

ON THE THEORY OF HIGHER RANK EULER, KOLYVAGIN AND STARK SYSTEMS, II

DAVID BURNS, RYOTARO SAKAMOTO AND TAKAMICHI SANO

ABSTRACT. We prove the existence of a canonical ‘higher Kolyvagin derivative’ homomorphism between the modules of higher rank Euler systems and higher rank Kolyvagin systems, as has been conjectured to exist by Mazur and Rubin. This homomorphism exists in the setting of p -adic representations that are free with respect to the action of a Gorenstein order \mathcal{R} and, in particular, implies that higher rank Euler systems control the \mathcal{R} -module structures of Selmer modules attached to the representation. We give a first application of this theory by considering the (conjectural) Euler system of Rubin-Stark elements.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Background to the problem	2
1.2. Overview of the solution	3
1.3. A summary of results	4
1.4. Organization	6
1.5. Some general notation	6
2. Exterior power biduals	7
2.1. Definition and basic properties	7
2.2. Further functorialities	8
3. Preliminaries concerning Galois cohomology	12
3.1. Notation and hypotheses	12
3.2. Application of the Chebotarev density theorem	15
4. Stark systems	19
4.1. Definition	19
4.2. Stark systems and Selmer modules	19
4.3. Stark Systems over Gorenstein orders	21
5. Kolyvagin systems	24
5.1. Definition	24
5.2. Regulator maps	25
5.3. Kolyvagin systems and Selmer modules	25
5.4. The proof of Theorem 5.2	26
5.5. Kolyvagin Systems over Gorenstein orders	35
6. Euler systems and Kolyvagin systems	36
6.1. Definition	36
6.2. The canonical Selmer structure	38
6.3. Kolyvagin derivatives	38
6.4. Construction of Kolyvagin systems	40

6.5. The proof of Theorem 6.12	44
7. Rubin-Stark elements and ideal class groups	47
References	51

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the problem. Ever since its introduction by Kolyvagin [9], the theory of Euler systems has played a vital role in the proof of many celebrated results concerning the structure of Selmer groups of p -adic representations over number fields.

In an attempt to axiomatise, and extend, the use of Euler systems, Mazur and Rubin [11] developed an associated theory of ‘Kolyvagin systems’ and showed both that Kolyvagin systems controlled the structure of Selmer groups and that Kolyvagin’s ‘derivative operator’ gave rise to a canonical homomorphism between the modules of Euler and Kolyvagin systems that are associated to a given representation.

In this way, it became clear that Kolyvagin systems play the key role in obtaining structural results about Selmer groups and that the link to Euler systems is pivotal for the supply of Kolyvagin systems that are related to the special values of L -series.

For many representations, however, families of cohomology classes (such as Euler or Kolyvagin systems) are not themselves sufficient to control Selmer groups and in such ‘higher rank’ cases authors have considered various collections of elements in higher exterior powers of cohomology groups.

The theory of ‘higher rank Euler systems’ has in principle been well-understood for some time by now, with the first general approach being described by Perrin-Riou in [16] after significant contributions were made by Rubin in an important special case (related to Stark’s Conjecture) in [18].

In addition, a general method was introduced in [18, §6] whereby higher rank Euler systems could be used to construct, in a non-canonical way, classical (rank one) Euler or Kolyvagin systems to which standard techniques could then be applied.

However, whilst this ‘rank reduction’ method has since been used both often and to great effect, notably by Perrin-Riou in [16] and by Büyükboduk in [5] and [6], it is intrinsically non-canonical and also requires several auxiliary hypotheses (such as, for example, the validity of Leopoldt’s Conjecture in the settings considered in [18] and [5]) that can themselves be very difficult to verify.

In an attempt to address these deficiencies, Mazur and Rubin [13] have developed a theory of ‘higher rank Kolyvagin systems’, and an associated notion of ‘higher rank Stark systems’ (these are collections of cohomology classes generalizing the units predicted by Stark-type conjectures), and showed that, under suitable hypotheses, such systems can be used to control Selmer groups.

However, the technical difficulties encountered when computing with higher exterior powers meant that the theory developed in [13] was insufficient in the following respects.

- Coefficient rings were restricted to be either principal artinian local rings or discrete valuation rings, whilst dealing with more general coefficient rings is essential if one is to deal effectively with questions arising, for example, in either deformation theory or Galois module theory.

- More importantly, whilst Mazur and Rubin conjectured the existence of a canonical link between the theories of higher rank Euler and Kolyvagin (or Stark) systems, they were unable to shed any light on the precise nature of this relationship (which they described as ‘mysterious’).

1.2. Overview of the solution. The first of the above problems was resolved independently by the first and third authors in [4] and by the second author in [20], a key part of the solution being the introduction of ‘exterior power biduals’ as a functorially stronger version of exterior powers.

Building on these earlier articles, *we shall now resolve the second problem, and hence prove the conjecture of Mazur and Rubin, by constructing a canonical ‘higher Kolyvagin derivative’ map between the modules of Euler and Kolyvagin systems of any given rank.*

We shall construct this map in the setting of p -adic representations that are free with respect to the action of an arbitrary Gorenstein order \mathcal{R} , as one would expect to suffice for applications to deformation theory. In addition, by combining the construction with results from [4], we are able to deduce that, under natural hypotheses, higher rank Euler systems determine all of the higher Fitting ideals over \mathcal{R} of the relevant Selmer modules.

In this regard we also note that obtaining concrete structural information about natural arithmetic modules such as ideal class groups, Tate-Shafarevic groups and Selmer groups with respect to coefficient rings that are not regular is a notoriously difficult problem and, despite an extensive literature discussing special cases (for recent examples see for instance Kurihara [10], Greither and Popescu [8] and Greither and Kučera [7] and the references contained therein), there has not hitherto been any general approach to this problem.

There are two further differences between our approach (using exterior power biduals) and that of earlier articles that seem worthy of comment.

Firstly, we are able to show that, under standard hypotheses, *the module of higher rank Kolyvagin systems is canonically isomorphic to the corresponding module of higher rank Stark systems and is therefore free of rank one over the coefficient ring \mathcal{R} .* This key fact allows us avoid the problem highlighted by Mazur and Rubin in [13, Rem. 11.9] that not all higher rank Kolyvagin systems defined in terms of higher exterior powers are, in their terminology, ‘stub’ systems.

Secondly, as a key step in our construction of the higher Kolyvagin derivative operator, we shall develop a variant of the (non-canonical) rank-reduction methods employed in [5], [16] and [18] that is both canonical in nature and also avoids difficult auxiliary hypotheses that are used in these earlier articles.

In a further article it will be shown that all of the key aspects of the theory developed here extend naturally to the analogous Iwasawa-theoretic setting.

In view of the range of existing applications of the classical theory of Euler and Kolyvagin systems, it thus seems plausible that the very general theory developed here will have significant applications in the future.

For the moment, however, to give an early indication of the usefulness of this approach we shall just restrict to the setting that was originally considered by Rubin in [18].

In this setting, we find that our methods allow us, in a straightforward fashion, to extend, refine and remove any hypotheses concerning the validity of Leopoldt’s Conjecture from the results of Rubin in [18] and of Büyükboduk in [5].

1.3. A summary of results. For the reader's convenience, we now give a brief summary of the main results of this article. For simplicity, we shall only discuss a special case of the general setting considered in later sections. In addition, we shall omit stating explicitly hypotheses that are standard in the theory of Euler, Kolyvagin and Stark systems (since, in each case, they are made precise by the indicated results in later sections).

We thus fix an odd prime p , a number field K and a Galois representation T over a Gorenstein \mathbb{Z}_p -order \mathcal{R} that is endowed with a continuous action of the absolute Galois group of K . We also fix a power M of p and set $A := T/MT$ and $R := \mathcal{R}/(M)$. For each natural number r we write $\text{ES}_r(T)$, respectively $\text{KS}_r(A)$ and $\text{SS}_r(A)$, for the modules of Euler systems of rank r for T , respectively of Kolyvagin and Stark systems of rank r for A , that are defined in §6.1, respectively in §5.1 and §4.1.

Our main result is then the following.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 6.12 and Corollaries 6.13 and 6.17). *Under standard hypotheses, there exists a canonical ‘higher Kolyvagin derivative’ homomorphism*

$$\mathcal{D}_r : \text{ES}_r(T) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A).$$

Under certain mild additional hypotheses, this homomorphism is surjective.

By this result, one can associate a canonical Kolyvagin system

$$\kappa(c) := \mathcal{D}_r(c)$$

in $\text{KS}_r(A)$ to every Euler system c in $\text{ES}_r(T)$.

A key aspect of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the development of a suitable ‘rank-reduction’ method by which consideration is restricted to the case $r = 1$ where the result can be established by the existing methods of Mazur and Rubin.

We shall also further develop the general theory of higher rank Kolyvagin systems in order to prove the next result.

In the sequel, for each commutative noetherian ring Λ , each non-negative integer i and each finitely generated Λ -module M we write $\text{Fitt}_\Lambda^i(M)$ for the i -th Fitting ideal of M .

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 5.2). *Under standard hypotheses, the following claims are valid.*

- (i) *The module $\text{KS}_r(A)$ of Kolyvagin systems of rank r is free of rank one over R .*
- (ii) *For each system κ in $\text{KS}_r(A)$ and each non-negative integer i one has*

$$I_i(\kappa) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_R^i(\text{Sel}(A)),$$

where $I_i(\kappa)$ is a canonical ideal associated with κ (see Definition 5.1) and $\text{Sel}(A)$ is a natural (dual) Selmer module for A (which is denoted by $H_{\mathcal{F}^}^1(K, A^*(1))^*$ in Theorem 5.2).*

- (iii) *If R is a principal ideal ring and κ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(A)$, then the inclusion in claim (ii) is an equality.*

Upon combining Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we immediately obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.3 (Corollaries 6.15 and 6.17). *The following claims are valid.*

- (i) *Under standard hypotheses, for each Euler system c in $\text{ES}_r(T)$ and each non-negative integer i one has $I_i(\kappa(c)) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_R^i(\text{Sel}(A))$.*
- (ii) *Under certain mild additional hypotheses, and if R is a principal ideal ring, then for each non-negative integer i one has $\langle I_i(\kappa(c)) \mid c \in \text{ES}_r(T) \rangle_R = \text{Fitt}_R^i(\text{Sel}(A))$.*

As a key step in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we must develop the theory of Stark systems in order to prove the next result.

Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 4.6). *Under standard hypotheses, the following claims are valid.*

- (i) *The module $\text{SS}_r(A)$ of Stark systems of rank r is free of rank one over R .*
- (ii) *For each system ϵ in $\text{SS}_r(A)$ and each non-negative integer i one has*

$$I_i(\epsilon) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_R^i(\text{Sel}(A)),$$

where $I_i(\epsilon)$ is a canonical ideal associated with ϵ (see Definition 4.1).

- (iii) *If ϵ is a basis of $\text{SS}_r(A)$, then the inclusion in claim (ii) is an equality.*

To relate Stark and Kolyvagin systems we prove (in §5.2) that there exists a canonical ‘regulator’ homomorphism of R -modules

$$\text{Reg}_r : \text{SS}_r(A) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A).$$

We are able to prove that this map is bijective, and as a consequence, that the module $\text{KS}_r(A)$ is free of rank one (see Theorem 5.2(i)). By combining this fact with Theorem 1.4, we are then able to prove Theorem 1.2.

We remark here that, for each system ϵ in $\text{SS}_r(A)$, it is natural to expect that for each non-negative integer i one has $I_i(\epsilon) = I_i(\text{Reg}_r(\epsilon))$. However, this seems to be difficult to prove and at present we have only verified it in the case R is a principal ideal ring (which leads to Theorem 1.2(iii)). For more details concerning this issue see Remark 5.26.

By simultaneously considering the representations $T/p^m T$ for all natural numbers m , one can define Kolyvagin and Stark systems ‘over \mathcal{R} ’ by setting

$$\text{KS}_r(T) := \varprojlim_m \text{KS}_r(T/p^m T) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{SS}_r(T) := \varprojlim_m \text{SS}_r(T/p^m T).$$

In this way we obtain analogues of Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 for the Selmer modules of T (see Theorem 5.25, Corollary 6.18 and Theorem 4.12 respectively).

To give a straightforward application of the general theory, we consider, for each one-dimensional p -adic character χ of the absolute Galois group of K , a certain twisted form T_χ of the representation $\mathbb{Z}_p(1)$. Since in this case the (dual) Selmer module coincides with the χ -isotypic component of a suitable ideal class group, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.5 (Theorem 7.1). *Let χ be a one-dimensional p -adic character of the absolute Galois group of K that is of finite prime-to- p order. Let L be the field fixed by $\ker(\chi)$. Assume that all archimedean places of K split completely in L , that no p -adic place of K splits completely in L , that χ is neither trivial nor equal to the Teichmüller character, and that either $p > 3$ or χ^2 is not equal to the Teichmüller character.*

Let r be the number of archimedean places of K and set $\mathcal{O} := \mathbb{Z}_p[\text{im}(\chi)]$. Then for each non-negative integer i one has

$$\langle I_i(\kappa(c)) \mid c \in \text{ES}_r(T_\chi) \rangle_{\mathcal{O}} = \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{O}}^i((\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L))^{\chi}),$$

where $\text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L)$ is the ideal class group of L .

We recall that, in this setting, the Rubin-Stark conjecture predicts the existence of a canonical Euler system in $\text{ES}_r(T_\chi)$ comprising ‘Rubin-Stark elements’ that are explicitly related to the values at zero of r -th derivatives of Dirichlet L -functions.

Finally, we note that, under mild additional hypotheses, a slightly more careful application of the methods used to prove Theorem 1.5 shows that for abelian extensions L of

K the higher Fitting ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L)$ as a $\mathbb{Z}_p[\text{Gal}(L/K)]$ -module are determined by Euler systems of rank r for induced forms of the representation $\mathbb{Z}_p(1)$. (For brevity, however, this result will be discussed in a separate article.)

1.4. Organization. In a little more detail, the basic contents of this article is as follows. In §2 we review the definitions and basic properties of exterior power biduals and then establish several new functorial properties that will play a crucial role in later sections. In §3 we establish various preliminary results concerning Selmer structures and Galois cohomology groups over zero-dimensional Gorenstein rings. In §4 we review the main results on higher rank Stark systems and Selmer groups that were established in our earlier articles [4] and [20] and also extend these results to the setting of representations over Gorenstein orders. In §5 we develop a theory of higher rank Kolyvagin systems in the same degree of generality and, in particular, show that under standard hypotheses, the modules of Stark systems and Kolyvagin systems (of any given rank) are both canonically isomorphic and free of rank one over the relevant ring of coefficients. In §6 we construct a canonical higher rank ‘Kolyvagin-derivative’ homomorphism between the module of Euler systems of any given rank and the module of Kolyvagin systems (defined with respect to the canonical Selmer structure) of the same rank. This is the key result of this article and, as an essential part of its proof, we establish precise links to the corresponding situation in rank one. Finally, in §7 we show that our approach leads directly to new results concerning the Galois structure of ideal class groups.

1.5. Some general notation. In this article, K always denotes a (base) number field (that is, a finite degree extension of \mathbb{Q}). We fix an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ of \mathbb{Q} , and every algebraic extension of \mathbb{Q} is regarded as a subfield of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. For a positive integer m , let μ_m denote the group of m -th roots of unity in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. For any field E , we denote the absolute Galois group of E by G_E . For each place v of K , we fix a place w of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ lying above v , and identify the decomposition group of w in G_K with G_{K_v} . For a finite extension F/K , the ring of integers of F is denoted by \mathcal{O}_F . For a finite set Σ of places of K , we denote by Σ_F the set of places of F which lie above a place in Σ . The ring of Σ_F -integers of F is denoted by $\mathcal{O}_{F,\Sigma}$. The set of archimedean places (resp. p -adic places) of F is denoted by $S_{\infty}(F)$ (resp. $S_p(F)$). We denote the set of places of K which ramify in F by $S_{\text{ram}}(F/K)$.

Non-archimedean places (or ‘primes’) of K are usually denoted by \mathfrak{q} . The Frobenius element of \mathfrak{q} is denoted by $\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}$.

For a continuous G_K -module A , we denote the set of places of K at which A is ramified by $S_{\text{ram}}(A)$. Suppose that there is a finite set S of places of K such that

$$S_{\infty}(K) \cup S_p(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(A) \subseteq S.$$

Let K_S denote the maximal Galois extension of K unramified outside S . Then we can consider Galois cohomology groups

$$H^i(\mathcal{O}_{K,S}, A) := H^i(K_S/K, A).$$

If A is a p -adic representation, then one can define, for each place v of K , a canonical (so-called) ‘finite’ local condition

$$H_f^1(K_v, A) \subseteq H^1(K_v, A)$$

(see [19, §1.3], for example). When $v \notin S$, this is the unramified cohomology $H_{\text{ur}}^1(K_v, A)$, which is defined by the kernel of the restriction to the inertia group. We set

$$H_{/f}^1(K_v, A) := H^1(K_v, A)/H_f^1(K_v, A).$$

More generally, for each index $*$ we set $H_{/f}^1(K_v, A) := H^1(K_v, A)/H_*^1(K_v, A)$.

2. EXTERIOR POWER BIDUALS

In this section we quickly review the basic theory of exterior power biduals and then prove several new results that will be very useful in the sequel.

At the outset we fix a commutative ring R . *All rings are assumed to be noetherian.* For each R -module X we set

$$X^* := \text{Hom}_R(X, R).$$

For each subset \mathcal{X} of X we write $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle_R$ for the R -submodule of X that is generated by \mathcal{X} .

If X is finitely presented, then for each non-negative integer i we write $\text{Fitt}_R^i(X)$ for the i -th Fitting ideal of X (as discussed by Northcott in [15]).

2.1. Definition and basic properties. We first recall the basic definitions.

For each R -module X , each positive integer r and each map φ in X^* , there exists a unique homomorphism of R -modules

$$\bigwedge_R^r X \rightarrow \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X$$

with the property that

$$x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_r \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^r (-1)^{i+1} \varphi(x_i) x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_{i-1} \wedge x_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_r$$

for each subset $\{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ of X . By abuse of notation, we shall also denote this map by φ . For non-negative integers r and s with $r \leq s$, this construction induces a natural homomorphism

$$\bigwedge_R^r X^* \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R \left(\bigwedge_R^s X, \bigwedge_R^{s-r} X \right); \varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_r \mapsto \varphi_r \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_1.$$

Here $\bigwedge_R^r X^*$ means $\bigwedge_R^r(X^*)$. (We often use such an abbreviation.) We use this map to regard any element of $\bigwedge_R^r X^*$ as an element of $\text{Hom}_R(\bigwedge_R^s X, \bigwedge_R^{s-r} X)$.

Definition 2.1. For any non-negative integer r , we define the ‘ r -th exterior bidual’ of X to be the R -module obtained by setting

$$\bigcap_R^r X := \left(\bigwedge_R^r X^* \right)^*.$$

Note that $\bigcap_R^1 X = X^{**}$. So, if X is reflexive, i.e. the canonical map

$$(1) \quad X \rightarrow X^{**}; x \rightarrow (\varphi \mapsto \varphi(x))$$

is an isomorphism, then one can regard $\bigcap_R^1 X = X$. In practice, we usually consider exterior biduals of reflexive modules. (The fact that any modules over self-injective rings (in other words, zero-dimensional Gorenstein rings) are reflexive is often used in this paper.)

Note also that there is a canonical homomorphism

$$\xi_X^r : \bigwedge_R^r X \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r X; x \mapsto (\Phi \rightarrow \Phi(x)),$$

which is neither injective nor surjective in general. However, if X is a finitely generated projective R -module, then one can show that ξ_X^r is an isomorphism.

