

## ABELIAN SUBGROUPS OF PRO-2 GALOIS GROUPS

IDO EFRAT

(Communicated by Lance W. Small)

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $a(K)$  be the maximal cardinality  $|I|$  such that  $\mathbb{Z}_2^I$  is a closed subgroup of the maximal pro-2 Galois group of a field  $K$ . We prove estimates on  $a(K)$  conjectured by Ware.

Let  $K$  be a field of characteristic  $\neq 2$ , and let  $K(2)$  be its maximal pro-2 Galois extension. Thus,  $K(2)$  is obtained from  $K$  by repeatedly adjoining all square roots. Let  $G_K(2)$  be the Galois group  $\text{Gal}(K(2)/K)$ . In [11] Ware defines the  $a$ -invariant  $a(K)$  of  $K$  to be the maximal rank (possibly  $\infty$ ) of closed subgroups of  $G_K(2)$  which are torsion-free and abelian. Note that by Pontryagin duality, such subgroups are of the form  $\mathbb{Z}_2^I$  for some index set  $I$ . Another closely related invariant of  $K$  is its (absolute) stability index  $\text{st}(K)$ , defined as the minimal positive integer  $m$  ( $\infty$  if no such  $m$  exists) such that  $I^{m+1}(K) = 2I^m(K)$ , where  $I(K)$  is the fundamental ideal of the Witt ring  $W(K)$  of  $K$ . In the present note we prove the following three conjectures raised in [11]:

- Theorem.** (I) If  $K$  is formally real, then  $a(K) \leq \text{rank } G_K(2) - 1$ .  
(II) For every finite extension  $E/K$  of fields,  $a(K) \leq a(E)$ .  
(III)  $a(K) \leq \text{st}(K)$ .

(With regard to conjecture (I), the conjecture in [11] is in fact only that  $a(K) \leq \text{rank } G_K(2)$ ; this slightly weaker inequality is proved in [11, Corollary 5, p. 992] for nonformally real fields.)

Our proofs are based on valuation-theoretic techniques. For convenience, we recall the following notions and facts from [2, p. 151]: A valued field  $(K, v)$  is *2-henselian* if  $v$  has a unique extension to  $K(2)$ . Equivalently, Hensel's lemma holds for polynomials that split completely in  $K(2)$ . An arbitrary valued field  $(K, v)$  has an immediate 2-extension  $(\widehat{K}, \widehat{v})$  which is 2-henselian and which uniquely embeds in every 2-henselian extension  $(L, u)$  of  $(K, v)$  contained in  $K(2)$ . In fact,  $\widehat{K}$  is the decomposition field of any extension of  $v$  to  $K(2)$ . An extension  $(\widehat{K}, \widehat{v})$  as above is called a *2-henselization* of  $(K, v)$ . We denote  $q(K) = (K^\times : (K^\times)^2)$ . To avoid notational inconsistency, we do not distinguish here and in the sequel between different infinite cardinalities.

---

Received by the editors July 9, 1993.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 12F12, 12J10.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $(K, v)$  be a 2-henselian field with value group  $\Gamma$  and residue field  $\bar{K}$  of characteristic  $\neq 2$ . Then:*

- (a)  $G_K(2) \cong A \rtimes G_{\bar{K}}(2)$ , where  $A$  is a torsion-free abelian group of rank  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_2} \Gamma/2\Gamma$ .
- (b) If  $\bar{K}$  contains all roots of unity of 2-power order over its prime field, then  $G_K(2) \cong A \times G_{\bar{K}}(2)$  with  $A$  as above.
- (c)  $q(K) = q(\bar{K})|\Gamma/2\Gamma|$ .

