; \phi, \gamma]$ is a limit-augmentation of $\mu$, with respect to the continuous ML-chain $(\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 0}$ and the data $\phi, \gamma$.

By Lemma 3.10, we may avoid limit-augmentations with $\deg(\phi) = m$, because they may be replaced by ordinary augmentations.

Example. Let $p$ be a prime number and consider the $p$-adic valuation $v = \text{ord}_p$ on $\mathbb{Q}$. Take a $p$-adic number with non-zero $p$-adic coefficients

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i p^i \in \mathbb{Z}_p, \quad c_i \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\},$$

and denote its partial sums by $a_i = \sum_{0 \leq j < i} c_j p^j \in \mathbb{Z}$, for all $i > 0$. Take $a_0 = 0$.

Consider the depth zero valuation $\mu = \mu(x, 0)$, and the chain of ordinary augmentations

$$\mu = \rho_0 \xrightarrow{x-a_1} \rho_1 \xrightarrow{x-a_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{x-a_i} \rho_i \xrightarrow{x-a_{i+1}} \cdots$$

These valuations have depth zero: $\rho_i = \mu(x-a_i, i)$ for all $i \geq 0$. Since

$$\rho_{i-1}(x-a_i) = i-1, \quad \rho_i(x-a_i) = i, \quad \forall i \geq 1,$$

we have $\Phi_{\rho_{i-1}, \rho_i} = [x-a_i]_{\rho_{i-1}}$. By Proposition 2.5, $x-a_i$ is a key polynomial for $\rho_{i-1}$ and $(x-a_{i+1})_{\rho_i} (x-a_i)$ for all $i \geq 1$. Also, $(x-a_1)_{\rho_0} x$ by construction, so that $x-a_1$ is a proper key polynomial for $\mu$. Therefore, we have built a continuous ML-chain of $\mu$.

One checks easily that a non-zero $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ is stable if and only if $f(\alpha) \neq 0$.

Let us analyze different possibilities for the limit of this continuous MacLane chain.

1. If $\alpha$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{Q}$, then the chain has a stable limit $\mu'$, which is not a depth zero valuation.

   With the notation introduced at the end of section 4, $\mu'$ has quasi-finite depth zero.

2. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $x-\alpha$ is a non-stable polynomial of minimal degree. Hence, $\mu' = [\mu_\infty; x-\alpha, \infty]$ is not a limit-augmentation. Actually, $\mu' = \mu(x-\alpha, \infty)$ is a depth zero valuation.

3. If $\alpha$ is algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}$ but it does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}$, let $\phi \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ be the minimal polynomial of $\alpha$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then $\phi$ is a monic non-stable polynomial of minimal degree. Since $\deg(\phi) > 1$, $\mu' = [\mu_\infty; \phi, \infty]$ is a limit-augmentation.
4. MacLane-Vaquí chains

Consider a countably infinite chain of mixed augmentations
\[ (1) \quad \mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} \mu_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} \mu_i \xrightarrow{\phi_{i+1}, \gamma_{i+1}} \mu_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\phi_{i+1}, \gamma_{i+1}} \cdots \]
in which every node \( \mu_{i+1} \) is either an ordinary augmentation or a limit-augmentation of the previous node
\[ \mu_i = \begin{cases} [\mu; \phi_i, \gamma_i]_{\mu_i}, & \text{if } \mu_i \to \mu_{i+1} \text{ is an ordinary augmentation}, \\ [\chi_i]_{\mu_i}, & \text{if } \mu_i \to \mu_{i+1} \text{ is a limit-augmentation}. \end{cases} \]

In an ordinary augmentation step, \( \phi_{i+1} \) is a key polynomial for \( \mu_i \).
In a limit-augmentation step, there is some continuous ML-chain of \( \mu_i \)
\[ \mu_i = \rho_0 \xrightarrow{\chi_{i, \beta_1}} \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\chi_{i, \beta_2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\chi_{i, \beta_{j-1}}} \rho_{j-1} \xrightarrow{\chi_{i, \beta_j}} \rho_j \xrightarrow{\chi_{i, \beta_j}} \cdots \]

admitting \( \phi_{i+1} \) as a non-stable polynomial of minimal degree (see section 3).

By Propositions 2.4 and 3.9, \( \phi_i \) is a key polynomial for \( \mu_i \) of minimal degree, for all \( i \geq 1 \). In particular,
\[ \deg(\mu_i) = \deg(\phi_i), \quad \forall i \geq 1. \]

Note that
\[ \Phi_{\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}} = \begin{cases} [\phi_{i+1}]_{\mu_i}, & \text{if } \mu_i \to \mu_{i+1} \text{ is an ordinary augmentation}, \\ [\chi_i]_{\mu_i}, & \text{if } \mu_i \to \mu_{i+1} \text{ is a limit-augmentation}. \end{cases} \]

In particular, if \( \mu_i \to \mu_{i+1} \) is an ordinary augmentation we have
\[ \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}}) = \deg(\mu_{i+1}) = \deg(\phi_{i+1}), \]
while in the limit-augmentation case,
\[ \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}}) = \text{stable degree of } (\rho_i; \chi_{i+1, \beta_{i+1}})_{i \geq 0}. \]

**Lemma 4.1.** For a chain of mixed augmentations as in (1), consider \( f \in K[x] \) such that \( \mu_i(f) = \mu_{i+1}(f) \) for some \( i \geq 0 \). Then, \( \mu_j(f) = \mu_i(f) \) for all \( j \geq i \).

**Proof.** Proposition 2.4 (if \( \mu_{i+1} \) is an ordinary augmentation of \( \mu_i \)), or Proposition 3.9 (if \( \mu_{i+1} \) is a limit-augmentation of \( \mu_i \)), show that \( H_{\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}}(f) \) is a unit in \( G_{\mu_{i+1}} \).

If the next augmentation \( \mu_{i+2} = [\mu_{i+1}; \phi_{i+2}, \gamma_{i+2}] \) is an ordinary one, then \( \Phi_{\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}}^\perp f \), and Proposition 2.4 shows that \( \mu_{i+1}(f) = \mu_{i+2}(f) \).

If \( \mu_{i+2} = [\mu_{i+1, \infty}; \phi_{i+2}, \gamma_{i+2}] \) is a limit-augmentation, and \((\rho_i, \chi_{i+1, \beta_{i+1}})_{i \geq 0} \) is the corresponding continuous ML-chain of \( \mu_{i+1} \), we have \( \chi_1 \downarrow_{\mu_{i+1}} f \). By Proposition 2.4, \( \mu_{i+1}(f) = \rho_1(f) \), so that \( f \) is stable. Thus, \( \mu_{i+1}(f) = \mu_{i+2}(f) \).

**Definition 4.2.** An infinite chain of augmentations as in (1) has a stable limit if for all \( f \in K[x] \) there exists an index \( i \) such that \( \mu_i(f) = \mu_j(f) \) for all \( j > i \).
In this case, the stability function \( \mu_{\infty} = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mu_i \) is a valuation on \( K[x] \).

**Lemma 4.3.** Consider an infinite chain of augmentations as in (1) having a stable limit \( \mu_{\infty} \). Then, \( \mu_{\infty} \) has trivial support and \( KP(\mu_{\infty}) = \emptyset \). In particular, \( \mu_{\infty} \) is a maximal valuation.

**Proof.** All non-zero \( f \in K[x] \) satisfy \( \mu_{\infty}(f) = \mu_i(f) < \infty \) for some \( i \). Thus, \( \mu_{\infty} \) has trivial support. All non-zero homogeneous elements in \( G_{\mu_{\infty}} \) are units by Corollary 2.7. By Theorem 1.10, \( KP(\mu_{\infty}) = \emptyset \), and Lemma 2.2 shows that \( \mu_{\infty} \) is maximal. \( \square \)
4.1. Definition of MacLane-Vaquié chains.

**Definition 4.4.** Consider a chain of mixed augmentations as in (7). We say that an index \( i \geq 0 \) is irregular if the following two conditions hold.

1. If \( i = 0 \), then \( \mu_0 \rightarrow \mu_1 \) is a limit-augmentation.
   If \( i > 0 \), then \( \mu_{i-1} \rightarrow \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) are two consecutive limit-augmentations.
2. \( \deg(\mu_i) \) is equal to the stable degree of the continuous MacLane chain of \( \mu_i \).

Otherwise, we say that \( i \) is a regular index.

**Definition 4.5.** A chain of mixed augmentations as in (7) is a MacLane-Vaquié chain (abbreviated MLV-chain) if it satisfies the following two conditions.

1. (MLV1) For all regular \( i \geq 0 \), it holds \( \deg(\mu_i) < \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu_{i+1}}) \).
2. (MLV2) For all irregular \( i > 0 \), it holds \( \chi_1 |_{\mu_i} \phi_i \), where \( (\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 0} \) is the continuous MacLane chain of \( \mu_i \).

**Definition 4.6.** We say that \( \mu \) admits a finite MacLane-Vaquié chain if \( \mu \) is the last valuation of a finite chain of mixed augmentations

\[
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_0, \gamma_0} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_{r-1}, \gamma_{r-1}} \mu_r = \mu,
\]

which satisfies conditions (MLV1) and (MLV2) for all \( 0 \leq i < r \).

A finite or infinite MLV-chain is complete if the valuation \( \mu_0 \) has depth zero.

Let us remark some specific features of complete MacLane-Vaquié chains.

Let \( \mu_0 = \mu(\phi_0, \gamma_0) \), for some monic polynomial \( \phi_0 \) of degree one, and denote \( m_i = \deg(\mu_i) = \deg(\phi_i), \quad \forall i \geq 0 \).

- In a MacLane-Vaquié chain we have \( m_i < m_{i+1} \) for all \( i \geq 0 \).
- In fact, if \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is an ordinary augmentation, then (MLV1) implies \( m_i = \deg(\mu_i) < \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu_{i+1}}) = \deg(\phi_{i+1}) = m_{i+1} \).
- If \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is a limit-augmentation, and \( m \) is the stable degree of the continuous ML-chain of \( \mu_i \), then \( m_i = \deg(\phi_i) \leq m < \deg(\phi_{i+1}) = m_{i+1} \).

