

10 Extensions of complete DVRs

Recall that in our *AKLB* setup, A is a Dedekind domain with fraction field K , the field L is a finite separable extension of K , and B is the integral closure of A in L ; as we proved in Theorem 5.24, this implies that B is also a Dedekind domain (with L as its fraction field). We now want to consider the special case where A is a complete DVR; in this case B is also a complete DVR, but this will take a little bit of work to prove. We first show that B is a DVR.

Theorem 10.1. *Assume $AKLB$ and that A is a complete DVR with maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} . Then B is a DVR whose maximal ideal \mathfrak{q} is necessarily the unique prime above \mathfrak{p} .*

Proof. We first show that $\#\{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{p}\} = 1$. At least one prime \mathfrak{q} of B lies above \mathfrak{p} , since the factorization of $\mathfrak{p}B \subsetneq B$ is non-trivial. Now suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2 \in \{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{p}\}$ with $\mathfrak{q}_1 \neq \mathfrak{q}_2$. Choose $b \in \mathfrak{q}_1 - \mathfrak{q}_2$ and consider the ring $A[b] \subseteq B$. The ideals $\mathfrak{q}_1 \cap A[b]$ and $\mathfrak{q}_2 \cap A[b]$ are distinct prime ideals of $A[b]$ containing $\mathfrak{p}A[b]$, and both are maximal, since they are nonzero and $\dim A[b] = \dim A = 1$ (note that $A[b] \subseteq B$ is integral over A and therefore has the same dimension). The quotient ring $A[b]/\mathfrak{p}A[b]$ thus has at least two maximal ideals. Let $f \in A[x]$ be the minimal polynomial of b over K , and let $\bar{f} \in k[x]$ be its reduction to the residue field A/\mathfrak{p} . We have

$$\frac{(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]}{(\bar{f})} \simeq \frac{A[x]}{(\mathfrak{p}, f)} \simeq \frac{A[b]}{\mathfrak{p}A[b]},$$

thus the ring $(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]/(\bar{f})$ has at least two maximal ideals, which implies that \bar{f} is divisible by two distinct irreducible polynomials (because $(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]$ is a PID). We can thus factor $\bar{f} = \bar{g}\bar{h}$ with \bar{g} and \bar{h} coprime. By Hensel's Lemma 9.19, we can lift this to a non-trivial factorization $f = gh$ of f in $A[x]$, contradicting the irreducibility of f .

Every maximal ideal of B lies above a maximal ideal of A , but A has only the maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} and $\#\{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{p}\} = 1$, so B has a unique (nonzero) maximal ideal \mathfrak{q} . Thus B is a local Dedekind domain, hence a local PID, and not a field, so B is a DVR, by Theorem 1.16. \square

Remark 10.2. The assumption that A is complete is necessary. For example, if A is the DVR $\mathbb{Z}_{(5)}$ with fraction field $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and we take $L = \mathbb{Q}(i)$, then the integral closure of A in L is $B = \mathbb{Z}_{(5)}[i]$, which is a PID but not a DVR: the ideals $(1 + 2i)$ and $(1 - 2i)$ are both maximal (and not equal). But if we take completions we get $A = \mathbb{Z}_5$ and $K = \mathbb{Q}_5$, and now $L = \mathbb{Q}_5(i) = \mathbb{Q}_5 = K$, since $x^2 + 1$ has a root in $\mathbb{F}_5 \simeq \mathbb{Z}_5/5\mathbb{Z}_5$ that we can lift to \mathbb{Z}_5 via Hensel's lemma; thus if we complete A then $B = A$ is a DVR as required.

Definition 10.3. Let K be a field with absolute value $|\cdot|$ and let V be a K -vector space. A *norm* on V is a function $\|\cdot\| : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

- $\|v\| = 0$ if and only if $v = 0$.
- $\|\lambda v\| = |\lambda| \|v\|$ for all $\lambda \in K$ and $v \in V$.
- $\|v + w\| \leq \|v\| + \|w\|$ for all $v, w \in V$.

Each norm $\|\cdot\|$ induces a topology on V via the distance metric $d(v, w) := \|v - w\|$.

