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Abstract. Splice type surface singularities were introduced by Neumann and Wahl as a generalization of the class of Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm complete intersections of dimension two. Their construction depends on a weighted graph with no loops called a splice diagram. In this paper, we study these singularities from the tropical viewpoint. We characterize their local tropicalizations as the cones over the appropriately embedded associated splice diagram. Furthermore, under suitable coprimality conditions on the weights of the splice diagram, we show that the diagram can be uniquely recovered from the local tropicalization. As a corollary, we reprove some of Neumann and Wahl’s earlier results on these singularities by purely tropical methods, and show that splice type surface singularities are Newton non-degenerate in the sense of Khovanskii.

1. Introduction

Splice diagrams are finite trees with half-edges weighted by integers and with nodes (internal vertices) decorated by ± signs. If the half-edge weights around each node are pairwise coprime, we say the splice diagram is coprime. This class was first introduced by Siebenmann [34] in 1980 to encode graph manifolds which are integral homology spheres. Coprime splice diagrams with only + node decorations and positive half-edge weights were used by Eisenbud and Neumann in [4] to study normal surface singularities. One of the main theorems of [4] states that integral homology sphere links of normal surface singularities are described by positively-weighted coprime splice diagrams satisfying the edge determinant condition, namely, that the product of the weights associated to any fixed edge must be greater than the product of the weights of the neighboring half-edges.

Interesting isolated singularities arise from splice diagrams. For example, complete intersections of Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm hypersurface singularities are associated to star splice diagrams (i.e., those with a single node). As recognized by Hamm in [6, §5] and [7], in order to determine an isolated singularity in $\mathbb{C}^n$, all maximal minors of the coefficient matrix $(c_{ij})_{i,j}$ of each polynomial $f_i := \sum_j c_{ij} z_j^{a_j}$ in the Brieskorn system must be non-zero. In turn, work of Neumann [17] shows that universal abelian covers of quasi-homogeneous complex normal surface singularities with rational homology sphere links are complete intersections of Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm hypersurface singularities.

In 2002, Neumann and Wahl [19] extended this family of complete intersections by defining splice type surface singularities associated to splice diagrams whose weights satisfy a special arithmetic property called the semigroup condition. These singularities are defined by explicit splice type systems of convergent power series near the origin, whose coefficients satisfy generalizations of Hamm’s maximal minors conditions. Splice type surface singularities (and the related splice quotients) have been further studied by both authors in [20, 21, 22], and by Némethi, Okuma and Pedersen [13, 14, 15, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30]. For more details, we refer the reader to the surveys [18, 27, 39].

The present paper uses tropical geometry techniques to study splice type systems with $n$ leaves associated to splice diagrams satisfying the edge determinant and the semigroup conditions. Our first main result recovers and strengthens a central theorem from [20] (see Theorem 2.14). More precisely:

Theorem 1.1. Splice type surface singularities are Newton non-degenerate isolated complete intersections not contained in any coordinate subspace of the corresponding ambient space $\mathbb{C}^n$.
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Theorem 1.2. Let $\Gamma$ be a splice diagram satisfying the semigroup condition and let $(X,0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be the germ defined by an associated splice type system. Then, the finite local tropicalization of $X$ is the cone over an embedding of $\Gamma$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, in the coprime case, $\Gamma$ can be uniquely recovered from this fan.

Theorem 1.2 shows that the link at the origin of the local tropicalization of $(X,0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ (obtained by intersecting the fan with the $(n-1)$-dimensional sphere) is homeomorphic to the splice diagram $\Gamma$. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first tropical interpretation of Siebenmann’s splice diagrams. In this spirit, we view Siebenmann’s paper [34] as a precursor to tropical geometry (for others, see [12, Chapter 1]).

Our method to characterize the local tropicalization is different from the general one explained in Oka’s book [23] and described briefly above. Namely, we do not use the Newton polyhedron of the product of defining series $f_i$. Instead, we use a “mine-sweeping” approach, using successive stellar subdivisions of the standard simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$ dictated by the splice diagram to remove relatively open cones in the positive orthant avoiding the local tropicalization. Once the local tropicalization is determined (via Theorem 1.2), a simple computation confirms the Newton non-degeneracy of the system. In turn, by analyzing the local tropicalizations of the germ intersected with the coordinate subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n$ we conclude that $(X,0)$ is an isolated complete intersection surface singularity, thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.1.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the definitions and main properties of splice diagrams, splice type systems and end-curves associated to rooted splice diagrams, following [20, 21]. Sections 3 and 4 include necessary background material of local tropicalizations and Newton non-degeneracy. In Section 5 we show how to embed a given splice diagram $\Gamma$ with $n$ leaves into the standard $(n-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and highlight various convexity properties of this map. The proof of the first part of Theorem 1.2 is discussed in Section 6, while Theorem 1.1 is proven in Section 7. Finally, Section 8 characterizes local...
tropicalizations of splice type systems defined by a coprime splice diagram and shows how to recover the diagram from the tropical fan, thus yielding the second part of Theorem 1.2.

Appendix A, written by Jonathan Wahl, includes a proof of [20, Lemma 3.3] that was absent from the literature. This result confirms that given a finite sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) in \(\mathbb{C} \{z_1, \ldots, z_n\}\) and a fixed positive integer vector \(w \in \mathbb{Z}^n\), the regularity of the sequence \((\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_s))\) of initial forms ensures the original sequence is regular, and furthermore, the \(w\)-initial ideal must be generated by the sequence of initial forms. This statement is essential to determine if a given \(w\) lies in the local tropicalization of the germ defined by the vanishing of the input sequence (see Corollary 7.5), providing an alternative proof to part of Theorem 1.2.

2. Splice diagrams, splice type systems and end-curves from rooted splice diagrams

In this section, we recall the construction of splice diagrams and the splice type systems associated to them. The definitions follow closely the work of Neumann and Wahl in [20, 21].

We start with some basic terminology and notation. A tree is a connected graph with no cycles and finitely many vertices, none of which has valency two. A node is a vertex \(v\) whose valency \(\delta_v\) is greater than one, whereas one-valent vertices are called leaves. For convenience, we often decompose the set of vertices of a tree \(\Gamma\) into the sets of nodes \(V(\Gamma)\) and leaves \(\partial\Gamma\). The star of a vertex \(v\) is the collection \(\text{Star}_\Gamma(v)\) of edges adjacent to \(v\). When the ambient graph is understood from the context, we remove it from the notation and simply write \(\text{Star}(v)\). By design, it contains precisely \(\delta_v\) edges.

**Definition 2.1.** A splice diagram is a tree \([\Gamma] = (V(\Gamma), E(\Gamma))\) with at least one node and no valency two vertices, and decorated with a collection of weight functions on the star of each node \(v\) of \(\Gamma\) denoted by
\[
\text{Star}_\Gamma(v) \to \mathbb{Z}_{>0}: e \mapsto d_{v,e}.
\]

We call \(d_{v,e}\) the weight of \(e\) at \(v\). If \(u\) is any other vertex of \(\Gamma\) such that \(e\) lies in the unique geodesic of \(\Gamma\) joining \(u\) and \(v\), we write \(d_{v,u} := d_{v,e}\). We view this as the weight in the neighborhood of \(v\) pointing towards \(u\). The total weight of a node \(v\) of \(\Gamma\) is the product \(d_v := \prod_{e \in E(\text{Star}(v))} d_{v,e}\).

**Remark 2.2.** Abusing notation, we may view \(\text{Star}_\Gamma(v)\) as a splice diagram with weights around its unique node \(v\) inherited from \(\Gamma\). Splice diagrams with a single node will be referred to as star splice diagrams, and the underlying graphs as star trees.

**Definition 2.3.** Given a subset \(W = \{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}\) of vertices of \(\Gamma\) we denote by \([W]\) or \([p_1, \ldots, p_k]\) the subtree of \(\Gamma\) spanned by these points on the tree \(\Gamma\). We call it the convex hull of the set \(\{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}\) inside \(\Gamma\). For example, \(\Gamma = [\partial\Gamma]\).

**Definition 2.4.** Let \(u\) and \(v\) be two distinct vertices of \(\Gamma\). The linking number \(\ell_{v,u}\) between \(v\) and \(u\) is the product of all the weights adjacent to, but not on, the geodesic \([u,v]\) joining \(u\) and \(v\). Therefore, \(\ell_{v,u} = \ell_{u,v}\).

We set \(\ell_{v,e} := d_v\) for each node \(v\) of \(\Gamma\). The reduced linking number \(\ell'_{v,u}\) is defined via a similar product where we exclude the weights around \(u\) and \(v\). In particular, \(\ell'_{v,v} = 1\) for each node \(v\) of \(\Gamma\).

**Remark 2.5.** Given a node \(v\) and a leaf \(\lambda\) of \(\Gamma\), it is immediate to check that \(\ell_{v,\lambda} d_{v,\lambda} = \ell'_{v,\lambda} d_v\).

Linking numbers satisfy the following useful identity, whose proof is immediate from Definition 2.4:

**Lemma 2.6.** If \(u, v, w\) are vertices of \(\Gamma\) with \(u \in [v, w]\), then \(\ell_{w,u} \ell_{a,v} = \ell_{w,v} d_u\).

In [16, Theorem 1], Neumann gave explicit descriptions of integral homology spheres associated to star splice diagrams as links of Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm surface singularities. The following definition was introduced by Neumann and Wahl in [21, Sect. 1] to characterize which integral homology spheres may be realized as links of normal surface singularities. Its origins can be traced back to [4, Page 82].
Definition 2.7. Let $\Gamma$ be a splice diagram. Given two adjacent nodes $u$ and $v$ of $\Gamma$, the determinant of the edge $[u, v]$ (denoted by $\det([u, v])$) is the difference between the product of the two decorations on $[u, v]$ and the product of the remaining decorations in the neighborhoods of $u$ and $v$, that is,
\begin{equation}
det([u, v]) := d_{u,v}d_{v,u} - \ell_{u,v}.
\end{equation}

The splice diagram $\Gamma$ satisfies the edge determinant condition if all edges have positive determinants.

As was shown by Eisenbud and Neumann in [4, Thm. 9.4], the edge determinant condition characterizes which integral homology spheres can be realized as surface singularity links. More precisely,

Theorem 2.8. The links of normal surface singularities which are integral homology spheres are precisely the oriented 3-manifolds $\Sigma(\Gamma)$ associated to splice diagrams $\Gamma$ which satisfy the edge determinant condition.

The construction of oriented 3-manifolds from splice diagrams is due to Siebenmann [34]. They are obtained from splicing Seifert-fibered oriented 3-manifolds $\Sigma(\text{Star}_v(\Gamma))$ associated to each node $v$ of $\Gamma$ along special fibers of their respective Seifert fibration corresponding to the edges of $\Gamma$. For each $\Sigma(\text{Star}_v(\Gamma))$, these special fibers are in bijection with the $\delta_v$-many edges adjacent to $v$. Each edge $[u, v]$ induces a splicing of both $\Sigma(\text{Star}_v(\Gamma))$ along the oriented fibers corresponding to the edge. These fibers are knots in both Seifert-fibered manifolds and their linking number is precisely $\ell_{u,v}$ (see [4, Thm. 10.1]).

The following result shows that the edge determinant conditions yield Cauchy-Schwarz’ type inequalities:

Lemma 2.9. Assume that the splice diagram $\Gamma$ satisfies the edge determinant condition. Then,
\begin{equation}
d_u d_v \geq \ell_{u,v}^2, \quad \text{for all nodes } u, v \in \Gamma.
\end{equation}
Furthermore, equality holds if and only if $u = v$.

Proof. The result follows by induction on the distance $\text{dist}_T(u, v)$ between $u$ and $v$. The base case corresponds to adjacent nodes. Lemma 2.6 is used for the inductive step. \hfill \Box

If $\Gamma$ satisfies the edge determinant condition, then the linking numbers verify the following more general inequality, reminiscent of the ultrametric condition for dual graphs of arborescent singularities (for a precise statement, see [5, Proposition 1.18]):

Proposition 2.10. Assume that the splice diagram $\Gamma$ satisfies the edge determinant condition. Then, for all nodes $u, v$ and $w$ of $\Gamma$, we have $\ell_{u,v} \ell_{u,w} \leq d_u \ell_{v,w}$. Furthermore, equality holds if and only if $u \in [v, w]$.

Proof. Consider the tree $T$ spanned by $u, v$ and $w$ and let $a$ be the unique node in the intersections of the three geodesics $[u, v]$, $[u, w]$ and $[v, w]$. We prove the inequality by a direct calculation. By Lemma 2.6 applied to the triples $\{u, v, a\}$, $\{u, w, a\}$ and $\{v, w, a\}$, we have:
\begin{equation}
\ell_{u,a} \ell_{a,v} = \ell_{u,v} d_a, \quad \ell_{u,a} \ell_{a,w} = \ell_{u,w} d_a \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{w,a} \ell_{a,v} = \ell_{w,v} d_a.
\end{equation}
These expressions combined with the inequality (2.2) applied to the pair $\{a, u\}$ yield:
\begin{equation}
\ell_{u,v} \ell_{u,w} = \frac{\ell_{w,a} \ell_{a,u}}{d_a} \leq \ell_{u,a} \ell_{w,a} \left(\frac{\ell_{a,u}}{d_a}\right)^2 = \ell_{w,a} \left(\frac{\ell_{a,u}}{d_a}\right)^2 \leq \ell_{w,v} d_a.
\end{equation}
Furthermore, Lemma 2.9 confirms that equality is attained if and only if $a = u$, that is, if and only if $u$ lies in the geodesic $[v, w]$. This concludes our proof. \hfill \Box

Before introducing splice type systems as defined by Neumann and Wahl [20, 21], we set up notation arising from toric geometry. We write $\ell(m) := |\partial \Gamma|$ for the number of leaves of $\Gamma$ (where $| \cdot |$ denotes the cardinality of a finite set) and let $\mathbb{Z}(\partial \Gamma)$ be the free abelian group generated by all leaves of $\Gamma$. We denote by $\mathbb{Z}(\partial \Gamma)$ its dual lattice (of weights) and write the associated pairing using dot product notation, i.e. $w \cdot m$ whenever $w \in \mathbb{Z}(\partial \Gamma)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}(\partial \Gamma)$. Fixing a basis $\{w_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma\}$ for $\mathbb{Z}(\partial \Gamma)$ and its dual basis $\{m_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma\}$ for $\mathbb{Z}(\partial \Gamma)$ identifies both lattices with $\mathbb{Z}^n$. To each coweight $m_\lambda$, we associated a variable $\ell_{\lambda} := \chi^{m_\lambda}$.

In addition to defining weights for all leaves of $\Gamma$, each node $u$ in $\Gamma$ has an associated weight vector:
\begin{equation}
w_u := \sum_{\lambda \in \partial \Gamma} \ell_{u,\lambda} w_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}(\partial \Gamma).
\end{equation}
As was mentioned in Section 1, star splice diagrams $\Gamma$ with a unique node $v$ produce Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm singularities using the monomials $\{z_{d_{v}, \lambda}^{\Delta_{v}} : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma\}$. Neumann and Wahl’s splice type systems \cite{20, 21} generalize this construct to diagrams with more than one node. In addition to satisfying the edge determinant condition, $\Gamma$ must have an extra arithmetic property that allows us to replace each monomial $z_{d_{v}, \lambda}$ by a suitable monomial associated to the pair $(v, e)$ where $v$ is any node and $e$ is an edge adjacent to it (see (2.8)). This property will automatically hold for star splice diagrams.

**Definition 2.11.** We say a splice diagram $\Gamma$ satisfies the semigroup condition if for each node $v$ and each edge $e \in \text{Star}(v)$ the total weight $d_{v}$ of $v$ belongs to the subsemigroup of $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ generated by the set of linking numbers between $v$ and any leaf $\lambda$ with $e \subseteq [v, \lambda]$. We write

\begin{equation}
(2.5) \quad d_{v} = \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,e} \Gamma} m_{v,e,\lambda} \ell_{v,\lambda}, \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad d_{v} = \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,e} \Gamma} m_{v,e,\lambda} \ell'_{v,\lambda},
\end{equation}

where $\{m_{v,e,\lambda}\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for all $\lambda$ and $\partial_{v,e} \Gamma$ is the set of leaves $\lambda$ of $\Gamma$ with $e \subseteq [v, \lambda]$.

We use the coefficients from (2.5) to define a co-weight (i.e., an element of $M(\partial \Gamma)$) for each pair $(v, e)$:

\begin{equation}
(2.6) \quad m_{v,e} := \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,e} \Gamma} m_{v,e,\lambda} \lambda \in M(\partial_{v,e} \Gamma) \subset M(\partial \Gamma).
\end{equation}

Following \cite{21}, we refer to it as an admissible co-weight for $(v, e)$. By (2.5) it satisfies

\begin{equation}
(2.7) \quad w_{v} \cdot m_{v,e} = d_{v} \quad \text{for each edge } e \in \text{Star}(v).
\end{equation}

Each lattice element $m_{v,e}$ defines an admissible monomial, which was denoted by $M_{v,e}$ in \cite{21}:

\begin{equation}
(2.8) \quad z_{m_{v,e}} := \prod_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,e} \Gamma} z_{\lambda}^{m_{v,e,\lambda}}.
\end{equation}

**Definition 2.12.** Let $\Gamma$ be a splice diagram which satisfies both the edge determinant and the semigroup conditions of Definitions 2.7 and 2.11. We fix an order for its set of $n$ leaves $\partial \Gamma$.

- A minimal splice type system associated to $\Gamma$ is a finite family of $(n - 2)$ polynomials of the form:

\begin{equation}
(2.9) \quad f_{v,i}(z) := \sum_{e \in \text{Star}(v)} c_{v,e,i} z_{m_{v,e}} \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_{v} - 2\} \text{ and } v \text{ a node of } \Gamma,
\end{equation}

where $m_{v,e} \in M(\partial \Gamma)$ are the admissible co-weights defined in (2.6). We also require the coefficients $c_{v,e,i}$ to satisfy the Hamm determinant conditions. Namely, for any node $v \in \Gamma$, if we fix an ordering of the edges in Star$(v)$, then all the maximal minors of the matrix of coefficients $(c_{v,e,i})_{e,i} \in \mathbb{C}^{\delta_{v} \times (\delta_{v} - 2)}$ must be non-zero.

- A splice type system $S(\Gamma)$ associated to $\Gamma$ is a finite family of power series of the form

\begin{equation}
(2.10) \quad F_{v,i}(z) := f_{v,i}(z) + g_{v,i}(z) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_{v} - 2\} \text{ and } v \text{ a node of } \Gamma,
\end{equation}

where the collection $(f_{v,i})_{v,i}$ determines a minimal splice type system associated to $\Gamma$ and each $g_{v,i}$ is a convergent power series near the origin satisfying the following condition for each exponent $m$ in the support of $g_{v,i}$ (compare with the equality imposed in (2.7)):

\begin{equation}
(2.11) \quad w_{v} \cdot m > d_{v} \quad \text{and} \quad w_{u} \cdot m > \ell_{u,v} \quad \text{for each node } u \text{ of } \Gamma \text{ with } u \neq v.
\end{equation}

- A splice type singularity associated to $\Gamma$ is the germ at $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ defined by $S(\Gamma)$.

**Remark 2.13.** As was shown by Neumann and Wahl in \cite[Lemma 3.2]{20}, the right-most inequality in (2.11) follows from the left-most one and the edge determinant condition. We choose to include both inequalities in (2.11) for mere convenience since we will need both of them for several arguments in Section 6.

As was mentioned in Section 1, splice type singularities satisfy the following crucial property, proved by Neumann and Wahl in \cite[Thm. 2.6]{20}. An alternative proof to this statement (using local tropicalization) will be provided at the end of Section 7.

**Theorem 2.14.** Splice type singularities are isolated complete intersection singularities.
Next, we determine the initial forms of the series $\mathcal{F}$. Then, for $2.4 \leq 2.13$, $2.4$

If $\mathcal{F}$, then $\mathcal{F}$ holds if and only if $z$.

An alternative system is obtained by replacing the admissible monomial $\mathcal{F}$, the semigroup condition is also satisfied and one may take as exponents $m_{u,[u,v]} = (0,0,1,1)$ and $m_{v,[u,v]} = (1,4,0,0,0)$ or $(3,1,0,0,0)$. The following system determines a minimal splice type singularity for $\Gamma$:

\[
\begin{aligned}
f_{u,1} &:= z_1^2 - 2 z_2^3 + z_4 z_5 = 0, \\
f_{v,1} &:= z_1 z_2 + z_1^3 + z_1^3 - 2155 z_5^2 = 0, \\
f_{v,2} &:= 33 z_1 z_2 + z_3 + 2 z_1^5 - 2123 z_5^2 = 0,
\end{aligned}
\]

(2.12)

An alternative system is obtained by replacing the admissible monomial $z_1 z_2$ with $z_1 z_2$.

