

Trees of varieties over \mathbb{Z}_p

I. Halupczok

Ecole Normale Supérieure
rue d'Ulm, Paris

Antalya Algebra days 2008

- ① Goal
- ② Understanding the trees
- ③ Definition of complexity d trees

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:
 $\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$
Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:
 $\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$
Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:
 $\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$
Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:
 $\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$
Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:
 $\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$
Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:
 $\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$
Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:

$$\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$$

Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Trees of sets in \mathbb{Z}_p^n

$X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ yields a tree $T(X)$:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \rightsquigarrow$ consider all balls of “radius” λ intersecting X :

$$X_\lambda := \{B = \bar{a} + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid B \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

- $T(X) := \dot{\bigcup}_\lambda X_\lambda$
- Inclusion of balls induces tree structure

Examples:

- $X = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightsquigarrow$ Every node of $T(X)$ has p children
- X finite \rightsquigarrow each $x \in X$ corresponds to infinite path in $T(X)$:
 $\bar{x} + \mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \bar{x} + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p^n \supset \dots$
Paths of \bar{x} and \bar{x}' separate at depth $\min_i v(x_i - x'_i)$

Goal (1)

Goal: describe which trees $T(X)$ one can get if X is...:

- $X = \{\bar{x} \mid f_1(\bar{x}) = \dots = f_k(\bar{x}) = 0\}$ affine algebraic set.
- More generally: X definable by first order formula in the valued field language.

Definition (Scowcroft, van den Dries)

X definable, $\dim X :=$ dimension of Zariski closure of X in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_p$.

Goal (1)

Goal: describe which trees $T(X)$ one can get if X is. . . :

- $X = \{\bar{x} \mid f_1(\bar{x}) = \dots = f_k(\bar{x}) = 0\}$ affine algebraic set.
- More generally: X definable by first order formula in the valued field language.

Definition (Scowcroft, van den Dries)

X definable, $\dim X :=$ dimension of Zariski closure of X in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_p$.

Goal (1)

Goal: describe which trees $T(X)$ one can get if X is. . . :

- $X = \{\bar{x} \mid f_1(\bar{x}) = \cdots = f_k(\bar{x}) = 0\}$ affine algebraic set.
- More generally: X definable by first order formula in the valued field language.

Definition (Scowcroft, van den Dries)

X definable, $\dim X :=$ dimension of Zariski closure of X in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_p$.

Goal (1)

Goal: describe which trees $T(X)$ one can get if X is. . . :

- $X = \{\bar{x} \mid f_1(\bar{x}) = \cdots = f_k(\bar{x}) = 0\}$ affine algebraic set.
- More generally: X definable by first order formula in the valued field language.

Definition (Scowcroft, van den Dries)

X definable, $\dim X :=$ dimension of Zariski closure of X in $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_p$.

Goal (2)

We will define *trees of complexity d* .

Conjecture (H.)

X definable, $\dim X = d \Rightarrow T(X)$ is of complexity d .

Goal of remainder of talk: make definition of trees of complexity d plausible.

The other direction is true:

Theorem (H.)

\mathcal{T} tree of complexity $d \Rightarrow$ there exists a definable X such that $T(X) = \mathcal{T}$

Goal (2)

We will define *trees of complexity d* .

Conjecture (H.)

X definable, $\dim X = d \Rightarrow T(X)$ is of complexity d .

Goal of remainder of talk: make definition of trees of complexity d plausible.

The other direction is true:

Theorem (H.)

\mathcal{T} tree of complexity $d \Rightarrow$ there exists a definable X such that $T(X) = \mathcal{T}$

Goal (2)

We will define *trees of complexity d* .

Conjecture (H.)

X definable, $\dim X = d \Rightarrow T(X)$ is of complexity d .

Goal of remainder of talk: make definition of trees of complexity d plausible.

The other direction is true:

Theorem (H.)

\mathcal{T} tree of complexity $d \Rightarrow$ there exists a definable X such that $T(X) = \mathcal{T}$

Goal (2)

We will define *trees of complexity d* .

