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#### Abstract

We introduce a formalism for considering infinite, linearly ordered products in groups. Using this, we define infinite compositions in certain groups of formal power series and show that such series can sometimes be represented as infinite, linearly ordered, semidirect products of ordered Abelian groups.


## Introduction

A linearly ordered set $I=(\underline{I},<)$ induces an $I$-indexed product function $\Pi_{I}^{\text {min }}$ on a group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$, whose domain is the set $\mathcal{G}^{(I)}$ of finitely supported functions $\underline{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$, and which sends a $g \in \mathcal{G}^{(I)}$ to the finite product

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi_{I}^{\min } g=g\left(i_{1}\right) \cdots g\left(i_{n}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the support of $g$ is $\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right\}$ with $i_{1}<\cdots<i_{n}$. How to extend (1) to families $I \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ that are not finitely supported?

We propose sensible generalisations of some of the properties of the family $\left(\Pi_{I}^{\text {min }}\right)_{I}$ on a general group $\mathcal{G}$, where $I$ ranges among all linearly ordered sets. Considering a family of partial functions $\Pi_{I}: \mathcal{G}^{\underline{I}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ indexed by linearly ordered sets $I=(\underline{I},<)$, we give axioms pertaining to the existence and values of possibly infinite products

$$
\Pi_{I} g=\cdots g(i) \cdots g(j) \cdots \in \mathcal{G}
$$

where $i, j \in I$ are thought as occurring according to the ordering $i<j$, and $g: \underline{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is a function. The group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$ together with the family $\left(\Pi_{I}\right)_{I}$ indexed by all linearly ordered sets $I$, is called a multipliability group.

Our motivation for studying infinite products comes from the theory of linearly ordered groups. We introduced [2] an elementary class of ordered groups, called "growth order groups", that includes certain linearly ordered groups of generalised power series under formal composition laws [10]. We believe such groups of formal series have natural structures of multipliability groups. In this paper, we illustrate this for $k$-powered series (see [1, Section 2.5]), i.e. formal series

$$
\sum_{e \in k} a(e) x^{e}
$$

where $k$ is an ordered field and the support $\{e \in k: a(e) \neq 0\}$ is reverse well-ordered. Dating to Hahn [10], Hausdorff [11], Krull [17] and Kaplansky [16], the theories of extensions of (ordered) algebraic structures benefited from both the development of valuation theory and the construction of goups and fields of formal series. In order to study the noncommutative, compositional context, we require an extension of the theory of non-commutative valuations on growth order groups (see [2, Section 2.2]), a general way to construct (ordered) groups of formal non-commutative series, and a way to study the properties of infinite non-commutative expansions and infinite products in general. This paper is dedicated to the third task, with some applications to the second one.

Looking at infinite products in the context of groups of formal series under composition laws, we are to develop notions of transfinite ordered compositions. In the case of certain types of logarithmic transseries, transfinite composition appear when studying normalisation problems related to the dynamics of (germs of) diffeomorphisms of the complex variable which fix the origin [19], as well as compositional inversion problems. We provide a general theory for such transfinite compositions, and we will give a thorough study of the simple case of $k$-powered series.

Let us describe our main results. Section 1 introduces our conventions for groups of functions and linearly ordered sets. In Section 2, we give the axiomatic definition of multipliability groups (axioms MG1-MG7), adapting the definition in [3, Section 1] to the non-commutative context. We give examples and show how to construct quotients of multipliability groups.

In order to construct the most important examples of multipliability groups, we rely on abstract axiomatic notions of infinite sums in vector spaces as considered in [20, 9, 3]. In [3], associative algebras $A$ over a field $k$ are enriched with an infinitary operator $\Sigma$ of transfinite summation, where each set $I$ gives rise to a linear function $\Sigma_{I}: \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I} \longrightarrow A$ whose domain is a subspace of $A^{I}$, and which takes a so-called summable family $a \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I}$ to its sum $\Sigma_{I} a \in A$. An example is the algebra $k\langle\langle I\rangle\rangle$ of formal power series in a set $\left\{X_{i}: i \in I\right\}$ of non-commuting variables. If moreover $A=k+\mathfrak{m}$ is a local algebra with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, then we say that $A$ has evaluations if for all summable families $a: I \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}$, the family $\left(a\left(i_{1}\right) \cdots a\left(i_{n}\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N} \wedge\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{n}}$ is also summable. Then each summable $a$ gives induces an evaluation morphism $\mathrm{ev}_{a}: k\left\langle\langle I\rangle>\longrightarrow A\right.$ which sends $X_{i}$ to $a(i)$ for each $i \in I$, and preserves infinite sums. All these notions are presented in Section 3.

In Section 4, we define ordered products in groups of the form $\mathcal{G}=1+\mathfrak{m}$ where the algebra $A=k+\mathfrak{m}$ has evaluations. For a linearly ordered set $(I,<)$ the natural ordered product $\cdots\left(1+X_{i^{\prime}}\right) \cdots\left(1+X_{i}\right) \cdots\left(1+X_{i^{\prime \prime}}\right) \cdots$ where the terms appear in order $i^{\prime}<i<i^{\prime \prime}$, is defined to be the series

$$
\left.\mathrm{OP}_{I}:=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N} \wedge i_{1}<\cdots<i_{n}} X_{i_{1}} \cdots X_{i_{n}} \in k\langle I\rangle\right\rangle
$$

This yields a notion of ordered products in the subgroup $1+\mathfrak{m} \subseteq A^{\times}$: if $a: I \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ is summable, then $1+a: I \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$ is said multipliable, and the ordered product $\Pi_{I}(1+a)$ is defined as the evaluation $\mathrm{ev}_{a}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)$ of $\mathrm{OP}_{I}$ at $a$.
Theorem 1. [Theorem 4.15] Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a summability algebra with evaluations, with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. For each linearly ordered set $I$, let $\Pi_{I}$ be the ordered product function on $(1+\mathfrak{m})^{\underline{I}}$. Then $(1+\mathfrak{m}, 1, \cdot, \Pi)$ is a multipliability group.

We then show that the group 1-Aut ${ }_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ of linear automorphisms $\sigma$ of a valued field ( $\mathbb{K}$, $v$ ) of Hahn series which commute with infinite sums and satisfy $v(\sigma(a)-a)>v(a)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{K}^{\times}$(see [18]) inherits a structure of multipliability group from a group of the form $1+\mathfrak{m}$.
Theorem 2. [consequence of Theorem 5.3] The group $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ has a natural structure of multipliability group.

Section 5 is dedicated to the introduction of the formalism of "chain rules" on algebras of Noetherian series [12, 20, 14, 3]. Let $(\mathbb{K}, v)$ be an ordered valued field of Hahn series equipped with a derivation $\partial: \mathbb{K} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K} ; a \mapsto a^{\prime}$ and a composition law $\circ: \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^{>k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}$, and assume that $\left(\mathbb{K}^{>k}, \circ\right)$ forms a group with identity $x$. What then distinguishes operators $\circ_{b}: \mathbb{K} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K} ; a \mapsto a \circ b$ from general field automorphisms of $\mathbb{K}$ is that the former satisfy the chain rule $(a \circ b)^{\prime}=b^{\prime} \cdot\left(a^{\prime} \circ b\right)$. So $\circ_{b}$ is among automorphisms $\sigma$ for which there exists a multiplication operator $\mu: a \mapsto b^{\prime} \cdot a$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial \circ \sigma=\mu \circ \sigma \circ \partial . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using formal methods, we show that certain groups of automorphisms which satisfy a chain rule (2) are closed under infinite products.

Theorem 3. [Theorem 5.5] Let $\phi \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ and assume that there is a $\xi \in \mathbb{K}$ with $\phi(\xi)=$ 1 and $v(\phi(a))>0$ whenever $v(a)>v(\xi)$. Then the subgroup of $\left(1-\mathrm{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K}), \circ, \operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}\right)$ of automorphisms $\sigma$ that satisfy a chain rule $\phi \circ \sigma=\mu \circ \sigma \circ \phi$. is closed under infinite products in $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$.

In fact, the previous results are established in the more general setting of algebras of Noetherian series. We then apply this in Section 6 to the case when $\mathbb{K}$ is the field of $k$ powered series. This case illustrates general properties of growth order groups in a context which is simple enough that they be easily readable, but rich enough that most aspects of the theory of transfinite products in growth order groups be showcased. Our main results are as follows:

Theorem 4. [consequence of Theorem 6.5] The group $\mathcal{T}=(\{x+\delta \in \mathbb{K}: \delta \prec x\}, \circ, x)$ has a natural multipliability structure.

For each $a \in \mathcal{T} \backslash\{x\}$, there is a natural isomorphism $e \mapsto a^{[e]}$ between $(k,+)$ and the centraliser of $a$ in ( $\mathcal{T}, \circ)$. Given $a, b \in \mathcal{T}$, write $a \ll b$ if $a^{[k]}<\max \left(b, b^{\text {inv }}\right)$. The growth order of an $a \in \mathcal{T} \backslash\{x\}$ corresponds to its equivalence class for the relation $a \sim b \Longleftrightarrow a \circ b^{\text {inv }} \ll a$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of representatives for each growth order in $\mathcal{T}$. Under a summability condition on $\mathcal{S}$, each $a \in \mathcal{T}$ can be represented uniquely as a well-ordered composition

$$
\begin{equation*}
a=\cdots \circ s_{\gamma} \circ \cdots \circ s_{1} \circ s_{0}, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda$ is an ordinal and $\left(s_{\gamma}\right)_{\gamma<\lambda}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of elements of $\mathcal{S}$ for $\ll$ :
Theorem 5. [Theorem 6.13] There is a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ such that for each $a \in \mathcal{T}$, there are a unique ordinal $\lambda$, a unique strictly $\ll$-decreasing function $s: \lambda \longrightarrow S$ and a unique function $e: \lambda \longrightarrow k^{\times}$with

$$
a=\cdots \circ s_{\gamma}^{[e(\gamma)]} \circ \cdots \circ s_{1}^{[e(1)]} \circ s_{0}^{[e(0)]} .
$$

The choice of left-trailing well-ordered expansion (3) is somewhat arbitrary. We introduce a class of initial segments of linear orderings on ordinals (see Remark 1.3) along which transfinite compositions of elements of $\mathcal{S}$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with elements of $\mathcal{T}$. The methods in Sections 5 and 6 are designed to adapt to larger fields than fields of $k$-powered series. In particular, we will extend the results of Section 6 to logarithmicexponential transseries [4, 7, 6] and more general fields of formal series in future work.

## 1 Groups and linearly ordered sets

### 1.1 Cartesian powers of groups

If $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$ is a group and $X$ is a set, then we write $\mathcal{G}^{X}$ for the group, under pointwise product, of functions $I \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$. That is, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^{X}$ and $x \in X$, we have

$$
(f \cdot g)(x)=f(x) \cdot g(x) \quad \text { and } \quad f^{-1}(x)=f(x)^{-1}
$$

The support of an $f \in \mathcal{G}^{X}$ is the set

$$
\operatorname{supp} f:=\{x \in X: f(x) \neq 1\} .
$$

We denote by $\mathcal{G}^{(X)}$ the subset of elements $f \in \mathcal{G}^{X}$ whose support is finite, which is a normal subgroup of $\mathcal{G}^{X}$.

### 1.2 Linearly ordered sets

Recall that a linearly ordered set is an ordered pair $I=(\underline{I},<)$ where $\underline{I}$ is a set and $<$ is a binary relation on $\underline{I}$ such that for all $i, j, l \in \underline{I}$, we have

$$
i \nless i \quad \text { and } \quad i<j \wedge j<l \Longrightarrow i<l \quad \text { and } \quad(i=j) \vee(i<j) \vee(j<i) .
$$

The category of all linearly ordered sets with nondecreasing maps as arrows is denoted by Los. Isomorphisms are to be understood in this sense, i.e. they are strictly increasing and bijective maps. Working in $I$, given an $i \in \underline{I}$, we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
& i^{-}:=(\{j \in \underline{I}: j<i\},<) \quad \text { and } \\
& i^{+}:=(\{j \in \underline{I}: i<j\},<),
\end{aligned}
$$

expecting that the ambient linearly ordered set $I$ is clear from the context.
We now give a few conventions and notations pertaining to linear orderings.

- If $\mathcal{I}=(I,<)$ is a linearly ordered set, then we write $\mathcal{I}:=I$ for its underlying set. We also write $\mathcal{I}^{*}=\left(I,<^{*}\right)$ where $<^{*}$ is the reverse ordering

$$
\forall i, j \in I,\left(i<^{*} j \Longleftrightarrow j<i\right)
$$

We also sometimes denote $<^{*}$ by $>$. Note that $\mathcal{I}^{*} \in \operatorname{Los}$ and that $\left(\mathcal{I}^{*}\right)^{*}=\mathcal{I}$.

- Let $I=(\underline{I},<) \in \operatorname{Los}$ and let $X \subseteq \underline{I}$ be a subset. We say that $X$ is a convex subset of $I$ if

$$
\forall i, j, l \in \underline{I},((i, l \in X \wedge i<j<l) \Longrightarrow j \in X)
$$

We say that $X$ is an initial subset of $I$ if

$$
\forall i, j \in \underline{I},((j \in X \wedge i<j) \Longrightarrow i \in X)
$$

We say that $X$ is a final subset of $I$ if it is an initial subset of $I^{*}$, i.e. if

$$
\forall i, j \in \underline{I},((j \in X \wedge j<i) \Longrightarrow i \in X)
$$

- If $I=\left(\underline{I},<_{I}\right), J=\left(\underline{J},<_{J}\right)$ are linearly ordered sets, then we write $I+J$ for the linearly ordered set $(\underline{I} \times\{0\} \sqcup \underline{J} \times\{1\},<)$ where $(i, 0)<\left(i^{\prime}, 0\right) \Longleftrightarrow i<_{I} i^{\prime}$ and $(j$, $1)<\left(j^{\prime}, 1\right) \Longleftrightarrow j<{ }_{J} j^{\prime}$ and $(i, 0)<(j, 1)$ for all $i \in \underline{I}$ and $j \in \underline{J}$. Note that the operation + is associative up to isomorphism, i.e. there is a natural isomorphism between the functors $(\cdot+\cdot)+\cdot$ and $\cdot+(\cdot+\cdot)$ from $\operatorname{Los}^{3}$ to Los. Therefore, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I_{1}, \ldots$, $I_{n} \in$ Los, we simply write $I_{1}+\cdots+I_{n}$ for $\left(\cdots\left(\left(I_{1}+I_{2}\right)+I_{3}\right)+\cdots+I_{n-1}\right)+I_{n}$.
- Let $J=(\underline{J},<) \in$ Los. Consider a linearly ordered set $I$ with ordering $<_{I}$ and a family $\left(J_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$ of linearly ordered subsets $\left(\underline{J_{i}},<\right)$ of $J$. We write

$$
J=\coprod_{I}\left(J_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}
$$

if we have

$$
\underline{J}=\bigcup_{i \in I} \underline{J_{i}} \quad \text { and } \quad \forall i, i^{\prime} \in I,\left(i<_{I} i^{\prime} \Longrightarrow\left(\forall\left(j, j^{\prime}\right) \in \underline{J_{i}} \times \underline{J^{\prime}},\left(j<j^{\prime}\right)\right)\right) .
$$

Then $\underline{J}$ is the disjoint union $\underline{J}=\bigsqcup_{i \in I} \underline{J_{i}}$. Note that if $\underline{I}=\left\{i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{n}\right\}$ has to elements $i_{1}<_{I} i_{2}<_{I} \cdots{ }_{I} i_{n}$, then $J_{1} \amalg J_{2} \amalg \cdots \amalg J_{n}$ is isomorphic to $J_{1}+J_{2}+\cdots+J_{n}$.

Any choice function in $\prod_{i \in \underline{I}} \underline{J}_{i}$ is a strictly increasing map $I \longrightarrow J$. Conversely, if $L$ is a subset of $\underline{J}$, then writing

$$
\underline{J_{l}}:=\{j \in \underline{J}:((j, l) \cup(l, j)) \cap L=\varnothing\}
$$

for each $l \in L$, each $\underline{J}_{l}$ is a convex subset of $J$ and we have $J=\coprod_{(L,<)}\left(J_{l}\right)_{l \in L}$.

### 1.3 Tree-like orderings on ordinals

We fix a non-zero ordinal $\lambda$, write $\lambda-1:=\{\beta \in \lambda: \beta+1<\lambda\}$, so $\lambda-1=\lambda$ if $\lambda$ is a limit and $\lambda-1=\beta$ if $\lambda=\beta+1$ is a successor. We will define a specific linear ordering on $\lambda$ that is suited to perform inductive definitions of products over ill-ordered linear orderings.

Let $N: \lambda-1 \longrightarrow\{-1,1\}$ be a function. We define a binary relation $<_{N}$ on $\lambda$ as follows. For $\alpha, \beta \in \lambda$ with $\alpha<\beta$, we set $\alpha<_{N} \beta$ if $N(\alpha)=1$ and $\beta<_{N} \alpha$ if $N(\alpha)=-1$. In other words, we have $\alpha<_{N} \beta$ if and only if

$$
(N \upharpoonleft \alpha) \cup([\alpha, \lambda-1) \times\{0\})<_{\operatorname{lex}}(N \upharpoonleft \beta) \cup([\beta, \lambda-1) \times\{0\})
$$

for the lexicographic ordering on functions $\lambda-1 \longrightarrow\{-1,0,1\}$. It follows that $<_{N}$ is a linear ordering on $\lambda$.