A central role in this paper will be played by tropicalizations and weighted initial forms of series and ideals of $\mathbb{C}[z_2 : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma]$, which we discuss in Section 3. Next, we determine the initial forms of the series $F_{v,i}$ defining a splice type system $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ with respect to each weight vector $w_u$ from (2.4). Our next two lemmas will be crucial for these computations:

**Lemma 2.16.** Assume that $\Gamma$ is a splice diagram satisfying the edge determinant condition. Then, for any pair of adjacent nodes $u, v$ of $\Gamma$ we have:

\[w_u \in \frac{\ell_{u,v}}{d_v} w_v + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\{w_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial_{v,[u,v]} \Gamma\} \].

\[\ell_{u,v} = \frac{\ell_{v,u}}{d_v} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\{w_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial_{v,[u,v]} \Gamma\} \]

**Proof.** We write $e = [u,v]$. The definition of linking numbers gives the following expressions for each $\lambda \in \partial \Gamma$:

\[
\ell_{u,v} = \begin{cases} 
\ell_{v,u} / (d_v d_{u,v}) & \text{if } \lambda \in \partial_{u,v} \Gamma, \\
\ell_{v,u} / (d_v d_{u,v}) / d_v & \text{if } \lambda \in \partial_{v,u} \Gamma.
\end{cases}
\]

The statement follows by substituting these expressions in the definition of $w_u$ from (2.4) combining the edge determinant condition, i.e.

\[
w_u = \frac{d_u}{d_v} \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,[u,v]} \Gamma} \ell_{v,u} w_\lambda + \frac{d_{v,u}}{d_v} \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,[u,v]} \Gamma} \ell_{u,v} w_\lambda = \frac{\ell_{u,v}}{d_v} w_v + \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,[u,v]} \Gamma} \frac{\det(e) \ell_{v,u}}{d_v w_\lambda}.
\]

**Lemma 2.17.** Assume that $\Gamma$ satisfies the edge determinant and semigroup conditions. Then, the co-weight $m_{v,e}$ from (2.6) satisfies $w_u \cdot m_{v,e} \geq \ell_{u,v}$ for all nodes $u$ of $\Gamma$ and each edge $e \in \text{Star}_\Gamma(v)$. Furthermore, equality holds if and only if $e \not\subseteq [u,v]$.

**Proof.** If $u = v$, then $w_u = m_{v,e} = d_e = \ell_{v,v}$. If $u \neq v$, we argue by induction on $\text{dist}_\Gamma(u,v) > 0$. If $\text{dist}_\Gamma(u,v) = 1$, we let $e' = [u,v]$. Expression (2.13) yields

\[w_u \cdot m_{v,e} \geq \frac{\ell_{u,v}}{d_v} w_v \cdot m_{v,e} + \frac{\det(e')}{d_v} \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,[u,v]} \Gamma} m_{v,e,u} \ell_{v,u} \right) = \frac{\ell_{u,v}}{d_v} w_v + \frac{\det(e')}{d_v} \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_{v,[u,v]} \Gamma} m_{v,e,u} \ell_{v,u} \right)
\]

The second summand is always non-negative and it equals zero if and only if $e \neq e'$.
If \( \text{dist}_r(u,v) > 1 \), we let \( u' \) be the unique node adjacent to \( u \) in \([u,v] \) and set \( e' := [u',u] \). Note that \( e \in [v,u] \) if and only if \( e \in [v,u'] \). Expression (2.13) applied to \([u,u']\), the non-negativity of each \( m_{v,e,\lambda} \), the inductive hypotheses on \([u',v]\) and Proposition 2.10 yield

\[
w_{u'} \cdot m_{v,e} = \frac{\ell_{u,u'}}{d_{u'}} \cdot w_{u'} \cdot m_{v,e} + \frac{\det(e')}{d_{u'}} \cdot \sum_{\lambda \in \delta_{r,e} \Gamma} m_{v,e,\lambda} \ell_{w,\lambda} \geq 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\ell_{u,u'}}{d_{u'}} \cdot \ell_{u',v} = \ell_{u,v}.
\]

By construction, equality is achieved if and only if \( e \subseteq [u',v] \), which is equivalent to \( e \subseteq [u,v] \).

As an immediate consequence of the previous lemma, we can determine the \( w_u \)-initial forms of each series in \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \) (see Definition 3.1):

**Proposition 2.18.** For each pair of nodes \( u, v \) in \( \Gamma \), we have:

\[
\in w_u(F_{v,i}) = \begin{cases} f_{v,i} - e_{v,[u,v]} \varpi^{m_{v,e}} & \text{if } u = v, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\]

where \( e \) is the unique edge adjacent to \( v \) with \( e \subseteq [v,u] \).

**Example 2.19.** Given the minimal splice type system from **Example 2.15**, we have \( w_u = (147,98,60,84,210) \) and \( w_v = (210,140,110,154,385) \). The polynomial \( f_{v,1} \) is \( w_u \)-homogeneous, whereas \( f_{r,1} \) and \( f_{v,2} \) are \( w_v \)-homogeneous. Finally, \( \in w_u(f_{v,1}) = f_{v,1} - z_1 z_2^2, \in w_u(f_{v,2}) = f_{v,2} - 33 z_2 z_4^2 \) and \( \in w_u(f_{u,1}) = f_{u,1} - z_3 z_4 z_5 \).

In addition to splice type systems, we will be interested in curves obtained from splice diagrams with a distinguished leaf \( r \), which we view as its root. We orient the rooted tree \( \Gamma_r \) towards the root and remove one weight in the neighborhood of each node, namely the one pointing towards the root, as seen on the right of Figure 1. We write \( \overline{\partial_r \Gamma} \) for the set of \((n-1)\) non-root leaves of \( \Gamma_r \) and assume it is ordered. The following definition was introduced in [20, Section 3] by the name of splice diagram curves. In view of Proposition 2.18, it will be useful to determine initial forms of the series defining \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \).

**Definition 2.20.** Assume that the rooted splice diagram \( \Gamma_r \) satisfies the semigroup condition and consider a fixed minimal splice type-system \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \) associated to the (unrooted) splice diagram \( \Gamma \). For each node \( v \) of \( \Gamma \) and each index \( i \in \{1,\ldots,\delta_v\} \), we let \( h_{v,i}(z) \in \mathbb{C}[z_\lambda : \lambda \in \overline{\partial_r \Gamma}] \) be the polynomial obtained from \( f_{v,i}(z) \) by removing the term corresponding to the unique edge adjacent to \( v \) pointing towards \( r \). The curve inside \( \mathbb{C}^{\overline{\partial_r \Gamma}} \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \) defined by the vanishing of \( (h_{v,i}(z))_{v,i} \) is called an end-curve for \( \Gamma_r \). We denote it by \( \overline{C_r} \).

A planar embedding of \( \Gamma_r \) determines an ordering of the edges adjacent to a fixed node \( v \) and ordering away from \( r \) (for example, by reading them from left to right). Once this order is fixed, by the Hamm determinant conditions, each group of equations \( (h_{v,i}(z))_{v,i} = 0 \) becomes equivalent to a collection of \( w_v \)-homogeneous binomial equations of degree \( \ell_{r,v} \) of the form

\[
z^{m_{r,j}} - a_{r,j} z^{m_{r,j}+1} = 0 \quad \text{for } j \in \{1,\ldots,\delta_v - 2\},
\]

with all \( a_{r,j} \neq 0 \). The next statement summarizes the main properties of \( \overline{C_r} \) discussed in [20, Theorem 3.1]:

**Theorem 2.21.** The curve \( \overline{C_r} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \) is a reduced complete intersection, smooth away from the origin, and meets any coordinate subspace of \( \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \) only at the origin. It has \( g \) many components, where \( g := \gcd\{\ell_{r,\lambda} : \lambda \in \overline{\partial_r \Gamma}\} \), and all are isomorphic to torus-translates of the monomial curve in \( \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \) with parameterization \( t \mapsto (t^{\ell_{r,\lambda}/g}, \ldots, t^{\ell_{r,\lambda}/g}) \).

**Example 2.22.** We fix the splice diagram from **Example 2.15** and consider its rooted analog obtained by setting the first leaf as its root \( r \), as seen in the right of Figure 1. By construction, \( \ell_{r,2} = 49, \ell_{r,3} = 30, \ell_{r,4} = 42, \ell_{r,5} = 105 \). The equations defining this end-curve are obtained by removing the monomial indexed by the edge pointing towards \( r \) in each equation from (2.12). Since all weights are coprime, the curve \( \overline{C_r} \) is reduced and irreducible. It is defined as the solution set to

\[
-2 z_3^2 + z_4 z_5 = z_4^2 + z_5^2 - 2155 z_2^2 = z_3^2 + 2 z_4^2 - 2123 z_5^2 = 0.
\]

Linear combinations of the last two expressions yield the equivalent binomial system:

\[
-2 z_3^2 + z_4 z_5 = z_4^2 + 32 z_5^2 = z_3^2 - 2187 z_5^2 = 0.
\]

An explicit parameterization is given by \((z_2, z_3, z_4, z_5) = (-t^{49} 3 t^{30}, -2 t^{42}, t^{105})\).
Theorem 2.21 or Trop is the sum of the terms in the series.

Remark 3.5 be the closure of the Section 6, the fiber of the restriction map \[ G_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N} \] over the origin is finite. Upper semicontinuity of fiber dimensions implies that the generic fiber is also 0-dimensional. Since \[ \dim H_{\lambda} = n - 2 \], the map \[ G_{\mathcal{M}}|_{H_{\lambda}} \] must be dominant.

3. Local tropicalization

In [31], the last two authors developed a theory of local tropicalizations, adapting the original formulation of (global) tropical geometry (see, e.g. [12]) to the local setting. In this section, we recall the basics on local tropicalizations that will be needed in Section 6. We focus our attention on germs \( (Y, 0) \to \mathbb{C}^n \) defined by ideals in the ring of convergent power series \( \mathcal{O} := \mathbb{C}[z_1, \ldots, z_n] \) near the origin, rather than over its completion \( \hat{\mathcal{O}} := \mathbb{C}[[z_1, \ldots, z_n]] \). Both notions of local tropicalizations will agree by Remark 3.5.

The notion of local tropicalization of an embedded germ is rooted on the construction of initial ideals associated to non-negative weight vectors, which we now describe. Any weight vector \( \mathbf{w} := (w_1, \ldots, w_n) \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n \) induces a valuation on \( \mathcal{O} \) by defining \( \mathbf{w}(z) := w_1 z_1 + \cdots + w_n z_n \). In turn, for each \( \mathbf{w} \), the \( \mathbf{w} \)-initial form \( \mathbf{w}(f) := \min\{ \mathbf{w}(z) : c_\alpha \neq 0 \} \) determines a map \( \text{Trop}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(f) \) of the germ \( \mathcal{O} \) that extends the original tropicalization. Our \( \mathbf{w} \)-initial form \( \text{Trop}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(f) \) is the Newton fan of \( f \).

Definition 3.1. Given \( f \in \mathcal{O} \), its \( \mathbf{w} \)-initial form \( \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) \) is the sum of the terms in the series \( f \) with minimal \( \mathbf{w} \)-weight \( \mathbf{w}(f) \). In turn, given an ideal \( J \) of \( \mathcal{O} \), we let \( \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(J) \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \) be the ideal of \( \mathcal{O} \) generated by the \( \mathbf{w} \)-initial forms of all elements of \( J \). We refer to it as the \( \mathbf{w} \)-initial ideal of \( J \) in the local ring \( \mathcal{O} \).

Definition 3.2. We write \( \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(J) \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \) instead of \( \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(J) \) to emphasize that we view this set as an ideal in \( \mathcal{O} \) rather than as an ideal in the polynomial ring \( \mathbb{C}[z_1, \ldots, z_n] \) graded by \( w \).

Definition 3.3. The Newton polyhedron \( \text{NP}(f) \) of a non-zero element \( f \in \mathcal{O} \) is the convex hull of the Minkowski sum of the support of \( f \) and \( (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n \). Given a face \( K \) of \( \text{NP}(f) \), we let \( \mathbf{w}(f) : K \) be the closure of the set of weight-vectors \( w \) in \( (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n \) supporting \( K \) (that is, where the support of \( \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(f) \) is \( K \)). The collection \( \{ \mathbf{w} : K \text{ face of } \text{NP}(f) \} \) is the Newton fan of \( f \).

Definition 3.4. Let \( (Y, 0) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n \) be a germ defined by an ideal \( I \) of \( \mathcal{O} \). The local tropicalization of \( I \) or of the germ \( Y \), is the set of all vectors \( w \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n \) such that the \( \mathbf{w} \)-initial ideal \( \text{in}_{\mathbf{w}}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{O} \) of \( I \) is monomial-free. We denote it by \( \text{Trop}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(f) \) or \( \text{Trop}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(Y) \). In turn, the positive local tropicalization of \( I \) or of the germ \( Y \), is obtained by intersecting the local tropicalization with the positive orthant \( (\mathbb{R}_{> 0})^n \). We denote it by \( \text{Trop}_{\mathbb{R}_{> 0}}(I) \) or \( \text{Trop}_{\mathbb{R}_{> 0}}(Y) \).

Remark 3.5. As shown in [31, Theorem 1.1], local tropicalizations admit several equivalent characterizations analogous to the Fundamental Theorem of Tropical Algebraic Geometry [12, Theorem 3.2.3]. One of them is as Euclidean closures in \( (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n \) of images of local valuation spaces. By [31, Corollary 5.17], the canonical inclusion \( (\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{m}) \to (\hat{\mathcal{O}}, \hat{\mathfrak{m}}) \) induces an isomorphism of local valuation spaces. This implies that extending an ideal in \( \mathcal{O} \) to the complete ring \( \hat{\mathcal{O}} \) will yield the same local tropicalization. Therefore, we can define local tropicalizations for germs defined over \( \mathcal{O} \) rather than \( \mathcal{O} \), in agreement with the setting of splice type systems.

Remark 3.6. Our choice of terminology for local tropicalizations differs slightly from [31], as we now explain. As was shown in [31, Section 6], the positive tropicalizations of the intersection of a germ \( (Y, 0) \to \mathbb{C}^n \) with each coordinate subspace of \( \mathbb{C}^n \) can be glued together to form and extended fan in \( (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{ \infty \})^n \). This was called the local nonnegative tropicalization of \( Y \) in [31]. In the present paper, we refer to this structure as an extended tropicalization of the germ \( Y \), in agreement with Kashiwara and Payne’s constructions for
global tropicalizations (see [12, §6.2]). The finite part of this extended tropicalization (i.e. its intersection with \((\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n\)) is the local tropicalization from Definition 3.4. A precise description of the boundary strata is given in Subsection 6.2.

If \(I\) is principal, generated by \(f \in \mathcal{O}\), and \(w \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n\), then each \(\text{in}_w(I)\) is also a principal ideal, with generator \(\text{in}_w(f)\). Furthermore \(\text{Trop } I\) is a subfan on the Newton fan of \(f\). By contrast, if \(I\) has two or more generators \(\{f_1, \ldots, f_k\}\), the set of their \(w\)-initial forms need not generate \(\text{in}_w(I)\). However, for the purpose of characterizing \(\text{Trop}_{\geq 0} I\), it is enough to have a finite tropical bases for \(I\), i.e., a finite set of generators \(\{f_1, \ldots, f_s\}\) of \(I\) for which any \(w\)-initial ideal \(\text{in}_w(I)\) contains a monomial if and only if one of the initial forms \(\text{in}_w(f_i)\) is monomial. Such tropical bases exist by [31, Theorem 10.3] and can be used to determine \(\text{Trop } I\) by intersecting the local tropicalizations of the corresponding hypersurface germs. Furthermore, the same property implies that local tropicalizations are rational fans in \((\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n\): they are subfans of the common refinement of the Newton fans of the elements in a tropical basis.

In the sequel we will be interested in the local tropicalizations of reduced germs of \(\mathbb{C}^n\) having no irreducible components contained in coordinate subspaces of \(\mathbb{C}^n\). In this situation, the local tropicalization of \(Y\) is the union of the local tropicalizations of its components. The next result will allow us to focus on positive local tropicalizations:

**Proposition 3.7.** [31, Thm. 11.9] Assume that the germ \((Y, 0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\) defined by an ideal \(I\) of \(\mathcal{O}\) has no irreducible component contained in any coordinate subspace of \(\mathbb{C}^n\). Then, \(\text{Trop } I\) is the closure of \(\text{Trop}_{\geq 0} I\) inside the cone \((\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n\).

In turn, local tropicalizations of reduced and irreducible germs meeting \((\mathbb{C}^*)^n\) verify the following key property (see [31, Thm. 11.9]):

**Proposition 3.8.** Let \((Y, 0)\) be a reduced and irreducible subgerm of \(\mathbb{C}^n\) meeting \((\mathbb{C}^*)^n\) defined by an ideal \(I\) of \(\mathcal{O}\). Then, \(\text{Trop } Y\) is the support of a rational polyhedral fan \(\mathcal{F}\) which satisfies the following conditions:

1. the dimension of all the maximal cones of \(\mathcal{F}\) agrees with the complex dimension of \(Y\);
2. the maximal cones of \(\mathcal{F}\) have non-empty intersections with \((\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n\);
3. given any cone \(\tau\) of \(\mathcal{F}\), the initial degeneration \(\text{in}_w(Y)\) defined by the \(w\)-initial ideal \(\text{in}_w(I)\) is independent of the choice of \(w \in \tau^o\).

**Remark 3.9.** When \(Y\) is a hypersurface germ defined by a series \(f \in \mathcal{O}\), the Newton fan of \(f\) satisfies all three conditions listed in Proposition 3.8. Furthermore, it is the coarsest fan with these properties. However, for germs of higher codimension no such canonical choice exists. For an example in the polynomial setting, we refer the reader to [12, Example 3.5.4].

**Remark 3.10.** Proposition 3.8 allows us to recover the complex dimension of an irreducible germ \((Y, 0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\) meeting the dense torus from its positive tropicalization (see, for instance, the proofs of Corollaries 6.18 and 6.19). Indeed, its dimension agrees with the dimension of any of the top-dimensional cones in any fixed tropicalizing fan of \(Y\). A similar procedure can be used in the reducible case to determine the maximal dimension of a component of the germ intersecting the dense torus.

**Definition 3.11.** Any fan \(\mathcal{F}\) satisfying all three conditions in Proposition 3.8 is called a tropicalizing fan for the embedding \((Y, 0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\). Whenever the embedding is understood, we say \(\mathcal{F}\) is a tropicalizing fan for \(Y\). For every cone \(\tau\) of \(\mathcal{F}\), we write \(\text{in}_\tau(Y) = \text{in}_w(Y)\), and \(\text{in}_\tau(I) = \text{in}_w(I)\), for any \(w \in \tau^o\).

The next proposition emphasizes the relevance of tropicalizing fans for producing birational models of irreducible germs with desirable geometric properties, in the spirit of Tevelev’s construction of tropical compactifications of subvarieties of tori [37]. Its proof is similar to the global analog [12, Proposition 6.4.7]:

**Proposition 3.12.** Fix a rational polyhedral fan \(\mathcal{F}\) whose cones are contained in \((\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n\) and let \(\pi_\mathcal{F} : X_\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\) be the associated toric morphism induced by the inclusion of fans. Given an irreducible germ \((Y, 0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\) meeting the dense torus, let \(\tilde{Y}\) be the strict transform of \(Y\) under \(\pi_\mathcal{F}\) and write \(\pi : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y\) for the restriction map. Then, the following properties hold:

1. The restriction \(\pi\) is proper if and only if the support \(|\mathcal{F}|\) contains the local tropicalization \(\text{Trop } Y\).
2. Assume that \(\pi\) is proper. Then, the strict transform \(\tilde{Y}\) intersects any orbits \(S\) of \(X_\mathcal{F}\) along a non-empty pure-dimensional subvariety with \(\text{codim}_\mathcal{F}(\tilde{Y} \cap S) = \text{codim}_\mathcal{F}(S)\) if and only if \(|\mathcal{F}| = \text{Trop } Y\).
One well-known feature of global tropicalizations of equidimensional subvarieties of toric varieties is the so-called balancing condition \[12, \text{Section 3.3}\]. To this end, tropical varieties must be endowed with positive integer weights (tropical multiplicities) along their top-dimensional cones. It suffices to discuss the case of irreducible germs:

**Definition 3.13.** Let \((Y, 0) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\) be an irreducible germ meeting \((\mathbb{C}^*)^n\), defined by an ideal \(I\) of \(\mathcal{O}\) and let \(\mathcal{F}\) be a tropicalizing fan for it. Given a top-dimensional cone \(\tau\) of \(\mathcal{F}\), we define the *tropical multiplicity* of \(\mathcal{F}\) at \(\tau\) to be the number of irreducible components of \(\text{in}_{\tau}(Y) \cap (\mathbb{C}^*)^n\), counted with multiplicity.

**Remark 3.14.** Balancing for local tropicalizations of equidimensional germs follows from \[31, \text{Remark 11.3, Theorem 12.10}\] and features in the proof of \textit{Proposition 6.24}. This property will help us prove that the embedded splice diagrams in \(\mathbb{R}^n\) are included in the local tropicalizations of the corresponding splice type systems (see \textit{Subsection 6.3}). Tropical multiplicities will be used in \textit{Section 8} to recover the weights on any coprime splice diagram \(\Gamma\) from the local tropicalization of any splice type system \(S(\Gamma)\) associated to it.

### 4. Newton non-degeneracy

Let \((Y, 0) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\) be an irreducible germ defined by an ideal \(I\) of \(\mathcal{O}\). In \textit{Proposition 3.12} we saw that if \(\mathcal{F}\) is a tropicalizing fan for \(Y\), then the strict transform \(\tilde{Y}\) of \(Y\) by the associated birational toric morphism \(\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n\) intersects all the orbits of \(\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{F}\) in analytic subspaces of the expected codimension. The germ \(Y\) is called Newton non-degenerate if, moreover, all these subspaces are smooth. In this section we review this notion of non-degeneracy starting with hypersurfaces and complete intersections.

