

On Galois Extensions of Local Fields with a Single Wild Ramification Jump

Samuel Goodman

May 2024

Introduction

Fix a local field K , for example a finite extension of \mathbb{Q}_p . A classical question is counting the number of tamely ramified extensions of K of a given degree, which in turn is done by Serre's mass formula (see [3]), giving precisely n degree n totally tamely ramified extensions (where $p \nmid n$), and then since a tamely ramified extension is uniquely a totally tamely ramified extension of its maximal unramified one and there is a unique unramified degree k extension of K for each k , we find there are $\sigma_0(n)$ tamely ramified degree n extensions, where $\sigma_0(n)$ is the sum of the divisors of n coprime to p .

Using Kummer theory and the explicit description of tamely ramified Galois extensions or more elementary techniques (see [1]), one can also obtain the following result:

Let K/\mathbb{Q}_p be a finite extension and let L be a finite unramified extension of K . Set $q = |k|$. Then there are $\gcd(n, q-1)$ tamely ramified Galois extensions M/K such that $L \subset M$ and M/L is totally ramified of degree n .

This Kummer Theory approach quickly devolves into a certain counting of fixed points under the Galois group of the unramified part, something which we greatly build upon using class field theory in a broader context. In terms of ramification jumps, tamely ramified Galois extensions can be thought of as $(-1, 0)$ Galois extensions since tamely ramified Galois extensions have ramification jumps only at -1 and 0 . The next natural question to ask is how to count $(-1, n)$ extensions for a given positive integer n ; these are the extensions with only a single wild ramification jump.

In this paper, we briefly sketch the relatively straightforward $(-1, 1)$ case and then give a complete treatment of the $(-1, 2)$ case, effectively determining explicit formulas for the number of $(-1, 2)$ extensions given a particular unramified K/K_1 setup (with K corresponding to the maximal unramified extension). In

fact, we determine explicit formulas in the cases when K_1/\mathbb{Q}_p is totally ramified and when it is unramified.

1 Preliminaries

We start by noting an immediate consequence of [2] (p. 67, Prop. 7):

Proposition 1.1

Let L/K be a Galois extension with Galois group G . Set $G_0 = I$ and let G_i be the i th higher ramification group for $i \geq 1$. Then we have that:

- 1) G_0/G_1 is isomorphic to a subgroup of l^\times , where l is the residue field of L , and thus is cyclic.
- 2) For $i \geq 1$, $G_i/G_{i+1} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^k$ for some k , and so in particular, G_1 is a p -group.

Letting π be a uniformizer for L/K and assuming the extension L/K is totally ramified, we have that $\mathcal{O}_L = \mathcal{O}_K[\pi]$ and so the ramification groups are determined by π . More precisely, letting $\text{Gal}(L/K) = G$, we have that $G_n = \{\sigma \in G, \sigma(\pi) \equiv \pi \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^{n+1}}\}$, where $\mathfrak{m} = (\pi)$ is the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_L . We will later seek to better understand these ramification groups.

Proposition 1.2

Let $M/L/K$ be a series of finite extensions of local fields such that M/L is abelian and L/K is Galois. Let H be the norm subgroup of L^\times associated to M under LCFT. Then M/K is Galois iff $\sigma(H) = H$ for all $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(L/K)$.

Proof. M/K being Galois is equivalent to $\sigma(M) = M$ for all $\sigma : M \rightarrow \bar{K}$ an embedding fixing K . Since L/K is Galois, $\sigma(L) = L$ for all such embeddings and thus $\sigma(M)/L$ is an abelian extension. Its norm group is clearly $\sigma(H)$. However, LCFT gives an order-reversing bijection between norm groups and finite abelian extensions, and so we have that $\sigma(M) = M$ for all σ iff $\sigma(H) = H$ for all σ . But $\sigma|_L$ precisely attains the elements of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$, and so we conclude. \square

2 Ramification Groups

We now prove some general results about ramification groups. We start with Herbrand's Theorem, which states that $G_u H/H = (G/H)_v$, where $v = \phi_{L/K}(u)$. We are interested in the case of Galois extensions where there is a single jump in the wild ramification groups. We now characterize such extensions in the context of Lubin-Tate Theory. As before, we have that $G = \text{Gal}(K_{\pi,n}/K) \cong$

$\mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m}^n)$ and so view subgroups of G in terms of subgroups of $\mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m}^n)$. We say that an subextension L/K with corresponding subgroup H has a (lower) ramification jump at u if $(G/H)_u \neq (G/H)_{u+1}$.

Lemma 2.1

Suppose that $K_{\pi,n}/K$ is a Lubin-Tate extension with Galois group G . The subextensions L/K with a single wild ramification jump at k correspond to the proper subgroups H of G that both contain $(1+\mathfrak{m}^{k+1})/(1+\mathfrak{m}^n)$ and have the property that the canonical map $H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m}^k)$ is surjective under the identification $G \cong \mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m}^n)$.

Proof. Now recall from Lubin-Tate theory that if $m < q^n, q^r \leq m < q^{r+1}$, we have that $G_m = (1+\mathfrak{m}^r)/(1+\mathfrak{m}^n)$. It follows that $G^{r+1} = G_{q^r}$ for each $0 \leq r < n$.

Next note that Galois extensions with a single positive ramification jump have $G_{\phi_{L/K}(v)} = G_v$ for all v . Indeed, letting the jump be at k , we have that for $v \leq k$, $G_{\phi_{L/K}(v)} = G_v$, where $\phi_{L/K}(v) = v$ follows since $[G_0 : G_v] = 1$ for all $0 \leq v < k+1$. On the other hand, for $v > k+1$, both are trivial since then $k < \phi_{L/K}(v) < v$. Thus the upper numbering and lower numbering groups coincide for such extensions.

