arXiv:2203.03842v4 [math.AG] 1 Aug 2022

RESOLUTION OF SINGULARITIES IN ARBITRARY CHARACTERISTIC

YI HU

Abstract. Let X be an integral affine or projective scheme of finite presentation over a perfect field. We prove that X admits a resolution, that is, there exists a smooth scheme $\widetilde{X}$ and a projective birational morphism from $\widetilde{X}$ onto X.

Regularities are all alike; every singularity is singular in its own way.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. A Quick Tour: the main idea and approach 13
3. Primary Plücker Relations and De-homogenized Plücker-Ideal 24
3.1. Plücker relations 25
3.2. Primary Plücker equations with respect to a fixed affine chart 28
3.3. De-homogenized Plücker ideal with respect to a fixed affine chart 30
3.4. Ordering the set of all primary Plücker equations 33
4. A Singular Local Birational Model $\mathscr{V}$ for $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ 35
4.1. The construction of $\mathscr{V} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ 35
4.2. ϖ-divisors, ϱ-divisors, and $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ 48
5. ϑ-Blowups 52
5.1. Some conventions on blowups 53
5.2. Main binomial equations: revisited 56
5.3. ϑ-centers and ϑ-blowups 59
5.4. Properties of ϑ-blowups 60

6. $\wp$- and ℓ-Blowups 68
6.1. The initial setup: $\wp_0$-blowups and ℓ_0-blowup 68
6.2. $\wp$-blowups and ℓ-blowup in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$ 71
6.3. Properties of $\wp$-blowups and ℓ-blowup in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$ 80
6.4. Proper transforms of defining relations in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ and in (ℓ_k) 89
7. Γ-schemes and Their Transforms 95
7.1. Γ-schemes 95
7.2. $\mathscr{F}$-transforms of Γ-schemes in $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ 96
7.3. ϑ-transforms of Γ-schemes in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ 102
7.4. $\wp$- and ℓ-transforms of Γ-schemes in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ and in (ℓ_k) 109
8. The Main Theorem on the Final Scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$ 117
9. Resolution of Singularity 128
9.1. Lafforgue's version of Mnëv's universality 128
9.2. Global resolution: the affine case 130
9.3. Global resolution: the projective case 135
10. Geometric Resolution 139
References 140

1. Introduction

Let X be an integral affine or projective scheme of finite presentation over a perfect field $\mathbf{k}$. We say X admits a resolution if there exists a smooth scheme $\widetilde{X}$ over $\mathbf{k}$ and a projective birational morphism from $\widetilde{X}$ onto X.

Theorem 1.1. (Resolution, Theorems 9.5 and 9.6) *Let X be an integral affine or projective scheme of finite presentation over a perfect field $\mathbf{k}$. Assume further that X is singular. Then, X admits a resolution.*

Mnëv showed ([18]) that every integral *singularity type* of finite type defined over $\mathbb{Z}$ appears in some configuration space of points on the projective plane. This result is called Mnëv's universality theorem in literature. Lafforgue ([13] and [14])

strengthened and proved the same statement scheme-theoretically. Also, Lee and Vakil ([15]) proved the similar scheme-theoretic statement on incidence schemes of points and lines on the projective plane. Using Gelfand-MacPerson correspondence, Lafforgue's version of Mnëv's universality theorem is equivalent to the statement that every integral singularity type of finite type defined over $\mathbb{Z}$ appears in some *matroid Schubert cell* on the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ of three-dimensional linear subspaces of a fixed vector space E of dimension greater than 3. Every matroid Schubert cell is an open subset of a unique closed subscheme of an affine chart of the Grassmannian. This unique closed subscheme of that affine chart of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ is called a Γ-scheme in this article.

We approach Theorem 1.1 via a detour through Mnëv's universality theorem by first resolving all the aforementioned Γ-schemes that are integral, hence also, all the matroid Schubert cells of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ that are integral.

Following Lafforgue's presentation of [14], suppose we have a set of vector spaces, $E_1, \cdots, E_n$ such that every E_α, $1 \leq \alpha \leq n$, is of dimension 1 over a field $\mathbf{k}$ (or, a free module of rank 1 over $\mathbb{Z}$), for some positive integer $n > 1$. We let

$$E = E_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus E_n.$$

Then, the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$, defined by

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} = \{\text{linear subspaces } F \hookrightarrow E \mid \dim F = d\},$$

is a projective variety defined over $\mathbb{Z}$, for any fixed integer $1 \leq d < n$. (For resolution of singularities, it suffices to focus on $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$; in this article, we still consider the general Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$: see the third paragraph of §3.)

We have a canonical decomposition

$$\wedge^d E = \bigoplus_{\underline{i}=(i_1<\cdots<i_d)\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} E_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{i_d},$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}$ is the set of all sequences of d distinct integers between 1 and n.

This gives rise to the Plücker embedding of the Grassmannian by

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E) = \{(p_{\underline{i}})_{\underline{i}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \in \mathbb{G}_m \backslash (\wedge^d E \backslash \{0\})\},$$

$$F \longrightarrow [\wedge^d F],$$

where $\mathbb{G}_m$ is the multiplicative group.

As a closed subscheme of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$, the Grassmanian $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ is defined, among other relations in general, by the Plücker ideal $I_\wp$, generated by all Plücker relations, whose typical member is expressed succinctly, in this article, as

$$F: \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{1.1}$$

where S_F is an index set, $\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$ for any $s \in S_F$, and $\mathrm{sgn}(s)$ is the $\pm$ sign associated with the term $p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$ (see (3.3) and (3.4) for details).

Given the above Plücker equation, we introduce the projective space $\mathbb{P}_F$ which comes equipped with the homogeneous coordinates $[x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}]_{s\in S_F}$. Then, corresponding to each Plücker relation (1.1), there is a linear homogeneous equation in $\mathbb{P}_F$, called the induced *linearized Plücker relation*,

$$L_F: \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \tag{1.2}$$

(see Definition 4.10). We set $\Lambda_F := \{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s) \mid s \in S_F\}$.

As any Γ-scheme is a closed subscheme of some affine chart, we can focus on an affine chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} = (p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0)$ of the Plücker projective space $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$ for some fixed $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$. We can identify the coordinate ring of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ with the polynomial ring $\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\{\underline{m}\}}$. For any Plücker relation F, we let $\bar{F}$ be the de-homogenization of F on the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. Given this chart, we then explicitly describe a set of Plücker relations, called *$\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations*, listed under a carefully chosen total order " $<_\wp$ ",

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}} = \{\bar{F}_1 <_\wp \cdots <_\wp \bar{F}_\Upsilon\},$$

with $\Upsilon = \binom{n}{d} - 1 - d(n-d)$, such that together they define the closed embedding $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E} \longrightarrow \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. Further, on the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$, if we set $p_{\underline{m}} = 1$ and set $x_{\underline{u}} = p_{\underline{u}}$ for any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\{\underline{m}\}$, then any $\underline{m}$-primary relation $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ admits the following de-homogenized expression

$$\bar{F}: \mathrm{sgn}(s_F) x_{\underline{u}_F} + \sum_{s\in S_F\backslash\{s_F\}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s},$$

where $x_{\underline{u}_F}$ is called the leading variable of $\bar{F}$ whose term is called the leading term of $\bar{F}$ and $s_F \in S_F$ is the index for the leading term. (See (3.8) and (3.10) for

details.) Correspondingly, the term $\mathrm{sgn}(s_F)x_{(\underline{u}_{s_F},\underline{v}_{s_F})}$ is called the leading term of the linearized Plücker relation L_F.

Next, motivated by a parallel construction in [10], we introduce the rational map

$$\bar{\Theta}_{[\Upsilon],\mathrm{Gr}} : \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \dashrightarrow \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F \tag{1.3}$$

$$[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \longrightarrow \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} [x_{\underline{u}}x_{\underline{v}}]_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_F}$$

where $[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}}$ is the de-homogenized Plücker coordinates of a point of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}\cap\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$.

We let $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ be the closure of the graph of the rational map $\bar{\Theta}_{[\Upsilon],\mathrm{Gr}}$. Then, we obtain the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} & \hookrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}. \end{array}$$

The scheme $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ is singular, in general, and is birational to $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$. (The reader is recommended to read §2 to see the purpose of introducing the model $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$.)

As the necessary and crucial steps to achieve our ultimate goal, we are to perform some specific sequential embedded blowups for $(\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}})$.

For the purpose of applying induction, employed mainly for proofs, we also introduce the following rational map.

For any positive integer m, we set $[m] := \{1, \cdots, m\}$.

Then, for any $k \in [\Upsilon]$, we have the rational map

$$\bar{\Theta}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}} : \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \dashrightarrow \prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{1.4}$$

$$[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \longrightarrow \prod_{i\in[k]} [x_{\underline{u}}x_{\underline{v}}]_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{F_i}}$$

We let $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ be the closure of the graph of the rational map $\bar{\Theta}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$. Then, we obtain the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} & \hookrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}. \end{array}$$

The scheme $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ is birational to $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$.

Set $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[0]}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. There exists a forgetful map

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}}, \quad \text{for any } j \in [\Upsilon].$$

In the above notations, we have

$$\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} = \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}}, \ \ \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}}.$$

Proposition 1.2. (Corollary 4.15) *The scheme $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F$, is defined by the following relations, for all $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$,*

$$B_{F,(s,t)}: \ \ x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} - x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}, \ \ \forall \ \ s,t \in S_F\backslash\{s_F\}, \tag{1.5}$$

$$B_{F,(s_F,s)}: \ \ x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\underline{u}_F} - x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}, \ \ \forall \ \ s \in S_F\backslash\{s_F\}, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}, \tag{1.7}$$

$$L_F: \ \ \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \tag{1.8}$$

with $\bar{F}$ expressed as $\mathrm{sgn}(s_F) x_{\underline{u}_F} + \sum_{s\in S_F\backslash\{s_F\}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}$, where $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$ is the set of binomial equations of pre-quotient type (see Definition 4.13).

Our construction of the desired embedded blowups on $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ is based upon the set of all binomial relations of (1.6):

$$\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}} = \{B_{F,(s_F,s)} \mid s \in S_F\backslash\{s_F\}\}, \ \ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} = \bigsqcup_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}},$$

and all the linearized Plücker relation

$$L_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} = \{L_F \mid \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}\}.$$

An element $B_{F,(s_F,s)}$ of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}$ is called a main binomial relation. We also let

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{res}} = \{B_{F,(s,t)} \mid \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}},\ s,t \in S_F\backslash\{s_F\}\}.$$

An element $B_{F,(s,t)}$ of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{res}}$ is called a residual binomial relation. The residual binomial relations or binomial relations of pre-quotient type in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$ play no roles in the *construction* of the aforesaid embedded blowups.

To apply induction, we provide a total order on the set $S_F\backslash\{s_F\}$ and list it as

$$S_F\backslash\{s_F\} = \{s_1 < \cdots < s_{\mathfrak{t}_F}\}$$

where $(\mathfrak{t}_F + 1)$ is the number of terms in the relation F. This renders us to write $B_{F,(s_F,s)}$ as $B_{(k\tau)}$ where $F = F_k$ for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$ and $s = s_\tau$ for some $\tau \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$.

We can now synopsize the process of the embedded blowups for $(\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}})$.

It is divided into two sequential blowups. The first is ϑ-blowups. The second is constructed by induction on $k \in [\Upsilon]$. For each fixed $k \in [\Upsilon]$, it consists of a sequential $\wp$-blowups and then a single ℓ-blowup.

• *On ϑ-sets, ϑ-centers, and ϑ-blowups.*

For any primary Plücker relation $\bar{F}_k \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, we introduce the corresponding ϑ-set $\vartheta_{[k]} = \{x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}}, x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}\}$ and the corresponding ϑ-center $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}} = X_{\underline{u}_{F_k}} \cap X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ where $X_{\underline{u}_{F_k}} = (x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}} = 0)$ and $X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} = (x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} = 0)$. We set $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} := \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. Then, inductively, we let $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ along (the proper transform of) the ϑ-center $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ for all $k \in [\Upsilon]$. This gives rise to the sequential ϑ-blowups

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}}. \tag{1.9}$$

Each morphism $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ is a smooth blowup, meaning, the blowup of a smooth scheme along a smooth closed center. For any k, we let $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ be the proper transform of $\mathscr{V}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$. We set $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta} := \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}}$.

• *On $\wp$-sets, $\wp$-centers, and $\wp$-blowups as well as ℓ-sets, ℓ-centers, and ℓ-blowups.*

All these are constructed based upon $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{F_k}$ and L_{F_k}, inductively on $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

For any main binomial $B_{(k\tau)} \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{F_k}$, there exist a finite integer $\rho_{(k\tau)}$ depending on $(k\tau)$ and a finite integer $\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}$ depending on $(k\tau)\mu$ for any $\mu \in [\rho_{(k\tau)}]$. We

set $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(11)\mathfrak{r}_0)}=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$. For each $((k\tau),\mu,h)$ $h\in[\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]$, there exists a $\wp$-set $\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}$ consisting of two special divisors on an inductively defined scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$; its corresponding $\wp$-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ is the scheme-theoretic intersection of the two divisors. We let $\mathcal{Z}_{\wp_k}=\{Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}\mid k\in[\Upsilon],\tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}],\mu\in[\rho_{(k\tau)}],h\in[\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]\}$, totally ordered lexicographically on the indexes (k,τ,μ,h). Then, inductively, we let we $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\to\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ along (the proper transform of) the $\wp$-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$. This gives rise to the sequential $\wp$-blowups with respect to $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}\to\cdots\to\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\to\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}\to\cdots\to\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}},\tag{1.10}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}}$ is inductively constructed from the previous $\wp$ and ℓ-blowups, and $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ is the end scheme of $\wp$-blowups with respect to $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$. For any $(k\tau)\mu h$, we let $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\subset\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ be the proper transform of $\mathscr{V}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. We set $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}\subset\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ be the last induced subscheme. Every scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ has a smooth open subset $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ containing $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

Now, we let $D_{L_{F_k}}$ be the divisor of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ defined by $(L_{F_k}=0)$; we let $X_{(\underline{u}_{s_F},\underline{v}_{s_F})}$ be the divisor of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ defined by $(x_{(\underline{u}_{s_F},\underline{v}_{s_F})}=0)$ where $\mathrm{sgn}(s_F)x_{(\underline{u}_{s_F},\underline{v}_{s_F})}$ is the leading term of L_F. We then let $D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}}$ be proper transform of $D_{L_{F_k}}$ and $X_{\wp_k,(\underline{u}_{s_F},\underline{v}_{s_F})}$ be the proper transform of $X_{(\underline{u}_{s_F},\underline{v}_{s_F})}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$. We let

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}\longrightarrow\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}\tag{1.11}$$

be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ along the intersection $D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}}\cap X_{\wp_k,(\underline{u}_{s_F},\underline{v}_{s_F})}$.

We let $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$ be the proper transform of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$. The scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$ has a smooth open subset $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell_k}$ containing $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$.

When $k=\Upsilon$, we obtain our final schemes

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}\subset\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}.$$

We point out here the ℓ-blowup with respect to F_k has to immediately follow the $\wp$-blowups with respect to F_k; the order of $\wp$-blowups with respect to a fixed Plücker relation F_k may be subtle and are carefully chosen.

To study the local structure of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell}\subset\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell}$, we approach it by induction via the sequential blowups (1.9), (1.10), and (1.11).

Definition 5.1 introduces the covering standard affine charts $\mathfrak{V}$ for any of the smooth schemes $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, and $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell_k}$ in the above.

($\star$) Proposition 5.10 introduces coordinate variables for any standard affine chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ and provides explicit geometric meaning for every coordinate variable.

Proposition 5.13 provides explicit description and properties of the local defining equations of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ on any standard affine chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

($\star$) Proposition 6.9 introduces coordinate variables for any standard affine chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ as well as $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell_k}$ and provides explicit geometric meaning for every coordinate variable.

Proposition 6.13 combined with Proposition 6.9 (9) provide explicit description and properties of the local defining equations of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ or $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ on any standard affine chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ or $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell_k}$.

To summarize the progress, we depict it in the diagram (1.12) below.

(1.12)

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\hbar} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\hbar'} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow = & & \uparrow = & & \uparrow = \\
\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\hbar} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\hbar} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\hbar} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\hbar'} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}_{\hbar,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}_{\hbar',\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])},\Gamma} \cdots & \longrightarrow & Z_{\Gamma} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow = \\
\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\hbar,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\hbar',\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])},\Gamma} \cdots & \longrightarrow & Z_{\Gamma},
\end{array}
$$

where all vertical uparrows are closed embeddings.

Thus far, we have obtained the first three rows of the diagram:

($\star$) In the first row: each morphism $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\hbar} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\hbar'}$ is $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$, or $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$, or $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$, and each is a blowup; every $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} \to \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}}$ is a projection, a forgetful map.

($\star$) In the third row: each morphism $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\hbar} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\hbar'}$ is $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$, or $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$, or $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}$, and this morphism as well as each $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} \to \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}}$ is surjective, projective, and birational.

($\star$) Further, a scheme in the second row is a smooth open subset of the scheme in first row containing the one in the third row, correspondingly.

To explain the fourth and fifth rows of the diagram, we go back to the fixed chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. This is the affine space which comes equipped with the coordinate variables $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}} := \{x_{\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\{\underline{m}\}\}$. Let Γ be any subset of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$ and let Z_Γ be the subscheme of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ defined by the ideal generated by all the elements of Γ together with all the de-homogenized $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations $\bar{F}$ with $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. This is a Γ-scheme mentioned in the beginning of this introduction. The precise relation between a given matroid Schubert cell and its corresponding Γ-scheme is given in (9.3).

Our goal is to resolve the Γ-scheme Z_Γ when it is integral and singular.

Let Γ be a subset $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$. Assume that Z_Γ is integral. Then, starting from Z_Γ, step by step, via induction within every of the sequential ϑ-, $\wp$-, and ℓ-blowup, we are able to construct the third and fourth rows in the diagram (1.12) such that

($\star$) every closed subscheme in the fourth row, $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma}$, respectively $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar}$, *admits explicit local defining equations* in any standard chart of a smooth open subset, containing $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma}$, respectively, $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\hbar}$, of the corresponding scheme in the first row;

($\star$) every closed subscheme in the fifth row $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma}$, respectively, $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\hbar}$, is an *irreducible component* of its corresponding subscheme $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma}$, respectively, $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar}$, such that the induced morphism $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$, respectively, $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\hbar} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$ is surjective, projective, and birational.

($\star$) the left-most $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ is smooth; so is $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma}$, now a connected component of $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$.

The closed subscheme $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma}$, called an $\mathscr{F}$-transform of Z_Γ, is constructed in Lemma 7.3; the closed subscheme $Z_{\vartheta_{[j]},\Gamma}$, called a ϑ-transform of Z_Γ, is constructed

in Lemma 7.4; the closed subscheme $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$, called a $\wp$-transform of Z_Γ, is constructed in Lemma 7.5; the closed subscheme $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell_k,\Gamma}$, called an ℓ-transform of Z_Γ, is also constructed in Lemma 7.5.

In this article, a scheme X is smooth if it is a disjoint union of finitely many connected smooth schemes of possibly various dimensions.

Our main theorem on the Grassmannian is

Theorem 1.3. (Theorems 8.5 and 8.6) *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be either $\mathbb{Q}$ or a finite field with p elements where p is a prime number. Let Γ be any subset of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}\underline{m}}$. Assume that Z_Γ is integral. Let $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ be the ℓ-transform of Z_Γ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$. Then, $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ is smooth over $\mathbb{F}$. In particular, the induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$ is a resolution over $\mathbb{F}$, provided that Z_Γ is singular.*

The proof of Theorem 1.3 (Theorems 8.5 and 8.6) is based upon the explicit description of the main binomials and linearized Plücker defining equations of $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ (Corollary 7.6) and detailed calculation and careful analysis on the Jacobian of these equations (§8).

Theorem 1.1 is obtained by applying Theorem 1.3, combining with Lafforgue's version of Mnëv's unversality theorem (Theorems 9.2 and 9.4), provided that X is defined over $\mathbb{Z}$. For a singular affine or projective variety X over a general perfect field $\mathbf{k}$, we spread it out and deduce that $X/\mathbf{k}$ admits a resolution as well. The details are written in §9.

In general, consider any fixed singular integral scheme X. By Theorem 1.1, X can be covered by finitely many affine open subsets such that every of these affine open subsets of X admits a resolution. It remains to glue finitely many such local resolutions to obtain a global one. This is being pursued.

We learned that Hironaka posted a preprint on resolution of singularities in positive characteristics [7].

In spite of the current article, the author is not in a position to survey the topics of resolution of singularities, not even very briefly. We refer to Kollár's book [12] for an extensive list of references on resolution of singularities. There have been some

recent progresses since the book [12]: risking inadvertently omitting some other's works, let us just mention a few recent ones [2], [17], and [19].

The approach presented in this paper was inspired by [10].

The author is grateful to the anonymous reviewers of [9] for their very helpful questions and constructive suggestions, especially for pointing out the insufficiency of an earlier version of [9]. In particular, the author would not have gone this far in a relatively short period of time without their helpful feedbacks.

He thanks János Kollár and Chenyang Xu for the suggestion to write a summary section, §2, to lead the reader a quick tour through the paper.

He thanks Laurent Lafforgue for several very kind suggestions and sharing a general question. He very especially thanks Caucher Birkar, also James McKernan and Ravi Vakil for the invitation to speak in workshop and seminars, and for helpful correspondences. He thanks Bingyi Chen for spotting a mistake in the proof of Theorem 10.5 of [9].

A List of Fixed Notations Used Throughout

$[h]$: the set of all integers from 1 to h, $\{1, 2 \cdots, h\}$.

$\mathbb{I}_{d,n}$: the set of all sequences of integers $\{(1 \leq u_1 < \cdots < u_d \leq n)\}$.

$\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$: the projective space with Plücker coordinates $p_{\underline{i}}, \underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$.

$I_{\wp}$: the ideal of $\mathbf{k}[p_{\underline{i}}]_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}}$ generated by all Plücker relations.

$I_{\widehat{\wp}}$: the ideal of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$.

$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$: the affine chart of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$ defined by $p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0$ for some fixed $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$.

$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$: the set of $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equations.

$\Upsilon := \binom{n}{d} - 1 - d(n-d)$: the cardinality of $\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$;

$\mathfrak{V}$: a standard affine chart of an ambient smooth scheme;

$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$: the set of all main binomial relations;

$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}$: the set of all residual binomial relations;

$\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$: the set of all binomial relations of pre-quotient type;

$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$: the set of all binomial relations of quotient type;

$\mathcal{B}$: $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} \sqcup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}} \sqcup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$;

$L_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$: the set of all linearized $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equations.

Γ: a subset of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$.

$A\backslash a$: $A\backslash\{a\}$ where A is a finite set and $a \in A$.

$|A|$: the cardinality of a finite set A.

$\mathbf{k}$: a fixed perfect field.

2. A Quick Tour: the main idea and approach

This section may be skipped entirely if the reader prefers to dive into the main text immediately. However, carefully reading this section first is strongly recommended.

• *A detour to* $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ *via Mnëv's universality.*

By Mnëv's universality, any singularity over $\mathbb{Z}$ appears in a matroid Schubert cell of the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ of three dimensional linear subspaces in a vector space E, up to smooth morphisms.

Consider the Plücker embedding $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E} \subset \mathbb{P}(\wedge^3 E)$ with Plücker coordinates p_{ijk}. A matroid Schubert cell of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ is a nonempty intersection of codimension one Schubert cells of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$; it corresponds to a matroid $\underline{\mathrm{d}}$ of rank 3 on the set $[n]$. Any Schubert divisor is defined by $p_{ijk} = 0$ for some (ijk). Thus, a matroid Schubert cell $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ of the matroid $\underline{\mathrm{d}}$ is an open subset of the closed subscheme $\overline{Z}_\Gamma$ of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ defined by $\{p_{ijk} = 0 \mid p_{ijk} \in \Gamma\}$ for some subset Γ of all Plücker variables. The matroid Schubert cell must lie in an affine chart $(p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0)$ for some $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{I}_{3,n}$. Thus, $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is an open subset of a closed subscheme of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E} \cap (p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0)$ of the following form

$$Z_\Gamma = \{p_{ijk} = 0 \mid p_{ijk} \in \Gamma\} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E} \cap (p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0).$$

This is a closed affine subscheme of the affine chart $(p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0)$. We aim to resolve Z_Γ, hence also the matroid Schubert cell $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$, when both are integral and singular.

• *Minimal set of Plücker relations for the chart* $(p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0)$.

Up to permutation, we may assume that $\underline{m} = (123)$ and the chart is

$$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} := (p_{123} \neq 0).$$

We write the de-homogenized coordinates of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ as

$$\{x_{abc} \mid (abc) \in \mathbb{I}_{3,n}\backslash\{(123)\}.$$

As a closed subscheme of the affine space $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$, Z_Γ is defined by

$$\{x_{ijk} = 0, \ \ \bar{F} = 0 \ \mid \ x_{ijk} \in \Gamma\},$$

where $\bar{F}$ rans over all de-homogenized Plücker relations. We need to pin down some explicit Plücker relations to form a minimal set of generators of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E} \cap \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$.

They are of the following forms:

$$\bar{F}_{(123),1uv} = x_{1uv} - x_{12u}x_{13v} + x_{13u}x_{12v}, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\bar{F}_{(123),2uv} = x_{2uv} - x_{12u}x_{23v} + x_{23u}x_{12v}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\bar{F}_{(123),3uv} = x_{3uv} - x_{13u}x_{23v} + x_{23u}x_{13v}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\bar{F}_{(123),abc} = x_{abc} - x_{12a}x_{3bc} + x_{13a}x_{2bc} - x_{23a}x_{1bc}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $u < v \in [n]\backslash\{1,2,3\}$ and $a < b < c \in [n]\backslash\{1,2,3\}$. Here, $[n] = \{1, \cdots, n\}$.

In a nutshell, we have the set

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}} = \{\bar{F}_{(123),iuv}, \ 1 \leq i \leq 3; \ \ \bar{F}_{(123),abc}\} \tag{2.5}$$

Every relation of $\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ is called $\underline{m}$-primary. Here, $\underline{m} = (123)$.

- *Nicely presented equations of Γ-schemes and arbitrary singularities.*

Hence, as a closed subscheme of the affine space $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$, Z_Γ is defined by

$$Z_\Gamma = \{x_{\underline{u}} = 0, \ \ \bar{F}_{(123),iuv}, \ 1 \leq i \leq 3, \ \ \bar{F}_{(123),abc} \mid x_{\underline{u}} \in \Gamma\}, \tag{2.6}$$

for all $u < v \in [n]\backslash\{1,2,3\}$ and $a < b < c \in [n]\backslash\{1,2,3\}$. The matroid Schubert cell Z_Γ° in Z_Γ is characterized by $x_{\underline{v}} \neq 0$ for any $x_{\underline{v}} \notin \Gamma$ (see Proposition 9.1 and (9.3).)

Upon setting $x_{\underline{u}} = 0$ with $\underline{u} \in \Gamma$, we obtain the affine coordinate subspace

$$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma} \subset \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$$

such that Z_Γ, as a closed subscheme of the affine subspace $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$, is defined by

$$\{\bar{F}_{(123),iuv}|_\Gamma, \ 1 \leq i \leq 3; \ \ \bar{F}_{(123),abc}|_\Gamma\}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\bar{F}|_\Gamma$ denotes the restriction of $\bar{F}$ to the affine subspace $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$. These are in general truncated Plücker equations, some of which may be identically zero.

One may view (2.6) *as the normal form of singularities, and* (2.7) *as the reduced normal form of singularities. These are the standardized equations of singularities over* $\mathbb{Z}$*, up to smooth morphisms. In other words, singularities may arbitrary, but amazingly, their equations can be nicely presented, up to smooth morphisms.*

We *do not* analyze singularities of Z_Γ.

But, we make some remarks. By the normal form of singularities (2.6), the Γ-scheme Z_Γ is cut out from the affine chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr})$ of the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ by the hyperplanes $(x_{\underline{u}} = 0)$ for all $x_{\underline{u}} \in \Gamma$. Although Z_Γ as well as the matroid Schubert cell Z_Γ° (see the sentence below (2.6)) are nicely described by Plücker variables and Plücker relations, the intersections of these coordinate hyperplanes with the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr})$ of the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ are arbitrary, according to Mnëv's universality. We may view $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ (allowing $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ to vary) as a universe that contains arbitrary singularities. Hence, intuitively, we need to birationally change the universe "along these intersections" so that eventually in the new universe, "they" re-intersect properly.

To achieve this, it is more workable if we can put all the singularities in a different universe $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, birationally modified from the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$, so that in the *new model* $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, all the terms of the above Plücker relations can be separated. (Years had been passed, or wasted in a way, before we *returned* to this correct approach.)

• *Separating the terms of Plücker relations.*

Motivated by [10], we establish a local model $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, birational to the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$, such that in a *specific* set of defining binomial equations of $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, *all the terms* of the above Plücker relations are separated.

To explain, we introduce the projective space $\mathbb{P}_F$ for each and every Plücker relation $F = \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$ with $[x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}]_{s\in S_F}$ as its homogeneous coordinates.

We then let $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ be the closure of the graph of the rational map $\bar{\Theta}_{[\Upsilon],\mathrm{Gr}}$ of (1.3) in the case of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$. (This is motivated by an analogous construction in [10].) By

calculating the multi-homogeneous kernel of the homomorphism

$$\bar{\varphi} : \mathbf{k}[(x_{\underline{w}}); (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})})] \longrightarrow \mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{w}}] \tag{2.8}$$

$$x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \to x_{\underline{u}} x_{\underline{v}},$$

we determine a set of defining relations of $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ as a closed subscheme of the smooth ambient scheme

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F.$$

These defining relations, among many others, include the following binomials

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{1uv}x_{(12u,13v)} - x_{12u}x_{13v}x_{(123,1uv)},\ x_{1uv}x_{(13u,12v)} - x_{13u}x_{12v}x_{(123,1uv)},\\ &x_{2uv}x_{(12u,23v)} - x_{12u}x_{23v}x_{(123,2uv)},\ x_{2uv}x_{(23u,12v)} - x_{23u}x_{12v}x_{(123,2uv)},\\ &x_{3uv}x_{(13u,23v)} - x_{13u}x_{23v}x_{(123,3uv)},\ x_{3uv}x_{(23u,13v)} - x_{23u}x_{12v}x_{(123,3uv)},\\ &x_{abc}x_{(12a,3bc)} - x_{12a}x_{3bc}x_{(123,abc)},\ x_{abc}x_{(13a,2bc)} - x_{13a}x_{2bc}x_{(123,abc)},\\ &x_{abc}x_{(23a,1bc)} - x_{23a}x_{1bc}x_{(123,abc)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

We see that the terms of all the $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations of (2.5) are separated into the two terms of the above binomials.

To distinguish, we call $x_{\underline{u}}$ (e.g., x_{12u}) a ϖ-variable and $X_{\underline{u}} = (x_{\underline{u}} = 0)$ a ϖ-divisor; we call $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ (e.g., $x_{(12u,13v)}$) a ϱ-variable and $X_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$ a ϱ-divisor.

The defining relations also include the linearized Plücker relations as in (1.2):

$$L_F = \sum_{s \in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s)}, \quad \forall\ \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}.$$

The set of all linearized Plücker relations is denoted by $L_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$.

There are many other *extra* defining relations.

All the Γ-schemes Z_Γ admit birational transforms in the singular model $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$. We still *do not* analyze the singularities of these transforms. But, we make a quick observation: when all the terms of some of the binomials in (2.9) vanish at a point of the transform of a Γ-scheme, then a singularity is likely to occur.

Thus, *as the first steps,* we would like to "remove" all the zero factors from all the terms of the binomials in (2.9). This also amounts to re-positioning the coordinate hyperplanes $(x_{\underline{u}} = 0)$ through blowups so that they eventually intersect properly

with the proper transform of the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ of the Grassmannian, for all $x_{\underline{u}} \in \Gamma$.

As it turns out, through years of "trial and error", "removing" all the zero factors from all the binomial relations of (2.9) successfully leads us to the correct path toward our ultimate purpose.

The geometric intuition behind the above sufficiency is as follows. The equations of (2.9) *alone together with* $L_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ *only define a reducible closed scheme, in general. The roles of other extra relations (to be discussed soon) are to pin down its main component* $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$*. As the process of "removing" zero factors goes, a process of some specific blowups, all the boundary components are eventually blown out of existence, making the proper transforms of* (2.9) *together with the linearized Plücker relations generate the ideal of the final blowup scheme* $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$ *of* $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$*, on all charts.*

We thus call the binomial equations of (2.9) the *main* binomials. The set of main binomials is denoted $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$. The set $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ is equipped with a carefully chosen total ordering (see (5.11)).

The defining relations of $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ in $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ also include many other binomials: we classify them as *residual* binomials (see Definition 4.16), binomials *of pre-quotient type* (see Definition 4.13). The set of residual binomials is denoted $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}$; the set of binomials of pre-quotient type is denoted $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$; Both are finite sets.

Together, the equations in the following sets

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}},\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}},\ \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}},\ L_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$$

define the scheme $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ in the smooth ambient scheme $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. See Corollary 4.15.

When we focus on an arbitrarily fixed chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$, binomials of pre-quotient type of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$ can be further reduced to binomials *of quotient type* whose set is denoted by $\mathcal{B}^q_{\mathfrak{V}}$. See Definition 4.22 and Proposition 4.23. (For the reason to use the term "*of quotient type*", see [10].)

As mentioned in the introduction, for the purpose of inductive proofs, we also need the rational map $\bar{\Theta}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$ of (1.4), and we let $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ be the closure of the rational

map of $\bar{\Theta}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$, for all $k \in [\Upsilon]$. In this notation, $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} = \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}}$. We let

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} := \mathrm{U} \times \prod_{i \in [k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i}.$$

This is a smooth scheme and contains $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ as a closed subscheme. Further, we have the natural forgetful map

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}. \tag{2.10}$$

• *The process of "removing" zero factors of main binomials.*

To remove zero factors of main binomials, we either work with the set of binomials of $\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}$ all together in the case of ϑ-blowups, or work on each main binomial of $\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}$ individually in the case of $\wp$-blowups. Upon completing $\wp$-blowups for the block of relations of $\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}$, we immediately perform the ℓ-blowup with respect to the linearized Plücker relation L_F.

To this end, we need to provide a carefully chosen total order on the set $\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$.

We let $\{\bar{F}_{(123),iuv},\ 1 \leq i \leq 3\}$ go first, then followed by $\{\bar{F}_{(123),abc}\}$. Within $\{\bar{F}_{(123),iuv},\ 1 \leq i \leq 3\}$, we say $\bar{F}_{(123),iuv} < \bar{F}_{(123),ju'v'}$ if $(uv) < (u'v')$ lexicographically, or when $(uv) = (u'v')$, $i < j$. Within $\{\bar{F}_{(123),abc}\}$, we say $\bar{F}_{(123),abc} < \bar{F}_{(123),a'b'c'}$ if $(abc) < (a'b'c')$ lexicographically. This ordering is compatible with that of $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$. We also provide an ordering on the set of all Plücker variables, compatible with the above orderings.

The purpose of "removing" zero factors is achieved through sequential blowups based upon factors of main binomials and their proper transforms.

⋆ *On ϑ-blowups.*

From the main binomial equations of (2.9), we select the following closed centers

$$\mathscr{Z}_\vartheta : (x_{iuv} = 0) \cap (x_{(123,iuv)} = 0), i \in [3];\ (x_{abc} = 0) \cap (x_{(123,abc)} = 0), a \neq b \neq c \in [n] \backslash [3].$$

We order the sets $\{(uv)\}$ and $\{(abc)\}$ lexicographically, respectively; we order $\{(iuv)\}$, written as $\{(i,(uv)) \mid i \in [3]\}$, reverse-lexicographically. We then let $\{(iuv)\}$ go before $\{(abc)\}$. This way, the set $\mathscr{Z}_\vartheta$ is equipped with a total order induced from the above-mentioned orders on the indexes.

We then blow up $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ along (the proper transforms of) the centers in $\mathcal{Z}_\vartheta$, in the above order. This gives rise to the sequence (1.9) in the introduction

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}}.$$

Each arrow in this sequence is a smooth blowup.

For any $k \in [\Upsilon]$, we let $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ be the proper transform of $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$. We then set $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\vartheta = \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}}$.

Besides removing the zero factors as displayed in the centers of $\mathcal{Z}_\vartheta$, ϑ-blowups also make the proper transforms of the residual binomial equations become dependent on the proper transforms of the main binomial equations on any standard chart. Thus, upon completing ϑ-blowups, we can discard all the residual binomials $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}$ from consideration. In addition, it also leads to the conclusion $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\vartheta \cap X_{\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = \emptyset$ for all $k \in [\Upsilon]$ where $X_{\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ is the proper transform of the ϱ-divisor $X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = (x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = 0)$, put it differently, the factor $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$, possibly zero somewhere before the ϑ-blowup, now that " zero factor " is removed upon completing ϑ-blowups.

$\star$ *On $\wp$-blowups.*

Here, we continue the process of "removing" zero factors of the proper transforms of the main binomials. From now on, we focus on each main binomial individually, starting from the first one.

The first main binomial equation of (2.9) is

$$B_{145,1} : x_{(124,135)}x_{145} - x_{(123,145)}x_{124}x_{135}.$$

The proper transforms of all the variables of B_{145} may assume zero value on $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\vartheta$ somewhere. For each and every term of $B_{145,1}$, we pick a "zero" factor to form a pair. For example, (x_{145}, x_{124}) is such a pair of $B_{145,1}$. Such a pair is called a $\wp$-set with respect to $B_{145,1}$. The common vanishing locus of the variables in a $\wp$-set gives rise to a $\wp$-center. Before we can blow up these $\wp$-centers, we need to order them. The order is somewhat subtle. But, the general rule is that we let $\wp$-sets having ϱ-variables go last and those having ϖ-variable go as the second last. In other words, we first declare ϱ-variables are the largest, ϖ-variables are the second largest, and

then compare the $\wp$-sets as pairs lexicographically. Then, we can blow up $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$ along (the proper transforms) of these $\wp$-centers, starting from the smallest one.