*Proof.* (a) is well known (see, e.g., [4, §§19, 20]). (b) follows from (a) and from [6, Theorem 2.2(ii)]. For (c), take a subset  $T$  of  $K^\times$  such that  $v(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , represent the distinct cosets of  $\Gamma/2\Gamma$ . By Hensel’s lemma, the 1-units of  $v$  are squares. Every element  $x \in K^\times$  can be written as  $x = \alpha t y^2$ , where  $\alpha$  is a unit of  $v$ ,  $t \in T$ , and  $y \in K$ . This induces a bijection  $K^\times / (K^\times)^2 \cong \bar{K}^\times / (\bar{K}^\times)^2 \times T$ , whence the assertion.  $\square$

Our main tool is the following valuation-theoretic description of the  $a$ -invariant:

**Proposition 2.** *Given a field  $K$  with  $a(K) \geq 2$  there exists a valuation  $v$  on  $K$  whose residue field  $\bar{K}$  and value group  $\Gamma$  satisfy:*

- (i)  $\text{char } \bar{K} \neq 2$ ;
- (ii)  $a(K) = \log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| + 1$  (in particular,  $\Gamma \neq 2\Gamma$ );
- (iii)  $a(\hat{K}) = a(K)$  for any 2-henselization  $\hat{K}$  of  $K$ ;
- (iv)  $\bar{K}(2)/\bar{K}(\mu)$  is infinite, where  $\mu$  is the group of all roots of unity of 2-power order over the prime field of  $\bar{K}$ .

*Proof.* We first observe that  $\text{char } K \neq 2$ . For otherwise  $\text{cd}(G_K(2)) \leq 1$  [9, II-4, Proposition 3]. Since  $\text{cd}(\mathbb{Z}_2^I) = |I|$  (use, e.g., [9, I-32, Proposition 22]), this implies that  $a(K) \leq 1$ , contrary to the assumption.

Now let  $L$  be the fixed field of a torsion-free abelian closed subgroup of  $G_K(2)$  of maximal rank. Write  $G_L(2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^I \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  with  $|I| \geq 1$ . By [6, Theorem 2.5] (and its proof),  $L$  has a 2-henselian valuation  $u$  whose residue field  $\bar{L}$  satisfies  $\text{char } \bar{L} \neq 2$  and  $G_{\bar{L}}(2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ . By [10, Theorem 3.6],  $L$  contains all roots of unity of 2-power order over its prime field. Hence, so does  $\bar{L}$ . Let  $v$  be the restriction of  $u$  to  $K$ , and let  $(\hat{K}, \hat{v})$  be a 2-henselization of  $(K, v)$ . We may take  $\hat{K} \subseteq L$ . Let  $v(2)$  be the unique extension of  $\hat{v}$  to  $K(2)$ , and let  $\bar{K}, \bar{K}(2)$  be the residue fields of  $(K, v)$  and  $(K(2), v(2))$ , respectively. Since  $\bar{L}/\bar{K}$  is an algebraic extension,  $\text{char } \bar{K} \neq 2$ . Therefore, the 2-extension  $\bar{K}(2)/\bar{K}$  is separable. Clearly,  $\bar{K}(2)$  is quadratically closed. Thus  $\overline{\bar{K}(2)} = \bar{K}(2)$ . Denoting the inertia field of  $(K(2), v(2))/(\hat{K}, \hat{v})$  by  $K^T$  we obtain from [4, Theorem 19.6] that

$$\text{Gal}(K^T/\hat{K}) \cong \text{Aut}(\overline{\bar{K}(2)}/\bar{K}) = G_{\bar{K}}(2).$$

Next let  $E = L \cap K^T$ . It is 2-henselian with respect to the unique extension of  $\hat{v}$  [2, Proposition 1.6] and has value group  $\Gamma$  and residue field  $\bar{L}$ . By Lemma 1(b),  $G_E(2)$  is a torsion-free abelian pro-2 group of rank  $\log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| + 1$ . As  $K \subseteq \hat{K} \subseteq E \subseteq L$  and  $a(K) = a(L)$ , we have

$$a(K) = a(\hat{K}) = a(E) = \log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| + 1,$$

proving (ii) and (iii).