First, we recall the notion of Newton non-degenerate series in \(\hat{\mathcal{O}}\), introduced by Kouchnirenko in \[10, \text{Sect. 8}\] and \[11, \text{Def. 1.19}\]. Kouchnirenko’s definition was later extended by Steenbrink \[35, \text{Def. 5}\] to \(\mathcal{O}\)-algebras of formal power series \(\mathbb{C}[P]\) with exponents on an arbitrary saturated sharp toric monoid \(P\). For precursors to this notion we refer the reader to Teissier’s work \[36, \text{Section 5}\].

**Definition 4.1.** Given a series \(f \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}\), we say that \(f\) is *Newton non-degenerate* if for any positive weight vector \(w \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n\), the subvariety of the dense torus \((\mathbb{C}^*)^n\) defined by \(\text{in}_w(f)\) is smooth.

The notion of Newton non-degeneracy extends naturally to finite sequences of functions. For our purposes, it suffices to restrict ourselves to *regular sequences*, i.e., collections \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) in \(\hat{\mathcal{O}}\) where

1. \(f_1\) is not a zero divisor of \(\hat{\mathcal{O}}\), and
2. for each \(i \in \{1, \ldots, s-1\}\), the element \(f_{i+1}\) is not a zero divisor in the quotient ring \(\hat{\mathcal{O}}/(f_1, \ldots, f_i)\hat{\mathcal{O}}\).

As \(\hat{\mathcal{O}}\) is a regular local ring, the germs defined by regular sequences in it are exactly the formal complete intersections at the origin of \(\mathbb{C}^n\).

**Definition 4.2.** Fix a positive integer \(s\) and a regular sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) in \(\hat{\mathcal{O}}\). The sequence defines a *Newton non-degenerate complete intersection* if for any positive weight vector \(w \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n\), the hypersurfaces defined by each \(\text{in}_w(f_i)\) form a normal crossings divisor in a neighborhood of their intersection with the dense torus. Equivalently, the differentials of the initial forms \(\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_s)\) must be linearly independent at each point of the intersection.

**Remark 4.3.** Notice that \textit{Definition 4.2} allows for the initial forms to be monomials. This would determine an empty intersection with the dense torus.

**Remark 4.4.** \textit{Definition 4.2} modifies slightly Khovanskii’s original definition from \[9, \text{Rem. 4 of Sect. 2.4}\], by imposing the regularity of the sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\). The generalization to formal power series \(\mathbb{C}[P]\) associated to an arbitrary sharp toric monoid \(P\) is straightforward, and parallels that done by Steenbrink \[35\] for hypersurfaces. A slightly different notion of *Newton non-degenerate ideals* was introduced by Saia in \[32\] for ideals of finite codimension in \(\hat{\mathcal{O}}\). For a comparison with Khovanskii’s approach we refer the reader to Bivià-Ausina’s work \[3, \text{Lemma 6.8}\]. For a general perspective on Newton non-degenerate complete intersections, the reader can consult Oka’s book \[23\]. A definition of Newton non-degenerate subgerms of \((\mathbb{C}^n, 0)\) for not necessarily complete intersections was given by Aroca, Gómez-Morales and Shabbir \[1\].
Lemma 5.2

Proposition 5.10. Here, $s = \delta_v - 1$ and $s' = \delta_{v'} - 1$.

5. Embeddings and convexity properties of splice diagrams

In this section, we describe simplicial fans in the real weight space $N(\partial \Gamma) \otimes \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ that arise from splice diagrams and appropriate subdiagrams. These constructions will play a central role in Section 6, when characterizing local tropicalizations of splice type systems. Throughout this section we assume that the splice diagram $\Gamma$ satisfies the edge determinant condition of Definition 2.7. The semigroup condition from Definition 2.11 plays no role.

Throughout, we let $[\Delta_{n-1}]$ be the standard $(n-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with vertices $\{w_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma\}$. We start by defining a piecewise linear map of $\Gamma$ into $\Delta_{n-1}$:

$$(5.1) \quad \iota : \Gamma \to \Delta_{n-1} \quad \text{where} \quad \iota(v) = \frac{w_v}{|w_v|} \quad \text{for each vertex} \ v \in \Gamma.$$

Here, $|\cdot|$ denotes the 1-norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, $|w_v| = \sum_{\lambda \in \partial \Gamma} \ell_{v,\lambda}$ for each node $v$ of $\Gamma$. After identifying each edge $e$ of $\Gamma$ with the interval $[0, 1]$, the map $\iota$ on $e$ is defined by convex combinations of the assignment at its endpoints. Injectivity of $\iota$ will be discussed in Theorem 5.11.

The following combinatorial definitions play a prominent role in proving Theorem 6.2.

Definition 5.1. A subtree $T$ of the splice diagram $\Gamma$ is star-full if $\text{Star}_T(v) \subset T$ for every node $v$ of $T$. A node of $T$ is called an end-node if it is adjacent to exactly one node of $T$.

Every tree that is not a star tree contains at least two end-nodes. The following statement describes a method to produce new star-full subtrees from old ones by pruning from an end-node. Its proof is straightforward, so we omit it. For an illustration, we refer to Figure 2.

Lemma 5.2. Let $T$ be a star-full subtree of $\Gamma$ with $d$ leaves $\{u_1, \ldots, u_d\}$. Fix an end-node $v$ of $T$ and assume that $u_1, \ldots, u_{\delta_v - 1}$ are the only leaves of $T$ adjacent to $v$. Then, $T' = [v, u_{\delta_v}, \ldots, u_d]$ is star-full.

Definition 5.3. A branch of a tree $T$ adjacent to a node $v$ is a connected component of

$$T \smallsetminus (\{v\} \cup \bigcup_{e \in \text{Star}_T(v)} e^o),$$

where $e^o$ denotes the interior of the edge $e$.

For example, $\{u_1\}, \ldots, \{u_d\}$ and the tree $T' := [v', T_1, \ldots, T_{s'}]$ on the left of Figure 2 are the $\delta_v$ branches of $T$ adjacent to the node $v$. Similarly, the branches of $T'$ adjacent to $v'$ are $T_1, \ldots, T_{s'}$ and $\{v\}$.

Star-full subtrees of splice diagrams have a key convexity property rooted in barycentric calculus. This is the content of Proposition 5.10. The following definition plays a central role in its proof.

Definition 5.4. Let $v$ be a node of $\Gamma$ and let $L$ be a collection of leaves of $\Gamma$. We define $\text{Bar}(L; v)$ as the barycenter of the leaves in $L$ with weights determined by $w_v$, that is:

$$(5.2) \quad \text{Bar}(L; v) = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{\ell_{v,\lambda}}{\ell} e_\lambda \quad \text{where} \quad \ell := \sum_{\lambda \in L} \ell_{v,\lambda}.$$  

In particular, $\text{Bar}(\{\lambda\}; v) = w_\lambda$ for any leaf $\lambda$. 

Figure 2. Pruning a star-full subtree $T$ of $\Gamma$ from an end-node $v$ of $T$ produces a new star-full subtree $T'$ with one fewer node, as in Lemma 5.2.
Remark 5.5. Fix a node \( v \) of \( \Gamma \) with adjacent branches \( \Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_{\delta_v} \). Then, the set \( \{ \text{Bar}(\partial \Gamma_i; v) : i = 1, \ldots, \delta_v \} \) is linearly independent, and a direct computation gives

\[
\iota(v) = \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v} \left( \frac{1}{|w_v|} \sum_{\lambda \in \partial \Gamma_j} \ell_{v,\lambda} \right) \text{Bar}(\partial \Gamma_j; v).
\]

In particular, \( \iota(v) \) lies in the relative interior of the simplex \( \text{conv}\{\text{Bar}(\partial \Gamma_j; v) : j = 1, \ldots, \delta_v\} \}).

Following the notation from Definition 2.11, we write \( \partial_{i[a,b]} \Gamma := \partial_{[a,b]} \Gamma \) and \( \partial_{b} \Gamma := \partial_{a,b} \Gamma \) for each pair of adjacent nodes \( a, b \) of \( \Gamma \). Barycenters determined by splitting \( \Gamma \) along the edge \([a,b] \) implies:

Lemma 5.6. Let \( a, b \) be two adjacent nodes of \( \Gamma \), with associated sets of leaves \( \partial_\alpha \Gamma \) and \( \partial_\beta \Gamma \) on each side of \( \Gamma \). Then:

1. \( \text{Bar}(\partial_\alpha \Gamma; a) = \text{Bar}(\partial_\beta \Gamma; b) \) and \( \text{Bar}(\partial_\beta \Gamma; a) = \text{Bar}(\partial_\alpha \Gamma; b) \) (which we denote by \( \text{Bar}(\partial_\alpha \Gamma; [a, b]) \) and \( \text{Bar}(\partial_\beta \Gamma; [a, b]) \), respectively).

2. The points \( \iota(a) \) and \( \iota(b) \) lie in the line segment \( [\text{Bar}(\partial_\alpha \Gamma; a), \text{Bar}(\partial_\beta \Gamma; b)] \).

3. \( \text{Bar}(\partial_\alpha \Gamma; [a, b]) < \iota(a) < \iota(b) < \text{Bar}(\partial_\beta \Gamma; [a, b]) \), where \( < \) is the order given by identifying the segment \( [\text{Bar}(\partial_\alpha \Gamma; a), \text{Bar}(\partial_\beta \Gamma; [a, b])] \) with \([0, 1]\).

Proof. The definition of linking numbers (see Definition 2.4) gives the following identities:

\[
\ell_{b,\lambda} = \ell_{a,\lambda} \frac{\ell_{a,b}}{d_a} \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \partial_\alpha \Gamma, \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{a,\mu} = \ell_{b,\mu} \frac{\ell_{a,b}}{d_b} \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \partial_\beta \Gamma.
\]

Thus, \( a \) and \( b \) contribute proportional weights to \( \partial_\alpha \Gamma \) and \( \partial_\beta \Gamma \), respectively. This implies that the corresponding barycenters agree, proving (1).

Next, we discuss (2). To simplify notation, we write \( w = \text{Bar}(\partial_\alpha \Gamma; [a, b]) \) and \( w' = \text{Bar}(\partial_\beta \Gamma; [a, b]) \). Then, (5.4) implies:

\[
w_a = \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_\alpha \Gamma} \ell_{a,\lambda} \right) w + \left( \sum_{\mu \in \partial_\beta \Gamma} \ell_{a,\mu} \right) w' \quad \text{and} \quad w_b = \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_\alpha \Gamma} \ell_{b,\lambda} \right) w + \left( \sum_{\mu \in \partial_\beta \Gamma} \ell_{b,\mu} \right) w'.
\]

The definition of \( \iota \) then confirms that \( \iota(a) \) and \( \iota(b) \) are convex combinations of \( w \) and \( w' \).

It remains to prove (3). The condition \( w < \iota(a) < \iota(b) < w' \) claimed in (3) is equivalent to:

\[
\left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_\alpha \Gamma} \ell_{a,\lambda} \right) \left( \sum_{\mu \in \partial_\beta \Gamma} \ell_{a,\mu} \right)^{-1} > \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_\alpha \Gamma} \ell_{b,\lambda} \right) \left( \sum_{\mu \in \partial_\beta \Gamma} \ell_{b,\mu} \right)^{-1}.
\]

Rearranging these expressions by sums with common indexing sets and simplifying further using (5.4) yields the equivalent identity:

\[
1 > \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_\alpha \Gamma} \ell_{b,\lambda} \right) \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial_\alpha \Gamma} \ell_{a,\lambda} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{\mu \in \partial_\beta \Gamma} \ell_{a,\mu} \right) \left( \sum_{\mu \in \partial_\beta \Gamma} \ell_{b,\mu} \right)^{-1} = \frac{\ell_{a,b}}{d_a} \frac{\ell_{a,b}}{d_b}.
\]

The edge determinant condition for \([a, b]\) confirms the validity of (5.5), and so (3) holds.

Our next result shows that the image under \( \iota \) of the vertices adjacent to a fixed node \( v \) satisfy a convexity property analogous to that of Remark 5.5:

Proposition 5.7. Let \( v \) be a node of \( \Gamma \), with adjacent vertices \( u_1, \ldots, u_{\delta_v} \). Then:

1. \( \{ \iota(u_j) : j = 1, \ldots, \delta_v \} \) is linearly independent;

2. \( \iota(v) \in \left( \text{conv}\{\{\iota(u_j) : j = 1, \ldots, \delta_v \}\} \right)^\circ \), where \( \text{conv} \) denotes the affine convex hull inside \( \Delta_{n-1} \).

Proof. Both statements are clear if \( v \) is only adjacent to leaves of \( \Gamma \) (i.e., when \( \Gamma \) is a star splice diagram), so we may assume \( v \) is adjacent to some node of \( \Gamma \). Thus, up to relabeling if necessary, we suppose \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_s\} \) are leaves of \( \Gamma \) and \( \{u_{s+1}, \ldots, u_{\delta_v}\} \) are nodes of \( \Gamma \) (we set \( s = 0 \) if \( v \) is only adjacent to nodes).

For each \( j \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v\} \), we let \( \Gamma_j \) be the branch of \( \Gamma \) adjacent to \( v \) containing \( u_j \), and set \( w_j := \text{Bar}(\partial \Gamma_j; v) \). Lemma 5.6 (2) and the definition of barycenters ensures the existence of \( \alpha_j \in (0, 1] \) satisfying

\[
\iota(u_j) = \alpha_j w_j + (1 - \alpha_j) \iota(v) \quad \text{for each } j \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v\},
\]

with \( \alpha_j = 1 \) if and only if \( j \in \{1, \ldots, s\} \).
We start by proving (1). We fix a linear relation \( \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v} \beta_j \iota(u_j) = 0 \). Substituting (5.6) into this dependency relation yields

\[
(5.7) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v} (\beta_j \alpha_j) w_j + B \iota(v) = 0 \quad \text{where} \quad B := \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v} \beta_j (1 - \alpha_j).
\]

We claim that \( B = 0 \). Indeed, assuming this is not the case, we use (5.7) to write \( \iota(v) \) in terms of \( w_1, \ldots, w_{\delta_v} \). Comparing this expression with (5.3) and using the linear independence of \( \{w_1, \ldots, w_{\delta_v}\} \) gives:

\[
(5.8) \quad \beta_j \alpha_j = -\frac{B}{|w_v|} \sum_{\lambda \in \partial T_j} \ell_{v, \lambda} \quad \text{for each} \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v\}.
\]

In particular, all \( \beta_i \) are non-zero and have the same sign, namely the opposite sign to \( B \). Summing up the expressions (5.8) over all \( j \) yields \( \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v} \beta_j = 0 \), which cannot happen due to the sign constraint on the \( \beta_j \)'s. From this it follows that \( B = 0 \).

Since \( B = 0 \), the linear independence of \( \{w_1, \ldots, w_{\delta_v}\} \) forces \( \beta_j \alpha_j = 0 \) for all \( j \). Combining this with our assumption that \( \alpha_j > 0 \) for all \( j \), gives \( \beta_j = 0 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, \delta_v \) and thus confirms (1).

To finish, we discuss (2). We let \( q_1, \ldots, q_{\delta_v} \) be the coefficients used in (5.3) to write \( \iota(v) \) as a convex combination of \( w_1, \ldots, w_{\delta_v} \). Substituting the value of each \( w_i \) obtained from (5.6) in expression (5.3) yields:

\[
(5.9) \quad \iota(v) = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \frac{q_j}{A} \iota(u_j) + \sum_{j=s+1}^{\delta_v} \frac{q_j}{A \alpha_j} \iota(u_j) \quad \text{where} \quad A := 1 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{\delta_v} \frac{q_j (1 - \alpha_j)}{\alpha_j}.
\]

The conditions \( 0 < \alpha_j < 1 \) for \( j \in \{s+1, \ldots, \delta_v\} \), and the definition of \( q_1, \ldots, q_{\delta_v} \) ensure that the right-hand side of (5.9) is a positive convex combination of \( \iota(u_1), \ldots, \iota(u_{\delta_v}) \), as we wanted to show. \( \square \)

Each subtree \( T \) of \( \Gamma \) determines a polytope via the map \( \iota \):

\[
(5.10) \quad \Delta_T := \operatorname{conv}\{\{\iota(u) : u \in \partial T\}\} \subseteq \Delta_{n-1}.
\]

For example, \( \Delta_T \) is the standard simplex \( \Delta_{n-1} \). We view the next result as a key convexity property of star-full subtrees of splice diagrams.

**Lemma 5.8.** Fix a star-full subtree \( T \) of \( \Gamma \). For every node \( u \) of \( T \), \( \iota(u) \) admits an expression of the form

\[
(5.11) \quad \iota(u) = \sum_{\mu \in \partial T} \alpha_\mu \iota(\mu) \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{\mu \in \partial T} \alpha_\mu = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_\mu > 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \mu \in \partial T.
\]

In particular, \( \iota(T) \subset \Delta_T \).

**Proof.** We let \( p \) be the number of nodes of \( T \) and proceed by induction on \( p \). The statement is vacuous for \( p = 0 \). If \( p = 1 \), then \( T \) is a star tree and the result follows by Proposition 5.7. For the inductive step, we let \( p \geq 2 \) and suppose that the result holds for star-full subtrees with \( (p - 1) \) nodes.

We fix \( \partial T = \{u_1, \ldots, u_d\} \) and we let \( v \) be an end-node of \( T \). Following Figure 2, we let \( v' \) be the unique node of \( T \) adjacent to \( v \) and assume that \( u_1, \ldots, u_{\delta_v-1} \) are adjacent to \( v \). Proposition 5.7 (2) applied to \( \text{Star}_T(v) \) gives

\[
(5.12) \quad \iota(v) = \beta_0 \iota(v') + \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v-1} \beta_j \iota(u_j) \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\delta_v-1} \beta_j = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_j > 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad j.
\]

Using Lemma 5.2, we let \( T' \) be the star-full subtree of \( \Gamma \) obtained by pruning \( T \) from \( v \). By construction, \( T' \) has \( (p - 1) \) nodes and its leaves are \( \{v\} \cup \{u_{\delta_v}, \ldots, u_d\} \). The inductive hypothesis yields the following expressions for \( v' \) and all other (potential) nodes \( u \neq v' \) of \( T' \):

\[
(5.13) \quad \iota(v') = \gamma_0 \iota(v) + \sum_{j=\delta_v}^{d} \gamma_j \iota(u_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \iota(u) = \alpha_0 \iota(v) + \sum_{j=\delta_v}^{d} \alpha_j \iota(u_j),
\]
with \( \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=\delta_v}^d \alpha_j = \gamma_0 + \sum_{j=\delta_v}^d \gamma_j = 1 \) and \( \alpha_j, \gamma_j > 0 \) for all \( j \). Since \( 0 < \gamma_0 \beta_0 < 1 \), substituting the expression for \( \iota(v') \) obtained from (5.13) into (5.12) produces the desired positive convex combination for \( \iota(v) \):

\[
\iota(v) = \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v-1} \frac{\beta_j}{1 - \gamma_0 \beta_0} \iota(u_j) + \sum_{j=\delta_v}^d \frac{\beta_0 \gamma_j}{1 - \gamma_0 \beta_0} \iota(u_j).
\]

In turn, substituting this identity in both expressions from (5.13) gives the positive convex combination statement for all remaining nodes of \( T \). The inclusion \( \iota(T) \subset \Delta_T \) follows by the convexity of \( \Delta_T \). \( \square \)

Proposition 5.7 and Lemma 5.8 combined have the following natural consequence:

**Corollary 5.9.** For each pair of star-full subtrees \( T, T' \) of \( \Gamma \) with \( T' \subseteq T \), we have \( \Delta_T \subseteq \Delta_{T'} \).

Our next result is a generalization of Proposition 5.7 and it highlights a key combinatorial property shared by \( \Gamma \) and all its star-full subtrees.

**Proposition 5.10.** Let \( T \) be a star-full subtree of \( \Gamma \). Then:

1. the weights \( \{\iota(u) : u \in \partial T\} \) are linearly independent;
2. \( \Delta_T \) is a simplex of dimension \( |\partial T| - 1 \);
3. for each node \( v \) of \( T \) we have \( \iota(v) \in \Delta_T^v \).

**Proof.** Item (2) is a direct consequence of (1). In turn, item (3) follows from (2) and Lemma 5.8. Thus, it remains to prove (1). We distinguish two cases, depending on the number of nodes of \( T \), denoted by \( p \).

**Case 1:** If \( p < 2 \), then \( T \) is either a vertex, an edge of \( \Gamma \), or a star tree. If \( T \) is a vertex of \( \Gamma \), then the claim holds because \( \iota(u) \neq 0 \) for any vertex \( u \) of \( T \). If \( T \) is a star tree, the statement agrees with Proposition 5.7 (1).

Next, assume \( T \) is an edge of \( \Gamma \). We consider two scenarios. First, if \( T \) joins a leaf \( \lambda \) and a node \( \alpha \) of \( \Gamma \), then the result follows immediately since \( \iota(u) \) and \( \iota(v) \) are linearly independent. On the contrary, assume \( T \) joins two adjacent nodes of \( \Gamma \), say \( u \) and \( v \). Pick two leaves \( \lambda, \mu \) of \( \Gamma \) with \( u \in [\lambda, v] \) and \( v \in [u, \mu] \) (i.e., \( \lambda \) is on the \( u \)-side and \( \mu \) is on the \( v \)-side of \( \Gamma \), as seen from the edge \([u, v])\). The definition of linking numbers yields the following formula for the \( (\lambda, \mu) \)-minor of the matrix \((w_u|w_v)\):

\[
\left(\begin{array}{c}
\ell_{\lambda, u} \\
\ell_{\mu, u}
\end{array}\right) = \frac{\ell_{\lambda, u} d_{u,v} d_{u,u} - \ell_{u,v}}{d_{u,v} d_{u,u}}.
\]

This expression is positive by the edge determinant condition, so \( \{\iota(u), \iota(v)\} \) are linearly independent.