In a MacLane-Vaquié chain, for any \( f \in K[x] \), we have

\[
\deg(f) < m_i \implies \mu_i(f) = \mu_{i+1}(f).
\]

This follows from Proposition 2.5 because \( m_i \leq \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu_{i+1}}) \).

- Every infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain has a stable limit.

In fact, any \( f \in K[x] \) has \( \deg(f) < m_i \) for some index \( i \). By (9), \( \mu_i(f) = \mu_{i+1}(f) \).

- In an infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain, all valuations \( \mu_i \) are residually transcendental, because they admit proper key polynomials. Thus, \( \gamma_i \in \Gamma_\mathbb{Q} \) for all \( i \geq 0 \).

By the same argument, in a finite MacLane-Vaquié chain as in (8), the valuations \( \mu_i \) are residually transcendental for \( 0 \leq i < r \). Thus, \( \gamma_i \in \Gamma_\mathbb{Q} \) for all \( 0 \leq i < r \). The value \( \gamma_r \) may be incommensurable, or even equal to \( \infty \).
The canonical homomorphisms $G_{\mu_i} \to G_{\mu_{i+1}}$ induce algebraic field extensions
$$k = \kappa_0 \longrightarrow \kappa_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \kappa_i \longrightarrow \cdots$$
where $\kappa_i := \kappa(\mu_i)$ is the maximal subfield of $\Delta_{\mu_i}$.

- By Propositions 2.4 and 3.9 we get a chain of value groups:

$$\Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}} := \Gamma \subset \Gamma_{\mu_i} \subset \cdots \subset \Gamma_{\mu_i} \subset \cdots$$

with $\Gamma_{\mu_i} = \langle \Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}}, \gamma_i \rangle$, $\forall i \geq 0$.

- If $\text{KP}(\mu_i) \neq \emptyset$, we have $\Gamma_{\mu_i,m_i} = \Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}}$.

In fact, if $\alpha = \mu_i(a)$ for some $a \in K[x]$ with $\deg(a) < \deg(\mu_i)$, then $\mu_{i-1}(a) = \mu_i(a) = \alpha$, by (9). Hence, $\Gamma_{\mu_i,m_i} \subset \Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\alpha \in \Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}}$. If $\mu_{i-1} \rightarrow \mu_i$ is an ordinary augmentation, then $\phi_i$ is a proper key polynomial for $\mu_{i-1}$. By Lemma 1.9 and Proposition 2.4, we get a chain of value groups:

$$\Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}} = \Gamma_{\mu_{i-1},m_i} \subset \Gamma_{\mu_i,m_i}.$$  

If $\mu_{i-1} \rightarrow \mu_i$ is a limit-augmentation with respect to some continuous ML-chain $(p_j; \xi_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1})_{j \geq 0}$ of $\mu_{i-1}$, then $\chi_1$ is a proper key polynomial for $\mu_{i-1}$. Since the stable degree is $m = \deg(\chi_1) < m_i$, Lemma 1.9 and Proposition 3.9 show that

$$\Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}} = \Gamma_{\mu_{i-1},m} \subset \Gamma_{\mu_i,m} \subset \Gamma_{\mu_i,m_i}.$$  

The above equality yields a reinterpretation of the relative ramification indices:

$$(11) \ e_i := e_{\text{rel}}(\mu_i) = (\Gamma_{\mu_i} : \Gamma_{\mu_{i-1}}), \quad \forall i \geq 0.$$

If the last valuation $\mu_r$ of a finite MLV-chain is incommensurable over $v$ (that is, $\gamma_r \not\in \Gamma_v$), then both sides of (11) are equal to infinity.

### 4.2. All valuations are stable limits of MacLane-Vaquié chains.

**Lemma 4.7.** Consider a complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chain of length $r \geq 0$:

$$\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_{r-1}, \gamma_{r-1}} \mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r.$$  

Then, for any augmentation $\mu_r \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu$, either ordinary or limit, the valuation $\mu$ admits a complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chain.

**Proof.** Let $\mu_0 = \mu(\phi_0, \gamma_0)$, with $\deg(\phi_0) = 1$. Denote $m_i = \deg(\phi_i)$ for all $i \geq 0$.

**Case 1.** The augmentation step $\mu_r \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu$ is ordinary.

In this case, $\Phi_{\mu_r, \mu} = [\phi]_{\mu_r}$. Thus, if $m_r < \deg(\phi)$, we obtain a complete MLV-chain of $\mu$ of length $r + 1$.

If $m_r = \deg(\phi)$ and $r = 0$, then $\mu = \mu(\phi, \gamma)$ is a valuation of depth zero, which constitutes a complete MLV-chain of length zero of $\mu$.

Suppose $m_r = \deg(\phi)$ and $r > 0$. If the augmentation step $\mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r$ is ordinary, then it is well known that $\mu = [\mu_{r-1}; \phi, \gamma]$ [7 Sec. 1.2]. We still have a MLV-chain of $\mu$ of length $r$ because $m_{r-1} < m_r = \deg(\phi)$.

Finally, suppose that $\mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r$ is a limit-augmentation with respect to some continuous ML-chain of $\mu_{r-1}$.

Since $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu_r$, $H_{\mu_r}(\phi)$ is not a unit. By Proposition 3.9, $\phi$ is non-stable of minimal degree for this continuous ML-chain.
Clearly, $\mu = [\mu_{r-1,\infty}; \phi, \gamma]$, by the very definition of both valuations. Since we did not change the continuous ML-chain of $\mu_{r-1}$, it still satisfies the conditions of a MLV-chain of length $r$ of $\mu$.

**Case 2.** The augmentation step $\mu_r \stackrel{\phi, \gamma}{\rightarrow} \mu$ is a limit-augmentation.

Let $(\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 0}$ be the continuous ML-chain of $\mu_r = \rho_0$, and let $m$ be its stable degree. We have $\Phi_{\mu_r, \mu} = [\chi_1]_{\mu_r}$.

If either $r = 0$, or $m > m_r$, we get a MLV-chain of length $r + 1$ of $\mu$.

Suppose that $r > 0$, $m = m_r$ and the previous augmentation $\mu_{r-1} \stackrel{\phi_{r, \gamma}}{\rightarrow} \mu_r$ is ordinary. We may apply again [7, Sec. 1.2] to join two consecutive ordinary augmentations to obtain a single ordinary augmentation

$$
\mu_{r-1} \stackrel{\phi_{r, \gamma}}{\rightarrow} \mu_r \xrightarrow{\chi_1, \beta_1} \rho_1 \rightsquigarrow \mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\chi_1, \beta_1} \rho_1
$$

Therefore, just by taking $\rho_0 = \mu_{r-1}$ instead of $\rho_0 = \mu_r$, we obtain a continuous ML-chain $(\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 0}$ of $\mu_{r-1}$, leading to the same stability function $\mu_{r-1, \infty} = \mu_{r, \infty}$.

Obviously, $\mu = [\mu_{r-1, \infty}; \phi, \gamma]$.

Since $m_{r-1} < \deg (\Phi_{\mu_{r-1}, \mu}) = m_r$, we obtain a MLV-chain of length $r$ of $\mu$.

Finally, suppose that $r > 0$, $m = m_r$ and the previous augmentation $\mu_{r-1} \stackrel{\phi_{r, \gamma}}{\rightarrow} \mu_r$ is a limit-augmentation. If $\chi_1 \nmid \rho_r$, we get a ML-chain of length $r+1$ of $\mu$, for which $r$ is an irregular index.

Anyway, since $H_{\mu_r}(\chi_1)$ is not a unit, Proposition 3.9 shows that $\chi_1$ is a non-stable monic polynomial of minimal degree with respect to the continuous ML-chain of $\mu_{r-1}$.

Since $\chi_2 \nmid \rho_1$, we may consider a MLV-chain of $\mu$ of length $r+1$, whose two last augmentations are the limit-augmentations:

$$
\mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\chi_1, \beta_1} \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma} \mu,
$$

where the continuous ML-chain of $\rho_1$ is $(\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 1}$, which has the same stability function $\rho_{1, \infty} = \mu_{r, \infty}$. The index $r$ is irregular too.

\[\square\]

**Theorem 4.8.** Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $K[x]$. Then, it falls in one, and only one, of the following cases.

1. It admits a complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chain.

$$
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \rightarrow \mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_{r, \gamma}} \mu_r = \mu.
$$

2. It is the stable limit of a continuous MacLane chain of some valuation $\mu_r$ which admits a complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chain:

$$
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_{r, \gamma}} \mu_r = \rho_0 \xrightarrow{(\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 1}} \mu_{r, \infty} = \mu.
$$

Moreover, if $r > 0$, we may assume that $\deg (\mu_r) < m$, where $m$ is the stable degree of the continuous MacLane chain.

3. It is the stable limit of a complete infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain.

$$
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \rightarrow \mu_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_{i, \gamma}} \mu_i \rightarrow \cdots
$$
**Proof.** If $\mu$ is a valuation of depth zero, then it obviously falls in case (1).

Otherwise, let $\gamma_0 = \mu(x)$. The depth zero valuation $\mu_0 = \mu(x, \gamma_0)$ forms a complete finite MLV-chain of length zero, whose last valuation satisfies $\mu_0 < \mu$.

**Claim.** Given a complete finite MLV-chain of length $r \geq 0$, whose last valuation $\mu_r$ satisfies $\mu_r < \mu$, the application of Proposition 2.5 leads to one of the following three situations:

(a) We get $\mu$ by a single (ordinary or limit) augmentation step $\mu_r \xrightarrow{\phi, \gamma} \mu$.

(b) There exists a continuous MacLane chain of $\mu_r$ having $\mu$ as its stable limit.

(c) The valuation $\mu_r$ may be augmented to some valuation $\mu'$ such that $\mu_r < \mu' < \mu$ and $\deg(\mu_r) < \deg(\mu')$.

Let us first show that the theorem follows from the Claim. In case (a), $\mu$ admits a complete finite MLV-chain, by Lemma 4.7, thus, it falls in case (1).

