

Dp-finite fields VI: the dp-finite Shelah conjecture

Will Johnson

May 29, 2020

Abstract

We prove the dp-finite case of the Shelah conjecture on NIP fields. If K is a dp-finite field, then K admits a non-trivial definable henselian valuation ring, unless K is finite, real closed, or algebraically closed. As a consequence, the conjectural classification of dp-finite fields holds. Additionally, dp-finite valued fields are henselian. Lastly, if K is an unstable dp-finite expansion of a field, then K admits a unique definable V-topology.

1 Introduction

A structure is *dp-finite* if it has finite dp-rank. We prove the following facts about dp-finite fields and valued fields:

Theorem 1.1 (dp-finite henselianity conjecture). *Let (K, v) be a dp-finite valued field. Then v is henselian.*

Theorem 1.2 (dp-finite Shelah conjecture). *Let K be a dp-finite field. Then one of the following holds:*

- K is finite.
- K is algebraically closed.
- K is real closed.
- K admits a definable non-trivial henselian valuation.

By Theorems 3.3 and 3.11 of [4], this implies a classification of dp-finite fields up to elementary equivalence:

Theorem 1.3. *A field K is dp-finite if and only if there is a henselian defectless valuation v on K such that*

- *The residue field Kv is elementarily equivalent to $\mathbb{F}_p^{\text{alg}}$ or a local field of characteristic 0, i.e., a finite extension of \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{Q}_p .*

- The value group vK is dp-finite as an ordered abelian group.
- If $\text{char}(K) = p$, then the value group vK is p -divisible.
- If (K, v) has mixed characteristic $(0, p)$, then $[-v(p), v(p)] \subseteq p \cdot vK$.

Moreover, when the above conditions hold, the theory of K is determined by the theory of Kv and the theory of vK (with $v(p)$ named as a constant in the mixed characteristic case).

Remark 1.4.

1. Dp-finite ordered abelian groups are classified in [1, 2, 3].
2. Theorems 3.3 and 3.11 of [4] are phrased for strongly dependent fields, but the proof applies to dp-finite fields as well. All strongly dependent fields are conjectured to be dp-finite ([4], Proposition 3.9).
3. The valuation v is not uniquely determined by K , and the map from $(\text{Th}(Kv), \text{Th}(vK))$ to $\text{Th}(K)$ is many-to-one, rather than a bijection. For example, if $(K, v_0) \models \text{ACVF}$, we could take v to be either v_0 or the trivial valuation. In the first case, the value group vK would be a divisible ordered abelian group; in the second case, it would be trivial.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $(K, +, \cdot, \dots)$ be an unstable dp-finite field, possibly with extra structure. Then K admits a unique definable V -topology.*

This implies the dp-finite Shelah and henselianity conjectures, by ([8], Proposition 6.4).

1.1 Reduction to W -topologies

In [6, 7] we defined a “canonical topology” on any unstable dp-finite field, and proved

Fact 1.6. *The canonical topology is a field topology. If it is V -topological, then it is the unique definable V -topology.*

However, in [8], we gave an example of an expanded field $(K, +, \cdot, \dots)$ of dp-rank 2, in which the canonical topology was not a V -topology. In [9] we introduced a class of “finite weight” topological fields, or W -topological fields. Field topologies of weight 1 are exactly V -topologies. We proved the following:

Fact 1.7.

1. *The canonical topology on an unstable dp-finite field K is a definable field topology of weight at most $\text{dp-rk}(K)$.*
2. *If τ is a field topology of finite weight (a W -topology), then there is at least one V -topological coarsening, i.e., a V -topology σ that is coarser than τ .*

3. If τ is a definable W -topology, then the V -topological coarsenings of τ are all definable.
4. If τ is the canonical topology of an unstable dp -finite field K , then the V -topological coarsenings of τ are exactly the definable V -topologies on K .

As a corollary, we obtained the existence part of Theorem 1.5. Moreover, the uniqueness of the definable V -topology was already known in characteristic $p > 0$, by ([6], Lemma 2.6 and [5], Proposition 3.5). So it remains to prove uniqueness in characteristic 0.