**Case 2:** If \( p \geq 2 \), we know that \( d := |\partial T| \geq 4 \). We prove the result by reverse induction on \( d \). When \( d = n \), we have \( T = \Gamma \) and there is nothing to prove since \( \iota(u) = w_u \) for all \( u \in \partial \Gamma \). Next, we fix \( d \in \{4, \ldots, n-1\} \) and let \( T \) be a star-full tree with \( d \) leaves, labeled \( u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d \). Assume that the linear independence holds for any star-full subtree with \( k \geq d + 1 \) leaves. Without loss of generality we assume \( u_1 \) is a node of \( \Gamma \) (one must exist since \( T \neq \Gamma \) is star-full). Set \( s = \delta_{u_1} - 1 \).

Next, we define \( T' := T \cup \text{Star}_T(u_1) \). By construction, \( T' \) is a star-full subtree of \( \Gamma \) with \((d + s - 1)\) leaves. Since \( u_1 \) is a node of \( T' \), Lemma 5.8 applied to \( T' \) yields a positive convex combination:

\[
\iota(u_1) = \sum_{v \in \partial T'} \beta_v \iota(v) \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{v \in \partial T'} \beta_v = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_v > 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad v \in \partial T'.
\]

To prove the linear independence for the \( d \) points \( \iota(u_1), \ldots, \iota(u_d) \), we fix a potential dependency relation \( \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j \iota(u_j) = 0 \). Substituting (5.14) into it gives a linear dependency relation for the leaves of \( T' \):

\[
\sum_{j=2}^d \left( \alpha_j + \alpha_1 \beta_{u_j} \right) \iota(u_j) + \sum_{j=d+1}^{d+s} \left( \alpha_1 \beta_{u_j} \right) \iota(u_j) = 0,
\]

where \( \{u_{d+1}, \ldots, u_{d+s}\} \) are the leaves of \( T' \) adjacent to \( u_1 \). The inductive hypothesis applied to \( T' \) and the positivity of each \( \beta_v \) with \( v \in \partial T' \) forces \( \alpha_j = 0 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, d \). Thus, (1) holds. \( \square \)

Next, we state the main result in this section, which is a natural consequence of Lemma 5.8:

**Theorem 5.11.** The map \( \iota \) from (5.1) is injective.
Proof. We prove the statement holds when restricted to any star-full subtree $T$ of $\Gamma$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.8, we argue by induction on the number $p$ of nodes of $T$. If $p = 0$, then $T$ is either a vertex $u$ or an edge $[u, v]$. The statement in the first case is tautological. The result for the second one holds by construction because $\{\iota(u), \iota(v)\}$ are linearly independent by Proposition 5.7 (1).

If $p = 1$, then $T$ is a star tree. Let $v$ be its unique node and $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{\delta_v}\}$ be its leaves. Injectivity over $T$ is a direct consequence of the following identity:

$$\iota([u_i, v]) \cap \iota([u_j, v]) = \{\iota(v)\} \quad \text{for all } i \neq j,$$

which we prove by a direct computation. Indeed, pick $0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1$ with

$$(5.15) \quad a \iota(u_i) + (1 - a) \iota(v) = b \iota(u_j) + (1 - b) \iota(v).$$

By Proposition 5.7 (2), $\iota(v)$ admits a unique expression:

$$\iota(v) = \sum_{k=1}^{\delta_v} \alpha_k \iota(u_k) \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\delta_v} \alpha_k = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_k > 0 \quad \text{for all } k.$$

Substituting this identity in (5.15) yields the following affine dependency relation for $\iota(\partial T)$:

$$(a + (b - a)\alpha_i) \iota(u_i) + ((b - a)\alpha_j - b) \iota(u_j) + \sum_{k \neq i, j} \alpha_k (b - a) \iota(u_k) = 0$$

By Proposition 5.7 (1), we conclude that $a + (b - a)\alpha_i = (b - a)\alpha_j - b = 0$ and $\alpha_k (b - a) = 0$ for all $k \neq i, j$. Since $\alpha_k > 0$ for all $k \neq i, j$ and $\delta_v \geq 3$, it follows that $b - a = 0$ and $a = -b = 0$. Therefore, expression (5.15) represents $\iota(v)$.

Finally, pick $p \geq 2$ and assume the result holds for star-full subtrees with $p - 1$ nodes. Let $T$ be a star-full subtree with $p$ nodes and pick an end-node $v$ of $T$. As in Figure 2, write $v'$ for the unique node of $T$ adjacent to it and $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{\delta_v - 1}\}$ for the leaves of $T$ adjacent to $v$.

As in Lemma 5.2, let $T'$ be the star-full subtree obtained by pruning $T$ from $v$. Our inductive hypothesis ensures that $\iota$ is injective when restricted to $T'$. By the $p = 1$ case we know that $\iota([v, u]) \cap \iota([v, u']) = \{\iota(v)\}$ if $i \neq j$. Thus, the injectivity of $\iota$ when restricted to $T$ will be proven if we show:

$$(5.16) \quad \iota([v, u_i]) \cap \iota(T') = \{\iota(v)\} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, \delta_v - 1.$$

The identity follows from Proposition 5.10. Indeed, we write any $w$ on the left-hand side of (5.16) as

$$(5.17) \quad w := a \iota(u_i) + (1 - a) \iota(v) \in \iota([v, u_i]) \cap \iota(T') \quad \text{with} \quad 0 \leq a \leq 1.$$

Recall that $w \in \iota(T') \subset \Delta_T$, and $\Delta_{T'} \subset \Delta_T$ by Corollary 5.9. Since $\iota(v) \in (\Delta_T)^\circ$ as in (3), substituting this expression into (5.17) and comparing it with the known expression for $w$ as an element of $\Delta_T$ yields an affine dependency equation for $\{\iota(u) : u \in \partial T\}$. The positivity constraint on the coefficients used to write $\iota(v)$ as an element of $(\Delta_T)^\circ$ forces $a = 0$, and so (5.16) holds. 

\section{Local tropicalizations of splice type systems}

Let $\Gamma$ be a splice diagram with $n$ leaves and let $S(\Gamma)$ be a splice type system associated to it, as in Definition 2.12. Fixing a total order on $\partial \Gamma$ yields an embedding of the corresponding splice type singularity $(X, 0)$ into $\mathbb{C}^n$. In this section we describe the local tropicalization of this embedded germ by computing the local tropicalization of the intersections of $X$ with each coordinate subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ (see Definition 3.4). As a byproduct, we confirm the first half of Theorem 1.1, namely that $(X, 0)$ is a complete intersection in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with no irreducible components contained in any coordinate subspace.

The injectivity of the map $\iota$ from (5.1), discussed in Theorem 5.11, fixes a natural simplicial fan structure on the cone over $\iota(\Gamma)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$:

\textbf{Definition 6.1.} Let $\Gamma$ be a splice diagram. Then, the set $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \iota(\Gamma)$ has a natural fan structure, with top-dimensional cones

$$\{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \iota([u, v]) : [u, v] \text{ is an edge of } \Gamma\}.$$

We call it the \textit{splice fan of} $\Gamma$.

Here is the main result of this section:

\textbf{Theorem 6.2.} The local tropicalization of $(X, 0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ is supported on the splice fan of $\Gamma$. 

We prove Theorem 6.2 in two steps by a double inclusion argument, first restricting our attention to the positive tropicalization. In Subsection 6.1 we show that the positive local tropicalization of \( S(\Gamma) \) is contained in the support of the splice fan of \( \Gamma \). We prove this fact by working with simplices associated to star-full subtrees of \( \Gamma \), which were introduced in Definition 5.1. For clarity of exposition, we break the arguments into a series of combinatorial lemmas and propositions. These results allow us to certify that the ideal generated by the \( w \)-initial forms of all the series \( F_{v,i} \) in \( S(\Gamma) \) where \( w \) lies in the complement of splice fan of \( \Gamma \) in \( (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n \), always contains a monomial.

In turn, showing that the support of the splice fan of \( \Gamma \) lies in the Euclidean closure of the local tropicalization of \((X,0)\) involves the so-called balancing condition for pure-dimensional local tropicalizations. This is the subject of Subsection 6.3. An alternative proof will be given in Section 7 after proving the Newton non-degeneracy of the germ \((X,0)\).

The fact that the positive tropicalization of \((X,0)\) is pure-dimensional is established in an indirect way. Our proof technique relies on the explicit computation of the boundary components of the extended tropicalization, which is done in Subsection 6.2. This establishes the first half of Theorem 1.1 discussed above (see Corollary 6.18). As a consequence, we confirm by Corollary 6.20 that the local tropicalization is the Euclidean closure of the positive one. This result together with the findings in Sections 6.1 and 6.3 complete the proof of Theorem 6.2.

Remark 6.3. Throughout the next subsections, we adopt the following convenient notation for the admissible co-weights \( m_{v,e} \) from (2.6). Given a node \( v \) and a vertex \( u \) of \( \Gamma \) with \( u \neq v \), we define \( m_{v,u} := m_{v,e} \) where \( e \) is the unique edge adjacent to \( v \) and lying in the geodesic \([v,u]\). Similarly, given a star-full subtree \( T \) of \( \Gamma \) not containing \( v \) we write \( m_{v,T} := m_{v,u} \), where \( u \) is any vertex of \( T \).

6.1. The positive local tropicalization is contained in the splice fan.

In this section we show that the only points in \( \Delta_{\geq 1} \) contained in the positive local tropicalization \( \text{Trop}_{\geq a} S(\Gamma) \) are those included in \( \iota(\Gamma) \). We exploit the terminology and convexity results stated in Section 5.

As expected, the Hamm determinant conditions imposed on the system \( S(\Gamma) \) from Definition 2.12 play a crucial role in determining this positive local tropicalization. The following lemma will be used extensively throughout this section:

Lemma 6.4. Fix a node \( v \) of \( \Gamma \) and let \( e, e', e'' \) be three distinct edges of \( \text{Star}_\Gamma(v) \). Fix \( w \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^n \) and suppose that the admissible co-weights \( m_{v,e}, m_{v,e'}, m_{v,e''} \) from (2.6) satisfy:

\[
(6.1) \quad w \cdot m_{v,e} < w \cdot m_{v,e'} \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{v,e} < w \cdot m_{v,e''}.
\]

Then, \( \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e}} = \text{in}_w(f) \) for some \( f \) in the linear span of \( \{f_{v,i} : i = 1, \ldots, \delta_v - 2\} \). If, in addition, \( w \) satisfies

\[
(6.2) \quad w \cdot m_{v,e} < w \cdot m \quad \text{for each} \quad m \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2} \text{Supp}(g_{v,i}),
\]

then \( \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e}} = \text{in}_w(F) \) for some series \( F \) in the linear span of \( \{F_{v,i} : i = 1, \ldots, \delta_v - 2\} \). In particular, \( w \notin \text{Trop} S(\Gamma) \).

Proof. We let \( e_1, \ldots, e_{\delta_v} \) be the edges adjacent to \( v \) and assume that \( e_{\delta_v-2} := e, e_{\delta_v-1} := e' \) and \( e_{\delta_v} := e'' \). Using the Hamm determinant conditions, we build a basis \( \{f'_{v,i} \}_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2} \) for the linear span of \( \{f_{v,i} \}_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2} \) where

\[
f'_{v,i} := \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e_i}} + a_i \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e''}} + b_i \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e'}} \quad \text{for each} \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v - 2\}.
\]

From (6.1) we conclude that \( \text{in}_w(f'_{v,i}) = \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e}} \). Taking \( f := f'_{v,\delta_v-2} \) proves the first part of the statement.

For the second part, the technique yields a new basis \( \{F'_{v,i} \}_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2} \) for the linear span of \( \{f'_{v,i} \}_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2} \) with

\[
F'_{v,i} = f'_{v,i} + g'_{v,i} \quad \text{for each} \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v - 2\},
\]

where each \( g'_{v,i} \) is a linear combination of \( \{g_{v,j} \}_{j=1}^{\delta_v-2} \). Condition (6.2) then ensures that

\[
\text{in}_w(F'_{v,\delta_v-2}) = \text{in}_w(f'_{v,\delta_v-2}) = \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e}}.
\]

Thus, the series \( F = F'_{v,\delta_v-2} \) satisfies the required properties. In particular, the ideal \( \text{in}_w(S(\Gamma)) \) contains the monomial \( \mathbf{z}^{m_{v,e}} \) and so \( w \notin \text{Trop} S(\Gamma) \) by definition. \( \square \)
Next, we state the main theorem in this section, which yields one of the required inclusions in Theorem 6.2 when choosing $T = \Gamma$. More precisely:

**Theorem 6.5.** For every star-full subtree $T$ of $\Gamma$, we have $\Delta_T \cap \operatorname{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma) \subseteq \iota(T)$.

**Proof.** Recall from (5.10) that $\Delta_T$ is the convex hull of the set of leaves $\partial T$ of $T$, viewed in $\Delta_{n-1}$ via the map $\iota$. We proceed by induction on the number of nodes of $T$, which we denote by $p$. If $p = 0$, then $T$ is either a vertex or an edge of $\Gamma$, and $\Delta_T = \iota(T)$. For the inductive step, assume $p \geq 1$ and pick a node $v$ of $T$. Let $T_1, \ldots, T_3$ be the branches of $T$ adjacent to $v$, as in Definition 5.3. We use the point $\iota(v)$ to perform a stellar subdivision of $\Delta_T$, giving a decomposition $\Delta_T = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \partial T} \tau_\lambda$, where

\begin{equation}
\tau_\lambda := \operatorname{conv}(\{\iota(v)\} \cup (\partial T \setminus \{\lambda\})) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \partial T.
\end{equation}

By Lemma 5.8, $\tau_\lambda$ is a simplex of dimension $|\partial T| - 1$. Proposition 6.7 below shows that $\tau_\lambda \cap \operatorname{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)$ lies in the boundary of $\tau_\lambda$. In turn, Proposition 6.8 ensures that

\[ \partial \tau_\lambda \cap \operatorname{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma) \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \delta_v} \Delta_{[T_i, v]}, \]

where $T_j$ is the unique branch of $T$ adjacent to $v$ and containing the leaf $\lambda$. Thus, combining this with the inductive hypothesis applied to all star-full subtrees $[T_i, v]$ of $\Gamma$ with $i \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v\}$ gives

\begin{equation}
\Delta_T \cap \operatorname{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\delta_v} (\Delta_{[T_i, v]} \cap \operatorname{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\delta_v} \iota([T_i, v]) \subseteq \iota(T). \tag*{\square}
\end{equation}

As a natural consequence of this result combined with Proposition 3.7, we deduce one of the two inclusions required to confirm Theorem 6.2:

**Corollary 6.6.** The positive local tropicalization of $S(\Gamma)$ is contained in the support of the splice fan of $\Gamma$.

In the remainder of this section, we discuss the two key propositions used in the proof of Theorem 6.5. We start by showing that the relative interior of a top-dimensional simplex $\tau_\lambda$ from (6.3) obtained from the stellar subdivision of $\Delta_T$ induced by a node $v$ of $T$ does not meet $\operatorname{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)$. Lemma 6.4 plays a central role. The task is purely combinatorial and the difficulty lies in how to select the triple of admissible co-weights required by the lemma that is compatible with the given input face of $\tau_\lambda$.

**Proposition 6.7.** For every star-full tree $T \subset \Gamma$ and every $\lambda \in \partial T$, we have $\tau_\lambda^\circ \cap \operatorname{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma) = \emptyset$, where $\tau_\lambda$ is the simplex from (6.3).

**Proof.** Let $u$ be the unique node of $T$ adjacent to $\lambda$, and denote by $T'_1, \ldots, T'_{\delta_v}$ the branches of $T$ adjacent to $u$. We assume that $T'_{\delta_v} = \{\lambda\}$ and pick any $w \in \tau_\lambda^\circ$. The definition of $\tau_\lambda$ allows us to write $w$ uniquely as

\[ w = \alpha_v \iota(v) + \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v-1} w_j \quad \text{where} \quad w_j := \sum_{\mu \in \partial T'_j} \alpha_{\mu, j} \iota(\mu) \quad \text{for all } j \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_u - 1\}, \]

and $\alpha_v, \alpha_{\mu, j} > 0$ for all $\mu \in \partial T'_j$.

We analyze the series $F_{u,i}$ defining the system $S(\Gamma)$ at $u$ and use Lemma 6.4 to confirm that $\underline{z}^{m_u, \lambda}$ is the $w$-initial form of a series in the linear span of $\{u_{i}(F_{u,i}) : i = 1, \ldots, \delta_u - 2\}$. Indeed, a direct computation together with (2.11) ensures that for each monomial $\underline{z}^m$ appearing in $g_{u,i}$ we have:

\begin{equation}
\alpha_v \iota(v) \cdot m_{u, \lambda} = \frac{\ell_{u,v}}{|w_v|} < \alpha_v \iota(v) \cdot m \quad \text{and} \quad w_j \cdot m_{u, \lambda} = \sum_{\mu \in \partial T'_j \cap \partial \Gamma} \alpha_{\mu, j} \frac{\ell_{u,\mu}}{|w_{\mu}|} \leq w_j \cdot m \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j < \delta_v.
\end{equation}

Furthermore, the inequality in (6.5) involving $w_j$ is strict whenever $\partial T'_j \notin \partial \Gamma$. Thus, $w \cdot m_{u, \lambda} < w \cdot m$ for each $\underline{z}^m$ appearing in any series $g_{u,i}$, as required by condition (6.2) of Lemma 6.4.

To finish, we must find two branches $T'_{j_1}$ and $T'_{j_2}$ of $T$ adjacent to $u$ with $j_1, j_2 < \delta_v$ satisfying

\begin{equation}
w \cdot m_{u, \lambda} < w \cdot m_{u, T'_{j_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{u, \lambda} < w \cdot m_{u, T'_{j_2}}.
\end{equation}

The notation $m_{u, T}$ was introduced in Remark 6.3.
Our choice will depend on the nature of $u$. If $u = v$ we pick any $j_1, j_2 < \delta_v$. On the contrary, if $u \neq v$ we take $T'_v$ to be the unique branch of $T$ adjacent to $u$ containing $v$, and let $T'_v$ be an arbitrary third branch. After relabeling, we may assume $j_1 = 1$ and $j_2 = 2$. In both cases, a direct computation yields
\[ \alpha_v \cdot \ell(v) \cdot m_{u, \lambda} = \alpha_v \cdot \ell(v) \cdot m_{u, T'_2} \leq \alpha_v \cdot \ell(v) \cdot m_{u, T'_1}. \]  
Note that the inequality is strict when $u \neq v$. Furthermore,
\[ (w_1 + w_2) \cdot m_{u, \lambda} < (w_1 + w_2) \cdot (m_{u, T'_1} + m_{u, T'_2}) \quad \text{and} \quad w_j \cdot m_{u, \lambda} = w_j \cdot m_{u, T'_1} = w_j \cdot m_{u, T'_2} \quad \text{for } 3 \leq j < \delta_v. \]  
Adding up (6.7) and (6.8) yields (6.6), as we wanted. This concludes our proof. \[ \square \]

Our next result is central to the inductive step in the proof of Theorem 6.5:

**Proposition 6.8.** Let $T$ be a star-full subtree of $\Gamma$, and let $v$ be a node of $T$. Denote by $T_1, \ldots, T_{\delta_v}$ the branches of $T$ adjacent to $v$. Let $L$ be a proper subset of $\partial T$ which is not included in any $\partial T_i$, and set
\[ (6.9) \quad P := \conv\{\ell(v)\} \cup \ell(L). \]  
Then, $P$ is a simplex of dimension $|L|$ and $P^\circ$ does not meet $\Trop{\partial T}{\partial T}$. 

**Proof.** By Lemma 5.8 we have $\ell(v) \in (\Delta T)^\circ$. In addition, Proposition 5.10 implies that $P$ is a simplex of the expected dimension. It remains to show that $P^\circ \cap \Trop{\partial T}{\partial T} = \emptyset$. For each $j = 1, \ldots, \delta_v$, we set
\[ (6.10) \quad L_j := L \cap \partial T_j \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_j = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\conv(\ell(L_j))). \]  
By definition, we have $\tau_j = \{0\}$ if $L_j = \emptyset$. Moreover, each $\tau_j$ is a simplicial cone of dimension $|L_j|$. Our assumptions on $L$ and a suitable relabeling of the branches $T_j$ (if necessary) ensure the existence of some $q \in \{2, \ldots, \delta_v\}$ with $L_j \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ and $L_j = \emptyset$ for all $j \in \{q + 1, \ldots, \delta_v\}$.

We argue by contradiction and pick $w \in P^\circ \cap \Trop{\partial T}{\partial T}$. Since $P$ is a simplex, we write $w$ as
\[ (6.11) \quad w = \alpha_v \cdot \ell(v) + \sum_{j=1}^q w_j \quad \text{with } \alpha_v > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w_j \in \tau_j \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{for all } j. \]  

Lemma 6.9 below implies that $L_j = \partial T_j$ for all $j \leq q$. Since $L \subseteq \partial T$, it follows that $q < \delta_v$.

