

ARBOREAL GALOIS GROUPS FOR QUADRATIC RATIONAL FUNCTIONS WITH COLLIDING CRITICAL POINTS

ROBERT L. BENEDETTO AND ANNA DIETRICH

ABSTRACT. Let K be a field, and let $f \in K(z)$ be rational function. The preimages of a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ under iterates of f have a natural tree structure. As a result, the Galois group of the resulting field extension of K naturally embeds into the automorphism group of this tree. In unpublished work from 2013, Pink described a certain proper subgroup M_ℓ that this so-called arboreal Galois group G_∞ must lie in if f is quadratic and its two critical points collide at the ℓ -th iteration. After presenting a new description of M_ℓ and a new proof of Pink's theorem, we state and prove necessary and sufficient conditions for G_∞ to be the full group M_ℓ .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let K be a field, and let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function. Writing $f = g/h$ with $g, h \in K[z]$ relatively prime, we define the degree of f to be $\deg f = \max\{\deg g, \deg h\}$. Then f induces an endomorphism $f : \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$, where \overline{K} is an algebraic closure of K . If $d \geq 1$, then every point of $\mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ has $d = \deg f$ preimages in $\mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$, counted with multiplicity.

For any integer $n \geq 0$, we write $f^n = f \circ \cdots \circ f$ for the n -th iterate of f under composition, with $f^0(z) = z$ and $f^1(z) = f(z)$. For any point $x_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$, the *forward orbit* and *backward orbit* of x_0 under f are

$$\text{Orb}_f^+(x_0) := \{f^n(x_0) \mid n \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Orb}_f^-(x_0) := \coprod_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(x_0) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K}),$$

respectively, where $f^{-n}(y)$ denotes the set $(f^n)^{-1}(y)$ of solutions of the equation $f^n(z) = y$ in $\mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$. Unless otherwise stated, we will assume that there are no critical points (i.e., ramification points) in the backward orbit of x_0 , so that $f^{-n}(x_0)$ has $\deg(f^n) = d^n$ elements.

For each $n \geq 0$, define

$$K_n := K(f^{-n}(x_0)) \subseteq \overline{K}.$$

If f is a separable mapping, then K_n/K is a separable and hence Galois extension, and we define

$$G_n := \text{Gal}(K_n/K)$$

to be the associated Galois group. We also define

$$G_\infty := \text{Gal}(K_\infty/K) \cong \varprojlim G_n, \quad \text{where} \quad K_\infty := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} K_n.$$

Assuming there are no critical points of f in the backward orbit of x_0 , we may consider $\text{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ as forming an infinite d -ary rooted tree $T_{d,\infty}$. The root node of the tree is x_0 , the elements of $f^{-n}(x_0)$ are the d^n nodes on the n -th level of the tree, and each $y \in f^{-(n+1)}(x_0)$

Date: July 30, 2023; revised June 1, 2024.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37P05, 11R32, 14G25.

is connected to $f(y) \in f^{-n}(x_0)$ by an edge. After making this identification, then, G_∞ is isomorphic to a subgroup of the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$ of the tree. (Here and throughout this paper, when we say that two groups acting on a tree are isomorphic, we mean that the isomorphism is equivariant with respect to the action on the tree.) Similarly, G_n is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(T_{d,n})$ for each $n \geq 0$, where $T_{d,n}$ is rooted d -ary tree up to the n -th level. In light of this action on trees, the groups G_n and G_∞ have come to be known as *arboreal* Galois groups. See [5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 26] for a limited selection of results on this topic, and [11] for a survey of the field.

When K is a number field or function field, it has been shown that G_∞ can be the full group $\text{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$ for some choices of K, f, x_0 ; see, for example, [4, 13, 15, 17, 19, 24, 25]. In analogy with Serre's Open Index Theorem for Galois representations arising from elliptic curves [22], a folklore conjecture states that when K is a number field or function field, G_∞ should usually have finite index in $\text{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$. Indeed, Jones formulated this statement as a precise conjecture for $d = 2$ in [11, Conjecture 3.11], and there are some conditional results for $d = 2, 3$ in [7, 14].

Just as Serre's Theorem has an exception for CM curves, these conjectures and results have exceptions for certain situations in which the index $[\text{Aut}(T_{d,\infty}) : G_\infty]$ is known to be infinite. For example, if $f(z) = z^d + c$ with $d \geq 3$, then the functional equation $f(\zeta_d z) = f(z)$, where ζ_d is a d -th root of unity, yields extra symmetries in $\text{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ and hence infinite index, as described in [8]. Another case is that f is *postcritically finite*, or PCF, meaning that every critical point c is preperiodic, i.e., there exist integers $n > m \geq 0$ such that $f^n(c) = f^m(c)$. (See [11, Theorem 3.1] for a proof that $[\text{Aut}(T_{d,\infty}) : G_\infty] = \infty$ for PCF maps, and [1, 3, 20] for the arboreal Galois groups of certain PCF examples.) In this paper, we consider another condition which forces $[\text{Aut}(T_{d,\infty}) : G_\infty] = \infty$, as follows.

Definition 1.1. Let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function, let $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ be two critical points of f , and let $\ell \geq 1$ be a positive integer. We say that ξ_1 and ξ_2 *collide* at the ℓ -th iterate if

$$(1) \quad f^\ell(\xi_1) = f^\ell(\xi_2) \quad \text{but} \quad f^{\ell-1}(\xi_1) \neq f^{\ell-1}(\xi_2).$$

If $\text{char } K \neq 2$, and if f is quadratic with colliding critical points, then Pink observed in [21, Theorem 4.8.1] that $[\text{Aut}(T_{2,\infty}) : G_\infty] = \infty$. (In this case, we must have $\ell \geq 2$, because the two critical values must be distinct, as each has only $d = 2$ preimages, counting multiplicity.) More precisely, if $K = k(t)$ where k is a field with $\text{char } k \neq 2$, and if $f \in k(z)$ and $x_0 = t$, Pink described the resulting Galois group G_∞ in terms of a countable set of topological generators in $\text{Aut}(T_{2,\infty})$. If a certain discriminant is not a square in k , then G_∞ is isomorphic to a certain subgroup \widetilde{M}_ℓ of $\text{Aut}(T_{2,\infty})$, and otherwise G_∞ is isomorphic to an index 2 subgroup M_ℓ of \widetilde{M}_ℓ . (We define \widetilde{M}_ℓ and M_ℓ in Definition 2.2. In [21], Pink denotes these groups $\widetilde{G}(r)$ and $G(r)$, respectively, where $r = \ell - 1$.) Specializing from $K = k(t)$ to the constant field k , the arboreal Galois group for such f with root point $x_0 \in k$ is therefore a subgroup of \widetilde{M}_ℓ .

Our goal in this paper is twofold. First, we describe the groups \widetilde{M}_ℓ and M_ℓ as sets of automorphisms $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_{2,\infty})$ satisfying a certain condition, rather than by giving generators, as Pink did. Second, we present necessary and sufficient conditions for the arboreal Galois group G_∞ associated with a quadratic rational map $f \in K(z)$ satisfying hypothesis (1) to

be isomorphic to the full group \widetilde{M}_ℓ or M_ℓ . These goals are summarized in the following two theorems.

Theorem 1.2. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2, and let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree 2 with critical points $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$. Let $\delta \in K^\times$ be the discriminant of the minimal polynomial of ξ_1 over K , which we understand to be $\delta = 1$ if $\xi_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, and let G_∞ be the arboreal Galois group for f over K , rooted at x_0 . Suppose that ξ_1 and ξ_2 collide at the ℓ -th iterate under f , for some integer $\ell \geq 2$. Then:*

- (1) G_∞ is isomorphic to a subgroup of \widetilde{M}_ℓ , via an appropriate labeling of the tree.
- (2) G_∞ is isomorphic to a subgroup of M_ℓ if and only if δ is a square in K .

Theorem 1.3. *With notation and hypothesis as in Theorem 1.2, there is a countable sequence of quantities*

$$\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots \in L := K(\sqrt{\delta}),$$

given by explicit expressions involving f and x_0 , with $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{\ell-1} \in K$, so that the following hold.

- (1) *If δ is a square in K , then the following are equivalent:*
 - (a) *No finite product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ (for $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ and $m \geq 1$) is a square in K .*
 - (b) $G_\infty \cong M_\ell$.
- (2) *If δ is not a square in K , then $\kappa_\ell \delta$ is a square in K , and the following are equivalent:*
 - (a) *The only finite product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ (for $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ and $m \geq 1$) that is a square in L is the single element κ_ℓ .*
 - (b) $G_\infty \cong \widetilde{M}_\ell$.


We define the quantities $\kappa_n \in K$ of Theorem 1.3 in Definition 6.1.

As noted earlier, the finite Galois group $G_n = \text{Gal}(K_n/K)$ acts on the finite tree $T_{2,n}$, for any integer $n \geq 0$. It is therefore convenient to define subgroups $M_{\ell,n}$ and $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ of the finite group $\text{Aut}(T_{2,n})$, restricting elements of M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ to $T_{2,n}$. (See Definition 2.4.) We present analogs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 for this finite setting in Corollary 4.2 and Theorem 6.5, respectively.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we set notation, describe tree labelings, and define the groups M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ in terms of the parities of $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_{2,\infty})$ acting on various portions of the tree. In Section 3, we present a number of elementary results involving discriminants, most notably a formula (Corollary 3.5) for discriminants of iterated maps in homogeneous coordinates. We then apply these formulas to prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 4, using the discriminants of Section 3 to detect the parity conditions of Section 2. In Section 5, we study certain generators for the groups M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ , in particular tree automorphisms that we call *odd cousins maps*. Finally, in Section 6, we define the quantities κ_n of Theorem 1.3 in terms of cross ratios and discriminants involving iterates of f . In Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4, we present explicit algebraic expressions involving iterated preimages of x_0 , illustrated in Figures 3 and 4, that can detect whether or not a given Galois automorphism is an odd cousins map. We then apply Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4 to prove Theorem 1.3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation and tree labelings. We set the following notation throughout this paper.

FIGURE 1. Labeling the tree T_3

- K : a field of characteristic different from 2, with algebraic closure \overline{K}
- ℓ : an integer $\ell \geq 2$
- f : a rational function $f(z) \in K(z)$, usually of degree 2
- x_0 : an element of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, to serve as the root of our preimage tree
- T_n : a binary rooted tree, extending n levels above its root node
- T_∞ : a binary rooted tree, extending infinitely above its root node
- K_n : for each $n \geq 0$, the extension field $K_n := K(f^{-n}(x_0))$
- K_∞ : the union $K_\infty = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} K_n$ in \overline{K}
- G_n : the Galois group $\text{Gal}(K_n/K_0)$
- G_∞ : the Galois group $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/K_0)$

Following [1, Definition 1.3], we assign labels to each of the nodes of the abstract trees T_n and T_∞ , as follows.

Definition 2.1. A *labeling* of T_∞ is a choice of two tree morphisms $0, 1 : T_\infty \rightarrow T_\infty$ such that 0 maps T_∞ bijectively onto the subtree rooted at one of the two nodes connected to the root node x_0 , and 1 maps T_∞ bijectively onto the subtree rooted at the other.

For any integer $n \geq 1$, a labeling of T_n is a choice of two injective tree morphisms $0, 1 : T_{n-1} \rightarrow T_n$ with the same property.

Given the two tree morphisms $0, 1$ of Definition 2.1, we can assign a label to each node of the tree, as follows. First, label the root node with the empty word $()$. Then, for each level $m \geq 1$ of the tree and each node w at level 1, label w with the unique ordered m -tuple $s_1 s_2 \dots s_m \in \{0, 1\}^m$, such that $w = s_1 \circ s_2 \circ \dots \circ s_m()$. See Figure 1.

Having fixed a labeling, we will often abuse terminology and conflate a node x of the tree with its label. In addition, for each point $y \in \text{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$, we will often label the corresponding node of the abstract tree T_n or T_∞ as y as well, with x_0 as the root node, and the 2^m nodes at the m -th level of the tree as the points of $f^{-m}(x_0)$.

2.2. Higher-level signs and Pink's groups. Fix a labeling of the tree T_∞ . Let y be a node of the tree, and let $m \geq 1$ be a positive integer. The 2^m nodes that are m levels above y have labels $ys_1 s_2 \dots s_m$, with each $s_i \in \{0, 1\}$. For any automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_\infty)$ of the (rooted) tree, we have

$$\sigma(ys_1 s_2 \dots s_m) = \sigma(y)t_1 t_2 \dots t_m, \quad \text{for some } t_1, \dots, t_m \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Thus, σ and y together induce a bijective function from $\{0, 1\}^m$ to itself, sending (s_1, \dots, s_m) to (t_1, \dots, t_m) . Following Pink, we define the m -th sign of σ above y , denoted $\text{sgn}_m(\sigma, y)$, to be the sign of this permutation of $\{0, 1\}^m$ — that is, $+1$ if the permutation is of even parity, or -1 if it is odd.

Definition 2.2. Fix a labeling of the tree T_∞ . Let $\ell \geq 2$ be an integer. We define \widetilde{M}_ℓ to be the set of all $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_\infty)$ for which

$$\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, y) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x_0) \quad \text{for every node } y \text{ of } T_\infty.$$

We also define M_ℓ to be the set of all $\sigma \in \widetilde{M}_\ell$ for which this common sign is $+1$.

Note that for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_\infty)$ and any node y for which $\sigma(y) \neq y$, the sign $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, y)$ depends on the choice of labeling of the tree. Thus, the subgroups \widetilde{M}_ℓ and M_ℓ also depend on the labeling. However, any two labelings are conjugate by an automorphism of the tree, so a change of labeling has the effect of replacing the subgroups \widetilde{M}_ℓ and M_ℓ by appropriate conjugates.

Theorem 2.3. Fix a labeling of the tree T_∞ and an integer $\ell \geq 2$. Then \widetilde{M}_ℓ and M_ℓ are subgroups of $\text{Aut}(T_\infty)$.

Proof. Clearly the identity automorphism e belongs to $M_\ell \subseteq \widetilde{M}_\ell$. For any $\sigma, \tau \in \text{Aut}(T_\infty)$, and for any node y of T_∞ , we have

$$(2) \quad \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma\tau, y) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, \tau(y)) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, y).$$

Indeed, τ maps the nodes above y to the nodes above $\tau(y)$, in particular permuting labels of the 2^ℓ nodes that are ℓ levels above y with sign $\text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, y)$. Then σ permutes the labels of those same nodes with sign $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, \tau(y))$ while moving them to the nodes above $\sigma(\tau(y))$.

Thus, if $\sigma, \tau \in \widetilde{M}_\ell$, then for any node y of the tree, we have

$$\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma\tau, y) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, \tau(y)) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, y) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, \tau(x_0)) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, x_0) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma\tau, x_0),$$

and hence $\sigma\tau \in \widetilde{M}_\ell$. Similarly, if $\sigma, \tau \in M_\ell$, then all the signs above are $+1$, so we have $\sigma\tau \in M_\ell$.