Example 10.4. Let V be a K -vector space with basis (e_i) , and for $v \in V$ let $v_i \in K$ denote the coefficient of e_i in $v = \sum_i v_i e_i$. The *sup-norm* $\|v\|_\infty := \sup\{|v_i|\}$ is a norm on V (so

every vector space has at least one norm). If V is also a K -algebra, an absolute value $\|\cdot\|$ on V (as a ring) is a norm on V (as a K -vector space) if and only if it extends the absolute value on K (fix $v \neq 0$ and note that $\|\lambda\| \|v\| = \|\lambda v\| = |\lambda| \|v\| \Leftrightarrow \|\lambda\| = |\lambda|$).

Proposition 10.5. *Let V be a vector space of finite dimension over a complete field K . Every norm on V induces the same topology, in which V is a complete metric space.*

Proof. See Problem Set 5. □

Theorem 10.6. *Let A be a complete DVR with fraction field K , maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} , discrete valuation $v_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and absolute value $|x|_{\mathfrak{p}} := c^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$, with $0 < c < 1$. Let L/K be a finite extension of degree n . The following hold.*

- (i) *There is a unique absolute value $|x| := |N_{L/K}(x)|_{\mathfrak{p}}^{1/n}$ on L that extends $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{p}}$;*
- (ii) *The field L is complete with respect to $|\cdot|$, and its valuation ring $\{x \in L : |x| \leq 1\}$ is equal to the integral closure B of A in L ;*
- (iii) *If L/K is separable then B is a complete DVR whose maximal ideal \mathfrak{q} induces*

$$|x| = |x|_{\mathfrak{q}} := c^{\frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{q}}} v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)},$$

where $e_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is the ramification index of \mathfrak{q} , that is, $\mathfrak{p}B = \mathfrak{q}^{e_{\mathfrak{q}}}$.

Proof. Assuming for the moment that $|\cdot|$ is actually an absolute value (which is not obvious!), for any $x \in K$ we have

$$|x| = |N_{L/K}(x)|_{\mathfrak{p}}^{1/n} = |x^n|_{\mathfrak{p}}^{1/n} = |x|_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

so $|\cdot|$ extends $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and is therefore a norm on L . The fact that $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is nontrivial means that $|x|_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 1$ for some $x \in K^{\times}$, and $|x|^a = |x|_{\mathfrak{p}} = |x|$ only for $a = 1$, which implies that $|\cdot|$ is the unique absolute value in its equivalence class extending $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Every norm on L induces the same topology (by Proposition 10.5), so $|\cdot|$ is the only absolute value on L that extends $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

We now show $|\cdot|$ is an absolute value. Clearly $|x| = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = 0$ and $|\cdot|$ is multiplicative; we only need to check the triangle inequality. It suffices to show $|x| \leq 1 \Rightarrow |x+1| \leq |x| + 1$, since we always have $|y+z| = |z||y/z+1|$ and $|y|+|z| = |z|(|y/z+1|)$, and without loss of generality we assume $|y| \leq |z|$. In fact the stronger implication $|x| \leq 1 \Rightarrow |x+1| \leq 1$ holds:

$$|x| \leq 1 \iff |N_{L/K}(x)|_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq 1 \iff N_{L/K}(x) \in A \iff x \in B \iff x+1 \in B \iff |x+1| \leq 1.$$

The first biconditional follows from the definition of $|\cdot|$, the second follows from the definition of $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{p}}$, the third is Corollary 9.21, the fourth is obvious, and the fifth follows from the first three after replacing x with $x+1$. This completes the proof of (i), and also proves (ii).

We now assume L/K is separable. Then B is a DVR, by Theorem 10.1, and it is complete because it is the valuation ring of L . Let \mathfrak{q} be the unique maximal ideal of B . The valuation $v_{\mathfrak{q}}$ extends $v_{\mathfrak{p}}$ with index $e_{\mathfrak{q}}$, by Theorem 8.20, so $v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x) = e_{\mathfrak{q}}v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ for $x \in K^{\times}$. We have $0 < c^{1/e_{\mathfrak{q}}} < 1$, so $|x|_{\mathfrak{q}} := (c^{1/e_{\mathfrak{q}}})^{v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)}$ is an absolute value on L induced by $v_{\mathfrak{q}}$. To show it is equal to $|\cdot|$, it suffices to show that it extends $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{p}}$, since we already know that $|\cdot|$ is the unique absolute value on L with this property. For $x \in K^{\times}$ we have

$$|x|_{\mathfrak{q}} = c^{\frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{q}}} v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)} = c^{\frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{q}}} e_{\mathfrak{q}} v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} = c^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} = |x|_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

and the theorem follows. □

Remark 10.7. The transitivity of $N_{L/K}$ in towers (Corollary 4.52) implies that we can uniquely extend the absolute value on the fraction field K of a complete DVR to an algebraic closure \overline{K} . In fact, this is another form of Hensel's lemma in the following sense: one can show that a (not necessarily discrete) valuation ring A is Henselian if and only if the absolute value of its fraction field K can be uniquely extended to \overline{K} ; see [4, Theorem 6.6].