Conjecture (H.)

X definable, $\dim X = d \Rightarrow T(X)$ is of complexity d .

Goal of remainder of talk: make definition of trees of complexity d plausible.

The other direction is true:

Theorem (H.)

\mathcal{T} tree of complexity $d \Rightarrow$ there exists a definable X such that $T(X) = \mathcal{T}$

Motivation: poincaré series

- $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightsquigarrow$ Poincaré series of X :

$$P_X(Z) := \sum_{\lambda \geq 0} \#X_\lambda \cdot Z^\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}[[Z]]$$

(Recall: $X_\lambda =$ nodes of $T(X)$ at depth λ .)

Theorem (Denef)

X definable $\Rightarrow P_X(Z) \in \mathbb{Q}(Z)$.

- It should be possible to see this on the structure of the trees.
- Indeed, complexity d trees have rational Poincaré series.

Motivation: poincaré series

- $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightsquigarrow$ Poincaré series of X :

$$P_X(Z) := \sum_{\lambda \geq 0} \#X_\lambda \cdot Z^\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}[[Z]]$$

(Recall: $X_\lambda =$ nodes of $T(X)$ at depth λ .)

Theorem (Denef)

X definable $\Rightarrow P_X(Z) \in \mathbb{Q}(Z)$.

- It should be possible to see this on the structure of the trees.
- Indeed, complexity d trees have rational Poincaré series.

Motivation: poincaré series

- $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightsquigarrow$ Poincaré series of X :

$$P_X(Z) := \sum_{\lambda \geq 0} \#X_\lambda \cdot Z^\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}[[Z]]$$

(Recall: $X_\lambda =$ nodes of $T(X)$ at depth λ .)

Theorem (Denef)

X definable $\Rightarrow P_X(Z) \in \mathbb{Q}(Z)$.

- It should be possible to see this on the structure of the trees.
- Indeed, complexity d trees have rational Poincaré series.

Motivation: poincaré series

- $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightsquigarrow$ Poincaré series of X :

$$P_X(Z) := \sum_{\lambda \geq 0} \#X_\lambda \cdot Z^\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}[[Z]]$$

(Recall: $X_\lambda =$ nodes of $T(X)$ at depth λ .)

Theorem (Denef)

X definable $\Rightarrow P_X(Z) \in \mathbb{Q}(Z)$.

- It should be possible to see this on the structure of the trees.
- Indeed, complexity d trees have rational Poincaré series.

Motivation: isometry

Lemma

$X, X' \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ p -adically closed. Then:

$$\{\text{bijective isometries } X \rightarrow X'\} \stackrel{1:1}{\leftrightarrow} \{\text{isomorphisms } T(X) \rightarrow T(X')\}$$

- So: trees help understanding sets up to isometry
- helpful for motivic integration in the Hrushovski-Kazhdan way

Motivation: isometry

Lemma

$X, X' \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ p -adically closed. Then:

$$\{\text{bijective isometries } X \rightarrow X'\} \stackrel{1:1}{\leftrightarrow} \{\text{isomorphisms } T(X) \rightarrow T(X')\}$$

- So: trees help understanding sets up to isometry
- helpful for motivic integration in the Hrushovski-Kazhdan way

Motivation: isometry

Lemma

$X, X' \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ p -adically closed. Then:

$$\{\text{bijective isometries } X \rightarrow X'\} \stackrel{1:1}{\leftrightarrow} \{\text{isomorphisms } T(X) \rightarrow T(X')\}$$

- So: trees help understanding sets up to isometry
- helpful for motivic integration in the Hrushovski-Kazhdan way

- ① Goal
- ② Understanding the trees
- ③ Definition of complexity d trees

Key lemma

Crucial ingredient is (a generalization of):

Lemma (Key lemma)

*Suppose $\phi: \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ satisfies $v(\phi(x') - \phi(x)) \geq v(x' - x)$.
Then $T(\text{graph}(\phi)) \cong T(\text{graph}(x \mapsto 0)) \cong T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$*

Smooth plane curves (1)

Suppose X is smooth plane curve.