In [7] (Proposition 5.17(4)), we used multiplicative infinitesimals to prove:

Fact 1.8. *Let K be an unstable dp -finite field, viewed as a topological field via the canonical topology. For every neighborhood $U \ni 1$, the set $U^2 = \{x^2 : x \in U\}$ is a neighborhood of 1.*

Equivalently, the squaring map $K^\times \rightarrow K^\times$ is an open map.

Thus, everything reduces to the following statement purely about W -topologies:

Lemma 1.9 (= Corollary 4.15). *Let (K, τ) be a W -topological field of characteristic 0. If the squaring map $K^\times \rightarrow K^\times$ is an open map, then τ has a unique V -topological coarsening.*

This in turn comes from the following decomposition theorem:

Theorem 1.10 (= Theorems 4.10 and 4.13). *Let (K, τ) be a W -topological field. Then there exist W -topological coarsenings τ_1, \dots, τ_n such that*

- *The τ_i are jointly independent and generate τ . In other words, the diagonal embedding*

$$(K, \tau) \hookrightarrow (K, \tau_1) \times \cdots \times (K, \tau_n)$$

is a homeomorphism onto its image, and the image is dense.

- *Each τ_i has a unique V -topological coarsening, and this establishes a bijection between $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n\}$ and the set of V -topological coarsenings of τ .*

We discuss the strategy for proving Theorem 1.10 in §2.2, after introducing some machinery in §2.

1.2 Conventions

This paper is a continuation of [9], and we use its notions of “weight,” and W_n -sets, -rings, and -topologies. A W -topology is a topology of finite weight, i.e., a W_n -topology for some n .

All rings will be commutative and unital. If R is a ring, then R^\times will denote the group of units of R , and $\text{Jac}(R)$ will denote the Jacobson radical. If R is an integral domain, then $\text{Frac}(R)$ will denote its field of fractions, and \tilde{R} will denote the integral closure of R in $\text{Frac}(R)$. We will tend to use the letter \mathcal{O} for valuation rings, and \mathfrak{m} for maximal ideals of valuation rings.

In a list, \dots, \hat{x}, \dots means “omit x from the list.” If R is a ring and x_1, \dots, x_n are elements of an R -module M , then the x_i are R -independent if no x_i lies in the R -module generated

by $\{x_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_i, \dots, x_n\}$. Often $M = R$ or $M = \text{Frac}(R)$. The “cube-rank” of ([9], §2.1) is the maximum length of an R -independent sequence in M .

If K is a field and $A, B \subseteq K$, we will say that A is *embeddable into* B if there is $c \in K^\times$ such that $c \cdot A \subseteq B$. We say that A and B are *co-embeddable* if A is embeddable into B and B is embeddable into A .

All topologies will be Hausdorff non-discrete locally bounded ring topologies on fields. We think of a topology as the filter of neighborhoods of 0, rather than the set of open sets. If τ is a topology, then τ^\perp will denote the ideal of bounded sets. By assumption, τ always intersects τ^\perp .

We will say that U “defines” or “induces” a topology τ if U is a locally bounded neighborhood in τ , i.e., $U \in \tau \cap \tau^\perp$. In this case, $\{cU : c \in K^\times\}$ is a filter basis for τ , as well as an ideal basis for τ^\perp (Lemma 2.1(e) of [10]).

If R is a proper subring of K and $\text{Frac}(R) = K$, then R induces a topology τ_R . The non-zero ideals of R form a neighborhood basis, but we will predominantly use the basis $\{cR : c \in K^\times\}$.

The terms “local class,” “local sentence,” and “local equivalence” will be used as in [10]. In particular, a local class is a class of topological fields defined by a set of local sentences, and two topological fields are locally equivalent if they satisfy the same local sentences. Local sentences allow two types of variables:

- Lower-case variables a, b, c, \dots, x, y, z , which range over the field sort.
- Upper-case variables U, V, W, \dots , which range over τ .

Quantification over τ is limited:

- Universal quantification $\forall U : \phi(U)$ is allowed only if U occurs positively in $\phi(U)$.
- Existential quantification $\exists U : \phi(U)$ is allowed only if U occurs negatively in $\phi(U)$.