In addition, for any $\sigma \in \widetilde{M}_\ell$, then choosing $\tau = \sigma^{-1} \in \text{Aut}(T_\infty)$, equation (2) yields

$$\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma^{-1}, y) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(y)) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(x_0)) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma^{-1}, x_0),$$

and hence $\sigma^{-1} \in \widetilde{M}_\ell$. Similarly, M_ℓ is also closed under inverses. \square

2.3. Pink's description of M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ . In Section 4.2 of [21], Pink defines $G(\ell - 1)$ to be the closure of the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(T_\infty)$ generated by a certain countable set of automorphisms

$$\{a_i \mid i \geq 1\} \cup \{b_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq \ell - 1\} \subseteq \text{Aut}(T_\infty).$$

Here, we mean closure with respect to the natural topology on $\text{Aut}(T_\infty)$, given by the basis $\{E_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ of open neighborhoods of e , where for each $n \geq 1$, the normal subgroup E_n consists of those $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_\infty)$ that are trivial on the finite subtree T_{n-1} .

In Proposition 4.2.5 of [21], Pink also works out the value of the signs $\text{sgn}_m(a_i, x_0)$ and $\text{sgn}_m(b_j, x_0)$ for all $m \geq 1$, all $i \geq 1$, and all $1 \leq j \leq \ell - 1$. In particular, combining his sign formulas with his recursive definitions of the elements a_i, b_j , it is immediate that the signs $\text{sgn}_\ell(a_i, y)$ and $\text{sgn}_\ell(b_j, y)$ are $+1$ for all such i, j and all nodes y of the tree. Thus, all of Pink's generators belong to our group M_ℓ . Moreover, M_ℓ is clearly closed with respect to the natural topology on $\text{Aut}(T_\infty)$, so it follows that Pink's group $G(\ell - 1)$ is contained in our group M_ℓ . We claim that the two groups coincide. To do so, we define the following two subgroups of $\text{Aut}(T_n)$.

Definition 2.4. Let $\ell \geq 2$ and $n \geq 0$ be integers. Define $M_{\ell,n}$ to be the quotient of M_ℓ formed by restricting each $\sigma \in M_\ell$ to the subtree T_n . Similarly define $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ to be the quotient of \widetilde{M}_ℓ formed by restricting to T_n .

It is well known that $\log_2 |\text{Aut}(T_n)| = 2^n - 1$, since any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_n)$ can be described by specifying, for each of the $2^n - 1$ nodes y at levels 0 to $n - 1$, whether σ switches or fixes the labels of the two nodes immediately above y . For each node y of T_n at level $n - \ell$ or lower, the condition that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, y) = +1$ introduces an index 2 restriction on $M_{\ell,n}$, and the restrictions for these various nodes y are independent of one another. Since there are no such nodes for $n < \ell$, and $2^{n-\ell+1} - 1$ such nodes for $n \geq \ell$, it follows that

$$\log_2[\text{Aut}(T_n) : M_{\ell,n}] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq n \leq \ell - 1, \\ 2^{n-\ell+1} - 1 & \text{if } n \geq \ell. \end{cases}$$

(Incidentally, it follows that M_ℓ is of infinite index in $\text{Aut}(T_\infty)$.) Hence,

$$(3) \quad \log_2 |M_{\ell,n}| = \begin{cases} 2^n - 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq n \leq \ell - 1, \\ 2^n - 2^{n-\ell+1} & \text{if } n \geq \ell. \end{cases}$$

This formula exactly coincides with Pink's computation of $|G(\ell - 1)_n|$ in Proposition 4.4.1 of [21], thus proving our claim that Pink's group $G(\ell - 1)$ is the same as our group M_ℓ .

Pink goes on to define a larger group $\widetilde{G}(\ell - 1)$ by adding one more generator, which he denotes \tilde{w} . In equation (4.8.8) of [21], he defines \tilde{w} by a recursive relation involving his earlier generator $b_{\ell-1}$. It is immediate from this definition and his aforementioned sign computations that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\tilde{w}, y) = -1$ for every node y of T_∞ , so that $\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{M}_\ell$, and hence $\widetilde{G}(\ell - 1) \subseteq \widetilde{M}_\ell$. On the other hand, just after defining \tilde{w} , Pink notes that $[\widetilde{G}(\ell - 1) : G(\ell - 1)] = 2$, and of course we clearly have $[\widetilde{M}_\ell : M_\ell] = 2$ as well. Therefore, it follows that Pink's group $\widetilde{G}(\ell - 1)$ also coincides with our group \widetilde{M}_ℓ .

Remark 2.5. We limit the use of Pink's notation a_i, b_j, \tilde{w} to this section. Having proven that Pink's groups are the same as our groups M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ , we will no longer need to refer to the specific generators Pink defined in [21].

3. HOMOGENEOUS DISCRIMINANTS

The discriminants of the equations $f^n(z) = x_0$ are especially important in the study of arboreal Galois groups. Iterative formulas for these discriminants may be found, for example, in [2, Proposition 3.2] for the polynomial case, and in [12, Theorem 3.2] for the rational function case. In our setting, it will be convenient to derive analogous formulas working in homogeneous coordinates on \mathbb{P}^1 , as follows.

Definition 3.1. Let $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ be homogeneous polynomials of degrees $m, n \geq 1$, respectively. Write

$$P(X, Y) = \prod_{i=1}^m (b_i X - a_i Y) \quad \text{and} \quad Q(X, Y) = \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i X - c_i Y),$$

with $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in \overline{K}$, such that for each i , at least one of a_i, b_i is nonzero, and at least one of c_i, d_i is nonzero. The (*homogeneous*) *resultant* of P and Q is

$$\text{Res}(P, Q) := \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (a_i d_j - b_i c_j) \in K,$$

and the (*homogeneous*) *discriminant* of P is

$$\Delta(P) := \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (a_i b_j - b_i a_j)^2 \in K.$$

If $P = a$ is constant, we understand $\text{Res}(a, Q)$ to be $a^{\deg Q}$, and similarly if $Q = c$ is constant, then $\text{Res}(P, c) = c^{\deg P}$. If $\deg P = 1$, we understand $\Delta(P)$ to be 1.

In the notation of Definition 3.1, the points $[a_i : b_i] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ are the zeros of P . Both the resultant and discriminant are invariant under all (Galois) permutations of these zeros, and hence they do indeed lie in K . They are also invariant under replacing (a_i, b_i) by $(\lambda_i a_i, \lambda_i b_i)$ for any $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \overline{K}^\times$ satisfying $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m = 1$. Clearly, we have

$$(4) \quad \text{Res}(P, Q) = \prod_{i=1}^m Q(a_i, b_i) = (-1)^{mn} \prod_{i=1}^n P(c_i, d_i).$$

If $b_i \neq 0$ for all i , i.e., if the point $[1 : 0]$ at ∞ is not a root of P , then the dehomogenization $p(z) = P(z, 1) \in K[z]$ of P is

$$p(z) = A \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \alpha_i), \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha_i = \frac{a_i}{b_i} \quad \text{and} \quad A = \prod_{i=1}^m b_i.$$

Similarly, if each $d_i \neq 0$, then writing $\gamma_i = c_i/d_i$ and $C = \prod_{i=1}^n d_i$, the dehomogenization q of Q is $q(z) = C \prod_{i=1}^n (z - \gamma_i)$. Thus, if $b_i, d_i \neq 0$ for all i , then

$$\text{Res}(P, Q) = A^n C^m \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (\alpha_i - \gamma_j) = \text{Res}(p, q)$$

coincides with the classical (nonhomogeneous) resultant, and

$$(5) \quad \Delta(P) = A^{2m-2} \prod_{i < j} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)^2 = \Delta(p)$$

coincides with the classical (nonhomogeneous) discriminant.

For brief expositions on homogeneous discriminants, see [16, Section IX.4] or [23, Section 2.4]. However, the iterated discriminant formulas we need involve the orbits of critical points. To incorporate them, the quotient rule inspires the following definition.

Definition 3.2. Let $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ be relatively prime homogeneous polynomials of degree $m \geq 1$. The *homogeneous differential* of (P, Q) is

$$D_{P,Q}(X, Y) := \frac{1}{Y}(P_X Q - P Q_X) = \frac{1}{X}(P Q_Y - P_Y Q) \in K[X, Y],$$

where P_X denotes the (formal) partial derivative of P with respect to X , and similarly for P_Y, Q_X, Q_Y .

A short algebraic computation, writing $P = A_m X^m + \dots$ and $Q = B_m X^m + \dots$, shows that $D_{P,Q}$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $2m - 2$ in $K[X, Y]$, and that the two formulas for it in Definition 3.2 agree. In addition, if $p(z), q(z) \in K[z]$ are the dehomogenizations of P, Q , then the derivative of the rational function $p(z)/q(z)$ is $D_{P,Q}(z, 1)/(q(z))^2$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ be relatively prime homogeneous polynomials of degree $m \geq 1$, with homogeneous differential $D = D_{P,Q}$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{K}$, not both zero, and define*

$$R(X, Y) := \beta P(X, Y) - \alpha Q(X, Y).$$

Then

- (1) $\text{Res}(R, D) = (-1)^{m(m-1)/2} \text{Res}(P, Q) \Delta(R)$.
- (2) Let $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta} \in \overline{K}$, not both zero, and define

$$\tilde{R}(X, Y) := \tilde{\beta} P(X, Y) - \tilde{\alpha} Q(X, Y).$$

$$\text{Then } \text{Res}(R, \tilde{R}) = (\alpha\tilde{\beta} - \beta\tilde{\alpha})^m \text{Res}(P, Q).$$

Proof. Since $R \in \overline{K}[X, Y]$ is homogeneous of degree m , there exist points $[\gamma_i, \delta_i] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ such that

$$R(X, Y) = \prod_{i=1}^m (\delta_i X - \gamma_i Y).$$

Writing $Q = \prod_{i=1}^m (d_i X - c_i Y)$, observe that equation (4) applied to $\text{Res}(R, Q)$ yields

$$(6) \quad \prod_{i=1}^m Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = (-1)^{m^2} \prod_{i=1}^m R(c_i, d_i) = (-1)^{m^2} \prod_{i=1}^m \beta P(c_i, d_i) = \beta^m \text{Res}(P, Q).$$

A similar computation applied to $\text{Res}(R, P)$ yields

$$(7) \quad \prod_{i=1}^m P(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = \alpha^m \text{Res}(P, Q).$$

Statement (1): We consider two cases.

Case 1: If $\beta \neq 0$, then $P = \beta^{-1}(R + \alpha Q)$, and hence

$$(8) \quad D = \frac{1}{\beta Y} (R_X Q + \alpha Q_X Q - R Q_X - \alpha Q Q_X) = \frac{1}{\beta Y} (R_X Q - R Q_X).$$

Noting that

$$R_X = \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i \prod_{j \neq i} (\delta_j X - \gamma_j Y),$$

we have $R_X(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = \delta_i \prod_{j \neq i} (\gamma_i \delta_j - \delta_i \gamma_j)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, and of course also $R(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = 0$. Thus, equation (8) yields

$$D(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = \beta^{-1} Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i) \prod_{j \neq i} (\gamma_i \delta_j - \delta_i \gamma_j),$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, m$. Therefore, by equation (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}(R, D) &= \prod_{i=1}^m D(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = \left(\beta^{-m} \prod_{i=1}^m Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i) \right) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j \neq i} (\gamma_i \delta_j - \delta_i \gamma_j) \\ &= (-1)^{m(m-1)/2} \left(\beta^{-m} \prod_{i=1}^m Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i) \right) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (\gamma_i \delta_j - \delta_i \gamma_j)^2, \\ &= (-1)^{m(m-1)/2} \text{Res}(P, Q) \Delta(R), \end{aligned}$$

by rearranging the final product in the first line and then applying equation (6).

Case 2: If $\alpha \neq 0$, then $Q = \alpha^{-1}(\beta P - R)$. A similar argument as in Case 1 yields

$$D = \frac{1}{\alpha X} (P_Y R - P R_Y) \quad \text{and} \quad R_Y(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = -\gamma_i \prod_{j \neq i} (\gamma_i \delta_j - \delta_i \gamma_j).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}(R, D) &= \prod_{i=1}^m D(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = \left(\alpha^{-m} \prod_{i=1}^m P(\gamma_i, \delta_i) \right) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j \neq i} (\gamma_i \delta_j - \delta_i \gamma_j) \\ &= (-1)^{m(m-1)/2} \text{Res}(P, Q) \Delta(R), \end{aligned}$$

by similar reasoning as in Case 1, using equation (7).

Statement (2): Without loss, we may assume $\beta \neq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}(R, \tilde{R}) &= \prod_{i=1}^m \tilde{R}(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = \beta^{-m} \prod_{i=1}^m (\beta \tilde{\beta} P(\gamma_i, \delta_i) - \beta \tilde{\alpha} Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i)) \\ &= \beta^{-m} \prod_{i=1}^m (\alpha \tilde{\beta} Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i) - \beta \tilde{\alpha} Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i)) \\ &= \beta^{-m} (\alpha \tilde{\beta} - \beta \tilde{\alpha})^m \prod_{i=1}^m Q(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = (\alpha \tilde{\beta} - \beta \tilde{\alpha})^m \text{Res}(P, Q), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is by equation (4), the third is because $R(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = 0$, and the fifth is by equation (6). \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ be relatively prime homogeneous polynomials of degree $m \geq 1$, with homogeneous differential $D = D_{P,Q}$. Let $J \in K[X, Y]$ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree $n \geq 1$, and let*

$$H(X, Y) := J(P(X, Y), Q(X, Y)).$$

Then

$$\Delta(H) = (-1)^{mn(m-1)/2} \Delta(J)^m \text{Res}(P, Q)^{n(n-2)} \text{Res}(H, D).$$

Proof. Write $J(X, Y) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\beta_i X - \alpha_i Y)$, with $[\alpha_i, \beta_i] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$. Then

$$H(X, Y) = \prod_{i=1}^n R_i(X, Y) \quad \text{where} \quad R_i = \beta_i P - \alpha_i Q.$$

Writing $R_i(X, Y) = \prod_{j=1}^m (\delta_{ij}X - \gamma_{ij}Y)$, we have

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta(H) &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} (\gamma_{ij}\delta_{ik} - \gamma_{ik}\delta_{ij})^2 \right] \left[\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \prod_{k=1}^n \prod_{\ell=1}^n (\gamma_{ik}\delta_{j\ell} - \gamma_{j\ell}\delta_{ik})^2 \right] \\ &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \Delta(R_i) \right] \left[\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \text{Res}(R_i, R_j)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first product in equation (9) is

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^n \Delta(R_i) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left[(-1)^{m(m-1)/2} \text{Res}(P, Q)^{-1} \text{Res}(R_i, D) \right] \\ &= (-1)^{mn(m-1)/2} \text{Res}(P, Q)^{-n} \text{Res}(H, D), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is by Proposition 3.3(1), and the second is by equation (4) and the fact that $H = \prod_{i=1}^n R_i$. The second product in equation (9) is

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \text{Res}(R_i, R_j)^2 &= \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \left[(\alpha_i\beta_j - \alpha_j\beta_i)^{2m} \text{Res}(P, Q)^2 \right] \\ &= \text{Res}(P, Q)^{n(n-1)} \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (\alpha_i\beta_j - \alpha_j\beta_i)^2 \right)^m \\ &= \text{Res}(P, Q)^{n(n-1)} \Delta(J)^m, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is by Proposition 3.3(2). Thus, equation (9) yields the desired formula. \square

