

## Note on Relatively Complete Fields

Eizi Inaba (稲葉榮次)

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science,  
Ochanomizu University

(Received April 30, 1952)

A real-valued function  $V(a)$  of a field  $k$  is a non-archimedean valuation  $V$  of  $k$ , if the relations  $V(ab)=V(a)+V(b)$  and  $V(a+b) \geq \text{Min}\{V(a), V(b)\}$  hold, where we put  $V(0)=\infty$ . The set of all elements  $a$  with  $V(a) \geq 0$  is the valuation ring  $R$  in  $k$ . All elements  $a$  with  $V(a) > 0$  form a prime ideal  $P$  in  $R$ . A polynomial  $f(x)$  with coefficients from  $R$  is called primitive, if among these coefficients there exists at least one unit. By Ostrowski the field  $k$  is termed relatively complete with respect to  $V$ , if Hensel's lemma holds for every primitive polynomial. The present note aims to reveal some characteristic properties of this field.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $f(x)$  be an irreducible polynomial over  $k$  and  $a_i, i=1, \dots, n$  be all roots of  $f(x)$ . If  $V$  has a unique prolongation to every algebraic extension of  $k$ , then the values  $V(a_i)$  are all equal.*

**Proof.** We consider the extension  $K=k(a_1)$  over  $k$ . If  $V(a_1) \neq V(a_2)$ , let  $\sigma$  be the isomorphism of  $K$  over  $k$  such that  $\sigma a_1 = a_2$ . Putting  $W(\beta) = V(\sigma\beta)$  for  $\beta \in K$ , we obtain another prolongation of  $V$  for  $K$ . Since  $W(a_1) = V(a_2) \neq V(a_1)$ , one would obtain two different prolongation, contrary to the hypothesis.

**Theorem 1.** *A field  $k$  is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , if and only if  $V$  has a unique prolongation to every algebraic extension of  $k$ .*

**Proof.** It is well known that the prolongation of  $V$  is unique, if  $k$  is relatively complete.<sup>1)</sup> We prove the converse as follows. First we show that every primitive irreducible polynomial  $f(x)$  is congruent modulo  $P$  to a unit in  $R$  or to a product of a unit and a power of a polynomial irreducible modulo  $P$ . Let  $a_i, i=1, \dots, n$  be all roots of  $f(x)$ . The values  $V(a_i)$  are all equal by Lemma 1. For the case, where  $V(a_i)$  are negative, every coefficient of the polynomial  $\left(\frac{x}{a_1} - 1\right) \dots \left(\frac{x}{a_n} - 1\right)$  except the constant term belongs to  $P$ . Hence  $f(x)$  is congruent to a unit modulo  $P$ . Next consider the case, where  $V(a_i) \geq 0$ . In this case every coefficient of  $f(x)$  is divisible by the leading coefficient and hence we can assume that  $f(x) = (x - a_1) \dots (x - a_n)$ . If  $f(x)$  had two different monic irreducible factors  $g(x)$  and  $h(x)$  modulo  $P$ , it would follow that  $g(a_\lambda) \in \overline{P}$  and  $h(a_\mu) \in \overline{P}$ , where  $\overline{P}$  is the prime ideal of the

<sup>1)</sup> We refer to Schilling, theory of valuations.

valuation ring in  $K=k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ . Since the prolongation of  $V$  is unique,  $\bar{P}$  is invariant under any automorphism of  $K/k$  as can be seen from the proof of Lemma 1. Consequently we have  $g(\alpha_\mu) \in \bar{P}$ . Now, by virtue of the relation  $g(x)A(x)+h(x)B(x) \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$ , we have  $g(\alpha_\mu)A(\alpha_\mu)+h(\alpha_\mu)B(\alpha_\mu) \in \bar{P}$  and hence  $1 \in \bar{P}$ , which yields a contradiction. Thus  $f(x)$  is a power of a polynomial irreducible modulo  $P$ . Next we consider the general case, where  $f(x)$  is assumed to be primitive. If  $f(x) \equiv g(x)h(x) \pmod{P}$  and  $g(x)A(x)+h(x)B(x) \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$ , then we can put  $f(x) = \Pi f_i^{(1)}(x) \Pi f_j^{(2)}(x)$ , where,  $f_i^{(1)}$  and  $f_j^{(2)}$  being primitive irreducible over  $k$ ,  $f_i^{(1)}(x) \equiv \varepsilon_i \pmod{P}$  holds with a unit  $\varepsilon_i$  and  $f_j^{(2)}(x)$  is congruent modulo  $P$  to a power of a polynomial irreducible mod.  $P$ . Further we can assume that  $g(x)$  is monic with degree  $m \geq 1$ . By virtue of the uniqueness of factorization modulo  $P$ , we can find polynomials  $G(x)$  and  $H(x)$  such that