Because of this constraint, local sentences can be evaluated on a filter basis for τ : if τ_0 is a filter basis for τ , and ψ is a local sentence, then

$$(K, \tau) \models \psi \iff (K, \tau_0) \models \psi.$$

Let K be a field. Consider the expansion of $(K, +, \cdot)$ by all unary predicates. Let All_K be the theory of the resulting object. Henceforth, an “ultrapower” of K will mean a monster model of All_K . If K^* is an “ultrapower” of K , and $U \subseteq K$, then U^* will denote the corresponding subset of K^* . In the structure K^* , the K -definable subsets of K^* are exactly the sets U^* . A \forall -definable set will be a complement of a type-definable set. Type-definable and \forall -definable sets will always be defined over small subsets of the “ultrapower.”

2 Topologies and \forall -definable rings

Fix a field K and an “ultrapower” K^* . We review the (easy) dictionary between locally bounded ring topologies on K and certain \forall -definable subrings of K^* .

Proposition 2.1. *For every topology τ on K , there is a ring $R = R_\tau \subseteq K^*$ such that*

1. R is a filtered union $\bigcup_{B \in \tau^\perp} B^*$, i.e., the union of B^* as B ranges over τ -bounded subsets of K .
2. R is \vee -definable over K .
3. R is a proper K -subalgebra of K^* .
4. If τ and τ' are two topologies, then τ is coarser than τ' if and only if $R_\tau \supseteq R_{\tau'}$.

Proof. Define R as in point 1. Then R is trivially \vee -definable over K . For the other points, we use Lemma 2.1 in [10]. If B_1, B_2 are two bounded sets, then $B_1 \cup B_2$ is bounded. Therefore the union is filtered. Any finite subset of K is bounded. Therefore $K \subseteq R$. If B_1, B_2 are bounded, then $B_1 - B_2$ and $B_1 \cdot B_2$ are bounded. Therefore R is a K -subalgebra of K^* . The set K is not itself bounded. By saturation of K^* , it follows that $R \neq K^*$.

Lastly, for point 4 we prove the following chain of equivalent statements:

1. τ is coarser than τ' , i.e., every τ -open is a τ' -open.
2. $\tau \subseteq \tau'$, i.e., every τ -neighborhood of 0 is a τ' -neighborhood of 0.
3. $(\tau')^\perp \subseteq \tau^\perp$, i.e., every τ' -bounded set is τ -bounded.
4. $R_{\tau'} \subseteq R_\tau$.

The equivalence (1) \iff (2) is easy. The equivalence (2) \iff (3) holds because τ and τ^\perp determine each other:

- $B \in \tau^\perp$ if and only if B is embeddable into every $U \in \tau$, in the sense that $\exists c \in K^\times : cB \subseteq U$. This is Lemma 2.1(d) in [10].
- $U \in \tau$ if and only if every $B \in \tau^\perp$ is embeddable into U . This holds by local boundedness of the topology.

Finally, the equivalence (3) \iff (4) follows by compactness (and the fact that the unions are filtered). \square

So R_τ is the ring of “ K -bounded” elements in K^* . One could also define the group of “ K -infinitesimals” as the intersection $\bigcap_{U \in \tau} U^*$. However, the ring of K -bounded elements is more useful for our purposes.

Proposition 2.2. *For every topology τ on K , there is a topology τ^* on K^* such that*

1. τ^* is defined by the ring $R = R_\tau$ of Proposition 2.1.
2. If U is any set defining τ , then U^* defines τ^* .

3. If τ_1, \dots, τ_n are topologies on K , and $\tau_1^*, \dots, \tau_n^*$ are the corresponding topologies on K^* , then there is a “local equivalence” in the sense of Prestel and Ziegler:

$$(K^*, \tau_1^*, \dots, \tau_n^*) \equiv (K, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n).$$

Proof. Fix any U defining τ . Then U is a bounded neighborhood of 0, so $U^* \subseteq R_\tau$. For every bounded set $B \in \tau^\perp$, there is $c \in K^\times$ such that $cB \subseteq U$. By saturation, there is $c \in (K^*)^\times$ such that $cB^* \subseteq U^*$ for all $B \in \tau^\perp$. Thus $cR_\tau \subseteq U^*$. So R_τ and U are co-embeddable.

By the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [10], U^* defines a topology τ^* on K^* , with $(K^*, \tau^*) \equiv (K, \tau)$. By co-embeddability of R_τ and U , the topology τ^* is also defined by R_τ . In particular, τ^* is independent of the choice of U .