For non-negative integers r, s with $r \leq s$ and $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^r X^*$, define a homomorphism

$$(2) \quad \bigcap_R^s X \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{s-r} X$$

as the R -dual of

$$\bigwedge_R^{s-r} X^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_R^s X^*; \Psi \mapsto \Phi \wedge \Psi.$$

We denote the map (2) also by Φ , by abuse of notation. One can check that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge_R^s X & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \bigwedge_R^{s-r} X \\ \xi_X^s \downarrow & & \downarrow \xi_X^{s-r} \\ \bigcap_R^s X & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \bigcap_R^{s-r} X. \end{array}$$

We now recall two results from [4] and [20] that we will frequently use in the sequel.

Proposition 2.2 ([4, Prop. A.2], [20, Lem. 4.8]).

- (i) *Let $\iota : X \rightarrow Y$ be an injective homomorphism of R -modules for which the group $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{coker}(\iota), R)$ vanishes. Then for each $r \geq 0$ the homomorphism*

$$\bigcap_R^r X \hookrightarrow \bigcap_R^r Y$$

that is naturally induced by ι is injective.

- (ii) *Suppose that we have an exact sequence of R -modules*

$$Y \xrightarrow{\bigoplus_{i=1}^s \varphi_i} R^{\oplus s} \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0.$$

If Y is free of rank $r + s$, then $\text{Fitt}_R^0(Z)$ is generated over R by the set

$$\left\{ \text{im}(F) \mid F \in \text{im} \left(\bigcap_R^{r+s} Y \xrightarrow{\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq s} \varphi_i} \bigcap_R^r Y \right) \right\}.$$

Proposition 2.3 ([4, Prop. A.3], [20, Lem. 2.1]). *Suppose that R is self-injective, i.e. R is injective as an R -module, and that we have an exact sequence of R -modules*

$$0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\bigoplus_{i=1}^s \varphi_i} R^{\oplus s},$$

where s is a positive integer. Then, for every non-negative integer r , we have

$$\text{im} \left(\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq s} \varphi_i : \bigcap_R^{r+s} Y \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r Y \right) \subseteq \bigcap_R^r X.$$

Here we regard $\bigcap_R^r X \subseteq \bigcap_R^r Y$ by Proposition 2.2(i). In particular, $\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq s} \varphi_i$ induces a homomorphism

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq s} \varphi_i : \bigcap_R^{r+s} Y \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r X.$$

2.2. Further functorialities. In this section we prove several new properties of exterior power biduals that will play a key role in subsequent sections.

We first establish an appropriate formalism in our setting of the ‘rank reduction methods’ that were initiated by Rubin in [18] and subsequently used by Perrin-Riou and by Büyükboduk. This result will later play an essential role in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that R is self-injective. Let X be an R -module and Y an R -submodule of X . Let r be a non-negative integer and identify $\bigcap_R^r Y$ with an R -submodule*

of $\bigcap_R^r X$ by using Proposition 2.2(i). Then one has

$$\bigcap_R^r Y = \left\{ x \in \bigcap_R^r X \mid \Phi(x) \in Y (= \bigcap_R^1 Y) \text{ for all } \Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X^* \right\}.$$

Proof. Since R is self-injective, upon taking the R -dual of the tautological exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow X/Y \rightarrow 0$ we obtain another exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (X/Y)^* \rightarrow X^* \rightarrow Y^* \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, by applying the result of Lemma 2.5 below to this sequence, we deduce that

$$\ker \left(\bigwedge_R^r X^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_R^r Y^* \right) = \left\langle \varphi \wedge \Phi \mid \varphi \in (X/Y)^*, \Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X^* \right\rangle_R,$$

and hence that the sequence

$$\left\langle \varphi \wedge \Phi \mid \varphi \in (X/Y)^*, \Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X^* \right\rangle_R \rightarrow \bigwedge_R^r X^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_R^r Y^* \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Taking R -duals of the latter exact sequence, we deduce that

$$(3) \quad \bigcap_R^r Y = \left\{ x \in \bigcap_R^r X \mid x(\varphi \wedge \Phi) = 0 \text{ for every } \varphi \in (X/Y)^* \text{ and } \Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X^* \right\}$$

Now we suppose that $x \in \bigcap_R^r X$ satisfies $\Phi(x) \in Y$ for every $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X^*$. Then we have

$$x(\varphi \wedge \Phi) = \varphi(\Phi(x)) = 0$$

for every $\varphi \in (X/Y)^* \subseteq X^*$ and $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X^*$. Hence, by (3), we have $x \in \bigcap_R^r Y$. This proves the proposition since the opposite inclusion is clear. \square

Lemma 2.5. *We suppose given a short exact sequence of R -modules*

$$0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{\iota} Y \xrightarrow{\pi} Z \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, for every non-negative integer r , the kernel of the natural homomorphism

$$\bigwedge_R^r Y \xrightarrow{\pi} \bigwedge_R^r Z$$

is generated over R by the elements $\iota(\varphi) \wedge \Phi$ as φ ranges over X and Φ over $\bigwedge_R^{r-1} Y$.

Proof. We shall denote \otimes_R simply by \otimes . For each integer i with $1 \leq i \leq r$, we consider the R -module

$$\Omega_{r,i} := Y \otimes \cdots \otimes Y \otimes X \otimes Y \otimes \cdots \otimes Y,$$

in which there are $r-1$ copies of Y and the module X occurs as the i -th module from the left hand end (so that $\Omega_{r,i}$ is isomorphic to $X \otimes Y^{\otimes(r-1)}$).

We set

$$\Omega_r := \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \Omega_{r,i}$$

and claim that the sequence of R -modules

$$\Omega_r \rightarrow Y^{\otimes r} \xrightarrow{\pi^{\otimes r}} Z^{\otimes r} \rightarrow 0,$$

in which the first map is the direct sum of the maps $\Omega_{r,i} \rightarrow Y^{\otimes r}$ that are induced by the given map $\iota : X \rightarrow Y$, is exact.

To prove this claim we use induction on r . When $r = 1$, the claim is clear. When $r > 1$, by the inductive hypothesis, we have the following commutative diagram of R -modules,

whose rows and columns are exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Omega_{r-1} \otimes X & \longrightarrow & Y^{\otimes(r-1)} \otimes X & \longrightarrow & Z^{\otimes(r-1)} \otimes X & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
\Omega_{r-1} \otimes Y & \longrightarrow & Y^{\otimes r} & \longrightarrow & Z^{\otimes(r-1)} \otimes Y & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
\Omega_{r-1} \otimes Z & \longrightarrow & Y^{\otimes(r-1)} \otimes Z & \longrightarrow & Z^{\otimes r} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & & 0 & & 0 & &
\end{array}$$

Since $\Omega_r = (\Omega_{r-1} \otimes Y) \oplus (Y^{\otimes(r-1)} \otimes X)$, we see that

$$\operatorname{im}(\Omega_r \rightarrow Y^{\otimes r}) = \ker(Y^{\otimes r} \rightarrow Z^{\otimes r})$$

by diagram chasing. Hence we have proved the claim.

Now we put $\Upsilon_r := \ker(\bigwedge_R^r Y \rightarrow \bigwedge_R^r Z)$ and consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\Omega_r & \longrightarrow & Y^{\otimes r} & \longrightarrow & Z^{\otimes r} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow f_1 & & \downarrow f_2 & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \Upsilon_r & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_R^r Y & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_R^r Z \longrightarrow 0,
\end{array}$$

whose rows are exact. Clearly, f_1 is surjective, and the map $\ker(f_1) \rightarrow \ker(f_2)$ is also surjective, so we see that the map $\Omega_r \rightarrow \Upsilon_r$ is surjective (by Snake lemma). This shows that the inclusion

$$\Upsilon_r \subseteq \left\langle \varphi \wedge \Psi \mid \varphi \in X, \Psi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} Y \right\rangle_R$$

holds. Since the opposite inclusion clearly holds, we have proved the lemma. \square

Corollary 2.6. *Suppose that R is self-injective. Let X be an R -module and $f: X \rightarrow R$ an R -homomorphism. Then for any non-negative integer r , we have*

$$\bigcap_R^r \ker(f) = \ker\left(f: \bigcap_R^r X \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} X\right).$$

Proof. By definition, we see that the composition $\bigcap_R^r \ker(f) \hookrightarrow \bigcap_R^r X \xrightarrow{f} \bigcap_R^{r-1} X$ is the zero map. Hence we have $\bigcap_R^r \ker(f) \subseteq \ker\left(f: \bigcap_R^r X \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} X\right)$. To prove the opposite inclusion, take $x \in \ker\left(f: \bigcap_R^r X \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} X\right)$. Then, by definition, we have

$$0 = f(x)(\Phi) = x(f \wedge \Phi) = f(\Phi(x))$$

for any $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} X^*$, and so $\Phi(x) \in \ker(f)$. By Proposition 2.4, we conclude that $x \in \bigcap_R^r \ker(f)$. \square

The following corollary will be used in §§4 and 5 to define Kolyvagin and Stark systems over a Gorenstein order.

Corollary 2.7. *We suppose to be given a surjective homomorphism $R \rightarrow S$ of self-injective rings. Let X be an R -module, F a free R -module of finite rank, and Y an S -module. We*

then suppose to be given a commutative diagram of R -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & F \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ Y \hookrightarrow & & F \otimes_R S \end{array}$$

in which the lower horizontal arrow is injective and the map π is induced by the given homomorphism $R \rightarrow S$.

Then for any positive integer r , there exists a natural homomorphism of R -modules

$$\bigcap_R^r X \rightarrow \bigcap_S^r Y$$

that is independent of the given maps $X \rightarrow F$ and $Y \hookrightarrow F \otimes_R S$ and is such that all squares of the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \bigwedge_R^r X & \xrightarrow{\xi_X^r} & \bigcap_R^r X & \longrightarrow & \bigcap_R^r F \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigwedge_S^r Y & \xrightarrow{\xi_Y^r} & \bigcap_S^r Y \hookrightarrow & \longrightarrow & \bigcap_S^r (F \otimes_R S) \end{array}$$

commute. Here the second upper and lower horizontal arrows denote the maps induced by the given maps $X \rightarrow F$ and $Y \hookrightarrow F \otimes_R S$.

Proof. Since the map $Y \hookrightarrow F \otimes_R S$ is injective, by replacing X with $\text{im}(X \rightarrow F)$, we may assume that the map $X \rightarrow F$ is injective. Since F is free of finite rank, the maps ξ_F^r and $\xi_{F \otimes_R S}^r$ are isomorphisms. Hence we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \bigwedge_R^r X & \xrightarrow{\xi_X^r} & \bigcap_R^r X \hookrightarrow & \bigcap_R^r F & \xrightarrow{(\xi_F^r)^{-1}} & \bigwedge_R^r F & \\ \downarrow & & & & & \downarrow \wedge^r \pi & \\ \bigwedge_S^r Y & \xrightarrow{\xi_Y^r} & \bigcap_S^r Y \hookrightarrow & \bigcap_S^r (F \otimes_R S) & \xrightarrow{(\xi_{F \otimes_R S}^r)^{-1}} & \bigwedge_S^r (F \otimes_R S). & \end{array}$$

Since the diagram commutes and the map $\bigcap_S^r Y \hookrightarrow \bigcap_S^r (F \otimes_R S)$ is injective by Proposition 2.2(i), we only need to show that

$$\text{im} \left(\bigcap_R^r X \rightarrow \bigwedge_S^r (F \otimes_R S) \right) \subseteq \text{im} \left(\bigcap_S^r Y \rightarrow \bigwedge_S^r (F \otimes_R S) \right).$$

To see this, take elements $x \in \bigwedge_R^r F$ with $\xi_F^r(x) \in \bigcap_R^r X$ and $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} F^*$. We also denote by Φ the image of Φ under the map

$$\bigwedge_R^r F^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_S^r (F^* \otimes_R S) \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigwedge_S^{r-1} (F \otimes_R S)^*.$$

Then by Proposition 2.4, we have $\Phi(x) \in X$. Hence we conclude that $\Phi((\wedge^r \pi)(x)) = \pi(\Phi(x)) \in Y$. Since the natural map

$$\text{Hom}_R(F, R) \otimes_R S \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(F \otimes_R S, S)$$

is bijective we can again apply Proposition 2.4 to deduce that $\xi_{F \otimes_R S}^r((\wedge^r \pi)(x))$ belongs to $\bigcap_S^r Y$, as required. \square

3. PRELIMINARIES CONCERNING GALOIS COHOMOLOGY

3.1. Notation and hypotheses. Let K be a number field. Let (R, \mathfrak{p}) be a self-injective (commutative) local ring (in other words, a zero-dimensional Gorenstein local ring) with a finite residue field $\mathbb{k} = R/\mathfrak{p}$ of characteristic $p > 0$. Note that R is an artinian ring, which is finite of order a power of p . Let A be a free R -module of finite rank with an R -linear continuous action of G_K . (A is endowed with discrete topology.) Since A is finite, the action of G_K factors through a finite quotient, so A is unramified outside a finite set of places of K .

3.1.1. Selmer structures. We fix a Selmer structure \mathcal{F} on A . Recall that a Selmer structure \mathcal{F} on A is a collection of the following data (see [11, Def. 2.1.1]):

- a finite set $S(\mathcal{F})$ of places of K such that $S_\infty(K) \cup S_p(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(A) \subseteq S(\mathcal{F})$;
- for every $v \in S(\mathcal{F})$, a choice of an R -submodule $H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A) \subseteq H^1(K_v, A)$.

The Selmer module attached to \mathcal{F} is defined by

$$H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K, A) := \ker \left(H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S(\mathcal{F})}, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in S(\mathcal{F})} H_{/\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A) \right).$$

(Recall that for any index $*$ we set $H_{/*}^1(K_v, A) := H^1(K_v, A)/H_*^1(K_v, A)$.) Note that

$$H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S(\mathcal{F})}, A) = \ker \left(H^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \notin S(\mathcal{F})} H_{/f}^1(K_v, A) \right),$$

so we have

$$H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K, A) = \ker \left(H^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_v H_{/\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A) \right),$$

where we set $H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A) := H_{/f}^1(K_v, A)$ ($= H_{\text{ur}}^1(K_v, A)$) for $v \notin S(\mathcal{F})$. In the following, we set $S := S(\mathcal{F})$ for simplicity. (Note that Selmer structures and modules can be defined for continuous representations of G_K of various other types: in §4.3, for example, we consider representations over one-dimensional Gorenstein rings and Selmer modules associated to them.)

We next review the definition of the dual Selmer structure \mathcal{F}^* on $A^*(1)$. By local Tate duality, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$H^1(K_v, A) \simeq H^1(K_v, A^*(1))^*.$$

Using this, we define \mathcal{F}^* to be the following data

- $S(\mathcal{F}^*) := S(\mathcal{F}) (= S)$;
- for $v \in S$,

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K_v, A^*(1)) := \ker(H^1(K_v, A^*(1)) \simeq H^1(K_v, A)^* \rightarrow H_{/\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A)^*).$$

If B is an $R[G_K]$ -submodule (resp. quotient) of A , then the Selmer structure \mathcal{F} on A induces a Selmer structure on B (which we also denote by \mathcal{F}) as follows: we define the local condition by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, B) &:= \ker(H^1(K_v, B) \rightarrow H_{/\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A)) \\ (\text{resp. } H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, B) &:= \text{im}(H_{/\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A) \rightarrow H^1(K_v, B))). \end{aligned}$$

The following result is a consequence of the (Poitou-Tate) global duality and is proved by Mazur and Rubin in [11, Th. 2.3.4].

Theorem 3.1 (Global duality). *Let \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 be Selmer structures on A such that at every place v one has $H_{\mathcal{F}_1}^1(K_v, A) \subseteq H_{\mathcal{F}_2}^1(K_v, A)$. Then there exists a canonical exact sequence*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_1}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_2}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_v H_{\mathcal{F}_2}^1(K_v, A) / H_{\mathcal{F}_1}^1(K_v, A) \\ \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_1^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^* \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_2^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^* \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

3.1.2. *Hypotheses.* Let $K(A)$ be the minimal Galois extension of K such that $G_{K(A)}$ acts trivially on A . Let $M := \min\{p^n \mid p^n R = 0\}$. We denote by $K(1)$ the maximal p -extension of K inside the Hilbert class field of K . We set

$$K_M := K(\mu_M, (\mathcal{O}_K^\times)^{1/M})K(1) \quad \text{and} \quad K(A)_M := K(A)K_M.$$

Here $(\mathcal{O}_K^\times)^{1/M}$ denotes the set $\{u \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \mid u^M \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times\}$.

In the following, we assume the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 3.2.

- (i) $A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}$ is an irreducible $\mathbb{k}[G_K]$ -module;
- (ii) there exists $\tau \in G_{K_M}$ such that $A/(\tau - 1)A \simeq R$ as R -modules;
- (iii) $H^1(K(A)_M/K, A) = H^1(K(A)_M/K, A^*(1)) = 0$.

Hypothesis 3.3. $(A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^{G_K} = ((A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))^{G_K} = 0$.

Remark 3.4. It is clear that if A satisfies Hypothesis 3.2, then so also does $A^*(1)$. Note also that the vanishing of $((A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))^{G_K}$ is equivalent to the vanishing of $(A^*(1) \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^{G_K}$ and so Hypothesis 3.3 for A is equivalent to the same hypothesis for $A^*(1)$.

Let \mathcal{P} be the set of primes $\mathfrak{q} \notin S$ of K such that $\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is conjugate to τ in $\text{Gal}(K(A)_M/K)$. In particular, by Hypothesis 3.2(ii), we see that \mathfrak{q} splits completely in K_M and that $A/(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1)A \simeq R$ for every $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$. For a set \mathcal{Q} of primes of K , we denote by $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ the set of square-free products of primes in \mathcal{Q} . (We let $1 \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ for convention.) For $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, the number of primes which divide \mathfrak{n} is denoted by $\nu(\mathfrak{n})$. (When $\mathfrak{n} = 1$, we set $\nu(1) := 0$.) We often abbreviate $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ to \mathcal{N} .

For $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, we denote by $K(\mathfrak{q})$ the maximal p -extension of K inside the ray class field modulo \mathfrak{q} . Put $G_{\mathfrak{q}} := \text{Gal}(K(\mathfrak{q})/K(1)) = \text{Gal}(K(\mathfrak{q})_{\mathfrak{q}}/K_{\mathfrak{q}})$, where $K(\mathfrak{q})_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is the completion of $K(\mathfrak{q})$ at the (fixed) place lying above \mathfrak{q} . For $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, we denote by $K(\mathfrak{n})$ the composite of $K(\mathfrak{q})$'s with $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}$. We set

$$G_{\mathfrak{n}} := \bigotimes_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} G_{\mathfrak{q}}.$$

Note that, since $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ splits completely in K_M , the order of $G_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is divisible by M .

3.1.3. *Modified Selmer structures.* For $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ which are pairwise relatively prime, we define a Selmer structure $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{a}}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{n})$ by

- $S(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{a}}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{n})) := S \cup \{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{n}\}$;

- for $v \in S(\mathcal{F}_a^b(\mathfrak{n}))$,

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_a^b(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K_v, A) := \begin{cases} H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K_v, A) & \text{if } v \in S, \\ 0 & \text{if } v \mid \mathfrak{a}, \\ H^1(K_v, A) & \text{if } v \mid \mathfrak{b}, \\ H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_v, A) & \text{if } v \mid \mathfrak{n}, \end{cases}$$

where $H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_q, A)$ is the ‘transverse’ submodule of $H^1(K_q, A)$ which fits in a canonical decomposition

$$H^1(K_q, A) = H_f^1(K_q, A) \oplus H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_q, A).$$

Explicitly, one defines

$$H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_q, A) := H^1(K(\mathfrak{q})_{\mathfrak{q}}/K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A^{G_{K(\mathfrak{q})_{\mathfrak{q}}}}) = \text{Hom}(G_{\mathfrak{q}}, A^{\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}=1}),$$

which is regarded as a submodule of $H^1(K_q, A)$ by the inflation map. Since $H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_q, A)$ is canonically isomorphic to $H_{/f}^1(K_q, A)$, we sometimes identify them. Note that $(\mathcal{F}_a^b(\mathfrak{n}))^* = \mathcal{F}_b^a(\mathfrak{n})$. This follows from the fact that

$$H_f^1(K_q, A) \simeq H_{/f}^1(K_q, A^*(1))^*$$

for every $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$. If $\mathfrak{a} = 1$, we abbreviate $\mathcal{F}_a^b(\mathfrak{n})$ to $\mathcal{F}^b(\mathfrak{n})$. Similarly, if $\mathfrak{b} = 1$ or $\mathfrak{n} = 1$, they are omitted. The Selmer structures $\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})$ will often appear. We remark that the associated Selmer modules are

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) := \ker \left(H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S_{\mathfrak{n}}}, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in S} H_{/f}^1(K_v, A) \right)$$

and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) := \ker \left(H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S_{\mathfrak{n}}}, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in S} H_{/f}^1(K_v, A) \oplus \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_v, A) \right)$$

respectively, where $S_{\mathfrak{n}} := S \cup \{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}\}$.