We then move on to the next main binomial equation

$$B_{145,2} : x_{(125,134)}x_{145} - x_{(123,145)}x_{125}x_{134}.$$

Notice here that the variable x_{145} may become an exceptional variable or acquires one due to the previous $\wp$-blowups. Hence, $B_{145,2}$ should have more $\wp$-sets. We declare these exceptional variables to be the smallest ones, and wthin them, we order them by reversing the order of occurrence. We can then select pairs of variables, one from each term, define $\wp$-centers, make an order on them, and repeat the above.

This way, we complete our $\wp$-blowups with respect to the block of relations of $\mathcal{B}_{F_1}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ and obtain $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_1}$.

Now, consider the linearized Plücker relation

$$L_{F_1} = x_{(123,145)} - x_{(124,135)} + x_{(125,134)}.$$

We can blow up $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_1}$ along the proper transform of the intersection

$$(L_{F_1} = 0) \cap (x_{(123,145)} = 0)$$

to obtain

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_1} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_1}.$$

This complete all the desired blowups for the block of equations

$$\{B_{145,1},\ B_{145,2},\ L_{F_1}\}.$$

We then move on to the next bock of relations

$$\{B_{245,1},\ B_{245,2},\ L_{F_2}\},$$

and repeat all the above, and then, the next block $\{B_{345,1}, B_{345,2}, L_{F_3}\}$, repeat all the above, and so on.

This gives rise to the sequential blowups (1.10) and (1.11) in the introduction

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k} \to \cdots \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})} \to \cdots \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}},$$

coming with the induced blowups

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k} \to \cdots \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})} \to \cdots \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_{k-1}}.$$

Each scheme in first sequence above has a smooth open subset $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{\ell_k}$ or $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{\wp_k}$ or $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ containing $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$ or $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}$ or $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, respectively.

An intermediate blowup scheme in the above is denoted by $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. Here $(k\tau)$ is the index of a main binomial. As the process of $\wp$-blowups goes on, more and more exceptional parameters may be acquired and appear in the proper transform of the later main binomial $B_{(k\tau)}$, resulting more pairs of zero factors, hence more corresponding $\wp$-sets and $\wp$-centers. The existence of the index $\mathfrak{r}_\mu$, called *round* μ, is due to the need to deal with the situation when an exceptional parameter with exponent greater than one is accumulated in the proper transform of the main binomial $B_{(k\tau)}$ (such a situation does not occur for the first few main binomials). The index $\mathfrak{s}_h$, called *step* h, simply indicates the corresponding step of the blowup.

When the process of $\wp$-blowups terminates, all the main binomials terminate, that is, all the variables in the main binomials are invertible along $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}$.

Hence, we have achieved our goal to "remove" zero factors of main binomials.

- "*Removing*" *zero factors of the leading terms of linearized Plücker relations.*

⋆ *On* ℓ*-blowups.*

Here, we make some more comments on ℓ-blowups.

For any of the Plücker relations of (2.5), either $\bar{F}_{(123),iuv}$ for some $1 \le i \le 3$ or $\bar{F}_{(123),abc}$, we express its linearized Plücker relation as

$$L_{F_k}: \ \operatorname{sgn}(s_{F_k})x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} + \sum_{s\in S_{F_k}\setminus s_{F_k}} \operatorname{sgn}(s)x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$$

where $\operatorname{sgn}(s_{F_k})x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ is the leading term. It comes equipped with a divisor

$$D_{L_{F_k}} = (L_{F_k} = 0)$$

in $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. We let $D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}}$ be the proper transform of $D_{L_{F_k}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$.

After the process of ϑ-blowups, the leading $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}$, can become an exceptional variable of the exceptional divisor $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ created by the corresponding ϑ-blowup with

respect to F_k mentioned earlier. We let $E_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k}$ be the proper transform of $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$. We can then let

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$$

be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ along the intersection $D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}} \cap E_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k}$. Then, the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ will remove that " zero factor " and bring up a variable $y_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ invertible along $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$. Geometrically, this process separates the two divisors $D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}}$ and $E_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k}$.

We point out here the ℓ-blowup with respect to F has to immediately follow the $\wp$-blowups with respect to F; the order of $\wp$-blowups with respect to a fixed Plücker relation F, as already mentioned, may be subtle and are carefully chosen.

In fact, the birational model $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ of the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ of the Grassmannian, also as a blowup of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr})$, has to be constructed first, as experience has shown. That is to say, the method of our approach is highly sensitive to the order of all these blowups.

In the above, the constructions of $\wp$-, and ℓ-blowups are discussed in terms of coordinate variables of the proper transforms of the main binomials or lineaized Plücker relations on local charts. In the main text, the constructions of all these blowups, like ϑ-blowups, are done globally via induction.

From the previous discussions, one sees that the process of $\wp$-blowups is highly inefficient. This is not a surprise as we treat *all singularities* all together, *once and for all.* To provide a concrete example for the whole process, $\mathrm{Gr}(2,n)$ would miss some main points; $\mathrm{Gr}(3,6)$ would be too long to include, and also, perhaps not too helpful as far as showing (a resolution of) a singularity is concerned.

• Γ-*schemes and their ϑ-, $\wp$-, ℓ-transforms.*

Fix any integral Γ-scheme Z_Γ, considered as a closed subscheme of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$. Our goal is to resolve Z_Γ when it is singular.

As in the introduction, we have the instrumental diagram (2.11).

(2.11)

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\hbar & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\hbar & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow = & & \uparrow = & & \uparrow = \\
\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_\ell & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_\hbar & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_\hbar & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\hbar & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\hbar'} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}_{\hbar,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}_{\hbar',\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])},\Gamma} \cdots & \longrightarrow & Z_\Gamma \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow = \\
\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\hbar,\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\hbar',\Gamma} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & Z^\dagger_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & Z^\dagger_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])},\Gamma} \cdots & \longrightarrow & Z_\Gamma.
\end{array}
$$

The first three rows follow from the above discussion; we only need to explain the fourth and fifth rows.

Here, when $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar',\Gamma}$) is not contained in the corresponding blowup center, $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar,\Gamma}$) is, roughly, obtained from the proper transform of $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar',\Gamma}$). When $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar',\Gamma}$) is contained in the corresponding blowup center, then $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar,\Gamma}$) is, roughly, obtained from a canonical rational slice of the total transform of $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar',\Gamma}$) under the morphism $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}} \to \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\hbar \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\hbar'}$) in the second row. Moreover, every $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar,\Gamma}$) admits explicit defining equations over any standard affine chart of the corresponding smooth open subset of the scheme in the first row. Furthermore, in every case, $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[j])}}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}_{\hbar,\Gamma}$) contains an irreducible component $Z^\dagger_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\hbar,\Gamma}$) such that it maps onto Z_Γ projectively and birationally.

• *Smoothness by Jacobian of main binomials and linearized Plücker relations.*

We are now ready to explain the smoothness of $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ when Z_Γ is integral. We first investigate the smoothness of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$ which is a special case of $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ when $\Gamma = \emptyset$.

The question is local. So we focus on an affine chart of $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell$. Corollary 7.6 provides the local defining equations for $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$.

As envisioned, we confirm that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$ is smooth on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ by some explicit calculations and careful analysis on the Jacobian of *the main binomial relations of* $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *and linearized Plücker relations of* $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$. This implies that on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$, the main binomial relations of $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ and the linearized Plücker relations of $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ together generate the ideal of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}\cap\mathfrak{V}$. Thus, as a consequence, the binomials of quotient type $\mathcal{B}^{q}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ can be discarded from consideration, as well.

Then, the similar calculations and analysis on the Jacobian of the induced main binomial relations of $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ and the induced linearized Plücker relations of $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ for $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ implies that $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ is smooth as well, on all charts $\mathfrak{V}$. In particular, $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma}$, now a connected component of $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$, is smooth, too.

This implies that $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma}\longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$ is a resolution, if Z_Γ is singular.

The above are done in §8.

• *Resolution via Mnëv universality.*

Upon reviewing Lafforgue's version of Mnëv universality, we can apply the resolution $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma}\longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$ to obtain a resolution for any singular affine or projective variety X defined over a prime field. For a singular affine or projective algebraic variety X over a general perfect field $\mathbf{k}$, we spread it out and deduce that $X/\mathbf{k}$ admits a resolution as well. The details are expanded in §9.

Let p be an arbitrarily fixed prime number. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be either $\mathbb{Q}$ or a finite field with p elements. From Section 3 to Section 8, every scheme considered is defined over $\mathbb{Z}$, consequently, is defined over $\mathbb{F}$, and is considered as a scheme over the perfect field $\mathbb{F}$.

3. Primary Plücker Relations and De-homogenized Plücker-Ideal

The purpose of this section is to describe a minimal set of Plücker relations so that they generate the Plücker ideal for a given chart. The approach of this article depends on these explicit relations. The entire section is elementary.

Fix a pair of positive integers $n>1$ and $1\leq d<n$. In this section, we focus on Grassmannians $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ where $E=E_1\oplus\cdots\oplus E_n$ is as introduced in the introduction.

For application to resolution of singularity, it suffices to consider $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$. However, we choose to work on the general case of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ for the following two reasons. (1) Working on $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$ instead of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ saves us little space or time: if we focus on (2.5) but not the general form $\sum_{s\in S_F} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}$ in the construction of ϑ-, $\wp$-, and ℓ-blowups, then the proofs of some key propositions would have to be somewhat case by case, less conceptual, and hence may be lengthier. However, it is always good to frequently use the equations of (2.5) and (2.9) as examples to help to understand the notations and the process. We caution here that replying only on Plücker equations of the form $\bar{F}_{(123),iuv},\ 1\leq i\leq 3$ from (2.5) (they correspond to Plücker equations of $\mathrm{Gr}^{2,E}$) might miss some crucial points. (2) As a convenient benefit, the results obtained and proofs provided for $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ here can be directly cited in the future.

All the results of this section are elementary and some might have already been known. Nonetheless, the development in the current section is instrumental for our approach. Hence, some good details are necessary.

We make a convention. Let A be a finite set and $a\in A$. Then, we write

$$A\backslash a := A\backslash\{a\}.$$

Also, we use $|A|$ to denote the cardinality of the set A.

3.1. **Plücker relations.**

Fix a pair of positive integers (n,d) with $n>1$ and $1\leq d<n$. We denote the set $\{1,\cdots,n\}$ by $[n]$. We let $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}$ be the set of all sequences of distinct integers $\{1\leq u_1<\cdots<u_d\leq n\}$. An element of $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}$ is frequently written as $\underline{u}=(u_1\cdots u_d)$. We also regard an element of $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}$ as a subset of d distinct integers in $[n]$. For instance, for any $\underline{u},\underline{m}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}$, $\underline{u}\backslash\underline{m}$ takes its set-theoretic meaning. Also, $u\in[n]\backslash\underline{u}$ if and only if $u\neq u_i$ for all $1\leq i\leq d$.

As in the introduction, suppose we have a set of vector spaces, $E_1,\cdots,E_n$ such that every E_α, $1\leq\alpha\leq n$, is of dimension 1 over $\mathbf{k}$ (or, a free module of rank 1 over $\mathbb{Z}$), and, we let

$$E := E_1\oplus\ldots\oplus E_n.$$

For any fixed integer $1 \leq d < n$, the Grassmannian, defined by

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} = \{F \hookrightarrow E \mid \dim F = d\},$$

is a projective variety defined over $\mathbb{Z}$.

We have the canonical decomposition

$$\wedge^d E = \bigoplus_{\underline{i}=(i_1,\cdots,i_d)\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} E_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{i_d}.$$

This gives rise to the Plücker embedding of the Grassmannian:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E) = \{(p_{\underline{i}})_{\underline{i}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \in \mathbb{G}_m \backslash (\wedge^d E \backslash \{0\})\},$$

$$F \longrightarrow [\wedge^d F],$$

where $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$ is the multiplicative group.

The group $(\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}})^n/\mathbb{G}_m$, where $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$ is embedded in $(\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}})^n$ as the diagonal, acts on $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$ by

$$\mathbf{t} \cdot p_{\underline{i}} = t_{i_1} \cdots t_{i_d} p_{\underline{i}}$$

where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_n)$ is (a representative of) an element of $(\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}})^n/\mathbb{G}_m$ and $\underline{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_d)$. This action leaves $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ invariant. The $(\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}})^n/\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ will only be used in §9.

The Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ as a closed subscheme of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$ is defined by a set of specific quadratic relations, called Plücker relations. We describe them below.

For narrative convenience, we will assume that $p_{u_1\cdots u_d}$ is defined for any sequence of d distinct integers between 1 and n, not necessarily listed in the sequential order of natural numbers, subject to the relation

$$p_{\sigma(u_1)\cdots\sigma(u_d)} = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) p_{u_1\cdots u_d} \tag{3.1}$$

for any permutation σ on the set $[n]$, where $\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)$ denotes the sign of the permutation. Furthermore, also for convenience, we set

$$p_{\underline{u}} := 0, \tag{3.2}$$

for any $\underline{u} = (u_1 \cdots u_d)$ of a set of d integers in $[n]$ if $u_i = u_j$ for some $1 \leq i \neq j \leq d$.

Now, for any pair $(\underline{h},\underline{k}) \in \mathbb{I}_{d-1,n} \times \mathbb{I}_{d+1,n}$ with

$$\underline{h} = \{h_1, \cdots, h_{d-1}\} \text{ and } \underline{k} = \{k_1, \cdots, k_{d+1}\},$$

we have the Plücker relation:

$$F_{\underline{h},\underline{k}} = \sum_{\lambda=1}^{d+1} (-1)^{\lambda-1} p_{h_1 \cdots h_{d-1} k_\lambda} p_{k_1 \cdots \overline{k_\lambda} \cdots k_{d+1}}, \tag{3.3}$$

where "$\overline{k_\lambda}$" means that k_λ is deleted from the list.

To make the presentation concise, we frequently succinctly express a general Plücker relation as

$$F = \sum_{s \in S_F} \operatorname{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}, \tag{3.4}$$

for some index set S_F, with $\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$, where $\operatorname{sgn}(s)$ *is the $\pm$ sign associated with the quadratic monomial term $p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$. We note here that* $\operatorname{sgn}(s)$ *depends on how every of $\underline{u}_s$ and $\underline{v}_s$ is presented, per the convention* (3.1).

Definition 3.1. *Consider any Plücker relation $F = F_{\underline{h},\underline{k}}$ for some pair $(\underline{h},\underline{k}) \in \mathbb{I}_{d-1,n} \times \mathbb{I}_{d+1,n}$. We let $\mathfrak{t}_F + 1$ be the number of terms in F. We then define the rank of F to be $\mathfrak{t}_F - 2$. We denote this number by* $\operatorname{rank}(F)$.

The integer $\mathfrak{t}_F$, as defined above, will be frequently used throughout.

Example 3.2. *Consider the Grassmannian* $\mathrm{Gr}(3,6)$. *Then, the Plücker relation*

$$F_{(16),(3456)} : p_{163}p_{456} - p_{164}p_{356} + p_{165}p_{346}$$

is of rank zero; the Plücker relation

$$F_{(12),(3456)} : p_{123}p_{456} - p_{124}p_{356} + p_{125}p_{346} - p_{126}p_{345}$$

is of rank one.

Let $\mathbb{Z}[p_{\underline{i}}]_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}}$ be the homogeneous coordinate ring of the Plücker projective space $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$ and $I_\wp \subset \mathbb{Z}[p_{\underline{i}}]_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}}$ be the homogeneous ideal generated by all the Plücker relations (3.3) or (3.4). We let $I_{\widehat{\wp}}$ by the homogeneous ideal of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$. Then $I_{\widehat{\wp}} \supset I_\wp$, but not equal over $\mathbb{Z}$, or a field of positive characteristic, in general: there are other additional relations (multivariate Plücker relations) for the Grassmannian

$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$, thanks to Matt Baker for pointing this out to the author. In characteristic zero, $I_{\widehat{\wp}} = I_{\wp}$.

3.2. **Primary Plücker equations with respect to a fixed affine chart.**

In this subsection, we focus on a fixed affine chart of the Plücker projective space $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$.

Fix any $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$. In $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$, we let

$$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} := (p_{\underline{m}} \equiv 1)$$

stand for the open chart defined by $p_{\underline{m}} \neq 0$. Then, the affine space $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ comes equipped with the coordinate variables $x_{\underline{u}} = p_{\underline{u}}/p_{\underline{m}}$ for all $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$. In practical calculations, we will simply set $p_{\underline{m}} = 1$, whence the notation $(p_{\underline{m}} \equiv 1)$ for the chart. We let

$$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$$

be the corresponding induced open chart of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$.

The chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr})$ is canonically an affine space. Below, we explicitly describe

$$\Upsilon := \binom{n}{d} - 1 - d(n-d)$$

many specific Plücker relations with respect to the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$, called the $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations, such that their restrictions to the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ define $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr})$ as a closed subscheme of the affine space $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$.

To this end, we write $\underline{m} = (m_1 \cdots m_d)$. We set

$$\mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}} = \{\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \mid |\underline{u}\backslash\underline{m}| \geq 2\} \subset \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$$

where $\underline{u}$ and $\underline{m}$ are also regarded as subsets of integers, and $|\underline{u}\backslash\underline{m}|$ denotes the cardinality of $\underline{u}\backslash\underline{m}$. In words, $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}$ if and only if $\underline{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_d)$ contains at least two elements distinct from elements in $\underline{m} = (m_1, \cdots, m_d)$. It is helpful to write explicitly the set $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}$:

$$\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}} = \{\underline{m}\} \cup \{\{u\} \cup (\underline{m} \setminus m_i) \mid \text{ for all } u \in [n]\backslash\underline{m} \text{ and all } 1 \leq i \leq d\},$$

where $u \notin \underline{m}$ if and only if $u \neq m_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d$. Then, one calculates and finds

$$|\mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}| = \Upsilon = \binom{n}{d} - 1 - d(n-d),$$

where $|\mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}|$ denotes the cardinality of $\mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$.

Further, let $\underline{a} = (a_1 \cdots a_k)$ be a list of some elements of $[n]$, not necessarily mutually distinct, for some $k < n$. We will write

$$v\underline{a} = v(a_1 \cdots a_k) = (va_1 \cdots a_k) \text{ and } \underline{a}v = (a_1 \cdots a_k)v = (a_1 \cdots a_k v),$$

each is considered as a list of some elements of $[n]$, for any $v \in [n]\backslash\underline{a}$.

Now, take any element $\underline{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_d) \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$. We let u_0 denote the smallest integer in $\underline{u}\backslash\underline{m}$. We then set

$$\underline{h} = \underline{u} \setminus u_0 \text{ and } \underline{k} = (u_0 m_1 \cdots m_d),$$

where $\underline{u} \setminus u_0 = \underline{u} \setminus \{u_0\}$ and $\underline{u}$ is regarded as a set of integers.

This gives rise to the Plücker relation $F_{\underline{h},\underline{k}}$, taking of the following form

$$F_{\underline{h},\underline{k}} = p_{(\underline{u}\setminus u_0)u_0} p_{\underline{m}} - p_{(\underline{u}\setminus u_0)m_1} p_{u_0(\underline{m}\setminus m_1)} + \cdots + (-1)^d p_{(\underline{u}\setminus u_0)m_d} p_{u_0(\underline{m}\setminus m_d)}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\underline{m} \setminus m_i = \underline{m} \setminus \{m_i\}$ and $\underline{m}$ is regarded as a set of integers, for all $i \in [d]$.

We give a new notation for this particular equation: we denote it by

$$F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} = p_{(\underline{u}\setminus u_0)u_0} p_{\underline{m}} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i p_{(\underline{u}\setminus u_0)m_i} p_{u_0(\underline{m}\setminus m_i)}, \tag{3.6}$$

because it only depends on $\underline{m}$ and $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$. To simplify the notation, we introduce

$$\underline{u}^r = \underline{u} \setminus u_0, \quad \widehat{m_i} = \underline{m} \setminus m_i, \quad \text{for all } i \in [d].$$

Then, (3.6) becomes

$$F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} = p_{\underline{m}} p_{\underline{u}^r u_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i p_{\underline{u}^r m_i} p_{u_0 \widehat{m_i}}. \tag{3.7}$$

We point out here that $\underline{u}$ and $\underline{u}^r u_0$ may differ by a permutation.

Definition 3.3. *We call the Plücker equation $F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$ of* (3.7) *a primary Plücker equation for the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} = (p_{\underline{m}} \equiv 1)$. We also say $F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$ is $\underline{m}$-primary. The term $p_{\underline{m}} p_{\underline{u}}$ is called the leading term of $F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$.*

(One should not confuse $F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$ with the expression of a general Plücker equation $F_{\underline{h},\underline{k}}$: we have $(\underline{m},\underline{u}) \in \mathbb{I}^2_{d,n}$ for the former and $(\underline{h},\underline{k}) \in \mathbb{I}_{d-1,n} \times \mathbb{I}_{d+1,n}$ for the latter.)

One sees that the correspondence between $\mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$ and the set of $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equations is a bijection.

3.3. **De-homogenized Plücker ideal with respect to a fixed affine chart.**

Following the previous subsection, we continue to fix an element $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$ and focus on the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$.

We will write $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$ for $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\{\underline{m}\}$.

Given any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$, by (3.7), it gives rise to the $\underline{m}$-primary equation

$$F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} = p_{\underline{m}} p_{\underline{u}^r u_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i p_{\underline{u}^r m_i} p_{u_0 \widehat{\underline{m}_i}}.$$

If we set $p_{\underline{m}} = 1$ and let $x_{\underline{w}} = p_{\underline{w}}$, for all $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$, then it becomes

$$\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} = x_{\underline{u}^r u_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i x_{\underline{u}^r m_i} x_{u_0 \widehat{\underline{m}_i}}. \tag{3.8}$$

Definition 3.4. *We call the relation* (3.8) *the de-homogenized (or the localized)* $\underline{m}$*-primary Plücker relation corresponding to* $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$*. We call the unique distinguished variable,* $x_{\underline{u}}$ *(which may differ* $x_{\underline{u}^r u_0}$ *by a sign), the leading variable of the de-homogenized Plücker relation* $\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$*.*

Throughout this paper, we often express an $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equation F as

$$F = \sum_{s \in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} = \mathrm{sgn}(s_F) p_{\underline{m}} p_{\underline{u}_{s_F}} + \sum_{s \in S_F \backslash s_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{3.9}$$

where s_F is the index for the leading term of F, and $S_F\backslash s_F := S_F\backslash\{s_F\}$. Then, upon setting $p_{\underline{m}} = 1$ and letting $x_{\underline{w}} = p_{\underline{w}}$ for all $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$, we can write the corresponding de-homogenized $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equation $\bar{F}$ as

$$\bar{F} = \sum_{s \in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} = \mathrm{sgn}(s_F) x_{\underline{u}_F} + \sum_{s \in S_F \backslash s_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{3.10}$$

where $x_{\underline{u}_F} := x_{\underline{u}_{s_F}}$ is the leading variable of $\bar{F}$.

Definition 3.5. *Let* F *be an* $\underline{m}$*-primary Plücker relation and* $\bar{F}$ *its de-homogenization with respect to the chart* $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$*. We set* $\mathfrak{t}_{\bar{F}} = \mathfrak{t}_F$ *and* $\mathrm{rank}\,(\bar{F}) = \mathrm{rank}\,(F)$*.*

For any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$, we let $x_{\underline{u}} = p_{\underline{u}}/p_{\underline{m}}$ for all $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$. Then, we can identify the coordinate ring of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ with $\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}}$. We let $I_{\wp,\underline{m}}$ be the ideal of $\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}}$ obtained from the ideal $I_\wp$ be setting $p_{\underline{m}} = 1$ and letting $x_{\underline{u}} = p_{\underline{u}}$ for all $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$. The ideal $I_{\wp,\underline{m}}$ is the de-homogenization of the homogeneous Plücker ideal $I_\wp$ on the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$.

Definition 3.6. *For any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}$, we define the $\underline{m}$-rank of $\underline{u}$ (resp. $x_{\underline{u}}$) to be the rank of its corresponding primary Plücker equation $F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$. If $\underline{u} \in (\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m})\backslash\mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}$, then we set* $\mathrm{rank}\,(\underline{u}) = -1$.

Proposition 3.7. *The affine subspace $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ embedded in the affine space $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ is defined by the relations in*

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}} := \{\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}\}.$$

Consequently, the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ comes equipped with the set of free variables

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}} := \{x_{\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\{\underline{m}\}\backslash\mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}\}$$

and is canonically isomorphic to the affine space with the above variables as its coordinate variables.

Proof. (This proposition is elementary; it serves as the initial check of an induction for some later proposition; we provide sufficient details for completeness.)

It suffices to observe that for any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}$, its corresponding de-homogenized Plücker primary Plücker equation $\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$ is equivalent to an expression of the leading variable $x_{\underline{u}}$ as a polynomial in the free variables of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$. For instance, one can check this by induction on the $\underline{m}$-rank, $\mathrm{rank}\,(\underline{u})$, of $\underline{u}$, as follows.

Suppose $\mathrm{rank}\,(\underline{u}) = 0$. Then, up to a permutation, we may write

$$\underline{u} = (\underline{m} \setminus \{m_i m_j\})vu$$

where $m_i, m_j \in \underline{m}$ for some $1 \leq i, j, \leq d$, and $u < v \notin \underline{m}$. Then, we have

$$\bar{F}_{\underline{u},u} : x_{\underline{u}} + (-1)^i x_{\underline{u}^r m_i} x_{u\widehat{m_i}} + (-1)^j x_{\underline{u}^r m_j} x_{u\widehat{m_j}}, \tag{3.11}$$

where $\underline{u}^r = (\underline{m} \setminus \{m_i m_j\})v$. One sees that $x_{\underline{u}^r m_i}$, $x_{u\widehat{m_i}}$, $x_{\underline{u}^r m_j}$ and $x_{u\widehat{m_j}}$ belong to $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$. Hence, the statement holds.

Now suppose that rank $(\underline{u}) > 0$. Using (3.8), we have

$$\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} : \; x_{\underline{u}^r u_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i x_{\underline{u}^r m_i} x_{u_0 \widehat{m_i}}.$$

Note that all variables $x_{u_0 \widehat{m_i}}, i \in [d]$, belong to $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$. Note also that

$$\mathrm{rank}\,(\underline{u}^r m_i) = \mathrm{rank}\,(\underline{u}) - 1,$$

provided that $p_{\underline{u}^r m_i}$ is not identically zero, that is, it is a well-defined Plücker variable (see (3.2)). Thus, applying the inductive assumption, any such $x_{\underline{u}^r m_i}$ is a polynomial in the variables of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$. Therefore, $\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$, is equivalent to an expression of $x_{\underline{u}}$ as a polynomial in the variables of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$.

Let J be the ideal of $\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \setminus \underline{m}}$ generated by $\{\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}\}$ and let $V(J)$ the subscheme of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ defined by J. By the above discussion, $V(J)$ is canonically isomorphic to the affine space of dimension $d(n-d)$ with the variables of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$ as its coordinate variables. Since $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) \subset V(J)$, we conclude $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) = V(J)$. □

Definition 3.8. *We call the variables in*

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}} := \{x_{\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \setminus \underline{m} \setminus \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}\}$$

the $\underline{m}$-basic Plücker variables. When $\underline{m}$ is fixed and clear from the context, we just call them basic variables.

Only non-basic Plücker variables correspond to $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equations.

Observe that for all Plücker relations F, we have $0 \leq \mathrm{rank}(F) \leq d-2$. Hence, for any $0 \leq r \leq d-2$, we let

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}^r = \{\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} \mid \mathrm{rank}(F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}) = r, \; \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}\}.$$

Then, we have

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}} = \bigcup_{0 \leq r \leq d-2} \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}^r.$$

Then, one observes the following easy but useful fact.

Proposition 3.9. *Fix any $0 \leq r \leq d-2$ any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}$ with $\mathrm{rank}_{\underline{m}}(F_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}) = r$. Then, the leading variable $x_{\underline{u}}$ of $\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$ does not appear in any relation in*

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}^0 \cup \cdots \cup \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}^{r-1} \cup (\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}^r \setminus \bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}).$$

To close this subsection, we raise a concrete question. Fix the chart ($p_{\underline{m}} \equiv 1$). In $\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\setminus\underline{m}}$, according to Proposition 3.7, every de-homogenized Plücker equation $\bar{F}_{\underline{h},\underline{k}}$ on the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ can be expressed as a polynomial in the de-homogenized primary Plücker relations $\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}$ with $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}^{\underline{m}}$. It may be useful in practice to find such an expression explicitly for an arbitrary $F_{\underline{h},\underline{k}}$. For example, for the case of $\mathrm{Gr}(2,5)$, this can be done as follows.

Example 3.10. *For* $\mathrm{Gr}(2,5)$*, we have five Plücker relations:*

$$F_1 = p_{12}p_{34} - p_{13}p_{24} + p_{14}p_{23},\ F_2 = p_{12}p_{35} - p_{13}p_{25} + p_{15}p_{23},$$

$$F_3 = p_{12}p_{45} - p_{14}p_{25} + p_{15}p_{24},\ F_4 = p_{13}p_{45} - p_{14}p_{35} + p_{15}p_{34},$$

$$F_5 = p_{23}p_{45} - p_{24}p_{35} + p_{25}p_{34}.$$

On the chart ($p_{45} \equiv 1$)*,* F_3, F_4*, and* F_5 *are primary. One calculates and finds*

$$p_{45}F_1 = p_{34}F_3 - p_{24}F_4 + p_{14}F_5,$$

$$p_{45}F_2 = p_{35}F_3 - p_{25}F_4 + p_{15}F_5.$$

In addition, the Jacobian of the de-homogenized Plücker equations of $\bar{F}_3, \bar{F}_4, \bar{F}_5$ *with respect to all the variables,* $x_{12}, x_{14}, x_{15}, x_{13}, x_{35}, x_{34}, x_{23}, x_{24}, x_{25}$*, is given by*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_{25} & x_{24} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & x_{14} & x_{15} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & x_{35} & x_{34} \end{pmatrix}.$$

There, one sees visibly a (3×3) *identity minor.*

3.4. **Ordering the set of all primary Plücker equations.**

Definition 3.11. *Let* K *be any fixed totally ordered finite set, with its order denoted by* $<$*. Consider any two subsets* $\eta \subset K$ *and* $\zeta \subset K$ *with the cardinality* n *for some positive integer* n*. We write* $\eta = (\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_n)$ *and* $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \cdots, \zeta_n)$ *as arrays according to the ordering of* K*. We say* $\eta <_{\mathrm{lex}} \zeta$ *if the left most nonzero number in the vector* $\eta - \zeta$ *is negative, or more explicitly, if we can express*

$$\eta = \{t_1 < \cdots < t_{r-1} < s_r < \cdots\}$$

$$\zeta = \{t_1 < \cdots < t_{r-1} < t_r < \cdots\}$$

such that $s_r < t_r$ for some integer $r \geq 1$. We call $<_{\text{lex}}$ the lexicographic order induced by $(K, <)$.

Likewise, we say $\eta <_{\text{invlex}} \zeta$ if the right most nonzero number in the vector $\eta - \zeta$ is negative, or more explicitly, if we can express

$$\eta = \{\cdots < s_r < t_{r+1} < \cdots < t_n\}$$

$$\zeta = \{\cdots < t_r < t_{r+1} < \cdots < t_n\}$$

such that $s_r < t_r$ for some integer $r \geq 1$. We call $<_{\text{invlex}}$ the reverselexicographic order induced by $(K, <)$.

This definition can be applied to the set

$$\mathbb{I}_{d,n} = \{(i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_d) \mid 1 \leq i_\mu \leq n, \forall\, 1 \leq \mu \leq d\}$$

for all d and n. Thus, we have equipped the set $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}$ with both the lexicographic ordering " $<_{\text{lex}}$ " and the reverse lexicographic ordering " $<_{\text{invlex}}$ ".

We point out here that neither is the order we used for the set of Plücker variables $\text{Var}_{\text{U}\underline{m}} = \{x_{\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}\}$, even thought by the obvious bijection between $\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$ and $\text{Var}_{\text{U}\underline{m}}$, each provides a total ordering on $\text{Var}_{\text{U}\underline{m}}$.

Definition 3.12. *Consider any $\underline{u}, \underline{v} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$. We say*

$$\underline{u} <_\wp \underline{v}$$

if one of the following three holds:

- $\text{rank}_{\underline{m}}\, \underline{u} < \text{rank}_{\underline{m}}\, \underline{v}$;
- $\text{rank}_{\underline{m}}\, \underline{u} = \text{rank}_{\underline{m}}\, \underline{v}$, $\underline{u}\backslash\underline{m} <_{\text{lex}} \underline{v}\backslash\underline{m}$;
- $\text{rank}_{\underline{m}}\, \underline{u} = \text{rank}_{\underline{m}}\, \underline{v}$, $\underline{u}\backslash\underline{m} = \underline{v}\backslash\underline{m}$, *and* $\underline{m} \cap \underline{u} <_{\text{lex}} \underline{m} \cap \underline{v}$.

Definition 3.13. *Consider any two Plücker variables $x_{\underline{u}}$ and $x_{\underline{v}}$. We say*

$$x_{\underline{u}} <_\wp x_{\underline{v}} \text{ if } \underline{u} <_\wp \underline{v}.$$

Consider any two distinct primary equations, $\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}}, \bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{v}} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ We say

$$\bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{u}} <_\wp \bar{F}_{\underline{m},\underline{v}} \text{ if } \underline{u} <_\wp \underline{v}.$$

Under the above order, we can write

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}} = \{\bar{F}_1 <_\wp \cdots <_\wp \bar{F}_\Upsilon\}.$$

In the sequel, when comparing two Plücker variables $x_{\underline{u}}$ and $x_{\underline{v}}$ or two $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equations, we exclusively use $<_\wp$. Thus, throughout, for simplicity, we will simply write $<$ for $<_\wp$. A confusion is unlikely.

We point out here that $x_{\underline{u}} <_\wp x_{\underline{v}}$ is neither lexicographic nor inverse-lexicographic on the indexes. Indeed, every non-lexicographic or non-inverse-lexicographic order, introduced in this article, is important for our method. Some orders may be subtle.

For later use, we introduce

Definition 3.14. *Let $\mathfrak{T}_i$ be a finite set for all $i \in [h]$ for some positive integer h. Then, the order*

$$\mathfrak{T}_1 < \cdots < \mathfrak{T}_h$$

naturally induces a partial order on the disjoint union $\sqcup_{i\in[h]}\mathfrak{T}_i$ as follows. Take any $i < j \in [h]$, $a_i \in \mathfrak{T}_i$, and $a_j \in \mathfrak{T}_j$. Then, we say $a_i < a_j$.

If every $\mathfrak{T}_i$ comes equipped with a total order for all $i \in [h]$. Then, in the situation of Definition 3.14, the disjoint union $\sqcup_{i\in[h]}\mathfrak{T}_i$ is totally ordered.

4. A Singular Local Birational Model $\mathscr{V}$ for $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$

The purpose of this section is to establish a local model $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, birational to $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$, such that all terms of all $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equations can be separated in the defining main binomial relations of $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ in a smooth ambient scheme $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. The construction of $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$ is modeled on a chart of the total scheme of the Hilbert family as constructed in [10].

4.1. The construction of $\mathscr{V} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$.

Consider the fixed affine chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ of the Plücker projective space $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$. For any $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, written as $F = \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$, we let $\mathbb{P}_F$ be the projective space with homogeneous coordinates written as $[x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}]_{s\in S_F}$. For convenience, we let

$$\Lambda_F = \{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s) \mid s \in S_F\}. \tag{4.1}$$

This is an index set for the homogeneous coordinates of the projective space $\mathbb{P}_F$. To avoid duplication, we make a convention:

$$x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} = x_{(\underline{v}_s,\underline{u}_s)},\ \forall\ s \in S_F,\ \forall\ \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}. \tag{4.2}$$

If we write $(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s)$ in the lexicographical order, i.e., we insist $\underline{u}_s <_{\text{lex}} \underline{v}_s$, then the ambiguity is automatically avoided. However, the convention is still useful.

Definition 4.1. *We call $x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$ a ϱ-variable of $\mathbb{P}_F$, or simply a ϱ-variable. To distinguish, we call a Plücker variable, $x_{\underline{u}}$ with $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$, a ϖ-variable.*

Fix $k \in [\Upsilon]$. We introduce the natural rational map

$$\Theta_{[k]} : \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E) \dashrightarrow \prod\nolimits_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.3}$$

$$[p_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \longrightarrow \prod_{i\in[k]} [p_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}}]_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{F_i}}$$

where $[p_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}}$ is the homogeneous Plücker coordinates of a point in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$. When restricting $\Theta_{[k]}$ to $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$, it gives rise to

$$\bar{\Theta}_{[k]} : \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \dashrightarrow \prod\nolimits_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.4}$$

We let

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E) \times \prod\nolimits_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.5}$$

be the closure of the graph of the rational map $\Theta_{[k]}$, and

$$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod\nolimits_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.6}$$

be the closure of the graph of the rational map $\bar{\Theta}_{[k]}$.