Now suppose τ_1, \dots, τ_n are fixed topologies on K . For each i , choose $U_i \subseteq K$ defining τ_i . Then there is an elementary equivalence

$$(K^*, +, \cdot, U_1^*, \dots, U_n^*) \equiv (K, +, \cdot, U_1, \dots, U_n).$$

By Corollary 2.4 in [10], this implies the desired local equivalence, as each U_i^* defines τ_i^* . \square

Proposition 2.3. *Let τ be a topology on K , and let R_τ be the corresponding \vee -definable ring.*

1. τ is a W_n -topology if and only if R_τ is a W_n -ring.

2. In particular, the weight of τ equals the weight of R_τ . (The weight may be infinite.)

Proof. First suppose τ is a W_n -topology. By definition (Definition 3.3 in [9]), there is a bounded W_n -set $U \subseteq K$. Then U^* is a W_n -set in K^* , and $U^* \subseteq R_\tau$, implying that R_τ is a W_n -set and a W_n -ring.

Conversely, if R_τ is a W_n -ring, then it defines a W_n -topology by Proposition 3.6 in [9]. Therefore, τ^* is a W_n -topology. By the local equivalence $(K, \tau) \equiv (K^*, \tau^*)$, it follows that τ is a W_n -topology.

This proves the first point. Then we know that $\text{wt}(\tau) \leq n \iff \text{wt}(R_\tau) \leq n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, implying that $\text{wt}(\tau) = \text{wt}(R_\tau)$. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let R_1, R_2 be two K -subalgebras of K^* , both \vee -definable over K . If R_1 and R_2 are co-embeddable, then $R_1 = R_2$. More generally, if R_1 is embeddable into R_2 , then $R_1 \subseteq R_2$.*

Proof. Each R_i is a filtered union of its K -definable sets. Suppose $cR_1 \subseteq R_2$ for some $c \in (K^*)^\times$. Then for every K -definable subset $U \subseteq R_1$, we have $cU \subseteq R_2$. By saturation, there must be some K -definable subset $V \subseteq R_2$ such that $cU \subseteq V$. The scalar c is from $(K^*)^\times$, but U and V are K -definable, and $K \preceq K^*$. Therefore we can find $e \in K^\times$ such that $eU \subseteq V$. Then $U \subseteq e^{-1}V \subseteq e^{-1}R_2 \subseteq R_2$, because $e^{-1} \in K \subseteq R_2$. As U was arbitrary, $R_1 \subseteq R_2$. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let R be a subring of K^* that is \vee -definable over K , and satisfies $K \subseteq R \subsetneq \text{Frac}(R) = K^*$.*

1. R is of the form R_τ for some topology on K if and only if R is co-embeddable with a definable set.
2. R is of the form R_τ for some W_n -topology on K if and only if R is a W_n -ring.
3. R is of the form R_τ for some V -topology on K if and only if R is a valuation ring.

Proof. 1. If $R = R_\tau$, then R is co-embeddable with U^* for any U defining τ , by Proposition 2.2(1-2).

Conversely, suppose R is co-embeddable with a definable set D . Write D as $\phi(K^*; \vec{b})$ for some formula $\phi(x; \vec{y})$ (in the language of All_K), and some parameters \vec{b} from K^* . Let S be the set of \vec{c} in K^* satisfying the equivalent conditions

- $\phi(K^*; \vec{c})$ is co-embeddable with D
- $\phi(K^*; \vec{c})$ is co-embeddable with R .

From the first characterization, S is definable. From the second characterization, S is $\text{Aut}(K^*/K)$ -invariant. Therefore S is K -definable, and we can find $\vec{c} \in S(K)$. Let $U = \phi(K; \vec{c})$. Then $U^* = \phi(K^*; \vec{c})$, and U^* is co-embeddable with R .

Let τ_R denote the topology on K^* induced by R , as in Example 1.2 of [10]. Then U^* defines τ_R , by co-embeddability. The fact that U^* defines a locally bounded ring-topology on K^* is expressed by a first-order sentence in the structure $(K^*, +, \cdot, U^*)$. The same sentence holds in $(K, +, \cdot, U)$, and so U defines a topology τ on K . Let $R' = R_\tau$ be the corresponding \vee -definable subring on K^* . Then R' is co-embeddable with U^* , by Proposition 2.2. Therefore R' is co-embeddable with R . By Lemma 2.4, $R' = R_\tau$.