Corollary 10.8. *Assume AKLB and that A is a complete DVR with maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} and let $\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{p}$. Then $v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x) = \frac{1}{f_{\mathfrak{q}}}v_{\mathfrak{p}}(N_{L/K}(x))$ for all $x \in L$.*

Proof. $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(N_{L/K}(x)) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(N_{L/K}((x))) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(N_{L/K}(\mathfrak{q}^{v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)})) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{p}^{f_{\mathfrak{q}}v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)}) = f_{\mathfrak{q}}v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)$. □

Remark 10.9. One can generalize the notion of a discrete valuation to a *valuation*, a surjective homomorphism $v: K^{\times} \rightarrow \Gamma$, in which Γ is a (totally) ordered abelian group and $v(x+y) \geq \min(v(x), v(y))$; we extend v to K by defining $v(0) = \infty$ to be strictly greater than any element of Γ . In the AKLB setup with A a complete DVR, one can then define a valuation $v(x) = \frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{q}}}v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)$ with image $\frac{1}{e_{\mathfrak{q}}}\mathbb{Z}$ that restricts to the discrete valuation $v_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on K . The valuation v then extends to a valuation on \overline{K} with $\Gamma = \mathbb{Q}$. Some texts take this approach, but we will generally stick with discrete valuations (so our absolute value on L restricts to K , but our discrete valuations on L do not restrict to discrete valuations on K , they extend them with index $e_{\mathfrak{q}}$).

Remark 10.10. Recall that a *valuation ring* is an integral domain A with fraction field K such that for every $x \in K^{\times}$ either $x \in A$ or $x^{-1} \in A$ (possibly both). As you will show on Problem Set 6, if A is a valuation ring, then there exists a valuation $v: K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ for some totally ordered abelian group Γ such that $A = \{x \in K : v(x) \geq 0\}$ is the valuation ring of K with respect to this valuation.

10.1 The Dedekind-Kummer theorem in a local setting

Recall that the Dedekind-Kummer theorem (Theorem 6.14) allows us to factor primes in our AKLB setting by factoring polynomials over the residue field, provided that B is monogenic (of the form $A[\alpha]$ for some $\alpha \in B$), or the prime of interest does not contain the conductor. We now show that in the special case where A and B are DVRs and the residue field extension is separable, B is always monogenic; this holds, for example, whenever K is a local field. To prove this, we first recall a form of Nakayama's lemma.

Lemma 10.11 (NAKAYAMA'S LEMMA). *Let A be a local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} , and let M be a finitely generated A -module. If the images of $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M$ generate $M/\mathfrak{p}M$ as an (A/\mathfrak{p}) -vector space then x_1, \dots, x_n generate M as an A -module.*

Proof. See [1, Corollary 4.8b]. □

Before proving our theorem on local monogenicity, we record a few corollaries of Nakayama's Lemma that will be useful later.

Corollary 10.12. *Let A be a local noetherian ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} , let $g \in A[x]$, and let $B := A[x]/(g(x))$. Every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of B contains the ideal $\mathfrak{p}B$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then $\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{p}B = B$ for some maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of B . The ring B is finitely generated over the noetherian ring A , hence a noetherian A -module, so its A -submodules are all finitely generated. Let z_1, \dots, z_n be A -module generators for \mathfrak{m} . Every coset of $\mathfrak{p}B$

in B can be written as $z + \mathfrak{p}B$ for some A -linear combination z of z_1, \dots, z_n , so the images of z_1, \dots, z_n generate $B/\mathfrak{p}B$ as an (A/\mathfrak{p}) -vector space. By Nakayama's lemma, z_1, \dots, z_n generate B , in which case $\mathfrak{m} = B$, a contradiction. \square

As a corollary, we immediately obtain a local version of the Dedekind-Kummer theorem that does not even require A and B to be Dedekind domains.

