

0902.0431: residuals

equations measured 2026-09-11T09:58:26Z against the model of 2026-09-10

Corrected (10)

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E00425 (was)	70	■ 0.082	$\begin{aligned} & A \times A^* \times Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^* \\ & \left(P M A^* \right)^* \left(P N A^* \right) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & \left(P M A^* \right) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & A X A^* \times A Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^* \\ & (P M A^*)^* (P N A^*) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & (P M A^*) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & A X A^* \times A Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^*, \\ & (P M A^*)^* (P N A^*) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & (P M A^*) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$
0902.0431_E00425 (now)	70	—	$\begin{aligned} & A \times A^* \times Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^* \\ & \left(P M A^* \right)^* \left(P N A^* \right) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & \left(P M A^* \right) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & A X A^* \times A Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^* \\ & (P M A^*)^* (P N A^*) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & (P M A^*) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & A X A^* \times A Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^*, \\ & (P M A^*)^* (P N A^*) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & (P M A^*) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$
basis: inferred / ink					
0902.0431_E00425 (was)	70	■ 0.082	$\begin{aligned} & A \times A^* \times Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^* \\ & \left(P M A^* \right)^* \left(P N A^* \right) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & \left(P M A^* \right) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & A X A^* \times A Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^* \\ & (P M A^*)^* (P N A^*) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & (P M A^*) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & A X A^* \times A Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^*, \\ & (P M A^*)^* (P N A^*) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & (P M A^*) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$
0902.0431_E00425 (now)	70	—	$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^3 \lambda_k H_k \\ & \lambda_0 (-H_0 + H_1 - H_2 + H_3) + \lambda_1 (-H_0 + H_1 + H_2 - \\ & \quad + \lambda_2 (H_0 + H_1 + H_2 + H_3) + \lambda_3 (-H_0 - H_1 + H_2 + H_3) \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & = \nu \left(\sum_{k=0}^3 \lambda_k H_k \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \left(\lambda_0 (-H_0 + H_1 - H_2 + H_3) + \lambda_1 (-H_0 + H_1 + H_2 - \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \lambda_2 (H_0 + H_1 + H_2 + H_3) + \lambda_3 (-H_0 - H_1 + H_2 + H_3) \right) \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & A X A^* \times A Y A^* = A(X \times Y) A^*, \\ & (P M A^*)^* (P N A^*) = A M^* P^* P N A = A(M^* N) A, \\ & (P M A^*) (A Y A^*) = P(M Y) A^*, \\ & \overline{P M A^* \times P N A^*} = \overline{{}^t \tilde{P}(M \times N) {}^t \tilde{A}^*} = \overline{P \overline{M} \times \overline{N} A^*}, \text{ etc. } \end{aligned}$
basis: inferred / ink					
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥0.9 ■ 0.5–0.9 ■ <0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: <i>basis</i>] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — <i>basis</i> names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E00515 (was)	85	■ 0.002	$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1 \\ & \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0 \quad \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 = 0 \quad \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 = 0 \end{aligned}$	$\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1$	$\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1$
0902.0431_E00515 (now)	85	—	$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1 \\ & \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0 \quad \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 = 0 \quad \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 = 0 \end{aligned}$	$\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1$	$\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1$
basis: inferred / ink					
0902.0431_E00515 (was)	85	■ 0.002	$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1 \\ & \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0 \quad \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 = 0 \quad \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 = 0 \end{aligned}$	$\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1$	$\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 \quad \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1$
