

ARITHMETIC GENUS INEQUALITIES WITH AN APPLICATION TO SUMS OF SQUARES

DAVID GRIMM, GONZALO MANZANO-FLORES

ABSTRACT. We show variants of the genus inequality for the irreducible components of the special fiber of an arithmetic curve over a henselian discrete valuation ring of residue characteristic zero that take into account the non-existence of rational, respectively real points on the the components. We then apply this inequality to obtain the bound 2^{ng} (respectively $2^{n(g+1)}$) on the totally positive sum-of-two-squares index in the function field of a curve of genus g over the field of n -fold iterated real Laurent series with (respectively without) real points. The bound $2^{n(g+1)}$ had been previously known only for hyperelliptic curves.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of sums of squares in function fields of one variable over a hereditarily pythagorean field K goes back to the 1970's when E. Becker showed that for any real field K , that is, a field K in which -1 is not a sum of squares, we have that every sum of squares in $K(X)$ is a sum of two squares if and only if K is hereditarily pythagorean. One implication was generalized in [24] to an arbitrary real function field F/K of genus zero, namely if K is hereditarily pythagorean then every sum of squares in F is a sum of two squares (the other implication was shown later in [12]). Naturally, the question arose whether any sum of squares in a function field of a curve of higher genus over a hereditarily pythagorean field is always a sum of 2 squares.

Also in the 1970's, L. Bröcker showed in [5] that every hereditarily pythagorean admits a henselian valuation whose residue field has at most two orderings.

This motivated [23] to study sums of squares of hyperelliptic function fields F over $\mathbb{R}((t))$, where they showed that assuming good t -adic reduction, every sum of squares in F is a sum of two squares, but they also showed that in the elliptic curve $Y^2 = (tX - 1)(X^2 + 1)$ over $\mathbb{R}((t))$, which is of bad t -adic reduction, the function tX is a sum of 3 squares but not of two squares in its function field. In the case of an arbitrary hyperelliptic function field F over a hereditarily pythagorean field K , it was shown in [4] that every sum of squares in F is a sum of 4 squares, and the index of the multiplicative group of nonzero sums of two squares $(F^2 + F^2)^\times$ in the multiplicative group of sums of (in this case 4) squares $(\sum F^2)^\times$ was studied, as a measure of how far off the sums of 4 squares are from the sums of 2 squares. In the special case where $K = \mathbb{R}((t_1)) \dots ((t_n))$, the field of

iterated real Laurent series, it is a consequence of [4, Theorem 3.10] that

$$\left[\left(\sum F^2 \right)^\times : (F^2 + F^2)^\times \right] \leq 2^{n(g+1)},$$

assuming that F/K is the function field of a *hyperelliptic* curve of genus g . In Example 5.5, we will extend this bound to an arbitrary (not necessarily hyperelliptic) function field F/K of genus g as a special case of the more general Theorem 5.4. Moreover, we show that

$$\left[\left(\sum F^2 \right)^\times : (F^2 + F^2)^\times \right] \leq 2^{ng}$$

whenever F is a real field. In this way, the bound is naturally optimal in the case of genus zero, by the aforementioned result in [24]. In fact, optimality of the bound $2^{n(g+1)}$ in the nonreal case is a consequence of [17, Example 4.5] and in the real case, we will show optimality of the bound 2^{ng} in Example 5.6: For every n and g , optimality is exhibited by the curves

$$Y^2 = - \prod_{i=0}^g (X^2 + t_n^{2i}) \quad \text{and} \quad Y^2 = (X-1) \prod_{i=1}^g (X^2 + t_n^{2i}),$$

defined over $\mathbb{R}((t_1)) \dots ((t_n))$, respectively. We should note that both bounds for arbitrary curves of arbitrary genus were already described for $n = 1$ in the introduction of [2], as an application of a genus inequality for the reduction of an arithmetic curve shown in that paper. However, this genus inequality is not sufficiently strong to extend the bound on sums of squares for general n , as we will discuss at the end of Section 5. A palatable synthesis of our arithmetic-geometric main results, which allows for an inductive application in the proof for the upper bound of the totally positive sum-of-two-squares index, is the following:

Theorem (Corollary 4.6 & Theorem 4.7). *Let T be a discrete henselian valuation ring with residue field k of characteristic zero and field of fractions K . Let F/K be a function field in one variable, and assume that K relatively algebraically closed in F . Then*

$$\sum_{w \in \Omega_T^r(F)} \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)} 1 + \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K),$$

if F is real, and

$$\sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)} 1 + \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1,$$

if F is nonreal.

Here, $\Omega_T^r(F)$, respectively $\Omega_T^{n/r}(F)$, denote the set of discrete residually transcendental valuation extensions w of T with real residue field κ_w , respectively with nonreal residue field κ_w but such that the relative algebraic closure of k in κ_w is real. By $\mathfrak{g}(F/K)$, respectively $\mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k)$, we denote the genus of the function

field, which coincides with the genus of the unique regular projective curve C with function field F , respectively κ_w , considered as a curve over the relative algebraic closure of K in F , respectively over the relative algebraic closure of k in κ_w . In Theorem 4.5 we will also show a related version of the genus inequality where we do not require henselianity of T , and where the residual genera of valuations “without *rational* point in the residual curve” are the ones that are increased by one. So far, we lack an application for this second version of the genus inequality, but we include it also, since from an arithmetic-geometric point of view, it is the more natural one to consider.

The genus inequality obtained in [2], while additionally admitting valued base fields with perfect residue fields of positive residue characteristic, is weaker in the sense that the additional weight “+1” could only be shown for those $w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)$ with $\mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) = 0$. The less restrictive conditions on the valued base field in [2] seem to restrict the kind of regular models of an arithmetic curve that one can work with. More precisely, it seems to require to work with the minimal regular model.

In contrast, in the present paper, we take advantage of the fact that in the motivating application to sums of squares, only (henselian) valued base fields of residue characteristic zero are considered. Under this condition, a cohomological flatness result by Raynaud [21] permits to adapt the methods from [2] so that they indeed work with a regular model of an arithmetic curve in which the special fiber is a normal crossing divisor.

All previous genus inequalities for constant field reductions in the literature, such as [18], [19], or [9] do not take into account any arithmetic properties of the residue function fields since in these works, k is always assumed to be algebraically closed.

Finally, taking advantage of the topological auxiliary results we obtain for the dual reduction graph of the reduction of a regular model with strict normal crossing of the special fiber, we apply a description of the failure of a local-global principle for quadratic forms of dimension two in terms of the fundamental group of the dual reduction graph shown in [13], in order to also bound the index of the multiplicative group $F^{\times 2}$ of nonzero squares in a function field F of a curve of genus g over $\mathbb{R}((t))$ inside the multiplicative subgroup $\mathcal{L}(F)$ of F^\times consisting of all local squares with respect to all residually transcendental valuation extensions of the t -adic valuation on $\mathbb{R}((t))$. In order to achieve this, we also improve slightly on the well known local-global principle originally shown in [6]. More precisely, we show that the principle is in fact stronger than stated, and that the very proof in [6], if analysed closely, actually shows that the set of discrete valuations on F for the local-global principle can be reduced to the residually transcendental extension of the t -adic one. With all this, we will show in Theorem 6.1 that

$$[\mathcal{L}(F) : F^{\times 2}] \leq 2^g.$$

The index of $F^{\times 2}$ inside $(F^2 + F^2)^\times$ in a function field F is always infinite and thus not interesting, but since

$$F^{\times 2} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(F) \subseteq (F^2 + F^2)^\times,$$

we believe the local squares to be an interesting substitute, since moreover, $\mathcal{L}(F)$ can be related to the so called Kaplansky radical of F . This connection will be explored in an upcoming work.

We would like first and foremost thank K.J. Becher for his generous encouragement and discussions on this continuation of [2]. We would also like to thank Qing Liu for patiently answering questions of the first named author and make him aware of the crucial cohomological flatness property in residue characteristic zero. The first named author gratefully acknowledges support from *Universidad de Santiago de Chile, proyecto DICYT 042432G*, and the second named author gratefully acknowledges support from *Fondecyt ANID Postdoctoral Grant 3240191*.

2. SYMMETRIES IN GRAPHS

Let \mathcal{D} be a finite (undirected) graph, that is a finite set of vertices \mathcal{V} and a finite set of edges \mathcal{E} , given by the disjoint union of subsets $\mathcal{E}_{\{v,w\}}$ for every (unordered) pair of vertices $\{v,w\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, considered the set of edges between v and w . For a vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we call $\deg(v) := |\{w \in \mathcal{V} \mid \{v,w\} \in \mathcal{E}\}|$ the *degree of v* . We say that two vertices $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ are *path-connected* if there is a sequence of vertices $v = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n = w \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}} \neq \emptyset$ for each $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. We say that \mathcal{D} is *connected*, if any two of its vertices are path-connected.

We denote by

$$\beta(\mathcal{D}) := 1 - |\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|$$

the *Betti number* of \mathcal{D} . Let for the rest of this section \mathcal{D} always denote a finite connected graph. Note that $\beta(\mathcal{D}) \geq 0$ and $\beta(\mathcal{D}) = 0$ if and only if \mathcal{D} is a tree (i.e. simply path connected).

We call a finite connected graph \mathcal{D} together with a group action of a group G via graph automorphisms a G -graph. Let \mathcal{V}^G denote the set of fixed vertices by G and \mathcal{D}^G the full subgraph of \mathcal{D} spanned by \mathcal{V}^G . We will call a full subgraph $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{R}})$ of a G -graph \mathcal{D} a *rigidity of \mathcal{D}* if there exists a subgroup $H \leq G$ such that \mathcal{R} is a connected component of \mathcal{D}^H and if H is the full stabilizer subgroup in G for every $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Note that this makes H unique. We call H the *rigidifier group* for \mathcal{R} . Any two rigidities of \mathcal{D} are clearly disjoint. Note that every connected component of \mathcal{D}^G is a rigidity of the G -graph \mathcal{D} with rigidifier group G .

A rigidity that consists of exactly one vertex will also be called a *singular rigidity*. They will be of particular interest in the current article. By \mathcal{D}_G we denote the set of rigidities of the G -graph \mathcal{D} .

The following Proposition, two Lemmas, Theorem and Corollary, as well as their proofs are a straight forward adaptation and slight generalization of [2, Proposition 3.1, Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3, Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5], where the notion of a *pivot vertex* was introduced and studied, a special kind of singular rigidity.

2.1. Proposition. *If \mathcal{D} is a tree, then $|\mathcal{D}_G| \leq 1$.*

Proof. If $|\mathcal{V}| \leq 1$ the statement is trivial. Assume now that \mathcal{D} is a tree with $|\mathcal{V}| > 1$. Then \mathcal{D} has at least one vertex of degree 1. By removing all vertices of degree 1 from \mathcal{D} , we obtain a subtree \mathcal{D}' of \mathcal{D} with strictly fewer vertices than \mathcal{D} , while any rigidity of \mathcal{D} restricts to a rigidity of \mathcal{D}' . Hence the statement follows by induction on $|\mathcal{V}|$. \square

Note that the G -action on \mathcal{D} induces a G -action on \mathcal{D}_G . More precisely, if $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{D}_G$ is a rigidity with stabilizer H , then $g.\mathcal{R}$ is a rigidity with stabilizer gHg^{-1} , for any $g \in G$. We denote by \mathcal{D}_G^G the rigidities that are fixed under this action of G . Note that if $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{D}_G^G$, that is, if $g.\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}$ for every $g \in G$, then G is not necessarily the rigidifier of \mathcal{R} in G . If, however, \mathcal{R} is a singular rigidity, then indeed $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{D}_G^G$ implies that G is the rigidifier of \mathcal{R} .