In case (b), $\mu$ falls in case (2). If $r > 0$ and the stable degree $m$ of the continuous ML-chain coincides with $\deg(\mu_r) = \deg(\phi_r)$, we may define

$$\begin{align*}
\rho_0 &= \mu_{r-1}, & \chi_1 &= \phi_r, & \beta_1 &= \gamma_r, \\
\rho_i &= \rho_{i-1}, & \chi_{i+1} &= \chi_i, & \beta_{i+1} &= \beta_i, & \forall i \geq 1.
\end{align*}$$

Then, $\mu$ is the stable limit of the continuous ML-chain $(\rho_i; \chi_i, \beta_i)_{i \geq 0}$ of $\mu_{r-1}$, with stable degree $m > \deg(\mu_{r-1})$. Thus, the last requirement of case (2) is satisfied.

By Lemma 4.7, an iteration of this procedure shows that either $\mu$ falls in cases (1) or (2) of the theorem, or there exists a complete infinite MLV-chain $(\mu_i)_{i \geq 0}$ satisfying $\mu_i < \mu$ for all $i$. The stable limit of this infinite MLV-chain is $\mu$ by Lemma 4.3.

Let us prove the Claim. By Proposition 2.5, any $\phi \in \Phi_{\mu_r, \mu}$ is a key polynomial for $\mu_r$ and the augmented valuation $\rho = [\mu_r; \phi, \mu(\phi)]$ satisfies $\rho \leq \mu$.

Let $m = \deg(\phi) = \deg(\rho)$.

If $\rho = \mu$, we fall in case (a) of the Claim. If $m > \deg(\mu_r)$, the augmentation $\mu' = \rho$ fulfills condition (c) of the Claim.

Suppose that $\rho < \mu$ and $m = \deg(\mu_r)$. Consider the set

$$V_m = \{\mu(f) \mid f \in K[x] \text{ monic}, \ \deg(f) = m\} \subset \Gamma_{\mu, \infty}.$$

The proof of the Claim distinguishes two cases according to possible upper bounds of $V_m$ in $\Gamma_{\mu, \infty}$.

**$V_m$ contains a maximal element.**

Let $\gamma = \max(V_m)$, and let $f$ be a monic polynomial of degree $m$ such that $\mu(f) = \gamma$.

By Theorem 1.7

$$\mu_r(f) \leq \mu_r(\phi) < \mu(\phi) \leq \gamma = \mu(f).$$

Hence, Proposition 2.5 shows that $f$ is a key polynomial of $\mu_r$ and the augmented valuation $\eta = [\mu_r; f, \gamma]$ satisfies $\eta \leq \mu$. If $\eta = \mu$, we fall in case (a).

Suppose $\eta < \mu$, and let $\Phi_{\eta, \mu} = [\chi]_\eta$. By Proposition 2.4, $f$ is a key polynomial for $\eta$ of minimal degree. Since $\chi$ is a key polynomial for $\eta$, $\deg(\chi) \geq m = \deg(f)$. 

**Proof.** [Details of proof not included, but the structure and key points should be clear.]
The equality $\deg(\chi) = m$ would imply $\eta(f) = \eta(\chi)$ by Theorem 1.7, and this would contradict the maximality of $\gamma$:

$$\gamma = \eta(f) = \eta(\chi) < \mu(\chi).$$

Therefore, $\deg(\chi) > m$, and if we take $\beta = \mu(\chi)$, the augmentation $\mu' = [\eta; \chi, \beta]$ falls in case (c) of the Claim.

$V_m$ does not contain a maximal element.

Let us choose a cofinal sequence of values in the set $V_m$, all of them greater than $\beta_0 := \mu_r(\phi_r) = \mu(\phi_r)$:

$$\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \cdots < \beta_i < \cdots$$

For all $\beta \in V_m$, there exists $i$ such that $\beta < \beta_i$.

For all $i \geq 0$ we choose $\chi_i \in K[x]$ a monic polynomial of degree $m$ such that $\mu(\chi_i) = \beta_i$. We may assume that $\chi_0 = \phi_r$. For all $i > 0$, $\chi_i$ belongs to the class $\Phi_{\mu_r, \mu}$.

In fact, by Theorem 1.7

$$\mu_r(\chi_i) \leq \mu_r(\phi_r) = \beta_0 < \beta_i = \mu(\chi_i).$$

By Proposition 2.5, $\chi_i$ is a key polynomial for $\mu_r$ for all $i \geq 0$. Consider $\rho_0 = \mu_r$ and the ordinary augmentations

$$\rho_i = [\mu_r; \chi_i, \beta_i] < \mu, \quad i \geq 1.$$

For any fixed index $i$, the same argument shows that $\chi_j \in \Phi_{\rho_i, \mu}$ for all $j > i$. Hence $\chi_j$ is a key polynomial for $\rho_i$, and $\rho_j = [\rho_i; \chi_j, \beta_j]$ for all $j > i$. On the other hand,

$$\beta_i = \rho_i(\chi_i) \leq \rho_{i+1}(\chi_i) \leq \mu(\chi_i) = \beta_i, \quad \forall i \geq 0.$$

Therefore, $\rho_{i+1}(\chi_i) = \beta_i$ and this implies $\chi_{i+1} \not\sim \rho_i \chi_i$, by Proposition 2.5.

Hence, the four conditions of Definition 3.2 are satisfied and we obtain a continuous ML-chain of $\mu_r$.

$$\mu_r = \rho_0 \xrightarrow{\chi_1, \beta_1} \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\chi_2, \beta_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\chi_{i-1}, \beta_{i-1}} \rho_i \xrightarrow{\chi_i, \beta_i} \rho_i \xrightarrow{\chi_i, \beta_i} \cdots$$

All polynomials of degree $m$ are stable with respect to this continuous ML-chain. In fact, if $f \in K[x]$ is monic of degree $m$, then $\mu(f) < \beta_i$ for some $i$. Hence,

$$\rho_i(f) \leq \mu(f) < \beta_i = \rho_i(\chi_i) = \rho_i(\chi_{i+1}),$$

the last equality by Theorem 1.7, having in mind that $\chi_i$, $\chi_{i+1}$ are key polynomials for $\rho_i$ of the same degree.

This implies $\chi_{i+1} \not\sim \rho_i f$, and this leads to $\chi_{i+1} \not\sim \rho_i f$, by Lemma 1.3. By Proposition 2.5, this implies $\rho_i(f) = \rho_{i+1}(f)$. Therefore, $f$ is stable.

If this continuous ML-chain has a stable limit $\mu_{r, \infty}$, this limit coincides with $\mu$ by Lemma 4.3. Then, we fall in case (b) of the Claim.

If the continuous ML-chain has no stable limit, there exists a monic non-stable $\phi \in K[x]$ of minimal degree, and we may consider the limit-augmentation

$$\mu' = [\mu_{r, \infty}; \phi, \mu(\phi)].$$

Clearly, $\mu' \leq \mu$ by the comparison of both valuations on $\phi$-expansions. Since $\deg(\mu') = \deg(\phi) > m$, we fall either in case (a) or case (c) of the Claim. \hfill \Box

Let us check that the three situations of Theorem 4.8 are mutually exclusive.
Lemma-Definition 4.9. Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $K[x]$, with support $p \in \text{Spec}(K[x])$.

It falls in case (1) of Theorem 4.8 if and only if $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ or $p \neq 0$.
In this case we say that $\mu$ has finite depth equal to $r$.

It falls in case (2) of Theorem 4.8 if and only if $\text{KP}(\mu) = \emptyset$, $p = 0$, and the valuations in $(-\infty, \mu)_{\Gamma_{\mu}}$ have a bounded degree.
In this case we say that $\mu$ has quasi-finite depth equal to $r$.

It falls in case (3) of Theorem 4.8 if and only if $\text{KP}(\mu) = \emptyset$, $p = 0$, and the valuations in $(-\infty, \mu)_{\Gamma_{\mu}}$ have unbounded degree.
In this case we say that $\mu$ has infinite depth.

Proof. Suppose that $\mu$ admits a complete finite MLV-chain of length $r$. If $\gamma_r = \infty$, then $p = \phi_r K[x]$. If $\gamma_r < \infty$, then $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ because $\phi_r$ is a key polynomial for $\mu$.

If $\mu$ is the stable limit of a chain of mixed augmentations, it has $p = 0$ and $\text{KP}(\mu) = \emptyset$ by Lemma 4.3. The distinction between the cases (2) and (3) is obvious. □

If $\mu/v$ is incommensurable, Theorem 1.11 shows that $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ and all key polynomials are improper. Thus, $\mu$ has finite depth by Lemma-Definition 4.9.

By Lemma 2.2, $\mu$ is not maximal. By Lemma 4.7, any augmentation of $\mu$ admits a finite MLV-chain. However $\mu$ will never be a node of this new MLV-chain, because it admits no proper key polynomials.

In the next section, we prove that the depth of the MLV-chain underlying $\mu$ is an intrinsic datum of $\mu$.

5. Unicity of MacLane-Vaquie chains

5.1. Unicity of an ordinary augmentation step.

Lemma 5.1. Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $K[x]$ admitting key polynomials $\phi, \phi_s \in \text{KP}(\mu)$. Let $\Gamma_{\mu} \hookrightarrow \Lambda$ be an embedding of ordered groups, and choose $\gamma, \gamma_s \in \Lambda^\infty$ such that $\mu(\phi) < \gamma$ and $\mu(\phi_s) < \gamma_s$.

Then, $\mu' = [\mu; \phi, \gamma]$ coincides with $\mu_s' = [\mu; \phi_s, \gamma_s]$ if and only if

$\text{(13)} \quad \deg(\phi) = \deg(\phi_s) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(\phi_s - \phi) \geq \gamma = \gamma_s.$

Proof. Suppose that the conditions of (13) hold. Let $\phi_s = \phi + a$ with $a \in K[x]$ of degree less than $\deg(\phi)$. By assumption, $\mu'(a) = \mu'(a) = \mu(a) \geq \gamma = \mu'(\phi)$.

Hence, $\mu'(\phi_s) \geq \gamma = \gamma_s = \mu'(\phi_s)$. By comparison of their action on $\phi_s$-expansions we deduce that $\mu' \geq \mu_s'$. By the symmetry of (13), $\mu' = \mu_s'$.

