

TAME FIELDS, GRADED RINGS AND FINITE COMPLETE SEQUENCES OF KEY POLYNOMIALS

SILVA DE SOUZA, C. H.

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we link the concept of tame field to the study of graded rings and complete sequences of key polynomials. We review some definitions and results on the theory of key polynomials and Mac Lane-Vaquié chains which enable us to prove that a valued field (K, v) is tame if and only if the Frobenius endomorphism on the associated graded ring is surjective and every simple algebraic extension of K admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials. We present a criterion for (K, v) to be henselian and defectless in terms of finite complete sequences of key polynomials. We also make some considerations on purely inertial and purely ramified extensions and their relations to properties of the associated graded ring and the module of Kähler differentials.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the main obstacles in the programs for solving the *Local Uniformization Problem* in positive characteristic (which is the local version of *resolution of singularities*) is the *defect* (see [6] and [13]). The defect of an extension has been vastly studied in the recent years (see [6], [13], [20] and [28]). *Tame fields*, defined in Section 8, can be seen as a better environment to do Valuations Theory and to achieve local uniformization. For instance, Knaf and Kuhlmann prove in [12] that every valuation admits local uniformization in a separable extension of the function field. The main tool used to achieve this result was the theory of tame fields. For more on tame fields, the reader may see [15].

There are several research programs aiming to achieve local uniformization in positive characteristic (see [11], [23] and [26]). One of these programs has *key polynomials* as one of its main tools. This concept was developed by Mac Lane in [16] and generalized by Vaquié in [27]. Recently, Novacoski and Spivakovsky in [24] and Decaup, Mahboub and Spivakovsky in [7] introduced a new notion of key polynomial. The structure of graded ring associated to a valuation is crucial in the study of these polynomials, together with the so called *complete sets of key polynomials* (for definitions see Sections 3 and 5).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13A18.

Key words and phrases. Key polynomials, graded algebras, Mac Lane-Vaquié key polynomials, abstract key polynomials.

During the realization of this project the author was supported by a grant from Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (process numbers 2021/13531-0 and 2023/04651-8).

In this paper we present a link between the concept of tame field and the study of graded rings and complete sequences of key polynomials. Connections between tame fields and key polynomials were already studied for example in [8], where complete sequences of key polynomials are constructed over tame fields. Here, we propose a necessary and sufficient condition for a valued field to be tame in terms of the mentioned objects.

One of the main results of this paper is the following. For a valued field (K, v) , denote by $\text{gr}(K)$ its associated graded ring (see definition in Section 3). We say that $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect if the Frobenius endomorphism on $\text{gr}(K)$ is surjective (see Section 6).

Main Result 1.1. *(Theorem 8.7) Let (K, v) be a valued field. Then (K, v) is a tame field if and only if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect and every simple algebraic extension $(L | K, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.*

In order to prove this theorem, we need to study necessary and sufficient conditions for a simple valued field extension to admit a finite complete sequence of key polynomials. For a simple algebraic valued field extension $(L | K, v)$, with $L = K(\eta)$, consider the induced valuation $\nu(f) := v(f(\eta))$ on $K[x]$. Denote by Ψ_m the set of all key polynomials of the same degree m . We will say that Ψ_m admits a maximum (with respect to ν) if $\nu(\Psi_m) := \{\nu(Q) \mid Q \in \Psi_m\}$ admits a maximal element.

Main Result 1.2. *(Proposition 5.9) Let $(L | K, v)$ be a simple algebraic extension and let ν be the induced valuation on $K[x]$. Then ν admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials if and only if for every $m \geq 1$ either Ψ_m is empty or it admits a maximum.*

In particular, this means that ν admits a complete sequence without *limit key polynomials*.

We will say that $(L | K, v)$ is unbranched if the extension of v from K to L is unique. Denoting by $d(L | K, v)$ the defect of the extension (see definition in Section 2), our other main result is the following.

Main Result 1.3. *(Theorem 5.10) Let $(L | K, v)$ be a simple algebraic extension and let ν be the induced valuation on $K[x]$. Then ν admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials if and only if $d(L | K, v) = 1$ and $(L | K, v)$ is unbranched.*

The main reasoning used to prove Theorem 5.10 is that a finite complete sequence of key polynomials gives us a *Mac Lane-Vaquie chain of augmentations* formed only by *ordinary augmentations* (see definitions in Section 4). In one direction, we use the multiplicative property of the *relative ramification index* and the *relative inertial degree* in a chain of valuations to prove that $[L : K] = (vL : vK)[Lv : Kv]$. In the other direction, we consider the chain of valuations given by the *truncations* ν_Q

(see definition in Section 5), where Q is an element of a complete sequence \mathbf{Q} for ν . We use a formula for the defect to show that this chain of augmentations must be finite and hence also \mathbf{Q} is finite.

As a consequence of Theorem 5.10, we have Theorem 5.13. For a finite extension $(L | K, \nu)$, with $L = K(a_1, \dots, a_m)$, we write $K_j = K(a_1, \dots, a_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$ and consider the simple extension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, \nu)$ (with $K_0 = K$). Theorem 5.13 states that (K, ν) is defectless and henselian (see definitions in Section 2) if and only if for every finite extension $(L | K, \nu)$ each simple subextension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, \nu)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.

We now describe the structure of this paper. In Section 2 we define valuations and the defect of a finite extension of valued fields. Sections 3 and 4 consist of a compilation of definitions and results (mostly from [19]) on Mac Lane-Vaquié key polynomials, augmentations and Mac Lane-Vaquié chains of valuations. At the end of Section 4 we present a formula from [20] that describes the defect of a simple valued field extension in terms of the defect of each augmentation in an associated chain of valuations.

Section 5 deals with (abstract) key polynomials (in the sense of [7] and [24]) and complete sequences. We give proofs for Proposition 5.9, Theorem 5.10 and Theorem 5.13 mentioned above.

In Section 6 we study in more details the graded ring $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ via the isomorphism with the semigroup ring $K\nu[t^{\nu K^{\geq 0}}]_\epsilon$ given by [1]. We focus on the Frobenius endomorphism F on $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$. We prove that F is surjective if and only if νK is p -divisible and $K\nu$ is perfect (Proposition 6.4). We will call $\text{gr}(K)$ perfect when F is surjective.

Section 7 is where we study what we call *simply defectless fields* (i.e. valued fields for which every simple algebraic extension is defectless). We give an example of a simply defectless field which is not defectless. We prove that if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect and (K, ν) is simply defectless, then it is defectless (Theorem 7.3).

Theorem 8.7 mentioned above is proved in Section 8, where we define tame fields and develop some initial properties of this valued fields. We also relate finite complete sequences of key polynomials to the notion of *algebraically maximal fields* (i.e. fields with no proper algebraic immediate extensions).

We highlight two properties which appear in Theorem 5.13 and Theorem 8.7.

- (FCS1):** every simple extension $(L | K, \nu)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials;
- (FCS2):** every finite extension $(L | K, \nu)$ is such that each simple subextension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, \nu)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.

Suppose (K, v) is henselian and denote also by v the unique extension of the valuation from K to a fixed algebraic closure \overline{K} . At the end of Section 8, we will have a diagram of implications as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

In Section 9 we make some considerations on purely inertial and purely ramified extensions. We prove some relations between these extensions, $\text{gr}(K)$ being perfect and the corresponding *module of Kähler differentials* being trivial. This is related to the studies developed recently in [4], [5] and [25] about *deeply ramified fields*. We prove that if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect, then purely inertial extensions and purely ramified extensions have trivial corresponding module of Kähler differentials (Proposition 9.3 and Proposition 9.6).

We end this paper with an appendix where we prove some lemmas which detail the construction of the example given in Section 7.




FIGURE 1. Diagram of implications when (K, v) is henselian.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank J. Novacoski and M. Spivakovskiy for the discussions, suggestions and the careful reading of this first version of the paper.

2. VALUATIONS AND DEFECT EXTENSIONS

Definition 2.1. Take a commutative ring R with unity. A **valuation** on R is a mapping $\nu : R \rightarrow \Gamma_\infty := \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ where Γ is a totally ordered abelian group (and the extension of addition and order to ∞ is done in the natural way), with the following properties:

- (V1): $\nu(ab) = \nu(a) + \nu(b)$ for all $a, b \in R$.
- (V2): $\nu(a + b) \geq \min\{\nu(a), \nu(b)\}$ for all $a, b \in R$.
- (V3): $\nu(1) = 0$ and $\nu(0) = \infty$.

Let $\nu : R \rightarrow \Gamma_\infty$ be a valuation. The set $\text{supp}(\nu) = \{a \in R \mid \nu(a) = \infty\}$ is called the **support** of ν . The **value group** of ν is the subgroup of Γ generated by $\{\nu(a) \mid a \in R \setminus \text{supp}(\nu)\}$ and is denoted by νR or Γ_ν . A valuation ν is a **Krull valuation** if $\text{supp}(\nu) = \{0\}$. If ν is a Krull valuation, then R is a domain and we

can extend ν to $K = \text{Quot}(R)$ on the usual way. In this case, define the **valuation ring** as $\mathcal{O}_K := \{a \in K \mid \nu(a) \geq 0\}$. The ring \mathcal{O}_K is a local ring with unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_K = \{a \in K \mid \nu(a) > 0\}$. We define the **residue field** of ν to be the field $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{m}_K$ and denote it by $K\nu$. The image of $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ in $K\nu$ is denoted by $a\nu$.

Let $(K, \nu) \subset (L, \nu)$ be a valued field extension. We have that νK can be seen as a subgroup of νL and νL as a field extension νK . We define

$$e(w/\nu) := (\nu L : \nu K) \text{ and } f(w/\nu) := [\nu L : \nu K]$$

the **ramification index** and the **inertia degree**, respectively. If $n = [L : K]$ is finite, then both the ramification index and the inertia degree are finite and $e(w/\nu)f(w/\nu) \leq n$. In this situation, we can have only a finite number of extension of ν from K to L . Denoting by w_1, \dots, w_r all these extensions, we have the *fundamental inequality* (see [9])

$$\sum_{i=1}^r e(w_i/\nu)f(w_i/\nu) \leq [L : K].$$

A valued field (K, ν) is said to be **henselian** if for every algebraic extension L of K there exists only one extension of ν from K to L . Fix an algebraic closure \overline{K} of K and an extension $\overline{\nu}$ of ν to \overline{K} . Take the separable closure K^{sep} of K in \overline{K} and consider K^h the fixed field of $G^d := \{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(K^{\text{sep}} \mid K) \mid \overline{\nu} \circ \sigma = \overline{\nu}\}$. Taking the restriction $\nu^h = \overline{\nu}|_{K^h}$, the valued field (K^h, ν^h) is a **henselization** of (K, ν) , that is, a henselian field which is contained in every other henselian field that extends (K, ν) . All henselizations of (K, ν) are isomorphic.

Let $(K, \nu) \subset (L, \nu)$ be a valued field extension. Take henselizations K^h and L^h of K and L inside $\overline{K} = \overline{L}$. We define the **defect** of the extension w/ν as

$$d(w/\nu) = \frac{[L^h : K^h]}{e(w/\nu)f(w/\nu)}.$$

If we call also by ν the valuation on L extending ν on K , then we will write the extension as $(L \mid K, \nu)$ and denote the defect of the extension by $d(L \mid K, \nu)$.