Definition 4.2. *Fix any $k \in [\Upsilon]$. We let*

$$R_{[k]} = \mathbf{k}[p_{\underline{u}}; x_{(\underline{v}_s,\underline{u}_s)}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n},s\in S_{F_i},i\in[k]}$$

and let

$$\bar{R}_{[k]} = \mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}; x_{(\underline{v}_s,\underline{u}_s)}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m},s\in S_{F_i},i\in[k]}$$

be the de-homogenization of $R_{[k]}$. A polynomial $f \in \bar{R}_{[k]}$ (resp. $R_{[k]}$) is called multi-homogeneous if it is homogenous in $[x_{(\underline{v}_s,\underline{u}_s)}]_{s\in S_{F_i}}$, for every $i \in [k]$ (resp. and is also

homogenous in $[p_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}}$*). A multi-homogeneous polynomial* $f\in \bar{R}_{[k]}$ *(resp.* $R_{[k]}$*) is* ϱ*-linear if it is linear in* $[x_{(\underline{v}_s,\underline{u}_s)}]_{s\in S_{F_i}}$*, whenever it contains some* ϱ*-variables of* $\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$*, for any* $i\in[k]$*.*

We set $R_0:=\mathbf{k}[p_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}}$ and $\bar{R}_0:=\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\setminus\underline{m}}$ Then, corresponding to the embedding (4.5), there exists a degree two homomorphism

$$\varphi_{[k]}:\ R_{[k]}=R_0[x_{(\underline{v}_s,\underline{u}_s)}]_{s\in S_{F_i},i\in[k]}\longrightarrow R_0,\quad x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}\to p_{\underline{u}_s}p_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{4.7}$$

for all $s\in S_{F_i},\ i\in[k]$, where $\varphi_{[k]}$ restricts the identity on R_0.

We then let

$$\bar{\varphi}_{[k]}:\ \bar{R}_{[k]}=\bar{R}_0[x_{(\underline{v}_s,\underline{u}_s)}]_{s\in S_{F_i},i\in[k]}\longrightarrow \bar{R}_0,\quad x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}\to x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{4.8}$$

for all $s\in S_{F_i}, i\in[k]$, be the de-homogenization of $\varphi_{[k]}$ with respect to the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}=(p_{\underline{m}}\equiv 1)$. This corresponds to the embedding (4.6).

We are mainly interested in the case when $k=\Upsilon$. Hence, we set

$$R:=R_{[\Upsilon]},\ \ \varphi:=\varphi_{[\Upsilon]},\ \ \bar{\varphi}:=\bar{\varphi}_{[\Upsilon]}.$$

We let $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$ (resp. $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\bar{\varphi}_{[k]}$) denote the set of all multi-homogeneous polynomials in $\ker\varphi_{[k]}$ (resp. $\ker\bar{\varphi}_{[k]}$).

Lemma 4.3. *The scheme* $\mathbb{P}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$*, as a closed subscheme of* $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)\times\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$*, is defined by* $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$*. In particular, the scheme* $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$*, as a closed subscheme of* $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}=\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}\times\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$*, is defined by* $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\bar{\varphi}_{[k]}$*.*

Proof. This is immediate. □

We need to investigate $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$.

Consider any $f\in\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$. We express it as the sum of its monic monomials (monomials with constant coefficients 1)

$$f=\sum\mathbf{m}_i.$$

We have $\varphi_{[k]}(f)=\sum\varphi_{[k]}(\mathbf{m}_i)=0$ in R_0. Thus, the set of the monic monomials $\{\mathbf{m}_i\}$ can be grouped into minimal groups to form partial sums of f so that *the images of elements of each group are identical* and the image of the partial sum of

each minimal group equals 0 in R_0. When ch.$\mathbf{k} = 0$, this means each minimal group consists of a pair $(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{m}_j)$ and its partial sum is the difference $\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}_j$. When ch.$\mathbf{k} = p > 0$ for some prime number p, this means each minimal group consists of either (1): a pair $(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{m}_j)$ and $\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}_j$ is a partial sum of f; or (2): exactly p elements $\mathbf{m}_{i_1}, \cdots, \mathbf{m}_{i_p}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{i_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{m}_{i_p}$ is a partial sum of f. But, the relation $\mathbf{m}_{i_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{m}_{i_p}$ is always generated by the relations $\mathbf{m}_{i_a} - \mathbf{m}_{i_b}$ for all $1 \leq a, b \leq p$.

Thus, regardless of the characteristic of the field $\mathbf{k}$, it suffices to consider binomials $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$.

Example 4.4. *Consider* $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$. *Then, the following binomials belong to* $\ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$ *for any fixed* $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

Fix $a, b, c \in [k]$, *all being distinct:*

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{(12a,13b)}x_{(13a,12c)}x_{(12b,13c)} \\ &-x_{(13a,12b)}x_{(12a,13c)}x_{(13b,12c)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{(12a,13b)}x_{(13a,12c)}x_{(12b,23c)}x_{(23b,13c)} \\ &-x_{(13a,12b)}x_{(12a,13c)}x_{(23b,12c)}x_{(13b,23c)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Fix $a, b, c, \bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c} \in [k]$, *all being distinct:*

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{(12a,3bc)}x_{(13a,2\bar{b}\bar{c})}x_{(13\bar{a},2bc)}x_{(12\bar{a},3\bar{b}\bar{c})} \\ &-x_{(13a,2bc)}x_{(12a,3\bar{b}\bar{c})}x_{(12\bar{a},3bc)}x_{(13\bar{a},2\bar{b}\bar{c})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Fix $a, b, c, a', \bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c} \in [k]$, *all being distinct:*

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{(12a,13a')}x_{(13a,2bc)}x_{(12a',3\bar{b}\bar{c})}x_{(12\bar{a},3bc)}x_{(13\bar{a},2\bar{b}\bar{c})} \\ &-x_{(13a,12a')}x_{(12a,3bc)}x_{(13a',2\bar{b}\bar{c})}x_{(13\bar{a},2bc)}x_{(12\bar{a},3\bar{b}\bar{c})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

These binomials are arranged so that one sees visibly the matching for multi-homogeneity.

Lemma 4.5. *Fix any* $i \in [k]$. *We have*

$$p_{\underline{u}'}p_{\underline{v}'}x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} - p_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}}x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')} \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}. \tag{4.13}$$

where $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}, x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')}$ *are any two distinct* ϱ*-variables of* $\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$. *Likewise, we have*

$$x_{\underline{u}'}x_{\underline{v}'}x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} - x_{\underline{u}}x_{\underline{v}}x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')} \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \bar{\varphi}_{[k]}. \tag{4.14}$$

Proof. This is trivial. □

Let $\mathbb{A}^l$ (resp. $\mathbb{P}^l$) be the affine (resp. projective) space of dimension l for some positive integer l with coordinate variables $(x_1, \cdots, x_l)$ (resp. with homogeneous coordinates $[x_1, \cdots, x_l]$). A monomial $\mathbf{m}$ is *square-free* if x^2 does not divide $\mathbf{m}$ for every coordinate variable x in the affine space. A polynomial is square-free if all of its monomials are square-free.

For any $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$, we define $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}')$ to be the total degree of $\mathbf{m}$ (equivalently, $\mathbf{m}'$) in ϱ-variables of $R_{[k]}$.

For any $F = \sum_{s \in S_F} p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$ with $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ and $s \in S_F$, we write $X_s = x_{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s)}$.

Recall that we have set $\varphi = \varphi_{[\Upsilon]} : R = R_{[\Upsilon]} \to R_0$.

Observe here that for any nonzero binomial $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$, we automatically have $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}') > 0$, since $\varphi_{[k]}$ restricts to the identity on R_0.

Lemma 4.6. *Consider a binomial $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$ with $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}') > 0$. We let h be the maximal common factor of the two monomials $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ in $R_{[k]}$. Then, we have*

$$\mathbf{m} = h \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{m}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{m}' = h \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{m}'_i$$

for some positive integer l such that for every $i \in [l]$, $\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}'_i \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$ and is of the following form:

$$\varphi(X_1)X_2 - \varphi(X'_1)X'_2, \tag{4.15}$$

where every of X_1, X_2, X'_1, and X'_2 is a monomial of R in ϱ-variables only (i.e., without ϖ-variables; here we allow $X_1 = X'_1 = 1$) such that

1. *$X_1X_2 - X'_1X'_2 \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi$ and is ϱ-linear;*
2. *$\varphi(X_1X_2)$ (equivalently, $\varphi(X'_1X'_2)$) is a square-free monomial;*
3. *for any $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ and $s \in S_F$, suppose $x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}$ divides $\mathbf{m}$ (resp. $\mathbf{m}'$), then $X_s = x_{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s)}$ divides X_1 (resp. X'_1) in one of the relations of* (4.15).

Proof. We prove by induction on $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}')$.

Suppose $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}') = 1$.

Then, we can write

$$\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}'=fx_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}-gx_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')}$$

for some $f,g\in R_0$, and two ϱ-variables of $\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$, $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ and $x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')}$ for some $i\in[k]$. If $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')}$, then one sees that $f=g$ and $\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}'=0$. Hence, we assume that $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}\neq x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')}$. Then, we have

$$fp_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}}=gp_{\underline{u}'}p_{\underline{v}'}.$$

Because $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ and $x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')}$ are two distinct ϱ-variables of $\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$, one checks from the definition that the two sets

$$\{p_{\underline{u}},p_{\underline{v}}\},\ \{p_{\underline{u}'},p_{\underline{v}'}\}$$

are disjoint. Consequently,

$$p_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}}\mid g,\ \ p_{\underline{u}'}p_{\underline{v}'}\mid f.$$

Write

$$g=g_1p_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}},\ \ f=f_1p_{\underline{u}'}p_{\underline{v}'}.$$

Then we have

$$p_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}}p_{\underline{u}'}p_{\underline{v}'}(f_1-g_1)=0\in R_0.$$

Hence, $f_1=g_1$. Then, we have

$$\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}'=h(p_{\underline{u}'}p_{\underline{v}'}x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}-p_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}}x_{(\underline{u}',\underline{v}')})$$

where $h:=f_1=g_1$. Observe that in such a case, we have that $\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}'$ is generated by the relations of (4.13), and it verifies all the statements in the lemma.

Suppose Lemma 4.6 holds for $\deg_\varrho<e$ for some positive integer $e>1$.

Consider $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}')=e$.

By the multi-homogeneity of $(\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}')$, we can write

$$\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}'=\mathbf{n}X_s-\mathbf{n}'X_t \tag{4.16}$$

such that X_s and X_t are the ϱ-variables of $\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$ corresponding to some $s,t\in S_{F_i}$ for some $i\in[k]$, and $\mathbf{n},\mathbf{n}'\in R_{[k]}$.

If $s=t$, then $\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}'=X_s(\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{n}')$. Hence, the statement follows from the inductive assumption applied to $(\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{n}')\in\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$ since $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{n}')=e-1$.

We suppose now $s\neq t$. Let $\bar{f}=\mathbf{n}x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s}-\mathbf{n}'x_{\underline{u}_t}x_{\underline{v}_t}$. Then, $\bar{f}\in\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$.

First, we suppose $\bar{f} = 0$.

Then, $x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \mid \mathbf{n}'$ and $x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} \mid \mathbf{n}$. Hence, we can write

$$\mathbf{n}' = x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \mathbf{n}'_0, \ \mathbf{n} = x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} \mathbf{n}_0.$$

And we have,

$$\bar{f} = \mathbf{n} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} - \mathbf{n}' x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} = x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} (\mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_0).$$

Hence, one sees that $\mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_0 \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$. If $\mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_0 = 0$, then $h = \mathbf{n}_0 = \mathbf{n}'_0$ is the maximal common factor of $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$, and further,

$$\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' = h(x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} X_s - x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} X_t).$$

In such a case, the statement of the lemma holds.

Hence, we can assume that $0 \neq \mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_0 \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$, in particular, this implies that $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_0) > 0$. Then, we have

$$\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' = \mathbf{n}_0 x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} X_s - \mathbf{n}'_0 x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} X_t.$$

Observe here that $x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} X_s - x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} X_t$ is in the form of (4.15), verifying the conditions (1) - (3). Thus, in such a case, the statement of the lemma follows by applying the inductive assumption to $(\mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_0) \in \ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$ since $\deg_\varrho(\mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_0) = e - 1$.

Next, we suppose $\bar{f} \neq 0$.

As $\deg_\varrho \bar{f} < e$, by the inductive assumption, we can write

$$\mathbf{n} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} = h(x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \mathbf{n}_s) \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathbf{n}_i, \quad \mathbf{n}' x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} = h(x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} \mathbf{n}_t) \prod_{j=1}^{l} \mathbf{n}'_j$$

for some integer $l \geq 1$, with $\mathbf{n}_0 = x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \mathbf{n}_s$ and $\mathbf{n}'_0 = (x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} \mathbf{n}_t)$ such that for each $0 \leq i \leq l$, it determines (matches) a unique $0 \leq i' \leq l$ such that $(\mathbf{n}_i - \mathbf{n}'_{i'})$ is of the form of (4.15) and verifies all the properties (1) - (3) of Lemma 4.6. Consider $\mathbf{n}_0 = x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \mathbf{n}_s$. It matches $\mathbf{n}'_{0'}$. By the multi-homogeneity of $\mathbf{n}_0 - \mathbf{n}'_{0'}$, (4.15) and (1) of Lemma 4.6, we can write $\mathbf{n}'_{0'} = x_{\underline{u}_{t'}} x_{\underline{v}_{t'}} \mathbf{n}_{t'}$ for some $t' \in S_{F_i}$ and $\mathbf{n}_{t'} \in R_{[k]}$. Therefore, by switching t with t' if $t \neq t'$, and re-run the above arguments, without loss of generality, we can assume $t' = t$ and $\mathbf{n}_0 = x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \mathbf{n}_s$ matches $\mathbf{n}'_0 = (x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} \mathbf{n}_t)$. Further, by re-indexing $\{\mathbf{n}'_j \mid j \in [l]\}$ if necessary, we can assume that $\mathbf{n}_i$ matches $\mathbf{n}'_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$.

Now, note that we have $\mathbf{n} = h(\mathbf{n}_s)\prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{n}_i,\ \mathbf{n}' = h(\mathbf{n}'_t)\prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{n}_i$. Hence

$$\mathbf{m} = h(\mathbf{n}_s X_s)\prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{n}_i,\ \ \mathbf{m}' = h(\mathbf{n}'_t X_t)\prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{n}_i.$$

We let $\mathbf{m}_0 = \mathbf{n}_s X_s$ and $\mathbf{m}_i = \mathbf{n}_i$ for all $i \in [l]$; $\mathbf{m}'_0 = (n_t X_t)$ and $\mathbf{m}_i = \mathbf{n}'_i$ for all $i \in [l]$. Then, one checks directly that Lemma 4.6 holds for $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}'$.

This proves the lemma. □

Definition 4.7. *Let $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]}$ be the set of all binomial relations of* (4.15) *that verify Lemma 4.6 (1) - (3); let $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]}$ the de-homogenizations with respect to $(p_{\underline{m}} \equiv 1)$ of all binomial relations of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]}$.*

Corollary 4.8. *The ideal $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$ is generated by $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]}$. Consequently, the ideal $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\bar{\varphi}_{[k]}$ is generated by $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]}$.*

Proof. Take any binomial $(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}') \in \ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$ with $\deg_{\varrho}(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}') > 0$. We express, by Lemma 4.6,

$$\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' = h(\prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{m}_i - \prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{m}'_i)$$

such that $\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}'_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]}$ for all $i \in [l]$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}' &= h(\prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}'_l\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\mathbf{m}_i + \mathbf{m}'_l\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\mathbf{m}_i - \prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{m}'_i)\\ &= h((\mathbf{m}_l - \mathbf{m}'_l)\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\mathbf{m}_i + \mathbf{m}'_l(\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\mathbf{m}_i - \prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\mathbf{m}'_i)).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by a simple induction on the integer l, the corollary follows. □

We now let $\Theta_{[k],\text{Gr}}$ be the restriction of $\Theta_{[k]}$ to $\text{Gr}^{d,E}$:

$$\Theta_{[k],\text{Gr}} : \text{Gr}^{d,E} \dashrightarrow \prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.17}$$

$$[p_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \longrightarrow \prod_{i\in[k]}[p_{\underline{u}}p_{\underline{v}}]_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{F_i}}.$$

We let

$$\text{Gr}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \hookrightarrow \text{Gr}^{d,E}\times\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{P}_{F_i} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)\times\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.18}$$

be the closure of the graph of the rational map $\Theta_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$.

We let $\bar{\Theta}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$ be the restriction of $\bar{\Theta}_{[k]}$ (or equivalently, $\Theta_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$) to the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$:

$$\bar{\Theta}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}} : \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) \dashrightarrow \prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.19}$$

$$[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \longrightarrow \prod_{i\in[k]} [x_{\underline{u}} x_{\underline{v}}]_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{F_i}}.$$

We let

$$\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) \times \prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i} \tag{4.20}$$

be the closure of the graph of the rational map $\bar{\Theta}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$.

Then, one sees that $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ is the proper transform of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr})$ in $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ under the birational morphism $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$.

Since we always focus on the fixed chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ below, we write $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} = \mathscr{V}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

By construction, there exists the natural forgetful map

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}} \tag{4.21}$$

and it induces a birational morphsim

$$\rho_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} : \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}. \tag{4.22}$$

Corresponding to the embedding $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \subset \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E) \times \prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i}$ of (4.18), we have the following homomorphism

$$\varphi_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}} : \ R_{[k]} \ (\longrightarrow R_0) \longrightarrow R_0/I_{\widehat{\wp}}, \quad x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \to p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{4.23}$$

for all $s \in S_{F_i}, i \in [k]$, where $I_{\widehat{\wp}}$ is the homogeneous ideal of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$.

Corresponding to the embedding $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ of (4.20), we have the following homomorphism

$$\bar{\varphi}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}} : \ \bar{R}_{[k]} \ (\longrightarrow \bar{R}_0) \longrightarrow \bar{R}_0/\bar{I}_{\wp}, \quad x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \to x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{4.24}$$

for all $s \in S_{F_i}, i \in [k]$, where $\bar{I}_{\wp}$ is the de-homogenization of the Plücker ideal $I_{\wp}$.

Lemma 4.9. *The scheme* $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$*, as a closed subscheme of* $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)\times\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$*, is defined by* $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$*. In particular, The scheme* $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$*, as a closed subscheme of* $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}=\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}\times\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$*, is defined by* $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\bar{\varphi}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$*, where* $\bar{\varphi}_{[k]}$ *is the de-homogenization of* $\varphi_{[k]}$ *with respect to* $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}=(p_{\underline{m}}\equiv 1)$*.*

Proof. This is immediate. □

We need to investigate $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\bar{\varphi}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$.

We let $f\in\bar{R}_{[k]}$ be any multi-homogenous polynomial and $\bar{f}\in\bar{R}_{[k]}$ be its de-homogenization with respect to the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}=(p_{\underline{m}}\equiv 1)$ such that $\bar{\varphi}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}(\bar{f})=0$. Then, by (4.24), and (4.23), it holds if and only if $\bar{\varphi}_{[k]}(\bar{f})\in\bar{I}_{\wp}$ if and only if $\varphi_{[k]}(f)\in I_{\wp}$. Thus, we can express $f=\sum_{F\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}f_F$ such that $\varphi_{[k]}(f_F)$ is a multiple of F for all $\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. It suffices to consider an arbitrarily fixed $\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. Hence, we may assume that $f=f_F$ for some arbitrarily fixed $\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. That is, in such a case, $\bar{\varphi}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}(\bar{f})=0$ if and only if

$$\varphi_{[k]}(f)=hF \text{ for some } h\in R_{[k]}.$$

Definition 4.10. *Given any* $\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$*, written as* $\bar{F}=\sum_{s\in S_F}\mathrm{sgn}(s)x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s}$*, we introduce*

$$L_F:\ \sum_{s\in S_F}\mathrm{sgn}(s)x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}.$$

This is called the linearized Plücker relation with respect to $\bar{F}$ *(or* F*). It is a canonical linear relation on* $\mathbb{P}_F$*.*

Observe here that among all linearized Plücker relations, only L_{F_i} with $i\in[k]$ belong to $\bar{R}_{[k]}$.

Lemma 4.11. *Fix any* $\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$*. Let* $f\in\bar{R}_{[k]}$ *be any multi-homogenous polynomial such that* $\varphi_{[k]}(f)=hF$ *for some* $h\in R_0$*. Then, modulo* $\ker^{\text{m-h}}\varphi_{[k]}$*, either* $f\equiv\mathbf{n}F$ *or* $f\equiv\mathbf{n}L_F$ *for some* $\mathbf{n}\in\bar{R}_{[k]}$*.*

Proof. First, by writing h as the sum of some monomials, and then expressing f as a sum accordingly, it suffices to consider the case when h is a monomial.

We write $F = \sum_{s\in S_F} \operatorname{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$. Accordingly, we express

$$f = \sum_{s\in S_F} \operatorname{sgn}(s) f_s$$

such that

$$\varphi_{[k]}(f_s) = h p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}, \text{ for all } s \in S_F.$$

We claim for any $s \in S_F$, either $x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \mid f_s$ or $p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} \mid f_s$.

Assume for some $s \in S_F$, the claim does not hold. Then, (at least) one of the factors of $p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$ in $\varphi_{[k]}(f_s)$, w.l.o.g., say, $p_{\underline{u}_s}$ can only come from the $\varphi_{[k]}$-image of $x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}'_s)}$ for some $\underline{v}'_s \neq \underline{v}_s$, and hence, $p_{\underline{v}'_s}$ must belong to the common factor h. Then, we compare f_s with f_t for any $t \neq s$. Using (4.15) in Lemma 4.6, we see that the $\varphi_{[k]}$-image $p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}'_s}$ of $x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}'_s)}$ must also belong to h. This makes $p_{\underline{u}_s} \mid (\varphi_{[k]}(f_s)/h)$ impossible. Hence, the claim holds.

Now, we first suppose that f does not contain any homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}_F$. Then by the claim, we can express $f_s = \mathbf{n}_s p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$ for all s. Because $\varphi_{[k]}(f_s) = \varphi_{[k]}(\mathbf{n}_s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} = h p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$, it implies that $\varphi_{[k]}(\mathbf{n}_s) = h$ for all $s \in S_F$. Therefore, modulo $\ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$, we have

$$f = \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathbf{n}_s \operatorname{sgn}(s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} \equiv \mathbf{n} F$$

for some $\mathbf{n} \in R_{[k]}$. (For example, one can take $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}_s$ for any fixed $s \in S_F$.)

Next, we suppose that f is nontrivially homogeneous in $\mathbb{P}_F$, that is, it contains some ϱ-variables of $\mathbb{P}_F$. Consider any $s \in S_F$. Suppose $x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \mid f_s$, then we can write $f_s = \mathbf{n}_s x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$ for some monomial $\mathbf{n}_s \in R_{[k]}$. Suppose $x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \nmid f_s$. Then, by homogeneity, we can write $f_s = \mathbf{m}_s x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)}$ for some $t \in S_F$ with $t \neq s$ and $\mathbf{m}_s \in R_{[k]}$. Further, by the above claim, $f_s = \mathbf{m}'_s p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)}$. Then, modulo the relation $p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} - p_{\underline{u}_t} p_{\underline{v}_t} x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$, we can also express

$$f_s \equiv \mathbf{n}_s x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \quad \mod (\ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]})$$

where $\mathbf{n}_s = \mathbf{m}'_s p_{\underline{u}_t} p_{\underline{v}_t}$. Again, because $\varphi_{[k]}(f_s) = \varphi_{[k]}(\mathbf{n}_s) p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s} = h p_{\underline{u}_s} p_{\underline{v}_s}$, we must have that $\varphi_{[k]}(\mathbf{n}_s) = h$ for all $s \in S_F$. This proves that $f_s \equiv \mathbf{n}\ x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$ for some $\mathbf{n} \in R_{[k]}$ for all $s \in S_F$, modulo $\ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$. Consequently, modulo $\ker^{\text{m-h}} \varphi_{[k]}$, we

obtain

$$f = \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) f_s \equiv \mathbf{n} \sum_{s} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s)} = \mathbf{n} L_F.$$

This proves the lemma. □

Corollary 4.12. *The ideal* $\ker^{\text{m-h}} \bar{\varphi}_{[k],\mathrm{Gr}}$ *is generated by all the relations in* $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]}$, $\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, *and* $\{L_{F_i} \mid i \in [k]\}$.

Proof. This follows from the combination of Corollary 4.8 and Lemma 4.11. □

Definition 4.13. *We let* $\mathcal{B}_i$ *(resp.* $\mathcal{B}_{[k]}$*) be the set of all binomial relations in* (4.14) *for any fixed* $i \in [k]$ *(resp. for all* $i \in [k]$*). We set* $\mathcal{B}_{[k]}^{\text{pre-q}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]} \backslash \mathcal{B}_{[k]}$. *An element of* $\mathcal{B}_{[k]}^{\text{pre-q}}$ *is called a binomial of pre-quotient type.*

Lemma 4.14. *The scheme* $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, *as a closed subscheme of* $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} = \mathrm{U}\underline{m} \times \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}_{F_i}$, *is defined by the following relations*

$$B_{F_i,(s,t)}: \quad x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} - x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}, \ \forall \ s,t \in S_{F_i} \backslash s_{F_i}, i \in [k], \tag{4.25}$$

$$B_{F_i,(s_{F_i},s)}: \quad x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\underline{u}_{F_i}} - x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_i})} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}, \ \ \forall \ \ s \in S_{F_i} \backslash s_{F_i}, \ i \in [k], \tag{4.26}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{[k]}^{\text{pre-q}}, \tag{4.27}$$

$$L_{F_i}: \ \sum_{s\in S_{F_i}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \ i \in [k], \tag{4.28}$$

$$\bar{F}_j: \ \sum_{s\in S_{F_j}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}, \ \ k < j \leq \Upsilon. \tag{4.29}$$

where $\bar{F}_i$ *is expressed as* $\mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_i}) x_{\underline{u}_{F_i}} + \sum_{s\in S_{F_i}\backslash s_{F_i}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}$ *for every* $i \in [k]$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.9 and Corollary 4.12, we have that $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} = \mathrm{U}\underline{m} \times \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}_{F_i}$, is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_{[k]}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}, \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}, \text{ and } L_F \text{ with } F = F_i \text{ for all } i \in [k].$$

Here note that $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{[k]} = \mathcal{B}_{[k]} \sqcup \mathcal{B}_{[k]}^{\text{pre-q}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{[k]}$ is precisely made of (4.25) and (4.26).

It suffices to show that under the presence of (4.25) and (4.26), $\bar{F}_i$ can be reduced to L_{F_i} for all $i \in [k]$.

Fix any $i \in [k]$. Take any $s \in S_{F_i}$. Consider the binomial relations of $\mathcal{B}_i$

$$x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} - x_{\underline{u}} x_{\underline{v}} x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \tag{4.30}$$

for all $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{F_i}$ (cf. (4.1)). By multiplying $\mathrm{sgn}(s)$ to (4.30) and adding together all the resulted binomials, we obtain,

$$x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} L_{F_i} = x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \bar{F}_i \ , \quad \mod (\langle \mathcal{B}_i \rangle), \tag{4.31}$$

where $\langle \mathcal{B}_i \rangle$ is the ideal generated by the relations in $\mathcal{B}_i$. Since $\mathbb{P}_{F_i}$ can be covered by affine open charts ($x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \neq 0$), we conclude that $\bar{F}_i$ depends on L_{F_i} and can be discarded for all $i \in [k]$. □

For conciseness, we set the following

$$\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} := \mathscr{V}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}},\ \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}},\ \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} := \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}}.$$

Then, we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}} & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\mathscr{F}} & \hookrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}(\mathrm{Gr}) & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} & = & \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}. \end{array}$$

In what follows, we will sometimes write $\mathscr{V}$ for $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, as we will exclusively focus on the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$, throughout, unless otherwise stated.

We also set

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}} = \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[\Upsilon]}.$$

By the case of Lemma 4.14 when $k = \Upsilon$, we have

Corollary 4.15. *The scheme $\mathscr{V}_{\underline{m}}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F$, is defined by the following relations*

$$B_{F,(s,t)} : \ x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} - x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}, \ \ \forall \ \ s,t \in S_F \backslash s_F \tag{4.32}$$

$$B_{F,(s_F,s)} : \ x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\underline{u}_F} - x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}, \ \ \forall \ \ s \in S_F \backslash s_F, \tag{4.33}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}, \tag{4.34}$$

$$L_F : \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \tag{4.35}$$

for all $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ with $\bar{F}$ being expressed as $\mathrm{sgn}(s_F) x_{\underline{u}_F} + \sum_{s\in S_F\backslash s_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}$.

Definition 4.16. *A binomial equation $B_{F,(s_F,s)}$ of* (4.33) *with $s \in S_F \setminus s_F$ is called a main binomial equation. We let*

$$\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}} = \{B_{F,(s_F,s)} \mid s \in S_F \setminus s_F\} \text{ and } \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} = \sqcup_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}.$$

A binomial equation $B_{F,(s,t)}$ of (4.32) *with $s,t \in S_F \setminus s_F$ and $s \neq t$ is called a residual binomial equation. We let*

$$\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{res}} = \{B_{F,(s,t)} \mid s,t \in S_F \setminus s_F\} \text{ and } \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}} = \sqcup_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{res}}.$$

Recall that an element of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$ is called a binomial relation of pre-quotient type.

We observe here that

$$\dim(\prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F) = \sum_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} |S_F \setminus s_F| = \sum_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} |\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}| = |\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}|, \tag{4.36}$$

where $|K|$ denotes the cardinality of a finite set K.

Definition 4.17. *We let $\mathfrak{G}_F = \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} \sqcup \{L_F\}$. We call it the block of (a part of) defining relations.*

We let

$$\mathfrak{G} = \bigsqcup_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathfrak{G}_F.$$

4.2. ϖ-divisors, ϱ-divisors, and $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$.

From earlier, we have the set $\Lambda_F = \{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s) \mid s \in S_F\}$. This is an index set for the homogeneous coordinates of the projective space $\mathbb{P}_F$, and is also an index set for all the variables that appear in the linearized Plücker equation $\bar{L}_F$ of (4.35). To be used later, we also set

$$\Lambda_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} = \sqcup_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \Lambda_F.$$

Definition 4.18. *Consider the scheme $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F$.*

Recall that the affine chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ comes equipped with the coordinate variables $\{x_{\underline{u}}\}_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\setminus\underline{m}}$. For any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\setminus\underline{m}$, we set

$$X_{\underline{u}} := (x_{\underline{u}} = 0) \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}.$$

We call $X_{\underline{u}}$ the Plücker divisor, in short, the ϖ-divisor, of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ associated with $\underline{u}$. We let $\mathcal{D}_{\varpi}$ be the set of all ϖ-divisors on the scheme $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$.

In addition to the ϖ-divisors, the scheme $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ comes equipped with the divisors

$$X_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} := (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$$

for all $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$. We call $X_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ the ϱ-divisor corresponding to $(\underline{u},\underline{v})$. We let $\mathcal{D}_{\varrho}$ be the set of all ϱ-divisors of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$.

Further, the scheme $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ also comes equipped with the divisors

$$D_{L_F} := (L_F = 0)$$

for all $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. We call D_{L_F} the $\mathfrak{L}$-divisor corresponding to F. We let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{L}}$ be the set of all $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$.

Definition 4.19. *Fix $k \in [\Upsilon]$. For every $\bar{F}_i \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ with $i \in [k]$, choose and fix an arbitrary element $s_{F_i,o} \in S_{F_i}$. Then, the scheme $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ is covered by the affine open charts of the form*

$$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{i\in[k]} (x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{F_i,o}},\underline{v}_{s_{F_i,o}})} \equiv 1) \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i}.$$

We call such an affine open subset a standard chart of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, often denoted by $\mathfrak{V}$.

Fix any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ as above. We let

$$\mathfrak{V}' = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{i\in[k-1]} (x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{F_i,o}},\underline{v}_{s_{F_i,o}})} \equiv 1) \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{i\in[k-1]} \mathbb{P}_{F_i}.$$

Then, this is a standard chart of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$, uniquely determined by $\mathfrak{V}$. We say $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over $\mathfrak{V}'$. In general, suppose $\mathfrak{V}''$ is a standard chart of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]}}$ with $j < k-1$. Via induction, we say $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over $\mathfrak{V}''$ if $\mathfrak{V}'$ lies over $\mathfrak{V}''$.

Note that the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ in the above definition is uniquely indexed by the set

$$\Lambda^{o}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} = \{(\underline{u}_{s_{F_i,o}}, \underline{v}_{s_{F_i,o}}) \in \Lambda_{F_i} \mid i \in [k]\}. \tag{4.37}$$

Given $\Lambda^{o}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, we let

$$\Lambda^{\star}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} = (\bigcup_{i\in[k]} \Lambda_{F_i}) \backslash \Lambda^{o}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}.$$

We set $\Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}} := \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}}$ and $\Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}} := \Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]}}$.

To be cited as the initial cases of certain inductions later on, we need the following two propositions.

Proposition 4.20. *Consider any standard chart*

$$\mathfrak{V} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{i\in[k]} (x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{F_i,o}}, \underline{v}_{s_{F_i,o}})} \equiv 1)$$

of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, indexed by $\Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ as above. It comes equipped with the set of free variables

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}},\ x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \mid \underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m},\ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}\}$$

and the de-homogenized linearized Plücker relations $L_{\mathfrak{V},F}$ for all $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ such that on the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$, we have

1. *the divisor $X_{\underline{w}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ is defined by $(x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = 0)$ for every $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \setminus \underline{m}$;*
2. *the divisor $X_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ is defined by $(x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$ for every $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.*
3. *the divisor $D_{L_F} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ is defined by $(L_{\mathfrak{V},F} = 0)$ for every $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} = (p_{\underline{m}} \equiv 1)$. Then, we let $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = x_{\underline{w}}$ for all $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$. Now consider every $i \in [k]$. Upon setting $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{F_i,0}}, \underline{v}_{s_{F_i,0}})} \equiv 1$, we let $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} = x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$ be the de-homogenization of $x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$ for all $s \in S_{F_i}\backslash s_{F_i,o}$. From here, the statement is straightforward to check. □

Proposition 4.21. *Let the notation be as in Propsotion 4.20. Then, the scheme $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$ is defined by the following relations*

$$x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s},\ \forall\ s,t \in S_{F_i}\backslash s_{F_i},\ i \in [k], \tag{4.38}$$

$$x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_{F_i}} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_i})} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s},\ \forall\ s \in S_{F_i}\backslash s_{F_i},\ i \in [k], \tag{4.39}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V},[k]}, \tag{4.40}$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_i} :\ \sum_{s\in S_{F_i}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)},\ i \in [k], \tag{4.41}$$

$$\bar{F}_{\mathfrak{V},j} :\ \sum_{s\in S_{F_j}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s},\ \ k < j \leq \Upsilon. \tag{4.42}$$

where the equations of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V},[k]}$ are the de-homogenizations of the equations of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[k]}$.

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 4.14. □

For any $f \in R$, we let $\deg_{\varpi} f$ be the degree of f considered as a polynomial in ϖ-variables only.

Definition 4.22. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$ be a binomial relation of pre-quotient type. We say f is a binomial relation of quotient type if $\deg_{\varpi} f = 0$, that is, it does not contain any ϖ-variable. We let $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}$ be the set of all binomial relations of quotient type. Fix a standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ as in Definition 4.19, we let $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V},[k]} \subset \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V},[k]}$ be the subset of all the de-homogenized binomial relations of quotient type.*

We write

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}} := \mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V},[\Upsilon]}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V}} := \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V},[\Upsilon]}.$$

We let R_{ϱ} be the subring of R consisting of polynomials with ϱ-variables only. Then, binomial relations of quotient type belong to R_{ϱ}.

By Lemma 4.6, all binomials of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ are ϱ-linear, in particular, they are square-free.

Proposition 4.23. *Let the notation be as in Proposition 4.21 for $k = \Upsilon$. Then, the scheme $\mathscr{V} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$, is defined by*

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}, \quad \forall \ s,t \in S_F \backslash s_F, \tag{4.43}$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_F,s)} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}, \quad \forall \ s \in S_F \backslash s_F, \tag{4.44}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \tag{4.45}$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F} : \sum_{s \in S_F} \operatorname{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \tag{4.46}$$

for all $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ with $\bar{F}$ being expressed as $\operatorname{sgn}(s_F) x_{\underline{u}_F} + \sum_{s \in S_F \backslash s_F} \operatorname{sgn}(s) x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s}$. Here, we set

$$x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{m}} \equiv 1; \quad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}},\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}})} \equiv 1, \quad \forall \ \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}},$$

Moreover, every binomial $B_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is linear in ϱ-variables, in particular, square-free.

Proof. By Proposition 4.21 for $k = \Upsilon$, the scheme $\mathscr{V} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$, is defined by relations in (4.43), (4.44) , (4.46), and $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

It remains to reduce $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ to $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

We claim that any relation f of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ can be reduced to relations of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

We prove it by induction on $\deg_\varpi(f)$.

When $\deg_\varpi(f)=0$, the statement holds trivially.

Assume that statement holds for $\deg_\varpi < e$ for some $e>0$.

Consider $\deg_\varpi(f)=e$.

By Lemma 4.6, we can write

$$f = x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} \mathbf{n}_s - x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} \mathbf{n}_t$$

for some $s,t \in S_F$ and some $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. Because on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$, we have

$$x_{\underline{u}_s} x_{\underline{v}_s} - x_{\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}}} x_{\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}}} x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)},\ x_{\underline{u}_t} x_{\underline{v}_t} - x_{\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}}} x_{\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}}} x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)},$$

where $s_{F,o}$ is as in Definition 4.19 with $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}},\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}})} \equiv 1$, we get

$$f = x_{\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}}} x_{\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}}} (x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \mathbf{n}_s - x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} \mathbf{n}_t).$$

Observe that $(x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \mathbf{n}_s - x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} \mathbf{n}_t) \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. Since $\deg_\varpi(x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \mathbf{n}_s - x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} \mathbf{n}_t) < e$, the statement then follows from the inductive assumption. □

Definition 4.24. *We let $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{B}^{\text{res}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$) be the set of all binomial relations of* (4.44) *(respectively,* (4.43), (4.45)*). We call relations of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{B}^{\text{res}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$) main (respectively, residual, of quotient type) binomial on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$. We let*

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}} \sqcup \mathcal{B}^{\text{res}} \sqcup \mathcal{B}^{\text{q}} \ \text{ and } \ \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\text{res}}_{\mathfrak{V}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\text{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}.$$

We let $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ be the set of all linear equations of (4.46)*. We call relations of $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ linearized Plücker relations on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.*

5. ϑ-Blowups

We begin now the process of "removing" zero factors of main binomials by sequential blowups. It is divided into two subsequences. The first are ϑ-blowups.

