

Math 531 Tom Tucker  
NOTES FROM CLASS 10/13

We were in the middle of proving the following...

**Lemma 19.1.** *Let  $A$  and  $B'$  be as last time. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a maximal prime of  $A$ , let  $k = A/\mathcal{P}$ , let  $S = A \setminus \mathcal{P}$ , and let  $\phi : S^{-1}B' \longrightarrow S^{-1}B'/S^{-1}B'\mathcal{P}$  be the usual quotient map. Let us denote  $S^{-1}B'/S^{-1}B'\mathcal{P}$  as  $C$ . Then for any  $y \in S^{-1}B'$ , we have  $\phi(T_{L/K}(y)) = T_{C/k}(\phi(y))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_n$  be a basis for  $C$  over  $k$  and pick  $w_i \in B'$  such that  $\phi(w_i) = \bar{w}_i$ . Since the  $\bar{w}_i$  are linearly independent, the  $w_i$  must be as well. To see this, suppose that  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i w_i = 0$  for  $a_i \in S^{-1}B'$  (remember that everything in  $L$  is  $x/a$  for  $x \in B'$  and  $a \in A$ ). By dividing through by a power of a generator  $\pi$  for  $A_{\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{P}$ , we can assume that not all of the  $a_i$  are in  $S^{-1}B'\mathcal{P}$ . This means then that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(a_i)\bar{w}_i = 0$ , with some  $\phi(a_i) \neq 0$ , which is impossible. Now, we are essentially done, since we can define the trace of any  $y \in B'$  with respect to this basis. We have

$$yw_i = \sum_{j=1}^n m_{ij}w_j$$

with  $m_{ij} \in A$ , and

$$\phi(y)\bar{w}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \phi(m_{ij})\bar{w}_j.$$

Hence,

$$\phi(T_{L/K}(y)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(m_{ii}) = T_{C/k}(\phi(y)).$$

□

We need one quick lemma from linear algebra.

**Lemma 19.2.** *Let  $V$  be a vector space. Let  $\phi : V \longrightarrow V$  be a linear map. Suppose that  $\phi^k = 0$  for some  $k \geq 1$ . Then the trace of  $\phi$  is zero.*

*Proof.* This is on your HW. □

When  $B$  is the integral closure of  $A$  in  $L$ , and  $\mathcal{P}$  is maximal in  $A$ , we can write

$$\mathcal{P}B = \mathcal{Q}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_m^{e_m}.$$

If  $e_i > 1$  for some  $i$ , then we say that  $\mathcal{P}$  *ramifies* in  $B$ . When  $B = A[\alpha]$ , we know that  $\mathcal{P}$  ramifies in  $B$  if and only if  $\Delta(B/A) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . That is true more generally.

**Theorem 19.3.** *Let  $B$  be the integral closure of  $A$  in  $L$  and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be maximal in  $A$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}$  ramifies in  $B$  if and only if  $\Delta(B/A) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ .*

*Proof.* It will suffice to prove this locally, that is to say, it will suffice to replace  $A$  with  $A_{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $B$  with  $S^{-1}B$  where  $S = A \setminus \mathcal{P}$ . As in the previous Lemma, we write  $k = A/\mathcal{P}$  and  $C = S^{-1}B/\mathcal{P}S^{-1}B$  and let

$$\phi : S^{-1}B \longrightarrow S^{-1}B/\mathcal{P}S^{-1}B$$

Also, as in that Lemma let  $\bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_n$  be basis for  $C$  over  $k$  and pick  $w_i \in S^{-1}B$  such that  $\phi(w_i) = \bar{w}_i$ . It is clear then that

$$A_{\mathcal{P}}w_1 + \dots A_{\mathcal{P}}w_n + \mathcal{P}S^{-1}B = S^{-1}B,$$

so by Nakayama's Lemma, the  $w_i$  generate  $S^{-1}B$  as an  $A_{\mathcal{P}}$  module. From the Lemma above we have  $T_{L/K}(w_i w_j) = T_{C/k}(\bar{w}_i \bar{w}_j)$ , so the matrix  $M = [T_{C/k}(\bar{w}_i \bar{w}_j)]$  represents the form  $(x, y) = T_{C/k}(xy)$  on  $C/k$ . Let us now decompose  $C/k$  as ring, we have

$$C \cong S^{-1}B/\mathcal{P}S^{-1}B \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^m S^{-1}B/S^{-1}B\mathcal{Q}_i^{e_i}$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}B = \mathcal{Q}_1^{e_1} \dots \mathcal{Q}_m^{e_m}.$$

If  $e_i > 1$ , then any element  $z \in C$  such that  $z = 0$  in every coordinate but  $i$  and has  $i$ -th coordinate in  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ , has the property that  $z^{e_i} = 0$ . This means that the pairing

$$(x, y) = T_{C/k}(xy)$$

on  $C$  is degenerate from your homework.

If  $e_i = 1$  for every  $i$ , then

$$C \cong S^{-1}B/S^{-1}B\mathcal{Q}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus S^{-1}B/S^{-1}B\mathcal{Q}_m$$

and  $S^{-1}B/S^{-1}B\mathcal{Q}_i$  is separable over  $k$  for each  $i$ . The trace form  $(x, y) = T_{C/k}(xy)$  decomposes into a sum of forms

$$(a, b) = T_{(S^{-1}B/S^{-1}B\mathcal{Q}_i)/k}(ab),$$

each of which is nondegenerate, so  $(x, y)$  is nondegenerate, so

$$\det[T_{L/K}(w_i w_j)] \notin \mathcal{P},$$

and we are done. □

Here is a simple and easy to prove fact comparing the discriminants of different subrings  $B$  and  $B'$  of  $L$

**Proposition 19.4.** *Let  $B' \subset B$  where  $B$  and  $B'$  are as usual (we will usually take  $B$  to be the integral closure of  $A$  in  $L$ ). Suppose that  $B$  has a basis  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  as an  $A$ -module and that  $B'$  has a basis  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  as an  $A$ -module. Writing*

$$w_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^n n_{i\ell} a_\ell,$$

*and letting  $N$  be the matrix  $[n_{i\ell}]$ , we have*

$$(1) \quad \det[\mathrm{T}_{L/K}(w_i w_j)] = (\det N)^2 \det[\mathrm{T}_{L/K}(v_i v_j)].$$

*Proof.* Now,

$$\mathrm{T}_{L/K}(w_i w_j) = \sum_{\ell=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n n_{i\ell} n_{jk} \mathrm{T}_{L/K}(v_\ell v_k).$$

A bit of linear algebra shows that this is exactly the same as the  $ij$ -th coordinate of the matrix  $N^t M N$  where  $M = [\mathrm{T}_{L/K}(v_i v_j)]$ . Equation 1 follows. I gave an easier explanation on the board.  $\square$