Conversely, suppose $\mu' = \mu_s'$. By Proposition 2.4, $\phi, \phi_s$ are key polynomials for $\mu'$ of minimal degree. Hence, $\deg(\phi) = \deg(\phi_s)$ and Theorem 1.7 shows that

$\gamma = \mu'(\phi) = \mu'(\phi_s) = \mu_s'(\phi_s) = \gamma_s.$

In particular, $\mu(\phi_s - \phi) = \mu'(\phi_s - \phi) \geq \gamma$. □

Let us describe the interval $(\mu, \mu')_\Lambda$. For any $\delta \in \Lambda$, $\delta > \mu(\phi)$, let us denote

$\mu_\delta = [\mu; \phi, \delta].$

Lemma 5.2. With the above notation, $(\mu, \mu')_\Lambda = \{\mu_\delta \mid \mu(\phi) < \delta < \gamma\}.$
Proof. Let \( \rho : K[x] \to \Lambda \) be valuation such that \( \mu < \rho < \mu' \). By Corollary \ref{cor:tame-limit},

\[
\Phi_{\mu, \rho} = \Phi_{\mu, \mu'} = [\phi]_{\mu},
\]

so that \( \mu(\phi) < \rho(\phi) \). On the other hand, \( \rho(\phi) \geq \gamma \) would imply \( \rho \geq \mu' \), by their action on \( \phi \)-expansions. Hence, \( \rho(\phi) < \gamma = \mu'(\phi) \). Since \( \phi \) is a monic polynomial of minimal degree with this property, it is a key polynomial for \( \rho \) by Proposition \ref{prop:stable-poly}. Hence, \( \rho = \mu_\delta \), for \( \delta = \rho(\phi) \), because both valuations coincide on \( \phi \)-expansions. \( \Box \)

5.2. Unicity of a limit-augmentation step.

Lemma-Definition 5.3. Let \( \rho_0, \rho_0^* \) be two valuations on \( K[x] \) extending \( v \). Suppose they admit continuous MacLane chains

\[
(\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}; \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 0}, \quad (\rho_i^*; \chi_{i+1}^*; \beta_{i+1}^*)_{i \geq 0},
\]

with stability functions \( \mu_\infty, \mu_\infty^* \), respectively.

Consider order-preserving embeddings \( \Gamma_{\rho_0} \hookrightarrow \Lambda, \Gamma_{\rho_0^*} \hookrightarrow \Lambda \) into some common ordered group, and suppose that the restrictions of these embeddings to \( \Gamma \) coincide.

Then, the following conditions are equivalent.

1. \( \mu_\infty = \mu_\infty^* \).
2. The sets \( \{\rho_i \mid i \geq 0\} \), \( \{\rho_i^* \mid i \geq 0\} \) are one cofinal in each other, with respect to the partial ordering \( \leq \) of valuations taking values in \( \Lambda \).

If these conditions hold, we say that the continuous MacLane chains are equivalent. Two equivalent continuous MacLane chains have the same value group \( \Gamma_{\rho_0} = \Gamma_{\rho_0^*} \), and the same stable degree.

Proof. Suppose that \( \{\rho_i \mid i \geq 0\} \) is cofinal in \( \{\rho_i^* \mid i \geq 0\} \). Then, any \( (\rho_i^*)_{i \geq 0} \)-stable polynomial \( f \in K[x] \) is \( (\rho_i)_{i \geq 0} \)-stable too, and \( \mu_\infty^*(f) = \mu_\infty(f) \). Thus, (2) implies (1).

Now, suppose that \( \mu_\infty = \mu_\infty^* \). That is, both continuous ML-chains have the same stable polynomials, and the stable values of these polynomials coincide.

We claim that there exists a valuation \( \mu' \) such that \( \rho_i, \rho_i^* < \mu' \) for all \( i, j \).

In fact, if \( (\rho_i)_{i \geq 0} \) has a stable limit, then \( \mu' = \mu_\infty = \mu_\infty^* \) is such a valuation.

If the continuous ML-chains do not have a stable limit, we may take a monic \( \phi \in K[x] \) which is a non-stable polynomial of minimal degree simultaneously for both continuous ML-chains. Then, the limit-augmentation valuation \( \mu' = [\mu_\infty; \phi, \infty] \) satisfies our claim.

By Theorem \ref{theo:limit}, the set

\[
\{\rho_i \mid i \geq 0\} \cup \{\rho_i^* \mid i \geq 0\}
\]

is totally ordered. Now, suppose there exists an index \( j \) such that \( \rho_j^* > \rho_i \) for all \( i \geq 0 \). Then, \( \chi_{i+1}^* \) would be \( (\rho_i^*)_{i \geq 0} \)-stable but not \( (\rho_i)_{i \geq 0} \)-stable, against our assumption. Thus, (1) implies (2).

Finally, since there exist \( i, j, k > 0 \) with \( \rho_i < \rho_j^* < \rho_k \), item (3) of Corollary \ref{cor:stable-limit} shows that the stable degrees coincide: \( \deg(\rho_i) = \deg(\rho_j^*) \) for all \( i, j > 0 \).

The equality \( \Gamma_{\rho_0} = \Gamma_{\rho_0^*} \) follows from Lemma \ref{lem:stable-limit}. \( \Box \)

Corollary 5.4. Consider two continuous MacLane chains as in (14) having the same stable limit. Suppose that \( \deg(\rho_0) < m \) and \( \deg(\rho_0^*) < m^* \), where \( m, m^* \) are their stable degrees, respectively. Then, \( \rho_0 = \rho_0^* \) and \( m = m^* \).
Proof. By Lemma-Definition 5.3, \( m = m^* \). By Theorem 2.8, the set \( \{ \rho_i \mid i \geq 0 \} \cup \{ \rho_i^* \mid i \geq 0 \} \) is totally ordered.

Suppose that \( \rho_0 < \rho_0^* \). Since \( \deg(\rho_0^*) < m \), we cannot have \( \rho_1 \leq \rho_0^* \). Thus,

\[ \rho_0 < \rho_0^* < \rho_1. \]

By Lemma 5.2, \( \rho_0^* = [\rho_0; \chi_1, \beta] \) for some \( \rho(\chi_1) < \beta < \beta_1 \). This implies \( \deg(\rho_0^*) = m \), against our assumption. Therefore, \( \rho_0 = \rho_0^* \).

Let us check when different building data \( \phi, \gamma \) lead to the same limit-augmentation.

**Lemma 5.5.** Consider two continuous MacLane chains as in (14). Denote their stability functions by \( \mu_\infty, \mu_\infty^* \), and their stable degrees by \( m, m^* \), respectively.

Suppose these continuous chains admit monic non-stable polynomials \( \phi, \phi^* \) of minimal degree, such that \( \deg(\phi) > m, \deg(\phi^*) > m^* \), respectively.

Consider order-preserving embeddings \( \Gamma_{\rho_0} \hookrightarrow \Lambda, \Gamma_{\rho_0^*} \hookrightarrow \Lambda \) into some common ordered group, and suppose that the restrictions of these embeddings to \( \Gamma \) coincide.

Choose \( \gamma, \gamma^* \in \Lambda \) such that \( \rho_i(\phi) < \gamma \) and \( \rho_i^*(\phi^*) < \gamma^* \) for all \( i \geq 0 \).

Then, \( \mu' = [\mu_\infty, \phi, \gamma] \) coincides with \( (\mu')^* = [\mu_\infty^*, \phi^*, \gamma^*] \) if and only if

\[ \mu_\infty = \mu_\infty^*, \quad \deg(\phi) = \deg(\phi^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_\infty(\phi^* - \phi) \geq \gamma = \gamma^*. \]  

Proof. If the conditions of (15) hold, we deduce \( \mu' = (\mu')^* \) by a completely analogous argument to that used in the proof of Lemma 5.1.

Conversely, suppose \( \mu' = (\mu')^* \). By Proposition 5.9, \( \phi, \phi^* \) are key polynomials for \( \mu' \) of minimal degree. Hence, \( \deg(\phi) = \deg(\phi^* \) and Theorem 1.7 shows that

\[ \gamma = \mu'(\phi) = (\mu')(\phi^*) = (\mu')^*(\phi^*) = \gamma^*. \]

In particular, \( \mu_\infty(\phi^* - \phi) = \mu'(\phi^* - \phi) \geq \gamma \).

It remains only to show that the continuous ML-chains are equivalent. Since \( \rho_i, \rho_j^* < \mu' \) for all \( i, j \), Theorem 2.8 shows that the set \( \{ \rho_i \mid i \geq 0 \} \cup \{ \rho_i^* \mid i \geq 0 \} \) is totally ordered. If for some index \( j \) we had \( \rho_j^* > \rho_i \) for all \( i \geq 0 \), then \( \chi_{j+1}^* \) would not be \( (\rho_i)_{i \geq 0} \)-stable. By the minimality of \( \deg(\phi) \) this leads to a contradiction:

\[ m^* = \deg(\chi_{j+1}^*) \geq \deg(\phi) = \deg(\phi^*) > m^*. \]

By Lemma-Definition 5.3, \( \mu_\infty = \mu_\infty^* \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.6.** Let \( (\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1})_{i \geq 0} \) be a continuous MacLane chain, with stable degree \( m \) and stability function \( \mu_\infty \). Let \( \beta_0 = \rho_0(\chi_1) \).

Let \( \Gamma_{\rho_0} \hookrightarrow \Lambda \) be an embedding of ordered groups. Consider the subsets

\[ S = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} S_i \subset \Lambda, \quad S_i = \{ \beta \in \Lambda \mid \beta_i < \beta \leq \beta_{i+1} \}. \]

(1) If \( (\rho_i)_{i \geq 0} \) has a stable limit \( \mu_\infty \), then

\[ (\rho_0, \mu_\infty) \Lambda = \{ \rho_\beta \mid \beta \in S \}. \]

(2) If \( (\rho_i)_{i \geq 0} \) has no stable limit, let \( \mu' = [\mu_\infty, \phi, \gamma] \) be a limit-augmentation, for some \( \gamma \in \Lambda \) such that \( \gamma > T = \{ \rho_j(\phi) \mid j \geq 0 \} \). Then,

\[ (\rho_0, \mu') \Lambda = \{ \rho_\beta \mid \beta \in S \} \cup \{ \mu_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Lambda, \ T < \gamma' < \gamma \}, \]

where \( \mu_\gamma = [\mu_\infty, \phi, \gamma] \).
Theorem 2.8 shows that \( \mu \).