- For each $(x_0, y_0) \in X$: implicit function theorem yields ball $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ on which X is the graph of a function ϕ
- If $v(\phi'(x_0)) < 0$ then exchange coordinates $\rightsquigarrow v(\phi'(x_0)) \geq 0$
- $\phi'(x_0) \approx \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x_0)}{x - x_0}$
- On smaller ball: $v(\phi(x) - \phi(x')) \geq v(x - x')$
- Key lemma $\Rightarrow T(X)$ on $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Smooth plane curves (1)

Suppose X is smooth plane curve.

- For each $(x_0, y_0) \in X$: implicit function theorem yields ball $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ on which X is the graph of a function ϕ
- If $v(\phi'(x_0)) < 0$ then exchange coordinates $\rightsquigarrow v(\phi'(x_0)) \geq 0$
- $\phi'(x_0) \approx \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x_0)}{x - x_0}$
- On smaller ball: $v(\phi(x) - \phi(x')) \geq v(x - x')$
- Key lemma $\Rightarrow T(X)$ on $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Smooth plane curves (1)

Suppose X is smooth plane curve.

- For each $(x_0, y_0) \in X$: implicit function theorem yields ball $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ on which X is the graph of a function ϕ
- If $v(\phi'(x_0)) < 0$ then exchange coordinates $\rightsquigarrow v(\phi'(x_0)) \geq 0$
- $\phi'(x_0) \approx \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x_0)}{x - x_0}$
- On smaller ball: $v(\phi(x) - \phi(x')) \geq v(x - x')$
- Key lemma $\Rightarrow T(X)$ on $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Smooth plane curves (1)

Suppose X is smooth plane curve.

- For each $(x_0, y_0) \in X$: implicit function theorem yields ball $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ on which X is the graph of a function ϕ
- If $v(\phi'(x_0)) < 0$ then exchange coordinates $\rightsquigarrow v(\phi'(x_0)) \geq 0$
- $\phi'(x_0) \approx \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x_0)}{x - x_0}$
- On smaller ball: $v(\phi(x) - \phi(x')) \geq v(x - x')$
- Key lemma $\Rightarrow T(X)$ on $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Smooth plane curves (1)

Suppose X is smooth plane curve.

- For each $(x_0, y_0) \in X$: implicit function theorem yields ball $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ on which X is the graph of a function ϕ
- If $v(\phi'(x_0)) < 0$ then exchange coordinates $\rightsquigarrow v(\phi'(x_0)) \geq 0$
- $\phi'(x_0) \approx \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x_0)}{x - x_0}$
- On smaller ball: $v(\phi(x) - \phi(x')) \geq v(x - x')$
- Key lemma $\Rightarrow T(X)$ on $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Smooth plane curves (1)

Suppose X is smooth plane curve.

- For each $(x_0, y_0) \in X$: implicit function theorem yields ball $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ on which X is the graph of a function ϕ
- If $v(\phi'(x_0)) < 0$ then exchange coordinates $\rightsquigarrow v(\phi'(x_0)) \geq 0$
- $\phi'(x_0) \approx \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(x_0)}{x - x_0}$
- On smaller ball: $v(\phi(x) - \phi(x')) \geq v(x - x')$
- Key lemma $\Rightarrow T(X)$ on $(x_0, y_0) + p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Smooth plane curves (2)

- \mathbb{Z}_p^2 compact, X closed in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2 \Rightarrow X$ is covered by finitely many balls B_i on which the tree is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.
- We may suppose that the B_i are disjoint.
- Total tree of X is:
 - finite tree with leafs B_i
 - a copy of $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ attached to each leaf.

Arbitrary smooth algebraic sets work similarly.

Smooth plane curves (2)

- \mathbb{Z}_p^2 compact, X closed in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2 \Rightarrow X$ is covered by finitely many balls B_i on which the tree is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.
- We may suppose that the B_i are disjoint.
- Total tree of X is:
 - finite tree with leafs B_i
 - a copy of $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ attached to each leaf.