Lemma 1.1. For each $\alpha<\mu<\lambda$, the set $[\alpha, \mu)$ is a convex subset of $\left(\mu,<_{N}\right)$.
Proof. By the characterisation of $<_{N}$ by $<_{\text {lex }}$ above, we have

$$
[\alpha, \mu)=\left\{\beta \in \mu: \forall \gamma<\alpha,\left(\left(\gamma<_{N} \alpha \Longrightarrow \gamma<_{N} \beta\right) \wedge\left(\alpha<_{N} \gamma \Longrightarrow \beta<_{N} \alpha\right)\right)\right\}
$$

which is clearly a convex subset of $\left(\mu,<_{N}\right)$.
For $\alpha<\mu<\lambda$, we write

$$
L_{N}(\alpha, \mu):=\left\{\beta<\mu: \beta<_{N}[\alpha, \mu)\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad R_{N}(\alpha, \mu):=\left\{\beta<\mu:[\alpha, \mu)<_{N} \beta\right\},
$$

so $\left(\mu,<_{N}\right)=\left(L_{N}(\alpha, \mu),<_{N}\right) \amalg\left([\alpha, \mu),<_{N}\right) \amalg\left(R_{N}(\alpha, \mu),<_{N}\right)$.
Lemma 1.2. For $\beta<\alpha$, the set $L_{N}(\beta, \mu)$ is an initial segment of $\left(L_{N}(\alpha, \mu),<_{N}\right)$ whereas $R_{N}(\beta, \mu)$ is a final segment of $\left(R_{N}(\alpha, \mu),<_{N}\right)$.

Proof. Let $\gamma \in L_{N}(\beta, \mu)$ and let $\eta \in L_{N}(\alpha, \mu)$ with $\eta<_{N} \gamma$. Since $\gamma \in L_{N}(\beta, \mu)$, we have $\gamma<_{N} \beta$ so $\eta<_{N} \beta$, whence in particular $\eta \notin R_{N}(\beta, \mu)$. Assume for contradiction that $\eta \notin$ $L_{N}(\beta, \mu)$. So $\eta \in[\beta, \mu)$. But $[\beta, \mu) \supseteq[\alpha, \mu)$ where $L_{N}(\alpha, \mu) \cap[\alpha, \mu)=\varnothing$ : a contradiction. So $\eta \in L_{N}(\beta, \mu)$ which is thus an initial segment of $\left(L_{N}(\alpha, \mu),<_{N}\right)$. The proof that $R_{N}(\beta$, $\mu)$ is a final segment of $\left(R_{N}(\alpha, \mu),<_{N}\right)$ is symmetric.

Remark 1.3. Conversely, if $\triangleleft$ is a linear ordering on $\lambda$ satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 1.1, then $\triangleleft$ coincides with $<_{N}$ for the function $N: \lambda-1 \longrightarrow\{-1,1\}$ defined by $N(\alpha)=1$ if $\alpha \triangleleft[\alpha+1, \lambda)$ and $N(\alpha)=-1$ if $[\alpha+1, \lambda) \triangleleft \alpha$.

## 2 Multipliability groups

### 2.1 Groups with linearly ordered products

Let $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$ be a group. We wish to extend the elementary properties of $\Pi^{\min }$ to families $\Pi=\left(\Pi_{I}\right)_{I \in \mathbf{L o s}}$ whose domains dom $\Pi_{I}$ may be strictly larger than $\mathcal{G}^{(\underline{I})}$ for certain $I \in$ Los. This leads to the following formalism. Consider a family $\Pi=\left(\Pi_{I}\right)_{I \in L o s}$ of partial functions

$$
\Pi_{I}: \mathcal{G}^{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}
$$

whose domains are denoted dom $\Pi_{I}$. Given $I, J \in \mathbf{L o s}$, we regard the following axioms:
MG1. The set dom $\Pi_{I}$ is a subgroup of $\mathcal{G}^{\underline{I}}$. Moreover, for $f, g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$, writing

$$
f[g]:=\left(\Pi_{\left(i^{+}\right)^{*}}\left(f^{-1} \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right) \cdot g(i) \cdot \Pi_{i^{+}}\left(f \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right)\right)_{i \in \underline{I}},
$$

we have

$$
\Pi_{I}(f \cdot g)=\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} f[g]\right) .
$$

MG2. We have dom $\Pi_{I} \supseteq \mathcal{G}^{(I)}$, and for all $g \in \mathcal{G}^{(I)}$, writing supp $g=\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right\}$ where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i_{1}<\cdots<i_{n}$, we have

$$
\Pi_{I} g=g\left(i_{1}\right) \cdots g\left(i_{n}\right) .
$$

MG3. If $\varphi: I \longrightarrow J$ is an isomorphism and $g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{J}$, then $g \circ \varphi \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$, and

$$
\Pi_{I}(g \circ \varphi)=\Pi_{J} g .
$$

MG4. Let $\left(I_{j}\right)_{j \in J}$ be a family with $I=\coprod_{J}\left(I_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$. Let $g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$ and for each $j \in \underline{J}$, set $g_{j}:=g \upharpoonleft \underline{I_{j}}$. Then

MG4a. $g_{j} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I_{j}}$ for each $j \in \underline{J}$.
MG4b. $\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} g_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{J}$.
MG4c. $\Pi_{J}\left(\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} g_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}\right)=\Pi_{I} g$.
MG5. If $I=I_{1} \amalg I_{2}$ and $(g, h) \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I_{1}} \times \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I_{2}}$, then $(g \sqcup h) \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$.
MG6. Let $g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$ and $g_{0} \in \mathcal{G}$. Then $g_{0} \cdot g \cdot g_{0}^{-1}=\left(g_{0} \cdot g(i) \cdot g_{0}^{-1}\right)_{i \in I} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$ and

$$
\Pi_{I}\left(g_{0} \cdot g \cdot g_{0}^{-1}\right)=g_{0} \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} g\right) \cdot g_{0}^{-1} .
$$

MG7. Let $g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$. Then $g^{-1} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I^{*}}$ and

$$
\Pi_{I^{*}} g^{-1}=\left(\Pi_{I} g\right)^{-1}
$$

Fullness. For each linear ordering $\triangleleft$ on $\underline{I}$, we have $\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}=\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{(\underline{I}, \triangleleft)}$.
Definition 2.1. If $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$ is a group and $\Pi$ is a function satisfying MG1-MG7, then we say that $\Pi$ is multipliability structure on $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$ and that $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ is a multipliability group. If furthermore $\Pi$ satisfies Fullness, then we say that $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ (resp. $\Pi$ ) is full.

Remark 2.2. If $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, \Pi)$ satisfies MG4, then for $I=(\underline{I},<) \in \operatorname{Los}, f \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$ and $X \subseteq \underline{I}$ such that $(X,<)$ is a convex subset of $I$, then we have $f \upharpoonleft X \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{(X,<)}$. Indeed, we can write $I=(L,<) \amalg(X,<) \amalg(R,<)$ where

$$
(L, R):=(\{i \in \underline{I}: \forall x \in X, i<X\},\{i \in \underline{I}: \forall x \in X, i>x\}) .
$$

Therefore, this follows from MG4a.
Remark 2.3. In MG1, it is implicitly assumed that $\Pi_{\left(i^{+}\right)}\left(f^{-1} \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i}^{+}\right)\right), \Pi_{i^{+}}\left(f \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right)$and $\Pi_{I} f[g]$ are well-defined. This follows from Remark 2.2 once one knows that ( $\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, \Pi$ ) satisfies MG4 and MG7. So when showing that $\Pi$ is a multipliability structure, we will omit the proofs of well-definedness of those families, and directly prove the other axioms.

We say that a family $g: \underline{I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is $I$-multipliable if $g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$. If $\Pi$ is full, then we simply say that $g$ is multipliable if it is $I$-multipliable.

Definition 2.4. Let $\left(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, \Pi^{\mathcal{G}}\right)$ and $\left(\mathcal{H}, \cdot, 1, \Pi^{\mathcal{H}}\right)$ be strong groups. A strongly multiplicative group morphism is a group morphism $\Phi: \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that for for all $I \in \mathbf{L o s}$ and $g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{\mathcal{G}}$, we have $\Phi \circ g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\Pi_{I}^{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi \circ g)=\Phi\left(\Pi_{I}^{\mathcal{G}} g\right)$.

We write $\operatorname{Hom}^{+}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$ for the set of strongly multiplicative group morphisms $\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}^{+}(\mathcal{G})$ for the set of strongly multiplicative group isomorphisms $\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$. Note that the compositum of composable strongly multiplicative group morphisms is strongly multiplicative. In particular $\operatorname{Aut}^{+}(\mathcal{G})$ is a subgroup of the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{G}$.

### 2.2 Examples

Throughout Section 2.2, we fix a group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$.
Example 2.5. It is routine to check that $\Pi^{\min }$ is a full multipliability structure on $\mathcal{G}$. We call $\Pi^{\min }$ the minimal multipliability structure on $\mathcal{G}$. Note that if $(\mathcal{H}, \cdot, 1, \Pi)$ is a multipliability group and $\mathcal{G}$ is equipped with $\Pi^{\min }$, then $\operatorname{Hom}^{+}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})=\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$.

Definition 2.6. Let $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, \Pi)$ be a multipliability group. A closed subgroup of $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ is a subgroup $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ such that $\Pi_{I} h \in \mathcal{H}$ whenever $I \in \operatorname{Los}$ and $h \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I} \cap \mathcal{H}^{\underline{I}}$.

Example 2.7. Let $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, \Pi)$ be a multipliability group and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a closed subgroup. The function $\Pi^{\mathcal{H}}$ given by $\Pi_{I}^{\mathcal{H}}:=\Pi_{I} \upharpoonleft \mathcal{H} \underline{\underline{I}}$ for each $I \in \operatorname{Los}$ is a multipliability structure on $\mathcal{H}$.

Example 2.8. Let ( $D, \leqslant$ ) be a directed set, and let $\left(\mathcal{G}_{d}, \Pi_{d}\right)_{d \in D}$ be a family of multipliability groups such that for all $d, d^{\prime} \in D$ with $d \leqslant d^{\prime}$, we have $\mathcal{G}_{d} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{d^{\prime}}$ and the identity $\mathcal{G}_{d} \longrightarrow$ $\mathcal{G}_{d^{\prime}}$ is an injective strongly multiplicative group morphism. We define a multipliability structure $\Pi$ on the direct limit $\mathcal{G}:=\underline{\longrightarrow}\left(\mathcal{G}_{d}\right)$ by defining, for each linearly ordered set $I$ :

$$
\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}:=\bigcup_{d \in D} \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{d, I} \quad \text { and } \quad \Pi_{I} g=\Pi_{d, I} g \text { whenever } g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{d, I} .
$$

We leave it to the reader to check that $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ is a multipliability group and that each inclusion $\mathcal{G}_{d} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ for $d \in D$ is an injective and strongly multiplicative group morphism.

### 2.3 Quotients

Let $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, \Pi)$ be a multipliability group and let $(\mathcal{H}, \cdot, 1)$ be a group. Let $\Phi: \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a group morphism and suppose that $\operatorname{Ker}(\Phi)$ is a closed subgroup of $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$. We define a multipliability structure $\Pi^{\Phi}$ on $\Phi(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ as follows. For all linearly ordered sets $I$, define

$$
\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{\Phi}=\left\{\Phi \circ g: g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad \Pi_{I}^{\Phi}(\Phi \circ g):=\Phi\left(\Pi_{I} g\right)
$$

for all $g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$. If $g^{\prime} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$ is such that $\Phi \circ g=\Phi \circ g^{\prime}$, then we have $g^{-1} \cdot g^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Ker}(\Phi)^{\underline{I}}$. Now $g^{\prime}=g \cdot\left(g^{-1} \cdot g^{\prime}\right)$ so MG1 gives $\Pi_{I} g^{\prime}=\left(\Pi_{I} g\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} g\left[g^{-1} \cdot g^{\prime}\right]\right)$. Since $\operatorname{Ker}(\Phi)$ is a normal subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$, the family $g\left[g^{-1} \cdot g^{\prime}\right]$ lies in $\operatorname{Ker}(\Phi) I^{I}$. It follows since $\operatorname{Ker}(\Phi)$ is a closed subgroup of $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ that $\Pi_{I} g\left[g^{-1} \cdot g^{\prime}\right] \in \operatorname{Ker}(\Phi)$, so $\Phi\left(\Pi_{I} g^{\prime}\right)=\Phi\left(\Pi_{I} g\right) \cdot \Phi\left(\Pi_{I} g\left[g^{-1} \cdot g^{\prime}\right]\right)=$ $\Phi\left(\Pi_{I} g\right)$. Therefore $\Pi_{I}^{\Phi}$ is well-defined.

Proposition 2.9. The structure $\left(\Phi(\mathcal{G}), \Pi^{\Phi}\right)$ is a multipliability group. It is full if $\Pi$ is full.
Proof. We fix linearly ordered sets $I, J$. Let $q=\Phi \circ f, r=\Phi \circ g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{\Phi}$ where $f, g \in$ $\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$. Then $q \cdot r^{-1}=\Phi \circ\left(f \cdot g^{-1}\right)$ where $f \cdot g^{-1} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$, so $q \cdot r^{-1} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{\Phi}$. So $\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{\Phi}$ is a subgroup of $\Phi(\mathcal{G})^{\underline{I}}$. For $s=\Phi \circ h \in \Phi(\mathcal{G})^{\underline{I}}$ where $h \in \mathcal{G}^{I}$, we have $s \cdot q \cdot s^{-1}=\Phi \circ\left(h \cdot f \cdot h^{-1}\right)$ where $h \cdot f \cdot h^{-1} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$ by MG1. So $s \cdot q \cdot s^{-1} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{\Phi}$, whence dom $\Pi_{I}^{\Phi}$ is a normal subgroup of $\Phi(\mathcal{G})^{\underline{I}}$. For $i \in \underline{I}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
q[r](i) & =\Pi_{\left(i^{+}\right) *}^{\Phi}\left(\Phi \circ f^{-1} \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right) \cdot(\Phi \circ g)(i) \cdot \Pi_{i^{+}}^{\Phi}\left(\Phi \circ f \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi\left(\Pi_{\left(i^{+}\right) * *}\left(f^{-1} \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right)\right) \cdot \Phi(g(i)) \cdot \Phi\left(\Pi_{i^{+}}\left(f \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi(f[g](i)) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore MG1 in $\mathcal{G}$ gives

$$
\left(\Pi_{I}^{\Phi} q\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I}^{\Phi} q[r]\right)=\Phi\left(\Pi_{I} q\right) \cdot \Phi\left(\Pi_{I} f[g]\right)=\Phi\left(\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} f[g]\right)\right)=\Phi\left(\Pi_{I} f \cdot g\right)=\Pi_{I}^{\Phi}(q \cdot r) .
$$

The axioms MG2, MG3 and MG5-MG7 follow immediately from the validity of their respective counterparts in $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$.

Assume that $I=\coprod_{J}\left(I_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$ and write $q_{j}:=q 1 \underline{I_{j}}$ and $f_{j}:=f \upharpoonleft \underline{I_{j}}$ for all $j \in \underline{J}$. Then by MG4 in ( $\mathcal{G}, \Pi$ ), we have that

- for $j \in \underline{J}, f_{j}$ lies in $\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I_{j}}$, so $q_{j}$ lies in dom $\Pi_{I_{j}}^{\Phi}$, and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi_{I_{j}}^{\Phi} q_{j}=\Phi\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} f_{j}\right) . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

- the family $\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} f_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$ lies in dom $\Pi_{J}$, so $\left(\Pi_{I_{j}}^{\Phi} q_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{J}^{\Phi}$ by (2.1).
- $\Pi_{J}\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} f_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}=\Pi_{I} f$, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{J}^{\Phi}\left(\Pi_{I_{j}}^{\Phi} q_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}} & =\Pi_{J}^{\Phi}\left(\Phi\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} f_{j}\right)\right)_{j \in \underline{J}} \\
& =\Phi\left(\Pi_{J}\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} f_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}\right) \\
& =\Phi\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \\
& =\Pi_{I}^{\Phi} q .
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves MG4. If $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ is full, then one easily sees that $\left(\Phi(\mathcal{G}), \Pi^{\Phi}\right)$ is full as well.
Note that $\Phi:(\mathcal{G}, \Pi) \longrightarrow\left(\Phi(\mathcal{G}), \Pi^{\Phi}\right)$ is strongly multiplicative by definition. Applying this for quotient maps and injective morphisms respectively, we obtain:

Corollary 2.10. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a closed normal subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$, then $\left(\mathcal{G} / \mathcal{H}, \Pi^{\Phi}\right)$ is a multipliability group for the quotient map $\Phi: \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} / \mathcal{H}$. Moreover $\left(\mathcal{G} / \mathcal{H}, \Pi^{\Phi}\right)$ is full if $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ is full.
Corollary 2.11. If $\Psi: \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is an injective morphism, then $\left(\Psi(\mathcal{G}), \Pi^{\Psi}\right)$ is a multipliability group which is full if $(\mathcal{G}, \Pi)$ is full.

## 3 Strongly linear algebra

In this section, we recall facts regarding a commutative version of multipliability groups that was introduced in [13, Section 6.2] and expanded upon in [20, 9, 3]. We fix a field $k$.