A rational function $f(z) = p(z)/q(z) \in K(z)$ of degree $d \geq 1$ may be written in homogeneous coordinates as $F(X, Y) = (P(X, Y), Q(X, Y))$, where

$$P(X, Y) := Y^d p(X/Y), \quad \text{and} \quad Q(X, Y) = Y^d q(X, Y),$$

which are both homogeneous polynomials of degree d . Of course, this lift to homogeneous coordinates is not unique, as we may multiply both P and Q by the same constant $\lambda \in K^\times$. Thus, having fixed a choice of P and Q , the iterate $F^n = (P_n, Q_n)$ is a choice of lift of f^n to homogeneous coordinates.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ be relatively prime homogeneous polynomials of degree $d \geq 1$, with homogeneous differential $D = D_{P, Q}$. Write*

$$D(X, Y) = c \prod_{i=1}^{2d-2} (\theta_i X - \eta_i Y) \quad \text{with} \quad c \in K^\times \quad \text{and} \quad [\eta_i, \theta_i] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K}).$$

Let $F = (P, Q)$, and let $s_0, t_0 \in K$ not both zero. For each $n \geq 0$, define

$$H_n(X, Y) = t_0 P_n(X, Y) - s_0 Q_n(X, Y) \in K[X, Y],$$

where $(P_n, Q_n) = F^n \in K[X, Y] \times K[X, Y]$. Then for each $n \geq 1$, we have

$$(10) \quad \Delta(H_n) = (-1)^{dn(d-1)/2} c^{dn} \Delta(H_{n-1})^d \text{Res}(P, Q)^{d^{n-1}(d^{n-1}-2)} \prod_{i=1}^{2d-2} H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i).$$

Proof. Note that $H_0(X, Y) = t_0X - s_0Y$ is homogeneous of degree 1, and for $n \geq 1$, we have that $H_n = H_{n-1} \circ F$ is homogeneous of degree d^n . Pulling the constant c out of D (and raising it to the power $\deg(H_n) = d^n$) and applying equation (4), we have

$$\text{Res}(H_n, D) = (-1)^{d^n(2d-2)} c^{d^n} \prod_{i=1}^{2d-2} H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i) = c^{d^n} \prod_{i=1}^{2d-2} H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i).$$

Thus, with $H = H_n$, $J = H_{n-1}$, $m = d$, and using d^{n-1} in the role of n , the desired formula is immediate from Theorem 3.4. \square

Theorem 3.6. *With notation as in Corollary 3.5, suppose the degree is $d = 2$, and that $\text{char } K \neq 2$. Suppose that there is an integer $\ell \geq 1$ such that*

$$F^\ell([\eta_1, \theta_1]) = F^\ell([\eta_2, \theta_2]) \text{ as points in } \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K}),$$

but

$$F^{\ell-1}([\eta_1, \theta_1]) \neq F^{\ell-1}([\eta_2, \theta_2]) \text{ as points in } \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K}).$$

Then $\ell \geq 2$, and we have

$$\text{Res}(P, Q) \prod_{i=1}^2 H_\ell(\eta_i, \theta_i) \in K^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{i=1}^2 H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i) \in K^2 \text{ for every } n \geq \ell + 1,$$

where K^2 denotes the set of squares of elements of K .

Proof. The two critical points $[\eta_1, \theta_1]$ and $[\eta_2, \theta_2]$ of the morphism $F : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ given by $F = [P, Q]$ must be distinct, since $\deg(F) = 2$, and a higher-multiplicity critical point would result in a strictly larger local degree. (Recall that we have $\text{char } K \neq 2$.) In addition, if $F([\eta_1, \theta_1]) = F([\eta_2, \theta_2])$, then this common point would have at least four preimages (counting multiplicity), again contradicting the fact that $\deg(F) = 2$. Thus, the smallest iterate ℓ for which $F^\ell([\eta_1, \theta_1]) = F^\ell([\eta_2, \theta_2])$ must satisfy $\ell \geq 2$, as claimed.

For any $\lambda \in \overline{K}^\times$, replacing (η_1, θ_1) by $(\lambda\eta_1, \lambda\theta_1)$ and (η_2, θ_2) by $(\lambda^{-1}\eta_2, \lambda^{-1}\theta_2)$ changes neither the points $F^n([\eta_i, \theta_i])$ nor the product $\prod_{i=1}^2 H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i)$. In addition, for any $c \in K^\times$, replacing (η_1, θ_1) by $(c\eta_1, c\theta_1)$ without changing (η_2, θ_2) similarly does not change the points $F^n([\eta_i, \theta_i])$, but it changes the product $\prod_{i=1}^2 H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i)$ by a factor of c^{2n} , which is a square in K for $n \geq 1$. Thus, since the quadratic form $D_{P,Q}(X, Y)$ is defined over K , we may assume that $\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2 \in L$, where L is either K or a quadratic extension of K ; and in the latter case, we may further assume that (η_2, θ_2) is $\text{Gal}(L/K)$ -conjugate to (η_1, θ_1) .

Let $[a, b] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ be the point

$$[a, b] := F^\ell([\eta_1, \theta_1]) = F^\ell([\eta_2, \theta_2]).$$

Since this point is either defined over K already, or else defined over L and $\text{Gal}(L/K)$ -conjugate to itself, we may assume that $a, b \in K$.

For each $i = 1, 2$, define $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in L$ by

$$(\alpha_i, \beta_i) := F^{\ell-1}(\eta_i, \theta_i).$$

Then since the two points $[\alpha_i, \beta_i] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ are distinct, the quadratic form $bP - aQ \in K[X, Y]$ must factor as

$$bP(X, Y) - aQ(X, Y) = \mu(\beta_1X - \alpha_1Y)(\beta_2X - \alpha_2Y)$$

for some $\mu \in K^\times$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^2 H_\ell(\eta_i, \theta_i) &= \prod_{i=1}^2 (t_0 P(\alpha_i, \beta_i) - s_0 Q(\alpha_i, \beta_i)) = \text{Res}(t_0 P - s_0 Q, \mu^{-1}(bP - aQ)) \\ &= \mu^{-2} \text{Res}(t_0 P - s_0 Q, bP - aQ) = \mu^{-2} (s_0 b - t_0 a)^2 \text{Res}(P, Q), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by Proposition 3.3(2). Multiplying by $\text{Res}(P, Q) \in K^\times$ yields that the first desired product is indeed a square in K .

For the second product, i.e., for $n \geq \ell + 1$, first consider the case that $\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2 \in K$. Then $F^{n-1}(\eta_1, \theta_1)$ and $F^{n-1}(\eta_2, \theta_2)$ are both in $K \times K$, and moreover they describe the same point in $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, since $n - 1 \geq \ell$. Hence, there is some $\mu \in K^\times$ such that

$$F^{n-1}(\eta_2, \theta_2) = \mu F^{n-1}(\eta_1, \theta_1), \quad \text{and hence} \quad F^n(\eta_2, \theta_2) = \mu^2 F^n(\eta_1, \theta_1).$$

It follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^2 H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i) = \mu^2 (H_n(\eta_1, \theta_1))^2 \in K^2,$$

as desired.

The other case is that (η_2, θ_2) is $\text{Gal}(L/K)$ -conjugate to (η_1, θ_1) , where L is a quadratic extension of K . Then $F^{n-1}(\eta_1, \theta_1)$ and $F^{n-1}(\eta_2, \theta_2)$ are both in $L \times L$ and are also Galois conjugate. As in the previous case, they also describe the same point in $\mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$, so this point must be K -rational. Hence, there is some $\mu \in L^\times$ and some $a_{n-1}, b_{n-1} \in K$ not both zero such that

$$F^{n-1}(\eta_1, \theta_1) = \mu(a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad F^{n-1}(\eta_2, \theta_2) = \sigma(\mu)(a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}),$$

where σ is the nontrivial element of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$. Let $\gamma = \mu\sigma(\mu) \in K^\times$. Then

$$\prod_{i=1}^2 H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i) = \gamma^2 (t_0 P(a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}) - s_0 Q(a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}))^2 \in K^2. \quad \square$$

Still in the case $d = 2$, we also have the following identity.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ be relatively prime homogeneous polynomials of degree 2, with homogeneous differential $D_{P,Q}$. Then $\Delta(D_{P,Q}) = 4 \text{Res}(P, Q)$.*

Proof. This is a brute-force calculation. Writing

$$P = a_0 X^2 + a_1 XY + a_2 Y^2 \quad \text{and} \quad Q = b_0 X^2 + b_1 XY + b_2 Y^2,$$

direct computation shows that both sides of the desired identity are equal to

$$4(a_2 b_0 - a_0 b_2)^2 - 4(a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2)(a_1 b_0 - a_0 b_1). \quad \square$$

Remark 3.8. Corollary 3.5 also yields the following formula for the (nonhomogeneous) discriminants of iterated polynomials. Let $f(z) \in K[z]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$ with lead coefficient $A \in K^\times$, and let $x_0 \in K$. Then for every $n \geq 1$, we have

$$(11) \quad \Delta(f^n - x_0) = (-1)^{d^n(d-1)/2} d^{d^n} A^{d^{2n-1}-1} (\Delta(f^{n-1} - x_0))^d \prod_{f'(c)=0} (f^n(c) - x_0),$$

where the product is over all finite critical points of f , repeated according to multiplicity.

Indeed, lifting f to homogeneous coordinates as $F[X, Y] = (P, Q) = (Y^d f(X/Y), Y^d)$, simple computations yield

$$\text{Res}(P, Q) = A^d \quad \text{and} \quad D = D_{P, Q} = dAY^{d-1} \prod_{f'(c)=0} (X - cY).$$

Writing $H_n = P_n - x_0 Y^{d^n}$, where $P_n = Y^{d^n} f^n(X/Y)$, we have $\Delta(H_n) = \Delta(f^n - x_0)$ by equation (5), and it is easy to check that the $\prod H_n(\eta_i, \theta_i)$ term in Corollary 3.5 becomes

$$d^{d^n} A^{2d^n-1} \prod_{f'(c)=0} (f^n(c) - x_0).$$

The desired equation is then immediate from Corollary 3.5.

A variant of formula (11) appeared in [2, Proposition 3.2], and a version similar to (11) appeared with an incorrect power of the lead coefficient in [4, Equation (1)].

4. COLLIDING CRITICAL POINTS AND M_∞

We are now prepared to prove our first main result, Theorem 1.2. The central goal of the proof is to produce a labeling of the tree of preimages with respect to which every $\sigma \in G_\infty$ acts as an element of \widetilde{M}_ℓ or M_ℓ . After some preliminaries, our strategy will be to start with a completely arbitrary labeling of the tree, and then to make successive changes to the labeling until it has this desired property.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Writing $f = p/q$ where $p, q \in K[z]$ with $\max\{\deg p, \deg q\} = 2$, define $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ by

$$P(X, Y) := Y^2 p(X/Y) \quad \text{and} \quad Q(X, Y) := Y^2 q(X/Y).$$

Thus, $F := (P, Q)$ is a homogenization of f , and the homogeneous differential $D = D_{P, Q}$ may be factored as

$$D(X, Y) = c(\theta_1 X - \eta_1 Y)(\theta_2 X - \eta_2 Y),$$

with $c \in K^\times$ and $\xi_i = \eta_i/\theta_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. (Here, we understand the latter expression to be the point at ∞ if $\theta_i = 0$.)

Any point x in the backward orbit $\text{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ corresponds to a node of the tree T_∞ , and we also call this node x . Writing $x = [s, t] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ with $s, t \in K(x)$, define

$$H_{x, \ell} := tP_\ell - sQ_\ell \in K(x)[X, Y],$$

where P_ℓ and Q_ℓ are the coordinate functions of F^ℓ , i.e., where $F^\ell = (P_\ell, Q_\ell)$.

Choose any labeling of the tree T_∞ . In the rest of the proof, we will make successive changes to this labeling until it successfully exhibits G_∞ as a subgroup of \widetilde{M}_ℓ or M_ℓ .

Case 1. If δ is a square in K , then $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Thus, we may assume that $\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta_1, \theta_2 \in K$. The discriminant $\Delta(D_{P, Q})$ is therefore also a square in K , and hence, by Proposition 3.7, so is $\text{Res}(P, Q) = 4\Delta(D_{P, Q})$.

With $d = 2$ in equation (10) of Corollary 3.5, it follows that for any $x \in \text{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$, the discriminant $\Delta(H_{x, \ell})$ is a square in $K(x)$. Then by Theorem 3.6, using the fact that $\text{Res}(P, Q) \in K^2$, we also have

$$\prod_{i=1}^2 H_{x, \ell}(\eta_i, \theta_i) \in K(x)^2.$$

We may also write

$$H_{x,\ell} = \prod_{i=1}^{2^\ell} (\beta_{\ell,i}X - \alpha_{\ell,i}Y),$$

where $\{[\alpha_{\ell,i}, \beta_{\ell,i}] \mid i = 1, \dots, 2^\ell\}$ are the preimages in $\mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ of x under f^ℓ . For any $\sigma \in G_\infty$, it follows that

$$(12) \quad \text{if } \sigma(x) = x, \quad \text{then} \quad \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x) = +1,$$

because any such σ permutes these 2^ℓ preimages, and it does so with even parity, since $\Delta(H_{x,\ell})$ is a square in $K(x)$.

In particular, implication (12) shows that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x_0) = +1$ for every $\sigma \in G_\infty$, since each such σ fixes $x_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. We will now proceed inductively up the tree, making adjustments to the labeling as we go. For any $m \geq 1$, suppose that we have already verified that for all nodes x up to level $m-1$, we have $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x) = +1$ for all $\sigma \in G_\infty$.

Given a node y at level m , its Galois orbit $G_\infty(y)$ consists of nodes at the same level m of the tree. For each such node $w \in G_\infty(y)$, choose $\sigma_w \in G_\infty$ such that $\sigma_w(y) = w$. Note that if $\sigma'_w \in G_\infty$ also satisfies $\sigma'_w(y) = w$, then

$$\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma'_w, y) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_w, y), \quad \text{since} \quad \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_w^{-1}\sigma'_w, y) = +1$$

by implication (12). Define

$$W_y := \{w \in G_\infty(y) \mid \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_w, y) = -1\}.$$

Observe that $y \notin W_y$, again by implication (12).

We now modify the labeling. For each node $w \in W_y$, transpose the labels of two nodes that lie ℓ levels above w (and which share the same parent $\ell-1$ levels above w). Since we made no change to the labeling above y but made this single transposition above w , the new labeling now gives $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_w, y) = +1$.

Moreover, for any two nodes w and z in the Galois orbit $G_\infty(y)$, and for any $\rho \in G_\infty$ with $\rho(w) = z$, we claim that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\rho, w) = +1$ under this new labeling. Indeed, the Galois automorphism

$$\lambda := \sigma_z^{-1} \circ \rho \circ \sigma_w$$

fixes y and hence, by implication (12), must have $\text{sgn}_\ell(\lambda, y) = +1$. In addition, by the previous paragraph, the signs $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_w, y)$ and $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_z, y)$ are also both $+1$. Hence, $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_w^{-1}, w) = +1$ as well. Therefore, by equation (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sgn}_\ell(\rho, w) &= \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_z \lambda \sigma_w^{-1}, w) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_z, y) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\lambda, y) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_w^{-1}, w) \\ &= (+1) \cdot (+1) \cdot (+1) = +1, \end{aligned}$$

proving our claim that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\rho, w) = +1$.

