# 5. Remarks on Corollary 2

## 5. Remarks on Corollary 2

Corollary 2 does not remain true if we delete (b). In fact, take e.g. $L = \mathbf{Q}(t, \sqrt{2(t^2-5)})$, $f(t) = 5$ and let $p > 5$. Then 2 is a norm from $\mathbf{Q}_p(\sqrt{5})$ to $\mathbf{Q}_p$, so $2(t^2-5)$ is a norm from $\mathbf{Q}_p(t, \sqrt{5})$ to $\mathbf{Q}_p(t)$, namely we can write

$$a_p(t)^2 - 5b_p(t)^2 = 2(t^2-5)$$

for suitable $a_p, b_p \in \mathbf{Q}_p(t)$. Necessarily $b_p$ is nonzero, so 5 is a norm from $\mathbf{Q}_p L$ to $\mathbf{Q}_p(t)$ for all $p > 5$. On the other hand simple congruence considerations show that this is not true for $p = 5$.

An assumption which may perhaps seem more natural than (a), is that (for $v = p$) $f$ *is a norm from* $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}_p L}$ *to* $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}_p(t)}$, where the *hat* denotes completion with respect to an extension of the Gauss norm on $\mathbf{Q}_p(t)$. This last assumption is directly related to the solvability of a congruence $N(t, x_1, \ldots, x_d) \equiv f \pmod{p}$ with $x_i \in \mathbf{F}_p(t)$. When such a congruence is solvable, Hensel's principle may lead to a solution with $x_i \in \widehat{\mathbf{Q}_p(t)}$, but not perhaps with $x_i \in \mathbf{Q}_p(t)$.

However *a posteriori* the solvability of the above congruence is equivalent with any of the mentioned assumptions, for almost all $p$. We sketch a proofs of this claim.

Take first $p$ to be a prime not dividing $d$ and such that the cover $L/K$ has good reduction at $p$. By this we mean that the Gauss norm on $\mathbf{Q}_p(t)$ admits only one extension to $\mathbf{Q}_p L$. Denote by $L(p)$ the residue field of $L$ with respect to this extended valuation. Then $L(p)$ is cyclic of degree $d$ over $\mathbf{F}_p(t)$. Also, it goes back to Deuring that the genus of $L(p)$ does not exceed the genus of $L$. We remark that it is well known that these properties are satisfied by all but finitely many $p$. For large $p$ we may also suppose that the reductions of the $\omega_i$'s are linearly independent over $\mathbf{F}_p(t)$. In that case to say that $f$ is a norm from $L(p)$ is equivalent to solving (13) with $x_i \in \mathbf{F}_p[t]$.

We now define certain relevant projective varieties. Consider the equation

$$N(t, x_1, \ldots, x_d) = x_0^d f\,, \tag{13}$$

where the $x_i$'s are polynomials of degree $\leq B$. This is equivalent to a certain system of homogeneous equations over $\mathbf{Q}$ (each of degree $d$) in the coefficients of the $x_i$'s. Such a system defines a variety in $\mathbf{P}^{(d+1)(B+1)-1}$ which we denote by $V_B$. To find a point of $V_B$ over a field $k$ means to find a nontrivial solution of (13) with $x_i \in k[t]$ of degree $\leq B$. In particular we may then represent $f$ as a norm from $kL$.

We pause to note a fact not without interest in itself. Let $\mathbf{k}$ be any field and let $\mathbf{L}$ be a cyclic, $\mathbf{k}$-regular separable extension of $\mathbf{k}(t)$ with Galois group $\Gamma$ of order $d$. Let $g$ be the genus of $\mathbf{L}$. By $\deg_{\mathbf{L}}$ we shall mean the degree (of a function or divisor) referred to $\mathbf{L}$, while deg will be referred to $\mathbf{k}(t)$. We have

PROPOSITION. *If $f$ is a norm from $\mathbf{L}$ to $\mathbf{k}(t)$, then it is the norm of a function $\psi \in \mathbf{L}$ with $\deg_{\mathbf{L}} \psi \leq \deg f + g + d - 1$.*