There being a unique jump at k is equivalent to $(G/H)^{k+1} = 1$ and $(G/H)^{k'} = (G/H)^0$ for $1 \leq k' \leq k$ by definition as these coincide with the lower ramification groups. By Herbrand's Theorem, this is equivalent to having $G^{k+1} = G_{q^k} \subset H$ and $G_{q^{k'}}H/H = (G/H)_0$ for $1 \leq k' \leq k$. The former condition is equivalent to containing $(1+\mathfrak{m}^{k+1})/(1+\mathfrak{m}^n)$. The latter just means that $G_{q^{k'}}H$ is constant for $1 \leq k' \leq k$, which is equivalent to having the condition that $H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m}^{k'})$ is surjective for $1 \leq k' \leq k$. However, surjectivity at $k-1$ implies surjectivity elsewhere, implying the claim. \square

We now use Lemma 2.1 to say more about the H such that there is a single jump at 1 or 2. For 1, the second condition is superfluous, and so it is enough to contain $(1+\mathfrak{m}^2)/(1+\mathfrak{m}^n)$. By Proposition 2.1 and class field theory, this implies that $L \subset K_{\pi,2}$, and so these are precisely the working extensions.

If we assume that there only a single jump at 1, then we must also have that the map $H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m})$ is surjective. However, we know that H is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m}^2)$, which has p -Sylow group $(1+\mathfrak{m})/(1+\mathfrak{m}^2)$ and cyclic subgroup of order $q-1$ generated by the coset of μ_{q-1} , giving a splitting $\mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1+\mathfrak{m}^2) \cong k^+ \times k^\times$, where k is the residue field of K , where the isomorphism is induced upon fixing a uniformizer π . Any subgroup of this group will be isomorphic to the direct product of its Sylow subgroups, thus isomorphic to a product of subgroups k_1, k_2 of k^+, k^\times , respectively.

Surjectivity is then equivalent to k_2 being all of k^\times . Now let $a \in k$ and note that the coset H_a of H of elements congruent to $a \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}$ is just $(a + (f(a) + k_1)\pi)/(1 + \mathfrak{m}^2)$ for some unique coset $f(a)$ of k^+/k_1 . We must then have that $H_a H_b = H_{ab}$, which implies that $af(b) + bf(a) \equiv f(ab) \pmod{k_1}$. Now since there a unique subgroup H with a given k_1 and every f gives a different subgroup with that corresponding k_1 , we conclude that for any subgroup k_1 of k^+ , the unique “differential” of the form $f : k \rightarrow k^+/k_1$ is the zero differential. Thus the 1 case is encapsulating the differential information of the residue field. The case of 2 can thus be seen as a more complicated type of differential.

Now we investigate this case. First we need some lemmas on finite fields.

3 Finite Fields

Lemma 3.1

Let k be a finite field of characteristic p and h, h' subgroups of k^+ . Let $r = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_p}(h')$. Say that $h \sim h'$ if $x^2 \in h$ for each $x \in h'$. Then the number of functions $f : h' \rightarrow k^+/h$ such that $f(a + b) \equiv f(a) + f(b) + ab \pmod{h}$ is

$$\begin{cases} 0 & p = 2, h \not\sim h' \\ p^{r(\text{codim}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(h))} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

.

Proof. From this relation and an easy induction, we deduce

$$f\left(\sum_{i=1}^r a_i\right) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^r f(a_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} a_i a_j \pmod{h}$$

which in particular implies that for any positive integer r , $f(ra) \equiv rf(a) + \binom{r}{2}a^2 \pmod{h}$ upon setting all a_i s equal. If $h \sim h'$ or $p \neq 2$, we find that $f(pa) \equiv 0 \pmod{h}$ and so f is in fact well-defined. If $p = 2$ and $h \not\sim h'$, then we get a contradiction since we would need $a^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{h}$ for all $a \in h'$, meaning that no such functions can exist.

Now let e_1, \dots, e_r be an \mathbb{F}_p -basis for h' . Upon choosing $f(e_i)$, the above relation gives $f(re_i) \equiv rf(e_i) + \binom{r}{2}e_i^2 \pmod{h}$, and so $f(re_i)$ is determined by $f(e_i)$. Furthermore, we must have

$$f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i\right) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n a_i f(e_i) + \binom{a_i}{2} e_i^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_i a_j e_i e_j \pmod{h}$$

and so f is completely determined by f on the basis.

The condition $f(a+b) \equiv f(a) + f(b) + ab \pmod{h}$ is equivalent to

$$f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i)e_i\right) = f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i\right) + f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i e_i\right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i e_i\right)$$

Using the known value of f , this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i)f(e_i) + \binom{a_i + b_i}{2} e_i^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (a_i + b_i)(a_j + b_j)e_i e_j &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i)f(e_i) + \\ &+ \left(\binom{a_i}{2} + \binom{b_i}{2}\right)e_i^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (a_i a_j + b_i b_j)e_i e_j + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i e_i\right) \pmod{h} \end{aligned}$$

which is an equality. Thus any choice of f on a basis determines a working f on all of k . As there are $p^{\text{codim}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(h)}$ choices of coset for each basis element, this gives a total of $p^{r \text{codim}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(h)}$ total choices of f . \square

Lemma 3.2

Let k be a finite field of characteristic p , k'/\mathbb{F}_p a subextension of k/\mathbb{F}_p , h a Galois invariant subgroup of k^+ . Let $q = |k'|$. Then the number of Galois equivariant functions $f : k^+ \rightarrow k^+/h$ such that $f(a+b) \equiv f(a) + f(b) + ab \pmod{h}$ is

$$\begin{cases} 0 & p = 2 \\ q^{\text{codim}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(h)} & p > 2 \end{cases}$$

Proof. By definition, we need to have $\sigma(f(a)) = f(\sigma(a))$ for all $a \in k$. Let e_1, \dots, e_r be a Galois invariant \mathbb{F}_p -basis for k .

We claim that it is enough to it be equivariant on the e_i s. Indeed, if it is, then representing $a = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i e_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(f(a)) &\equiv f\left(\sigma\left(\sum_{i=1}^r a_i e_i\right)\right) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \sigma(f(e_i)) + \binom{a_i}{2} \sigma(e_i^2) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} \sigma(a_i a_j e_i e_j) \\ &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^r a_i f(\sigma(e_i)) + \binom{a_i}{2} \sigma(e_i)^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} a_i a_j \sigma(e_i) \sigma(e_j) \equiv f(\sigma(a)) \pmod{h} \end{aligned}$$

proving the claim.