Repeat this relabeling for each of the (finitely many) Galois orbits among the 2^m nodes at level m . That is, for each such orbit, choose a node y in the orbit, define the set W_y as above, and adjust the labels above each $w \in W_y$. Having completed this process for each Galois orbit at level m , it follows that for any node x at level m and any $\sigma \in G_\infty$, we have $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x) = +1$. Hence, extending this relabeling inductively up the tree, we have $G_\infty \subseteq M_\ell$, proving the reverse implication of part (2) of the theorem.

Case 2. If δ is not a square in K , then the critical points ξ_1, ξ_2 are Galois conjugate and defined over the quadratic extension $L := K(\sqrt{\delta})$ of K . In addition, $\text{Res}(P, Q)$ is not a square in K , since as in Case 1, it is a square times δ .

Defining $H_{x,\ell}$ as in Case 1, observe that Corollary 3.5 and Theorem 3.6 together show that for any $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$, the quantity $\delta\Delta(H_{x,\ell})$ is a square in $K(x)$. Since $\sqrt{\Delta(H_{x,\ell})}$ is an arithmetic combination of the points in $f^{-\ell}(x)$ (see Definition 3.1 and equation (5)), it follows that $\sqrt{\delta} \in K(x)_\ell$, where $K(x)_\ell$ is the extension of $K(x)$ obtained by adjoining $f^{-\ell}(x)$. In particular,

$$\sqrt{\delta} \in K(x_0)_\ell = K_\ell \subseteq K_\infty.$$

Therefore, it makes sense to define $G'_\infty := \text{Gal}(K_\infty/L)$, which is a subgroup of G_∞ of index 2.

Fix $\tau \in G_\infty \setminus G'_\infty$. Note that the two cosets of G'_∞ in G_∞ are

$$G'_\infty = \{\sigma \in G_\infty \mid \sigma(\sqrt{\delta}) = \sqrt{\delta}\} \quad \text{and} \quad G'_\infty\tau = \{\sigma \in G_\infty \mid \sigma(\sqrt{\delta}) = -\sqrt{\delta}\}.$$

Applying Case 1 with L in place of K and G'_∞ in place of G_∞ , we may label the tree so that $G'_\infty \subseteq M_\ell$. Even after this relabeling, note that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, x_0) = -1$, since, as noted above, $\Delta(H_{x_0,\ell})$ is δ times a square in $K(x_0) = K$, and hence τ must map this discriminant to its negative, meaning that it acts as an odd permutation on the 2^ℓ points of $f^{-\ell}(x_0)$. In particular, we have $\tau \in G_\infty \setminus M_\ell$, proving the forward implication of part (2) of the theorem.

We will now make some further adjustments to this labeling. For any $m \geq 1$, suppose that we have already verified that for all nodes x up to level $m-1$, we have

$$\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x_0) \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in G_\infty,$$

a condition which holds vacuously at level 0. Given a node y at level m , the Galois orbit $G'_\infty(y)$ either coincides with $G_\infty(y)$ or is a subset of exactly half the size, since $[G_\infty : G'_\infty] = 2$.

In the former case, for every node w in the same orbit $G'_\infty(y) = G_\infty(y)$, there is some $\rho_w \in G'_\infty$ such that $\rho_w(w) = \tau(w)$. Note that $\rho_w^{-1}\tau$ maps $\sqrt{\delta}$ to its negative and hence also maps $\sqrt{\Delta(H_{w,\ell})}$ to its negative, as once again, $\Delta(H_{w,\ell})$ is δ times a square in $K(w)$. Since $\rho_w^{-1}\tau$ fixes w , it follows that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\rho_w^{-1}\tau, w) = -1$. Thus, by equation (2), for any $\sigma \in G'_\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma\tau, w) &= \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, \tau(w)) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\rho_w, w) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\rho_w^{-1}\tau, w) = (+1) \cdot (+1) \cdot (-1) \\ &= (+1) \cdot (-1) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x_0) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, x_0) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma\tau, x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every σ in either of the two cosets of G'_∞ in G_∞ , we have $\text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, w) = \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x_0)$, as desired.

In the latter case, the Galois orbit $G_\infty(y)$ is the disjoint union of $V_{y,0} := G'_\infty(y)$ and $V_{y,1} := G'_\infty\tau(y)$. If $\text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, y) = +1$, then for each node $w \in V_{y,1}$, transpose the labels of two nodes that lie ℓ levels above w and share the same parent, as we did in Case 1. Since every $\sigma \in G'_\infty$ maps the set of nodes $V_{y,1}$ to itself, this change in labeling preserves the inclusion $G'_\infty \subseteq M_\ell$, but now we may assume that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, y) = -1$.

Therefore, for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in G'_\infty \subseteq M_\ell$, equation (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} (13) \quad \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_1\tau\sigma_2^{-1}, \sigma_2(y)) &= \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_1, \tau(y)) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\tau, y) \cdot \text{sgn}_\ell(\sigma_2^{-1}, \sigma_2(y)) \\ &= (+1) \cdot (-1) \cdot (+1) = -1. \end{aligned}$$

Given any $w \in V_{y,0}$ and any $\rho \in G'_\infty\tau$, we may write $w = \sigma_2(y)$ and $\rho = \sigma_1\tau\sigma_2^{-1}$ for some $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in G'_\infty$. Hence, equation (13) becomes

$$(14) \quad \text{sgn}_\ell(\rho, w) = -1 = \text{sgn}_\ell(\rho, x_0).$$

In addition, given any $w \in V_{y,1}$ and any $\rho \in G'_\infty \tau$, then applying equation (14) to ρ^{-1} , with $\rho(w)$ in the role of w , gives us

$$\operatorname{sgn}_\ell(\rho^{-1}, \rho(w)) = \operatorname{sgn}_\ell(\rho^{-1}, x_0).$$

Taking inverses once again gives $\operatorname{sgn}_\ell(\rho, w) = \operatorname{sgn}_\ell(\rho, x_0)$; so we have shown that this equality holds for every w in the Galois orbit $G_\infty(y)$ and any $\rho \in G_\infty$.

As in Case 1, repeat this relabeling for each of the Galois orbits of nodes at level m of the tree. Having completed this process at level m , it follows that for any node x at level m and any $\sigma \in G_\infty$, we have $\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma, x) = \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma, x_0)$. Hence, extending this relabeling inductively up the tree, we have $G_\infty \subseteq \widetilde{M}_\ell$, proving statement (1). \square

Remark 4.1. Theorem 1.2 is essentially the content of Theorem 4.9.3 of [21]. We have provided the proof above both to present a different argument and to illustrate that the result can be proven directly from our parity- and discriminant-based descriptions of the groups M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ .

We close this section with a result describing the action of the finite Galois group G_n on the finite tree T_n , and its relationship to the groups $M_{\ell,n}$ and $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ of Definition 2.4. The hypotheses are exactly the same as in Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 4.2. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2, and let $f \in K(z)$ be a rational function of degree 2 with critical points $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$. Let $\delta \in K^\times$ be the discriminant of the minimal polynomial of ξ_1 over K , which we understand to be $\delta = 1$ if $\xi_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, and let G_∞ be the arboreal Galois group for f over K , rooted at x_0 . Suppose that ξ_1 and ξ_2 collide at the ℓ -th iterate under f , for some integer $\ell \geq 2$. Let $n \geq 0$ be an integer.*

- (1) G_n is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$, via an appropriate labeling of the tree.
- (2) If $n \geq \ell$, then G_n is isomorphic to a subgroup of $M_{\ell,n}$ if and only if δ is a square in K .

Proof. Recall that throughout this paper, we understand an isomorphism between two groups that act on a tree to be an equivariant isomorphism, as described in the introduction. Therefore, statement (1) of Corollary 4.2 is immediate from statement (1) of Theorem 1.2.

For statement (2), since we have assumed $n \geq \ell$, we have that G_n is a subgroup of $M_{\ell,n}$ if and only if every $\overline{\sigma} \in G_n$ satisfies $\operatorname{sgn}_\ell(\overline{\sigma}, x_0) = +1$. By the definition $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ via restriction of elements of \widetilde{M}_ℓ , this latter condition holds if and only if every $\sigma \in G_\infty$ satisfies $\operatorname{sgn}_\ell(\sigma, x_0) = +1$. Thus, G_n is a subgroup of $M_{\ell,n}$ if and only if G_∞ is a subgroup of M_ℓ ; by statement (2) of Theorem 1.2, this occurs if and only if δ is a square in K . \square

5. ODD COUSINS

In this section, we investigate certain aspects of the group M_ℓ .

Definition 5.1. Fix a labeling on the tree T_∞ and an integer $\ell \geq 2$, and let M_ℓ be the associated subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}(T_\infty)$, as in Definition 2.2. Let $\sigma \in M_\ell$.

- (1) Let y_0, y_1 be the two children of a node w , i.e., the two nodes connected to w on the level above w . We say that σ

$$\text{acts } \ell\text{-positively above } w \text{ if } \operatorname{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_0) = \operatorname{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_1) = +1,$$

or that σ

acts ℓ -negatively above w if $\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_0) = \text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_1) = -1$.

- (2) Let $n \geq \ell$, let $m := 2^{n-\ell}$, and let w_1, \dots, w_m be the nodes that lie $n - \ell$ levels above a node x . We say that σ is an (ℓ, n) -odd cousins map above x if the set

$$\{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid \sigma \text{ acts } \ell\text{-negatively above } w_i\}$$

has odd cardinality. Otherwise, we say σ is an (ℓ, n) -even cousins map above x .

When restricting to the finite subtree T_n , we define odd cousins and even cousins maps $\sigma \in M_{\ell, n}$ similarly.

Note that the two signs $\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_0)$ and $\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_1)$ in Definition 5.1(1) must indeed be equal. To see this, suppose y_0 has label $w0$, and y_1 has label $w1$. If $\text{sgn}_1(\sigma, w) = +1$, meaning that $\sigma(w0) = \sigma(w)0$ and $\sigma(w1) = \sigma(w)1$, then σ permutes the labels (each of length $\ell - 1$) of the $2^{\ell-1}$ nodes above $w0$ with parity given by $\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_0)$, and σ separately permutes the labels of the $2^{\ell-1}$ nodes above $w1$ with parity given by $\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_1)$. Therefore,

$$\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_0) \cdot \text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_1) = \text{sgn}_{\ell}(\sigma, w) = +1,$$

where the second equality is because $\sigma \in M_{\ell}$. On the other hand, if $\text{sgn}_1(\sigma, w) = -1$, so that $\sigma(w0) = \sigma(w)1$ and $\sigma(w1) = \sigma(w)0$, then define λ to be the automorphism of the tree T_{ℓ} rooted at w given by $\lambda(w0S) = w1S$ and $\lambda(w1S) = w0S$, for any string of symbols $S \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell-1}$ of length $\ell - 1$. (That is, λ simply swaps the two subtrees $T_{\ell-1}$ rooted at y_0 and y_1 .) Note that λ acts ℓ levels above w by $2^{\ell-1}$ transpositions of labels of length ℓ , and hence $\text{sgn}_{\ell}(\lambda, w) = +1$, since $\ell \geq 2$. In addition, $\text{sgn}_1(\sigma\lambda) = +1$, so we may apply the result of the previous case, yielding

$$\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_0) \cdot \text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_1) = \text{sgn}_{\ell}(\sigma\lambda, w) = \text{sgn}_{\ell}(\sigma, w) \cdot \text{sgn}_{\ell}(\lambda, w) = +1.$$


Thus, in either case, we do indeed have $\text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_0) = \text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\sigma, y_1)$.

As for part (2) of Definition 5.1, observe that in the language of parent and child nodes, the four nodes $x00$, $x01$, $x10$, and $x11$ lying 2 levels above a node x form a set of cousins, since they share a common grandparent x . (More generally, the 2^{ℓ} nodes that are ℓ levels above x form a set of $(\ell - 1)$ -th cousins, in this same family tree analogy.) For any $n \geq \ell$, the 2^n nodes that lie n levels above x are naturally partitioned into $m := 2^{n-\ell}$ sets of 2^{ℓ} nodes, with one such set above each of the nodes w_1, \dots, w_m in Definition 5.1(2); and $\sigma \in M_{\ell}$ must act with even parity on each of these m sets.

Example 5.2. We illustrate a $(2, 3)$ -odd cousins map σ above a node x in Figure 2, restricted to T_3 . Observe that $\text{sgn}_2(\sigma, 0) = \text{sgn}_2(\sigma, 1) = +1$ as part of the restriction that $\sigma \in M_2$. However, σ acts 2-negatively above 0 (since for both of the children y of 0, we have $\text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y) = -1$), but 2-positively above 1. Since σ acts 2-negatively above an odd number of these $m = 2^{3-2} = 2$ nodes $w = 0, 1$, it is indeed a $(2, 3)$ -odd cousins map above x .

The following result is a byproduct of the proof of [25, Lemma 1.6], but we include a self-contained proof here for the convenience of the reader, given our slightly different context.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $n \geq 1$, and fix a labeling on the tree T_n . Let $G \subseteq \text{Aut}(T_n)$ be a subgroup. Suppose the quotient of G formed by restricting to the subtree T_{n-1} is the full group $\text{Aut}(T_{n-1})$. Suppose further that there exists $\sigma_n \in G$ that acts trivially on T_{n-1} and in addition satisfies $\text{sgn}_n(\sigma_n, x_0) = -1$. Then $G = \text{Aut}(T_n)$.*

FIGURE 2. Example 5.2: a (2,3)-odd cousins map above x on T_3

Proof. Let E be the (normal) subgroup of $\sigma \in G$ acting trivially on T_{n-1} , so that $G' := G/E$ is the quotient given by restriction to T_{n-1} . By hypothesis, we have $G' \cong \text{Aut}(T_{n-1})$. Let S be the set of the $m := 2^{n-1}$ nodes at level $n-1$ of the tree, and let \mathbb{F}_2 denote the field of 2 elements. Writing elements of the m -dimensional \mathbb{F}_2 -vector space \mathbb{F}_2^S as $v = (v_y)$, where $v_y \in \mathbb{F}_2$ is the coordinate of v at entry $y \in S$, the quotient group G' acts on \mathbb{F}_2^S by $\tau(v)_y = v_{\tau^{-1}(y)}$, i.e., by permuting the coordinates.

For each $\sigma \in E$, let $w(\sigma) \in \mathbb{F}_2^S$ be the vector whose y -entry is 0 if $\text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y) = +1$, or 1 if $\text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y) = -1$; that is, $w(\sigma)_y := (1 - \text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y))/2$, viewed as an element of \mathbb{F}_2 . Define W to be the set of vectors $w(\sigma)$, for all $\sigma \in E$. Then W is a subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^S . Define

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} V &:= \left\{ v \in \mathbb{F}_2^S \mid \sum_{y \in S} v_y \cdot w(\sigma)_y = 0 \forall \sigma \in E \right\} \\ &= \left\{ v \in \mathbb{F}_2^S \mid \prod_{y \in S} \text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y)^{v_y} = +1 \forall \sigma \in E \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the set of all $v \in \mathbb{F}_2^S$ such that every $\sigma \in E$ is nontrivial above an even number of the nodes $y \in S$ at which $v_y = 1$.