Take w_1, \dots, w_r all extensions of ν to L . We have the following equality (see [9]):

$$[L : K] = \sum_{i=1}^r e(w_i/\nu)f(w_i/\nu)d(w_i/\nu).$$

If the extension w is unique, then

$$d(w/\nu) = \frac{[L : K]}{e(w/\nu)f(w/\nu)} \text{ and } n = efd.$$

We say that w/ν is a **defect extension** if $d(w/\nu) > 1$ and a **defectless extension** if $d(w/\nu) = 1$. The valued field (K, ν) is called **defectless** if every finite valued field extension of K is a defectless extension.

3. GRADED RINGS AND MAC LANE-VAQUIÉ KEY POLYNOMIALS

Let ν be a valuation on a integral domain R . For each $\gamma \in \nu(R)$, we consider the abelian groups

$$\mathcal{P}_\gamma = \{a \in R \mid \nu(a) \geq \gamma\} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_\gamma^+ = \{a \in R \mid \nu(a) > \gamma\}.$$

Definition 3.1. *The **graded ring** associated to ν is defined by*

$$\text{gr}_\nu(R) := \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \nu(R)} \mathcal{P}_\gamma / \mathcal{P}_\gamma^+.$$

The sum on $\text{gr}_\nu(R)$ is defined coordinatewise and the product is given by extending the product of homogeneous elements, which is described by

$$\left(a + \mathcal{P}_{\nu(a)}^+\right) \cdot \left(b + \mathcal{P}_{\nu(b)}^+\right) := \left(ab + \mathcal{P}_{\nu(a)+\nu(b)}^+\right).$$

For $a \notin \text{supp}(\nu)$, we denote by $\text{in}_\nu(a) := a + \mathcal{P}_{\nu(a)}^+$ the image of a in $\mathcal{P}_{\nu(a)} / \mathcal{P}_{\nu(a)}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{G}_\nu$. If $a \in \text{supp}(\nu)$, then we define $\text{in}_\nu(a) = 0$. The next lemma follows from the definitions above.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $a, b \in R$. We have the following.*

- (1) $\text{gr}_\nu(R)$ is an integral domain.
- (2) $\text{in}_\nu(a) \cdot \text{in}_\nu(b) = \text{in}_\nu(ab)$.
- (3) $\text{in}_\nu(a) = \text{in}_\nu(b)$ if and only if $\nu(a - b) > \nu(a) = \nu(b)$.
- (4) If $\nu(a) = \nu(b) \leq \nu(a + b)$, then $\text{in}_\nu(a + b) = \text{in}_\nu(a) + \text{in}_\nu(b)$.

We focus on valuations on the polynomial ring $K[x]$. Let ν_i and ν_j be valuations on $K[x]$ with common value group such that $\nu_i(f) \leq \nu_j(f)$ for all $f \in K[x]$ (denoted by $\nu_i < \nu_j$). Let $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(K[x], \nu_i) = \{f \in K[x] \mid \nu_i(f) \geq \gamma\}$ (analogously we define $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(K[x], \nu_j)$, $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^+(K[x], \nu_i)$ and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^+(K[x], \nu_j)$). We have the inclusions

$$\mathcal{P}_\gamma(K[x], \nu_i) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\gamma(K[x], \nu_j) \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_\gamma^+(K[x], \nu_i) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\gamma^+(K[x], \nu_j)$$

for any $\gamma \in \nu_i(K[x]) \subseteq \nu_j(K[x])$. For simplicity, denote $\text{gr}_{\nu_i}(K[x]) = \mathcal{G}_{\nu_i}$. We consider the following map:

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_{ij} : \mathcal{G}_{\nu_i} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_{\nu_j} \\ \text{in}_{\nu_i}(f) &\longmapsto \begin{cases} \text{in}_{\nu_j}(f) & \text{if } \nu_i(f) = \nu_j(f) \\ 0 & \text{if } \nu_i(f) < \nu_j(f), \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and we extend this map naturally for an arbitrary element. This map is well-defined [2, Corollary 5.5] and, by construction, it is a homomorphism of graded rings.

Take $f, g \in K[x]$. We say that f is **ν -equivalent** to g (denoted by $f \sim_\nu g$) if $\text{in}_\nu(f) = \text{in}_\nu(g)$. We say that g **ν -divides** f (denoted by $g \mid_\nu f$) if there exists $h \in K[x]$ such that $f \sim_\nu g \cdot h$. The polynomial f is **ν -irreducible** if $f \mid_\nu g \cdot h$

implies $f \mid_\nu g$ or $f \mid_\nu h$ (i.e. $\text{in}_\nu(f)\mathcal{G}_\nu$ is a non-zero prime ideal). We say that f is ν -**minimal** if $f \mid_\nu h$ implies $\deg(h) \geq \deg(f)$ for every $h \in K[x]$.

Definition 3.3. *A monic polynomial $Q \in K[x]$ is a **Mac Lane-Vaquié (MLV) key polynomial** for ν if it is ν -irreducible and ν -minimal.*

Denote by $\text{KP}(\nu)$ the set of all MLV key polynomials for ν . For all $\phi \in \text{KP}(\nu)$ we write

$$[\phi]_\nu := \{\varphi \in \text{KP}(\nu) \mid \phi \sim_\nu \varphi\}.$$

All polynomials in $[\phi]_\nu$ have the same degree. If $\text{KP}(\nu) \neq \emptyset$, then we define

$$\mathbf{deg}(\nu) := \min\{\deg(\phi) \mid \phi \in \text{KP}(\nu)\}.$$

If $\text{supp}(\nu) = fK[x]$ for some irreducible polynomial f , then we define $\deg(\nu) := \deg(f)$.

For each $f \in K[x]$ and ϕ a non-constant polynomial there exist uniquely determined polynomials $f_0, \dots, f_r \in K[x]$ with $\deg(f_i) < \deg(\phi)$ for every k , $0 \leq k \leq r$, such that $f = f_0 + f_1\phi + \dots + f_r\phi^r$. We call this expression the ϕ -**expansion** of f . If $\phi \in \text{KP}(\nu)$, then by [18, Proposition 2.3] the ν -minimality of ϕ is equivalent to

$$\nu(f) = \min_{0 \leq k \leq r} \{\nu(f_k\phi^k)\}.$$

4. AUGMENTATIONS AND MAC LANE-VAQUIÉ CHAINS

The content of this section was mostly taken from [19].

4.1. Ordinary augmentations. Let μ be a valuation on $K[x]$ and ϕ be a Mac Lane-Vaquié key polynomial for μ . Let Λ be a totally ordered group such that $\Gamma_\mu \subset \Lambda$ and $\gamma \in \Lambda_\infty$ such that $\gamma > \mu(\phi)$. For $f \in K[x]$, write the ϕ -expansion $f = f_0 + f_1\phi + \dots + f_r\phi^r$.

Definition 4.1. *The valuation*

$$\nu(f) := \min_{0 \leq k \leq r} \{\mu(f_k) + k\gamma\}$$

*is called an **ordinary augmentation** of μ . We denote it by $\nu = [\mu; \phi, \gamma]$.*

See [16, Theorem 4.4] or [22, Theorem 5.1] for a proof that ν defined above is indeed a valuation. We have the following properties [19, Proposition 2.1].

- $\mu < \nu$, i.e., $\mu(f) \leq \nu(f)$ for every $f \in K[x]$ and there exists $h \in K[x]$ such that $\mu(h) < \nu(h)$.
- If $\gamma < \infty$, then ϕ is a MLV key polynomial for ν of minimal degree. In particular $\deg(\nu) = \deg(\phi)$.

4.2. Depth zero valuations. Take $a \in K$ and $\gamma \in \Lambda_\infty \supset \Gamma_v$. The map $\mu = \omega_{a,\gamma}$, defined as

$$\mu \left(\sum_{0 \leq k \leq r} a_k (x-a)^k \right) := \min_{0 \leq k \leq r} \{v(a_k) + k\gamma\},$$

is called a **depth zero valuation**. If $\gamma < \infty$, then $x-a$ is a MLV key polynomial for μ and $\deg(\mu) = 1$ (see [19] for more details).

4.3. Continuous families of valuations and MLV limit key polynomials.

Take μ a non-maximal valuation on $K[x]$ and $\Lambda \supset \Gamma_\mu$. We say that a family $\mathcal{A} = (\rho_i)_{i \in A}$ of valuations on $K[x]$ is a **continuous family of augmentations of μ** of stable degree m if

- A is a totally ordered set without maximal element and $i \mapsto \rho_i$ is an isomorphism of totally ordered sets;
- $\rho_i = [\mu; \chi_i, \beta_i]$ where $\beta_i \in \Lambda$, $\beta_i > \mu(\chi_i)$ and $\beta_i < \beta_j$ for $i < j$;
- all MLV key polynomials $\chi_i \in \text{KP}(\mu)$ have the same degree $\deg(\mathcal{A}) := m$, called the stable degree of \mathcal{A} ;
- for all $i < j$, χ_j is a MLV key polynomial for ρ_i , $\chi_i \approx_{\rho_i} \chi_j$ and $\rho_j = [\rho_i; \chi_j, \beta_j]$.

A polynomial $f \in K[x]$ is said to be **\mathcal{A} -stable** if there is $i_0 \in A$ such that $\rho_i(f) = \rho_{i_0}(f)$ for all $i \geq i_0$. We denote this stable value by $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(f) := \rho_{i_0}(f)$. Let m_∞ be the minimal degree of an \mathcal{A} -unstable polynomial. If all polynomials are \mathcal{A} -stable, then we set $m_\infty = \infty$. We say that \mathcal{A} is **essential** if $\deg(\mathcal{A}) < m_\infty < \infty$.

Definition 4.2. *A monic polynomial $\phi \in K[x]$ is a **MLV limit key polynomial** for \mathcal{A} if it is \mathcal{A} -unstable and has the smallest degree among \mathcal{A} -unstable polynomials.*

We denote by $\text{KP}_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ the set of MLV limit key polynomials for \mathcal{A} . Take $\phi \in \text{KP}_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ and $\gamma \in \Lambda_\infty$ such that $\gamma > \rho_i(\phi)$ for all $i \in A$. For $f \in K[x]$, write the ϕ -expansion $f = f_0 + f_1\phi + \dots + f_r\phi^r$.

Definition 4.3. *The valuation*

$$\nu(f) = \min_{0 \leq k \leq r} \{\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(f_k) + k\gamma\},$$

is called a **limit augmentation** of \mathcal{A} . We denote it by $\nu = [\mathcal{A}; \phi, \gamma]$.

See [22, Theorem 5.16] or [27, Proposition 1.22] for a proof that ν defined above is indeed a valuation such that $\rho_i < \nu$ for all $i \in A$. If $\gamma < \infty$, then $\phi \in \text{KP}_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ is a MLV key polynomial for $\nu = [\mathcal{A}; \phi, \gamma]$ and $\deg(\nu) = \deg(\phi)$.

For a continuous family of augmentations $\mathcal{A} = (\rho_i)_{i \in A}$ with $\mu = \rho_{i_0}$ where $i_0 = \min(A)$, we say that \mathcal{A} is **based on μ** if $\deg(\mu) = \deg(\mathcal{A})$. We will write $\mu \rightarrow \nu$ to describe an augmentation. In this case, either

$$\nu = [\mu; \phi, \gamma], \quad \phi \in \text{KP}(\mu), \quad \gamma > \mu(\phi) \text{ or}$$

$$\nu = [\mathcal{A}; \phi, \gamma], \quad \phi \in \text{KP}_\infty(\mathcal{A}), \quad \gamma > \rho_i(\phi) \text{ for all } i \in A,$$

with \mathcal{A} based on μ .