By the Galois module structure for \mathbb{F}_{p^n} , we can choose a basis for k over \mathbb{F}_p of the form $\sigma_i(a_j), 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq s$. Then given any choice of $f(\sigma_1(a_1)), \dots, f(\sigma_1(a_r))$, we must have that $f(\sigma_k(a_j)) = \sigma_k(f(a_j))$, which determines f on the part of basis consisting of the conjugates of a_j and thus on the entire basis.

By the proof of Lemma 3.1, any choice of f on an \mathbb{F}_p -basis for some $p \neq 2$ uniquely determines a function satisfying $f(a + b) = f(a) + f(b) + ab$ and for $p = 2$, there are no such functions since $k^+ \not\sim h$ as h is proper and the squaring map is surjective on k . As any such function is automatically equivariant on the basis, it must be equivariant on all of k . But then there are $|k|/|h|$ choices of coset for each $f(\sigma_1(a_j))$, giving $(|k|/|h|)^s = q^{\text{codim}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(h)}$ total choices. \square

Lemma 3.3

Let t be the trace 0 subspace of $l = \mathbb{F}_{p^k}$, i.e. the kernel of the trace map $\mathbb{F}_{p^k} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$, let $l' = \mathbb{F}_{p^{k'}}$ be a subfield, and $G = \text{Gal}(l/l')$ with g a generator. Set $r = |G|$ and $s = \frac{k}{r}$. Then there is an \mathbb{F}_p -basis for t of the form $\{g^i \alpha_j, 0 \leq i \leq r-1, 1 \leq j \leq s-1\} \cup \{g^i (g-1) \alpha_s, 0 \leq i \leq r-2\}$.

Proof. We start with the $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ -module structure of l , where x acts as multiplication by g , which is $\prod_{i=1}^s \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^r - 1)$. Note that t is a G -invariant subspace since any l' -conjugate is certainly an \mathbb{F}_p -conjugate. Hence it also is naturally endowed with the structure of a $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ -module, and so it too has a decomposition into elementary divisors $\prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(p_i(x)^{e_i})$ according to the structure theorem (so that the p_i s are irreducible).

Then note that multiplication by $x-1$ on $\prod_{i=1}^s \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^r - 1)$ gives a submodule of t under this isomorphism, meaning that t contains the submodule $\prod_{i=1}^s (x-1)/(x^r - 1)$ and thus a submodule isomorphic to $\prod_{i=1}^s \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(\frac{x^r-1}{x-1})$. Breaking both these submodules into their invariant factor decompositions and choosing any monic irreducible $p(x) \neq x-1$ in these decompositions, it follows that the dimension of the $p(x)^e$ is the same for both of these for any e , and so it follows that t has identical $p(x)^e$ -torsion, and so in particular these elementary divisors match.

The only other possibility for a $p_i(x)$ in the decomposition for t is $x-1$ itself, and by considering $(x-1)^e$ torsion in $\prod_{i=1}^s \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(\frac{x^r-1}{x-1})$, we see that all exponents must be at least one less than the common exponent in the decomposition of k^+ . For dimension reasons, we must then have that all exponents are equal except for one which is one less. Thus we get an elementary divisor decomposition of t of the form $\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^r - 1) \oplus \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(\frac{x^r-1}{x-1})$. The element corresponding to 1 in the last summand and 0 elsewhere is in the kernel of the trace map $\text{Tr}_{l/l'}$, and thus is of the form $(g-1)\alpha_s$ for some α_s (by a counting argument or Hilbert 90), completing the proof. \square

Lemma 3.4

Let k be a finite field of characteristic 2 with $[k : \mathbb{F}_2] = n$ and choose $\alpha \in k$. Let $q = 2^r$ be a prime power with $n = rm$ so that $m \geq 2$ and set $\alpha_i = \alpha^{q^i} + \alpha^{q^{i+1}}$.

Let t be the trace 0 subspace. Then $\sum_{0 \leq i < j < m} \alpha_i \alpha_j \equiv \alpha^{q+1} + \alpha \pmod t$ if m is odd and $0 \pmod t$ if m is even.

Proof. Note that $\sum_{0 \leq i < j < m} \alpha_i \alpha_j = \sum_{0 \leq i < j < m} \alpha^{q^i+q^j} + \alpha^{q^{i+1}+q^{j+1}} + \alpha^{q^{i+1}+q^j} + \alpha^{q^i+q^{j+1}}$. First note that the pairs $(i, j) \pmod m$ obtained by $(i+1, j+1)$ for $0 \leq i < j < m$ are just the pairs (i, j) for $1 \leq i < j \leq m$. Hence these completely overlap the (i, j) pairs with $0 \leq i < j < m$ except for those with $i = 0$ in the latter case and $j = m$ in the former. Hence this part of the sum just becomes $\sum_{0 < i < m} \alpha^{1+q^i} + \sum_{1 \leq i < m} \alpha^{q^i+q^m} = \sum_{0 < i < m} \alpha^{1+q^i} + \alpha^{q^i+q^m} = 0$.

Hence we just need to determine $\sum_{0 \leq i < j < m} \alpha^{q^{i+1}+q^j} + \alpha^{q^i+q^{j+1}}$. The pairs $(i+1, j)$ obtained for $0 \leq i < j < m$ are precisely those of the form (i, j) for $1 \leq i \leq j < m$ while the pairs $(i, j+1)$ obtained for $0 \leq i < j < m$ are precisely those of the form (i, j) for $0 \leq i < j \leq m$ with $i+1 < j$. The pairs (i, j) for $1 \leq i \leq j < m$ that are not of the form (i, j) for $0 \leq i < j \leq m$ with $i+1 < j$ are precisely those with $i = j$ or $i+1 = j$ while the pairs (i, j) for $0 \leq i < j \leq m$ with $i+1 < j$ that are not of the form (i, j) for $1 \leq i \leq j < m$ are precisely those with $i = 0$ or $j = m$. Hence all terms in the sum cancel out except these (since they all other pairs will have exactly 2 copies), leaving $\sum_{1 \leq i < m} \alpha^{2q^i} + \sum_{1 \leq i < m-1} \alpha^{q^i+q^{i+1}} + \sum_{j=2}^m \alpha^{1+q^j} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-2} \alpha^{q^i+q^m} - \alpha^{1+q^m}$ (since both of the latter two sums count the case $(0, m)$).