Here, \cdot is the standard dot product, which is a non-degenerate bilinear form on \mathbb{F}_2^S . Observe that V is the orthogonal complement of W in \mathbb{F}_2^S with respect to \cdot , and hence V is an \mathbb{F}_2 -subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^S satisfying

$$\dim V + \dim W = |S|.$$

(This identity holds even in characteristic 2, in spite of the fact that $V \cap W$ may be nontrivial. Indeed, V is the kernel of the $(\dim W) \times |S|$ matrix whose rows are a set of basis vectors for W .) Moreover, V is also an $\mathbb{F}_2[G']$ -module, because for any $\tau \in G'$ and $v \in V$, we have $\tau(v) \in V$. To see this, lift τ to G . Then for any $\sigma \in E$ and $y \in S$, equation (2) gives

$$\text{sgn}_1(\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau, \tau^{-1}(y)) = \text{sgn}_1(\tau^{-1}, \sigma(y)) \cdot \text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y) \cdot \text{sgn}_1(\tau, \tau^{-1}(y)) = \text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y),$$

where the second equality is because $\sigma(y) = y$, and hence

$$\text{sgn}_1(\tau^{-1}, \sigma(y)) = \text{sgn}_1(\tau^{-1}, y) = \text{sgn}_1(\tau, \tau^{-1}(y)).$$

Therefore,

$$\prod_{y \in S} \text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y)^{\tau(v)_y} = \prod_{y \in S} \text{sgn}_1(\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau, \tau^{-1}(y))^{v_{\tau^{-1}(y)}} = \prod_{y \in S} \text{sgn}_1(\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau, y)^{v_y},$$

which is $+1$ for all $\sigma \in E$, since $v \in V$. Thus, $\tau(v) \in V$; so V is indeed an $\mathbb{F}_2[G']$ -module.

We claim that V is trivial. To prove the claim, observe (by the orbit-stabilizer theorem) that for every $v \in V$, the orbit $G'v$ has cardinality dividing $|G'| = |\text{Aut}(T_{n-1})|$, which is a

power of 2. Thus, the only way $|G'v|$ can be odd is if $|G'v| = 1$, that is, if v is fixed by every element of G' . Observe further that since G' acts transitively on S , the only two elements of \mathbb{F}_2^S that are fixed by every element of G' are $(0, \dots, 0)$ and $(1, \dots, 1)$. That is, the only G' -orbits in \mathbb{F}_2^S of odd order are $\{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ and $\{(1, \dots, 1)\}$.

If V were nontrivial, then $|V|$ would be even, because V is a finite-dimensional \mathbb{F}_2 -vector space. Partitioning V into G' -orbits, and observing that one of those orbits is the odd-cardinality orbit $\{(0, \dots, 0)\}$, there must be another odd-cardinality orbit in V , and hence $(1, \dots, 1) \in V$. Therefore, for every $\sigma \in E$, the definition of V yields that $\text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y) = +1$ for an even number of nodes $y \in S$. Because each such σ fixes all of the nodes at level $n - 1$, it follows that for every $\sigma \in E$, we have $\text{sgn}_n(\sigma, x_0) = +1$, contradicting the hypothesis about σ_n . This contradiction proves our claim.

Thus, we have

$$\dim W = 0 + \dim W = \dim V + \dim W = |S| = m = 2^{n-1},$$

and therefore W is the full vector space \mathbb{F}_2^S . Hence, E is the full group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^m$ of all combinations of swaps and non-swaps above each of the nodes $y \in S$. Because the quotient $G' = G/E$ is the full group $\text{Aut}(T_{n-1})$, it follows that $G = \text{Aut}(T_n)$. \square

Whereas Proposition 5.3 concerns odd versus even parities of permutations, the following concerns only even permutations, but distinguishing odd cousins from even cousins maps.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $n \geq \ell \geq 2$ be integers, fix a labeling on T_n , and let $G \subseteq M_{\ell, n}$ be a subgroup. Suppose that the quotient of G formed by restricting to the subtree T_{n-1} is the full group $M_{\ell, n-1}$. Suppose further that there exists $\sigma_n \in G$ that acts trivially on T_{n-1} and is an (ℓ, n) -odd cousins map above x_0 . Then $G = M_{\ell, n}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 5.3, let E be the (normal) subgroup of elements $\sigma \in G$ that act trivially on T_{n-1} . Also as before, let S be the set of the $m := 2^{n-1}$ nodes at level $n - 1$ of the tree, let \mathbb{F}_2 denote the field of 2 elements, and for any $v \in \mathbb{F}_2^S$, write $v_y \in \mathbb{F}_2$ for the coordinate of v at entry $y \in S$. Once again, the quotient $G' := G/E$ given by restriction to T_{n-1} acts on \mathbb{F}_2^S by permuting the coordinates, and our hypotheses say that $G' \cong M_{\ell, n-1}$.

Also as in that proof, let W be the subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^S consisting of all vectors $w(\sigma)$ given by $w(\sigma)_y := (1 - \text{sgn}_1(\sigma, y))/2$, for all $\sigma \in E$. Similarly, define the subspace V as in equation (15). As before, V and W are $\mathbb{F}_2[G']$ -modules with $\dim V + \dim W = |S|$.

For each node u at level $n - \ell$ of the tree, let $S_u \subseteq S$ be the set of $2^{\ell-1}$ nodes at level $n - 1$ that are above u . Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^S$ be the subspace of vectors that are constant on each such set S_u . Note that $\dim X = 2^{n-\ell}$, since that is the number of nodes at level $n - \ell$. In addition, X is invariant under the action of G' .

Thus, G' acts on the quotient vector space \mathbb{F}_2^S/X . As before, for every

$$[v] := X + v \in \mathbb{F}_2^S/X,$$

the orbit $G'[v]$ has cardinality dividing $|G'| = |M_{\ell, n-1}|$, which is a power of 2. The G' -orbit of the zero vector $[0] \in \mathbb{F}_2^S/X$ clearly has only one element.

Claim 1: There is exactly one nonzero one-element orbit in \mathbb{F}_2^S/X .

To prove Claim 1, we define a particular vector $\tilde{v} \in \mathbb{F}_2^S$ as follows. Each node u at level $n - \ell$ of the tree has two children, $u0$ and $u1$, on level $n - \ell + 1$. Let S_{u0} be the set of $2^{\ell-2}$ nodes at level $n - 1$ that lie above $u0$, and let S_{u1} be the set of $2^{\ell-2}$ nodes at level $n - 1$ that

lie above $u1$, so that S_u is the disjoint union of S_{u0} and S_{u1} . Define \tilde{v} by setting

$$\tilde{v}_y := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y \in S_{u0} \text{ for some node } u \text{ at level } n - \ell, \\ 1 & \text{if } y \in S_{u1} \text{ for some node } u \text{ at level } n - \ell, \end{cases}$$

for each $y \in S$. (That is, the coordinates of \tilde{v} consist of alternating blocks of $2^{\ell-2}$ 0's and of $2^{\ell-2}$ 1's.) Clearly any $v \in \mathbb{F}_2^S$ belongs to the coset $[\tilde{v}]$ if and only if v is constant on each block S_{ui} of $2^{\ell-2}$ nodes, but not constant on any block S_u of $2^{\ell-1}$ nodes. In that case, applying any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(T_{n-1})$ to v — and hence applying any $\sigma \in G'$ — yields a vector σv with the same property. Thus, we have verified that $\sigma[\tilde{v}] = [\tilde{v}]$, and hence that the orbit $G'[\tilde{v}]$ does indeed have only one element. Clearly $\tilde{v} \notin X$, and hence $[\tilde{v}] \neq [0]$.

To finish the proof of Claim 1, suppose $v' \in \mathbb{F}_2^S$ has the property that the orbit $G'[v']$ has only one element. We must show that $[v']$ is either $[0]$ or $[\tilde{v}]$.

We begin by showing that v' is constant on each block S_{ui} of $2^{\ell-2}$ elements. To see this, given any node u at level $n - \ell$, pick a node $y \in S_{u0}$. For any two nodes $z_1, z_2 \in S_{u1}$, there is some $\tau \in G'$ that swaps z_1 and z_2 but fixes y , since G' acts as $\text{Aut}(T_{\ell-1})$ on the copy of $T_{\ell-1}$ rooted at u . Now $\tau v' \in \tau[v'] = [v']$, since the orbit $G'[v']$ has only one element. The difference $\tau v' - v'$ therefore belongs to X and hence is constant on S_u . But $(\tau v')_y = (v')_y$, so this constant difference is 0. Thus, we have

$$(v')_{z_1} = (\tau v')_{z_1} = (v')_{z_2}.$$

Since this identity holds for all $z_1, z_2 \in S_{u1}$, it follows that v' is constant on S_{u1} . By a similar argument, v' is also constant on S_{u0} , as desired.

Suppose that there is a node u at level $n - \ell$ for which v' is constant on S_u . Then for any node t at level $n - \ell$, there is some $\tau' \in G$ for which $\tau' u = t$, because G' acts transitively at that level. As in the previous paragraph, we have $\tau'[v'] = [v']$, so that $\tau' v' - v' \in X$, and hence $\tau' v' - v'$ is constant on S_t . But $\tau' v'$ is also constant on S_t , since v' is constant on S_u . Thus, v' itself is constant on S_t . That is, we have shown that if v' is constant on even one block S_u of $2^{\ell-1}$ nodes, then it is constant on all such blocks.

By the previous two paragraphs, either v' is constant on all blocks S_u , or else on each block S_u , v' takes on one constant value $i \in \{0, 1\}$ on S_{u0} , and the other constant value $1 - i$ on S_{u1} . In the first of these cases, we have $v' \in X$; in the second, we have $v' - \tilde{v} \in X$. That is, we have either $[v'] = [0]$ or $[v'] = [\tilde{v}]$, proving Claim 1.

Claim 2: The space V is $V = X$, i.e. V/X is trivial.

To see this, suppose not. Then $|V/X|$ is even, since it is a nontrivial power of 2. Yet again following the proof of Proposition 5.3, partition V/X into G -orbits. Since one of those orbits is the single-element $G'[0]$, some other orbit in V must also have odd cardinality. But as we noted, all orbits are a power of 2 in cardinality, and hence V/X must contain the other single-element orbit $[\tilde{v}]$. That is, $\tilde{v} \in V$. Our hypotheses state that E contains an (ℓ, n) -odd cousins map λ . In particular, there are an odd number of sets S_u for which λ is nontrivial above an odd number of nodes of S_{u1} . It follows that

$$\prod_{y \in S} \text{sgn}_1(\lambda, y)^{\tilde{v}_y} = \prod_u \prod_{y \in S_{u1}} \text{sgn}_1(\lambda, y) = -1,$$

where the second product is over all nodes u at level $n - \ell$. By definition of V , it follows that $\tilde{v} \notin V$, a contradiction.

Claim 2 follows: we have $V = X$. Hence,

$$\log_2 |E| = \dim W = |S| - \dim V = |S| - \dim X = 2^{n-1} - 2^{n-\ell},$$

and therefore

$$\log_2 |G| = \log_2 |E| + \log_2 |M_{\ell, n-1}| = (2^{n-1} - 2^{n-\ell}) + (2^{n-1} - 2^{n-\ell}) = 2^n - 2^{n-\ell+1} = \log_2 |M_{\ell, n}|$$

by equation (3). Since $G \subseteq M_{\ell, n}$, it follows that $G = M_{\ell, n}$. \square

Theorem 5.5. *Fix a labeling on the tree T_∞ and an integer $\ell \geq 2$. Let $n \geq 0$ be an integer, and define $\psi_n : M_{\ell, n} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}^n$ by $\psi_n(\sigma) := (e_1, \dots, e_n)$, where for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have*

$$e_i := \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}_i(\sigma, x_0) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1, \\ +1 & \text{if } i \geq \ell \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is an } (\ell, i)\text{-even cousins map above } x_0, \\ -1 & \text{if } i \geq \ell \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is an } (\ell, i)\text{-odd cousins map above } x_0. \end{cases}$$

Then ψ_n is a surjective group homomorphism, and $\ker \psi_n$ is the commutator subgroup of $M_{\ell, n}$. In particular, the abelianization $M_{\ell, n}^{\text{ab}}$ is isomorphic to $\{\pm 1\}^n$.

Proof. It is straightforward to see that the composition of two (ℓ, i) -even cousins maps, or of two (ℓ, i) -odd cousins maps, is an (ℓ, i) -even cousins map. Similarly, the composition of one (ℓ, i) -even and one (ℓ, i) -odd cousins map is an (ℓ, i) -odd cousins map. It is also well known that the composition of two like-sign permutations is even, and of two opposite-sign permutations is odd. Thus, ψ_n is a group homomorphism. In addition, any permutation and its inverse have the same sign, and similarly for even-cousins and odd-cousins maps. Therefore, for any $\sigma, \tau \in M_{\ell, n}$, the commutator $[\sigma, \tau] := \sigma\tau\sigma^{-1}\tau^{-1}$ must lie in $\ker \psi_n$.

For the rest of the proof, we proceed by induction on $n \geq 0$. The desired result is trivially true for $n = 0$. For each $n \geq 1$, assume the statement is true for $n - 1$, and let $E_n \subseteq M_{\ell, n}$ be the normal subgroup of elements of $M_{\ell, n}$ acting trivially on the first $n - 1$ levels of the tree. For $n \leq \ell - 1$, we have $M_{\ell, n} = \operatorname{Aut}(T_n)$, and hence half of the elements of E_n are even, and half are odd. Similarly, for $n \geq \ell$, half of the elements of E_n are (ℓ, n) -even cousins maps, and the other half are (ℓ, n) -odd cousins maps. We also have $M_{\ell, n}/E_n \cong M_{\ell, n-1}$ by restricting to the subtree T_{n-1} .

To see that ψ_n is surjective, consider an arbitrary $(e_1, \dots, e_n) \in \{\pm 1\}^n$. By our inductive assumption of surjectivity, there is some $\bar{\sigma} \in M_{\ell, n-1}$ such that

$$\psi_{n-1}(\bar{\sigma}) = (e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}).$$

Lift $\bar{\sigma}$ to some $\sigma \in M_{\ell, n}$, so that

$$\psi_n(\sigma) = (e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}, \tilde{e}_n) \quad \text{for some } \tilde{e}_n \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

If $\tilde{e}_n = e_n$, we are done. Otherwise, if $n \leq \ell - 1$, then pick $\tau \in E_n$ that is odd; or if $n \geq \ell$, pick $\tau \in E_n$ that is an odd cousins map. Then $\psi_n(\tau\sigma) = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$, as desired.

It remains to show, given $\sigma \in \ker(\psi_n)$, that σ belongs to the commutator subgroup of $M_{\ell, n}$. Restricting σ to T_{n-1} yields $\bar{\sigma} \in M_{\ell, n-1}$, which by our inductive hypothesis is a product of commutators

$$\bar{\sigma} = \prod_{i=1}^N [\bar{\rho}_i, \bar{\tau}_i]$$

with $\bar{\rho}_i, \bar{\tau}_i \in M_{\ell, n-1}$. Lifting $\bar{\rho}_i$ and $\bar{\tau}_i$ to $\rho_i, \tau_i \in M_{\ell, n}$, we have that

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^N [\rho_i, \tau_i] \right)^{-1} \sigma \in \ker(\psi_n) \cap E_n.$$

If the expression above is a product of commutators, then so is σ . Thus, we may assume without loss that $\sigma \in \ker(\psi_n) \cap E_n$.