4.4. Mac Lane-Vaquié Chains. Let

$$(2) \quad \mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \mu_{t-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_t, \gamma_t} \mu_t \cdots$$

be a finite or countably infinite chain of augmented valuations where each μ_{t+1} is of one of the following types:

- **Ordinary augmentation:** $\mu_{t+1} = [\mu_t; \phi_{t+1}, \gamma_{t+1}]$ for some $\phi_{t+1} \in \text{KP}(\mu_t)$.
- **Limit augmentation:** $\mu_{t+1} = [\mathcal{A}; \phi_{t+1}, \gamma_{t+1}]$ for some $\phi_{t+1} \in \text{KP}_\infty(\mathcal{A})$, where \mathcal{A} is an essential continuous family of augmentations of μ_t .

By [19, p.13] we have $\gamma_t = \mu_t(\phi_t) < \gamma_{t+1}$ and ϕ_t is a key polynomial for μ_t of minimal degree.

Let μ and ν be valuations on $K[x]$ such that $\mu < \nu$. Define

$$\Phi_{\mu, \nu} := \{\phi \in K[x] \mid \phi \text{ monic with minimal degree such that } \mu(\phi) < \nu(\phi)\}.$$

We call $\Phi_{\mu, \nu}$ the **tangent direction** of μ determined by ν . By [19, Corollary 2.5] and [27, Theorem 1.15], every $\phi \in \Phi_{\mu, \nu}$ is a MLV key polynomial for μ and $\Phi_{\mu, \nu} = [\phi]_\mu$. Denote by $\deg(\Phi_{\mu, \nu})$ the common degree of the polynomials in $\Phi_{\mu, \nu}$. This set has also the following properties (see [19]):

- for any $\phi \in \Phi_{\rho, \mu}$ we have $\rho < [\rho; \phi, \mu(\phi)] \leq \mu$;
- for valuations $\rho < \mu < \nu$, we have $\Phi_{\rho, \mu} = \Phi_{\rho, \nu}$;
- in (2), we have $\deg(\mu_t) = \deg(\phi_t) \mid \deg(\Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}})$.

If \mathcal{A} is a continuous family of limit augmentations of μ , then we denote $\Phi_{\mu, \mathcal{A}} := \Phi_{\mu, \rho_i} = [\chi_i]_\mu$. This set does not depend on i . By [19], for a chain of valuations as in (2) we have

$$\Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}} = \begin{cases} [\phi_{t+1}]_{\mu_t}, & \text{if } \mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1} \text{ is ordinary,} \\ \Phi_{\mu_t, \mathcal{A}} = [\chi_i]_{\mu_t}, & \text{if } \mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1} \text{ is limit,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\deg(\Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}}) = \begin{cases} \deg(\phi_{t+1}), & \text{if } \mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1} \text{ is ordinary,} \\ \deg(\mathcal{A}), & \text{if } \mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1} \text{ is limit.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 4.4. A finite or countably infinite chain of augmentations as in (2) is a **Mac Lane-Vaquié (MLV) chain** if every augmentation step satisfies:

- If $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ is ordinary, then $\deg(\mu_t) < \deg(\Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}})$.
- If $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ is limit, then $\deg(\mu_t) = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}})$ and $\phi_t \notin \Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}}$.

A Mac Lane-Vaquié chain is **complete** if the valuation μ_0 has depth zero.

Remark 4.5. A MLV chain can be composed by a mix of ordinary and limit augmentation. Moreover, since we consider chains as in (2), if $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ is limit, then the continuous family of augmentations associated to μ_t is essential, i.e., the

degree $\deg(\phi_{t+1})$ of the limit key polynomial is strictly greater than the stable degree $\deg(\mathcal{A})$. That is, if $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ is either ordinary or limit augmentation, then $\deg(\mu_t) = \deg(\phi_t) < \deg(\phi_{t+1}) = \deg(\mu_{t+1})$ [19, p. 14].

Theorem 4.6. [19, Theorem 4.3] *Every valuation ν on $K[x]$ falls in one of the following cases.*

(1) *It is the last valuation of a complete finite Mac Lane-Vaquié chain:*

$$\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r = \nu.$$

(2) *It is the stable limit of a continuous family $\mathcal{A} = (\rho_i)_{i \in A}$ of augmentations of some valuation μ_r which falls in case 1:*

$$\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \mu_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_r, \gamma_r} \mu_r \xrightarrow{(\rho_i)_{i \in A}} \rho_{\mathcal{A}} = \nu,$$

such that the class $\Phi_{\mu_r, \nu}$ has degree $\deg(\mu_r)$ and $\phi_r \notin \Phi_{\mu_r, \nu}$.

(3) *It is the stable limit of a complete infinite Mac Lane-Vaquié chain:*

$$\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \mu_{t-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_t, \gamma_t} \mu_t \longrightarrow \cdots$$

By [19, Lemma 4.5], ν falls in Case (1) of Theorem 4.6 above if and only if $\text{KP}(\nu) \neq \emptyset$ or $\text{supp}(\nu) \neq (0)$.

Take

$$\mu_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_1, \gamma_1} \mu_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_2, \gamma_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \mu_{t-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_t, \gamma_t} \mu_t \cdots$$

a Mac Lane-Vaquié chain of length $r \in \mathbb{N}_\infty$. Let us fix the following notations and highlight some properties.

- $m_t = \deg(\mu_t) = \deg(\phi_t)$. If $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ is ordinary, then $m_{t+1} = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}})$.
- $e_t = (\Gamma_{\mu_t} : \Gamma_{\mu_{t-1}})$.
- $\Delta_t = \Delta_{\mu_t}$, the subring of zero grade elements of \mathcal{G}_{μ_t} ,
- $\kappa_t = \kappa(\mu_t)$, the algebraic closure of Kv in Δ_t .
- $f_t = [\kappa_{t+1} : \kappa_t] = \deg(\Phi_{\mu_t, \nu}) / (e_t m_t)$ [19, Lemma 5.2].

Consider $v_t = [\mu_t; \phi_t, \infty]$ on $K[x]$ for each $t \geq 0$. We have $\Gamma_{v_t} = \{\mu_{t-1}(h) \mid h \neq 0 \text{ and } \deg(h) < \deg(\phi_t)\} = \Gamma_{\mu_{t-1}}$ and $K[x]v_t = \kappa_t$ [18, Propositions 2.12 and 3.6]. Also

$$e(v_t/v) = e_0 \cdots e_{t-1} \text{ and } f(v_t/v) = f_0 \cdots f_{t-1}.$$

4.5. The defect formula. We will end this section with a formula that allows us to calculate the defect of a finite valued field extension by using a chain of augmentations.

We start with a lemma from which we will derive the notion of defect of a augmentation.

Lemma 4.7. [20, Lemma 6.1] *Let $\mu \rightarrow \nu$ be an augmentation. Let $\Phi_{\mu,\nu}$ be the corresponding tangent direction. For $Q \in \Phi_{\mu,\nu}$ set $\rho_Q = [\mu; Q, \nu(Q)]$. Let $\phi \in K[x]$ be either a MLV key polynomial of minimal degree of ν or $\text{supp}(\nu) = \phi K[x]$. Then the positive integer*

$$d = \min\{\deg_{\rho_Q}(\phi) \mid Q \in \Phi_{\mu,\nu}\}$$

is independent of the choice of ϕ . Moreover, the set of all $Q \in \Phi_{\mu,\nu}$ such that $\deg_{\rho_Q}(\phi) = d$ is cofinal in $\Phi_{\mu,\nu}$.

Definition 4.8. *The stable value d is called the **defect** of the augmentation. We denote it by $d(\mu \rightarrow \nu)$.*

Some properties of this notion of defect are listed in the lemma below.

Lemma 4.9. [20, Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4]

- (1) *If $\mu \rightarrow \nu$ is an ordinary augmentation, then $d(\mu \rightarrow \nu) = 1$.*
- (2) *Suppose (K, v) henselian. For all augmentations $\mu \rightarrow \nu$ we have*

$$d(\mu \rightarrow \nu) = \deg(\nu) / \deg(\Phi_{\mu,\nu}).$$

In particular, if $\mu \rightarrow \nu$ is a limit augmentation, then

$$d(\mu \rightarrow \nu) = \deg(\nu) / \deg(\mu).$$

Remark 4.10. *Suppose (K, v) henselian. If $\mu \rightarrow \nu$ is a limit augmentation which comes from an essential continuous family based on μ , then $d(\mu \rightarrow \nu) = \deg(\nu) / \deg(\mu) > 1$. Hence, for a MLV chain, $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ is ordinary if and only if $d(\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}) = 1$.*

We say that an augmentation $\mu \rightarrow \nu$ is **proper** when the class $\Phi_{\mu,\nu}$ is proper, that is, when there exists $\varphi \in \text{KP}(\mu)$ such that $\varphi \approx_\mu \phi$ for some $\phi \in \Phi_{\mu,\nu}$. A chain of augmentation is said to be proper if all of its augmentations are proper. By [19], all MLV chains are proper.

The next results state a formula for the defect of a finite simple field extension in terms of the defect of augmentations.

Theorem 4.11. [20, Theorem 6.14] *Let w be an extension of v to a finite simple extension $L \mid K$. Let μ be the valuation on $K[x]$ induced by w . For any proper chain of augmentation ending on μ we have*

$$d(w/v) = d(\mu_0 \rightarrow \mu_1) \cdots d(\mu_r \rightarrow \mu).$$

Corollary 4.12. [20, Corollary 6.16] *Suppose that (K, v) is henselian. Let w be an extension of v to a finite simple extension $L \mid K$. Let μ be the valuation on $K[x]$ induced by w . For any proper chain of augmentation ending on μ we have*

$$d(w/v) = \prod_{t \in J} \frac{\deg(\mu_{t+1})}{\deg(\mu_t)}$$

where J contains all indices t such that $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ is a limit augmentation.

Remark 4.13. *The above corollary is a version of [19, Corollary 6.1], where we note that it is not necessary to suppose (K, v) henselian. It is sufficient to suppose that the extension w of v is unique. A similar result can be found in [29, Corollary 2.10].*

5. COMPLETE SEQUENCES OF KEY POLYNOMIALS

5.1. Key polynomials. Fix a valuation ν on $K[x]$, the ring of polynomials in one indeterminate over the field K . Our definition of key polynomial relates to the ones in [24] and [10]. Fix an algebraic closure \overline{K} for K and fix a valuation $\overline{\nu}$ on $\overline{K}[x]$ such that $\overline{\nu}|_{K[x]} = \nu$.

Let $f \in K[x]$ be a non-zero polynomial.

- If $\deg(f) > 0$, set

$$\delta(f) := \max\{\overline{\nu}(x - a) \mid a \in \overline{K} \text{ and } f(a) = 0\}.$$

- If $\deg(f) = 0$, set $\delta(f) = -\infty$.

Remark 5.1. *According to [21], $\delta(f)$ does not depend on the choice of the algebraic closure \overline{K} or the extension $\overline{\nu}$ of ν .*

Definition 5.2. *A monic polynomial $Q \in K[x]$ is a **(abstract) key polynomial** of level $\delta(Q)$ if, for every $f \in K[x]$,*

$$\delta(f) \geq \delta(Q) \implies \deg(f) \geq \deg(Q).$$

Let $q \in K[x]$ be a non-constant polynomial and ν a valuation on $K[x]$. For a given $f \in \mathbb{K}[x]$, denote by f_0, \dots, f_r the coefficients of the q -expansion of f . The map

$$\nu_q(f) := \min_{0 \leq k \leq r} \{\nu(f_k q^k)\},$$

is called the **truncation** of ν at q . This map is not always a valuation, as we can see in [24, Example 2.4]. If Q is a key polynomial, then ν_Q is a valuation on $K[x]$ [21, Proposition 2.6] and $Q \in \text{KP}(\mu_Q)$ [22, Corollary 4.7].

In the following lemmas, we state some properties of key polynomials and truncations.