### 3.1 Summability spaces and strongly linear functions

Let ( $V,+, 0,$. ) be a vector space over $k$. Let us be given, for each set $I$, a $k$-linear function

$$
\Sigma_{I}: \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I} \longrightarrow V
$$

whose domain dom $\Sigma_{I}$ is a subspace of the vector space $V^{I}$. Given sets $I, J$, consider the following axioms:

SS1. $V^{(I)} \subseteq \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I}$ and $\Sigma_{I} v=\sum_{i \in \operatorname{supp} v} v(i)$ for all $v \in V^{(I)}$.
SS2. if $\varphi: I \longrightarrow J$ is bijective and $v \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{J}$, then $v \circ \varphi \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I}$, and $\Sigma_{I}(v \circ \varphi)=\Sigma_{J} v$.
SS3. if $I=\bigsqcup_{j \in J} I_{j}$ and $v \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{J}$, then writing $v_{j}:=v \upharpoonleft I_{j}$ for each $j \in J$, we have
SS3a. $v_{j} \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I_{j}}$ for all $j \in J$,
SS3b. $\left(\sum_{I_{j}} v_{j}\right)_{j \in J} \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{J}$, and
SS3c. $\sum_{I} v=\sum_{J}\left(\left(\sum_{I_{j}} v_{j}\right)_{j \in J}\right)$.
SS4. if $I=I_{1} \sqcup I_{2}$ and $(v, w) \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I_{1}} \times \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I_{2}}$, then the family $(v \sqcup w): I \longrightarrow V$ given by $(v \sqcup w)\left(i_{1}\right):=v\left(i_{1}\right)$ and $(v \amalg w)\left(i_{2}\right)=w\left(i_{2}\right)$ for all $i_{1} \in I_{1}$ and $i_{2} \in I_{2}$ lies in dom $\Sigma_{I}$.
UF. For all $v \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I}$ and all families $\left(f_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ of scalar valued functions $f_{i}: X_{i} \longrightarrow k$ with finite domains $X_{i}$, writing $I^{\prime}=\left\{(i, x): i \in I \wedge x \in X_{i}\right\}$, the family $\left(f_{i}(x) v(i)\right)_{i \in I \wedge x \in X_{i}}$ lies in $\operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I^{\prime}}$.
We say that $\Sigma=\left(\Sigma_{I}\right)_{I \in \text { Set }}$ is a summability structure on $V$, or that $(V, \Sigma)$ is a summability space, if ( $V, \Sigma$ ) satisfies SS1-SS4 and UF for all sets $I$.

Remark 3.1. Here, we call summability spaces what are called ultrafinite summability spaces in [3].

Given a set $I$, a family $v \in V^{I}$ is said summable (in $(V, \Sigma)$ ) if $v \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I}$. A subspace $W \subseteq V$ is said closed if for all sets $I$ and families $v \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I} \cap W^{I}$, we have $\Sigma_{I} v \in W$. Then we have a summability structure $\Sigma^{W}$ on $W$ defined by $\Sigma_{I}^{W}:=\Sigma_{I} \cap\left(W^{I} \times W\right)$ for each set $I$.

Let $(V, \Sigma)$ and $\left(V_{1}, \Sigma_{1}\right)$ be summability spaces over $k$. A function $\phi: V \longrightarrow V_{1}$ is said strongly linear if it is linear, and if, for all sets $I$ and families $v \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I}$, the family $\phi \circ v$ lies in dom $\Sigma_{1, I}$ and $\Sigma_{1, I}(\phi \circ v)=\phi\left(\Sigma_{I} v\right)$. We write $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(V)$ for the vector space of strongly linear functions $V \longrightarrow V$.

A family $\phi: J \longrightarrow \operatorname{Lin}^{+}(V)$ is said Lin-summable if for all sets $I$ and all families $v \in$ dom $\Sigma_{I}$, we have $\phi(v):=(\phi(j)(v(i)))_{(i, j) \in I \times J} \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I \times J}$. For $v_{0} \in V$, the family $\left(v_{0}\right)_{i \in\{0\}}$ is summable by SS1, so $\phi\left(v_{0}\right):=\left(\phi(j)\left(v_{0}\right)\right)_{j \in J}$ is summable, and we set

$$
\left(\sum_{j \in J} \phi(j)\right)\left(v_{0}\right):=\Sigma_{J} \phi\left(v_{0}\right) .
$$

One can check that the function $\sum_{j \in J} \phi(j)$ thus defined is strongly linear. Lin-summability defines [3, Proposition 1.25] a summability structure on $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(V)$.

### 3.2 Summability algebras

Let $(A,+, \cdot,$.$) be a k$-algebra, where $(A,+, \cdot)$ is a possibly non-commutative, possibly nonunital ring. We consider $A$ as a Lie algebra under the Lie bracket $[a, b]:=a \cdot b-b \cdot a$, and understand Lie subalgebras of $A$ in this sense.

Let $\Sigma$ be a summability structure on $(A,+,$.$) . We say that (A, \Sigma)$ is a summability algebra if the following axiom is satisfied.

SA. For all sets $I, J$ and all $(a, b) \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I} \times \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{J}$, the family $a \cdot b:=(a(i)$. $b(j))_{(i, j) \in I \times J}$ lies in $\operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{I \times J}$, and we have

$$
\sum_{I \times J}(a \cdot b)=\left(\sum_{I} a\right) \cdot\left(\sum_{J} b\right) .
$$

Given a summability space $(V, \Sigma)$, the algebra $\left(\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(V),+, ., \circ\right)$, with its summability structure of Lin-summability, is a summability algebra [3, Proposition 1.30].

Proposition 3.2. [3, Proposition 1.28] Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a summability algebra. Then for all $a \in A$, the left and right product functions $a \cdot: A \longrightarrow A ; b \mapsto a \cdot b$ and $\cdot a: A \longrightarrow A ; b \mapsto b \cdot a$ are strongly linear.

Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a summability $k$-algebra. A closed ideal of a summability algebra $(A, \Sigma)$ is a bilateral ideal of $A$ which is a closed subspace of $(A, \Sigma)$.

We write $\operatorname{End}^{+}(A)$ for the set of strongly linear endomorphisms of algebra of $A$. A derivation on $A$ is a $k$-linear function $\partial: A \longrightarrow A$ which satisfies the Leibniz product rule. We write $\operatorname{Der}^{+}(A)$ for the set of strongly linear derivations on $A$. It is a closed Lie subalgebra of $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(A)$.

### 3.3 Formal power series

An important example of summability algebra is Magnus' algebra of formal series in noncommuting variables. Let $J$ be a set. Write

$$
J^{\star}:=\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} J^{n}
$$

where $J^{0}=\{\varnothing\}$. We see elements of $J^{\star}$ as finite words with letters in $J$. For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\beta, \gamma)=\left(\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{m}\right),\left(\gamma_{1}, \ldots, \gamma_{n}\right)\right) \in J^{m} \times J^{n}$, we define

$$
\beta: \gamma:=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{m}, \gamma_{1}, \ldots, \gamma_{n}\right) \in J^{m+n},
$$

where it is implied that $\varnothing: \theta=\theta: \varnothing=\theta$ for all $\theta \in J^{\star}$. Then $\left(J^{\star},:, \varnothing\right)$ is a cancellative monoid.
We write $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle:=k^{J^{\star}}$ for the vector space over $k$ of functions $J^{\star} \longrightarrow k$. This comes with a natural summability structure of pointwise summability, whereby a family $Q: I \longrightarrow k\langle\langle J\rangle$ is pointwise summable if for all $\theta \in J^{\star}$, the set $I_{\theta}:=\left\{i \in I: \theta \in \operatorname{supp} Q_{i}\right\}$ is finite. We then define $\Sigma_{I} Q$ as the pointwise sum

$$
\Sigma_{I} Q: J^{\star} \longrightarrow k ; \theta \mapsto \sum_{i \in I_{\theta}} Q_{i}(\theta) .
$$

The space $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle$ is equipped with a Cauchy product: for $P, Q \in k\langle\langle \rangle\rangle$, we have

Note that

$$
\forall \theta \in J^{\star},(P \cdot Q)(\theta):=\sum_{\theta=\beta: \gamma} P(\beta) Q(\gamma)
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{supp}(P+Q) & \subseteq \operatorname{supp} P \cup \operatorname{supp} Q \quad \text { and } \\
\operatorname{supp}(P \cdot Q) & \subseteq(\operatorname{supp} P):(\operatorname{supp} Q) . \tag{3.1}
\end{align*}
$$

Then $k\langle\langle J\rangle$ is a unital summability algebra. Moreover the set

$$
k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle_{0}:=\{P \in k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle: P(\varnothing)=0\}
$$

is a closed two-sided ideal.
For $\theta \in J^{\star}$, we write $X_{\theta}$ for the function $J^{\star} \longrightarrow k$ with support $\{\theta\}$ and $X_{\theta}(\theta)=1$. So $X_{\varnothing}=1$, and writing $\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right)$, we have $X_{\theta}=X_{\theta_{1}} \cdots X_{\theta_{n}}$. For all $P \in k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle$, the family $\left(P(\theta) X_{\theta}\right)_{\theta \in J^{\star}}$ is pointwise summable, with $P=\sum_{\theta \in J^{\star}} P(\theta) X_{\theta}$. Lastly, for each subset $X \subseteq J$, the restriction function

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho_{X}: k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle & \longrightarrow k\langle\langle X\rangle\rangle \\
P & \longmapsto P \upharpoonleft X^{\star}
\end{aligned}
$$

is a strongly linear morphism of algebras.

### 3.4 Evaluations

Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a unital summability algebra of the form $A=k+\mathfrak{m}$ where $\mathfrak{m}$ is a closed two-sided ideal. Then $A$ has evaluations if for all sets $J$ and all $f \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{J}^{\mathfrak{m}}$, the family $\left(f\left(\theta_{1}\right) \cdots f\left(\theta_{n}\right)\right)_{\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in J^{\star}}$ is summable. Then for all sets $J$, all $f \in \operatorname{dom} \Sigma_{J}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ and all $P \in k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle$, we define the evaluation of $P$ at $f$ as

$$
\operatorname{ev}_{f}(P):=\sum_{\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in J^{\star}} P(\theta) f\left(\theta_{1}\right) \cdots f\left(\theta_{n}\right) \in A .
$$

If $J=\{0, \ldots, m-1\}$ where $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then we simply write $\operatorname{ev}_{f(0), \ldots, f(m-1)}(P):=\operatorname{ev}_{f}(P)$. Each such evaluation map $\operatorname{ev}_{f}: k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle \longrightarrow A$ is [3, Theorem 2.6] a strongly linear morphism of algebras. The summability algebra $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle=k+k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle_{0}$ itself has evaluations.

Proposition 3.3. Let $A=k+\mathfrak{m}$ be a summability algebra with evaluations. Then $A$ is local algebra with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. In particular, the set $(1+\mathfrak{m}, \cdot, 1)$ is a subgroup of $A^{\times}$.

The following proposition is very useful in order to derive identities in summability algebras from formal identities in $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle$.

Proposition 3.4. [3, Proposition 2.7] Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a summability algebra with evaluations, with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Let $I, J$ be sets and let $Q: I \longrightarrow k\left\langle\langle J\rangle_{0}\right.$ and $a: J \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ be summable. For all $P \in k\langle\langle I\rangle\rangle$, we have

$$
\operatorname{ev}_{a}\left(\operatorname{ev}_{Q}(P)\right)=\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\operatorname{ev}_{a}(Q(i))\right)_{i \in I}}(P)
$$

If $k$ has characteristic zero, then we have a formal power series

$$
\log \left(1+X_{\bullet}\right):=\sum_{m>0} \frac{(-1)^{m-1}}{m} X_{\bullet}^{m} \in k\left\langle\langle\{\bullet\}\rangle_{0} .\right.
$$

Proposition 3.5. [3, Corollary 2.10] Assume that $k$ has characteristic zero. Let $(k+\mathfrak{m}, \Sigma)$ be a summability algebra with evaluations. Then we have a bijection

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log : 1+\mathfrak{m} & \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m} \\
\delta & \longmapsto \operatorname{ev}_{\delta-1}\left(\log \left(1+X_{\bullet}\right)\right)=\sum_{m>0} \frac{(-1)^{m-1}}{m}(\delta-1)^{m}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 3.6. Assume that $k$ has characteristic zero. Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a summability algebra with evaluations, with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Let $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{m}$. The function

$$
\begin{aligned}
k & \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m} \\
c & \longmapsto(1+\varepsilon)^{[c]}:=\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\binom{c}{m} \varepsilon^{m}
\end{aligned}
$$

is a group morphism $(k,+) \longrightarrow(1+\mathfrak{m}, \cdot)$ with $(1+\varepsilon)^{[1]}=1+\varepsilon$ and $\left((1+\varepsilon)^{[c]}\right)^{\left[c^{\prime}\right]}=(1+\varepsilon)^{\left[c c^{\prime}\right]}$ for all $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $c, c^{\prime} \in k$.

Proof. In view of [3, Proposition 2.16], it suffices to note that the reciprocal exp of log satisfies the classical formula $\exp \left(c \log \left(1+X_{\bullet}\right)\right)=\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\binom{c}{m} X_{\bullet}^{m}$ in $k\langle\{\bullet \bullet\rangle\rangle$.

## 4 Ordered products in algebras with evaluations

### 4.1 The formal ordered product

We fix two linearly ordered sets $J=(\underline{J},<)$ and $I=(\underline{I},<)$. Let $J^{\star}$ denote the subset of $(\underline{J})^{\star}$ of words $\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in(\underline{J})^{\star}$ with $\theta_{1}<\cdots<\theta_{n}$. It is understood that $\varnothing \in J^{\star}$. Note that if $J=\coprod_{I}\left(J_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ for a family $\left(J_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
J^{\star}=\bigsqcup_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\star}}\left(J_{i_{1}}\right)^{\star}: \cdots:\left(J_{i_{n}}\right)^{\star} . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define

$$
\mathrm{OP}_{J}:=\sum_{\theta \in J^{\star}} X_{\theta} \in k\langle\langle\underline{J}\rangle\rangle .
$$

Note that $\varnothing^{\star}=\{\varnothing\}$ and that $\mathrm{OP}_{\varnothing}=1$. We think of $\mathrm{OP}_{J}$ as the formal expansion of the product of all terms $\left(1+X_{j}\right) \in 1+k\left\langle\langle\underline{J}\rangle_{0}\right.$, each appearing in definite order according to the ordering on $J$. We also set $\mathrm{op}_{J}:=\mathrm{OP}_{J}-1 \in k\left\langle\langle\bar{J}\rangle_{0}\right.$. The following is an immediate consequence of the definition of $\mathrm{OP}_{J}$ :

Lemma 4.1. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $J=(\{0, \ldots, m-1\},<)$ where $0<\cdots<m-1$. Then

$$
\mathrm{OP}_{J}=\left(1+X_{0}\right) \cdots\left(1+X_{m-1}\right) .
$$

Proposition 4.2. Let I be a linearly ordered set and assume that $J=\coprod_{I}\left(J_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$. Then $\left(\mathrm{op}_{J_{i}}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$ is summable in $k\left\langle\langle\underline{J}\rangle_{0}\right.$ and we have

$$
\mathrm{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{op}_{J_{i}}\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)=\mathrm{OP}_{J} .
$$

Proof. That $\left(\mathrm{op}_{J_{i}}\right)_{i \in I}$ is summable follows from the fact that the sets $J_{i}, i \in I$ are pairwise disjoint. Write $P:=\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\operatorname{op}_{J_{i}}\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J_{i}}\right)$. For $i \in \underline{I}$, we have supp op $j_{i} \subseteq J_{i}^{\star}$. By (4.1), the set $\operatorname{supp} P$ is contained in

So $\operatorname{supp} P \subseteq J^{\star}=\operatorname{supp}$ OP $_{J}$.
Therefore it suffices in order to conclude to show that for $\theta \in J^{\star}$, we have $P(\theta)=1$. Let $\theta \in J^{\star}$ and let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\theta \in(\underline{J})^{p}$. If $p=0$, then $\theta=\varnothing$ and $P(\varnothing)=1$ by definition. Assume now that $p>0$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
P(\theta) & =\sum_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\star}} \mathrm{OP}_{I}\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right)\left(\mathrm{op}_{J_{i_{1}}} \cdots \mathrm{op}_{J_{i n}}\right)(\theta) \\
& =\sum_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\star}}\left(\mathrm{op}_{J_{i_{1}}} \cdots \mathrm{op}_{J_{i_{n}}}\right)(\theta) .
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\star}$, if the product

$$
\left(\mathrm{op}_{J_{i_{1}}} \cdots \mathrm{op}_{J_{i_{n}}}\right)(\theta)=\sum_{\theta_{1}: \cdots: \theta_{n}=\theta} \operatorname{op}_{J_{i_{1}}}\left(\theta_{1}\right) \cdots \mathrm{op}_{J_{i_{n}}}\left(\theta_{n}\right)
$$

is non-zero, then one of its summands must be non-zero, so there must exist $\theta_{1} \in J_{i_{1}}^{\star} \backslash\{\varnothing\}, \ldots$, $\theta_{n} \in J_{i_{n}}^{\star} \backslash\{\varnothing\}$ with $\theta=\theta_{1}: \cdots: \theta_{n}$, in which case $\operatorname{op}_{J_{i_{1}}}\left(\theta_{1}\right) \cdots$ op $_{J_{i_{n}}}\left(\theta_{n}\right)=1 \cdots 1=1$. In view of $(4.1)$, there is a unique $\operatorname{such}\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right)$. Thus the $\operatorname{sum} \sum_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\star}}\left(\operatorname{op}_{J_{i_{1}}} \cdots \mathrm{op}_{J_{i_{n}}}\right)(\theta)$ has exactly one non-zero term, which is one, i.e. $P(\theta)=1$. We conclude that $P=\mathrm{OP}_{J}$.