To prove this assertion, let $N = N_{\mathbf{k}(t)}^{\mathbf{L}}$ be the mentioned norm and write $f = N(\phi)$. Let $F$ be a prime divisor of $\mathbf{k}(t)$ appearing in $f$ with multiplicity $m = m_F$. We may write, as in the proof of Corollary 2,

$$F = e(G_1 + \cdots + G_r),$$

where the $G_i$ are prime divisors of $\mathbf{L}$, rational over $\mathbf{k}$, $e = e_F$ is the ramification index and $G_i = \gamma^{i-1}(G_1)$. We have $\deg_{\mathbf{L}} F = d \deg F = e r \deg_{\mathbf{L}} G_1$. By taking norms we have $dF = er \sum_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \sigma(G_1)$. Let $\sum m_i G_i$ be the part of $\operatorname{div}(\phi)$ made up with the $G_i$'s. Since $N(\phi) = f$ we have $d(\sum_i m_i) = erm$. Hence $|\sum m_i| \leq |erm/d|$ and we may write $\sum m_i G_i = m' G_1 + \sum m_i' G_i$, where $|m'| \leq |erm/d|$ and $\sum m_i' = 0$. Also, $\sum m_i' G_i$ can be written as a sum of terms $G_i - G_j$, $i < j$. In turn, $G_i - G_j = \sum_{s=i}^{j-1} (G_s - G_{s+1})$ is of the form $G - \gamma(G)$ for some rational divisor $G$. These arguments prove that we may write the divisor of $\phi$ in the form $D_+ - D_- + (D - \gamma(D))$, where $D_+ . D_- . D$ are $\mathbf{k}$-rational, $D_+ . D_-$ are positive and

$$\deg_{\mathbf{L}} D_{\pm} \leq \sum_{\pm m_F \geq 0} (\pm m_F) \frac{e\, r}{d} \deg_{\mathbf{L}} G_1 \leq \sum_{\pm m_F \geq 0} m_F \deg F = \deg f .$$

Take now the divisor $Z$ of zeros of the function $t$, say. This is positive of $\mathbf{L}$-degree $d$, rational over $\mathbf{k}$ and invariant by $\Gamma$. Let $h$ be the least integer such that $\deg D + hd \geq g$. Then $g \leq \deg(D + hZ) \leq g + d - 1$. By Riemann-Roch there exists a function $\xi \in \mathbf{L}$ such that its divisor is of the form $E - D - hZ$, where $E$ is positive. Since $D$, $Z$ and $\xi$ are rational over $\mathbf{k}$, $E$ is also rational over $\mathbf{k}$. Also, $\deg_{\mathbf{L}} E = \deg_{\mathbf{L}} D + hd \leq g + d - 1$. Put $\psi = \phi \frac{\xi}{\gamma(\xi)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\psi) &= D_+ - D_- + D - \gamma(D) + E - D - hZ - \gamma(E) + \gamma(D) + hZ \\ &= D_+ - D_- + E - \gamma(E) . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the divisor of zeros of $\psi$ has degree (in $\mathbf{L}$) bounded by $\deg_{\mathbf{L}}(E + D_+) \leq \deg f + g + d - 1$. Also $N(\psi) = N(\phi) = f$. This proves the claim.

COROLLARY. *If $f$ is a norm from $kL$ to $k(t)$, then $V_B$ has a $k$-point for some $B$ bounded only in terms of* $\deg f$ *and $L$ (but not on $k$).*

Here $k$ is any field of characteristic zero and $kL := k(t) \otimes_{Q(t)} L$. To prove the assertion, let $\psi$ be as in the Proposition (with $\mathbf{L} = kL$, $\mathbf{k} = k$) and write $\psi = \sum_{i=1}^{d} y_i \omega_i$ with $y_i \in k(t)$. Conjugating the equation over $k(t)$ we obtain a $d \times d$ invertible linear system in the $y_i$'s, namely $\sigma(\psi) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} y_i \sigma(\omega_i)$ for $\sigma \in \Gamma$. We may solve this system for the $y_i$ and express them as linear combinations of the $\sigma(\psi)$ with coefficients depending only on the basis $\{\omega_i\}$. On the other hand the $(kL)$-degree of $\sigma(\psi)$ is bounded as in the Proposition. Since the degree is subadditive and $\deg y_i = (\deg_{kL} y_i)/d$, we see that $\deg y_i$ is bounded depending only on $\deg f$ and $L$. Therefore we may write $y_i = x_i/x_0$, where the $x_i$'s are polynomials in $k[t]$ whose degree is likewise bounded, say by $B = B(\deg f, L)$, and the claim follows.

Applying then the Proposition with $\mathbf{L} = L(p)$, $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{F}_p$ and arguing as in the above Corollary we may assume that the degrees of the $x_i$'s are bounded in terms of $\deg f$ and $L$ only. In turn, this is like finding an $\mathbf{F}_p$-point on the reduction of $V_B$, provided $B = B(\deg f, L)$ is large enough.