Overlapping the last two sums gives $\alpha^{1+q^{m-1}} + \alpha^2 + \alpha^2 + \alpha^{q+q^m} + \sum_{j=2}^{m-2} 2\alpha^{1+q^j} \equiv \alpha^{1+q^{m-1}} + \alpha^{q+q^m} - \alpha^{1+q^m} \equiv \alpha^2 \pmod t$. Hence the overall sum becomes $\alpha^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < m} \alpha^{2q^i} + \sum_{1 \leq i < m-1} \alpha^{q^i+q^{i+1}}$. Note that $\alpha^{2q^i} \equiv \alpha \pmod t$ for each i , while similarly, $\alpha^{q^i+q^{i+1}} \equiv \alpha^{q+1} \pmod t$ for each i (this is because the coset of t is determined by the trace and taking the trace of an \mathbb{F}_2 -conjugate gives the same result). It follows that $\alpha^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < m} \alpha^{2q^i} + \sum_{1 \leq i < m-1} \alpha^{q^i+q^{i+1}} \equiv \alpha + (m-1)\alpha + (m-2)\alpha^{q+1} \equiv m(\alpha + \alpha^{q+1}) \pmod t$, as desired. \square

4 Main Results

Theorem 4.1

Suppose K_1/\mathbb{Q}_p , where $K_1 \neq \mathbb{Q}_p$, is finite and totally ramified, and let K be a finite unramified extension of K_1 . Let $n = [K : K_1]$. Set $f(x) = \frac{x^n - 1}{(x-1)^{p^{v_p(n)}}} \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $\deg(f) = n - p^{v_p(n)} = d$, and $\zeta_f(s) = \sum_{i=0}^d \frac{a_n}{p^{ns}}$ be the zeta function for the ring $S = \frac{\mathbb{F}_p[x]}{(f)}$ (equivalently, a_n is the number of degree n monic factors of f). Then the number of Galois extensions L/K_1 such that L/K is totally ramified with a single ramification jump at 2 is

$$\begin{cases} 0 & p = 2 \\ \frac{2p^{n+1} - p^n - p^{d+1}}{p-1} \zeta_f(1) & p > 2 \end{cases}$$

Proof. First note that $G = \text{Gal}(L/K)$ has single wild ramification jump at 2, which means that the extension is totally wildly ramified. Thus by Proposition 1.1, we see that $G_2/G_3 \cong \text{Gal}(L/K)$ is the direct sum of cyclic groups of order p . In particular, G is abelian, and so by class field theory we may attach a norm group $\text{Nm}_{L/K}(L^\times)$ to it. As L/K is totally ramified, we may let $\pi \in \text{Nm}_{L/K}(L^\times)$ be a uniformizer of \mathcal{O}_K . It then follows that $\text{Nm}_{L/K}(L^\times) = \pi^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{Nm}_{L/K}(\mathcal{O}_L^\times)$. Let $H = \text{Nm}_{L/K}(\mathcal{O}_L^\times)$. By Proposition 2.2, since G is abelian, the extension L/K_1 being Galois is equivalent to having the norm group corresponding to the abelian extension L/K under class field theory to be fixed by $\text{Gal}(K/K_1)$. This means that $\pi^{\mathbb{Z}}H$ is invariant under the Galois action.

Since σ preserves valuations, $\pi^{\mathbb{Z}}H$ is invariant under $\text{Gal}(K/K_1)$ iff $\pi^f H$ is for each integer f . As K/K_1 is unramified, let $\pi = \pi' u$ for some uniformizer π' of \mathcal{O}_{K_1} and $u \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$. The group \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H has finite order, and so choosing $f = |\mathcal{O}_K^\times/H|$, Lagrange implies that $\pi^f H = \pi'^f H$. Thus to be Galois invariant in this case just means that H is Galois invariant. Now knowing that H is Galois invariant, we see that $\pi^{\mathbb{Z}}H$ is invariant precisely if $\sigma(u)/u \in H$ for each $\sigma \in G = \text{Gal}(K/K_1)$. Thus for a given Galois invariant H , it suffices to find the number of classes $u \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H$ that are also Galois invariant. As H is Galois invariant, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H naturally obtains the structure of a G -module.

In order for the extension to be Galois, we just need two things to happen. First, we need that h is fixed under the Galois action. Indeed, given $x \in \text{Nm}_{L/K}(\mathcal{O}_L^\times) \cap (1 + \mathfrak{m}^2)$ and $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(K/K_1)$, we have that $\sigma(x) \in \text{Nm}_{L/K}(L^\times)$ by Proposition 2.2 since L/K_1 is Galois. Furthermore, $1 + \mathfrak{m}^2$ is Galois invariant since it \mathfrak{m} is the unique maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Thus $\sigma(x) \in \text{Nm}_{L/K}(\mathcal{O}_L^\times) \cap (1 + \mathfrak{m}^2)$. As σ has finite order, this implies that h is Galois invariant.

Then given such a subgroup h , we need to have that the fibers under the projection map onto $(1 + \mathfrak{m})/(1 + \mathfrak{m}^2)$ are fixed under the Galois action. This means that $\sigma(H_a) = H_{\sigma(a)}$ for all $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(K/K_1)$ and a among our lifts.