Lemma 4.3. Let $\varsigma \notin \bigcup \underline{J}$, let $\underline{J} \times\{\varsigma\}$ be an isomorphic copy of $J$ under $j \mapsto(j, \varsigma)$ and write $\underline{J^{\prime}}=\underline{J} \sqcup(\underline{J} \times\{\varsigma\})$. For all $j \in \underline{J}$, write

$$
C_{J}(j):=\mathrm{OP}_{j^{+}}^{-1} \cdot\left(1+X_{(j, \varsigma)}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{j^{+}} \in 1+k\left\langle\left\langle\underline{J^{\prime}}\right\rangle_{0}\right.
$$

Then $\left(C_{J}(j)-1\right)_{i \in \underline{j}}$ is summable in $k\left\langle\left\langle\underline{J}^{\prime}\right\rangle\right\rangle_{0}$, and

$$
\mathrm{ev}_{\left(\left(1+X_{j}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{(j, 5)}\right)-1\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right)=\mathrm{OP}_{J} \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{\left(C_{J}(j)-1\right)_{i \in \underline{j}}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right)
$$

Proof. For $j \in \underline{J}$, we have $C_{J}(j)-1=\mathrm{OP}_{j^{+}}^{-1} \cdot X_{(j, \varsigma)} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{j^{+}}$. Since $\mathrm{OP}_{j^{+}} \in k\langle\langle\underline{J}\rangle\rangle$ and $(j$, $\varsigma) \notin \underline{J}$, any two $C_{J}(j)-1$ and $C_{J}\left(j^{\prime}\right)-1$ for distinct $j, j^{\prime} \in \underline{J}$ have disjoint supports. It follows that $\left(C_{J}(j)-1\right)_{i \in \underline{j}}$ is summable. As in Proposition 4.2, it suffices to prove the result for finite $\underline{J}$. In that case, we have $C_{J}(j)=f[g]$ for $f=\left(1+X_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$ and $g=\left(1+X_{(j, \varsigma)}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$, so this follows from Lemma 4.1.

Let $J$ be a set and let $\varepsilon \in k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle_{0}$. Recall that $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle$ is a summability algebra and that $k\left\langle\langle J\rangle_{0}\right.$ is a closed bilateral ideal. By Proposition 3.2, the conjugacy function

$$
\begin{aligned}
k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle & \longrightarrow k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle \\
P & \longmapsto(1+\varepsilon) \cdot P \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

is a strongly linear automorphism of $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle$ that sends $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle_{0}$ into $k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle_{0}$. It follows that:
Lemma 4.4. Let $J, I$ be sets, let $\varepsilon \in k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle_{0}$ and let $Q: I \longrightarrow k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle_{0}$ be a summable family and write $(1+\varepsilon) \cdot Q \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}$ for the family $\left((1+\varepsilon) \cdot Q(i) \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}\right)_{i \in I}$. Then for all $P \in k\langle\langle J\rangle\rangle$, we have

$$
\operatorname{ev}_{(1+\varepsilon) \cdot Q \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}}(P)=(1+\varepsilon) \cdot \operatorname{ev}_{Q}(P) \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}
$$

Corollary 4.5. Let $J$ be a linearly ordered set, let $\varsigma \notin \underline{J}$ and let $J^{\prime}:=\underline{J} \sqcup\{\varsigma\}$. Write $P$ for the family $\underline{J} \longrightarrow k\left\langle\left\langle J^{\prime}\right\rangle\right\rangle_{0}$ with $Q(j):=\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot X_{j} \cdot\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right)^{-1}$ for all $j \in \underline{J}$. Then

$$
\mathrm{ev}_{Q}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right)=\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{J} \cdot\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right)^{-1}
$$

Lemma 4.6. Let $I=(\underline{I},<)$ be a linearly ordered set. We define a family $R: \underline{I} \longrightarrow k\langle\langle\underline{I}\rangle$ by

We have

$$
\forall i \in \underline{I}, R(i):=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}}(-1)^{n} X_{i}^{n}=\left(1+X_{i}\right)^{-1}
$$

$$
\mathrm{ev}_{R-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right)=\mathrm{OP}_{I}^{-1}
$$

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \in(\underline{I})^{n}$. Let us show that $\operatorname{ev}_{R-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right)(\theta)=\mathrm{OP}_{I}^{-1}(\theta)$. Write $S:=\left(\left\{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{p}\right\},<\right)$ and $R^{\prime}=R \upharpoonleft\left\{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right\}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ev}_{R-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right)(\theta) & =\operatorname{ev}_{R^{\prime}-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{S^{*}}\right)(\theta) \quad \text { and } \\
\mathrm{OP}_{I}^{-1}(\theta) & =\mathrm{OP}_{S}^{-1}(\theta)
\end{aligned}
$$

so we may assume that $\underline{I}$ is finite (hence also $R^{\prime}=R$ ). Write $I=\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{m}\right\}$ where $m \leqslant n$ and $i_{1}<\cdots<i_{n}$. By Lemma 4.1, we have $\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}=\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \cdots\left(1+X_{i_{1}}\right)$ and $\mathrm{OP}_{I}=$ $\left(1+X_{i_{1}}\right) \cdots\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right)$, so

$$
\operatorname{ev}_{R-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right)=R\left(i_{n}\right) \cdots R\left(i_{1}\right)=\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right)^{-1} \cdots\left(1+X_{i_{1}}\right)^{-1}=\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)^{-1}
$$

In particular $\mathrm{ev}_{R-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right)(\theta)=\mathrm{OP}_{I}^{-1}(\theta)$. This concludes the proof.
Lemma 4.7. Assume that $k$ has characteristic zero. Let $I=(\underline{I},<)$ be a linearly ordered set, and let $L$ be a closed Lie subalgebra of $k\left\langle\langle I\rangle_{0}\right.$ containing the set $\left\{\log \left(1+X_{i}\right): i \in \underline{I}\right\}$. Then $\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \in L$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on the cardinal $\kappa:=|\underline{I}|$. In view of Lemma 4.1 and by [3, Proposition 2.11], the result holds if $\kappa \leqslant 2$. By induction, it holds if $\kappa<\omega$. Let $\kappa$ such that the result holds for all cardinals $\lambda<\kappa$. Let $f: \kappa \longrightarrow \underline{I}$ be a bijection, and write $J_{\alpha}:=\{f(\beta): \beta<\alpha\}$ for each $\alpha \leqslant \kappa$. So $J_{\alpha}$ has cardinality $<\kappa$ whenever $\alpha<\kappa$, and $J_{\kappa}=\underline{I}$.

Let $J \subseteq \underline{I}$. Note that $\rho_{J}\left(\mathrm{op}_{I}\right)=\left(\sum_{\theta \in I^{\star} \cap(J,<)^{\star}} X_{\theta}\right)-1=\mathrm{op}_{(J,<)}$. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho_{J}\left(\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)\right) & =\rho_{J}\left(\sum_{m>0} \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{m} \mathrm{op}_{I}^{m}\right) \\
& =\sum_{m>0} \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{m}\left(\rho_{J}\left(\mathrm{op}_{I}\right)\right)^{m} \\
& =\sum_{m>0} \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{m} \mathrm{op}_{(J,<)}^{m} \\
& =\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{(J,<)}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \in \log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{(J,<)}\right)+\operatorname{Ker}\left(\rho_{J}\right)$ for each $J \subseteq \underline{I}$. So for each $\alpha<\kappa$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)-\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\alpha},<\right)}\right) \in \operatorname{Ker}\left(\rho_{J_{\alpha}}\right) . \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Write $Q_{\alpha}:=\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\alpha+1},<\right)}\right)-\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\alpha},<\right)}\right)$ for each $\alpha<\kappa$. Our induction hypothesis for $L$ gives $\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\alpha+1},<\right)}\right), \log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\alpha},<\right)}\right) \in L$, whence $Q_{\alpha} \in L$. Furthermore [3, Proposition 2.11] implies that $Q_{\alpha}$ lies in the closed subspace of $k\left\langle\left\langle J_{\alpha+1}\right\rangle\right\rangle$ generated by $\log \left(1+X_{f(\alpha)}\right)$, Lie brackets of $\log \left(1+X_{f(\alpha)}\right)$ and elements in $k\left\langle\left\langle J_{\alpha}\right\rangle\right.$. It follows since supp $\log \left(1+X_{f(\alpha)}\right) \subseteq$ $J_{\alpha+1}^{\star} \backslash J_{\alpha}^{\star}$ and in view of (3.1) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{supp} Q_{\alpha} \subseteq J_{\alpha+1}^{\star} \backslash J_{\alpha}^{\star} . \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, the family $\left(Q_{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha<\kappa}$ is summable in $k\langle\langle I\rangle\rangle$. We deduce since $L$ is closed that $\sum_{\alpha<\kappa} Q_{\alpha} \in L$. We claim that $\sum_{\alpha<\kappa} Q_{\alpha}=\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)$, and we will prove by induction on $\alpha \leqslant \kappa$ that $\sum_{\beta<\alpha} Q_{\beta}=\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\alpha},<\right)}\right)$. This holds for $\alpha=0$ since $\log (1)=0$. Let $\alpha \leqslant \kappa$ such that the result holds for all $\beta<\alpha$. If $\alpha=\beta+1$ is a successor, then we immediately get the desired identity. Assume that $\alpha$ is a non-zero limit.

For $\theta \in J_{\alpha}^{\star}$, there is a least $\gamma \leqslant \alpha$ with $\theta \in J_{\gamma}^{\star}$ (since $\theta$ is a finite word). We have $\theta \in J_{\gamma}^{\star} \backslash J_{\eta}^{\star}$ for all $\eta<\gamma$ by minimality, and $\theta \notin \operatorname{Ker}\left(\rho_{J_{\gamma}}\right)$. So

$$
\begin{align*}
\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\alpha},<\right)}\right)(\theta) & =\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\gamma},<\right)}\right)(\theta)  \tag{4.2}\\
& =\sum_{\eta<\gamma} Q_{\gamma}(\theta) \\
& =\sum_{\beta<\alpha} Q_{\beta}(\theta) . \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

We deduce by induction that $\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)=\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(J_{\kappa},<\right)}\right)=\sum_{\beta<\kappa} Q_{\beta} \in L$.

### 4.2 Ordered products in $1+\mathfrak{m}$

In this section, we fix a summability algebra $A=k+\mathfrak{m}$ with evaluations. We also fix a linearly ordered set $I$ and an element $\varsigma \notin \underline{I} \cup(\cup \underline{I})$.

A family $f: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$ is said multipliable if $f-1: \underline{I} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ is summable. We then define the ordered product $\Pi_{I} f$ of $f$ as

$$
\Pi_{I} f:=\mathrm{ev}_{f-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \in 1+\mathfrak{m} .
$$

We fix a multipliable family $f: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$.
Proposition 4.8. The set $\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$ is a subgroup of $(1+\mathfrak{m})^{\underline{I}}$.
Proof. Let $g: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$ be multipliable. By SA in $(A, \Sigma)$, the family $(f-1) \cdot(g-1)$ is summable, so $f \cdot g-1=(f-1)+(g-1)+(f-1) \cdot(g-1)$ is summable. So $f \cdot g \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$. Since $(A, \Sigma)$ has evaluations, the family $\left((-1)^{k}(f(i)-1)^{k}\right)_{i \in I \wedge k>0}$ is summable. By SS3, so is $\left(\sum_{k>0}(-1)^{k}(f(i)-1)^{k}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}=\left(f(i)^{-1}-1\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$. Therefore $f^{-1} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}$. So dom $\Pi_{I}$ is a subgroup of $(1+\mathfrak{m})^{\underline{I}}$.

Proposition 4.9. Let $g: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$ be multipliable. Consider the family

$$
f[g]:=\left(\Pi_{\left(i^{+}\right)}\left(f^{-1} \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right) \cdot g(i) \cdot \Pi_{i^{+}}\left(f \upharpoonleft\left(\underline{i^{+}}\right)\right)\right)_{i \in \underline{I}} .
$$

Then $f[g]$ is multipliable, with $\Pi_{I}(f \cdot g)=\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} f[g]\right)$.
Proof. In the notations of Lemma 4.3, let $\varphi: \underline{I} \longrightarrow \underline{I} \times\{\varsigma\} ; i \mapsto(i, \varsigma)$ be the natural isomorphism and write $g^{\prime}=g \circ \varphi$. So $g^{\prime}-1$ is summable. We have

$$
\mathrm{ev}_{\left(\left(1+X_{i}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{(i, \varsigma)}\right)-1\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)=\mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{\left(C_{I}(i)-1\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Pi_{I}(f \cdot g)=\operatorname{ev}_{(f(i) \cdot g(i))_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \\
& =\mathrm{ev}_{\mathrm{ev}_{f \cup g^{\prime}}\left(\left(\left(1+X_{i}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{(i, \varsigma)}\right)-1\right)\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \\
& =\mathrm{ev}_{f \sqcup g^{\prime}}\left(\mathrm{ev}_{\left.\left(\left(1+X_{i}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{(i, 5)}\right)-1\right)\right)_{i \in I}}\right)\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)  \tag{byProposition3.4}\\
& =\mathrm{ev}_{f \sqcup g^{\prime}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{\left(C_{I}(i)-1\right)_{i \in i}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)\right) \\
& \left.=\mathrm{ev}_{f \sqcup g^{\prime}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{f \sqcup g^{\prime}}\left(\mathrm{ev}_{\left(C_{I}(i)-1\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{ev}_{f \cup g^{\prime}}\left(C_{I}(i)-1\right)\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \\
& =\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot \operatorname{ev}_{((f[g](i)-1))_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \\
& =\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} f[g]\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

(by Proposition 3.4)

This concludes the proof.
Proposition 4.10. Assume that $f$ has finite support $\operatorname{supp} f=\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right\}$ where $i_{1}<\cdots<i_{n}$. Then $\Pi_{I} f=f\left(i_{1}\right) \cdots f\left(i_{n}\right)$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, we have $\Pi_{I} f=\left(1+f\left(i_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(1+f\left(i_{n}\right)-1\right)=f\left(i_{1}\right) \cdots f\left(i_{n}\right)$.
Proposition 4.11. Let $J$ be a linearly ordered set and let $\varphi: J \longrightarrow I$ be an isomorphism. Then $f \circ \varphi$ is multipliable, and $\Pi_{J}(f \circ \varphi)=\Pi_{I} f$.

Proof. The function $\varphi$ is bijective, so $\operatorname{SS} 2$ in $(A, \Sigma)$ implies that $f \circ \varphi-1$ is summable. The map $\varphi$ induces a bijection $\varphi^{\star}: J^{\star} \longrightarrow I^{\star} ;\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \longmapsto\left(\varphi\left(j_{1}\right), \ldots, \varphi\left(j_{n}\right)\right)$. Write

$$
\begin{aligned}
F & :=\left(\left(f\left(i_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(f\left(i_{n}\right)-1\right)\right)_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\star}} \text { and } \\
G & :=\left(\left(f \circ \varphi\left(j_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(f \circ \varphi\left(j_{n}\right)-1\right)\right)_{\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \in J^{\star}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We have $G=F \circ \varphi^{\star}$ where $\Pi_{I} f=\Sigma_{I^{\star}} F$ and $\Pi_{J}(f \circ \varphi)=\Sigma_{J^{\star}} G$, so $\operatorname{SS} 2$ in $(A, \Sigma)$ gives $\Pi_{I} f=\Pi_{J}(f \circ \varphi)$.

Proposition 4.12. Let $J$ be a linearly ordered set, and let $\left(I_{j}\right)_{j \in J}$ be a family of linearly ordered subsets with $J=\coprod_{j \in J} I_{j}$. Let $g: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$ be multipliable. For each $j \in \underline{J}$, write $g_{j}:=g \upharpoonleft \underline{I_{j}}$. Then
a) $g_{j}$ is multipliable,
b) $\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} g_{j}\right)_{j \in J}-1$ is multipliable, and
c) $\Pi_{J}\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} g_{j}\right)_{j \in J}=\Pi_{I} g$.