Corollary 10.13. *Let A be a local noetherian ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} , let $g \in A[x]$ be a polynomial with reduction $\bar{g} \in (A/\mathfrak{p})[x]$, and let α be the image of x in the ring $B := A[x]/(g(x)) = A[\alpha]$. The maximal ideals of B are $(\mathfrak{p}, g_i(\alpha))$, where $g_1, \dots, g_m \in A[x]$ are lifts of the distinct irreducible polynomials $\bar{g}_i \in (A/\mathfrak{p})[x]$ that divide \bar{g} .*

Proof. By Corollary 10.12, the quotient map $B \rightarrow B/\mathfrak{p}B$ gives a one-to-one correspondence between maximal ideals of B and maximal ideals of $B/\mathfrak{p}B$, and we have

$$\frac{B}{\mathfrak{p}B} \simeq \frac{A[x]}{(\mathfrak{p}, g(x))} \simeq \frac{(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]}{(\bar{g}(x))}.$$

Each maximal ideal of $(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]/(\bar{g}(x))$ is the reduction of an irreducible divisor of \bar{g} , hence one of the \bar{g}_i (because $(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]$ is a PID). The corollary follows. \square

Theorem 10.14. *Assume $AKLB$, with A and B DVRs with residue fields $k := A/\mathfrak{p}$ and $l := B/\mathfrak{q}$. If l/k is separable then $B = A[\alpha]$ for some $\alpha \in B$; if L/K is unramified this holds for any $\alpha \in B$ whose image generates the residue field extension l/k .*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p}B = \mathfrak{q}^e$ be the factorization of $\mathfrak{p}B$ and let $f = [l : k]$ be the residue field degree, so that $ef = n := [L : K]$. The extension l/k is separable, so we may apply the primitive element theorem to write $l = k(\alpha_0)$ for some $\alpha_0 \in l$ whose minimal polynomial \bar{g} is separable of degree equal to f . Let $g \in A[x]$ be a monic lift of \bar{g} , and let α_0 be any lift of $\bar{\alpha}_0$ to B . If $v_{\mathfrak{q}}(g(\alpha_0)) = 1$ then let $\alpha := \alpha_0$. Otherwise, let π_0 be any uniformizer for B and let $\alpha := \alpha_0 + \pi_0 \in B$ (so $\alpha \equiv \bar{\alpha}_0 \pmod{\mathfrak{q}}$). Writing $g(x + \pi_0) = g(x) + \pi_0 g'(x) + \pi_0^2 h(x)$ for some $h \in A[x]$ via Lemma 9.11, we have

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}}(g(\alpha)) = v_{\mathfrak{q}}(g(\alpha_0 + \pi_0)) = v_{\mathfrak{q}}(g(\alpha_0) + \pi_0 g'(\alpha_0) + \pi_0^2 h(\alpha_0)) = 1,$$

so $\pi := g(\alpha)$ is also a uniformizer for B .

We now claim $B = A[\alpha]$, equivalently, that $1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{n-1}$ generate B as an A -module. By Nakayama's lemma, it suffices to show that the reductions of $1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{n-1}$ span $B/\mathfrak{p}B$ as a k -vector space. We have $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}^e$, so $\mathfrak{p}B = (\pi^e)$. We can represent each element of $B/\mathfrak{p}B$ as a coset

$$b + \mathfrak{p}B = b_0 + b_1\pi + b_2\pi^2 \cdots + b_{e-1}\pi^{e-1} + \mathfrak{p}B,$$

where b_0, \dots, b_{e-1} are determined up to equivalence modulo πB . Now $1, \bar{\alpha}, \dots, \bar{\alpha}^{f-1}$ are a basis for $B/\pi B = B/\mathfrak{q}$ as a k -vector space, and $\pi = g(\alpha)$, so we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned} b + \mathfrak{p}B &= (a_0 + a_1\alpha + \cdots + a_{f-1}\alpha^{f-1}) \\ &\quad + (a_f + a_{f+1}\alpha + \cdots + a_{2f-1}\alpha^{f-1})g(\alpha) \\ &\quad + \cdots \\ &\quad + (a_{ef-f+1} + a_{ef-f+2}\alpha + \cdots + a_{ef-1}\alpha^{f-1})g(\alpha)^{e-1} + \mathfrak{p}B. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\deg g = f$, and $n = ef$, this expresses $b + \mathfrak{p}B$ in the form $b' + \mathfrak{p}B$ with b' in the A -span of $1, \dots, \alpha^{n-1}$. Thus $B = A[\alpha]$.