We will now introduce a framework for understanding our lifts. Choose a $\text{Gal}(k/k')$ -invariant \mathbb{F}_p -basis for k (using the \mathbb{F}_p -module structure of \mathbb{F}_{p^m}), say e_1, \dots, e_m and lift these basis elements to roots of unity $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m$ in \mathcal{O}_K^\times . Each $a \in k$ can uniquely written as $\sum z_i e_i$, where $z_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$, and so there is a unique lift of a of the form $\sum z_i \omega_i$, where $0 \leq z_i \leq p-1$. Let $a' = \sum a_i \omega_i$ be this lift of a . Notice that $a' + b' = \sum a_i \omega_i + \sum b_i \omega_i = \sum (a_i + b_i) \omega_i$. On the other hand, the lift $(a+b)' = \sum (a+b)_i \omega_i$ is equal to $\sum (a_i + b_i) \omega_i$, so we have that $a_i + b_i = (a+b)_i$ in \mathbb{F}_p , which implies that $a_i + b_i \equiv (a+b)_i \pmod{p}$. But since K/\mathbb{Q}_p is totally ramified of degree > 1 , we know that $a_i + b_i \equiv (a+b)_i \pmod{\pi^2}$ and so $a' + b' \equiv (a+b)' \pmod{\pi^2}$.

Now set $H_a = (1 + a'\pi + f(a)\pi^2)(1 + \mathfrak{m}^3)$ for some coset $f(a)$ of h in k . The

key idea is that

$$\begin{aligned} H_a H_b &= ((1 + a'\pi + f(a)\pi^2)(1 + \mathfrak{m}^3))((1 + b'\pi + f(b)\pi^2)(1 + \mathfrak{m}^3)) = \\ &(1 + (a' + b')\pi + (f(a) + f(b) + ab)\pi^2)(1 + \mathfrak{m}^3) = (1 + (a + b)'\pi + (f(a) + f(b) + ab)\pi^2)(1 + \mathfrak{m}^3) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $H_{a+b} = H_a H_b$ is equivalent to $f(a+b) \equiv f(a) + f(b) + ab \pmod{h}$, which defines our group structure. By Galois invariance of our basis, we have that $\sigma(a') = (\sigma(a))'$, and so $\sigma(H_a) = (1 + (\sigma(a))'\pi + \sigma(f(a))\pi^2)(1 + \mathfrak{m}^3)$. Thus in order to have $\sigma(H_a) = H_{\sigma(a)}$ we just need to have that $\sigma(f(a)) = f(\sigma(a))$ for all $a \in k$. In other words, we want the map f to be Galois equivariant. By Lemma 3.2, the number of functions satisfying these two conditions is $(|k|/|h|)^s$.

Now since the projection map $H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^\times / (1 + \mathfrak{m}^2)$ is surjective, any element of \mathcal{O}_K^\times / H has a coset representative of the form $1 + \pi'^2 x$. We want to compute the number of G -invariant points of \mathcal{O}_K^\times / H given a choice of H . We may view x as an element of k since shifting x by something in \mathfrak{m} does not change its coset. Such an element x is then precisely defined by its coset in k/h . The action of G on k/h restricts to the action of $G_1 = \text{Gal}(k/k_1)$ on k/h , and so we just seek the number of G_1 invariant fixed points of k/h for a given choice of h .

Now note that its coset $x + h$ is invariant under G_1 iff it is invariant under a generator σ , meaning that we just need $x^q - x \in h$. Thus we seek the number of elements $x + h$ of k/h such that $x^q - x \equiv 0 \pmod{h}$, where $q = |k_1|$. The map $x \rightarrow x^q - x$ is a linear map $k \rightarrow k$ with kernel consisting of the elements of \mathbb{F}_q and image t , where t' is the trace 0 subspace (i.e. the kernel of Tr_{k/k_1}), since anything in the image is in the kernel of the trace map and t and the image have the same order. The subspace of h in the image of this map is then $h \cap t$. Each of these images is attained q times, so the total number of images in h is $q|h \cap t|$. The total number of cosets of h is then $q|h \cap t|/|h|$, and so this is the number of fixed points.

Now fix $|h|$. We want to determine $\sum |h \cap t'|$ over all subspaces h of k with $|h|$ of a given size. For this, we use the Galois module structure. Since K'/\mathbb{Q}_p is totally ramified, \mathbb{F}_{p^n} naturally has a structure as a $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ -module, decomposing as $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^n - 1)$. The virtue of this is that $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ -submodules, i.e. Galois invariant \mathbb{F}_p -subspaces, correspond precisely to ideals of $R = \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^n - 1)$.

Under this correspondence, the subspace t' is just the ideal $(x - 1)R$, and so $|h \cap t'| = |(x - 1) \cap I|$. But now I s is necessarily a principal ideal corresponding to a monic factor f of $x^n - 1$ in $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$. Let $I = (f(x))$. If $x - 1 | f(x)$, then $I \subset (x - 1)$ and so $|(x - 1) \cap I| = |I|$. Otherwise, $(x - 1) \cap I = (f(x)(x - 1))$ and so $|(x - 1) \cap I| = |I|/p$. But then $|h| = |I|$ and so the sum we seek is $|h| \sum_{i=0}^1 \frac{N_{i,t}}{p^i}$. Let $|h| = p^t$. Thus the total sum over h with $|h| = p^t$ becomes $p(\sum_{i=0}^1 \frac{N_{i,t}}{p^i})$.

Now this is the total number of fixed points for a given choice of $|h|$. For each h with $|h| = p^t$, there are p^{n-t} ways to extend it to a G -invariant subgroup H of \mathcal{O}_K^\times that is surjective on the projection map, and so by Lemma 3.2, to get the total number of extensions, we sum this over all possible t , meaning that we get

$$p^{n+1} \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^1 \frac{N_{i,t}}{p^{i+t}}$$

as desired. Now we determine $N_{i,t}$ more explicitly. Firstly, if $i = 1$, then $N_{1,t}$ counts the number of degree t factors indivisible by $x - 1$, which is $a_{d-t} = a_t$. If $i = 0$, then we now restrict to those divisible by $x - 1$, which is $a_{t-1} + a_{t-2} + \dots + a_{t-p^{v_p(n)}}$. Setting $b_t = 2a_t + \sum_{i=1}^{p^{v_p(n)}-1} a_{t-i}$, we get $p^n \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \frac{b_t}{p^t}$, which can also be rewritten $p^n (2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-d-1} \frac{1}{p^i}) (\sum_{t=0}^d \frac{a_t}{p^t})$, as desired. \square

In Theorem 4.1, we crucially assumed that K/\mathbb{Q}_p was ramified in order for our coset machinery to work properly. However, the approach will work for any ramified K/\mathbb{Q}_p , with the only fallback in general being that the fixed point counts have a less pleasant expression when K/\mathbb{Q}_p is not totally ramified. In fact, the count depends entirely on the content of the residue field extension k/k' , and so it depends entirely on the residue field extension. In particular, for K/K_1 of fixed degree, only the residue degree of K_1/\mathbb{Q}_p will impact the count. We will now treat the unramified case.