3.1.4. Finite-singular comparison maps. For $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, we recall the definition of the ‘finite-singular comparison map’

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}: H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{q}},$$

which is important in the theory of Kolyvagin systems. We use the following canonical isomorphisms:

$$H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq A/(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1)A; \quad a \mapsto a(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}) \text{ (evaluation of } \text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}} \text{ to the 1-cocycle } a),$$

$$H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{q}} = \text{Hom}(G_{\mathfrak{q}}, A^{\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}=1}) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{q}} \simeq A^{\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}=1}; \quad f \otimes \sigma \mapsto f(\sigma).$$

Since $A/(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1)A \simeq R$, one has $\det(1 - \text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}} \mid A) = 0$, so there exists a unique polynomial $Q_{\mathfrak{q}}(x) \in R[x]$ such that $(x - 1)Q_{\mathfrak{q}}(x) = \det(1 - \text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}x \mid A)$ in $R[x]$. By the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, we know that $(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1} - 1)Q_{\mathfrak{q}}(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1})$ annihilates A , so we have a well-defined map

$$Q_{\mathfrak{q}}(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}) : A/(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1)A \rightarrow A^{\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}=1}; \quad a \mapsto Q_{\mathfrak{q}}(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1})a.$$

(This is actually an isomorphism, see [19, Cor. A.2.7].)

Now we define $\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}$ to be the composite homomorphism

$$\varphi_q^{\text{fs}} : H_f^1(K_q, A) \simeq A/(\text{Fr}_q - 1)A \xrightarrow{Q_q(\text{Fr}_q^{-1})} A^{\text{Fr}_q=1} \simeq H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_q, A) \otimes G_q.$$

3.2. Application of the Chebotarev density theorem. In this subsection, we prove several basic results that will be used later.

For an R -module X and an ideal I of R we consider the R -submodule

$$X[I] := \{x \in X \mid ax = 0 \text{ for all } a \in I\}$$

of X comprising elements that are annihilated by elements of I .

Proposition 3.5. *Assume $(A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^{G_K}$ vanishes. Then, for any ideal I of R , the homomorphism $H^1(K, A[I]) \rightarrow H^1(K, A)[I]$ induced by the inclusion $A[I] \hookrightarrow A$ is bijective.*

Although a proof of this result was given by Mazur and Rubin in [11, Lem. 3.5.3], it relies on the validity of a lemma, which contains an error (see [11, Lem. 2.1.4] and [13, ‘Erratum’ on p.182]), and so their induction argument apparently fails. For the reader’s convenience, we shall give a full proof of Proposition 3.5.

To prove this proposition, we need the following algebraic lemmas.

Lemma 3.6. *Let (S, \mathfrak{p}_S) be a local ring, G a group and B an $S[G]$ -module. Suppose that B is a flat S -module and that $(B/\mathfrak{p}_S B)^G = 0$. Then we have*

$$B^G = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{p}_S^i B)^G.$$

In particular, if $\mathfrak{p}_S^n B = 0$ for a sufficiently large n , then we have $B^G = 0$.

Proof. Since B is a flat S -module, we have $S[G]$ -isomorphisms

$$\mathfrak{p}_S^i B / \mathfrak{p}_S^{i+1} B \simeq \mathfrak{p}_S^i / \mathfrak{p}_S^{i+1} \otimes_S B \simeq (B/\mathfrak{p}_S B)^{\dim_S / \mathfrak{p}_S (\mathfrak{p}_S^i / \mathfrak{p}_S^{i+1})}.$$

By the assumption $(B/\mathfrak{p}_S B)^G = 0$, we see that $(\mathfrak{p}_S^i B)^G = (\mathfrak{p}_S^{i+1} B)^G$. This equality holds for arbitrary i , so we have $B^G = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{p}_S^i B)^G$. \square

Lemma 3.7. *If $(A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^{G_K}$ vanishes, then the following claims are valid.*

(i) *For any ideals I_1, \dots, I_d of R , we have*

$$(\text{coker}(A \rightarrow A/I_1 A \times \dots \times A/I_d A))^{G_K} = 0,$$

where $A \rightarrow A/I_1 A \times \dots \times A/I_d A$ is the diagonal map.

(ii) *For any elements $r_1, \dots, r_d \in R$, we have*

$$\left(\text{coker} \left(A \xrightarrow{(r_1, \dots, r_d) \times} A^d \right) \right)^{G_K} = 0.$$

Proof. We prove claim (i) by induction on d . When $d = 1$, the claim is clear. When $d > 1$, we set

$$M_d := \text{coker}(A \rightarrow A/I_1 A \times \dots \times A/I_d A)$$

and

$$M_{d-1} := \text{coker}(A \rightarrow A/I_1 A \times \dots \times A/I_{d-1} A).$$

Applying the ‘kernel-cokernel lemma’ (see [14, Exer. 2 in Chap. I, §3]) to the sequence

$$A \xrightarrow{f} A/I_1 A \times \dots \times A/I_d A \xrightarrow{g} A/I_1 A \times \dots \times A/I_{d-1} A,$$

where g is the natural projection, we obtain the exact sequence

$$\ker(g \circ f) \rightarrow \ker(g) \rightarrow \operatorname{coker}(f) \rightarrow \operatorname{coker}(g \circ f) \rightarrow \operatorname{coker}(g).$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \ker(g \circ f) &= I_1 \cap \cdots \cap I_{d-1} =: J, \\ \ker(g) &= A/I_d A, \\ \operatorname{coker}(f) &= M_d, \\ \operatorname{coker}(g \circ f) &= M_{d-1}, \\ \operatorname{coker}(g) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A/(J + I_d)A \rightarrow M_d \rightarrow M_{d-1} \rightarrow 0.$$

By the inductive hypothesis, we have $M_{d-1}^{G_K} = 0$. Also, by applying Lemma 3.6 to $S := R/(J + I_d)$, $B := A/(J + I_d)A$ and $G := G_K$, we see that $(A/(J + I_d)A)^{G_K} = 0$. Hence we have $M_d^{G_K} = 0$. This proves (i).

Next, we prove claim (ii). We set $I_i := R[r_i]$ for each $1 \leq i \leq d$ and consider the sequence

$$A \xrightarrow{f} A/I_1 A \times \cdots \times A/I_d A \xrightarrow{g} A^d,$$

where g is induced by the ‘multiplication by (r_1, \dots, r_d) ’:

$$g : A/I_1 A \times \cdots \times A/I_d A \rightarrow A^d; (a_1, \dots, a_d) \mapsto (r_1 a_1, \dots, r_d a_d).$$

(Note that this is injective.) Using the kernel-cokernel lemma, we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \operatorname{coker}(f) \rightarrow \operatorname{coker}(g \circ f) \rightarrow A/r_1 A \times \cdots \times A/r_d A \rightarrow 0.$$

Since we know that $\operatorname{coker}(f)^{G_K} = 0$ by (i) and that $(A/r_i A)^{G_K} = 0$ by Lemma 3.6, we have $\operatorname{coker}(g \circ f)^{G_K} = 0$, i.e.

$$\left(\operatorname{coker} \left(A \xrightarrow{(r_1, \dots, r_d) \times} A^d \right) \right)^{G_K} = 0.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Let $\{r_1, \dots, r_d\}$ be a set of generators of an ideal I of R . We have a short exact sequence

$$(4) \quad 0 \rightarrow A[I] \rightarrow A \rightarrow A/A[I] \rightarrow 0$$

and an injection

$$(5) \quad A/A[I] \hookrightarrow A^d; a \mapsto (r_1 a, \dots, r_d a).$$

Since $(A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^{G_K} = 0$, we see by Lemma 3.6 that the sequence (4) induces an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(K, A[I]) \rightarrow H^1(K, A) \rightarrow H^1(K, A/A[I]).$$

(We apply Lemma 3.6 with $S := R/R[I]$ and $B := A/A[I]$.) One also sees by Lemma 3.7(ii) that (5) induces an injection

$$H^1(K, A/A[I]) \hookrightarrow H^1(K, A^d) = H^1(K, A)^d.$$

Since the composition map

$$H^1(K, A) \rightarrow H^1(K, A/A[I]) \rightarrow H^1(K, A)^d$$

is multiplication by (r_1, \dots, r_d) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(K, A[I]) &= \ker(H^1(K, A) \rightarrow H^1(K, A/A[I])) \\ &= \ker\left(H^1(K, A) \xrightarrow{(r_1, \dots, r_d)^\times} H^1(K, A)^d\right) \\ &= H^1(K, A)[I]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.8 ([11, Lem. 3.5.3]). *Suppose that $(A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)^{G_K}$ vanishes. Then, for any ideal I of R , the inclusion map $A^*(1)[I] \hookrightarrow A^*(1)$ induces an isomorphism*

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1)[I]) \simeq H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))[I].$$

(Here \mathcal{F} denotes the fixed Selmer structure on A , and \mathcal{F}^* the dual Selmer structure on $A^*(1)$ of \mathcal{F} . Note that the Selmer structure on $A^*(1)[I]$ induced by \mathcal{F}^* coincides with the dual of the Selmer structure on A/IA induced by \mathcal{F} , so the notation $H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1)[I])$ makes no confusion.)

Proof. We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1)[I]) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S}, A^*(1)[I]) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in S} H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K_v, A^*(1)[I]) \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))[I] & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S}, A^*(1))[I] & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in S} H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K_v, A^*(1)). \end{array}$$

Here each row is exact. The middle vertical arrow is an isomorphism by Proposition 3.5. The right vertical arrow is injective since the dual $H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K_v, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K_v, A/IA)$ is surjective (by the definition of the induced Selmer structure). Hence we conclude that the left vertical arrow is an isomorphism. □

Let $\tau \in G_{K_M}$ be the element in Hypothesis 3.2(ii). Recall that \mathcal{P} is the set of primes $\mathfrak{q} \notin S$ of K such that $\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is conjugate to τ in $\text{Gal}(K(A)_M/K)$.

Lemma 3.9 ([11, Prop. 3.6.1]). *Assume Hypothesis 3.2. Let $c_1, \dots, c_s \in H^1(K, A)$ and $c_1^*, \dots, c_t^* \in H^1(K, A^*(1))$ be non-zero elements. If $s+t < p$, then there is a subset $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ of positive density such that $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(c_i)$ and $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(c_i^*)$ are all non-zero for every $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$, where $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ denotes the localization map $H^1(K, -) \rightarrow H^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, -)$.*

Proof. Let $B \in \{A, A^*(1)\}$. By Hypothesis 3.2(iii), we know that the restriction map

$$\text{Res} : H^1(K, B) \rightarrow H^1(K(A)_M, B)^{G_K} = \text{Hom}(G_{K(A)_M}, B)^{G_K}$$

is injective. Since B is an irreducible $R[G_K]$ -module by Hypothesis 3.2(i) and since $(\tau-1)B$ is a free R -module of rank $\text{rank}_R(A) - 1$ by Hypothesis 3.2(ii), there is no non-trivial G_K -stable R -submodule of $(\tau-1)B$. Hence the natural map

$$f : H^1(K(A)_M, B)^{G_K} = \text{Hom}(G_{K(A)_M}, B)^{G_K} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(G_{K(A)_M}, B/(\tau-1)B)$$

is also injective.

Now suppose $B = A$. For $1 \leq i \leq s$, let F_i be the field corresponding to the subgroup $\ker(\text{Res}(c_i))$ of $G_{K(A)_M}$. Note that F_i is a finite Galois extension over K (this follows from the fact that $\text{Rec}(c_i)$ is a G_K -homomorphism). Let $\tilde{c}_i: G_K \rightarrow A$ be a 1-cocycle, which represents c_i , and set $a_i := -\tilde{c}_i(\tau) \in A/(\tau-1)A$. By the definition of 1-coboundary, note that $a_i \in A/(\tau-1)A$ is independent of the choice of the representative \tilde{c}_i of c_i . Define $H_i \subseteq G_{K(A)_M}$ by

$$H_i = f(\text{Res}(c_i))^{-1}(a_i).$$

Since c_i is non-zero and both Res and f are injective, we have

$$[G_{K(A)_M} : \ker(f(\text{Res}(c_i)))] \geq p.$$

Next, we suppose $B = A^*(1)$. For $1 \leq i \leq t$, define F_i^* , a_i^* , and $H_i^* \subseteq G_{K(A)_M}$ similarly by using c_i^* instead of c_i .

Since $s + t < p$ and $[G_{K(A)_M} : \ker(f(\text{Res}(c)))] \geq p$ for each $c \in \{c_1, \dots, c_s, c_1^*, \dots, c_t^*\}$, we have

$$G_{K(A)_M} \neq H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_s \cup H_1^* \cup \dots \cup H_t^*.$$

Now set $F := F_1 \cdots F_s F_1^* \cdots F_t^*$ (this is a finite Galois extension of K) and define \mathcal{Q} to be the set of primes $\mathfrak{q} \notin S$ of K such that \mathfrak{q} is unramified in F/K and $\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is conjugate to $\tau\gamma$ in $\text{Gal}(F/K)$ for some $\gamma \in G_{K(A)_M} \setminus (H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_s \cup H_1^* \cup \dots \cup H_t^*)$. Then we see that $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ by construction, and that \mathcal{Q} is of positive density by the Chebotarev density theorem. If $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$, then for any $1 \leq i \leq s$ we have

$$\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(c_i) = \tilde{c}_i(\tau\gamma) = \tau\tilde{c}_i(\gamma) + \tilde{c}_i(\tau) = f(\text{Res}(c_i))(\gamma) - a_i \neq 0 \text{ in } A/(\tau-1)A$$

where we identify $H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) = A/(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}-1)A = A/(\tau-1)A$. Similarly, we have $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(c_i^*) \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq t$ and $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.10. *Assume Hypothesis 3.2. Let S be a self-injective ring and $R \rightarrow S$ a surjective ring homomorphism. Then for any free, finitely generated, R -submodule X of $H^1(K, A)$ the natural homomorphism $X \otimes_R S \rightarrow H^1(K, A \otimes_R S)$ is injective.*

Proof. We may assume $X \neq 0$. Let \mathcal{Q} be the set of all primes \mathfrak{q} in \mathcal{P} such that $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(X) \not\subseteq H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)$. Note that \mathcal{Q} is a finite set. Let $e_1 \in X$ with $\text{Ann}_R(e_1) = 0$ and x a generator of $R[\mathfrak{p}]$. (The assumption that R is a zero-dimensional Gorenstein local ring ensures that $R[\mathfrak{p}]$ is a principal ideal.) Note that $a \in R$ is a unit if and only if $xa \neq 0$. Since $xe_1 \neq 0$, there is a prime $\mathfrak{q}_1 \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ with $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}(xe_1) \neq 0$ by Lemma 3.9. Since $H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}_1}, A)$ is a free R -module of rank 1 and $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}(xe_1) \neq 0$, the composition $Re_1 \rightarrow X \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}_1}, A)$ is an isomorphism and we have

$$X \simeq H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}_1}, A) \oplus \ker(\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}|_X) \simeq Re_1 \oplus \ker(\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}|_X).$$

In particular, the R -module $\ker(\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}|_X)$ is free. Hence we can take an element $e_2 \in \ker(\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}|_X)$ with $\text{Ann}_R(e_2) = 0$. Similarly, by Lemma 3.9, we get a prime $\mathfrak{q}_2 \in \mathcal{P} \setminus (\mathcal{Q} \cup \{\mathfrak{q}_1\})$ such that the composition $Re_2 \rightarrow X \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}_2}, A)$ is an isomorphism. Since $e_2 \in \ker(\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}|_X)$, the composition

$$Re_1 \oplus Re_2 \rightarrow X \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}_1}, A) \oplus H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}_2}, A)$$

is an isomorphism and

$$X = Re_1 \oplus Re_2 \oplus (\ker(\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}|_X) \cap \ker(\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}_2}|_X)).$$

By repeating this argument, we can find an ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ such that the sum of localization maps

$$X \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{m}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)$$

is an isomorphism. Since $H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \otimes_R S \simeq H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R S)$ for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, the map $X \otimes_R S \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{m}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R S)$ is an isomorphism. This implies that $X \otimes_R S \rightarrow H^1(K, A \otimes_R S)$ is injective. \square

4. STARK SYSTEMS

In this section, we review some basic results on Stark systems. We continue to use the notation introduced in the previous section.

4.1. Definition. Let r be a non-negative integer. We recall the definition of Stark systems of rank r . The module of Stark systems is defined by the inverse limit

$$\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}) := \varprojlim_{\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}} \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A),$$

where the transition maps

$$v_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}} : \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{m})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)$$

($\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{m}$) are defined as follows. For each $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, we fix an isomorphism $H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R$ and let $v_{\mathfrak{q}}$ be the composition map

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}} : H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}} H^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R.$$

Since we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{n}} v_{\mathfrak{q}} R^{\nu(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{n})},$$

we see that $\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{n}} v_{\mathfrak{q}}$ induces

$$\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{n}} v_{\mathfrak{q}} : \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{m})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A),$$

by Proposition 2.3. We denote this map by $v_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}}$. Note that $v_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}} = \bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{n}} v_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is well-defined up to sign, but one can explicitly choose a sign for each pair $(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n})$ so that one has $v_{\mathfrak{m}', \mathfrak{n}} = v_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}} \circ v_{\mathfrak{m}', \mathfrak{m}}$ when $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{m}'$. (For an explicit choice of sign, see [4, §3.1].) Thus the collection $\{v_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}}\}_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}}$ forms an inverse system.

By definition, a Stark system of rank r (for (A, \mathcal{F})) is an element

$$(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}})_{\mathfrak{n}} \in \prod_{\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}} \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)$$

that satisfies $v_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}}(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}$ for all ideals \mathfrak{m} and \mathfrak{n} in \mathcal{N} with $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{m}$.

4.2. Stark systems and Selmer modules. We can now define the key invariants that are associated to a Stark system.

In this definition we use the fact that each element of $\bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)$ is, by its very definition, a homomorphism of R -modules from $\bigwedge_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)^*$ to R .

Definition 4.1. Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_n)_n \in \text{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. Then for each non-negative integer i we define an ideal $I_i(\epsilon)$ of R by setting

$$I_i(\epsilon) := \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}, \nu(n)=i} \text{im}(\epsilon_n).$$

We consider the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4.2. There exists an ideal \mathfrak{n} in \mathcal{N} such that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A^*(1))$ vanishes and $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)$ is a free R -module of rank $r + \nu(\mathfrak{n})$.