2. If τ is a W_n -topology, then R_τ is a W_n -ring by Proposition 2.3. Conversely, suppose R is a W_n -ring. By assumption, R is \vee -definable. By Proposition 4.1 in [9], R is co-embeddable with a definable set. By the previous point, $R = R_\tau$ for some topology τ . By Proposition 2.3, the fact that R is a W_n -ring forces τ to be a W_n -topology.
3. This is the $n = 1$ case of the previous point. □

Lemma 2.6. *If τ is a V -topology on K and $\mathcal{O} = R_\tau$ is the corresponding valuation ring, then the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ is the set of K -infinitesimals, i.e., $\mathfrak{m} = \bigcap_{U \in \tau} U^*$.*

Proof. Fix a bounded neighborhood $B \in \tau \cap \tau^\perp$. Let $C = \{x \in K : 1/x \notin B\}$. Then $C^{-1} \cap B = \emptyset$ and $C \cup B^{-1} = K$, so that C is a bounded neighborhood of 0. (This follows by properties of V -topologies, such as the *definition* of V -topologies given in §3 of [10].) Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O} &= \bigcup_{U \in \tau^\perp} U^* = \bigcup_{a \in K^\times} aB^*. \\ \bigcap_{U \in \tau} U^* &= \bigcap_{a \in K^\times} aC^* = \bigcap_{a \in K^\times} a^{-1}C^*. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the following are equivalent for $x \in K^*$:

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \mathfrak{m} &\iff 1/x \notin \mathcal{O} \iff (\forall a \in K^\times : 1/x \notin aB^*) \\
&\iff (\forall a \in K^\times : 1/(ax) \notin B^*) \iff (\forall a \in K^\times : ax \in C^*) \\
&\iff (\forall a \in K^\times : x \in a^{-1}C^*) \iff x \in \bigcap_{a \in K^\times} a^{-1}C^* \iff x \in \bigcap_{U \in \tau} U^*. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let $X \subseteq K^*$ be \vee -definable over a small set. If X has finite orbit under $\text{Aut}(K^*/K)$, then X is \vee -definable over K .*

This is somewhat well-known, but we include the proof for completeness.

Proof. We first claim that X is $\text{Aut}(K^*/K)$ -invariant (K -invariant). Recall that if \approx is a K -invariant equivalence relation with boundedly-many equivalence classes, and $a \equiv_K b$, then $a \approx b$, because K is a model.¹ Let $a \approx b$ indicate that $a \in \sigma(X) \iff b \in \sigma(X)$ for all $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(K^*/K)$. Then \approx is K -invariant, with finitely many equivalence classes. If X itself fails to be K -invariant, then there are a and b such that $a \equiv_K b$ but $a \in X$ and $b \notin X$. Then $a \not\approx b$, a contradiction.

Thus, X is K -invariant. Now, any \vee -definable K -invariant set is \vee -definable over K .² Indeed, if X is \vee -definable over a small parameter set $B \supseteq K$, then X corresponds to some open set U in the space $S_n(B)$ of n -types over B . The K -invariance means that U is the preimage of some set $U' \subseteq S_n(K)$ under the continuous surjection $S_n(B) \rightarrow S_n(K)$. The complement $S_n(K) \setminus U'$ is the image of the closed set $S_n(B) \setminus U$, so $S_n(K) \setminus U'$ is closed, U' is open, and X is \vee -definable over K . \square

Proposition 2.8. *Let τ be a W -topology on K , and let $R = R_\tau$ be the corresponding subring of K^* .*

- *There is a unique W -topology $\tilde{\tau}$ such that the corresponding ring $R_{\tilde{\tau}}$ is the integral closure of R .*
- *There are W -topologies τ_1, \dots, τ_n such that the corresponding rings $R_{\tau_1}, \dots, R_{\tau_n}$ are exactly the localizations of R at its maximal ideals.*

Proof. By Propositions 4.7 and 4.8 in [9], the integral closure and the localizations are \vee -definable. The integral closure is clearly K -invariant, and the localizations can at most be permuted by $\text{Aut}(K^*/K)$. By Lemma 2.7, the localizations and the integral closure are \vee -definable over K . They are larger than R , so they contain K and are K -algebras. By Lemma 2.7 in [9], they are rings of finite weight. By Proposition 2.5, they come from W -topologies on K . \square

Definition 2.9. Let τ be a W -topology on K .