Finally, (iv) follows from the fact that  $\overline{K}(\mu) \subseteq \overline{L} \subset \overline{K}(2)$ , and  $G_{\overline{L}}(2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ .  $\square$

*Remarks.* (1) Given a field  $K$ , with  $a(K) \geq 2$ , one in general does not have a valuation on  $K$  with value group  $\Gamma$  satisfying  $a(K) = \log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma|$ . For example, let  $\mathbb{Q}_{ab}$  be the maximal pro-abelian extension of  $\mathbb{Q}$  and let  $E$  be any algebraic extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_{ab}$  with absolute Galois group  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . The field  $K = E((t))$  is henselian with respect to its natural valuation  $u$ . By Lemma 1(b),  $G_K(2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ , hence  $a(K) = 2$ . We show that for every nontrivial valuation  $v$  on  $K$  with value group  $\Gamma$ ,  $|\Gamma/2\Gamma| \leq 2$ . Indeed, if  $v$  and  $u$  are independent, then the (ordinary) henselization of  $K$  with respect to  $u$  is the algebraic closure  $\tilde{K}$  [5, Corollary 2.4], so  $\Gamma$  is in this case divisible. Suppose on the other hand that  $v$  and  $u$  are dependent and distinct. Since the value group  $\mathbb{Z}$  of  $u$  has no nontrivial isolated subgroups, there are no proper nontrivial coarsenings of  $u$  [1, Chapter VI, §4.3, Proposition 4]. Therefore,  $v$  is finer than  $u$ . Let  $v^0$  be the valuation induced by  $v$  on the residue field  $E$  of  $u$ , and let  $\Gamma_0$  be its value group. One has a short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow 0$$

[1, Chapter VI, §4.3, Remark]. The restriction of  $v_0$  to  $\mathbb{Q}$  is  $p$ -adic for some prime  $p$ . Since  $\sqrt[n]{p} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ab} \subseteq E$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , the group  $\Gamma_0$  is divisible. Therefore,  $\Gamma/2\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ , as desired.

(2) For every valuation  $v$  on  $K$  with value group  $\Gamma$  and residue characteristic  $\neq 2$ ,  $\log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| \leq a(K)$  [11, Corollary 2(i), p. 990].

*Proof of (I).* By Kummer theory and [9, I-38, Corollary],

$$\log_2 q(K) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_2} \text{Hom}(G_K(2), \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) = \text{rank } G_K(2).$$

We therefore need to show that  $a(K) \leq \log_2 q(K) - 1$  for  $K$  formally real. This is trivial when  $q(K) = \infty$ . Suppose then that  $q(K) < \infty$ . We prove the assertion by induction on  $q(K)$ . The case  $a(K) = 0$  is clear. If  $a(K) = 1$ , then  $q(K) \geq 4$  by [11, Example (1)], as required. We may therefore assume that  $a(K) \geq 2$ . Let  $v$ ,  $\overline{K}$ , and  $\Gamma$  be as in Proposition 2, and let  $(\widehat{K}, \widehat{v})$  be a 2-henselization of  $(K, v)$ . Then  $\widehat{K} = K\widehat{K}^2$  (see, e.g., [3, Lemma 2.4(a)]). Therefore, the natural homomorphism

$$\Lambda: K^\times / (K^\times)^2 \rightarrow \widehat{K}^\times / (\widehat{K}^\times)^2$$

is surjective, so one of the following holds:

*Case (1):  $\Lambda$  is not injective.* Then  $2q(\widehat{K}) \leq q(K)$ . If  $\widehat{K}$  is formally real, we may therefore apply the induction hypothesis to obtain that  $a(\widehat{K}) \leq \log_2 q(\widehat{K}) - 1$ . If  $\widehat{K}$  is not formally real, then we still have  $a(\widehat{K}) \leq \log_2 q(\widehat{K})$ , by [11, Corollary 5, p. 992]. As  $a(K) = a(\widehat{K})$ , we conclude that  $a(K) \leq \log_2(\widehat{K}) \leq \log_2 q(K) - 1$ , as required.