Lemmas 5.2 and 5.6 describe all subintervals indicated in Theorem 4.8.

\[
\text{Lemma 5.3.} \text{ Unicity of MacLane-Vaqué chains.}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Lemma 5.7.} \text{ Consider a finite or infinite MacLane-Vaqué chain of augmentations} \\
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \mu_i \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} \mu_i \rightarrow \cdots \\
\text{Let } \mu \text{ be the last valuation of the chain, or its stable limit.} \\
\text{For any positive integer } m \text{ consider the set} \\
V_m = \{ \mu(f) \mid f \in K[x] \text{ monic with } \deg(f) = m \} \subset \Gamma_{\mu, \infty}.
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{For a fixed index } i \text{ such that } \mu_i < \mu, \text{ denote } m = \deg(\mu_i), \ d = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i, \mu}). \\
\text{Then, the following conditions hold.} \\
\text{1. The set } V_d \text{ contains a maximal element if and only if } \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \text{ is an ordinary augmentation step. In this case, } \mu(\phi_{i+1}) = \gamma_{i+1} \text{ is the maximal value of } V_d. \\
\text{2. The set } V_m \text{ contains a maximal element if and only if } m < d. \\
\text{In this case, } \mu(\phi_i) = \gamma_i \text{ is the maximal value of } V_m.
\end{align*}\]

Proof. Suppose that \( V_d \) contains a maximal element, and let \( \phi \in K[x] \) a monic polynomial of degree \( d \) such that \( \gamma = \mu(\phi) = \Max(V_d) \).

Suppose that \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is a limit-augmentation step with respect to a continuous ML-chain of augmentations \( (\rho_j; \chi_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}) \) of \( \mu_i = \rho_0 \).

Since \( \Phi_{\mu_i, \mu} = \Phi_{\rho_0, \rho_1} = [\chi_1], \rho_0 \), the stable degree of the continuous ML-chain is \( \deg(\chi_1) = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i, \mu}) = d \).
By definition, the minimal degree of non-stable polynomials is greater than \( d \); hence, the polynomial \( \phi \) is stable. This leads to a contradiction. In fact, if \( \mu(\phi) = \rho_j(\phi) \) for some \( j \), then Theorem 1.7 shows that
\[
\gamma = \mu(\phi) = \rho_j(\phi) \leq \rho_j(\chi_{j+1}) < \beta_{j+1} = \rho_{j+1}(\chi_{j+1}) = \mu(\chi_{j+1}),
\]
contradicting the maximality of \( \gamma \).

Therefore, \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) must be an ordinary augmentation step.

Conversely, suppose that \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is an ordinary augmentation step. Since
\[
\Phi_{\mu_i, \mu} = \Phi_{\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}} = [\phi_{i+1}]_{\mu_i},
\]
we have \( d = \deg(\phi_{i+1}) > \deg(\mu_i) = m \), by the conditions we imposed on MLV-chains.

We claim that \( \gamma_{i+1} = \mu_{i+1}(\phi_{i+1}) \) is the maximal value of \( V_d \).

Take a monic \( f \in K[x] \) with \( \deg(f) = d \). By Theorem 1.7, \( \mu_{i+1}(f) \leq \mu_{i+1}(\phi_{i+1}) \).

If \( \mu_{i+1} = \mu \) this proves our claim. If \( \mu_{i+1} = \mu \), then \( d < \deg(\Phi_{\mu_{i+1}, \mu_{i+1}}) \), by the conditions we imposed on MLV-chains. By equation (9),
\[
\mu_{i+1}(f) = \mu_{i+1}(\phi_{i+1}) = \mu_{i+1}(\phi_{i+1}) = \mu(\phi_{i+1}),
\]
so that \( \mu(f) \leq \mu(\phi_{i+1}) = \gamma_{i+1} \). This ends the proof of item (1).

Suppose that \( V_m \) contains a maximal element, and let \( \phi \in K[x] \) a monic polynomial of degree \( m \) such that \( \gamma = \mu(\phi) = \Max(V_m) \).

By the conditions of a MLV-chain, the equality \( m = d = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i, \mu}) \) implies that \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is a limit-augmentation step with stable degree \( m \). In this case, since \( \deg(\phi) = m \), the polynomial \( \phi \) should be stable, and this leads to a contradiction, as we have seen in the previous case. Therefore, \( m < d \).

Conversely, suppose that \( d = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i, \mu}) > m \).

The polynomial \( \phi_i \) is a key polynomial for \( \mu_i \) of degree \( m \). Let us show that \( \gamma_i = \mu_i(\phi_i) = \mu(\phi_i) \) is the maximal value of the set \( V_m \).

Take a monic \( f \in K[x] \) with \( \deg(f) = m \). By Theorem 1.7, \( \mu_i(f) \leq \mu_i(\phi_i) \). On the other hand, by equation (9)
\[
\mu_i(f) = \mu_{i+1}(f) = \mu(f), \quad \mu_i(\phi_i) = \mu_{i+1}(\phi_i) = \mu(\phi_i).
\]
This ends the proof of item (2). \( \square \)

**Theorem 5.8.** Consider two complete infinite MacLane-Vaqué chains
\[
\begin{align*}
\mu_0 & \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_i} \mu_1 & \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_i} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\phi_{i-1}, \gamma_i} & \mu_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} & \mu_i & \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} & \cdots \\
\mu_0^* & \xrightarrow{\phi_1^*, \gamma_i^*} \mu_1^* & \xrightarrow{\phi_2^*, \gamma_i^*} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\phi_{i-1}^*, \gamma_i^*} & \mu_{i-1}^* & \xrightarrow{\phi_i^*, \gamma_i^*} & \mu_i^* & \xrightarrow{\phi_i^*, \gamma_i^*} & \cdots
\end{align*}
\]
having the same stable limit \( \mu \). Denote \( m_i = \deg(\mu_i) \) for all \( i \geq 0 \).

Then, for all \( i \geq 0 \), the following conditions hold.

1. If the set \( V_{m_i} \) defined in (10) contains a maximal element, then:
   a. \( \mu_i = \mu_i^* \) and \( \gamma_i = \gamma_i^* \).
   b. The augmentation steps \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \), \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}^* \) are both ordinary, or both limit-augmentations. In the latter case, the two continuous MacLane chains of \( \mu_i \) are equivalent and have stable degree greater than \( m_i \). In particular, \( \mu_{i, \infty} = \mu_{i, \infty}^* \).
(2) If the set $V_{m_i}$ does not contain a maximal element, the augmentation steps

$$
\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}, \quad \mu_i^* \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}^*
$$

are limit-augmentations whose continuous MacLane chains are equivalent and have stable degree $m_i$. In particular, $\mu_{i,\infty} = \mu_{i+1,\infty}^*$.

Moreover, in both cases (1) and (2), we get $\Gamma_{\mu_i} = \Gamma_{\mu_i^*}$ and $\deg(\phi_{i+1}) = \deg(\phi_{i+1}^*)$.

**Proof.** We proceed by induction on $i \geq 0$. For any fixed index $i \geq 0$ we assume that either $i = 0$, or $i > 0$ and the theorem holds for all lower indices. Note that

$$
\Gamma_{\mu_i-1} = \Gamma_{\mu_i^*-1}, \quad \deg(\phi_i) = \deg(\phi_i^*) = m_i,
$$

either by the induction hypothesis, or because $\Gamma_{\mu_i-1} = \Gamma_{\mu_i^*-1} = \Gamma$ and $\deg(\phi_0) = \deg(\phi_0^*) = 1$.

**Case (1).** $V_{m_i}$ contains a maximal element. By Lemma 5.7, $\gamma_i = \mu(\phi_i)$, $\gamma_i^* = \mu(\phi_i^*)$ are the maximal element of $V_{m_i}$ and

$$
\deg(\mu_i) = \deg(\mu_i^*) = m_i < d := \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu}).
$$

In particular, $\gamma_i = \gamma_i^*$. By equation (10), this implies $\Gamma_{\mu_i} = \Gamma_{\mu_i^*}$.

Suppose that either $i = 0$ or $\mu_{i-1} \rightarrow \mu_i$ is an ordinary augmentation step.

If $i > 0$, then $\Phi_{\mu_{i-1},\mu} = [\phi_i]_{\mu_{i-1}}$, and $m_{i-1} < m_i = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_{i-1},\mu})$ by the conditions imposed on ML-chains. By Lemma 5.7, the set $V_{m_{i-1}}$ contains a maximal element, so that $\mu_{i-1} = \mu_{i-1}^*$ by the induction hypothesis. In any case, since $\deg(\phi_i - \phi_i^*) < m_i$, equation (9) shows that

$$
\mu_{i-1}(\phi_i - \phi_i^*) = \mu_i(\phi_i - \phi_i^*) = \mu(\phi_i - \phi_i^*) \geq \gamma_i.
$$

Since $\phi_0 - \phi_0^* \in K$, this inequality holds in the case $i = 0$ too, by taking $\mu_{i-1} = \nu_i$.

If $i = 0$, we get $\mu_0 = \mu(\phi_0, \gamma_0) = \mu(\phi_0^*, \gamma) = \mu_0^*$, as indicated in (3).

If $i > 0$, we get $\mu_i = \mu_i^*$ by Lemma 5.1.

Now, suppose that $i > 0$ and $\mu_{i-1} \rightarrow \mu_i$ is a limit-augmentation step. By the induction hypothesis, $\mu_{1,\infty}^* \rightarrow \mu_i^*$ is a limit-augmentation step too, and the continuous ML-chains of $\mu_{i-1}$ and $\mu_{i-1}^*$ are equivalent; that is, $\mu_{i-1,\infty} = \mu_{i-1,\infty}^*$. Also, $m_i = \deg(\phi_i) = \deg(\phi_i^*)$ is the minimal degree of non-stable polynomials for both continuous ML-chains. Since $\deg(\phi_i - \phi_i^*) < m_i$, the polynomial $\phi_i - \phi_i^*$ is stable:

$$
\mu_{i-1,\infty}(\phi_i - \phi_i^*) = \mu(\phi_i - \phi_i^*) \geq \gamma_i.
$$

Thus, $\mu_i = \mu_i^*$ by Lemma 5.5. This ends the proof of item (a).

By Lemma 5.7, $\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}$ is ordinary if and only if $\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}^*$ is ordinary, because both facts are equivalent to $V_d$ having a maximal element. In this case, $\deg(\phi_{i+1}) = d = \deg(\phi_{i+1}^*)$.