¹This is a well-known fact about Lascar strong type, and is easy to prove by using a global coheir of $\text{tp}(a/K)$ to build a sequence c_1, c_2, \dots such that both a, c_1, c_2, \dots and b, c_1, c_2, \dots are K -indiscernible.

²An equivalent, better-known statement is that a type-definable K -invariant set is type-definable over K .

- The *integral closure* of τ is the topology $\tilde{\tau}$ of Proposition 2.8.
- The *local components* of τ are the topologies τ_1, \dots, τ_n of Proposition 2.8.

Recall from ([9], Proposition 2.12) that if R is a W_n -ring, then the integral closure \tilde{R} is a multi-valuation ring, a finite intersection of valuation rings.

$$\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_n.$$

If the \mathcal{O}_i are chosen to be pairwise incomparable, then the \mathcal{O}_i are exactly the localizations of \tilde{R} at its maximal ideals ([7], Corollary 6.7).

Proposition 2.10. *Let τ be a W -topology on K . Then the V -topological coarsenings of τ are exactly the local components of the integral closure.*

In other words, if $R \subseteq K^$ is the corresponding \vee -definable ring, and we write \tilde{R} as an intersection of pairwise incomparable valuation rings*

$$\tilde{R} = \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_n,$$

then the \mathcal{O}_i are exactly the \vee -definable rings corresponding to the V -topological coarsenings of τ .

Proof. By Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.1(4), the V -topological coarsenings of τ correspond exactly to the valuation rings \mathcal{O} on K with the following properties:

- \mathcal{O} is non-trivial, i.e., $\mathcal{O} \neq K^*$.
- \mathcal{O} is \vee -definable over K .
- \mathcal{O} contains R .

As in the proof of Proposition 2.8, the \mathcal{O}_i certainly have these properties. Let \mathcal{O} be some other valuation ring with these properties. Then $\mathcal{O} \supseteq \tilde{R} = \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_n$. By Corollary 6.8 in [7], there is some i such that $\mathcal{O} \supseteq \mathcal{O}_i$. Then \mathcal{O} is a coarsening of \mathcal{O}_i . By non-triviality, \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}_i induce the same topology, so they are co-embeddable. By Lemma 2.4, $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_i$. \square

2.1 Local W -topologies

Definition 2.11. A W_n -topology on K is *local* if for every bounded set $B \subseteq K$, there is a bounded set $C \subseteq K$ such that

$$\forall x \in B : (1/x \in C \text{ or } 1/(1-x) \in C).$$

Proposition 2.12. *Let K^* be an “ultrapower” of K . Let τ be a W -topology on K , and let R be the associated ring in K^* . Then τ is local if and only if R is a local ring.*

Proof. Let $\gamma(X, Y)$ stand for

$$\forall x \in X : 1/x \in Y \text{ or } 1/(1-x) \in Y.$$

Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. R is a local ring.
2. For every $x \in R$, at least one of x or $1-x$ is in R^\times .
3. $\gamma(R, R)$.
4. For every bounded $B \subseteq K$, we have $\gamma(B^*, R)$.
5. For every bounded $B \subseteq K$, there is bounded $C \subseteq K$ such that $\gamma(B^*, C^*)$.
6. For every bounded $B \subseteq K$, there is bounded $C \subseteq K$ such that $\gamma(B, C)$.
7. τ is a local W-topology.

The equivalences are proven as follows:

- (1) \iff (2): well-known commutative algebra.
- (2) \iff (3): the definition of $\gamma(-, -)$.
- (3) \iff (4): R is covered by the B^* .
- (4) \iff (5): R is a filtered union of the C^* , and the structure is saturated.
- (5) \iff (6): $K \preceq K^*$.
- (6) \iff (7): the definition of “local W-topology.” □

For example, if τ is a W-topology, then the local components of τ (Definition 2.9) are local W-topologies.