To start, it is useful to fix some terminology, used throughout.

5.1. **Some conventions on blowups.**

Let X be a scheme over the base field $\mathbf{k}$. When we blow up the scheme X along the ideal (the homogeneous ideal, respectively) $I = \langle f_0, \cdots, f_m \rangle$, generated by some elements $f_0, \cdots, f_m$, we will realize the blowup scheme $\widetilde{X}$ as the graph of the closure of the rational map

$$f : X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^m,$$

$$x \to [f_0(x), \cdots, f_m(x)].$$

Then, upon fixing the generators $f_0, \cdots, f_m$, we have a natural embedding

$$\widetilde{X} \hookrightarrow X \times \mathbb{P}^m. \tag{5.1}$$

We let

$$\pi : \widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X \tag{5.2}$$

be the induced blowup morphism.

We will refer to the projective space $\mathbb{P}^m$ as the *factor projective space* of the blowup corresponding to the generators $f_0, \cdots, f_m$. We let $[\xi_0, \cdots, \xi_m]$ be the homogeneous coordinates of the factor projective space $\mathbb{P}^m$, corresponding to $(f_0, \cdots, f_m)$.

When X is smooth and the center of the blowup is also smooth, then, the scheme $\widetilde{X}$, as a closed subscheme of $X \times \mathbb{P}^m$, is defined by the relations

$$f_i\xi_j - f_j\xi_i, \text{ for all } 0 \leq i \neq j \leq m. \tag{5.3}$$

Definition 5.1. *Suppose that the scheme X is covered by a set $\{\mathfrak{V}'\}$ of open subsets, called (standard) charts.*

Fix any $0 \leq i \leq m$. We let

$$\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_i \neq 0)) \cap \widetilde{X}. \tag{5.4}$$

We also often express this chart as

$$\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_i \equiv 1)) \cap \widetilde{X}.$$

It is an open subset of $\widetilde{X}$, and will be called a standard chart of $\widetilde{X}$ lying over the (standard) chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of X. Note that every standard chart of $\widetilde{X}$ lies over a unique (standard) chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of X. Clearly, $\widetilde{X}$ is covered by the finitely many standard charts.

In general, we let

$$\widetilde{X}_k \longrightarrow \widetilde{X}_{k-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \widetilde{X}_0 := X$$

be a sequence of blowups such that every blowup $\widetilde{X_j} \to \widetilde{X}_{j-1}$ *is as in* (5.1), $j \in [k]$.

Consider any $0 \leq j < k$. *Let* $\mathfrak{V}$ *(resp.* $\mathfrak{V}''$*) be a standard chart of* $\widetilde{X}_k$ *(resp. of* $\widetilde{X}_j$*). Let* $\mathfrak{V}'$ *be the unique standard chart* $\mathfrak{V}'$ *of* $\widetilde{X}_{k-1}$ *such that* $\mathfrak{V}$ *lies over* $\mathfrak{V}'$. *Via induction, we say* $\mathfrak{V}$ *lies over* $\mathfrak{V}''$ *if* $\mathfrak{V}'$ *equals to (when* $j = k-1$*) or lies over* $\mathfrak{V}''$ *(when* $j < k-1$*).*

We keep the notation as above. Let $\widetilde{X} \to X$ be a blowup as in (5.1); we let $\mathfrak{V}$ be a standard chart of $\widetilde{X}$, lying over a unique (standard) chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of X; let $\pi_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}'} : \mathfrak{V} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{V}'$ be the induced projection.

Definition 5.2. *Assume that the open chart* $\mathfrak{V}$ *(resp.* $\mathfrak{V}'$*) comes equipped with a set of free variables in* $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *(resp.* $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$*). Let* $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *(resp.* $y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$*) be a coordinate variable of* $\mathfrak{V}$ *(resp.* $\mathfrak{V}'$*). We say the coordinate variable* y *is a proper transform of the coordinate variable* y' *if the divisor* $(y = 0)$ *on the chart* $\mathfrak{V}$ *is the proper transform of the divisor* $(y' = 0)$ *on the chart* $\mathfrak{V}'$.

Keep the notation and assumption as in Definition 5.2.

We assume in addition that the induced blowup morphism

$$\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{V}') \longrightarrow \mathfrak{V}'$$

corresponds to the blowup of $\mathfrak{V}'$ along the coordinate subspace of $\mathfrak{V}'$ defined by

$$Z = \{y'_0 = \cdots = y'_m = 0\}$$

with $\{y'_0, \cdots, y'_m\} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. As earlier, we let $\mathbb{P}^m$ be the corresponding factor projective space with homogeneous coordinates $[\xi_0, \cdots, \xi_m]$, corresponding to $(y'_0, \cdots, y'_m)$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ corresponds to $(\xi_0 \equiv 1)$, that is,

$$\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1)) \cap \widetilde{X}.$$

Then, we have that $\mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1)$, is defined

$$y'_i - y'_0 \xi_i, \ \text{ for all } i \in [m]. \tag{5.5}$$

The following proposition is standard and will be applied throughout.

Proposition 5.3. *Keep the notation and assumption as above. In addition, we let E be the exceptional divisor of the blowup $\widetilde{X} \to X$.*

Then, the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ comes equipped with a set of free variables

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{\zeta, y_1, \cdots, y_m; y := y' \mid y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \backslash \{y'_0, \cdots, y'_m\}\}$$

where $\zeta := y'_0, y_i := \xi_i, i \in [m]$ such that

(1) *$E \cap \mathfrak{V} = (\zeta = 0)$; we call ζ the exceptional variable/parameter of E on $\mathfrak{V}$;*
(2) *$y_i \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is a proper transform of $y'_i \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ for all $i \in [m]$;*
(3) *$y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is a proper transform of $y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ for all $y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \backslash \{y'_0, \cdots, y'_m\}$.*

Proof. It is straightforward from (5.5). □

Let $\mathbf{m}$ be a monomial in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. Then, for every variable $x \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, we let $\deg_x \mathbf{m}$ be the degree of x in $\mathbf{m}$.

Definition 5.4. *Keep the notation and assumption as in Proposition 5.3. In addition, we let*

$$\phi = \{y'_0, \cdots, y'_m\} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}.$$

Let $B_{\mathfrak{V}'} = T^0_{\mathfrak{V}'} - T^1_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ be a binomial with variables in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. We let

$$m_{\phi, T^i_{\mathfrak{V}'}} = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \deg_{y'_j}(T^i_{\mathfrak{V}'}), \quad i = 0, 1,$$

$$l_{\phi, B_{\mathfrak{V}'}} = \min\{m_{\phi, T^0_{\mathfrak{V}'}}, m_{\phi, T^1_{\mathfrak{V}'}}\}.$$

Applying (5.5), we substitute y'_i by $y'_0 \xi_i$, for all $i \in [m]$, into $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ and switch y'_0 by ζ and ξ_i by y_i with $i \in [m]$ to obtain the pullback $\pi^*_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}'} B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ where $\pi_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}'} : \mathfrak{V} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{V}'$ is the induced projection. We then let

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}} = (\pi^*_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}'} B_{\mathfrak{V}'}) / \zeta^{l_{\phi, B_{\mathfrak{V}'}}}. \tag{5.6}$$

We call $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$, a binomial in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, the proper transform of $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$.

In general, for any polynomial $f_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ such that $f_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ does not vanish identically along $Z = (y'_0 = \cdots = y'_m = 0)$, we let $f_{\mathfrak{V}} = \pi^*_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}'} f_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. This is the pullback, but for convenience, we also call $f_{\mathfrak{V}}$ the proper transform of $f_{\mathfrak{V}'}$.

Moreover, suppose ζ appears in $B_{\mathfrak{V}} = (\pi^*_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}'}B_{\mathfrak{V}'})/\zeta^{l_{\psi,B_{\mathfrak{V}'}}}$ or in $f_{\mathfrak{V}} = \pi^*_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}'}f_{\mathfrak{V}'}$, and is obtained through the substitution y'_i by $y'_0\xi_i$ (note here that $\zeta := y'_0$ and i needs not to be unique), then we say that the exceptional parameter ζ is acquired by y'_i. In general, for sequential blowups, if ζ is acquired by y' and y' is acquired by y'', then we also say ζ is acquired by y''.

Lemma 5.5. *We keep the same assumption and notation as in Definition 5.4.*

We let $T_{\mathfrak{V}',B}$ (resp. $T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$) be any fixed term of $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ (resp. $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$). Consider any $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}\backslash\zeta$ and let $y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ be such that y is the proper transform of y'. Then, $y^b \mid T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ if and only if $y'^b \mid T_{\mathfrak{V}',B}$ for all integers $b \geq 0$.

Proof. This is clear from (5.6). □

Definition 5.6. *We keep the same assumption and notation as in Definition 5.4.*

Consider an arbitrary binomial $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ (resp. $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$) with variables in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ (resp. $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$). Let $\mathbf{z}' \in \mathfrak{V}'$ (resp. $\mathbf{z} \in \mathfrak{V}$) be any fixed closed point of the chart. We say $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ (resp. $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$) terminates at $\mathbf{z}'$ (resp. $\mathbf{z}$) if (at least) one of the monomial terms of $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ (resp. $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$), say, $T_{\mathfrak{V}',B}$ (resp. $T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$), does not vanish at $\mathbf{z}'$ (resp. $\mathbf{z}$). In such a case, we also say $T_{\mathfrak{V}',B}$ (resp. $T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$) terminates at $\mathbf{z}'$ (resp. $\mathbf{z}$).

5.2. **Main binomial equations: revisited.**

Recall that we have chosen and fix the total order " $<$ " on $\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ and we have listed it as

$$\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}} = \{\bar{F}_1 < \cdots < \bar{F}_\Upsilon\}.$$

Fix and consider F_k for any $k \in [\Upsilon]$. We express $F_k = \sum_{s\in S_{F_k}} \mathrm{sgn}(s)p_{\underline{u}_s}p_{\underline{v}_s}$. Its corresponding linearized Plücker equation can be expressed as $\sum_{s\in S_{F_k}} \mathrm{sgn}(s)x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$, denoted by L_{F_k}. We let $s_{F_k} \in S_{F_k}$ be the index for the leading term of F_k, written as $\mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k})p_{\underline{m}}p_{\underline{u}_{F_k}}$. Correspondingly, the leading term of the de-homogenization $\bar{F}_k$ of F_k, and the leading term of the linearized Plücker equation L_{F_k}, are defined to be $\mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k})x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}}$, and $\mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k})x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$, respectively.

We are to provide a total ordering on the set $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$.

Recall that the set of all Plücker-variables is also totally ordered, compatible with that on $\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. (It is neither lexicographical nor inverse-lexicographical.)

Throughout the remaining part of this article, when we use $<_{\text{lex}}$, we mean the lexicographical order induced on the power set 2^K for a given totally ordered set $(K, <)$ (see Definition 3.11).

Definition 5.7. *First, for any fixed $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, we provide a total ordering on the set $S_F \backslash s_F$ by induction on* rank F *as follows.*

• *Suppose* rank $F = 0$. *Then, $S_F \backslash s_F$ consists of two elements $\{s, t\}$. We say $s < t$ if $(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s) <_{\text{lex}} (\underline{u}_t, \underline{v}_t)$ where each pair is listed lexicographically according to the order on the set of all Plücker variables.*

Suppose the set $S_F \backslash s_F$ is totally order when rank $F = r - 1$ *for some $r > 0$.*

• *Suppose* rank $F = r > 0$. *Then, for any $s \in S_F \backslash s_F$, one of $p_{\underline{u}_s}$ and $p_{\underline{v}_s}$ is a basic variable, the other is of rank equal to* rank $F - 1$. *Without loss of generality, we suppose* rank $p_{\underline{u}_s} = r - 1$ *and let $F_{\underline{u}_s}$ be its corresponding Plücker relation. Then, we say $s < t$ if $F_{\underline{u}_s} < F_{\underline{u}_t}$, that is if $\underline{u}_s < \underline{u}_t$.*

Let $B' \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{F'}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{F}$ with $F' \neq F$. We say $B' < B$ if $F' < F$.

Consider two elements in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_F$. By Definition 4.16, we have $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_F = \{B_{F,(s_F,s)} \mid s \in S_F \setminus s_F\}$. For any two distinct $s, t \in S_F \backslash s_F$, we say $B_{F,(s_F,s)} < B_{F,(s_F,t)}$ if $s < t$.

Then, by Definition 3.14, the above provides a total ordering on the set of all main binomials $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}} = \sqcup_{\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_F$.

This ordering is important for our purpose.

Recall that we have

$$\mathfrak{G} = \bigsqcup_{\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathfrak{G}_F,$$

where $\mathfrak{G}_F = \{\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_F, L_F\}$. We can endow a total order on $\mathfrak{G}$ as follows. We say $\mathfrak{G}_{F'} < \mathfrak{G}_F$ if $F' < F$. This order is compatible with the order on $\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ as well as on $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}$. Put it equivalently, the order on $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}$ is induced by the order on $\mathfrak{G}$ and the order on each and every $S_F \backslash s_F$.

As in Definition 3.1, we let $(\mathfrak{t}_{F_k} + 1)$ be the number of terms in F_k. Then, we can list S_{F_k} as

$$S_{F_k} = \{s_{F_k};\ s_1 < \cdots < s_{\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}\}.$$

Then, by Corollary 4.15, the scheme $\mathscr{V}$ as a closed subscheme of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \times \prod_{\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \mathbb{P}_F$ is defined by the following relations

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{res}},\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}, \tag{5.7}$$

$$B_{(k\tau)}:\ x_{(\underline{u}_{s_\tau},\underline{v}_{s_\tau})}x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}} - x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}x_{\underline{u}_{s_\tau}}x_{\underline{v}_{s_\tau}},\ \ \forall\ \ s_\tau \in S_{F_k}\backslash s_{F_k},\ 1\leq \tau \leq \mathfrak{t}_{F_k}, \tag{5.8}$$

$$L_{F_k}:\ \sum_{s\in S_{F_k}} \mathrm{sgn}(s)x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \tag{5.9}$$

$$\bar{F}_k = \sum_{s\in S_{F_k}} \mathrm{sgn}(s)x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s} \tag{5.10}$$

for all $k\in[\Upsilon]$.

Definition 5.8. *Given any binomial equation $B_{(k\tau)}$ as in* (5.8)*, we let $T^+_{(k\tau)} = x_{(\underline{u}_{s_\tau},\underline{v}_{s_\tau})}x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}}$, called the plus-term of $B_{(k\tau)}$, and $T^-_{(k\tau)} = x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}x_{\underline{u}_{s_\tau}}x_{\underline{v}_{s_\tau}}$, called the minus-term of $B_{(k\tau)}$. Then, we have $B_{(k\tau)} = T^+_{(k\tau)} - T^-_{(k\tau)}$.*

We do not name any term of a binomial of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{res}}\cup\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}$ a plus-term or a minus-term since the two terms of such a binomial are indistinguishable.

In addition, we let $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{F_k} = \{B_{(k\tau)} \mid \tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]\}$ for any $k\in[\Upsilon]$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}} = \bigsqcup_{k\in[\Upsilon]} \mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_{F_k} = \{B_{(k\tau)} \mid k\in[\Upsilon],\ \tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]\}.$$

We let

$$\text{Index}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}} = \{(k\tau) \mid k\in[\Upsilon],\ \tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]\} \tag{5.11}$$

be the index set of $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}$. Observe that the order " $<$ " on the set $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}$ now coincides with the lexicographic order on $\text{Index}_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}}$, that is,

$$B_{(k\tau)} < B_{(k'\tau')} \iff (k,\tau) <_{\text{lex}} (k',\tau').$$

Further, because $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}_F = \{B_{F,(s_F,s)} \mid s\in S_F\backslash s_F\}$, we have a natural bijection between $\mathcal{B}^{\text{mn}}$ and $\sqcup_F(S_F\backslash s_F)$. Hence, $\sqcup_F(S_F\backslash s_F)$ admits an induced total order.

5.3. **ϑ-centers and ϑ-blowups.**

Besides serving as a part of the process of "removing" zero factors of the main binomial relations, the reason to perform ϑ-blowups first is to eliminate all residual binomial relations by making them dependent on the main binomial relations.

Recall that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} := \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ comes equipped with two kinds of divisors: ϖ-divisors $X_{\underline{w}}$ for all $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash \underline{m}$ and ϱ-divisors $X_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ for all $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$.

Definition 5.9. *Fix any $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$. We let*

$$\vartheta_{\underline{u}} = (X_{\underline{u}}, X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u})}).$$

We call it the ϑ-set with respect to $\underline{u}$. We then call the scheme-theoretic intersection

$$Z_{\vartheta_{\underline{u}}} = X_{\underline{u}} \cap X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u})}$$

the ϑ-center with respect to $\underline{u}$.

We let

$$\Theta = \{\vartheta_{\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}\}, \quad \mathcal{Z}_\Theta = \{Z_{\vartheta_{\underline{u}}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}\}.$$

We let Θ, respectively, $\mathcal{Z}_\Theta$, inherit the total order from $\mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$. Thus, if we write

$$\mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n} = \{\underline{u}_1 < \cdots < \underline{u}_\Upsilon\}$$

and also write $\vartheta_{\underline{u}_k} = \vartheta_{[k]}$, $Z_{\vartheta_{\underline{u}_k}} = Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, then, we can express

$$\mathcal{Z}_\Theta = \{Z_{\vartheta_{[1]}} < \cdots < Z_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}}\}.$$

We then blow up $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ along $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, $k \in [\Upsilon]$, in the above order. More precisely, we start by setting $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} := \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. Suppose $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ has been constructed for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$. We then let

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$$

be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ along the proper transform of $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, and we call it the ϑ-blowup in $(\vartheta_{[k]})$.

The above gives rise to the following sequential ϑ-blowups

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}} \to \cdots \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[1]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} := \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}, \tag{5.12}$$

Every blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[j]}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[j-1]}}$ comes equipped with an exceptional divisor, denoted by $E_{\vartheta_{[j]}}$. Fix $k \in [\Upsilon]$. For any $j < k$, we let $E_{\vartheta_{[k]},j}$ be the proper transform of $E_{\vartheta_{[j]}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$. For notational consistency, we set $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}} = E_{\vartheta_{[k]},k}$. We call the divisors $E_{\vartheta_{[k]},j}$, $j \leq k$, the exceptional divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

For every $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \setminus \underline{m}$, we let $X_{\vartheta_{[k]},\underline{w}}$ be the proper transform of $X_{\underline{w}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, still called ϖ-divisor; for every $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$, we let $X_{\vartheta_{[k]},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ be the proper transform of $X_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, still called ϱ-divisor. for every $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, we let $D_{\vartheta_{[k]},L}$ be the proper transform of D_{L_F} in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, still called the $\mathfrak{L}$-divisor.

5.4. **Properties of ϑ-blowups.**

By Definition 5.1, the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ is covered by a set of standard charts.

Proposition 5.10. *Consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, lying over a unique chart $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} = \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. We suppose that the chart $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ is indexed by $\Lambda^{o}_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}} = \{(\underline{u}_{\mathfrak{s}_{F,o}}, \underline{v}_{\mathfrak{s}_{F,o}}) \mid \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}\}$ (cf. (4.37)). We let $\mathbb{I}^{*}_{d,n} = \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \setminus \underline{m}$ and $\Lambda^{\star}_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}} = \Lambda_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}} \setminus \Lambda^{o}_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$.*

Then, the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ comes equipped with

$$\text{a subset } \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} \subset \mathbb{I}^{*}_{d,n} \text{ and a subset } \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} \subset \Lambda^{\star}_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$$

such that every exceptional divisor of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ with $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$ is either labeled by a unique element $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ or labeled by a unique element $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. We let $E_{\vartheta_{[k]},\underline{w}}$ be the unique exceptional divisor on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ labeled by $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$; we call it an ϖ-exceptional divisor. We let $E_{\vartheta_{[k]},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ be the unique exceptional divisor on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ labeled by $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$; we call it an ϱ-exceptional divisor. (We note here that being ϖ-exceptional or ϱ-exceptional is strictly relative to the given standard chart.)

Further, the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ comes equipped with the set of free variables

$$\text{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} := \left\{ \begin{array}{cc|c} \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}}, & \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} & \underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} \\ x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}}, & x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} & \underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}^{*}_{d,n} \setminus \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{\star}_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}} \setminus \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} \end{array} \right\} \tag{5.13}$$

such that on the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$, we have

1. *the divisor $X_{\vartheta_{[k]},\underline{w}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ is defined by $(x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = 0)$ for every $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}^{*}_{d,n} \setminus \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$;*
2. *the divisor $X_{\vartheta_{[k]},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ is defined by $(x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$ for every $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{\star}_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}} \setminus \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$;*

(3) *the divisor* $D_{\vartheta_{[k]},L} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *is defined by* $(L_{\mathfrak{V},F} = 0)$ *for every* $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ *where* $L_{\mathfrak{V},F}$ *is the proper transform of* L_F*;*

(4) *the divisor* $X_{\vartheta_{[k]},\underline{w}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *does not intersect the chart for all* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(5) *the divisor* $X_{\vartheta_{[k]},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ *does not intersect the chart for all* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(6) *the* ϖ*-exceptional divisor* $E_{\vartheta_{[k]},\underline{w}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by an element* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *is define by* $(\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = 0)$ *for all* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(7) *the* ϱ*-exceptional divisor* $E_{\vartheta_{[k]},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by an element* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *is define by* $(\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$ *for all* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(8) *any of the remaining exceptional divisor of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ *other than those that are labelled by some* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *or* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *does not intersect the chart.*

Proof. When $k = 0$, we have $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} = \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. In this case, we set

$$\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \emptyset.$$

Then, the statement follows from Proposition 4.20 with $k = \Upsilon$.

We now suppose that the statement holds for $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

We consider $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

As in the statement, we let $\mathfrak{V}$ be a standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, lying over a (necessarily unique) standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$.

If $(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k) \in \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ (cf. (4.37)), then $\mathfrak{V}'$ does not intersect the proper transform of the blowup center Z_{ϑ_k} and $\mathfrak{V} \to \mathfrak{V}'$ is an isomorphism. In this case, we let $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$, $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'} = \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, and $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Then, the statements on $\mathfrak{V}'$ carry over to $\mathfrak{V}$.

In what follows, we assume $(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k) \notin \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

Consider the embedding

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ is the factor projective space with homogeneous coordinates $[\xi_0,\xi_1]$ corresponding to $(X_{\underline{u}_k}, X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)})$. We let $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ be the exceptional divisor created by the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$.

First, we consider the case when

$$\mathfrak{V} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1).$$

We let Z'_{ϑ_k} be the proper transform of the ϑ-center Z_{ϑ_k} in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$. Then, in this case, on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$, we have

$$Z'_{\vartheta_k} \cap \mathfrak{V}' = \{x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k} = x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = 0\}$$

where $x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k}$ (resp. $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$) is the proper transform of $x_{\underline{u}}$ (resp. $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$) on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$. Then, $\mathfrak{V}$ as a closed subset of $\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1)$ is defined by

$$x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k}\xi_1.$$

We let

$$\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \underline{u}_k \sqcup \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \text{ and}$$

$$\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} = x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k},\ x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = \xi_1;\ y_{\mathfrak{V}} = y_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \forall\ y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\backslash\{x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k}, x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}\}.$$

Observe that $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} = 0)$ and $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = \xi_1$ is the proper transform of $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$. By the inductive assumption on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$, one verifies directly that (1) - (7) of the proposition hold (cf. Proposition 5.3).

Next, we consider the case when

$$\mathfrak{V} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_1 \equiv 1).$$

Then, $\mathfrak{V}$ as a closed subset of $\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_1 \equiv 1)$ is defined by

$$x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k} = x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}\xi_0.$$

We let

$$\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)\} \sqcup \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \text{ and}$$

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)},\ x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} = \xi_0;\ y_{\mathfrak{V}} = y_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \forall\ y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\backslash\{x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k}, x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}\}.$$

Observe that $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = 0)$ and $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} = \xi_0$ is the proper transform of $x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k}$. By the inductive assumption on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$, like in the above case, one checks directly that (1) - (7) of the proposition hold.

This proves the proposition. □

Observe here that $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}}$ with $\underline{u} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ and $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ with $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \delta_{\mathfrak{V}}$ are not variables in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. For notational convenience, to be used throughout, we make a convention:

(5.14) • $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}} = 1$ if $\underline{u} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$; • $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 1$ if $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

For any $k \in [\Upsilon]$, the ϑ-blowup in $(\vartheta_{[k]})$ gives rise to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} & \hookrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathscr{V} & \hookrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}, \end{array} \tag{5.15}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ is the proper transform of $\mathscr{V}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Alternatively, we can set $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} := \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}}$. Suppose $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ has been constructed for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$. We then let $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ be the proper transform of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$.

Definition 5.11. *Fix any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ lying over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ for any $k \in [\Upsilon]$. When $k = 0$, we let $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ and $L_{\mathfrak{V},F}$ be as in Proposition 4.23 for any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\rm res} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\rm q}$ and $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. Consider any fixed general $k \in [\Upsilon]$. Suppose $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ and $L_{\mathfrak{V}',F}$ have been constructed over $\mathfrak{V}'$. Applying Definition 5.4, we obtain the proper transforms on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$*

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}}, \ \ \forall\ B \in \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\rm res} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\rm q}; \ \ L_{\mathfrak{V},F}, \ \ \forall\ \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}.$$

We need the following notations.

Fix any $k \in [\Upsilon]$. We let $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{<k}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}^{\rm res}_{<k}$ or $L_{<k}$) be the set of all main (resp. residual or linear Plücker) relations corresponding to $F < F_k$. Similarly, we let $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{>k}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}^{\rm res}_{>k}$, $\mathcal{L}_{>k}$) be the set of all main (resp. residual or linear Plücker) relations corresponding to $F > F_k$. Likewise, replacing $<$ by $\leq$ or $>$ by $\geq$, we can introduce $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\leq k}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\rm res}_{\leq k}$, and $L_{\leq k}$ or $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\geq k}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\rm res}_{\geq k}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\geq k}$. Then, upon restricting the above to a fixed standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$, we obtain $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V},<k}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\rm res}_{\mathfrak{V},<k}$, $L_{\mathfrak{V},<k}$, etc..

Recall from the above proof, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\vartheta_k}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta_k}$ be the factor projective space of the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$. We write $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta_k} = \mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$ such that $[\xi_0, \xi_1]$ corresponds to $(X_{\underline{u}_k}, X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)})$.

Definition 5.12. *Let $\mathfrak{V}'$ be any standard chart on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$. Then, we call*

$$\mathfrak{V} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1))$$

a ϖ-standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$; we call

$$\mathfrak{V} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_1 \equiv 1))$$

a ϱ-standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Proposition 5.13. *We keep the notation and assumptions in Proposition 5.10.*

Suppose $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \in \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ or $\mathfrak{V}$ is a ϱ-standard chart. Then, we have that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V},<k}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{V},<k}, \tag{5.16}$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s)}: \qquad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} - \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}, \quad \forall \ s \in S_{F_k} \backslash s_{F_k}, \tag{5.17}$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k}: \ \operatorname{sgn}(s_F) \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} + \sum_{s \in S_F \backslash s_F} \operatorname{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \tag{5.18}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \tag{5.19}$$

where $\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s}$ and $\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}$ are some monomials in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

Suppose $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \notin \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ and $\mathfrak{V}$ is a ϖ-standard chart. Then, we have that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V},<k}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{V},<k}, \tag{5.20}$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s)}: \qquad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}, \quad \forall \ s \in S_{F_k} \backslash s_{F_k}, \tag{5.21}$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k}: \ \operatorname{sgn}(s_F) \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} + \sum_{s \in S_F \backslash s_F} \operatorname{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \tag{5.22}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \tag{5.23}$$

where $\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s}$ and $\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}$ are some monomials in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

Moreover, for any binomial $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} \sqcup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{>k}$, $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is ϱ-linear and square-free.

Furthermore, consider an arbitrary binomial $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$ and its proper transform $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$. Let $T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ be any fixed term of $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$. Then, $T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ is ϱ-linear and admits at most one ϑ-exceptional parameter in the form of $\delta_{(\underline{m},\underline{u})}$ for some $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ or $\varepsilon_{\underline{u}} x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u})}$ for some $\underline{u} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. In particular, it is square-free.

Proof. We follow the notation as in the proof of Proposition 5.10.

When $k = 0$, we have $(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}}) = (\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}})$. Then, the statement follows from Proposition 4.23.

Suppose that the statement holds for $(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}})$ for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

We now consider $(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}})$.

As in the proof of Proposition 5.10, we let $\mathfrak{V}$ be a standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ lying over a (necessarily unique) standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$. Also, $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ of of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}}$. We let $\pi_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}} : \mathfrak{V} \to \mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ be the induced projection.

To prove the statement about the defining equations of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ in $\mathfrak{V}$, by applying the inductive assumption to $\mathfrak{V}'$, it suffices to prove that the proper transform of any residual binomial of F_k depends on the main binomials on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

For that purpose, we take any two $s, t \in S_{F_k} \backslash s_{F_k}$ and consider the residual binomial $B_{F_k,(s,t)}$ (cf. (4.32)).

Suppose $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \in \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, hence $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} \equiv 1$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$. In this case, the blowup along (the proper transform of) $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ does not affect the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$. Likewise, suppose $\mathfrak{V}$ is a ϱ-standard chart. Then, $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, hence $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = 1$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ by (5.14). In any case, one calculates and finds that we have the following two main binomials

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s)} : \qquad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} - \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s},$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},t)} : \qquad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} - \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t},$$

where $\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = \pi^*_{\mathfrak{V},\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{w}}$ denoted the pullback for any $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \backslash \underline{m}$. Similarly, one calculates and finds that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}.$$

Then, one verifies directly that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)} = x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},t)} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s)}.$$

This proves the statement about the defining equations of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ in $\mathfrak{V}$.

Moreover, consider any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ with respect to F_j. Observe that $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ uniquely appears in the main binomials with respect to F_k; $x_{\underline{u}_k}$ only appears in the main binomials with respect to F_k and the minus terms of certain main binomials of F_j with $j > k$. It follows that $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is ϱ-linear and square-free.

Likewise, consider any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}$ with respect to F_j with $j > k$. It is of the form

$$B_{(s,t)} : \quad x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}x_{\underline{u}_t}x_{\underline{v}_t} - x_{(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)}x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s}$$

for some $s \neq t \in S_{F_j}$. Observe here that B does not contain any ϱ-variable of the form $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u})}$ and the ϖ-variables in B are identical to those of the minus terms of the corresponding main binomials. Hence, the same line of the proof above for main binomials implies that $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is ϱ-linear and square-free.

Further, consider any $B \in \mathcal{B}^q$. If $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ does not contain $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ or $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \in \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, then the form of $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ remains unchanged (except for the meanings of its variables). Suppose next that $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ contains $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ and $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \notin \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$. Note that the proper transform of the ϑ-center $\vartheta_{[k]}$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ equals to $(x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k}, x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)})$. Thus, from the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ to the ϱ-standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$, we have that $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ becomes $\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ in $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$. By Lemma 4.6 (2), applied to the variable $p_{\underline{m}}$ (before de-homogenization), we see that any fixed term T_B of B contains at most one ϱ-variables of the form $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u})}$ with $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$. Hence, one sees that the last statement on $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ holds, in this case.

Thus, this proves the statement of the proposition when $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \in \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ or when $\mathfrak{V}$ is a ϱ-standard chart.

Next, we consider the case when $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \notin \Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ and $\mathfrak{V}$ is a ϖ-standard chart.

Again, to prove the statement about the defining equations of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ in $\mathfrak{V}$, it suffices to prove that the proper transform of any residual binomial of F_k depends on the main binomials on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

To show this, we again take any two $s, t \in S_{F_k} \backslash s_{F_k}$.

On the chart $\mathfrak{V}$, we have the following two the main binomials

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s)} : \qquad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s},$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},t)} : \qquad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t}.$$

We also have the following residual binomial

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}.$$

Then, we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)} = \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t}B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s)} - \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s}\tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},t)}.$$

Thus, the statement of the proposition about the equations of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ follows.

Next, consider any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$. The fact that $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is ϱ-linear and square-free follows from the same line of proof in the previous case.

Finally, consider any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{q}$. If $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ does not contain $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$, then the form of $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ remains unchanged. Suppose next that $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ contains $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$. Again, the proper transform of the ϑ-center $\vartheta_{[k]}$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ equals to $(x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_k}, x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)})$. Hence, from the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ to the ϖ-standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$, we have that $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ turns into $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k}x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ in $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$. Then, again, by applying Lemma 4.6 (2), applied to the variable $p_{\underline{m}}$ (before de-homogenization), we have that any fixed term T_B of B contains at most one ϱ-variables of the form $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u})}$ with $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$. Hence, one sees that the last statement on $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ holds.

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

We need the final case of ϑ-blowups.

We set $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}}$. $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta} := \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}}$.

Corollary 5.14. *Let the notation be as in Proposition 4.21 for $k = \Upsilon$. Then, the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]}}$, is defined by*

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ \ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}. \tag{5.24}$$

Further, for any binomial $B_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, it is ϱ-linear and square-free.

Corollary 5.15. *Fix any $k \in [\Upsilon]$. Let $X_{\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ be the proper transform of $X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$. Then*

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta} \cap X_{\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = \emptyset.$$

In particular, $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta}$ is covered by the standard charts that either lie over the chart $(x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} \equiv 1)$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ or the ϱ-standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Proof. Fix any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

If $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over the chart $(x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} \equiv 1)$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$, that is, $(\underline{m}, \underline{u}_k) \in \Lambda^{o}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, then the first statement $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta} \cap X_{\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = \emptyset$ follows from the definition.

If $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over a ϱ-standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, then the fact that $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta} \cap X_{\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = \emptyset$ follows from Proposition 5.10 (4); $x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} = 1$ by the convention (5.14).

Suppose $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over a ϖ-standard chart $\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$. Then, in this case, we have the following main binomial relation on the chart $\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s_{F,o})}: \qquad 1 - x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}},\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}}} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}},\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}}} \tag{5.25}$$

because $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}},(\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}},\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}})} \equiv 1$ with $(\underline{u}_{s_{F,o}}, \underline{u}_{s_{F,o}}) \in \Lambda^{o}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ and $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}},\underline{u}_k} = 1$ by (5.14). Thus $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta_{[k]}},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ is nowhere vanishing along $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$. This implies the statement. □

Definition 5.16. *We call any standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$ as described by Corollary 5.15 a preferred standard chart.*

6. $\wp$- and ℓ-Blowups

6.1. The initial setup: $\wp_0$-blowups and ℓ_0-blowup.

Our initial scheme is $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{-1}} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$.

We let

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_0} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_0} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{-1}} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$$

be the trivial blowups along the empty set. In the sequel, a blowup is called trivial if it is a blowup along the emptyset. We make the identifications

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_0} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_0} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{-1}} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}.$$

For any $k \in [\Upsilon]$, we are to construct

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}}.$$

The morphism $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}}$ is decomposed as a sequential blowups based on all relations in $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$, and, $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ is a single blowup based on L_{F_k}.

We do it by induction on the set $[\Upsilon]$.

As a part of the initial data on the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{-1}} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$, we have equipped it with the following sets of divisors,

• The set $\mathcal{D}_{\vartheta,\varpi}$ of the proper transforms $X_{\vartheta,\underline{w}}$ of ϖ-divisors $X_{\underline{w}}$ for all $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n} \backslash \underline{m}$. These are still called ϖ-divisors.

• The set $\mathcal{D}_{\vartheta,\varrho}$ of the proper transforms $X_{\vartheta,(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ of ϱ-divisors $X_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ for all $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$. These are still called ϱ-divisors.

• The set $\mathcal{E}_\vartheta$ of the proper transforms $E_{\vartheta,k} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$ of the ϑ-exceptional divisors $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ for all $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

• The set $\mathcal{D}_{\vartheta,\mathfrak{L}}$ of the proper transforms D_{ϑ,L_F} of $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors D_{L_F} for all $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. These are still called $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors.

On the intial scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$, we have the set of divisors

$$\mathcal{D}_\vartheta = \mathcal{D}_{\vartheta,\varrho} \sqcup \mathcal{D}_{\vartheta,\varpi} \sqcup \mathcal{E}_\vartheta.$$

In addition, we have $\mathcal{D}_{\vartheta,\mathfrak{L}}$. The set $\mathcal{D}_{\vartheta,\mathfrak{L}}$ will not be used until the ℓ-blowup.

As the further initial data, we need to introduce the instrumental notion: "association" with multiplicity as follows.

Definition 6.1. *Consider any main binomial relation $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ written as*

$$B = B_{\mathfrak{V},(s_{F_k},s)} = T_B^+ - T_B^- : \qquad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_k} - x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}$$

for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$ and $s \in S_{F_k}$, where $\underline{u}_k = \underline{u}_{F_k}$. Consider any ϖ-divisor, ϱ-divisor, or exceptional divisor Y on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$.

Let $Y = X_{\vartheta,\underline{u}}$ be any ϖ divisor for some $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$. We set

$$m_{Y,T_B^+} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \underline{u} = \underline{u}_k \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$m_{Y,T_B^-} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \underline{u} = \underline{u}_s \text{ or } \underline{u} = \underline{v}_s, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Y = X_{\vartheta,(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ be any ϱ divisor. We set

$$m_{Y,T_B^+} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (\underline{u},\underline{v}) = (\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Due to Corollary 5.15, we do not associate $X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ with T_B^-. Hence, we set

$$m_{Y,T_B^-} = 0.$$

Let $Y = E_{\vartheta,j}$ be any exceptional-divisor for some $j \in [\Upsilon]$. If $k = j$, we set

$$m_{Y,T_B^+} = m_{Y,T_B^-} = 0.$$

Suppose now $k \neq j$. We set

$$m_{Y,T_B^+} = 0,$$

$$m_{Y,T_B^-} = m_{X_{\vartheta,\underline{u}_j},T_B^-}.$$

We call the number $m_{Y,T_B^\pm}$ the multiplicity of Y associated with the term $T_B^\pm$. We say Y is associated with $T_B^\pm$ if $m_{Y,T_B^\pm}$ is positive. We do not say Y is associated with $T_B^\pm$ if the multiplicity $m_{Y,T_B^\pm}$ is zero.