2.2. Lemma. *Let $\mathcal{D}_G^G \neq \emptyset$. Then $|\mathcal{D}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 1$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R}_0 \in \mathcal{D}_G$. We will show that $|\mathcal{D}_G \setminus \{\mathcal{R}_0\}| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D})$. For $v \in \mathcal{V}$ let $d(v)$ denote the distance between v and \mathcal{R}_0 , that is, the smallest $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that there exist $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_r \in \mathcal{V}$ with $\{v_{i-1}, v_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ where $v_r = v$ and $v_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0$. Note that $d(gv) = d(v)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $g \in G$.

The proof of the statement is by induction on $|\mathcal{E}|$. If $|\mathcal{E}| = 0$, then $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{R}_0 = \{v_0\}$ and the statement holds trivially. Assume now that $|\mathcal{E}| \geq 1$. We set $m = \max\{d(v) \mid v \in \mathcal{V}\}$, $\mathcal{M} = \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid d(v) = m\}$ and $\mathcal{E}^* = \mathcal{E} \cap \{\{w, w'\} \mid w, w' \in \mathcal{M}\}$.

We first consider the case where $\mathcal{E}^* \neq \emptyset$. We set $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}^*$ and consider the graph $\mathcal{D}' = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}')$. Note that \mathcal{D}' is connected, $\beta(\mathcal{D}') < \beta(\mathcal{D})$, and the G -action on \mathcal{D} restricts to a G -action on \mathcal{D}' . Furthermore, every rigidity of \mathcal{D} , after removing edges from \mathcal{E}^* , either remains connected and hence remains a single rigidity of \mathcal{D}' , or it decomposes in several components, each of which gives a rigidity on \mathcal{D}' . Since $|\mathcal{E}'| < |\mathcal{E}|$, we therefore obtain by the induction hypothesis that $|\mathcal{D}_G \setminus \{\mathcal{R}_0\}| \leq |\mathcal{D}'_G \setminus \{\mathcal{R}_0\}| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}') < \beta(\mathcal{D})$.

We now consider the case where $\mathcal{E}^* = \emptyset$. Set $\mathcal{V}' = \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{M}$. We consider the graph $\mathcal{D}' = (\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{E}')$ where $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \cap \{\{v, v'\} \mid v, v' \in \mathcal{V}'\}$ (i.e. the full subgraph of \mathcal{D} spanned by \mathcal{V}'). Note that \mathcal{D}' is connected, $\beta(\mathcal{D}') \leq \beta(\mathcal{D})$, the G -action on \mathcal{D} restricts to a G -action on \mathcal{D}' , and every rigidity of \mathcal{D} that contains a vertex in \mathcal{V}' restricts to at least one rigidity of \mathcal{D}' . Since $\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$ we have that $|\mathcal{E}'| < |\mathcal{E}|$. Hence, the induction hypothesis yields that $|\mathcal{D}'_G \setminus \{\mathcal{R}_0\}| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}')$. Let \mathcal{M}_G denote the set of (necessarily singular) rigidities of \mathcal{D}_G that contain no vertex in \mathcal{V}' . Then $|\mathcal{D}_G \setminus \{\mathcal{R}_0\}| \leq |\mathcal{D}'_G \setminus \{\mathcal{R}_0\}| + |\mathcal{M}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}') + |\mathcal{M}_G|$. Since $\mathcal{E}^* = \emptyset$, we have

$|\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}'| = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{M}} \deg(w)$ and therefore $\beta(\mathcal{D}) - \beta(\mathcal{D}') = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{M}} (\deg(w) - 1)$. Since every vertex in \mathcal{M}_G has degree at least 2, we obtain that $\beta(\mathcal{D}) - \beta(\mathcal{D}') \geq |\mathcal{M}_G|$. Hence we conclude that $|\mathcal{D}_G \setminus \{R_0\}| \leq |(\mathcal{D}'_G) \setminus \{R_0\}| + |\mathcal{M}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D})$. \square

2.3. Lemma. $|\{\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{D}_G \mid \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap Gv = \emptyset\}| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}) + |Gv| - 1$ for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proof. If $v \in \mathcal{V}^G$, then in particular $|Gv| = 1$, so the statement of the Lemma coincides with the statement of Lemma 2.2. Suppose now that $v \notin \mathcal{V}^G$. We then apply Lemma 2.2 to a graph obtained from \mathcal{D} by adding one vertex and connecting it with all vertices in Gv : Let v_0 denote an extra vertex, not contained in \mathcal{V} , and set $\mathcal{V}_0 = \mathcal{V} \cup \{v_0\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E} \cup \{\{v_0, gv\} \mid g \in G\}$. We obtain that $\mathcal{D}_0 = (\mathcal{E}_0, \mathcal{V}_0)$ is a connected graph with $\beta(\mathcal{D}_0) = \beta(\mathcal{D}) + |Gv| - 1$. By letting $gv_0 = v_0$ for all $g \in G$ we extend the G -action on \mathcal{D} to a G -action on \mathcal{D}_0 . Note that if $v \notin \mathcal{V}^G$, then none of the vertices in $G.v$ is part of a rigidity in \mathcal{D}_0 , and $\{v_0\}$ is a rigidity in \mathcal{D}_0 . Otherwise The connected component of \mathcal{D}_0^G that contains v_0 and v is a rigidity of \mathcal{D}_0 , and every vertex $G.v$ is contained in at most one rigidity of \mathcal{D} . This explains the stated inequality in the case where $v \notin \mathcal{V}^G$. \square

We denote by $G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G$ the set of G -orbits in \mathcal{D}_G , i.e. the set of G -orbits of G -rigidities in the G -graph \mathcal{D} .

2.4. Theorem. Assume that $\mathcal{D}_G \neq \emptyset$. Let $d = \min\{|G.\mathcal{R}| \mid \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{D}_G\}$. Then $|\mathcal{D}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 2d - 1$. Furthermore,

$$\left| G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G \right| \leq \frac{1}{d}(\beta(\mathcal{D}) - 1) + 2.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R}_0 \in \mathcal{D}_G$ such that $\{g.\mathcal{R}_0 \mid g \in G\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_G$ is a subset of cardinality d . It follows by Lemma 2.3 that

$$|\mathcal{D}_G| = |\mathcal{D}_G \setminus G.\mathcal{R}_0| + d \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 2d - 1.$$

Then $|G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G| \cdot d \leq |\mathcal{D}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 2d - 1$ and hence $|G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G| \leq \frac{1}{d}(\beta(\mathcal{D}) - 1) + 2$. \square

2.5. Corollary. $\left| G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G \right| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 1$, and if equality holds then $\mathcal{D}_G^G = \mathcal{D}_G$ or $\beta(\mathcal{D}) = 1$ and $\mathcal{D}_G^G = \emptyset$.

Proof. We assume that $\mathcal{D}_G \neq \emptyset$, because otherwise there is nothing to show. Set $d = \min\{|G.\mathcal{R}| \mid \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{D}_G\}$. Note that $d = 1$ if and only if $\mathcal{D}_G^G \neq \emptyset$.

So let us first assume that $d \geq 2$. By Theorem 2.4, we have that $|G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G| \leq \frac{1}{d}(\beta(\mathcal{D}) - 1) + 2$. If $\beta(\mathcal{D}) \geq 2$ then $\frac{1}{d}(\beta(\mathcal{D}) - 1) + 2 < \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 1$, whereby $|G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D})$. If $\beta(\mathcal{D}) = 1$ then $|G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G| \leq 2 = \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 1$. If $\beta(\mathcal{D}) = 0$, then \mathcal{D} is a tree, and as $\mathcal{D}_G \neq \emptyset$, it follows by Proposition 2.1 that $|\mathcal{D}_G| = 1 = \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 1$, in particular $\mathcal{D}_G = \mathcal{D}_G^G$.

Assume finally that $d = 1$. It follows by Lemma 2.2 that $|\mathcal{D}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 1$, whereby in particular $|G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D})$ if G acts nontrivially on \mathcal{D}_G , so $|G \setminus \mathcal{D}_G| = \beta(\mathcal{D}) + 1$ implies that $\mathcal{D}_G = \mathcal{D}_G^G$. \square

A bipartite graph is a graph that allows a coloring of the vertices by two colors, say cyan and purple, such that every edge is between vertices of distinct color.

Let us from now on assume that the connected graph $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is bipartite and such that every purple vertex has degree 2.

Let $\mathcal{D}' = (\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{E}')$ be another bipartite finite graph. A *morphism* $\varphi : \mathcal{D}' \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ of bipartite finite graphs $\mathcal{D} =$ and $\mathcal{D}' =$ is a color-respecting map $\varphi : \mathcal{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ on the set of vertices such that $\{\varphi(v), \varphi(w)\} \in \mathcal{E}$ whenever $\{v, w\} \in \mathcal{E}'$. We say that φ is an *epimorphism* if $\varphi : \mathcal{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is surjective and for every edge $v', w' \in \mathcal{E}'$ there is $v, w \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\varphi(v) = v'$ and $\varphi(w) = w'$.

Write $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{V}' = \mathcal{C}' \cup \mathcal{P}'$, where $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'$ denote the for the set of cyan and vertices and $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'$ the set of purple vertices, respectively.

For $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ set $e_\Gamma = |\varphi^{-1}(\Gamma)|$. For $x \in \mathcal{P}$ set $i_x = |\varphi^{-1}(x)|$. Moreover, using the fact that for every $x \in \mathcal{P}$ there exist exactly two cyan vertices $\Gamma, \tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\{x, \Gamma\}, \{x, \tilde{\Gamma}\} \in \mathcal{E}$, and we set $e_x = \frac{1}{2}(e_\Gamma + e_{\tilde{\Gamma}})$.

2.6. Lemma. *Assume that \mathcal{D}' is connected. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{D}' \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be an epimorphism of bipartite graphs such that for every $x \in \mathcal{P}$ we have that $i_x \geq e_\Gamma$ for every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\{x, \Gamma\} \in \mathcal{E}$. Then $\beta(\mathcal{D}) \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}')$.*

Proof. If $\beta(\mathcal{D}) = 0$, there is nothing to show. Hence, we may assume that \mathcal{D} is not a tree. Since for every purple vertex in \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' there are two edges, we have that $\beta(\mathcal{D}) = |\mathcal{P}| - |\mathcal{C}| + 1$ and $\beta(\mathcal{D}') = |\mathcal{P}'| - |\mathcal{C}'| + 1$. In order to show $\beta(\mathcal{D}) \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}')$, we need to show that $|\mathcal{C}'| - |\mathcal{C}| \leq |\mathcal{P}'| - |\mathcal{P}|$. We first show this in the case where every cyan vertex in \mathcal{D} has degree at least 2, and we will not require \mathcal{D}' to be connected in this case. We clearly have that

$$|\mathcal{P}'| - |\mathcal{P}| = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{P}} (i_x - 1) \geq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{P}} (e_x - 1) \geq \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}} (e_\Gamma - 1) = |\mathcal{C}'| - |\mathcal{C}|.$$

We will now prove the statement for the general situation where \mathcal{D} is connected but not a tree, without requiring \mathcal{D}' to be connected, by induction on the number of vertices of \mathcal{D} . If every cyan vertex in \mathcal{D} has degree at least 2, we do not need to involve the induction hypothesis. Otherwise, let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ be a cyan vertex of degree one, and $x \in \mathcal{P}$ its unique purple neighbouring vertex. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ denote the full subgraph of \mathcal{D} spanned by all vertices except for Γ and x , and let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}'}$ denote the full subgraph of \mathcal{D}' spanned by all vertices except $\varphi^{-1}(\Gamma)$ and $\varphi^{-1}(x)$. Since both graphs are bipartite, and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is connected, and the restriction $\varphi : \tilde{\mathcal{D}'} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is an epimorphism, we have by induction hypothesis that

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{C}'}| - |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}| \leq |\tilde{\mathcal{P}'}| - |\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|,$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \tilde{\mathcal{C}'}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}'}$ denote the set of cyan and purple vertices in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}, \tilde{\mathcal{D}'}$, respectively. On the other hand, we clearly have that $|\mathcal{C}'| - |\mathcal{C}| = |\tilde{\mathcal{C}'}| - |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}| + e_\Gamma - 1$ and $|\mathcal{P}'| - |\mathcal{P}| = |\tilde{\mathcal{P}'}| - |\tilde{\mathcal{P}}| + i_x - 1$. The inequality $|\tilde{\mathcal{C}'}| - |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}| \leq |\tilde{\mathcal{P}'}| - |\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|$ now follows from the assumption that $i_x \geq e_\Gamma$. \square

3. GALOIS-SYMMETRIES IN THE REDUCTION OF A REGULAR MODEL WITH NORMAL CROSSINGS

For this section, let K be a field of characteristic zero, $T \subseteq K$ a discrete valuation ring of K and F/K a function field in one variable, that is, a finitely generated field extension of transcendence degree one. Suppose moreover that K is relatively algebraically closed in F .