Next, we use Lemma 6.4 to confirm that $z_{\delta_v, T_v}$ is the $w$-initial form of a series in the linear span of $\{\mu_{v, T_v}\}_{\delta_v}^{-1}$, which contradicts our assumption $w \in \Trop{\partial T}{\partial T}$. First, a simple inspection shows
\[ \ell(v) \cdot m_{v, T_v} = \ell(v) \cdot m_{v, T_1} = \frac{d_v}{w_v}, \quad (w_1 + w_2) \cdot m_{v, \delta_v} < (w_1 + w_2) \cdot (m_{v, T_1} + m_{v, T_2}) \quad \text{and} \]  
\[ w_j \cdot m_{v, \delta_v} = w_j \cdot m_{v, T_1} = w_j \cdot m_{v, T_2} \quad \text{for all } j \in \{3, \ldots, q\}. \]  
Combining these expressions yields $w \cdot m_{v, \delta_v} < w \cdot m_{v, T_1}$ and $w \cdot m_{v, \delta_v} < w \cdot m_{v, T_2}$ since $\alpha_v > 0$.

To finish we compare the $w$-weight of $z_{\delta_v, T_v}$ with that of any exponent $m$ in the support of a fixed $g_{v,i}$. For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ we write $w_j := \sum_{\mu \in \partial T} \alpha_{\mu,j} \cdot \ell(\mu)$ with $\alpha_{\mu,j} > 0$ for all $\mu$. Then, the defining properties of $g_{v,i}$ imply
\[ (6.12) \quad \ell(v) \cdot m_{v, T_v} < \ell(v) \cdot m \quad \text{and} \quad w_j \cdot m_{v, T_v} = \sum_{\mu \in L_j \setminus \partial T} \alpha_{\mu,j} \cdot \frac{\ell(\mu)}{w_\mu} \leq w_j \cdot m \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq q. \]  
Note that the inequality for $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ is strict whenever $L_j \notin \partial T$. Combining both parts in (6.12) yields $w \cdot m_{v, T_v} < w \cdot m$ whenever $z_w$ appears in $g_{v,i}$. This verifies the second hypothesis required for Lemma 6.4, contradicting our choice of $w \in \Trop{\partial T}{\partial T}$. \[ \square \]

**Lemma 6.9.** For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v\}$, let $L_j$ be the set of leaves of $T_j$ as in (6.10). If $P^\circ \cap \Trop{\partial T}{\partial T} \neq \emptyset$, then $L_j$ is either empty or equal to $\partial T_j$.

**Proof.** We argue by contradiction and assume $\emptyset \subset L_j \subset \partial T_j$, so in particular $|\partial T_j| > 1$. We break the argument into four combinatorial claims, guided by Figure 3. The left-most picture informs the discussion for Claims 1 and 2. The central picture refers to Claim 3, and the right-most picture illustrates Claim 4. Throughout, we fix $w \in P^\circ \cap \Trop{\partial T}{\partial T}$ and write $w$ as in (6.11) where $w_j = \sum_{\mu \in L_j} \alpha_{\mu,j} \cdot \ell(\mu)$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$, with $\alpha_{\mu,j} > 0$ for all $\mu, j$.

First, we pick $\lambda \in \partial T_j \setminus L_j$ furthest away from $v$ in the geodesic metric on $T$. Let $v'$ be the unique node of $T_j$ adjacent to $\lambda$. This maximality restricts the nature of the node $v'$. More precisely,
Figure 3. Building a maximal sub-branch of $T_j$ avoiding $L_j$ starting from a suitable leaf $\lambda \in \partial T_j \setminus L_j$ and moving inwards towards $v$, as in the proof of Lemma 6.9. Here, $s \leq \delta_w - 2$ and $r = \delta_{w''} - 1$.

**Claim 1.** The node $v'$ is an end-node of $T_j$.

**Proof.** We consider all branches $T'_k$ of $T_j$ adjacent to $v'$ and containing neither $v$ nor $\lambda$. Our goal is to show that $|\partial T'_k| = 1$ for all $k$. We argue by contradiction.

If $|\partial T'_k| > 1$, then by the maximality of the distance between $v$ and $\lambda$ we have $\partial T'_k \subseteq L_j$. We consider the series defining $S(\Gamma)$ at $v'$, and the admissible co-weights at $v'$ associated to $\lambda$, $v$ and $T'_k$. We claim that the weight $w$ satisfies

$$w \cdot m_{v', \lambda} < w \cdot m_{v', T'_k}, \quad w \cdot m_{v', \lambda} < w \cdot m_{v', v} \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{v', \lambda} < w \cdot m$$

for each $m$ in the support of some $g_{v', i}$. This cannot happen by Lemma 6.4 since $w \in \text{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)$.

To prove the inequalities in (6.13) we analyze the contributions of each summand of $w$ as in the proof of Proposition 6.8. Our reasoning is similar to that of Proposition 6.7 replacing $u$ by $v'$. First, we observe:

$$\alpha_v \ell(v) \cdot m_{v', \lambda} = \alpha_v \ell(v) \cdot m_{v', T'_k} < \alpha_v \ell(v) \cdot m_{v', v}. \quad (6.14)$$

In turn, for each $p \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$, the weight $w_p$ satisfies

$$w_p \cdot m_{v', \lambda} = \sum_{\mu \in L_p \setminus \partial \Gamma} \alpha_{\mu, p} \ell_{v', \mu} \leq w_p \cdot m_{v', T'_k}. \quad (6.15)$$

Furthermore, the inequality is strict for $p = j$ since $L_j \subsetneq \partial T_j$. Combining (6.14) with (6.15) yields the left inequality in (6.13). Similarly, we have

$$w_p \cdot m_{v', \lambda} \leq w_p \cdot m_{v', v} \quad \text{for all } p \in \{1, \ldots, q\},$$

and the inequality is strict for $p \neq j$. Since $\delta_v \geq 3$ and $q \geq 2$, this proves the center inequality in (6.13).

Finally, the properties defining the series $g_{v', i}$ combined with (6.14) and (6.15) imply that for each monomial $m^p \subseteq m$ appearing in some $g_{v', i}$ we have

$$\alpha_v \ell(v) \cdot m_{v', \lambda} < \alpha_v \ell(v) \cdot m \quad \text{and} \quad w_p \cdot m_{v', \lambda} \leq w_p \cdot m \quad \text{for all } p = 1, \ldots, q.$$

Thus, the right-most inequality in (6.13) is also valid.

**Claim 2.** We have $\text{Star}_{T_j}(v') \cap L_j = \emptyset$. In particular, none of the leaves of $T_j$ adjacent to $v'$ can lie in $L_j$.

**Proof.** The claim follows by the same line of reasoning as Claim 1, working with the exponents $m_{v', v}$, $m_{v', \lambda}$ and $m_{v', T'_k}$ for any other branch $T'_k$ of $T_j$ adjacent to $v'$. If $\partial T'_k \subseteq L_j$, the inequalities (6.13) will remain valid, and this will contradict $w \in \text{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)$.

As a consequence of Claim 2 we conclude that $\lambda$ is part of a branch of $T_j$ avoiding $L_j$ with at least one node. Let $T'$ be a maximal branch of $T_j$ with this property and furthest away from $v$. We claim that $T' = T_j$. To prove this, we argue by contradicting the maximality of $T'$. We let $u$ be the node of $T_j$ adjacent to $T'$ and $u'$ be the node of $T''$ adjacent to $u$, as seen in the center of Figure 3. Next, we analyze the intersections between $L_j$ and the leaves of all relevant branches of $T_j$ adjacent to $u$. We treat two cases, depending on the size of each such branch, starting with singleton branches:

**Claim 3.** None of the leaves of $T_j$ adjacent to $u$ belong to $L_j$. 

\[ \square \]
Proof. Pick a leaf $\mu$ of $T_j$ adjacent to $u$. If $\mu \in L_j$, a similar calculation to that of Claim 1 for the series $F_{u,i}$ replacing $\lambda$ by $T'$ and $T'_k$ by $\mu$ confirms that
\[
 w \cdot m_{u,T'} < w \cdot m_{u,\mu}, \quad w \cdot m_{u,T'} < w \cdot m_{u,v}, \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{u,T'} < w \cdot m
\]
whenever $m \in \text{Supp}(g_{u,i})$. This cannot happen by Lemma 6.4 since $w \in \text{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)$. \hfill $\diamond$

Next, consider a non-singleton branch $T''$ of $T_j$ adjacent to $u$ and not containing $v$, with $T'' \neq T'$. As in the right-most picture in Figure 3, we let $u''$ be the unique node of $T''$ adjacent to $u$ in $\Gamma$ and let $T''_1, \ldots, T''_r$ be the branches of $T''$ adjacent to $u''$ that do not contain $v$. Then:

Claim 4. For all $k$, we have either $\partial T''_k \subseteq L_j$ or $\partial T''_k \cap L_j = \emptyset$.

Proof. If $\partial T''_k \not\subseteq L_j$, picking $\lambda \in \partial T''_k \setminus L_j$ will produce a maximal branch of $T''$ not meeting $L_j$. This branch will be further away from $v$ than $T'$ was, unless it equals $T''_k$. Thus, we conclude $\partial T''_k \cap L_j = \emptyset$. \hfill $\diamond$

The previous claim yields a stronger identity, namely:
\[(6.16) \quad \partial T'' \cap L_j = \emptyset.\]
To prove the latter, we first assume that $\partial T'' \subseteq L_j$. We consider the series of $S(\Gamma)$ determined by the node $u$. Replacing the roles of $v'$, $\lambda$ and $T'_k$ in (6.13) by $u$, $T'$ and $T''$, respectively, the same proof technique from Claim 1 yields
\[
 w \cdot m_{u,T'} < w \cdot m_{u,v}, \quad w \cdot m_{u,T'} < w \cdot m_{u,v}, \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{u,T'} < w \cdot m
\]
for each $m$ in the support of any fixed $g_{u,i}$. Lemma 6.4 then shows that $w \notin \text{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)$, contradicting our original assumption on $w$. From here it follows that $\partial T'' \not\subseteq L_j$, so by Claim 4 we can find some $k$ with $\partial T''_k \cap L_j = \emptyset$.

Now, if $\partial T'' \cap L_j \neq \emptyset$, once again, Claim 4 yields $\partial T''_p \subseteq L_j$ for some $p \neq k$. Analyzing the equations of $S(\Gamma)$ at the node $u''$, and replacing $v'$, $\lambda$ and $T'_k$ in (6.13) by $u''$, $T''_k$ and $T''_p$, respectively, we conclude:
\[
 w \cdot m_{u'',T''_k} < w \cdot m_{u'',T''_p}, \quad w \cdot m_{u'',T''_k} < w \cdot m_{u'',v}, \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{u'',T''_k} < w \cdot m
\]
for each $m$ in the support of a given $g_{u'',i}$. Lemma 6.4 then forces $w \notin \text{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma)$, leading to a contradiction. Therefore, (6.16) holds.

To finish, we observe that Claim 3 combined with (6.16) above contradicts the maximality of $T'$, since the convex hull of all branches adjacent to $u$ and not containing $v$ will be a branch of $T_j$ strictly containing $T'$ and not meeting $L_j$. From here it follows that $T' = T_j$, which cannot happen since $L_j \neq \emptyset$. \hfill $\Box$

6.2. Boundary components of the extended tropicalization.

In this section, we characterize the boundary strata of the extended tropicalization of the germ $(X,0)$ defined by $S(\Gamma)$ (see Remark 3.6). These strata are determined by the positive local tropicalization of the intersection of $X$ with each coordinate subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$. This will serve two purposes. First, it will show by combinatorial methods that $(X,0)$ is a two-dimensional complete intersection with no boundary components. Second, it will help us prove the remaining inclusion from Theorem 6.5. The latter is the subject of Subsection 6.3.

We start by setting up notation. Throughout, we write $\sigma := (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$ and fix a positive-dimensional proper face $\tau$ of $\sigma$. Since $N(\partial \Gamma) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n$ by choosing the basis $\{w_{\lambda} : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma\}$ from Section 2 we define
\[(6.17) \quad L_{\tau} := \{ \mu \in \partial \Gamma : w_{\mu} \text{ is a ray of } \tau \}.
\]
We let $k$ be the dimension of $\tau$ and consider the natural projection of vector spaces
\[(6.18) \quad \text{pr}_\tau : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n/\tau \simeq \mathbb{R}^{n-k}.
\]
By abuse of notation, whenever $w_{\lambda} \notin \tau$, we identify $w_{\lambda}$ with its image in $\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ under $\text{pr}_\tau$.

Definition 6.10. Given a series $f \in \mathbb{C}[z_{\lambda} : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma]$, we let $f^\tau$ be the series obtained from $f$ by setting all $z_{\lambda}$ with $\lambda \in L_{\tau}$ to be zero. We view $f^\tau \in \mathbb{C}[\tau^\perp \cap \mathbb{Z}^n]$ as a series in the $n-k$ variables in $\{z_{\lambda} : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma \setminus L_{\tau}\}$. We call it the $\tau$-truncation of $f$. 

Definition 6.11. We let $X_{\tau}$ be the intersection of the germ $(X, 0)$ defined by $S(\Gamma)$ with the dense torus in the coordinate subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by $\tau$. This new germ is defined by the vanishing of the $\tau$-truncations of all series in $S(\Gamma)$. The local tropicalization of $S(\Gamma)$ with respect to $\tau$ is defined as the positive tropicalization of $X_{\tau}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. Following [31, Section 12], we denote it by $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$.

Our first result generalizes Lemma 6.4, when some, but not all, admissible monomials at a fixed node of $\Gamma$ have trivial $\tau$-truncations. It will simplify the computation of each $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$.

Lemma 6.12. Fix a positive-dimensional proper face $\tau$ of $\sigma$, a node $v$ of $\Gamma$ and some $w \in p_v(\sigma)$. Assume that some $\tau$-truncated series in $\{f_{v,i}\}_{i=1}^{\delta_{\tau}-2}$ is non-zero and that one of these conditions hold:

(1) the system involves at most $\delta_{\tau} - 2$ admissible monomials and there exists an edge $e$ adjacent to $v$ with $m_{v,e} \notin N(\{\lambda : \lambda \in L_\tau\})$ satisfying $w \cdot m_{v,e} < w \cdot m$ for each $m$ in the support of any $(g_{v,i})^\tau$; or
(2) the system involves exactly $\delta_{\tau} - 1$ monomials and we have two distinct edges $e, e'$ of $\text{Star}_\tau(v)$ with $m_{v,e}, m_{v,e'} \notin N(\{\lambda : \lambda \in L_\tau\})$ such that $w \cdot m_{v,e} < w \cdot m_{v,e'}$ and $w \cdot m_{v,e'} < w \cdot m$ for each $m$ in the support of any fixed $(g_{v,i})^\tau$.

Then, $\underline{z}^{m_{v,e}}$ is the $w$-initial form of a series in the linear span of $\{(f_{v,i})^\tau\}_{i=1}^{\delta_{\tau}-2}$ and $w \notin \text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$.

Proof. The proof follows the same reasoning as that of Lemma 6.4, considering the truncations of the new basis $\{F_{v,i}\}_{i=1}^{\delta_{\tau}-2}$ obtained by ordering the edges adjacent to $v$ in a convenient way. If the conditions (1) hold, we pick any two edges $e', e''$ with $m_{v,e'}, m_{v,e''} \in N(\{\lambda : \lambda \in L_\tau\})$ and order the edges adjacent to $v$ so that $e_{\delta_{\tau} - 2} = e, e_{\delta_{\tau} - 1} = e'$ and $e_{\delta_{\tau}} = e''$. In this situation, the statement follows since

$$\text{in}_w(F_{v,\delta_{\tau} - 2})^\tau = \text{in}_w((F_{v,\delta_{\tau} - 2})^\tau) = \underline{z}^{m_{v,e}}.$$ 

Similarly, if the conditions of (2) hold, we pick $e''$ to be the unique edge with $m_{v,e''} \in N(\{\lambda : \lambda \in L_\tau\})$. The same method produces the desired result for the series $(F_{v,\delta_{\tau} - 2})^\tau$. 

Here is the main result of this section:

Theorem 6.13. Let $\tau$ be a positive-dimensional face of $\sigma$ with $\lambda \in L_\tau$. Let $v$ be the unique node of $\Gamma$ adjacent to $\lambda$. Then:

(1) If $\dim \tau = 1$, then $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) \subseteq R_{>0}(p_v(w_v))$.
(2) If $\dim \tau \geq 2$, then $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) = \emptyset$.

Proof. We fix $k = \dim \tau$. Since $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$ is a fan in $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^{n-k}$, we can determine the positive tropicalization of $\Delta_{n-k-1}$ by following the proof strategy of Theorem 6.5. Since the vector $p_v(w_v) \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^{n-k}$ is non-zero, we set

$$\underline{w}' := \frac{p_v(w_v)}{|p_v(w_v)|} \in \Delta_{n-k-1}$$

and perform a stellar subdivision of this standard simplex using $w_v'$. If $\dim \tau = 1$, Proposition 6.14 below ensures that for every simplex $\rho$ of the stellar subdivision that meets $\Delta_{n-k}$ we have $\rho^\circ \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) = \emptyset$ unless $\rho$ is zero-dimensional. The only remaining simplex is $\{p_v(w_v)\}$, so item (1) holds. In turn, when $\dim \tau = 2$, the same proposition applies also when $\rho$ is a point. This forces $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) = \emptyset$, as stated in item (2).

Proposition 6.14. Let $\tau, \lambda$ and $v$ be as in Theorem 6.13 and $L_\tau$ be as in (6.17). Fix a proper subset $L$ of $\partial \Gamma \setminus L_\tau$. Let $w_v' \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^{n-k}$ be as in (6.19) and set $\underline{w}' := \text{conv}(\{w_v' \cup \{w_\mu : \mu \in L\}) \subseteq \Delta_{n-k-1}$ where $k = \dim \tau$. If $|L \cup L_\tau| > 1$, then

$$\rho^\circ \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) = \emptyset.$$ 

Proof. We follow the proof strategy of Proposition 6.8 for $T = \Gamma$. We let $T_1, \ldots, T_{\delta_\tau}$ be the branches of $\Gamma$ adjacent to $v$, with $T_1 = \{\lambda\}$. For each $j \in \{2, \ldots, \delta_\tau\}$ we set

$$L_{\tau,j} := L_\tau \cap T_{\tau,j}, \quad L_j := L \cap T_{\tau,j} \quad \text{and} \quad p_j := (\mathbb{R}_{>0}(p_v(w_\mu) : \mu \in L_j) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n-k}.$$ 

If $L_j = \emptyset$, we declare $\rho_j = \{0\}$. Since $1 < |L \cup L_\tau| < n$, upon relabeling the branches $T_2, \ldots, T_{\delta_\tau}$ if necessary, we can find a unique $q \in \{2, \ldots, \delta_\tau\}$ with $L_j \cup L_{\tau,j} \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$, and $L_j \cup L_{\tau,j} = \emptyset$ for $j > q$. 


We argue by contradiction and pick $w \in \rho^c \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma), \tau)$. Since $\rho$ is a simplex and $T_1 \subset L_\tau$, we have

$$w = \alpha_v w'_v + \sum_{j=2}^q w_j \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_v > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w_j \in \rho_j^c \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in \{2, \ldots, \delta_v\}.$$  

In particular, we know that $w_j = 0$ if and only if $\rho_j = \{0\}$.

Lemma 6.15 below ensures that $L_j \cup L_{\tau,j} = \partial T_j$ for all $j \leq q$. From here we conclude that $1 < q < \delta_v$, so $\partial T_1 \subset L \cup L_\tau$ and $\partial T_{\delta_v} \cap (L \cup L_\tau) = \emptyset$. This ensures that the $\tau$-truncation of $z^{m,\tau}_{v,1}$ is non-zero, so the $\tau$-truncated series $\{(f_{v,i})^\tau_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2}\}$ are not all identically zero. In turn, since $z^{m,\tau}_{v,1} = z_{\lambda v,1}^{\delta_v,\lambda}$, the system of $\tau$-truncations involves at most $\delta_v - 1$ admissible monomials.

We claim that $z^{m,\tau}_{v,1}$ is the $w$-initial form of a series in the linear span of $\{(f_{v,i})^\tau_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2}\}$, which contradicts our assumption that $w \in \text{Trop}_{>0}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma), \tau)$. We prove this claim by a case-by-case analysis. Each case matches one of the two possible settings of Lemma 6.12.

First, we assume that the system of $\tau$-truncations $\{(f_{v,i})^\tau_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2}\}$ involves exactly $\delta_v - 1$ monomials. In particular, $(z^{m,\tau}_{v,1})^\tau \neq 0$. This forces both $\rho_2 \neq \{0\}$ and $w_2 \cdot m_{v,T_2} > 0$ since $L_2 \cup L_{\tau,2} = \partial T_2$. We consider the admissible co-weights $m_{v,T_2}$ and $m_{v,T_{\delta_v}}$ and fix any $z^m$ appearing in some $g_{v,i}$ with non-zero $\tau$-truncation. A direct calculation reveals the following inequalities and identities:

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha_v w'_v \cdot m_{v,T_2} &= \alpha_v w'_v \cdot m_{v,T_2} = \alpha_v d_v \frac{d_v}{|p_{\tau}(w_v)|} < \alpha_v w'_v \cdot m, \\
0 &\leq w_2 \cdot m \quad \text{and} \quad w_j \cdot m_{v,T_\delta} = w_j \cdot m_{v,T_\delta} = 0 \leq w_j \cdot m \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 3, \ldots, q.
\end{align*}$$

Thus, the conditions for Lemma 6.12 (2) hold, as we wanted.

