



Detecting $\text{td}(K/k)$

- **Idea** Use homogeneous forms
- $q(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ homogeneous form over some field K
- K'/K field extension
- **Definition**
 - q is universal over K' if the following $\forall\exists$ formula is true in K' :

$$\forall a \in K'^{\times} \exists a_1, \dots, a_n \in K' \text{ such that } q(a_1, \dots, a_n) = a$$

- q represents zero over K' if the following \exists formula is true in K' :

$$\exists a_1, \dots, a_n \in K' \text{ not all zero, such that } q(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$$

Special Case Suppose that $K' = K[\alpha]$ for α an algebraic integer over K .

Theorem

- q is universal over K' is a $\forall\exists$ formula with only parameters the coefficients q over K
- q does not represent zero over K' is a \forall formula with only parameter the coefficients of q over K

How To Use It

- (t_1, \dots, t_r) a system of elements in K^\times
- p a natural number
- Consider $(\underline{t}_i)_{\underline{i}}$ where $\underline{t}_i = t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_r^{i_r} \quad \forall 0 \leq i_1 \dots i_r < p$
- Set $q_{(t_1, \dots, t_r)}^{(p)} = \sum_{\underline{i}} \underline{t}_i x_{\underline{i}}^p$
- Coefficients depend only on (t_1, \dots, t_r)
- p^r variables

- **Consequence** $q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)}^{(p)}$
 - is universal over $K' = K[\alpha]$
 - does not represent 0 over $K' = K[\alpha]$
- **Application** $\exists(t_1, \dots, t_d)$ such that

$$q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)}^{(p)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{is universal } \dots \exists \forall \text{ sentence} \\ \text{does not represent } 0 \dots \exists \forall \text{ sentence} \end{array} \right.$$

Case 1 Char $k = p > 0$

- Recall p -Bases of K/k
- Let k be perfect, K/k function field
- Then for a system (t_1, \dots, t_d) of elements in K^\times the following are equivalent:
 1. (t_1, \dots, t_d) is a p -Basis for K
 2. $q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)}^{(p)}$ is universal but does not represent 0
 3. dt_1, \dots, dt_d is a K -basis of $\Omega_{K/k}$

Fact (**Char** $k = p > 0$) K/k arithmetic/geometric function field

1. $\text{td}(K/k) = d \iff \exists \forall \exists$ sentence:

$\exists(t_1, \dots, t_d)$ such that $q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)}^{(p)}$

is universal but does not represent 0

2. (t_1, \dots, t_d) is a separable transcendence basis \iff

1) holds for (t_1, \dots, t_d)

- Preparation for geometric + **Char** $k \neq 2$ and arithmetic case
- Context as above $p = 2$ then $q_{(t_1, \dots, t_r)} := q_{(t_1, \dots, t_r)}^{(2)}$ is the r -fold Pfister form defined by (t_1, \dots, t_r)

Lemma

- Let R be a discrete valued ring (DVR)
- π uniformizing parameter
- $k = R/(\pi)$
- Let $\bar{q}_o = \bar{q}_o(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a diagonal quadratic form over k
- \bar{q} a lifting of \bar{q}_o over R
- $q := q_o \underbrace{??? (x_o^2 + \pi x_1^2)}_{q(\pi)} = q(x_1, \dots, x_n) + \pi q(y_1, \dots, y_n)$
- If \bar{q}_o does not represent 0 over k then q does not represent 0 over $K = \mathbf{Qout}(R)$

Proof Exercise

Fact (k algebraically closed, **Char** $\neq 2$)

K/k a function field then

1. $\mathbf{td}(K/k) = d \iff \forall t_1, \dots, t_d \in K^\times, q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)}$ is universal **and**
 $\exists t_1, \dots, t_d \in K^\times$ such that $q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)}$ does not represent 0
(Thus $\mathbf{td}(K/k)$ is a $\forall\exists \wedge \exists\forall\exists$ sentence)
2. Moreover, if (t_1, \dots, t_d) is a separable transcendence base and $\mathbf{td}(K/k) = d$
then $\exists a_1, \dots, a_d \in k$ such that $q_{(t_1 - a_1, \dots, t_d - a_d)}$ does not represent 0

Proof

- Use the C_r -property of fields
- \mathcal{K} is a C_r -field if all homogeneous forms $q(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of degree d represent 0 provided $n > d^r$
- **Example** (Chevellay-Waring) Finite fields are C_1
- **Example** if K is complete, discrete valued, with algebraically closed residue field, it is C_1
- **Big Conjecture** (Artin Conjecture) \mathbb{Q}^{ab} is C_1

3. $K = C_r$, K'/K algebraic $\implies K'$ is C_r

4. $k = C_r$, $\mathbf{td}(K/k) = d \implies K$ is C_{r+d}

In particular, k algebraically closed, K/k function field with $\mathbf{td}(K/k) = d$
 $\implies K$ is C_r ???

Proof of Fact

- (t_1, \dots, t_d) in K^\times $a \in K^\times$
- $q = q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)} - ax_{2^d+1}^2$ represents 0 where $\mathbf{td}(K/k) = d$
- $\implies q_{(t_1, \dots, t_d)}$ represents 0 (Why?)

For the rest

- Let $\mathcal{T} = (t_1, \dots, t_d)$ be a separable transcendence base
- Let $R = k[t_1, \dots, t_d]$ $\mathbf{Spec} R \cong \mathbb{A}_k^d$
- S =integral closure of R in K
- $\mathbf{Spec} S = X \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbb{A}_k^d$
- ϕ is étale on an open subset $U \subseteq X$
- Choose $x \in U$ closed point

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{A}_k^d & & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}_k^d, x_o} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{X, x} \\ & & & & \\ x & \longmapsto & x_o & & \end{array}$$

- $(t_1 - a_1, \dots, t_d - a_d)$ local parameters of x_o with $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \in k$
- If follows $(t_1 - a_1, \dots, t_d - a_d)$ local parameters at x

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}^d, x_o} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X, x} \xrightarrow{\sim} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbb{A}^d, x_o} \xrightarrow{\sim} K[[t_1 - a_1, \dots, t_d - a_d]] \xrightarrow{=} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X, x}$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\Lambda \xrightarrow{=} k((t_1 - a_1)) \cdots ((t_d - a_d))$$

- Using the Lemma before: $q_{(t_1 - a_1, \dots, t_d - a_d)}$ does not represent 0 over Λ
(Induction on d)