Definition 6.2. *Consider any linearized Plücker relation*

$$L_F = \sum_{s\in S_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}.$$

for some $F \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. Fix any $s \in S_F$. Consider any ϖ-divisor, ϱ-divisor, or exceptional-divisor Y on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$.

Let $Y = X_{\vartheta,\underline{w}}$ be any ϖ divisor for some $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$. We set $m_{Y,s} = 0$.

Let $Y = X_{\vartheta,(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ be any ϱ divisor. We set

$$m_{Y,s} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (\underline{u},\underline{v}) = (\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Y = E_{\vartheta,j}$ be any exceptional-divisor for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$. We let

$$m_{Y,s} = m_{X_{\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)},s}\ .$$

We call the number $m_{Y,s}$ the multiplicity of Y associated with $s \in S_F$. We say Y is associated with s if $m_{Y,s}$ is positive. We do not say Y is associated with s if the multiplicity $m_{Y,s}$ is zero.

Now, take any $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

We suppose that all the blowups

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_j} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_j} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{j-1}}$$

have been constructed for all the blocks in

$$\mathfrak{G}_{[k-1]} = \bigsqcup_{j\in[k-1]} \mathfrak{G}_j$$

such that for all $j \in [k-1]$:

• $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_j} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{j-1}}$ is a sequential $\wp$-blowups with respect to the main binomial relations of the block $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{F_j}$.

• $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_j} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_j}$ is a single ℓ-blowup with respect to L_{F_j}.

We are to construct

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}}$$

in the next subsection.

6.2. $\wp$-blowups and ℓ-blowup in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$.

$\wp$-blowups in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$

We proceed by applying induction on the set

$$\{(k\tau)\mu \mid k \in [\Upsilon], \tau \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}], \mu \in [\rho_{(k\tau)}]\},$$

ordered lexicographically on (k, τ, μ), where $\rho_{(k\tau)}$ is a to-be-defined finite positive integer depending on $(k\tau) \in \text{Index}_{\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}}$ (cf. (5.11)).

The initial case for $\wp$-blowups with respect to the block $\mathfrak{G}_k$ is $\wp_{(k1)}\mathfrak{r}_0$ and the initial scheme is $\mathscr{R}_{(\wp_{(k1)}\mathfrak{r}_0)} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}}$. When $k = 0$, we get $\mathscr{R}_{(\wp_{(11)}\mathfrak{r}_0)} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{-1}} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$.

We suppose that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ has been constructed and the following package in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})$ has been introduced for some integer $\mu \in [\rho_{(k\tau)}]$, where $1 \leq \rho_{(k\tau)} \leq \infty$ is an integer depending on $(k\tau) \in \text{Index}_{\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}}$. (It will be proved to be finite.) Here, to reconcile notations, we make the convention:

$$(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_0) := (\wp_{(k(\tau-1))}\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{(k(\tau-1))}}),\ \forall\ 1 \leq k \leq \Upsilon,\ 2 \leq \tau \leq \mathfrak{t}_{F_k},$$

$$(\wp_{(k1)}\mathfrak{r}_0) := (\wp_{((k-1)\mathfrak{t}_{F_{k-1}})}\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{((k-1)\mathfrak{t}_{F_{k-1}})}}),\ \forall\ 2 \leq k \leq \Upsilon,$$

provided that $\rho_{(k(\tau-1))}$ and $\rho_{((k-1)\mathfrak{t}_{F_{k-1}})}$ are (proved to be) finite.

• *The inductive assumption. The scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ has been constructed. It comes equipped with the following.*

The set of ϖ-divisors,

$$\mathcal{D}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\varpi}:\quad X_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\underline{w}},\ \ \underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}.$$

The set of ϱ-divisors

$$\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\varrho}: \quad X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),(\underline{u},\underline{v})}, \quad (\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}.$$

The set of $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors

$$\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\mathfrak{L}}: D_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),L_{F_j}}, \ \ j\in[k-1].$$

The set of the exceptional divisors

$$\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}: \quad E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),(k'\tau')\mu'h'}, \ \ (11)0\leq(k'\tau')\mu'\leq(k\tau)(\mu-1), \ h'\in[\sigma_{(k'\tau')\mu'}]$$

for some finite positive integer $\sigma_{(k'\tau')\mu'}$ depending on $(k'\tau')\mu'$. We set $\sigma_{(11)0}=\Upsilon$. This counts the number of exceptional divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_1\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)}=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$.

We let

$$\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}=\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\varrho}\sqcup\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\varpi}\sqcup\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$$

be the set of all the aforelisted divisors. The set $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\mathfrak{L}}$ will not be used until the ℓ-blowup.

Fix any $Y\in\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$. Consider any $B\in\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}\cup\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ and let T_B be any fixed term of B. Then, we have that Y is associated with T_B with the multiplicity m_{Y,T_B}, a nonnegative integer. In the sequel, we say Y is associated with T_B if $m_{Y,T_B}>0$; we do not say Y is associated with T_B if $m_{Y,T_B}=0$.

Likewise, for any term of $T_s=\mathrm{sgn}(s)x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$ of $L_F=\sum_{s\in S_F}\mathrm{sgn}(s)x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$, Y is associated with T_s with the multiplicity $m_{Y,s}$, a nonnegative integer. We say Y is associated with T_s if $m_{Y,s}>0$; we do not say Y is associated with T_s if $m_{Y,s}=0$.

We are now to construct the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu)}$. The process consists of a finite steps of blowups; the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu)}$ is the one obtained in the final step.

As before, fix any $k\in[\Upsilon]$, we write $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}=\{B_{(k\tau)}\mid\tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]\}$. For every $B_{(k\tau)}\in\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$, we have the expression

$$B_{(k\tau)}=T^+_{(k\tau)}-T^-_{(k\tau)}=x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}x_{\underline{u}_k}-x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s}x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$$

where $s\in S_{F_k}\backslash s_{F_k}$ corresponds to τ and $x_{\underline{u}_k}$ is the leading variable of $\bar{F}_k$ for some $\underline{u}_k\in\mathbb{I}^{\underline{m}}_{d,n}$. We can write $s=(k\tau)$, and, use B_s and $B_{(k\tau)}$ interchangeblly.

Definition 6.3. *A pre-$\wp$-set ϕ in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)$, written as*

$$\phi = \{Y^+,\ Y^-\},$$

consists of exactly two divisors of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ such that $Y^\pm$ is associated with $T^\pm_{(k\tau)}$.

Given the above pre-$\wp$-set ϕ, we let

$$Z_\phi = Y^+ \cap Y^-$$

be the scheme-theoretic intersection. The pre-$\wp$-set ϕ (resp. Z_ϕ) is called a $\wp$-set (resp. $\wp$-center) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)$ if

$$Z_\phi \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})} \neq \emptyset.$$

In such a case, we also call ϕ (resp. Z_ϕ) a $\wp_k$-set (resp. $\wp_k$-center).

Recall that due to Corollary 5.15, we do not associate $X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ with $T^-_{(k\tau)}$. Hence $Y^- \neq X_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$. Had we associated $X_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$ with $T^-_{(k\tau)}$, the condition, $Z_\phi \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})} \neq \emptyset$, would also exclude it.

As there are only finitely many ϖ-, ϱ-, and exceptional divisors on the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$, that is, the set $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ is finite, one sees that there are only finitely many $\wp$-sets in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)$. We let $\Phi_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$ be the finite set of all $\wp$-sets in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)$; we let $\mathcal{Z}_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$ be the finite set of all corresponding $\wp$-centers in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)$. We need a total ordering on the set $\Phi_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$, hence on the set $\mathcal{Z}_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$, to produce a canonical sequential blowups.

Definition 6.4. *Let $\mathcal{D}^\pm_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ be the set of all divisors associated with $T^\pm_{(k\tau)}$.*

We order the set $\mathcal{D}^+_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ as follows. We let $X_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$ be the largest and $X_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\underline{u}_k}$ be the second largest. The rest are exceptional divisors. We order them by reversing the order of occurrence of the exceptional divisors. By Definition 3.14, $\mathcal{D}^+_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ is totally ordered.

We order the set $\mathcal{D}^-_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ as follows. We let $\mathcal{D}^-_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\varpi}$ be the subset of ϖ-divisors with the order induced from that on the set of all Plücker-variables. We let $\mathcal{E}^-_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ be the subset of exceptional divisors by reversing the order of occurrence.

We then declare

$$\mathcal{E}^{-}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})} < \mathcal{D}^{-}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\varpi}.$$

By Definition 3.14, $\mathcal{D}^{-}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ is totally ordered.

Now, let $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Phi_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$ be any two distinct elements. Write $\phi = \{Y_i^+, Y_i^-\}, i = 1, 2$. We $\phi_1 < \phi_2$ if $Y_1^+ < Y_2^+$ or $Y_1^+ = Y_2^+$ and $Y_1^- < Y_2^-$.

This endows $\Phi_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$ a total order " $<$ ".

Thus, we can list $\Phi_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$ as

$$\Phi_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu} = \{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu 1} < \cdots < \phi_{(k\tau)\mu\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}}\}$$

for some finite positive integer $\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}$ depending on $(k\tau)\mu$. We then let the set $\mathcal{Z}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$ of the corresponding $\wp$-centers inherit the total order from that of $\Phi_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$. Then, we can express

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu} = \{Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu 1}} < \cdots < Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}}}\}.$$

We let $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_1)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$ along the $\wp$-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu 1}}$. Inductively, we assume that $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{(h-1)})}$ has been constructed for some $h \in [\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]$. We then let

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$$

be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ along (the proper transform of) the $\wp$-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$. We call it a $\wp$-blowup or a $\wp_k$-blowup.

Here, to reconcile notation, we set

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_0)} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)(\mu-1)}})}.$$

All of these can be summarized as the sequence

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu)} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}})} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_1)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}.$$

Given $h \in [\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]$, consider the induced morphism $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$.

• We let $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\underline{w}}$ be the proper transform of $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),\underline{w}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, for all $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$. These are still called ϖ-divisors. We denote the set of all ϖ-divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ by $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\varpi}$.

• We let $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ be the proper transform of the ϱ-divisor $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, for all $(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$. These are still called ϱ-divisors. We denote the set of all ϱ-divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ by $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\varrho}$.

• We let $D_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),L_F}$ be the proper transform of the $\mathfrak{L}$-divisor $D_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),L_F}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, for all $\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. These are still called $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors. We denote the set of all $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ by $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\mathfrak{L}}$.

• We let $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(k'\tau')\mu'h'}$ be the proper transform of $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1}),(k'\tau')\mu'h'}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, for all (11)$0\leq(k'\tau')\mu'\leq(k\tau)(\mu-1)$ with $h'\in[\sigma_{(k'\tau')\mu'}]$. We denote the set of these exceptional divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ by $\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\text{old}}$.

We let

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}=\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\varpi}\sqcup\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\varrho}\sqcup\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\text{old}}$$

be the set of all of the aforementioned divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. The set $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\mathfrak{L}}$ will not be used until the ℓ-blowup.

In addition to the proper transforms of the divisors from $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$, there are the following *new* exceptional divisors.

For any $h\in[\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]$, we let $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ be the exceptional divisor of the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\longrightarrow\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. For any $1\leq h'<h\leq\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}$, we let $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(k\tau)\mu h'}$ be the proper transform in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ of the exceptional divisor $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h'})}$. To reconcile notation, we also set $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(k\tau)\mu h}:=E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. We set

$$\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\text{new}}=\{E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(k\tau)\mu h'}\mid 1\leq h'\leq h\leq\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}\}.$$

We then order the exceptional divisors of $\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\text{new}}$ by reversing the order of occurrence, that is, $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(k\tau)\mu h''}\leq E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(k\tau)\mu h'}$ if $h''\geq h'$.

We then let

$$\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}=\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\sqcup\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\text{new}}.$$

Finally, we set $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau))\mathfrak{r}_\mu}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}})}$, and let

$$\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu),\varpi}=\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}}),\varpi},\ \mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu),\varrho}=\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}}),\varrho},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu}=\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}}),\text{old}}\sqcup\mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}}),\text{new}}.$$

This can be summarized as

$$\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu)} := \mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu),\varpi} \sqcup \mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu),\varrho} \sqcup \mathcal{E}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu)}.$$

This way, we have equipped the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu)}$ with the set $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu),\varpi}$ of ϖ-divisors, the set $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu),\varrho}$ of ϱ-divisors, the set $\mathcal{E}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu}$ of exceptional divisors, together with the set $\mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu),\mathfrak{L}}$ of $\mathfrak{L}$-divisors (which will not be used until the ℓ-blowup).

Now, we are ready to introduce the notion of "association" in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)$, as required to carry on the process of induction.

We do it inductively on the set $[\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]$.

Definition 6.5. *Fix any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$. We let T_B be any fixed term of the binomial B. Meanwhile, we also consider any $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ and let T_s be the term of L_F corresponding to any fixed $s \in S_F$.*

We assume that the notion of "association" in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})$ has been introduced. That is, for every divisor $Y' \in \mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$, the multiplicities m_{Y',T_B} and $m_{Y',s}$ have been defined.

Consider an arbitrary divisor $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

First, suppose $Y \neq E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. Then, it is the proper transform of a (unique) divisor $Y' \in \mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. In this case, we set

$$m_{Y,T_B} = m_{Y',T_B}, \quad m_{Y,s} = m_{Y',s}.$$

Next, we consider the exceptional $Y = E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

We let $\phi = \phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}$. We have that

$$\phi = \{Y^+, Y^-\} \subset \mathcal{D}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}.$$

For any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$, we write $B = T_B^0 - T_B^1$. We let

$$m_{\phi,T_B^i} = m_{Y^+,T_B^i} + m_{Y^-,T_B^i},\ i = 0, 1,$$

$$l_{\phi,B} = \min\{m_{\phi,T_B^0}, m_{\phi,T_B^1}\}.$$

(For instance, by definition, $l_{\phi,B} > 0$ when $B = B_{(k\tau)}$. In general, it can be zero.) Then, we let

$$m_{E_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)},T_B^i} = m_{\phi,T_B^i} - l_{\phi,T_B^i}.$$

Likewise, for $s \in S_F$ with $F \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, we let

$$m_{E_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)},s} = m_{Y^+,s} + m_{Y^-,s}.$$

We say Y is associated with T_B (resp. T_s) if its multiplicity m_{Y,T_B} (resp. $m_{Y,s}$) is positive. We do not say Y is associated with T_B (resp. T_s) if its multiplicity m_{Y,T_B} (resp. $m_{Y,s}$) equals to zero.

When $h = \sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}$, we obtain all the desired data on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}}}$.

Now, with all the aforedescribed data equipped for $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)}$, we obtain our inductive package in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)$. This allows us to introduce the set $\Phi_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu+1}}$ of $\wp$-sets and the set $\mathcal{Z}_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu+1}}$ of $\wp$-centers in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu+1})$ as in Definition 6.3, endow a total order on $\Phi_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu+1}}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu+1}}$ as in Definition 6.4, and then advance to the next round of the $\wp$-blowups. Here, to reconcile notations, we set

$$(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{(k\tau)+1}}) := (\wp_{((k(\tau+1))}\mathfrak{r}_1), \quad 1 \le \tau < \mathfrak{t}_{F_k};$$

$$(\wp_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})}\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})+1}}) := (\wp_{((k+1)1)}\mathfrak{r}_1), \quad 1 \le k < \Upsilon,$$

provided that $\rho_{(k\tau)}$ and $\rho_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})}$ are (proved to be) finite.

Given any $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$, the $\wp$-blowup in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ gives rise to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} & \hookrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathscr{V} & \hookrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}, \end{array} \tag{6.1}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ is the proper transform of $\mathscr{V}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

We let $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)} = \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}})}$.

Definition 6.6. *Fix any $k \in [\Upsilon], \tau \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$. Suppose there exists a finite integer μ such that for any pre-$\wp$-set ϕ in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu+1})$ (cf. Definition 6.3), we have*

$$Z_\phi \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu)} = \emptyset.$$

Then, we let $\rho_{(k\tau)}$ be the smallest integer such that the above holds. Otherwise, we let $\rho_{(k\tau)}=\infty$.

It will be shown soon that $\rho_{(k\tau)}$ is finite for all $k\in[\Upsilon]$, $\tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$.

For later use, we let

$$\Phi_k=\{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}\mid \tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}],\mu[\rho_{(k\tau)}],h\in[\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]\},\tag{6.2}$$

$$\mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k}=\{(k\tau)\mu h\mid \tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}],\mu\in[\rho_{(k\tau)}],h\in[\sigma_{(k\tau)\mu}]\}.$$

Then, the order of $\wp_k$-blowups coincides with the lexicographical order on Index_{Φ_k}

Upon proving that $\rho_{(k\tau)}$ is finite for all $\tau\in[\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$, we can summarize the process of $\wp_k$-blowups as a single sequence of blowup morphisms:

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}\longrightarrow\cdots\longrightarrow\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\longrightarrow\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}\longrightarrow\cdots\longrightarrow\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k1)}\mathfrak{r}_0)}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}},\tag{6.3}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})}\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}})}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})}\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}})}$ is the blowup scheme reached in the final step $(\wp_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})}\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}})$ of all $\wp$-blowups in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$.

Further, the end of all $\wp$-blowups in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$ gives rise to the following induced diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}&\hookrightarrow&\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}\\ \downarrow&&\downarrow\\ \mathscr{V}&\hookrightarrow&\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}},\end{array}\tag{6.4}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}$ is the proper transform of $\mathscr{V}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$.

The ℓ-blowup in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$

Definition 6.7. *Let $D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}}$ be the $\mathfrak{L}$-divisor defined by L_{F_k} and $E_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k}$ be the proper transform of the exceptional divisor $E_{\vartheta,k}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$ (or equivalently, the exceptional divisor $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$) in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$. We call the set of the two divisors*

$$\chi_k=\{D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}},E_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k}\}$$

the ℓ-set with respect to L_{F_k} or just ℓ_k-set. We let Z_{χ_k} be the scheme-theoretic intersection

$$Z_{\chi_k}=D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}}\cap Y_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k}$$

and call it ℓ-center with respect to L_{F_k} or just ℓ_k-center.

We then let

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$$

be the blowup of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ along Z_{χ_k}. The is called the ℓ-blowup with respect to L_{F_k} or just ℓ_k-blowup.

Recall that $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ comes equipped with the sets of ϱ-, ϖ-, $\mathfrak{L}$-, and exceptional divisors. For any such a divisor, we take its proper transform in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$ and let it inherit its original name.

There is only one new divisor on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$: we let E_{ℓ_k} be the exceptional divisor of the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$, and call it the ℓ_k-exceptional divisor. (We comment here that this is not to be confused with the $\mathfrak{L}$-divisor D_{ℓ_k,L_k}.)

Now, we are ready to introduce the notion of "association" in (ℓ_k), as required to carry on the process of induction.

Definition 6.8. *Fix any binomial $B \in \mathcal{B}_G^{\mathrm{mn}} \sqcup B^{\mathrm{q}}$ with $G > F_k$, written as $B = T_B^+ - T_B^-$. For any $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, let T_s be the term of L_F corresponding to some fixed $s \in S_F$.*

As assumed, the notion of "association" in $(\wp_k)$ has been introduced. That is, for any divisor Y' on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$, the multiplicities $m_{Y',T_B^\pm}$, $m_{Y',s}$ have been defined.

Suppose a divisor Y of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$ is the proper transform of Y' of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$. We define

$$m_{Y,T_B^\pm} = m_{Y',T_B^\pm}, \;\; m_{Y,s} = m_{Y',s}.$$

We define

$$m_{E_{\ell_k},T_B^\pm} = m_{E_{\wp_k},\vartheta_k,T_B^\pm}, \;\; m_{E_{\ell_k},s} = m_{E_{\wp_k},\vartheta_k,s}.$$

We say Y is associated with $T_B^\pm$ or T_s if its multiplicity $m_{Y,T_B^\pm}$ or $m_{Y,s}$ is positive.

Finally, we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k} & \hookrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathscr{V}_{\wp_k} & \hookrightarrow & \mathscr{R}_{\wp_k}, \end{array} \tag{6.5}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$ is the proper transform of $\mathscr{V}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$.

When $k=\Upsilon$, we write $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_\Upsilon}$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_\Upsilon}$. We obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell} & \hookrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathscr{V} & \hookrightarrow & \mathscr{R}. \end{array} \tag{6.6}$$

The schemes $(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell}\subset\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell})$ are the ones we aim to construct.

For the use in induction in the next subsection, we set $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k1)\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{k-1}}$. When $k=0$, we have $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(11)\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_{-1}}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$.

In the next two sections, we will state and prove certain properties about

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h}\subset\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h},$$

using induction on the indexes $(k\tau)\mu h$. To include $(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}\subset\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k})$ in the statements and proofs, we let ℓ_k correspond to one more step after the last step of $\wp_k$-blowups, namely, $\sigma_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}+1$. In full writing, we set

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}\mathfrak{s}_{(\sigma_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}+1)})}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k},\quad \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}\mathfrak{s}_{(\sigma_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}+1)})}:=\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k},$$

We also write

$$\ell_k:=\big(\wp(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\mathfrak{r}_{\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}\mathfrak{s}_{(\sigma_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}+1)}\big).$$

6.3. Properties of $\wp$-blowups and ℓ-blowup in $(\mathfrak{G}_k)$.

Fix and consider any

$$(k\tau)\mu h\in\mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k}\sqcup\{((k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}(\sigma_{(k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k})\rho_{k\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}}}+1))\}$$

(cf. (6.2) for Index_{Φ_k}).

Proposition 6.9. *Suppose that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ has been constructed, covered by a finite set of open subsets, called standard charts (see Definition 5.1).*

Consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, lying over a unique chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$, and a unique chart $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$. We suppose that the chart $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ is indexed by $\Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}=\{(\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}},\underline{v}_{s_{F,o}})\mid\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}\}$. We set

$$\mathbb{I}^*_{d,n}=\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m},\ \Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}=\Lambda_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}\backslash\Lambda^o_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}},\ \textit{and}\ L_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}},[k]}=\{L_{F_j}\mid j\in[k]\}.$$

Then, the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ *has a smooth open subset* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ *containing the subscheme* $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$*. By shrinking the open subsets, if necessary, we can assume that the blowup morphism sends the open subset* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ *onto the open subset* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$*. In the sequel, by a standard chart of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$*, we mean the intersection* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\cap\mathfrak{V}$ *where* $\mathfrak{V}$ *is a standard chart of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$*.*

The chart $\mathfrak{V}$ *of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ *comes equipped with*

$$\text{a subset } \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}\subset\mathbb{I}^*_{d,n},\quad \text{a subset } \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}\subset\Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}},\quad \text{and a subset } \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}\subset L_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m},[k]}$$

and also

$$\text{a subset } \mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)\mid L_F\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}\subset\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$$

such that every exceptional divisor E *(i.e., not a* ϖ*- nor a* ϱ*-divisor) of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp(k\tau)}$ *with* $E\cap\mathfrak{V}\neq\emptyset$ *is either labeled by a unique element* $\underline{w}\in\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *or labeled by a unique element* $(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *or labeled by a unique element* $L\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*. We let* $E_{\ell_k,\underline{w}}$ *be the unique exceptional divisor on the chart* $\mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by* $\underline{w}\in\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*; we call it an* ϖ*-exceptional divisor. We let* $E_{\ell_k,(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ *be the unique exceptional divisor on the chart* $\mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by* $(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*; we call it an* ϱ*-exceptional divisor. We let* $E_{\ell_k,L}$ *be the unique exceptional divisor on the chart* $\mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by* $L\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*; we call it an* $\mathfrak{l}$*-exceptional divisor. (We note here that being* ϖ*-exceptional or* ϱ*-exceptional or* $\mathfrak{l}$*-exceptional is strictly relative to the given standard chart. Again,* $E_{\ell_k,L}$ *is not to be confused with* $D_{\ell_k,L}$*, the* $\mathfrak{L}$*-divisor of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$*.)*

Further, the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ *admits a set of free variables*

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}:=\left\{\begin{array}{c|c}\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}},\quad \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} & \underline{w}\in\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}},\quad (\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}\backslash\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}}\\ y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} & (\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)\in\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}}\\ x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}},\quad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} & \underline{w}\in\mathbb{I}^*_{d,n}\backslash\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}},\quad (\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}\backslash\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}\end{array}\right\}. \tag{6.7}$$

such that $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}$ *are invertible on the chart, and a set of exceptional variables for* ℓ*-exceptional divisors*

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}}=\{\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}\mid L_F\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ i.e.,\ (\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)\in\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}.$$

Furthermore, we also have a set of free variables

$$\mathrm{Var}^\vee_{\mathfrak{V}}=(\{y\in\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}\backslash\{y_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}\mid L_F\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}\})\sqcup\{\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}\mid L_F\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}.$$

We set

$$\mathrm{Var}^{+}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} \sqcup \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}}.$$

Then, all the relations in $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \{L_{\mathfrak{V},F} \mid F \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}\}$ *are polynomials in* $\mathrm{Var}^{+}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

Moreover, on the standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$*, we have*

(1) *the divisor* $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\underline{w}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *is defined by* $(x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = 0)$ *for every* $\underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}^{*}_{d,n} \backslash \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(2) *the divisor* $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *is defined by* $(x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$ *for every* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{\star}_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \backslash \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(3) *the divisor* $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\underline{w}}$ *does not intersect the chart for all* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(4) *the divisor* $X_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ *does not intersect the chart for all* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(5) *the* ϖ*-exceptional divisor* $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\underline{w}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by an element* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *is define by* $(\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = 0)$ *for all* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(6) *the* ϱ*-exceptional divisor* $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by an element* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *is define by* $(\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$ *for all* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(7) *the* $\mathfrak{l}$*-exceptional divisor* $E_{\ell_k,L_F} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *labeled by an element* $L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *is define by* $(\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} = 0)$ *for all* $L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*;*

(8) *any of the remaining* exceptional *divisors of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ *other than those that are labelled by some* $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *or* $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *or* $L \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *does not intersect the chart.*

(9) *Assume* $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h) = \ell_k$*.*

Suppose $\mathfrak{V}$ *lies over the standard chart* $(x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} \equiv 1)$ *of* $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$*. Then,* $L_{F_k} \notin \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*, and the* ℓ_k*-blowup is trivial.*

Suppose $\mathfrak{V}$ *lies over the* ϱ*-standard chart of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$*. Then,* $L_{F_k} \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*, and we can choose* those *standard charts* $\mathfrak{V}$ *of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell_k}$ *such that they cover* $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$*, and on any such chart* $\mathfrak{V}$*, we can express*

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k} = 1 + \mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k}) y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$$

where $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *is an invertible variable in* $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*, labeled by* $(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})$*.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $(k\tau)\mu h \in \{(11)10\} \sqcup \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k} \sqcup \{\ell_k\}$, where $(11)10$ is the smallest element, ℓ_k is the largest, and the elements of Index_{Φ_k} are ordered lexicographically (which coincides with the order of $\wp_k$-blowups).

For the initial case, the scheme is $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(11)}\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta}$. Then, this proposition is the same as Proposition 5.10 with $k = \Upsilon$. In this case, we set $\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \emptyset$. Then, one checks that the proposition holds.

We suppose that the statement holds over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ for some $(k\tau)\mu h \in \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k} \sqcup \{\ell_k\}$. (Recall that for the largest element of Index_{Φ_k}, if we add 1 to the index of the step, then, by convention, it corresponds to ℓ_k.)

We now consider $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

We have the embedding

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})} \times \mathbb{P}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}},$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ is the factor projective space. We let $\phi'_{(k\tau)\mu h} = \{Y'_0, Y'_1\}$ where Y'_0, Y'_1 are, respectively, the proper transforms in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ of the two divisors of the $\wp$-set $\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h} = \{Y^+, Y^-\}$ with $Y^\pm$ being associated with $T^\pm_{(k\tau)}$, or, in the case when $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}) = \wp_k$, $(Y'_0, Y'_1) = (D_{\wp_k, L_{F_k}}, E_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k})$. In addition, we let $[\xi_0, \xi_1]$ be the homogenous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ corresponding to $\{Y'_0, Y'_1\}$.

Let $\mathfrak{V}$ be any standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ that lies over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ such that $\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_i \equiv 1)) \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, for $i = 0$ or 1.

By assumption, the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ comes equipped with a subset $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \subset \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}$, a subset $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \subset \Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$, and admits a set of free variables

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'} := \left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}},\ \ \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} & \underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\backslash\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \\ y_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} & (\underline{m},\underline{u}_F) \in \mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \\ x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}},\ \ x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} & \underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}^*_{d,n}\backslash\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^\star_{\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}\backslash\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \end{array} \right\}, \tag{6.8}$$

such that $y_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}$ are invertible on the chart, a set of exceptional variables for ℓ-exceptional divisors

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}} = \{\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \mid L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ i.e.,\ (\underline{m},\underline{u}_F) \in \mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\},$$

and a set of free variables

$$\mathrm{Var}^\vee_{\mathfrak{V}'} = (\{y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}\backslash\{y_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \mid L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}) \sqcup \{\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \mid L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\},$$

all together verifying the properties (1)-(9) as in the proposition.

First, we prove that $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ is smooth along $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

We only need to focus on the situation when $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ meets $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\cap\mathfrak{V}'$ along a nonempty closed subset.

On the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$, by assumption, we have

$$Y'_0\cap\mathfrak{V}'=(y'_0=0),\ Y'_1\cap\mathfrak{V}'=(y'_1=0),\ \text{ for some } y'_0,y'_1\in\mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}'}. \tag{6.9}$$

Now, because $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_j})}\in\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is an invertible variable in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ for all $L_{F_j}\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$, we see that we must have $y'_0,y'_1\in\mathrm{Var}^\vee_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Then, it is immediate that the blowup center on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ is smooth, hence, $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{V}')$, as the blowup of $\mathfrak{V}'$ along the smooth center, is smooth, so is $\mathfrak{V}$.

We now prove the remaining statements for the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

First, we suppose that the proper transform $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ of the $\wp$- or the ℓ_k-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ does not meet the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$. (If $(k\tau)\mu h$ corresponds to ℓ_k, we let $\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}:=\chi_k$.) Then, we let $\mathfrak{V}$ inherit all the data from those of $\mathfrak{V}'$, that is, we set $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$, $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$, $\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$, $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}}=\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}}$, and $\mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}'}$: changing the subindex "$\mathfrak{V}'$" for all the variables in $\mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ to "$\mathfrak{V}$". As the $\wp$-blowup along the proper transform of $Z_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ does not affect the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$, one sees that the statements of the proposition hold for $\mathfrak{V}$.

Next, we suppose that $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ meets the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ along a nonempty closed subset.

Then, the chart $\mathfrak{V}=(\mathfrak{V}'\times(\xi_i\equiv1))\cap\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}'\times(\xi_i\equiv1)$, is defined by

$$y'_j=y'_i\xi_j,\ \text{ with } j\in\{0,1\}\backslash i. \tag{6.10}$$

There are six possibilities for $Y'_i\cap\mathfrak{V}'$ according to the types of the variable y'_i. Based on every of such possibilities, we set

(6.11)
$$\begin{cases}
\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\sqcup\underline{w},\ \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}, & \text{if } y'_i=x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}} \text{ for some } \underline{w}\in\mathbb{I}^*_{d,n}\backslash\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\\
\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}, & \text{if } y'_i=\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}} \text{ for some } \underline{w}\in\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\\
\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\sqcup(\underline{u},\underline{v}),\ \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}, & \text{if } y'_i=x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \text{ for some } (\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda^*_{d,n}\\
\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}, & \text{if } y'_i=\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \text{ for some } (\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\backslash\mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}'}
\end{cases}$$

For the fifth possibility, we let

$$\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \text{ if } y'_i=\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \text{ for some } L_F\in\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}.$$

For the sixth possibility, we let

$$\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \sqcup L_{F_k},\ \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'},\ \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'}, \quad \text{if } (y_i' = 0) \text{ defines } D_{\wp_k, L_{F_k}} \cap \mathfrak{V}'.$$

(This last case corresponds the the case of the ℓ-blowup with respect to L_{F_k}.)

Accordingly, we introduce

$$\text{(6.12)} \qquad \begin{cases} \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = y_i', & \text{if } y_i' = x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}} \text{ for some } \underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} \backslash \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \\ \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = y_i', & \text{if } y_i' = \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}} \text{ for some } \underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'} = \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = y_i', & \text{if } y_i' = x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \text{ for some } (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^*_{d,n} \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = y_i', & \text{if } y_i' = \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \text{ for some } (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \backslash \mathfrak{d}^{\mathrm{lt}}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \end{cases}$$

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} = y_i', \quad \text{if } y_i' = \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}, \text{ for some } L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$$

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} = y_i', \quad \text{if } (y_i' = 0) \text{ defines } D_{\wp_k, L_{F_k}} \cap \mathfrak{V}'.$$

(The last case corresponds the ℓ-blowup with respect to L_{F_k}.)

This defines the exceptional variable for the blowup.

To introduce the variable corresponding to $j \in \{0,1\} \backslash i$, we then set

$$\text{(6.13)} \qquad \begin{cases} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{a}} = \xi_j, & \text{if } y_j' = x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{a}} \\ \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{a}} = \xi_j, & \text{if } y_j' = \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{a}} \\ x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{a},\underline{b})} = \xi_j, & \text{if } y_j' = x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{a},\underline{b})} \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{a},\underline{b})} = \xi_j, & \text{if } y_j' = \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{a},\underline{b})}. \end{cases}$$

Also, we let $\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} = \xi_j$, if $y_j' = \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}$ for some $L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$.

Thus, we have introduced $y_i', \xi_j \in \mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}}$ where y_i', and ξ_j are endowed with the new names as in (6.12), and in (6.13), respectively.

Next, we define the set $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} \backslash \{y_i', \xi_j\}$ to consist of the following variables:

$$\text{(6.14)} \qquad \begin{cases} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}}, & \forall\ \underline{w} \in \mathbb{I}^*_{d,n} \backslash \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ and } x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}} \neq y_i', y_j' \\ x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})}, & \forall\ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{\star}_{\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}} \backslash \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ and } x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \neq y_i', y_j' \\ \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{w}} = \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}}, & \forall\ \underline{w} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ and } \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{w}} \neq y_i', y_j' \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})}, & \forall\ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ and } \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \neq y_i', y_j' \\ y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{u}_F)} = y_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{u}_F)}, & \forall\ L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}. \end{cases}$$

We let $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ be the set of the variables in (6.12), (6.13), and (6.14). Substituting (6.10), one sees that $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is a set of free variables on the open chart $\mathfrak{V}$. This describes (6.8) in the proposition.

We then let $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}} = \{\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \mid L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}$, and obtain

$$\mathrm{Var}^{\vee}_{\mathfrak{V}} = (\{y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}\} \backslash \{y_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \mid L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}) \sqcup \{\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \mid L_F \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}.$$

One sees that $\mathrm{Var}^{\vee}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is also a set of free variables on the open chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

We set $\mathrm{Var}^{+}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} \sqcup \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$. By substituting (6.10) and taking proper transforms, one sees that all the relations in $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ are polynomials in $\mathrm{Var}^{+}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

Now, it remains to verity (1)-(9) of the proposition on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

First, consider the unique new exceptional divisor $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ created by the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. Then, we have

$$E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (y'_i = 0)$$

where y'_i is renamed as in (6.12) and in the sentence immediately following it. This way, the new exceptional divisor $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ is labelled on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$. Further, we have that the proper transform of Y'_i in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ does not meet the chart $\mathfrak{V}$, and if Y'_i is an exceptional parameter labeled by some element of $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \sqcup \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \sqcup \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$, then, on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$, its proper transform is no longer labelled by that element. This verifies the cases of (3)-(7) *whenever the statement therein involves the newly created exceptional divisor* $E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.

For any of the remaining ϖ-, ϱ-, and exceptional divisors on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, it is the proper transform of a unique corresponding ϖ-, ϱ-, and exceptional divisor on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. Hence, by applying the inductive assumption on $\mathfrak{V}'$ accordingly, we conclude that every of (1)-(8) of the proposition hold on $\mathfrak{V}$.

(9)

Assume $\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h = \ell_k$.

By the inductive assumption, the statement holds for all $j < k$. We only need to consider L_{F_k}.

Assume $\mathfrak{V}'$ lies over $(x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} \equiv 1)$, then $Z_{\chi_k} \cap \mathfrak{V} = \emptyset$ because $E_{\wp_k,\vartheta_k} \cap \mathfrak{V} = \emptyset$, where Z_{χ_k} is the ℓ_k-center. Hence, the statement holds.

Assume $\mathfrak{V}'$ lies over the ϱ-standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ (hence, so does $\mathfrak{V}$). Notice that the variable $\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}$ never appears in any relation of the blocks $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V}',F_j}$ for all $j \leq k$, except $L_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k}$. Hence, by Proposition 5.13 and the inductive assumption, $L_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k}$ takes the following form

$$L_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} = \operatorname{sgn}(s_{F_k})\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} + \sum_{s\in S_{F_k}\setminus s_{F_k}} \operatorname{sgn}(s)\pi^*_{\mathfrak{V}',\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}} x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}.$$

Then, one sees from the definition that the ℓ_k-blowup ideal on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ is

$$\langle L^\star_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k},\ \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}\rangle$$

where $L^\star_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} = \sum_{s\in S_{F_k}\setminus s_{F_k}} \operatorname{sgn}(s)\pi^*_{\mathfrak{V}',\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}} x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}$. We let $\mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$ be the factor projective space of the ℓ_k-blowup such that (ξ_0,ξ_1) corresponds to $(L^\star_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k},\ \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)})$.

First, we consider the chart $(\xi_0 \equiv 1)$.