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥0.9 ■ 0.5–0.9 ■ <0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: basis] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — <i>basis</i> names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E00515 (now)	85	—	$\begin{aligned} \nu H &= \nu \bigg(\sum_{k=0}^3 \lambda_k H_k \bigg) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 (-H_0 + H_1 - H_2 + H_3) + \lambda_1 (-H_0 + H_1 + H_2 - H_3) \\ &\quad + \lambda_2 (H_0 + H_1 + H_2 + H_3) + \lambda_3 (-H_0 - H_1 + H_2 + H_3)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) H_0 + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) H_1 \end{aligned}$	$\begin{array}{cc} \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 = 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0 + \lambda_2 = 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0 + \lambda_3 = 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 = 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 = 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$	
basis: inferred / ink					
0902.0431_E00756 (was)	125	■0.119	$\begin{array}{l} \lambda_{\{0\}} - \lambda_{\{1\}} = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} \& \lambda_{\{1\}} = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} + \lambda_{\{1\}} = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} - \lambda_{\{2\}} = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} + \lambda_{\{2\}} = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} - \lambda_{\{3\}} = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} + \lambda_{\{3\}} = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{1\}} - \lambda_{\{2\}} = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{1\}} + \lambda_{\{2\}} = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{1\}} - \lambda_{\{3\}} = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{1\}} + \lambda_{\{3\}} = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{2\}} - \lambda_{\{3\}} = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{2\}} + \lambda_{\{3\}} = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 1 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{0\}} + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cc} \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 = 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 = 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 = 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0 + \lambda_2 = 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_0 - \lambda_3 = 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0 + \lambda_3 = 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 = 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 = 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cc} \lambda_0 + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_2 + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_3 + \frac{1}{2} (\mu_2 - \mu_3) = 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥0.9 ■ 0.5-0.9 ■ <0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: basis] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — basis names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E00756 (now)	125	—	$\begin{array}{l} \backslash begin{array}{llllllllllllll} \lambda_{\{0\}}-\lambda_{\{1\}}=1 \\ \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \lambda_{\{0\}}+\lambda_{\{1\}}=1 \& \\ 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 1 \backslash \backslash \lambda_{\{0\}}-\lambda_{\{2\}}=1 \& 1 \& \\ 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \lambda_{\{0\}}+\lambda_{\{2\}}=1 \& 1 \& 2 \\ \& 2 \& 2 \& 1 \backslash \backslash \lambda_{\{0\}}-\lambda_{\{3\}}=1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \\ \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \lambda_{\{0\}}+\lambda_{\{3\}}=1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 2 \& \\ 2 \& 1 \backslash \backslash \lambda_{\{1\}}-\lambda_{\{2\}}=0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \\ 0 \& 0 \& \lambda_{\{1\}}+\lambda_{\{2\}}=0 \& 1 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 1 \\ \backslash \backslash \lambda_{\{1\}}-\lambda_{\{3\}}=0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \\ \& \lambda_{\{1\}}+\lambda_{\{3\}}=0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 2 \& 2 \& 1 \backslash \backslash \\ \lambda_{\{2\}}-\lambda_{\{3\}}=0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \\ \lambda_{\{2\}}+\lambda_{\{3\}}=0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 2 \& 2 \& 1 \backslash \backslash \& \& \\ \lambda_{\{0\}}+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}})\left(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}}\right)=1 \\ \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& \& \& \& \backslash \backslash \& \& \lambda_{\{1\}}+ \\ \frac{1}{2}(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}})\left(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}}\right)=0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& \\ 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& \& \& \backslash \backslash \& \& \lambda_{\{2\}}+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}})\left(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}}\right)=0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& \& \& \\ \& \backslash \backslash \& \& \lambda_{\{3\}}+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}})\left(\mu_{\{2\}}-\mu_{\{3\}}\right)=0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& \& \& \& \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{llllll} \lambda_0-\lambda_1=1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_0-\lambda_2=1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_0-\lambda_3=1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_1-\lambda_2=0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_1-\lambda_3=0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_2-\lambda_3=0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{llllll} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0+\lambda_1=1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0+\lambda_2=1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_0+\lambda_3=1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1+\lambda_2=0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_1+\lambda_3=0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_2+\lambda_3=0 & 0 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{llllll} 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll} \lambda_0+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_2+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_3+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{llllll} \lambda_0-\lambda_1=1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_0-\lambda_2=1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_0-\lambda_3=1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_1-\lambda_2=0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_1-\lambda_3=0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_2-\lambda_3=0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{llllll} \lambda_0+\lambda_1=1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \lambda_0+\lambda_2=1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \lambda_0+\lambda_3=1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \lambda_1+\lambda_2=0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \lambda_1+\lambda_3=0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \lambda_2+\lambda_3=0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll} \lambda_0+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_2+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_3+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\mu_3)=0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$
basis: inferred / ink					
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥ 0.9 ■ $0.5-0.9$ ■ < 0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix's reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: <i>basis</i>] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix's own reading — <i>basis</i> names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E00922 (was)	153	■ 0.102	$f^{-1}\left(\sum_{i<j<k}x_{ij\,k}\,\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_{jk}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}h(x_{156}) & h(x_{164},\overline{x}_{256}) & h(x_{145},\overline{x}_{356}) \\ h(x_{256},\overline{x}_{164}) & h(x_{264}) & h(x_{245},\overline{x}_{364}) \\ h(x_{356},\overline{x}_{145}) & h(x_{364},\overline{x}_{245}) & h(x_{345}) \\ h(x_{423}) & h(x_{431},\overline{x}_{523}) & h(x_{412},\overline{x}_{623}) \\ h(x_{523},\overline{x}_{431}) & h(x_{531}) & h(x_{512},\overline{x}_{631}) \\ h(x_{623},\overline{x}_{412}) & h(x_{631},\overline{x}_{512}) & h(x_{612})\end{array}\right),$	$f^{-1}\left(\sum_{i<j<k}x_{ijk}\boldsymbol{e}_i\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_j\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_k\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}h(x_{156}) & h(x_{164},\overline{x}_{256}) & h(x_{145},\overline{x}_{356}) \\ h(x_{256},\overline{x}_{164}) & h(x_{264}) & h(x_{245},\overline{x}_{364}) \\ h(x_{356},\overline{x}_{145}) & h(x_{364},\overline{x}_{245}) & h(x_{345}) \\ h(x_{423}) & h(x_{431},\overline{x}_{523}) & h(x_{412},\overline{x}_{623}) \\ h(x_{523},\overline{x}_{431}) & h(x_{531}) & h(x_{512},\overline{x}_{631}) \\ h(x_{623},\overline{x}_{412}) & h(x_{631},\overline{x}_{512}) & h(x_{612})\end{array}\right),$	$f^{-1}\left(\sum_{i<j<k}x_{ijk}\boldsymbol{e}_i\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_j\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_k\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}h(x_{156}) & h(x_{164},\overline{x}_{256}) & h(x_{145},\overline{x}_{356}) \\ h(x_{256},\overline{x}_{164}) & h(x_{264}) & h(x_{245},\overline{x}_{364}) \\ h(x_{356},\overline{x}_{145}) & h(x_{364},\overline{x}_{245}) & h(x_{345}) \\ h(x_{423}) & h(x_{431},\overline{x}_{523}) & h(x_{412},\overline{x}_{623}) \\ h(x_{523},\overline{x}_{431}) & h(x_{531}) & h(x_{512},\overline{x}_{631}) \\ h(x_{623},\overline{x}_{412}) & h(x_{631},\overline{x}_{512}) & h(x_{612})\end{array}\right),$
