# 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 5.25, 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 $A[b]$ 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 $\bar{f} \in (A/\mathfrak{p})[x]$ be its reduction to the residue field $A/\mathfrak{p}$.

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

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 $|\ |$ and let $V$ be a $K$-vector space. A *norm* on $V$ is a function $\|\ \| : V \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ 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 $\|\ \|$ 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 $V$ (thus every vector space has at least one norm). If $V$ is also a $K$-algebra, an absolute value $\| \ \|$ 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. $\square$

**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 $|x| := |\mathrm{N}_{L/K}(x)|_\mathfrak{p}^{1/n}$ on $L$ that extends $| \ |_\mathfrak{p}$;*

(ii) *The field $L$ is complete with respect to $| \ |$, and its valuation ring $\{x \in L : |x| \le 1\}$ 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 $| \ |$ is actually an absolute value (which is not obvious!), for any $x \in K$ we have

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

so $| \ |$ extends $| \ |_\mathfrak{p}$ and is therefore a norm on $L$. The fact that $| \ |_\mathfrak{p}$ 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 $| \ |$ is the unique absolute value in its equivalence class extending $| \ |_\mathfrak{p}$. Every norm on $L$ induces the same topology (by Proposition 10.5), so $| \ |$ is the only absolute value on $L$ that extends $| \ |_\mathfrak{p}$.

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

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

The first biconditional follows from the definition of $| \ |$, the second follows from the definition of $| \ |_\mathfrak{p}$, 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 $| \ |$, it suffices to show that it extends $| \ |_\mathfrak{p}$, since we already know that $| \ |$ 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. $\square$

**Remark 10.7.** The transitivity of $\mathrm{N}_{L/K}$ 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 $v_\mathfrak{q}(x) = \frac{1}{f_\mathfrak{q}} v_\mathfrak{p}(\mathrm{N}_{L/K}(x))$ for all $x \in L$.*

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

**Remark 10.9.** One can generalize the notion of a discrete valuation to a *valuation*, a surjective homomorphism $v\colon K^\times \to \Gamma$, in which $\Gamma$ 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 $\Gamma$. 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 $v\colon K \to \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ for some totally ordered abelian group $\Gamma$ 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 $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in M$ generate $M/\mathfrak{p}M$ as an $(A/\mathfrak{p})$-vector space then $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ 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 $B \coloneqq A[x]/(g(x))$. 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 $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ 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 $z_1, \ldots, z_n$, so the images of $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ generate $B/\mathfrak{p}B$ as an $(A/\mathfrak{p})$-vector space. By Nakayama's lemma, $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ 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 $\alpha$ be the image of $x$ in the ring $B \coloneqq A[x]/(g(x)) = A[\alpha]$. The maximal ideals of $B$ are $(\mathfrak{p}, g_i(\alpha))$, where $g_1, \ldots, g_m \in A[x]$ 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 $B \to B/\mathfrak{p}B$ 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 $k \coloneqq A/\mathfrak{p}$ and $l \coloneqq B/\mathfrak{q}$. If $l/k$ is separable then $B = A[\alpha]$ for some $\alpha \in B$; if $L/K$ is unramified this holds for every lift $\alpha$ of any generator $\bar{\alpha}$ for $l = k(\bar{\alpha})$.*

*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 $ef = n \coloneqq [L : K]$. 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 $\alpha_0$ be any lift of $\bar{\alpha}_0$ to $B$. If $v_{\mathfrak{q}}(g(\alpha_0)) = 1$ then let $\alpha \coloneqq \alpha_0$. Otherwise, let $\pi_0$ be any uniformizer for $B$ and let $\alpha \coloneqq \alpha_0 + \pi_0 \in B$ (so $\alpha \equiv \bar{\alpha}_0 \bmod \mathfrak{q}$) 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 $\pi \coloneqq g(\alpha)$ is also a uniformizer for $B$.