$$G(x) \equiv g(x) \pmod{P}, \quad H(x) \equiv h(x) \pmod{P},$$

and  $f(x) = G(x)H(x)$ , the degree of  $G(x)$  being  $m$ . Hence Hensel's lemma holds for  $k$ .

**Corollary.** *Every algebraic extension of a field, which is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , is also relatively complete with respect to the prolongation of  $V$ .*

Ostrowski's criterion asserts that a field  $k$  is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , if and only if  $k$  is separably algebraically closed in the completion  $k^*$  of  $k$ .<sup>2)</sup> We shall show that this criterion follows from Theorem 1. Let  $k$  be relatively complete with respect to  $V$  and  $K=k(\alpha)$  be a finite separable extension over  $k$ , which is contained in  $k^*$ . Let  $f(x)$  be the irreducible polynomial over  $k$  with the root  $\alpha$ .  $f(x)$  being separable, there exists another root  $\beta$  of  $f(x)$ , which is different from  $\alpha$ . Since  $\alpha$  belongs to  $k^*$ , there exists a sequence  $\{c_i\}$  of elements  $c_i \in k$  such that  $\lim V(c_i - \alpha) = \infty$ . By Lemma 1 and Theorem 1 we have  $V(c_i - \beta) = V(c_i - \alpha)$ . This implies  $V(\alpha - \beta) = \infty$ , which yields a contradiction. Hence  $k$  has no separable extension, which is contained in  $k^*$ . In order to prove the converse, it suffices to show by Theorem 1 that  $V$  has a unique prolongation to every finite separable normal extension  $K$  over  $k$ . For the prolongation is always unique for every purely inseparable extension.<sup>3)</sup> Since  $k$  is separably algebraically closed in  $k^*$ , it follows that  $K \cap k^* = k$ . Let  $f(x)$  be the monic irreducible polynomial over  $k$ , which has  $\alpha \in K$  as a root. Then this becomes  $f(x) = (x - \alpha_1) \cdots (x - \alpha_n)$  with  $\alpha_i \in K$ , where  $\alpha_1 = \alpha$ . Now we observe that  $f(x)$  is irreducible over  $k^*$ . In fact, if  $f(x)$

<sup>2)</sup> A. Ostrowski, Untersuchungen zur arithmetischen Theorie der Körper, Math. Zeitschr. 39 (1935).

<sup>3)</sup> Schilling, l. c.

$=g(x)h(x)$  with  $g(x) \in k^*[x]$  and  $h(x) \in k^*[x]$ , then all coefficients of  $g(x)$  and  $h(x)$  would belong to  $K \cap k^* = k$ . Hence  $V(a)$  is uniquely determined as the value  $\frac{1}{n}V(c)$ , where  $c$  is the constant term of  $f(x)$ .

**Corollary.** *A field  $k$  is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , if and only if every separable irreducible polynomial over  $k$  is also irreducible over the completion  $k^*$  of  $k$ .*

**Proof.** It was shown in the proof of Ostrowski's criterion that any separable irreducible polynomial over  $k$  is also irreducible over  $k^*$ , if  $k$  is relatively complete. The converse can be proved as follows. If an element  $a$  from  $k^*$  is separable over  $k$ , then the irreducible polynomial over  $k$  with the root  $a$  is also irreducible over  $k^*$ . Hence the degree of the polynomial is one and  $a$  belongs to  $k$ . The proof is now complete by Ostrowski's criterion, since  $k$  is separably algebraically closed in  $k^*$ ,

**Theorem 2.** *A field  $k$  is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , if and only if the following condition is satisfied: for every separable irreducible polynomial  $f(x)$  over  $k$  with degree larger than one, the set of values  $V(f(a))$  for all  $a \in k$  is upper bounded.*