Warning 2.13. 1. A local W_n -ring need not induce a local W_n -topology. For example, let \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 be the two valuation rings $\mathbb{Z}[i]_{(2+i)}$ and $\mathbb{Z}[i]_{(2-i)}$ on the field $K = \mathbb{Q}(i)$. The residue fields are both isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/(5)$. Let R be the set of $x \in \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2$ such that $\text{res}_1(x) = \text{res}_2(x)$. Then R is a W_2 -ring, because it contains the valuation ring $\mathbb{Z}_{(5)}$ on the subfield \mathbb{Q} , and $[\mathbb{Q}(i) : \mathbb{Q}] = 2$. (See Lemma 2.7 in [9].) Additionally, R is a local ring—the maximal ideal is the set of x such that $\text{res}(x) = 0$. However, R is co-embeddable with $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2$, and induces a V^2 -topology, which is not local.

2. Conversely, a non-local W_n -ring can induce a local W_n -topology. For example, if \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 are two incomparable but dependent valuation rings, then $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2$ is a non-local W_2 -ring which induces the same V-topology as $\mathcal{O}_1 \cdot \mathcal{O}_2$. V-topologies are local.

We shall need the fact that local W_n -topologies form a local class, in the sense of [10]. The following lemma helps translate statements about bounded sets into statements about neighborhoods.

Lemma 2.14. *Let (K, τ) be a field with a locally bounded ring topology. As usual τ denotes the filter of neighborhoods of 0 and τ^\perp denotes the ideal of bounded sets. Let $\phi(X)$ be a formula in $X \subseteq K$, depending positively on X . Then*

$$\exists B \in \tau^\perp : \phi(B)$$

is equivalent to

$$\forall U \in \tau \exists c \in K^\times : \phi(cU). \quad (1)$$

Dually, if $\phi(X)$ is a formula in which X appears negatively, then

$$\forall B \in \tau^\perp : \phi(B)$$

is equivalent to

$$\exists U \in \tau \forall c \in K^\times : \phi(cU).$$

Proof. We prove the first claim; the other follows formally. Suppose there is a bounded set B such that $\phi(B)$ holds. By definition of “bounded,” for any $U \in \tau$ there is $e \in K^\times$ such that $eB \subseteq U$. Then $e^{-1}U \supseteq B$, and so $\phi(e^{-1}U)$ is true. This proves (1).

Conversely, suppose (1) holds. By local boundedness, there is $U \in \tau$ such that U is bounded. By (1), there is $c \in K^\times$ such that $\phi(cU)$ holds. Then $B = cU$ is bounded, and $\phi(B)$ holds. \square

Proposition 2.15. *The class of local W_n -topologies is cut out by a local sentence, and is therefore a local class.*

Proof. The class of W_n -topologies is defined by a local sentence ([9], Remark 3.4). As in the proof of Proposition 2.12, let $\gamma(X, Y)$ be the formula

$$\forall x \in X : (1/x \in Y \text{ or } 1/(1-x) \in Y).$$

This formula is negative in X and positive in Y . Then (K, τ) is local if and only if

$$\forall B \in \tau^\perp \exists C \in \tau^\perp : \gamma(B, C).$$

By two applications of Lemma 2.14, this is equivalent to

$$\exists U \in \tau \forall c \in K^\times \forall V \in \tau \exists e \in K^\times : \gamma(cU, eV).$$

This is a local sentence. In detail, it is

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists U \in \tau \forall c \in K^\times \forall V \in \tau \exists e \in K^\times \forall x : \\ &(x/c \in U) \rightarrow (1/(xe) \in V \text{ or } 1/((1-x)e) \in V). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Remark 2.16. Suppose one is only interested in locally bounded ring topologies. Because of Lemma 2.14, one could extend Prestel and Ziegler’s notion of “local sentence” to allow quantification over bounded sets, i.e., over τ^\perp , subject to the constraints:

- Universal quantification $\forall B \in \tau^\perp : \phi(B)$ is allowed only if B occurs negatively in $\phi(B)$.
- Existential quantification $\exists B \in \tau^\perp : \phi(B)$ is allowed only if B occurs positively in $\phi(B)$.

These are opposite to the constraints on quantification over neighborhoods.

2.2 Where we are going

We give an outline of the remainder of the paper, in reverse order, working backwards from our goal.

Let τ be a W -topology on K . Let τ_1, \dots, τ_n be the local components of τ . For reasons discussed in the introduction, we would like to prove the following two statements:

1. The τ_i are jointly independent, and generate τ .
2. Each τ_i has a unique V -topological coarsening, and this establishes a bijection between $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n\}$ and the set of V -topological coarsenings.