0902.0431_E00922 (now)	153	—	$f^{-1}\left(\sum_{i<j<k}x_{ij\,k}\,\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_{jk}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}h(x_{156}) & h(x_{164},\overline{x}_{256}) & h(x_{145},\overline{x}_{356}) \\ h(x_{256},\overline{x}_{164}) & h(x_{264}) & h(x_{245},\overline{x}_{364}) \\ h(x_{356},\overline{x}_{145}) & h(x_{364},\overline{x}_{245}) & h(x_{345}) \\ h(x_{423}) & h(x_{431},\overline{x}_{523}) & h(x_{412},\overline{x}_{623}) \\ h(x_{523},\overline{x}_{431}) & h(x_{531}) & h(x_{512},\overline{x}_{631}) \\ h(x_{623},\overline{x}_{412}) & h(x_{631},\overline{x}_{512}) & h(x_{612})\end{array}\right),$	$f^{-1}\left(\sum_{i<j<k}x_{ijk}\boldsymbol{e}_i\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_j\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_k\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}h(x_{156}) & h(x_{164},\overline{x}_{256}) & h(x_{145},\overline{x}_{356}) \\ h(x_{256},\overline{x}_{164}) & h(x_{264}) & h(x_{245},\overline{x}_{364}) \\ h(x_{356},\overline{x}_{145}) & h(x_{364},\overline{x}_{245}) & h(x_{345}) \\ h(x_{423}) & h(x_{431},\overline{x}_{523}) & h(x_{412},\overline{x}_{623}) \\ h(x_{523},\overline{x}_{431}) & h(x_{531}) & h(x_{512},\overline{x}_{631}) \\ h(x_{623},\overline{x}_{412}) & h(x_{631},\overline{x}_{512}) & h(x_{612})\end{array}\right),$	$f^{-1}\left(\sum_{i<j<k}x_{ijk}\boldsymbol{e}_i\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_j\wedge\boldsymbol{e}_k\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}h(x_{156}) & h(x_{164},\overline{x}_{256}) & h(x_{145},\overline{x}_{356}) \\ h(x_{256},\overline{x}_{164}) & h(x_{264}) & h(x_{245},\overline{x}_{364}) \\ h(x_{356},\overline{x}_{145}) & h(x_{364},\overline{x}_{245}) & h(x_{345}) \\ h(x_{423}) & h(x_{431},\overline{x}_{523}) & h(x_{412},\overline{x}_{623}) \\ h(x_{523},\overline{x}_{431}) & h(x_{531}) & h(x_{512},\overline{x}_{631}) \\ h(x_{623},\overline{x}_{412}) & h(x_{631},\overline{x}_{512}) & h(x_{612})\end{array}\right),$
basis: inferred / ink					
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥0.9 ■ 0.5–0.9 ■ <0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: basis] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — <i>basis</i> names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E01032 (was)	173	■ 0.022	$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1+\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_2-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 1 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_2-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_2-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_2-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1+\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_2+\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 2 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_2+\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 2 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_2-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 2 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_2+\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_3-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 3 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 1 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_3-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1+\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_3-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mu_3-\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_3+\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 3 \quad 5 \quad 4 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 3 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0+\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_3+\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 2 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1+\lambda_2-\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_3+\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 2 \\ & \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_0-\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3\right)-\frac{1}{2}\mu_3+\frac{2}{3}\nu=1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 2 \end{aligned}$	(not rendered)	

Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥0.9 ■ 0.5-0.9 ■ <0.5 — no value

LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ

Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured

[refined: basis] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — basis names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E01032 (now)	173	—	$\begin{aligned} \kappa\pi H &= \tfrac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)H_1 \\ &+ \tfrac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_2 + \tfrac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_3, \end{aligned}$	$\kappa\pi H = \tfrac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)H_1 + \tfrac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_2 + \tfrac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_3,$	$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 + \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 + \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_2 + \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 - \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 + \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 3 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 + \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 + \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_3 + \frac{2}{3}\nu &= 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{aligned}$
basis: inferred / ink					