Lemma 5.3. [24, Proposition 2.10] *Let $Q, Q' \in K[x]$ be key polynomials for ν . We have the following.*

- (1) *If $\deg(Q) < \deg(Q')$, then $\delta(Q) < \delta(Q')$.*
- (2) *If $\delta(Q) < \delta(Q')$, then $\nu_Q(Q') < \nu(Q')$.*
- (3) *If $\deg(Q) = \deg(Q')$, then*

$$\nu(Q) < \nu(Q') \iff \nu_Q(Q') < \nu(Q') \iff \delta(Q) < \delta(Q').$$

Lemma 5.4. [22, Corollaries 3.9 and 3.10] *Let $Q, Q' \in K[x]$ be key polynomials such that $\delta(Q) \leq \delta(Q')$.*

- (1) *We have $\nu_{Q'}(Q) = \nu(Q)$.*

- (2) For every $f \in K[x]$, we have $\nu_Q(f) \leq \nu_{Q'}(f)$. In particular, if $\delta(Q) = \delta(Q')$ then $\nu_Q = \nu_{Q'}$.

For a key polynomial Q we consider the following set:

$$\Psi(Q) := \{f \in K[x] \mid f \text{ is monic with minimal degree such that } \nu_Q(f) < \nu(f)\}.$$

In the language of Section 4, we have $\Psi(Q) = \Phi_{\nu_Q, \nu}$, the tangent direction of ν_Q determined by ν .

Lemma 5.5. [24, Lemma 2.11] *If Q is a key polynomial, then every $Q' \in \Psi(Q)$ is also a key polynomial. Moreover, $\delta(Q) < \delta(Q')$.*

5.2. Complete sequences of key polynomials.

Definition 5.6. *A set $\mathbf{Q} \subset K[x]$ is called a **complete set** for ν if for every $f \in \mathbb{K}[x] \setminus \{0\}$ there exists $q \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that*

$$\deg(q) \leq \deg(f) \text{ and } \nu(f) = \nu_q(f).$$

*A set $\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ is said a **sequence of key polynomials** if every element Q_i is a key polynomial, the set I is well ordered and the map $i \rightarrow Q_i$ is order preserving (with respect to δ). A sequence of key polynomials $\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a **complete sequence of key polynomials** if the set \mathbf{Q} is a complete set for ν .*

According to [24, Theorem 1.1], every valuation ν on $K[x]$ admits a complete sequence \mathbf{Q} of key polynomials. Moreover, the next proposition gives us more details about \mathbf{Q} .

Proposition 5.7. [22, Corollary 6.5] *Let ν be a valuation on $K[x]$, set $\nu_0 := \nu|_K$. Then there exists a family*

$$\mathcal{F} = \{(\nu_Q, Q, \nu(Q))\}_{Q \in \mathbf{Q}}$$

such that for every $f \in K[x]$, there exists $Q \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $\nu(f) = \nu_Q(f)$ for every $Q' \in \mathbf{Q}$ with $\epsilon(Q) \leq \epsilon(Q')$ (in particular, \mathbf{Q} is complete). The set \mathbf{Q} can be chosen as

$$\mathbf{Q} = \bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i,$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, with the following properties.

- (1) \mathbf{Q} admits a smallest element Q_0 (with respect to ϵ) of the form $x - a \in K[x]$ and

$$\nu_{Q_0} = [\nu_0; \nu_{Q_0}(Q_0) = \nu(Q_0)].$$

- (2) For every i , $1 \leq i < N$, we can write $I_i = A_i \cup B_i$ where
- $B_i = \{Q_{i,1}, \dots, Q_{i,n_i}\}$ for some $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\nu_{Q_{i,j+1}} = [\nu_{Q_{i,j}}; \nu_{Q_{i,j+1}}(Q_{i,j+1}) = \nu(Q_{i,j+1})]$$

for every j , $1 \leq j < n_i$, and

$$\deg(Q_{i,1}) < \deg(Q_{i,2}) < \dots < \deg(Q_{i,n_i});$$

- $\mathcal{A}_i = \{\nu_Q\}_{Q \in A_i}$ is an essential continuous family of augmentations based on Q_{i,n_i} with $\deg(Q) > \deg(Q_{i,n_i})$ for every $Q \in A_i$.
- (3) For every i , $1 < i < N$, I_i admits a first element Q which is a MLV-limit key polynomial for \mathcal{A}_{i-1} .
- (4) If $N < \infty$, then $I_N = A_N \cup B_N$ with
- A_N and B_N as in (3), or
 - $A_N = \emptyset$ and $B_N = \{Q_{N,1}, \dots, Q_{N,L-1}\}$ for some $L \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that

$$\nu_{Q_{i,j+1}} = [\nu_{Q_{i,j}}; \nu_{Q_{i,j+1}}(Q_{i,j+1}) = \nu(Q_{i,j+1})]$$

for every j , $1 \leq j < L$ (if B_N is finite, consider $L = |B_N| + 1$).

Remark 5.8. In the language of [19], from the family \mathcal{F} we can construct a Mac Lane-Vaquié chain ending in ν .

5.3. Finite complete sequences of key polynomials. Let $(L | K, \nu)$ be a simple algebraic extension and take η a generator for $L | K$. Let ν be the valuation on $K[x]$ defined by η and v : for $f \in K[x]$, we define

$$(3) \quad \nu(f) := v(f(\eta)).$$

Take g the minimal polynomial of η over K with degree n . Since $\nu(g) = \infty$, we have also $\delta(g) = \infty$ and $\text{supp}(\nu) = (g)$. Hence g is a key polynomial for ν (if $\deg(f) < \deg(g)$, then $f \notin \text{supp}(\nu)$, that is, $\delta(f) < \infty$). Moreover, there is no key polynomial of degree greater than n (since a key polynomial of degree greater than n must have δ greater than $\delta(g) = \infty$, what does not happen).

We denote by Ψ_m the set of all key polynomials for ν of degree $m \geq 1$. We will say that Ψ_m admits a maximum (with respect to ν) if $\nu(\Psi_m) := \{\nu(Q) \mid Q \in \Psi_m\}$ admits a maximal element.

The following proposition is a first step in order to prove one of our main results. It says that a finite complete sequence of key polynomials exists if and only if there are no limit key polynomials for ν (in the sense of [24]). In the sequence, we prove two of our main results.

Proposition 5.9. Let $(L | K, \nu)$ be a simple algebraic extension and let ν be the valuation on $K[x]$ defined in (3). Then ν admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials if and only if for every $m \geq 1$ either Ψ_m is empty or it admits a maximum.

Proof. Suppose that for every m either Ψ_m is empty or it admits a maximum. For each m such that $\Psi_m \neq \emptyset$, choose one Q_m of maximal value. Let \mathcal{Q} be the set of these maximal elements Q_m . We will show that \mathcal{Q} is a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.

Take $f \in K[x]$ any monic polynomial. If $\deg(f) \geq n$, then via the g -expansion of f we have

$$\nu(f) = \nu(f_0 + f_1g + \dots + f_s g^s) = \nu(f_0) = \nu_g(f)$$

because $\nu(g) = \infty$.

Suppose $\deg(f) < n$. Let m be the biggest integer such that $\Psi_m \neq \emptyset$ and $m \leq \deg(f)$. Take $Q_m \in \mathbf{Q}$ the chosen element of maximal value of Ψ_m . Let us prove that $\nu_{Q_m}(f) = \nu(f)$. Indeed, if $\nu_{Q_m}(f) < \nu(f)$, then take any $h \in \Psi(Q_m)$, which is a key polynomial (Lemma 5.5). We must have $m \leq \deg(h) \leq \deg(f)$. If $m < \deg(h)$, then we contradict the choice of m . If $m = \deg(h)$, then by Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.3 (3) we conclude that $\nu(Q_{\bar{m}}) < \nu(h)$, a contradiction. Hence $\nu_{Q_m}(f) = \nu(f)$.

Therefore, \mathbf{Q} is complete. It is finite since $\Psi_m = \emptyset$ for every $i > n$.

For the converse, let $\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_r\}$ be a finite complete sequence of key polynomials. Take m and suppose $\Psi_m \neq \emptyset$. Take $Q \in \Psi_m$. Hence, there exists $Q_i \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $\deg(Q_i) \leq m$ and $\nu_{Q_i}(Q) = \nu(Q)$. Let us see that $Q_i \in \Psi_m$. Indeed, if $\deg(Q_i) < m = \deg(Q)$, then $\delta(Q_i) < \delta(Q)$ and this implies that $\nu_{Q_i}(Q) < \nu(Q)$ (Lemma 5.3), a contradiction.

Consider $Q_{\bar{i}} \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that

$$\delta(Q_{\bar{i}}) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\delta(Q_i) \mid Q_i \in \Psi_m\}.$$

We will prove that $Q_{\bar{i}}$ is an element with maximal value in Ψ_m . Suppose there is $Q \in \Psi_m$ such that $\nu(Q_{\bar{i}}) < \nu(Q)$. However, we know that there exists $Q_j \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $\deg(Q_j) \leq m$ and $\nu_{Q_j}(Q) = \nu(Q)$. By the same reasoning above, we have $Q_j \in \Psi_m$. By Lemma 5.3 (3), $\nu(Q_{\bar{i}}) < \nu(Q)$ implies $\delta(Q_{\bar{i}}) < \delta(Q_j)$, contradicting the choice of $Q_{\bar{i}}$. Therefore, Ψ_m has a maximum. \square

We will call the valued field extension $(L \mid K, v)$ **unbranched** if v admits a unique extension from K to L .

Theorem 5.10. *Let $(L \mid K, v)$ be a simple algebraic extension and let ν be the valuation on $K[x]$ defined in (3). Then ν admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials if and only if $d(L \mid K, v) = 1$ and $(L \mid K, v)$ is unbranched.*

Proof. Suppose $d(L \mid K, v) = 1$ and $(L \mid K, v)$ unbranched. Consider the Mac Lane-Vaquí chain ending in ν given by $\mathcal{F} = \{(\nu_Q, Q, \nu(Q))\}_{Q \in \mathbf{Q}}$ from Proposition 5.7. Corollary 4.12 shows us that we cannot have limit augmentations in \mathcal{F} (because in a Mac Lane-Vaquí chain, a limit augmentation $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}$ satisfies $d(\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_{t+1}) = \deg(\mu_{t+1})/\deg(\mu_t) > 1$). That is, $N = 1$ in Proposition 5.7. This means that the complete set \mathbf{Q} from Proposition 5.7 is such that $\mathbf{Q} = I_1 = B_1 = \{Q_{1,1}, \dots, Q_{1,n_1}\}$ for some $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, \mathbf{Q} is a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.

For the converse, consider g the minimal polynomial of η over K . Suppose ν admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials, that is, for all m either $\Psi_m = \emptyset$ or it admits a maximum. Consider $n_0 < n_1 < \dots < n_r = \deg(g)$ the indexes such that $\Psi_{n_t} \neq \emptyset$ and $\Psi_m = \emptyset$ for all $n_t < m < n_{t+1}$, where $t \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$. Denote by Q_{n_t} a chosen element of Ψ_{n_t} , where $Q_{n_r} = g$. Then we have the following chain of augmentation

$$\mu_0 \rightarrow \mu_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mu_r = \nu$$

where $\mu_t = \nu_{Q_{n_t}}$. This is a finite depth Mac Lane-Vaquié chain and every augmentation is ordinary. Indeed, by Lemma 5.3 (2) we have $\mu_{t+1}(Q_{n_{t+1}}) < \nu(Q_{n_{t+1}})$ and, since $\Psi_m = \emptyset$ for $n_t < m < n_{t+1}$, we conclude that $Q_{n_{t+1}} \in \Psi(Q_{n_t})$. By Theorem 6.1 of [22], $\mu_{t+1} = [\mu_t; Q_{n_{t+1}}, \nu(Q_{n_{t+1}})]$. Since $\deg(\Phi_{\mu_{t+1}, \nu}) = \deg(Q_{n_{t+1}}) = m_t$ (because all augmentations are ordinary) and $\deg(\mu_t) = \deg(Q_{n_t})$, it follows that we have a Mac Lane-Vaquié chain.