Finally, if the $\tau$-truncated system $\{(f_{v,i})^\tau_{i=1}^{\delta_v-2}\}$ has at most $\delta_v - 2$ admissible monomials, the result follows again by Lemma 6.12 (1) since the inequalities involving $m_{v,T_2}$ and $m$ in (6.23) remain valid.

Our next result is analogous to Lemma 6.9. We prove it using the same techniques.

**Lemma 6.15.** Fix $L_{\tau,j}$, $L_j$ and $\rho_j$ as in (6.21). If $\rho^c \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma), \tau) \neq \emptyset$ then, the set $L_j \cup L_{\tau,j}$ is either empty or it equals $\partial T_j$.

**Proof.** We use the notation established in the proof of Proposition 6.14 and pick $w \in \rho^c \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma), \tau)$. We write $w$ as in (6.11). We argue by contradiction, assuming $1 \leq |L_j \cup L_{\tau,j}| \leq |\partial T_j| - 1$.

First, note that we can find a branch $T'$ of $\Gamma$ contained in $T_j$ with $\partial T' \cap (L_j \cup L_{\tau,j}) = \emptyset$. For example, any leaf $\mu$ of $\partial T_j$ in $L \cup L_\tau$ will produce such a branch. Since $T_j$ is finite, we can choose the branch $T'$ to be maximal with respect to the condition $\partial T' \cap (L_j \cup L_{\tau,j}) = \emptyset$ and furthest away from $v$ in the geodesic metric on $\Gamma$. Let $u$ be the unique node of $\Gamma$ adjacent to $T'$. Since $(L_j \cup L_{\tau,j}) \neq \emptyset$, we know that $u \neq v$.

Assume that there are $r$ branches adjacent to $u$ with this maximality property, and denote them by $T'_1 = T', \ldots, T'_r$ as in Figure 4. We let $T'_{r+1}, \ldots, T'_{\delta_v-1}$ be the remaining branches of $\Gamma$ adjacent to $u$ and not containing $\lambda$. The maximality of both $T'$ and $\text{distr}(u, v)$ combined with the condition $u \neq v$ implies that $r < \delta_v - 1$ and $\partial T'_i \subset L_j \cup L_{\tau,j}$ for each $i \in \{r + 1, \ldots, \delta_v - 1\}$. Indeed, if the latter were not the case, we could find a branch $T''$ of $\Gamma$ inside $T'_i$ with the same properties as $T'$ but further away from $v$.
Note that since $(\tilde{z}^{m_{u,v}})^{\tau} \neq 0$, we know that the collection $\{(f_{u,v})^{\tau}\}_{i=1}^{\delta_u - 2}$ is not identically zero. We claim that $\tilde{z}^{m_{u,v}}$ is the initial form of a series in linear span of $\{(F_{u,v})^{\tau}\}_{i=1}^{\delta_u - 2}$. This will contradict our original assumption that $w \in \text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$. We prove our claim by analyzing three cases, depending on the number of admissible monomials in each series that remain after $\tau$-truncation.

First, assume that $f_{u,v} = (F_{u,v})^{\tau}$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_u - 2\}$. Then, after replacing each $g_{u,v}$ with its $\tau$-truncation, we are in the setting of Lemma 6.6. In this situation, the condition $\partial T_0^r \cap \partial C = \emptyset$ and the defining properties of $g_{u,v}$ ensure that

$$w \cdot m_{u,v} < w \cdot m_{u,v} \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{u,T_1^r} < w \cdot m_{u,T_1^r - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad w \cdot m_{u,T_1^r} < w \cdot m_{u,T_1^r - 1}$$

for each $\tilde{z}^{m}$ appearing in some $(g_{u,v})^{\tau}$. The aforementioned lemma implies our claim regarding $\tilde{z}^{m_{u,v}}$.

Second, assume the $\tau$-truncated series $\{(f_{u,v})^{\tau}\}_{i=1}^{\delta_u - 2}$ involve at most $\delta_u - 2$ admissible monomials. In this case, the claim follows by Lemma 6.12 (1) since the inequalities involving $m_{u,T_1^r}$ and $m$ in (6.24) remain valid in this scenario.

Finally, assume that the $\tau$-truncated series at $w$ involves exactly $\delta_u - 1$ admissible monomials. In this situation, up to relabeling of $T_{r+1}^r, \ldots, T_{\delta_u - 1}^r$ we know that exactly one of the monomials with exponent $m_{u,v}$ or $m_{u,T_1^r - 1}$ vanish under $\tau$-truncation. The inequalities involving $m_{u,T_1^r}, m$ and the surviving among $m_{u,v}$ or $m_{u,T_1^r - 1}$ in (6.24) ensure that the hypothesis required by Lemma 6.12 (2) hold. \hfill $\square$

Theorem 6.13 has the following two important consequences:

**Corollary 6.16.** The intersection of the germ defined by the system $S(\Gamma)$ with any coordinate subspace $H$ of $\mathbb{C}^n$ of codimension at least two is just the origin.

**Proof.** Let $H'$ be the minimal coordinate subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ contained in $H$ with $X \cap H' \neq \{0\}$, and consider the face $\tau$ of $(\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$ associated to $H'$. It follows that $X_\tau \neq \emptyset$, but this cannot happen since $\dim X_\tau = \dim \text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$ by Proposition 3.8 (1) and $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) = \emptyset$ by Theorem 6.13 (2). \hfill $\square$

**Corollary 6.17.** The germ $(X,0)$ defined by the system $S(\Gamma)$ intersects each coordinate hyperplane along a germ of a curve. All its irreducible components meet the dense torus of the corresponding hyperplane.

**Proof.** We fix a coordinate hyperplane $\{z_\lambda = 0\}$ and let $\tau$ be the cone generated by $w_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Counting the number of equations defining $Y := X \cap \{z_\lambda = 0\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$, we see that $\dim Y \geq 1$ by Krull’s principal ideal theorem. By construction, $X_\tau = Y \cap (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$. Since any face $\tau'$ of $(\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$ properly containing $\tau$ satisfies $X_{\tau'} = \emptyset$ by Corollary 6.16, it follows from Proposition 3.8 (1) that $\dim X_\tau = \dim \text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$ and, furthermore, no component of $Y$ lies in the toric boundary of $\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. However, $\dim \text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) \leq 1$ by Theorem 6.13 (1), so $\dim X_\tau = 1$. \hfill $\square$

In turn, the last corollary has two consequences. First, it confirms that the germ defined by $S(\Gamma)$ is a complete intersection, and second, it shows that equality must hold in Theorem 6.13 (1).

**Corollary 6.18.** The germ $(X,0)$ defined by the system $S(\Gamma)$ is a two-dimensional complete intersection. Each of its irreducible components meets the dense torus $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^n$ non-trivially in dimension two.

Note that this result allows a priori for the germ $(X,0)$ to have several irreducible components. We will see in Corollary 7.10 that $(X,0)$ is in fact irreducible.

**Corollary 6.19.** Let $\lambda$ be a leaf of $\Gamma$ and let $v$ be the unique node of $\Gamma$ adjacent to it. If $\tau = \mathbb{R}_{>0}(w_\lambda)$, then $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau) = \mathbb{R}_{>0}(p_\tau(w_\nu))$.

**Proof.** The result follows by combining Theorem 6.13 (1), Corollary 6.17, and the equality between the dimensions of $X_\tau$ and $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma), \tau)$ stated in Proposition 3.8 (1). \hfill $\square$

Finally, Corollary 6.18 and Proposition 3.7 combined characterize the local tropicalization of $(X,0) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$:

**Corollary 6.20.** The local tropicalization of the germ $(X,0)$ is the Euclidean closure of $\text{Trop}_{>0}(S(\Gamma))$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. 

6.3. The splice fan is contained in the local tropicalization of the splice type system.

In this section, we prove the remaining inclusion in Theorem 6.2. Our arguments are purely combinatorial, and rely on the balancing condition for pure-dimensional local tropicalizations (see Remark 3.14). Corollary 6.18 confirms that such condition holds for the positive tropicalization of the germ defined by $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. Furthermore, the proofs in this section imply that no proper two-dimensional subset of $\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ is balanced.

We start by stating the main result in this section. Its proof will be broken into several lemmas and propositions for clarity of exposition.

**Theorem 6.21.** For every splice diagram $\Gamma$, we have $\iota(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ in $(\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 6.22 below we know that $\Delta_{n-1} \cap \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ is a 1-dimensional polyhedral complex and $\iota(v) \in \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ for some node $v$ of $\Gamma$. We claim that, in fact, $\iota(u) \in \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ for each node $u$ of $\Gamma$.

We prove this claim by induction on the distance between $u$ and $v$ (recall that $\Gamma$ is connected). If $u = v$ there is nothing to show. For the inductive step, pick a node $u$ with $\text{dist}_\Gamma(u, v) = k \geq 1$ and assume that the claim holds for each node $u'$ of $\Gamma$ with $\text{dist}_\Gamma(u', v) = k - 1$. Let $u'$ be the unique node of $[u, v]$ adjacent to $u$. Then, $\iota(u') \in \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ by our inductive hypothesis. Proposition 6.24 below and Corollary 6.20 yield:

$$\iota(u) \in \iota(\text{Star}_\Gamma(u')) \subseteq \overline{\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)} = \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma).$$

The desired inclusion $\iota(\Gamma) \subseteq \overline{\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)}$ follows by combining Proposition 6.24 with the identity $\iota(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{v \text{ node of } \Gamma} \text{Star}_\Gamma(v)$. $\square$

Our first lemma ensures that the image of some node of $\Gamma$ lies in the positive tropicalization of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$.

**Lemma 6.22.** The intersection $\Delta_{n-1} \cap \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ is a 1-dimensional polyhedral complex. Furthermore, there exists a node $v$ of $\Gamma$ with $\iota(v) \in \Delta_{n-1} \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$.

**Proof.** By Corollary 6.18 we know that $\text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ is a fan of pure dimension two, and so $\Delta_{n-1} \cap \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ is a pure 1-dimensional polyhedral complex. To conclude, we must find a node $v$ with $\iota(v) \in \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$.

Since $\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \subset \iota(\Gamma)$ by Corollary 6.6, we have two possibilities for any $w \in \Delta_{n-1} \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$: either $w = \iota(v)$ for some node $v$ of $\Gamma$ or $w \in \iota([u, u'])^o$ for two adjacent vertices $u, u'$ of $\Gamma$. In the second situation, Lemma 6.23 ensures that $\iota([u, u']) \subset \Delta_{n-1} \cap \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. Since one of $u$ or $u'$ must be a node of $\Gamma$ and each node maps to $(\Delta_{n-1})^o$ under $\iota$, the claim follows. $\square$

Our next lemma is central to the proof of both Theorem 6.21 and Lemma 6.22. It describes the possible intersections between the local tropicalization of $\Delta_{n-1}$ and the edges embedded in $\Delta_{n-1}$ via the map $\iota$.

The balancing condition for positive local tropicalizations plays a prominent role.

**Lemma 6.23.** Let $u, u'$ be two adjacent vertices of $\Gamma$. If $\iota([u, u'])^o$ intersects $\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ non-trivially, then $\iota([u, u']) \subseteq \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$.

**Proof.** It suffices to show that $\iota([u, u'])^o \subseteq \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. We argue by contradiction and fix a point $w \in \iota([u, u']) \setminus \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. We fix a standard homeomorphism $\varphi: [0, 1] \to [u, u']$ with $\varphi(0) = u$ and $\varphi(1) = u'$, and write $w = \varphi(t_0)$ for a unique $t_0 \in [0, 1]$. Since $\text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ is closed in $(\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$, we can find a pair $a, b \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $a < t_0 < b$ and such that the open segment $\iota([\varphi(a), \varphi(b)])$ avoids $\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. Furthermore, we pick $(a, b)$ to be the maximal open interval in $[0, 1]$ containing $t_0$ with this property. A contradiction will arise naturally if we prove that $a = 0$ and $b = 1$.

By symmetry, it suffices to show that $a = 0$. We argue by contradiction, and assume $a > 0$, so $\iota(\varphi(a)) \in (\Delta_{n-1})^o$ by construction. The maximality of $(a, b)$ combined with Corollary 6.20 ensures that $\iota(\varphi(a)) \in \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. Recall from Corollary 6.6 that $\Delta_{n-1} \cap \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \subseteq \iota(\Gamma)$. Since $\iota$ is an injection by Theorem 5.11, the balancing condition for $\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ forces $\iota(\varphi(a))$ to lie in the relative interior of a 2-dimensional cone of $\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. This cannot happen since $\iota(\varphi(a), b)$ avoids $\text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. $\square$

Our next result plays a prominent role in the induction arguments used to prove Theorem 6.21. Once again, the balancing condition for local tropicalizations becomes crucial.

**Proposition 6.24.** Let $v$ be a node of $\Gamma$ with $\iota(v) \in \text{Trop}_{>0}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. Then, $\iota(\text{Star}_\Gamma(v)) \subseteq \text{Trop}\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$. 

Proof. After refinement if necessary, we may assume that \( \tau := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \iota(v) \) is a ray of \( \text{Trop}_{> 0} \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \). Given a vertex \( u \) of \( \Gamma \) adjacent to \( v \), we consider the 1-dimensional saturated lattice
\[
\Lambda := \frac{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap \mathbb{R}(w_u, w_v)}{(\mathbb{Z}^n \cap \mathbb{R}(w_v))},
\]
and the natural projection map \( \pi : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \Lambda \). Let \( w_{u|\tau} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \iota([u, v]) \) be such that \( \pi(w_{u|\tau}) \) generates the lattice \( \Lambda \). In particular, we can write \( w_{u|\tau} \) uniquely as
\[
w_{u|\tau} := \alpha_u \iota(u) + \beta_u \iota(v)
\]
for some \( \alpha_u, \beta_u \in \mathbb{Q} \) and with \( \alpha_u > 0 \).

We let \( u_1, \ldots, u_{\delta_v} \) be the vertices of \( \Gamma \) adjacent to \( v \). The balancing condition for \( \text{Trop}_{> 0} \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \) at \( \tau \) combined with Theorem 6.5 ensures the existence of non-negative integers \( \{k_1, \ldots, k_{\delta_v}\} \) (i.e., the tropical multiplicities) satisfying:
\[
(6.26) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\delta_v} k_i w_{u_i|\tau} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n \cap \mathbb{R}(w_v)).
\]
Moreover, by Definition 3.13, \( \iota([u_j, v])^\circ \) intersects \( \text{Trop}_{> 0} \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \) non-trivially in a neighborhood of \( \iota(v) \) if and only if \( k_j \neq 0 \).

Since \( \text{Trop}_{> 0} \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \) is pure of dimension two and \( \iota(v) \in \text{Trop}_{> 0} \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \), we know that \( k_{j_0} > 0 \) for some \( j_0 \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v\} \). We claim that, furthermore, all \( k_1, \ldots, k_{\delta_v} \) are positive integers. The inclusion \( \iota(\text{Star}_\Gamma(v)) \subset \text{Trop} \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \) follows by combining this statement with Lemma 6.23.

To prove our claim, we consider the following linear equation in \( k_1, \ldots, k_{\delta_v} \) that is equivalent to (6.26):
\[
(6.27) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\delta_v} (k_j \alpha_{u_j}) \iota(u_j) = \beta \iota(v) \quad \text{with } \beta \in \mathbb{Q}.
\]
First, we argue that this system admits a unique solution \( (k_1, \ldots, k_{\delta_v}) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\delta_v} \) for all \( \beta \). Uniqueness follows directly since \( \alpha_{u_j} > 0 \) for all \( j \) and \( \{\iota(u_1), \ldots, \iota(u_{\delta_v})\} \) are linearly independent by Proposition 5.10 (1).

Second, we claim that for \( \beta \neq 0 \), any solution to (6.27) has \( k_j \neq 0 \) for all \( j \). By homogeneity, we may assume \( \beta = 1 \). Then, Proposition 5.7 (2) and the linear independence of \( \{\iota(u_j)\}_{j=1}^{\delta_v} \) force the coefficients \( k_j \alpha_{u_j} \) in (6.27) to be the ones used to write \( \iota(v) \) as an element of \( (\Delta_{\text{Star}_\Gamma(v)})^\circ \). Since \( \alpha_{u_j} > 0 \) for all \( j \) we have \( k_j > 0 \) for all \( j \), as we wanted.

To finish we argue that (6.26) has a solution with \( k_{j_0} > 0 \) by the balancing condition. This forces \( \beta \neq 0 \) in (6.27), and so \( k_j \neq 0 \) for all \( j \) by the previous discussion. This concludes our proof. \( \square \)

7. Splice type singularities are Newton non-degenerate

In this section we discuss the Newton non-degeneracy of splice type singularities following the original framework introduced by Khovanskii (see Definition 4.2). This property only involves the initial forms of the generators of the system \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \), as opposed to the initial ideals of \( \langle \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \rangle \). In turn, Theorem A.1 ensures the \( w \)-initial forms of \( (F_{v,i})_{v,i} \) generate the \( w \)-initial ideal of \( \langle \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \rangle \), for each \( w \) in the positive local tropicalization of \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \), thus giving an alternative proof of Theorem 6.21. Furthermore, Newton non-degeneracy implies that condition (3) of Proposition 3.8 holds for every cell in \( \iota(\Gamma) \), thus showing that the splice fan of \( \Gamma \) is a tropicalizing fan for the germ defined by the system \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \), in the sense of Definition 3.11.

We start by setting up notation. For each vertex \( w \in (\mathbb{R}_{> 0})^n \) we define:
\[
(7.1) \quad J_w := \langle \iota(w(F_{v,i})) : v \text{ node of } \Gamma, i = 1, \ldots, \delta_v - 2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}[z_{\lambda_1}, \ldots, z_{\lambda_n}].
\]
and let \( Z_w \) be the subscheme of \( \mathbb{C}^n \) defined by \( J_w \). Newton non-degeneracy will be certified by showing that \( Z_w \cap (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \) is smooth whenever \( w \in \text{Trop}_{> 0} \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \). This is the content of the main result of this section:

**Theorem 7.1.** The splice type system \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \) is Newton non-degenerate.

**Proof.** This follows from Lemmas 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 below. Indeed, monomial curves are smooth outside the origin by Theorem 2.21 and for each node \( u \) of \( \Gamma \), the components of the scheme \( Z_{w_u} \) are Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm singularities and they can only meet at a coordinate subspace of \( \mathbb{C}^n \). Thus, \( Z_{w_u} \cap (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \) is smooth. \( \square \)
The next three lemmas characterize the ideal $J_w$ associated to points in the relative interior of each cell in the polyhedral complex $\iota(\Gamma)$.

**Lemma 7.2.** Let $u$ be a node of $\Gamma$ and let $w = w_u$. Let $\Gamma_0$ be the star of $\Gamma$ at $u$, viewed as a splice diagram with inherited weights around $u$. Then:

1. $J_w = \langle \text{in}_w(f_{v,i}) : v \text{ node of } \Gamma, i = 1, \ldots, \delta_w - 2 \rangle$.
2. $Z_w$ is a complete intersection of dimension two;
3. $Z_w$ has no component in the boundary of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$, so $J_w$ is monomial-free;
4. all components of $Z_w$ are images of $\mathbb{C}$ under a (torus-translated) monomial map whose domain is a Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm complete intersection in $\mathbb{C}^{\delta_w}$ determined by $\Gamma_0$;
5. the intersection of any two distinct components of $Z_w$ lies outside $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$.

**Proof.** Item (1) follows from the identity $\text{in}_w(F_{v,i}) = \text{in}_w(f_{v,i})$ for all $v$ and $i$ that is valid due to (2.11). To prove the remaining items, we let $k$ be the number of nodes of $\Gamma$ adjacent to $u$ and $T_1, \ldots, T_k$ the branches of $\Gamma$ adjacent to $u$, each $T_j$ containing the corresponding node $u_j$. Set $\Gamma_i = [T_i, u]$ and express $J_w$ as a sum of the following $k + 1$ ideals:

$$J_0 = \langle \text{in}_w(f_{u,j}) : j = 1, \ldots, \delta_w - 2 \rangle, \quad J_i = \langle \text{in}_w(f_{v,j}) : v \text{ node of } \Gamma_i, j = 1, \ldots, \delta_v - 2 \rangle, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, k.$$ 

Note that the generators of each $J_i$ with $i \neq 0$ lie in $\mathbb{C}[z_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial T_i]$. In particular, no variable $z_\lambda$ with $\lambda$ adjacent to $u$ appears in them. To fix notation, we write these leaves as $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$ with $k + l = \delta_u$.

For simplicity, we write $Z = Z_w$. We start by characterizing the components of $Z$. Each $J_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, defines an end-curve $C_i$ determined by the splice diagram $\Gamma_i$, rooted at $u$. In turn, Theorem 2.21 ensures that each of the $g$-many components of $C_i$ admits a (torus-translated) monomial parametrization of the form

$$\mathbb{C}[z_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial_i \Gamma] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[t_r] \quad \text{where } z_\lambda \mapsto c^{(r)}_{\lambda,i} t_r^{r_{\lambda,i}/g},$$

with $c^{(r)}_{\lambda,i} \neq 0$ for all $\lambda, i$. Thus, each component of $C_1 \times \ldots \times C_k$ can be parameterized using $\mathbb{C}^k$ by combining these (torus-translated) monomial maps.