Remark 4.3. The following observation will frequently be used: if one assumes Hypothesis 4.2, then, for any ideal \mathfrak{m} in \mathcal{N} for which the group $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A^*(1))$ vanishes, the R -module $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A)$ is free of rank $r + \nu(\mathfrak{m})$. In fact, let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ be an ideal as in Hypothesis 4.2 and $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Take an ideal $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{d}$ and $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{d}$. Then, by the global duality, we have exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{d}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \frac{\mathfrak{d}}{\mathfrak{n}}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{d}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \frac{\mathfrak{d}}{\mathfrak{m}}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow 0.$$

By Hypothesis 4.2 and the definition of \mathcal{P} , we have $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})}$ and $H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R$ for any $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, and so $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{d}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{d})}$. Since R is a local ring, a projective R -module is free. Hence we conclude that $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{m})}$ by using the second (split) exact sequence.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume Hypothesis 4.2. Let i be a positive integer and $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\nu(\mathfrak{n}) \geq i$. Suppose that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A^*(1))$ vanishes. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) &= \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}\left(H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*\right) \\ &= \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}\left(H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Hypothesis 4.2, we see that, for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, there is an ideal $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}$ such that $\nu(\mathfrak{n}) \geq i$ and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Hence the first equality implies the second equality. To show the first equality, take an ideal $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\nu(\mathfrak{n}) \geq i$ such that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Note that $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})}$ by Remark 4.3. Then, by the global duality, we have exact sequences

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^* \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \frac{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{r}}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{r}}}^1(K, A^*(1))^* \rightarrow 0$$

for any prime $\mathfrak{r} \mid \mathfrak{n}$. Since $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})}$ and $H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R$ for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, these sequences give finite presentations of $H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*$ and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{r}}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*$

respectively. Hence we see that

$$\mathrm{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) = \sum_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} \mathrm{Fitt}_R^{i-1}\left(H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*\right).$$

□

Using Lemma 4.4 repeatedly, we deduce the following

Corollary 4.5. *Assume Hypothesis 4.2. Then, for any non-negative integer i , we have*

$$\mathrm{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) = \sum_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}, \nu(\mathfrak{m})=i} \mathrm{Fitt}_R^0\left(H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*\right).$$

We can now state one of the main results in the theory of Stark systems.

Theorem 4.6. *Under Hypothesis 4.2 all of the following claims are valid.*

(i) *Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Then the natural projection homomorphism*

$$\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A); \quad \epsilon \mapsto \epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}$$

is bijective. In particular, the R -module $\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ is free of rank one.

(ii) *The following claims are valid for all ϵ in $\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ and all $i \geq 0$.*

(a) *$I_i(\epsilon) \subseteq I_{i+1}(\epsilon)$, with equality for all sufficiently large i .*

(b) *$I_{\infty}(\epsilon) := \bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i(\epsilon)$ is equal to R if and only if ϵ is a basis of $\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$.*

(c) *$I_i(\epsilon) = I_{\infty}(\epsilon) \cdot \mathrm{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*)$.*

Proof. Both claim (i) and, in the case that ϵ is a basis of $\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$, the equality $I_i(\epsilon) = \mathrm{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*)$ in claim (ii)(c) were independently proved by the first and third authors in [4, Th. 3.17 and 3.19(ii)] and by the second author in [20, Th. 4.7 and 4.10].

To deduce the remainder of claim (ii) we fix a basis ϵ_0 of $\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ and then for each ϵ in $\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ define $\lambda_{\epsilon} \in R$ by the equality $\epsilon = \lambda_{\epsilon} \cdot \epsilon_0$. Then for each $i \geq 0$ one has

$$(6) \quad I_i(\epsilon) = \lambda_{\epsilon} \cdot I_i(\epsilon_0) = \lambda_{\epsilon} \cdot \mathrm{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*).$$

Claim (ii)(a) is thus true since the definition of higher Fitting ideal implies both that

$$\mathrm{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) \subseteq \mathrm{Fitt}_R^{i+1}(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*)$$

and $\mathrm{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) = R$ for all sufficiently large i .

The latter fact also combines with (6) to imply $I_i(\epsilon) = (\lambda_{\epsilon})$ for all sufficiently large i , and hence that $I_{\infty}(\epsilon) = (\lambda_{\epsilon})$. This equality implies claim (ii)(b) directly and also shows that (6) implies claim (ii)(c). □

4.3. Stark Systems over Gorenstein orders. Let Q be a finite extension of \mathbb{Q}_p and \mathcal{O} the ring of integers of Q . Let \mathcal{Q} be a finite-dimensional semisimple commutative Q -algebra. Let $(\mathcal{R}, \mathfrak{p})$ be a local Gorenstein \mathcal{O} -order in \mathcal{Q} (for basic properties of Gorenstein orders, see [4, §A.3]). Note that $\mathcal{R}/(\mathfrak{p}^m)$ is a zero-dimensional Gorenstein local ring since \mathfrak{p} is a regular element of \mathcal{R} .

Let T be a free \mathcal{R} -module of finite rank with an \mathcal{R} -linear continuous action of G_K which is unramified outside a finite set of places of K . Let $K(T)$ denote the minimal Galois extension of K such that $G_{K(T)}$ acts trivially on T . Recall that $K_{p^m} := K(\mu_{p^m}, (\mathcal{O}_K^{\times})^{1/p^m})K(1)$ and $K(T)_{p^m} := K(T)K_{p^m}$ for any positive integer m . Set $K(T)_{p^{\infty}} := \bigcup_{m>0} K(T)_{p^m}$ and $\overline{T} := T/\mathfrak{p}T$.

For an \mathcal{R} -module X we endow the Pontryagin dual $X^\vee := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(X, Q/\mathcal{O})$ with the natural action of \mathcal{R} . For any positive integer m and any $\mathcal{R}/(p^m)$ -module X , the module X^\vee is naturally isomorphic to $X^* := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}/(p^m)}(X, \mathcal{R}/(p^m))$ and in such cases we often identify the functors $(-)^\vee$ and $(-)^*$.

In this subsection, we assume the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4.7.

- (i) \overline{T} is an irreducible $(\mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{p})[G_K]$ -module;
- (ii) there exists $\tau \in G_{K(T)_{p^\infty}}$ such that $T/(\tau - 1)T \simeq \mathcal{R}$ as \mathcal{R} -modules;
- (iii) $H^1(K(T)_{p^\infty}/K, \overline{T}) = H^1(K(T)_{p^\infty}/K, \overline{T}^\vee(1)) = 0$;

Remark 4.8. Hypothesis 4.7 implies that \overline{T}^{G_K} and $\overline{T}^\vee(1)^{G_K}$ both vanish. To see this note that if \overline{T}^{G_K} does not vanish, then Hypothesis 4.7(i) implies $\dim_{\mathbb{k}}(\overline{T}) = 1$ and hence that \overline{T} is the trivial G_K -representation. But then, in this case, the module

$$H^1(K(T)_{p^\infty}/K, \overline{T}) = \text{Hom}(\text{Gal}(K(T)_{p^\infty}/K), \overline{T})$$

does not vanish since there is a non-trivial p -subextension of $K(T)_{p^\infty}/K$ and this contradicts Hypothesis 4.7(iii). The vanishing of $\overline{T}^\vee(1)^{G_K}$ is proved by a similar argument.

Remark 4.9. If we assume Hypothesis 4.7, then $T/p^m T$ satisfies Hypotheses 3.2 and 3.3 for any positive integer m . In fact, it clearly satisfies Hypotheses 3.2(i) and (ii). By Remark 4.8, Hypothesis 3.3 also holds true. We shall show Hypothesis 3.2(iii), i.e. that, setting $A := T/p^m T$, one has

$$H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, A) = H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, A^*(1)) = 0.$$

Since the inflation map $H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \overline{T}) \rightarrow H^1(K(T)_{p^\infty}/K, \overline{T})$ is injective, we have $H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \overline{T}) = 0$ by Hypothesis 4.7(iii). Let i be a non-negative integer. By the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}^{i+1}A \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}^i A \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}^i A/\mathfrak{p}^{i+1}A \rightarrow 0$ and Remark 4.8 we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \mathfrak{p}^{i+1}A) \rightarrow H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \mathfrak{p}^i A) \rightarrow H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \mathfrak{p}^i A/\mathfrak{p}^{i+1}A).$$

Since the $(\mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{p})[G_K]$ -module $\mathfrak{p}^i A/\mathfrak{p}^{i+1}A$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of \overline{T} , the group $H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \mathfrak{p}^i A/\mathfrak{p}^{i+1}A)$ vanishes and so the natural map

$$H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \mathfrak{p}^{i+1}A) \rightarrow H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, \mathfrak{p}^i A)$$

is bijective. Since i is arbitrary and $\mathfrak{p}^m A = 0$, we conclude that $H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, A)$ vanishes. The vanishing of $H^1(K(A)_{p^m}/K, A^*(1))$ is proved by a similar argument.

We fix a Selmer structure \mathcal{F} on T . For a positive integer m , let \mathcal{P}_m denote the set of primes $\mathfrak{q} \notin S(\mathcal{F})$ of K such that $\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is conjugate to τ in $\text{Gal}(K(T/p^m T)_{p^m}/K)$. Put $\mathcal{N}_m = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}_m)$. Note that $\mathcal{N}_{m+1} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_m$ for any positive integer m .

We suppose that $(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_m)$ satisfies Hypothesis 4.2 for any positive integer m . Let m be a positive integer and let \mathfrak{m} and \mathfrak{n} be ideals of \mathcal{N}_{m+1} such that $\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{n}$ and $H^1_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}(K, (T/p^{m+1}T)^\vee(1))$ vanishes. Then $H^1_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}(K, (T/p^m T)^\vee(1))$ vanishes by Corollary 3.8 and so $H^1_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}(K, T/p^{m+1}T) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}/(p^{m+1})} \mathcal{R}/(p^m)$ and $H^1_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}(K, T/p^m T)$ are free $\mathcal{R}/(p^m)$ -modules of the same rank by Remark 4.3. Hence by Lemma 3.10, the natural homomorphism

$$H^1_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}(K, T/p^{m+1}T) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}/(p^{m+1})} \mathcal{R}/(p^m) \rightarrow H^1_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}(K, T/p^m T)$$

is an isomorphism. Hence there is a canonical injection

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, T/p^m T) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, T/p^{m+1} T) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}/(p^{m+1})} \mathcal{R}/(p^m).$$

Applying Corollary 2.7 with $X = H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, T/p^{m+1} T)$, $Y = H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, T/p^m T)$, and $F = H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, T/p^{m+1} T)$, we get a natural homomorphism

$$\bigcap_{\mathcal{R}/(p^{m+1})}^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{m})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, T/p^{m+1} T) \rightarrow \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}/(p^m)}^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{m})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, T/p^m T).$$

Since \mathfrak{m} is any element of \mathcal{N}_{m+1} , we get a homomorphism

$$\mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}).$$

Lemma 4.10. *Let m be a positive integer.*

- (i) *The map $\mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F})$ is surjective.*
- (ii) *Fix $\epsilon^{(m+1)}$ in $\mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F})$ and write $\epsilon^{(m)}$ for its image in $\mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F})$. Then for each non-negative integer i one has $I_i(\epsilon^{(m+1)})\mathcal{R}/(p^m) = I_i(\epsilon^{(m)})$.*

Proof. Take an ideal $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1}$ such that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, (T/p^{m+1} T)^\vee(1))$ vanishes. Then we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}/(p^{m+1})}^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, T/p^{m+1} T) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}/(p^m)}^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, T/p^m T). \end{array}$$

The horizontal maps are isomorphisms by Theorem 4.6(i) and the right vertical map is surjective by the commutativity of the diagram in Corollary 2.7 and that

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, T/p^{m+1} T) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}/(p^{m+1})} \mathcal{R}/(p^m) \simeq H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, T/p^m T) \simeq (\mathcal{R}/(p^m))^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})}.$$

Hence the map $\mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F})$ is surjective.

We will show claim (ii). We may assume that $\epsilon^{(m+1)}$ is a basis of $\mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F})$. By claim (i), $\epsilon^{(m)}$ is also a basis of $\mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F})$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_i(\epsilon^{(m+1)})\mathcal{R}/(p^m) &= \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}/(p^{m+1})}^i \left(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, (T/p^{m+1} T)^\vee(1))^\vee \mathcal{R}/(p^m) \right) \\ &= \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}/(p^m)}^i \left(\left(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, (T/p^{m+1} T)^\vee(1)) [p^m] \right)^\vee \right) \\ &= \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}/(p^m)}^i \left(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, (T/p^m T)^\vee(1))^\vee \right) \\ &= I_i(\epsilon^{(m)}) \end{aligned}$$

where the first and forth equality follows from Theorem 4.6(ii) and the third equality follows from Corollary 3.8. \square

Definition 4.11. We define the module $\mathrm{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ of Stark systems of rank r for (T, \mathcal{F}) to be the inverse limit

$$\mathrm{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F}) := \varprojlim_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \mathrm{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}).$$

Let i be non-negative integer and $\epsilon = (\epsilon^{(m)})_m \in \mathrm{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$. Then, by Lemma 4.10(ii), we see that the family $(I_i(\epsilon^{(m)}))_m$ is an inverse system. We define an ideal $I_i(\epsilon)$ of \mathcal{R} to be the inverse limit

$$I_i(\epsilon) := \varprojlim_m I_i(\epsilon^{(m)}).$$

Theorem 4.12.

- (i) The \mathcal{R} -module $\mathrm{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ is free of rank one.
- (ii) The following claims are valid for all ϵ in $\mathrm{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ and all $i \geq 0$.
 - (a) $I_i(\epsilon) \subseteq I_{i+1}(\epsilon)$, with equality for all sufficiently large i .
 - (b) $I_\infty(\epsilon) := \bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i(\epsilon)$ is equal to \mathcal{R} if and only if ϵ is a basis of $\mathrm{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$.
 - (c) $I_i(\epsilon) = I_\infty(\epsilon) \cdot \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T^\vee(1))^\vee)$.

Proof. Claim (i) follows directly from Lemma 4.10(i) and Theorem 4.6(i).

To prove claim (ii) it is enough, just as with the proof of Theorem 4.6(ii), to show that if $\epsilon = (\epsilon^{(m)})_m$ is a basis of $\mathrm{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$, then for each non-negative integer i one has $I_i(\epsilon) = \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T^\vee(1))^\vee)$.

In this case, each element $\epsilon^{(m)}$ is a basis of $\mathrm{SS}_r(T/(p^m), \mathcal{F})$ over $\mathcal{R}/(p^m)$ and so Theorem 4.6(ii) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} I_i(\epsilon) &= \varprojlim_m \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}/(p^m)}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, (T/p^m T)^\vee(1))^\vee) \\ &= \varprojlim_m \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T^\vee(1))^\vee) \mathcal{R}/(p^m) \\ &= \mathrm{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T^\vee(1))^\vee), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Corollary 3.8 and the last from the fact that \mathcal{R} is a complete noetherian ring and so every ideal is closed. \square

5. KOLYVAGIN SYSTEMS

In this section, we develop the theory of higher rank Kolyvagin systems. We continue to use the notation introduced in §3.

5.1. Definition. In the following, we suppose $r > 0$. (We do not define Kolyvagin systems of rank zero).

We recall the definition of Kolyvagin systems. As in §4.1, we fix an isomorphism $H_{f, \mathfrak{q}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R$ for each $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ and identify them. We will again use the map $v_{\mathfrak{q}}$, which is defined by

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}} : H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}} H^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow H_{f, \mathfrak{q}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) = R.$$

If $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}$, this map induces

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}} : \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}} \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}.$$

(For the definition of $G_{\mathfrak{n}}$, see §3.1.2.)

The finite-singular comparison map

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\mathrm{fs}} : H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}} H_{f, \mathfrak{q}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\mathrm{fs}}} H_{\mathrm{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{q}} = H_{f, \mathfrak{q}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{q}} = R \otimes G_{\mathfrak{q}},$$

which is defined in §3.1.4, induces

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\mathrm{fs}} : \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}} \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}.$$

A Kolyvagin system of rank r (for (A, \mathcal{F})) is an element

$$(\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}})_{\mathfrak{n}} \in \prod_{\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}} \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}$$

which satisfies the ‘finite-singular relation’

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}}) = \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}}) \text{ in } \bigcap_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}.$$

The set of all Kolyvagin systems of rank r is denoted by $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. This is an R -submodule of $\prod_{\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}} \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}$.

5.2. Regulator maps. We quickly review the relation between Kolyvagin and Stark systems (see [4, §4.2]).

There exists a canonical homomorphism of R -modules

$$\text{Reg}_r : \text{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}),$$

which is referred to in loc. cit. as a ‘regulator map’. The definition of this map is as follows. Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}})_{\mathfrak{n}} \in \text{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. For each $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, we define

$$\kappa(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}) := \left(\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} \right) (\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}) \in \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}},$$

where we regard $\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}$ as a map

$$\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} : \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}.$$

Then one sees that $(\kappa(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}))_{\mathfrak{n}}$ is a Kolyvagin system. In fact, if $\mathfrak{q} | \mathfrak{n}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\mathfrak{q}}(\kappa(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}})) &= v_{\mathfrak{q}} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}'|\mathfrak{n}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}'}^{\text{fs}} \right) (\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}) \right) \\ &= \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}'|\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}'}^{\text{fs}} \right) (v_{\mathfrak{q}}(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}})) \right) \\ &= \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}'|\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}'}^{\text{fs}} \right) (\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}}) \right) \\ &= \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}(\kappa(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}})). \end{aligned}$$

The regulator map is defined by setting $\text{Reg}_r(\epsilon) := (\kappa(\epsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}))_{\mathfrak{n}}$.

5.3. Kolyvagin systems and Selmer modules. For each $\kappa \in \text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$, we can associate it with invariants $I_i(\kappa)$, similarly to the case of Stark systems (see Definition 4.1).

Definition 5.1. Let $\kappa \in \text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. We fix a generator of $G_{\mathfrak{q}}$ for each $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ and regard

$$\bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}} = \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)$$

for every $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. For a non-negative integer i , define an ideal $I_i(\kappa)$ of R by

$$I_i(\kappa) := \sum_{\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}, \nu(\mathfrak{n})=i} \text{im}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}}),$$

where we regard $\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}} \in \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) = \text{Hom}_R \left(\bigwedge_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)^*, R \right)$. These ideals, of course, do not depend on the choice of a generator of $G_{\mathfrak{q}}$ for each \mathfrak{q} .

The aim of this subsection is to prove the following theorem, which is one of the main results in this paper.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume Hypotheses 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2, and also suppose $p > 3$.*

(i) *The regulator map*

$$\text{Reg}_r : \text{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$$

is an isomorphism. In particular, the R -module $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ is free of rank one.

(ii) *Fix κ in $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. Then for each ideal \mathfrak{n} in \mathcal{N} one has*

$$\text{im}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}}) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_R^0(H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*),$$

with equality if κ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. In particular, if κ is a basis, then

$$\text{im}(\kappa_1) = \text{Fitt}_R^0(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*).$$

(iii) *Fix κ in $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. Then for each non-negative integer i one has*

$$I_i(\kappa) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*),$$

with equality if R is a principal ideal ring and κ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$.

Remark 5.3. For each κ in $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ and each non-negative integer i , Theorem 5.2(i) allows us to define a canonical ideal of R by setting

$$I'_i(\kappa) := I_i(\text{Reg}_r^{-1}(\kappa)),$$

where the right hand side is as defined in Definition 4.1. If R is a principal ideal ring and κ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$, then Theorems 4.6(ii) and 5.2(iii) combine to imply that $I'_i(\kappa) = I_i(\kappa)$ for all i . It would be interesting to know if such an equality is true more generally but this question seems to be difficult.

The next subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5.2.

5.4. The proof of Theorem 5.2. In this subsection, we always assume Hypotheses 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2, and fix an injection $\mathbb{k} \hookrightarrow R$. Note that

$$H_{?}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \otimes_R \mathbb{k} \xrightarrow{\sim} H_{?}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and

$$H_{?}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_{?}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)[\mathfrak{p}]$$

where $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, $? \in \{\emptyset, f, /f, \text{tr}, /tr\}$, the first map is the natural map, and the second is induced by the fixed map $\mathbb{k} \hookrightarrow R$.

Lemma 5.4. *If $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ is an ideal such that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$, then the natural map*

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \otimes_R \mathbb{k} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and the map

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)[\mathfrak{p}]$$

induced by $\mathbb{k} \hookrightarrow R$ are isomorphisms.