Proof. That $g_{j}-1$ is summable follows from SS3a in $(A, \Sigma)$. Since $(A, \Sigma)$ is has evaluations, the family $\left(\mathrm{op}_{I}\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right)\left(g\left(i_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(g\left(i_{n}\right)-1\right)\right)_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\star}}$ is summable. Let $I^{\prime}:=\bigsqcup_{j \in \underline{J}} I_{j}^{\star}$, so $I^{\prime} \subseteq I^{\star}$. The family $\left(\mathrm{op}_{I}\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right)\left(g\left(i_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(g\left(i_{n}\right)-1\right)\right)_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I^{\prime}}$ is also summable by SS3a. By SS3b in $(A, \Sigma)$ for the disjoint union $I^{\prime}=\bigsqcup_{j \in J} I_{j}^{\star}$, the family

$$
\left(\sum_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in I_{j}} \operatorname{op}_{I}\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right)\left(g\left(i_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(g\left(i_{n}\right)-1\right)\right)_{j \in \underline{J},}
$$

is summable. But this is none other than $\left(\Pi_{I} g_{j}\right)_{j \in J}$. So b) holds. Finally, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{I}\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} g_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}} & =\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\left(\Pi_{I_{j}} g_{j}\right)-1\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{ev}_{g_{j}-1}\left(\mathrm{op}_{I_{j}}\right)\right)_{j \in J}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{ev}_{g-1}\left(\mathrm{op}_{I_{j}}\right)\right)_{j \in J}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{g-1}\left(\mathrm{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{op}_{I_{j}}\right)_{j \in J}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right)\right) \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{g-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \\
& =\Pi_{I} g .
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\left.=\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\operatorname{ev}_{g-1}\left(\mathrm{op}_{I_{j}}\right)\right)_{j \in J}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right) \quad\left(\text { since each } \mathrm{op}_{I_{j}} \in k\left\langle\underline{I_{j}}\right\rangle\right\rangle\right)
$$

$$
=\operatorname{ev}_{g-1}\left(\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{op}_{j_{j}}\right)_{j \in J}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right)\right) \quad \text { (by Proposition 3.4) }
$$

$$
=\mathrm{ev}_{g-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \quad \text { (by Proposition 4.2) }
$$

This proves $c$ ).
Proposition 4.13. Let $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{m}$. Then the family

$$
(1+\varepsilon) \cdot f \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}=\left((1+\varepsilon) \cdot f(i) \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}
$$

is multipliable and $\Pi_{I}\left((1+\varepsilon) \cdot f \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}\right)=(1+\varepsilon) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}$.
Proof. That $(1+\varepsilon) \cdot f \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}$ is multipliable follows from the fact that $(A, \Sigma)$ is a strong algebra. That it takes values in $\mathfrak{m}$ follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a bilateral ideal in $A$. Consider $I^{\prime}:=\underline{I} \sqcup\{\varsigma\}$ as in Corollary 4.5 and write $f^{\prime}$ for the family $f-1 \sqcup\{(\varsigma$, $\varepsilon)\}: I^{\prime} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$. We have

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
\Pi_{I}\left((1+\varepsilon) \cdot f \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}\right) & =\operatorname{ev}_{(1+\varepsilon) \cdot f \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{ev}_{f^{\prime}}\left(\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot X_{i} \cdot\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right)^{-1}\right)\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{f^{\prime}}\left(\mathrm{ev}_{\left.\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot X_{i} \cdot\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)\right)} \quad\right. \text { (by Corollary 4.5) } \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{f^{\prime}}\left(\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right)^{-1}\right) \quad \text { (by Proposition 3.4) } \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{f^{\prime}}\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{f^{\prime}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{f^{\prime}}\left(1+X_{\varsigma}\right)^{-1} \\
& =(1+\varepsilon) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} f\right) \cdot(1+\varepsilon)^{-1} .
\end{array}
$$

This concludes the proof.

Proposition 4.14. The family $f^{-1}=\left(f(i)^{-1}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$ is multipliable and $\Pi_{I^{*}}\left(f^{-1}\right)=\left(\Pi_{I} f\right)^{-1}$.
Proof. We define a family $P: I \longrightarrow k\langle\langle\underline{I}\rangle\rangle$ by setting $R(i):=\left(1+X_{i}\right)^{-1}$ for each $i \in \underline{I}$. Set $Q:=\sum_{i \in I} R(i) \in k\langle\langle\underline{I}\rangle\rangle$. The family $\left(Q\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right)\left(f\left(i_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(f\left(i_{n}\right)-1\right)\right)_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in \underline{I}^{\star}}$ is summable. Now by SS3 in $(A, \Sigma)$, the family $f^{-1}-1=\left(\operatorname{ev}_{f-1}(R(i))\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$, i.e.

$$
\left(\sum_{\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right) \in\{i\}^{\star}} Q\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{n}\right)\left(f\left(i_{1}\right)-1\right) \cdots\left(f\left(i_{n}\right)-1\right)\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}
$$

is summable. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
\Pi_{I^{*}} f^{-1} & =\mathrm{ev}_{f^{-1}-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right) \\
& =\mathrm{ev}_{\left(\mathrm{ev}_{f-1}(R(i))-1\right)_{i \in I}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{ev}_{f-1}\left(\mathrm{ev}_{R-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right)\right)  \tag{byProposition3.4}\\
& =\mathrm{ev}_{f-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}^{-1}\right) \\
& =\mathrm{ev}_{f-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)^{-1} \\
& =\left(\Pi_{I} f\right)^{-1} .
\end{align*}
$$

(by Lemma 4.6)

This concludes the proof.

### 4.3 The multipliability group $1+\mathfrak{m}$

Theorem 4.15. Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a summability algebra with evaluations, and write $\mathfrak{m}$ for its maximal ideal. For each linearly ordered set $I$, let $\Pi_{I}$ be the ordered product function on $(1+\mathfrak{m})^{\underline{I}}$. Then $(1+\mathfrak{m}, 1, \cdot, \Pi)$ is a full multipliability group.

Proof. The validity of the axioms MG1-MG7 follows from Propositions 4.8-4.14. The axiom Fullness is satisfied by definition of multipliability in $1+\mathfrak{m}$.

Suppose that $k$ has characteristic zero. For all $\varepsilon, \delta \in \mathfrak{m}$, define

$$
\varepsilon * \delta:=\operatorname{ev}_{\varepsilon, \delta}\left(\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{(2,<)}\right)\right) \in \mathfrak{m}
$$

By evaluating $\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)$ in $\mathfrak{m}$, one obtains a multipliability structure $\Pi^{\log }$ on the group ( $\mathfrak{m}$, *) as in Corollary 2.11, such that $\log : 1+\mathfrak{m} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}$ is a strongly multiplicative isomorphism.

Proposition 4.16. Assume that $k$ has characteristic zero. Let $G \subseteq 1+\mathfrak{m}$ be a subset such that $\log (G)$ is a closed Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{m}$. Then $G$ is a closed subgroup of $1+\mathfrak{m}$.

Proof. Let $a, b \in G$. By [3, Proposition 2.11], the element $\log (a) * \log \left(b^{-1}\right)$ lies in all closed Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{m}$ containing $\log (a)$ and $\log \left(b^{-1}\right)=-\log (b)$. So $\log \left(a \cdot b^{-1}\right)=$ $\log (a) * \log \left(b^{-1}\right) \in \log (G)$, whence $a \cdot b^{-1} \in G$. Therefore $G$ is a subgroup of $1+\mathfrak{m}$.

Let $I=(\underline{I},<)$ be a linearly ordered set and let $\left(g_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$ be a family in $G$ which is multipliable in $1+\mathfrak{m}$. We want to show that its product $g=\prod_{I}\left(g_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$ lies in $G$. Since log is injective, it suffices to show that $\log (g) \in \log (G)$. Let $\delta=\left(g_{i}-1\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$, so $\delta$ is summable in $\mathfrak{m}$. We have

$$
\log (g)=\log \left(\operatorname{ev}_{\delta}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)\right)
$$

$$
\left.=\operatorname{ev}_{\mathrm{ev}_{\delta}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)-1}\left(\log \left(1+X_{\bullet}\right)\right) \quad \text { (by definition of } \log \right)
$$

$$
=\operatorname{ev}_{\delta}\left(\operatorname{ev}_{\mathrm{OP}_{I}-1}\left(\log \left(1+X_{\bullet}\right)\right)\right) \quad \text { (by Proposition 3.4) }
$$

$$
\left.=\operatorname{ev}_{\delta}\left(\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)\right) . \quad \text { (by definition of } \log \right)
$$

By Lemma 4.7, the formal series $\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)$ lies in all closed Lie subalgebras of $k\langle\underline{I}\rangle_{0}$ containing $\left\{\log \left(1+X_{i}\right): i \in \underline{I}\right\}$. Consider the subspace $L:=\mathrm{ev}_{\delta}^{-1}(\log (G))$ of $\left.k\langle\underline{I}\rangle\right\rangle_{0}$. Since $\mathrm{ev}_{\delta}: k\left\langle\langle I\rangle_{0} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}\right.$ is a morphism of algebras, this is a Lie subalgebra of $k\langle I I\rangle_{0}$. It contains $\left\{\log \left(1+X_{i}\right): i \in \underline{I}\right\}$ since $\operatorname{ev}_{\delta}\left(\log \left(1+X_{i}\right)\right)=\log \left(g_{i}\right) \in \log (G)$ for each $i \in \underline{I}$. Lastly, if $J$ is a set and $\left(a_{j}\right)_{j \in J} \in L^{J}$ is summable in $k\left\langle\langle\underline{I}\rangle_{0}\right.$, then by closedness of $\log (G)$, we have $\operatorname{ev}_{\delta}\left(\sum_{j \in J} a_{j}\right)=\sum_{j \in J} \operatorname{ev}_{\delta}\left(a_{j}\right) \in \log (G)$. This shows that $L$ is a closed subspace of $k\left\langle\langle I\rangle_{0}\right.$. So $\log \left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right) \in L$, whence $\log (g) \in \log (G)$.

## 5 Chain rules in algebras of Noetherian series

### 5.1 A formal setting for chain rules

Let $I=(\underline{I},<)$ be a non-empty linearly ordered set. Let $\varsigma \notin \underline{I} \cup \bigcup \underline{I}$, and consider the set

$$
I_{\varsigma}:=\underline{I} \sqcup\{\varsigma\} \sqcup(\underline{I} \times\{\varsigma\}) .
$$

We have a summability algebra $k\left\langle\left\langle I_{\mathrm{S}}\right\rangle\right\rangle$. Let $\mathcal{R}(\underline{I})$ be the subset of $k\left\langle\langle J\rangle_{0}\right.$ containing

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1+X_{i}\right) \cdot X_{\varsigma}-\left(1+X_{(i, \varsigma)}\right) \cdot X_{\varsigma} \cdot\left(1+X_{i}\right), \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $i \in \underline{I}$. We write $\mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ for the smallest closed ideal of $k\left\langle\langle J\rangle_{0}\right.$ containing $\mathcal{R}(\underline{I})$.
Consider the family $Q_{I}: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1+k\left\langle\langle J\rangle_{0}\right.$ given by

$$
Q_{I}(i):=\mathrm{OP}_{i^{-}} \cdot\left(1+X_{(i, \varsigma)}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{i^{-}}^{-1}
$$

where $i^{-}=\{j \in \underline{I}: j<i\}$ for each $i \in \underline{I}$. The occurrence of $X_{(i, 5)}$ in the definition of $Q_{I}(i)$ implies that $\operatorname{supp}\left(Q_{I}(i)-1\right) \cap \operatorname{supp}\left(Q_{I}(j)-1\right)=\varnothing$ whenever $i, j \in \underline{I}$ are distinct. Therefore $Q_{I}-1: I \longrightarrow k\langle J J\rangle_{0}$ is summable. As a consequence, the following ordered product is welldefined:

$$
M_{I}:=\operatorname{ev}_{Q_{I}-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)=\prod_{I}\left(Q_{I}(i)\right)_{i \in \underline{I}} \in 1+k\left\langle\langle J\rangle_{0} .\right.
$$

Lemma 5.1. We have $M_{I} \cdot X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I}-\mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot X_{\varsigma} \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$.
Proof. We proceed in a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 4.7. Let $\kappa$ be the cardinality of $\underline{I}$ and let $f: \kappa \longrightarrow \underline{I}$ be a bijection. For all $\alpha \leqslant \kappa$, let $I_{\alpha}$ denote the subset $I_{\alpha}:=\{f(\beta)$ : $\beta<\alpha\} \subseteq \underline{I}$. Write

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{\alpha} & :=M_{\left(I_{\alpha},<\right)} \cdot X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{\left(I_{\alpha},<\right)}-\mathrm{OP}_{\left(I_{\alpha},<\right)} \cdot X_{\varsigma} \quad \text { and } \\
D_{\alpha, \beta} & :=R_{\beta}-R_{\alpha}
\end{aligned}
$$

for each $\alpha, \beta \leqslant \kappa$. Note that $\operatorname{supp} R_{\alpha} \subseteq\left(\left(I_{\alpha}\right)_{\varsigma}\right)^{\star}$ and $\operatorname{supp} D_{\alpha, \beta} \subseteq\left(\left(I_{\max (\alpha, \beta)}\right)_{\varsigma}\right)^{\star}$.
For each $\alpha \leqslant \beta \leqslant \kappa$, we can write $\mathrm{OP}_{\left(I_{\beta},<\right)}=\mathrm{OP}_{\left(I_{\alpha},<\right)}+N_{\alpha, \beta}$ and $M_{\left(I_{\beta},<\right)}=M_{\left(I_{\alpha},<\right)}+T_{\alpha, \beta}$ where $\operatorname{supp} N_{\alpha}, \operatorname{supp} T_{\alpha} \subseteq\left(\left(I_{\beta}\right)_{\varsigma}\right)^{\star} \backslash\left(\left(I_{\alpha}\right)_{\varsigma}\right)^{\star}$. Therefore the series $D_{\beta, \alpha}=R_{\beta}-R_{\alpha}=T_{\alpha, \beta}$. $X_{\zeta} \cdot\left(\mathrm{OP}_{\left(I_{\alpha},<\right)}+N_{\alpha, \beta}\right)+M_{\left(I_{\alpha},<\right)} \cdot X_{\zeta} \cdot N_{\alpha, \beta}-N_{\alpha, \beta} \cdot X_{\varsigma}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{supp} D_{\alpha, \beta} \subseteq\left(\left(I_{\beta}\right)_{\varsigma}\right)^{\star} \backslash\left(\left(I_{\alpha}\right)_{\varsigma}\right)^{\star} . \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, the supports of elements of the family $\left(D_{\beta, \beta+1}\right)_{\beta<\kappa}$ are pairwise disjoint, so that family is summable in $k\left\langle\left\langle I_{\varsigma}\right\rangle\right\rangle$.

We first prove by induction on $\alpha \leqslant \kappa$ that we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{\alpha}=\sum_{\beta<\alpha} D_{\beta, \beta+1} . \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $I_{0}=\varnothing$, so

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{0}=M_{\left(I_{0},<\right)} \cdot X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{\left(I_{0},<\right)}-\mathrm{OP}_{\left(I_{0},<\right)} \cdot X_{\varsigma}=1 \cdot X_{\varsigma} \cdot 1-1 \cdot X_{\varsigma}=0 . \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

So the identity (5.3) holds at $\alpha=0$. Let $\alpha \leqslant \kappa$ such that it holds for all $\gamma<\alpha$. If $\alpha$ is a successor, it follows immediately that it holds at $\alpha$. Assume that $\alpha$ is a non-zero limit. Consider a $\theta \in\left(I_{\alpha}\right)_{\varsigma}$. There is a $\gamma<\alpha$ such that $\theta \in\left(I_{\gamma}\right)_{\varsigma}$. We deduce in view of (5.2) and using the induction hypothesis that

$$
R_{\alpha}(\theta)=R_{\gamma}(\theta)=\sum_{\beta<\gamma} D_{\beta, \beta+1}(\theta)=\sum_{\beta<\alpha} D_{\beta, \beta+1}(\theta),
$$

so $R_{\alpha}=\sum_{\beta<\alpha} D_{\beta, \beta+1}$.
We next claim and we prove by induction on $\kappa$ that $R_{\kappa} \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$. Assume first that $\kappa<\omega$, so $\underline{I}$ is finite. Write $\underline{I}=\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{\kappa}\right\}$ with $i_{1}<\cdots<i_{\kappa}$. If $\kappa=0$, then the result follows from (5.4). Assume that $\kappa>0$ and set $\underline{I}^{\prime}:=\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{k}\right\}$ and $I^{\prime}:=\left(\underline{I}^{\prime},<\right)$.

Recall by Lemma 4.1 that $\mathrm{OP}_{I}=\left(1+X_{i_{1}}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}}$ whereas $\mathrm{OP}_{i_{m}^{-}}=\left(1+X_{i_{1}}\right) \cdots\left(1+X_{i_{m-1}}\right)$ for all $m \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$. We thus see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{I}=M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot\left(1+X_{\left(i_{n}, \varsigma\right)}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}}^{-1} \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
a & :=\left(1+X_{\left(i_{n}, \varsigma\right.}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \cdot X_{\varsigma}-X_{\varsigma} \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \quad \text { and } \\
b & :=M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot X_{\varsigma}-X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}},
\end{aligned}
$$

so $a \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ by (5.1) and $b \in \mathfrak{q}\left(\underline{I}^{\prime}\right) \subseteq \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ by the induction hypothesis. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I} & =X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \\
& =\left(M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot X_{\varsigma}-b\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \\
& =\left(M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right)+d
\end{aligned}
$$

where $d:=-b \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$. Now

$$
\left(M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot X_{\varsigma}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right)=M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot\left(1+X_{\left(i_{n}, \varsigma\right)}\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \cdot X_{\varsigma}+d
$$

where $d:=M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot a \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$. In view of (5.5), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.M_{I^{\prime}} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot\left(1+X_{\left(i_{n}, \varsigma\right.}\right)\right) \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \cdot X_{\varsigma} & =M_{I} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I^{\prime}} \cdot\left(1+X_{i_{n}}\right) \cdot X_{\varsigma} \\
& =M_{I} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot X_{\varsigma} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We deduce that $R_{\kappa}=X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I}-M_{I} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot X_{\varsigma} \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ as claimed. By induction, the result holds whenever $\kappa$ is finite.