Given a discrete valuation ring T of K with residue field k , we call a regular 2-dimensional integral regular scheme \mathcal{X} together with a flat projective morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(T)$ a *regular model for F/T* , if the function field of \mathcal{X} is K -isomorphic to F . We denote by $\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{X} \times_T K$ the *generic fiber of \mathcal{X} over T* and by $\mathcal{X}_s = \mathcal{X} \times_T k$ the *special fiber of \mathcal{X} over T* . Note that the morphism $\mathcal{X}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ given by projection is an open immersion, and the morphism $\mathcal{X}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a closed immersion. By [16, Lemma 3.2.14], \mathcal{X}_0 is a geometrically integral regular projective curve over K and \mathcal{X}_s is a geometrically connected projective curve over k by [16, Corollary 8.3.6]. We call \mathcal{X} a *regular model with normal crossings for F/T* if the special fiber \mathcal{X}_s , seen as a divisor of \mathcal{X} , is a normal crossings divisor, that is, if it has normal crossing at every closed point $P \in \mathcal{X}$, that is, if the irreducible factors of the element in the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},P}$ of \mathcal{X} at P that defines the pull-back of the divisor \mathcal{X}_s in $\mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},P})$ forms part of a minimal set of generators of the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X},P}$ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},P}$. Since $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$, a regular model for F/T with normal crossings exists, see [16, Proposition 10.1.8].

From now on, let \mathcal{X} denote a fixed regular model with normal crossing of F/T . We recall that the generic point of every irreducible component Γ of \mathcal{X}_s is of codimension one in \mathcal{X} , whereby its local ring defines a discrete valuation ring of F centered in T in K , and hence it defines a discrete valuation v_Γ on F extending the discrete valuation $v_T : K^\times \rightarrow K^\times/\mathcal{O}^\times \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ on K induced by T . Moreover, the residue field of each v_Γ is k -isomorphic to the function field $k(\Gamma)$ of Γ , and thereby a non-algebraic field extension of k . We denote by $\Omega_T(F)$ the set of all valuation extensions of v_T whose residue field is a non-algebraic extension of k . Note that by [3, Proposition 3.1], the residue field κ_w of any $w \in \Omega_T(F)$ is a function field in one variable over k . We denote by ℓ_w the relative algebraic closure of k in κ_w , and we say that κ_w/ℓ_w *admits a rational place* if there exists a valuation on κ_w that is trivial on ℓ_w and with residue field ℓ_w , or equivalently, if the smooth projective curve C over ℓ_w with function field κ_w/ℓ_w admits an ℓ_w -rational point. We set

$$\Omega_T^{\mathrm{rat}}(F) := \{w \in \Omega_T(F) \mid \kappa_w/\ell_w \text{ admits a rational place}\}.$$

3.1. Remark. Let $w \in \Omega_T(F)$ be such that $w \neq v_\Gamma$ for some irreducible component Γ of \mathcal{X}_s . Then, by [3, Proposition 3.7], we have that $\kappa_w \simeq \ell(t)$ for some finite extension ℓ/k and a transcendental element t over ℓ . In particular $g(\kappa_w/K) = 0$ and $w \in \Omega_T^{\mathrm{rat}}(F)$.

For every closed connected subscheme $C \subset \mathcal{X}_s$, the *dual graph of C* is defined in [16, Definition 10.1.48] as the graph whose vertices correspond to the irreducible components of C , and between any two distinct irreducible components Γ_1, Γ_2 of C , the set of edges between both vertices is defined to be the intersection number $\Gamma_1 \cdot \Gamma_2 := \sum_{P \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2} (\Gamma_1 \cdot \Gamma_2)_P$, where $(\Gamma_1 \cdot \Gamma_2)_P = \text{length}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},P}/(p_1, p_2))$, where $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},P}$ are irreducible elements that define Γ_1 and Γ_2 locally. In our case, since \mathcal{X}_s has normal crossings, the local intersection number at a point P where any two irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_s intersect is one and zero in any other point on the special fiber, see [16, Proposition 9.1.8]. In particular, the local parameters of the irreducible components at P generate the maximal ideal of the local ring at P , and at most two irreducible components of C intersect at P , so every edge of the dual graph between vertices corresponds to a unique intersection point. Hence, we adapt the notion of the dual graph slightly by assigning a colour, say cyan, to the vertices corresponding to irreducible components and introducing an additional set of vertices of a different color, say purple, where a purple vertex corresponds to an intersection point between two irreducible components, and the edges are formed by pairs consisting of an irreducible component Γ of C together with an intersection point of Γ with a distinct irreducible component of C . This way we define a *bipartite dual graph $\mathcal{D}(C)$* , which topologically is essentially equivalent to the normal (non-bipartite) dual graph of C , in particular it has the same Betti number. Note that all purple vertices in this graph have degree 2.

Let T' be a maximal unramified valuation ring extension of T inside an algebraic closure of K . Denote by K' and k' field of fraction and residue field of T' respectively. We denote $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X} \times_T T'$.

3.2. Lemma. *\mathcal{X}' is a regular model with normal crossings for FK'/T' . Moreover $\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)) \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s))$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{X} is flat projective over T , we have that \mathcal{X}' is flat projective over T' , by [16, Corollary 3.3.32] and [16, Proposition 4.3.3, (e)]. As $\mathcal{X}'_0 \simeq_{K'} \mathcal{X}_0 \times_K K'$ and $\mathcal{X}'_s \simeq_{k'} \mathcal{X}_s \times_k k'$, we have that both are curves over K' and k' , respectively, by [16, Proposition 3.2.7]. Hence $\dim(\mathcal{X}') = 2$. We claim furthermore that \mathcal{X}' is regular. By [16, Corollary 4.2.17] it is enough to show regularity only for closed points. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}_s \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a closed point. Since T' is an unramified extension of T , the projection $\pi : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is unramified by [16, Proposition 4.3.22]. Hence $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X}',x} = \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X},\pi(x)} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}',x}$, whereby the regularity of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\pi(x)}$, implies the regularity of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}',x}$. To show that furthermore \mathcal{X}' has normal crossings at x , let $t \in T$ denote a uniformizer of T . Since the closed subscheme \mathcal{X}_s of \mathcal{X} can be defined by the sheaf of ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ generated by t , we have by the normal crossing property of \mathcal{X} at $p(x)$ that $t = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2}$ for some $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and some irreducible elements $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\pi(x)}$ that generate the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X},\pi(x)}$. Since t is also a uniformizer of T' , we have that \mathcal{X}'_s is the closed subscheme of \mathcal{X}' defined by the sheaf of ideal generated by t in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'}$. Considering the equality $t = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}',x}$, and the fact that p_1 and p_2 also generate the maximal ideal

$\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X}',x}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}',x}$, we conclude that \mathcal{X}'_s has normal crossing at x . The base change $\pi_s : \mathcal{X}'_s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_s$ of π induces a epimorphism $\varphi : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ of bipartite connected graphs. Recall that since both special fibers have normal crossing in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' , respectively, we have that every purple vertex in either graph has degree two. Moreover, if Γ is an irreducible component of \mathcal{X}_s and $x \in \Gamma$ a point of intersection with another irreducible component, then we have that $\ell_\Gamma \subseteq \kappa(x)$, and thus in view of Lemma 2.6 that $i_x = [\kappa(x) : k] \geq [\ell_\Gamma : k] = e_\Gamma$, whereby $\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)) \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s))$. \square

Let G denote the absolute Galois group of k . It acts naturally by k -scheme automorphisms on \mathcal{X}'_s via the canonical identification $\mathcal{X}'_s \simeq \mathcal{X}_s \times_k k'$. In particular, G acts on the set of irreducible components and on the set of intersection points of distinct irreducible components. This also induces naturally a Galois action on the bipartite dual graph $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$.

We will now apply the general graph-theoretic symmetry considerations from the previous section to the dual graph $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$. We endow any closed connected subset $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}_s$ with its induced reduced subscheme structure (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) , and we set $\ell_Y := H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$, i.e. the ring of global regular functions on Y . Since Y is connected and reduced, we have that ℓ_Y is a finite field extension of k , see [16, Corollary 3.3.21]. We denote by \mathcal{E}_Y the set of k -embeddings $\sigma : \ell_Y \rightarrow k'$.

3.3. Lemma. *For any closed connected subset Y of \mathcal{X}_s , we have that*

$$Y \times_k k' \simeq \bigsqcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_Y} Y \times_{(\ell_Y, \sigma)} k',$$

is a disjoint union of distinct closed connected subschemes $Y'_\sigma = Y \times_{(\ell_Y, \sigma)} k'$ of \mathcal{X}'_s . The natural G -action on \mathcal{X}'_s induces a transitive G -action on $\{Y'_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_Y\}$ corresponding to the natural G -action on \mathcal{E}_Y with stabilizers $\text{stab}_{Y'_\sigma} = \text{Gal}(k'/\sigma(\ell_Y))$ for $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_Y$. Moreover, if Y is irreducible, then so is Y'_σ for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_Y$.

Proof. The reduced closed subscheme Y has a natural structure over ℓ_Y , and by [22, Lemma 0FD1], we have that $Y \times_{\ell_Y, \sigma} k'$ is connected for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_Y$. If Y is irreducible, then ℓ_Y coincides with the relative algebraic closure of k in the function field of Y , since Y is smooth by the normal crossing hypothesis on \mathcal{X}_s and thus (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) is a normal curve.

Let $U = \text{Spec}(A)$ be an arbitrary open dense affine subscheme of Y . Then A is a finitely generated k -algebra, and thus in particular finitely generated as an ℓ_Y -algebra. In case Y (and hence U) is irreducible, we have that A is an integral domain and ℓ_Y is relatively algebraically closed in A , whereby $A \otimes_{\ell_Y, \sigma} k'$ is a domain, thus $Y \times_{\ell_Y, \sigma} k'$ is irreducible, for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_Y$.

In order to study the Galois action on $Y \times_k k'$, it is enough to study it on $U \times_k k'$. The latter given by the spectrum of

$$A \otimes_k k' = (A \otimes_{\ell_Y} \ell_Y) \otimes_k k' = A \otimes_{\ell_Y} (\ell_Y \otimes_k k') = A \otimes_{\ell_Y} \prod_{i=1}^n k',$$

where $n = [\ell_Y : k]$ and $\prod_{i=1}^n k'$ is considered as an ℓ_Y -algebra via the diagonal embedding $x \mapsto (\sigma_1(x), \dots, \sigma_n(x))$ of ℓ_Y with $\mathcal{E}_Y = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$. Hence, $A \otimes_k k' \simeq \prod_{i=1}^n A \otimes_{\ell_Y, \sigma_i} k'$. The natural action of G on $A \otimes_k k'$ where $\sigma \in G$ acts via $\text{id}_A \otimes \sigma$, induces an action on $\prod_{i=1}^n A \otimes_{\ell_Y, \tau} k'$ where $\sigma \in G$ acts on (x_1, \dots, x_n) by $\sigma \cdot (x_1, \dots, x_n) = (\sigma(x_{\sigma(1)}), \dots, \sigma(x_{\sigma(n)}))$, where by $\sigma(i)$ we denote the index j such that $\sigma_j = \sigma \circ \sigma_i$. In particular G induces a transitive permutation action of the set of Cartesian factors. The stabilizer subgroup in G of the Cartesian factor $A \otimes_{\ell_Y, \sigma_i} k'$ is $\text{Gal}(k'/\sigma_i(\ell_Y))$. Since $U \subseteq Y$ was an arbitrary open subscheme of Y , we conclude that $Y \times_{\ell_Y, \sigma_i} k'$ and $Y \times_{\ell_Y, \sigma_j} k'$ are disjoint in $Y \times_k k'$ and thus in \mathcal{X}'_s . \square

3.4. Proposition. *The set of G -orbits of cyan G -rigidities of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$ is in bijection with the set of reduced connected closed sub-curves Y of \mathcal{X}_s which satisfy the following properties:*

There exists a finite normal field extension ℓ/ℓ_Y such that

- (i) $\ell \simeq_k \ell_\Gamma$ for every irreducible component Γ of Y and,
- (ii) The complement in Y of all intersection points P between distinct irreducible components such that $\ell \not\subseteq k(P)$, is connected.
- (iii) If Δ is an irreducible component of \mathcal{X}_s such that $\Delta(\ell) \cap Y(\ell) \neq \emptyset$, then $\Delta \subset Y$.