Proof. Note that $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})}$ by Hypothesis 4.2. Applying Lemma 3.10 with $S = \mathbb{k}$ and $X = H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)$, we see that the natural map

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \otimes_R \mathbb{k} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

is injective. By Hypothesis 3.3 and Lemma 3.6, we have $(\text{coker}(A \otimes_R \mathbb{k} \rightarrow A))^{G_K} = 0$, and so the map

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A)[\mathfrak{p}]$$

induced by $\mathbb{k} \hookrightarrow R$ is also injective. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} r + \nu(\mathfrak{n}) &= \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes_R \mathbb{k} \\ &\leq \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \\ &\leq \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)[\mathfrak{p}] \\ &= r + \nu(\mathfrak{n}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} R[\mathfrak{p}] = 1$ and $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})}$. Hence both the injections are isomorphisms. \square

Corollary 5.5. *For any ideal $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)[\mathfrak{p}]$ induced by the map $\mathbb{k} \hookrightarrow R$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. By using Lemma 3.9, we can take an ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{m}$ and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Then by the definition of the Selmer structure $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})$, we have the following diagram, whose rows are exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A_{\mathbb{k}}) & \hookrightarrow & H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A_{\mathbb{k}}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A_{\mathbb{k}}) \oplus \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A_{\mathbb{k}}) & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq & & \\ H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)[\mathfrak{p}] & \hookrightarrow & H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A)[\mathfrak{p}] & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)[\mathfrak{p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)[\mathfrak{p}] & & \end{array}$$

Here we abbreviate $A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}$ to $A_{\mathbb{k}}$, the vertical maps are induced by $\mathbb{k} \hookrightarrow R$ and the rightmost vertical map is an isomorphism. By Lemma 5.4, the middle vertical map is also an isomorphism, and so is the left. \square

For an ideal $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, put

$$\lambda(\mathfrak{n}) := \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and

$$\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}) := \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)).$$

Corollary 5.6. *For any ideal \mathfrak{n} in \mathcal{N} one has $r = \lambda(\mathfrak{n}) - \lambda^*(\mathfrak{n})$ and hence also $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}) < \lambda(\mathfrak{n})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. We take an ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{m}$ and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$ by using Lemma 3.9. Then $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) = 0$ by Corollary 3.8. Hence we have

$$\lambda(\mathfrak{n}) - \lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) - \nu(\mathfrak{m}) = r$$

where the first equality follows from the global duality and

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = 1$$

for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, and the second equality follows from Lemma 5.4 and Hypothesis 4.2. \square

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}$. Assume that the localization maps*

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) \rightarrow H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))$$

are non-zero. Then we have $\lambda(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) = \lambda(\mathfrak{n}) - 1$ and $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) = \lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}) - 1$.

Proof. By the assumption and the fact that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) = 1,$$

the sequences

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))^* \rightarrow H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))^* \rightarrow 0$$

are exact. Hence by the global duality and the second exact sequence, we have

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}),$$

and so

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \cap H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}).$$

Thus $\lambda(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) = \lambda(\mathfrak{n}) - 1$ by the first exact sequence, and so $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) = \lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}) - 1$ by Corollary 5.6. \square

According to Mazur and Rubin [11], it is convenient to regard elements in \mathcal{N} as ‘vertices’. In Definition 5.12 below, we consider a graph, whose vertices consist of elements in \mathcal{N} . We first recall the notion of ‘core vertices’ introduced by Mazur and Rubin.

Definition 5.8. We say that $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ is a core vertex if $H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$.

Remark 5.9.

- (i) By Corollary 3.8, $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ is a core vertex if and only if $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}) = 0$. In this case, we have $\lambda(\mathfrak{n}) = r$ by Corollary 5.6.
- (ii) Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ be a core vertex. By the global duality, we have

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} H_{/tr}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})}$ by Hypothesis 4.2 and $H_{/tr}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R$ for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, the R -module $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)$ is free of rank r .

Lemma 5.10. *Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}$. Then we have $|\lambda(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) - \lambda(\mathfrak{n})| \leq 1$ and $|\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) - \lambda^*(\mathfrak{n})| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{/tr}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = 1$, we have

$$0 \leq \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) - \lambda(\mathfrak{n}) \leq 1$$

and

$$0 \leq \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) - \lambda(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) \leq 1.$$

Hence $|\lambda(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) - \lambda(\mathfrak{n})| \leq 1$. The inequality $|\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) - \lambda^*(\mathfrak{n})| \leq 1$ follows from Corollary 5.6 and $|\lambda(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}) - \lambda(\mathfrak{n})| \leq 1$. \square

Corollary 5.11. *There is a core vertex $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\nu(\mathfrak{n}) = \lambda^*(1)$. Furthermore, every core vertex $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfies an inequality $\nu(\mathfrak{n}) \geq \lambda^*(1)$.*

Proof. The existence of a core vertex $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\nu(\mathfrak{n}) = \lambda^*(1)$ follows from Lemma 3.9, Corollary 5.6, and Proposition 5.7. The second claim follows from Lemma 5.10. \square

Definition 5.12. We define a graph \mathcal{X}^0 as follows.

- The vertices of \mathcal{X}^0 are the core vertices.
- Let \mathfrak{n} and \mathfrak{nq} be core vertices. We join \mathfrak{n} and \mathfrak{nq} by an edge in \mathcal{X}^0 if and only if the localization map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero.

Lemma 5.13. *Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}$.*

- If \mathfrak{n} is a core vertex and the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero, then \mathfrak{nq} is also a core vertex and \mathfrak{n} and \mathfrak{nq} are joined by an edge in \mathcal{X}^0 .*
- If \mathfrak{nq} is a core vertex and the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{nq})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero, then \mathfrak{n} is also a core vertex and \mathfrak{n} and \mathfrak{nq} are joined by an edge in \mathcal{X}^0 .*

Proof. We first prove claim (i). If \mathfrak{n} is a core vertex, we have an exact sequence by the global duality

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \\ \rightarrow H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))^* \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = 1$ and the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero, we have $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) = 0$, and so $H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{nq})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) = 0$.

To prove claim (ii), we can show in a similar way that \mathfrak{n} is a core vertex, by showing that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) = 0$. By the global duality, the cokernel of the localization map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ injects into $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))^* = 0$. Hence \mathfrak{n} and \mathfrak{nq} are joined by an edge in \mathcal{X}^0 . \square

Lemma 5.14 ([11, Lem. 4.3.9]). *If \mathfrak{n} and \mathfrak{nq} are core vertices, then there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n} to \mathfrak{nq} .*

Proof. We may assume that the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is zero. Then we have

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{nq})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

where the second equality follows from $\lambda(\mathfrak{n}) = r = \lambda(\mathfrak{nq})$. Furthermore, by the global duality, we have $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n}))^*}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) = 1$. By Lemma 3.9, there is a prime $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{r} \nmid \mathfrak{nq}$ such that the localization maps

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and

$$H_{(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n}))^*}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))$$

are non-zero. By Lemma 5.13(i) and $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{nq})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$, it follows from the fact that the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero that both \mathfrak{nr} and \mathfrak{nqr} are core vertices and that there are paths in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n} to \mathfrak{nr} and from \mathfrak{nq} to \mathfrak{nqr} . Hence again by Lemma 5.13(i), we only need to show that

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{nr})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \neq H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{nr})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}).$$

Since the map $H_{(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n}))^*}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))$ is non-zero, we have $H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\mathfrak{r}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ by the global duality. Hence we get an equality

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{nr})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{r}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{r}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

where the second equality follows from $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_q(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$. Since the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}_q(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{r})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{r}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \lambda(\mathfrak{n}) - 1 = \lambda(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{r}) - 1.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.15. *Let s be a positive integer. For $1 \leq i \leq s$, let $\mathfrak{n}_i \in \mathcal{N}$ be a core vertex and $\mathfrak{q}_i \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{q}_i \mid \mathfrak{n}_i$. If $2s < p$ and $\mathfrak{n}_i/\mathfrak{q}_i$ is not a core vertex for any $1 \leq i \leq s$, then there is a prime $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{r} \nmid \mathfrak{n}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{n}_s$ such that $\mathfrak{n}_1\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{n}_s\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_s$ are core vertices and that there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n}_i to $\mathfrak{n}_i\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq s$.*

Proof. Let $1 \leq i \leq s$ and put $\mathfrak{m}_i = \mathfrak{n}_i/\mathfrak{q}_i$. Since $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{n}_i) = 0$ and \mathfrak{m}_i is not a core vertex, we have $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}_i) = r + 1$ and $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}_i) = 1$ by Corollary 5.6 and Lemma 5.10. Note that

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}_i)}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \subseteq H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{q}_i}(\mathfrak{m}_i)}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m}_i)}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}).$$

In fact, we have $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}_i) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{q}_i}(\mathfrak{m}_i)}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \leq \lambda(\mathfrak{n}_i) + 1 = \lambda(\mathfrak{m}_i)$, where the second inequality follows from the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}_i)}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{q}_i}(\mathfrak{m}_i)}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = 1$. By Lemma 3.9 and $2s < p$, there is a prime $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{r} \nmid \mathfrak{n}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{n}_s$ such that the maps

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}_i)}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{m}_i)}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))$$

are non-zero for any $1 \leq i \leq s$. Then $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}_i\mathfrak{r}) = \lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}_i) - 1 = 0$ by Proposition 5.7. Hence $\mathfrak{m}_i\mathfrak{r}$ is a core vertex. Furthermore, by Lemma 5.13(i), $\mathfrak{n}_i\mathfrak{r}$ is also a core vertex. Therefore by using Lemma 5.14, there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n}_i to $\mathfrak{m}_i\mathfrak{r}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq s$. \square

Corollary 5.16. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{n}_1, \mathfrak{n}_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ are core vertices and $\nu(\mathfrak{n}_1) = \nu(\mathfrak{n}_2) = \lambda^*(1)$. If $p > 3$, then there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n}_1 to \mathfrak{n}_2 .*

Proof. We will prove this lemma by induction on $\lambda^*(1) - \nu(\gcd(\mathfrak{n}_1, \mathfrak{n}_2)) \geq 0$. When it is equal to zero, we have $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathfrak{n}_2$ and there is nothing to prove. Suppose $\mathfrak{n}_1 \neq \mathfrak{n}_2$, and fix distinct primes $\mathfrak{q}_1 \mid \mathfrak{n}_1$ and $\mathfrak{q}_2 \mid \mathfrak{n}_2$. Then $\mathfrak{n}_1/\mathfrak{q}_1$ and $\mathfrak{n}_2/\mathfrak{q}_2$ are not core vertices by Corollary 5.11. By Lemma 5.15 and $p > 3$, there is a prime $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{r} \nmid \mathfrak{n}_1\mathfrak{n}_2$ such that both $\mathfrak{n}_1\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_1$ and $\mathfrak{n}_2\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_2$ are core vertices and that there are paths in \mathcal{X}^0 connecting \mathfrak{n}_1 to $\mathfrak{n}_1\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_1$ and \mathfrak{n}_2 to $\mathfrak{n}_2\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_2$. Since $\nu(\gcd(\mathfrak{n}_1\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{n}_2\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_2)) = \nu(\gcd(\mathfrak{n}_1, \mathfrak{n}_2)) + 1$, there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 connecting $\mathfrak{n}_1\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_1$ to $\mathfrak{n}_2\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{q}_2$ by the induction hypothesis. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.17. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ is a core vertex with $\nu(\mathfrak{n}) > \lambda^*(1)$. Then there is a core vertex $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\nu(\mathfrak{m}) = \nu(\mathfrak{n}) - 1$ such that there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n} to \mathfrak{m} .*

Proof. By Lemma 5.14, we may assume that $\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}$ is not a core vertex for any $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}$. Then by Lemma 5.13(ii), we have

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}).$$

Since $\lambda(1) - \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}_n}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \lambda(1) - \lambda(\mathfrak{n}) = \lambda(1) - r = \lambda^*(1) < \nu(\mathfrak{n})$ and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_n}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \ker \left(H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \right),$$

the map $H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is not surjective. For any prime $\mathfrak{q} | \mathfrak{n}$, if $H_{\mathcal{F}_n}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \neq H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$, there is an element $x \in H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ such that $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(x) \neq 0$ and $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}'}(x) = 0$ for each prime $\mathfrak{q}' | \mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}$. Hence there is a prime $\mathfrak{q} | \mathfrak{n}$ such that

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_n}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

since the map $H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is not surjective. Let $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}$. Since \mathfrak{m} is not a core vertex, we have $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}) = 1$ by Lemma 5.10. Hence by Lemma 3.9, there is a prime $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{r} \nmid \mathfrak{n}$ such that the maps

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_n}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))$$

are non-zero. Then $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{r}$ are core vertices by Proposition 5.7 and Lemma 5.13(i). Hence by using Lemma 5.14, we see that there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n} to $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}$.

Since the map $H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))$ is surjective, we have $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}\mathfrak{r}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ by the global duality. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) &= H_{\mathcal{F}\mathfrak{r}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \cap H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \\ &= H_{\mathcal{F}\mathfrak{r}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{r}}}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = r - 1$$

since the map $H_{\mathcal{F}_n}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{r}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_m}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}_n}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}).$$

Since $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}) = r$, we conclude that the sum of localization maps

$$H_{\mathcal{F}\mathfrak{r}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s}|\mathfrak{m}} H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{s}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

is non-zero. Thus there is a prime $\mathfrak{s} | \mathfrak{m}$ such that the localization map

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{s}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

is non-zero. By Lemma 5.13(ii), $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{s}$ is a core vertex. Hence by Lemma 5.14 there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{s}$ to $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 5.18 ([11, Th. 4.3.12]). *Suppose that Hypotheses 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2. If $p > 3$, then the graph \mathcal{X}^0 is connected.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{n}_1, \mathfrak{n}_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ be core vertices. By Corollary 5.11 and Lemma 5.17, there are core vertices $\mathfrak{m}_1, \mathfrak{m}_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}_1) = \lambda(\mathfrak{m}_2) = \lambda^*(1)$ such that there are paths in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{n}_1 to \mathfrak{m}_1 and \mathfrak{n}_2 to \mathfrak{m}_2 . Since $p > 3$, there is a path in \mathcal{X}^0 from \mathfrak{m}_1 to \mathfrak{m}_2 by Corollary 5.16. Hence the graph \mathcal{X}^0 is connected. \square

Lemma 5.19. *Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}$. If \mathfrak{n} and $\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}$ are core vertices and the localization map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero, then the maps*

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} : \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}} \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}}$$

and

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}} : \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}} \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}}$$

are isomorphisms.

Proof. Note that $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)$ is free of rank r by Remark 5.9. The natural map

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes_R \mathbb{k} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

is an isomorphism by Lemma 3.10 and the fact that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes_R \mathbb{k} = r = \lambda(\mathfrak{n}) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}).$$

Thus the localization map

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)$$

is surjective since $H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \otimes_R \mathbb{k} \simeq H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ and the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$ is non-zero. Hence, by the global duality, we have a split exact sequence of free R -modules

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow 0$$

and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1)) = H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Again, by the global duality and the fact that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$, we have a split exact sequence of free R -modules

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since the R -modules $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)$ and $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A)$ are free of rank r , the maps $\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}$ and $v_{\mathfrak{q}}$ are isomorphisms. \square

Theorem 5.20. *Suppose Hypotheses 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2. Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ be a core vertex. If $p > 3$, then the projection map*

$$\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}; \kappa \mapsto \kappa_{\mathfrak{n}}$$

is an isomorphism. In particular, $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a free R -module of rank one.

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ is a core vertex, by the global duality, we have a split exact sequence of free R -modules:

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, by Hypothesis 4.2, the map

$$(7) \quad \bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} : \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{n})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}$$

is an isomorphism. By using the map $\text{Reg}_r : \text{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ and by Theorem 4.6(i), we conclude that the map $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}}$ is surjective.

Let $\kappa \in \text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ with $\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}} = 0$. To prove injectivity, we will show that $\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$ for any ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ by induction on $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{m})$. If $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}) = 0$, then \mathfrak{m} is a core vertex. Hence by Theorem 5.18, Lemma 5.19, and $\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}} = 0$, we have $\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$. Suppose that $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}) > 0$

and $\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}} \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.9, we can take an ideal $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathcal{N}$ coprime to \mathfrak{m} such that the localization maps

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

and

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1)) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, (A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})^*(1))$$

are non-zero for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{r}$ and that the sum of localization maps

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{r}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k})$$

is injective. Then the map

$$H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{r}} H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)$$

is also injective by using Corollary 5.5 and the injectivity of the maps $H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A \otimes_R \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_f^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)$ induced by the map $\mathbb{k} \hookrightarrow R$ for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$. By taking the dual of this map, we see that

$$0 = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{r}} \ker \left(\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} : \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{m}} \rightarrow \bigcap_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{q}} \right)$$

by Corollary 2.6. Hence there is a prime $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{r}$ such that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}}) \neq 0$, since we suppose $\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}} \neq 0$. Furthermore, we have $\lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{q}) = \lambda^*(\mathfrak{m}) - 1$ by Proposition 5.7, and so we conclude that $\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{q}} = 0$ by the induction hypothesis. By the definition of Kolyvagin system, we have $0 = v_{\mathfrak{q}}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{q}}) = \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}}) \neq 0$. This is a contradiction. Thus $\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$. \square

Remark 5.21. The proof of Theorem 5.18 is parallel to that of [11, Th. 4.3.12]. However, the notion of exterior power bidual plays a critical role in the proof of Theorem 5.20, allowing us to overcome the problem discussed by Mazur and Rubin in [13, Rem. 11.9]. More precisely, it is crucial for the proof of Theorem 5.20 that if $\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}}$ does not vanish, then there exists a prime ideal \mathfrak{q} such that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{m}})$ does not vanish and the corresponding fact is not true if one defines Kolyvagin systems by using exterior powers rather than exterior power biduals. This is the reason why Mazur and Rubin could not prove any result that corresponds to Theorem 5.20.

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 5.2(iii).

Lemma 5.22. *Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. Then for each natural number i one has*

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*),$$

with equality if $\text{Ann}_R(H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A))$ vanishes.

Proof. Note that, if \mathcal{F} satisfies Hypothesis 4.2, then so does $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})$. In fact, by Lemma 3.9, we can take an ideal $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathcal{N}$ coprime to \mathfrak{n} such that $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{d}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1))$ vanishes. Then, by the global duality, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{d}}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\partial\mathfrak{n}}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\partial\mathfrak{n})}$ by Remark 4.3 and $H_{/\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R$ for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}$, we conclude that $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\partial(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A) \simeq R^{r+\nu(\partial)}$.

Hence we can apply Lemma 4.4 for the Selmer structure $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})$ and we have

$$\text{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) = \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}(H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*).$$

(Note that $S(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})) = S \cup \{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}\}$ and so the primes running in the sum on the right hand side are restricted to $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}$.) Since the natural maps $H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A^*(1))^* \rightarrow H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*$ are surjective, we have

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) \subseteq \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}(H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*).$$

It is therefore enough to show that if $\text{Ann}_R(H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A))$ vanishes, then the reverse inclusion is also valid.

Under this assumption, there exists an element e of $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)$ with $\text{Ann}_R(e) = 0$. Let x be a generator of $R[\mathfrak{p}]$. Then by Lemma 3.9, there is an ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ coprime to \mathfrak{n} such that $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(xe) \neq 0$ for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{m}$ and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Since $H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \simeq R$, it follows from the fact that $\text{loc}_{\mathfrak{q}}(xe) \neq 0$ that the map $H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)$ is surjective for any prime $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{m}$. Hence, by the global duality, we have $H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1)) = H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A^*(1))$. Therefore we have

$$H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A^*(1)) = H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1)) \cap H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A^*(1)) = H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A^*(1)).$$

Again by Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) &= \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{m}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}(H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{n})}}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) \\ &= \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{m}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{n}} \text{Fitt}_R^{i-1}(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 5.23. *For each natural number i one has*

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}, \nu(\mathfrak{m})=i} \text{Fitt}_R^0(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{m})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_R^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A^*(1))^*),$$

with equality provided that $\text{Ann}_R(H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A))$ vanishes for all ideals \mathfrak{n} in \mathcal{N} .