Arbitrary smooth algebraic sets work similarly.

Smooth plane curves (2)

- \mathbb{Z}_p^2 compact, X closed in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2 \Rightarrow X$ is covered by finitely many balls B_i on which the tree is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.
- We may suppose that the B_i are disjoint.
- Total tree of X is:
 - finite tree with leafs B_i
 - a copy of $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ attached to each leaf.

Arbitrary smooth algebraic sets work similarly.

Smooth plane curves (2)

- \mathbb{Z}_p^2 compact, X closed in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2 \Rightarrow X$ is covered by finitely many balls B_i on which the tree is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.
- We may suppose that the B_i are disjoint.
- Total tree of X is:
 - finite tree with leafs B_i
 - a copy of $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ attached to each leaf.

Arbitrary smooth algebraic sets work similarly.

Smooth plane curves (2)

- \mathbb{Z}_p^2 compact, X closed in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2 \Rightarrow X$ is covered by finitely many balls B_i on which the tree is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.
- We may suppose that the B_i are disjoint.
- Total tree of X is:
 - finite tree with leafs B_i
 - a copy of $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ attached to each leaf.

Arbitrary smooth algebraic sets work similarly.

Smooth plane curves (2)

- \mathbb{Z}_p^2 compact, X closed in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2 \Rightarrow X$ is covered by finitely many balls B_i on which the tree is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.
- We may suppose that the B_i are disjoint.
- Total tree of X is:
 - finite tree with leafs B_i
 - a copy of $T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ attached to each leaf.

Arbitrary smooth algebraic sets work similarly.

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is
 $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $ac(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $ac(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $ac(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is
 $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is
 $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is
 $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is
 $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

X is cusp curve

Example: $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid x^3 = y^2\}$, $p \neq 2$

- $T(X)$ contains $\{p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. What are the side branches?
- $x^3 = y^2$ (and suppose $\lambda := v(x) > 0$) \Rightarrow
 - $v(y) = \frac{3}{2}v(x) > \lambda$
 - $y = \pm x\sqrt{x}$, i.e. x is square
 - $\iff 2 \mid \lambda$ and $\text{ac}(x)$ is square in \mathbb{F}_p
- $(x, y) \in B := (p^\lambda x_0, 0) + p^{\lambda+1} \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
 B is child of $p^\lambda \mathbb{Z}_p^2$.
- The tree on B :
 - $X \cap B =$ union of the two graphs $x \mapsto \pm x\sqrt{x}$
 - Distance between graphs is $\frac{3}{2}\lambda$
 - Satisfy (generalization of) key lemma
 - \Rightarrow Tree on B is
 $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \{\text{Two paths separating at depth } \frac{1}{2}\lambda - 1\}$
- \rightsquigarrow Total tree: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ such side branches at even depths, no side branches at odd depths

- ① Goal
- ② Understanding the trees
- ③ Definition of complexity d trees

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity 0

Examples \rightsquigarrow definition of trees of complexity d

Trees of complexity 0:

- $\dim X = 0 \iff X$ finite
 \rightsquigarrow *trees of complexity 0* := tree with finitely many bifurcations

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity 0

Examples \rightsquigarrow definition of trees of complexity d

Trees of complexity 0:

- $\dim X = 0 \iff X$ finite
 \rightsquigarrow *trees of complexity 0* := tree with finitely many bifurcations

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity 0

Examples \rightsquigarrow definition of trees of complexity d

Trees of complexity 0:

- $\dim X = 0 \iff X$ finite

\rightsquigarrow *trees of complexity 0* := tree with finitely many bifurcations

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity 0

Examples \rightsquigarrow definition of trees of complexity d

Trees of complexity 0:

- $\dim X = 0 \iff X$ finite
 \rightsquigarrow *trees of complexity 0* := tree with finitely many bifurcations