We now note that if L/K is unramified then l/k is separable (this is part of the definition of unramified), and $e = 1$, $f = n$, in which case there is no need to require $g(\alpha)$ to be a uniformizer and we can just take $\alpha = \alpha_0$ to be any lift of any $\bar{\alpha}_0$ that generates l over k . \square

In our $AKLB$ setup, if A is a complete DVR with maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} then B is a complete DVR with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{p}$ and the formula $[L : K] = \sum_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{p}} e_{\mathfrak{q}}f_{\mathfrak{q}}$ given by Theorem 5.34 has only one term $e_{\mathfrak{q}}f_{\mathfrak{q}}$. We now simplify matters even further by reducing to the two extreme cases $f_{\mathfrak{q}} = 1$ (a totally ramified extension) and $e_{\mathfrak{q}} = 1$ (an unramified extension, provided that the residue field extension is separable).¹

10.2 Unramified extensions of a complete DVR

Let A be a complete DVR with fraction field K and residue field k . Associated to any finite unramified extension of L/K of degree n is a corresponding finite separable extension of residue fields l/k of the same degree n . Given that the extensions L/K and l/k are finite separable extensions of the same degree, we might wonder how they are related. More precisely, if we fix K with residue field k , what is the relationship between finite unramified extensions L/K of degree n and finite separable extensions l/k of degree n ? Each L/K uniquely determines a corresponding l/k , but what about the converse?

This question has a surprisingly nice answer. The finite unramified extensions L of K form a category $\mathcal{C}_K^{\text{unr}}$ whose morphisms are K -algebra homomorphisms, and the finite separable extensions l of k form a category $\mathcal{C}_k^{\text{sep}}$ whose morphisms are k -algebra homomorphisms. These two categories are equivalent.

Theorem 10.15. *Let A be a complete DVR with fraction field K and residue field $k := A/\mathfrak{p}$. The categories $\mathcal{C}_K^{\text{unr}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_k^{\text{sep}}$ are equivalent via the functor $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{C}_K^{\text{unr}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_k^{\text{sep}}$ that sends each unramified extension L of K to its residue field l , and each K -algebra homomorphism $\varphi: L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ to the k -algebra homomorphism $\bar{\varphi}: l_1 \rightarrow l_2$ defined by $\bar{\varphi}(\bar{\alpha}) := \overline{\varphi(\alpha)}$, where α is any lift of $\bar{\alpha} \in l_1 := B_1/\mathfrak{q}_1$ to B_1 and $\overline{\varphi(\alpha)}$ is the reduction of $\varphi(\alpha) \in B_2$ to $l_2 := B_2/\mathfrak{q}_2$; here $\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2$ are the maximal ideals of the valuation rings B_1, B_2 of L_1, L_2 , respectively.*

In particular, \mathcal{F} gives a bijection between the isomorphism classes in $\mathcal{C}_K^{\text{unr}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_k^{\text{sep}}$, and if L_1, L_2 and have residue fields l_1, l_2 then \mathcal{F} induces a bijection of finite sets

$$\text{Hom}_K(L_1, L_2) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2).$$

Proof. Let us first verify that \mathcal{F} is well-defined. It is clear that it maps finite unramified extensions L/K to finite separable extension l/k , but we should check that the map on morphisms does not depend on the lift α of $\bar{\alpha}$ we pick. So let $\varphi: L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ be a K -algebra homomorphism, and for $\bar{\alpha} \in l_1$, let α and α' be two lifts of $\bar{\alpha}$ to B_1 . Then $\alpha - \alpha' \in \mathfrak{q}_1$, and this implies that $\varphi(\alpha - \alpha') \in \varphi(\mathfrak{q}_1) = \varphi(B_1) \cap \mathfrak{q}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{q}_2$, and therefore $\overline{\varphi(\alpha)} = \overline{\varphi(\alpha')}$. The identity $\varphi(\mathfrak{q}_1) = \varphi(B_1) \cap \mathfrak{q}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{q}_2$ follows from the fact that φ restricts to an injective ring homomorphism $B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ and $B_2/\varphi(B_1)$ is a finite extension of DVRs in which \mathfrak{q}_2 lies over the prime $\varphi(\mathfrak{q}_1)$ of $\varphi(B_1)$. It's easy to see that \mathcal{F} sends identity morphisms to identity morphisms and that it is compatible with composition, so we have a well-defined functor.