**Proof.** Let  $k$  be relatively complete with respect to  $V$  and put  $f(x) = (x - a_1) \cdots (x - a_n)$ ,  $K = k(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . If there exists a sequence  $\{a_i\}$  with  $a_i \in k$  such that  $V(f(a_i)) = \lambda_i$  and  $\lim \lambda_i = \infty$ , then we obtain a subsequence  $\{b_i\}$  of  $\{a_i\}$  such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} V(b_i - a_s) = \infty$$

for a certain  $a_s$ . Then  $a_s$  belongs to the completion  $k^*$  of  $k$ . This yields  $a_s \in K \cap k^*$  and consequently  $a_s \in k$  by Ostrowski's criterion, since  $a_s$  is separable over  $k$ . Then  $f(x)$  is of degree one, contrary to the hypothesis. Next we prove that  $k$  is relatively complete, if the condition is satisfied. By Ostrowski's criterion it suffices to show that  $k$  is separably algebraically closed in the completion  $k^*$ . Let  $K = k(a)$  be a finite separable extension over  $k$ , which is contained in  $k^*$ . The relation  $\lim V(c_i - a) = \infty$  holds for a sequence  $\{c_i\}$  with  $c_i \in k$ . We consider the separable irreducible polynomial  $f(x)$  over  $k$  with the root  $a$ . Then we have  $\lim V(f(c_i)) = \infty$ . Hence  $f(x)$  must be of degree one by virtue of the condition, whence  $K = k$ .

**Remark.** For an irreducible polynomial  $f(x)$  of the second degree over the field of all real numbers there exists a positive real number  $c$  such that  $f(a) \geq c$  for all real numbers  $a$ . Theorem 2 is an analogy of this fact.

Let  $k$  be a field with a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ . For a polynomial  $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n$  over  $k$  we put  $V(f(x)) = \text{Min} \{V(a_0), V(a_1), \dots, V(a_n)\}$ . We define the set of all polynomials  $g(x)$  with  $V(g(x) - f(x)) \geq \lambda$  as a neighborhood of  $f(x)$ . By a neighborhood of an element

$c$  from  $k$  we understand the set of all elements  $d$  from  $k$  with  $V(d-c) \geq \lambda$  as usual.

**Theorem 3.** *A field  $k$  is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , if and only if the following condition is satisfied: for any separable polynomial  $f(x)$ , which has no root from  $k$ , there exists a neighborhood of  $f(x)$  such that every polynomial in the neighborhood has no root from  $k$ .*

**Proof.** We can assume without loss of generality that  $f(x)$  is monic with coefficients from  $R$ . If  $k$  is relatively complete, there exists a positive real number  $\lambda$  such that  $V(f(a)) \leq \lambda$  for all  $a \in R$  by Theorem 2, since  $f(x)$  is a product of separable irreducible polynomials with degree larger than one. We consider a polynomial  $g(x)$  with  $V(g(x) - f(x)) \geq \lambda + 1$ . Then all coefficients of  $g(x)$  belong to  $R$ , the leading coefficient being a unit. Since  $V(g(a) - f(a)) \geq \lambda + 1$  for all  $a \in R$ , we have  $V(g(a)) \leq \lambda$  for all  $a \in R$ . If  $g(x)$  had a root  $b$  from  $k$ , it would necessarily belong to  $R$  and  $V(g(b)) = \infty$ . This yields a contradiction. Next we prove the converse. Let  $f(x)$  be a separable irreducible polynomial over  $k$  of degree larger than one with a root  $\alpha \in k^*$ . We put  $f(x) = (x - \alpha)h(x)$ , where  $h(x)$  is a polynomial over  $k(\alpha)$ . If we choose an element  $c$  from  $k$  such that  $V(\alpha - c)$  is sufficiently large, then we can find a polynomial  $F(x) = (x - c)H(x)$  with  $H(x)$  over  $k$  in every neighborhood of  $f(x)$ . This contradicts with the condition. Hence  $k$  is separably algebraically closed in  $k^*$  and relatively complete by Ostrowski's criterion.