Then, $\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1)) \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1)$, is defined by

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} = L^\star_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} \cdot \xi_1. \tag{6.15}$$

Notice that on this chart, we have

$$E_{\ell_k} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (L^\star_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} = 0)$$

where E_{ℓ_k} is the exceptional divisor created by the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$. Upon substituting (6.15), we obtain

$$L_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} = L^\star_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k}(1 + \operatorname{sgn}(s_{F_k})\xi_1),$$

and

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k} = 1 + \operatorname{sgn}(s_{F_k})\xi_1. \tag{6.16}$$

This implies that ξ_1 is invertible along $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$. Thus, if necessary, we can shrink the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ such that it still contains $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$, and assume that ξ_1 is invertible on $\mathfrak{V}$. Now, as ξ_1 is the proper transform $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ of $\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$, we can also write

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k} = 1 + \operatorname{sgn}(s_{F_k})y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$$

with $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ being invertible on the chart. Thus, we obtain the desired form of $L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k}$ as stated in (9).

Finally, observe that by (6.15), as ξ_1 is invertible on the chart, we have

$$E_{\ell_k} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (L^{\star}_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} = 0) = (\delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})} = 0)$$

with $L_{F_k} \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

Next, we consider the chart $(\xi_1 \equiv 1)$.

Then, the chart $\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_1 \equiv 1)) \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$ of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_1 \equiv 1)$, is defined by

$$L^{\star}_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} = \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}\xi_0. \tag{6.17}$$

By substitution, we obtain

$$L_{\mathfrak{V}',F_k} = \delta_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}(\xi_0 + \mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k}))$$

and

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k} = \xi_0 + \mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k}).$$

Then, this implies that ξ_0 is invertible along $\mathfrak{V} \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$. Hence, again, if necessary, by shrinking the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ such that it still contains $\mathfrak{V} \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$, we can assume that ξ_0 is invertible on the chart. Therefore, we can discard the current chart and switch back to the chart lying over $(\xi_0 \equiv 1)$. This sends us back to the previous case where the statement is proved.

By Corollary 5.15 and the above discussion, the charts chosen in (9) together cover the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$.

This completes the proof. □

Definition 6.10. *A standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$ as characterized by Proposition 6.9 (9) is called a preferred standard chart.*

Corollary 6.11. *We let*

$$\rho_{\ell_k,\wp_k} : \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}$$

be the morphism induced from the blowup morphism $\rho_{\ell_k,\wp_k} : \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$. Then, $\rho_{\ell_k,\wp_k}$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. We continue to use the notation of the proof of Proposition 6.9 (9). We can cover $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$ by preferred standard charts. Let $\mathfrak{V}$ be any such a chart such that $Z_{\chi_k} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \neq \emptyset$. Then, by (6.16), we have

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_k} = 1 + \mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k})\xi_1.$$

Then, $\xi_1 = -\mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k})$. This implies that

$$\rho^{-1}_{\ell_k,\wp_k}(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k}) = \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\wp_k} \times [1, -\mathrm{sgn}(s_{F_k})].$$

Hence, the morphisms $\rho_{\ell_k,\wp_k}$ is an isomorphism. □

We remark here that we obtain our final scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$ from $\mathscr{V}$ by suquentially blowing up the embient space $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$, and then take the induced sequential blowups of $\mathscr{V}$. If we do not perform ℓ-blowups, we will obtain different final schemes and would not suffice for our purpose, in general.

6.4. **Proper transforms of defining relations in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ and in (ℓ_k).**

Consider any fixed $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$ and $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. Suppose $B_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ and $L_{\mathfrak{V}',F}$ have been constructed over $\mathfrak{V}'$. Applying Definition 5.4, we obtain the proper transforms on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}},\ B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}};\ \ L_{\mathfrak{V},F},\ \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}.$$

Definition 6.12. (cf. Definition 5.6) *Consider any main binomial relation $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$. Let $\mathfrak{V}$ be a standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ (including $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$) and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathfrak{V}$ be a closed point. We say that B terminates at $\mathbf{z}$ if (at least) one of its two terms of $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ does not vanish at $\mathbf{z}$. We say B terminates on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ if it terminates at all closed points of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \cap \mathfrak{V}$. We say B terminates on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ if it terminates on all standard charts $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.*

In the sequel, for any $B = T^+_B - T^-_B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$, we express $B_{\mathfrak{V}} = T^+_{\mathfrak{V},B} - T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$. If $B = B_{(k\tau)}$ for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$ and $\tau \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$, we also write

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}} = T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)} - T^-_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}.$$

Below, we follow the notations of Proposition 6.9 as well as those in its proof.

In particular, we have that $\mathfrak{V}$ is a standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ (including $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$), lying over a standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. We have that $\phi'_{(k\tau)\mu h} = \{Y'_0,\ Y'_1\}$ is the proper transforms of $\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h} = \{Y^+, Y^-\}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ with $Y^\pm$ being associated with $T^\pm_{(k\tau)}$ or $\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h} = \chi_k$ in which case Y'_0 is the $\mathfrak{L}$-divisor $D_{\wp,L_{F_k}}$. Likewise, $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ is the proper transforms of the $\wp$-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ or is the ℓ_k-center in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. Also, assuming that $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \neq \emptyset$, then, as in (6.9), we have

$$Y'_0 \cap \mathfrak{V}' = (y'_0 = 0),\ Y'_1 \cap \mathfrak{V}' = (y'_1 = 0),\ \text{ with } y'_0, y'_1 \in \mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}'}$$

Further, we have $\mathbb{P}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}} = \mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$ with the homogeneous coordinates $[\xi_0, \xi_1]$ corresponding to (y'_0, y'_1).

Proposition 6.13. *Let the notation be as in Proposition 6.9 and be as in above.*

Let $\mathfrak{V}$ be any standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. Then, the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}.$$

Assume $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \neq \emptyset$. We let $\zeta = \zeta_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)\mu h}$ be the exceptional parameter in $\mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}}$ such that

$$E_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (\zeta = 0).$$

In the sequel, when $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$, we assume that $\mathfrak{V}$ is the preferred chart on $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$ (cf. Definition 6.10).

Then, we have that the following hold.

(1) *Suppose $\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_0 \equiv 1)) \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. We let $y_1 \in \mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}}$ be the proper transform of y'_1. Then, we have*
   (1a) *$T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ is square-free, $y_1 \nmid T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$, and $\deg(T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}) = \deg(T^+_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}) - 1$. Suppose $\deg_{y'_1} T^-_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)} = b$ for some integer b, positive by definition, then we have $\deg_\zeta T^-_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)} = b - 1$. Consequently, either $T^-_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ is linear in y_1 or else $\zeta \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$.*
   (1b) *Let $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ with $B > B_{(k\tau)}$. Then, $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ is square-free and $y_1 \nmid T^+_{\mathfrak{V},B}$. Suppose $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$ and $y_1 \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$, then either $T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ is linear in y_1 or $\zeta \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$. Suppose $B \notin \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$ and $y_1 \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$, then $\zeta \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$.*

(2) *Suppose* $\mathfrak{V} = (\mathfrak{V}' \times (\xi_1 \equiv 1)) \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu \mathfrak{s}_h)}$. *We let* $y_0 \in \mathrm{Var}^+_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *be the proper transform of* y'_0. *Then, we have*

(2a) $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ *is square-free,* $y_0 \nmid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$, *and* $\deg(T^-_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}) = \deg(T^-_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}) - 1$.

(2b) *Let* $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ *with* $B > B_{(k\tau)}$. *Then,* $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ *is square-free. Suppose* $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$, *then* $y_0 \nmid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$. *Suppose* $B \notin \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$ *and* $y_0 \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$, *then* $\zeta \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$.

(3) $\rho_{(k\tau)} < \infty$. *Moreover, for every* $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}$ *with* $B \leq B_{(k\tau)}$, *we have that* B *terminates on* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$.

(4) *Consider any fixed term* T_B *of any given* $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$. *We can assume* y'_i *turns into* ζ *for some* $i \in \{0,1\}$ *and* y_j *is the proper transform of* y'_j *with* $j = \{0,1\}\backslash\{i\}$ *Suppose* $y_j \mid T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$, *then either* $T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ *is linear in* y_j *or* $\zeta \mid T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$.

Proof. We continue to follow the notation in the proof of Proposition 6.9.

We prove the proposition by applying induction on $(k\tau)\mu h \in \{((11)10)\} \sqcup \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k} \sqcup \{\ell_k\}$.

The initial case is (11)10 with $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(11)\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$. In this case, the statement about defining equations of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(11)\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ follows from Proposition 5.13 with $k = \Upsilon$; the remainder statements (1) - (4) are void.

Assume that the proposition holds for $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu \mathfrak{s}_{h-1})$ with $(k\tau)\mu h \in \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k} \sqcup \{\ell_k\}$.

Consider $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu \mathfrak{s}_h)$.

Consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu \mathfrak{s}_h)}$, lying over a standard chart of $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu \mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. By assumption, all the desired statements of the proposition hold over the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$.

The statement of the proposition on the defining equations of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu \mathfrak{s}_h)} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ follows straightforwardly from the inductive assumption.

For the statements of (1)-(4), we structure our proofs as follows. Because the ℓ_k-blowup occurs after all $\wp$-blowups are performed, we will prove (1), (2), and (3) for $\wp$-blowups first, and then, we will return to prove (1) and (2) for the ℓ_k-blowup. We prove (4) at the end.

(1)

($1_\wp$) We first consider the case when the blowup is $\wp_k$ blowup (not the ℓ_k-blowup).

We may express

$$B_{(k\tau)} = x_{(\underline{u}_{s_\tau},\underline{v}_{s_\tau})}x_{\underline{u}_k} - x_{\underline{u}_{s_\tau}}x_{\underline{v}_{s_\tau}}x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_k)}$$

where $x_{\underline{u}_k}$ is the leading variable of $\bar{F}_k$, and $s_\tau \in S_{F_k}\backslash s_{F_k}$ corresponds to $\tau \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$.

(1a)

Observe that the variables $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_\tau},\underline{v}_{s_\tau})}$ and $x_{\underline{u}_k}$ do not appear in any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{F_j}$ with $j < k$. Thus, the fact that the plus-term $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ is square-free is immediate if $\tau = 1$. (This serves as checking the initial case.)

For a general $\tau \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$, it follows from the inductive assumption on $T^+_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}$. The remainder statements follow from straightforward calculations. We omit the obvious details.

(1b). Let $B > B_{(k\tau)}$.

Suppose $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{F_k}$. We we can write $B = B_{(k\tau')}$ with $\tau' \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$ and $\tau' > \tau$. We can express

$$B = B_{(k\tau')} = x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}},\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}})}x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}} - x_{\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}}}x_{\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}}}x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}.$$

We have $T^+_B = x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}},\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}})}x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}}$, and it *retains* this form prior to the $\wp$-blowups with respect to binomials of $\mathcal{B}_{F_k}$ because $x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}}$ and $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}},\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}})}$ do not appear in any relation $\mathfrak{G}_{F_j}$ with $j < k$. (Recall here the convention: $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}} = 1$ if $\underline{u} \in \mathfrak{e}_{\mathfrak{V}}$; $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 1$ if $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.)

Starting the $\wp$-blowups with respect to the first binomial relation $B_{(k1)}$ of $\mathcal{B}_{F_k}$, T^+_B can only acquire exceptional parameters through the leading variable $x_{\underline{u}_{F_k}}$. From here, one sees directly that $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau')}$ is square-free.

Now, suppose $y_1 \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$. We can assume $\deg_{y'_1}(T^-_{\mathfrak{V}',B}) = b$ for some integer $b > 0$. Since T^+_B is square-free, we have two possibilities: (1) $\deg_{y_1}(T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}) = b$ and $\deg_\zeta(T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}) = b-1$, if $y'_0 \mid T^+_{\mathfrak{V},B}$. (2) $\deg_{y_1}(T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}) = b$ and $\deg_\zeta(T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}) = b$, if $y'_0 \nmid T^+_{\mathfrak{V},B}$. Hence, in either case, either $T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ is linear in y_1 when $b = 1$ in the first case, or else, $\zeta \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ when $b > 1$ in the first case or in any situation of the second case.

Suppose $B \notin \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{F_k}$. We we can write $B = B_{(k'\tau')}$ with $\tau' \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_{k'}}]$ and $k' > k$. We can express

$$B = B_{(k'\tau')} = x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}},\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}})}x_{\underline{u}_{F_{k'}}} - x_{\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}}}x_{\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}}}x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_{k'}})}.$$

Since $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}},\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}})}$ and $x_{\underline{u}_{F_{k'}}}$ do not appear in any relation in $\mathfrak{G}_{F_j}$ with $j < k'$ and $k < k'$, we see that $T_B^+ = x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{\tau'}},\underline{v}_{s_{\tau'}})}x_{\underline{u}_{F_{k'}}}$ *retains* this form under the current blowup, in particular, $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},B}$ is square-free. Furthermore, if $y_1 \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$, then $\zeta \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$.

This proves $(1_\wp)$.

(2)

$(2_\wp)$ We continue to consider the case when the blowup is $\wp_k$ blowup (not the ℓ_k-blowup).

(2a).

The proof of the fact that the plus-term $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ is square-free is totally analogous to the corresponding part of (1a). The remainder statements follow from straightforward calculations. We omit the obvious details.

(2b) Let $B > B_{(k\tau)}$.

The fact that $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ is square-free, again, follows from the same line of arguments as in the corresponding part of (1b).

If $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{F_k}$, one sees that $y_0' \nmid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$.

Suppose $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{F_k}$. Then, by the same line of argument of the correpsonding part of (1b), we again obtain that if $y_0 \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$, then $\zeta \mid T^-_{\mathfrak{V},B}$.

This proves $(2_\wp)$.

(3) (The statement is exclusively about $\wp$-blowups.)

From $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ to $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, over any chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, by (1a) and (1b), we have

$$\deg(T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}) = \deg(T^+_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}) - 1$$

or

$$\deg(T^-_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}) = \deg(T^-_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}) - 1.$$

Hence, after finitely many steps, over any chart $\mathfrak{V}$, either all variables in $B_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ are invertible along the proper transform of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}$, or else, one of the two terms of $B_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ must become a constant.

This implies that the process of $\wp$-blowups in $(\wp_{(k\tau)})$ must terminate after finitely many rounds. That is, $\rho_{(k\tau)} < \infty$. The remaining statements follows from $\rho_{(k\tau)} < \infty$.

(1_ℓ) Now we return to consider the ℓ_k-blowup.

In this case, we have y'_0, defining the $\mathfrak{L}$-divisor $D_{\wp_k, L_{F_k}}$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$, does not appear in any relation B of $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$.

(1a) By (3) (already proved), all $B_{(k\tau)}$ of $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$ terminate. Thus, it follows that $T^{+}_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$ is square-free. The remaining statements are void.

(1b) Then, the same line of aruments applied to $x_{\underline{u}_{F_{k'}}}$ as in (1a) of $(1_\wp)$ can be reused to obtain the desried statement.

(2_ℓ) We still consider the ℓ_k-blowup.

Because $\mathfrak{V}$ is a preferred chart (by assumption), the statement is void.

(4)

$(4_\wp)$ We first consider the case when the blowup is $\wp_k$ blowup (not the ℓ_k-blowup).

When we begin with the block $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{F_k}$, we have

$$B_{(k\tau)} : x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_\tau},\underline{u}_{s_\tau})} x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_F} - a_\tau,\ \tau \in [\mathfrak{t}_{F_k}]$$

where a_τ are some monomials.

Fix and consider any $B^{\mathrm{q}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$. We can write $B^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}'} = T_{\mathfrak{V}',0} - T_{\mathfrak{V}',1}$.

Consider the $\wp$-blowups with respect to the first relation $B_{(k1)}$.

First, assume $y'_0 = x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_F}$. Note that the variable $x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_F}$ does not appear in B^{q}. If y'_1 does not appear in B^{q}, there is nothing to prove. If y'_1 appears in one of the two terms of $B^{\mathrm{q}} = B^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}'} = T_{\mathfrak{V}',0} - T_{\mathfrak{V}',1}$, say $T_{\mathfrak{V}',0}$, then y'_1 can become the exceptional parameter ζ or brings ζ with it into $T_{\mathfrak{V},0}$. Hence, in either case, we obtain $\zeta \mid T_0$.

Next, assume $y'_0 = x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$. Suppose $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$ does not appear in B^{q}, then the same line of arguments in the previous case implies the desired statement. Suppose $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$ appears in B^{q}, w.l.o.g., say, in $T_{\mathfrak{V}',0}$. Then it is linear in T_0 by Lemma 4.6 (2). If y'_1 does not appear in B^{q}, the statement follows immediately. If y'_1 also appears in $T_{\mathfrak{V}',0}$, then $\zeta \mid T_{\mathfrak{V},0}$. Suppose y'_1 appears in $T_{\mathfrak{V}',1}$ with degree $b > 0$. If y'_1 becomes ζ, then $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$ is the proper transform of $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$, then $B^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ remains linear in $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$. If $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$ becomes ζ, then we have $\zeta^{b-1} y_1^b \in T_{\mathfrak{V}',1}$ where y_1 is the proper transform of y'_1. Thus, the statement follows immediately.

Then, we move on to $B_{(k2)}$. Notice that during the previous blowups with respect $B_{(k1)}$ the variable $x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_F}$ does not bring any exceptional variable ε into B^{q}. Hence, any exceptional variable in the plus term of $B_{(k2)}$, just like $x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_F}$ in the previous

case, does not appear in B^{q} on the chart. When such an exceptional variable belongs to the local blowup center, then, by the same arguments for $x_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_F}$ in the previous case, we conclude that the desired statement of (4) holds when the exceptional variables in the plus term of $B_{(k2)}$ belong to the local $\wp$- or ℓ-set.

When $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_2},\underline{u}_{s_2})}$ belongs to the local blowup center, then the exactly same argument applied to $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{u}_{s_1})}$ can be reused for $x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u}_{s_2},\underline{u}_{s_2})}$ to obtain (4).

We can then move to the next and the remaining binomial relations, one by one, repeat exactly the same argument to obtain the desired statement.

(4_ℓ) We consider the case when the blowup is ℓ_k-blowup.

In this case, note that y_0', locally defining $D_{\wp_k,L_{F_k}}$, does not appear in $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}$. Also, since $\mathfrak{V}$ is a preferred chart, we have $\zeta = \delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ with $L_{F_k} \in \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. Hence, if $y_1 \mid T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$, a term of $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$, then $\zeta \mid T_{\mathfrak{V},B}$.

This proves (4).

By induction, Proposition 6.13 is proved. □

7. Γ-schemes and Their Transforms

7.1. Γ-schemes.

Here, we return to the initial affine chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \subset \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E)$.

Definition 7.1. *Let Γ be an arbitrary subset of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}} = \{x_{\underline{u}} \mid \underline{u} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}\}$. We let I_Γ be the ideal of $\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}}$ generated by all the elements $x_{\underline{u}}$ in Γ, and,*

$$I_{\wp,\Gamma} = \langle x_{\underline{u}},\ \bar{F} \mid x_{\underline{u}} \in \Gamma,\ \bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}\rangle$$

be the ideal of $\mathbf{k}[x_{\underline{u}}]_{\underline{u}\in\mathbb{I}_{d,n}\backslash\underline{m}}$ generated by I_Γ together with all the de-homogenized $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$. We let Z_Γ ($\subset \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \cap \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$) be the closed subscheme of the affine space $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ defined by the ideal $I_{\wp,\Gamma}$. The subscheme Z_Γ is called the Γ-scheme of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. Note that $Z_\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ since $0 \in Z_\Gamma$.

(Thus, a Γ-scheme is an intersection of certain Schubert divisors with the chart $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. But, in this article, we do not investigate Γ-schemes in any *Schubert* way.)

Take $\Gamma = \emptyset$. Then, $I_{\wp,\emptyset}$ is the ideal generated by all the de-homogenized $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations. Thus, $Z_\emptyset = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$.

Let Γ be any fixed subset of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$. We let $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$ be the coordinate subspace of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$ defined by I_Γ. That is,

$$\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma} = \{(x_{\underline{u}} = 0)_{x_{\underline{u}} \in \Gamma}\} \subset \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}.$$

This is a coordinate subspace of dimension $\binom{n}{d} - 1 - |\Gamma|$ where $|\Gamma|$ is the cardinality of Γ. Then, Z_Γ is the scheme-theoretic intersection of $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ with the coordinate subspace $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$. For any $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker equation $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, we let $\bar{F}|_\Gamma$ be the induced polynomial obtained from the de-homogeneous polynomial $\bar{F}$ by setting $x_{\underline{u}} = 0$ for all $x_{\underline{u}} \in \Gamma$. Then, $\bar{F}|_\Gamma$ becomes a polynomial on the affine subspace $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$. We point out that $\bar{F}|_\Gamma$ can be identically zero on $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$.

Definition 7.2. *Let Γ be any fixed subset of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$. Let $(\bar{F})$ F be any fixed (de-homogenized) $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relation. We say $(\bar{F})$ F is Γ-irrelevant if every term of $\bar{F}$ belongs to the ideal I_Γ. Otherwise, we say $(\bar{F})$ F is Γ-relevant. We let $\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{rel}}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$ be the set of all Γ-relevant de-homogenized $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations. We let $\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{irr}}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$ be the set of all Γ-irrelevant de-homogenized $\underline{m}$-primary Plücker relations.*

If $\bar{F}$ is Γ-irrelevant, then $\bar{F}|_\Gamma$ is identically zero along $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$. Indeed, $\bar{F}$ is Γ-irrelevant if and only if every term of $\bar{F}$ contains a member of Γ. The sufficiency direction is clear. To see the necessary direction, we suppose a term $x_{\underline{u}}x_{\underline{v}} \in I_\Gamma$, then as I_Γ is prime (the coordinate subspace $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m},\Gamma}$ is integral), we have $x_{\underline{u}}$ or $x_{\underline{v}} \in \Gamma$.

7.2. $\mathscr{F}$-transforms of Γ-schemes in $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

In what follows, we keep notation of Proposition 4.21.

Recall that for any $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, $\Lambda_F = \{(\underline{u}_s, \underline{v}_s) \mid s \in S_F\}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Fix any subset Γ of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. Assume that Z_Γ is integral.*

Consider $F_k \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$ for any fixed $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

Then, we have the following:

- *there exists a closed subscheme $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ of $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ with an induced morphism $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$;*
- *$Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ comes equipped with an irreducible component $Z^\dagger_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ with the induced morphism $Z^\dagger_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$;*

- *for any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ such that $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$, there exists a subset, possibly empty,*

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \ \subset \ \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}.$$

Further, consider any given standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ with $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$. Then, the following hold.

(1) *The scheme $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by the following relations*

$$y, \quad y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \tag{7.1}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{\mathfrak{V},[k]},$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_t} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_t} - x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_t,\underline{v}_t)} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}, \ \ s,t \in S_{F_i}, \ i \in [k],$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_i} : \ \sum_{s \in S_{F_i}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \ \ i \in [k],$$

$$\bar{F}_{\mathfrak{V},j} : \ \sum_{s \in S_{F_j}} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}_s}, \ \ k < j \leq \Upsilon.$$

Further, we take $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ to be the maximal subset (under inclusion) among all those subsets that satisfy the above.

(2) *The induced morphism $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \to Z_{\Gamma}$ is birational.*

(3) *Fix any variable $y = x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}}$ or $y = x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$ if and only if $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$. (We remark here that this property is not used within this lemma, but will be used as the initial case of Lemma 7.4.)*

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on k with $k \in \{0\} \cup [\Upsilon]$.

When $k = 0$, we have $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[0]}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$, $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[0]}} := \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$. There exists a unique chart $\mathfrak{V} = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. In this case, we set

$$Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[0]},\Gamma} = Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[0]},\Gamma} := Z_{\Gamma}$$

Further, we let

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \Gamma.$$

Then, the statement holds trivially.

Inductively, we suppose that Lemma 7.3 holds for $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$.

We now consider $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \subset \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

Recall from (4.22), we have the natural birational morphsim

$$\rho_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} : \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}},$$

induced from the forgetful map $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$.

First, we suppose F_k is Γ-relevant.

In this case, we set

$$\Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma} := \{x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \in \Lambda_{F_k} \mid x_{\underline{u}} \text{ or } x_{\underline{v}} \in \Gamma\}. \tag{7.2}$$

(Here, recall the convention of (4.2): $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = x_{(\underline{v},\underline{u})}$.)

We then let $\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$ be the scheme-theoretic pre-image and define $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ to be the scheme-theoretic intersection

$$Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0 \mid (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma}), \tag{7.3}$$

Next, because F_k is Γ-relevant and $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ is birational to Z_Γ, one checks that $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ is not contained in the exceptional locus of the birational morphism $\rho_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$. Thus, there exists a Zariski open subset $Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ of $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ such that

$$\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \longrightarrow Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$$

is an isomorphism.

We claim

$$\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \subset Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0 \mid (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma}). \tag{7.4}$$

To see this, note that since $\bar{F}_k$ is Γ-relevant, there exists a term $x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s}$ of $\bar{F}_k$ for some $s \in S_{F_k}$ such that it does not vanish generically along $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ (which is birational to Z_Γ). Then, we consider the binomial relation of $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ in $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$

$$x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}x_{\underline{u}_s}x_{\underline{v}_s} - x_{\underline{u}}x_{\underline{v}}x_{(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, \tag{7.5}$$

for any $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{F_k}$. It follows that $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ vanishes identically along $\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cong Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ if $x_{\underline{u}}$ or $x_{\underline{v}} \in \Gamma$. Hence, (7.4) holds.

We then let $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ be the closure of $\rho^{-1}_{[k]}(Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$ in $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$. Since $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ is closed in $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ and contains the Zariski open subset $\rho^{-1}_{[k]}(Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$ of $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$, it is an irreducible component of $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$.

Further, consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, lying over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$, such that $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\neq\emptyset$. We set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\sqcup\{x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}\in\Lambda_{F_k}\mid x_{\underline{u}}\text{ or }x_{\underline{v}}\in\Gamma\}. \tag{7.6}$$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 7.3 (1), (2) and (3) in the case of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

(1). Note that scheme-theoretically, we have

$$\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})\cap\mathfrak{V}=\pi^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})\cap\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}\cap\mathfrak{V}$$

where $\pi_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}:\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}\to\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$ is the projection. We can apply Lemma 7.3 (1) in the case of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$ to $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ and $\pi^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$, apply Proposition 4.21 to $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}\cap\mathfrak{V}$, and use the construction (7.3) of $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ (cf. (7.2) and (7.6)), we then obtain that $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by

$$y,\ \ y\in\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[k]};$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)},\ \ s,t\in S_{F_i}\ \text{ with all } i\in[k]$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_i},\ i\in[k];\ \bar{F}_{\mathfrak{V},j},\ k<j\leq\Upsilon.$$

Then, the above implies Lemma 7.3 (1) in the case of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

(2). By construction, we have that the composition $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\to\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}\to Z_{\Gamma}$ is birational. This proves Lemma 7.3 (2) in the case of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

(3). It suffices to prove that if $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$, then $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$.

If $y=x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}}$ $(=x_{\underline{u}}$, cf. the proof of Proposition 4.20), then $x_{\underline{u}}\in\Gamma$ because $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ is birational to Z_{Γ}. Therefore, $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$ by (7.1), which holds by (the just proved) Lemma 7.3 (1) for $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

Now assume $y=x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$. Here, $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ is the de-homogenization of $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ (cf. the proof of Proposition 4.20). Below, upon setting $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{F_i,o}},\underline{v}_{s_{F_i,o}})}\equiv 1$ for all $i\in[k]$ (cf. Definition 4.19), we can write $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=x_{\mathfrak{V}',(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$.

Suppose $(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{F_i}$ with $i\in[k-1]$. By taking the images of $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$ under $\rho_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, we obtain $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}'\subset(x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=0)$. Hence, we have $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}'\subset$

$(x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=0)$ by Lemma 7.3 (3) for $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$. Therefore, $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}\in\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ by the maximality of the subset $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Then, by (7.6), $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=0)$.

Now suppose $(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda_{F_k}$. Consider the relations

$$x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}}x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}}-x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}x_{\underline{u}_{s_{F_k,o}}}x_{\underline{v}_{s_{F_k,o}}}.$$

Here, we have used $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_{F_k,o}},\underline{v}_{s_{F_k,o}})}\equiv 1$. Then, we have $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}}x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}}$ vanishes identically along $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$, hence, so does one of $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}}$ and $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{v}}$, that is, $x_{\underline{u}}$ or $x_{\underline{v}}\in\Gamma$, since $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ (birational to Z_Γ) is integral. In either case, it implies that $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}\subset(x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=0)$ by (7.2) and (7.3).

This proves the lemma when F_k is Γ-relevant.

Next, we suppose F_k is Γ-irrelevant.

In this case, we have that

$$(\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}))/(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$$

is defined by the set of equations of L_{F_k} and $\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[k]}$, all regarded as relations in ϱ-variables of F_k. All these relations are linear in ϱ-variables of F_k, according to Lemma 4.6. Putting together, we call $\{L_{F_k},\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[k]}\}$ a linear system in ϱ-variables of F_k.

We can let $\Lambda^{\text{det}}_{F_k,\Gamma}$ be the subset of Λ_{F_k} such that the minor corresponding to variables

$$\{x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}\mid(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda^{\text{det}}_{F_k,\Gamma}\}$$

achieves the maximal rank of the linear system $\{L_{F_k},\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[k]}|\}$, regarded as relations in ϱ-variables of F_k, at any point of some fixed Zariski open subset $Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ of $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$.

We then set and plug

$$x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}=0,\ \forall\ (\underline{u},\underline{v})\notin\Lambda^{\text{det}}_{F_k,\Gamma}\tag{7.7}$$

into the linear system $\{L_{F_k},\mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[k]}\}$ to obtain an induced linear system of full rank over $Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$. This induced linear system can be solved over the Zariski open subset $Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ such that all variables

$$\{x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})}\mid(\underline{u},\underline{v})\in\Lambda^{\text{det}}_{F_k,\Gamma}\}$$

are explicitly determined by the coefficients of the induced linear system.

We then let

$$\Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma} \subset \Lambda_{F_k} \tag{7.8}$$

be the subset consisting of $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \notin \Lambda^{\det}_{F_k,\Gamma}$ and $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{\det}_{F_k,\Gamma}$ such that $x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \equiv 0$ over $Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$. Observe here that we immediately obtain that for any $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{F_k}$,

$$x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \text{ vanishes identically over } Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma} \text{ if and only if } (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma}. \tag{7.9}$$

We let $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ be the scheme-theoretic intersection

$$\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0,\ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma}). \tag{7.10}$$

Now, fix and consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$, lying over a standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$ with $\widetilde{Z}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$, equivalently, $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \neq \emptyset$. We set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \sqcup \{x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} \mid (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma}\}. \tag{7.11}$$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 7.3 (1), (2) and (3) in the case of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

Similar to the proof of Lemma 7.3 (1) for the previous case when $\bar{F}_k$ is Γ-relevant, by Lemma 7.3 (1) in the case of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$ applied to $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ and $\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$, applying Proposition 4.21 to $\mathscr{V}_{F_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, and using (7.10) and (7.11), we obtain that $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by

$$y,\ \ y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\text{pre-q}}_{[k]};$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},(s,t)},\ \ s,t \in S_{F_i}\ \text{ with all } i \in [k]$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F_i},\ \ i \in [k];\ \bar{F}_{\mathfrak{V},j},\ k < j \leq \Upsilon.$$

Then, the above implies that Lemma 7.3 (1) holds on $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

Next, by construction, the induced morphism

$$\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}) \cap (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0,\ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma}) \longrightarrow Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}}$$

is an isomorphism. We let $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ be the closure of

$$\rho^{-1}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}(Z^{\dagger\circ}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}) \cap (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0,\ (\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma})$$

in $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$. Then, it is closed in $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ and contains an open subset of $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$, hence, is an irreducible component of $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$. It follows that the composition

$$Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \to Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k-1]}} \to Z_{\Gamma}$$

is birational. This proves Lemma 7.3 (2) on $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

Finally, we are to prove Lemma 7.3 (3) on $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$. Suppose $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$ for some $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. If $y = x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}}$ or $y = x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})}$ with $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{F_i}$ with $i \in [k-1]$, then the identical proof in the previous case carries over here without changes. We now suppose $Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$ with $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda_{F_k}$, then by (7.9), $(\underline{u},\underline{v}) \in \Lambda^{=0}_{F_k,\Gamma}$. Thus, by (7.10), $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma} \subset (x_{(\underline{u},\underline{v})} = 0)$. This proves Lemma 7.3 (3) on $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$.

By induction, Lemma 7.3 is proved. □

We call $Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]},\Gamma}$ the $\mathscr{F}$-transform of Z_{Γ} in $\mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}_{[k]}}$ for any $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

7.3. ϑ-transforms of Γ-schemes in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

We now construct the ϑ-transform of Z_{Γ} in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Lemma 7.4. *Fix any subset Γ of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. Assume that Z_{Γ} is integral.*

Fix any $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

Then, we have the following:

- *there exists a closed subscheme $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ with an induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \to Z_{\Gamma}$;*
- *$\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ comes equipped with an irreducible component $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ with the induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \to Z_{\Gamma}$;*
- *for any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ such that $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$, there are two subsets, possibly empty,*

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}.$$

Further, consider any given standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ with $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$. Then, the following hold:

(1) *the scheme* $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$*, as a closed subscheme of the chart* $\mathfrak{V}$*, is defined by the following relations*

$$\begin{gathered} y, \quad y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \\ y-1, \quad y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k},\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}; \end{gathered} \tag{7.12}$$

further, we take $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ *to be the maximal subset (under inclusion) among all those subsets that satisfy the above;*

(2) *the induced morphism* $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \to Z_{\Gamma}$ *is birational;*

(3) *for any variable* $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$*,* $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$ *if and only if* $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$*. Consequently,* $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset \widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k+1]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *if and only if* $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset \widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k+1]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ *where* $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ *is the proper transform of the* ϑ*-center* $Z_{\vartheta_{[k+1]}}$ *in* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$*.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $k \in \{0\} \cup [\Upsilon]$.

The initial case is $k = 0$. In this case, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} := \mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}, \quad \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}} := \mathscr{V}_{\mathscr{F}}, \quad \widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[0]},\Gamma} := Z_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]},\Gamma}, \quad \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[0]},\Gamma} := Z^{\dagger}_{\mathscr{F}_{[\Upsilon]},\Gamma}.$$

Then, in this case, Lemma 7.4 is Lemma 7.3 for $k = \Upsilon$, where we set $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \emptyset$.

We now suppose that Lemma 7.4 holds over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

We then consider the case of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Suppose that $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, or equivalently $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, by Lemma 7.4 (3) in the case of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$, is not contained in $Z'_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ where $Z'_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ is the proper transform in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ of the ϑ-center $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ (of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[0]}}$). We then let $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ (respectively, $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$) be the proper transform of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ (respectively, $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$) in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$. As $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ is closed in $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ and contains a Zariski open subset of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$, it is an irreducible component of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$.

Further, consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, lying over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$, such that $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$. We set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\};$$

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}.$$

We now prove Lemma 7.4 (1), (2) and (3) in the case of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

We can apply Lemma 7.4 (1) in the case of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ to $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ to obtain the defining equations of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}'$ as stated in the lemma; we note here that these equations include $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V}',\geq k}$. We then take the proper transforms of these equations in $\mathfrak{V}'$ to obtain the corresponding equations in $\mathfrak{V}$, and then apply (the proof of) Proposition 5.13 to reduce $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},\geq k}$ to $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}$. Because $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]}\Gamma}$ is the proper transform of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, this implies Lemma 7.4 (1) in the case of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

By construction, we have that the composition $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}\to\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}\to Z_\Gamma$ is birational. This proves Lemma 7.4 (2) in the case of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

To show Lemma 7.4 (3) in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, we fix any $y\in\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. It suffices to show that if $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$, then $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$. By construction, $y\neq\zeta_{\mathfrak{V},\vartheta_{[k]}}$, the exceptional variable in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ corresponding to the ϑ-center $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$. Hence, y is the proper transform of some $y'\in\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Then, by taking the images of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$ under the morphism $\rho_{\vartheta_{[k]}}:\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}\to\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ (which is induced from the blowup morphism $\pi_{\vartheta_{[k]}}:\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}\to\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$), we obtain $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}'\subset(y'=0)$, hence, $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}'\subset(y'=0)$ by the inductive assumption. Then, as $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ is the proper transform of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, we obtain $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\subset(y=0)$.

The last statement Lemma 7.4 (3) follows from the above because $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k+1]}}\cap\mathfrak{V}=(y_0=y_1=0)$ for some $y_0,y_1\in\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

We now suppose that $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, or equivalently $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, by Lemma 7.4 (3) in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$, is contained in the proper transform $Z'_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ of the ϑ-center $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, lying over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$, such that $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\neq\emptyset$.

We let $\vartheta'_{[k]}$ be the proper transform in the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of the ϑ-set $\vartheta_{[k]}$. Then, $\vartheta'_{[k]}$ consists of two variables

$$\vartheta'_{[k]}=\{y'_0,y'_1\}\subset\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}.$$

We let $\mathbb{P}^1_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$ be the factor projective space for the ϑ-blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}\to\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ with $[\xi_0,\xi_1]$ corresponding to (y'_0,y'_1). Without loss of generality, we can assume that the open chart $\mathfrak{V}$ is given by

$$(\mathfrak{V}'\times(\xi_0\equiv 1))\cap\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}\subset\mathfrak{V}'\times\mathbb{P}^1_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}.$$

We let $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}} := \zeta_{\mathfrak{V},\vartheta_{[k]}} \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ be such that $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}} = 0)$ where $E_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ is the exceptional divisor of the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$. Note here that according to the proof of Proposition 5.10, the variable y'_0 corresponds to (or turns into) the exceptional $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$. We then let $y_1(=\xi_1) \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ be the proper transform of $y'_1 \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

In addition, we observe that

$$\vartheta'_{[k]} = \{y'_0, y'_1\} \subset \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$$

because $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ is contained in the proper transform $Z'_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ of the ϑ-center $Z_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

We set,

$$\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}},\ y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \backslash \vartheta'_{[k]}\}, \tag{7.13}$$

$$\overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{\ y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}. \tag{7.14}$$

Consider the scheme-theoretic pre-image $\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$ where $\rho_{\vartheta_{[k]}} : \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ is induced from the blowup morphism $\pi_{\vartheta_{[k]}} : \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$.