Now, suppose that $\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}$ and $\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}^*$ are limit-augmentations. Both continuous ML-chains have stable degree $d = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu})$; thus, $\deg(\phi_{i+1}), \deg(\phi_{i+1}^*) > d$.

By Theorem 2.8, the valuations $\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}$ and $\mu_{i+1}^*$ are totally ordered. Suppose that

$$
\mu_i < \mu_{i+1}^* < \mu_{i+1}.
$$
Since \( \deg (\mu_{i+1}^*) > d \), Lemma 5.6 shows that:
\[
[\mu_{i,\infty}^*; \phi_{i+1}^*; \gamma_{i+1}^*] = [\mu_{i,\infty}; \phi_{i+1}, \gamma'],
\]
for some value \( \gamma' \). This implies \( \mu_{i,\infty} = \mu_{i,\infty}^* \) and \( \deg (\phi_{i+1}) = \deg (\phi_{i+1}^*) \), by Lemma 5.5. This ends the proof of Case (1).

**Case (2).** \( V_m \) does not contain a maximal element.

By Lemma 5.7,
\[
\deg (\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu}) = \deg (\mu_i) = m_i = \deg (\mu_i^*) = \deg (\Phi_{\mu_i^*,\mu}) .
\]
By the conditions imposed on MLV-chains, both augmentation steps
\[
\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}, \quad \mu_i^* \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}^*
\]
are limit-augmentations, whose continuous ML-chains
\[
\mu_i \rightarrow (\rho_j; \chi_{j+1}; \beta_{j+1})_{j \geq 0}, \quad \mu_i^* \rightarrow (\rho_j^*; \chi_{j+1}^*; \beta_{j+1}^*)_{j \geq 0}
\]
have stable degree \( m_i \). In particular, the minimal degree of a non-stable polynomial is greater than \( m_i \) in both cases: \( \deg (\phi_{i+1}), \deg (\phi_{i+1}^*) > m_i \).

By Theorem 2.8, the set \( \{ \rho_j \mid j \geq 0 \} \cup \{ \rho_j^* \mid j \geq 0 \} \) is totally ordered. Since the continuous ML-chains have the same stable degree, they must be equivalent.

In fact, \( \rho_j^* > \rho_i \) for all \( i \) would imply that \( \chi_{j+1}^* \) is not \( (\rho_j)_{j \geq 2i}-\)stable, contradicting the minimality of \( \deg (\phi_{i+1}) \). By Lemma-Definition 5.3, the continuous ML-chains are equivalent, so that \( \mu_{i,\infty} = \mu_{i,\infty}^* \) and \( \Gamma_{\mu_i} = \Gamma_{\mu_i^*} \).

Also, this implies that the minimal degrees of non-stable polynomials coincide: \( \deg (\phi_{i+1}) = \deg (\phi_{i+1}^*) \). This ends the proof of Case (2). \( \square \)

**Corollary 5.9.** With the above notation, the following conditions hold.

(1) \( \Gamma_{\mu_i} = \Gamma_{\mu_i^*} \) and \( \deg (\mu_i) = \deg (\mu_i^*) \), for all \( i \geq 0 \).

(2) If \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is an ordinary augmentation step, then
\[
\mu_i = \mu_i^*, \quad \gamma_i = \gamma_i^*, \quad \mu_{i+1} = \mu_{i+1}^*, \quad \gamma_{i+1} = \gamma_{i+1}^* .
\]

(3) If \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is a limit-augmentation step, then \( \mu_i^* \rightarrow \mu_{i+1}^* \) is a limit-augmentation step and \( \mu_{i,\infty} = \mu_{i,\infty}^* \).

**Proof.** Only item (2) deserves some comments. If \( \mu_i \rightarrow \mu_{i+1} \) is an ordinary augmentation step, then by the conditions imposed on MLV-chains
\[
\deg (\mu_i) < \deg (\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu}) , \quad \deg (\mu_{i+1}) < \deg (\Phi_{\mu_{i+1},\mu}) .
\]
By Lemma 5.7 both sets \( V_m \) and \( V_{m+1} \) contain a maximal element and we fall in Case (1) of Theorem 5.8 for both indices \( i \) and \( i + 1 \). \( \square \)

These arguments yield completely analogous results for MacLane-Vaquié chains of finite and quasi-finite depth.

**Theorem 5.10.** Consider two complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chains
\[
\mu_0 \phi_1 \gamma_1 \mu_1 \phi_2 \gamma_2 \cdots \rightarrow \mu_{r-1} \phi_r \gamma_r \mu_r
\]
\[
\mu_0^* \phi_1^* \gamma_1^* \mu_1^* \phi_2^* \gamma_2^* \cdots \rightarrow \mu_{s-1}^* \phi_s^* \gamma_s^* \mu_s^*
\]
having the same last valuation \( \mu_r = \mu = \mu_s^* \). Then, \( r = s \).

Moreover, if \( r > 0 \), then all statements of Theorem 7.8 hold, for all \( 0 \leq i < r \).
Proof. Suppose that $r \leq s$. The arguments in the proof of Theorem 5.8 show that $\deg(\mu_r) = \deg(\mu_s^*)$. This implies $r = s$, because otherwise

\[
\deg(\mu^*_r) > \deg(\mu^*_s) = \deg(\mu_r) = \deg(\mu), \quad \forall i > r,
\]

and this contradicts Corollary 2.7. \hfill \square

Theorem 5.11. Consider two complete finite MacLane-Vaquié chains, followed by a continuous MacLane chain admitting the same stable limit:

\[
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \rightarrow \mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r = \rho_0 (\kappa_i \chi_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1}) \geq 0 \mu_{\infty}
\]

\[
\mu_0^* \xrightarrow{\phi_1^*, \gamma_1^*} \mu_1^* \xrightarrow{\phi_2^*, \gamma_2^*} \cdots \rightarrow \mu_{s-1}^* \xrightarrow{\phi_s^*, \gamma_s^*} \mu_s^* = \rho_0 (\kappa_i^* \chi_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}) \geq 0 \mu_{\infty}
\]

and such that $\deg(\mu_r) < m$, $\deg(\mu_s^*) < m^*$, where $m$, $m^*$ are the stable degrees of the continuous MacLane chains.

Then, $r = s$, $\mu_r = \mu_s^*$ and $m = m^*$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.4, $m = m^*$ and $\mu_r = \mu_s^*$. By Theorem 5.10, $r = s$. \hfill \square

6. Structure of $\mathcal{G}_\mu$ as a $\mathcal{G}_v$-algebra

Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $K[x]$. Let $\kappa = \kappa(\mu)$ be the algebraic closure of $k$ in $\Delta = \Delta_\mu$.

By Theorem 4.8, there is a MacLane-Vaquié chain

\[
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \rightarrow \mu_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_i, \gamma_i} \mu_i \rightarrow \cdots
\]

such that $\mu$ falls in one of the following three cases:

1. $\mu = \mu_r$ has finite depth,
2. $\mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \rho_i$ is the stable limit of a continuous ML-chain of $\mu_r$ of stable degree $m$. Moreover, either $r = 0$, or $\deg(\mu_r) < m$.
3. $\mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mu_i$ is the stable limit of the infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain.

For each index $i \geq 0$, we denote

\[
\Gamma_i = \Gamma_{\mu_i}, \quad \Delta_i = \Delta_{\mu_i}, \quad \kappa_i = \kappa(\mu_i), \quad m_i = \deg(\mu_i).
\]

Also, we agree that $\Gamma_{-1} = \Gamma$.

For $i \geq 0$ suppose that $\text{KP}(\mu_i) \neq \emptyset$; that is, either $\mu_i < \mu$ or, $i = r$ and $\mu_r = \mu$ has trivial support. Then, we consider the following element in the graded algebra $\mathcal{G}_{\mu_i}$:

\[
q_i = H_{\mu_i}(\phi_i)
\]

homogeneous prime element of degree $\gamma_i$.

For $i \geq 0$ suppose that $\mu_i$ is residually transcendental; that is, either $\mu_i < \mu$ or, $i = r$ and $\mu_r = \mu$ is commensurable over $v$ with $\text{KP}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. Then, we consider the following elements in the graded algebra $\mathcal{G}_{\mu_i}$:

\[
u_i e_i \xi_i u_i^{-1} \in \Delta_i \quad \text{Hauptmodul of } \Delta_i \text{ over } \kappa_i
\]

Order $\rho$ be any valuation such that $\mu_i < \rho \leq \mu$. By Corollary 2.7, the canonical homomorphism $G_{\mu_i} \rightarrow G_{\rho}$ maps the three elements $q_i, u_i, \xi_i$ to homogeneous units in $\mathcal{G}_\rho$, which we denote by $x_i, u_i, z_i$, respectively.

In this notation, we omit the reference to the valuation $\rho$. Actually, this will be a general convention on the notation of units of the graded algebras.
Convection. Let $\eta < \rho$ be two valuations on $K[x]$. Given a unit $u \in G^*_\rho$, we denote by the same symbol $u \in G^*_\mu$ the image of $u$ under the canonical homomorphism $G_\eta \to G_\mu$. By Theorem 6.2 we determine the structure of the fields $\kappa_i$ and its minimal polynomial over $\kappa_i$ is the residual polynomial $R_{\mu_i, \phi_i, u_i}(\phi)$.

Proof. If $\mu_i \to \mu_{i+1}$ is an ordinary augmentation with $\mu_{i+1} \leq \mu$, then $\phi = \phi_{i+1}$. Let us denote $\rho = \mu_{i+1}$ in this case.

Otherwise, $\mu_i = \rho_0$ is the starting valuation of some continuous ML-chain, and $\phi = \chi_1$. Let us denote $\rho = \rho_1$ in this case. Let

$$R = R_{\mu_i, \phi_i, u_i} : K[x] \to \kappa_i[y]$$

be the residual polynomial operator attached to $\mu_i$ in section 1.3.

In all cases, $\phi_i$ is a key polynomial for $\mu_i$ of minimal degree, and $\phi$ is a key polynomial for $\mu_i$ such that $\phi_i \mid_{\mu_i} \phi$. Hence, the decomposition $\phi_i = \epsilon R(\phi)(\xi_i)$ for some unit $\epsilon \in G^*_{\mu_i}$. By Corollary 2.7 the homomorphism $G_{\mu_i} \to G_\rho$ vanishes on $H_{\mu_i}(\phi)$. Thus, it vanishes on $R(\phi)(\xi_i)$ too; that is, $R(\phi)(z_i) = 0$.