Proof. This result follows directly from Lemma 5.22. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Claim (i) follows from Theorem 4.6(i), Theorem 5.20, and the isomorphism (7).

To prove claim (ii) it is enough to consider the case that κ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. To do this we fix an ideal \mathfrak{n} in \mathcal{N} and a generator of each $G_{\mathfrak{q}}$ and we regard $\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}}$ as an element of $\bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A)$. By claim (i), there exists a basis ϵ of $\text{SS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$ such that $\text{Reg}_r(\epsilon) = \kappa$.

By using Lemma 3.9, we can take an ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{m}$ and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A^*(1)) = 0$. Then by global duality, we have an exact sequence

$$(8) \quad 0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow X \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1))^* \rightarrow 0$$

where $X = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} H_{\text{tr}}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A) \oplus \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}} H_{/f}^1(K_{\mathfrak{q}}, A)$. Note that, under Hypothesis 4.2, the R -modules X and $H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A)$ are respectively free of ranks $\nu(\mathfrak{m})$ and $r + \nu(\mathfrak{m})$. Since $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a generator of $\bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{m})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A)$ by Theorem 4.6(i), $\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}}$ is a generator of the R -module

$$\text{im} \left(\bigwedge_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}} : \bigcap_R^{r+\nu(\mathfrak{m})} H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A) \right)$$

by the definitions of Stark system and the map Reg_r . Hence by Lemma 2.2(ii) and the exact sequence (8), we have

$$\text{Fitt}_R^0(H_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A^*(1))^*) = \text{im}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{n}}).$$

Next, we will prove claim(iii). In view of claim(ii) and Corollary 5.23, we only need to show that $\text{Ann}_R(H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A))$ vanishes for any ideal $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ when R is a principal ideal ring.

Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. Then, by using Lemma 3.9, take an ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathfrak{n} \mid \mathfrak{m}$ and $H_{(\mathcal{F}^*)_{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A^*(1))$ vanishes. Then we have

$$\text{rank}_R(X) = \nu(\mathfrak{m}) < r + \nu(\mathfrak{m}) = \text{rank}_R(H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A)).$$

Since R is principal, there is an injection

$$R^r \hookrightarrow \ker(H_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathfrak{m}}}^1(K, A) \rightarrow X) = H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A),$$

by the elementary divisor theorem. Hence the ideal $\text{Ann}_R(H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, A))$ vanishes, as required. \square

5.5. Kolyvagin Systems over Gorenstein orders. In this subsection, we use the same notation as in §4.3. Furthermore, *we assume that Hypothesis 4.7 and $(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_m)$ satisfies Hypothesis 4.2 for any positive integer m .*

Let m be a positive integer and $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1}$ a core vertex for $(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F})$. Then \mathfrak{n} is also a core vertex for $(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F})$ by Corollary 3.8. Hence in the same way as in §4.3, we can construct a map

$$\text{KS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}).$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{SS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Reg}_r} & \text{KS}_r(T/p^{m+1} T, \mathcal{F}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Reg}_r} & \text{KS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}) \end{array}$$

commutes.

Definition 5.24. We define the module $\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ of Kolyvagin systems for (T, \mathcal{F}) to be the inverse limit

$$\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F}) := \varprojlim_m \text{KS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}).$$

The maps $\text{Reg}_r: \text{SS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(T/p^m T, \mathcal{F})$ induce a homomorphism (also denoted by Reg_r)

$$\text{Reg}_r: \text{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F}).$$

By Corollary 3.8 and Theorem 5.2(ii), we have $I_i(\kappa^{(m+1)})\mathcal{R}/(p^m) \subseteq I_i(\kappa^{(m)})$ for any $\kappa = \{\kappa^{(n)}\} \in \text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ and non-negative integer i . Hence we can define an ideal $I_i(\kappa)$ of \mathcal{R} to be the inverse limit

$$I_i(\kappa) := \varprojlim_m I_i(\kappa^{(m)}).$$

Theorem 5.25. *Suppose that $p > 3$.*

- (i) *The map $\text{Reg}_r: \text{SS}_r(T, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ constructed above is an isomorphism. In particular, the \mathcal{R} -module $\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ is free of rank one.*
- (ii) *For each κ in $\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ one has*

$$I_0(\kappa) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}}^0(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T^\vee(1))^\vee),$$

with equality if κ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$.

- (iii) *Fix κ in $\text{KS}_r(A, \mathcal{F})$. Then for each non-negative integer i one has*

$$I_i(\kappa) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T^\vee(1))^\vee),$$

with equality if \mathcal{R} is a principal ideal ring and κ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$.

Proof. Claims (i), (ii) and (iii) follow as direct consequences of the respective claims in Theorem 5.2. \square

Remark 5.26. For each κ in $\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$ and each non-negative integer i , Theorem 5.25(i) allows us to define an ideal of \mathcal{R} by setting

$$I'_i(\kappa) := I_i(\text{Reg}_r^{-1}(\kappa)),$$

where the right hand side is as defined in Definition 4.11. If \mathcal{R} is a principal ring and κ is a \mathcal{R} -basis of $\text{KS}_r(T, \mathcal{F})$, then Theorems 5.25(iii) and 4.12(ii)(c) combine to imply that $I'_i(\kappa) = I_i(\kappa)$ for all i but we do not know if this is true more generally.

6. EULER SYSTEMS AND KOLYVAGIN SYSTEMS

In this section, we shall give a natural construction of higher rank Kolyvagin systems from higher rank Euler systems (see Theorem 6.12 and Corollary 6.13).

By using results in previous sections, we shall then show that higher rank Euler systems control Selmer modules (see Corollaries 6.15, 6.17 and 6.18).

6.1. Definition. Let K be a number field. Let p be a prime number. Let Q be a finite extension of \mathbb{Q}_p , and \mathcal{O} the ring of integers of Q . Let \mathcal{Q} be a finite dimensional semisimple commutative Q -algebra. Let \mathcal{R} be a semilocal Gorenstein \mathcal{O} -order in \mathcal{Q} . Let T be a free \mathcal{R} -module of finite rank with a continuous \mathcal{R} -linear action of G_K . We assume that $S_{\text{ram}}(T)$ is finite, and choose a finite set S of places of K such that

$$S_\infty(K) \cup S_p(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(T) \subseteq S.$$

For a prime $q \notin S$, we set

$$P_q(x) := \det(1 - \text{Fr}_q^{-1}x \mid T^*(1)) \in \mathcal{R}[x],$$

where $T^*(1) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(T, \mathcal{R}(1))$. Let \mathcal{K}/K be an abelian pro- p extension such that all infinite places $v \in S_{\infty}(K)$ split completely in \mathcal{K} . We define a set of subfields of \mathcal{K}/K by

$$\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K) := \{F \mid K \subseteq F \subseteq \mathcal{K}, F/K \text{ is finite}\}.$$

For a field F in $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$, set

$$\begin{aligned} S(F) &:= S \cup S_{\text{ram}}(F/K), \\ \mathcal{G}_F &:= \text{Gal}(F/K). \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we assume

Hypothesis 6.1.

- (i) $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)$ is a reflexive $\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]$ -module for every $F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$.
- (ii) $H^0(F, T) = 0$ for every $F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$.

Remark 6.2. Since \mathcal{R} is a Gorenstein \mathcal{O} -order, Hypothesis 6.1(i) is satisfied if and only if each group $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)$ is free as an \mathcal{O} -module. (See [1, Th. 6.2].)

Remark 6.3. When $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $T = \mathbb{Z}_p(1)$, Hypothesis 6.1(i) is equivalent to the condition that the p -completion of the unit group $\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}^{\times}$ is torsion-free for every $F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$. This condition often appears in the context of Stark conjectures, and we usually choose another set Σ of places to avoid assuming the condition, by considering the ‘ Σ -modified unit group’ $\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F),\Sigma}^{\times}$ (see [18], where our Σ is denoted by T). For a general p -adic representation T , we can consider the ‘ Σ -modified cohomology’ in a similar way to avoid assuming Hypothesis 6.1(i). For details, see [4, §2.3]. In this article, we do not consider such modified cohomology theory for simplicity.

The definition of higher rank Euler systems is as follows.

Definition 6.4 ([4, Definition 2.3]). Let r be a non-negative integer. An element

$$(c_F)_F \in \prod_{F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)} \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)$$

is said to be an Euler system of rank r for (T, \mathcal{K}) if

$$\text{Cor}_{F'/F}(c_{F'}) = \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{q} \in S(F') \setminus S(F)} P_{\mathfrak{q}}(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}) \right) c_F \text{ in } \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F')}, T)$$

for any $F, F' \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$ with $F \subseteq F'$, where

$$\text{Cor}_{F'/F} : \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_{F'}]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F',S(F')}, T) \rightarrow \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F')}, T)$$

is the map induced by the corestriction map.

The set of Euler systems of rank r (for (T, \mathcal{K})) is denoted by $\text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K})$. This has a natural structure of $\mathcal{R}[[\text{Gal}(\mathcal{K}/K)]]$ -module.

Remark 6.5. If Hypothesis 6.1(i) is satisfied, then we have

$$\bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^1 H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T) = H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)^{**} = H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)$$

for every $F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$, so we can regard an Euler system of rank one as an element in $\prod_{F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)$. Thus our definition generalizes the classical definition of Euler systems given in [19, Def. 2.1.1].

6.2. The canonical Selmer structure. The canonical Selmer structure \mathcal{F}_{can} on T (see [11, Def. 3.2.1]) is the following data:

- $S(\mathcal{F}_{\text{can}}) := S_{\infty}(K) \cup S_p(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(T)$;
- for $v \in S(\mathcal{F}_{\text{can}})$,

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{can}}}^1(K_v, T) := \begin{cases} \ker(H^1(K_v, T) \rightarrow H^1(K_v^{\text{ur}}, T \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Q}_p)) & \text{if } v \notin S_{\infty}(K) \cup S_p(K), \\ H^1(K_v, T) & \text{if } v \in S_{\infty}(K) \cup S_p(K). \end{cases}$$

Here K_v^{ur} denotes the maximal unramified extension of K_v .

The significance of this Selmer structure is explained by the following well-known result (taken from [19, Cor. B.3.5]).

Lemma 6.6. *Let c be an Euler system of rank one for (T, \mathcal{K}) . Assume that \mathcal{K} contains a \mathbb{Z}_p^d -extension of K for some $d \geq 1$, in which no finite place of K splits completely. Then c_F belongs to $H_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{can}}}^1(F, T)$ for every F in $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$.*

In practice, one usually takes \mathcal{K} to be a sufficiently large abelian pro- p extension. For later purposes, we now state the usual assumptions on \mathcal{K} as an explicit hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6.7. The field \mathcal{K} contains $K(\mathfrak{q})$ for every $\mathfrak{q} \notin S$ and a \mathbb{Z}_p^d -extension of K for some $d \geq 1$, in which no finite place of K splits completely.

Remark 6.8. This hypothesis is included in the definition of Euler systems given in [19, Def. 2.1.1].

6.3. Kolyvagin derivatives. We review the construction of ‘Kolyvagin derivatives’ in the higher rank case (see [4, §4.3.1]). We fix M , a power of p . We also fix $E \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$ such that E/K is unramified outside S and that $K(1) \subseteq E$. (Recall that $K(1)$ denotes the maximal p -extension inside the Hilbert class field of K .) We denote $\overline{\mathcal{R}} := \mathcal{R}/(M)$, $R := \overline{\mathcal{R}}[\text{Gal}(E/K)]$, $A := T/MT$, $\mathcal{T} := \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_E}(T)$, and $\mathcal{A} := \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_E}(A) = \mathcal{T}/M\mathcal{T}$.

We shall recall some notation from §3.1.2 and set some new notation. We consider the set \mathcal{P} of primes $\mathfrak{q} \notin S$ such that

- \mathfrak{q} splits completely in $K(\mu_M, (\mathcal{O}_K^{\times})^{1/M})K(1)$,
- $\mathcal{A}/(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1)\mathcal{A} \simeq R$ as R -modules.

Note that \mathcal{P} contains that defined in §3.1.2 if we assume Hypothesis 3.2(ii) for \mathcal{A} . Let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ be the set of square-free products of primes in \mathcal{P} . We set

$$G_{\mathfrak{q}} := \text{Gal}(K(\mathfrak{q})/K(1)) \simeq \text{Gal}(E(\mathfrak{q})/E),$$

where $E(\mathfrak{q}) := E \cdot K(\mathfrak{q})$. For $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, we set $K(\mathfrak{n}) := \prod_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} K(\mathfrak{q})$ (compositum) and $E(\mathfrak{n}) := E \cdot K(\mathfrak{n})$. We also set $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{n}} := \text{Gal}(E(\mathfrak{n})/K)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{n}} := \text{Gal}(E(\mathfrak{n})/E)$. Note that we have natural identifications

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{n}} = \text{Gal}(K(\mathfrak{n})/K(1)) = \prod_{\mathfrak{q}|\mathfrak{n}} G_{\mathfrak{q}}.$$

For an Euler system c of rank r and $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, we set

$$c_{\mathfrak{n}} := c_{E(\mathfrak{n})} \in \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{n}}]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathfrak{n}), S_{\mathfrak{n}}}, T),$$

where $S_{\mathbf{n}} := S \cup \{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathbf{n}\} (= S(E(\mathbf{n})))$. Fix a generator $\sigma_{\mathfrak{q}}$ of $G_{\mathfrak{q}}$ for each \mathfrak{q} , and consider the ‘derivative operator’

$$D_{\mathfrak{q}} := \sum_{i=1}^{|G_{\mathfrak{q}}|-1} i\sigma_{\mathfrak{q}}^i \in \mathbb{Z}[G_{\mathfrak{q}}].$$

For $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, we set

$$D_{\mathbf{n}} := \prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathbf{n}} D_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{n}}].$$

(We set $D_1 := 1$ for convention.)

Note that the natural ‘mod M ’ map $T \rightarrow T/MT = A$ induces a map

$$(9) \quad \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{n}}]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathbf{n}), S_{\mathbf{n}}}, T) \rightarrow \bigcap_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{n}}]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathbf{n}), S_{\mathbf{n}}}, A).$$

We explain the construction of this map, since we need Hypothesis 6.1(i) here. We set $H^1(T) := H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathbf{n}), S_{\mathbf{n}}}, T)$ and $H^1(A) := H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathbf{n}), S_{\mathbf{n}}}, A)$ for simplicity. Also, for the moment we denote $\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{n}}]$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{n}}]$ simply by \mathcal{R} and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ respectively (by abuse of notation). First, note that Hypothesis 6.1(i) implies that

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{R}}^1(H^1(T), \mathcal{R}) = 0.$$

(See [4, §A.3].) From this, we see that

$$H^1(T)^*/M = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(H^1(T), \mathcal{R})/M \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}(H^1(T)/M, \overline{\mathcal{R}}) = (H^1(T)/M)^*,$$

where we abbreviate X/MX to X/M . Since there is a natural map $H^1(T)/M \rightarrow H^1(A)$, we obtain a map

$$H^1(A)^* \rightarrow (H^1(T)/M)^* \simeq H^1(T)^*/M.$$

This map induces a map

$$(10) \quad \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^r H^1(A)^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^r (H^1(T)^*/M) = \left(\bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}}^r H^1(T)^* \right) / M.$$

Then we obtain (9) as the following map:

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}}^r H^1(T) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}}^r H^1(T)^*, \overline{\mathcal{R}} \right) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}}^r H^1(T)^* \right) / M, \overline{\mathcal{R}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(10)}{\rightarrow} \mathrm{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}} \left(\bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^r H^1(A)^*, \overline{\mathcal{R}} \right) \\ &= \bigcap_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^r H^1(A). \end{aligned}$$

We denote the image of $c_{\mathbf{n}}$ under (9) by $\bar{c}_{\mathbf{n}}$. The following is well-known.

Lemma 6.9 ([19, Lem. 4.4.2(i)]). *The element $D_{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \bar{c}_{\mathbf{n}}$ lies in $\left(\bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{n}}]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathbf{n}), S_{\mathbf{n}}}, A) \right)^{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{n}}}$.*

Proof. We use the identity

$$(11) \quad (\sigma_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1)D_{\mathfrak{q}} = |G_{\mathfrak{q}}| - N_{G_{\mathfrak{q}}},$$

where $N_{G_{\mathfrak{q}}} := \sum_{\sigma \in G_{\mathfrak{q}}} \sigma$. (This is checked by direct computation.)

We shall show that

$$(\sigma - 1)D_{\mathbf{n}} \cdot c_{\mathbf{n}} \in M \cdot \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{n}}]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathbf{n}), S_{\mathbf{n}}}, T)$$

for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_n$. We prove this by induction on $\nu(n)$. When $\nu(n) = 0$, i.e. $n = 1$, there is nothing to prove. When $\nu(n) > 0$, it is sufficient to show that

$$(\sigma_q - 1)D_n \cdot c_n \in M \cdot \bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n), S_n}, T)$$

for every $\mathfrak{q} \mid n$ (since the augmentation ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{H}_n]$ is generated by the elements $\sigma_q - 1$ for any $\mathfrak{q} \mid n$). Using (11), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_q - 1)D_n c_n &= (|G_q| - N_{G_q})D_{n/q} c_n \\ &= |G_q|D_{n/q} c_n - P_q(\text{Fr}_q^{-1})D_{n/q} c_{n/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the definition of Euler systems. Here we regard $c_{n/q}$ as an element in $\bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n), S_n}, T)$ via the restriction map. (To relate the corestriction map on \bigcap^r with N_{G_q} , a slightly delicate consideration is needed, but we omit the detail. See [21, Rem. 2.12] concerning this issue.) Note that

$$P_q(\text{Fr}_q^{-1})D_{n/q} c_{n/q} = (P_q(\text{Fr}_q^{-1}) - P_q(1))D_{n/q} c_{n/q} + P_q(1)D_{n/q} c_{n/q},$$

and that we know by induction hypothesis that the first term in the right hand side vanishes modulo M . Hence, since both $|G_q|$ and $P_q(1)$ are divisible by M (by the definition of \mathcal{P}), we conclude that $(\sigma_q - 1)D_n c_n$ vanishes modulo M . This proves the lemma. \square

One can also show that

$$\left(\bigcap_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n), S_n}, A) \right)^{\mathcal{H}_n} = \bigcap_R^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n), S_n}, A)^{\mathcal{H}_n}.$$

(See [4, Prop. A.4]). Furthermore, under Hypothesis 6.1(ii), we have

$$H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n), S_n}, A)^{\mathcal{H}_n} = H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E, S_n}, A) = H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S_n}, A)$$

(see [4, §4.3.1]). Combining these observations with Lemma 6.9, we have proved the following

Proposition 6.10. *Assume Hypothesis 6.1. Then for each $n \in \mathcal{N}$ one has*

$$\kappa'(c_n) := D_n \cdot \bar{c}_n \in \bigcap_R^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S_n}, A).$$

The element $\kappa'(c_n)$ is called a Kolyvagin derivative.

6.4. Construction of Kolyvagin systems. In this subsection, we modify the Kolyvagin derivatives $(\kappa'(c_n))_n$ to construct a Kolyvagin system. Theorem 6.12 below is the main result of this section.

We write \mathcal{I}_n for the augmentation ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{H}_n]$. We recall that the cyclic subgroup of $\mathcal{I}_n^{\nu(n)}/\mathcal{I}_n^{\nu(n)+1}$ generated by $\prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid n} (\sigma_q - 1)$ is a direct summand, and is isomorphic to $G_n := \bigotimes_{\mathfrak{q} \mid n} G_q$:

$$\begin{aligned} G_n &= \bigotimes_{\mathfrak{q} \mid n} G_q \xrightarrow{\sim} \left\langle \prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid n} (\sigma_q - 1) \right\rangle \subseteq \mathcal{I}_n^{\nu(n)}/\mathcal{I}_n^{\nu(n)+1} \\ &\quad \bigotimes_{\mathfrak{q} \mid n} \sigma_q \mapsto \prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid n} (\sigma_q - 1). \end{aligned}$$

(See [12, Prop. 4.2].) We often identify G_n with $\left\langle \prod_{q|n} (\sigma_q - 1) \right\rangle$. In particular, we regard a Kolyvagin system for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F})$ (for the definition, see §5.1) as an element in $\prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \left\langle \prod_{q|n} (\sigma_q - 1) \right\rangle$.