Since $m_r = \deg(Q_{n_r}) = \deg(g)$, the properties listed at the end of Subsection 4.4 lead us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} f(L | K, v) &= f(\nu/v) \\ &= \prod_{t=0}^{r-1} f_t \\ &= \prod_{t=0}^{r-1} \frac{\deg(\Phi_{\mu_t, \mu_{t+1}})}{e_t m_t} \\ &= \frac{m_r}{e_{r-1} m_{r-1}} \dots \frac{m_1}{e_0 m_0} \\ &= \frac{m_r}{e_{r-1} \dots e_0} \\ &= \frac{\deg(g)}{e(L | K, v)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the fundamental inequality, we must have $d(L | K, v) = 1$ and $(L | K, v)$ unbranched. \square

Remark 5.11. *In (3), we see that the definition of ν depends on the chosen generator η for the simple extension. However, since $d(L | K, v)$ and the property of being unbranched do not depend on η , we conclude that the existence of a finite complete sequence of key polynomials also does not depend on the choice of the generator of the extension.*

The next theorem will give us a characterization of henselian defectless fields in terms of finite complete sequences of key polynomials. We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.12. *We have (K, v) henselian if and only if for every simple field extension $L | K$ we have $(L | K, v)$ unbranched.*

Proof. One direction follows from the definition of a henselian valued field. For the other implication, take $\bar{\mu}_1$ and $\bar{\mu}_2$ extensions of v to \bar{K} . For each $a \in \bar{K}$, consider the restrictions $(K(a), \mu_1)$ and $(K(a), \mu_2)$ where $\mu_i = \bar{\mu}_i|_{K(a)}$. By hypothesis, $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ in $K(a)$, hence $\bar{\mu}_1(a) = \bar{\mu}_2(a)$ for every $a \in \bar{K}$. It follows that the extension of v from K to \bar{K} is unique, that is, (K, v) is henselian. \square

For a finite extension $(L | K, v)$, with $L = K(a_1, \dots, a_m)$, we write $K_j = K(a_1, \dots, a_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$ and consider the simple extension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, v)$ (with $K_0 = K$). We will say that $(K_j | K_{j-1}, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials if the valuation ν_j induced by $(K_j | K_{j-1}, v)$ on the polynomial ring $K_{j-1}[x]$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials. By Remark 5.11, this property does not depend on the choice of the generators a_1, \dots, a_m .

Theorem 5.13. *We have (K, v) henselian defectless if and only if for every finite extension $(L | K, v)$ each simple subextension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 5.10, Lemma 5.12 and the fact that for a finite extension $(L | K, v)$ we have

$$d(L | K, v) = \prod_{j=1}^m d(K_j | K_{j-1}, v).$$

\square

6. THE GRADED RING $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$

6.1. The graded ring viewed as a semigroup ring. Let (K, v) be a valued field and $\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq K$ the valuation ring associated to v . Consider $vK^{\geq 0}$ the subgroup of vK generated by $v(\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\})$. Take

$$\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K) := \bigoplus_{\gamma \in vK^{\geq 0}} \mathcal{P}_\gamma / \mathcal{P}_\gamma^+.$$

In [1] it is proved that $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ is isomorphic to the semigroup ring $Kv[t^{vK^{\geq 0}}]$, that is, the set of finite formal sums

$$\sum_{i=1}^n b_i v t^{\gamma_i}, \text{ with } a_i v \in Kv \text{ and } \gamma_i \in vK^{\geq 0} \text{ for each } i = 1, \dots, n$$

where

$$\sum_{i=1}^n b_i v \cdot t^{\gamma_i} + \sum_{i=1}^n b'_i v \cdot t^{\gamma_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n (b_i + b'_i) v \cdot t^{\gamma_i}$$

and, in general, the product is not given by the usual multiplication but by the one defined as follows. A **choice function** on $vK^{\geq 0}$ is any map $\epsilon : vK^{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $v(\epsilon(\gamma)) = \gamma$ for every $\gamma \in vK^{\geq 0}$ (i.e. ϵ is a right inverse of v). We only consider choice functions with $\epsilon(0) = 1$. For each choice function, we define the **twisting**

$$\bar{\epsilon} : vK^{\geq 0} \times vK^{\geq 0} \rightarrow Kv$$

$$\bar{\epsilon}(\gamma, \gamma') := \left(\frac{\epsilon(\gamma)\epsilon(\gamma')}{\epsilon(\gamma + \gamma')} \right) v.$$

The map

$$\begin{aligned} \times_\epsilon : Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}] \times Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}] &\rightarrow Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}] \\ (a, b) &\mapsto a \times_\epsilon b \end{aligned}$$

where we set $t^\gamma \times_\epsilon t^{\gamma'} := \bar{\epsilon}(\gamma, \gamma') \cdot t^{\gamma + \gamma'}$ and extend it to $Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}]$ in the natural way. This map satisfies the multiplication axioms and turns $Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}]$ into a commutative ring. This multiplication is called **twisted multiplication** induced by ϵ and we denote the ring by $Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}]_\epsilon$.

Remark 6.1. For $a, b \in \mathcal{O}_K$, by the definition of the twisted multiplication we have

$$t^{v(ab)} = t^{v(a)+v(b)} = \left(\frac{\epsilon(v(a) + v(b))}{\epsilon(v(a))\epsilon(v(b))} \right) v \cdot t^{v(a)} \times_\epsilon t^{v(b)}.$$

Proposition 6.2. [1, Theorem 1.1]

$$\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K) \cong Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}]_\epsilon$$

through the isomorphism

$$\text{in}_v(a) \mapsto \left(\frac{a}{\epsilon(v(a))} \right) v \cdot t^{v(a)}.$$

In the following subsection we give a direct application of the above isomorphism.

6.2. Frobenius endomorphism on $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$. For a ring R with $\text{char} R = p > 0$, the **Frobenius endomorphism** on R is the map given by $a \mapsto a^p$. Suppose $\text{char} Kv = p > 0$ and consider the Frobenius endomorphisms F and \bar{F} on $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ and $Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}]_\epsilon$ respectively.

Lemma 6.3. *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K) & \xrightarrow{F} & \text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K) \\ \psi \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi \\ Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}]_\epsilon & \xrightarrow{\bar{F}} & Kv[t^{vK \geq 0}]_\epsilon \end{array}$$

is commutative. Hence, F is surjective if and only if \bar{F} is surjective.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(F(\text{in}_v(a))) &= \psi((\text{in}_v(a))^p) = \psi(\text{in}_v(a^p)) \\ &= \left(\frac{a^p}{\epsilon(v(a^p))} \right) v \cdot t^{v(a^p)} \\ &= \left(\frac{a^p}{\epsilon(v(a^p))} \frac{\epsilon(v(a^p))}{\epsilon(v(a))^p} \right) v \cdot t^{v(a)} \times_\epsilon \cdots \times_\epsilon t^{v(a)} \\ &= \left(\frac{a^p}{\epsilon(v(a))^p} \right) v \cdot (t^{v(a)})^p \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{F}(\psi(\text{in}_v(a))) &= \overline{F}\left(\left(\frac{a}{\epsilon(v(a))}\right)v \cdot t^{v(a)}\right) = \left(\left(\frac{a}{\epsilon(v(a))}\right)v \cdot t^{v(a)}\right)^p \\ &= \left(\left(\frac{a}{\epsilon(v(a))}\right)v\right)^p \left(t^{v(a)}\right)^p \\ &= \left(\frac{a^p}{\epsilon(v(a))^p}\right)v \cdot \left(t^{v(a)}\right)^p.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the diagram commutes and hence F is surjective if and only if \overline{F} is surjective. \square

The following result will say that the surjectiveness of the Frobenius endomorphism F on $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ can be checked by looking at the valued group and the residue field of (K, v) .

Proposition 6.4. *Suppose $\text{char}Kv = p > 0$. Then F is surjective if and only if $vK^{\geq 0}$ is p -divisible (hence vK is p -divisible) and Kv is perfect.*

Proof. Suppose F is surjective, that is, \overline{F} is surjective. We first prove that $vK^{\geq 0}$ is p -divisible. For $v(a) \in vK^{\geq 0}$, since \overline{F} is surjective we have

$$t^{v(a)} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i v \cdot t^{v(a_i)}\right)^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^p v \frac{\epsilon(v(a_i^p))}{\epsilon(v(a_i))^p} \cdot t^{pv(a_i)}$$

for some $b_1 v, \dots, b_n v \in Kv$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Since the elements t^γ , with $\gamma \in vK^{\geq 0}$, are linearly independent, we must have $t^{v(a)} = t^{pv(a_j)}$ for one and only one index j , $1 \leq j \leq n$. Hence, $v(a) = pv(a_j)$ and therefore $vK^{\geq 0}$ is p -divisible.

Now we see that vK is p -divisible. If $v(a) < 0$, then $-v(a) > 0$. Since $vK^{\geq 0}$ is p -divisible, there exists $v(a') \geq 0$ such that $-v(a) = pv(a')$, that is, $v(a) = p(-v(a'))$. Thus, vK is also p -divisible.

Let us prove that Kv is perfect. The restriction $\overline{F}|_{Kv}$ is an endomorphism on Kv since $(av)^p \in Kv$ for every $av \in Kv$. We know that

$$av = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i v \cdot t^{v(a_i)}\right)^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^p v \frac{\epsilon(v(a_i^p))}{\epsilon(v(a_i))^p} v \cdot t^{pv(a_i)} \in Kv$$

for some $b_1 v, \dots, b_n v \in Kv$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{O}_K$, because \overline{F} is surjective. Hence, for one and only one index j we have

$$av = av \cdot t^0 = b_j^p v \frac{\epsilon(v(a_j^p))}{\epsilon(v(a_j))^p} v \cdot t^{pv(a_j)}.$$

Thus, $pv(a_j) = 0$ (which implies $v(a_j) = 0$) and $av = b_j^p v \frac{\epsilon(v(a_j^p))}{\epsilon(v(a_j))^p} v$. Since $\epsilon(v(a_j)) = \epsilon(0) = 1$, we conclude that $\frac{\epsilon(v(a_j^p))}{\epsilon(v(a_j))^p} v = 1v$ and then

$$av = b_j^p v = (b_j v)^p.$$

For the converse, suppose $vK^{\geq 0}$ p -divisible and Kv perfect. It is enough to prove that an element of the form $bv \cdot t^{v(a)}$ is a p -power. Since $vK^{\geq 0}$ is p -divisible, there exists $a' \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $v(a) = pv(a')$. Since Kv is perfect, there exists $b'v \in Kv$ such that

$$\frac{\epsilon(v(a'^p))}{\epsilon(v(a'))^p} v b v = (b'v)^p.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (b'v \cdot t^{v(a')})^p &= (b'v)^p (t^{v(a')})^p \\ &= \frac{\epsilon(v(a'^p))}{\epsilon(v(a'))^p} v b v \frac{\epsilon(v(a'))^p}{\epsilon(v(a'^p))} v \cdot t^{pv(a')} \\ &= b v \cdot t^{v(a)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, \overline{F} is surjective, then F is also surjective. \square

We will say that a ring R with positive characteristic is **perfect** if the Frobenius endomorphism is surjective. We note that $\text{gr}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ is perfect if and only if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect. Also, if K is perfect, then $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect.

