APPENDIX TO MY PAPER "ON UNIQUE FACTORIZATION IN ALGEBRAIC FUNCTION FIELDS"

BY

J. V. ARMITAGE

1. Introduction. The proof in §4 of the paper of the title [1] is much too sketchy and open to some quite alarming misinterpretations. For example, Dr. E. Kunz has pointed out to me that it would appear to "prove" that $\mathbf{Q}^2$ viewed as a vector space over $\mathbf{Q}$ is a finite union of lines through the origin. In fact, in order to justify the assertion (12) in [1] one must use the relation between the linear topology and the topology defined by the valuation $\| \alpha \|_{\mathfrak{P}_j}$. In this appendix, we supply the details of the argument.

2. Proof of the finite intersection property. We begin by amplifying the remark on the ordering of the linear spaces $L = \mathfrak{L}(\mathfrak{b}, S) + R$. Observe that one need consider only a finite number of possibilities for deg $(\mathfrak{b})$. Now order the L by considering $\sum_{j=1}^{s} (\nu_{\mathfrak{P}_j}(\mathfrak{b}))^2$. From the resulting sequence $\Lambda = (L_i)$, we select subsequences $\Lambda^{(j)} = (L_i^{(j)})$, $1 \leq j \leq s$, which together give Λ and such that in $\Lambda^{(j)}$, $\nu_{\mathfrak{P}_j}(\mathfrak{b}_i)$ is strictly increasing.

Now in (12) of [1] the argument ought to run as follows. If (11) holds for every n, then either (12) holds (in which case we have finished) or for every sequence (λ_i) of coset representatives the finite intersection property fails for some n. It is this latter possibility which was dismissed without comment in [1]. Suppose that we are in this case and assume for the moment that one can construct a sequence (λ_i) of coset representatives which is a finite union of convergent subsequences (in the sense of the topology defined by $\| \quad \|_{\mathfrak{P}_j}$). Let $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{K}$ denote the limit of one of them. Then for $\lambda \in K$ and arbitrarily close to $\hat{\lambda}$ at $\mathfrak{P}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{P}_s$ (approximation theorem, see Chevalley, [2, Chapter I, §6]) either $\lambda \notin \Lambda$ (in which case we already have a contradiction to (3) of [1]) or $\lambda \in$ some L. But then, since $\hat{E}$ is an ultrametric space, all the λ_i sufficiently close to λ are in L. By considering the other subsequences, we obtain a finite covering as in (8) of [1].

It remains to justify our assumption on the existence of such subsequences in the case in question. Suppose for simplicity of notation, that $\lambda_1^{(1)} \notin L_1^{(1)}$ but $\lambda_1^{(1)} \in L_2^{(1)}$. (If $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ is not in any member of $\Lambda^{(1)}$, then we can ignore $\Lambda^{(1)}$.) We construct $\lambda_2^{(1)} \notin L_1^{(1)} \cup L_2^{(1)}$ and such that

$$\nu_{\mathfrak{P}_1}(\lambda_2^{(1)}) > \nu_{\mathfrak{P}_1}(\lambda_1^{(1)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{\mathfrak{P}_j}(\lambda_2^{(1)} - \lambda_1^{(1)})$$

is arbitrarily large for $2 \leq j \leq s$. From now on, we omit the superfix 1.

Received August 4, 1967.