To show that \mathcal{F} is an equivalence of categories we need to prove two things:

¹Recall from Definition 5.36 that separability of the residue field extension is part of the *definition* of an unramified extension. If the residue field is perfect (as when K is a local field, for example), the residue field extension is automatically separable, but in general it need not be, even when L/K is unramified.

- \mathcal{F} is essentially surjective: each separable l/k is isomorphic to the residue field of some unramified L/K
- \mathcal{F} is full and faithful: the induced map $\text{Hom}_K(L_1, L_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ is a bijection.

We first show that \mathcal{F} is essentially surjective. Given a finite separable extension l/k , we may apply the primitive element theorem to write

$$l \simeq k(\bar{\alpha}) = \frac{k[x]}{(\bar{g}(x))},$$

for some $\bar{\alpha} \in l$ whose minimal polynomial $\bar{g} \in k[x]$ is necessarily monic, irreducible, separable, and of degree $n := [l : k]$. Let $g \in A[x]$ be any monic lift of \bar{g} ; then g is also irreducible, separable, and of degree n . Now let

$$L := \frac{K[x]}{(g(x))} = K(\alpha),$$

where α is the image of x in $K[x]/g(x)$. Then L/K is a finite separable extension, and by Corollary 10.13, $(\mathfrak{p}, g(\alpha))$ is the unique maximal ideal of $A[\alpha]$ (since \bar{g} is irreducible) and

$$\frac{B}{\mathfrak{q}} \simeq \frac{A[\alpha]}{(\mathfrak{p}, g(\alpha))} \simeq \frac{A[x]}{(\mathfrak{p}, g(x))} \simeq \frac{(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]}{(\bar{g}(x))} \simeq l.$$

We thus have $[L : K] = \deg g = [l : k] = n$, and it follows that L/K is an unramified extension of degree $n = f := [l : k]$: the ramification index of \mathfrak{q} is necessarily $e = n/f = 1$, and the extension l/k is separable by assumption (so in fact $B = A[\alpha]$, by Theorem 10.14).

We now show that the functor \mathcal{F} is full and faithful. Given finite unramified extensions L_1, L_2 with valuation rings B_1, B_2 and residue fields l_1, l_2 , we have induced maps

$$\text{Hom}_K(L_1, L_2) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_A(B_1, B_2) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2).$$

The first map is given by restriction from L_1 to B_1 , and since tensoring with K gives an inverse map in the other direction, it is a bijection. We need to show that the same is true of the second map, which sends $\varphi: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ to the k -homomorphism $\bar{\varphi}$ that sends $\bar{\alpha} \in l_1 = B_1/\mathfrak{q}_1$ to the reduction of $\varphi(\alpha)$ modulo \mathfrak{q}_2 , where α is any lift of $\bar{\alpha}$.

As above, use the primitive element theorem to write $l_1 = k(\bar{\alpha}) = k[x]/(\bar{g}(x))$ for some $\bar{\alpha} \in l_1$. If we now lift $\bar{\alpha}$ to $\alpha \in B_1$, we must have $L_1 = K(\alpha)$, since $[L_1 : K] = [l_1 : k]$ is equal to the degree of the minimal polynomial \bar{g} of $\bar{\alpha}$ which cannot be less than the degree of the minimal polynomial g of α (both are monic). Moreover, we also have $B_1 = A[\alpha]$, since this is true of the valuation ring of every finite unramified extension in our category.

Each A -module homomorphism in

$$\text{Hom}_A(B_1, B_2) = \text{Hom}_A\left(\frac{A[x]}{(g(x))}, B_2\right)$$

is uniquely determined by the image of x in B_2 . Thus gives us a bijection between $\text{Hom}_A(B_1, B_2)$ and the roots of g in B_2 . Similarly, each k -algebra homomorphism in

$$\text{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2) = \text{Hom}_k\left(\frac{k[x]}{(\bar{g}(x))}, l_2\right)$$

is uniquely determined by the image of x in l_2 , and there is a bijection between $\text{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ and the roots of \bar{g} in l_2 . Now \bar{g} is separable, so every root of \bar{g} in $l_2 = B_2/\mathfrak{q}_2$ lifts to a unique root of g in B_2 , by Hensel's Lemma 9.15. Thus the map $\text{Hom}_A(B_1, B_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ induced by \mathcal{F} is a bijection. \square

Remark 10.16. In the proof above we actually only used the fact that L_1/K is unramified. The map $\text{Hom}_K(L_1, L_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ is a bijection even if L_2/K is not unramified.