For $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, we shall denote $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1})$ simply by $P_{\mathfrak{q}}$. If \mathfrak{q} does not divide $n \in \mathcal{N}$, then \mathfrak{q} is unramified in $E(n)$, so we can regard $P_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \mathcal{R}[\mathcal{H}_n]$. Furthermore, since $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(1) \equiv 0 \pmod{M}$, we can regard $P_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \overline{\mathcal{R}} \otimes \mathcal{I}_n/\mathcal{I}_n^2$, which we denote by $P_{\mathfrak{q}}^n$. (Recall that $\overline{\mathcal{R}} := \mathcal{R}/(M)$.)

For $n \in \mathcal{N}$, we define an element $\mathcal{D}_n \in \overline{\mathcal{R}} \otimes \left\langle \prod_{q|n} (\sigma_q - 1) \right\rangle$ as follows. We write $n = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_\nu$ ($\nu = \nu(n)$). We define

$$\mathcal{D}_n := \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P_{\mathfrak{q}_1}^{\mathfrak{q}_2} & \cdots & & P_{\mathfrak{q}_1}^{\mathfrak{q}_\nu} \\ P_{\mathfrak{q}_2}^{\mathfrak{q}_1} & 0 & P_{\mathfrak{q}_2}^{\mathfrak{q}_3} & \cdots & P_{\mathfrak{q}_2}^{\mathfrak{q}_\nu} \\ \vdots & P_{\mathfrak{q}_3}^{\mathfrak{q}_2} & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ P_{\mathfrak{q}_\nu}^{\mathfrak{q}_1} & P_{\mathfrak{q}_\nu}^{\mathfrak{q}_2} & \cdots & & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \overline{\mathcal{R}} \otimes \left\langle \prod_{q|n} (\sigma_q - 1) \right\rangle.$$

(Compare [12, Def. 6.1] and [22, Def. 4.4].) One checks that this does not depend on the choice of the labeling $\mathfrak{q}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{q}_\nu$ of the prime divisors of n .

Now we consider the following modification of $(\kappa'(c_n))_n$:

$$\kappa(c)_n := \sum_{\mathfrak{d}|n} \left(\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}}) \otimes \prod_{q|\mathfrak{d}} (\sigma_q - 1) \right) \mathcal{D}_{n/\mathfrak{d}} \in \bigcap_R^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S_n}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \left\langle \prod_{q|n} (\sigma_q - 1) \right\rangle.$$

(Each $\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}}) \in \bigcap_R^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S_{\mathfrak{d}}}, \mathcal{A})$ is regarded as an element of $\bigcap_R^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K, S_n}, \mathcal{A})$.) One easily checks that

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{d}|n} \left(\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}}) \otimes \prod_{q|\mathfrak{d}} (\sigma_q - 1) \right) \mathcal{D}_{n/\mathfrak{d}} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}(n)} \text{sgn}(\tau) \kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}_\tau}) \otimes \prod_{q|\mathfrak{d}_\tau} (\sigma_q - 1) \prod_{q|n/\mathfrak{d}_\tau} P_{\tau(q)}^q,$$

where $\mathfrak{S}(n)$ is the set of permutations of prime divisors of n , and $\mathfrak{d}_\tau := \prod_{\tau(q)=q} q$. So one can also write

$$\kappa(c)_n = \sum_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}(n)} \text{sgn}(\tau) \kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}_\tau}) \otimes \prod_{q|\mathfrak{d}_\tau} (\sigma_q - 1) \prod_{q|n/\mathfrak{d}_\tau} P_{\tau(q)}^q.$$

Note that this construction is parallel to that given by Mazur and Rubin in [11, (33) in Appendix A].

We need the following hypothesis which corresponds to an assumption in [11, Th. 3.2.4].

Hypothesis 6.11. $\text{Fr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{p^k} - 1$ is injective on T for every $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $k \geq 0$.

Now we state the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 6.12. *Let r be a positive integer and $c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K})$. Let $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\text{can}}$ be the canonical Selmer structure (see §6.2). Assume Hypotheses 6.1, 6.7 and 6.11. Then, for every $n \in \mathcal{N}$, we have*

$$\kappa(c)_n \in \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \left\langle \prod_{q|n} (\sigma_q - 1) \right\rangle$$

and

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}}(\kappa(c)_n) = \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}(\kappa(c)_{n/\mathfrak{q}}).$$

for every $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}$. In particular, $\kappa(c) := (\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}})_{\mathfrak{n}} \in \text{KS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F})$.

The proof of Theorem 6.12 will be given in the next subsection. For the moment, however, we use the result to derive several important consequences.

Corollary 6.13. *Let r and \mathcal{F} be as in Theorem 6.12. Assume Hypotheses 6.1, 6.7 and 6.11. Choose a subfield F of E/K and set $A_F := \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F}(T/MT)$. Then there is a canonical ‘higher Kolyvagin derivative’ homomorphism*

$$\mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{D}_r^F : \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A_F, \mathcal{F}).$$

Proof. The construction of Kolyvagin systems given in Theorem 6.12 gives a homomorphism

$$\text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}); \quad c \mapsto \kappa(c).$$

The map \mathcal{D}_r^F is obtained by composing this map with the natural map

$$\text{KS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A_F, \mathcal{F})$$

induced by $\mathcal{A} (= \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_E}(T/MT)) \rightarrow A_F$. \square

Remark 6.14. Although we take F as a subfield of E/K in Corollary 6.13, this condition is not essential, since for an arbitrary finite abelian (p -)extension F/K one can take E so that $F \cdot K(1) \subseteq E$ by enlarging \mathcal{K} and S if necessary. The role of the field E is auxiliary (in fact, \mathcal{D}_r^F is independent of the choice of E), and so one can think of F in Corollary 6.13 as arbitrary.

Corollary 6.15. *Suppose $p > 3$. Let r be a positive integer, $c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\text{can}}$. Choose a subfield F of E/K and set $A_F := \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F}(T/MT)$. Assume Hypotheses 6.1, 6.7 and 6.11, and Hypotheses 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 for A_F and \mathcal{F} . Let $\kappa(c) := \mathcal{D}_r^F(c) \in \text{KS}_r(A_F, \mathcal{F})$ be the Kolyvagin system constructed in Corollary 6.13.*

(i) *For \mathfrak{n} in \mathcal{N} one has $\text{im}(\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}}) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^0(H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})^*}^1(K, A_F^*(1))^*)$. In particular, one has*

$$\text{im}(c_F) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^0(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A_F^*(1))^*).$$

Here we regard $c_F \in \bigcap_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S}, T)$ as an element in $\bigcap_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S}, A) \simeq \bigcap_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S}, A_F)$ by using the natural map (9).

(ii) *For every non-negative integer i , we have*

$$I_i(\kappa(c)) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A_F^*(1))^*).$$

Proof. This follows directly from Theorems 5.2(ii) and (iii), noting that $\kappa(c)_1 = c_F$. \square

Remark 6.16. The set \mathcal{P} defined in §6.3 for \mathcal{A} is in general smaller than the corresponding set that is defined in §3.1.2 for A_F . However, this difference does not matter since, as long as we can choose a subset of \mathcal{P} of positive density as in Lemma 3.9 (by the Chebotarev density theorem), the theory of Stark and Kolyvagin systems work. We shall implicitly consider such a smaller set \mathcal{P} also in the statements of the results below.

In the following result we recall the ideals $I'_i(\kappa)$ from Remark 5.3.

Corollary 6.17. *Let p, r, \mathcal{F}, F and A_F be as in Corollary 6.15. For $c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K})$, we set $\kappa(c) := \mathcal{D}_r^F(c) \in \text{KS}_r(A_F, \mathcal{F})$. Assume Hypotheses 6.1, 6.7 and 6.11, and Hypotheses 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 for \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{F} .*

We also consider the following additional hypotheses.

- (a) $Y_K(T) := \bigoplus_{v \in S_\infty(K)} H^0(K_v, T^*(1))$ is a free \mathcal{R} -module of rank r ;
(b) $H^0(K_v, \mathcal{A}^*(1))$ vanishes for each prime $v \in S \setminus S_\infty(K)$.

Then the following claims are valid.

(i) One has

$$\langle \text{im}(c_F) \mid c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rangle_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]} \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^0(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A_F^*(1))^*),$$

with equality if hypotheses (a) and (b) are satisfied.

(ii) For each non-negative integer i one has

$$\langle I_i'(\kappa(c)) \mid c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rangle_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]} \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A_F^*(1))^*),$$

with equality if hypotheses (a) and (b) are satisfied.

(iii) If $\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]$ is a principal ideal ring, then for each non-negative integer i one has

$$\langle I_i(\kappa(c)) \mid c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rangle_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]} \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, A_F^*(1))^*),$$

with equality if hypotheses (a) and (b) are satisfied.

Proof. By Theorems 5.2 and 4.6 (and Remark 5.3), it is sufficient to show that the validity of the given hypotheses (a) and (b) imply the existence of an Euler system c such that $\kappa(c)$ is a basis of $\text{KS}_r(A_F, \mathcal{F})$, or equivalently, that the homomorphism

$$\mathcal{D}_r^F : \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A_F, \mathcal{F})$$

is surjective.

Since the natural map

$$\text{KS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(A_F, \mathcal{F})$$

is surjective (by Theorem 5.2(i) and the argument in the proof of Lemma 4.10(i)), it is thus enough to show surjectivity of the map

$$\mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{D}_r^E : \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{KS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}),$$

or equivalently, surjectivity of the composite

$$\text{Reg}_r^{-1} \circ \mathcal{D}_r : \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{SS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}).$$

We prove surjectivity of this map by using results of the first and the third author in [4].

To do this we recall that the Selmer structure \mathcal{F}_S on \mathcal{A} that is considered in [4] is defined by setting

- $S(\mathcal{F}_S) := S$;
- for $v \in S$, $H_{\mathcal{F}_S}^1(K_v, \mathcal{A}) := H^1(K_v, \mathcal{A})$.

We also note that the stated hypotheses (a) and (b) above correspond to [4, Hyp. 2.11 and 3.9]. We shall recall some constructions given in [4].

By [4, Th. 2.17], under hypotheses (a) and 6.1, there is a homomorphism

$$\theta_{T, \mathcal{K}} : \text{VS}(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}),$$

where $\text{VS}(T, \mathcal{K})$ is the module of ‘vertical determinantal systems’ (see [4, Def. 2.8]). We define $\mathcal{E}^b(T, \mathcal{K}) := \text{im}(\theta_{T, \mathcal{K}})$. This is called the module of ‘basic Euler systems’ (see [4, Def. 2.18]).

By [4, Th. 3.11(ii)], under hypotheses (b) and 3.2, there is an isomorphism

$$\text{HS}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{SS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_S),$$

where $\text{HS}(\mathcal{A})$ is the module of ‘horizontal determinantal systems’ (see [4, Def. 3.2]). There is a natural surjection $\text{VS}(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{HS}(\mathcal{A})$ (as in [4, §4.3.2]).

The argument in the proof of [4, Th. 4.16] shows the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{E}^b(T, \mathcal{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Reg}_r^{-1} \circ \mathcal{D}_r} & \text{SS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}) \hookrightarrow \text{SS}_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_S) \\
 \theta_{T, \mathcal{K}} \uparrow & & \nearrow \simeq \\
 \text{VS}(T, \mathcal{K}) & \longrightarrow & \text{HS}(\mathcal{A}).
 \end{array}$$

This diagram shows that $\text{Reg}_r^{-1} \circ \mathcal{D}_r$ is surjective, as required. \square

Corollary 6.18. *Suppose $p > 3$. Let r be a positive integer, $c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\text{can}}$. Choose a subfield F of E/K and set $T_F := \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F}(T)$. Assume Hypotheses 6.1, 6.7, 6.11 and 4.7 for T and Hypothesis 4.2 for $(T_F/p^m T_F, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_m)$ for all positive integers m .*

- (i) *One has $\text{im}(c_F) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^0(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T_F^\vee(1))^\vee)$.*
- (ii) *Let $\kappa(c)_m := \mathcal{D}_r^F(c) \in \text{KS}_r(T_F/p^m T_F, \mathcal{F})$ be the Kolyvagin system constructed in Corollary 6.13 (with $M = p^m$). We set*

$$\kappa(c) := (\kappa(c)_m)_m \in \varprojlim_m \text{KS}_r(T_F/p^m T_F, \mathcal{F}) = \text{KS}_r(T_F, \mathcal{F}).$$

Then for each non-negative integer i one has $I_i(\kappa(c)) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^}^1(K, T_F^\vee(1))^\vee)$.*

- (iii) *Assume, in addition, that $\bigoplus_{v \in S_\infty(K)} H^0(K_v, T^*(1))$ is a free \mathcal{R} -module of rank r and that $H^0(E_w, (T/pT)^\vee(1))$ vanishes for all non-archimedean places w of E above S . Then for each non-negative integer i one has*

$$\langle I'_i(\kappa(c)) \mid c \in \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]} = \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^i(H_{\mathcal{F}^*}^1(K, T_F^\vee(1))^\vee).$$

If $\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]$ is a principal ideal ring, then one can replace the ideals $I'_i(\kappa(c))$ by $I_i(\kappa(c))$ in this equality.

Proof. Claims (i) and (ii) follow directly from Theorem 5.25(ii) and (iii) (after noting that $I_0(\kappa(c)) = \text{im}(c_F)$.)

In a similar way, since the additional hypotheses in claim (iii) are equivalent to the validity of the hypotheses (a) and (b) in Corollary 6.17 for the representations T and $\text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_E}(T/pT)$ respectively, this claim is a straightforward consequence of Corollary 6.17(iii) and Remark 5.26. \square

Remark 6.19. In results above, we excluded the case $p = 3$. This is due to the technical condition on p in Lemma 3.9. However, it is possible to treat the case $p = 3$, if we assume that T is not ‘self-dual’. In fact, Mazur and Rubin proved the result corresponding to Lemma 3.9 in [11, Prop. 3.6.1] under their running hypotheses, one of which is ‘either T is not self-dual or $p > 4$ ’ (see [11, (H.4) in §3.5]).

6.5. The proof of Theorem 6.12. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 6.12.

When $r = 1$, this result can be proved by using the argument of Mazur and Rubin in [11, Th. 3.2.4]. More precisely, whilst our setting is more general than that of [11], since we work over a general number field K and the coefficient ring of T is a general Gorenstein order, it can be checked that the method of the proof of [11, Th. 3.2.4] also applies in this more general setting.

The essential idea is, therefore, to reduce the general case of Theorem 6.12 to the case that $r = 1$.

Throughout this subsection, we assume Hypotheses 6.1, 6.7 and 6.11. We remark that

$$\Psi = (\Psi_F)_F \in \varprojlim_{F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)} \bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)^*$$

induces a homomorphism

$$\Psi: \text{ES}_r(T, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{ES}_1(T, \mathcal{K}); (c_F)_F \rightarrow (\Psi_F(c_F))_F.$$

This construction was introduced by Rubin in [18, §6] and also used by Perrin-Riou in [16, §1.2.3].

The following lemma is a key.

Lemma 6.20. *Let $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. Then, for every $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S_{\mathfrak{n}}}, \mathcal{A})^*$, there exists $\Psi \in \varprojlim_F \bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)^*$ such that for any $\mathfrak{d} \mid \mathfrak{n}$ we have*

$$\Phi(\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}})) = \kappa'(\Psi(c)_{\mathfrak{d}}) \text{ in } H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A}).$$

(Note that $\Psi(c) \in \text{ES}_1(T, \mathcal{K})$, and $\kappa'(\Psi(c)_{\mathfrak{d}})$ denotes the Kolyvagin derivative of the rank one Euler system $\Psi(c)$.)

Before proving this lemma, we use it to give a proof of Theorem 6.12.

Proof of Theorem 6.12. We first show that, for each $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, the element

$$\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}} = \sum_{\mathfrak{d} \mid \mathfrak{n}} \left(\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}}) \otimes \prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{d}} (\sigma_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1) \right) \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{d}}$$

lies in $\bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \left\langle \prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} (\sigma_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1) \right\rangle$. By Proposition 2.4, it is sufficient to show that

$$(12) \quad \Phi(\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{d} \mid \mathfrak{n}} \left(\Phi(\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}})) \otimes \prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{d}} (\sigma_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1) \right) \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{d}} \in H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \left\langle \prod_{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}} (\sigma_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1) \right\rangle$$

for every $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S_{\mathfrak{n}}}, \mathcal{A})^*$.

By Lemma 6.20, there exists $\Psi \in \varprojlim_F \bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)^*$ such that

$$\Phi(\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}})) = \kappa'(\Psi(c)_{\mathfrak{d}})$$

for every $\mathfrak{d} \mid \mathfrak{n}$, so (12) follows from the fact that Theorem 6.12 holds for the rank one Euler system $\Psi(c)$.

Next, we show that

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}}(\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}}) = \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\text{fs}}(\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{q}})$$

for every $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{n}$. As in Definition 5.1, we fix an identification

$$\bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A}) \otimes G_{\mathfrak{n}} = \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A})$$

for each $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. We note that, by definition,

$$\bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A}) = \left(\bigwedge_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A})^* \right)^*,$$

so $\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}} \in \bigcap_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A})$ is a map

$$\kappa(c)_{\mathfrak{n}} : \bigwedge_R^r H_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{n})}^1(K, \mathcal{A})^* \rightarrow R.$$

We also note that $v_q(\kappa(c)_n)$ is the map

$$\bigwedge_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A})^* \rightarrow R; \Phi \mapsto \kappa(c)_n(v_q \wedge \Phi).$$

Since we identify $\bigcap_R^1 H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A}) = H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A})$ and regard $\Phi(\kappa(c)_n) \in H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A})$, we have

$$\kappa(c)_n(v_q \wedge \Phi) = (-1)^{r-1} v_q(\Phi(\kappa(c)_n)).$$

Similarly, $\varphi_q^{\text{fs}}(\kappa(c)_{n/q}) \in \bigcap_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A})$ is the map

$$\bigwedge_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A})^* \rightarrow R; \Phi \mapsto \kappa(c)_{n/q}(\varphi_q^{\text{fs}} \wedge \Phi) = (-1)^{r-1} \varphi_q^{\text{fs}}(\Phi(\kappa(c)_{n/q})).$$

So, to prove the equality of maps $v_q(\kappa(c)_n) = \varphi_q^{\text{fs}}(\kappa(c)_{n/q})$, it is sufficient to prove that they send each $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A})^*$ to the same element, namely,

$$(13) \quad v_q(\Phi(\kappa(c)_n)) = \varphi_q^{\text{fs}}(\Phi(\kappa(c)_{n/q}))$$

for every $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} H_{\mathcal{F}(n)}^1(K, \mathcal{A})^*$.

By Lemma 6.20, there exists $\Psi \in \varprojlim_F \bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)^*$ such that

$$\Phi(\kappa(c)_n) = \kappa(\Psi(c))_n \text{ and } \Phi(\kappa(c)_{n/q}) = \kappa(\Psi(c))_{n/q},$$

So (13) follows again from the fact that Theorem 6.12 holds for the rank one Euler system $\Psi(c)$. \square

In the rest of this section we prove Lemma 6.20.

At the outset we fix Φ in $\bigwedge_R^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S_n}, \mathcal{A})^*$. Then, since the restriction map

$$\bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, A)^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_R^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E,S_n}, A)^* = \bigwedge_R^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S_n}, \mathcal{A})^*$$

is surjective (since rings we consider here are self-injective), we can choose a lift $\tilde{\Phi} \in \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, A)^*$ of $\Phi \in \bigwedge_R^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{K,S_n}, \mathcal{A})^*$.