Theorem 4.2

Suppose K_1/\mathbb{Q}_p is unramified of degree n and let K be a finite unramified extension of K_1 . Then the number of finite Galois extensions L/K_1 such that L/K is totally ramified with a single ramification jump at 2 is

$$\begin{cases} 2^{n+1} & p = 2, \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Set $[K : K_1] = r$.

By Proposition 1.1, $G_2/G_3 \cong \text{Gal}(L/K)$ is the direct sum of cyclic groups of order p . By Artin reciprocity and noting that L/K is totally ramified, we have that $\text{Gal}(L/K) \cong \mathcal{O}_K^\times / \text{Nm}_{L/K}(\mathcal{O}_L^\times)$. This means that $(\mathcal{O}_K^\times)^p \subset \text{Nm}_{L/K}(\mathcal{O}_L^\times)$.

Now we suppose that $p > 2$. We claim that $1 + p^2\mathcal{O}_K \subset (\mathcal{O}_K^\times)^p$.

Indeed, note that $(1 + py)^p \equiv 1 + p^2y \pmod{p^3}$ if $p > 2$, which implies that for the polynomial $f(x) = x^p - (1 + p^2y)$, $|f(1 + p^2y)| \leq p^{-3}$. On the other hand, $f'(1 + p^2y) = p(1 + p^2y)^{p-1}$, and so $|f'(1 + p^2y)| = p^{-1}$, which shows that $|f(1 + p^2y)| \leq |f'(1 + p^2y)|^2$. Thus by Hensel's Lemma, we can find a solution $z \in \mathcal{O}_K$ to $x^2 - (1 + p^2y) = 0$, which shows that $1 + p^2\mathcal{O}_K \subset (\mathcal{O}_K^\times)^p$. Thus

$1 + p^2\mathcal{O}_K \subset \text{Nm}_{L/K}(\mathcal{O}_L^\times) = H$. However, to have a single ramification jump at 3, we need the map $H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^\times/(1 + p^2\mathcal{O}_K)$ to be surjective, which implies that $H = \mathcal{O}_K^\times$, contradicting Lemma 2.1.

Next we handle the case of $p = 2$. We will determine precisely $(\mathcal{O}_K^\times)^2$. Note that $(1 + 2z)^2 = 1 + 4(z^2 + z)$. If we can find x such that $z^2 + z = y$, then we have that $1 + 2z$ is a solution to $x^2 - (1 + 4y) = 0$, and so as before, Hensel's Lemma implies that we can find w with $w^2 = 1 + 4y$. Thus the squares in $1 + 2\mathcal{O}_K$ are precisely those of the form $1 + 4(z^2 + z) \pmod{8}$. In particular, we deduce that if h is the image of $H \cap (1 + 4\mathcal{O}_K) \rightarrow (1 + 4\mathcal{O}_K)/(1 + 8\mathcal{O}_K) \cong k^+$, then h contains the subspace consisting of all values $z^2 + z, z \in k$. The map $z \rightarrow z^2 + z$ is a homomorphism on k with kernel $0, 1$, and thus the image has size $\frac{|k|}{2}$, meaning that this subspace is an index 2 subgroup of k^+ . In particular, we must have that h is precisely this subspace or else h would be the whole of k^+ which would imply as before that $H = \mathcal{O}_K^\times$, which is again not proper, contradicting Lemma 2.1.

By Lemma 3.3, we can choose an \mathbb{F}_2 -basis for t of the form $\{g^i\alpha_j, 0 \leq i \leq r - 1, 1 \leq j \leq n - 1\} \cup \{g^i(g - 1)\alpha_n, 0 \leq i \leq r - 2\}$, where g is a generator of $\text{Gal}(k/k_1)$. Denote these elements as e_1, \dots, e_{rn-1} . Lift these basis elements to roots of unity $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{rn-1}$ in \mathcal{O}_K^\times . Each $a \in k$ can uniquely written as $\sum f_i e_i$, where $z_i \in \mathbb{F}_2$, and so there is a unique lift of a of the form $\sum z_i \omega_i$, where $0 \leq z_i \leq 1$. Let $a' = \sum a_i \omega_i$ be this lift of a .

Now set $H_a = (1 + 2a' + 4f(a))(1 + \mathfrak{m}^3)$ for some coset $f(a)$ of t in k . Getting a subgroup structure is equivalent to having $H_a H_b = H_{a+b}$ for all $a, b \in k$.

First suppose that $a, b \in t$. The lift $(a + b)'$ for $a + b$ will differ from $a' + b'$ by $2(\sum e'_i)$, where the sum ranges over some subset of e'_1, \dots, e'_{rn-1} . Thus $1 + 2(a' + b') + 4ab + 4f(a) + 4f(b) = 1 + 2(a + b)' + 4(\sum e'_i) + 4ab + 4f(a) + 4f(b)$. The key point is that now $\sum e'_i$ will be an element of h and thus will not change the coset of h dictated by the values of f , and thus $1 + 2(a + b)' + 4f(a + b) = 1 + 2(a' + b') + 4ab + 4f(a) + 4f(b) = 1 + 2(a + b)' + 4(\sum e'_i) + 4ab + 4f(a) + 4f(b) = 1 + 2(a + b)' + 4ab + 4f(a) + 4f(b)$, and so we deduce that $f(a + b) \equiv f(a) + f(b) + ab \pmod{t}$ for all $a, b \in t$.

Case 1: r is odd.