Let us note the following corollary, which follows from our proof of Theorem 10.15.

Corollary 10.17. *Assume $AKLB$ with A a complete DVR with residue field k . Then L/K is unramified if and only if $B = A[\alpha]$ for some $\alpha \in L$ whose minimal polynomial $g \in A[x]$ has separable image \bar{g} in $k[x]$.*

Proof. The forward direction was proved in the proof of the theorem, and for the reverse direction note that \bar{g} must be irreducible, since otherwise we could use Hensel's lemma to lift a non-trivial factorization of \bar{g} to a non-trivial factorization of g , so the residue field extension is separable and has the same degree as L/K , so L/K is unramified. \square

Corollary 10.18. *Let A be a complete DVR with fraction field K and residue field k , and let ζ_n be a primitive n th root of unity in some algebraic closure of K , with n prime to the characteristic of k . The extension $K(\zeta_n)/K$ is unramified.*

Proof. The field $K(\zeta_n)$ is the splitting field of $f(x) = x^n - 1$ over K . The image \bar{f} of f in $k[x]$ is separable when $p \nmid n$, since $\gcd(\bar{f}, \bar{f}') \neq 1$ only when $\bar{f}' = nx^{n-1}$ is zero, equivalently, only when $p|n$. When \bar{f} is separable, so are all of its divisors, including the reduction of the minimal polynomial of ζ_n , which must be irreducible since otherwise we could obtain a contradiction by lifting a non-trivial factorization via Hensel's lemma. It follows that the residue field of $K(\zeta_n)$ is a separable extension of k , thus $K(\zeta_n)/K$ is unramified. \square

When the residue field k is finite (always the case if K is a local field), we can give a precise description of the finite unramified extensions L/K .

Corollary 10.19. *Let A be a complete DVR with fraction field K and finite residue field \mathbb{F}_q , and let L be a degree n extension of K . Then L/K is unramified if and only if $L \simeq K(\zeta_{q^n-1})$. When this holds, $A[\zeta_{q^n-1}]$ is the integral closure of A in L and L/K is a Galois extension with $\text{Gal}(L/K) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. The reverse implication is implied by Corollary 10.18; note that $K(\zeta_{q^n-1})$ has degree n over K because its residue field is the splitting field of $x^{q^n-1} - 1$ over \mathbb{F}_q , which is an extension of degree n (indeed, one can take this as the definition of \mathbb{F}_{q^n}).

Now suppose L/K is unramified. The residue field has degree n and is thus isomorphic to \mathbb{F}_{q^n} , so its multiplicative group is a cyclic of order $q^n - 1$ generated by some $\bar{\alpha}$. The minimal polynomial $\bar{g} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ of $\bar{\alpha}$ divides $x^{q^n-1} - 1$, and since \bar{g} is irreducible, it is coprime to the quotient $(x^{q^n-1} - 1)/\bar{g}$. By Hensel's Lemma 9.19, we can lift \bar{g} to a polynomial $g \in A[x]$ that divides $x^{q^n-1} - 1 \in A[x]$, and by Hensel's Lemma 9.15 we can lift $\bar{\alpha}$ to a root α of g , in which case α is also a root of $x^{q^n-1} - 1$; it must be a primitive $(q^n - 1)$ -root of unity because its reduction $\bar{\alpha}$ is.

Let B be the integral closure of A in L . We have $B \simeq A[\zeta_{q^n-1}]$ by Theorem 10.14, and L is the splitting field of $x^{q^n-1} - 1$, since its residue field \mathbb{F}_{q^n} is (we can lift the factorization of $x^{q^n-1} - 1$ from \mathbb{F}_{q^n} to L via Hensel's lemma). It follows that L/K is Galois, and the bijection between $(q^n - 1)$ -roots of unity in L and \mathbb{F}_{q^n} induces an isomorphism $\text{Gal}(L/K) \simeq \text{Gal}(l/k) = \text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n}/\mathbb{F}_q) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. \square

Corollary 10.20. *Let A be a complete DVR with fraction field K and finite residue field of characteristic p , and suppose that K does not contain a primitive p th root of unity. The extension $K(\zeta_m)/K$ is ramified if and only if p divides m .*