*Case (2):  $\Lambda$  is an isomorphism.* Let  $M$  be the maximal ideal of the valuation ring of  $v$ . By Hensel's Lemma,  $1+M \subseteq \widehat{K}^2 \cap K = K^2$ . This implies that  $(K, v)$  is 2-henselian [7, Lemma 3.14], i.e.,  $\widehat{K} = K$ . We have  $q(\overline{K}) < (\Gamma: 2\Gamma)q(\overline{K}) = q(K)$ , by Lemma 1(c). Moreover,  $\overline{K}$  is formally real [7, Lemma 3.15]. From

the induction hypothesis we therefore get  $a(\overline{K}) \leq \log_2 q(\overline{K}) - 1$ . Conclude from [11, Corollary 1, p. 990] that

$$a(K) \leq \log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| + a(\overline{K}) \leq \log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| + \log_2 q(\overline{K}) - 1 = \log_2 q(K) - 1,$$

completing the induction.  $\square$

*Remarks.* (1) Ware [11, Remark, p. 992] proves (I) for  $K$  (real-)pythagorean and shows that in general  $a(K) \leq 2 \log_2(K) - 2$ .

(2) The bound  $a(K) \leq \log_2 q(K) - 1$  for  $K$  formally real is sharp. For example, a repeated application of Lemma 1(a) shows that  $K = \mathbb{R}((t_1)) \cdots ((t_n))$  has  $G_K(2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^n \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ , hence  $a(K) = \log_2 q(K) - 1 = n$ .

(3) If  $K$  is not formally real, then in general one cannot improve the bound  $a(K) \leq \log_2 q(K)$  given in [11, Corollary 5, p. 992]. E.g.,  $K = \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}((t_1)) \cdots ((t_n))$  has  $a(K) = \log_2 q(K) = n$ .

(4) Denote the maximal rank of torsion-free abelian closed subgroups of a pro-2 group  $G$  by  $a(G)$ . The inequality  $a(G) \leq \text{rank } G$ , although valid for maximal pro-2 Galois groups of fields (by (I) and [11, Corollary 5, p. 992]), does not hold for arbitrary pro-2 groups. For example, the wreath product  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \wr (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})$  has rank 2, yet it has  $\mathbb{Z}_2^4$  as an open subgroup.

For the next proof we need an almost trivial yet important observation:

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a subgroup of a finite index of a torsion-free abelian group  $\Delta$ . Then  $(\Delta : 2\Delta) = (\Gamma : 2\Gamma)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\Delta$  is torsion-free,  $\Delta/\Gamma \cong 2\Delta/2\Gamma$  naturally. The assertion therefore follows from the equalities

$$(\Delta : 2\Delta)(2\Delta : 2\Gamma) = (\Delta : 2\Gamma) = (\Delta : \Gamma)(\Gamma : 2\Gamma). \quad \square$$

*Proof of (II).* If  $a(E) = 0$ , then  $[E(2) : E] \leq 2$  by [11, Example (1)], whence  $[K(2) : K] < \infty$  and we get  $a(K) = 0$ . We may therefore assume that  $a(K) \geq 2$ . Let  $v, \Gamma, \overline{K}$ , and  $\mu$  be as in Proposition 2. Also let  $u$  be an extension of  $v$  to  $E$ , let  $\overline{E}$  be the residue field of  $(E, u)$ , and let  $\Delta$  be its value group. Fix a 2-henselization  $\widehat{E}$  of  $(E, u)$ . Since  $\overline{E}/\overline{K}$  and, hence,  $\overline{E}(\mu)/\overline{K}(\mu)$  are finite extensions and since  $\overline{E}(2)/\overline{K}(\mu)$  is infinite,  $\overline{E}(\mu) \neq \overline{E}(2)$ . By [11, Theorem 1(i)],  $a(\widehat{E}) = \log_2 |\Delta/2\Delta| + a(\overline{E})$ . Since  $\overline{K}(2)/\overline{K}$  is an infinite extension, so is  $\overline{E}(2)/\overline{K}$ , hence so is  $\overline{E}(2)/\overline{E}$ . In particular,  $1 \leq a(\overline{E})$ , by [11, Example (1)], p. 985] again. From this and from Lemma 3 we deduce:

$$a(K) = \log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| + 1 \leq \log_2 |\Delta/2\Delta| + a(\overline{E}) = a(\widehat{E}) \leq a(E). \quad \square$$