Recall that the two children of x_0 are the nodes labeled 0 and 1. Write

$$\sigma = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1) \in E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1},$$

where σ_i describes the action of σ on the copy of T_{n-1} rooted at node i . In what follows, we will say that σ_i is even if it is an even permutation of the 2^{n-1} nodes at the top level of the tree T_{n-1} that it acts on; otherwise, we will say σ_i is odd. We consider several cases.

First, suppose that $n \leq \ell - 1$ and both σ_0 and σ_1 are even. Then by our inductive hypothesis, both σ_0 and σ_1 are products of commutators in $M_{\ell, n-1}$. For each commutator $[\rho, \tau]$ in the product for σ_0 , we may define

$$\tilde{\rho} := (\rho, e) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\tau} := (\tau, e),$$

both of which are elements of $\text{Aut}(T_n) = M_{\ell, n}$. Thus, (σ_0, e) is a product of commutators $[\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\tau}]$. By similar reasoning, (e, σ_1) is also a product of commutators in $M_{\ell, n}$, and hence so is $\sigma = (\sigma_0, e)(e, \sigma_1)$.

Second, suppose that $n = \ell$, in which case σ_0 and σ_1 are both necessarily even, since we assumed that $e_\ell = +1$, and hence that σ is an even-cousins map. Again by our inductive hypothesis, both σ_0 and σ_1 are products of commutators in $M_{\ell, \ell-1}$. Fix $\theta \in E_{\ell-1}$ that is odd. For each commutator $[\rho, \tau]$ in the product for σ_0 , define

$$\tilde{\rho} := \begin{cases} (\rho, e) & \text{if } \rho \text{ is even,} \\ (\rho, \theta) & \text{if } \rho \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\tilde{\rho} \in M_{\ell, \ell}$, because our definition ensures that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\tilde{\rho}, x_0) = +1$. Define $\tilde{\tau} \in M_{\ell, \ell}$ similarly. Then (σ_0, e) is a product of the commutators $[\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\tau}]$, because any appearances of θ in the second coordinate will cancel within the individual commutators. Similarly, (e, σ_1) is also a product of commutators in $M_{\ell, \ell}$, and hence so is $\sigma = (\sigma_0, e)(e, \sigma_1)$.

Third, suppose that $n \geq \ell + 1$ and that both σ_0 and σ_1 are even-cousins maps in $M_{\ell, n-1}$. Then both σ_0 and σ_1 are products of commutators in $M_{\ell, n-1}$, by our inductive hypothesis. Recalling the automorphism $\theta \in E_{\ell-1}$ from the previous case, define $\theta_{n-1} \in M_{\ell, n-1}$ to be the automorphism of T_{n-1} given by

$$\theta_{n-1}(yw) := \theta(y)w$$

for each node y at level $\ell - 1$ and each word $w \in \{0, 1\}^{n-\ell}$. (That is, θ_{n-1} acts like θ at level $\ell - 1$ but makes no further permutations of the labels above that level.) For each commutator $[\rho, \tau]$ in the product for σ_0 , define

$$\tilde{\rho} := \begin{cases} (\rho, e) & \text{if } \text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\rho, 0) = +1, \\ (\rho, \theta_{n-1}) & \text{if } \text{sgn}_{\ell-1}(\rho, 0) = -1. \end{cases}$$

As in the previous case, our definition ensures that $\text{sgn}_\ell(\tilde{\rho}, x_0) = +1$, so that $\tilde{\rho} \in M_{\ell, n}$. Define $\tilde{\tau} \in M_{\ell, n}$ similarly. As in the previous two cases, using the commutators $[\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\tau}]$, it follows that $\sigma = (\sigma_0, e)(e, \sigma_1)$ is a product of commutators in $M_{\ell, n}$.

Finally, suppose either that $n \leq \ell - 1$, and both σ_0 and σ_1 are odd; or that $n \geq \ell + 1$, and both σ_0 and σ_1 are odd-cousins maps. Let $\lambda \in M_{\ell,n}$ be the automorphism given by $\lambda(0w) = 1w$ and $\lambda(1w) = 0w$, for every word $w \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1}$. (That is, λ simply exchanges the two halves of the tree.) It is immediate from the definition of the group that $\lambda \in M_{\ell,n}$, since $\text{sgn}_\ell(\lambda, y) = +1$ for every node y of the tree.

If $n \leq \ell - 1$, choose $\rho \in E_{n-1}$ that is odd; of if $n \geq \ell + 1$, choose $\rho \in E_{n-1}$ that is an odd-cousins map. Define μ to be the commutator

$$\mu := [\lambda, (\rho, e)] = (\rho^{-1}, \rho) \in E_n,$$

which is odd (respectively, an odd-cousins map) on each half of the n -th level of the tree, if $n \leq \ell - 1$ (respectively, if $n \geq \ell + 1$). Thus,

$$\sigma\mu^{-1} = (\sigma_0\rho, \sigma_1\rho^{-1}) \in E_n$$

is even (respectively, an even-cousins map) on each half of the tree. By the first (respectively, third) case above, $\sigma\mu^{-1}$ is a product of commutators. Therefore, σ is also such a product, because μ is a commutator. \square

6. ATTAINING THE FULL GROUP

Before proving Theorem 1.3, we must define the quantities $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots$ referred to in the statement of that result. To do so, we recall that the *cross ratio* of four points $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ is

$$\text{CR}(a, b, c, d) := \frac{(a-b)(c-d)}{(a-c)(b-d)},$$

with the usual understanding of what this expression means if any one of the four points is ∞ , i.e. the two terms containing ∞ cancel. (For example, if $c = \infty$, the cross ratio above is $-(a-b)/(b-d)$.)

We also set the following notation throughout this section. As in Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, assume that the two critical points $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ of the quadratic rational function $f \in K(z)$ collide at the ℓ -th iterate, for some $\ell \geq 2$. Observe that ξ_1 and ξ_2 cannot both be periodic; otherwise, if $n \geq \ell$ is a multiple of both periods, we would have

$$\xi_1 = f^n(\xi_1) = f^n(\xi_2) = \xi_2,$$

a contradiction. Thus, it cannot be that each of ξ_1 and ξ_2 is in the forward orbit of the other. Without loss, then, we may assume that ξ_2 is not in the forward orbit of ξ_1 .

Set the following notation:

- $\delta \in K^\times$: the discriminant of the minimal polynomial of ξ_1 over K ,
or $\delta = 1$ if $\xi_1 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$
- L : the field $L := K(\sqrt{\delta})$
- $F = (P, Q)$: a homogeneous lift of f , with $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$
- (s_0, t_0) : a lift of the point $x_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ to $K \times K \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$
- (η_i, θ_i) : for each $i = 1, 2$, a lift of the critical point ξ_i to $L \times L \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$
- (P_n, Q_n) : for each integer $n \geq 1$, write $(P_n, Q_n) = F^n$
- H_n : the polynomial $H_n := t_0 P_n - s_0 Q_n$, as in Corollary 3.5

In particular, $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ are relatively prime homogeneous polynomials of degree 2 such that $f(z) = P(z, 1)/Q(z, 1)$. In addition, we have $x_0 = s_0/t_0$, with the usual understanding of $1/0$ as the point ∞ .

Definition 6.1. With notation as above, define $\kappa_n \in L = K(\sqrt{\delta})$ by

$$\kappa_n := \begin{cases} \Delta(H_n) & \text{if } 1 \leq n \leq \ell - 1, \\ \text{CR}(x_0, f^{n-\ell+1}(\xi_1), f^n(\xi_2), f(\xi_2)) & \text{if } n \geq \ell + 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\kappa_\ell := \begin{cases} \Delta(H_\ell) & \text{if } \sqrt{\delta} \notin K, \\ \frac{f(\xi_2) - f^{\ell-1}(\xi_2)}{f(\xi_2) - f^{\ell-1}(\xi_1)} \cdot \text{CR}(x_0, f(\xi_1), f^\ell(\xi_2), f(\xi_2)) & \text{if } \sqrt{\delta} \in K \text{ and } \ell \geq 3, \\ \Delta(\theta_2 P - \eta_2 Q) \cdot \text{CR}(x_0, f(\xi_1), f^2(\xi_2), f(\xi_2)) & \text{if } \sqrt{\delta} \in K \text{ and } \ell = 2. \end{cases}$$

If the above formulas would result in $\kappa_n = \infty$, then re-define $\kappa_n := 0$.

The final case of Definition 6.1, that the original formula would give $\kappa_n = \infty$, can only arise from one of the cross ratio terms, and then only if $f^n(\xi_2) = x_0$.

The special case $n = \ell$ in Definition 6.1 corresponds, not coincidentally, to the lowest level of the tree at which the groups M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ differ. Indeed, as we saw in the proof of Theorem 1.2, the discriminant $\Delta(H_\ell)$ is a square in K if and only if δ is also a square in K .

Note also that if we replace the lifts F and (s_0, t_0) of f and x_0 by other lifts \tilde{F} and $(\tilde{s}_0, \tilde{t}_0)$, the effect is to multiply each H_n by some $c \in K^\times$. The discriminant $\Delta(H_n)$ is then multiplied by an even power of c , and hence by a square in K^\times . Similar reasoning applies to $\Delta(\theta_2 P - \eta_2 Q)$ in the case that $\sqrt{\delta} \in K$. Thus, although a different choice of lift may change the exact values of $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_\ell$, it does not change whether any of the products $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ of Theorem 1.3 are squares. This condition is also not affected by K -rational coordinate changes, as the next result shows.

Proposition 6.2. *With notation as above, let $\nu \in \text{PGL}(2, K)$, let $g := \nu \circ f \circ \nu^{-1}$, and let $y_0 := \nu(x_0)$. Let $\tilde{\kappa}_1, \tilde{\kappa}_2, \dots \in L = K(\sqrt{\delta})$ be the associated quantities for the preimages of y_0 under iterates of g . Then for each $n \geq 1$, there exists $c_n \in K^\times$ such that $\tilde{\kappa}_n = c_n^2 \kappa_n$.*

Proof. Observe that the K -rational coordinate change ν does not change the discriminant δ of the critical points, except possibly by a factor of a square in K . In particular, the field $K(\sqrt{\delta})$ is the same for g as for f , and the choice of which of the three formulas used to define κ_ℓ also does not change.

In addition, cross ratios are well known to be unaffected by coordinate change, as is easy to check by hand. Hence, it suffices to show that the discriminants $\Delta(H_n)$ and (when $\sqrt{\delta} \in K$) $\Delta(\theta_2 P - \eta_2 Q)$ are affected only by square factors in K under coordinate changes. We will prove this fact for $\Delta(H_n)$; the proof for $\Delta(\theta_2 P - \eta_2 Q)$ is the same with $n = 1$.

Lift f to $F = (P, Q)$ and x_0 to (s_0, t_0) as in the notation presented just before Definition 6.1. Lift ν to $N = (R, S)$, where

$$R = aX + bY \quad \text{and} \quad S = cX + dY, \quad \text{with} \quad a, b, c, d \in K \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon := ad - bc \in K^\times.$$

Then $G := N \circ F \circ N^{-1}$ is a lift of g , and $(u_0, v_0) := N(s_0, t_0)$ is a lift of y_0 .

For any $n \geq 1$, write $F^n = (P_n, Q_n)$ and $G^n = (\tilde{P}_n, \tilde{Q}_n)$, so that

$$\tilde{P}_n = aP_n \circ N^{-1} + bQ_n \circ N^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Q}_n = cP_n \circ N^{-1} + dQ_n \circ N^{-1},$$

Therefore, writing $H_n := t_0P_n - s_0Q_n$ and $\tilde{H}_n := v_0\tilde{P}_n - u_0\tilde{Q}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}_n &= (cs_0 + dt_0)(aP_n \circ N^{-1} + bQ_n \circ N^{-1}) - (as_0 + bt_0)(cP_n \circ N^{-1} + dQ_n \circ N^{-1}) \\ &= adt_0P_n \circ N^{-1} + bcs_0Q_n \circ N^{-1} - bct_0P_n \circ N^{-1} - ads_0Q_n \circ N^{-1} \\ &= (ad - bc)H_n \circ N^{-1} = \varepsilon H_n \circ N^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Write $N^{-1} = (R', S') = (a'X + b'Y, c'X + d'Y)$. Then a simple computation shows

$$\text{Res}(R', S') = a'd' - b'c' = (ad - bc)^{-1} = \text{Res}(R, S)^{-1} = \varepsilon^{-1}.$$

Hence, applying Theorem 3.4 with $J = H_n$ to the composition $H_n \circ N^{-1}$, and writing $m := \deg(H_n) = 2^n$, we have

$$\Delta(H_n \circ N^{-1}) = (-1)^0 \Delta(H_n)^1 (\varepsilon^{-1})^{m(m-2)} \text{Res}(H_n, \varepsilon^{-1}) = \varepsilon^{-m(m-1)} \Delta(H_n),$$

where the second equality is because ε^{-1} is a constant, and hence

$$\text{Res}(H_n, \varepsilon^{-1}) = (\varepsilon^{-1})^{\deg(H_n)} = \varepsilon^{-m}.$$

Combining the above computations, we have

$$\Delta(\tilde{H}_n) = \Delta(\varepsilon H_n \circ N^{-1}) = \varepsilon^{2m-2} \Delta(H_n \circ N^{-1}) = \varepsilon^{-(m-2)(m-1)} \Delta(H_n),$$

and therefore the result follows by choosing $c_n := \varepsilon^{-(m-2)(m-1)/2} \in K^\times$. \square

Before proving Theorem 1.3, we also need two important technical results.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\ell \geq 2$, and suppose that*

$$(16) \quad f(z) = \frac{Az^2 + B}{z^2 + C} \quad \text{for some } A, B, C \in K \text{ with } AC - B \neq 0.$$

Suppose further that the two critical points $0, \infty$ of f collide at the ℓ -th iterate, and that ∞ is not in the forward orbit of 0 . Let $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ not be in the forward orbit of $f(\infty)$, and write $f^{-1}(x) = \{\pm y\}$ for some $y \in \overline{K}$. Define $m := 2^{\ell-2}$, and write

$$f^{-(\ell-1)}(y) = \{\pm\alpha_1, \dots, \pm\alpha_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-(\ell-1)}(-y) = \{\pm\alpha'_1, \dots, \pm\alpha'_m\},$$

for some $\alpha_i, \alpha'_i \in \overline{K}$. Then, possibly after reversing the roles of α_m and $-\alpha_m$, we have

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_i \right)^2 = 4q_{\ell-1} \cdot \text{CR}(x, f(0), f^\ell(\infty), f(\infty)),$$

where

$$q_{\ell-1} := (-C)^{2^{\ell-2}} \prod_{i=2}^{\ell-1} \left(\frac{f(\infty) - f^i(\infty)}{f(\infty) - f^i(0)} \right)^{2^{\ell-i-1}} \in K^\times.$$

Proof. Note that for any points $s, t \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ with $f(s) = t$, we do indeed have $f^{-1}(t) = \{\pm s\}$. In particular, the notation $f^{-1}(x) = \{\pm y\}$ in the statement of the lemma makes sense, as does the notation for $f^{-(\ell-1)}(\pm y)$; see Figure 3.