Proof. If p does not divide m then Corollary 10.18 implies that $K(\zeta_m)/K$ is unramified. If p divides m then $K(\zeta_m)$ contains $K(\zeta_p)$, which by Corollary 10.19 is unramified if and only if $K(\zeta_p) \simeq K(\zeta_{p^n-1})$ with $n := [K(\zeta_p) : K]$, which occurs if and only if p divides $p^n - 1$ (since $\zeta_p \notin K$), which it does not; thus $K(\zeta_p)$ and therefore $K(\zeta_m)$ is ramified when $p|m$. \square

Example 10.21. Consider $A = \mathbb{Z}_p$, $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$, $k = \mathbb{F}_p$, and fix $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ and $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$. For each positive integer n , the finite field \mathbb{F}_p has a unique extension of degree n in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$, namely, \mathbb{F}_{p^n} . Thus for each positive integer n , the local field \mathbb{Q}_p has a unique unramified extension of degree n ; it can be explicitly constructed by adjoining a primitive root of unity ζ_{p^n-1} to \mathbb{Q}_p . The element ζ_{p^n-1} will necessarily have minimal polynomial of degree n dividing $x^{p^n-1} - 1$.

Another useful consequence of Theorem 10.15 that applies when the residue field is finite is that the norm map $N_{L/K}$ restricts to a surjective map $B^\times \rightarrow A^\times$ on unit groups; in fact, this property characterizes unramified extensions.

Theorem 10.22. *Assume AKLB with A a complete DVR with finite residue field. Then L/K is unramified if and only if $N_{L/K}(B^\times) = A^\times$.*

Proof. See Problem Set 6. \square

Definition 10.23. Let L/K be a separable extension. The *maximal unramified extension of K in L* is the subfield

$$\bigcup_{\substack{K \subseteq E \subseteq L \\ E/K \text{ fin. unram.}}} E \subseteq L$$

where the union is over finite unramified subextensions E/K . When $L = K^{\text{sep}}$ is the separable closure of K , this is the *maximal unramified extension of K* , denoted K^{unr} .

Example 10.24. The field $\mathbb{Q}_p^{\text{unr}}$ is an infinite extension of \mathbb{Q}_p with Galois group

$$\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}_p^{\text{unr}}/\mathbb{Q}_p) \simeq \text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p/\mathbb{F}_p) = \varprojlim_n \text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{p^n}/\mathbb{F}_p) \simeq \varprojlim_n \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} =: \hat{\mathbb{Z}},$$

where the inverse limit is taken over positive integers n ordered by divisibility. The ring $\hat{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the *profinite completion* of \mathbb{Z} . The field $\mathbb{Q}_p^{\text{unr}}$ has value group \mathbb{Z} and residue field $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$.

Theorem 10.25. *Assume AKLB with A a complete DVR and separable residue field extension l/k . Let $e_{L/K}$ and $f_{L/K}$ be the ramification index and residue field degrees, respectively. The following hold:*

- (i) *There is a unique intermediate field extension E/K that contains every unramified extension of K in L and it has degree $[E : K] = f_{L/K}$.*
- (ii) *The extension L/E is totally ramified and has degree $[L : E] = e_{L/K}$.*
- (iii) *If L/K is Galois then $\text{Gal}(L/E) = I_{L/K}$, where $I_{L/K} = I_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is the inertia subgroup of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$ for the unique prime \mathfrak{q} of B .*

Proof. (i) Let E/K be the finite unramified extension of K in L corresponding to the finite separable extension l/k given by Theorem 10.15; then $[E : K] = [l : k] = f_{L/K}$ as desired. The maximal unramified extension E' of K in L has the same residue field l as L , which is also the residue field of E , and equivalence of categories given by Theorem 10.15 implies that the trivial isomorphism $\ell \simeq \ell$ corresponds to an isomorphism $E \simeq E'$ that allows us to

view E as a subfield of L ; the same applies to any unramified extension of K with residue field l , so E is unique up to isomorphism.

(ii) We have $f_{L/E} = [l : l] = 1$, so $e_{L/E} = [L : E] = [L : K]/[E : K] = e_{L/K}$.

(iii) By Proposition 7.23, we have $I_{L/E} = \text{Gal}(L/E) \cap I_{L/K}$, and these three groups all have the same order $e_{L/K}$ so they must coincide. \square

References

- [1] David Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra with a view toward algebraic geometry*, Springer, 1995.
- [2] N. Koblitz, *p-adic numbers, p-adic analysis, and zeta function*, Springer, 1984.
- [3] S. Lang, *Algebraic number theory*, second edition, Springer, 1994.
- [4] J. Neukirch, *Algebraic number theory*, Springer, 1999.