Under this bijection, the G -rigidities of a G -orbit are singular if and only if Y is irreducible.

Proof. Let Y be a closed reduced connected subcurve of \mathcal{X}_s satisfying the properties and let $Y' = Y \times_k k'$. By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$Y' = \bigsqcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_Y} Y \times_{\ell_Y, \tau} k',$$

is a decomposition in connected components where \mathcal{E}_Y denote the distinct k -embeddings of ℓ_Y into k' . Moreover, the natural G -action on $Y' = Y \times_k k'$ is the restriction of the natural G -action of \mathcal{X}'_s and its induced action on the set of connected components $Y \times_{\ell_Y, \tau} k'$ corresponds to the natural G -action on the index-set \mathcal{E}_Y , which is transitive. We are thus left to show that for each k -embedding $\tau : \ell_Y \rightarrow k'$, the connected component $Y'_\tau := Y \times_{(\ell_Y, \tau)} k'$ of $Y \times_k k'$ corresponds to a G -rigidity of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$ with stabilizer $\text{Gal}(k'/\tau(\ell_Y))$ and rigidifier $\text{Gal}(k'/\tau(\ell))$ for some the unique homomorphic continuation $\tau : \ell \rightarrow k'$ of $\tau : \ell_Y \rightarrow k'$. Property (iii) guaranties that $Y \times_{\ell_Y, \tau} k'$ defines a full connected component in the invariant subgraph of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$ under $\text{Gal}(k'/\tau(\ell))$, and (i) and (ii) furthermore characterize that is indeed a G -rigidity, as is clear from Lemma 3.3.

Now assume conversely that Y'_1, \dots, Y'_d are connected curves of \mathcal{X}'_s that corresponds to a G -orbit of G -rigidities. Then, for the corresponding connected closed subcurve Y in \mathcal{X}_s , we can identify ℓ_Y with the fixed subfield in k' of the stabilizer subgroup $\text{stab}_G(Y'_1)$ of G . Let $H \subseteq \text{stab}_G(Y'_1)$ be the rigidifier of Y'_1 and let ℓ denote its fixed field in k' . We are left to show that ℓ/ℓ_Y is normal.

For the closed immersion $\iota_\Gamma : \Gamma \hookrightarrow Y$ of an irreducible component of Y let $\iota_\Gamma^* : \ell_Y \hookrightarrow \ell_\Gamma$ be the corresponding k -embedding, and for the closed immersion of a closed point $\iota_{\Gamma,P} : \{P\} \hookrightarrow \Gamma$ let $\iota_{\Gamma,P}^* : \ell_\Gamma \rightarrow k(P)$ denote the corresponding k -embedding. These homomorphisms fit together in such a way that if P is a point of intersection for two irreducible components Γ_1 and Γ_2 of Y , then $\iota_{\Gamma_1,P} \circ \iota_{\Gamma_1} = \iota_{\Gamma_2,P} \circ \iota_{\Gamma_2}$.

Considering that Y is connected, the irreducible components of Y together with the closed point of intersections of distinct irreducible components yield a large connected commutative diagram where ℓ_Y can be identified with the pushout of this diagram, that is, an element of $x \in \ell_Y$ corresponds to a tuple

$$(x_\Gamma)_{\Gamma \subseteq Y \text{ irr.}} \in \prod_{\substack{\Gamma \subseteq Y \\ \text{irr.}}} \ell_\Gamma$$

with the matching property that for any two irreducible components $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \subseteq Y$ with nonempty intersection and every $P_{\{1,2\}} \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$ we have $\iota_{\Gamma_1, P_{\{1,2\}}}^*(x_{\Gamma_1}) = \iota_{\Gamma_2, P_{\{1,2\}}}^*(x_{\Gamma_2})$. We have that $\Gamma \times_k k' = \prod_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_\Gamma} \Gamma \times_{\ell_\Gamma, \sigma} k'$, and $\Gamma \times_{\ell_\Gamma, \sigma} k'$ is an irreducible component of $Y \times_{\ell_Y, \tau} k'$ for every k -embedding $\sigma : \ell_\Gamma \rightarrow k'$ such that $\sigma \circ \iota_\Gamma^* = \tau$.

The stabilizer subgroup of one of the connected components of Y' , say $Y \times_{h, \tau} k'$, is clearly $\text{Gal}(k'/\tau(\ell_Y))$. Let us identify ℓ_Y a priori inside of k' and τ as the identity inclusion. Let $x \in \ell_Y = H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$. Clearly, for every irreducible component Γ of Y , the closed immersion $\iota_\Gamma : \Gamma \hookrightarrow Y$ yields a homomorphism $\iota_\Gamma^* : \ell_Y = H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) \rightarrow H^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_\Gamma) = \ell_\Gamma$, and so by setting $x_\Gamma := \iota_\Gamma^*(x)$, we obtain tuple with the corresponding matching property. Conversely, we every tuple $(x_\Gamma)_\Gamma$ with $x_\Gamma \in \ell_\Gamma$ with the matching property defines an element $x \in \ell_Y = H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$. Note that by assumption $k(P_{\{1,2\}}) \simeq_k \ell \simeq_k H^0(\Gamma_i, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_i})$ for $i = 1, 2$, whereby $\iota_{\Gamma_i, P_{\{1,2\}}}$ are isomorphisms. Fixing one irreducible component $\Gamma_0 \in Y$, and identifying $\ell = H^0(\Gamma_0, \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_0})$, we can thus identify $H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ as the set of elements $x \in \ell$ such that for any closed path $\gamma = (\Gamma_0, P_{\{0,1\}}, \Gamma_1, P_{\{1,2\}}, \dots, P_{\{n-1,n\}}, \Gamma_n, P_{\{n,0\}}, \Gamma_0)$ in the connected subgraph of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ corresponding to Y , we have $\sigma_\gamma(x) = x$ where

$$\sigma_\gamma = \left(\iota_{\Gamma_0, P_{\{0,1\}}} \circ \iota_{\Gamma_1, P_{\{0,1\}}}^{-1} \right) \circ \dots \circ \left(\iota_{\Gamma_n, P_{\{0,n\}}} \circ \iota_{\Gamma_0, P_{\{0,n\}}}^{-1} \right)$$

is an k -automorphism of ℓ . Hence, $\ell_Y \subseteq \ell$ is the subfield of invariants of a set of automorphisms of ℓ , and hence ℓ/ℓ_Y is a Galois extension. \square

Let $N(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s))$ denote the number of G -orbits of cyan singular G -rigidities $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$. Denote

$$\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) := \{ \Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{X}_s \mid \Gamma \text{ irreducible component} \},$$

and

$$\Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s) := \{ \Gamma \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \mid \exists \tilde{\Gamma} \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \{ \Gamma \} : \Gamma(\ell_\Gamma) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\ell_\Gamma) \neq \emptyset \},$$

i.e. the set of irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_s that intersect some other irreducible component of \mathcal{X}_s in a point that is rational for the first mentioned component. With this notation, we obtain directly from the second part of Proposition 3.4 the following:

3.5. Corollary. $N(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)) = |\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)|$.

We say that a property \mathcal{P} of fields *satisfies going up* if for any place $M \dashrightarrow L$ (i.e. a homomorphism $M \hookrightarrow L$ or the residue homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_M \rightarrow L$ of a valuation ring \mathcal{O}_M of M with residue field L), we have that $\mathcal{P}(M)$ implies $\mathcal{P}(L)$. We say that the property \mathcal{P} *satisfies going down* if $\mathcal{P}(L)$ implies $\mathcal{P}(M)$.

3.6. Example. the field property $\mathcal{P} = \text{“is nonreal”}$, i.e. “ -1 is a sum of squares in the field”, satisfies going up. The empty property, say $\mathcal{P} = \text{“}1 \neq 0\text{”}$, also satisfies going up.

Let \mathcal{P} be a property of fields that satisfies going up for field extensions. Then its negation $\neg\mathcal{P}$ satisfies going down for field extensions. We say that a finite field extension ℓ/k is $\neg\mathcal{P}$ -*minimal in* \mathcal{X}_s if $\neg\mathcal{P}(\ell)$ is true and $\mathcal{X}_s(\ell) \neq \emptyset$, and if furthermore $\mathcal{X}_s(\tilde{\ell}) = \emptyset$ for every proper subfield $\tilde{\ell} \subsetneq \ell$ containing k . We denote

$$\Omega_T^{\mathcal{P}}(F) := \{w \in \Omega_T(F) \mid \mathcal{P}(\kappa_w) \text{ is true}\}$$

and

$$\Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) := \{\Gamma \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \mid \forall \ell/k : \Gamma(\ell) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\ell)\}.$$

3.7. Remark. If $\Gamma \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s)$ is such that $v_{\Gamma} \in \Omega_T^{\mathcal{P}}(F)$, then $\Gamma \in \Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$.

3.8. Lemma. *Let \mathcal{P} denote a field property that satisfies going up. Then*

$$|\Omega_T^{\mathcal{P}}(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| \leq |\Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)| \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)) + 1.$$

Moreover, these inequalities are strict in the following cases:

(i) *If there exists $\Gamma \in \Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ such that $\Gamma(\ell_{\Gamma}) \neq \emptyset$ then*

$$|\Omega_T^{\mathcal{P}}(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| < |\Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)|.$$

(ii) *If there exist $\Gamma \neq \tilde{\Gamma} \in \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ with $\Gamma(\ell) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\ell) \neq \emptyset$ for a finite field extension ℓ/k that is $\neg\mathcal{P}$ -minimal in \mathcal{X}_s , then*

$$|\Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)| < \beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)) + 1.$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from Remark 3.1, and obviously the inequality is strict if there exists $\Gamma \in \Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ such that $\Gamma(\ell_{\Gamma}) \neq \emptyset$.

For the second inequality, we observe that $\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ corresponds exactly to the set of G -orbits of singular cyan G -rigidities in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$, by the second part of Proposition 3.4. Hence, the second inequality follows from Corollary 2.5, with obvious strictness of the inequality if there exists $\Gamma \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus (\Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \cup \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s))$. Assuming this is not the case, i.e. that $\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s) = \Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$, we

also see easily from Corollary 2.5 that strictness of the inequality holds, whenever $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)$ contains a nonsingular G -rigidity. So we will additionally assume that this is not the case. Let us consider first the case $\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)) \neq 1$. According to Corollary 2.5, supposing equality instead of inequality for the sake of contradiction, implies in this case that $\ell_{\Gamma'} = k$ for all $\Gamma' \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$. Recall that by the hypothesis of (ii) there is a finite extension ℓ/k that is $\neg\mathcal{P}$ -minimal in \mathcal{X}_s , as well as $\Gamma, \tilde{\Gamma} \in \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ together with $P \in \Gamma(\ell) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\ell)$. Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}_s$ be a maximal connected closed subcurve containing Γ and $\tilde{\Gamma}$, such that every irreducible component Γ' of Y satisfies $\ell_{\Gamma'} \simeq \ell$, and such that Y remains connected after removing all closed points Q with $\ell \subsetneq \kappa(Q)$. So, (i) and (ii) of Proposition 3.4 are automatically satisfied for Y . Let Δ be an irreducible component of \mathcal{X}_s such that $\Delta(\ell) \cap Y(\ell) \neq \emptyset$. In particular, $\Delta \notin \Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$. On the other hand, $\ell_{\Delta} \subseteq \ell$ and thus satisfies $\neq \mathcal{P}(\ell_{\Delta})$. If the inclusion were proper, this would imply that $\Delta \notin \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$, by $\neg\mathcal{P}$ -minimality of ℓ , but we are assuming that $\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s) = \Omega^{-\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$, so $\ell_{\Delta} = \ell$, and thus Γ is a component of Y . However, by Proposition 3.4, this leads to the contradiction that Y corresponds to a G -orbit of non-singular G -rigidities.

Under the previous assumptions, let us now consider the case where $\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)) = 1$. According to Corollary 2.5, supposing equality instead of inequality for the sake of contradiction, implies in this case that $\ell_{\Gamma'} \neq k$ for both $\Gamma' \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$. Let again ℓ/k be $\neg\mathcal{P}$ -minimal in \mathcal{X}_s , and $\Gamma \neq \tilde{\Gamma} \in \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ that $\Gamma(\ell) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\ell) \neq \emptyset$, as guaranteed by the hypothesis of (ii), whereby $\ell_{\Gamma} = \ell_{\tilde{\Gamma}} = \ell$. Let again $Y \subset \mathcal{X}_s$ be a closed connected subcurve that contains Γ and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and which is maximal with respect to the property that $\ell_{\Gamma'} = \ell$ for every irreducible component Γ' of Y and such that Y remains connected after removing all intersection points between distinct components that are not ℓ -rational. Since by assumption Y cannot correspond to a non-singular G -rigidity, there must exist a irreducible component Δ of \mathcal{X}_s such that $\Delta(\ell) \cap Y(\ell) \neq \emptyset$ but $\ell_{\Delta} \subsetneq \ell$. By the $\neg\mathcal{P}$ -minimality of ℓ , we conclude that $\Delta \notin \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$, but on the other hand, we also have clearly that $\Delta \notin \Omega^{-\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$, which contradicts the previous assumption that $\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s) = \Omega^{-\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$. \square

3.9. Remark. In this article, the only meaningful application of Lemma 3.8 is for either the empty property or for the property “being non-real”. Nevertheless we choose to state it in the abstract framing, since on the one hand it potentially allows for a more direct application in future articles, and on the other hand it helps to expose the necessity of certain subtleties in the definition of G -rigidity.

4. ARITHMETIC GENUS INEQUALITIES IN RESIDUE CHARACTERISTIC ZERO

Let us first recall the definition of the *arithmetic genus for an algebraic curve C over a field ℓ* , which is defined as

$$\mathbf{g}(C/\ell) = 1 - \dim_{\ell} H^0(\mathcal{O}_C, C) + \dim_{\ell} H^1(\mathcal{O}_C, C).$$

We recall from [16, Corollary 5.2.27] that the arithmetic genus is stable under base change. We also recall that there is a notion of $g(E/\ell)$, the *genus of a function field in one variable* E/ℓ defined in [7] based on valuation-divisors. Let it suffice to recall from [2, Proposition 2.1] that for the unique projective regular curve C over the relative algebraic closure $\tilde{\ell}$ of ℓ in E such that $E \simeq_{\ell} \ell(C)$, we have

$$\mathfrak{g}(E/\ell) = \mathfrak{g}(C/\tilde{\ell}).$$

As in the previous section, we fix again a field K of characteristic zero, $T \subseteq K$ a discrete valuation ring of K with residue field k , a function field F/K in one variable such that K is relatively algebraically closed in F , and \mathcal{X} a regular model with normal crossing for F over T , a maximal unramified extension T' of T inside an algebraic closure of K , and we set $\mathcal{X}' = \mathcal{X} \times_T T'$. Throughout this section, we additionally assume

$$\text{char}(k) = 0,$$

which is crucial for the following:

4.1. Proposition. $\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)) \leq \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}_s/k) - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_i/k)$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{Y} be the special fiber \mathcal{X}_s with the induced reduced structure, that is with structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s}/\mathcal{N}$, where \mathcal{N} is the ideal sheaf of nilpotents in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s}$. Then we have $\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)) \leq \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{Y}/k) - \sum_i \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_i/k)$ by [16, Proposition 10.1.51]. Furthermore, by a cohomological flatness result when $\text{char}(k) = 0$, see [21, Proposition 6.4.2], we have that $H^0(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s}) = k$. Then

$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{Y}/k) = 1 - \dim_k H^0(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}) + \dim_k H^1(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \leq \dim_k H^1(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s}) = \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}_s/k)$$

follows from the exact sequence of k -vector spaces

$$0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{N}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \rightarrow 0$$

obtained by applying sheaf cohomology to the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow 0$$

of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s}$ -modules. □

4.2. Corollary.

$$\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'_s)) \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K) - \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} [\ell_w : k] \cdot \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k).$$

Proof. Since K is algebraically closed in F , we have that \mathcal{X}_0 is geometrically integral, see [16, Corollary 2.3.14]. Moreover, we have that $\mathfrak{g}(F/K) = \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}_0/K)$, and by [16, Corollary 8.3.6], we have that $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}_0/K) = \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}_s/k)$. Since the arithmetic genus of a curve is stable under base change and since $\mathcal{X}_s \times_k k' \simeq \mathcal{X}'_s$, we have that $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}_s/k) = \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}'_s/k')$, and hence $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{X}'_s/k') = \mathfrak{g}(F/K)$. On the other hand, every irreducible component of \mathcal{X}'_s is a connected component of $\Gamma \times_k k'$ for an irreducible component Γ of \mathcal{X}_s . More precisely $\Gamma \times_k k'$ is the disjoint union of $[\ell_{\Gamma} : k]$ copies of $\Gamma \times_{\ell_{\Gamma}} k'$. Note that $\mathfrak{g}(\Gamma \times_{\ell_{\Gamma}} k'/k') = \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma/\ell_{\Gamma}) = \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k)$, where w

is the discrete valuation on F induced by the generic point of Γ . Considering Remark 3.1, we obtain the inequality by applying the inequality of Proposition 4.1 to the regular model with normal crossing \mathcal{X}' of $F' = FK'$ over T' . \square

4.3. Remark. In [2, Theorem 5.3], the previous inequality was obtained only for the minimal regular model, but where k was only required to be perfect, instead of our standing assumption that $\text{char}(k) = 0$.

The statements of the following Lemma is probably well known. Since we could not find a reference, we decided to include an ad hoc proof.

- 4.4. Lemma.** *a) If K admits a finite extension L/K in which T ramifies completely and such that L contains the residue field of a K -trivial valuation on F , then $\mathcal{X}_s(k) \neq \emptyset$.*
b) If F is real and T is henselian, then there exists a finite real extension ℓ/k such that $\mathcal{X}_s(\ell) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. The model \mathcal{X} over T can be defined by finitely homogeneous polynomials $f_1(X_0, \dots, X_m), \dots, f_r(X_0, \dots, X_m)$ with coefficients in T . The special fiber of \mathcal{X}_s is then defined by the polynomials $\overline{f}_1(X_0, \dots, X_m), \dots, \overline{f}_r(X_0, \dots, X_m)$ obtained by projecting the coefficients into the residue field k . A K -rational place of F corresponds to a K -rational point of the generic fiber \mathcal{X}_0 , which in turn corresponds to a projective tuple $[x_0 : \dots : x_m] \in \mathbb{P}(K^m)$ solving the homogeneous equations given by the previous homogeneous polynomials. We may assume that all $x_i \in T$ and that without loss of generality $x_0 = 1$. Then $[\overline{x}_0 : \dots : \overline{x}_m] \in \mathbb{P}(k^m)$ defines a k -rational point in \mathcal{X}_s . This proves a). Let us now assume that T is henselian and that F is formally real. The latter implies in particular that K is formally real, which implies that k is formally real, by the assumption that T is henselian. Moreover, F being formally real is equivalent to the existence of an L -rational point of \mathcal{X}_K for some finite real extension L/K , see for example [10, Proposition 2.3]. Since T is henselian, there exists a unique valuation extension to L , and we denote its valuation ring by T_L . We denote its residue field by ℓ , which is formally real, since T_L is henselian. If $[x_0 : \dots : x_m] \in \mathbb{P}(L^m)$ is a solution to the system of homogeneous equation, we may assume that all $x_i \in T_L$ and without loss of generality $x_0 = 1$. Hence, $[\overline{x}_0 : \dots : \overline{x}_m] \in \mathbb{P}(\ell^m)$, and it defines an ℓ -point in \mathcal{X}_s . This proves b). \square

We say that F/K admits a totally T -ramified place if there exists a valuation on F that is trivial on K such that its residue field (which is a finite extension of K) admits a unique, totally ramified, valuation ring extension of T . We are now in position to prove our two geometric arithmetic main theorems of this article.

4.5. Theorem.

$$|\Omega_T(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} [\ell_w : k] \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1.$$

Moreover, this inequality is strict if F/K admits a totally T -ramified place.

Proof. Let $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n$ be the irreducible components of \mathcal{X}_s . Let $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ be the dual graph of \mathcal{X}_s and β its Betti number. Then we have that

$$\beta \leq \mathfrak{g}(C/K) - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{g}(\Gamma_i/k) = \mathfrak{g}(F/K) - \sum_{i=1}^n [\ell_{\Gamma_i} : k] \mathfrak{g}(k(\Gamma_i)/k).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.8 applied to the empty property \mathcal{P} , we have that

$$|\Omega_v(F) \setminus \Omega_v^{\text{rat}}(F)| \leq |\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)| \leq \beta + 1.$$

If F admits a K -rational place, or a place to an totally ramified extension of K with respect to T , then $\mathcal{X}_s(k) \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 4.4. Clearly, since all the irreducible components Γ of \mathcal{X}_s are smooth over k , we have that $\ell_\Gamma = k$ for every component Γ with $\Gamma(k) \neq \emptyset$. First consider the case, where there exists an irreducible component Γ with $\Gamma(k) \neq \emptyset$ but Γ intersects no other irreducible component of \mathcal{X}_s in a k -rational point. Then $|\Omega_T(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| < |\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)|$, by Lemma 3.8. In the complementary case, we have that every irreducible component Γ with $\Gamma(k) \neq \emptyset$ intersects at least one other irreducible component in a k -rational point. In particular, since $\mathcal{X}_s(k) \neq \emptyset$, there exists at least one such component. Hence $|\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)| < \beta + 1$ in this case, by Lemma 3.8. \square

As already mentioned in the introduction, we set

$$\Omega_T^r(F) := \{w \in \Omega_T(F) \mid \kappa_w \text{ is real}\},$$

as well as

$$\Omega_T^{\text{n/r}}(F) := \{w \in \Omega_T(F) \mid \kappa_w \text{ is nonreal and } \overline{k}^{\text{alg}} \cap \kappa_w \text{ is real}\}.$$

Note that both sets are empty if K is nonreal, and the first set is empty if F is nonreal. Since no nonreal function field with real field of constants can permit a rational place, we obtain directly from Theorem 4.5 the following genus inequality:

4.6. Corollary.

$$\sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{\text{n/r}}(F)} 1 + [\ell_w : k] \cdot \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1.$$

This corollary is obviously only nontrivial when F is nonreal. We will now prove a nontrivial genus inequality in the real case. We need to additionally assume henselianity of T . It should be noted already that due to optimality examples in the latter application to sums of squares in function fields, both inequalities (in the nonreal case and in the real case) will turn out to be optimal.

4.7. Theorem. *Suppose T is henselian and F is real. Then*

$$\sum_{w \in \Omega_T^r(F)} [\ell_w : k] \cdot \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{\text{n/r}}(F)} 1 + [\ell_w : k] \cdot \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K).$$

Proof. Since F is real, we have that so is K , and by the henselian hypothesis on T , we have in particular that k is real. Note first that if $w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)$ then in particular $w \in \Omega_T^{\mathcal{P}}(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)$ for the field property $\mathcal{P} = \text{“is nonreal”}$, since if the function field κ_w had a rational place, then it could not possibly be non-real. Hence, abbreviating $\delta_w = [\ell_w : k]$ for $w \in \Omega_T(F)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^r(F)} \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)} 1 + \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) &\leq |\Omega_T^{\mathcal{P}}(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \\ &\leq |\Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)| + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

for both the empty field property $\mathcal{P} = \text{“}1 \neq 0\text{”}$ and the field property $\mathcal{P} = \text{“is nonreal”}$, which both satisfy going up. The second and third inequality follow from Lemma 3.8 and Corollary 4.2. By Lemma 4.4 there exists a finite real extension ℓ/k such that $\mathcal{X}_s(\ell) \neq \emptyset$. Let us choose ℓ/k of minimal degree with this property. Let $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{X}_s$ be an irreducible component such that $\Gamma(\ell) \neq \emptyset$. In particular $\ell_\Gamma \subseteq \ell$, whereby ℓ_Γ is real.

If $\ell_\Gamma \subsetneq \ell$, then $v_\Gamma \in \Omega_T^r(F)$ and $\Gamma \notin \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)$ by the minimality assumption on ℓ , whereby

$$\sum_{w \in \Omega_T^r(F)} \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)} 1 + \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) < |\Omega_T(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k).$$

If $\ell_\Gamma = \ell$ and $\Gamma \notin \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$, then

$$|\Omega_T(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| < |\Omega(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)|.$$

Suppose now that $\ell_\Gamma = \ell$ and $\Gamma \in \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$. Hence, there exists $\tilde{\Gamma} \in \Omega(\mathcal{X}_s)$ such that $\kappa(P) = \ell$ for some $P \in \Gamma \cap \tilde{\Gamma}$. In particular $v_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \in \Omega_v^r(F)$. If $\ell_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \subsetneq \ell$, then we have by minimality on ℓ that and $\tilde{\Gamma} \in \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)$, whereby

$$\sum_{w \in \Omega_T^r(F)} \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)} 1 + \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) < |\Omega_v(F) \setminus \Omega_v^{\text{rat}}(F)| + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} \delta_w \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k).$$

If, on the other hand, $\ell_{\tilde{\Gamma}} = \ell$, then we have

$$|\Omega^{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{X}_s) \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}^{\text{rat}}(\mathcal{X}_s)| + \sum_{w \in \Omega_v(F)} [\ell_w : k] \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) < \mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1$$

by (ii) of Lemma 3.8 for the property $\mathcal{P} = \text{“is nonreal”}$. In either case, we obtain a strict inequality for one of the intermediate inequalities, whereby we may replace $\mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1$ by $\mathfrak{g}(F/K)$. \square

5. APPLICATION TO SUMS OF SQUARES IN FUNCTION FIELDS

Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\sum^m K^2$ the subset of K consisting of elements that can be written as a sum of m squares. We write $\sum K^2$ for the set of all elements that can be written as a finite sum of squares. The *Pythagoras number of K* is the smallest positive integer m such that $\sum^m K^2 = \sum K^2$ if such an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ exists, and ∞ otherwise. We denote it by $p(K)$. The *level of K* is the smallest positive integer m such that $-1 \in \sum^m K^2$ when K is nonreal, and ∞ if K is real. We denote it by $s(K)$. When K is nonreal, we have the pythagoras-level inequality

$$s(K) \leq p(K) \leq s(K) + 1,$$

due to the identity $x = \left(\frac{x+1}{2}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{x-1}{2}\right)^2$.

We recall that $\sum^m K^2$ is multiplicatively closed when m is a power of two and that $s(K)$ is always a power of two when F is nonreal, as shown by A. Pfister, see [15, Theorem 1.1, Theorem 2.2]. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $(\sum^{2^\ell} K^2)^\times$, respectively by $(\sum K^2)^\times$, the multiplicative group of nonzero sums of 2^ℓ squares, respectively of an arbitrary finite number of squares, in K . We set $K^{\times 2} := (\sum^1 K^2)^\times$. Considering the filtration of groups

$$K^{\times 2} \subseteq \left(\sum^2 K^2\right)^\times \subseteq \dots \subseteq \left(\sum^{2^\ell} K^2\right)^\times \subseteq \dots \subseteq \left(\sum K^2\right)^\times \subseteq K^\times,$$

the size of successive the quotient groups in this filtration gives additional information on the sum of squares structure of K beyond the pythagoras number of the field. Clearly, the inclusions become stationary at the smallest 2-power bigger or equal than the Pythagoras number of K .

For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $G_\ell(K) = \left(\sum^{2^{\ell+1}} K^2\right)^\times / \left(\sum^{2^\ell} K^2\right)^\times$. We define the ℓ^{th} *Pfister index of K* as

$$\rho_\ell(K) := \log_2 |G_\ell(K)| \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

5.1. Lemma. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Let K be a field with a discrete henselian valuation w with $\text{char}(\kappa_w) \neq 2$. Then*

$$\rho_\ell(K) \leq \begin{cases} \rho_\ell(\kappa_w), & \text{if } s(\kappa_w) \geq 2^{\ell+1}, \\ 1 + \rho_\ell(\kappa_w), & \text{if } s(\kappa_w) = 2^\ell. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $\ell \geq 1$ and either $s(\kappa_w) \leq 2^{\ell-1}$ or $s(\kappa_w) = \infty$ and $p(\kappa_w) \leq 2^\ell$ then $\rho_\ell(K) = 0$.

Proof. We assume first that $s(\kappa_w) \geq 2^\ell$. Note that $2^\ell \leq p(\kappa_w) \leq 2^\ell + 1 \leq 2^{\ell+1}$ by the pythagoras-level inequality when $s(\kappa_w) = 2^\ell$, and that $w(\sigma) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for all $\sigma \in \left(\sum^{2^{\ell+1}} K^2\right)^\times$ when $s(\kappa_w) \geq 2^{\ell+1}$ (see for example [3, Lemma 4.1]). We write

\bar{n} for $n + 2\mathbb{Z}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and \bar{x} for the residue in κ_w for any $x \in K$ with $w(x) = 0$. Fix any $t \in K$ with $w(t) = 1$. Consider the group homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : G_\ell(K) &\rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times G_\ell(\kappa_w) \\ [\sigma] &\mapsto \left(\overline{w(\sigma)}, \overline{[\sigma t^{-w(\sigma)}]} \right) \end{aligned}$$

For $[\sigma] \in \ker(\Phi)$, we have that $\overline{\sigma t^{-w(\sigma)}} \in \left(\sum^{2^\ell} \kappa_w^2 \right)^\times$, and hence $\sigma \in \sum^{2^\ell} K^2$, since w is henselian. This shows that Φ is injective, and hence $\rho_\ell(K) \leq 1 + \rho_\ell(\kappa_w)$. If $s(\kappa_w) \geq 2^{\ell+1}$, then by the earlier argument, we have that $\text{im}(\Phi) \subseteq \{0\} \times G_\ell(K)$, and hence $\rho_\ell(K) \leq \rho_\ell(\kappa_w)$. Finally, if $p(\kappa_w) \leq 2^\ell$ then $\rho_\ell(\kappa_w) = 0$. If, in this situation, $s(\kappa_w) = \infty$, then by what we have already shown, we obtain $\rho_\ell(K) = \rho_\ell(\kappa_w) = 0$, and if on the other hand $s(\kappa_w) \leq 2^{\ell-1}$ then $s(K) \leq 2^{\ell-1}$, and thus $p(K) \leq 2^\ell$, whereby $\rho_\ell(K) = 0$. \square

Let K be the field of fractions of a discrete valuation ring T with residue field k of characteristic different from 2, and let F/K be a function field. For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$\Omega_T^\ell(F) = \{w \in \Omega_T(F) \mid 2^\ell = s(\kappa_w)\}$$

and

$$\Omega_T^{\geq \ell}(F) = \{w \in \Omega_T(F) \mid 2^{\ell+1} \leq s(\kappa_w)\}$$

5.2. Lemma. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\ell \geq 1$. Let K be the field of fractions of a non-dyadic discrete henselian valuation ring T with residue field k of characteristic different from 2. Assume that $p(k(X)) \leq 2^\ell$. Let F/K be a function field in one variable. Then*

$$\rho_\ell(F) \leq \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{\geq \ell}(F)} \rho_\ell(\kappa_w) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^\ell(F)} 1 + \rho_\ell(\kappa_w).$$

Proof. We recall the local-global principle for isotropy of quadratic forms at least 3 variables over F with respect to all discrete valuations in F in case that T is complete from [6, Theorem 3.1]. The completeness condition can be relaxed to the henselian condition, see [1, Theorem 4.4]. For a discrete valuation w on F , we denote by F^w its completion with respect to w . Let $\Omega(F)$ denote the set of all discrete valuations on F . Applied to our situation, the local global principle implies the injectivity of the natural homomorphism

$$G_\ell(F) \hookrightarrow \prod_{w \in \Omega(F)} G_\ell(F^w),$$

and thus $\rho_\ell(F) \leq \sum_{w \in \Omega(F)} \rho_\ell(F^w)$, since if $f \in F$ is any sum of $2^{\ell+1}$ squares that becomes locally a sum of 2^ℓ squares, then the quadratic form $X_1^2 + \dots + X_{2^\ell}^2 - fY^2$ is certainly isotropic over F since $\ell \geq 1$, by the local-global principle, and thus f is already a sum of 2^ℓ squares in F . Observe that by [4, Theorem 3.5], since $p(k(X)) \leq 2^\ell$, we have for any $w \in \Omega(F)$ such that $w(K) = 0$ that $s(\kappa_w) \leq 2^{\ell-1}$

if κ_w is nonreal, as well as $p(\kappa_w) < 2^\ell$ if κ_w is real. In particular $\rho_\ell(F^w) = 0$, by Lemma 5.1. If $w(K) \neq 0$, then necessarily $\mathcal{O}_w \cap K = T$. Moreover, if κ_w is algebraic over k , then $p(\kappa_w) < 2^\ell$, again by [4, Theorem 3.5] applied to a description of κ_w as a direct limit of finite extensions of k . Thus we only need to take into consideration residually transcendental valuation extensions of T :

$$\rho_\ell(F) \leq \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} \rho_\ell(F^w) \leq \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{\geq \ell}(F)} \rho_\ell(\kappa_w) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^\ell(F)} 1 + \rho_\ell(\kappa_w).$$

□

5.3. Remark. The final argument in the previous proof for why in our particular application of the local-global principle [6, Theorem 3.1], only residually transcendental valuation extensions of T mattered in the application, will be made somewhat obsolete in the subsequent section, were we will show that, in fact, the local-global principle [6, Theorem 3.1] itself already holds true when only formulated for those valuations.

Before stating and proving our main theorem in this section, we need to define some technical notions for valuations on K , which in the most important example situation $K = \mathbb{R}((t_1)) \dots ((t_n))$ are just straight forward.

We say that a valuation $v : K^\times \rightarrow (\Gamma, \leq)$ (without loss of generality $\Gamma = v(K^\times)$) is an *n-discrete valuation on K* if (Γ, \leq) is isomorphic as an ordered abelian group to the lexicographically ordered group $(\mathbb{Z}^n, \leq_{\text{lex}})$. For simplicity, let us identify $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^n$. Letting $\pi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ denote the projection onto the lexicographically dominant component, we call the valuation $\pi \circ v : K^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ the *1-discrete coarsening of v*, and we denote it by v_1 . On κ_{v_1} we now have naturally defined an $n - 1$ -discrete valuation

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v} : \kappa_{v_1}^\times &\rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \\ \bar{x} &\mapsto v(x) \end{aligned}$$

that we will call the residual valuation of v modulo its 1-discrete coarsening. It is an easy exercise left to the reader to see that the dominant component of $v(x)$ is zero, and that indeed $v(x)$ does not depend on the choice of representant of \bar{x} . We have that that $\kappa_v = \kappa_{\bar{v}}$, see [8, Section 8]. If v is henselian, then so is v_1 and \bar{v} , see [8, Corollary 4.1.4]. One can also do this in reverse: Given a 1-discrete valuation $v : K^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and an $n - 1$ -discrete valuation $w : \kappa_v \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$, then we can define the composite valuation with respect to uniformizer π of v

$$\begin{aligned} w \circ v : K^\times &\rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \\ x &\mapsto (v(x), w(\overline{x\pi^{-v(x)}})). \end{aligned}$$

We leave it again to the reader to verify that this is an n -discrete valuation, and that a different choice of uniformizer does not change the equivalence class of valuation that we obtain.

5.4. Theorem. *Suppose that K carries a henselian n -discrete valuation for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with residue field k of characteristic zero. Suppose that $p(E) \leq 2^\ell$ for every function field in one variable E/k for some integer $\ell \geq 1$. Then $p(K(X)) \leq 2^\ell$, and for any function field F/K in one variable, we have $p(F) \leq 2^\ell + 1$ with*

$$\rho_\ell(F) \leq n \cdot (\mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1),$$

if F is nonreal, and

$$\rho_\ell(F) \leq n \cdot \mathfrak{g}(F/K),$$

if F is real.

Proof. The fact that $p(F) \leq 2^\ell + 1$ for any function field F/K was shown in [1, Corollary 1.5]. We will show the remaining affirmation by induction on n . If $n = 0$, then $k = K$, so that by hypothesis $p(F) \leq 2^\ell$, that is $\rho_\ell(F) = 0$ for every function field in one variable F/K . Now suppose that $n \geq 1$. Let v be the henselian n -discrete valuation on K with the properties given in the statement. Let v_1 be its 1-discrete coarsening and let $T \subseteq K$ denote the discrete valuation ring of v_1 and k_1 its residue field. Denote by \bar{v} the residual valuation of v modulo v_1 on k_1 . Since \bar{v} is a $(n - 1)$ -discrete henselian valuation on k_1 with residue field $\kappa_{\bar{v}} = k$, we may apply the induction hypothesis to any function field in one variable over k_1 . Let F/K be a function field in one variable of genus g . Since the genus of a function field is defined with respect to the relative algebraic closure of the base field, we may assume without loss of generality that K is algebraically closed in F , as any n -discrete henselian valuation extends uniquely to an n -discrete henselian valuation in a finite extension. We first observe that under the conditions of the theorem, we have $\Omega_T^r(F) \subseteq \Omega_T^{>\ell}(F)$ and

$$(\Omega_T^{>\ell}(F) \cup \Omega_T^\ell(F)) \subseteq \left(\Omega_T^r(F) \cup \Omega_T^{n/r}(F) \right),$$

since the residue field κ_w of any residually transcendental valuation extension w of T on F with nonreal relative algebraic closure of k_1 in κ_w has level at most $2^{\ell-1}$ by [4, Theorem 3.5], since $p(k_1(X)) \leq 2^\ell$ by induction hypothesis. Moreover we conclude with [3, Theorem 6.10] that $p(K(X)) \leq 2^\ell$ from this induction hypothesis.

Now, by Lemma 5.2, the above mentioned inclusions of valuation sets, the induction hypotheses for ρ_ℓ for function fields over k_1 , and either Corollary 4.6 or

Theorem 4.7 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho_\ell(F) &\leq \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{>\ell}(F)} \rho_\ell(\kappa_w) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^\ell(F)} 1 + \rho_\ell(\kappa_w) \\
 &\leq \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^i(F)} \rho_\ell(\kappa_w) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)} 1 + \rho_\ell(\kappa_w) \\
 &\leq \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^i(F)} \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k_1)(n-1) + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T^{n/r}(F)} 1 + (\mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k_1) + 1)(n-1) \\
 &\leq (n-1)\mathfrak{g}^*(F/K) + |\Omega_T^{n/r}(F)| \\
 &\leq n \cdot \mathfrak{g}^*(F/K),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{g}^*(F/K) := \mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1$ when F is nonreal, and $\mathfrak{g}^*(F/K) := \mathfrak{g}(F/K)$ when F is real, to keep the inequalities visually readable. Note that we applied Corollary 4.6, respectively Theorem 4.7 in the penultimate, as well as the ultimate inequality. \square

5.5. Example. Let $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell \geq 1$. It is well known that the pythagoras number of any function field in one variable over $\mathbb{R}(X_1, \dots, X_{\ell-1})$ is at most 2^ℓ , see [20, Example 1.4 (4), chap. 7]. Hence, the field $K = \mathbb{R}(X_1, \dots, X_{\ell-1})((t_1)) \dots ((t_n))$ satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 5.4 and we obtain

$$\rho_\ell(F) \leq n \cdot (\mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1)$$

for any function field F/K in one variable, and $\rho_\ell(F) \leq n \cdot \mathfrak{g}(F/K)$ when F is real. The case $\ell = 1$ is the case discussed in the introduction.

The optimality of the bound $\rho_1(F) \leq n \cdot (g + 1)$ from Theorem 5.4 in the nonreal case is a consequence of [17, Example 4.5]: For $g \in \mathbb{N}$, the curve

$$Y^2 = - \prod_{i=0}^g (X^2 + t_n^{2i})$$

over $\mathbb{R}((t_1)) \dots ((t_n))$ has genus g , its function field is nonreal, and it was shown that $\rho_1(F) = n(g + 1)$. The following example shows optimality of the bound $\rho_1(F) \leq n \cdot g$ in the case where F is real:

5.6. Example. Let $n, g \in \mathbb{N}$. Let F be the function field of the curve

$$Y^2 = (X - 1) \prod_{i=1}^g (X^2 + t_n^{2i}),$$

over $K = \mathbb{R}((t_1)) \dots ((t_n))$. This curve has genus g and F is real. We will show that $\rho_1(F) = ng$. Let v_n be the unique discrete valuation on K (the t_n -adic one). Its residue field is $k = \mathbb{R}((t_1)) \dots ((t_{n-1}))$. For $1 \leq j \leq g$, let w'_j be the so called

Gauss extension of v_n with respect to $Z = Xt_n^{-j}$, and let w_j denote an extension of w'_j to F . Note that $K(X) = K(Z)$. Since $F = K(Z)(\sqrt{g(Z)})$ with

$$g(Z) = (t_n^j Z - 1)(t_n^{2j-2} Z^2 + 1) \cdots (t_n^2 Z^2 + 1) \cdot (Z^2 + 1) \cdot (Z^2 + t_n^2) \cdots (Z^2 + t_n^{2(g-j)}) \in \mathcal{O}_{w'_j},$$

we obtain that

$$\kappa_{w_j} = \kappa_{v_n}(\bar{Z}) \left(\sqrt{-g(Z)} \right) \simeq \mathbb{R}((t_1)) \cdots ((t_{n-1}))(X) \left(\sqrt{-(X^2 + 1)} \right).$$

Thus $s(\kappa_{w_j}) = 2$. Since k admits a henselian $n - 1$ -discrete valuation and κ_{w_j}/k is a function field of genus zero, we have by [17, Lemma 4.4] that $\rho_1(\kappa_{w_j}) = n - 1$. By [17, Theorem 3.6], we conclude that there must be $n - 1$ valuations on κ_{w_j} that are d -discrete for some $1 \leq d \leq n - 1$ and whose residue fields have level 2. After composition with the respective w_j , we obtain for each $j \leq g$ a set of $n - 1$ valuations on F which are d -discrete for some $2 \leq d \leq n$, and since the composition does not change the residue field by [17, Remark 2.3], they are of level 2. Counting additionally each w_j as a 1-discrete valuation, we obtain this way in total gn distinct (nonequivalent) valuations on F that are d -discrete for some $1 \leq d \leq n$ and with residue field of level 2. Hence, [17, Theorem 3.6] shows that $\rho_1(F) \geq ng$. Of course, we have equality by Theorem 5.4.

5.7. Question. *Let $K = \mathbb{R}(X)((t_1)) \cdots ((t_n))$. Is there a nonreal function field in one variable F/K such that $\rho_2(F) = n \cdot (\mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1)$? Is there a real function field F/K such that $\rho_2(F) = n \cdot \mathfrak{g}(F/K)$? If not, what is the correct formula for the optimal bound on ρ_2 ?*

We end this section by analyzing why the genus inequality from [2] would not have sufficed to prove the bound $\rho_1(F) \leq n \cdot (\mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1)$. In our notation, the genus inequality shown in [2] is

$$|\Omega_T^0(F) \setminus \Omega_T^{\text{rat}}(F)| + \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} [\ell_w : k] \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1,$$

where $\Omega_T^0(F) = \{w \in \Omega_T(F) \mid \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k) = 0\}$, and a condition for when equality can occur is also given, which we do not repeat here, but suffice to say that this condition is taken into account in the following:

Let $K = \mathbb{R}((t_1))((t_2))$. Let us consider the situation where F/K is a nonreal function field of genus 3. Note that, in difference to the almost similar looking Corollary 4.6, the above mentioned genus inequality does not exclude the possibility of the existence of 3 residually transcendental valuation extensions w_1, w_2 and w_3 of the t_2 -adic valuations on K , such that all κ_{w_i} have genus 1 over $\mathbb{R}((t_1))$ and the latter is relative algebraically closed in κ_{w_i} . Again, for each of $\kappa_{w_i}/\mathbb{R}((t_1))$, there is no obstruction coming from the genus inequality above that would prevent the existence of two residually transcendental valuation extensions $v_{i,1}$ and $v_{i,2}$ of the t_1 -adic one to κ_{w_i} , such that $\kappa_{v_{i,j}}$ are of genus zero over \mathbb{R} and such that \mathbb{R} is relatively algebraically closed in $\kappa_{v_{i,j}}$. In particular

$\kappa_{v_{i,j}} \simeq \mathbb{R}(X)(\sqrt{-(X^2 + 1)})$, which has level 2. This would force the existence of in total 6 distinct 2-discrete valuations with residue field of level 2 on F . By [17, Lemma 4.4], this implies that $\rho_1(F) \geq 2 \cdot 6 = 12$. But we know from our previous result that $\rho_1(F) \leq 2(\mathfrak{g}(F/K) + 1) = 8$.

6. APPLICATION TO LOCAL SQUARES IN FUNCTION FIELDS

In this section, we will assume that K is the field of fractions of a complete discrete valuation ring T of residue characteristic zero. Let F/K be a function field in one variable. We let $\mathcal{L}(F) \subseteq F^\times$ denote the elements of F that are squares in the completion of F^w for every $w \in \Omega_T(F)$. Note that $\mathcal{L}(F)$ is a multiplicative group containing $F^{\times 2}$.

The point of this short section is to prove (en passant) the following theorem, taking advantage of our earlier topological/arithmetical studies of the dual graph of a regular model with normal crossings:

6.1. Theorem.

$$\log_2 \left| \mathcal{L}(F) / F^{\times 2} \right| \leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K) - \sum_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} [\ell_w : k] \cdot \mathfrak{g}(\kappa_w/k).$$

This inequality is possibly interesting for its own sake, but we also need it (or rather only the trivially implied inequality “ $\leq \mathfrak{g}(F/K)$ ”, where the negative contributions from reductions are omitted) in an upcoming article on the so called Kaplansky radical of function fields, where we otherwise do not introduce any of the geometric notions related to reduction.

Apart from our topological/arithmetical studies of the dual graph, this result will mainly rely on a local global principle for quadratic forms in at least 3 variables (which was already heavily used in the previous section) in [6], which in essence is a consequence of a geometric local global principle obtained by Harbater, Hartmann and Krashen, who later described in [13] the Witt classes of quadratic forms in two variables for which the local-global principle fails, which will be the other (and arguably more important) external ingredient in the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Unfortunately, both the local-global principle for quadratic forms in at least 3 variables in [6], as well as the description of the quadratic forms in 2 variables failing the local-global principle in [13] are stated with respect to the set of all discrete valuations on F , but a closer analysis of the respective proofs actually shows that the same result holds true when only considering $\Omega_T(F)$, i.e. residually transcendental valuations extensions of T . We will thus start with presenting a Lemma that should help to bridge this gap.

6.2. Lemma. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$ and $q = a_1 X_1^2 + \dots + a_n X_n^2$ with $a_1, \dots, a_n \in F^\times$ be an anisotropic diagonal form over F . Then q remains anisotropic over F^w for some $w \in \Omega_T(F)$ if and only if q remains anisotropic over the field of fractions*

F_x of the completion of the local ring of some point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for some regular model \mathcal{X} of F/T where the effective divisor $D = \mathcal{X}_s + \text{supp}(a_1) + \dots + \text{supp}(a_n)$ has only normal crossings.

Proof. Suppose first that q is anisotropic over F^w for some $w \in \Omega_T(F)$. Then there exists a regular model \mathcal{X} of F/T such that $w = v_\Gamma$ for some irreducible component Γ of \mathcal{X}_s , see [3, Proposition 3.7]. Moreover, by embedded resolution of singularities, see [16, Theorem 9.2.26], we may assume that the divisor D has only normal crossings. Now suppose that q is anisotropic over F_x for some point $x \in \mathcal{X}_s$ for some regular model \mathcal{X} where D has only normal crossings. If x is a generic point of an irreducible component Γ of \mathcal{X}_s , then clearly $F_x = F^w$ for $w = v_\Gamma \in \Omega_T(F)$. If on the other hand $x \in \mathcal{X}_s$ is a closed point, we have by the normal crossing assumption on D that the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X},x}$ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}$ can be generated by two elements $\pi, \delta \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}$ such that $a_i = u_i \pi^{m_i} \delta^{n_i}$ for some $u \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}^\times$ and some $m_i, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and moreover such that π is a local parameter for one (of at most two) irreducible component Γ of \mathcal{X}_s passing through x . We claim that q is anisotropic over F^w for $w = v_\Gamma$. Suppose on the other hand a nontrivial solution (x_1, \dots, x_n) in F^w . After renumbering and rescaling, we may assume that $w(x_i) \geq 0$ for all i and $w(x_1) = 0$, and moreover that $a_i = u_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$, $a_i = u_i \delta$ for $i \in \{n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\}$, $a_i = u_i \pi$ for $i \in \{n_2 + 1, \dots, n_3\}$, and $a_i = u_i \pi \delta$ for $i \in \{n_3 + 1, \dots, n\}$ for certain $1 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3 \leq n$. We may assume that $n_1 \geq 2$. Simple valuation comparisons (also known as the trivial direction in Springer's theorem) shows that $\overline{u_1 x_1^2} + \dots + \overline{u_{n_1} x_{n_1}^2} = 0$ in $\kappa_w = \text{quot}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}/(\pi))$. As $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}/(\pi)$ is a discrete valuation ring of κ_w with uniformizer δ and residue field $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X},x}$, we may after some rescaling and renumbering assume that $x_i \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ and $x_1 \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}^\times$. Hence, (x_1, \dots, x_{n_1}) is a nontrivial approximate solution modulo $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{X},x}$ of $u_1 X_1^2 + \dots + u_{n_1} X_{n_1}^2$, and by Hensel's Lemma for complete Noetherian domains, we may lift this to a nontrivial solution of q on F_x . \square

With this Lemma, it should be relatively clear, how the local global principle for isotropy of quadratic forms over F in at least 3 variables with respect to $\Omega_T(F)$ follows more or less directly from the following point isotropy criterion, shown in [13, Theorem 9.3] and in [11].

6.3. Theorem. *Let $q = a_1 X_1^2 + \dots + a_n X_n^2$ be a diagonal quadratic form in $n \geq 3$ variables with $a_1, \dots, a_n \in F^\times$. Let \mathcal{X} be any regular model for F/T . Then q is isotropic over F if and only if it is isotropic over F_x for every $x \in \mathcal{X}_s$.*

For the proof of Theorem 6.1, we will need the following description of the local squares in terms of a kernel of the product restriction morphism of Witt groups

$$W(F) \rightarrow \prod_{w \in \Omega_T(F)} W(F^w).$$

We will denote this kernel by $\text{III}(F)$.

Note that if instead of $\Omega_T(F)$, one considers all discrete valuations on F , then the corresponding kernel, which we shall denote $\widetilde{\text{III}}(F)$ is a priori smaller. We refer to [15] for details about the construction and properties of Witt groups of quadratic forms over fields.

6.4. Lemma. $\mathcal{L}(F)/_{F^{\times 2}} \simeq \text{III}(F)$.

Proof. By the local global principle for quadratic forms in 3 or more variables with respect to $\Omega_T(F)$, any nontrivial Witt class in $\text{III}(F)$ is defined by an anisotropic quadratic form of dimension 2. Again, using this local global principle, we can show that any scalar multiple of an anisotropic quadratic form of dimension two whose Witt class lies in $\text{III}(F)$, defines the same Witt class. So, any element in $\text{III}(F)$ is represented by an anisotropic quadratic form $X^2 - cY^2$ for some $c \in \mathcal{L}(F)$, and in fact two such c define the same Witt class if and only if their product is a square in F . \square

The following is a strengthening of [13, Theorem 9.6].

6.5. Theorem. *Let \mathcal{X} be a regular model with normal crossings for F/T . Let β be the Betti number of the dual graph $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)$. Then*

$$|\text{III}(F)| = 2^\beta.$$

Proof. Let us first observe that one verifies easily that since \mathcal{X}_s has only normal crossings in \mathcal{X} , our reduction graph $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)$ coincides with the reduction graph defined in [13]. For a point $x \in \mathcal{X}_s$, we denote by F_x the field of fractions of the completion of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}$ with respect to its maximal ideal. By [13, Theorem 9.6], the kernel of the product of restriction morphisms of Witt groups $\varphi : WF \rightarrow \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}_s} WF_x$ is isomorphic to the abelian 2-group $\text{Hom}(\pi_1(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_s)), \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$,

where $\pi_1(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}))$ is the fundamental group of the graph $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X})$ as a topological space. It follows by [14, Proposition 1A.1 and Proposition 1A.2] that the group $\pi_1(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}))$ is freely generated by β elements. Hence $\text{Hom}(\pi_1(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X})), \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^\beta$, whereby $|\ker \varphi| \leq 2^\beta$. On the other hand, we have by [13, Proposition 9.11 (c)] that $\ker(\varphi) = \widetilde{\text{III}}(F) \subseteq \text{III}(F)$. Let $c \in \mathcal{L}(F)$. Let q be an anisotropic quadratic form over F whose Witt class is in $\text{III}(F)$. Then $q = X^2 - cY^2$ for some $c \in \mathcal{L}(F)$ by Lemma 6.4. By embedded resolution of singularities [16, Theorem 9.2.26], there exists a regular model \mathcal{Y} of F/T with a birational morphism $\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that the effective divisor $\mathcal{Y}_s + \text{supp}(c)$ has only normal crossings in \mathcal{Y} . We have by Lemma 6.2 that the Witt class of q is in the kernel of

$$\varphi' : WF \rightarrow \prod_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_s} WF_y.$$

Since \mathcal{Y} is also a model with the normal crossings property of its special fiber, we have that $\ker(\varphi') = \widetilde{\text{III}}(F) = \ker(\varphi)$, again by [13, Proposition 9.11 (c)], and

thus the Witt class of q is in $\ker(\varphi)$. This shows $\ker(\varphi) = \text{III}(F)$, and thus $|\text{III}(F)| = 2^\beta$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.1: Let \mathcal{X} be a regular model for F/T with normal crossing. Let T' be a maximal unramified valuation ring extension of T inside an algebraic closure of K . Denote by K' and k' field of fraction and residue field of T' respectively. We denote $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X} \times_T T'$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that $\beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X})) \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}'))$. The statement now follows directly from Theorem 6.5 with Lemma 6.4 and Corollary 4.2. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] K.J. Becher, N. Daans, D. Grimm, G. Manzano-Flores, M. Zaninelli. *The Pythagoras number of a rational function field in two variables*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.11425> (2024).
- [2] K.J. Becher, D. Grimm. *Nonsplit conics in the reduction of an arithmetic curve*. *Math. Z.* **306**, 12 (2024).
- [3] K.J. Becher, D. Grimm, J. Van Geel. *Sums of squares in algebraic function fields over a complete discretely valued field*. *Pacific J. Math.* **267**, 257–276 (2014).
- [4] K.J. Becher, J. Van Geel. *Sums of squares in function fields of hyperelliptic curves*. *Math. Z.* **261**, 829–844 (2009).
- [5] L. Bröcker. *Characterization of fans and hereditarily pythagorean fields*. *Math. Z.* **152**, 149–163 (1976).
- [6] J.-L. Colliot-Thélène, R. Parimala, V. Suresh. *Patching and local-global principles for homogeneous spaces over function fields of p -adic curves*. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, no. 87, 1011–1033 (2012).
- [7] M. Deuring. *Lectures on the theory of algebraic functions of one variable*. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **314**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin–New York, (1973).
- [8] A.J. Engler, A. Prestel. *Valued Fields*. Springer, (2005).
- [9] B. Green, M. Matignon, F. Pop. *On valued function fields I*. *Manuscripta Math.* **65**, 357–376 (1989).
- [10] D. Grimm. *Lower bounds for Pythagoras numbers of function fields*. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **90**, no. 2, pp. 365–375 (2015).
- [11] D. Grimm. *On an isotropy criterion for quadratic forms over function fields of curves over non-dyadic complete discrete valuation rings*. *Banach Center Publications.* **108**, 95–103 (2016).
- [12] D. Grimm. *Splitting fields of conics and sums of squares of rational functions*. *Manuscripta math.* **141**, 727–736 (2013).
- [13] D. Harbater, J. Hartmann, D. Krashen. *Local-global principles for torsors over arithmetic curves*. *American Journal of Mathematics* **137**, no. 6, 1559–1612 (2015).
- [14] A. Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge univ. Press, Cambridge, (2000).
- [15] T.Y. Lam. *Introduction to quadratic forms over fields*. American Mathematical Society, (2005).
- [16] Q. Liu. *Algebraic Geometry and Arithmetic Curves*. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2002).
- [17] G. Manzano-Flores. *Sums of squares in function fields over henselian discretely valued fields*. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **228**, 107756 (2024).
- [18] H. Mathieu. *Das Verhalten des Geschlechts bei Konstantenreduktionen algebraischer Funktionenkörper*. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **20**, 597–611 (1969).

- [19] M. Matignon. *Genre et genre résiduel des corps de fonctions valués*. Manuscripta Math. **58**, 179–214 (1987).
- [20] A. Pfister. *Quadratic forms with applications to algebraic geometry and topology*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 217, Cambridge University Press, (1995).
- [21] M. Raynaud. *Spécialisation du foncteur de Picard*. Publ. Math. IHES **38**, 27–76 (1970).
- [22] *Stacks project*, <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, (2024).
- [23] S. V. Tikhonov, J. Van Geel, V.I. Yanchevskiĭ. *Pythagoras numbers of function fields of hyperelliptic curves with good reduction*. Manuscripta Math. **119**, 305–322 (2006).
- [24] S. V. Tikhonov, V. I. Yanchevskiĭ. *Pythagoras number of function fields of conics over hereditarily pythagorean fields*. Dokl. Nats. Akad. Nauk Belarusi **47**, 5–8 (2003).

UNIVERSIDAD DE SANTIAGO DE CHILE, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, AVENIDA LIBERTADOR BERNARDO O’HIGGINS N° 3363, ESTACIÓN CENTRAL, SANTIAGO, CHILE

Email address: david.grimm@usach.cl

UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, LAS PALMERAS 3425, ÑUÑO A, SANTIAGO, CHILE

Email address: gonzalo.manzano@usach.cl