Substituting the expressions from (7.2) for the chosen component of each $C_i$ into the generators of $J_0$ shows that the closure of each component of $Z$ can be parameterized using a component of a splice type singularity defined by the diagram $\Gamma_0$. Note that the Hamm determinant conditions at $u$ arising from $S(\Gamma_0)$ agree with those determined by the generators of $J_0$ up to multiplying the columns corresponding to the branches $\Gamma_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, by non-zero constants. Therefore, each component of $Z$ is the image of a (torus-translated) monomial map from $\mathbb{C}^k$ restricted to a Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm complete intersection defined by $\Gamma_0$. In particular, no component of $Z$ lies in a coordinate subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$, so $J_w$ is monomial-free. This proves (3) and (4).

Since $Z$ is equidimensional of dimension two and it is defined by $n - 2$ polynomial equations, it is a complete intersection. This proves (2). It remains to address (5) when $Z$ is not irreducible.

To determine the intersection of two distinct components (say, $Z_1$ and $Z_2$) of $Z$ we exploit the parameterizations described earlier. Let $I \subset \{1, \ldots, k\}$ be the collection of indices $i$ for which the projection of $Z_1$ and $Z_2$ to $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[t_i])$ do not agree. If $I = \emptyset$, then the two components are parameterized using the same Pham-Brieskorn-Hamm system of equations associated to $\Gamma_0$ and the same (torus-translated) monomial map. This cannot happen since such germs are irreducible and $Z_1 \neq Z_2$.

Next, assume $|I| \geq 1$. In this setting, the projection of $Z_1 \cap Z_2$ to $\mathbb{C}^{|\Gamma_i|}$, for each $i \in I$ lies in the intersection of two components of the end-curve $C_i$, which can only be origin of $\mathbb{C}^{|\Gamma_i|}$ by Theorem 2.21. This means that $Z_1 \cap Z_2$ lies in the coordinate subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by the vanishing of all $z_\lambda$ with $\lambda \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \partial_i \Gamma_i$. This concludes our proof.

**Lemma 7.3.** Let $u$ be a node of $\Gamma$ adjacent to a leaf $\lambda$ and pick $w \in \iota([w_u, w_\lambda])$. Then, $Z_w$ is a cylinder over a monomial curve in $\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ with $\gcd(f_{\lambda,a} : \mu \in \partial \Gamma \setminus \{\lambda\})$ many components and, $J_w$ is monomial-free.

**Proof.** We prove that $J_w$ defines the cylinder over the end-curve $C_\lambda$ associated to the rooted splice diagram $\Gamma_\lambda$. A simple inspection shows that for all nodes $v$ of $\Gamma$ and each $i \in \{1, \ldots, \delta_v - 2\}$, the initial form $\text{in}_w(f_{v,i})$ agrees with the polynomial $h_{v,i}$ defining $C_\lambda$. Indeed, if we write $w$ as

$$w = \alpha w_\lambda + (1 - \alpha) w_u \quad \text{with } 0 < \alpha < 1,$$

then $w$ is in the relative interior of the cylinder over $C_\lambda$.
Proposition 2.10 imply that the generators of \( S_v \), so

Theorem 6.21 combined with Lemmas 7.2 and 7.4 yields

\[
\ell_w \cdot m_{v,e} \geq \ell_{w,v} (\alpha + (1 - \alpha) \frac{\ell_{v,v} \lambda}{d_{u,v}}) \quad \text{for each edge } e \text{ in } \text{Star}_v(v).
\]

Furthermore, equality holds if and only if \( e \not\subseteq [v, \lambda] \). Thus, \( \ell_w(f_{v,i}) \) is obtained from \( f_{v,i} \) by dropping the admissible monomial at \( v \) pointing towards \( \lambda \). In particular, these initial forms do not involve \( z_\lambda \).

The above discussion and Definition 2.20 show that \( J_w' := J_w \cap C[z_\mu : \mu \in \partial \Gamma \setminus \{ \lambda \}] \) defines \( C_\lambda \). The general point of this curve lies in \( (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n-1} \) by Theorem 2.21, so \( J_w' \) is monomial-free. In turn, the same result confirms that \( J_w' \) defines a reduced complete intersection, smooth outside the origin, and with \( \gcd(\ell_{v,v,\mu} : \mu \in \partial \Gamma \setminus \{ \lambda \} \) many irreducible components. Since \( J_w \) is obtained from \( J_w' \) by base change to \( C[z_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma] \), and both ideals admit a common generating set, the result follows.

Given two adjacent nodes \( u \) and \( u' \) of \( \Gamma \), we let \( T' \) be the branch of \( \Gamma \) adjacent to \( u' \) containing \( u \). Similarly, we let \( T \) be the branch of \( \Gamma \) adjacent to \( u \) and containing \( u' \). We set \( \partial_u \Gamma = \partial_{T'} \) and \( \partial_{u'} \Gamma = \partial_T \). Our final lemma is analogous to Lemma 7.3:

**Lemma 7.4.** Let \( u \) and \( u' \) be two adjacent nodes of \( \Gamma \) and pick \( w \in \iota([w_u, w_{u'}]) \). Then, \( Z_w \) is isomorphic to a product of two monomial curves in \( C[\partial \Gamma] \times C[\partial \Gamma'] \). Furthermore, the number of irreducible components of \( Z_w \) equals \( \gcd(\ell_{v,v,\mu} : \lambda \in \partial u \Gamma) \) and \( J_w, w \) is monomial-free.

**Proof.** We write \( w = \alpha w_u + (1 - \alpha) w_{u'} \) with \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) and follow the same proof-strategy as in Lemma 7.3. The conditions on \( \alpha \) guarantee that for each node \( v \) in \( T' \), \( \ell_w(f_{v,i}) \) is obtained from \( f_{v,i} \) by dropping the admissible monomial at \( v \) pointing towards \( u' \). This observation and the symmetry between \( u \) and \( u' \) determine a partition of the generating set of \( J_w \), where each initial form \( \ell_w(f_{v,i}) \) for any node \( v \) of \( T' \) (respectively, in \( T \) only involves the leaves of \( T' \) (respectively, of \( T \)). Thus, each set determines the end-curves for the diagrams \( [T', u'] \) and \( [T, u] \), rooted at \( u' \) and \( u \), respectively.

By construction, \( J_w \) defines the product of these two monomial curves. Since each of them is a complete intersection in their respective ambient spaces, the same is true for \( J_w \). The number of components is determined by Theorem 2.21. Since \( Z_w \) meets \( (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \), we conclude that \( J_w \) is monomial-free.

The next result is a direct consequence of Theorem A.1 and the previous three lemmas. It gives an alternative proof of Theorem 6.21 since for any \( w \) in \( \iota(\Gamma)^n \), these lemmas confirm that \( J_w \) is monomial-free.

**Corollary 7.5.** For any strictly positive vector \( w \) in the splice fan of \( \Gamma \) we have \( \ell_w(S(\Gamma)) = J_w \).

**Proof.** By construction, we have \( J_w \subseteq \ell_w(S(\Gamma)) \) for each \( w \in (\Delta_{n-1})^0 \cap \iota(\Gamma) \). In addition, Lemmas 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 imply that the generators of \( J_w \) form a regular sequence in the ring of convergent power series \( C[z_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma] \) near the origin. Thus, Theorem A.1 implies that \( J_w = \ell_w(S(\Gamma)) \) as ideals of \( C[z_\lambda : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma] \) for each \( w \in Q^n \cap R_{\geq 0}(\iota(\Gamma)) \). Finally, since these ideals are constant when we consider all rational points in the relative interior of any fixed edge of \( \iota(\Gamma) \), the same must be true for all points in these open segments.

**Remark 7.6.** The geometric information collected in Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4 combined with Corollary 7.5 determine the tropical multiplicities of the positive tropicalization of \( S(\Gamma) \). Using Definition 3.13, we have:

\begin{enumerate}
\item If \( \tau = R_{\geq 0}(\iota([\lambda, u])) \) for a node \( u \) of \( \Gamma \), then we assign to \( \tau \) the weight \( \frac{1}{d_{u,v} \cdot d_{e,u}} \gcd(\ell_{u,\mu} : \mu \in \partial \Gamma \setminus \{ \lambda \}) \);
\item If \( \tau = R_{\geq 0}(\iota([u, v])) \) for two adjacent nodes \( u \) and \( v \) of \( \Gamma \), then \( \tau \) gets weight \( \frac{1}{d_{u,v} \cdot d_{e,v}} \gcd(\ell_{v,\mu} : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma, u \in [\lambda, v]) \gcd(\ell_{e,\lambda} : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma, v \in [\lambda, u]) \).
\end{enumerate}

This information completes the characterization of \( \text{Trop}_{w,0} S(\Gamma) \) as a tropical object, i.e., as a weighted balanced polyhedral fan. We use this data in Section 8 when discussing how to recover \( \Gamma \) from its splice fan.

Our next statement follows naturally from Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 7.5:

**Corollary 7.7.** The splice fan of \( \Gamma \) is a tropicalizing fan for the germ \( (X, 0) \) defined by \( S(\Gamma) \).

We conclude this section by showing how we can use the local tropicalization to recover some known facts about splice type systems and their associated end-curves from [20, 21]. Our first statement discusses the intersection of the initial degenerations of the germ defined by \( S(\Gamma) \) will suitable codimension-2 coordinate subspaces of \( \mathbb{C}^n \):
Lemma 7.8. Let \( w \) be a vector which has strictly positive coordinates and lies on the embedded splice diagram \( \iota(\Gamma) \), and let \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) be two leaves of \( \Gamma \) in different branches of \( \iota(\Gamma) \) adjacent to \( w \). Then, the system
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{in}_w(F_{v,i}) &= 0, \, v \text{ is a node of } \Gamma, \ i = 1, \ldots, \delta_v, \\
\lambda \cdot z & = \mu = 0
\end{align*}
\]
has 0 as its only solution.

Proof. If \( w = \iota(u) \) is the (normalized) weight vector corresponding to a node \( u \) of \( \Gamma \), this statement can be proved using the arguments outlined in the proof of [20, Theorem 2.6], in particular, on page 710. However, a closer look reveals that this reasoning can also be used for any point \( w \) in \( \iota(\Gamma) \cap (\Delta_n)^S \).

Our second statement gives a stronger version of Corollary 2.23:

Corollary 7.9. Assume that the conditions of Lemma 7.8 hold and consider the map \( F_w : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^{n-2} \) obtained from the collection \( \{\text{in}_w(F_{v,i})\}_{v,i} \), ordered appropriately. Then, the restriction of this map to the codimension-2 subspace \( L = \{ z_\lambda = z_\mu = 0 \} \) of \( \mathbb{C}^n \) is surjective.

Proof. By Lemma 7.8, we see that the fiber of the restriction of \( F_w \) to \( L \) over the origin of \( \mathbb{C}^{n-2} \) is 0-dimensional. By upper semicontinuity of fiber dimensions, the generic fiber of \( F_{w|L} \) is also 0-dimensional. Since \( \dim L = n - 2 \), the map \( F_{w|L} \) is dominant.

Since \( F_{w|L} \) is defined by weighted homogeneous functions, then it admits a projectivization as a map between weighted projective spaces. But a dominant projective map must be surjective. Thus, as an affine map, \( F_{w|L} \) is surjective as well.

Finally, we recover Theorem 2.14 (originally due to Neumann and Wahl) by combining Corollary 6.16 with the following result:

Corollary 7.10. The singularity defined by the splice type system \( S(\Gamma) \) is isolated. In particular, it is also irreducible.

Proof. Let \( (X, 0) \to \mathbb{C}^n \) be the germ defined by \( S(\Gamma) \). By Corollary 6.16, we know that \( X \cap (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \) is dense in \( X \). Since \( S(\Gamma) \) is Newton non-degenerate, \( X \subset \mathbb{C}^n \) admits an embedded toric resolution (see, e.g., [8, Section 2.7]). In particular, for a suitable subdivision \( \Sigma \) of the splice fan of \( X \) the corresponding toric morphism \( \pi : X_\Sigma \to \mathbb{C}^n \) induces an embedded resolution of the pair \( (X, \mathbb{C}^n) \). But as we saw in Theorem 6.2, the local tropicalization of \( S(\Gamma) \) intersects the boundary of the positive octant only along the canonical basis elements. It follows from this that the morphism \( \pi \) is an isomorphism outside the origin, i.e. \( \pi \) is a resolution of \( (X, 0) \). We conclude that the singularity at the origin is isolated. As \( (X, 0) \) is moreover a complete intersection of dimension two by Corollary 6.18, it is automatically irreducible.

8. Recovering splice diagrams from splice fans

The construction of splice fans from splice diagrams raises a natural question: how much data about \( \Gamma \) can be recovered from its splice fan, decorated with the tropical multiplicities? Our main result gives a positive answer to this question under the following coprimality restrictions, which are central to [21]:

Definition 8.1. We say a splice diagram \( \Gamma \) is coprime if the weights around each node of \( \Gamma \) are pairwise coprime.

Our next result highlights the restrictions on the tropically weighted splice fan imposed by a coprime splice diagram. Its proof will be postponed until the end of this section. Precise formulas for the tropical multiplicities are given in Remark 7.6.

Theorem 8.2. Let \( \Gamma \) be a coprime splice diagram. Then:

1. for each node \( v \) of \( \Gamma \) the vector \( w_v \in N(\partial \Gamma) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n \) is primitive;
2. all tropical multiplicities in \( \text{Trop}_{>0} S(\Gamma) \) equal one.

Our main result in this section ensures that coprime splice diagrams can be recovered from their tropically weighted splice fans:

Theorem 8.3. Assume that all tropical multiplicities on the splice fan equal one. Then, there is a unique coprime splice diagram \( \Gamma \) yielding the given splice fan.
The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of these two results. A series of lemmas and propositions will simplify the exposition.

Remark 8.4. Notice that the analog of Theorem 8.3 may fail if we drop the tropical multiplicity one restrictions. This can be seen by looking at the example in Figure 5. For each choice of edge weight $d_1 = 1, 2$ or 4, the diagram $\Gamma$ satisfies the semigroup and edge determinant conditions. Furthermore, all tropical multiplicities on the 2-dimensional cones of the splice fan equal four. For each value of $d_1$ we can choose systems $S(\Gamma)$ defining a germ in $\mathbb{C}^4$, whose local tropicalization is supported on the input splice fan.

Our first technical result will allow us to employ a pruning argument to prove Theorem 8.3. To this end, we use superscripts to indicate the underlying splice diagram considered for the computation of each linking number. The absence of a superscript refers to $\Gamma$. The same notation will be used for weight vectors.

**Proposition 8.5.** Let $[u,v]$ be an internal edge of a splice diagram $\Gamma$. Let $T$ be the branch of $\Gamma$ adjacent to $u$ and containing $v$. Consider $\Gamma' = [u,T]$ with weights around its nodes inherited from $\Gamma$. Then, the weighted tree $\Gamma'$ is a splice diagram, i.e., it satisfies the semigroup and the edge determinant conditions.

**Proof.** We only need to check that the semigroup conditions hold for $\Gamma'$. The linking numbers for $\Gamma$ involving a vertex $v'$ of $\Gamma'$ with $v' \neq u$ and a leaf $\lambda$ of $\Gamma$ can be obtained from those in $\Gamma'$ via:

$$
(8.1) \quad \ell_{v',\lambda} = \begin{cases} 
\ell_{v',\lambda}^{\Gamma'} & \text{if } \lambda \in \partial \Gamma' \cap \partial \Gamma, \\
\frac{\ell_{v',u}}{\ell_{v,u}} \ell_{v,u}^{\Gamma} & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
$$

Since the semigroup condition at each $v'$ holds for $\Gamma$, expression (8.1) implies the same is true for $\Gamma'$.

Assume that $u$ and $v$ are adjacent nodes of $\Gamma$ and let $\Gamma'$ be the associated splice diagram introduced in Proposition 8.5. Up to relabeling, we write $\partial \Gamma \setminus \partial \Gamma' = \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s\}$ for some $s$. Consider the following $n \times (n - s + 1)$ matrix with integer entries in block form obtained from (8.1):

$$
(8.2) \quad A := \begin{pmatrix}
\ell_{u,\lambda_1}/d_{u,v} & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\ell_{u,\lambda_s}/d_{u,v} & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & \text{Id}_{n-s}
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

A direct computation yields the following identity:

**Lemma 8.6.** Let $\Gamma'$ be as in Proposition 8.5. Then, for each vertex $v'$ of $\Gamma'$ with $v' \neq u$ we have $A w_{u,v}^{\Gamma'} = w_{u,v}$.

**Remark 8.7.** Notice that $A w_{u,v}^{\Gamma'} = \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \partial u, \Gamma} \ell_{u,\lambda}/d_{u,v} \right) \text{Bar}(\partial_u \Gamma; [u,v]) \neq w_{u}$.

**Lemma 8.8.** Fix a coprime splice diagram $\Gamma$. Let $u,v$ be adjacent nodes of $\Gamma$, and let $\Gamma'$ be the diagram from Proposition 8.5. Then, we have $d_{u,v} = \text{gcd}(\ell_{v,\lambda} : \lambda \in \partial \Gamma' \cap \partial \Gamma)$.

**Proof.** The result follows by an easy induction on the number of nodes of $\Gamma'$. If $\Gamma'$ has two nodes, the result holds by the coprimality of the weights around $v$. For the inductive step, we assume that $v$ is adjacent to $q$ leaves and $k$ nodes other than $u$, denoted by $\{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_q\}$ and $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$, respectively. Then,

$$
(8.3) \quad \text{gcd}(\ell_{v,\mu_1}, \ldots, \ell_{v,\mu_q}) = d_{v,u} \prod_{j=1}^k d_{v,v_j}.
$$

For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ we let $T_j$ be the branch of $\Gamma'$ adjacent to $v$ and containing $v_j$. Let $\Gamma'_j = [v,T_j]$ be the corresponding splice diagram with inherited weights. The inductive hypothesis on each $\Gamma'_j$ yields
Lemma 8.6 ensures that the vector $w_u$ is primitive whenever $v' \neq u$ is a node of $\Gamma'$. If $v' = u$ we have

$$w_u = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{d_{u,\lambda_i}}{d_{u,\lambda_i}} w_{\lambda_i} + \frac{d_u}{d_{u,v}} \sum_{\mu \in \partial_u \Gamma} \ell_{v,\mu} w_{\mu},$$

where $\partial_u \Gamma$ is the set $\partial_{u,[v,u]} \Gamma$ from Definition 2.11. Since $\gcd(\ell_{v,\mu} : \mu \in \partial_u \Gamma) = d_{v,u}$ by Lemma 8.8, and $\gcd(d_u/d_{u,\lambda_i} : i = 1, \ldots, s) = d_{u,v}$, the pairwise coprimality of weights around $u$ ensures that $w_u$ is a primitive vector in $N(\partial \Gamma')$.

To finish, we compute the tropical multiplicities. Remark 7.6, Lemma 8.8 and the coprimality of weights around $u$ implies that the multiplicity corresponding to the edge $[u, \lambda]$ of $\Gamma$ is one. Indeed, we have

$$\gcd(\frac{\ell_{u,u}}{d_{u,\lambda}} : \mu \in \partial \Gamma) = \gcd(\gcd(\frac{d_u}{d_{u,\lambda_i}d_{u,\lambda_j}} j = 1, \ldots, s, j \neq i), \gcd(\frac{\ell_{v,\mu}}{d_{u,v}} \frac{d_u}{d_{u,\lambda_i}d_{u,v}} : \mu \in \partial_v \Gamma))$$

$$= \gcd(\gcd(\frac{d_u}{d_{u,\lambda_i}d_{u,\lambda_j}} j = 1, \ldots, s, j \neq i), \frac{d_u}{d_{u,\lambda_i}d_{u,v}}) = 1.$$

If we pick an edge $[v', \lambda_j]$ with $j > s$ we get multiplicity one by the inductive hypothesis applied to $\Gamma'$ combined with (8.1) and the coprimality of the weights around $u$. More precisely,

$$\gcd(\frac{\ell_{v',\lambda}}{d_{v',\lambda_k}} : k = s + 1, \ldots, n, k \neq j), \gcd(\frac{\ell_{v',\lambda}}{d_{v',\lambda_k}} : i = 1, \ldots, s) =$$

$$\gcd(\gcd(\frac{\ell_{v',\lambda}}{d_{v',\lambda_k}} : k = s + 1, \ldots, n, k \neq j), \frac{\ell_{v',\lambda}}{d_{v',\lambda_k}}, \gcd(\frac{\ell_{u,\lambda}}{d_{u,v}} : i = 1, \ldots, s)) = 1.$$

Finally, the cone associated to an edge between two adjacent nodes $v', v'$ of $\Gamma$ will have tropical multiplicity one by Lemma 8.8 since $\gcd(\ell_{v',\lambda}/d_{v',v'} : \lambda \in \partial_{v',[v',v']} \Gamma) = \gcd(\ell_{v',\lambda}/d_{v',v'} : \mu \in \partial_{v',[v',v']} \Gamma) = 1.$
Next, assume \( p > 1 \) and fix an end-node \( u \) of \( \Gamma \). Let \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s \) be the leaves of \( \Gamma \) adjacent to \( u \), and \( v \) be the unique node of \( \Gamma \) adjacent to \( u \). Let \( \Gamma' \) be the tree obtained by pruning \( \Gamma \) from \( u \). The weights around \( u \) can be recovered uniquely from the splice fan of \( \Gamma \). Write

\[
(8.5) \quad w_u = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{d_u}{d_{u,\lambda_i}} w_{\lambda_i} + \sum_{j=s+1}^n \frac{\ell_{u,\lambda_j}}{d_{u,v}} w_{\lambda_j}.
\]

The coprimality condition gives \( d_{u,v} = \gcd(d_u/d_{u,\lambda_i} : i = 1, \ldots, s) \) and \( d_u = \text{lcm}(d_u/d_{u,\lambda_i} : i = 1, \ldots, s) \). From this we recover all remaining \( s \) weights at \( u \) since \( d_{u,\lambda_i} = d_u/(d_u/d_{u,\lambda_i}) \) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, s\} \).