7. SIMPLY DEFECTLESS VALUED FIELDS

We will call a valued field (K, v) **simply defectless** if all simple algebraic extensions of K are defectless. The next corollary follows directly from Theorem 5.10.

Corollary 7.1. *We have (K, v) simply defectless and henselian if and only if every simple field extension of K admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.*

Every defectless field is simply defectless. but the converse is not true in general. This fact is illustrated in the following example provided by M. Spivakovsky, based on an example from F.K. Schmidt.

Example 7.2. *Let p be a prime number and $t, c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$ be independent variables. Let $k = \mathbb{F}_p \left(c_1^{p^{-\infty}}, c_2^{p^{-\infty}}, \dots \right)$. Let $s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i t^i \in k[[t]] \setminus k[[t^p]]$. This is a transcendental power series (see the proof in the Appendix). Let $K = k \langle t^p, s^p \rangle \subset k((t^p))$ denote the henselization of $k \langle t^p, s^p \rangle$ endowed with the t -adic valuation inherited from $k((t^p))$. We will show that (K, v) is simply defectless, but not defectless.*

First we see that (K, v) is not defectless. Indeed, the extension $(k \langle t, s \rangle | K, v)$ has degree p^2 . We have an isomorphism of residue fields, both of which are isomorphic to k , and an extension $p\mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ of value groups of index p . Hence $d(k \langle t, s \rangle | K, v) = p$.

However, (K, v) is simply defectless. Consider a simple algebraic extension $(L|K, v)$ with $L = K(x)$. After taking some auxiliary fields extensions (first the separable closure L' of K in L , then a finite Galois extension of K containing L' and at last the fixed field of $\text{Aut}(L/K)$), we can assume that $(L|K, v)$ is purely

inseparable. Let e denote the smallest positive integer such that $y := x^{p^e} \in K$. We may also assume that K admits no purely inseparable simple defect extensions of degree strictly less than p^e . Let $K' := K(x^p)$, whose value group is $vK' = \frac{1}{p^{e-2}}\mathbb{Z}$. Then the extension $(K'|K, v)$ is defectless and $L|K'$ has degree p .

We have $x^{p^{e-1}} \notin K$. Since $k[[t^p]] \cap k\langle t, s \rangle = K$ (see Lemma 10.5 in the Appendix), this implies that $x^{p^{e-1}} \notin k[[t^p]]$, then

$$x^p \notin k \left[\left[t^{\frac{1}{p^{e-3}}} \right] \right].$$

Hence, we can write

$$x^p = \sum_{i=A}^{N-1} a_i t^{\frac{i}{p^{e-2}}} + a_N t^{\frac{N}{p^{e-2}}} + \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} a_i t^{\frac{i}{p^{e-2}}}$$

for some $A \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $N \in A + \mathbb{N}$ such that $p \mid i$ for all $A \leq i \leq N-1$ with $a_i \neq 0$ and $p \nmid N$. Then $z = \sum_{i=A}^{N-1} a_i t^{\frac{i}{p^{e-2}}}$ is such that $v(x^p - z) \notin pvK'$. We have

$$L = K'(x) = K' \left((x^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) = K' \left((x^p - z)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right).$$

This implies that

$$[vL : vK'] = p = [L : K']$$

since $pv((x^p - z)^{\frac{1}{p}}) = v(x^p - z) = \frac{N}{p^{e-2}} \in vK'$. This proves that $(L|K', v)$ is defectless and hence $(L|K, v)$ is defectless.

Next, we will see that if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect, then we have the converse.

Theorem 7.3. *Suppose (K, v) henselian. If (K, v) is simply defectless and $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect, then (K, v) is a defectless field.*

Proof. Suppose $(L|K, v)$ is a finite defect extension. We will show that there exists a simple algebraic extension of K which is not defectless. Take N the normal closure of $L|K$. Then $(N|K, v)$ is also a finite defect extension. Take $G = \text{Aut}_K(N)$ and consider the fixed field K^G , which is a purely inseparable extension of K .

We note that since $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect, we have $(K^G|K, v)$ immediate. Indeed, $Kv \subset K^Gv$ is also purely inseparable and vK^G/vK is a p -group. Since Kv is perfect and vK is p -divisible, it follows that $Kv = K^Gv$ and $vK = vK^G$.

If $K = K^G$, since $K = K^G \subset N$ is separable and finite, then $(N|K, v)$ is a simple defect extension and we are done. If $K^G \neq K$, take $a \in K^G \setminus K$ and consider the simple extension $K \subset K(a) \subset K^G$. This is also an immediate extension, hence $d(K(a)|K, v) = [K(a) : K] > 1$. \square

8. TAME FIELDS

8.1. Tame fields and $\text{gr}(K)$. A unibranched extension $(L|K, v)$ is called **tame** if every finite subextension $E|K$ of $L|K$ satisfies the following conditions.

(TE1): $(vE : vK)$ is not divisible by $\text{char}Kv$.

(TE2): $E|Kv$ is a separable extension.

(TE3): $(E | K, v)$ is defectless.

Definition 8.1. A valued field (K, v) is called a **tame field** if it is henselian and its algebraic closure with the unique extension of the valuation is a tame extension.

All henselian valued fields with $\text{char}Kv = 0$ are tame [15, p. 14]. Then we will focus on valued fields with positive residue characteristic.

The following proof appears partially in [15, Theorem 3.2].

Lemma 8.2. Let (K, v) be a henselian valued field with $\text{char}Kv = p > 0$. Take \bar{K} an algebraic closure of K . We have the following.

- (1) $(\bar{K} | K, v)$ satisfies (TE1) if and only if vK is p -divisible.
- (2) $(\bar{K} | K, v)$ satisfies (TE2) if and only if Kv is perfect.

Proof.

- (1) Suppose vK is not p -divisible and take $a \in K$ such that $v(a) \neq 0$ and it is not p -divisible. Take $b \in \bar{K}$ a root of $f(x) = x^p - a \in K[x]$, that is, $b^p = a$. Consider the finite extension $K(b)$ and $(K(b) | K, v)$. We have the following.
 - We have $(vK(b) : vK) \geq p$. Indeed, since $v(a) = v(b^p) = pv(b)$, we see that $v(b) \notin vK$ because $v(a)$ is not p -divisible. Hence, $v(b) + vK$ is non zero and has order p in $vK(b)/vK$. Since $[K(b) : K]$ is finite, it follows that $vK(b)/vK$ is of finite order. Thus, p divides $(vK(b) : vK)$ and $(vK(b) : vK) \geq p$.
 - $p = [K(b) : K] \geq (vK(b) : vK)$ due to the fundamental inequality.

Therefore, $p = (vK(b) : vK)$ and $(\bar{K} | K, v)$ does not satisfies (TE1).

Now suppose that vK is p -divisible and that $(\bar{K} | K, v)$ does not satisfies (TE1). Take a finite extension $E | K$ such that $(vE : vK)$ is divisible by p . Hence, there exists a non-zero element $\gamma + vK \in vE/vK$ such that $\gamma \notin vK$ and $p\gamma \in vK$. That is, $p\gamma = \delta$ for some $\delta \in vK$. Since vK is p -divisible, there exists $\delta' \in vK$ such that $\delta = p\delta'$. Therefore, $p\gamma = \delta = p\delta'$, which implies $p(\gamma - \delta') = 0$. Since vE is torsion free, we must have $\gamma = \delta' \in vK$, a contradiction. Hence, $(\bar{K} | K, v)$ satisfies (TE1).

- (2) Suppose, aiming for a contradiction, that Kv is not perfect. Let $av \in Kv$, $v(a) = 0$, be such that av does not have a p -root. Take $b \in \bar{K}$ a root of $f(x) = x^p - a \in K[x]$, that is, $b^p = a$. Considering $\bar{f}(x) = x^p - av \in Kv[x]$, we see that $bv \neq 0v$ is a root of this polynomial. Since $\bar{f}(x)$ has no root in Kv , because av is not a p -root, it follows that $\bar{f}(x)$ is irreducible. That is, $\bar{f}(x)$ is the minimal polynomial of bv over Kv . Since the formal derivative of $\bar{f}(x)$ is $px^{p-1} = 0$, we conclude that bv is not separable over Kv , contradicting (TE2).

For the converse, we note that the field Kv being perfect is equivalent to every finite extension of Kv being separable. In particular, we have (TE2). \square

The next corollary follows immediately.

Corollary 8.3. *Let (K, v) be a henselian defectless valued field with $\text{char}Kv = p > 0$. Then (K, v) is a tame field if and only if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect.*

8.2. Tame fields and finite complete sequences of key polynomials.

During this and the next section we suppose $\text{char}Kv = p > 0$. Our second main result is a way of characterizing tame fields in terms of graded rings and complete sequences of key polynomials. We start with that following corollary. Remember that for a finite extension $L = K(a_1, \dots, a_m)$, we write $K_j = K(a_1, \dots, a_j)$ where $1 \leq j \leq m$.

Corollary 8.4. *Let (K, v) be a valued field. Then (K, v) is a tame field if and only if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect and for every finite extension $(L | K, v)$ each simple subextension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.4 and Lemma 8.2, we see that (TE1) and (TE2) together are equivalent to $\text{gr}(K)$ perfect. By Theorem 5.13, (K, v) henselian and satisfying (TE3) is equivalent to for every finite extension $(L | K, v)$ each simple subextension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials. \square

Remark 8.5. *Every tame field is perfect [15, Lemma 3.1]. If we add in Theorem 8.7 the hypothesis that K is perfect, then we can state that (K, v) is tame if and only if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect and every simple extension $(L | K, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials. What we will see next is that we do not need to assume that K is perfect to achieve this result.*

Let us give names for the properties appearing in Corollary 8.4 and Remark 8.5 above.

(FCS1): every simple extension $(L | K, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials;

(FCS2): every finite extension $(L | K, v)$ is such that each simple subextension $(K_j | K_{j-1}, v)$ admits a finite complete sequence of key polynomials.

We always have that (FCS2) implies (FCS1). The next corollary states a converse for this implication.

Corollary 8.6. *Suppose that $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect. Then (FCS1) and (FCS2) are equivalent.*

Proof. We only need to prove the converse. It follows from Theorem 5.13 and Theorem 7.3, since (FCS1) is equivalent to (K, v) being henselian and simply defectless. \square

Finally, we can prove our other main result.

Theorem 8.7. *Let (K, v) be a valued field. Then (K, v) is a tame field if and only if $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect and (K, v) satisfies (FCS1).*

Proof. It follows from Corollaries 8.4 and 8.6. \square

8.3. Algebraically maximal fields. A valued field extension $(L | K, v)$ is said to be **immediate** if $vL = vK$ and $Lv = Kv$. A valued field (K, v) is called **algebraically maximal** if it does not admit proper immediate algebraic extensions. Every henselian defectless field is algebraically maximal, but the converse does not hold in general [15, p.13]. In [15], we find the following result closely related to our Theorem 8.7.

Proposition 8.8. [15, Theorem 3.2] *A henselian valued field (K, v) is tame if and only if it is algebraically maximal, vK is p -divisible and Kv is perfect.*

In fact, the property of being algebraically maximal is related to (FCS1), as we see in the following proposition. Remember that \bar{v} is a fixed extension of v from K to a fixed algebraic closure \bar{K} . We will make use of a result from [3].