This ends the proof, because $R(\phi) \in \kappa_i[y]$ is a monic irreducible polynomial by Theorem 1.14.

Our aim in this section is to describe the structure of $G_\mu$ as a $G_\rho$-algebra, in terms of data supported by any MacLane-Vaquié chain of $\mu$.

6.1. Computation of $\kappa$ and the residue class field $k_\mu$. As a preliminary result, we determine the structure of the fields $\kappa$ and $k_\mu$.

Theorem 6.2. If $\mu = \mu_r$ has finite depth, then

$$\kappa = k(z_0, \ldots, z_{r-1}), \quad k_\mu = \begin{cases} \kappa(\xi_r), & \text{if } \gamma_r < \infty \text{ and } \mu/v \text{ commensurable,} \\ \kappa, & \text{if } \gamma_r = \infty \text{ or } \mu/v \text{ incommensurable.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose that $\mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \rho_i$ is the stable limit of a continuous ML-chain of $\mu_r$ of stable degree $m$. Moreover, either $r = 0$, or $\deg(\mu_r) < m$. Then,

$$\kappa = k(z_0, \ldots, z_r) = k_\mu.$$ 

If $\mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mu_i$ is the stable limit of an infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain, then

$$\kappa = k(z_0, \ldots, z_i, \ldots) = k_\mu.$$

Theorem 6.2 will follow from the computation of $\kappa$ in an augmentation step, ordinary or limit, and in a stable limit. The statements about $k_\mu$ follow from Theorems 1.10, 1.11 and 1.13.

Lemma 6.3. For any augmentation $\mu_i \xrightarrow{\phi_{i+1}, \gamma_{i+1}} \mu_{i+1}$, either ordinary or limit, we have $\kappa_{i+1} = \kappa_i(z_i).$
Proof. Let $\epsilon \in \kappa_{i+1}^* = \Delta_{i+1}^*$. By Lemma 1.6 a unit of degree zero in the graded algebra may be written as

$$\epsilon = H_{\mu_i+1}(a), \quad a \in K[x], \quad \deg(a) < m_{i+1}, \quad \mu_{i+1}(a) = 0.$$ 

Suppose that the augmentation step is ordinary. Since $\phi_{i+1} \mu_i a$, Proposition 2.4 shows that $\mu_i(a) = \mu_{i+1}(a) = 0$. Hence, $H_{\mu_i}(a)$ belongs to $\Delta_i$, so that $\epsilon = H_{\mu_i+1}(a)$ belongs to the image of the ring homomorphism $\Delta_i \to \Delta_{i+1}$. By Theorem 1.13 $\Delta_i = \kappa_i[\xi_i]$, and we deduce that

$$\epsilon \in \operatorname{Im}(\Delta_i \to \Delta_{i+1}) = \kappa_i[z_i] = \kappa_i(z_i).$$

Now, suppose that the step is a limit-augmentation. The condition $\deg(a) < m_{i+1}$ implies that $a$ is stable with respect to the continuous ML-chain $(\rho_i; \chi_{i+1}; \beta_{i+1})$ of $\mu_i$. Hence, there exists an index $j$ such that

$$\rho_j(a) = \rho_{j+1}(a) = \mu_{i+1}(a) = 0.$$ 

This means that $\epsilon$ is the image of the unit $H_{\rho_{j+1}}(a) \in \kappa(\rho_{j+1})$.

By the computation in the ordinary case (and Corollary 6.4 below which follows immediately from it), we have $\kappa(\rho_{j+1}) = \kappa(\rho_1) = \kappa_i(z_i)$.

\begin{corollary}
Let $\mu_i \xrightarrow{\phi \gamma_j} \rho$ be an ordinary augmentation such that $\deg(\phi) = m_i$. Then, the canonical homomorphism $\mathcal{G}_{\mu_i} \to \mathcal{G}_\rho$ identifies $\kappa_i = \kappa(\rho)$.
\end{corollary}

Proof. By Lemma 6.3, $\kappa(\rho) = \kappa_i(z_i)$. Since $\deg(\phi) = \deg(\phi_j)$, Theorem 1.14 shows that $\deg(R_{\mu_i, \phi, \mu_i}(\phi)) = 1$. By Lemma 6.1, $z_i$ belongs to (the image of) $\kappa_i$. \hfill $\square$

Corollary 6.4. Let $\mu_i \xrightarrow{\phi \gamma_j} \rho$ be an ordinary augmentation such that $\deg(\phi) = m_i$. Then, the canonical homomorphism $\mathcal{G}_{\mu_i} \to \mathcal{G}_\rho$ identifies $\kappa_i = \kappa(\rho)$.

Proof. By Lemma 6.3, $\kappa(\rho) = \kappa_i(z_i)$. Since $\deg(\phi) = \deg(\phi_j)$, Theorem 1.14 shows that $\deg(R_{\mu_i, \phi, \mu_i}(\phi)) = 1$. By Lemma 6.1, $z_i$ belongs to (the image of) $\kappa_i$. \hfill $\square$

Corollary 6.5. Up to natural isomorphisms, the tower of finite extensions

$$k = k_0 \twoheadrightarrow k_1 \twoheadrightarrow \cdots \twoheadrightarrow k_i \twoheadrightarrow \cdots$$

is independent of the MacLane-Vaquié chain underlying $\mu$.

Finally, Theorem 6.2 follows from Lemma 6.3 and the following observation.

Lemma 6.6. (1) If $\mu = \lim_{j \to \infty} \rho_j$ is the stable limit of a continuous MacLane-chain $(\rho_j; \chi_{j+1}; \beta_{j+1})$ of $\mu_i = \rho_0$, then

$$\kappa = \kappa(\rho_1) = \kappa_i(z_i).$$

(2) If $\mu = \lim_{j \to \infty} \rho_j$ is the stable limit of an infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain, then

$$\kappa = \bigcup_{j \geq 0} \kappa_j.$$ 

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, $\operatorname{KP}(\mu) = \emptyset$ and every non-zero homogeneous element in $\mathcal{G}_{\mu}$ is a unit. Hence, any $\epsilon \in \kappa^* = \Delta^*$ may be written as

$$\epsilon = H_{\mu}(f), \quad f \in K[x], \quad \mu(f) = 0.$$ 

In case (1), there exists an index $j$ such that $\rho_j(f) = \rho_{j+1}(f) = \mu(f) = 0$. The canonical homomorphisms $\mathcal{G}_{\rho_j} \to \mathcal{G}_{\rho_{j+1}} \to \mathcal{G}_\mu$ map $H_{\rho_j}(f) \mapsto H_{\rho_{j+1}}(f) \mapsto H_{\mu}(f) = \epsilon$.

Since $H_{\rho_{j+1}}(f)$ is a unit of degree zero in $\mathcal{G}_{\rho_{j+1}}$, it belongs to $\kappa(\rho_{j+1}) = \kappa(\rho_1)$, the last equality by Corollary 6.4. By Lemma 6.3, $\kappa(\rho_1) = \kappa_i(z_i)$.

This proves (1). The proof of (2) is completely analogous. \hfill $\square$
6.2. Structure of $G_\mu$ as a $G_v$-algebra. With the above notation, the embedding of
graded $k$-algebras $G_v \hookrightarrow G_\mu$ induces a natural embedding of graded $\kappa$-algebras:

$$(G_v \otimes_k \kappa) \hookrightarrow G_\mu.$$ 

The aim of this section is to find an explicit description of $G_\mu$ as a $(G_v \otimes_k \kappa)$-algebra.

Together with Theorem 6.2, which computes $\kappa$ in terms of data of the underlying
MacLane-Vaquié chain of $\mu$, we obtain an explicit description of the structure of $G_\mu$
as a $G_v$-algebra.

**Lemma 6.7.** Let $\mu_i < \mu$ be a node of the MacLane-Vaquié chain underlying $\mu$. For
any $\alpha \in \Gamma_i$, there exists a homogeneous unit $u \in G_{\mu_i}^*$ of degree $\alpha$ if and only if
$\alpha \in \Gamma_{i-1}$. In this case,

$$(P_\alpha(\mu_i)/P_\alpha^+(\mu_i)) \cap G_{\mu_i}^* = \kappa_i^+ u.$$ 

**Proof.** As we have seen in (11), $\Gamma_{i-1} = \Gamma_{i,m_i}$. Thus, for any $\alpha \in \Gamma_{i-1}$ there exists
$a \in K[x]$ with $\deg(a) < m_i$ such that $\mu_i(a) = \alpha$. By Lemma 1.6, $H_{\mu_i}(a)$ is a unit of
degree $\alpha$.

On the other hand, by (10), any $\alpha \in \Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}$ can be written as

$$\alpha = \ell \gamma_i + \beta, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \ell \neq 0, \quad \beta \in \Gamma_{i-1}.$$ 

If $\ell < 0$, Lemma 1.3 shows that $P_\alpha = 0$. Suppose that $\ell > 0$.

By the previous argument, there exists a unit $u \in G_{\mu_i}^*$ of degree $\beta$. Then, $u q_i^\ell$
has degree $\alpha$, and there is no unit in

$$P_\alpha/P_\alpha^+ = (u q_i^\ell) \Delta_i,$$

because $q_i$ is a prime element in $G_{\mu_i}$.

Finally, if $u \in G_{\mu_i}^*$ is a homogeneous unit of degree $\alpha$, we have

$$(P_\alpha/P_\alpha^+) \cap G_{\mu_i}^* = (\Delta_i u) \cap G_{\mu_i}^* = \Delta_i^+ u = \kappa_i^+ u.$$ 

This ends the proof of the lemma. 