In this case, take some element β of k_1 such that $\text{Tr}_{k_1/\mathbb{F}_2}(\beta) = 1$ and let $e_{rn} = \beta$. Then note that $\text{Tr}_{k/\mathbb{F}_2}(\beta) = [K : K_1]\text{Tr}_{k_1/\mathbb{F}_2}(\beta) = 1$, and so $\beta \notin t$, showing that β completes the basis. Then if both $a, b \notin t$, the element $(a + b)' - (a' + b')$ will now be of the form $2(\sum e'_i)$, where it includes e'_{rn} , and so now $\sum e'_i$ will indeed change the coset. Hence we deduce that $f(a + b) \equiv f(a) + f(b) + ab + e_{rn} \pmod{h}$. Let l be the subspace of k spanned by $e_1, \dots, e_{r(n-1)}$. Applying Lemma 3.1 upon noting that l has a Galois invariant basis and stays in t upon squaring (since t maps to itself upon squaring), meaning that $l \sim t$, we conclude that

there are 2^{n-1} Galois equivariant functions satisfying $f(a+b) \equiv f(a) + f(b) + ab \pmod{t}$ on l .

We will now show that each of these equivariant functions has exactly two extensions to k^+ . First note that $f((g-1)\alpha_n) = f(\alpha_n^q + \alpha_n)$. In order for the functional equation to be satisfied and to have Galois equivariance, we must have that $f(\alpha_n^q + \alpha_n) \equiv 2f(\alpha_n) + \alpha_n^{q+1} \equiv \alpha_n^{q+1} \pmod{h}$ if $\alpha_n \in t$ and $f(\alpha_n^q + \alpha_n) \equiv 2f(\alpha_n) + \alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n \equiv \alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n \pmod{h}$ if $\alpha_n \notin t$. Note that the former is just $\alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n$ since $\alpha_n \in t$, so we have that $f(\alpha_n^q + \alpha_n) = \alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n$ in all cases. Then since the Galois group preserves t , Galois equivariance forces $f(\alpha_n^{q^i} + \alpha_n^{q^{i-1}}) \equiv \alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n \pmod{h}$ for each i . Finally, we let $f(\beta)$ be either of the two possibilities. This defines f on all of k^+ via the functional equation, and by the proof of Lemma 3.1, will give a well-defined function.

Hence we just need to check that each such function is Galois equivariant. Write $a = a_{rn}\beta + \sum_{i=1}^{n(r-1)} a_i e_i + c$ and let $b = a_{rn}\beta + \sum_{i=1}^{n(r-1)} a_i e_i$. Note that $\sigma(f(a)) = \sigma(f(b)) + \sigma(f(c)) + \sigma(bc)$. Since the basis elements in the expansion of b form a Galois invariant set, the proof of Lemma 3.2 implies that $\sigma(f(b)) = f(\sigma(b))$. Since we know that f satisfies the functional equation, we must have that $f(\sigma(a)) = f(\sigma(b)) + f(\sigma(c)) + \sigma(b)\sigma(c)$. Hence it suffices to show that $\sigma(f(c)) = f(\sigma(c))$.

By definition and Galois equivariance on the basis, we have $c = \sum_{i=r(n-1)}^{rn-1} a_i e_i = \sum_{i=0}^{r-2} a'_i g^i (g-1)\alpha_n$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} g(f(c)) &= \sum_{i=0}^{r-2} a'_i g(f(g^i(g-1)\alpha_n)) + \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r} g(a'_i a'_j (g^i(g-1)\alpha_n)(g^j(g-1)\alpha_n)) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{r-2} a'_i f((g-1)\alpha_n) + \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-2} a'_i a'_j (g^{i+1}(g-1)\alpha_n)(g^{j+1}(g-1)\alpha_n) \end{aligned}$$

Next note that $gc = a'_{r-2}(g-1)\alpha_n + \sum_{i=0}^{r-3} (a'_i + a'_{r-2})g^{i+1}(g-1)\alpha_n$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} f(gc) &= f\left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-3} a'_i g^{i+1}(g-1)\alpha_n\right) + a'_{r-2} f\left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n\right) + \\ &= a'_{r-2} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-3} a'_i g^{i+1}(g-1)\alpha_n\right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we know that

$$\begin{aligned} f\left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-3} a'_i g^{i+1}(g-1)\alpha_n\right) &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-3} a'_i f(g^{i+1}(g-1)\alpha_n)\right) + \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-3} a'_i a'_j (g^{i+1}(g-1)\alpha_n)(g^{j+1}(g-1)\alpha_n) \end{aligned}$$

Combining everything, it remains to show that $f(\sum_{i=0}^{r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n) \equiv f((g-1)\alpha_n) \pmod{h}$. Expanding out the left hand side gives $(r-1)f((g-1)\alpha_n) + \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n(g^j(g-1)\alpha_n)$, and so since $f((g-1)\alpha_n) \equiv \alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n \pmod{h}$, it remains to show that $\sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n(g^j(g-1)\alpha_n) \equiv r(\alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n) \pmod{h}$. By Lemma 3.4, we have that $\sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-1} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n(g^j(g-1)\alpha_n) = r(\alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n)$. But then rewriting the sum gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n(g^j(g-1)\alpha_n) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n \right) (g^{r-1}(g-1)\alpha_n) = \\ & \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n(g^j(g-1)\alpha_n) + ((1+g^{r-1})\alpha_n)(g^r - g^{r-1})\alpha_n \end{aligned}$$

However, $((1+g^{r-1})\alpha_n)(g^r - g^{r-1})\alpha_n \equiv (\alpha_n + \alpha_n^{q^{r-1}})(\alpha_n^{q^r} + \alpha_n^{q^{r-1}}) \equiv (\alpha_n + \alpha_n^{q^{r-1}})^2 = \alpha_n + \alpha_n^{q^{r-1}} \equiv 0 \pmod{h}$, and so we conclude that $\sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq r-2} g^i(g-1)\alpha_n(g^j(g-1)\alpha_n) \equiv r(\alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n) \pmod{h}$, completing the proof.

Case 2: r is even.