Now we observe the following fact: *Given a projective variety $V/\mathbf{Q}$, for almost all $p$ the existence of a point over $\mathbf{F}_p$ in the reduction of $V$ mod $p$ is equivalent to the existence of a point in $V(\mathbf{Q}_p)$.*
(We tacitly assume to choose a set of defining equations for $V$ and to define the reduction of $V$ by reducing modulo $p$ the equations, for large $p$.) This claim is most probably well known, but we have no reference. We just sketch a proof of the nontrivial part by induction on $\dim V$. If $V$ is a finite set of points and some such point $P$ reduces in $\mathbf{F}_p$ modulo some prime ideal above $p$, then $\mathbf{Q}(P)$ may be embedded in $\mathbf{Q}_p$ for large $p$. Suppose $m = \dim V \geq 1$. We may assume that $V$ is $\mathbf{Q}$-irreducible and express it as a union of absolutely irreducible varieties $W_\sigma$ defined over a number field $k$ and conjugate over $\mathbf{Q}$. Suppose $V$ has a point over $\mathbf{F}_p$, where $p$ is large. Then there exist some $W_\sigma$ and a prime $\pi$ of $k$, lying above $p$, such that the reduction of $W_\sigma$ modulo $\pi$ has a point over $\mathbf{F}_p$. If such a reduction is defined over $\mathbf{F}_p$ then it contains points over $\mathbf{F}_p$ in any prescribed Zariski open subset; in fact the reduction is absolutely irreducible for large $p$ and we may apply the Lang-Weil theorem [Se2, Thm. 3.6.1, p. 30]. In this case Hensel's principle gives a point of $W_\sigma$ over $\mathbf{Q}_p$. If the reduction is not defined over $\mathbf{F}_p$, then the mentioned point lies in the intersection with some other conjugate over $\mathbf{F}_p$, i.e. in the reduction of

some intersection $W_\sigma \cap W_\tau$ of distinct conjugates. This has smaller dimension and induction applies.

In conclusion, for large $p$ and $B$ as above we have that the following are equivalent: *(i) $f$ is norm from $\mathbf{Q}_p L$; (ii) $V_B$ has a $\mathbf{Q}_p$-point; (iii) $V_B$ has an $\mathbf{F}_p$-point; (iv) $f$ is a norm from $L(p)$.*

We finally observe that the varieties $V_B$ so defined satisfy the usual local-global principle, in view of the above Corollary 2 (with $\Sigma = \varnothing$) and in view of the Corollary to the Proposition (applied with $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{Q}_v$).

REMARK 2. A proof of the equivalence of *(i)* and *(iv)* may also be given by arguments partially analogous to the proof of the Theorem, without invoking the Proposition or the varieties $V_B$. We start by finding a solution over a finite normal extension $k$ of $\mathbf{Q}$. We embed $k$ in a finite extension $k_v$ of $\mathbf{Q}_p$ and we consider the functions $\psi_\sigma$, $L_\sigma$, $Q_{\sigma,\tau}$ for $\sigma, \tau \in G' := \mathrm{Gal}(k_v/\mathbf{Q}_p)$; for large $p$ we may reduce everything modulo $v$, denoting it with a tilde, finding a similar situation over the residue field $\mathbf{F}_v$ of $k_v$. Also, we may assume that $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbf{F}_v/\mathbf{F}_p) \cong G'$. By assumption, there exists $\xi \in L(p)$ with norm $\tilde{f}$. Then $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\xi$ have the same norm, whence $\tilde{\varphi} = \xi(A/\gamma A)$ for some $A \in \mathbf{F}_v L(p)$. This easily leads to $\widetilde{L}_\sigma = (A/\sigma A)\widetilde{B}_\sigma(t)$, where $\widetilde{B}_\sigma \in \mathbf{F}_v(t)$. In turn we find that $\widetilde{Q}_{\sigma,\tau} = \partial(\widetilde{B}_\sigma)$. If $p$ is so large that no two zeros or poles of $Q_{\sigma,\tau}$ may collapse after reduction, then is is easily seen that we may find rational functions $B_\sigma \in k_v(t)$ such that $Q_{\sigma,\tau}/\partial(B_\sigma) \in k_v$, reducing to the case when the $Q_{\sigma,\tau}$ are constant. Actually, by using equations (5), we reduce to the case when they are roots of unity in $k_v$, in which case the proof is easily completed.

## 6. EFFECTIVENESS

The problem is the following. How can we decide whether a given $f$ admits a nontrivial representation in the form (13), with $x_i \in \mathbf{Q}[t]$ ? An answer can be given with the methods at the end of the last section. In fact, we have proved that if some representation exists, then a certain projective variety $V$ (whose equations can be found) has a $\mathbf{Q}$-point and conversely. We have observed that $V$ satisfies the local-global principle. Known methods allow one to decide whether $V$ has points over all $\mathbf{Q}_v$ and this gives an answer to the original question.