Lemma 8.9. [3, Theorem 1.1] *A henselian valued field (K, v) is algebraically maximal if and only if the set $\bar{v}(\eta - K) := \{\bar{v}(\eta - a) \mid a \in K\}$ has a maximum for every $\eta \in \bar{K} \setminus K$.*

Proposition 8.10. *If (K, v) satisfies (FCS1), then it is algebraically maximal.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.9 and Theorem 5.10, (FCS1) implies that every simple extension $L = K(\eta)$ is such that the set $\bar{v}(\eta - K) = \nu(x - K) = \nu(\Psi_1)$ admits a maximum. Then we apply the above lemma. \square

Remark 8.11. *We can also prove Proposition 8.10 using the fact that (FCS1) is equivalent to (K, v) being henselian and simply defectless (Corollary 7.1). By the contrapositive, suppose $(L | K, v)$ is a proper immediate algebraic extension. Take any $\eta \in L \setminus K$ and consider the simple algebraic extension $(K(\eta) | K, v)$. It is also a proper immediate extension. Since (K, v) is henselian, it is a defect extension. Hence, (K, v) is not simply defectless.*

When (K, v) is henselian, we have the diagram of implications as illustrated in Figure 1 at the Introduction.

If $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect, then from Proposition 8.8 and our Theorem 8.7 we conclude that (FCS1) and algebraically maximal are equivalent properties. In the next corollary we compile other equivalences, proved or stated in this paper, which are valid when $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect.

Corollary 8.12. *Suppose (K, v) henselian and $\text{gr}(K)$ perfect. The following properties are equivalents.*

- (i) (K, v) is defectless.
- (ii) (K, v) is simply defectless.
- (iii) (K, v) satisfies (FCS1).
- (iv) (K, v) satisfies (FCS2).
- (v) (K, v) is tame.
- (vi) (K, v) is algebraically maximal.
- (vii) (K, v) is such that $\bar{v}(\eta - K)$ has a maximum for every $\eta \in \bar{K} \setminus K$.

9. PURELY INERTIAL AND PURELY RAMIFIED EXTENSIONS

In this last section we see how the property of $\text{gr}(K)$ being perfect (or more generally how Kv perfect and vK p -divisible) interacts with the definitions of purely ramified and purely inertial extension, together with the module of Kähler differentials associated to such extensions. In this sense, we give increments for some results of [25].

Definition 9.1. Let $(L | K, v)$ be a simple algebraic extension of valued fields. We say that:

- (i): $(L | K, v)$ is **purely ramified** if vL/vK is cyclic and $[L : K] = (vL : vK)$.
- (ii): $(L | K, v)$ is **purely inertial** if Lv/Kv is simple and $[L : K] = [Lv : Kv]$.

If $(L | K, v)$ is purely inertial, take $\eta \in \mathcal{O}_L$ such that $Lv = Kv(\eta v)$. If $(L | K, v)$ is purely ramified, take $\eta \in L$ such that $vL = vK[v(\eta)]$. In both cases, one can show that $L = K(\eta)$. Moreover, the set $\mathbf{Q} = \{x\}$ is a complete set for the induced valuation ν on $K[x]$ [25, Proposition 5.8].

Let $\Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K}$ be the **module of Kähler differentials** for the extension $\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K$ (see [17] for a construction of this module). The study of this module has shown itself to be crucial to the understanding of the so called *deeply ramified fields* and their relations to the defect (see [4] and [5]).

Suppose $(L | K, v)$ purely inertial. We see in [25, Lemma 6.3 and Proposition 6.4] that $\mathcal{O}_L = \mathcal{O}_K[\eta]$ and

$$\Omega \cong \frac{\mathcal{O}_L}{(g'(\eta))},$$

where $L = K(\eta)$ and g is the minimal polynomial of η over K .

Lemma 9.2. [25, Corollary 6.5] *If $(L | K, v)$ is purely inertial, then $\Omega = (0)$ if and only if $Lv | Kv$ is separable.*

Proof. From the identification above, $\Omega = (0)$ if and only if $v(g'(\eta)) = 0$. Take $\eta \in \mathcal{O}_L$ such that $Lv = Kv(\eta v)$. It follows that $L = K(\eta)$. Let $\bar{h}(y) \in Kv[y]$ be the minimal polynomial of ηv over Kv . Then $v(g'(\eta)) = 0$ if and only if $\frac{d\bar{h}}{dy} \neq 0$, which is equivalent to ηv being separable over Kv . \square

The following proposition already appears in [4, Theorem 4.3] and follows directly from Lemma 9.2 above.

Proposition 9.3. *If Kv is perfect, then every purely inertial extension of K is such that $\Omega = (0)$.*

Proof. If Kv is perfect, then all algebraic extensions of Kv are separable. Therefore, if $(L | K, v)$ is purely inertial, then $Lv | Kv$ is a simple algebraic extension, thus separable. By the Lemma 9.2, we have $\Omega = (0)$. \square

Suppose now $(L | K, v)$ purely ramified. Take η such that $v(\eta)$ generates vL over vK . Then $L = K(\eta)$. Consider the set $v(\eta - K)$. Hence $\gamma = v(\eta)$ is the maximum of $v(\eta - K)$ (since $v(\eta - a) = \nu(x - a) = \nu_x(x - a) \leq \nu(x) = v(\eta)$).

Assume $\gamma > 0$. Let Δ denote the greatest isolated¹ subgroup of vL such that $\Delta < \gamma$. Let $g = a_0 + a_1x + \dots + x^n$ be the minimal polynomial of η over K .

Lemma 9.4. [25, Proposition 6.13] *Suppose $(L | K, v)$ purely ramified.*

(i): *If $(\frac{vL}{\Delta})_{>0}$ contains a minimal element, then $\Omega \neq (0)$.*

(ii): *If $(\frac{vL}{\Delta})_{>0}$ does not contain a minimal element, then $\Omega = (0)$ if and only if there is l , $1 \leq l \leq n$, such that*

$$v(l) + v(a_l) - (n - l)\gamma \in \Delta.$$

Consider the following condition.

(DRvg): whenever $\Gamma_1 \subsetneq \Gamma_2$ are convex subgroups of vK , then Γ_2/Γ_1 is not isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} .

Lemma 9.5. *If vK is p -divisible, then (DRvg) is satisfied.*

Proof. Take $\gamma \in \Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1$, without loss of generality $\gamma \geq 0$. Then $\gamma = p\delta$ for some $\delta \in vK^{\geq 0}$. We must have $0 \leq \delta < \gamma$. Hence, by the convexity $\delta \in \Gamma_2$. Also, $\delta \notin \Gamma_1$ since in this case $\gamma + \Gamma_1 = p\delta + \Gamma_1 = \Gamma_1$ and then we would have $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$, which is not the case.

By the induced order, $\Gamma_1 < \delta + \Gamma_1 < \gamma + \Gamma_1$. By repeating this process we construct a strictly decreasing sequence of positive elements in Γ_2/Γ_1 . Therefore, $\Gamma_2/\Gamma_1 \not\cong \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Using the above lemmas, we can deduce a result similar to Proposition 9.3 for purely ramified extensions.

Proposition 9.6. *If vK is p -divisible (or more generally if (DRvg) is satisfied), then every purely ramified extension of K is such that $\Omega = (0)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 9.5, since vK is p -divisible, then (DRvg) is satisfied. We first see that if we have (DRvg) then $(\frac{vL}{\Delta})_{>0}$ does not contain a minimal element. Indeed, suppose $\gamma_m + \Delta > 0$ minimal element of $(\frac{vL}{\Delta})_{>0}$. Since $\gamma_m \notin \Delta$, it follows that $k\gamma_m \notin \Delta$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^*$. Take $\sigma \in vL$ such that $k\gamma_m + \Delta < \sigma + \Delta < (k+1)\gamma_m + \Delta$. Hence, $0 + \Delta < \sigma - k\gamma_m + \Delta < \gamma_m + \Delta$, contradicting γ_m being the minimal element

¹Isolated here means that, for all $x \in vL$, either $x \in \Delta$ or $kx \notin \Delta$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^*$.

of $(\frac{vL}{\Delta})_{>0}$. Then, we define the isomorphism $\phi : (\frac{vL}{\Delta}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by $\phi(k\gamma_m + \Delta) = k$, contradicting (DRvg).

Hence, to see that $\Omega = (0)$ it is sufficient to prove that $v(l) + v(a_l) - (n-l)\gamma \in \Delta$ for some l , $1 \leq l \leq n$ (by the Lemma above). Suppose, aiming for a contradiction, that $p \mid n = [L : K] = (vL : vK)$. Then, for every $\sigma \in vL$ we have $n\sigma = \xi \in vK$ and $\xi = p\xi'$ for some $\xi' \in vK$. Since $n = pn'$ we have $pn'\sigma = p\xi'$, that is, $p(n'\sigma - \xi') = 0$. This implies $n'\sigma = \xi'$, contradicting the order of vL/vK being $n > n'$. Then, $p \nmid n$. Therefore, if we take $l = n$ we conclude that $v(n) + v(a_n) - (n-n)\gamma = 0 + v(1) + 0\gamma = 0 \in \Delta$. Hence, $\Omega = (0)$. \square

Corollary 9.7. *If $\text{gr}(K)$ is perfect, then every purely ramified extension and every purely inertial extension of K is such that $\Omega = (0)$.*

10. APPENDIX: DETAILS OF EXAMPLE 7.2

Let us remember the setting of Example 7.2. Let p be a prime number and $t, c_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$ be independent variables. Let $k = \mathbb{F}_p(c_1^{p^{-\infty}}, c_2^{p^{-\infty}}, \dots)$. Let $s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i t^i \in k[[t]] \setminus k[[t^p]]$. Let $K = k\langle t^p, s^p \rangle \subset k((t^p))$ denote the henselization of $k\langle t^p, s^p \rangle$ endowed with the t -adic valuation inherited from $k((t^p))$.

For a positive integer i , let

$$\begin{aligned} s_{0i} &= \sum_{j=1}^i c_j t^j, \\ s_i &= \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} c_j t^j \quad \text{and} \\ c^{(i)} &= (c_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, i\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let S and T be independent variables. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let ∂_{S_i} denote the i -th Hasse derivative with respect to S and similarly for ∂_{T_i} .

Lemma 10.1. *Let f be a non-zero element of $k(T)[S]$.*

- (1) *We have $f(t, s(t)) \neq 0$.*
- (2) *There exists $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ such that for all $l \geq l_0$ we have $vf(s, t) = vf(t, s_{0l})$; moreover, the element $\text{in}_v f(t, s_{0l}) \in \text{gr}_v k((t))$ is independent of $l \geq l_0$.*

Proof. Let $d = \deg_S f$. We proceed by induction on d , the case $d = 0$ being trivial. Assume that $d > 0$ and that the Lemma holds for polynomials of degree less than or equal to $d - 1$, in particular, for all of $\partial_{S_i} f$ with $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

Fix l_0 sufficiently large so that the conclusion of the Lemma holds with f replaced by $\partial_{S_i} f$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. This means that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and all $l \geq l_0$ we have

$$\text{in}_v(\partial_{S_i} f(t, s)) = \text{in}_v(\partial_{S_i} f(t, s_{0l}));$$

in particular,

$$v(\partial_{S_i} f(t, s)) = v(\partial_{S_i} f(t, s_{0l})).$$

By Taylor's formula, for every $l \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we have

$$(4) \quad f(t, s) = f(t, s_{0l}) + \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{S_i} f(t, s_{0l}) s_l^i.$$

Increasing l_0 , if necessary, we may assume, in addition, that $\text{in}_v(\partial_{S_i} f(t, s_{0l}))$ is defined already over $\mathbb{F}_p(c^{(l_0)})$.