Consider our basis $\{g^i\alpha_j, 0 \leq i \leq r-1, 1 \leq j \leq n-1\} \cup \{g^i(g-1)\alpha_n, 0 \leq i \leq r-2\}$ for t coming from Lemma 3.3. This corresponds to the $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ -module decomposition $t \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{F}_2[x]/(x^r - 1) \oplus \mathbb{F}_2[x]/(x^{r-1} + \dots + 1)$. We claim that $\alpha_n \notin t$. Suppose that $\alpha_n \in t$. Then we can write $\alpha_n = (g-1)b$ for some b , and so then $(g-1)\alpha_n = (g-1)^2b$. Since r is even, we know that $x-1 \mid x^{r-1} + \dots + 1$, and so it follows that $(g-1)^2b$ is annihilated by the element $\frac{g^{r-1} + \dots + 1}{g-1}$, contradiction since $(g-1)\alpha_n$ corresponds to 1 in the last component under the $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ -module isomorphism.

Now using the exact same reasoning as in Case 1, we can define our function f on the subspace l corresponding to the Galois equivariant part of the basis for t and note that that $f((g-1)\alpha_n) \equiv f(\alpha_n^q + \alpha_n) \equiv \alpha_n^{q+1} + \alpha_n \pmod{h}$, this time using that $\alpha_n \notin t$. Furthermore, since $\alpha_n \notin t$, we can use it to complete our basis for k^+ . There are then 2 choices for $f(\alpha_n)$, each defining f on all of k^+ via the functional equation, and by the proof of Lemma 3.1 implies that we get a well-defined function in each case.

Hence we just need to check that each function is Galois equivariant. The proof of equivariance in the case when the α_n coefficient is 0 is identical to the proof in Case 1. Hence we just need to show equivariance in the case where the α_n coefficient is 1. Write $a = a' + \alpha$ so that $a' \in t$. Noting that we already have equivariance on t , we have that $\sigma(f(a)) \equiv \sigma(f(a')) + \sigma(f(\alpha)) + \sigma(a'\alpha) \equiv f(\sigma(a')) + \sigma(a')\sigma(\alpha) + \sigma(f(\alpha)) \pmod{h}$. Hence we just need to show that $\sigma(f(\alpha)) \equiv f(\sigma(\alpha)) \pmod{h}$. Note that

$$f(g(\alpha)) \equiv f(\alpha + (g-1)\alpha) \equiv f(\alpha) + f((g-1)\alpha) + \alpha(g-1)\alpha \equiv$$

$$f(\alpha) + \alpha^{q+1} + \alpha + \alpha(\alpha^q + \alpha) \equiv f(\alpha) + \alpha^2 + \alpha \equiv f(\alpha) \pmod{h}$$

completing the proof.

Hence in each case, we have 2^n Galois equivariant functions for $h = t$, which shows that there are 2^n possibilities for h in each case. Now since the quotient k/t consists of two cosets and each is fixed (since t itself is), we conclude that there are 2 fixed points. Hence following the proof of Theorem 4.1, we conclude that there are precisely 2^{n+1} extensions, as desired. \square

With the main theorems proven, we now determine the cohomology of our subgroups H of \mathcal{O}_K^\times and the quotients \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H since H and thus \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H are equipped with the structures of G -modules, building off our calculation of fixed points.

Theorem 5.1

We have that $\hat{H}^0(G, H) \cong \hat{H}^1(G, H) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^b$, where $p^b = |h \cap k_1| |h \cap t'|/|h|$.

Proof. We begin with the exact sequence $1 \rightarrow H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H \rightarrow 1$. Taking cohomology and using the 2-periodicity of cyclic cohomology gives the exact sequences

$$\hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times) \rightarrow \hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H) \rightarrow \hat{H}^1(G, H) \rightarrow \hat{H}^1(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$$

and

$$\hat{H}^1(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times) \rightarrow \hat{H}^1(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H) \rightarrow \hat{H}^0(G, H) \rightarrow \hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$$

Now since K/K_1 is unramified, $\hat{H}^1(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ vanishes by Hilbert 90 and $\hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ vanishes since $\text{Nm}_{K/K_1}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times) = \mathcal{O}_{K_1}^\times$. Thus the exact sequences become

$$1 \rightarrow \hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H) \rightarrow \hat{H}^1(G, H) \rightarrow 1$$

and

$$1 \rightarrow \hat{H}^1(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H) \rightarrow \hat{H}^0(G, H) \rightarrow 1$$

inducing isomorphisms $\hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H) \cong \hat{H}^1(G, H)$ and $\hat{H}^1(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H) \cong \hat{H}^0(G, H)$. As \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H is a finite G -module and G is cyclic, the theory of the Herbrand quotient implies that $h(\mathcal{O}_K^\times/H) = 1$, which shows that $|\hat{H}^1(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)| = |\hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)|$. We now compute $|\hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)|$ explicitly. Note that

$$|\hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)| = |(\mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)^G|/|\text{Nm}_{K/K_1}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)|$$

We have shown that $|(\mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)^G| = q|h \cap t'|/|h|$, and so it remains to compute $\text{Nm}_{K/K_1}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)$. Again, we may view this as $\text{Tr}_{k/k_1}(k/h)$. The number of elements $x \in k$ with $\text{Tr}_{k/k_1}(x) = 0$ is $|k|/q$ by surjectivity of Tr_{k/k_1} . Thus there

are $|k||h \cap k_1|/q$ with image in h , and so this means that $q/|h \cap k_1|$ cosets are reached, showing that the image has order $q/|h \cap k_1|$. Hence

$$|\hat{H}^0(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)| = |h \cap k_1||h \cap t'|/|h|$$

Now since the \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H is p -torsion, so are $\hat{H}^i(G, \mathcal{O}_K^\times/H)$, and this immediately implies the claim. \square

References

- [1] Hasse, Helmut. Number Theory, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 1979.
- [2] Serre, Jean-Pierre, Local fields, Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [3] Serre, J.-P.: Une “formule de masse” pour les extensions totalement ramifiées de degré donné d’un corps local. Comptes Rendus 286, 1031–1036 (1978)