Note that scheme-theoretically, we have,

$$\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap \mathfrak{V} = \pi^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}.$$

Applying Lemma 7.4 (1) in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$ to $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ and $\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$, and applying Proposition 5.13 to $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, we obtain that $\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by

$$y_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ y_{\mathfrak{V}} - 1,\ y_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k};\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}. \tag{7.15}$$

(Observe here that $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.)

Thus, by setting $y_{\mathfrak{V}} = 0$ for all $y_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ and $y_{\mathfrak{V}} = 1$ for all $y_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ in $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ of the above, we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \tilde{L}_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}. \tag{7.16}$$

Note that for any $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, if $L_{\mathfrak{V},F}$ contains y_1, then it contains $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}$, hence $\tilde{L}_{\mathfrak{V},F}$ does not contain y_1. We keep those equations of (7.16) that contain the variable y_1 and

obtain

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \hat{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{res}}_{\mathfrak{V},>k}, \hat{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \tag{7.17}$$

viewed as a system of equations in y_1. By Proposition 5.13 (the last two statements), one sees that (7.17) is a *linear* system of equations in y_1. Furthermore, we have that

$$(\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap \mathfrak{V})/(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}')$$

is defined by the linear system (7.17).

There are the following two cases for (7.17):

($\star a$) the rank of the linear system (7.17) equals one over general points of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$.

($\star b$) the rank of the linear system (7.17) equals zero at general points of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, hence at all points of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$.

Proof of Lemma 7.4 for $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ under the condition ($\star a$).

By the condition ($\star a$), there exists a Zariski open subset $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ such that the rank of the linear system (7.17) equals one at any point of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$. By solving y_1 from the linear system (7.17) over $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$, we obtain that the induced morphism

$$\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$$

is an isomorphism.

First, we suppose y_1 is identically zero along $\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$. We then set,

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_1\} \cup \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{7.18}$$

where $\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is as in (7.13). In this case, we let

$$\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap D_{y_1} \tag{7.19}$$

scheme-theoretically, where D_{y_1} is the closure of $(y_1 = 0)$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$. We remark here that D_{y_1} does not depend on the choice of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

Next, suppose y_1 is not identically zero along $\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$. We then set,

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{7.20}$$

where $\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is as in (7.13). In this case, we let

$$\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}). \tag{7.21}$$

We always set (under the condition $(\star a)$)

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{7.22}$$

where $\overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is as in (7.14).

In each case, by construction, we have

$$\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \subset \widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]}\Gamma},$$

and we let $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ be the closure of $\rho^{-1}_{(\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$ in $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$. It is an irreducible component of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ because $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ is closed in $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ and contains the Zariski open subset $\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma})$ of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$. Then, we obtain that the composition

$$\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_{\Gamma}$$

is birational. This proves Lemma 7.4 (2) over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

In each case of the above (i.e., (7.18) and (7.20)), by the paragraph of (7.15), one sees that $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by the equations as stated in the Lemma. This proves Lemma 7.4 (1) over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

It remains to prove Lemma 7.4 (3) over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Fix any $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, it suffices to show that if $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$, then $\widetilde{Z}_{(\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$. If $y \neq \zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}, y_1$, then y is the proper transform of some variable $y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Hence, by taking the images under $\rho_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$, we have $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \subset (y' = 0)$; by Lemma 7.4 (3) in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]}}$, we obtain $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \subset (y' = 0)$, thus $y' \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ by the maximality of the subset $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Therefore, $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$, by (the already-proved) Lemma 7.4 (1) for $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ (cf. (7.13) and (7.18) or (7.20)). Next, suppose $y = y_1$ (if it occurs). Then, by construction, $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$. Finally, we let $y = \zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}$. Again, by construction, $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}} = 0)$.

As earlier, the last statement Lemma 7.4 (3) follows from the above.

Proof of Lemma 7.4 over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ under the condition $(\star b)$.

Under the condition $(\star b)$, we have that

$$\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$$

can be canonically identified with the trivial $\mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$-bundle:

$$\rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) = \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma} \times \mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}.$$

In this case, we define

$$\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap ((\xi_0,\xi_1) = (1,1)),$$

$$\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}) \cap ((\xi_0,\xi_1) = (1,1)),$$

both scheme-theoretically. The induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ is an isomorphism. Again, one sees that $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ is an irreducible component of $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$. Therefore,

$$\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_{\Gamma}$$

is birational. This proves Lemma 7.5 (2) over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Further, under the condition $(\star b)$, we set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_1\} \cup \overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}.$$

Then, again, by the paragraph of (7.15), one sees that $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by the equations as stated in the Lemma. This proves Lemma 7.4 (1) over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

It remains to prove Lemma 7.4 (3) in over $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$.

Fix any $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, it suffices to show that if $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$, then $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$. By construction, $y \neq y_1$. Then, the corresponding proof of Lemma 7.4 (3) for $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ under the condition $(\star a)$ goes through here without change. The last statement Lemma 7.4 (3) follows from the above. This proves Lemma 7.4 (3) in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ under the condition $(\star b)$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 7.4. □

We call $\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma}$ the ϑ-transform of Z_{Γ} in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\vartheta_{[k]}}$ for any $k \in [\Upsilon]$.

We need the final case of Lemma 7.4. We set

$$\widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta,\Gamma} := \widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]},\Gamma}, \quad \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta,\Gamma} := \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\vartheta_{[\Upsilon]},\Gamma}.$$

7.4. **$\wp$- and ℓ-transforms of Γ-schemes in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ and in (ℓ_k).**

We now construct the $\wp$-transform of Z_Γ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. Here, as in Proposition 6.9, we assume that the last of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ is $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$.

Lemma 7.5. *Fix any subset Γ of $\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. Assume that Z_Γ is integral.*

Consider $(k\tau)\mu h \in \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k} \sqcup \{\ell_k\}$.

Then, we have the following:

- *there exists a closed subscheme $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ with an induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$;*
- *$\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ comes equipped with an irreducible component $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ with the induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$;*
- *for any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ such that $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$, there come equipped with two subsets, possibly empty,*

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \ \subset\ \mathrm{Var}^{\vee}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} \ \subset\ \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}.$$

Further, consider any given chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ with $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$. Then, the following hold:

(1) *the scheme $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by the following relations*

$$\begin{aligned} y, &\quad y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \\ y-1, &\quad y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ &L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}; \end{aligned} \tag{7.23}$$

further, we take $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ to be the maximal subset (under inclusion) among all those subsets that satisfy the above.

(2) *the induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$ is birational;*

(3) *for any variable $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$ if and only if $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$. Consequently, $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset \widetilde{Z}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu(h+1)}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ if and only if $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset \widetilde{Z}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu(h+1)}} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ where $\widetilde{Z}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu(h+1)}}$ is the proper transform of the $\wp$-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu(h+1)}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $(k\tau)\mu h \in \{(11)10)\} \sqcup \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k} \sqcup \{\ell_k\}$ (cf. (6.2)).

The initial case is (11)10. In this case, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(11)}\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)} := \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta,\ \ \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(11)}\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0)} := \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\vartheta,\ \ \widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(11)}\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0),\Gamma} := \widetilde{Z}_{\vartheta,\Gamma},\ \ \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp_{(11)}\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{s}_0),\Gamma} := \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\vartheta,\Gamma}.$$

Then, in this case, Lemma 7.5 is Lemma 7.4 for $k = \Upsilon$.

We now suppose that Lemma 7.5 holds for $(k\tau)\mu(h-1)$ for some $(k\tau)\mu h \in \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k}$.

We treat exclusively $\wp$-transforms of Z_Γ first, in other words, we assume that $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})} \neq \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$. We treat ℓ-transforms of Z_Γ in the end.

We then consider the case of $(k\tau)\mu h$.

We let

$$\rho_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} : \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})} \tag{7.24}$$

be the morphism induced from $\pi_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} : \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$.

Suppose that $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$, or equivalently $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$, by Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{(h-1)})$, is not contained in $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ where $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ is the proper transform in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ of the $\wp$-center $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$(of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_{\mu-1})}$).

We then let $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$) be the proper transform of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$ (resp. $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$) in $\mathscr{V}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. As $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ is closed in $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ and contains a Zariski open subset of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$, it is an irreducible component of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$.

Further, consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, lying over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$, such that $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$. We set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\};$$

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}.$$

We now prove Lemma 7.5 (1), (2) and (3) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

Lemma 7.5 (1) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ follows from Lemma 7.5 (1) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})$ because $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ is the proper transform of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$.

By construction, we have that $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \to \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$ is birational. This proves Lemma 7.5 (2) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

To show Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$, we fix any $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$. It suffices to show that if $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$, then $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$. By construction, $y \neq \zeta_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)\mu h}$, the exceptional variable in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ corresponding to the $\wp$-set $\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}$. Hence, y is the proper transform of some $y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Then, by taking the images under the morphism $\rho_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ of (7.24), we obtain $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \subset (y'=0)$, hence, $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \subset (y'=0)$ by the inductive assumption. Then, as $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ is the proper transform of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$, we obtain $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y=0)$. The last statement of Lemma 7.5 (3) follows from the above because $\widetilde{Z}_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu(h+1)}} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (y_0 = y_1 = 0)$ for some $y_0, y_1 \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

We now suppose that $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$, or equivalently $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$, by Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{(h-1)})$, is contained in the proper transform $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$ of $Z_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$.

Consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, lying over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$, such that $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \neq \emptyset$.

We let $\phi'_{(k\tau)\mu h}$ be the proper transform in the chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of the $\wp$-set $\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}$. Then, $\phi'_{(k\tau)\mu h}$ consists of two variables such that

$$\psi'_{(k\tau)\mu h} = \{y'_0, y'_1\} \subset \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}.$$

In addition, we let $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}} \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ be such that $E_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \cap \mathfrak{V} = (\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}} = 0)$ where $E_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ is the exceptional divisor of the blowup $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that y'_0 corresponds to the exceptional variable $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}$ on the chart $\mathfrak{V}$. We then let $y_1 \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ be the proper transform of y'_1.

Now, we observe that

$$\phi'_{(k\tau)\mu h} \subset \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$$

because $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$ is contained in the proper transform $Z'_{\phi_{(k\tau)\mu h}}$.

We set,

$$\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}},\ y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'} \backslash \phi'_{(k\tau)\mu h}\}, \tag{7.25}$$

$$\overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{\ y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}. \tag{7.26}$$

Consider the scheme-theoretic pre-image $\rho^{-1}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})$.

Note that scheme-theoretically, we have

$$\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})\cap\mathfrak{V}=\pi^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})\cap\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\cap\mathfrak{V}.$$

Applying Lemma 7.5 (1) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})$ to $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$ and $\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})$, and applying Proposition 6.13 to $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}\cap\mathfrak{V}$, we obtain that the pre-image $\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})\cap\mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by

$$y_{\mathfrak{V}}\in\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ y_{\mathfrak{V}}-1,\ y_{\mathfrak{V}}\in\overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}};\ \ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}. \tag{7.27}$$

(Observe here that $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}\in\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.)

Thus, by setting

$$y_{\mathfrak{V}}=0\text{ for all }y_{\mathfrak{V}}\in\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}\text{ and }y_{\mathfrak{V}}=1\text{ for all }y_{\mathfrak{V}}\in\overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}$$

in $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}},L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}$ of the above, we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\tilde{L}_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}}. \tag{7.28}$$

Note that for any $\bar{F}\in\mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$, if a term of $L_{\mathfrak{V},F}$ contains $y_1\in\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, then it contains $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}y_1$, hence $\tilde{L}_{\mathfrak{V},F}$ does not contain y_1. We keep those equations of (7.28) such that they contain the variable $y_1\in\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ and obtain

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\hat{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \tag{7.29}$$

viewed as a system of equations in y_1. Then, by Proposition 6.13 (1), 2), and (4), (7.29) is a *linear* system of equations in y_1. (We point out that y_1 here can correspond to either y_0 or y_1 as in Proposition 6.13.) Furthermore, one sees that

$$(\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})\cap\mathfrak{V})/(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}')$$

is defined by the linear system (7.29).

There are the following two cases for (7.29):

($\star a$) the ranks of the linear system (7.29) equal one at general points of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$.

($\star b$) the ranks of the linear system (7.29) equal zero at general points of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$, hence at all points of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$.

Proof of Lemma 7.5 in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ under the condition ($\star a$).

By the condition $(\star a)$, there exists a Zariski open subset $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$ of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$ such that the rank of the linear system (7.29) equals one at any point of $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$. By solving y_1 from the linear system (7.29) over $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$, we obtain that the induced morphism

$$\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$$

is an isomorphism.

Suppose y_1 is identically zero along $\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})$. We then set,

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_1\} \cup \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{7.30}$$

where $\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is as in (7.25). In this case, we let

$$\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}) \cap D_{y_1} \tag{7.31}$$

scheme-theoretically, where D_{y_1} is the closure of $(y_1 = 0)$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$. We remark here that D_{y_1} does not depend on the choice of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

Suppose y_1 is not identically zero along $\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})$. We then set,

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{7.32}$$

where $\overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is as in (7.25) . In this case, we let

$$\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}). \tag{7.33}$$

We always set (under the condition $(\star a)$)

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{7.34}$$

where $\overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is as in (7.26).

In each case, we have

$$\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}) \subset \widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma},$$

and we let $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ be the closure of $\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})$ in $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$. It is an irreducible component of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ because $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ is closed in $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$

and contains the Zariski open subset $\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma})$ of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$. Then, it follows that the composition

$$\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$$

is birational. This proves Lemma 7.5 (2) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

In each case of (7.30) and (7.32), by the paragraph of (7.27), we have that $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$ is defined by the equations as stated in the Lemma. This proves Lemma 7.5 (1) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

It remains to prove Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

Fix any $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, it suffices to show that if $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$, then $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$. If $y \neq \zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}, y_1$, then y is the proper transform of some variable $y' \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Hence, by taking the images under $\rho_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$, we obtain $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \subset (y' = 0)$, and then, by Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})$, $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \subset (y' = 0)$, thus $y' \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$ by the maximality of $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}$. Therefore, $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$, by (the already-proved) Lemma 7.5 (1) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$. Next, suppose $y = y_1$ (if it occurs). Then, by construction, $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$. Finally, we let $y = \zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}$. Again, by construction, $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}} = 0)$. As in the previous case, the last statement of Lemma 7.5 (3) follows from the above.

Proof of Lemma 7.5 in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ under the condition $(\star b)$.

Under the condition $(\star b)$, we have that

$$\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$$

can be canonically identified with the trivial $\mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$-bundle:

$$\rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}) = \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \times \mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}.$$

In this case, we let $\mathbf{p} = [1, 1] \in \mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$, and define

$$\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} := \rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}) \times_{\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}} \mathbf{p}$$

$$\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} := \rho^{-1}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}) \times_{\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}} \mathbf{p}.$$

The induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$ is an isomorphism. Again, one sees that $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ is an irreducible component of $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$. Therefore,

$$\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \longrightarrow \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$$

is birational. This proves Lemma 7.5 (2) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

Further, under the condition $(\star b)$, we set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \overline{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}, \quad \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_1\} \cup \overline{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}.$$

Then, by the paragraph of (7.27), we have that $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, as a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}$, is defined by the equations as stated in the Lemma. This proves Lemma 7.5 (1) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

It remains to prove Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$.

Fix any $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, it suffices to show that if $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$, then $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \subset (y = 0)$. By construction, $y \neq y_1$. Then, the corresponding proof of Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ under the condition $(\star a)$ goes through here without change. As earlier, the last statement of Lemma 7.5 (3) follows from the above. This proves Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ under the condition $(\star b)$.

• ℓ-transform

Now, we assume that $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} = \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$. By Corollary 6.11, $\rho_{\ell_k,\wp_k} : \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$ is an isomorphism. In this case, we let

$$\widetilde{Z}_{\ell_k,\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\ell_k,\wp_k}(\widetilde{Z}_{\wp_k,\Gamma}),$$

$$\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell_k,\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}_{\ell_k,\wp_k}(\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\wp_k,\Gamma}).$$

Consider any standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\ell_k}$, lying over a unique standard chart $\mathfrak{V}'$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\wp_k}$, such that $\widetilde{Z}_{\wp_k,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}' \neq \emptyset$.

First, we suppose that $\widetilde{Z}_{\wp_k,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}'$, or equivalently $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\wp_k,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}'$, by Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp_k)$, is not contained in the ℓ-center $Z_{\chi_k} \cap \mathfrak{V}'$.

We set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\};$$

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \{y_{\mathfrak{V}} \mid y_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ is the proper transform of some } y_{\mathfrak{V}'} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}.$$

Then, Lemma 7.5 (1), (2) and (3) follow from the same proofs for the corresponding cases of $\wp$-blowups. We avoid repetation.

We now suppose that $\widetilde{Z}_{\wp_k,\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}'$, or equivalently $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\wp_k,\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}'$, by Lemma 7.5 (3) in $(\wp_k)$, is contained in $Z_{\chi_k}\cap\mathfrak{V}'$

This case corresponds to the precious case under the condition $(\star a)$ where y_1 there corresponds to $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ here, and $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ is not identically zero along $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell_k,\Gamma}$. So, we follow the proof in that case.

Thus, we set,

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\{\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}},\ y_{\mathfrak{V}}\mid y_{\mathfrak{V}}\text{ is the proper transform of some }y_{\mathfrak{V}'}\in\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\backslash\chi_k\},\tag{7.35}$$

$$\Gamma^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}=\{\ y_{\mathfrak{V}}\mid y_{\mathfrak{V}}\text{ is the proper transform of some }y_{\mathfrak{V}'}\in\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}'}\}.\tag{7.36}$$

Then, following the correponding proofs for the precious case *under the condition* $(\star a)$ *where* y_1 *is not identically zero,* Lemma 7.5 (1), (2) and (3) follow. But, we need to point out that here, $\zeta_{\mathfrak{V}}=\delta_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_{F_k})}$ is not a variable in $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$, but a free variable in $\mathrm{Var}^{\vee}_{\mathfrak{V}}$.

Putting all together, this completes the proof of Lemma 7.5. □

We call $\widetilde{Z}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma}$ the $\wp$-transform of Z_Γ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ for any $(k\tau)\mu h\in\mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k}$. We call $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell_k}$ he $\wp$-transform of Z_Γ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{\ell_k}$.

We need the final case of Lemma 7.5. We set

$$\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}:=\widetilde{Z}_{\ell_\Upsilon,\Gamma},\ \ \widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma}:=\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell_\Upsilon,\Gamma}.$$

Corollary 7.6. *Fix any standard chart* $\mathfrak{V}$ *of* $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell}$ *as described in Lemma 7.5 such that* $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}\neq\emptyset$. *Then,* $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}\cap\mathfrak{V}$, *as a closed subscheme of* $\mathfrak{V}$, *is defined by the following relations*

$$\begin{gathered}y,\ \ \forall\ \ y\in\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}}\subset\mathrm{Var}^{\vee}_{\mathfrak{V}};\quad y-1,\ \ \forall\ \ y\in\widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}};\\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}.\end{gathered}\tag{7.37}$$

Furthermore, the induced morphism $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma}\to Z_\Gamma$ *is birational.*

8. The Main Theorem on the Final Scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$

Let p be an arbitrarily fixed prime number. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be either $\mathbb{Q}$ or a finite field with p elements. In this entire section, every scheme is defined over $\mathbb{Z}$, consequently, is defined over $\mathbb{F}$, and is considered as a scheme over the perfect field $\mathbb{F}$.

Take any $(k\tau\mu h) \in \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k}$ (cf. 6.2). Consider the $\wp$-blowup at $(k\tau\mu h)$

$$\pi : \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}.$$

Fix any chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ and we let $\mathfrak{V}'$ be a chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ such that $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over $\mathfrak{V}'$. Then, we can assume that the induced morphism $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{V}') \longrightarrow \mathfrak{V}'$ corresponds to the ideal of the form

$$\langle y_0', y_1' \rangle,$$

where y_0' is a variable in $T^+_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}$, y_1' is a variable in $T^-_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}$, and $B_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)} = T^+_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)} - T^-_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}$. We let $\mathbb{P}_{[\xi_0,\xi_1]}$ be the corresponding factor projective space such that (ξ_0, ξ_1) corresponds to (y_0', y_1').

Observe here that the set of variables in $T^{\pm}_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}$ corresponds a subset of divisors associated to $T^{\pm}_{(k\tau)}$, hence possesses a naturally induced total order.

Given any point $\mathbf{z}$ on a chart, we say a variable is blowup-relevant at $\mathbf{z}$ if it can appear in the local blowup ideal $\langle y_0', y_1' \rangle$ as above such that the corresponding blowup center contains $\mathbf{z}$. For example, a variable is not blowup-relevant at $\mathbf{z}$ if it does not vanish at $\mathbf{z}$.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\langle y_0', y_1' \rangle$ be the local blowup ideal as in the above such that y_0' is the largest blowup-relevant variable at the point $\mathbf{z}$ among all the variables of $T^+_{\mathfrak{V}',(k\tau)}$. Then, the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ can be chosen to lie over $(\xi_1 \equiv 1)$ so that the proper transform y_0 of y_0' belongs to the term $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$.*

Proof. Using the notation before the statement of the lemma, we can write,

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}'} = a' y_0' - b' y_1'$$

where a' and b' are some monomials.

Suppose $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over $(\xi_0 \equiv 1)$. Then, by taking proper transforms, we obtain

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}} = a - \xi_1 b$$

where a and b are some monomials. Because y_0' is the largest variable in the term $T^+_{\mathfrak{V},(k\tau)}$, by the order of the $\wp$-blowups, we have that $B_{\mathfrak{V}}$ terminates. Hence, ξ_1 is invertible along $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu \mathfrak{s}_h)} \cap \mathfrak{V}$. Thus, by shrinking the chart if necessary, we can switch to the chart $(\xi_1 \equiv 1)$.

Now, let $\mathfrak{V}$ lie over $(\xi_1 \equiv 1)$. Then, we obtain

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}} = a\xi_0 - b,$$

where a and b are some monomials, and $\xi_0 = y_0$ is the proper transform of y_0'. Hence, the statement follows. □

We aim to show that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$ is smooth. The question is local. In the sequel, we will focus on a fixed closed point $\mathbf{z} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$ throughout.

Fix any standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_\ell$ containing $\mathbf{z}$. We let $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ be the unique standard chart of $\mathscr{R}_{\mathscr{F}}$ such that $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$ and we let $\mathbf{z}_0 \in \mathscr{V}_{[0]}$ be the image point of $\mathbf{z}$.

Definition 8.2. *Consider the ordered set of blocks of relations*

$$\mathfrak{G} = \{\mathfrak{G}_{F_1} < \cdots < \mathfrak{G}_{F_\Upsilon}\}. \tag{8.1}$$

Fix and consider any variable $y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ that appears in some relation of a block of $\mathfrak{G}$ in the above. We say that y is pleasant if y does not appear in any relation of any earlier block.

Lemma 8.3. *Fix any closed point $\mathbf{z} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$. Consider any $\bar{F} \in \mathscr{F}_{\underline{m}}$. Then, there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_\ell$ containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that the Jacobian $J(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F})$ admits a maximal minor $J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F})$ such that it is an invertible square matrix at $\mathbf{z}$, and all the variables that are used to compute $J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F})$ are pleasant with respect to the list $\mathfrak{G} = \{\mathfrak{G}_{F_1} < \cdots < \mathfrak{G}_{F_\Upsilon}\}$.*

Proof. Consider the main binomial relations

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},s} : x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_F} - x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_s} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{v}_s}$$

for all $s \in S_F \backslash s_F$. We let

$$S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}} = \{s \in S_F \backslash s_F \mid x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0\}$$

and

$$S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{inc}} = \{s \in S_F \backslash s_F \mid x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) = 0\}$$

The two subsets $S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}}$ and $S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}}$ depend on the point $\mathbf{z}$.

Case (α). *First, we assume* $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0$.

As $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0$, we can assume that $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over $(x_{(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} \equiv 1)$.

We can write

$$S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}} = \{s_1, \cdots, s_\ell\} \text{ and } S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{inc}} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_q\}$$

for some integers l and q such that $l + q = |S_F| - 1$.

Then, on the chart $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$, the set $\mathcal{B}_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}}$ consists of the following relations

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},s_i} : \; x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_F} - x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_{s_i}} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{v}_{s_i}}, \;\; 1 \leq i \leq l. \tag{8.2}$$

By the relation $L_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},F}(\mathbf{z}_0) = 0$, we see that there must exist $s \in S_F \backslash s_F$ such that $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0$, thus, the set $\mathcal{B}_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}}$ must not be empty. Hence, $l > 0$. This observation will be used later.

The set $\mathcal{B}_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{inc}}$ consists of the following relations

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},t_i} : \; x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_F} - x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_{t_i}} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{v}_{t_i}}, \;\; 1 \leq i \leq q \tag{8.3}$$

for some integer $q \geq 0$ with $q = 0$ when $\mathcal{B}_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{inc}} = \emptyset$.

We treat the relations of (8.2) first.

First observe that during any of $\wp$-blowups, if a variable y acquires an exceptional parameter ε, then we have $\varepsilon < y$ by Definition 6.4.

Consider B_{s_i} for any fixed $i \in [l]$.

We suppose $B_s \in \mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}$ is the smallest binomial relation.

Assume that $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})}$ is the last (non-trivial) $\wp$-blowup that makes B_s terminate in $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{(\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)}$ for some $(k\tau)\mu h \in \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k}$ (cf. (6.2)). We let $\hbar = (\wp_{(k\tau)}\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h)$ and $\hbar' = (k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1})$. Then, over some chart $\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_{\hbar'}$, the last $\wp$-blowup must correspond to $(x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'},\underline{u}_F}, y_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'}})$ when $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0$ or

$(x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, y_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'}})$ when $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) = 0$, where $y_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'}}$ is a variable in the minus term of $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'},s}$. We apply Lemma 8.1 to $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'},s}$. Then, either we have the ϖ-variable $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},\underline{u}_F}$ terminates and belongs to $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},s}$ (e.g., when $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0$), or, $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'},\underline{u}_F}$ turns into an exceptional-variable $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ (e..g, in the case when $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) = 0$). Further, $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},\underline{u}_F}$ or $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},\underline{u}_F}$ also appears in all the remaining binomials that are larger than B_s (in this special case, it is just all the remaining binomials since B_s is assumed to be smallest; we term it this way so that the same line of arguments can be reused later).

During the $\wp$-blowups with respect to B_s, after the variable $x_{\underline{u}_F}$ terminates or becomes exceptional, any further $\wp$-blowup must correspond $(x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}, y_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar'}})$ when $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)}(\mathbf{z}_0) = 0$. But, such a $\wp$-blowup will not affect *the plus term* of $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},t}$ with $t \neq s$.

In any case, $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},\underline{u}_F}$ or $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$, remains to be second largest variable, second only the ϱ-variables in $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},s_i}$ with $s_i > s$.

We then move on to the second smallest binomial relation of $\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}$ and repeat all the above arguments, until it is the turn to start the process of $\wp$-blowups with respect to B_{s_i}.

Then, because $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},\underline{u}_F}$ or $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$, remains to be the largest blowup-relevant variable in $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},s_i}$ (since $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0$), we can then apply Lemma 8.1 to $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\hbar},s_i}$ to obtain that that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},s_i}: \quad a_i x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F} - c_i$$

for some monomial a_i and c_i, where $y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ is either the ϖ-variable $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ or the proper transform of an exceptional-variable $\varepsilon_{\underline{u}_F}$.

Hence, by shrinking the charts if necessary, we conclude that that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},s_i}: \quad a_i x_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F} - c_i, \quad \text{for all } \ i \in [l] \tag{8.4}$$

where $y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ is either the ϖ-variable $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ or the proper transform of an exceptional-variable $\varepsilon_{\underline{u}_F}$ such that all of these relations terminate at $\mathbf{z}$.

Now consider $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{\vartheta},t_i}$ with $i \in [q]$.

Because $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})}(\mathbf{z}_0)=0$ and $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})}$ is the largest variable in the plus term of $B_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},t_i}$, we can apply Lemma 8.1 directly to B_{t_i} for all $i\in[q]$ to obtain that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},t_i}:\ \ b_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})}-d_i, i\in[q].$$

where b_i and d_i are some monomials for all $i\in[q]$.

Put all together, shrinking the charts if necessary, we conclude that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^{\circ}_{\ell}$, containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\mathfrak{V},s_i}:&\ \ a_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})}y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}-c_i,\ \ i\in[l]\\ B_{\mathfrak{V},t_i}:&\ \ b_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})}-d_i,\ \ i\in[q].\end{aligned}\tag{8.5}$$

Further, because $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}(\mathbf{z}_0)\neq 0$, the ℓ-blowups do not affect the (unique) chart $\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$ which $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over. Hence, we have

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F}=\operatorname{sgn}(s_F)+\sum_{i=1}^{l}\operatorname{sgn}(s_i)x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})}+\sum_{i=1}^{q}\operatorname{sgn}(s_i)e_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})}\tag{8.6}$$

where e_i are monomials in exceptional variables such that $e_i(\mathbf{z})=0$, for all $i\in[q]$.

As the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ is fixed and is clear from the context, in the sequel, to save space, we will selectively drop some subindex " $\mathfrak{V}$ ". For instance, we may write $y_{\underline{u}_F}$ for $y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$, $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{v}_{s_1})}$ for $x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{v}_{s_1})}$, etc. A confusion is unlikely.

We introduce the following maximal minor of the Jacobian $J(\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}},L_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}})$

$$J^*(\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}},L_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}})=\frac{\partial(B_{\mathfrak{V},s_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}\cdots B_{\mathfrak{V},s_l}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}},B_{\mathfrak{V},t_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}\cdots B_{\mathfrak{V},t_q}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}},L_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}})}{\partial(y_{\underline{u}_F},x_{(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{v}_{s_1})}\cdots x_{(\underline{u}_{s_l},\underline{v}_{s_l})},x_{(\underline{u}_{t_1},\underline{v}_{t_1})}\cdots x_{(\underline{u}_{t_q},\underline{v}_{t_q})})}.$$

Then, one calculates and finds that at the point $\mathbf{z}$, it is equal to

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1x_{(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{v}_{s_1})} & a_1y_{\underline{u}_F} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0\\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ a_lx_{(\underline{u}_{s_l},\underline{v}_{s_l})} & 0 & \cdots & a_ly_{\underline{u}_F} & 0 & \cdots & 0\\ * & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_1 & \cdots & 0\\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ * & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & b_q\\ 0 & \operatorname{sgn}(s_1) & \cdots & \operatorname{sgn}(s_l) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}(\mathbf{z}).$$

Recall here that we have $l>0$.

We can use the last q columns to cancel the entries marked "$*$" in the first column without affecting the remaining entries.

Then, multiplying the first column by $-y_{\underline{u}_F}$ ($\neq 0$ at $\mathbf{z}$), we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} -a_1 x_{(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{v}_{s_1})} y_{\underline{u}_F} & a_1 y_{\underline{u}_F} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ -a_l x_{(\underline{u}_{s_l},\underline{v}_{s_l})} y_{\underline{u}_F} & 0 & \cdots & a_l y_{\underline{u}_F} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & b_q \\ 0 & \operatorname{sgn}(s_1) & \cdots & \operatorname{sgn}(s_l) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}(\mathbf{z}).$$

Multiplying the $(i+1)$-th column by $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})}$ and adding it to the first column for all $1 \leq i \leq l$, we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_1 y_{\underline{u}_F} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_l y_{\underline{u}_F} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & b_q \\ \sum_{i=1}^{l} \operatorname{sgn}(s_i) x_{(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} & \operatorname{sgn}(s_1) & \cdots & \operatorname{sgn}(s_l) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}(\mathbf{z}).$$

But, at the point $\mathbf{z}$, by (8.6), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} \operatorname{sgn}(s_i) x_{(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})}(\mathbf{z}) = -\operatorname{sgn}(s_F) \neq 0.$$

Thus, we conclude that $J^*(\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{ori}}_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}, L_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}})$ is a square matrix of full rank at $\mathbf{z}$, and one sees that all the variables used to compute it are pleasant with respect to the list (8.1). More precisely, $x_{(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})}$ and $x_{(\underline{u}_{t_j},\underline{v}_{t_j})}$ are pleasant because they uniquely appear in the block $\mathfrak{G}_F$. The variable $y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ does not appear in the block $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F'}$ with $F' < F$, because all the relations of $\mathfrak{G}_{F'}$, terminate before $\wp$- and ℓ-blowups with respect to the relations of the block of $\mathfrak{G}_F$ are performed.

Case (β). Next, we assume $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}(\mathbf{z}_0) = 0$.

As $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}(\mathbf{z}_0) = 0$, we can assume $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over ($x_{(\underline{v}_{s_0},\underline{v}_{s_0})} \equiv 1$) for some $s_0 \in S_F \backslash s_F$.

In this case, we can write

$$S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}} = \{s_0, s_1, \cdots, s_\ell\} \text{ and } S_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{inc}} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_q\}$$

for some integers l and q such that $l + q = |S_F| - 2$.

Then, on the chart $\mathfrak{V}_{[0]}$, the set $\mathcal{B}_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{ori}}$ consists of the following relations

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},s_0} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_F} - x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_{s_0}} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{v}_{s_0}} \tag{8.7}$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},s_i} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_F} - x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_{s_i}} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{v}_{s_i}}, \quad 1 \le i \le l. \tag{8.8}$$

The set $\mathcal{B}_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{inc}}$ consists of the following relations

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},t_i} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_F} - x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{u}_{t_i}} x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},\underline{v}_{t_i}}, \quad 1 \le i \le q \tag{8.9}$$

for some integer $q \ge 0$ with $q = 0$ when $\mathcal{B}_F^{\varrho,\mathrm{inc}} = \emptyset$.

By Corollary 5.15, we can assume that $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over a preferred chart, that is, in this case, the ϱ-chart with respect to F. Then, by Proposition 5.13, we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,s_0} : \quad x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{u}_F} - \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{u}_{s_0}} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{v}_{s_0}} \tag{8.10}$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,s_i} : x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{u}_F} - \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{u}_{s_i}} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{v}_{s_i}}, 1 \le i \le l = |S_F| - 2$$

$$B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,t_i} : x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})} x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{u}_F} - \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{u}_{t_i}} \tilde{x}_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{v}_{t_i}}, \quad i \in [q], \tag{8.11}$$

$$L_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,F} = \mathrm{sgn}(s_F) \delta_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)} + \sum_{s \in S_F \setminus s_F} \mathrm{sgn}(s) x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,(\underline{u}_s,\underline{v}_s)} \tag{8.12}$$

where $\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta$ is the unique chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\vartheta$ that $\mathfrak{V}$ lies over.

We treat the relation $B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,s_0}$ first.

Notice that $x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,\underline{u}_F}$ is the largest variable in the plus-term of $B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,s_0}$. If B_{s_0} is the smallest in $\mathcal{B}_F^{\mathrm{mn}}$, then we can apply Lemma 8.1 directly to $B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,s_0}$ and conclude that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},s_0} : \quad a_0 x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F} - c_0$$

for some monomial a_0 and c_0.

Suppose B_{s_0} is not the smallest. Then by the same lines of arguments applied for $B_{\mathfrak{V},s_i}$ with $i \in [l]$ as in *Case* (α), we can obtain that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing

the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},s_0}: \quad a_0 y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F} - c_0$$

where $y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ is either the ϖ-variable $x_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F}$ or the proper transform of an exceptional-variable $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{V}',\underline{u}_F}$.

Now consider $B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,s_i}$ with $i \in [l]\}$. because $x_{\mathfrak{V}_{[0]},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})}(\mathbf{z}_0) \neq 0$, one sees that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},s_i}: \quad a_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} - c_i, \quad i \in [l]$$

for some monomial a_i and c_i.

Next, consider $B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,t_i}$ with $i \in [q]$.

Because $x_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})}$ is the largest blowup-relevant variable in the plus term of $B_{\mathfrak{V}_\vartheta,t_i}$, we can apply Lemma 8.1 to B_{t_i} for all $i \in [q]$ to obtain that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$B_{\mathfrak{V},t_i}: \quad b_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})} - d_i, i \in [q]$$

for some monomial b_i and d_i.

Put all together, shrinking the charts if necessary, we conclude that there exists a chart $\mathfrak{V}$ containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ such that we have

$$\begin{aligned} &B_{\mathfrak{V},s_0}: \quad a_0 y_{\mathfrak{V},\underline{u}_F} - c_0 \\ &B_{\mathfrak{V},s_i}: \quad a_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{s_i},\underline{v}_{s_i})} - c_i, \quad i \in [l] \\ &B_{\mathfrak{V},t_i}: \quad b_i x_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{u}_{t_i},\underline{v}_{t_i})} - d_i, \quad i \in [q]. \end{aligned} \tag{8.13}$$

Furthermore, by Proposition 6.9 (9), we can choose the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ such that

$$L_{\mathfrak{V},F} = 1 + \operatorname{sgn}(s_F) y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}$$

where $y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)}$ is the variable for the proper transform of the divisor E_{ℓ,ϑ_k} and is pleasant with respect to the list (8.1).

Now, we introduce the following maximal minor of the Jacobian $J(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F})$

$$J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}) = \frac{\partial(B_{\mathfrak{V},s_0}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}, B_{\mathfrak{V},s_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}} \cdots B_{\mathfrak{V},s_l}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}), B_{\mathfrak{V},t_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}} \cdots B_{\mathfrak{V},t_q}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}, L_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}})}{\partial(y_{\underline{u}_F}, x_{(\underline{u}_{s_1},\underline{v}_{s_1})} \cdots x_{(\underline{u}_{s_l},\underline{v}_{s_l})}, x_{(\underline{u}_{t_1},\underline{v}_{t_1})} \cdots x_{(\underline{u}_{t_q},\underline{v}_{t_q})}, y_{\mathfrak{V},(\underline{m},\underline{u}_F)})}$$

Then, one calculates and finds that at the point $\mathbf{z}$, it is equal to

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ * & a_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & & \\ * & 0 & \cdots & a_l & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & & & \\ * & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & b_l & 0 \\ 0 & * & \cdots & * & * & \cdots & * & \operatorname{sgn}(s_F) \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{z}).$$

Thus, we conclude that $J^*(\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V},F}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}})$ is a square matrix of full rank at $\mathbf{z}$, and all the variables that are used to compute it are pleasant.

This proves the lemma. □

Definition 8.4. *A scheme X is smooth if it is a disjoint union of finitely many connected smooth schemes of possibly various dimensions.*

Theorem 8.5. *Let Γ be any subset $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}\underline{m}}$. Assume that Z_Γ is integral. Let $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ be the ℓ-transform of Z_Γ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$. Then, $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ is smooth over $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{F}$. Consequently, $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma}$ is smooth over $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{F}$.*

In particular, when $\Gamma = \emptyset$, we obtain that $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$ is smooth over $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{F}$.

Proof. Let Γ be any subset $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}\underline{m}}$. Assume that Z_Γ is integral.

We let $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ be the ℓ-transform of Z_Γ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$. (As mentioned earlier, Z_Γ and $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ are considered as $\mathbb{F}$-schemes.) Recall that $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\emptyset} = \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$ when $\Gamma = \emptyset$.

Fix any closed point $\mathbf{z} \in \widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}_\ell$. We let $\mathfrak{V}$ be a standard chart containing the point $\mathbf{z}$ as chosen in Lemma 8.3. In the sequel, we such a chart a preferred chart for the point $\mathbf{z}$.

By Corollary 7.6, the scheme $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, if nonempty, as a closed subscheme of the chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell$, is defined by

$$y,\ \ y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=0}_{\mathfrak{V}};\quad y-1,\ \ y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}^{=1}_{\mathfrak{V}}; \tag{8.14}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{mn}}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ \mathcal{B}^{q}_{\mathfrak{V}},\ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}.$$

We let

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}} = \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=0} \sqcup \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=1}.$$

By setting $y = 0$ for all $y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=0}$ and $y = 1$ for all $y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=1}$, we obtain a smooth open subset $\mathfrak{V}_\Gamma$ of $\mathfrak{V}$:

$$\mathfrak{V}_\Gamma = \{y = 0,\ y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=0};\ y = 1,\ y \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=1}\} \subset \mathfrak{V}.$$

The open susbet $\mathfrak{V}_\Gamma$ comes equipped with the set of free variables

$$\{y \mid y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}} \backslash \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}\}.$$

For any polynomial $f \in \mathbf{k}[y]_{y \in \mathrm{Var}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$, we let $f|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$ be obtained from f by setting all variables in $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=0}$ to be 0 and setting all variables in $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=0}$ to be 1. This way, $f|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$ becomes a polynomial over $\mathfrak{V}_\Gamma$. For any subset P of polynomials over $\mathfrak{V}$, we let $P|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}} = \{f|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}} \mid f \in P\}$. This way, we have $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{\mathrm{mn}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{\mathrm{q}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$, etc.

Then, $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ can be identified with the closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{V}_\Gamma$ defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{\mathrm{mn}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}},\ \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{q}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}},\ L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}. \tag{8.15}$$

Now, we introduce the following maximal minor of the Jacobian $J(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}})$

$$J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}) = \begin{pmatrix} J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ * & J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F_2}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & \\ * & * & * & \cdots & J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V},F_\Upsilon}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8.16}$$

By Lemmas 8.3, all the blocks along diagonal are invertible at $\mathbf{z}$; the entries in the upper right blocks are due the fact that the variables used to compute the diagonal blocks are all pleasant. Therefore, (8.16) is a square matrix of full rank at the point $\mathbf{z}$. We need to point out here that the terminating variables that we use to compute diagonal blocks as in Lemma 8.3 can not belong to $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=1}$ because when the variables of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=1}$ are introduced, the corresponding main binomial relation must not terminate by consrtuction; they obviously do not belong to $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}^{=0}$.

Now, we begin to prove that $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ is smooth.

First, we consider the case when $\Gamma = \emptyset$. In this case, we have $Z_\emptyset = \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ and $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\emptyset} = \widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$.

As earlier, we fix and consider an arbitrary closed point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathfrak{V} \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$ where $\mathfrak{V}$ is a preferred standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell$.

We let $J := J(\mathcal{B}^{\rm q}, \mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}, L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}})$ be the full Jacobian of all the defining equations of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ in $\mathfrak{V}$. We let $J^* := J^*(\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{V}})$ be the matrix of (8.16) in the case of $\Gamma = \emptyset$. at the given point $\mathbf{z} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$. (The maximal minor J^* depends on the point $\mathbf{z}$.) Let $T_{\mathbf{z}}(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell})$ be the Zariski tangent space of $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$ at $\mathbf{z}$. Then, we have

$$\dim T_{\mathbf{z}}(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}) = \dim \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell - \text{rank } J(\mathbf{z}) \le \dim \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell - \text{rank } J^*(\mathbf{z})$$

$$= \dim \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} + |\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}| - (|\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}| + \Upsilon) = \dim \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} - \Upsilon = \dim \widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell},$$

where $\dim \widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell = \dim \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}} + |\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}|$ by (4.36) and rank $J^*(\mathbf{z}) = |\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}| + \Upsilon$ by (8.16). Hence, $\dim T_{\mathbf{z}}(\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}) = \dim \widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$, thus, $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$ is smooth at $\mathbf{z}$. Therefore, $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$ is smooth.

Consequently, one sees that on any preferred standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell$, all the relations of $\mathcal{B}^q_{\mathfrak{V}}$ must lie in the ideal generated by relations of $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ and $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}$, thus, can be discarded from the chart $\mathfrak{V}$.

Now, we return to a general subset Γ of $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}}$ as stated in the theorem.

Again, we fix and consider any closed point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathfrak{V} \subset \widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ where $\mathfrak{V}$ is a preferred standard chart of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}^\circ_\ell$ for the point.

By the previous paragraph (immediately after proving that $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}_\ell}$ is smooth), over any preferred standard chart $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\widetilde{\mathscr{R}}_\ell$ with $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V} \neq \emptyset$, we can discard $\mathcal{B}^{\rm q}_{\mathfrak{V}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$ from the defining equations of $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$ and focus only on the equations of $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$ and $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$. In other words, $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$, if nonempty, as a closed subcheme of $\mathfrak{V}_\Gamma$ (which depends on both Γ and the point $\mathbf{z}$), is defined by the equations in

$$\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}, \quad L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}.$$

Then, by (8.16), the rank of the full Jacobian of $\mathcal{B}^{\rm mn}_{\mathfrak{V}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$ and $L_{\mathfrak{V},\mathscr{F}\underline{m}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\mathfrak{V}}}$ equals to the number of the above defining equations at the closed point $\mathbf{z}$ of $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma} \cap \mathfrak{V}$. Hence, $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$ is smooth at $\mathbf{z}$, thus, so is $\widetilde{Z}_{\ell,\Gamma}$.

This proves the theorem. □

Let X be an integral scheme. We say X admits a resolution if there exists a smooth scheme $\widetilde{X}$ and a projective birational morphism from $\widetilde{X}$ onto X.

Theorem 8.6. *Let Γ be any subset $\mathrm{Var}_{\mathrm{U}\underline{m}}$. Assume that Z_Γ is integral. Then, the morphism $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$ can be decomposed as*

$$\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\varrho,\Gamma} \to \cdots \to \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\hbar,\Gamma} \to \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\hbar',\Gamma} \to \cdots \to Z^\dagger_{\mathscr{F}_{[j]},\Gamma} \to Z^\dagger_{\mathscr{F}_{[j-1]},\Gamma} \to \cdots \to Z_\Gamma$$

such that every morphism $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\hbar,\Gamma} \to \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\hbar',\Gamma}$ in the sequence is $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\vartheta_{[k]},\Gamma} \to \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\vartheta_{[k-1]},\Gamma}$ for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$, or $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_h),\Gamma} \to \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{(\wp(k\tau)\mathfrak{r}_\mu\mathfrak{s}_{h-1}),\Gamma}$ for some $(k\tau)\mu h \in \mathrm{Index}_{\Phi_k}$, or $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell_k,\Gamma} \to \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\wp_k}$ for some $k \in [\Upsilon]$. Further, every morphism in the sequence is surjective, projective, and birational. In particular, $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$ is a resolution if Z_Γ is singular.

Proof. The smoothness of $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma}$ follows from Theorem 8.5; the decomposition of $\widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma} \to Z_\Gamma$ follows from Lemmas 7.3, 7.4, 7.5. □

9. Resolution of Singularity

9.1. **Lafforgue's version of Mnëv's universality.**

We first review Lafforgue's presentation of [14] on Mnëv's universality theorem.

As before, suppose we have a set of vector spaces, $E_1, \cdots, E_n$ such that E_α is of dimension 1 (or, a free module of rank 1 over $\mathbb{Z}$). We let

$$E_I = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} E_\alpha, \ \ \forall\, I \subset [n],$$

$$E := E_{[n]} = E_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus E_n.$$

(Lafforgues [14] considers the more general case by allowing E_α to be of any finite dimension.)

For any fixed integer $1 \leq d < n$, the Grassmannian

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} = \{F \hookrightarrow E \mid \dim F = d\}$$

decomposes into a disjoint union of locally closed strata

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \{F \hookrightarrow E \mid \dim(F \cap E_I) = d_I, \ \ \forall\, I \subset [n]\}$$

indexed by the family $\underline{\mathrm{d}} = (d_I)_{I \subset [n]}$ of nonnegative integers $d_I \in \mathbb{N}$ verifying

- $d_\emptyset = 0, d_{[n]} = d$,
- $d_I + d_J \leq d_{I \cup J} + d_{I \cap J}$, for all $I, J \subset [n]$.

The family $\underline{\mathrm{d}}$ is called a matroid of rank d on the set $[n]$. The stratum $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is called a matroid Schubert cell.

The Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}$ comes equipped with the (lattice) polytope

$$\Delta^{d,n} = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 0 \leq x_\alpha \leq 1,\ \forall\, \alpha;\ x_1 + \cdots + x_n = d\}.$$

For any $\underline{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_d) \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}$, we let $\mathbf{x}_{\underline{i}} = (x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ be defined by

$$\begin{cases} x_i = 1, & \text{if } i \in \underline{i}, \\ x_i = 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9.1}$$

It is known that $\Delta^{d,n} \cap \mathbb{N}^n = \{\mathbf{x}_{\underline{i}} \mid \underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}\}$ and it consists of precisely the vertices of the polytope $\Delta^{d,n}$.

Then, the matroid $\underline{\mathrm{d}} = (d_I)_{I \subset [n]}$ above defines the following subpolytope of $\Delta^{d,n}$

$$\Delta^{d,n}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \Delta^{d,n} \mid \sum_{\alpha \in I} x_\alpha \geq d_I,\ \forall\, I \subset [n]\}.$$

This is called the matroid subpolytope of $\Delta^{d,n}$ corresponding to $\underline{\mathrm{d}}$.

Recall that we have a canonical decomposition

$$\wedge^d E = \bigoplus_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}} E_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{i_d}$$

and it gives rise to the Plücker embedding of the Grassmannian

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E) = \{(p_{\underline{i}})_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \in \mathbb{G}_m \backslash (\wedge^d E \backslash \{0\})\}.$$

Proposition 9.1. (Proposition, p4, [14]) *Let $\underline{d}$ be any matroid of rank d on the set $[n]$ as considered above. Then, in the Grassmannian*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\wedge^d E) = \{(p_{\underline{i}})_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{d,n}} \in \mathbb{G}_m \backslash (\wedge^d E \backslash \{0\})\},$$

the matroid Schubert cell $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}_{\underline{d}}$, as a locally closed subscheme, is defined by

$$p_{\underline{i}} = 0, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{x}_{\underline{i}} \notin \Delta^{d,n}_{\underline{d}},$$

$$p_{\underline{i}} \neq 0, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{x}_{\underline{i}} \in \Delta^{d,n}_{\underline{d}}.$$

Let $\underline{\mathrm{d}} = (d_I)_{I\subset[n]}$ be a matroid of rank d on the set $[n]$ as above. Assume that $\underline{\mathrm{d}}_{[n]\setminus\{\alpha\}} = d-1$ for all $1 \leq \alpha \leq n$. Then, the configuration space $C^{d,n}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ defined by the matroid $\underline{\mathrm{d}}$ is the classifying scheme of families of n points

$$P_1, \cdots, P_n$$

on the projective space $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ such that for any nonempty subset $I \subset [n]$, the projective subspace P_I of $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ generated by the points $P_\alpha, \alpha \in I$, is of dimension

$$\dim P_I = d - 1 - \underline{\mathrm{d}}_I.$$

Theorem 9.2. (Mnëv, Theorem I. 14, [14]) *Let X be an affine scheme of finite type over* $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{Z}$. *Then, there exists a matroid $\underline{d}$ of rank 3 on the set $[n]$ such that* PGL_3 *acts freely on the configuration space $C^{3,n}_{\underline{d}}$. Further, there exists a positive integer r and an open subset $U \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ projecting surjectively onto X such that U is isomorphic to the quotient space $\underline{C}^{3,n}_{\underline{d}} := C^{3,n}_{\underline{d}}/\mathrm{PGL}_3$.*

Theorem 9.3. (Gelfand, MacPherson, Theorem I. 11, [14]) *Let $\underline{d}$ be any matroid of rank d on the set $[n]$ as considered above. Then, the action of* PGL_{d-1} *on $C^{d,n}_{\underline{d}}$ is free if and only if* $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta^{d,n}_{\underline{d}} = n-1$. *Similarly, the action of $\mathbb{G}^n_m/\mathbb{G}_m$ on $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,n}_{\underline{d}}$ is free if and only if* $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta^{d,n}_{\underline{d}} = n-1$. *Further, when* $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta^{d,n}_{\underline{d}} = n-1$, *the quotient $C^{d,n}_{\underline{d}}/\mathrm{PGL}_{d-1}$ can be canonically identified with the quotient $\mathrm{Gr}^{d,E}_{\underline{d}}/(\mathbb{G}^n_m/\mathbb{G}_m)$.*

By the above correspondence, we have the following equivalent version of Theorem 9.2.

Theorem 9.4. (Mnëv, Theorem I. 14, [14]) *Let X be an affine scheme of finite type over* $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{Z}$. *Then, there exists a matroid $\underline{d}$ of rank 3 on the set $[n]$ such that $(\mathbb{G}^n_m/\mathbb{G}_m)$ acts freely on the matroid Schubert cell $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{d}}$. Further, there exists a positive integer r and an open subset $U \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ projecting onto X such that U is isomorphic to the quotient space $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{d}} := \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{d}}/(\mathbb{G}^n_m/\mathbb{G}_m)$.*

9.2. **Global resolution: the affine case.**

Theorem 9.5. (Resulution: Affine Case) *Let X be an affine scheme of finite presentation over a perfect field* $\mathbf{k}$. *Assume further that X is integral and singular. Then,*

X admits a resolution, that is, there exists a smooth scheme $\widetilde{X}$ and a projective birational morphism from $\widetilde{X}$ onto X.

Proof. First, we assume that X is defined over $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{Z}$.

We apply Theorem 9.4 to X and follow the notations in Theorem 9.4.

We identify $U \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ with the quotient space $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}/(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$.

Consider the quotient map

$$\pi : \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \longrightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}/(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m).$$

We have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}/(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m) \cong U & \hookrightarrow & X \times \mathbb{A}^r \\ & & & & \downarrow \\ & & & & X. \end{array} \tag{9.2}$$

We can apply Proposition 9.1 to the matroid Schubert cell $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$.

Since $\Delta^{3,n}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \neq \emptyset$, there exists $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{I}_{3,n}$ such that $\mathbf{x}_{\underline{m}} \in \Delta^{3,n}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$. We define

$$\Gamma := \Gamma_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{I}_{3,n} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\underline{i}} \notin \Delta^{3,n}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}\}. \tag{9.3}$$

Then, we have that

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \hookrightarrow Z_\Gamma \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$$

and $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is an open subset of the Γ-scheme $Z_\Gamma \subset \mathrm{U}_{\underline{m}}$. As X is integral (by assumption), one sees that Z_Γ is integral.

We then let

$$\varpi_\Gamma : \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$$

be as in Theorem 8.6. This is a resolution. We set $\widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \varpi_\Gamma^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}})$, scheme-theoretically. Then

$$\varpi|_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}} : \widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$$

is a resolution.

We now aim to produce a resolution of the scheme $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \cong U \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^r$. Recall that we have the quotient map $\pi : \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \longrightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \cong U \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^r$. In what follows, we will identify $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ with the open subset U of $X \times \mathbb{A}^r$.

As the morphism $\varpi_\Gamma : \widetilde{Z}^\dagger_{\ell,\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$ is projective, so is the restricted morphism $\varpi|_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}} : \widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$. Hence, by Theorem 7.17 of [5], we can assume that $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is the blowup of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ along an ideal sheaf $\widetilde{J}$ on $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$.

As X is affine, we assume that X is a closed affine subscheme of $\mathbb{A}^m$ for some integer m. Thus, $X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ is a closed affine subscheme of $\mathbb{A}^m \times \mathbb{A}^r$. We let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_m)$ be the affine coordinates of $\mathbb{A}^m$ (the first factor of $\mathbb{A}^m \times \mathbb{A}^r$) and $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_r)$ be the affine coordinates of $\mathbb{A}^r$ (the second factor of $\mathbb{A}^m \times \mathbb{A}^r$).

Now, observe that the quotient map

$$\pi : \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \longrightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} (\cong U)$$

is a principal $(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$-bundle, and is étale locally trivial. As any étale locally trivial principal $(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$-bundle is Zariski locally trivial (that is, $(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$ is special in the sense of Serre), we can over $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} (\cong U)$ by a finite set $\{O\}$ of open subsets such that for any open subset O in the cover, we have a trivialization

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O \cong O \times (\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m). \tag{9.4}$$

Further, we take a split and let

$$(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m) \cong \mathbb{G}_m^{n-1} = \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathbb{F}[s_1^{\pm}, \cdots, s_{n-1}^{\pm}].$$

Then, we can realize $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O \cong O \times (\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$ as a locally closed subset of

$$\mathrm{Spec}\, \mathbb{F}[x_1, \cdots, x_m, t_1, \cdots, t_r, s_1^{\pm}, \cdots, s_{n-1}^{\pm}].$$

In what follows, we will write $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \cdots, s_{n-1})$. For any $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$, we write $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{a}} = s_1^{a_1} \cdots s_{n-1}^{a_{n-1}}$.

Over the open subset $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$ and using the trivialization (9.4), we can suppose that the ideal $\widetilde{J}|_O$ ($\widetilde{J}$ restricted to $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$) is generated by

$$g_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}), \cdots, g_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) \in \widetilde{J}|_O \subset \mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, s_1^{\pm}, \cdots, s_{n-1}^{\pm}],$$

modulo the ideal of (the closure of) $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$ in $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, s_1^{\pm}, \cdots, s_{n-1}^{\pm}]$, for some positive integer k.

By the construction of the isomorphism $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \cong U \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ (see the proof of Theorem I. 14, [14]), the variables $\mathbf{t}$ of $\mathbb{A}^r$ correspond to the choices of some auxiliary free points on the projective plane. Then, by the construction of the resolution $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_{\Gamma}$, we conclude that for every $i \in [k]$, $g_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = g_i(\mathbf{x})$ is independent of the variables $\mathbf{t}$ and $\mathbf{s}$.

In particular, we can let $\underline{\tilde{J}}|_O$ be the ideal of $(O \subset U \subset)\ X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ generated by $g_i(\mathbf{x}), 1 \leq i \leq k$, modulo the ideal of O.

We define the following

- We let J be the ideal of $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}]$ generated by $g_i(\mathbf{x})$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, modulo the ideal of X. We then let

$$\widetilde{X} \to X$$

  be the blowup of X along J.
- We let $\underline{\tilde{J}}$ be the ideal sheaf of $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ corresponding to the closure of $V(\underline{\tilde{J}}|_O)$, where $V(\underline{\tilde{J}}|_O)$ is the closed subscheme of O corresponding to $\underline{\tilde{J}}|_O$. We let

$$\widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$$

  be the blowup of $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ along $\underline{\tilde{J}}$.
- We let $\widetilde{J}$ be the ideal sheaf of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ corresponding to the closure of $V(\widetilde{J}|_O)$, where $V(\widetilde{J}|_O)$ is the closed subscheme of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$ corresponding to $\widetilde{J}|_O$. Note here that $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is the blowup of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ along $\widetilde{J}$.

A priori, the ideals $\widetilde{J}$ and $\underline{\tilde{J}}$, and their corresponding close subscheme $V(\widetilde{J})$ and $V(\underline{\tilde{J}})$, are constructed from the open subset $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$. But, because $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ and $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ are irreducible, it is straightforward to check that $V(\widetilde{J})$ (resp. the ideal sheaf $\widetilde{J}$) $V(\underline{\tilde{J}})$ (resp. the ideal sheaf $\underline{\tilde{J}}$) do not depend on the choice of the open subset O nor on the trivialization $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O \cong O \times (\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$. Of course, for any open subset O in the cover $\{O\}$ of $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$, the ideals $\widetilde{J}$ and $\underline{\tilde{J}}$ admit similar descriptions as above.

The above discussion implies the following. We have the cartesian diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}} \oplus_{d\geq 0}(\tilde{J})^d & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}} \oplus_{d\geq 0}(\underline{\tilde{J}})^d & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \cong U \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^r \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\widetilde{X} = \mathrm{Proj}_X \oplus_{d\geq 0} J^d & \xrightarrow{\rho} & X,
\end{array}
\tag{9.5}
$$

such that

- $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is the $(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$-fiber bundle, obtained from the pullback of the $(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$-fiber bundle $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$;
- $\underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{X}$ is a smooth morphism with typical fiber isomorphic to an open subset of $\mathbb{A}^r$.

Here, we say a morphism $f : Y \to S$ between two schemes Y and S is a F-fiber bundle for some fixed scheme F if S can be covered by an open subset $\{O\}$ such that $f^{-1}(O)$ is isomorphism to $O \times F$.

Because $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is smooth, by the first fiber bundle, $\underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is smooth. Then by the second smooth morphism, we conclude that $\widetilde{X}$ is smooth. Therefore, the morphism

$$\rho : \widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X$$

is a resolution over the prime field $\mathbb{F}$, provided that X is defined over $\mathbb{Z}$.

Now, we consider the general case when the affine scheme $X/\mathbf{k}$ is of finite presentation over a perfect field $\mathbf{k}$.

The field $\mathbf{k}$ is an extension of its unique prime (minimal) subfield $\mathbb{F}'$. This unique prime subfield $\mathbb{F}'$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$ when $\mathbf{k}$ has characteristic zero or isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_p$ when $\mathbf{k}$ has the characteristic $p > 0$, that is, $\mathbb{F}' \cong \mathbb{F}$.

We suppose that $X/\mathbf{k}$ is defined by a finite set of polynomials $g_1, \cdots, g_m$ in $\mathbf{k}[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$ for some positive integers m and n. Let $R' = \mathbb{F}'[\text{coefficients of } g_1, \cdots, g_m]$. When $\mathbb{F}'$ has the characteristic zero, we let $R = R'$; when $\mathbb{F}'$ has the characteristic $p > 0$, we let R be the subring of $\mathbf{k}$ generated by R' and p^i-th roots of elements of

R' for all $i > 0$. Then the same description of X over $\mathbf{k}$ also makes sense as the description of a scheme $Y/\mathbb{F}'$ over $B = \operatorname{Spec} R$ (cf. [4], Theorems 8.8.2 and 8.10.5). Let K be the fraction field of R. This is a perfect subfield of $\mathbf{k}$. Then, by the above, we have a dominant morphism $f : Y \to B$ of finite presentation over B, such that X/K is isomorphic to the generic fiber Y_K of the morphism f.

Now, as Y is affine and defined over $\mathbb{F}'$, we can take a resolution $\widetilde{Y} \to Y$ over $\mathbb{F}'$. Then, we consider the induced dominant morphism $\tilde{f} : \widetilde{Y} \to B$. Since $\widetilde{Y}$ is smooth, we have that the generic fiber $\widetilde{X}/K$ of $\tilde{f}$ is regular as well. Because K is perfect, we have that $\widetilde{X}/K$ is smooth. Then by the scalar extension $K \subset \mathbf{k}$, we obtain that $\widetilde{X}/\mathbf{k}$ is smooth. Clearly, the induced morphism $\widetilde{X}/\mathbf{k} \to X/\mathbf{k}$ is projective, birational, and surjective, hence is a resolution, as desired.

This implies Theorem 9.5. □

9.3. **Global resolution: the projective case.**

Theorem 9.6. (Resulution: Projective Case) *Let X be a projective scheme of finite presentation over any fixed perfect field $\mathbf{k}$. Assume further that X is integral and singular. Then, X admits a resolution, that is, there exists a smooth scheme $\widetilde{X}$ and a projective birational morphism from $\widetilde{X}$ onto X.*

Proof. We continue to follow the idea and notation of the proof of Theorem 9.5.

We first assume that X is defined over $\mathbb{Z}$.

Take and fix a projective embedding of $X \subset \mathbb{P}^m$. Let C_X be the affine cone of X defined by the above embedding, and, let $C_X^0 = C_X \backslash \{0\}$. Then, C_X^0 is a $\mathbb{G}_m$-bundle over X, locally trivial in Zariski topology.

The affine cone C_X is a closed affine subscheme of the affine space $\mathbb{A}^{m+1}$. We let $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \cdots, x_m)$ (resp. $[\mathbf{x}] = [x_0, \cdots, x_m]$) be the affine coordinates of $\mathbb{A}^{m+1}$ (resp. the homogeneous coordinates of the projective space $\mathbb{P}^m$).

As in the proof of Theorem 9.5, by applying the similar argument to the affine scheme C_X, we obtain the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}/(\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m) \cong U & \hookrightarrow & C_X \times \mathbb{A}^r \\ & & & & & & \downarrow \\ & & & & C_X^0 & \hookrightarrow & C_X \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \vdots \\ & & & & X & \xrightarrow{=} & X \subset \mathbb{P}^m, \end{array} \tag{9.6}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is induced from the resolution $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$ for some Γ.

Using C_X to take the role of the affine scheme X as in the proof of Theorem 9.5, we can keep and follow the notations used in that proof. In particular, using the trivialization of (9.4)

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O \cong O \times (\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m),$$

we can realize $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O \cong O \times (\mathbb{G}_m^n/\mathbb{G}_m)$ as a locally closed subset of

$$\mathrm{Spec}\, \mathbb{F}[x_1, \cdots, x_m, t_1, \cdots, t_r, s_1^{\pm}, \cdots, s_{n-1}^{\pm}].$$

We can assume that the $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O \to \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$ is the blowup of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$ along an ideal $\tilde{J}|_O$, generated by $g_1, \cdots, g_k \in \subset \mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, s_1^{\pm}, \cdots, s_{n-1}^{\pm}]$, modulo the ideal of (the closure of) $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}|_O$ in $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, s_1^{\pm}, \cdots, s_{n-1}^{\pm}]$, for some positive integer k.

Again, as in the proof of Theorem 9.5, by the construction of the isomorphism $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \cong U \subset C_X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ (see the proof of Theorem I. 14, [14]), and by the construction of the resolution $\widetilde{Z}^{\dagger}_{\ell,\Gamma} \longrightarrow Z_\Gamma$, we conclude that for every $i \in [k]$, $g_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = g_i(\mathbf{x})$ is free of the variables $\mathbf{t}$ and $\mathbf{s}$, and furthermore, it is also homogeneous in $\mathbf{x}$. In particular, we can let $\underline{\tilde{J}}|_O$ be the (affine) ideal of $(O \subset U \subset) C_X \times \mathbb{A}^r$ generated by $g_i(\mathbf{x}), 1 \leq i \leq k$, modulo the ideal of O.

We define the following

- We let J be the homogeneous ideal of $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}]$ generated by $g_i(\mathbf{x})$, modulo the ideal of X. We then let
$$\widetilde{X} \to X$$
be the blowup of X along J.

- We let J_{aff} be the affine ideal of $\mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}]$ generated by $g_i(\mathbf{x})$, modulo the ideal of C_X. We then let
$$\widetilde{C_X} \to C_X$$
be the blowup of C_X along J_{aff}.
- We let $\underline{\tilde{J}}$ be the ideal sheaf of $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ corresponding to the closure of $V(\underline{\tilde{J}}|_O)$. We then let
$$\widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$$
be the blowup of $\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ along $\underline{\tilde{J}}$.
- We let $\widetilde{J}$ be the ideal sheaf of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ corresponding to the closure of $V(\widetilde{J}|_O)$. Note here that $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is the blowup of $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ along $\widetilde{J}$.

As in the proof of Theorem 9.5, the above definitions do not depend on the choice of the open subset O nor on the trivialization (9.4).

Then, the above discussions imply the following. We have the diagram

(9.7)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}} \oplus_{d\geq 0}(\tilde{J})^d & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}} \oplus_{d\geq 0}(\underline{\tilde{J}})^d & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \cong U \subset C_X \times \mathbb{A}^r & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
\widetilde{C^0_X} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{C_X} = \mathrm{Proj}_{C_X} \oplus_{d\geq 0} J^d_{\text{aff}} & \longrightarrow & C_X & \longleftarrow & C^0_X \\
\downarrow & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \downarrow \\
\widetilde{X} & \xrightarrow{=} & \widetilde{X} = \mathrm{Proj}_X \oplus_{d\geq 0} J^d & \longrightarrow & X & \xleftarrow{=} & X
\end{array}$$

such that

- $\widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is the $(\mathbb{G}^n_m/\mathbb{G}_m)$-fiber bundle, obtained from the pullback of the $(\mathbb{G}^n_m/\mathbb{G}_m)$-fiber bundle $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \to \underline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$;
- $\underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{C_X}$ is a smooth morphism with typical fiber isomorphic to an open subset of $\mathbb{A}^r$;

- $\widetilde{C^0_X} \longrightarrow \widetilde{X}$ is the $\mathbb{G}_m$-fiber bundle, obtained from the pullback of the $\mathbb{G}_m$-fiber bundle $C^0_X \longrightarrow X$.

Because $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is smooth, by the first fiber-bundle, we obtain that $\widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{Gr}}}^{3,E}_{\underline{\mathrm{d}}}$ is smooth; by the second-fiber bundle, we see that $\widetilde{C_X}$ and hence its open subset $\widetilde{C^0_X}$ are smooth; by the third fiber bundle, we conclude that $\widetilde{X}$ is smooth over any prime field $\mathbb{F}$.

Thus, the morphism $\widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X$ is a resolution over $\mathbb{F}$.

Now, we consider the general case when the affine scheme $X/\mathbf{k}$ is of finite presentation over a perfect field $\mathbf{k}$.

The field $\mathbf{k}$ is an extension of its unique prime (minimal) subfield $\mathbb{F}'$. This unique prime subfield $\mathbb{F}'$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$ when $\mathbf{k}$ has characteristic zero or isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_p$ when $\mathbf{k}$ has the characteristic $p > 0$, that is, $\mathbb{F}' \cong \mathbb{F}$.

Now, using the similar arguments as in the end of the proof of Theorem 9.5, there exist a subring R of $\mathbf{k}$ such that its fraction field K is a perfect subfield of $\mathbf{k}$, an integral scheme $Y/\mathbb{F}'$, and a dominant morphism $f : Y \to B$ of finite presentation over $B = \operatorname{Spec} R$, such that X/K is isomorphic to the generic fiber Y_K of the morphism f. By taking a projective closure of B and the corresponding projective closure of Y/B, we may assume that B and Y are projective.

Now, as Y is projective and defined over $\mathbb{F}'$, we can take a resolution $\widetilde{Y} \to Y$ over $\mathbb{F}'$. Then, we consider the induced dominant morphism $\tilde{f} : \widetilde{Y} \to B$. Since $\widetilde{Y}/\mathbb{F}'$ is smooth, we have that the generic fiber $\widetilde{X}/K = Y_K$ of $\tilde{f}$ is regular as well. Because K is perfect, we have that $\widetilde{X}/K$ is smooth. Hence, by the scalar extension $K \subset \mathbf{k}$, $\widetilde{X}/\mathbf{k}$ is smooth. Clearly, the induced morphism $\widetilde{X}/\mathbf{k} \to X/\mathbf{k}$ is projective, birational, and surjective, hence is a resolution, as desired.

This proves Theorem 9.6. □

(Of course Theorem 9.5 is a direct consequence of Theorem 9.6, and the proofs of the two theorems are largely parallel. But, we find the above organization makes our idea and proofs more tranparent.)

When the base field $\mathbf{k}$ has characteristic zero, the above two theorems are well known from Hironaka's resolution [6]. When the base field $\mathbf{k}$ has positive characteristic, Abhyankar [1] proved resolution of singularities for algebraic threefolds in

characteristic greater than 6. (One may consult [22] for the case when $\mathbf{k}$ is not perfect.)

In this article, we approach resolution of singularity by performing blowups of (a chart of) $\mathrm{Gr}^{3,E}$. It is convincible that certain parallel blowups exist for $(\mathbb{P}^2)^n$ that can also lead to achieve resolution of singularity ([11]). (Indeed, when the author began to work on resolution of singularity, he tried both approaches and switched between the two for quite a while before settling down on the current approach via Grassmannians.)

10. Geometric Resolution

Prior to de Jong's geometric approach [3], resolutions of varieties in general dimensions are essentially done by finding good algorithms. In such an approach, one isolates a set of bounded invariants and prove that after certain finite steps, such invariants improve strictly. As the invariants are bounded, the algorithm terminates. These approaches are nicely presented in Kollar's book [12].

According to [20], many moduli spaces or deformation spaces exhibit arbitrary singularities. In other words, all singularities exist *geometrically*. Since singularities exist for geometric reasons, one would wonder whether there should be *geometric ways* to resolve them, avoiding pure algorithms on polynomials. Being philosophically optimistic, the author believes that every singular moduli admits a resolution, in a specific relative sense, such that the resolution itself is also a moduli.

In other words, it would be desirable if the following problem can be answered in some positive ways.

Problem 10.1. *For any singular moduli space $\mathfrak{M}$, find another moduli space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ that only modifies the boundary objects of $\mathfrak{M}$ such that every irreducible component of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$, endowed with the reduced stack structure, is smooth, and all such irreducible components meet transversally.*

Here, an object of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ should be obtained from the corresponding object of $\mathfrak{M}$ by adding certain extra data. The extra data should reduce the automorphisms of the original object, and ideally, should remove all removable obstructions.

See Conjectures 5.4 and 5.5 of [8] for somewhat more precise formulations.

References

[1] Shreeram S. Abhyankar, *Resolution of singularities of embedded algebraic surfaces,* Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Acad. Press (1966).

[2] Dan Abramovich, Michael Temkin, Jaroslaw Wlodarczyk, *Functorial Embedded Resolution via Weighted Blowings up,* arXiv:1906.07106v3.

[3] Aise Johan de Jong, *Smoothness, Semi-stability and Alterations,* Publ. Math. IHES 83, (1996) 51-93.

[4] Alexander Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique IV: Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas,* III, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. 28 (1966).

[5] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Springer, 1977.

[6] Heisuke Hironaka, *Resolution of Singularities of an Algebraic Variety over a Field of Characteristic zero, I, II*, Ann. of Math., 2, 79 (1), (1964) 109-203, 205-326.

[7] Heisuke Hironaka, *Resolution of Singularities in Positive Characteristics*, http://www.math.harvard.edu/∼hironaka/pRes.pdf

[8] Yi Hu, *Relative Resolution and Its Applications,* Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians. Vol. I, 467-488, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), 36, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2017.

[9] Yi Hu, *Grassmannians and Singularities,* arXiv:2109.02968, Sept. 7, 2021.

[10] Yi Hu, *Hilbert Families and Hilbert Quotients of Grassmannians Revisited,* Preprint, 2022.

[11] Yi Hu, *Configuration Spaces and Singularities,* (Incomplete draft), Jan. 2015.

[12] János Kollár, *Lectures on Resolutions of Singularities,* Ann. of Math. Studies, No. 166, 2007.

[13] Laurent Lafforgue, *Pavages des simplexes, schémas de graphes recollés et compactification des* $\mathrm{PGL}_r^{n+1}/\mathrm{PGL}_r$. (French. English summary) [Pavings of simplices, schemes of graphs that are "pasted together" and compactification of $\mathrm{PGL}_r^{n+1}/\mathrm{PGL}_r$] Invent. Math. 136 (1999), 233–271.

[14] −, *Chirurgie des grassmanniennes.* (French) [Surgery on Grassmannians], CRM Monogr. Ser. 19, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2003.

[15] Seok Hyeong Lee and Ravi Vakil, *Mnëv-Sturmfels Universality for Schemes,* Clay Mathematics Proceedings, Volume 18, 2013.

[16] Qing Liu, *Algebraic Geometry and Arithmetic Curves,* Oxford University Press, 2002.

[17] Michael McQuillan, Gianluca Marzo, *Very Fast, Very Functorial, and Very Easy Resolution of Singularities,* arXiv:1906.06745v1

[18] Nikolai Mnëv, *The Universality Theorems on the Classification Problem of Configuration Varieties and Convex Polytope Varieties,* In Topology and Geometry, Rohlin Seminar, LNM 1346, 527-543, Springer, Berlin, 1988.

[19] M. Temkin, *Tame distillation and desingularization by p-alterations,* Ann. of Math. 186 (2017), 97 - 126.

[20] Ravi Vakil, *Murphy's Law in Algebraic Geometry: Badly-Behaved Deformation Spaces,* Inven. Math. 164 569-590 (2006)

[21] Oscar Zariski, *Local uniformization theorem on algebraic varieties,* Ann. of Math. 41 (1940), 852 - 896.

[22] Oscar Zariski, *The concept of a simple point of an abstract algebraic variety,* Trans. AMS (1947), 1 - 52.

Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, USA.