We now claim $B = A[\alpha]$, equivalently, that $1, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha^{n-1}$ generate $B$ as an $A$-module. By Nakayama's lemma, it suffices to show that the reductions of $1, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha^{n-1}$ span $B/\mathfrak{p}B$ as an $k$-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

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

where $b_0, \ldots, b_{e-1}$ are determined up to equivalence modulo $\pi B$. Now $1, \bar{\alpha}, \ldots, \bar{\alpha}^{f-1}$ 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

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

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 $1, \ldots, \alpha^{n-1}$. 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 5.35 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 $\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathrm{unr}}$ whose morphisms are $K$-algebra homomorphisms, and the finite separable extensions $l$ of $k$ form a category $\mathcal{C}_k^{\mathrm{sep}}$ 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 $\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathrm{unr}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_k^{\mathrm{sep}}$ are equivalent via the functor $\mathcal{F}\colon \mathcal{C}_K^{\mathrm{unr}} \to \mathcal{C}_k^{\mathrm{sep}}$ that sends each unramified extension $L$ of $K$ to its residue field $l$, and each $K$-algebra homomorphism $\varphi\colon L_1 \to L_2$ to the $k$-algebra homomorphism $\bar{\varphi}\colon l_1 \to l_2$ defined by $\bar{\varphi}(\bar{\alpha}) := \overline{\varphi(\alpha)}$, where $\alpha$ 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 $\mathcal{C}_K^{\mathrm{unr}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_k^{\mathrm{sep}}$, and if $L_1, L_2$ and have residue fields $l_1, l_2$ then $\mathcal{F}$ induces a bijection of finite sets*

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

*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 extensions $l/k$, but we should check that the map on morphisms does not depend on the lift $\alpha$ of $\bar{\alpha}$ we pick. So let $\varphi\colon L_1 \to L_2$ be a $K$-algebra homomorphism, and for $\bar{\alpha} \in l_1$, let $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ 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 $\varphi$ restricts to an injective ring homomorphism $B_1 \to B_2$ 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:

[1] Recall from Definition 5.37 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 $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L_1, L_2) \to \mathrm{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ 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 $\alpha$ 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

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

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 $\varphi\colon B_1 \to B_2$ to the $k$-homomorphism $\overline{\varphi}$ that sends $\overline{\alpha} \in l_1 = B_1/\mathfrak{q}_1$ to the reduction of $\varphi(\alpha)$ modulo $\mathfrak{q}_2$, where $\alpha$ 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 $\alpha$ (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

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

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

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

is uniquely determined by the image of $x$ in $l_2$, and there is a bijection between $\mathrm{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ 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 $\mathrm{Hom}_A(B_1, B_2) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ 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 $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L_1, L_2) \to \mathrm{Hom}_k(l_1, l_2)$ 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. □

**Corollary 10.18.** *Let $A$ be a complete DVR with fraction field $K$ and residue field $k$, and let $\zeta_n$ 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 $\zeta_n$, 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. □

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* $\mathrm{Gal}(L/K) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.

*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 $\alpha$ of $g$, in which case $\alpha$ 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 $\mathrm{Gal}(L/K) \simeq \mathrm{Gal}(l/k) = \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n}/\mathbb{F}_q) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. □

**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 $\zeta_{p^n-1}$ to $\mathbb{Q}_p$. The element $\zeta_{p^n-1}$ 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 $\mathrm{N}_{L/K}$ restricts to a surjective map $B^\times \to A^\times$ 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 $\mathrm{N}_{L/K}(B^\times) = A^\times$.*

*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 $L = K^{\mathrm{sep}}$ is the separable closure of $K$, this is the *maximal unramified extension of $K$*, denoted $K^{\mathrm{unr}}$.

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

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

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 $\mathbb{Q}_p^{\mathrm{unr}}$ 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 $\mathrm{Gal}(L/E) = I_{L/K}$, where $I_{L/K} = I_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is the inertia subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(L/K)$ 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 7.13, we have $I_{L/E} = \mathrm{Gal}(L/E) \cap I_{L/K}$, 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 functions*, Springer, 1984.

[3] S. Lang, *Algebraic number theory*, second edition, Springer, 1994.

[4] J. Neukirch, *Algebraic number theory*, Springer, 1999.