Let $i_0 = \min \{i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \mid \partial_{S_i} f \neq 0\}$. Write $\text{in}_v(\partial_{S_{i_0}} f(s_{0l}))$ as

$$\text{in}_v(\partial_{S_{i_0}} f(s_{0l})) = a \bar{t}^q \in \mathbb{F}_p(c^{(l_0)})[\bar{t}] \subset \text{gr}_v k((t))$$

for suitable $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a \in \mathbb{F}_p(c^{(l_0)})$, where $\bar{t} = \text{in}_v(t)$. Then the right hand side of (4), viewed as a power series in t with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_p(c)$, contains the term $a c_{i_0+1}^{i_0} t^{q+i_0(l+1)}$ that cannot be canceled by any other term in the sum (since the c_j were chosen to be algebraically independent over \mathbb{F}_p). This proves (1).

To prove (2), note that all the terms in the sum

$$f(t, s_{0l}) + \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{S_i} f(t, s_{0l}) s_l^i,$$

except, possibly, for $f(t, s_{0l})$, have values that are strictly increasing to infinity with l . Since $v(f(t, s))$ is a natural number independent of l , after increasing l_0 once again, if necessary, we obtain both (1) and (2) of the Lemma. \square

Corollary 10.2. *The series s is transcendental over $k(t)$.*

Lemma 10.3. *Consider an element $f = \frac{a}{b} \in k(T, S)$, where $a, b \in K[T, S]$ satisfy $a(t, s)b(t, s) \neq 0$. Then the conclusions of Lemma 10.1 hold for f .*

Proof. This follows by applying Lemma 10.1 separately to the polynomials a and b . \square

Lemma 10.4. *We have $k[[t^p]] \cap k(t, s) = k(t^p, s^p)$.*

Proof. The inclusion \supset is clear. To prove the other inclusion, take an element

$$f \in k(t, s) \setminus k(t^p, s^p).$$

We will prove that $f \notin k[[t^p]]$. Indeed, there exists

$$(5) \quad F = \frac{a}{b} \in k(T, S) \setminus k(T^p, S^p),$$

where $a, b \in k[T, S]$, $a(t, s)b(t, s) \neq 0$ and $F(t, s) = f$.

By (5), the elements $\partial_{T_1} F$ and $\partial_{S_1} F$ cannot be simultaneously 0. First, assume that

$$(6) \quad \partial_{S_1} F \neq 0.$$

Take $l \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large so that $\text{in}_v \partial_{S_1} F$ is defined over $\mathbb{F}_p(c^{(l)})$ (such an l exists by Lemma 10.3). Write $\text{in}_v \partial_{S_1} F$ as

$$\text{in}_v \partial_{S_1} F = a\bar{t}^q \in \text{gr}_v k((t))$$

for suitable $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a \in \mathbb{F}_p(c^{(l)})$. Increasing l , if necessary, we may further assume that

$$(7) \quad p \nmid l + 1 + q.$$

By Taylor's formula, we have

$$(8) \quad f = F(t, s_{0l}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \partial_{S_i} F(t, s_{0l}) s_i^i,$$

where the infinite sum is understood as a power series in t (for $l \geq 2$ this sum converges in the t -adic topology). The right hand side of (8), viewed as a power series in t with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_p(c)$, contains the term $ac_{l+1}t^{q+l+1}$ that cannot be canceled by any other term in the sum (since the c_j were chosen to be algebraically independent over \mathbb{F}_p). In view of (7), we obtain $f \notin k[[t^p]]$. This completes the proof when assuming (6).

Next, assume that

$$(9) \quad \partial_{T_1} F \neq 0.$$

We can write $t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_i s^i$, with each $d_i \in \mathbb{F}_p(c)$ and $\{d_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ algebraically independent over \mathbb{F}_p . Thus, interchanging the elements t and s does not change the problem. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 10.5. *We have $k[[t^p]] \cap k\langle t, s \rangle = K$.*

Proof. Again, the inclusion \supset is clear. To prove the opposite inclusion, note that the henselization of a rank one valued field L coincides with the separable algebraic closure of L inside the completion of L . Let $K' = k[[t^p]] \cap k\langle t, s \rangle$ and assume that

$$(10) \quad K' \not\subseteq K,$$

aiming for contradiction. Since $K' \neq k\langle t, s \rangle$ (for example, we have $t \notin K'$) and $[k\langle t, s \rangle : K] = p^2$, (10) implies that $[k\langle t, s \rangle : K'] = p$. Then there exists a finite separable (hence simple) subextension $K'' = k(t^p, s^p)(y) \subset K$ such that

$$(11) \quad [(k[[t^p]] \cap k\langle t, s, y \rangle) : K''] = p.$$

Let $F = k[[t^p]] \cap k\langle t, s, y \rangle$.

Claim. We have $[(F \cap k\langle t, s \rangle) : k(t^p, s^p)] = p$.

The Claim implies that

$$k[[t^p]] \cap k\langle t, s \rangle = k[[t^p]] \cap (k\langle t, s, y \rangle \cap k\langle t, s \rangle) = F \cap k\langle t, s \rangle \not\subseteq k(t^p, s^p),$$

contradicting Lemma 10.4. It remains to prove the Claim.

Proof of Claim. Let L be the smallest normal extension of $k(t^p, s^p)$, containing K'' (we are not saying that L is contained in $k((t))$). Then the compositum $L.F$ is a Galois extension of F . By (11), the extension $L.F|k(t^p, s^p)$ can be seen as the composition of the separable extension $k(t^p, s^p) \hookrightarrow L$ with the purely inseparable extension $L \hookrightarrow L.F$ of degree p . Since $(L.F)|k(t^p, s^p)$ is normal, we can consider the fixed field L_{insep} of the automorphism group

$$\text{Aut}((L.F)/k(t^p, s^p)) = \text{Aut}((L.F)/((L.F) \cap k(t, s)));$$

L_{insep} is a purely inseparable extension of $k(t^p, s^p)$ of degree p . In this way, the extension $(L.F)|k(t^p, s^p)$ can be expressed as a composition of a purely inseparable extension $L_{\text{insep}}|k(t^p, s^p)$ of degree p with a separable extension $(L.F)|L_{\text{insep}}$. We have natural isomorphisms of the automorphism groups:

$$\text{Gal}((L.k)(t, s)/k(t, s)) \cong \text{Aut}((L.F)/((L.F) \cap k(t, s))) \cong \text{Gal}(L/k(t^p, s^p)).$$

Hence the fixed field L_{insep} of $\text{Aut}((L.F)/((L.F) \cap k(t, s)))$ is contained in the fixed field $k(t, s)$ of $\text{Gal}(L.k(t, s)/k(t, s))$:

$$L_{\text{insep}} \subset k(t, s).$$

This proves that $(L.F) \cap k(t, s)$ is a purely inseparable extension of $k(t^p, s^p)$ of degree p . Finally, $F \cap k(t, s) = (L.F) \cap k(t, s)$, which completes the proof of Claim and, with it, of Lemma 10.5. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. S. Barnabé, J. Novacoski, M. Spivakovsky, *On the structure of the graded algebra associated to a valuation*, J. Algebra 560 (2020), 667-679.
- [2] A. Bengus-Lasnier, *Minimal Pairs, Truncation and Diskoids*, J. Algebra 579 (2021), 388-427.
- [3] A. Bishnoi, S. K. Khanduja, *On Algebraically Maximal Valued Fields and Defectless Extensions*, Canad. Math. Bull. 55 (2) (2012), 233-241.
- [4] S. D. Cutkosky, F.-V. Kuhlmann, *Kähler differentials of extensions of valuation rings and deeply ramified fields*, arXiv:2306.04967v1 (2023).
- [5] S. D. Cutkosky, F.-V. Kuhlmann, A. Rzepka *Characterizations of Galois extensions with independent defect*. arXiv:2306.10022 (2023).
- [6] S. D. Cutkosky, H. Mourtada, *Defect and local uniformization*. Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat. Ser. A Mat. 113 (2017), 4211-4226.
- [7] J. Decaup, W. Mahboub e M. Spivakovsky, *Abstract key polynomials and comparison theorems with the key polynomials of Mac Lane-Vaquié*, Ill. J. Math. 62 (2018), 253-270.
- [8] A. Dutta, F. -V. Kuhlmann, *Tame key polynomials*, J. Algebra 629 (2022), 162-190.
- [9] A. Engler, A. Prestel, *Valued Fields*. Springer-Verlag, 2005. 205 p.
- [10] F. J. Herrera Govantes, W. Mahboub, M. A. Olalla Acosta, M. Spivakovsky, *Key polynomials for simple extensions of valued fields*, J. Singul. 25 (2022), 197-267.
- [11] H. Knaf, F. -V. Kuhlmann, *Abhyankar places admit local uniformisation in any characteristic*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) 38, 6 (2005), 833-846.
- [12] H. Knaf, F. -V. Kuhlmann, *Every place admits local uniformization in a finite extension of the function field*, Adv. Math. 221, 2 (2009), 428-453.
- [13] F. -V. Kuhlmann, *Valuation theoretic and model theoretic aspects of local uniformization*. In: Hauser, H., Lipman, J., Oort, F., Quirós, A. (eds) Resolution of Singularities. Progress in Mathematics, vol 181. Birkhäuser, Basel (2000)

- [14] F.-V. Kuhlmann, *A classification of Artin-Schreier defect extensions and characterizations of defectless fields*, Ill. J. Math. 54, 2 (2010), 397-448.
- [15] F.-V. Kuhlmann, *The algebra and model theory of tame valued fields*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 719 (2016), 1-43.
- [16] S. MacLane, *A construction for absolute values in polynomial rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 40, 3 (1936), 363-395.
- [17] H. Matsumura, *Commutative Algebra*, Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Reading, Mass (1970).
- [18] E. Nart, *Key polynomials over valued fields*. Publ. Mat. 64 (2020), 3-42.
- [19] E. Nart, *MacLane-Vaquié chains of valuations on a polynomial ring*, Pacific J. Math. 311, 1 (2021), 165-195.
- [20] E. Nart, J. Novacoski, *The defect formula*, Adv. Math. 482 (2023), 1-44.
- [21] J. Novacoski, *Key polynomials and minimal pairs*, J. Algebra 523 (2019), 1-14.
- [22] J. Novacoski, *On MacLane-Vaquié key polynomials*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 225 (2021), 106644.
- [23] J. Novacoski, M. Spivakovsky, *Reduction of local uniformization to the rank one case*, Valuation Theory in Interaction, EMS Series of Congress Reports (2014), 404-431.
- [24] J. Novacoski, M. Spivakovsky, *Key polynomials and pseudo-convergent sequences*, J. Algebra 495 (2018), 199-219.
- [25] J. Novacoski, M. Spivakovsky, *Kähler differentials, pure extensions and minimal key polynomials*, (2023), arXiv:2311.14322.
- [26] B. Teissier, *Valuations, deformations, and toric geometry*. Valuation theory and its applications, Vol. II (Saskatoon, SK, 1999), Fields Inst. Commun. **33** (2003), 361-459.
- [27] M. Vaquié, *Extension d'Une Valuation*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 359, 7 (2007), 3439-3481.
- [28] M. Vaquié, *Famille admissible de valuations et défaut d'une extension*, J. Algebra 359 no. 2 (2007), 859-876.
- [29] M. Vaquié, *Famille admise associée à une valuation de $K[x]$* , in: Singularités franco-japonaises, in: Séminaires et Congrès, 10, Soc. Math. France, 2005.

CAIO HENRIQUE SILVA DE SOUZA
Departamento de Matemática–UFSCar
Rodovia Washington Luís, 235
13565-905, São Carlos - SP, Brasil.
Email: caiohss@estudante.ufscar.br