Next, for each node \( v' \) of \( \Gamma \) with \( v' \neq u \), we use the full-rank matrix \( A \) from (8.2) to recover \( w_{u,v}^i \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-s+1} \) uniquely from \( w_{v'} \). Since \( w_{u,v}^i \) is a prescribed canonical basis element of \( N(\partial \Gamma') \cong \mathbb{Z}^{n-s+1} \), the set of vectors \( \{w_{v'}^i : v \text{ is a node of } \Gamma'\} \) allows us to determine the splice fan of \( \Gamma' \). The inductive hypothesis then uniquely recovers the splice diagram \( \Gamma' \), and hence \( \Gamma \) has been fully determined.

\[\square\]
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Appendix A. Initial ideals and local regular sequences

(by Jonathan Wahl)

In [20], the authors invoke a folklore lemma in commutative algebra in order to prove several of their main theorems. This result involves regular sequences in a polynomial ring and their initial forms with respect to integer weight vectors. As originally stated, [20, Lemma 3.3] is not quite-correct: the global setting must be replaced by a local one. This appendix provides a complete proof of this result in the local setting of convergent power series near the origin, a result we could not locate in the literature. This local version agrees with the general framework of [20]. Throughout, we let \( n \) be a positive integer and let \( [\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{m}] \) denote the local ring of convergent power series \( \mathbb{C}\{z_1, \ldots, z_n\} \) near the origin.

We start by stating our main result, namely, a reformulation of [20, Lemma 3.3] in the local setting. Its proof will be given at the end of this appendix, after discussing a series of preliminary technical results. Note that the same statement and proof will hold if \( \mathcal{O} \) denotes the localization of the polynomial ring \( \mathbb{C}[z_1, \ldots, z_n] \) at the maximal ideal of the origin of \( \mathbb{C}^n \).

**Theorem A.1.** Let \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) be a finite sequence of elements in the maximal ideal \( \mathfrak{m} \) of \( \mathcal{O} \), and let \( J \) be the ideal generated by them. Fix a positive weight vector \( w \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^n \). Assume that \((\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_s))\) is a regular sequence in \( \mathcal{O} \). Then:

1. the sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) is also regular, and
2. the \( w \)-initial ideal \( \text{in}_w(J)\mathcal{O} \) is generated by \((\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_s))\).

**Remark A.2.** As mentioned earlier, Theorem A.1 does not hold in the polynomial setting. For instance \((z_1(1-z_1), z_2(1-z_1))\) is a regular sequence in the local ring \( \mathbb{C}\{z_1, z_2\} \) but not in the polynomial ring \( \mathbb{C}[z_1, z_2] \). However, the sequence of initial forms \((z_1, z_2)\) with respect to any weight vector \( w \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^2 \) determine a regular sequence in both rings.

**Remark A.3.** The regularity of the sequence of \( w \)-initial forms is needed in Theorem A.1. As an example, fix \( n = 4 \), \( w = (1,1,1,1) \), and consider the sequence \((f_1, f_2)\) with

\[
 f_1 := z_1^2 + z_2^4 - z_3^3 \quad \text{and} \quad f_2 := z_1 z_2 - z_4^3.
\]
By construction, \((f_1, f_2)\) is a regular sequence in \(O\) defining an isolated complete intersection surface singularity. The sequence of initial forms \((\text{in}_w(f_1), \text{in}_w(f_2)) = (z_1^2, z_1 z_2)\) is not regular, and the \(w\)-initial ideal of \((f_1, f_2)\) \(O\) is generated by \(\text{in}_w(f_1), \text{in}_w(f_2)\) and \(\text{in}_w(z_2 f_1 - z_1 f_2) = -z_2 z_3^3 + z_1 z_4^2\).

Throughout, we fix \(w \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^n\) and an arbitrary sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) of elements of the maximal ideal \(m\). We let \(J\) be the ideal generated by the \(f_i\)'s. Consider the first few steps in the Koszul complex of \(O\)-modules determined by it (see, e.g., [33, Sect. IV.A]):

\[
\begin{align*}
F & := \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq s} O \cdot e_{ij} \\
E & := \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq s} O \cdot e_i \\
\end{align*}
\]

The map \(d_1: E \to O\) sends \(e_i\) to \(f_i\) for each \(i = 1, \ldots, s\) and the kernel \([R]\) of \(d_1\) is the module of relations between the given generators of \(J\). The morphism \(d_2: F \to E\) sends \(e_{ij}\) to \(f_j e_i - f_i e_j\), and its image is the submodule of “trivial relations” between \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\). By definition, the image of \(d_2\) lies in \(R\), so we view \(d_2\) also as as a map \(d_2: F \to R\).

By a standard result in commutative algebra (see, e.g., [33, Prop.3, Chapter IV.A.2]) we have:

**Proposition A.4.** The sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) of elements in \(m\) is regular in \(O\) if and only if the Koszul complex (A.1) is exact at \(E\).

Since the definition of \(E\) does not depend on the order of the sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\), the following consequence arises naturally:

**Corollary A.5.** If \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) is a regular sequence in \(O\), any reordering of it is also a regular sequence.

The weight vector \(w\) inducing the \(w\)-weight valuation (3.1) on \(O\) endows this ring with a weight filtration by ideals \((I_\rho)_{\rho \geq 0}\), where \([I]_\rho := \{g \in O : w(g) \geq \rho\}\). Similarly, we can filter \(O\) via the ideals \((m^{\rho})_{\rho \geq 0}\). Both filtrations are cofinal since

\[
I_{\rho p} \subseteq m^{\rho} \subseteq I_\rho \quad \text{for all} \quad \rho \geq 0,
\]

where \([d]\) is the maximum among all coordinates of \(w\). It follows from this that the completions of \(O\) with respect to both filtrations are canonically isomorphic. The completion induced by the \(m\)-adic filtration \((m^{\rho})_{\rho \geq 0}\) is the ring of formal power series in \(n\) variables.

In a similar fashion, we can filter the modules \(E\) and \(F\) appearing in (A.1) via \((E_\rho)_{\rho \geq 0}\) and \((F_\rho)_{\rho \geq 0}\), respectively, by assigning the weights \(w(f_j)\) and \(w(f_i) + w(f_j)\) to \(e_i\) and \(e_{ij}\), respectively. More precisely,

\[
\begin{align*}
[E]_\rho & := \{ \sum_{i=1}^s a_i e_i : w(a_i) \geq \rho - w(f_i) \forall i \} \quad \text{and} \\
[F]_\rho & := \{ \sum_{i<j} b_{ij} e_{ij} : w(b_{ij}) \geq \rho - w(f_i) - w(f_j) \forall i,j \}.
\end{align*}
\]

These choices ensure that the maps \(d_1\) and \(d_2\) from the Koszul complex (A.1) preserve the filtration. In addition, the module \(R\) of relations is filtered as well, via

\[
[R]_\rho := E_\rho \cap R.
\]

We use these filtrations to define the \(w\)-initial forms on \(E\) and \(F\). We state the definition for \(E\), since the one for \(F\) is analogous. The definition for \(R\) is given by restriction.

**Definition A.6.** Given any \(g \in E\) with \(g \neq 0\), we let \(p\) be the unique integer such that \(g \in E_p \setminus E_{p+1}\). An element \(g := \sum_{i=1}^s r_i e_i \in E_p \setminus E_{p+1}\) satisfies \(w(r_i) + w(f_i) \geq \rho\) for all \(i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}\) and equality must hold for some index \(i\). Let \(I\) be the set of indices where equality is achieved. The \(w\)-initial form of \(g\) is \(\text{in}_w(g) := \sum_{i \in I} \text{in}_w(r_i) e_i\). We set \(\text{in}_w(0) = 0\).

By Proposition A.4, the regularity of the sequence \((f_1, \ldots, f_s)\) is equivalent to the surjectivity of the map \(d_2: F \to R\) induced by (A.1). We prove the later in Lemma A.11, assuming the regularity of the sequence of \(w\)-initial forms of all \(f_i\)’s.

Our first two lemmas use the regularity assumptions for the sequence of \(w\)-initial forms to prove the surjectivity of \(d_2: F \to R\) by working with the filtrations of \(F\) and \(R\) described above.
Lemma A.7. Assume that the sequence \((\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_s))\) is regular in \(\mathcal{O}\). Then, the morphism of \(\mathbb{C}\)-vector spaces \(\varphi_p: F_p/F_{p+1} \to R_p/R_{p+1}\) induced by the morphism of \(\mathcal{O}\)-modules \(d_2: F \to R\) is surjective for all integers \(p \geq 0\).

Proof. We must show that modulo \(R_{p+1}\), every element \(g\) of \(R_p\) is the image of an element of \(F_p/F_{p+1}\) under the map \(\varphi_p\). If \(g = 0\), there is nothing to show, so we assume \(g \neq 0\). In particular, \(g\) lifts to an element in \(R_p \setminus R_{p+1}\), which we denote by \(g\) as well. We write \(g = \sum_{j=1}^{s} r_j e_j\).

Assume that \(\text{in}_w(g)\) has \(k\) many terms, with \(k \in \{1, \ldots, s\}\) (see Definition A.6). By Corollary A.5, we can reorder the original sequence while preserving its regularity, and write \(\text{in}_w(g)\) as

\[
\text{in}_w(g) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \text{in}_w(r_j) e_j \quad \text{with} \quad w(r_j) + w(f_j) = p \quad \text{for all } j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}.
\]

We claim that \(g\) is congruent, modulo the image of \(\varphi_p\), to an element of \(R_p\) whose \(w\)-initial form lies in the ideal generated by \(\{\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_{k-1})\}\). The original statement will follow by induction on \(k \leq s\).

Since \(\sum_{j=1}^{s} r_j f_j = 0\) by definition of \(R\) and \(w(r_j) + w(f_j) > p\) for \(j \in \{k+1, \ldots, s\}\), we conclude that the expected \(w\)-initial form of \(\sum_{j=1}^{s} r_j f_j\) must vanish, i.e.,

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{k} \text{in}_w(r_j) \text{in}_w(f_j) = 0.
\]

Therefore, \(\text{in}_w(r_k) \text{in}_w(f_k)\) is zero modulo the ideal \(I := (\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_{k-1}))\mathcal{O}\). Since the sequence \(\{\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_{k-1})\}\) is regular, we conclude \(\text{in}_w(r_k)\) must lie in \(I\).

Taking the \(w\)-weight value of \(r_k\) and each \(f_j\) into account we write \(\text{in}_w(r_k)\) as

\[
\text{in}_w(r_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_j \text{in}_w(f_j),
\]

where \(a_j\) is either 0 or a non-zero \(w\)-weighted homogeneous polynomial with \(w(a_j) = p - w(f_k) - w(f_j) \geq 0\) for all \(j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}\). It follows from this that the element

\[
r'_k := r_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_j f_j
\]

satisfies \(w(r'_k) > p - w(f_k)\), so \(r'_k e_k \in E_{p+1}\). Simple arithmetic manipulations give a new formula for \(g\), i.e.,

\[
(A.5) \quad g = \sum_{j=1}^{s} r_j e_j = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (r_j + a_j f_k) e_j + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_j (f_j e_k - f_k e_j) + r'_k e_k + \sum_{j=k+1}^{s} r_j e_j.
\]

By construction, it follows that \(h = \varphi_p(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_j e_{jk}) \in \varphi_p(F_p/F_{p+1})\). Furthermore, \(\text{in}_w(g)\) only involves terms in the first of the four summands on the right-hand side of \((A.5)\) since the last two summands lie in \(E_{p+1}\). This establishes the claim. \(\square\)

Lemma A.8. Let \(J\) be the ideal of \(\mathcal{O}\) generated by \(\{f_1, \ldots, f_s\}\) and assume that \(\{\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_s)\}\) is a regular sequence in \(\mathcal{O}\). If \(g \in J\) has \(w\)-weight equal to \(p \in \mathbb{N}\), then \(g\) admits an expression of the form \(g = \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i f_i\), where \(w(a_i f_i) \geq p\) for all \(i\). In particular, \(\text{in}_w(g)\) belongs to the ideal of \(\mathcal{O}\) generated by \(\{\text{in}_w(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_w(f_s)\}\).

Proof. Since \(g \in J\), we may write \(g\) as \(g = \sum_{i=1}^{s} b_i f_i\) with \(b_i \in \mathcal{O}\) for each \(i\). Consider

\[
p' = \min\{w(b_i f_i) : i = 1, \ldots, s\}.
\]

Assume that this weight is achieved at \(k\) many terms, which we can fix to be \(\{b_1 f_1, \ldots, b_k f_k\}\) upon reordering. If \(p' \geq p\) we have \(w(a_i f_i) \geq p\) for all \(i\) and equality must hold for some \(i\) by definition of \(p\). From here it follows that \(\text{in}_w(g) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \text{in}_w(a_j) \text{in}_w(f_j)\), as we wanted to show.

On the contrary assume that \(p' < p\). We claim that we can find an alternative expression \(g = \sum_{j=1}^{s} b'_j f_j\) where the corresponding minimum weight \(p'' := \min\{w(b'_j f_j)\}\) is not strictly smaller than \(p'\) and the number
of summands realizing \( p'' \) is strictly smaller than \( k \). An easy induction combined with the fact that \( p', p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) will then yield a new expression for \( g \) with \( p' \geq p \), as in our previous case.

It remains to prove the claim. Since \( p' < p \), the terms in \( g \) with \( w \)-weight \( p' \) must cancel out, i.e., \( \sum_{j=1}^{k} in_w(b_j) in_w(f_j) = 0 \). As in the proof of Lemma A.7, the fact that \( (in_w(f_1), \ldots, in_w(f_s)) \) is a regular sequence in \( \mathcal{O} \) ensures that

\[
in_w(b_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} c_j in_w(f_j),
\]

where \( c_j \) is either zero or a \( w \)-homogeneous polynomial with \( w(c_j) = p' - w(f_j) \geq 0 \). It follows from here that the element \( b'_k := b_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} c_j f_j \) has weight \( w(b'_k) > w(b_k) \), so \( w(b'_k f_k) > p' \).

An arithmetic manipulation allows us to rewrite \( g \) as follows:

\[
(A.6) \quad g = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (b_j + c_j f_k) f_j + b'_k f_k + \sum_{j=k+1}^{s} b_j f_j
\]

By construction, the terms with minimum \( w \)-weight only appear in the first of the three summands on the right-hand side of \((A.6)\). Furthermore, the corresponding minimum weight \( p'' \) satisfies \( p'' \geq p' \) since \( w(b'_j f_j) \geq p' \) for all \( j \) and \( w(c_j f_k f_j) \geq w(b'_k f_k) = p' \) for \( j < k \). This confirms the validity of our claim. \( \square \)

A standard commutative algebra result (see, e.g., [2, Lemma 10.23]) combined with Lemma A.8 yields:

**Lemma A.9.** Assume that the sequence \((in_w(f_1), \ldots, in_w(f_s))\) is regular in \( \mathcal{O} \). Then, the map \( d_2 : F \to R \) of filtered modules induces a surjection between their completions relative to the filtrations \((F_p)_{p \geq 0}\) and \((R_p)_{p \geq 0}\) respectively. More precisely, \( \varprojlim F/F_p \to \varprojlim R/R_p \).

We let \( \hat{F} \) and \( \hat{R} \) be the \( m \)-adic completions of \( F \) and \( R \) respectively, which can be computed with standard methods. Indeed, by [2, Theorem 10.13], we have

\[
(A.7) \quad \hat{F} \simeq F \otimes_\mathcal{O} \hat{\mathcal{O}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{R} \simeq R \otimes_\mathcal{O} \hat{\mathcal{O}}.
\]

The double inclusions in \((A.2)\) allow us to compare the completions in Lemma A.9 induced by \((F_p)_{p \geq 0}\) and \((R_p)_{p \geq 0}\), with \( \hat{F} \) and \( \hat{R} \), respectively. More precisely,

**Lemma A.10.** Assume that the sequence \((in_w(f_1), \ldots, in_w(f_s))\) is regular in \( \mathcal{O} \). Then, the completions appearing in Lemma A.9 agree with the \( m \)-adic ones, i.e.

\[
(A.8) \quad \varprojlim F/F_p \simeq \varprojlim F/m^p F \simeq F \otimes_\mathcal{O} \hat{\mathcal{O}} \quad \text{and} \quad \varprojlim R/R_p \simeq \varprojlim R/m^p R \simeq R \otimes_\mathcal{O} \hat{\mathcal{O}}.
\]

**Proof.** We let \( \ell := \max\{w(f_j) : j = 1, \ldots, s\} \). It suffices to prove the first isomorphism on each side of \((A.8)\), since the remaining ones appear in \((A.7)\). By \((A.3)\), we have

\[
E_p := \bigoplus_i I_{p-w(f_i)} e_i \quad \text{and} \quad F_p := \bigoplus_{i<j} I_{p-w(f_i)-w(f_j)} e_{ij} \quad \text{for each } p \geq 0.
\]

It follows from here that \( I_p E \subseteq E_p \subseteq I_{p-\ell} E \) and \( I_p F \subseteq F_p \subseteq I_{p-2\ell} F \) for each \( p \geq 0 \). Combining these inclusions with \((A.2)\) yields:

\[
(A.9) \quad E_{dp+\ell} \subseteq I_{dp} E \subseteq m^p E \subseteq E_p \quad \text{and} \quad F_{dp+2\ell} \subseteq I_{dp} F \subseteq m^p F \subseteq F_p \quad \text{for each } p \geq 0.
\]

The inclusions appearing on the right of \((A.9)\) ensure that the filtrations \((m^p F)_{p \geq 0}\) and \((F_p)_{p \geq 0}\) are cofinal in \( F \). Thus, they yield isomorphic completions. This proves the first isomorphism in \((A.8)\).

Next, consider the filtration \( R_p \) from \((A.4)\). First, notice that \( m^p R \subseteq R_p \) by \((A.9)\). To finish, we claim the existence of some \( k \geq 0 \) for which \( R_{dp+(dk+\ell)} \subseteq m^p R \) for all \( p \gg 0 \). Indeed, by the Artin-Rees Lemma (see, e.g., [2, Theorem 10.10]), there exists an integer \( k \geq 0 \) satisfying

\[
R \cap m^p E = m^{p-k} (R \cap m^k E) \quad \text{for all } p \geq k.
\]

Therefore, combining this fact with property \((A.9)\) we obtained the desired inclusion:

\[
R_{dp+(dk+\ell)} = R \cap E_{dp+(dk+\ell)} \subseteq R \cap m^{p+k} E = m^p (R \cap m^k E) \subseteq m^p R.
\]

We conclude that \((m^p R)_{p \geq 0}\) and \((R_p)_{p \geq 0}\) are cofinal filtrations in \( R \), so they yield isomorphic completions. \( \square \)
We let $M$ be the cokernel of the map $d_2: F \to R$ given by (A.1), and we let $\hat{M}$ be its $m$-adic completion. Lemma A.10 yields the following result:

**Lemma A.11.** Assume that the sequence $(\mathfrak{m}_w(f_1), \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_w(f_s))$ is regular in $O$. Then, $\hat{M} = 0$ and $M = 0$. In particular, the Koszul complex (A.1) is exact at $E$.

**Proof.** By standard commutative algebra (see, e.g., [33, Corollaire 2, Chap. II.A.5]) we know that $\hat{O}$ is a flat $O$-module. Therefore, taking $m$-adic completion is an exact functor. Since $\hat{F} \to \hat{R}$ is surjective (by combining Lemmas A.9 and A.10) it follows that $\hat{M} = 0$.

By [2, Theorem 10.17], the kernel of the canonical morphism $M \to \hat{M}$ is annihilated by an element of the form $(1 + z)$ where $z \in m$. As $O$ is a local ring, the element $(1 + z)$ must be a unit of $O$, thus $M = 0$ as claim. The exactness of the Koszul complex at $E$ follows immediately, as it is equivalent to the surjectivity of the morphism $d_2: F \to R$. □

We end this appendix by proving its main result:

**Proof of Theorem A.1.** Since $(\mathfrak{m}_w(f_1), \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_w(f_s))$ is regular in $O$, Lemma A.11 ensures that the Koszul complex (A.1) is exact at $E$. In turn, Proposition A.4 implies that $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ is a regular sequence in $O$. This proves item (1) of the statement.

To finish, we must show that the $w$-initial forms $\{\mathfrak{m}_w(f_1), \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_w(f_s)\}$ generate the $w$-initial ideal $\mathfrak{m}_w(J)O$. By definition, the ideal generated by these forms is contained in $\mathfrak{m}_w(J)O$. As $\mathfrak{m}_w(J)O$ is generated over $O$ by all elements $\mathfrak{m}_w(g)$ with $g \in J$, the reverse inclusion will follow immediately if we show that $\mathfrak{m}_w(g) \in (\mathfrak{m}_w(f_1), \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_w(f_s))O$. This identity is a direct consequence of Lemma A.8. Therefore, item (2) holds. This concludes our proof. □
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