Now let $\kappa$ be infinite and such that the result holds for all strictly smaller cardinalities. In particular, we have $R_{\gamma} \in \mathfrak{q}\left(I_{\gamma}\right) \subseteq \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ for all $\gamma<\kappa$. It follows since $\mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ is a subgroup of $k\left\langle I_{\varsigma}\right\rangle$ that $D_{\gamma, \gamma+1} \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ for each $\gamma<\kappa$. Finally, we deduce since $\mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ is closed that $R_{\kappa}=\sum_{\gamma<\kappa} D_{\gamma, \gamma+1} \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$. This concludes the proof.

Lemma 5.2. Let $(A, \Sigma)$ be a summability algebra with evaluations, with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Let $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{m}$ and let $a: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$ and $b: \underline{I} \times\{\varsigma\} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$ be multipliable in $1+\mathfrak{m}$. Write $d:=a \sqcup\{(\varsigma, 1+\varepsilon)\} \sqcup b: I_{\varsigma} \longrightarrow 1+\mathfrak{m}$. Assume that for each $i \in \underline{I}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon \cdot a(i)=b(i) \cdot a(i) \cdot \varepsilon . \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\varepsilon \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} a\right)=\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(M_{I}\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} a\right) \cdot \varepsilon$.
Proof. We have a strongly linear evaluation morphism $\mathrm{ev}_{d}: k\left\langle\left\langle I_{\varsigma}\right\rangle\right\rangle \longrightarrow A$. Let $\mathfrak{p}:=\operatorname{Ker}\left(\mathrm{ev}_{d}\right)$, so $\mathfrak{p}$ is a closed ideal of $\left.k\left\langle I_{\varsigma}\right\rangle\right\rangle$. In view of (5.6), we have $\mathcal{R}(\underline{I}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathfrak{q}(\underline{I}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Let $P:=M_{I} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot X_{\varsigma}-X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I}$. We have $P \in \mathfrak{q}(\underline{I})$ by Lemma 5.1, so $\mathrm{ev}_{d}(P)=0$, whence

$$
\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(M_{I}\right) \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} a\right) \cdot \varepsilon=\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(M_{I} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I} \cdot X_{\varsigma}\right)=\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(X_{\varsigma} \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)=\varepsilon \cdot\left(\Pi_{I} a\right)
$$

### 5.2 Application to Noetherian series

In the sequel, we assume that $k$ has characteristic zero. Let $(M, \cdot, 1,<)$ be an ordered monoid. Let $\mathbb{A}=k((M))$ be a summability algebra of Noetherian series over $k$ as per [3, Section 3]. So $\mathbb{A}$ is the $k$-algebra, under the convolution product, of functions $a: M \longrightarrow k$ whose support supp $a=\{m \in M: a(m) \neq 0\}$ is a Noetherian subset of $(M,<)$, i.e. a wellfounded subset without infinite antichains.

For $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$, we write $a \prec b$ if $b \neq 0$ and for all $m \in \operatorname{supp} a$, there is an $m^{\prime} \in \operatorname{supp} b$ with $m^{\prime}<m$. A $k$-linear function $\phi: \mathbb{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}$ is said contracting if for all $a \in \mathbb{A} \backslash\{0\}$, we have $\phi(a) \prec a$. We write $\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ for the set of strongly linear and contracting functions $\mathbb{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}$. The summability algebra $k \operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A}) \subseteq \operatorname{Lin}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ under composition has evaluations [3, Theorem 3.17]. It follows by Theorem 4.15 that $\left(\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A}), \circ\right)$ has a structure of multipliability group. Furthermore, writing $\mathbb{A}^{\prec}:=\{a \in \mathbb{A}: a \prec 1\}$, the subalgebra $k+\mathbb{A}^{\prec}$ of $\mathbb{A}$ is closed and has evaluations.

Theorem 5.3. The subset $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A}):=\left(\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})\right) \cap \operatorname{End}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ is a closed subgroup of $\left(\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A}), \circ\right)$.
Proof. By [3, Theorem 3.17], the set $\log \left(1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A})\right)$ is that of strongly linear and contracting derivations on $\mathbb{A}$. This is a closed Lie subalgebra of $\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ by [3, Proposition 2.2], so Proposition 4.16 applies and yields the result.

The structure of multipliability group on $\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ thus induces a structure of full multipliability group on $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$, which we denote $\Pi$.

Given $a \in \mathbb{A}$, we write $\mu_{a}$ for the product with $a$ on the left, i.e.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{a}: \mathbb{A} & \longrightarrow \mathbb{A} \\
b & \longmapsto a \cdot b .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\varepsilon \prec 1$, then $\mu_{1+\varepsilon}$ lies in $\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$. We write $\mu_{1+\mathbb{A}} \prec$ for the subgroup of $\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+$ $\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ of functions $\mu_{1+\varepsilon}$ where $\varepsilon$ ranges in $\mathbb{A}^{\prec}$.

Lemma 5.4. The set $\mu_{1+\mathbb{A}}$ is a closed subgroup of $\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
1+\mathbb{A}^{\prec} & \longrightarrow \mu_{1+\mathbb{A}^{\prec}} \\
1+\varepsilon & \longmapsto \mu_{1+\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}
$$

is a strongly multiplicative isomorphism.
Proof. Let $J=(\underline{J},<) \in \operatorname{Los}$ and let $\left(\mu_{1+\varepsilon_{j}}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$ be $J$-multipliable in $\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$. So $\left(\mu_{1+\varepsilon_{j}}-\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}=\left(\mu_{\varepsilon_{j}}\right)_{j \in J}$ is summable in $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$. This means in particular that the family $\left(\left(\mu_{1+\varepsilon_{j}}-\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}\right)(1)\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}=\left(\varepsilon_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$ is summable in $\mathbb{A}$, whence in turn $\left(1+\varepsilon_{j}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}$ is $J$ multipliable in $1+\mathbb{A}^{\prec}$. Write $1+\varepsilon$ for its product. For $a \in \mathbb{A}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\prod_{J}\left(\mu_{1+\varepsilon_{j}}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}\right)(a) & =\left(\operatorname{ev}_{\mu_{1+\varepsilon_{j}}-\mathrm{Id}_{A}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right)\right)(a) \\
& =\left(\sum_{\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in J^{\star}} \mu_{\varepsilon_{\theta_{1}}} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{\varepsilon_{\theta_{n}}}\right)(a) \\
& =\sum_{\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in J^{\star}} \varepsilon_{\theta_{1}} \cdots \varepsilon_{\theta_{n}} \cdot a \\
& =\left(\sum_{\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in J^{\star}} \varepsilon_{\theta_{1}} \cdots \varepsilon_{\theta_{n}}\right) \cdot a \\
& =\left(\operatorname{ev}_{\left.\left(\varepsilon_{j}\right)\right)_{j \in J}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{J}\right)\right) \cdot a \\
& =(1+\varepsilon) \cdot a .
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that $\prod_{J}\left(\mu_{1+\varepsilon_{j}}\right)_{j \in \underline{J}}=\mu_{1+\varepsilon}$, so $\mu_{1+\mathbb{A}}$ is a closed subgroup and $1+\delta \mapsto \mu_{1+\delta}$ is strongly multiplicative.

If $\phi: \mathbb{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}$ is a function, then we write $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\phi}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ for the subset of $1-\mathrm{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ of automorphisms $\sigma$ that satisfy a chain rule

$$
\phi \circ \sigma=\mu \circ \sigma \circ \phi
$$

for a $\mu \in \mu_{1+\mathbb{A}} \prec$. Since $\sigma \circ \mu_{1+\varepsilon} \circ \sigma^{-1}=\mu_{\sigma(1+\varepsilon)} \in \mu_{1+\mathbb{A}} \prec$ for all $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{A}^{\prec}$, and $\sigma \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$, the set $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\phi}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ is a subgroup of $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$.

Theorem 5.5. Assume that $\phi \in \operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ and assume that there is a $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$ with $\phi(\xi)=1$ and $\phi(a) \prec 1$ whenever $a \prec \xi$. Then $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\phi}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ is a closed subgroup of $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$.

Proof. We fix an $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$ as in the statement. Let $I=(\underline{I},<)$ be a linearly ordered set and let $\left(\sigma_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ be family in $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\phi}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ which is multipliable in $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ with product $\sigma$, and let $\mu^{\sigma_{i}} \in \mu_{1+\mathbb{A}} \prec$ with $\mu^{\sigma_{i}} \circ \sigma_{i} \circ \phi=\phi \circ \sigma$ for each $i \in \underline{I}$. The family $\left(\sigma_{i}-\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$ is summable in $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(\mathbb{A})$, so $\left(\delta_{i}\right)_{i \in I}:=\left(\sigma_{i}(\xi)-\xi\right)_{i \in I}$ is summable in $\mathbb{A}$. By strong linearity of $\phi$, so is the family $\left(\varepsilon_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}:=\left(\phi\left(\delta_{i}\right)\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}$. Let $i \in \underline{I}$. We have $\delta_{i} \prec \xi$, whence $\varepsilon_{i} \in \mathbb{A}^{\prec}$. Furthermore

$$
1+\varepsilon_{i}=1+\phi\left(\delta_{i}\right)=\phi\left(\sigma_{i}(\xi)\right)=\mu^{\sigma_{i}}(\sigma(\phi(\xi)))=\mu^{\sigma_{i}}(\sigma(1))=\mu^{\sigma_{i}}(1)
$$

We deduce since $\left(1+\varepsilon_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is multipliable that $\left(\mu^{\sigma_{i}}\right)_{i \in I}$ is multipliable.
Consider the families $a: \underline{I} \longrightarrow 1$ - ut $^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ and $b: \underline{I} \times\{\varsigma\} \longrightarrow 1$-Aut ${ }^{+}(\mathbb{A})$ given by

$$
a(i):=\sigma_{i} \quad \text { and } \quad b(i, \varsigma):=\mu^{\sigma_{i}}
$$

for each $i \in \underline{I}$. Also write $d:=a \sqcup b \sqcup\left\{\left(\varsigma, \operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{A}}+\phi\right)\right\}$. Note that $(a, b)$ satisfies (5.6) with respect to $\phi$, so Lemma 5.2 gives

$$
\phi \circ \sigma=\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(M_{I}\right) \circ \sigma \circ \phi
$$

It suffices to show in order to conclude that $\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(M_{I}\right) \in \mu_{1+\mathbb{A} \prec}$. Recall that

$$
\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(M_{I}\right)=\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(\operatorname{ev}_{Q_{I}-1}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)\right)=\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(Q_{I}(i)-1\right)\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I}\right)=\prod_{I}\left(\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(Q_{I}(i)\right)\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}
$$

is an ordered product by Proposition 3.4. In view of Lemma 5.4, it suffices to show that each $\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(Q_{I}(i)\right)$ for $i \in \underline{I}$ lies in $\mu_{1+\mathbb{A} \prec}$. Let $i \in \underline{I}$. We have $Q_{I}(i)=\mathrm{OP}_{i^{-}} \cdot\left(1+X_{(i, \varsigma)}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OP}_{i^{-}}^{-1}$, where $\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(1+X_{(i, \varsigma)}\right)=\mu^{\sigma_{i}} \in \mu_{1+\mathbb{A} \prec}$. Now $\varphi:=\operatorname{ev}_{d}\left(\operatorname{OP}_{i^{-}}\right)$lies in 1-Aut ${ }^{+}(\mathbb{A}), \operatorname{so~}_{d}\left(Q_{I}(i)\right)=$ $\varphi \circ \mu^{\sigma_{i}} \circ \varphi^{\text {inv }}$ lies in $\mu_{1+\mathbb{A}^{\prec}}$.

## 6 Applications to $k$-powered series

For the sequel of the paper, we assume that $k$ is an ordered field. Consider its underlying ordered additive group $\left(k,+, 0,<^{*}\right)$ with the reverse ordering. We have a $k$-algebra $\mathbb{K}:=$ $k((k))$ which is a field [10]. We write $v a:=\min \operatorname{supp} a$ for each $a \in \mathbb{K}^{\times}$, where the minimum is taken in $\left(k,<^{*}\right)$ (i.e. we take the maximum in $\left.(k,<)\right)$. The function $v: \mathbb{K}^{\times} \longrightarrow k$ is a valuation, and for $a, b \in \mathbb{K}^{\times}$, we have $a \prec b \Longleftrightarrow v b<v a$. We also write $a \asymp b$ of $v(a)=v(b)$ and $a \preccurlyeq b$ if $v b \leqslant v a$. We have an ordering on $\mathbb{K}$ with positive cone

$$
\mathbb{K}^{>}:=\left\{a \in \mathbb{K}^{\times}: a(v a)>0\right\}
$$

Given $e \in k$, we write $x^{e}$ for the indicator function $k \longrightarrow\{0,1\}$ of the set $\{e\} \subseteq k$. So $x^{0}=1$ and we have an isomorphism of ordered groups $\left(k,+, 0,<^{*}\right) \longrightarrow\left(x^{k}, \cdot, 1, \prec\right) ; e \mapsto x^{e}$. We write $x:=x^{1}$. The field $\mathbb{K}$ has a natural summability structure $[14,1,3,9]$ where for each $a \in \mathbb{K}$, the family $\left(a(e) x^{e}\right)_{e \in k}$ is summable with sum $a=\sum_{e \in k} a(e) x^{e}$. We write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G} & :=\{a \in \mathbb{K}: \forall c \in k, a>c\}=\{a \in \mathbb{K}: a>0 \wedge a \succ 1\} \quad \text { and } \\
\mathcal{T} & :=\{a \in \mathbb{K}: a-x \prec x\}=x+x \mathbb{K}^{\prec} .
\end{aligned}
$$

### 6.1 Composition and derivation

We recall important facts on $\mathbb{K}$ and its structure.
i. The function $\partial: \mathbb{K} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K} ; a \mapsto \sum_{e \in k} e a(e) x^{e-1}$ is a strongly linear derivation on $\mathbb{K}$ with $\partial(x)=1$.
ii. For all $a \in \mathbb{K}^{\times}$, we have $\partial(a) \preccurlyeq x^{-1} a$. In particular, for all $b \prec x$, the function $\mu_{b} \circ \partial$ is contracting.
iii. For $a \in \mathbb{K}^{>}$and $e \in k$, writing $a=a(v a) x^{v a}(1+\varepsilon)$, the family $\left.\binom{e}{k} \varepsilon^{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is summable, and setting

$$
a^{e}:=a(v a)^{e} x^{e(v a)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\binom{e}{k} \varepsilon^{k}
$$

yields [1, Section 2.5.1] a law of ordered vector space over $k$

$$
\begin{aligned}
k \times \mathbb{K}^{>} & \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}^{>} \\
(e, a) & \longmapsto a^{e}
\end{aligned}
$$

on the ordered Abelian group ( $\mathbb{K}^{>}, \cdot, 1,<$ ).
iv. We have $\partial\left(a^{e}\right)=e \partial(a) a^{e-1}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{K}^{>}$and $e \in k$.
v. For each $b \in \mathcal{G}$, there is a unique strongly linear and strictly increasing morphism of algebras $\triangle_{b}: \mathbb{K} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}$ with

$$
\begin{align*}
\triangle_{b}(x) & =b \text { and }  \tag{6.1}\\
\forall a \in \mathbb{K}^{>}, \triangle_{b}\left(a^{e}\right) & =\triangle(a)^{e} . \tag{6.2}
\end{align*}
$$

vi. Write $a \circ b:=\triangle_{b}(a)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{K}, b \in \mathcal{G}$. For $a \in \mathbb{K}$ and $b, d \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $b \circ d \in \mathcal{G}$ and

$$
a \circ(b \circ d)=(a \circ b) \circ d .
$$

vii. For each $a \in \mathbb{K}$ and $b \in \mathcal{T}$, the family $\left(\frac{\partial^{[p]}(a)}{p!}(b-x)^{p}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is summable with $a \succ$ $\partial(a)(b-x) \succ \cdots \succ \frac{\partial^{[k]}(a)}{k!}(b-x)^{k}$ and

$$
\triangle_{b}(a)=\sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\partial^{[p]}(a)}{p!}(b-x)^{p} .
$$

In particular $\triangle_{b} \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$.
Remark 6.1. All these properties are known (see [5, p 12] and [1, Theorem 2.5.12]) in the case when $k=\mathbb{R}$ is the ordered field of real numbers. Since they can be translated into sets of universal statements in the language of ordered fields, it follows by considering the real closure of $k$ that they hold in $k$.

For $a, b \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $\triangle_{b}\left(\triangle_{a}(x)\right)=a \circ b$ whence $\triangle_{b} \circ \triangle_{a}=\triangle_{a \circ b}$ by v. In particular $\mathcal{T}$ is a group under $\circ$ and we have a group isomorphism

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T} & \longrightarrow \triangle_{\mathcal{T}}:=\left\{\triangle_{b}: b \in \mathcal{T}\right\} \\
b & \longmapsto \triangle_{b}^{\text {inv }} .
\end{aligned}
$$

### 6.2 Growth orders

We define the growth order $\operatorname{go}(f)$ of an $a \in \mathcal{T} \backslash\{x\}$ to be the unique term $c x^{e} \in k^{\times} x^{(-\infty, 1)}$ with $a-x-c x^{e} \prec x^{e}$. So $a-x-\operatorname{go}(a) \prec \operatorname{go}(a)$. We also set $\operatorname{go}(x):=0$.