We regard $\tilde{\Phi}$ as an element of $\bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, T)^*/M$ via the map

$$\bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, A)^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, T)^*/M$$

induced by $T \rightarrow T/M = A$ (see (10)). We also have a surjective homomorphism

$$\bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, T)^* \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, T)^*/M,$$

and we fix a lift $\Psi_n \in \bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, T)^*$ of $\tilde{\Phi} \in \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_n]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(n),S_n}, T)^*/M$. Then, since the transition maps of the inverse limit

$$\varprojlim_{F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)} \bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)^*$$

are surjective (by Hypothesis 6.1 and [21, Lem. 2.10]), one can take

$$\Psi = (\Psi_F)_F \in \varprojlim_{F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)} \bigwedge_{\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)}, T)^*$$

such that $\Psi_{E(n)} = \Psi_n$.

We shall show that this Ψ satisfies the condition in Lemma 6.20, namely that

$$\Phi(\kappa'(c_\mathfrak{d})) = \kappa'(\Psi(c)_\mathfrak{d})$$

for all $\mathfrak{d} \mid \mathfrak{n}$.

We first note that

$$\kappa'(\Psi(c)_{\mathfrak{d}}) = D_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot \tilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}(\bar{c}_{\mathfrak{d}}) \text{ in } H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathfrak{d}), S_{\mathfrak{d}}}, A),$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}} \in \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{d}}]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathfrak{d}), S_{\mathfrak{d}}}, A)^*$ is the restriction of $\tilde{\Phi} \in \bigwedge_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{n}}]}^{r-1} H^1(\mathcal{O}_{E(\mathfrak{n}), S_{\mathfrak{n}}}, A)^*$. Hence one has

$$\kappa'(\Psi(c)_{\mathfrak{d}}) = D_{\mathfrak{d}} \tilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}(\bar{c}_{\mathfrak{d}}) = \tilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}(D_{\mathfrak{d}} \bar{c}_{\mathfrak{d}}) = \Phi(\kappa'(c_{\mathfrak{d}})),$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\tilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is a lift of Φ by construction. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.20.

7. RUBIN-STARK ELEMENTS AND IDEAL CLASS GROUPS

In this final section, we give a straightforward application of our theory in the original setting considered by Rubin in [18].

In this setting we shall (unconditionally) prove a strong refinement of previous results of Rubin and of Büyükboduk that were obtained under the assumed validity of Leopoldt's Conjecture. In addition, by a slightly more careful application of the same methods one can also prove much stronger result in this direction (see Remark 7.3 below).

At the outset we fix an odd prime number p (see Remark 6.19). We also fix a number field K and a homomorphism

$$\chi : G_K \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^{\times},$$

that has finite prime-to- p order. We fix an embedding $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ and set $\mathcal{O} := \mathbb{Z}_p[\text{im}(\chi)]$. We write L for the field extension of K that corresponds to $\ker(\chi)$ and set $\Delta := \text{Gal}(L/K)$. We suppose that all archimedean places of K split completely in L . (In particular, if K is totally real, then we assume that χ is totally even.)

For a $\mathbb{Z}_p[\Delta]$ -module X , we define its ' χ -part' by

$$X^{\chi} := \{a \in \mathcal{O} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} X \mid \sigma(a) = \chi(\sigma)a \text{ for every } \sigma \in \Delta\}.$$

We note that, since $|\Delta|$ is prime to p , this module is naturally isomorphic to $\mathcal{O} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p[\Delta]} X$, where \mathcal{O} is regarded as a $\mathbb{Z}_p[\Delta]$ -algebra via χ .

We write T_{χ} for a free \mathcal{O} -module of rank one upon which G_K acts by the rule

$$\sigma \cdot a := \chi_{\text{cyc}}(\sigma) \chi^{-1}(\sigma) a \quad (\sigma \in G_K, a \in T),$$

where $\chi_{\text{cyc}} : G_K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^{\times}$ denotes the cyclotomic character. This T_{χ} is usually denoted by $\mathcal{O}(1) \otimes \chi^{-1}$.

Let \mathcal{F}_{can} be the canonical Selmer structure on T_{χ} and recall that there is a natural identification

$$(14) \quad H_{(\mathcal{F}_{\text{can}})^*}^1(K, T_{\chi}^{\vee}(1))^{\vee} \simeq (\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L[1/p]))^{\chi}.$$

Here $\text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L[1/p])$ denotes the quotient of the ideal class group $\text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L)$ of L by the subgroup generated by the classes of all prime ideals that divide p .

We set $r := |S_{\infty}(K)|$ and fix a finite set S of places of K such that

$$S_{\infty}(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(L/K) \subseteq S.$$

We always assume that $|S| > r$. (In particular, if L/K is ramified then we can take $S = S_{\infty}(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(L/K)$.)

We quickly recall some notations from §6.1. We fix a pro- p abelian extension \mathcal{K}/K that is sufficiently large to ensure Hypothesis 6.7 is satisfied (for $S \cup S_p(K)$), and we write $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$ for the set of subfields of \mathcal{K}/K that are finite over K . For a finite abelian extension F/K we set $\mathcal{G}_F := \text{Gal}(F/K)$ and $S(F) := S \cup S_{\text{ram}}(F/K)$. For a set Σ of places of K with $S(F) \subseteq \Sigma$, we denote by Σ_F the set of places of F which lie above a place in Σ . The ring of Σ_F -integers of F is denoted by $\mathcal{O}_{F,\Sigma}$ and we write $\theta_{F/K,\Sigma}(s)$ for the Σ -truncated equivariant L -function for F/K (as defined, for example, in [2, §3.1]).

Since p is odd and \mathcal{K}/K is a pro- p extension, all places in $S_\infty(K)$ split completely in \mathcal{K} . We label, and hence order, the places in $S_\infty(K)$ as $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ and for each v_i we fix a place w_i of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ that lies above v_i . Since $|\Sigma| > r$ we can also fix a non-archimedean place v_0 in S and a place w_0 of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ lying above v_0 .

Then for each $F \in \Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$ and each finite set Σ of places of K with $S(F) \subseteq \Sigma$, the Dirichlet regulator map induces an isomorphism of $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}_{LF}]$ -modules

$$\mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \bigwedge_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{G}_{LF}]}^r \mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma}^\times \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \bigwedge_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{G}_{LF}]}^r X_{LF,\Sigma}$$

where $X_{LF,\Sigma}$ denotes the kernel of the map $\bigoplus_{w \in \Sigma_{LF}} \mathbb{Z} \cdot w \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ that sends $\sum_w a_w w$ to $\sum_w a_w$.

Under the stated assumptions on S , the functions $s^{-r} \theta_{LF/K,\Sigma}(s)$ are holomorphic at $s = 0$ (see [23, Chap. I, Prop. 3.4]) and, following Rubin [18], one defines the ‘Rubin-Stark element’ $\eta_{LF/K,\Sigma}$ to be the unique element of $\mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \bigwedge_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{G}_{LF}]}^r \mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma}^\times$ that the above isomorphism sends to

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s^{-r} \theta_{LF/K,\Sigma}(s) \cdot (w_1 - w_0) \wedge \cdots \wedge (w_r - w_0).$$

If Σ contains $S_p(K)$, then Kummer theory induces canonical isomorphisms

$$(\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma}^\times)^\chi \simeq H^1(\mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma}, \mathbb{Z}_p(1))^\chi \simeq H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,\Sigma}, T_\chi).$$

(Note that, since $[L : K]$ is prime to p , L is disjoint from \mathcal{K} and so one can define the χ -component of a $\mathbb{Z}_p[\mathcal{G}_{LF}]$ -module.)

In particular, after fixing an embedding $\mathbb{R} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p$ we define $\eta_{LF/K,\Sigma}^\chi$ to be the image of $\eta_{LF/K,\Sigma}$ under the composite

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \bigwedge_{\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{G}_{LF}]}^r \mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma}^\times &\subseteq \mathbb{C}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \bigwedge_{\mathbb{Z}_p[\mathcal{G}_{LF}]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma \cup S_p(K)}, \mathbb{Z}_p(1)) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \bigwedge_{\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,\Sigma \cup S_p(K)}, T_\chi) \end{aligned}$$

with the second map induced by the projection

$$H^1(\mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma \cup S_p(K)}, \mathbb{Z}_p(1)) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_{LF,\Sigma \cup S_p(K)}, \mathbb{Z}_p(1))^\chi = H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,\Sigma \cup S_p(K)}, T_\chi).$$

For each F in $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$ we set $S(F)_p := S \cup S_{\text{ram}}(F/K) \cup S_p(K) (= S(F) \cup S_p(K))$ and we assume that the group $(\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{LF,S(F)_p}^\times)^\chi$ is a free \mathcal{O} -module.

Under this hypothesis the Rubin-Stark conjecture [18, Conj. B'] predicts that the element $c_{F,\chi}^{\text{RS}} := \eta_{LF/K,S(F)}^\chi$ belongs to $\bigcap_{\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)_p}, T_\chi)$ (regarded as a submodule of $\mathbb{C}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \bigwedge_{\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{G}_F]}^r H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F,S(F)_p}, T_\chi)$ via [4, Prop. A.7]).

In addition, if this conjecture is valid for every F in $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$, then the collection

$$c_\chi^{\text{RS}} := (c_{F,\chi}^{\text{RS}})_F$$

forms an Euler system of rank r for the pair (T_χ, \mathcal{K}) (for a proof of this see [18, Prop. 6.1] or [21, Prop. 3.5]).

By applying Corollary 6.18 in this setting, we can now prove the following result (the context of which is explained in Remark 7.3 below).

Theorem 7.1. *Assume that*

- (a) χ is neither trivial nor equal to the Teichmüller character, that
- (b) no place in $S_p(K)$ splits completely in L/K , and that
- (c) either $p > 3$ or χ^2 is not equal to the Teichmüller character.

For each non-negative integer i define an ideal of \mathcal{O} by setting

$$I_i(T_\chi) := \langle I_i(\kappa(c)) \mid c \in \text{ES}_r(T_\chi, \mathcal{K}) \rangle_{\mathcal{O}},$$

where $\kappa(c) \in \text{KS}_r(T_\chi, \mathcal{F})$ is the Kolyvagin system constructed from c . Then the following claims are valid.

- (i) For each i one has $I_i(T_\chi) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{O}}^i((\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L))^{\times})$.
- (ii) If no place in $S \setminus S_\infty(K)$ splits completely in L/K , then the inclusions in claim (i) are equalities and there is an isomorphism of \mathcal{O} -modules

$$(\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L))^{\times} \simeq \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} I_{i+1}(T_\chi) / I_i(T_\chi).$$

- (iii) If the Rubin-Stark Conjecture is valid for LF/K for each F in $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$, then one has $\text{im}(\eta_{L/K, S}^{\times}) \subseteq \text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{O}}^0((\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L))^{\times})$.

Proof. At the outset, note that assumption (c) is used simply so that we can include the case $p = 3$ (see Remark 6.19).

We next show that the conditions of Corollary 6.18 are satisfied under the hypotheses given above.

Firstly, under hypothesis (a) above, the \mathcal{O} -module $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{F, S(F)_p}, T_\chi) = (\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_{LF, S(F)_p}^{\times})^{\times}$ is easily seen to be free for every F in $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$ and so Hypotheses 6.1(i) is satisfied. We also obviously have $H^0(F, T_\chi) = 0$ and so Hypothesis 6.1(ii) is satisfied.

The field \mathcal{K} is chosen so that Hypothesis 6.7 is satisfied and Hypothesis 6.11 is also trivial in this case.

Hypotheses 4.7(i) and (ii) are trivial since T_χ is of rank one over \mathcal{O} (and so one can take $\tau = 1$). Hypothesis 4.7(iii) also follows from the stated assumption (a): in fact this is checked in [19, Lem. 3.1.1] (see also [11, Lem. 6.1.5]).

By [11, Cor. 4.1.9(iii)] and [13, Cor. 3.5(ii)], for all positive integers m , Hypothesis 4.2 is satisfied for $(T_\chi/p^m T_\chi, \mathcal{F}_{\text{can}}, \mathcal{P}_m)$ since in this case the coefficient ring is \mathcal{O} . (Note that in this case, the hypothesis (b) given above implies that the ‘core rank’ is equal to $r = |S_\infty(K)|$.)

Finally we consider the conditions (a) and (b) in Corollary 6.17. In this setting the validity of condition (a) follows directly from the assumption that all places in $S_\infty(K)$ split completely in L/K .

In addition, if no place in $S \setminus S_\infty(K)$ splits completely in L/K , then the \mathcal{O} -module

$$H^0(E_w, (T_\chi/pT_\chi)^{\vee}(1)) = H^0(E_w, \mathcal{O}/(p) \otimes \chi)$$

is easily seen to vanish for each non-archimedean prime w of E above $S \cup S_p(K)$. (Recall, from §6.3, that E is a fixed auxiliary field in $\Omega(\mathcal{K}/K)$ that contains $K(1)$ and is such that E/K is unramified outside $S \cup S_p(K)$. For example, one could take $E := K(1)$.)

We have now verified that the hypotheses of Corollary 6.18(i) and (ii) are satisfied under the given conditions (a), (b) and (c), and that the larger set of hypotheses of Corollary 6.18(iii) is satisfied if, in addition, no place in $S \setminus S_\infty(K)$ splits completely in L/K .

Next we note that, since χ is both non-trivial and primitive, the natural projection map $(\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L))^{\chi} \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L[1/p]))^{\chi}$ is bijective under the given condition (b). Therefore the identification (14) implies that $H_{(\mathcal{F}_{\text{can}})^*}^1(K, T_{\chi}^{\vee}(1))^{\vee} = (\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L))^{\chi}$.

Given these observations, all of the stated claims follow directly from the result of Corollary 6.18 and the fact that $c_{K,\chi}^{\text{RS}} = \eta_{L/K,S}^{\chi}$. \square

Remark 7.2. If K is totally real, then the assumption that places in $S_\infty(K)$ split completely in L implies χ is not the Teichmüller character and so the condition in Theorem 7.1(a) reduces to requiring χ is not trivial. In regard to Theorem 7.1(ii), note that if $S = S_\infty(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(L/K)$ (which is permissible if L/K is ramified), then no place in $S \setminus S_\infty(K)$ splits completely in L/K . In all cases, it is straightforward to choose a set S that contains $S_\infty(K) \cup S_{\text{ram}}(L/K)$ and is such that no place in $S \setminus S_\infty(K)$ splits completely in L/K .

Remark 7.3. Theorem 7.1 both refines and extends the results of Rubin in [17] and [18] and, more recently, of Büyükboduk in [5]. (For example, the main result of the latter article deals only with the case $i = 0$ and assumes, amongst other things, that K is totally real, L/K is unramified at p and, crucially, that Leopoldt's conjecture is valid.) In addition, under certain mild additional hypotheses, a more careful application of the methods used to prove Theorem 7.1 allows one to prove that for a wide range of abelian extensions L of K the higher Fitting ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Cl}(\mathcal{O}_L)$ as a $\mathbb{Z}_p[\text{Gal}(L/K)]$ -module are determined by Euler systems of rank r for induced forms of the representation $\mathbb{Z}_p(1)$. For brevity, however, we defer further discussion of this result to a subsequent article.

Remark 7.4. The approach used to prove Theorem 7.1 also leads to analogous results for the twisted representations $T_{\chi}(a) := T_{\chi} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}_p(a)$ for arbitrary integers a . Taken in conjunction with the known validity of the Quillen-Lichtenbaum conjecture, this in turn leads to concrete new information about the Galois structure of even dimensional higher algebraic K -groups.

To be a little more precise, in this setting the Rubin-Stark Euler system c_{χ}^{RS} defined above can be replaced, modulo the generalized Rubin-Stark conjecture formulated by Kurihara and the first and third authors in [3, Conj. 3.5(i)], by an Euler system that is constructed in just the same way after replacing Rubin-Stark elements by the 'generalized Stark elements' $\eta_{L/K,S}(-a)$ that are introduced in loc. cit.

The same argument as in the proof of Theorem 7.1 then shows that for any integer a , and all suitable characters χ of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$, the validity of [3, Conj. 3.5(i)] implies that ideals of the form $\text{im}(\eta_{L/K,S}(-a)^{\chi})$ are contained in $\text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{O}}^0(H^2(\mathcal{O}_{L,S}, \mathbb{Z}_p(a+1))^{\chi})$, respectively in $\text{Fitt}_{\mathcal{O}}^0((\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} K_{2a}(\mathcal{O}_L))^{\chi})$ if $a > 0$.

However, since no essentially new ideas are involved in this argument, we prefer not to give any more details here.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Bass, On the ubiquity of Gorenstein rings, *Math. Z.* **82** (1963) 8-28.
- [2] D. Burns, M. Kurihara, T. Sano, On zeta elements for \mathbb{G}_m , *Doc. Math.* **21** (2016) 555-626.
- [3] D. Burns, M. Kurihara, T. Sano, On Stark elements of arbitrary weight and their p -adic families I, submitted for publication.
- [4] D. Burns, T. Sano, On the theory of higher rank Euler, Kolyvagin and Stark systems, submitted for publication, arXiv:1612.06187v1.
- [5] K. Büyükboduk, Kolyvagin systems of Stark units, *J. reine u. Angew. Math.* **631** (2009) 85-107.
- [6] K. Büyükboduk, On Euler systems of rank r and their Kolyvagin systems, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **59** (2010) 1277-1332.
- [7] C. Greither, R. Kučera, Eigenspaces of ideal class groups, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **65** (2014) 2165-2203.
- [8] C. Greither, C. Popescu, The Galois module structure of ℓ -adic realizations of Picard 1-motives and applications, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, Volume 2012, 986-1036.
- [9] V. A. Kolyvagin, Euler systems, *The Grothendieck Festschrift Vol II* (1990) 435-483.
- [10] M. Kurihara, Refined Iwasawa theory for p -adic representations and the structure of Selmer groups, *Muenster J. Math.* **7** (2014) 149-223.
- [11] B. Mazur, K. Rubin, Kolyvagin systems, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **799** (2004).
- [12] B. Mazur, K. Rubin, Refined class number formulas and Kolyvagin systems, *Compos. Math.* **147** (2011) 56-74.
- [13] B. Mazur, K. Rubin, Controlling Selmer groups in the higher core rank case, *J. Th. Nombres Bordeaux* **28** (2016) 145-183.
- [14] J. Neukirch, A. Schmidt, K. Wingberg, *Cohomology of number fields*, Springer Verlag, 2000.
- [15] D. G. Northcott, *Finite free resolutions*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge New York 1976.
- [16] B. Perrin-Riou, Systèmes d'Euler p -adiques et théorie d'Iwasawa, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **48** (1998) 1231-1307.
- [17] K. Rubin, Stark units and Kolyvagin's 'Euler systems', *J. reine Angew. Math.* **425** (1992) 141-154.
- [18] K. Rubin, A Stark Conjecture 'over \mathbb{Z} ' for abelian L -functions with multiple zeros, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **46** (1996) 33-62.
- [19] K. Rubin, Euler systems, *Annals of Math. Studies* **147**, Princeton Univ. Press, 2000.
- [20] R. Sakamoto, Stark systems over complete regular local rings, submitted for publication.
- [21] T. Sano, Refined abelian Stark conjectures and the equivariant leading term conjecture of Burns, *Compositio Math.* **150** (2014) 1809-1835.
- [22] T. Sano, A generalization of Darmon's conjecture for Euler systems for general p -adic representations, *J. Number Theory* **144** (2014) 281-324.
- [23] J. Tate, Les Conjectures de Stark sur les Fonctions L d'Artin en $s = 0$ (notes par D. Bernardi et N. Schappacher), *Progress in Math.*, **47**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1984.

KING'S COLLEGE LONDON, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LONDON WC2R 2LS, U.K.

E-mail address: david.burns@kcl.ac.uk

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, 3-8-1 KOMABA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO, 153-8914, JAPAN

E-mail address: sakamoto@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

OSAKA CITY UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 3-3-138 SUGIMOTO, SUMIYOSHI-KU, OSAKA, 558-8585, JAPAN

E-mail address: sano@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp