

GENERIC NEWTON POLYGON FOR EXPONENTIAL SUMS IN n VARIABLES WITH PARALLELOTOPE BASE

RUFEI REN

ABSTRACT. Let p be a prime number. Every n -variable polynomial $f(\underline{x})$ over a finite field of characteristic p defines an Artin–Schreier–Witt tower of varieties whose Galois group is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_p . Our goal of this paper is to study the Newton polygon of the L -function associated to a nontrivial finite character of \mathbb{Z}_p and a generic polynomial whose convex hull is an n -dimensional parallelotope Δ . We denote this polygon by $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$. We prove a lower bound of $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$, which is called the improved Hodge polygon $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$. We show that $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ lies above the usual Hodge polygon $\text{HP}(\Delta)$ at certain infinitely many points, and when p is larger than a fixed number determined by Δ , it coincides with $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$ at these points. As a corollary, we roughly determine the distribution of the slopes of $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Dwork’s trace formula	5
3. The improved Hodge polygon	8
4. The generic Newton polygon	17
5. Nonvanishing of leading terms in universal coefficients	20
References	35

1. INTRODUCTION

We shall state our main results and their motivation after recalling the notion of L -functions for Witt coverings. Let p be a prime number, and

$$f(\underline{x}) := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} a_P \underline{x}^P$$

be an n -variable polynomial in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We denote by $\mathbb{F}_p(f)$ the coefficient field of $f(\underline{x})$ and set $m(f) := [\mathbb{F}_p(f) : \mathbb{F}_p]$. Then we put $\hat{a}_P \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{m(f)}}$ to be the Teichmüller lift of a_P , where $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{m(f)}}$ is the unramified extension of \mathbb{Z}_p of degree $m(f)$, and call

$$\hat{f}(\underline{x}) := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} \hat{a}_P \underline{x}^P$$

the *Teichmüller lift* of $f(\underline{x})$.

Viewing \mathbb{Z}^n as the lattice points in \mathbb{R}^n with origin denoted by \mathcal{O} , we call the convex hull of $\mathcal{O} \cup \{P \mid a_P \neq 0\}$ *the polytope* of f and denote it by Δ_f .

Date: March 13, 2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11T23 (primary), 11L07 11F33 13F35 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. Artin–Schreier–Witt towers, T -adic exponential sums, Slopes of Newton polygon, T -adic Newton polygon for Artin–Schreier–Witt towers, Eigencurves.

The *Artin–Schreier–Witt tower* associated to f is the sequence of varieties \mathcal{V}_i over $\mathbb{F}_{p^{m(f)}}$ defined by the following equations:

$$\mathcal{V}_i : y_i^F - y_i = \sum_{P \in \Delta_f} (a_P \underline{x}^P, 0, 0, \dots)_i,$$

where $y_i = (y_i^{(1)}, y_i^{(2)}, \dots, y_i^{(i)})$ are Witt vectors of length i , and \bullet^F means raising each Witt coordinate to the p th power. The Artin–Schreier–Witt tower $\dots \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0 := \mathbb{A}^n$ is a tower of Galois covers of \mathbb{A}^n with total Galois group \mathbb{Z}_p , and consequently the study of zeta function of the tower can be reduced to the study of the L-functions associated to (finite) characters of the Galois group \mathbb{Z}_p . For more details we refer the readers to [DWX, §1].

Let $(\mathbb{G}_m)^n$ be the n -dimensional torus over $\mathbb{F}_{p^{m(f)}}$. The main subject of our study is the L -function associated to a finite character $\chi : \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p^\times$ of conductor p^{m_χ} which is given by

$$L_f^*(\chi, s) := \prod_{\underline{x} \in |(\mathbb{G}_m)^n|} \frac{1}{1 - \chi\left(\text{Tr}_{\mathbb{Q}_{p^{m(f) \deg(\underline{x})}}/\mathbb{Q}_p}(\hat{f}(\hat{\underline{x}}))\right) s^{\deg(\underline{x})}},$$

where $|(\mathbb{G}_m)^n|$ is the set of closed points of $(\mathbb{G}_m)^n$, $\hat{\underline{x}}$ is the Teichmüller lift of a geometric point at \underline{x} , and $\deg(\underline{x})$ stands for the degree of \underline{x} over $\mathbb{F}_{p^{m(f)}}$.

It is proved in [LWei, Theorem 1.3] that when f is a non-degenerate polynomial with convex hull Δ_f , the function

$$L_f^*(\chi, s)^{(-1)^{n-1}} = \sum_{i=0}^{n!p^{n(m_\chi-1)}\text{Vol}(\Delta_f)} v_i s^i \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_{p^{m_\chi}}][s]$$

is a polynomial of degree $n!p^{n(m_\chi-1)}\text{Vol}(\Delta_f)$, where $\zeta_{p^{m_\chi}}$ is a primitive p^{m_χ} -th root of unity.

In this paper, we confine ourselves to studying these f whose polytopes are of the simpler shape. Let Δ be an n -dimensional parallelopete generated by linearly independent vectors $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{O}\mathbf{V}_1}, \overrightarrow{\mathcal{O}\mathbf{V}_2}, \dots, \overrightarrow{\mathcal{O}\mathbf{V}_n}$, where $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$ are integral points.

Hypothesis 1.1. We assume that p is a prime such that $p \nmid (n! \text{Vol}(\Delta))$ and $p > (n+4)D$, where D is a positive integer depending only on Δ (See Definition 2.2).

In particular, when Δ is an n -dimensional cube with side length d , the integer $D = d$.

Notation 1.2. Let $k\Delta$ denote a scaling of Δ . We write

$$\Delta_k^+ := k\Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$$

for the set consisting of the lattice points in $k\Delta$ and put

$$\mathfrak{x}_k^+ := \#\Delta_k^+.$$

Let Δ° denote the parallelopete Δ with all faces not containing \mathcal{O} removed. We put

$$\Delta_k^- := k\Delta^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{x}_k^- := \#\Delta_k^-.$$

For simplicity, we write Δ^\pm for Δ_1^\pm when no confusion can arise.

Notation 1.3. One may naturally identify the set of polynomials with polytope Δ as an open subscheme of $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}^{\Delta^+}$ by recording the coefficients a_P of f .

Definition 1.4. If f satisfies the non-degenerate condition in [LWei], we call the lower convex hull of the set of points $\left(i, p^{m_\chi-1}(p-1)\text{val}_{p^{m(f)}}(v_i)\right)$ the *normalized Newton polygon* of $L_f^*(\chi, s)^{(-1)^{n-1}}$ which is denoted by $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_L$. Here, $\text{val}_{p^{m(f)}}(-)$ is the p -adic valuation normalized so that $\text{val}_{p^{m(f)}}(p^{m(f)}) = 1$.

The following Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.8 are the main results of this paper.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume Hypothesis 1.1. Let $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ denote the set of all non-degenerate polynomials $f(\underline{x}) = \sum_{P \in \Delta^+} a_P \underline{x}^P \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\underline{x}]$ with $\Delta_f = \Delta$. Then there is a Zariski open subset $O_{\text{Zar}} \subset \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ such that for any $f \in O_{\text{Zar}}$ and any finite character $\chi : \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p^\times$ of conductor p^{m_χ} , if we put $\left\{ \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{p^{n(m_\chi-1)}n! \text{Vol}(\Delta)} \right\}$ to be the set of $p^{m(f)}$ -adic Newton slopes of $L_f^*(\chi, s)^{(-1)^{n-1}}$, it has the following distribution.*

For every $0 \leq i_1 \leq n-1$ and every $0 \leq i_2 \leq p^{m_\chi-1} - 1$ we have

$$(1) \# \left\{ \alpha_j \mid \alpha_j \in \left(i_1 + \frac{i_2}{p^{m_\chi-1}}, i_1 + \frac{i_2+1}{p^{m_\chi-1}} \right) \right\} = \sum_{t=0}^{i_1} (-1)^t \binom{n}{t} \left(\mathbb{X}_{(i_1-t)p^{m_\chi-1}+i_2+1}^- - \mathbb{X}_{(i_1-t)p^{m_\chi-1}+i_2}^+ \right),$$

$$(2) \# \left\{ \alpha_j \mid \alpha_j = i_1 + \frac{i_2}{p^{m_\chi-1}} \right\} = \sum_{t=0}^{i_1} (-1)^t \binom{n}{t} \left(\mathbb{X}_{(i_1-t)p^{m_\chi-1}+i_2}^+ - \mathbb{X}_{(i_1-t)p^{m_\chi-1}+i_2}^- \right).$$

Remark 1.6. • By Poincaré duality, all slopes of $L_f^*(\chi, s)^{(-1)^{n-1}}$ belong to $[0, n)$.

• The distribution above includes all slopes of $L_f^*(\chi, s)^{(-1)^{n-1}}$.

To study L -function it is more convenient to work with the so-called *characteristic power series*

$$C_f^*(\chi, s) := \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\infty} L_f^*(\chi, p^{m(f)j} s)^{\binom{n+j-1}{n-1}} \right)^{(-1)^{n-1}}, \quad (1.1)$$

whose normalized p -adic Newton polygon we denote by $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$.

Definition 1.7. The *generic Newton polygon* of Δ is defined by

$$\text{GNP}(\Delta) := \inf_{\substack{\chi : \mathbb{Z}_p/p^{m_\chi} \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p^\times \\ \Delta_f = \Delta}} \left(\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C \right),$$

where $\chi : \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p^\times$ runs over all nontrivial finite characters, and f runs over all non-degenerate polynomials in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[x]$ such that $\Delta_f = \Delta$.

Theorem 1.8. *The generic Newton polygon $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$ passes through the points $(\mathbb{X}_k^\pm(\Delta), h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for any $k \geq 0$, where \mathbb{X}_k^\pm and $h(\Delta_k^\pm)$ are defined in Notation 2.1 and Definition 3.11 respectively.*

In [DWX], Davis, Wan, and Xiao studied the p -adic Newton slopes of $L_f^*(\chi, s)$ and $C_f^*(\chi, s)$ when f is a one-variable polynomial whose degree d is coprime to p . They concluded that, for each character $\chi : \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p^\times$ of a relatively large conductor, the p -adic Newton slopes of $L_f^*(\chi, s)$ are in a finite union of arithmetic progressions. Their proof strongly inspired the proof of spectral halo conjecture by Liu, Wan, and Xiao in [LWX]; we refer to [RWXY, §1.5] for the discussion on the analogy of the two proofs.

Motivated by the attempt of extending spectral halo type results beyond the case of modular forms, it is natural to ask whether one can generalize the main results of [DWX] to more general cases:

- (1) changing the tower to \mathbb{Z}_{p^ℓ} for $\ell \geq 2$, and
- (2) making the base to higher dimensional.

The first case is examined in a joint work with Wan, Xiao, and Yu see [RWXY]. The goal of this current paper is to investigate the second case.

From the Iwasawa theory point of view, it is important to have access to the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ associated to this Artin-Schreier-Witt tower. When p is ‘‘ordinary’’,

this polygon was explicitly computed by Adolphson–Sperber [AS], Berndt–Evans [BE], and Wan [Wan] in many special cases, and by Liu–Wan [LWan] in the general case (and in the T -adic setup).

Going beyond the ordinary case, there has been many researches on understanding the generic Newton polygon of $L_f(\chi, s)$ when f is a polynomial of a single variable. Here is an incomplete list.

- In [DWX], Davis, Wan, and Xiao prove that the Newton slopes of $L_f(\chi, s)$ form a finite union of arithmetic progressions, when f is a one-variable polynomial and χ is a finite character of a relatively large conductor.
- When p is large enough, Zhu [Zhu1] and Scholten–Zhu [SZ] showed that for a non-degenerate one-variable polynomial f and a finite character χ_0 of conductor p , the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_L$ coincides $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$.
- Later, Blache, Ferard, and Zhu in [BFZ] proved a lower bound for the Newton polygon of $f(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x, \frac{1}{x}]$ of degree (d_1, d_2) , which is called a Hodge–Stickelberger polygon. They also showed that when p approaches to infinity, the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(\chi, f)_L$ coincides with the Hodge–Stickelberger polygon.
- In [BF], Blache and Ferard worked on the generic Newton polygon associated to characters of large conductors.
- In [OY], Ouyang and Yang studied the one-variable polynomial $f(x) = x^d + a_1x$. A similar result can be found in [OZ], where Ouyang and Zhang studied the family of polynomials of the form $f(x) = x^d + a_{d-1}x^{d-1}$.
- In [KW], Koster and Wan studied a more general \mathbb{Z}_p -tower, and they proved the genus stability of all such \mathbb{Z}_p -tower.

However, for technical reasons, it is difficult to prove that the slopes of the L -function form a union of arithmetic progression when f is a multi-variable polynomial. Zhu in [Zhu2] shows that $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$ and $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ coincide for characters of \mathbb{Z}_p of conductor p when Δ is a rectangular and p is large enough. A similar result is obtained by the author in [Ren] when the polytope of f is an isosceles right triangle.

In this paper, we focus on the generic Newton polygon of an n -dimensional parallelotope Δ . Our main contribution in this paper is to prove the distribution of slopes of the generic Newton polygon $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$, when p is not necessary to be ordinary with respect to Δ . We refer reader to Theorem 1.5 for the statement.

Now we list the key steps of the proof of our main theorems.

Step 1: Instead of working with the L -function itself, it is more convenient (from the point of view of Dwork trace formula) to work with the characteristic power series $C_f^*(\chi, s)$, which recovers the L -function by

$$L_f^*(\chi, s)^{(-1)^{n-1}} = \prod_{j=0}^n C_f^*(\chi, p^{m(f)j} s)^{(-1)^j \binom{n}{j}}. \quad (1.2)$$

The power series $C_f^*(\chi, s)$ is genuinely the characteristic power series of a nuclear operator (or equivalently an infinite matrix N with respect to some canonical basis). Moreover, we can do this for the universal character (as opposed to just finite characters) of the Galois group of the tower \mathbb{Z}_p .

Step 2: We construct the improved Hodge polygon $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ for Δ in Definition 3.1, and prove that it is a lower bound of $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ for every nontrivial finite character χ . The polygon $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ lies above the usual Hodge polygon at $x = \mathfrak{x}_k^\pm$ for every $k \geq 1$. In fact, we show in Proposition 3.3 the condition that $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ lies strictly above the usual Hodge polygon at $x = \mathfrak{x}_k^\pm$.

The key point of this step lies in: the usual way of obtaining Hodge polygon is to conjugate N by an appropriate diagonal matrix, and observe that each row is entirely divisible by a certain power of p . In this paper, we dig into the definition of characteristic power series as the sum over permutations, which allows us to slightly but crucially improve the usual Hodge polygon.

Step 3: We show in Proposition 4.3 that for every polynomial $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$, if there is a finite character χ_0 of conductor p such that $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ coincides with $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ at

$$x = \mathbf{x}_k^\pm \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n+2,$$

then for every nontrivial finite character χ , $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ and $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ coincide at

$$x = \mathbf{x}_k^\pm \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

This proposition reduces the problem to show that all the polynomials $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ such that $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ and $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ coincide at $x = \mathbf{x}_k^\pm$ for $1 \leq k \leq n+2$ form a Zariski open dense subset of $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$.

For this, one may consider the characteristic power series for a ‘‘universal’’ polynomial \tilde{f} , namely all coefficients of \tilde{f} are viewed as variables. We need to show that when we write $\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm} = \tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} T^{h(\Delta_k^\pm)} + O(T^{h(\Delta_k^\pm)+1})$, the coefficients

$$\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq k \leq n+2. \quad (1.3)$$

Step 4: We show (1.3) in §5. The technical core of this paper lies in proving (1.3). Roughly speaking, the key is to show that for each $0 \leq k \leq n+2$, a certain monomial of $\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm}$ is nonzero. Tracing back to the definition of $\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm}$, we see the contribution to such *leading* monomial must come from a unique special permutation that appears in the definition of the characteristic power series. Computing explicitly the contribution of this special permutation to the leading term, which itself was subdivided into simpler cases, allows us to prove (1.3).

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank his advisor Liang Xiao for the many help and support on this paper. The author is grateful for the anonymous referee to many useful comments to improve the presentation. He also thanks Douglas Haessig, Hui June Zhu, and Daqing Wan for helpful discussions.

2. DWORK’S TRACE FORMULA

In this section, we will introduce Dwork trace formula to express $C_f^*(\chi, s)$ as the characteristic power series of some infinite matrix and deduce a natural lower bound of $\text{NP}(T, f)_C$ called the improved Hodge polygon.

Recall from introduction that Δ is an n -dimensional parallelopete generated by linearly independent vectors $\overrightarrow{\text{OV}}_1, \overrightarrow{\text{OV}}_2, \dots, \overrightarrow{\text{OV}}_n$.

Notation 2.1. We denote the *cone* of Δ by

$$\text{Cone}(\Delta) := \left\{ Q \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid kQ \in \Delta \text{ for some } k > 0 \right\},$$

and put

$$\mathbb{M}(\Delta) := \text{Cone}(\Delta) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$$

to be the set of integer point points in $\text{Cone}(\Delta)$.

Definition 2.2. Let D be the smallest positive integer such that

$$\mathbb{M}(\Delta) \subset \left\{ z_1 \mathbf{V}_1 + z_2 \mathbf{V}_2 + \dots + z_n \mathbf{V}_n \mid z_i \in \frac{1}{D} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

In particular, when Δ is an n -cube with side length d , we have $D = d$.

Notation 2.3. Let

$$\Lambda_\Delta := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cdot \mathbf{V}_i \subset \mathbb{M}(\Delta).$$

From now on, let p be a prime satisfying Hypothesis 1.1, and let $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ denote the set of all non-degenerate polynomials $f(\underline{x}) = \sum_{P \in \Delta^+} a_P \underline{x}^P \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\underline{x}]$ with $\Delta_f = \Delta$. We denote by $\mathbb{F}_p(f)$ the *coefficient field* of f which is the finite field generated by the coefficients of f .

We will fix such a polynomial $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ in §2 and §3. We set $\mathbb{F}_q := \mathbb{F}_p(f)$ and $m = [\mathbb{F}_q : \mathbb{F}_p]$. Let $\hat{a}_P \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ be the Teichmüller lift of a_P . We call $\hat{f}(\underline{x}) := \sum_{P \in \Delta^+} \hat{a}_P \underline{x}^P$ the *Teichmüller lift* of $f(\underline{x})$.

2.1. T -adic exponential sums.

Notation 2.4. We recall that the *Artin–Hasse exponential series* is defined by

$$E(\pi) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i \pi^i = \exp\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\pi^{p^i}}{p^i}\right) \in 1 + \pi + \pi^2 \mathbb{Z}_p[[\pi]]. \quad (2.2)$$

Setting $E(\pi) = 1 + T$ gives an isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}_p[[\pi]] \cong \mathbb{Z}_p[[T]]$.

Definition 2.5. For a ring R and a power series $g \in R[[T]]$, we define its *T -adic valuation*, denoted by $\text{val}_T(g)$, as the largest integer k such that $g \in T^k R[[T]]$.

Definition 2.6. For every $k \geq 1$, the *T -adic exponential sum* of f over $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}^\times$ is

$$S_f^*(k, T) := \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^k}^\times)^n} (1 + T)^{\text{Tr}_{\mathbb{Q}_{q^k}/\mathbb{Q}_p}(\hat{f}(\underline{x}))} \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[T]].$$

Definition 2.7. The *T -adic characteristic power series* of f is defined by

$$C_f^*(T, s) := \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} -(q^k - 1)^{-n} S_f^*(k, T) \frac{s^k}{k}\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_k(T) s^k \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[T, s]]. \quad (2.3)$$

It is not difficult to check that every nontrivial finite character $\chi : \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p^\times$ satisfies

$$C_f^*(\chi, s) = C_f^*(T, s)|_{T=\chi(1)-1}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $C_f^*(\chi, s)$ is defined in §1. We refer the readers to [DWX, §2] for the proof.

Notation 2.8. We put

$$E_f(\underline{x}) := \prod_{P \in \Delta^+} E(\hat{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P) \in \mathbb{Z}_q[[T]][[\underline{x}]] \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} E(\hat{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P) = \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} e_Q(T) \underline{x}^Q \in \mathbb{Z}_q[[T]][[\underline{x}]]. \quad (2.6)$$

We shall later in §4 and §5 need a version of $E_f(\underline{x})$ for a universal polynomial $\tilde{f}(\underline{x})$. Namely, we consider the universal polynomial

$$\tilde{f}(\underline{x}) = \sum_{P \in \Delta^+} \tilde{a}_P \underline{x}^P \in \mathbb{F}_p[\tilde{a}_P; P \in \Delta^+][\underline{x}],$$

where \tilde{a}_P are treated as variables. Then we put

$$\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} E(\tilde{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P) = \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} \tilde{e}_Q(T) \underline{x}^Q \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\tilde{a}_P; P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}][[T]][[\underline{x}]]. \quad (2.7)$$

2.2. Dwork's trace formula.

Definition 2.9. We fix a D -th root $T^{1/D}$ of T . Define

$$\mathbf{B} = \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} b_Q \underline{x}^Q \mid b_Q \in \mathbb{Z}_q[[T^{1/D}]], \text{val}_T(b_Q) \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ when } Q \rightarrow \infty \right\}.$$

Let ψ_p denote the operator on \mathbf{B} such that

$$\psi_p \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} b_Q \underline{x}^Q \right) := \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} b_{pQ} \underline{x}^Q.$$

Definition 2.10. Define

$$\psi := \sigma_{\text{Frob}}^{-1} \circ \psi_p \circ E_f(\underline{x}) : \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B} \quad (2.8)$$

where σ_{Frob} represents the arithmetic Frobenius acting on the coefficients, and $E_f(\underline{x})(g) := E_f(\underline{x}) \cdot g$ for every $g \in \mathbf{B}$.

Note that its k -th iterate satisfies

$$\psi^k = \sigma_{\text{Frob}}^{-k} \circ \psi_p^k \circ \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} E_f^{\sigma_{\text{Frob}}^i}(x_1^{p^i}, x_2^{p^i}, \dots, x_n^{p^i}).$$

Lemma 2.11. Let N be the matrix of ψ acting on \mathbf{B} with respect to the basis $\{\underline{x}^Q\}$, then the entries

$$N_{Q', Q} = E(\hat{a}_O \pi) e_{pQ' - Q}(T),$$

where $e_{pQ' - Q}(T)$ is defined in (2.6).

Proof. From

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_p \circ E_f(\underline{x})(\underline{x}^Q) &= \psi_p \left(E(\hat{a}_O \pi) \sum_{Q'' \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} e_{Q''}(T) \underline{x}^{Q'' + Q} \right) \\ &= E(\hat{a}_O \pi) \sum_{\substack{Q'' \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta) \\ Q + Q'' = pQ'}} e_{Q''}(T) \underline{x}^{Q'} = \sum_{Q' \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} E(\hat{a}_O \pi) e_{pQ' - Q}(T) \underline{x}^{Q'}, \end{aligned}$$

we complete the proof. \square

Recall that $m = [\mathbb{F}_q : \mathbb{F}_p]$ and $C_f^*(T, s) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_k(T) s^k \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[T, s]]$.

Theorem 2.12 (Dwork Trace Formula). *For every integer $k \geq 1$, we have*

$$(-1)^{n-1} (q^k - 1)^n S_f^*(k, \underline{x}) = \text{Tr}_{\mathbf{V}/\mathbb{Z}_q[[\pi]]}(\psi^{mk}).$$

Proof. See [LWan, Lemma 4.7]. \square

We refer [Wan] for a thorough treatment of the universal Dwork trace formula.

Theorem 2.13 (Analytic trace formula). *The theorem above has an equivalent multiplicative form:*

$$C_f^*(T, s) = \det(I - s\psi^m \mid \mathbf{B}/\mathbb{Z}_q[[\pi]]). \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. It follows from Dwork trace formula. For proof, see [LWan, Theorem 4.8]. \square

Definition 2.14. The *normalized Newton polygon* of $C_f^*(T, s)$, denoted by $\text{NP}(f, T)_C$, is the lower convex hull of the set of points $\left\{ \left(i, \frac{\text{val}_T(u_i(T))}{m} \right) \right\}$.

Now we recall the weight function and the usual Hodge polygon.

Definition 2.15. For an integer point Q in \mathbb{Z}^n , assume that the line \overline{OQ} intersects some surface of Δ at a point Q' . Then we define *the weight* of Q by the dilation $d \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\overrightarrow{OQ} = d \cdot \overrightarrow{OQ'}$, and denote it by $w(Q)$. Note that $w(Q)$ is negative if \overrightarrow{OQ} and $\overrightarrow{OQ'}$ have opposite directions.

Definition 2.16. Let \mathbb{W}_ℓ denote a set consisting of ℓ elements of $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ with minimal weights. The usual Hodge polygon, denoted by $\text{HP}(\Delta)$, is the lower convex hull of

$$\left\{ \left(\ell, \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{W}_\ell} (p-1)w(Q) \right) \right\}.$$

Proposition 2.17. *The Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, T)_C$ lies on or above $\text{HP}(\Delta)$.*

Proof. See [LWei, Theorem 1.3]. □

Definition 2.18. We call p *ordinary with respect to Δ* if $p \equiv 1 \pmod{D}$.

3. THE IMPROVED HODGE POLYGON

As we have explained in §2 that for $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$, the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, T)_C$ lies on or above the Hodge polygon introduced in Definition 2.16. However, unless p is ordinary with respect to Δ , this Hodge polygon is not expected to be sharp. In this section, we introduce an improved Hodge polygon which is again a lower bound of $\text{NP}(f, T)_C$, and we prove that for a generic f , our improved Hodge polygon coincides with $\text{NP}(f, T)_C$ at infinitely many points.

Definition 3.1. The *improved Hodge polygon* of Δ , denoted by $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$, is the lower convex hull of the set of points

$$\left\{ \left(\ell, \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{W}_\ell} ([w(pQ)] - [w(Q)]) \right) \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where \mathbb{W}_ℓ consists of ℓ elements of $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ with minimal weights as in Definition 2.16.

We will later give a simplified expression of this polygon at some particular points.

Remark 3.2. Each point $Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ can be written as a rational linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{V}_i$ of the basis vectors. It is straightforward to see that

$$w(Q) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{z_i\}. \quad (3.2)$$

In particular, since each $z_i \in \frac{1}{D}\mathbb{Z}$, we have $w(Q) \in \frac{1}{D}\mathbb{Z}$ for every $Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$.

Moreover, the weight function is subadditive, namely, for every two points $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$, we have

$$w(Q_1) + w(Q_2) \geq w(Q_1 + Q_2). \quad (3.3)$$

Proposition 3.3.

(1) *The improved Hodge polygon $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ lies on or above $\text{HP}(\Delta)$ at $x = \mathbf{x}_k^\pm$ for every $k \geq 1$.*

(2) *If there is a point $P_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Delta^-$ and $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that*

(a) $r_{j_1} < r_{j_2}$, and

(b) $pr_{j_1} - \lfloor pr_{j_1} \rfloor > pr_{j_2} - \lfloor pr_{j_2} \rfloor$,

then $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ lies strictly above $\text{HP}(\Delta)$ at $x = \mathbf{x}_k^\pm$ for every $k \geq 2$.

(3) If there is a point $P_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Delta^-$ such that

$$\left\{ j \mid r_j = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (r_i) \right\} \cap \left\{ j \mid pr_j - \lfloor pr_j \rfloor = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (pr_i - \lfloor pr_i \rfloor) \right\} = \emptyset,$$

then $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ lies strictly above $\text{HP}(\Delta)$ at $x = \mathbf{x}_k^\pm$ for every $k \geq 1$.

Notation 3.4. For a point Q in $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ we write $Q\%$ for its residue in Δ^- modulo Λ_Δ , and set

$$\begin{aligned} \eta : \quad \Delta^- &\rightarrow \Delta^- \\ Q &\mapsto (pQ)\%. \end{aligned}$$

be a permutation of Δ^- .

Proof of Proposition 3.3. (1) Since any point $Q \in \Delta_k^+ \setminus \Delta_k^-$ has integer weight, we get

$$\lfloor w(pQ) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor = w(pQ) - w(Q).$$

Therefore, we only need to prove this proposition for $x = \mathbf{x}_k^-$.

Since Δ_k^- can be decomposed into a disjoint union of shifts of Δ^- by points in Λ_Δ , we reduce the question to show

$$\sum_{Q - Q_1 \in \Delta^-} \left(\lfloor w(pQ) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor - w(pQ) + w(Q) \right) \geq 0 \text{ for every } Q_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Lambda_\Delta. \quad (3.4)$$

Let $Q - Q_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Delta^-$. We set

$$m_{\max} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} (m_j) \quad \text{and} \quad S =: \{1 \leq i \leq n \mid m_i = m_{\max}\}.$$

Take $j \in S$ such that $r_j = \max_{i \in S} (r_i)$. Then we have

$$\lfloor w(Q) \rfloor + w(pQ) = m_j + pr_j + pm_j = w(pQ + Q_1). \quad (3.5)$$

Since η is a permutation of Δ^- , we know that

$$\sum_{Q - Q_1 \in \Delta^-} w(Q) = \sum_{Q - Q_1 \in \Delta^-} w(Q_1 + \eta(Q - Q_1)). \quad (3.6)$$

Since $pQ \equiv \eta(Q - Q_1) \pmod{\Lambda_\Delta}$, we know

$$w(pQ - \eta(Q - Q_1)) = (pr_j + pm_j) - (pr_j - \lfloor pr_j \rfloor) = pm_j + \lfloor pr_j \rfloor = \lfloor w(pQ) \rfloor. \quad (3.7)$$

Combining (3.3), (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{Q-Q_1 \in \Delta^-} \left(\lfloor w(pQ) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor - w(pQ) + w(Q) \right) \\
 \stackrel{(3.6)}{=} & \sum_{Q-Q_1 \in \Delta^-} \left(\lfloor w(pQ) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor - w(pQ) + w(Q_1 + \eta(Q - Q_1)) \right) \\
 \stackrel{(3.7)}{=} & \sum_{Q-Q_1 \in \Delta^-} \left(w(pQ - \eta(Q - Q_1)) - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor - w(pQ) + w(Q_1 + \eta(Q - Q_1)) \right) \\
 \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} & \sum_{Q-Q_1 \in \Delta^-} \left(w(pQ - \eta(Q - Q_1)) + w(Q_1 + \eta(Q - Q_1)) - w(pQ + Q_1) \right) \\
 \stackrel{(3.3)}{\geq} & 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

(2) We put $Q_1 = \mathbf{V}_{j_1} + \mathbf{V}_{j_2}$ and $Q = Q_1 + P_0$. From the assumptions (a) and (b), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 w(pQ - \eta(Q - Q_1)) + w(Q_1 + \eta(Q - Q_1)) - w(pQ + Q_1) \\
 = p + \lfloor pr_{j_2} \rfloor + (1 + pr_{j_1} - \lfloor pr_{j_1} \rfloor) - (p + pr_2 + 1) \\
 = pr_{j_1} - \lfloor pr_{j_1} \rfloor - (pr_{j_2} - \lfloor pr_{j_2} \rfloor) > 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

(3) The proof of (3) is similar to (2). \square

Example 3.5. Let $p = 29$, $\mathbf{V}_1 = (3, 0)$ and $\mathbf{V}_2 = (0, 2)$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{W}_6 = \Delta_1^- = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1), (0, 2), (1, 2)\},$$

and the chart of weight of points in Δ^- :

P_0	(0, 0)	(0, 1)	(1, 0)	(1, 1)	(0, 2)	(1, 2)
$w(P_0)$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$
$w(pP_0)$	0	$\frac{29}{3}$	$\frac{29}{2}$	$\frac{29}{2}$	$\frac{58}{3}$	$\frac{58}{3}$

Computing the left hand side of (3.4) for $Q_1 = (0, 0)$, we have

$$\sum_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \left(\lfloor w(pP_0) \rfloor - \lfloor w(P_0) \rfloor - w(pP_0) + w(P_0) \right) = \frac{1}{3} > 0.$$

We next give an estimate of the T -adic valuation of each entry of the matrix N . For this, we need to control the T -adic valuation of each $e_Q(T)$.

Lemma 3.6.

(1) Recall that $\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} E(\hat{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P)$ expands as $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} e_Q(T) \underline{x}^Q$. Then we have

$$e_{\mathcal{O}}(T) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{val}_T(e_Q(T)) \geq \lceil w(Q) \rceil \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta).$$

(2) Recall that $\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} E(\tilde{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P)$ expands as $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} \tilde{e}_Q(T) \underline{x}^Q$. Then we have

$$\tilde{e}_{\mathcal{O}}(T) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{val}_T(\tilde{e}_Q(T)) \geq \lceil w(Q) \rceil \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta).$$

Proof. (1) We will only prove (1) since the proof of (2) is similar.

It follows from Definition 2.6 that $e_{\mathcal{O}}(T) = 1$.

For each $P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\} = \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}$, we expand $E(\hat{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P)$ to a power series in variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n , and get

$$\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} E(\hat{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P) = \sum_{\vec{j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}}} \left(\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} c_{j_P} (\hat{a}_P \pi \underline{x}^P)^{j_P} \right),$$

where $\{\hat{a}_P\}$ is the set of coefficients of $\hat{f}(\underline{x})$ and $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ is the π^i coefficient of $E(\pi)$.

Expanding this product and the sum, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} e_Q(T) &= \sum_{\left\{ \vec{j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} \mid \sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P P = Q \right\}} \left(\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} \left(c_{j_P} (\hat{a}_P \pi)^{j_P} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\left\{ \vec{j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} \mid \sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P P = Q \right\}} \left(\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} \left(c_{j_P} (\hat{a}_P)^{j_P} \right) \pi^{\sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since each point in $\Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}$ has weight less or equal to 1, for each \vec{j} such that $\sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P P = Q$, we have

$$\text{val}_T \left(\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} c_{j_P} (\hat{a}_P)^{j_P} \pi^{\sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P} \right) = \sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P \geq \sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P w(P) \geq w(Q).$$

Note that $\text{val}_T(\pi) = 1$. Therefore, we immediately obtain $\text{val}_T(e_Q(T)) \geq w(Q)$. Since $\text{val}_T(e_Q(T))$ is an integer, we have

$$\text{val}_T(e_Q(T)) \geq \lceil w(Q) \rceil. \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.7. *If both Q and Q' belong to $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$, then*

$$\text{val}_T(N_{Q',Q}) = \text{val}_T(e_{pQ'-Q}) \geq \lfloor w(pQ') \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor, \quad (3.8)$$

where $N_{Q',Q}$ is the entry of matrix N as in Lemma 2.11.

Proof. Since $\text{val}_T(E(\hat{a}_{\mathcal{O}})) = 0$, we have

$$\text{val}_T(N_{Q',Q}) = \text{val}_T(E(\hat{a}_{\mathcal{O}}) \cdot e_{pQ'-Q}) = \text{val}_T(e_{pQ'-Q}).$$

We assume that $pQ' - Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$, for otherwise $\text{val}(e_{pQ'-Q}) = \infty$, which leads to (3.8) directly.

By Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}(e_{pQ'-Q}) &\geq \lceil w(pQ') - w(Q) \rceil \\ &= \left\lceil w(pQ') - w(Q) - \left(\lfloor w(pQ') \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor \right) \right\rceil + \lfloor w(pQ') \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor \\ &\geq \lfloor w(pQ') \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Notation 3.8.

(1) Let \mathbb{S}_1 and \mathbb{S}_2 be two sets of the same cardinality ℓ . We denote by $\text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2)$ the set of bijections from \mathbb{S}_1 to \mathbb{S}_2 . If the elements in these two sets are labeled as

$$\mathbb{S}_1 := \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_\ell\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{S}_2 := \{Q'_1, Q'_2, \dots, Q'_\ell\},$$

for a bijection $\tau \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2)$ such that $\tau(Q_i) = Q'_{j_i}$ we put

$$\text{sgn}(\tau) = \text{sgn}(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell).$$

(2) For a function G on $\mathbb{S}_1 \times \mathbb{S}_2$, we put

$$\det \left(G(Q, Q') \right)_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}_1 \times \mathbb{S}_2} := \pm \sum_{\tau \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2)} \text{sgn}(\tau) \prod_{Q \in \mathbb{S}_1} G(Q, \tau(Q)),$$

which is independent to the order of elements in \mathbb{S}_1 and \mathbb{S}_2 up to a sign.

Notation 3.9.

- (1) For the rest of this section, we shall consider multisets, i.e. sets of possibly repeating elements. They are marked with a superscript star to be distinguished from usual sets.
- (2) The disjoint union of two multisets \mathbb{S}^* and \mathbb{S}'^* is denoted by $\mathbb{S}^* \uplus \mathbb{S}'^*$ as a multiset.
- (3) For a set \mathbb{S} , we write \mathbb{S}^{*m} (resp. $\mathbb{S}^{*\infty}$) for the union of m (resp. countably infinite) copies of \mathbb{S} as a multiset.

Notation 3.10. For two multisets \mathbb{S}_1^* and \mathbb{S}_2^* of the same cardinality, we denote by $\text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}_1^*, \mathbb{S}_2^*)$ the set of bijections (as multisets) from \mathbb{S}_1^* to \mathbb{S}_2^* . When $\mathbb{S}_1^* = \mathbb{S}_2^* = \mathbb{S}^*$, we simply set $\text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}^*) := \text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}^*, \mathbb{S}^*)$.

Definition 3.11. Let \mathbb{S}^* be a subset of $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)^{*\infty}$. We define

$$h(\mathbb{S}^*) := \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}^*} [w(pQ)] - [w(Q)]. \quad (3.9)$$

The expression on the right hand side will be related to the estimate in Corollary 3.7, and to the expression (3.1).

If \mathbb{S}^* belongs to $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$, we suppress the star from the notation.

Notation 3.12. We denote $\mathcal{M}_\ell(k)$ to be the set consisting of all sub-multisets of $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)^{*k}$ of cardinality $k\ell$. For simplicity, we put $\mathcal{M}_\ell := \mathcal{M}_\ell(1)$.

Remark 3.13. It is clear that $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ is the lower convex hull of the set of points $\left\{ \left(\ell, \min_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell} h(\mathbb{S}) \right) \right\}$.

Now we gather more information of $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$. Recall that D is the smallest positive integer that satisfies (2.1).

Lemma 3.14. Let $\mathbb{S}_1, \dots, \mathbb{S}_m \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$ so that their disjoint union $\mathbb{S}^* = \biguplus_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{S}_j \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(m)$.

Then the following two statements are equivalent.

- (1) The minimum of $h(\mathbb{S}^*)$ over all $\mathbb{S}^* \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(m)$ is achieved by \mathbb{S}^* .
- (2) For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, the sum of weights $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}_i} w(Q)$ achieves the minimum of

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}'} w(Q) \text{ over all } \mathbb{S}' \in \mathcal{M}_\ell.$$

Proof. It is obvious that h is additive. Hence, without loss of generality, we assume $m = 1$ in the proof.

First, we claim that for Q and Q' two points in $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$, if $w(Q) > w(Q')$, then

$$[w(pQ)] - [w(Q)] - ([w(pQ')] - [w(Q')]) > 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Indeed, by Definition 2.2, if $w(Q) > w(Q')$, then

$$w(Q) \geq w(Q') + \frac{1}{D}.$$

Since we assume $p > D(n+4)$ in Hypothesis 1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [w(pQ)] - [w(Q)] - ([w(pQ')] - [w(Q')]) \\ & > w(pQ) - w(pQ') - w(Q) + w(Q') - 2 \geq \frac{p-1}{D} - 2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\mathbb{S}' \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$ such that $h(\mathbb{S}')$ is minimal over all $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$, then $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}'} w(Q)$ takes the minimum of $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}} w(Q)$ for all $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$.

Let \mathbb{S}' and \mathbb{S}'' be two subsets of \mathcal{M}_ℓ such that $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}'} w(Q)$ and $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}''} w(Q)$ reach the minimum of $\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}} w(Q)$ over all $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$. Clearly, the two multisets $\{w(Q) \mid Q \in \mathbb{S}'\}$ and $\{w(Q) \mid Q \in \mathbb{S}''\}$ are the same, which implies $h(\mathbb{S}') = h(\mathbb{S}'')$ and this lemma. \square

Proposition 3.15. *For every integer $\ell \geq 1$, let \mathbb{W}_ℓ be a set of ℓ elements in $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ with minimal weights. Then we have*

- (1) $\min_{\mathbb{S}^* \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(m)} h(\mathbb{S}^*) = mh(\mathbb{W}_\ell)$.
- (2) *Order the elements in $\mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ by their weights (in the non-decreasing order): P_1, P_2, \dots . Suppose that n_1, n_2, \dots are exactly the indices such that $w(P_{n_i+1}) > w(P_{n_i})$. Then IHP(Δ) has vertices $(n_i, h(\mathbb{W}_{n_i}))$ for every $i \geq 1$.*

Proof. (1) From the proof of Lemma 3.14, we know that the minimum on the left is achieved when $\mathbb{S}^* = \bigsqcup_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{S}_j$ with $\mathbb{S}_j = \mathbb{W}_\ell$. Since h is additive, we have

$$h\left(\bigsqcup_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{S}_j\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} h(\mathbb{S}_j) = mh(\mathbb{W}_\ell).$$

(2) Since $\{w(P_n)\}$ is non-decreasing, by Lemma 3.14, the improved Hodge polygon IHP(Δ) passes through the point $\left(\ell, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} ([w(pP_i)] - [w(P_i)])\right)$ for every $\ell \geq 1$. Since $w(P_{n_i+1}) > w(P_{n_i})$, by (3.10), we have

$$[w(pP_{n_i+1})] - [w(P_{n_i+1})] - ([w(pP_{n_i})] - [w(P_{n_i})]) > 0.$$

Therefore, $(n_i, h(\mathbb{W}_{n_i}))$ is a vertex of IHP(Δ) for every $i \geq 1$. \square

Corollary 3.16.

- (1) *The height of the improved Hodge polygon at $x = \mathfrak{x}_k^\pm$ satisfies*

$$\min_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm}} h(\mathbb{S}) = h(\Delta_k^\pm).$$

- (2) *Every Newton slope of IHP(Δ) before point $x = \mathfrak{x}_k^-$ is strictly less than $k(p-1)$.*
- (3) *Every slope after the point $x = \mathfrak{x}_k^+$ is strictly greater than $k(p-1)$.*
- (4) *Every Newton slope of IHP(Δ) between points $x = \mathfrak{x}_k^-$ and $x = \mathfrak{x}_k^+$ is equal to $k(p-1)$.*
- (5) *For every $k \geq 1$, the point $(\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ is a vertex of IHP(Δ).*

Proof. They are straightforward corollaries of Proposition 3.15. \square

Notation 3.17. For a subset $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ we put

$$\Delta^-(I) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Delta^- \mid r_i = 0 \text{ if } i \in I; r_i \in (0, 1) \text{ otherwise} \right\} \subseteq \Delta^-.$$

Lemma 3.18. *For every integer $k \geq 1$ we have*

- (1) $\mathfrak{x}_k^- = k^n \text{Vol}(\Delta)$, and
- (2) $\mathfrak{x}_k^+ = \sum_{I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \#\Delta^-(I) k^{\#I} (k+1)^{n-\#I}$.

Proof. (1) Every point in $Q \in \Delta_k^-$ can be uniquely written as a sum of a point $P_0 \in \Delta^-$ and a point $Q_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Lambda_\Delta$ for an n -dimensional vector $\underline{m} \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}^n$. It implies $\mathfrak{x}_k^- = \#(\Delta^-) k^n$. Since Δ is a paralleloptope, we have $\#\Delta^- = \text{Vol}(\Delta)$, and hence $\mathfrak{x}_k^- = k^n \text{Vol}(\Delta)$.

(2) Let $I \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $P_0 \in \Delta^-(I)$ and $Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ such that $Q \equiv P_0 \pmod{\Lambda_\Delta}$. Write $Q = P_0 + Q_1$ for some $Q_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Lambda_\Delta$. Then Q belongs to Δ_k^+ if and only if $0 \leq m_i \leq k$ for every $i \in I$ and $0 \leq m_i \leq k-1$ for every $i \notin I$. Therefore, there are $k^{\#I} (k+1)^{n-\#I}$ points in Δ_k^+ with the residue P_0 module Λ_Δ . It completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.19. *The functions $h(\Delta_k^-)$ and $h(\Delta_k^+)$ are both polynomials in k of degree $n+1$, i.e. for every $k \geq 1$ we have*

$$h(\Delta_k^\pm) = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} A_i^\pm k^i,$$

where A_i^\pm are integers which depend only on Δ .

Proof. By Lemma 3.18, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\Delta_k^+) &= h(\Delta_k^-) + (p-1)k(\mathfrak{x}_k^+ - \mathfrak{x}_k^-) \\ &= h(\Delta_k^-) + (p-1)k \sum_{I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \left(\#\Delta^-(I) k^{\#I} (k+1)^{n-\#I} - \#\Delta^-(I) k^n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it is enough to prove the statement for $h(\Delta_k^-)$. For every nonempty subset $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $k \geq 1$, we put

$$U(k; I) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Lambda_\Delta \left| \begin{array}{l} m_i = k \quad \text{if } i \in I \\ m_i < k \quad \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Clearly, a point $Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ belongs to $\Delta_k^- \setminus \Delta^-$ if and only if there exist $P_0 \in \Delta^-$, $\ell \leq k-1$, and a nonempty subset $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $Q \in P_0 + U(\ell; I)$. Therefore, we have the following decomposition:

$$\Delta_k^- = \Delta^- \sqcup \coprod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \coprod_{\substack{I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \\ I \neq \emptyset}} \coprod_{\ell=1}^{k-1} (P_0 + U(\ell; I)).$$

Since h is additive, we obtain

$$h(\Delta_k^-) = h(\Delta^-) + \sum_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \sum_{\substack{I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \\ I \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} h(P_0 + U(\ell; I)).$$

It is enough to show that for a fixed P_0 and a nonempty subset $I \subseteq I(P_0)$, the sum $\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} h(P_0 + U(\ell; I))$ is a polynomial in k of degree $\leq n+1$.

Now we prove that every pair of points $P_1 = P_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n m_{1,i} \mathbf{V}_i \in P_0 + U(k_1; I)$ and $P_2 = P_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n m_{2,i} \mathbf{V}_i \in P_0 + U(k_2; I)$ satisfies

$$h(P_1) = h(P_2) + (k_1 - k_2)(p - 1), \quad (3.11)$$

where $h(P) := \lfloor w(pP) \rfloor - \lfloor w(P) \rfloor$.

Let $P_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mathbf{V}_i$ and $r_s = \max_{i \in I} \{r_i\}$ for some $s \in I$. By (3.2), we have

$$\left\lfloor w\left(p\left(P_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} V_i\right)\right) \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor w\left(P_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} V_i\right) \right\rfloor = \lfloor pr_s \rfloor + pk_j - k_j$$

for $j = 1, 2$, which implies (3.11).

We choose a representative $P' \in U(1; I)$ and put

$$h(P_0; I) := h(P_0 + P').$$

By (3.11), $h(P_0; I)$ is well defined and for every point $P \in P_0 + U(\ell; I)$ we have

$$h(P) = h(P_0; I) + (\ell - 1)(p - 1).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(P_0 + U(\ell; I)) &= \#U(\ell; I) \left(h(P_0; I) + (\ell - 1)(p - 1) \right) \\ &= \ell^{n-\#I} \left(h(P_0; I) + (\ell - 1)(p - 1) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

For every $\ell \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$ we put $G_{k,\ell} := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} i^k$, which is well-known to be a polynomial in ℓ of degree $k + 1$. Therefore, the function

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \ell^{n-\#I} \left(h(P_0; I) + (\ell - 1)(p - 1) \right) = G_{n-\#I, k-1} (h(P_0; I) - p + 1) + (p - 1) G_{n+1-\#I, k-1}$$

is a polynomial in k of degree in $n + 1$, so is $h(\Delta_k^-)$ when combined with (3.12). \square

Notation 3.20. We denote by

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_0 & P_1 & \cdots & P_{\ell-1} \\ Q_0 & Q_1 & \cdots & Q_{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix}_M$$

the $\ell \times \ell$ -submatrix formed by elements of a matrix M whose row indices belong to $\{P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{\ell-1}\}$ and whose column indices belong to $\{Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_{\ell-1}\}$.

Recall that we defined the improved Hodge polygon $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ in Definition 3.1.

Proposition 3.21. *For every $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$, the normalized Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, T)_C$ lies above $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$.*

Proof. We first recall the definition of u_ℓ in (2.3), and write N for the standard matrix of $\psi_p \circ E_f$ corresponding to the basis $\{\underline{x}^Q\}_{Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)}$ of the Banach space \mathbf{B} . By [RWXY, Corollary 3.9], we know that the standard matrix of ψ^n corresponding to the same basis is

equal to $\sigma_{\text{Frob}}^{m-1}(N) \circ \sigma_{\text{Frob}}^{m-2}(N) \circ \cdots \circ N$. By [RWXY, Proposition 4.6], for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$u_\ell(T) = \sum_{\substack{\{Q_{0,0}, Q_{0,1}, \dots, Q_{0,\ell-1}\} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell \\ \{Q_{1,0}, Q_{1,1}, \dots, Q_{1,\ell-1}\} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell \\ \vdots \\ \{Q_{m-1,0}, Q_{m-1,1}, \dots, Q_{m-1,\ell-1}\} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell}} \det \left(\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{j+1,0} & Q_{j+1,1} & \cdots & Q_{j+1,\ell-1} \\ Q_{j,0} & Q_{j,1} & \cdots & Q_{j,\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} \right)_{\sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j(N)}, \quad (3.13)$$

where $Q_{m,i} := Q_{0,i}$ for each $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$.

We set $\mathbb{S}_j = \{Q_{j,0}, Q_{j,1}, \dots, Q_{j,\ell-1}\}$, where $\mathbb{S}_m = \mathbb{S}_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{val}_T \left(\det \left(\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{j+1,0} & Q_{j+1,1} & \cdots & Q_{j+1,\ell-1} \\ Q_{j,0} & Q_{j,1} & \cdots & Q_{j,\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} \right)_{\sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j(N)} \right) \\ &= \text{val}_T \left(\prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \det \left(\sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j(e_{pQ'-Q}) \right)_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}_{j+1} \times \mathbb{S}_j} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \min_{\tau_j \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}_{j+1}, \mathbb{S}_j)} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}_{j+1}} \text{val}_T(\sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j(e_{p\tau_j(Q)-Q})) \right\} \\ &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \min_{\tau_j \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{S}_{j+1}, \mathbb{S}_j)} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}_{j+1}} \lfloor w(p\tau_j(Q)) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor \right\} \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \biguplus_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{S}_j} (\lfloor w(pQ) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q) \rfloor) = h \left(\biguplus_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{S}_j \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Therefore, we deduce

$$\frac{\text{val}_T(u_\ell(T))}{m} \geq \frac{\min_{\mathbb{S}_0, \dots, \mathbb{S}_{m-1} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell} h \left(\biguplus_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{S}_j \right)}{m} = \min_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell} h(\mathbb{S}) = h(\mathbb{W}_\ell), \quad (3.15)$$

which implies that $\text{NP}(T, f)_C$ lies on or above $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$. \square

Corollary 3.22. *Let $\chi : \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_p^\times$ be a finite character of conductor $p^{m \times}$. The improved Hodge polygon is a lower bound of the normalized Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$.*

Proof. Note that specializing T with $\chi(1) - 1$ does not lower the polygon. Therefore, for every nontrivial finite character χ , the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ lies on or above $\text{NP}(f, T)_C$. Hence, $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ lies on or above $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$, when combined with Proposition 3.21. \square

Corollary 3.23. *For every $k \geq 1$ we have*

$$u_{\mathbb{x}_k^\pm} \equiv \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j \left(\det(e_{pQ'-Q})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} \right) \pmod{T^{mh(\Delta_k^\pm)+1}}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.15, when $\ell = \mathbb{x}_k^\pm$, the equalities hold in (3.14) if and only if

$$\mathbb{S}_j = \Delta_k^\pm \text{ for every } 0 \leq j \leq m-1. \quad \square$$

4. THE GENERIC NEWTON POLYGON

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.8, which is given by a sequence of sufficient statements.

Recall that $\tilde{e}_Q(T)$ is defined in (2.7), and satisfies $\text{val}_T(\tilde{e}_Q(T)) \geq [w(pQ)] - [w(Q)]$ for all $Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$ (see Lemma 3.6 (2)).

Notation 4.1. We put

$$\det(I - \tilde{e}_{pQ'-Qs})_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{u}_i(T) s^i \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\tilde{u}_P; P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}][[s]]. \quad (4.1)$$

Similar to (3.15), we have

$$\text{val}_T(\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm}(T)) \geq h(\Delta_k^\pm), \quad (4.2)$$

which allows us to put

$$\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm}(T) := \sum_{i=h(\Delta_k^\pm)}^{\infty} \tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, i} T^i \quad \text{for } \tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, i} \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\tilde{u}_P; P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}] \quad (4.3)$$

with an explicit lower bound of the summation.

Proposition 4.2. *For every integer $1 \leq k \leq n+2$, we have*

$$\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \quad (4.4)$$

We will give its proof in §5.

Proposition 4.3. *Proposition 4.2 implies Theorems 1.8 and 1.5.*

We give its proof after several lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume Proposition 4.2. Then there exists a Zariski open subset $O_{\text{Zar}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ such that for every $f \in O_{\text{Zar}}$ and every finite character χ_0 of conductor p , the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through the point $(\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$.*

Proof. Since $\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$, the subset

$$O_{\text{Zar}}(\Delta) := \left\{ f(\underline{x}) = \sum_{P \in \Delta^+} a_P \underline{x}^P \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta) : \tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \Big|_{\tilde{a}_P = \hat{a}_P} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \right. \\ \left. \text{for every } 1 \leq k \leq n+2 \right\} \quad (4.5)$$

is a nonempty open subset of $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$.

Similar to Corollary 3.23, we have

$$\det(\tilde{e}_{pQ'-Q})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} \equiv \tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} T^{h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \pmod{(p, T^{h(\Delta_k^\pm)+1})}. \quad (4.6)$$

Hence, for every $f(\underline{x}) = \sum_{P \in \Delta^+} a_P \underline{x}^P \in O_{\text{Zar}}(\Delta)$ and every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$ we have

$$u_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm} \equiv \prod_{j=0}^{m(f)-1} \sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j \left(\det(e_{pQ'-Q})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} \right) = \prod_{j=0}^{m(f)-1} \sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j \left(\det(\tilde{e}_{pQ'-Q})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} \Big|_{\tilde{a}_P = \hat{a}_P} \right) \\ \equiv \prod_{j=0}^{m(f)-1} \sigma_{\text{Frob}}^j \left(\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \Big|_{\tilde{a}_P = \hat{a}_P} \right) T^{m(f)h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(p, T^{m(f)h(\Delta_k^\pm)+1})}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $m(f) = [\mathbb{F}_p(f) : \mathbb{F}_p]$.

Combining (2.4) with Corollary 3.22, we get

$$C_f^*(\chi_0, s) = C_f^*(T, s) \Big|_{T=\chi_0(1)-1} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm} = \sum_{\ell=T^{mh(\Delta_k^\pm)}}^{\infty} u_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, \ell} T^\ell.$$

Together with (4.7), these two equalities imply that for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$ the p -adic valuation of the coefficient of $s^{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm}$ in $C_f^*(\chi_0, s)$ satisfies

$$\text{val}_p \left(u_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm} \Big|_{T=\chi_0(1)-1} \right) = m \text{val}_p(\xi_p - 1) h(\Delta^\pm) = \frac{mh(\Delta_k^\pm)}{p-1}.$$

It implies that $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ lies below $(\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$. Since $(\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ are *vertices* of $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ which, by Corollary 3.22, is a lower bound for $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$, we conclude that $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ must pass through the points $(\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$. \square

Lemma 4.5. *For a polynomial $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ and a finite character χ_0 of conductor p , if $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through $(\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for some $1 \leq k \leq n+2$, then it passes $(\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for all $k \geq 1$.*

Proof. Since for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$ the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through the points $(\mathbf{x}_k^-, h(\Delta_k^-))$ and $(\mathbf{x}_k^+, h(\Delta_k^+))$, which are vertices of its lower bound $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$, we have the following.

- (a) The points $(\mathbf{x}_k^-, h(\Delta_k^-))$ and $(\mathbf{x}_k^+, h(\Delta_k^+))$ are vertices of $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$, and the segment connecting them is contained in $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$.
- (b) There are \mathbf{x}_k^- slopes of $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ strictly less than $k(p-1)$.
- (c) There are \mathbf{x}_k^+ slopes of $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ less than or equal to $k(p-1)$.

We denote by $\mathbb{L}^* := \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{n|\text{Vol}(\Delta)}\}$ the Newton slopes of $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_L$ in a non-descending order. By Weil conjecture, $\alpha \in [0, n(p-1)]$ for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{L}^*$. We denote by \mathfrak{t}_i the index such that

$$\mathfrak{t}_i = \#\{\alpha \in \mathbb{L}^* \mid \alpha < i(p-1)\} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

Set

$$\mathbf{X}_i := \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{t}_i} \alpha_j \quad \text{and} \quad C_f^*(\chi_0, s) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} u_{\chi_0, i} s^i \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[s]].$$

Consider the relation between $C_f^*(\chi_0, s)$ and $L_f^*(\chi_0, s)$:

$$C_f^*(\chi_0, s) = \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\infty} L_f^*(\chi_0, q^j s)^{\binom{n+j-1}{n-1}} \right)^{(-1)^{n-1}}. \quad (4.8)$$

We obtain that for every $\ell \geq 1$ there are

$$\sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\ell-1} \binom{n+j-1}{n-1} (\mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j})$$

slopes of $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ are contained in $[(\ell-1)(p-1), \ell(p-1))$, where $\mathfrak{t}_{<0} = 0$. Therefore, the slopes of $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ strictly less than $k(p-1)$ is equal to

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\ell-1} \binom{n+j-1}{n-1} (\mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j}),$$

and $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through the points

$$\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\ell-1} \binom{n+j-1}{n-1} (\mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j}), \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\ell-1} \binom{n+j-1}{n-1} (\mathbf{X}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathbf{X}_{\ell-j} + j(p-1)(\mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j})) \right)$$

for all $k \geq 1$.

Combining it with (b), for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$ we have

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\ell-1} \binom{n+j-1}{n-1} (\mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j}) = \mathfrak{x}_k^- = k^n \text{Vol}(\Delta). \quad (4.9)$$

Note that the left hand side of (4.9) is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left((\mathfrak{t}_{i+1} - \mathfrak{t}_i) \sum_{\ell=1}^k \binom{n+\ell-i-1}{n-1} \right),$$

which is a polynomial of degree n . Since the both sides of (4.9) are polynomials in k of degree n and they have the same values for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$, they must be identical as polynomials. Namely, the equality (4.9) holds for all $k \geq 1$.

On the other hand, combining (4.9) with (a), we get

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\ell-1} \binom{n+j-1}{n-1} (\mathbf{X}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathbf{X}_{\ell-j} + j(p-1)(\mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j+1} - \mathfrak{t}_{\ell-j})) = h(\Delta_k^-) \quad (4.10)$$

for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$.

Clearly, the left hand side of (4.10) is a polynomial in k of degree $n+1$. By Lemma 3.19, the right hand side of (4.10) is also a polynomial in k of degree $n+1$. Running the similar argument as above, we conclude that the equality (4.10) holds for every $k \geq 1$. Therefore, the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through the point $(\mathfrak{x}_k^-, h(\Delta_k^-))$ for every $k \geq 1$.

A similar argument shows that $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through the point $(\mathfrak{x}_k^+, h(\Delta_k^+))$ for every $k \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 4.6. *For a polynomial $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ with $m = [\mathbb{F}_p(f) : \mathbb{F}_p]$, if there exists a finite character χ_0 of conductor p such that $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through $(\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for all integer $k \geq 1$, then for every nontrivial finite character χ the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ passes through the points $(\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for all $k \geq 0$.*

Proof. Recall that $C_f^*(T, s) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} u_i s^i$. Since

$$u_{\mathfrak{x}_0^-} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\mathfrak{x}_0^+} = -\text{Norm}_{\mathbb{F}_p(f)/\mathbb{F}_p}(E(\hat{a}_0 \pi)) \equiv -1 \pmod{T},$$

the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ passes through the point $(\mathfrak{x}_0^\pm, h(\Delta_0^\pm))$.

We next show that for every integer $k \geq 1$ we have

$$u_{\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p, T^{mh(\Delta_k^\pm)+1}}. \quad (4.11)$$

Suppose it is false. Without loss of generality, we may assume that there exists $k_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$u_{\mathfrak{x}_{k_0}^-} \equiv 0 \pmod{p, T^{mh(\Delta_{k_0}^-)+1}}.$$

This congruence equality implies that the p -adic valuation of the coefficient of $s^{\mathfrak{x}_{k_0}^-}$ in $C_f^*(\chi_0, s)$ satisfies

$$\text{val}_p \left(u_{\mathfrak{x}_{k_0}^-} \Big|_{T=\chi_0(1)-1} \right) > \frac{mh(\Delta_{k_0}^-)}{p-1},$$

and hence the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ can never pass through the point $(\mathfrak{x}_{k_0}^-, h(\Delta_{k_0}^-))$. However, $(\mathfrak{x}_{k_0}^-, h(\Delta_{k_0}^-))$ is a vertex of the lower bound $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ of $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$, a contradiction to the assumption in this lemma.

Therefore, we prove the inequality (4.11) and hence

$$\text{val}_p \left(u_{\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm} \Big|_{T=\chi(1)-1} \right) = \frac{mh(\Delta_k^\pm)}{(p-1)p^{m\chi-1}}.$$

The last equality implies that $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ passes through $(\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for every $k \geq 1$ when combined with Corollary 3.22. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.8. We know already from Corollary 3.22 that $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ is a lower bound for $\text{GNP}(\Delta)$. Now we show that it is sharp at the point $(\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for every $k \geq 0$.

If we choose a polynomial $f \in O_{\text{Zar}}$, by Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, for every finite character χ_0 of conductor $p^{m\chi_0}$ and every integer $k \geq 0$, the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi_0)_C$ passes through the point $(\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let χ be a nontrivial finite character and $f \in O_{\text{Zar}}$, where O_{Zar} is defined as in Lemma 4.4. By Lemmas 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6, the Newton polygon $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$ passes through the point $(\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm))$ for every $k \geq 0$. Since these points are vertices of $\text{IHP}(\Delta)$ which is a lower bound of $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$, they must also be vertices of $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_C$.

Therefore, by (1.2), for every $0 \leq i_1 \leq n-1$ and every $0 \leq i_2 \leq p^{m\chi-1}-1$ there are

$$\sum_{t=0}^{i_1} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \mathfrak{x}_{(i_1-t)p^{m\chi-1}+i_2}^+ \quad \left(\text{resp.} \quad \sum_{t=0}^{i_1} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \mathfrak{x}_{(i_1-t)p^{m\chi-1}+i_2}^- \right)$$

slopes of $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_L$ less than or equal to (resp. strictly less than) $i_1(p-1)p^{m\chi-1} + (p-1)i_2$. Since the slopes of $\text{NP}(f, \chi)_L$ divided by $(p-1)p^{m\chi}$ are the $p^{m(f)}$ -adic Newton slopes of $L_f^*(\chi, s)$, we complete the proof. \square

5. NONVANISHING OF LEADING TERMS IN UNIVERSAL COEFFICIENTS

To show (4.4) for $1 \leq k \leq n+2$, it is enough to show the coefficient of one special term in $\tilde{u}_{\mathfrak{x}_k^\pm}$ is not zero. Computing explicitly the contribution of this permutation of Δ_k^\pm to this special term, which itself is subdivided into simpler cases, allows us to prove (4.4).

5.1. Proof of Proposition 4.2 with assuming Propositions 5.13 and 5.14. Recall that in Notation 3.4, we define the function η which maps $Q \in \Delta^-$ to the residue of pQ module Λ_Δ in Δ^- .

Notation 5.1.

- (1) For every non-empty subset $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we set $\mathbf{V}_S := \sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{V}_i$, and denote by

$$\text{Ver}(\Delta) := \{\mathbf{V}_S \mid S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \text{ and } S \neq \emptyset\}$$

the set consisting of all vertices of Δ except the origin \mathcal{O} .

- (2) For a polynomial $g(\tilde{a}_P) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\tilde{a}_P, P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}]$, we denote by g^{res} the polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_n]$ obtained by
- specializing \tilde{a}_P with 0 if $P \notin \text{Ver}(\Delta)$, and
 - replacing \tilde{a}_P by $\zeta_{\#S}$ if $P = \mathbf{V}_S$.
- (3) For a point $P_0 \in \Delta^-$, we put

$$\Delta_k^\pm(P_0) = \{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm \mid Q \equiv P_0 \pmod{\Lambda_\Delta}\}.$$

Theorem 5.2. *For every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$, we have*

$$\det(\tilde{e}_{pQ-Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(p, T^{h(\Delta_k^\pm)+1})}. \quad (5.1)$$

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of this theorem.

Lemma 5.3. *Theorem 5.2 implies Proposition 4.2.*

Proof. From (5.1) we have

$$\det(\tilde{e}_{pQ'-Q})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(p, T^{h(\Delta_k^\pm)+1})}$$

for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$. Combined with (4.6), these congruence inequalities imply that

$$\tilde{u}_{\mathbf{x}_k^\pm, h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

for every $1 \leq k \leq n+2$. \square

Lemma 5.4. *For every $\tau \in \text{Iso}(\Delta_k^\pm)$, if there exist $P_0 \in \Delta^-$ and $Q_0 \in \Delta_k^\pm(P_0)$ such that $\tau(Q_0) \notin \Delta_k^\pm(\eta(P_0))$, then*

$$\prod_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(P_0)} \tilde{e}_{pQ-\tau(Q)}^{\text{res}} = 0. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Recall that for every $Q \in \mathbb{M}(\Delta)$, we have

$$\tilde{e}_Q(T) = \sum_{\left\{ \vec{j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} \mid \sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P P = Q \right\}} \left(\prod_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} c_{j_P} (\tilde{a}_P \pi)^{j_P} \right). \quad (5.3)$$

If $\tau(Q_0) \notin \Delta_k^\pm(\eta(P_0))$, then $pQ_0 - \tau(Q_0) \not\equiv \mathcal{O} \pmod{\Lambda_\Delta}$. Therefore, every linear combination

$$pQ_0 - \tau(Q_0) = \sum_{P \in \Delta^+ \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}} j_P P$$

contains $P \notin \text{Ver}(\Delta)$ must have $j_P \neq 0$, which implies

$$\tilde{e}_{pQ_0-\tau(Q_0)}^{\text{res}} = 0.$$

Hence, to compute $\det(\tilde{e}_{pQ-Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm}$, it suffices to take sum over all the permutations τ such that $\tau(Q) \equiv pQ \pmod{\Lambda_\Delta}$ for every $Q \in \Delta_k^\pm$. \square

Notation 5.5. For a point $Q = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{V}_i$, we set

$$I(Q) := \{i \mid z_i = 0\}.$$

For a subset $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we generalize Notations 3.17 and 5.1(3) to

- $\Delta_k^\pm(I) := \left\{ Q = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{V}_i \in \Delta_k^\pm \mid \begin{array}{l} z_i = 0 \text{ if } i \in I \\ z_i > 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{array} \right\},$
- $\Delta_k^+(I, P_0) := \Delta_k^+(I) \cap \Delta_k^+(P_0)$ and $\Delta_k^-(I, P_0) := \Delta_k^-(I) \cap \Delta_k^-(P_0).$

Lemma 5.6.

- (1) *For each $P_0 \in \Delta^-$, if $I \not\subseteq I(P_0)$, then $\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0) = \emptyset$.*
- (2) *The set Δ_k^\pm is a disjoint union of $\Delta_k^\pm(P_0, I)$ for all points $P_0 \in \Delta^-$ and all subsets $I \subseteq I(P_0)$.*

Proof. Both (1) and (2) are straightforward. \square

Lemma 5.7. *For every $\tau \in \text{Iso}(\Delta_k^\pm)$, if there exists a subset $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\tau(\Delta_k^\pm(I)) \neq \Delta_k^\pm(I)$, then*

$$\prod_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(P_0)} \tilde{e}_{pQ-\tau(Q)} = 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. We put $I_0 \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ to be one of the smallest subset such that

$$\tau(\Delta_k^\pm(I_0)) \neq \Delta_k^\pm(I_0).$$

Namely, every set I that contains fewer elements than I_0 satisfies

$$\tau(\Delta_k^\pm(I)) = \Delta_k^\pm(I).$$

It implies a point $Q_0 \in \Delta_k^\pm(I_0)$ such that $pQ_0 - \tau(Q_0) \notin \text{Cone}(\Delta)$. Hence, we obtain $\tilde{e}_{pQ_0-\tau(Q_0)} = 0$ and consequently (5.4). \square

Proposition 5.8. *We have the following equality*

$$\det(\tilde{e}_{pQ-Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} = \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \det(\tilde{e}_{P_0-\eta(P_0)+pQ-Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)}. \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. By Lemmas 5.4 and 5.7, for every $\tau \in \text{Iso}(\Delta_k^\pm)$ if

$$\prod_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(P_0)} \tilde{e}_{pQ-\tau(Q)}^{\text{res}} \neq 0,$$

then τ must map $\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)$ onto $\Delta_k^\pm(I, \eta(P_0))$ for every point $P_0 \in \Delta^-$ and every integer $I \in I(P_0)$. Note that

$$\Delta_k^\pm(I, \eta(P_0)) = \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0) - P_0 + \eta(P_0). \quad (5.6)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\tilde{e}_{pQ-Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} &= \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \det(\tilde{e}_{pQ-Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0), Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, \eta(P_0))} \\ &= \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \det(\tilde{e}_{P_0-\eta(P_0)+pQ-Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Definition 5.9.

- (1) The *partial degree* of a monomial $\prod_{i=1}^n \zeta_i^{t_i}$, denoted by $\text{Deg}(\prod_{i=1}^n \zeta_i^{t_i})$, is defined to be the vector $(t_n, t_{n-1}, \dots, t_1) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, where $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ equips with a reverse lexicographic order. Namely, for two vectors $\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ and $\vec{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ in \mathbb{R}^n , we call \vec{v} *strictly greater than* \vec{u} , denoted by $\vec{v} \succ \vec{u}$, if there is $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that

- $v_i = u_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, and
- $v_k > u_k$.

Note that the partial degree of every nonzero constant is just $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$.

- (2) The *partial degree* of a polynomial $g \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[T]][\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_n]$, denoted by $\text{Deg}(g)$, is the maximal partial degree of nonzero monomials in g .

- (3) For a point $Q = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} z_j \mathbf{V}_{S_j}$ such that $0 = z_0 < z_1 < \dots < z_\ell$, the *degree* of Q , denoted by $\text{Deg}(Q)$, is the n -dimensional vector (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) such that

$$v_{n+1-\sum_{j=i}^{\ell} \#S_j} = z_i - z_{i-1} \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq i \leq \ell,$$

and all other components are zero.

- (4) The leading term of g , denoted by $\text{LD}(g)$, is the sum of monomials in g of the maximal partial degree.

Property 5.10.

- (1) Every nonzero $g \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[T]][\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_n]$ satisfies

$$\text{Deg}(g - \text{LD}(g)) \prec \text{Deg}(g).$$

- (2) For every two polynomials $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[T]][\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_n]$, we have

- (I) $\text{Deg}(g_1 - g_2) \preceq \max(\text{Deg}(g_1), \text{Deg}(g_2))$.
- (II) $\text{Deg}(g_1 g_2) = \text{Deg}(g_1) + \text{Deg}(g_2)$.
- (III) $\text{LD}(g_1 g_2) = \text{LD}(g_1) \text{LD}(g_2)$.
- (IV) $\text{LD}(g_1) = \text{LD}(g_2)$ if and only if $\text{Deg}(g_1) \succ \text{Deg}(g_1 - g_2)$.

Lemma 5.11. Let $\coprod_{i=1}^{\ell} S_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$ for some $n' \leq n$ and $Q_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in \Lambda_{\Delta}$ such that $0 = m_0 < m_1 < \dots < m_{\ell}$. Then

- (1) the leading term

$$\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q_1}^{\text{res}}) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} c_{m_i - m_{i-1}} \left(\zeta_{\sum_{j=i}^n \#S_j} \pi \right)^{m_i - m_{i-1}}, \quad (5.7)$$

where $\{c_i\}$ is defined in (2.2).

- (2) $\text{Deg}(\tilde{e}_{Q_1}^{\text{res}}) = \text{Deg}(Q_1)$.

Proof. (1) By (5.3) and Notation 5.1 (3), the polynomial \tilde{e}_{Q_1} can be written explicitly as

$$\tilde{e}_{Q_1}^{\text{res}} = \sum_{\left\{ \vec{j} \mid \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \\ S \neq \emptyset}} j_S \mathbf{V}_S = Q_1 \right\}} \left(\prod_{\substack{S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \\ S \neq \emptyset}} c_{j_S} (\zeta_{\#S} \pi)^{j_S} \right).$$

The monomial

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} c_{m_i - m_{i-1}} \left(\zeta_{\sum_{j=i}^n \#S_j} \pi \right)^{m_i - m_{i-1}}$$

is the unique term in $\tilde{e}_{Q_1}^{\text{res}}$ of the maximal degree, which completes the proof.

- (2) It follows directly from (1). \square

Notation 5.12.

- (1) Let $P_0 \in \Delta^-$ and $I \subseteq I(P_0)$. By relabeling indices, we may assume that $I = \{n'+1, n'+2, \dots, n\}$. Let $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{\ell}$ be an ordered disjoint subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$

such that $\coprod_{i=1}^{\ell} S_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$.

We set

$$\Delta_k^{\pm}(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_{\ell}) := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} z_j \mathbf{V}_{S_j} \in \Delta_k^{\pm}(I, P_0) \mid 0 < z_1 < \dots < z_{\ell} \right\}.$$

- (2) For $1 \leq \ell \leq n'$, we set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\ell}(\Delta_k^{\pm}(I, P_0)) := \{ \Delta_k^{\pm}(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_{\ell}) \},$$

where S_1, \dots, S_{ℓ} runs over all ordered disjoint subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$.

(3) Let

$$\mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)) = \prod_{\ell=0}^{n'} \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)).$$

Clearly, we have

$$\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0) = \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \mathbb{S}.$$

We next to show that Theorem 5.2 follows from Propositions 5.13 and 5.14 whose proofs are given later in §5.2 and §5.3 respectively.

Proposition 5.13. *For every subset $I \subseteq I(P_0)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LD} \left(\det(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \right) \\ = \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Proposition 5.14. *For every point $P_0 \in \Delta^-$ and every subset $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$ we have*

$$\det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}} = b_{P_0, \mathbb{S}} \times g_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}(\underline{\zeta}) \pi^{\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}} (\lfloor pw(Q) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q - P_0 + \eta(P_0)) \rfloor)}, \quad (5.9)$$

where $b_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}$ is a p -adic unit in \mathbb{Z}_p and $g_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}(\underline{\zeta})$ is a monomial in $\mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_n]$.

Proof of Theorem 5.2 (Assuming Propositions 5.13 and 5.14). By Property 5.10, Propositions 5.8, 5.13 and 5.14, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{LD} \left(\det(\tilde{e}_{pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm} \right) \\ &= \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \text{LD} \left(\det(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}})_{Q, Q' \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \right) \quad (\text{Prop 5.8}) \\ &= \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}} \quad (\text{Prop 5.13}) \\ &= \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} b_{P_0, \mathbb{S}} \times g_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}(\underline{\zeta}) \pi^{\sum_{Q \in \mathbb{S}} (\lfloor pw(Q) \rfloor - \lfloor w(Q - P_0 + \eta(P_0)) \rfloor)} \quad (\text{Prop 5.14}) \\ &= \pi^{h(\Delta_k^\pm)} \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} b_{P_0, \mathbb{S}} \times g_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}(\underline{\zeta}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from

$$\begin{aligned} h(\Delta_k^\pm) &= \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \mathbb{S} \\ &= \prod_{P_0 \in \Delta^-} \prod_{I \subseteq I(P_0)} \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \{Q - P_0 + \eta(P_0) \mid Q \in \mathbb{S}\}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Now we prove Propositions 5.13 and 5.14.

5.2. Proof of Proposition 5.13 assuming Proposition 5.14. The essence of the proof is the only terms that contribute to the left hand side of (5.8) come from the determinant of the leading terms on its right hand side.

Lemma 5.15. *Let*

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\ell'} S'_j \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} S_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}.$$

For every two points $Q = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i}$ and $Q' = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} z'_j \mathbf{V}_{S'_j}$ in Λ_{Δ} such that

- (1) $0 < z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_{\ell}$ and $0 < z'_1 < z'_2 < \dots < z'_{\ell'}$;
- (2) $z_i - z_{i-1} > z'_{\ell'} - z'_1$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$,

then we have

$$\text{Deg}(Q - Q') \preceq \text{Deg}(Q) - \text{Deg}(Q') \quad (5.10)$$

with the equality if and only if for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, there is $1 \leq j_i \leq \ell'$ such that

- (I) $S_i \subseteq S'_{j_i}$, and
- (II) $j_{i_1} \leq j_{i_2}$ for every $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq \ell$.

Proof. When $\ell = 1$, if $\ell' \leq 1$, it is easy to show that

$$\text{Deg}(Q - Q') = \text{Deg}(Q) - \text{Deg}(Q').$$

Now we assume that $\ell' > 1$. By condition (2) and Definition 5.9(3), we obtain

$$\text{Deg}(Q - Q') = \left(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \#S_j}, (z_1 - z'_{\ell'}), \underbrace{\dots}_{\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \#S_{j-1}} \right) \quad (5.11)$$

and

$$\text{Deg}(Q) - \text{Deg}(Q') = \left(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \#S_j}, (z_1 - z'_1), \underbrace{\dots}_{\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \#S_{j-1}} \right), \quad (5.12)$$

which directly imply $\text{Deg}(Q - Q') \prec \text{Deg}(Q) - \text{Deg}(Q')$.

Assume (5.10) and its equality condition hold for $\ell > 1$; we will prove them for $\ell + 1$.

We set $j' := \max\{j \mid S_1 \cap S'_j \neq \emptyset\}$. By condition (2) and Definition 5.9 (3) again, we have

$$\text{Deg}(Q - Q') = \left(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \ell - 1}, (z_1 - z'_{j'}), \dots \right) \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$\text{Deg}(Q) - \text{Deg}(Q') = \left(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \ell - 1}, (z_1 - z'_1), \dots \right). \quad (5.14)$$

If $j' > 1$, then

$$\text{Deg}(Q - Q') \prec \text{Deg}(Q) - \text{Deg}(Q').$$

Then we show that in this case (I) and (II) cannot be both satisfied. Otherwise, from (I), we have $S_1 \subseteq S'_{j'}$. Since $j' > 1$, there exists $1 < i \leq \ell$ such that $S_i \subseteq S'_1$. Therefore, we obtain $j_1 = j' > 1 = j_i$, which contradicts to (II).

If $j' = 1$, we have $S_1 \subseteq S'_1$, hence

$$\prod_{j=2}^{\ell'} S'_j \subseteq \prod_{i=2}^{\ell} S_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}.$$

We set

$$Q_0 := \sum_{i=2}^{\ell+1} (z_i - z_1) \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \text{ and } Q'_0 := \sum_{j=2}^{\ell'} (z'_j - z'_1) \mathbf{V}_{S'_j}.$$

It is easy to check that Q_0 and Q'_0 also satisfy the conditions (1) and (2). By condition (2) and Lemma 5.11, we get

$$\text{Deg}(Q) - \text{Deg}(Q') - \text{Deg}(Q - Q') = \text{Deg}(Q_0) - \text{Deg}(Q'_0) - \text{Deg}(Q_0 - Q'_0).$$

Therefore, we are left to show that this result holds for Q_0 and Q'_0 , which follows directly from the induction. \square

Lemma 5.16. *Let $\coprod_{i=1}^{\ell} S_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$ and $Q = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in \text{Cone}(\Delta)$ such that $0 < z_1 < \dots < z_{\ell}$. The point $(p-1)Q - \eta(Q\%)$ is a linear combination of $\{\mathbf{V}_{S_i}\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$ with integer coefficients, i.e.*

$$(p-1)Q - \eta(Q\%) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i},$$

and $t_i - t_{i-1} > n + 2$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, where $t_0 = 0$.

Proof. Taking $t_i = \lfloor pz_i \rfloor - z_i$ we prove

$$(p-1)Q - \eta(Q\%) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i}.$$

Combined with our assumption that $p > D(n+4)$, this implies that

$$t_{i+1} - t_i \geq (p-1)(z_{i+1} - z_i) - 1 \geq \frac{p-1}{D} - 1 > n + 2 \geq 0$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. \square

Lemma 5.17. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n+2$, $\coprod_{i=1}^{\ell} S_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$, and $\coprod_{j=1}^{\ell'} S'_j \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$. For every pair of points $Q \in \Delta_k^{\pm}(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_{\ell})$ and $Q' \in \Delta_k^{\pm}(I, P_0; S'_1, S'_2, \dots, S'_{\ell'})$, we have*

$$\text{Deg}(pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - Q') \leq \text{Deg}(pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0) - \text{Deg}(Q'),$$

with the equality if and only if S_i 's and S'_j 's satisfy that

- for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell'$ there exists $1 \leq j_i \leq \ell$ such that $S_i \subseteq S'_{j_i}$, and
- for every $1 \leq i_1 \leq \ell'$ and $1 \leq i_2 \leq \ell'$ if $i_1 < i_2$, then $j_{i_1} \leq j_{i_2}$.

Proof. Let

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i}, \quad pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \quad \text{and} \quad Q' = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} z'_j \mathbf{V}_{S'_j}$$

such that $0 < z_1 < \dots < z_{\ell}$ and $0 < z'_1 < \dots < z'_{\ell'}$.

By Lemma 5.16, we have

$$t_i - t_{i-1} > n + 2 \geq z'_{\ell'} - z'_1, \tag{5.15}$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Then it follows directly from Lemma 5.15. \square

Notation 5.18. We set

$$K := \min\{i \mid \mathcal{S}_i(\Delta_k^{\pm}(I, P_0)) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Corollary 5.19. *Let $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$. If $Q \in \mathbb{S}$ and $Q' \in \Delta_k(I, P_0)$ satisfy*

$$\text{Deg}(pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - Q') = \text{Deg}(pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0) - \text{Deg}(Q'), \quad (5.16)$$

then

$$Q' \in \prod_{j=K}^{\ell} \coprod_{\mathbb{S}' \in \mathcal{S}_j(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \mathbb{S}'. \quad (5.17)$$

Moreover, if

$$Q' \in \coprod_{\mathbb{S}' \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \mathbb{S}',$$

then $Q' \in \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. It follows directly from Lemma 5.17. \square

Proposition 5.20. *For a permutation $\tau \in \text{Iso}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$, the equality*

$$\text{Deg}(pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - \tau(Q)) = \text{Deg}(pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0) - \text{Deg}(\tau(Q)) \quad (5.18)$$

holds for every $Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)$ if and only if

$$\tau(\mathbb{S}) = \mathbb{S}$$

for every $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$.

Proof. The “if part” follows from Lemma 5.17.

Now we prove the “only if part”. Assume τ is a permutation of $\mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$ such that every $Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)$ satisfies (5.18). Combining two statements in Corollary 5.19 gives that $\tau(\mathbb{S}_K) = \mathbb{S}_K$.

Assume that any $K \leq \ell' < \ell$ and any $\mathbb{S}_{\ell'} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$ satisfies $\tau(\mathbb{S}_{\ell'}) = \mathbb{S}_{\ell'}$. Let \mathbb{S}_ℓ be any subset of $\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)$ in $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$. Combining the induction assumption with Corollary 5.19, we know

$$\tau(\mathbb{S}_\ell) \subseteq \prod_{\mathbb{S}' \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \mathbb{S}',$$

and hence $\tau(\mathbb{S}_\ell) = \mathbb{S}_\ell$. \square

Notation 5.21. Let

$$\text{Iso}^{\text{SP}}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)) := \{\tau \in \text{Iso}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)) \mid \tau(\mathbb{S}) = \mathbb{S} \text{ for every } \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))\}.$$

Lemma 5.22. *Let τ be a permutation of $\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)$. We have*

$$\text{Deg}\left(\prod_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \tilde{e}_{pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - \tau(Q)}^{\text{res}}\right) = \max_{\tau' \in \text{Iso}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \left(\text{Deg}\left(\prod_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \tilde{e}_{pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - \tau'(Q)}^{\text{res}}\right)\right)$$

if and only if $\tau \in \text{Iso}^{\text{SP}}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$.

Proof. By Property 5.10 (2) II, Lemma 5.11 (2), and Lemma 5.17, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Deg} \left(\prod_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \tilde{e}_{pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - \tau(Q)}^{\text{res}} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \text{Deg} \left(\tilde{e}_{pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - \tau(Q)}^{\text{res}} \right) \quad (\text{Property 5.10(2)(II)}) \\
 &= \sum_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \text{Deg} (pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0 - \tau(Q)) \quad (\text{Lemma 5.11(2)}) \\
 &\preceq \sum_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \left(\text{Deg} (pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0) - \text{Deg} (\tau(Q)) \right) \quad (\text{Lemma 5.17}) \\
 &= \sum_{Q \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \left(\text{Deg} (pQ - \eta(P_0) + P_0) - \text{Deg} (Q) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.20, the equality holds in the above inequality if and only if

$$\tau \in \text{Iso}^{\text{SP}}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)). \quad \square$$

Lemma 5.23. *Let J be an index set and $\{g_j \mid j \in J\}$ be a set of polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}_p[[T]][\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_n]$. Denote by J_0 the subset of J such that for every $j \in J$, we have*

$$\text{Deg}(g_j) = \max_{i \in J} \left(\text{Deg}(g_i) \right) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad j \in J_0.$$

Then we have either

- (1) $\sum_{j \in J_0} \text{LD}(g_j) = \text{LD}(\sum_{j \in J} g_j)$ or
- (2) $\sum_{j \in J_0} \text{LD}(g_j) = 0$.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

We prove Proposition 5.13 assuming Proposition 5.14.

Proof of Proposition 5.13. By Property 5.10(2)(III) and the definition of $\text{Iso}^{\text{SP}}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\tau \in \text{Iso}^{\text{SP}}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \text{LD} \left(\text{sgn}(\tau) \prod_{P \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0)} \tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - \tau(Q)}^{\text{res}} \right) \\
 = \prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}}. \quad (5.19)
 \end{aligned}$$

Assuming Proposition 5.14, we know that

$$\prod_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0))} \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ - Q'}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q, Q' \in \mathbb{S}} \neq 0. \quad (5.20)$$

Combining (5.20) with Lemmas 5.22 and 5.23, we obtain (5.8). □

5.3. Proof of Proposition 5.14.

Notation 5.24. We set

$$Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \mid m_i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } 0 \leq m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \dots \leq m_\ell \leq k \right\}.$$

As in Notation 5.12, we assume that $I = \{n' + 1, n' + 2, \dots, n\}$.

Lemma 5.25. *For every nonempty set $\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_\ell)$, there exist*

$$Q_{\min} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_{\min, i} \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_\ell),$$

where $0 < z_{\min, i} - z_{\min, i-1} \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, and integers K^\pm such that

$$\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_\ell) = Q_{\min} + Y_{K^\pm}(S_1, \dots, S_\ell). \quad (5.21)$$

Proof. Let Q_{\min} denote the point in $\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_\ell)$ with the minimal degree. Now we show that $0 < z_{\min, i} - z_{\min, i-1} \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Suppose that it is false, then there exists an integer j such that $z_{\min, j} - z_{\min, j-1} > 1$. It is easy to check that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_{\min, i} \mathbf{V}_{S_i} - \mathbf{V}_{S_j}$ is a point in $\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_\ell)$ of a smaller degree than Q_{\min} , a contradiction.

The rest of this lemma is obvious. We show it by an example. \square

Example 5.26. When Δ is a cube generated by $(3, 0, 0), (0, 3, 0), (0, 0, 3)$, $p = 29$, and $P_0 = (1, 0, 0)$.

(1) For $\Delta_3^\pm(\{2\}, P_0; \{1\}, \{3\})$, it is easy to show that

- $\Delta_3^-(\{2\}, P_0; \{1\}, \{3\}) = \{(1, 0, 3), (1, 0, 6), (4, 0, 6)\}$ and
- $\Delta_3^+(\{2\}, P_0; \{1\}, \{3\}) = \{(1, 0, 3), (1, 0, 6), (4, 0, 6), (1, 0, 9), (4, 0, 9), (7, 0, 9)\}$,

hence $Q_{\min} = (1, 0, 3)$.

It is easy to check that

$$Q_{\min} + Y_1(\{1\}, \{3\}) = \Delta_3^-(\{2\}, P_0; \{1\}, \{3\})$$

and

$$Q_{\min} + Y_2(\{1\}, \{3\}) = \Delta_3^+(\{2\}, P_0; \{1\}, \{3\}).$$

(2) For $\Delta_3^\pm(\{2\}, P_0; \{3\}, \{1\})$, we get

$$\Delta_3^\pm(\{2\}, P_0; \{3\}, \{1\}) = \{(4, 0, 3), (7, 0, 3), (7, 0, 6)\},$$

hence $Q_{\min} = (4, 0, 3)$.

It is easy to check that

$$Q_{\min} + Y_1(\{3\}, \{1\}) = \Delta_3^\pm(\{2\}, P_0; \{3\}, \{1\}).$$

Recall that in Notation 2.4, we denote by $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ the coefficients of π^i in $E(\pi)$.

Notation 5.27. Let $Q_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in \Lambda_\Delta$ such that $0 \leq m_1 \leq \dots \leq m_\ell$. We put

$$\gamma(Q_1) := \pi^{m_\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \left(\zeta_{\sum_{j=i}^{\ell} \#S_j(Q_1)} \right)^{m_i - m_{i-1}}. \quad (5.22)$$

Remark 5.28. Although the method of writing Q_1 as a sum like that is not unique, $\gamma(Q_1)$ is well-defined.

Lemma 5.29. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, and let $Q = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i}$ such that*

$$z_i - z_{i-1} > k \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq i \leq \ell.$$

For every $Q_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)$ and every $Q_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m'_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)$, the leading term

$$\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q+pQ_1-Q_2}^{\text{res}}) = \frac{\gamma(Q)\gamma(pQ_1)}{\gamma(Q_2)} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} c_{z_i+pm_i-m'_i}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.11, we have

$$\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q+pQ_1-Q_2}^{\text{res}}) = \gamma(Q + pQ_1 - Q_2) \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} c_{z_i+pm_i-m'_i}.$$

By Notation 5.27, we know that

$$\gamma(Q + pQ_1 - Q_2) = \frac{\gamma(Q)\gamma(pQ_1)}{\gamma(Q_2)}.$$

Combining them, we complete the proof. \square

Notation 5.30.

(1) For a vector $\vec{w} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ such that $w_0 < w_1 < \dots < w_\ell$, we denote

$$\xi(\vec{w}) := \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} c_{w_{i+1}-w_i}.$$

(2) Let

$$V_{\ell,k} := \{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell \mid 0 \leq z_1 \leq \dots \leq z_\ell \leq k\}.$$

Rearranging the vectors in $V_{\ell,k}$ with increasing partial order as defined in Definition 5.9(1), we obtain a sequence of vectors as $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}^{\binom{\ell+k}{k}}$. For a vector $\vec{w} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ such that $k < w_i - w_{i-1}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we set

$$M(\vec{w}, k) := \left(\xi(\vec{w} + p\vec{v}_i - \vec{v}_j) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq \binom{\ell+k}{k}}.$$

Proposition 5.31. *Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $Q = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i}$ such that $0 = z_0 < z_1 < \dots < z_\ell$. If*

$$z_i - z_{i-1} > k \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq i \leq \ell,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q+pQ_1-Q_2}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q_1, Q_2 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \\ &= \det \left(M \left((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), k \right) \right) \times \prod_{Q_1 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \gamma(Q + (p-1)Q_1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.29, we simplify $\det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q+pQ_1-Q_2}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q_1, Q_2 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q+pQ_1-Q_2}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q_1, Q_2 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \\
 &= \det \left(\text{diag} \left(\gamma(Q_1)^{-1} \right)_{Q_1 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q+pQ_1-Q_2}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q_1, Q_2 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \text{diag} \left(\gamma(Q_2) \right)_{Q_2 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \right) \\
 &= \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q+pQ_1-Q_2}^{\text{res}}) \gamma(Q_2) \gamma^{-1}(Q_1) \right)_{Q_1, Q_2 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \\
 &= \det \left(\text{diag} \left(\gamma(Q + pQ_1 - Q_1) \right)_{Q_1 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} M \left((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), k \right) \right) \quad (\text{Lemma 5.29}) \\
 &= \det \left(M \left((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), k \right) \right) \times \prod_{Q_1 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \left(\gamma(Q + pQ_1 - Q_1) \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{diag} \left(\gamma(Q_1) \right)_{Q_1 \in Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)}$ is a diagonal matrix whose rows and columns are indexed by the points in $Y_k(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)$. \square

Lemma 5.32. *Let $\vec{w} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_\ell)$ be an ℓ -dimensional vector. If*

$$k \leq w_i - w_{i-1} \leq p - k \quad (5.24)$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, then

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Proof. We prove it by induction. When $\ell = 1$, we have $\vec{w} = (w_1)$. For every $k \geq 1$ we write the determinant explicitly as

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) = \det \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} & c_{w_1+p} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp} \\ c_{w_1-1} & c_{w_1+p-1} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp-1} \\ c_{w_1-2} & c_{w_1+p-2} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{w_1-k} & c_{w_1+p-k} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp-k} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.25)$$

By [RWXY][Lemma 5.2] and (5.24), the congruence relation

$$(w_1 - j)c_{w_1+ip-j} - c_{w_1+ip-j-1} \equiv c_{w_1+(i-1)p-j} \pmod{p} \quad (5.26)$$

holds for every $0 \leq i \leq k$ and $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$, where $c_s = 0$ for all $s < 0$.

Therefore, by (5.26), the equality (5.25) can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) \\
 &= \det \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} & & & & c_{w_1+p} & & \cdots & & & & c_{w_1+kp} \\ c_{w_1-1} - w_1 c_{w_1} & & & & c_{w_1+p-1} - w_1 c_{w_1+p} & & \cdots & & & & c_{w_1+kp-1} - w_1 c_{w_1+kp} \\ c_{w_1-2} - (w_1-1)c_{w_1-1} & & & & c_{w_1+p-2} - (w_1-1)c_{w_1+p-1} & & \cdots & & & & c_{w_1+kp-2} - (w_1-1)c_{w_1+kp-1} \\ \vdots & & & & \vdots & & \ddots & & & & \vdots \\ c_{w_1-k} - (w_1-k+1)c_{w_1-k+1} & & & & c_{w_1+p-k} - (w_1-k+1)c_{w_1+p-k+1} & & \cdots & & & & c_{w_1+kp-k} - (w_1-k+1)c_{w_1+kp-k+1} \end{pmatrix} \\
 &\equiv \det \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} & c_{w_1+p} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+kp} \\ 0 & -c_{w_1} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p} \\ 0 & -c_{w_1-1} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & -c_{w_1-k+1} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p-k+1} \end{pmatrix} \equiv (-1)^k c_{w_1} \det \left(M(\vec{w}, k-1) \right) \pmod{p}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

Since $k-1 \leq w_{i+1} - w_i \leq p-k+1$ for every $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, by simply taking induction on k , we know that

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) \equiv (-1)^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}} c_{w_1}^{k-1} \pmod{p}. \tag{5.28}$$

Condition (5.24) shows

$$c_{w_1} = \frac{1}{w_1!} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \tag{5.29}$$

Combining (5.29) and (5.28), we complete the proof of the case when $\ell = 1$. For $\ell = 2$, by definition, we have

$$M(\vec{w}, k) = \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M_{00} & c_{w_1+p} M_{01} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp} M_{0k} \\ c_{w_1-1} M_{10} & c_{w_1-1+p} M_{11} & \cdots & c_{w_1-1+kp} M_{1k} \\ c_{w_1-2} M_{20} & c_{w_1-2+p} M_{21} & \cdots & c_{w_1-2+kp} M_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{w_1-k} M_{k0} & c_{w_1-k+p} M_{k1} & \cdots & c_{w_1-k+kp} M_{kk} \end{pmatrix},$$

where for every $0 \leq i \leq k$ and every $0 \leq j \leq k$,

$$M_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_2-w_1} & c_{w_2-w_1+p} & \cdots & c_{w_2-w_1+jp} \\ c_{w_2-w_1-1} & c_{w_2-w_1+p-1} & \cdots & c_{w_2-w_1+jp-1} \\ c_{w_2-w_1-2} & c_{w_2-w_1+p-2} & \cdots & c_{w_2-w_1+jp-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{w_2-w_1-i} & c_{w_2-w_1+p-i} & \cdots & c_{w_2-w_1+jp-i} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $A_i = [I_{(n-i) \times (n-i)}, 0_{(n-i) \times 1}]$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. It is easy to see that $M_{i,j} = A_i M_{i-1,j}$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k$ and every $1 \leq i \leq k$. Therefore, imitating the row operations used in

(5.27), we modify $M(\vec{w}, k)$ by “block row operations” as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \begin{pmatrix} I_0 & & & \\ -w_1 A_1 & I_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & I_k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_0 & & & \\ & I_1 & & \\ -(w_1-1)A_2 & I_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & I_k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_0 & & & \\ & I_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & I_{k-1} \\ & & & & I_k \end{pmatrix} M(\vec{w}, k) \\
 &= \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M_{00} & & c_{w_1+p} M_{01} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp} M_{0k} \\ (c_{w_1-1} - w_1 c_{w_1}) M_{10} & & (c_{w_1-1+p} - w_1 c_{w_1+p}) M_{11} & \cdots & (c_{w_1-1+kp} - w_1 c_{w_1+kp}) M_{1k} \\ (c_{w_1-2} - (w_1-1)c_{w_1-1}) M_{20} & & (c_{w_1+p-2} - (w_1-1)c_{w_1+p-1}) M_{21} & \cdots & (c_{w_1+k-2} - (w_1-1)c_{w_1+k-1}) M_{2k} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (c_{w_1-k} - (w_1-k+1)c_{w_1-k+1}) M_{k0} & & (c_{w_1-k+p} - (w_1-k+1)c_{w_1-k+1+p}) M_{k1} & \cdots & (c_{w_1-k+kp} - (w_1-k+1)c_{w_1-k+1+kp}) M_{kk} \end{pmatrix} \\
 &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M_{00} & c_{w_1+p} M_{01} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+kp} M_{0k} \\ 0 & -c_{w_1} M_{11} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p} M_{1k} \\ 0 & -c_{w_1-1} M_{21} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p-1} M_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & -c_{w_1-k+1} M_{k1} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p-k+1} M_{kk} \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

It is not hard to show that

$$M(\vec{w}, k-1) = \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M_{11} & \cdots & c_{w_1+(k-1)p} M_{1k} \\ c_{w_1-1} M_{21} & \cdots & c_{w_1+(k-1)p-1} M_{2k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{w_1-k+1} M_{k1} & \cdots & c_{w_1+(k-1)(p-1)} M_{kk} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.31}$$

Combining it with (5.30) gives

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) \equiv \det \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M(\vec{w}', k) & * \\ 0 & -M(\vec{w}, k-1) \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p},$$

where $\vec{w}' = (w_1)$ and $*$ represents a $\binom{k+\ell-1}{k} \times \binom{k+\ell-1}{k-1}$ matrix.

Since \vec{w}' is a one-dimensional vector, as the argument above, the determinant

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}', k) \right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Combining it with (5.29) shows that

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \det \left(M(\vec{w}, k-1) \right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Since

$$M(\vec{w}, 0) = c_{w_2-w_1} = \frac{1}{(w_2-w_1)!} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

we show that

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Assume this statement holds for all $t \leq \ell - 1$; we will prove it for ℓ .

We first put

$$M(\vec{w}, k) = \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M_{00} & c_{w_1+p} M_{01} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp} M_{0k} \\ c_{w_1-1} M_{10} & c_{w_1-1+p} M_{11} & \cdots & c_{w_1-1+kp} M_{1k} \\ c_{w_1-2} M_{20} & c_{w_1-2+p} M_{21} & \cdots & c_{w_1-2+kp} M_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{w_1-k} M_{k0} & c_{w_1-k+p} M_{k1} & \cdots & c_{w_1-k+kp} M_{kk} \end{pmatrix},$$

where M_{ij} is a $\binom{k-1+\ell-i}{k-1} \times \binom{k-1+\ell-j}{k-1}$ matrix; and

$$M_{00} = M(\vec{w}', k) \quad (5.32)$$

for $\vec{w}' = (w_2 - w_1, w_3 - w_1, \dots, w_\ell - w_1)$.

Similar to the case $\ell = 2$ there exists a set of matrices $\{A_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$, such that for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, A_i is a $\binom{k-1+\ell-i}{k-1} \times \binom{k-1+\ell-i+1}{k-1}$ reduced echelon matrix and

$$M_{i,j} = A_i M_{i-1,j}.$$

Similar to (5.30) and (5.31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} I_0 & & & \\ -w_1 A_1 & I_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & I_k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_0 & & & \\ & I_1 & & \\ & -(w_1-1)A_2 & I_2 & \\ & & & \ddots \\ & & & & I_k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_0 & & & \\ & I_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & I_{k-1} \\ & & & -(w_1-k+1)A_k & I_k \end{pmatrix} M(\vec{w}', k) \\ & \equiv \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M_{00} & c_{w_1+p} M_{01} & \cdots & c_{w_1+kp} M_{0k} \\ 0 & -c_{w_1} M_{11} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p} M_{1k} \\ 0 & -c_{w_1-1} M_{21} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)p-1} M_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & -c_{w_1-k+1} M_{k1} & \cdots & -c_{w_1+(k-1)(p-1)} M_{kk} \end{pmatrix} \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M(\vec{w}', k) & * \\ 0 & -M(\vec{w}, k-1) \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

where $*$ represents a $\binom{k+\ell-1}{k} \times \binom{k+\ell-1}{k-1}$ matrix, and

$$M(\vec{w}, k-1) = \begin{pmatrix} c_{w_1} M_{11} & \cdots & c_{w_1+(k-1)p} M_{1k} \\ c_{w_1-1} M_{21} & \cdots & c_{w_1+(k-1)p-1} M_{2k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{w_1-k+1} M_{k1} & \cdots & c_{w_1+(k-1)(p-1)} M_{kk} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By induction and (5.29), the determinant

$$\det(c_{w_1} M(\vec{w}', k)) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

which implies

$$\det(M(\vec{w}, k)) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \det(M(\vec{w}, k-1)) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Since

$$M(\vec{w}, 0) = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell} c_{w_{i+1}-w_i} = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell} \frac{1}{(w_{i+1}-w_i)!} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

we show that

$$\det \left(M(\vec{w}, k) \right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 5.14. Let $\mathbb{S} = \Delta_k^\pm(P_0, I; S_1, S_2, \dots, S_\ell)$. By Lemma 5.25, there exists

$$Q_{\min} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_{\min, i} \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in \Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_\ell),$$

where $0 < z_{\min, i} - z_{\min, i-1} \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, and integers K^\pm such that

$$\Delta_k^\pm(I, P_0; S_1, \dots, S_\ell) = Q_{\min} + Y_{K^\pm}(S_1, \dots, S_\ell). \quad (5.34)$$

It is easy to see that we can put

$$Q := (p-1)Q_{\min} - \eta(P_0) + P_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} z_i \mathbf{V}_{S_i} \in \Lambda_\Delta.$$

Since P_0 and $\eta(P_0)$ are both in Δ^- and $z_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we know that

$$\left| z_i - z_{i-1} - (p-1)(z_{\min, i} - z_{\min, i-1}) \right| \leq 1.$$

Therefore, by Hypothesis 1.1, we get

$$n+2 < z_i - z_{i-1} < p - (n+2) \quad (5.35)$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$.

Since $K^\pm < n+2$, we know that Q and $Y_{K^\pm}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_\ell)$ satisfy the condition in Proposition 5.31, hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pP - Q}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{P, Q \in \mathbb{S}} \\ &= \det \left(\text{LD}(\tilde{e}_{Q + pQ_1 - Q_2}^{\text{res}}) \right)_{Q_1, Q_2 \in Y_{K^\pm}(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} \\ &= \det \left(M((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), K^\pm) \right) \times \prod_{Q_1 \in Y_{K^\pm}(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} (\gamma(Q + pQ_1 - Q_1)) \\ &= \det \left(M((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), K^\pm) \right) \times g_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}(\zeta) \pi^{\sum_{Q_1 \in Y_{K^\pm}(S_1, \dots, S_\ell)} w(Q + pQ_1 - Q_1)} \\ &= \det \left(M((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), K^\pm) \right) \times g_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}(\zeta) \pi^{\sum_{Q' \in \mathbb{S}} w(P_0 - \eta(P_0) + pQ' - Q')} \\ &= \det \left(M((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), K^\pm) \right) \times g_{P_0, \mathbb{S}}(\zeta) \pi^{\sum_{Q' \in \mathbb{S}} \left(\lfloor pw(Q') \rfloor - \lfloor w(\eta(P_0) - P_0 + Q') \rfloor \right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

By (5.35), the vector $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_\ell)$ satisfies the conditions in Lemma 5.32. Therefore, we obtain

$$\det \left(M((z_1, \dots, z_\ell), K^\pm) \right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

which completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [AS] A. Adolphson and S. Sperber, Exponential sums and Newton polyhedra: Cohomology and estimates. *Ann. of Math.* **130** (1989), 367–406.
- [BE] B. Berndt and R. Evans, The determination of Gauss sums, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **5** (1981), 107–129.
- [BF] R. Blache, E. Ferard, Newton stratification for polynomials: the open stratum, *J. Number Theory.* **123** (2007), 456–472.
- [BFZ] R. Blache, E. Ferard, and H. Zhu, Hodge–Stickelberger polygons for L -functions of exponential sums of $P(x^s)$, *Math. Res. Lett.* **15** (2008), no. 5, 1053–1071.

- [DWX] C. Davis, D. Wan, and L. Xiao, Newton slopes for Artin–Schreier–Witt towers, *Math. Ann.* **364** (2016), no. 3, 1451–1468.
- [H] D. Haessig, L -functions of symmetric powers of Kloosterman sums (unit root L -functions and p -adic estimates), *Math. Ann.* **369** (2017), no. 1-2, 17–47.
- [KW] M. Kusters, D. Wan, Genus growth in \mathbb{Z}_p towers of function fields, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **146** (2018), no.4, 1481–1494.
- [LWan] C. Liu and D. Wan, T -adic exponential sums over finite fields, *Algebra Number Theory* **3** (2009), no. 5, 489–509.
- [LWX] R. Liu, D. Wan, and L. Xiao, Slopes of eigencurves over the boundary of the weight space, *Duke Math. J.* **166** (2017), no. 9, 1739–1787.
- [LWei] C. Liu and D. Wei, The L -functions of Witt coverings, *Math. Z.* **255** (2007), 95–115.
- [OY] Y. Ouyang and J. Yang, Newton polygons of L functions of polynomials $x^d + ax$. *J. Number Theory.* **160** (2016), 478–491.
- [OZ] Y. Ouyang and S. Zhang, Newton polygons of L -functions of polynomials $x^d + ax^{d-1}$ with $p \equiv -1 \pmod{d}$. *Finite Fields and their Appl.* **37** (2016), 285–294.
- [Ren] R. Ren, Generic Newton polygon for exponential sums in two variables with triangular base, [arXiv:1701.00254](https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.00254).
- [RWXY] R. Ren, D. Wan, L. Xiao, and M. Yu, Slopes for higher rank Artin–Schreier–Witt Towers, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **370** (2018), 6411–6432.
- [SZ] J. Scholten and H. Zhu, Slope estimates of Artin-Schreier curves. *Compositio Math.* **137** (2003), no. 3, 275–292.
- [Wan] D. Wan, Variation of p -adic Newton polygons for L -functions of exponential sums, *Asian J. Math.* **8** (2004), no. 3, 427–471.
- [Zhu1] H. Zhu, p -adic variation of L -functions of one variable exponential sums, I. *American Journal of Mathematics.* **125** (2003), 669–690.
- [Zhu2] H. Zhu, Generic Newton Slopes for Artin–Schreier–Witt Tower in two variables, [arXiv:1612.07158](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.07158).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER 915 HYLAN BUILDING, ROCHESTER, NY 14627
E-mail address: rren2@ur.rochester.edu