For $a, b \in \mathcal{T} \backslash\{x\}$, writing $a=x+c_{a} x^{e_{a}}+\delta_{a}$ and $b=x+c_{b} x^{e_{b}}+\delta_{b}$ where $\delta_{a} \prec \operatorname{go}(a)=$ $c_{a} x^{e_{a}}$ and $\delta_{b} \prec \operatorname{go}(b)=c_{b} x^{e_{b}}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
a \circ b & =b+c_{a} b^{e_{a}}+\delta_{a} \circ b \\
& =b+c_{a}\left(x+c_{b} x^{e_{b}}+\delta_{b}\right)^{e}+\delta_{a} \circ b \\
& =x+c_{b} x^{x_{b}}+\delta_{b}+c_{a} x^{e_{a}}\left(1+\varepsilon_{1}\right)+\delta_{a}\left(1+\varepsilon_{2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\varepsilon_{1}=\sum_{p>0}\binom{e}{p}\left(c_{b} x^{e_{b}-1}+\frac{\delta_{b}}{x}\right)^{p} \quad \text { and } \quad \varepsilon_{2}=\frac{\triangle_{b}\left(\delta_{a}\right)-\delta_{a}}{\delta_{a}}
$$

are infinitesimal. Writing $\delta=c_{a} x^{e_{a}} \varepsilon_{1}+\delta_{a}$, we have $a \circ b=x+\operatorname{go}(a)+\operatorname{go}(b)+\delta+\delta_{b}$ where $\delta \prec \operatorname{go}(a)$ and $\delta_{b} \prec \operatorname{go}(b)$. From this, we deduce that:

$$
\begin{gather*}
(\operatorname{go}(a \circ b)=\operatorname{go}(a) \text { if } \operatorname{go}(a) \succ \operatorname{go}(b)) \text { and }(\operatorname{go}(a \circ b)=\operatorname{go}(b) \text { if } \operatorname{go}(a) \prec \operatorname{go}(b))  \tag{6.3}\\
(\operatorname{go}(a \circ b)=\operatorname{go}(a)+\operatorname{go}(b)) \quad \text { if } \quad(\operatorname{go}(a) \asymp \operatorname{go}(b) \text { and } \operatorname{go}(a)+\operatorname{go}(b) \neq 0)  \tag{6.4}\\
(\operatorname{go}(a \circ b) \prec \operatorname{go}(a), \operatorname{go}(b)) \quad \text { if } \quad \operatorname{go}(a)+\operatorname{go}(b)=0 . \tag{6.5}
\end{gather*}
$$

Remark 6.2. The structure $(\mathcal{T}, \circ, x,<)$ is a growth order group as per [2, Definition 2.27], and our notion of growth order corresponds to that of [2, Definition 2.18].

### 6.3 The group of right compositions

Lemma 6.3. Let $\sigma \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ and assume that there is an $f \in \mathbb{K}$ with $\sigma \circ \partial=\mu_{f} \circ \partial \circ \sigma$. Then $\sigma\left(a^{e}\right)=\sigma(a)^{e}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{K}^{>}$and $e \in k$.

Proof. Write $\sigma=\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}+\phi$ where $\phi: \mathbb{K} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is contracting. By considering $\triangle_{x+x^{-1}} \circ \sigma$ and in view of (6.2) and vii, we may assume that $\phi(a) \prec 1$ for all $a \in \mathbb{K}$. Let $a \in \mathbb{K}^{>}$and $e \in k$. We have

$$
f \cdot\left(\sigma\left(a^{e}\right)\right)^{\prime}=\sigma\left(\left(a^{e}\right)^{\prime}\right)=\sigma\left(e a^{e-1}\right)=\frac{e \sigma\left(a^{e}\right)}{\sigma(a)}=f \cdot\left(\sigma(a)^{e}\right)^{\prime} .
$$

So $\left(\sigma\left(a^{e}\right)\right)^{\prime}=\left(\sigma(a)^{e}\right)^{\prime}$, whence there is an $c(a) \in k$ with $\sigma\left(a^{e}\right)=\sigma(a)^{e}+c(a)$. We have

$$
\sigma\left(a^{e}\right)=a^{e}+\phi\left(a^{e}\right)=(a+\phi(a))^{e}+c(a)=a^{e}+\varepsilon+c(a)
$$

where $\varepsilon(a):=\sum_{n>0} \frac{\partial^{[n]}\left(x^{e}\right)}{k!} \phi(a)^{n}$ and $\phi\left(a^{e}\right)$ are both infinitesimal. It follows that $c(a)=$ $\phi\left(a^{e}\right)-\varepsilon(a)$ is infinitesimal, so $c(a)=0$. This yields the result.

Lemma 6.4. Let $\sigma \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ and assume that $\sigma\left(a^{e}\right)=\sigma(a)^{e}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{K}^{>}$and $e \in k$. Then there is an $f \in 1+\mathbb{K}^{\prec}$ with $\sigma \circ \partial=\mu_{f} \circ \partial \circ \sigma$.

Proof. Write $f=\frac{1}{\sigma(x)^{\prime}}$. We have $\sigma(x)=x+\delta$ for a certain $\delta \prec x$ so $\sigma(x)^{\prime}=1+\delta^{\prime} \in 1+\mathbb{K}^{\prec}$, so $f \in 1+\mathbb{K}^{\prec}$. Let $\mathbb{X}$ denote the subset $\mathbb{K}$ of series $a \in \mathbb{K}$ with $\sigma\left(a^{\prime}\right)=f \sigma(a)^{\prime}$. Since $\partial, \sigma$ and $\mu_{f}$ are strongly linear, this is a closed subspace of $\mathbb{K}$. For $e \in k$, we have

$$
\sigma \circ \partial\left(x^{e}\right)=e \sigma\left(x^{e-1}\right)=e \sigma(x)^{e-1}=\frac{e \sigma(x)^{\prime} \sigma(x)^{e-1}}{\sigma(x)^{\prime}}=\frac{\left(\sigma(x)^{e}\right)^{\prime}}{\sigma(x)^{\prime}}=\mu_{f} \circ \partial \circ \sigma\left(x^{e}\right),
$$

so $x^{e} \in \mathbb{X}$. It follows that $\mathbb{X}=\mathbb{K}$.
Theorem 6.5. The set $\triangle_{\mathcal{T}}=\left\{\triangle_{f}: f \in \mathcal{T}\right\}$ is a closed subgroup of 1-Aut ${ }_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$.
Proof. By Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4 , the set $\triangle_{\mathcal{T}}$ coincides with $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\partial}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$. Now $\partial$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 5.5, so $1-\mathrm{Aut}_{\partial}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ is a closed subgroup of $1-\mathrm{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$.

The next two results will not be used in the paper. We will rely on them in future work.
Proposition 6.6. For $\sigma \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$, we have $\sigma \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\partial}^{+}(\mathbb{K}) \Longleftrightarrow \log (\sigma) \in \mu_{\mathbb{K}} \circ \partial$.
Proof. Suppose that $\mathrm{d}:=\log (\sigma)=\mu_{a} \circ \partial$ for an $a \in \mathbb{K}$. Note that

$$
\partial \circ \sigma=\mu_{a^{-1}} \circ \mathrm{~d} \circ \sigma=\mu_{a^{-1}} \circ \sigma \circ \mathrm{~d}=\mu_{a^{-1}} \circ \sigma \circ\left(\mu_{a} \circ \partial\right)=\mu_{a^{-1 . \sigma(a)}} \circ \sigma \circ \partial .
$$

Now $\sigma(a)-a \prec a$, so $a^{-1} \cdot \sigma(a) \in 1+\mathbb{K}^{\prec}$, so $\sigma \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\partial}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$.
Suppose now that $\sigma \in 1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\partial}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$. We may assume that $\sigma \neq \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}$, so $\sigma(x) \neq x$ (recall that $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{\partial}^{+}(\mathbb{K})=\triangle_{\mathcal{T}}$ ). Considering $\sigma^{\text {inv }}$ if necessary, we may assume that $\sigma(x)>x$. Let us fix an ordered field extension $C$ of $k$ which is has a structure of ordered exponential field, so that we may consider the field $C \llbracket x \rrbracket \supseteq \mathbb{K}$ of grid-based transseries over $C$ as in [15]. This field is equipped with its derivation and composition law of [15, Chapter 5]. The arguments in the proof of [8, Theorem 3.7] apply to all series in $\mathcal{G}$, and we have (see [8, Theorem 4.1]) a series $t \in \mathbb{K}$ with $t>0, t \prec x$ and $t \sigma(x)^{\prime}=t \circ \sigma(x)$. Let $V \in C \llbracket x \rrbracket$ with $V^{\prime}=t^{-1}$. Writing $t^{-1}=\sum_{e \in k} t^{-1}(e) x^{e}$, we have

$$
V=t^{-1}(-1) \log x+\sum_{e \in k \backslash\{-1\}} \frac{t^{-1}(e)}{e+1} x^{e+1},
$$

so $V$ has coefficients in $k$. We have $\left(V^{\prime} \circ \sigma(x)\right) \sigma(x)^{\prime}=V^{\prime}$. By the chain rule [15, Proposition 5.11(b)], we have $(V \circ \sigma(x))^{\prime}=V^{\prime}$, whence $c_{0}:=V \circ \sigma(x)-V \in k$.

We claim that $c_{0}=1$. For $k=\mathbb{R}$, this follows from [8, Theorem 4.1]. Since $c_{0}$ is a rationnal function of finitely many coefficients and exponents in the series $\sigma(x)$, the identity $c_{0}=1$ holds for all $k$. So we have $V \circ \sigma(x)=V+1$. We deduce with [15, Theorem 5.12] that $\sigma(x)=V^{\text {inv }} \circ(x+1) \circ V$. We have

$$
\left(V^{\mathrm{inv}}\right)^{\dagger}=\frac{\left(V^{\mathrm{inv}}\right)^{\prime}}{V^{\mathrm{inv}}}=\left(\frac{1}{V^{\prime} x}\right) \circ V^{\mathrm{inv}}=\left(\frac{t}{x}\right) \circ V^{\mathrm{inv}} .
$$

Now $t / x \prec 1$ so $\left(V^{\text {inv }}\right)^{\dagger} \prec 1$ by [15, Proposition 5.10 . We may thus apply [ 15 , Proposition 5.11(c)] and obtain

$$
\sigma(x)=\left(V^{\mathrm{inv}} \circ(x+1)\right) \circ V=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\left(V^{\mathrm{inv}}\right)^{(n)} \circ V}{k!} .
$$

Consider the strongly linear derivation $\mathrm{d}:=\frac{1}{V^{\prime}} \partial$ on $\mathbb{K}$. Note that $\frac{1}{V^{\prime}}=t \prec x$, so $\frac{1}{V^{\prime}} \partial \in$ $\operatorname{Der}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ by ii. An easy induction using the chain rule shows that $\mathrm{d}^{[n]}(x)=\left(V^{\text {inv }}\right)^{(n)} \circ V$ for all $k>0$, whence $\exp (\mathrm{d})(x)=\sigma(x)$. We have $\exp (\mathrm{d}) \in 1-\mathrm{Aut}_{\partial}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ by the first paragraph of the proof. Thefore $\exp (\mathrm{d}), \sigma \in \triangle_{\mathcal{T}}$, whence $\sigma=\exp (\mathrm{d})$ by v.

Corollary 6.7. For $e \in k$ and $a \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $\triangle_{a}^{[e]} \in \triangle_{\mathcal{T}}$.
Proof. We have $\log \left(\triangle_{a}\right) \in \mu_{\mathbb{K}} \circ \partial$ by Proposition 6.6. Now $\log \left(\triangle_{a}^{[e]}\right)=e\left(\log \left(\triangle_{a}\right)\right) \in \mu_{\mathbb{K}} \circ \partial$, so we deduce with Proposition 6.6 that $\triangle_{a}^{[e]} \in \triangle_{\mathcal{T}}$.

For $a \in \mathcal{T}$ and $e \in k$, we write $a^{[e]}:=\triangle_{a}^{[e]}(x)$. So $a^{\left[e+e^{\prime}\right]}=a^{[e]} \circ a^{\left[e^{\prime}\right]}$ for all $e, e^{\prime} \in k$ and $\left\{a^{[e]}:\right.$ $e \in k\}$ is the centralizer of $a$ in $\mathcal{T}$ if $a \neq x$. Note by Corollary 6.7 that $\triangle_{a}^{[e]}=\triangle_{a^{[e]}}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{T}$ and $e \in k$. Let $a \in \mathcal{T} \backslash\{x\}$ and $e \in k^{\times}$. We have $a^{[e]}=\triangle_{a}^{[e]}(x)=x+e \phi(x)+\binom{e}{2} \phi^{[2]}(x)+\cdots$ where $\phi$ is contracting and $\phi(x)=\sum_{p>0} \frac{\partial^{[p]}(x)}{p!}(a-x)^{p}=a-x$. So $\left(a^{[e]}-x\right)-e(a-x) \prec$ $x-a \asymp \operatorname{go}(a)$, so $\left(a^{[e]}-x\right)-e \operatorname{go}(a) \prec \operatorname{go}(a)$, whence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{go}\left(a^{[e]}\right)=e \operatorname{go}(a) \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 6.4 Decompositions along scales

In view of Theorem 6.5, we have a natural and full multipliability structure $\Pi$ on $\triangle_{\mathcal{T}}$, which the structure on $1-\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ extends. Recall that we have an isomorphism

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}:\left(\triangle_{\mathcal{T}}, \circ\right) & \longrightarrow(\mathcal{T}, \circ) \\
\sigma & \longmapsto \sigma^{\operatorname{inv}}(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By Corollary 2.11, we obtain a full multipliability structure $\Pi^{*}:=\Pi^{\mathcal{E}}$ on $\mathcal{T}$ given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{*}= & \left\{\mathcal{E} \circ \sigma: \sigma \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}\right\} \\
= & \left\{\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}:\left(\triangle_{a_{i}}^{\text {inv }}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}\right\} \\
= & \left\{\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}:\left(\triangle_{a_{i}}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I^{*}}\right\}  \tag{byMG7}\\
& \left\{\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}:\left(\triangle_{a_{i}}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}\right\}, \quad \text { and } \\
\Pi_{I}^{*}\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}:= & \mathcal{E}\left(\Pi_{I}\left(\left(\triangle_{a_{i}}^{\text {inv }}\right)_{i \in I}\right)\right) \\
= & \left(\Pi_{I}\left(\left(\triangle_{a_{i}}^{\text {inv }}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}\right)\right)^{\text {inv }}(x) \\
= & \left(\Pi_{I^{*}}\left(\triangle_{a_{i}}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}}\right)(x) \tag{byMG7}
\end{align*}
$$

(by Fullness)
for all $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in \underline{I}} \in \operatorname{dom} \Pi_{I}^{*}$.
Proposition 6.8. Let $I$ be a set and let $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in I} \in \mathcal{T}^{I}$ be a family. Then $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is multipliable in $\left(\mathcal{T}, \Pi^{*}\right)$ if and only if $\left(a_{i}-x\right)_{i \in I}$ is summable in $(\mathbb{K}, \Sigma)$.

Proof. Write $\sigma_{i}:=\triangle_{a_{i}}, \phi_{i}:=\sigma_{i}-\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and $\delta_{i}:=a_{i}-x \prec x$ for each $i \in I$. Recall that by definition, the family $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is multipliable in $\left(\mathcal{T}, \Pi^{*}\right)$ if and only if $\left(\phi_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is Lin-summable in $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$. For $i \in I$, and $a \in \mathbb{K}$, we have

$$
\phi_{i}(a)=\sum_{p>0} \frac{a^{(p)}}{p!} \delta_{i}^{p}=\left(\sum_{p>0} \frac{1}{p!} \mu_{\delta_{i}}^{[p]} \circ \partial^{[p]}\right)(a) .
$$

Assume that $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is multipliable. Then $\left(\phi_{i}(x)\right)_{i \in I}=\left(\delta_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is summable in $\mathbb{K}$.

Conversely, assume that $\left(\delta_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is summable in $\mathbb{K}$. We claim that the family $\left(\phi_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is Lin-summable in $\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$. Indeed, for $i \in I$, we have $\delta_{i} \prec x$ and $\delta_{i}^{\prime} \prec 1$, so the functions $\mu_{\delta_{i}} \circ \partial$ and $\mu_{\delta_{i}^{\prime}}$ are contracting. Furthermore, since $\partial$ is strongly linear, the family $\left(\delta_{i}^{\prime}\right)_{i \in I}$ is summable. So both $\left(\mu_{\delta_{i}}\right)_{i \in I}$ and $\left(\mu_{\delta_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)_{i \in I}$ are Lin-summable, whence also $\left(\mu_{\delta_{i}} \circ \partial\right)_{i \in I}$ is Lin-summable.