Observe that ∞ cannot be periodic; if it were, then choosing $n \geq \ell$ to be a multiple of the period, we would have $f^n(0) = f^n(\infty) = \infty$, contradicting the hypotheses. In addition, we have $f^n(0) \neq f(\infty)$ for all $n \geq 0$, because ∞ itself is the only immediate preimage of $f(\infty)$. Similarly, we also have $f^n(\infty) \neq f(\infty)$ for all $n \geq 2$.




FIGURE 3. Lemma 6.3

Generalize the formula for $q_{\ell-1}$ by defining

$$q_n := (-C)^{2^{n-1}} \prod_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{f(\infty) - f^i(\infty)}{f(\infty) - f^i(0)} \right)^{2^{n-i}}$$

for each $n \geq 1$. By the previous paragraph, the numerators and denominators in this product all lie in K^\times . Similarly, we have $C \in K^\times$; for if $C = 0$, then we would have $f(0) = \infty$. Thus, we have $q_n \in K^\times$.

Observe that for any $a, b, c \in \overline{K}$, we have

$$(17) \quad \frac{a^2 - b^2}{a^2 - c^2} = \text{CR}(a^2, b^2, c^2, \infty) = \text{CR}(f(a), f(b), f(c), f(\infty)),$$

since $f(z)$ is a linear fractional transformation applied to z^2 , and because, as noted in the proof of Proposition 6.2, cross ratios are unchanged under linear fractional transformations.

We claim that for each $n \geq 1$ and for any point $w \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ not in the forward orbit of $f(\infty)$, we have

$$(18) \quad \prod_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}} \beta_i^2 = q_n \cdot \left(\frac{w - f^n(0)}{w - f^n(\infty)} \right), \quad \text{where } f^{-n}(w) = \{\pm\beta_1, \dots, \pm\beta_{2^{n-1}}\}.$$

(The assumption that w is not in the forward orbit of $f(\infty)$ guarantees that both sides of equation (18) are defined and finite.) To prove this identity for $n = 1$, write $f^{-1}(w) = \{\pm\beta_1\}$. Solving the equation $f(\beta_1) = w$ for β_1^2 gives

$$\beta_1^2 = \frac{Cw - B}{A - w} = -C \left(\frac{w - B/C}{w - A} \right) = -C \left(\frac{w - f(0)}{w - f(\infty)} \right),$$

verifying the claim for $n = 1$, since $q_1 = -C$. Proceeding inductively, for any $n \geq 2$, suppose the claim is true for $n - 1$. Write $f^{-1}(w) = \{\pm u\}$ for some $u \in \overline{K}$, with

$$f^{-(n-1)}(u) = \{\pm\beta_1, \dots, \pm\beta_{2^{n-2}}\} \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-(n-1)}(-u) = \{\pm\beta_{1+2^{n-2}}, \dots, \pm\beta_{2^{n-1}}\}.$$

Then by our inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}} \beta_i^2 &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^{2^{n-2}} \beta_i^2 \right] \cdot \left[\prod_{i=1+2^{n-2}}^{2^{n-1}} \beta_i^2 \right] = \left[q_{n-1} \cdot \left(\frac{u - f^{n-1}(0)}{u - f^{n-1}(\infty)} \right) \right] \left[q_{n-1} \cdot \left(\frac{-u - f^{n-1}(0)}{-u - f^{n-1}(\infty)} \right) \right] \\ &= q_{n-1}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{u^2 - (f^{n-1}(0))^2}{u^2 - (f^{n-1}(\infty))^2} \right) = q_{n-1}^2 \cdot \text{CR} (w, f^n(0), f^n(\infty), f(\infty)) \\ &= q_{n-1}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{f(\infty) - f^n(\infty)}{f(\infty) - f^n(0)} \right) \left(\frac{w - f^n(0)}{w - f^n(\infty)} \right) = q_n \cdot \left(\frac{w - f^n(0)}{w - f^n(\infty)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality is by equation (17) and the fact that $f(u) = w$, and the sixth is by definition of q_n . Thus, we have proven the claim of equation (18).

Returning to the notation of the statement of the lemma, the claim gives

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_i \right)^2 = q_\ell \left(\frac{x - f^\ell(0)}{x - f^\ell(\infty)} \right) = q_\ell = q_{\ell-1}^2 \left(\frac{f(\infty) - f^\ell(\infty)}{f(\infty) - f^\ell(0)} \right) = q_{\ell-1}^2,$$

where the second and fourth equalities are because $f^\ell(0) = f^\ell(\infty)$, and the third is by definition of q_n . Thus, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_i = \pm q_{\ell-1},$$

and by switching the roles of α_m and $-\alpha_m$ if necessary, we may assume that this product is in fact $q_{\ell-1}$. In addition, because $f^\ell(0) = f^\ell(\infty)$ but $f^{\ell-1}(0) \neq f^{\ell-1}(\infty)$, we must have $f^{\ell-1}(\infty) = -f^{\ell-1}(0)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_i \right)^2 &= \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^2 + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i'^2 + 2 \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_i \\ &= q_{\ell-1} \cdot \left[\left(\frac{y - f^{\ell-1}(0)}{y - f^{\ell-1}(\infty)} \right) + \left(\frac{-y - f^{\ell-1}(0)}{-y - f^{\ell-1}(\infty)} \right) + 2 \right] \\ &= q_{\ell-1} \cdot \left[\frac{(y - f^{\ell-1}(0))^2 + (y + f^{\ell-1}(0))^2 + 2(y - f^{\ell-1}(0))(y + f^{\ell-1}(0))}{y^2 - (f^{\ell-1}(\infty))^2} \right] \\ &= q_{\ell-1} \cdot \left(\frac{4y^2}{y^2 - (f^{\ell-1}(\infty))^2} \right) = 4q_{\ell-1} \cdot \left(\frac{y^2 - 0^2}{y^2 - (f^{\ell-1}(\infty))^2} \right) \\ &= 4q_{\ell-1} \cdot \text{CR} (x, f(0), f^\ell(\infty), f(\infty)), \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is because $f^{\ell-1}(\infty) = -f^{\ell-1}(0)$, and the final equality is by equation (17) and the fact that $f(y) = x$. \square

The expression $\prod \alpha_i + \prod \alpha'_i$ in Lemma 6.3 involves each of the $2m = 2^{\ell-1}$ pairs of nodes at level ℓ of the tree. The next lemma involves all the nodes at level $n \geq \ell$, by partitioning them into $2^{n-\ell}$ such sets of $2^{\ell-1}$ pairs, and taking the product of all the resulting expressions $\prod \alpha_i + \prod \alpha'_i$. This product is important because its square is invariant under the action of M_ℓ on the tree. More precisely, even without squaring, it is invariant under (ℓ, n) -even cousins maps in M_ℓ , and it is sent to its negative by (ℓ, n) -odd cousins maps in M_ℓ .

Lemma 6.4. *Let $f(z) = (Az^2 + B)/(z^2 + C) \in K(z)$ and $\ell \geq 2$ as in Lemma 6.3, with the critical points $0, \infty$ colliding at the ℓ -th iterate, and with ∞ not in the forward orbit of 0 .*




FIGURE 4. Lemma 6.4

Let $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ not be in the forward orbit of $f(\infty)$, let $n \geq \ell + 1$, and define $m := 2^{\ell-2}$ and $R := 2^{n-\ell}$. Write the $2R$ points of $f^{-(n-\ell+1)}(x)$ as $\pm\beta_1, \dots, \pm\beta_R$. For each $j = 1, \dots, R$, write

$$f^{-(\ell-1)}(\beta_j) = \{\pm\alpha_{j,1}, \dots, \pm\alpha_{j,m}\} \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-(\ell-1)}(-\beta_j) = \{\pm\alpha'_{j,1}, \dots, \pm\alpha'_{j,m}\}.$$

If necessary, reverse the names of $\alpha_{j,m}$ and $-\alpha_{j,m}$ as dictated by Lemma 6.3 for β_j in the role of y . Then

$$\prod_{j=1}^R \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_{j,i} \right)^2 = r_n^2 \cdot \text{CR}(x, f^{n-\ell+1}(0), f^n(\infty), f(\infty)),$$

where

$$r_n := (4q_{\ell-1})^{2^{n-\ell-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n-\ell} \left(\frac{f^{\ell+i-1}(\infty) - f(\infty)}{f^i(0) - f(\infty)} \right)^{2^{n-\ell-i}} \in K^\times,$$

and where $q_{\ell-1} \in K^\times$ is as in Lemma 6.3.

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n \geq \ell$. Note that the lemma is only stated for $n \geq \ell + 1$, but the formula for r_n makes sense for $n = \ell$ and yields $r_\ell := \sqrt{4q_{\ell-1}}$, even though that value may not lie in K . With this definition of r_ℓ , the case $n = \ell$ is exactly the content of Lemma 6.3. For the rest of the proof, then, consider $n \geq \ell + 1$, and suppose the statement holds for $n - 1$.

Write $f^{-1}(x) = \{\pm y\}$. After re-indexing the β_i 's if necessary, we have

$$f^{-(n-\ell)}(y) = \{\pm\beta_1, \dots, \pm\beta_{R/2}\} \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-(n-\ell)}(-y) = \{\pm\beta_{1+R/2}, \dots, \pm\beta_R\}$$

as in Figure 4. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j=1}^R \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_{j,i} \right)^2 &= \prod_{j=1}^{R/2} \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_{j,i} \right)^2 \cdot \prod_{j=1+R/2}^R \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_{j,i} \right)^2 \\ &= r_{n-1}^2 \text{CR}(y, f^{n-\ell}(0), f^{n-1}(\infty), f(\infty)) \cdot r_{n-1}^2 \text{CR}(-y, f^{n-\ell}(0), f^{n-1}(\infty), f(\infty)) \\ &= \left[r_{n-1}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{f^{n-1}(\infty) - f(\infty)}{f^{n-\ell}(0) - f(\infty)} \right) \right]^2 \cdot \left(\frac{(y - f^{n-\ell}(0))(-y - f^{n-\ell}(0))}{(y - f^{n-1}(\infty))(-y - f^{n-1}(\infty))} \right) \\ &= r_n^2 \cdot \frac{y^2 - f^{n-\ell}(0)^2}{y^2 - f^{n-1}(\infty)^2} = r_n^2 \cdot \text{CR}(x, f^{n-\ell+1}(0), f^n(\infty), f(\infty)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is by the inductive hypothesis, the fourth is by the definition of r_n , and the fifth is by equation (17) and the fact that $f(y) = x$. \square

We are now prepared to prove our second main result, Theorem 1.3, which we restate below in expanded form as Theorem 6.5. As we have assumed throughout this section, recall that K is a field of characteristic different from 2, that $f \in K(z)$ is a rational function of degree 2 with critical points $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$, and that $\delta \in K^\times$ is the discriminant of the minimal polynomial of ξ_1 over K . We also define the quantities $\kappa_n \in L := K(\sqrt{\delta})$ as in Definition 6.1.

For any integer $n \geq 0$, recall from Definition 2.4 that $M_{\ell,n}$ and $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ are the quotients of the groups M_ℓ and \widetilde{M}_ℓ formed by restricting to the subtree T_n . For ease of notation in stating Theorem 6.5 below, we will also sometimes denote as M_ℓ itself as $M_{\ell,\infty}$, and \widetilde{M}_ℓ as $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,\infty}$. As in Section 2.3, we have

$$M_{\ell,n} = \widetilde{M}_{\ell,n} = \text{Aut}(T_n) \text{ for } n \leq \ell - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad [\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n} : M_{\ell,n}] = 2 \text{ for } n \geq \ell.$$

As always, recall that when we say that two groups acting on a tree are isomorphic, we mean that the isomorphism is equivariant with respect to the action.

Theorem 6.5. *With notation and assumptions as stated just above, let N be either ∞ or a positive integer.*

- (1) *If δ is a square in K , then the following are equivalent:*
 - (a) *No finite product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ (for integers $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m \leq N$ and $m \geq 1$) is a square in K .*
 - (b) $G_N \cong M_{\ell,N}$.
- (2) *If δ is not a square in K , then $\kappa_\ell \delta$ is a square in K . In addition, if $N \geq \ell$, then the following are equivalent:*
 - (a) *The only finite product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ (for integers $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m \leq N$ and $m \geq 1$) that is a square in L is the single element κ_ℓ .*
 - (b) $G_N \cong \widetilde{M}_{\ell,N}$.

On the other hand, still assuming δ is not a square in K , if instead $1 \leq N \leq \ell - 1$, then the following are equivalent:

- (a) *No finite product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ (for integers $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m \leq N$ and $m \geq 1$) is a square in K .*
- (b) $G_N \cong \widetilde{M}_{\ell,N}$.

Proof. If either of the critical points ξ_i lies in $f^{-n}(x_0)$ for some $n \geq 1$, then Definition 6.1 yields $\kappa_n = 0$, forcing each of conditions (1a) and (2a) to be false. At the same time, two nodes at level n of the tree must both correspond to ξ_i , and hence any $\sigma \in G_\infty$ must act in exactly the same way on the subtrees rooted at those two nodes. Since there are elements of M_ℓ that act differently on any two such subtrees, it follows that both versions of statement (b) are also false.

Thus, we may assume for the remainder of the proof that x_0 does not lie in the forward orbit of either $f(\xi_1)$ or $f(\xi_2)$. In addition, as noted just before Definition 6.1, by switching their roles if necessary, we may further assume that ξ_2 is not in the forward orbit of ξ_1 .

Case 1. If δ is a square in K , then $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ are K -rational. Hence, there is a linear fractional transformation $\nu \in \text{PGL}(2, K)$ such that $\nu(0) = \xi_1$ and $\nu(\infty) = \xi_2$. By Proposition 6.2, changing coordinates by ν does not affect condition (a) of statement (1)

of the theorem. In addition, as noted at the start of the proof of that proposition, the discriminant of the conjugate $\nu \circ f \circ \nu^{-1}$ is δ times a square in K , and hence is itself a square in K . Furthermore, this K -rational coordinate change does not change the field extensions K_n or K_∞ , and hence it also does not change the Galois groups G_n or G_∞ or their action on the tree of preimages. Thus, condition (b) is also unaffected by this coordinate change.

Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that $\xi_1 = 0$ and $\xi_2 = \infty$. Then $f(z)$ is a function of z^2 . Moreover, the fact that the critical points collide implies that f cannot be a polynomial. Thus, we have $f(z) = (Az^2 + B)/(z^2 + C)$ as in equation (16), with $AC - B \neq 0$. (This last condition is because $\deg(f) = 2$, and hence there is no cancellation.)

According to Theorem 1.2, we may label the tree so that G_∞ is a subgroup of M_ℓ , since we have assumed that δ is a square in K .

Claim: For each integer $n \geq 1$, the quantity $\kappa_n \in K$ is a square in K_n .

To prove the claim, first consider $1 \leq n \leq \ell - 1$. Then the discriminant $\Delta(H_n) = \kappa_n$ is a square in K_n , because all of the roots of H_n are defined over K_n .