**Theorem 4.** *If a field  $k$  is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , and if  $f(x)$  is a polynomial over  $k$ , which has a simple root  $a$  from  $k$ , then there exists a neighborhood of  $f(x)$  such that every polynomial in the neighborhood has a simple root in any given neighborhood of  $a$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $k$  be relatively complete with respect to  $V$ . We can assume without loss of generality that all coefficients of  $f(x)$  belong to the valuation ring  $R$  in  $k$  and the leading coefficient is 1. Then it is evident that the root  $a$  belongs to  $R$ . Putting  $f(x) = (x - a)F(x)$ , we have  $f'(a) = F(a) \neq 0$  by hypothesis. If we put  $V(F(a)) = e$ , then  $e \geq 0$ , since  $F(x)$  is a polynomial over  $R$ . Let  $g(x)$  be a polynomial with  $V(g(x) - f(x)) \geq \lambda + e$ , where  $\lambda \geq 1 + e$ . Then  $g(x)$  is a polynomial over  $R$ . Now we shall show that we can construct a sequence  $\{a_i\}$  of elements  $a_i$  from  $R$  such that  $V(a_i - a) \geq \lambda$  and  $V(g(a_i)) \geq \lambda + e + i - 1$ . For  $i = 1$ , we put  $a_1 = a$  and we have  $V(g(a_1)) \geq \lambda + e$ ,  $V(a_1 - a) = V(0) \geq \lambda$ , since  $V(g(a_1) - f(a_1)) \geq \lambda + e$  and  $f(a_1) = 0$ . If  $a_i$  satisfies the above relations, then we have  $V(F(a_i)) = e$ , since  $F(a_i) = F(a) + (a_i - a)h_i$  with  $h_i \in R$  and  $e = V(F(a)) < \lambda \leq V((a_i - a)h_i)$ . If we put

$$a_{i+1} = a_i - \frac{g(a_i)}{F'(a_i)},$$

it follows that  $V(a_{i+1}-a_i) \geq \lambda+i-1$  and hence  $V(a_{i+1}-a) \geq \lambda$ . Further we have

$$g(a_{i+1}) = g(a_i) + (a_{i+1}-a_i)g'(a_i) + (a_{i+1}-a_i)^2\theta_i,$$

where  $\theta_i \in R$  and this amounts to

$$(1) \quad g(a_{i+1}) = \frac{g(a_i)}{F'(a_i)}(F'(a_i)-g'(a_i)) + (a_{i+1}-a_i)^2\theta_i.$$

For the derivative of the polynomial  $g(x)-f(x)$  we have  $V(g'(x)-f'(x)) \geq \lambda+e$  and hence  $V(g'(a)-f'(a)) \geq \lambda+e$ . Then  $V(g'(a_i)-F'(a_i)) \geq \lambda$  by virtue of the relation  $V(a_i-a) \geq \lambda$ . Consequently the relation (1) yields  $V(g(a_{i+1})) \geq \lambda+i+e$ , since  $\lambda \geq e+1$ . Thus we have a sequence  $\{a_i\}$  such that  $\lim V(g(a_i)) = \infty$  and  $V(a_{i+1}-a_i) \geq \lambda+i-1$ . This implies that there exists an element  $\alpha$  in the completion  $k^*$  of  $k$  such that  $g(\alpha)=0$ ,  $V(\alpha-a) \geq \lambda$  with  $\lim V(\alpha-a_i) = \infty$ . Since  $V(g'(a)-f'(a)) \geq \lambda$  and  $V(f'(a))=e$ , we have  $V(g'(a))=e$ . Then  $g'(\alpha) \neq 0$  and  $\alpha$  is a simple root of  $g(x)$ , which lies in the neighborhood of  $a$  with  $V(\alpha-a) \geq \lambda$ . Since  $\alpha$  is separable over  $k$  and contained in  $k^*$ , it must be an element from  $k$  by Ostrowski's criterion.

**Corollary.** *If  $k$  is relatively complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation  $V$ , and if  $n$  is a positive integer, which is not divisible by the characteristic of  $k$ , then there exists a positive real number  $\lambda$  such that every element  $a \in k$  with  $V(a-1) \geq \lambda$  is an  $n$ -th power of an element from  $k$ .*

**Proof.** The unity is a simple root of the polynomial  $x^n-1$ , since  $n$  is not divisible by the characteristic of  $k$ . By Theorem 4 we can find  $\lambda$  such that every polynomial  $x^n-a$  with  $V(a-1) \geq \lambda$  has a root from  $k$ . This completes the proof.

It is to be remarked that the above corollary is a precision of a lemma by Schilling. If  $k$  is a  $p$ -adic number field, this is important in class field theory and its usual proof is based upon the use of exponential and logarithmic functions.