**Theorem 6.8.** (1) If $\mu = \mu_\tau$ has finite depth, then

$$G_\mu = \begin{cases} 
(G_v \otimes_k \kappa)[x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}], & \text{if } \gamma_r = \infty, \\
(G_v \otimes_k \kappa)[x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}][q_r], & \text{if } \gamma_r < \infty.
\end{cases}$$

If $\gamma_r < \infty$, then $q_r$ is a homogeneous prime element of degree $\gamma_r$ which is transcen-
dental over $G_v \otimes_k \kappa$. If moreover $\mu/v$ is commensurable, this element satisfies the
following algebraic minimal equation over $\Delta = \kappa[\xi_r]$:

$$q_r^{e_r} = u_r \xi_r.\tag{18}$$

(2) Suppose that $\mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \rho_i$ is the stable limit of a continuous ML-chain of $\mu_\tau$
of stable degree $m$. Moreover, either $r = 0$, or $\deg(\mu_\tau) < m$. Then,

$$G_\mu = (G_v \otimes_k \kappa)[x_0, \ldots, x_r].$$

(3) If $\mu = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mu_i$ is the stable limit of an infinite MacLane-Vaquié chain, then

$$G_\mu = (G_v \otimes_k \kappa)[x_0, \ldots, x_i, \ldots].$$

In all three cases, $x_i$ is a homogeneous unit of degree $\gamma_i$ which is algebraic over
$G_v \otimes_k \kappa$, with minimal equation

$$x_i^{e_i} = u_i z_i, \quad i \geq 0.\tag{19}$$
Proof. Suppose that \( \mu = \mu_r \) has finite depth. Since \( \Gamma_{r-1} = \langle \Gamma, \gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_{r-1} \rangle \) and \( x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1} \) are units of degree \( \gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_{r-1} \) respectively, the subalgebra
\[
(\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}]
\]
contains a homogeneous unit \( u_\alpha \) of degree \( \alpha \), for all \( \alpha \in \Gamma_{r-1} \). By Lemma 6.7 this algebra contains all homogeneous units of degree \( \alpha \), for all \( \alpha \in \Gamma_{r-1} \).

If \( \gamma_r = \infty \), we have \( \Gamma_\mu = \Gamma_{r-1} \) and for all \( \alpha \in \Gamma_\mu \),
\[
P_\alpha(\mu)/P_\alpha^+(\mu) = \kappa u_\alpha \subset (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}].
\]
Hence, \( (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}] = \mathcal{G}_\mu \).

Suppose \( \gamma_r < \infty \), and consider the subalgebra
\[
\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}][q_r] \subset \mathcal{G}_\mu.
\]

If \( \mu/v \) is incommensurable, then \( \Delta = \kappa \) by Theorem 1.11. If \( \mu/v \) is commensurable, the algebra \( \mathcal{G} \) contains \( \xi_r = q_r^{e_r} u_r^{-1} \) because \( (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}] \) contains \( u_r \) by the arguments above. Thus, in all cases
\[
\Delta \subset \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{G}_\mu.
\]

We claim that \( \mathcal{G} \) contains a homogeneous element of degree \( \alpha \) for all \( \alpha \in \Gamma_r = \Gamma_\mu \) such that \( P_\alpha/P_\alpha^+ \neq 0 \).

In fact, if \( P_\alpha/P_\alpha^+ \) contains a non-zero element \( H_\mu(f) \), Lemma 1.3 shows that
\[
\alpha = \mu(f) = \ell \gamma_r + \beta, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad \beta \in \Gamma_{r-1}.
\]
If \( u \) is an homogeneous unit in \( (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}] \) of degree \( \beta \), the element \( \zeta = q_r^{e_r} u \) belongs to \( \mathcal{G} \) and has degree \( \alpha \).

Hence, \( P_\alpha/P_\alpha^+ = \Delta \zeta \) is contained in \( \mathcal{G} \). This proves that \( \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_\mu \).

This proves (1). The other two cases follow from similar arguments. Actually, the proof is easier in both cases, because \( \Delta = \kappa \) and all non-zero homogeneous elements are units.

The arguments in the proof of Theorem 6.8 show that for all \( \alpha \in \Gamma_{i-1} \) the subalgebra \( (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{i-1}] \) contains all homogeneous units of degree \( \alpha \).

Therefore, we may reinterpret Theorem 6.8 as an intrinsic construction of \( \mathcal{G}_\mu \), depending only on the data \( e_i, \gamma_i \) for all \( i \geq 0 \).

For instance, suppose that \( \mu \) has finite depth \( r \). We consider indeterminates \( x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1} \) of degrees \( \gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_{r-1} \), submitted to the relations (13).

For \( i < r-1 \), once the subalgebra \( (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{i-1}] \) has been constructed, we may choose an arbitrary homogeneous unit \( u_i \) of degree \( e_i \gamma_i \in \Gamma_{i-1} \) in this subalgebra, and this facilitates the construction of \( (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_i] \).

If \( \gamma_r = \infty \) we get \( \mathcal{G}_\mu = (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}] \).

If \( \gamma_r < \infty \), we consider an indeterminate \( q_r \) of degree \( \gamma_r \) and we take \( \mathcal{G}_\mu = (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}][q_r] \).

If \( \gamma_r \) belongs to \( \Gamma_0 \), then \( e_r \gamma_r \in \Gamma_{r-1} \) and we may take a homogeneous unit \( u_r \) of degree \( e_r \gamma_r \) in \( (\mathcal{G}_v \otimes_k \kappa) [x_0, \ldots, x_{r-1}] \). Then, \( \xi_r = q_r^{e_r} u_r^{-1} \) is transcendental over \( \kappa \) and \( \Delta = \kappa[\xi_r] \) is the subring of homogeneous elements of degree zero in this algebra.
7. Defect of the extension of a valuation

7.1. Numerical data attached to a valuation on $K[x]$. Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $K[x]$ with underlying MacLane-Vaquié chain as in (17).

Keeping with all notation introduced in section [4] we may attach to each node $\mu_i < \mu$ of the chain the following numerical data.

The relative ramification index and residual degree, defined as

$$e_i = (\Gamma_i: \Gamma_{i-1}), \quad f_i = \deg_{\kappa_i}(z_i) = [\kappa_{i+1}: \kappa_i],$$

respectively. Also, the relative gap is defined as

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mu_i \to \mu_{i+1} \text{ is an ordinary augmentation}, \\ \deg(\phi_{i+1})/m, & \text{if } \mu_i \to \mu_{i+1} \text{ is a limit-augmentation}, \end{cases}$$

where $m$ is the stable degree of the continuous ML-chain of $\mu_i$.

By Corollaries 5.9 and 6.5 these numbers are intrinsic data of $\mu$.

Lemma 7.1. If $\mu_i < \mu$, then $\deg(\phi_{i+1}) = e_if_id_i \deg(\phi_i)$.

Proof. We recall that $\phi_i$ is a key polynomial for $\mu_i$ of minimal degree. Denote simply by $R$ the residual polynomial operator $R_{\mu_i,\phi_i,\kappa_i}$

Suppose that $\mu_i \to \mu_{i+1}$ is an ordinary augmentation. Theorem 1.14 shows that

$$\deg(\phi_{i+1}) = \deg(\phi_i)e_i \deg(R(\phi_{i+1})).$$

Since $\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu_{i+1}} = [\phi_{i+1}]_{\mu_i}$, Lemma 6.1 shows that $\deg(R(\phi_{i+1})) = f_i$. This proves the lemma in this case, in which $d_i = 1$.

Suppose that $\mu_i \to \mu_{i+1}$ is a limit-augmentation with respect to the continuous ML-chain $(\rho_j; \chi_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1})_{j \geq 0}$ of $\mu_{i-1}$. Let $m = \deg(\chi_1)$ be the stable degree.

Theorem 1.14 shows that

$$\deg(\phi_{i+1}) = \frac{\deg(\phi_{i+1})}{m} \deg(\chi_1) = d_i \deg(\chi_1) = d_i \deg(\phi_i)e_i \deg(R(\chi_1)).$$

Since $\Phi_{\mu_i,\mu_{i+1}} = [\chi_1]_{\mu_i}$, Lemma 6.1 shows that $\deg(R(\chi_1)) = f_i$.

For any $i \geq 0$ we may consider the valuation

$$v_i := v_{\mu_i,\phi_i} := [\mu_i; \phi_i, \infty],$$

with support $p_{v_i} = \phi_iK[x]$. This valuation determines an extension of $v$ to the finite field extension $K_{\phi_i}/K$, where $K_{\phi_i} = K[x]/(\phi_iK[x])$. We abuse of language and use the same symbol $v_i$ to denote this valuation:

$$v_i: K[x] \to K_{\phi_i} \xrightarrow{v_i} \Gamma_{\mu_i} \infty, \quad \Gamma_{v_i} = \Gamma_{\mu_i,\kappa_i} = \Gamma_{i-1}, \quad k_{v_i} \simeq \kappa_i.$$
In fact, the formulas for $e(\phi_i)$ and $f(\phi_i)$ follow immediately from (20) and the definition of the numbers $e_j, f_j$. The formula for $d(\mu/v)$ follows from Lemma 7.1.

7.2. Defect of a valuation on a simple finite extension of fields. Let $L/K$ be a finite simple field extension. That is, $L = K(\theta)$, where $\theta$ is the root of some monic irreducible $F \in K[x]$ in some fixed algebraic closure of $K$.

Let $\mu$ be a valuation on $L$ extending $v$. We abuse of language and use the same symbol to denote the valuation on $K[x]$ determined by $\mu$.

Since $\mu$ has non-trivial support $p = F_K[x]$, Lemma-Definition 4.9 shows that $\mu$ has finite depth and admits a finite MacLane-Vaquié chain

$$
\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r = \mu
$$

with $\gamma_r = \infty$ and $\phi_r = F$. By the definitions in (20),

(22) $$[L : K] = \deg(\phi_r) = e(\mu/v)f(\mu/v)d(\mu/v).$$

If $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_g$ are the different extensions of $v$ to $L$, the well known inequality

$$
\sum_{i=1}^g e(\eta_i/v)f(\eta_i/v) \leq [L : K]
$$

gives a hint about the information contained in the rational number $d(\mu/v)$.

However, if $\mu$ is the only extension of $v$ to $L$, then the equality in (22) shows that $d(\mu/v)$ coincides with the defect of the extension $\mu/v$.

In this case, $d(\mu/v) = p^a$ is an integer, where $p = 1$ if $k$ has characteristic zero and $p$ is the characteristic of $k$ if it is positive.

Hence, the computation of (21) yields the following result.

**Corollary 7.2.** If $\mu$ is the only extension of $v$ to $L$, the defect of the extension $\mu/v$ is the product of the relative gaps of any MacLane-Vaquié chain of $\mu$.
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