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity $d > 0$

Cusp \rightsquigarrow *Tree of complexity 1* :=

- Tree \mathcal{T}_0 with finitely many bifurcations (corresponding to singularities of X)
[Cusp: only one path to 0]
- + additional side branches at each node v
[Cusp: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ side branches if $2 \mid \text{depth}(v)$]
- Side branches are of the form $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \mathcal{T}_v$
where \mathcal{T}_v is of complexity 0
[Cusp: \mathcal{T}_v two paths separating at depth $\frac{1}{2} \text{depth}(v) - 1$]
- \mathcal{T}_v is *uniform* in $\text{depth}(v)$: lengths of segments are linear in $\text{depth}(v)$

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity $d > 0$

Cusp \rightsquigarrow *Tree of complexity 1* :=

- Tree \mathcal{T}_0 with finitely many bifurcations (corresponding to singularities of X)
[Cusp: only one path to 0]
- + additional side branches at each node v
[Cusp: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ side branches if $2 \mid \text{depth}(v)$]
- Side branches are of the form $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \mathcal{T}_v$
where \mathcal{T}_v is of complexity 0
[Cusp: \mathcal{T}_v two paths separating at depth $\frac{1}{2} \text{depth}(v) - 1$]
- \mathcal{T}_v is *uniform* in $\text{depth}(v)$: lengths of segments are linear in $\text{depth}(v)$

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity $d > 0$

Cusp \rightsquigarrow *Tree of complexity 1* :=

- Tree \mathcal{T}_0 with finitely many bifurcations (corresponding to singularities of X)
[Cusp: only one path to 0]
- + additional side branches at each node v
[Cusp: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ side branches if $2 \mid \text{depth}(v)$]
- Side branches are of the form $\mathbb{T}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \mathcal{T}_v$
where \mathcal{T}_v is of complexity 0
[Cusp: \mathcal{T}_v two paths separating at depth $\frac{1}{2} \text{depth}(v) - 1$]
- \mathcal{T}_v is *uniform* in $\text{depth}(v)$: lengths of segments are linear in $\text{depth}(v)$

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity $d > 0$

Cusp \rightsquigarrow *Tree of complexity 1* :=

- Tree \mathcal{T}_0 with finitely many bifurcations (corresponding to singularities of X)
[Cusp: only one path to 0]
- + additional side branches at each node v
[Cusp: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ side branches if $2 \mid \text{depth}(v)$]
- Side branches are of the form $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \mathcal{T}_v$
where \mathcal{T}_v is of complexity 0
[Cusp: \mathcal{T}_v two paths separating at depth $\frac{1}{2} \text{depth}(v) - 1$]
- \mathcal{T}_v is *uniform* in $\text{depth}(v)$: lengths of segments are linear in $\text{depth}(v)$

Generalizing the idea: trees of complexity $d > 0$

Cusp \rightsquigarrow *Tree of complexity 1* :=

- Tree \mathcal{T}_0 with finitely many bifurcations (corresponding to singularities of X)
[Cusp: only one path to 0]
- + additional side branches at each node v
[Cusp: $\frac{p-1}{2}$ side branches if $2 \mid \text{depth}(v)$]
- Side branches are of the form $T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \times \mathcal{T}_v$
where \mathcal{T}_v is of complexity 0
[Cusp: \mathcal{T}_v two paths separating at depth $\frac{1}{2} \text{depth}(v) - 1$]
- \mathcal{T}_v is *uniform* in $\text{depth}(v)$: lengths of segments are linear in $\text{depth}(v)$

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition

Definition of trees of complexity d

- General definition:
 - Define *uniform families of trees of complexity d*
 - Trees of complexity $d + 1$ are with finitely many bifurcations + uniform side branches of complexity d

Theorem (H.)

For any definable $X \subset \mathbb{Z}_p^2$, $T(X)$ is of complexity $\dim X$.

- (Trees of definable set are not really more complicated than trees of varieties.)

Idea of proof:

- For varieties: similar to cusp (use theorem of Puiseux)
- For definable sets: additionally use cell decomposition