Next, consider $n \geq \ell + 1$. Then

$$\kappa_n = \text{CR}(x_0, f^{n-\ell+1}(\xi_1), f^n(\xi_2), f(\xi_2)) = \text{CR}(x_0, f^{n-\ell+1}(0), f^n(\infty), f(\infty))$$

is a square in K_n by Lemma 6.4. Indeed, with $x := x_0$ in that lemma, the points $\alpha_{j,i}$ and $\alpha'_{j,i}$ lie in $f^{-n}(x_0)$, and $r_n \in K^\times \subseteq K_n^\times$. Thus, the conclusion of the lemma yields that κ_n is the square of an explicit element of K_n .

The remaining possibility is that $n = \ell$. Then the quantity $q_{\ell-1} \in K$ of Lemma 6.3 is a square in K times

$$\frac{f(\infty) - f^{\ell-1}(\infty)}{f(\infty) - f^{\ell-1}(0)} = \frac{f(\xi_2) - f^{\ell-1}(\xi_2)}{f(\xi_2) - f^{\ell-1}(\xi_1)}$$

if $\ell \geq 3$, or times

$$-4C = \Delta(-X^2 - CY^2) = \Delta(\theta_2 P - \eta_2 Q)$$

if $\ell = 2$, since $(\eta_2, \theta_2) = (1, 0)$ and $Q(X, Y) = X^2 + CY^2$. Thus, according to Lemma 6.3 and Definition 6.1, it follows that κ_n is a square in K_n , proving our claim.

1(a) \Rightarrow 1(b): For this implication, since $G_\infty \cong \varprojlim G_n$, it suffices to show that $G_n \cong M_{\ell,n}$ for each integer $0 \leq n \leq N$. We proceed by induction on n . The desired isomorphism holds trivially for $n = 0$.

For arbitrary $1 \leq n \leq N$, assume $G_{n-1} \cong M_{\ell,n-1}$. By Theorem 5.5, the abelianization G_{n-1}^{ab} of G_{n-1} is isomorphic to $\{\pm 1\}^{n-1}$. By our claim, for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, the quantity κ_i is a square in $K_i \subseteq K_{n-1}$. If κ_n were also a square in K_{n-1} , then we would have

$$L'_n := K(\sqrt{\kappa_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\kappa_n}) \subseteq K_{n-1}.$$

However, it follows from condition 1(a) that $\text{Gal}(L'_n/K) \cong \{\pm 1\}^n$, which is a strictly larger abelian group than the abelianization $G_{n-1}^{\text{ab}} \cong \{\pm 1\}^{n-1}$. This is a contradiction, since $K \subseteq L'_n \subseteq K_{n-1}$ and L'_n/K is an abelian extension.

Thus, it must be that κ_n is *not* a square in K_{n-1} . Again by our claim, we have $\sqrt{\kappa_n} \in K_n$, so there exists

$$\sigma_n \in \text{Gal}(K_n/K_{n-1}) \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma_n(\sqrt{\kappa_n}) = -\sqrt{\kappa_n}.$$

That is, σ_n acts trivially on the subtree T_{n-1} , but it sends $\sqrt{\kappa_n}$ to its negative.

If $n \leq \ell - 1$, then since $\kappa_n = \Delta(H_n)$, we must have $\text{sgn}_n(\sigma_n, x_0) = -1$. By Proposition 5.3, we have $G_n \cong \text{Aut}(T_n) = M_{\ell,n}$, as desired.

If $n = \ell$, then writing

$$f^{-n}(x_0) = \{\pm\alpha_1, \dots, \pm\alpha_m\} \cup \{\pm\alpha'_1, \dots, \pm\alpha'_m\}$$

as in Lemma 6.3, we have that

$$\pi_n := \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_i \in K_n$$

is $\sqrt{\kappa_n}$ times an element of $K^\times \subseteq K_{n-1}^\times$. Thus, we must have $\sigma_n(\pi_n) = -\pi_n$. Since σ_n fixes each node $f(\alpha_i)$ and $f(\alpha'_i)$ at level $n-1$, it follows that σ_n acts as an odd permutation of both $\{\pm\alpha_1, \dots, \pm\alpha_m\}$ and $\{\pm\alpha'_1, \dots, \pm\alpha'_m\}$. That is, σ_n is an (ℓ, ℓ) -odd cousins map. By Theorem 5.4, we again have $G_n \cong M_{\ell, n}$.

Finally, if $n \geq \ell + 1$, then writing

$$f^{-n}(x_0) = \bigcup_{j=1}^R \left(\{\pm\alpha_{j,1}, \dots, \pm\alpha_{j,m}\} \cup \{\pm\alpha'_{j,1}, \dots, \pm\alpha'_{j,m}\} \right)$$

as in Lemma 6.4, we have that

$$\pi_n := \prod_{j=1}^R \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} + \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha'_{j,i} \right) \in K_n$$

is $\sqrt{\kappa_n}$ times an element of $K^\times \subseteq K_{n-1}^\times$. Thus, we again have $\sigma_n(\pi_n) = -\pi_n$, while σ_n also fixes each node $f(\alpha_{j,i})$ and $f(\alpha'_{j,i})$ at level $n-1$. Hence, for an odd number of indices j , σ_n acts as an odd permutation of both $\{\pm\alpha_{j,1}, \dots, \pm\alpha_{j,m}\}$ and $\{\pm\alpha'_{j,1}, \dots, \pm\alpha'_{j,m}\}$. That is, σ_n is an (ℓ, n) -odd cousins map, and therefore by Theorem 5.4, we conclude that $G_n \cong M_{\ell, n}$, completing our induction.

1(b) \Rightarrow 1(a): We prove the contrapositive of this implication. Consider a product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ that is a square in K , with $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m \leq N$ and $m \geq 1$. Without loss, assume $n := i_m$ is the smallest index for which such a product exists.

Because no nonempty product of κ_i 's with $i < n$ is a square in K , the argument from the previous implication shows that $G_{n-1} \cong M_{\ell, n-1}$. By the claim within that implication, each κ_i is a square in $K_i^\times \subseteq K_{n-1}^\times$. That is, we have

$$L'_{n-1} := K(\sqrt{\kappa_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\kappa_{n-1}}) \subseteq K_{n-1}.$$

Since the product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ is a square in $K^\times \subseteq K_{n-1}^\times$, it follows that

$$(19) \quad \sqrt{\kappa_n} = \sqrt{\kappa_{i_m}} \in L'_{n-1} \subseteq K_{n-1}.$$

If $n \leq \ell - 1$, then $\kappa_n = \Delta(H_n)$. Therefore, equation (19) implies that every $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_n/K_{n-1})$ acts as an even permutation of the nodes at level n of the tree. But $M_{\ell, n} = \text{Aut}(T_n)$ includes automorphisms that fix all the nodes below level n and yet are odd at level n . Thus, $G_n \subsetneq M_{\ell, n}$. In fact, because $M_{\ell, n}$ is a finite group, it follows that G_n is not isomorphic to $M_{\ell, n}$, even if we were to label the tree differently.

If $n \geq \ell$, then with notation as in the previous implication, we also have that π_n is a square in K_{n-1} , and hence every $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_n/K_{n-1})$ is an (ℓ, n) -even cousins map. However, $M_{\ell, n}$ includes odd cousins maps that fix the nodes below level n . Thus, as in the $n \leq \ell - 1$ case above, it follows that $G_n \subsetneq M_{\ell, n}$, and hence that G_n is not isomorphic to $M_{\ell, n}$.

Case 2. As in Section 4, we have that $\kappa_\ell \delta = \Delta(H_\ell) \delta$ is a square in K , by Corollary 3.5, Theorem 3.6, and Proposition 3.7. Thus, we have proven the first desired statement.

Moreover, if $N \leq \ell - 1$, then $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,N} = M_{\ell,N}$, and so we are already done by Case 1. Therefore, we may assume for the remainder of the proof that $N \geq \ell$.

As in Case 1, we have $\sqrt{\Delta(H_\ell)} \in K_\ell$, and hence $L = K(\sqrt{\delta}) \subseteq K_n$ for every $n \geq \ell$. Thus, we may define $G'_n := \text{Gal}(K_n/L)$ for each integer $n \geq \ell$, and $G'_\infty := \text{Gal}(K_\infty/L)$. By Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 4.2, the Galois groups G_n and G'_n are equivariantly isomorphic to subgroups of $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ and $M_{\ell,n}$, respectively, for every $1 \leq n \leq \infty$.

2(a) \Rightarrow 2(b): Since $\kappa_\ell \delta$ is a square in K but δ is not, condition 2(a) implies that no nontrivial product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ with $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m \leq \ell$ is a square in K . By the same argument as in the 1(a) \Rightarrow 1(b) proof above, it follows that $G_\ell \cong \text{Aut}(T_\ell) = \widetilde{M}_{\ell,\ell}$.

As noted above, we also have $L \subseteq K_\ell$. Since $[L : K] = 2$, it follows that G'_ℓ is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(T_\ell)$ of index 2. In addition, since $\kappa_\ell = \Delta(H_\ell)$ is a square in L , every $\sigma \in G'_\ell$ acts as an even permutation of the nodes at the ℓ -th level of the tree. Thus, G'_ℓ must be isomorphic to the set of elements of $\text{Aut}(T_\ell)$ that are even at the ℓ -th level; that is, $G'_\ell \cong M_{\ell,\ell}$.

Applying the same inductive argument as in the $n \geq \ell + 1$ portion of the 1(a) \Rightarrow 1(b) proof, it follows that $G'_n \cong M_{\ell,n}$ for all $1 \leq n \leq N$. Thus, G_n is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ that contains $G'_n \cong M_{\ell,n}$ as a subgroup of index $[L : K] = 2$. Therefore, G_n is isomorphic to the whole group $\widetilde{M}_{\ell,n}$ for all such n , including $n = N$.

2(b) \Rightarrow 2(a): Suppose there is a product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ that is a square in K , with

$$1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m \leq N \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq 1,$$

and such that some i_j is not ℓ . Thus, even if κ_ℓ appears in the product, we may remove it, leaving a nontrivial product $\kappa_{i_1} \cdots \kappa_{i_m}$ that does not include κ_ℓ , and which is not a square in L .

By Case 1, it must be that G'_N is *not* isomorphic to $M_{\ell,N}$. That is, G'_N is isomorphic to a proper subgroup of $M_{\ell,N}$, so that $[M_{\ell,N} : G'_N] \geq 2$. Since $[G_N : G'_N] = [L : K] = 2$, and $[\widetilde{M}_{\ell,N} : M_{\ell,N}] = 2$, it follows that $[\widetilde{M}_{\ell,N} : G_N] \geq 2$. In particular, $G_N \not\cong \widetilde{M}_\ell$. \square

Acknowledgments. The first author gratefully acknowledges the support of NSF grant DMS-2101925. The authors thank the anonymous referee for their careful reading of the original manuscript of the paper, and for their suggestions, which greatly improved the exposition.

REFERENCES

- [1] Faseeh Ahmad, Robert L. Benedetto, Jennifer Cain, Gregory Carroll, and Lily Fang, The arithmetic basilica: a quadratic PCF arboreal Galois group, *J. Number Theory* **238** (2022), 842–868.
- [2] Wayne Aitken, Farshid Hajir, and Christian Maire, Finitely ramified iterated extensions, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2005**, 855–880.
- [3] Robert L. Benedetto, Xander Faber, Benjamin Hutz, Jamie Juul, and Yu Yasufuku, A large arboreal Galois representation for a cubic postcritically finite polynomial, *Res. Number Theory* **3** (2017), Art. 29, 21.
- [4] Robert L. Benedetto and Jamie Juul, Odoni’s conjecture for number fields, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **51** (2019), 237–250.
- [5] Nigel Boston and Rafe Jones, Arboreal Galois representations, *Geom. Dedicata* **124** (2007), 27–35.
- [6] Irene I. Bouw, Özlem Ejder, and Valentijn Karemaker, Dynamical Belyi maps and arboreal Galois groups, *Manuscripta Math.* **165** (2021), 1–34.

- [7] Andrew Bridy and Thomas J. Tucker, *Finite index theorems for iterated Galois groups of cubic polynomials*, *Math. Ann.* **373** (2019), 37–72.
- [8] Michael R. Bush, Wade Hindes, and Nicole R. Looper, Galois groups of iterates of some unicritical polynomials, *Acta Arith.* **181** (2017), 57–73.
- [9] Andrea Ferraguti, Carlo Pagano, and Daniele Casazza, The inverse problem for arboreal Galois representations of index two, preprint, 2019. Available at [arXiv:1907.08608](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.08608).
- [10] Wade Hindes, Average Zsigmondy sets, dynamical Galois groups, and the Kodaira-Spencer map, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **370** (2018), 6391–6410.
- [11] Rafe Jones, Galois representations from pre-image trees: an arboreal survey, in *Actes de la Conférence “Théorie des Nombres et Applications”*, *Pub. Math. Besançon* (2013), 107–136.
- [12] Rafe Jones and Michelle Manes, Galois theory of quadratic rational functions, *Comment. Math. Helv.* **89** (2014), 173–213.
- [13] Jamie Juul, Iterates of generic polynomials and generic rational functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **371** (2019), 809–831.
- [14] Jamie Juul, Holly Krieger, Nicole Looper, Michelle Manes, Bianca Thompson, and Laura Walton, Arboreal representations for rational maps with few critical points, in *Research directions in number theory — Women in Numbers IV*, Springer, Cham, 2019, pages 133–151.
- [15] Borys Kadets, Large arboreal Galois representations, *J. Number Theory* **210** (2020), 416–430.
- [16] Serge Lang, *Algebra*, 3rd ed. Springer, New York, 2002.
- [17] Nicole Looper, Dynamical Galois groups of trinomials and Odoni’s conjecture, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **51** (2019), 278–292.
- [18] Volodymyr Nekrashevych, *Self-Similar Groups*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2005.
- [19] R. W. K. Odoni, The Galois theory of iterates and composites of polynomials, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **51** (1985), no. 3, 385–414.
- [20] Richard Pink, Profinite iterated monodromy groups arising from quadratic polynomials, preprint 2013. Available at [arXiv:1307.5678](https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.5678).
- [21] Richard Pink, Profinite iterated monodromy groups arising from quadratic morphisms with infinite postcritical orbits, preprint 2013. Available at [arXiv:1309.5804](https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.5804).
- [22] Jean-Pierre Serre, Propriétés galoisiennes des points d’ordre fini des courbes elliptiques, *Invent. Math.* **15** (1972), 259–331.
- [23] Joseph H. Silverman, *The Arithmetic of Dynamical Systems*, Springer, New York, 2007.
- [24] Joel Specter, Polynomials with surjective arboreal Galois representations exist in every degree, preprint, 2018. Available at [arXiv:1803.00434](https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.00434).
- [25] Michael Stoll, Galois groups over \mathbf{Q} of some iterated polynomials, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **59** (1992), 239–244.
- [26] Ashvin A. Swaminathan, On arboreal Galois representations of rational functions, *J. Algebra* **448** (2016), 104–126.

AMHERST COLLEGE, AMHERST, MA 01002, USA
Email address: rlbenedetto@amherst.edu

BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE, RI 02912, USA
Email address: anna_dietrich@brown.edu