*Remark.* The inequality (II) holds also when  $\text{char } K = 2$ . Indeed, as observed at the beginning of the proof of Proposition 2, this implies that  $a(K) \leq 1$ . Moreover,  $a(E) = 0$  if and only if  $E$  is quadratically closed. But in this case we obviously have  $a(K) = 0$  as well.

*Proof of (III).* If  $\text{st}(K) = 0$ , then  $K$  is quadratically closed and we are done. We may therefore assume that  $a(K) \geq 2$ . Let  $v, \Gamma$ , and  $\overline{K}$  be as in Proposition 2, and choose a subset  $T$  of  $K^\times$  such that the cosets of  $v(t), t \in T$ , form a linear basis of  $\Gamma/2\Gamma$  over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ . Thus,  $a(K) = \log_2 |\Gamma/2\Gamma| + 1 = |T| + 1$ . Since  $\overline{K}$  is not quadratically closed, there exists a  $v$ -unit  $\alpha$  in  $K$  whose residue  $\overline{\alpha}$

is not in  $\overline{K}^2$ . For any finite subset  $T_0$  of  $T$  having  $m$  elements, consider the  $(m+1)$ -Pfister form  $\varphi_{T_0} = \langle\langle\alpha\rangle\rangle \otimes \bigotimes_{t \in T_0} \langle\langle t \rangle\rangle$ . Its similarity class is in  $I^{m+1}(K)$ . But all its nonzero residue forms (cf. [8, p. 136]) are  $\langle\langle\bar{\alpha}\rangle\rangle$  and, hence, are not in  $2\mathcal{W}(\overline{K})$ . It follows that  $\varphi_{T_0} \notin 2I^m(K)$ , so  $m < \text{st}(K)$ . Conclude that  $a(K) = |T| + 1 \leq \text{st}(K)$ .  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This note was written during the author's stay at Konstanz University as an Alexander von Humboldt fellow. He thanks Jochen Koenigsmann for very helpful discussions on this subject.

#### REFERENCES

1. N. Bourbaki, *Commutative algebra*, Hermann, Paris, 1972.
2. L. Bröcker, *Characterization of fans and hereditarily pythagorean fields*, *Math. Z.* **151** (1976), 149–163.
3. I. Efrat, *Free product decompositions of Galois groups over pythagorean fields*, *Comm. Algebra* **21** (1993), 4495–4511.
4. O. Endler, *Valuation theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1972.
5. A. Engler, *Fields with two incomparable henselian valuation rings*, *Manuscripta Math.* **23** (1977), 373–385.
6. B. Jacob and R. Ware, *A recursive description of the maximal pro-2 Galois group via Witt rings*, *Math. Z.* **200** (1989), 379–396.
7. T. Y. Lam, *Orderings, valuations and quadratic forms*, *Conf. Board Math. Sci.*, vol. 52, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1983.
8. W. Scharlau, *Quadratic and Hermitian forms*, Springer, Berlin, 1985.
9. J. P. Serre, *Cohomologie Galoisienne*, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. 5, Springer, Berlin, 1965.
10. R. Ware, *When are Witt rings groups rings?* II, *Pacific J. Math.* **76** (1978), 541–564.
11. ———, *Stability in Witt rings and abelian subgroups of pro-2-Galois groups*, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **19** (1989), 985–995.

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT KONSTANZ, POSTFACH 5560, D-7750 KONSTANZ, GERMANY