Set $J:=(I \times\{0,1\}) \sqcup\{0\}$, and consider the family $\phi: J \longrightarrow \operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\phi(0)=\partial$, and $\phi(i, 0)=\mu_{\delta_{i}} \circ \partial$ and $\phi(i, 1)=\mu_{\delta_{i}^{\prime}}$ for each $i \in I$. By SS4 in $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$, the family $\phi$ is Linsummable. Note that $\partial \circ \mu_{\delta_{i}}=\phi(i, 0)+\phi(i, 1)$ for all $i \in I$. An easy induction on $p>0$, shows that there are an $n_{p}>0$, integers $m_{p, 1}, \ldots, m_{p, n_{p}}$ and words $\theta_{p, 1}(i), \ldots, \theta_{p, n_{p}}(i) \in((\{i\} \times\{0$, $1\}) \sqcup\{0\})^{\star}$ of length $p$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{\delta_{i}}^{[p]} \circ \partial^{[p]}=\operatorname{ev}_{\phi}\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{n_{p}} m_{p, \ell} X_{\theta_{p, \ell}(i)}\right) . \tag{6.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that since each $\theta_{p, \ell}(i)$ for $\ell \in\left\{1, \ldots, n_{p}\right\}$ has length $p$, the sum

$$
P:=\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{p>0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_{p}} \frac{1}{p!} m_{p, \ell} X_{\theta_{p}, \ell(i)} \in k\langle\langle J\rangle
$$

is well-defined. The algebra $k \operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ has evaluations, so the family $\left(P(\theta) \operatorname{ev}_{\phi}\left(X_{\theta}\right)\right)_{\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in J^{\star}}$ is Lin-summable. By SS3 in $\operatorname{Lin}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$, so is $\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{n_{p}} P\left(\theta_{p, \ell}(i)\right) \operatorname{ev}_{\phi}\left(X_{\theta_{p, \ell}(i)}\right)\right)_{p>0 \wedge i \in I}=\left(\frac{1}{p!} \mu_{\delta_{i}}^{[p]} \circ \partial^{[p]}\right)_{p>0 \wedge i \in I}$. We deduce again with SS3 that $\left(\sum_{p>0} \frac{1}{p!} \mu_{\delta_{i}}^{[p]} \circ \partial^{[p]}\right)_{i \in I}=\left(\phi_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is Lin-summable. Therefore $\left(\sigma_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is multipliable in 1- $\operatorname{Aut}_{k}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$, so $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i \in I}$ is multipliable in $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 6.9. $A$ scale on $\mathcal{T}$ is a function $S:(-\infty, 1) \times k \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that

$$
\text { i. } S(e, 0)=x \text { for all } e \in(-\infty, 1) \text {. }
$$

ii. $\operatorname{go}(S(e, c))=c x^{e}$ for all $(e, c) \in(-\infty, 1) \times k$.
iii. for all reverse well-ordered subsets $W \subseteq(-\infty, 1)$ and all families $\left(c_{e}\right)_{e \in W} \in k^{W}$, the family $\left(S\left(e, c_{e}\right)-x\right)_{e \in W}$ is summable in $\mathbb{K}$.

Example 6.10. The functions $S_{0}(e, c):=x+c x^{e}$ and $S_{1}(e, c):=\left(x+x^{e}\right)^{[c]}$ are scales on $\mathbb{K}$. For $S_{0}$, this is clear. Let us turn to $S_{1}$. For $(e, c) \in(-\infty, 1) \times k$, we have go $\left(S_{1}(e\right.$, $c))=c x^{e}$ by $(6.6)$ and $S_{1}(e, 0)=x$ by definition. Let $W \subseteq(-\infty, 1)$ be reverse well-ordered and let $\left(c_{e}\right)_{e \in W} \in k^{W}$. Then $(S(e, 1)-x)_{e \in W}=\left(x^{e}\right)_{e \in W}$ is summable, so by Proposition 6.8, the family $\left(\triangle_{S(e, 1)}\right)_{e \in W}$ is multipliable. Therefore $\left(\phi_{e}\right)_{e \in W}:=\left(\triangle_{S_{1}(e, 1)}-\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}\right)_{e \in W}$ is Linsummable in $\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$. Since $k \operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$ has evaluations, so is $\left(\binom{c_{e}}{p} \phi_{e}^{[p]}\right)_{e \in W \wedge p \in \mathbb{N}>0}$. By SS3 in $k \operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}+\operatorname{Lin}_{\prec}^{+}(\mathbb{K})$, the family $\left(\sum_{p>0}\binom{c_{e}}{p} \phi_{e}^{[p]}\right)_{e \in W}=\left(\triangle_{S(e, 1)}^{\left[c_{e}\right]}-\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}\right)_{e \in W}$ is also Lin-summable. Therefore $\left(\triangle_{S_{1}(e, 1)}^{\left[c_{e}\right]}(x)-x\right)_{e \in W}=\left(S_{1}\left(e, c_{e}\right)\right)_{e \in W}$ is summable in $\mathbb{K}$.

As a corollary of Proposition 6.8, we obtain:
Corollary 6.11. Let $S$ be a scale on $\mathbb{K}$. For $c:(-\infty, 1) \longrightarrow k$ with reverse well-ordered support, the family $(S(e, c(e)))_{e<1}$ is multipliable in $\left(\mathcal{T}, \Pi^{*}\right)$.

Lemma 6.12. Let $S$ be a scale on $\mathbb{K}$ and let $\triangleleft$ be a linear ordering on $(-\infty, 1)$. For $c$ : $(-\infty, 1) \longrightarrow k$ with reverse well-ordered support in $((-\infty, 1),<)$, writing $e_{0}:=\min \operatorname{supp} c \in$ $(-\infty, 1)$ we have $\operatorname{go}\left(\Pi_{((-\infty, 1), \triangleleft)}^{*}(S(e, c(e)))_{e<1}\right)=c\left(e_{0}\right) x^{e_{0}}$.

Proof. Write $I:=((-\infty, 1), \triangleleft)$ and $a:=\Pi_{((-\infty, 1), \prec)}^{*}(S(e, c(e)))_{e<1}$. We first prove that $\operatorname{go}(a) \preccurlyeq x^{e_{0}}$. As in Corollary 6.11, writing $\sigma_{e}:=\triangle_{S(e, c(e))}$ and $\phi_{e}:=\sigma_{e}-\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{K}}$ for each $e \in(-\infty, 1)$, we have $\phi_{e}=\sum_{p>0} \frac{1}{p!} \mu_{S(e, c(e))-x}^{[p]} \circ \partial^{[p]}$ and $a=\left(\mathrm{ev}_{\left(\phi_{e}\right)_{e<1}}\left(\mathrm{OP}_{I^{*}}\right)\right)(x)$. Since each $\phi_{e}$ is contracting, we have $\operatorname{ev}_{\left(\phi_{e}\right)_{e<1}}\left(X_{\theta}\right)(x) \prec \operatorname{ev}_{\left(\phi_{e}\right)_{e<1}}\left(X_{\theta_{n}}\right)(x)$ for all $\theta=\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{n}\right) \in\left(I^{*}\right)^{\star}$ with $n>1$. Since $\{(j): j \in \underline{I}\} \subseteq\left(I^{*}\right)^{\star}$, and $\phi_{e}(x) \prec \phi_{s}(x)$ whenever $e<s$ in $(-\infty, 1)$, it follows that $\operatorname{go}(a)=\operatorname{go}\left(x+\phi_{e_{0}}(x)\right)$. Now $\phi_{e_{0}}(x)=\left(S\left(e_{0}, c\left(e_{0}\right)\right)-x\right) \cdot 1+0=S\left(e_{0}, c\left(e_{0}\right)\right)-x$, so $\operatorname{go}(a)=\operatorname{go}\left(S\left(e_{0}, c\left(e_{0}\right)\right)\right)=c\left(e_{0}\right) x^{e_{0}}$.

Let $\kappa$ be a cardinal number that does not embed into $(k,<)$. Let $N: \kappa \longrightarrow\{-1,1\}$ be a function and consider the linear ordering $<_{N}$ on $\kappa$ of Section 1.3. If $\lambda \in \kappa, e:(\lambda, \in) \longrightarrow(-\infty$, 1 ) is a strictly decreasing function and $c: \lambda \longrightarrow k$ is a function, then by Corollary 6.11 and MG3, the family $a:=(S(e(\gamma), c(\gamma)))_{\gamma \in \lambda}$ is multipliable in $\left(\mathcal{T}, \Pi^{*}\right)$. We define

$$
N_{S}(e, c):=\Pi_{\left(\lambda,<_{N}\right)}^{*} a \in \mathcal{T} .
$$

Writing

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N_{S, \gamma}(e, c):=\Pi_{\left([\gamma, \lambda),<_{N}\right)}^{*}(a \upharpoonleft[\gamma, \lambda)), \\
& N_{S, \gamma}^{L}(e, c):=\Pi_{\left(L_{N}(\gamma, \lambda),<_{N}\right)}^{*}\left(a \upharpoonleft L_{N}(\gamma, \lambda)\right) \quad \text { and } \\
& N_{S, \gamma}^{R}(e, c):=\Pi_{\left(R_{N}(\gamma, \lambda),<_{N}\right)}^{*}\left(a \upharpoonleft R_{N}(\gamma, \lambda)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

the axiom MG4c gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{S}(e, c)=N_{S, \gamma}^{L}(e, c) \circ N_{S, \gamma}(e, c) \circ N_{S, \gamma}^{R}(e, c) \tag{6.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In view of Lemma 1.2 and MG4c, given $\eta<\gamma$, we can further expand

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{S, \gamma}^{L}(e, c)=N_{S, \eta}^{L}(e, c) \circ b_{\gamma, \eta,}^{L} \quad \text { and } \quad N_{S, \gamma}^{R}(e, c)=b_{\gamma, \eta}^{R} \circ N_{S, \eta}^{R}(e, c), \tag{6.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_{\gamma, \eta}^{L} & :=\Pi_{\left(L_{n}(\gamma, \lambda) \backslash L_{N}(\eta, \lambda),<_{N}\right)}^{*}\left(a \upharpoonleft L_{N}(\gamma, \lambda) \backslash L_{N}(\eta, \lambda)\right) \quad \text { and } \\
b_{\gamma, \eta}^{R} & :=\Pi_{\left(R_{N}(\gamma, \lambda) \backslash R_{N}(\eta, \lambda),<_{N}\right)}^{*}\left(a \upharpoonleft R_{N}(\gamma, \lambda) \backslash R_{N}(\eta, \lambda)\right) \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 6.12, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{go}\left(b_{\gamma, \eta}^{L}\right), \operatorname{go}\left(b_{\gamma, \eta}^{R}\right) \prec x^{e(\eta)} \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 6.13. Let $S$ be a scale on $\mathbb{K}$ and let $N: \kappa \longrightarrow\{-1,1\}$ be a function. For each $a \in \mathcal{T}$, there are a unique ordinal $\lambda_{0}<\kappa$, a unique strictly decreasing function $e: \lambda_{0} \longrightarrow(-\infty$, 1) and a unique function $c: \lambda_{0} \longrightarrow k^{\times}$such that $a=N_{S}(e, c)$.

Proof. Let us first prove the existence. We may assume that $a \neq x$, otherwise the empty family yields the result. We define a strictly increasing function $e: \lambda \longrightarrow(-\infty, 1)$ and a map $c: \lambda \longrightarrow k^{\times}$on an ordinal $\lambda<\kappa$ as follows. Let $\lambda<\kappa$ such that for all $\gamma<\lambda$, the maps $e$ and $c$ are defined on $\gamma$ and $e$ is strictly decreasing on $\gamma$, and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{go}\left(\left(N_{S, \eta}^{L}(e \upharpoonleft \gamma, c \upharpoonleft \gamma)\right)^{[-1]} \circ a \circ\left(N_{S, \eta}^{R}(e \upharpoonleft \gamma, c \upharpoonleft \gamma)\right)^{[-1]}\right) \preccurlyeq x^{e(\eta)} \tag{6.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\eta<\gamma$. If $\lambda$ is a limit, then $e$ and $c$ are defined on $\lambda$ and $e$ is strictly decreasing on $\lambda$. The condition (6.11) is trivially satisfied for $\lambda$.

Assume that $\lambda=\gamma+1$ is a successor. Let $e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}$ be the extensions of $e, c$ to $\lambda$ with ( $e^{\prime}(\gamma)$, $\left.c^{\prime}(\gamma)\right)=(e(\gamma)-1,0)$. Set

$$
a_{1}:=\left(N_{S, \gamma}^{L}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)\right)^{[-1]} \circ a \circ\left(N_{S, \gamma}^{R}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)\right)^{[-1]}
$$

If $a_{1}=x$, then we set $\lambda=\gamma$, and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
a=N_{S, \gamma}^{L}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right) \circ N_{S, \gamma}^{R}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)=N_{S, \gamma}(e, c) . \tag{6.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that $a_{1} \neq x$. For $\eta<\gamma$, we can write

$$
N_{S, \gamma}^{L}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)=N_{S, \eta}^{L}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right) \circ b_{\gamma, \eta}^{L} \quad \text { and } \quad N_{S, \eta}^{R}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)=b_{\gamma, \eta}^{R} \circ N_{S, \gamma}^{R}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)
$$

as in (6.9), where $\operatorname{go}\left(b_{\gamma, \eta}^{L}\right), \operatorname{go}\left(b_{\gamma, \eta}^{R}\right) \prec x^{e(\eta)}$. Note that $a_{1}=\left(b_{\gamma, \eta}^{L}\right)^{[-1]} \circ b \circ\left(b_{\gamma, \eta}^{R}\right)^{[-1]}$, where

$$
b:=\left(N_{S, \eta}^{L}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)\right)^{[-1]} \circ a \circ\left(N_{S, \eta}^{R}\left(e^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)\right)^{[-1]}
$$

has growth order go $(b) \preccurlyeq x^{e(\eta)}$ by the induction hypothesis. We deduce with (6.3-6.5) that $\operatorname{go}\left(a_{1}\right) \preccurlyeq x^{e(\eta)}$. Set $c x^{e}:=\operatorname{go}\left(a_{1}\right)$. Assume that $N(\gamma)=1$. and write $c(\gamma) x^{e(\gamma)}:=\operatorname{go}\left(a_{1} \circ S(c\right.$, $e)^{[-1]}$ ). We have $e(\gamma)<e(\eta)$ for all $\eta<\gamma$ by (6.5), so this extends the functions $e, c$ as desired. Now we have $\left(N_{S, \gamma}^{L}(e, c)\right)^{[-1]} \circ a \circ\left(N_{S, \gamma}^{R}(e, c)\right)^{[-1]}=a_{1} \circ S(e, c)^{[-1]}$, so the sequences $e, c$ satisfy (6.11) for $\lambda$. If $N(\gamma)=-1$, then define $c(\gamma) x^{e(\gamma)}=\operatorname{go}\left(S(e, c)^{[-1]} \circ a_{1}\right)$. Symmetric arguments show that this extends the functions as required.

Since $(-e(\gamma))_{\gamma<\lambda}$ is a strictly increasing sequence in $(k,<)$, the inductive process must stop at an ordinal $\lambda_{0}<\kappa$, and we have $a=N_{S}(e, c)$ as in (6.12) for that ordinal.

We next prove the unicity. Let $\lambda_{1}<\kappa$, let $e_{1}: \lambda_{1} \longrightarrow(-\infty, 1)$ be a strictly decreasing function and let $c_{1}: \lambda_{1} \longrightarrow k^{\times}$be a function. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\lambda \leqslant \lambda_{1}$. Assume that $(e, c) \neq\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right)$ and let $\alpha \in \lambda \cup \lambda_{1}$ be minimal to witness this. That is, either $\alpha=\lambda<\lambda_{1}$, or $\alpha<\lambda$ and $(e(\alpha), c(\alpha)) \neq\left(e_{1}(\alpha), c_{1}(\alpha)\right)$. Writing

$$
N_{S}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right)=N_{S, \alpha}^{L}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right) \circ N_{S, \alpha}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right) \circ N_{S, \alpha}^{R}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right),
$$

we see that $N_{S}(e, c)=N_{S, \alpha}^{L}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right) \circ d \circ N_{S, \alpha}^{R}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right)$ for $d=\prod_{\left([\alpha, \lambda),<_{N}\right)}(S(e(\gamma), c(\gamma)))_{\gamma \in[\alpha, \lambda)}$. We have $d=x$ if $\alpha=\lambda$, and go $(d)=c(\alpha) x^{e(\alpha)}$ by Lemma 6.12 if $\alpha<\lambda$. In the first case, since $\operatorname{go}\left(N_{S, \alpha}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right)\right)=c_{1}(\alpha) x^{e_{1}(\alpha)} \neq 0$, we have $N_{S, \alpha}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right) \neq x$ so $N_{S}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right) \neq N_{S}(e, c)$. In the second case, since since $\operatorname{go}\left(N_{S, \alpha}\left(e_{1}, c_{1}\right)\right)=c_{1}(\alpha) x^{e_{1}(\alpha)} \neq c(\alpha) x^{e(\alpha)}$, we have $N_{S}\left(e_{1}\right.$, $\left.c_{1}\right) \neq N_{S}(e, c)$.

Remark 6.14. Taking $S$ to be the scale $S_{1}$ of Example 6.10, Theorem 6.13 gives a representation of $\mathcal{T}$ as an infinite semidirect product $\mathcal{T} \simeq \searrow_{e \in(-\infty, 1)}(k,+, 0)$ of copies of $(k,+, 0)$, with the trivial multipliability structure, along the linear ordering $(-\infty, 1)$. This gives an instance of a positive answer of [2, Question 1]. Elements in this semidirect product should be thought as families of elements $\left(c_{e}\right)_{e \in(-\infty, 1)}$ whose support is isomorphic to a ( $\lambda$, $<_{N}$ ) for some ordinal $\lambda<\kappa$. We expect that many groups of transseries and hyperseries can be obtained as direct limits of such transfinite semidirect products.
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