0902.0431_E01059 (was)	180	■ 0.093	$\begin{aligned} &\&=\left\{\alpha\in\left(E_8\right)^{\left\{1,1-,1-\right\}}\mid\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha=\alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\right\} \\ &\&=\left\{\alpha\in E_7^C\mid\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha=\alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\right\}\text{ (Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &\&=\left\{\alpha\in E_7^C\mid\tau\lambda\alpha=\alpha\tau\lambda\right\}\text{ (by the correspondence to Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &\&=E_7\text{ (Lemma 4.3.3.(4)).} \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} &=\left\{\alpha\in\left(E_8^C\right)_{1,1-,1-}\mid\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha=\alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\right\} \\ &=\left\{\alpha\in E_7^C\mid\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha=\alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\right\}\text{ (Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &=\left\{\alpha\in E_7^C\mid\tau\lambda\alpha=\alpha\tau\lambda\right\}\text{ (by the correspondence to Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &=E_7\text{ (Lemma 4.3.3.(4)).} \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} &=\left\{\alpha\in\left(E_8^C\right)_{1,1-,1-}\mid\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha=\alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\right\} \\ &=\left\{\alpha\in E_7^C\mid\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha=\alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\right\}\text{ (Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &=\left\{\alpha\in E_7^C\mid\tau\lambda\alpha=\alpha\tau\lambda\right\}\text{ (by the correspondence to Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &=E_7\text{ (Lemma 4.3.3.(4)).} \end{aligned}$
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥ 0.9 ■ 0.5–0.9 ■ < 0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: <i>basis</i>] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — <i>basis</i> names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E01059 (now)	180	—	$\begin{aligned} \kappa\pi H = & \frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_0 + \frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)H_1 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_2 + \frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)H_3, \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} &= \{\alpha \in (E_8^C)_{1,1^-,1_-} \mid \tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha = \alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\} \\ &= \{\alpha \in E_7^C \mid \tau\widetilde{\lambda}\alpha = \alpha\tau\widetilde{\lambda}\} \text{ (Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &= \{\alpha \in E_7^C \mid \tau\lambda\alpha = \alpha\tau\lambda\} \text{ (by the correspondence to Proposition 5.7.1)} \\ &= E_7 \text{ (Lemma 4.3.3.(4)).} \end{aligned}$	
basis: inferred / ink					
0902.0431_E01117 (was)	189	■ 0.108	$\begin{aligned} &\& (\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y}) = \\ &\left(X_{\{1\}}, Y_{\{1\}} \right) + \left(X_{\{2\}}, Y_{\{2\}} \right) + \\ &\left(X_{\{3\}}, Y_{\{3\}} \right) \in C, \quad \& \& \angle \\ &\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y} \angle = \left(\angle X_{\{1\}}, Y_{\{1\}} \right) + \left(\angle X_{\{2\}}, Y_{\{2\}} \right) \\ &\right) + \left(\angle X_{\{3\}}, Y_{\{3\}} \right) \in C, \quad \& \boldsymbol{X} \times \boldsymbol{Y} = \left(\begin{array}{ll} X_2 \times Y_3 - Y_2 \times X_3 \\ X_3 \times Y_1 - Y_3 \times X_1 \\ X_1 \times Y_2 - Y_1 \times X_2 \end{array} \right) \in (\mathfrak{J}^C)^3, \\ &\boldsymbol{X} \cdot \boldsymbol{Y} = \left(\begin{array}{ll} (X_1, Y_1) & (X_1, Y_2) \\ (X_2, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_2) \\ (X_3, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_3) \\ X \vee Y & (X_3, Y_3) \end{array} \right) - \frac{1}{3}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})E \in \mathfrak{sl}(3, C), \\ &\boldsymbol{X}Y_1 + X_2 \vee Y_2 + X_3 \vee Y_3 \in \mathfrak{e}_6^C, \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} &(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y}) = (X_1, Y_1) + (X_2, Y_2) + (X_3, Y_3) \in C, \\ &\langle \boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y} \rangle = \langle X_1, Y_1 \rangle + \langle X_2, Y_2 \rangle + \langle X_3, Y_3 \rangle \in C, \\ &\boldsymbol{X} \times \boldsymbol{Y} = \left(\begin{array}{ll} X_2 \times Y_3 - Y_2 \times X_3 \\ X_3 \times Y_1 - Y_3 \times X_1 \\ X_1 \times Y_2 - Y_1 \times X_2 \end{array} \right) \in (\mathfrak{J}^C)^3, \\ &\boldsymbol{X} \cdot \boldsymbol{Y} = \left(\begin{array}{ll} (X_1, Y_1) & (X_1, Y_2) \\ (X_2, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_2) \\ (X_3, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_3) \\ X \vee Y & (X_3, Y_3) \end{array} \right) - \frac{1}{3}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})E \in \mathfrak{sl}(3, C), \\ &\boldsymbol{X}Y_1 + X_2 \vee Y_2 + X_3 \vee Y_3 \in \mathfrak{e}_6^C, \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} &(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y}) = (X_1, Y_1) + (X_2, Y_2) + (X_3, Y_3) \in C, \\ &\langle \boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y} \rangle = \langle X_1, Y_1 \rangle + \langle X_2, Y_2 \rangle + \langle X_3, Y_3 \rangle \in C, \\ &\boldsymbol{X} \times \boldsymbol{Y} = \left(\begin{array}{ll} X_2 \times Y_3 - Y_2 \times X_3 \\ X_3 \times Y_1 - Y_3 \times X_1 \\ X_1 \times Y_2 - Y_1 \times X_2 \end{array} \right) \in (\mathfrak{J}^C)^3, \\ &\boldsymbol{X} \cdot \boldsymbol{Y} = \left(\begin{array}{ll} (X_1, Y_1) & (X_1, Y_2) \\ (X_2, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_2) \\ (X_3, Y_1) & (X_3, Y_2) \\ (X_3, Y_1) & (X_3, Y_2) \end{array} \right) - \frac{1}{3}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})E \in \mathfrak{sl}(3, C), \\ &\boldsymbol{X} \vee \boldsymbol{Y} = X_1 \vee Y_1 + X_2 \vee Y_2 + X_3 \vee Y_3 \in \mathfrak{e}_6^C, \end{aligned}$
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥0.9 ■ 0.5-0.9 ■ <0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: <i>basis</i>] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — <i>basis</i> names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					

Identifier	Page	Conf.	LaTeX source	Rendered	Scan image
0902.0431_E01117 (now)	189	—	$\begin{aligned} & (\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y}) = (X_1, Y_1) + (X_2, Y_2) + (X_3, Y_3) \in C, \\ & \langle \boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y} \rangle = \langle X_1, Y_1 \rangle + \langle X_2, Y_2 \rangle + \langle X_3, Y_3 \rangle \in C, \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \times \boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} X_2 \times Y_3 - Y_2 \times X_3 \\ X_3 \times Y_1 - Y_3 \times X_1 \\ X_1 \times Y_2 - Y_1 \times X_2 \end{pmatrix} \in (\mathfrak{J}^C)^3, \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \cdot \boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} (X_1, Y_1) & (X_1, Y_2) & (X_1, Y_3) \\ (X_2, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_2) & (X_2, Y_3) \\ (X_3, Y_1) & (X_3, Y_2) & (X_3, Y_3) \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{3}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})E \in \mathfrak{sl}(3, C), \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \vee \boldsymbol{Y} = X_1 \vee Y_1 + X_2 \vee Y_2 + X_3 \vee Y_3 \in \mathfrak{e}_6^C, \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & (\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y}) = (X_1, Y_1) + (X_2, Y_2) + (X_3, Y_3) \in C, \\ & \langle \boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y} \rangle = \langle X_1, Y_1 \rangle + \langle X_2, Y_2 \rangle + \langle X_3, Y_3 \rangle \in C, \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \wedge \boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} X_2 \wedge Y_3 - Y_2 \wedge X_3 \\ X_3 \wedge Y_1 - Y_3 \wedge X_1 \\ X_1 \wedge Y_2 - Y_1 \wedge X_2 \end{pmatrix} \in (\mathfrak{J}^C)^3, \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \cdot \boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} (X_1, Y_1) & (X_1, Y_2) & (X_1, Y_3) \\ (X_2, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_2) & (X_2, Y_3) \\ (X_3, Y_1) & (X_3, Y_2) & (X_3, Y_3) \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{3}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})E \in \mathfrak{sl}(3, C), \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \vee \boldsymbol{Y} = X_1 \vee Y_1 + X_2 \vee Y_2 + X_3 \vee Y_3 \in \mathfrak{e}_6^C, \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & (\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y}) = (X_1, Y_1) + (X_2, Y_2) + (X_3, Y_3) \in C, \\ & \langle \boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y} \rangle = \langle X_1, Y_1 \rangle + \langle X_2, Y_2 \rangle + \langle X_3, Y_3 \rangle \in C, \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \times \boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} X_2 \times Y_3 - Y_2 \times X_3 \\ X_3 \times Y_1 - Y_3 \times X_1 \\ X_1 \times Y_2 - Y_1 \times X_2 \end{pmatrix} \in (\mathfrak{J}^C)^3, \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \cdot \boldsymbol{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} (X_1, Y_1) & (X_1, Y_2) & (X_1, Y_3) \\ (X_2, Y_1) & (X_2, Y_2) & (X_2, Y_3) \\ (X_3, Y_1) & (X_3, Y_2) & (X_3, Y_3) \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{3}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})E \in \mathfrak{sl}(3, C), \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \vee \boldsymbol{Y} = X_1 \vee Y_1 + X_2 \vee Y_2 + X_3 \vee Y_3 \in \mathfrak{e}_6^C, \end{aligned}$
basis: inferred / ink					
Conf. MathPix confidence: ■ ≥ 0.9 ■ $0.5-0.9$ ■ < 0.5 — no value LaTeX source MathPix’s reading, unchanged; Rendered the same reading, with a display environment (align/alignat/flalign/eqnarray/gather/multline/split) mapped to its in-math form so it can typeset in this cell — the two may legitimately differ Residual render vs scan (inkdrill): ● C component ● W weak ● S stable ● N noise ● K clean ● not measured [refined: <i>basis</i>] beside an identifier: the LaTeX-source and Rendered cells both show a VERIFIED refinement, not MathPix’s own reading — <i>basis</i> names what verified it (e.g. ink, source). The original reading is unchanged in the model but is not the one drawn here.					