One can reduce (1) to (2) using the independence criterion of ([9], Theorem 7.16), more or less.

As for (2), it translates into a statement about rings. Fix an “ultrapower” K^* , and let R be the ring corresponding to τ . Let \tilde{R} be its integral closure. Then (2) translates into

3. For any maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} of R , there is a unique maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of \tilde{R} such that $\tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \tilde{R}_{\mathfrak{m}}$. This establishes a bijection between the maximal ideals of R and the maximal ideals of \tilde{R} .

By commutative algebra, we reduce to the case where R and τ are local:

4. If τ is local, then τ has a unique V -topological coarsening.
5. If R is local, then \tilde{R} is a valuation ring.

This cannot be proven purely by commutative algebra—the W_2 -ring of Warning 2.13(1) is local, but its integral closure is not. We must use the fact that R is a V -definable ring induced by a topology.

Assume henceforth that R and τ are local. By pushing the commutative algebra a little further, (5) reduces to...

6. If $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ are the incomparable valuation rings whose intersection is \tilde{R} , and \mathfrak{m}_i is the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_i , then

$$\mathfrak{m}_i \cap R \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}_j \cap R$$

for $i \neq j$.

Translated back into topology, this says the following

7. If τ_1 and τ_2 are two distinct V-topological coarsenings of τ , then the following *can't* happen: τ_1 induces a finer topology than τ_2 on each τ -bounded set.

This makes intuitive sense, as τ_1 and τ_2 are independent V-topologies. To make this intuition precise, we need τ -bounded sets to be big enough:

8. In the topology on K^* induced by \widetilde{R} , the closure of R includes the Jacobson radical $\text{Jac}(\widetilde{R}) = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{m}_n$.

In the case of DV-topologies, there was a trick to prove that R is dense in its integral closure \mathcal{O} ; see §5.4 of [8]. A variant of that method works in our setting, but we need the following configuration:

9. For any non-zero a there are y_1, \dots, y_n such that
 - For each i , ay_i is not in the R -module generated by $\{y_1, \dots, \widehat{y_i}, \dots, y_n\}$.
 - For fixed i , the elements y_1, \dots, y_n all have the same valuation with respect to \mathcal{O}_i .

Ignoring the factor of a , we need a sequence y_1, \dots, y_n which is R -independent in the sense of §1.2, but which is very far from being \widetilde{R} -independent—in fact $y_i \in Ry_j$ for all i, j . Such a sequence can be obtained by scrambling an R -independent sequence by a random matrix from $GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$:

10. Let R be a W_n -ring, extending \mathbb{Q} for simplicity. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be an R -independent sequence in R , and let $\vec{y} = \mu \cdot \vec{x}$, where μ is a “random” matrix from $GL_n(\mathbb{Q})$.
 - If R is local, then \vec{y} is an R -independent sequence.
 - If R is a multi-valuation ring, then $y_i \in Ry_j$ for all i, j .

Thus, local W_n -rings and multi-valuation rings behave differently, and this difference can be leveraged to prove (9).

3 Scrambling and density

For the entirety of §3, we will work over a fixed infinite field K_0 . All fields will extend K_0 , all rings will be K_0 -algebras, and all valuations will be trivial on K_0 .

3.1 Scrambling

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(K, \text{val}_1, \dots, \text{val}_m)$ be a multi-valued field. For any $z, w \in K$, there is $c \in K_0$ such that for all i ,*

$$\text{val}_i(z - cw) = \min(\text{val}_i(z), \text{val}_i(w)). \quad (2)$$

Proof. For each i , let $\text{res}_i : K \rightarrow k_i \cup \{\infty\}$ be the residue map of val_i , extended by setting $\text{res}_i(x) = \infty$ when $\text{val}_i(x) < 0$.

If $w = 0$, then any c works. Otherwise, take $c \in K_0$ such that $c \neq \text{res}_i(z/w)$ for all i . This is possible since K_0 is infinite. If (2) fails, then by the strong triangle inequality

$$\text{val}_i(z - cw) > \text{val}_i(z) = \text{val}_i(w).$$

Then $\text{val}_i(z/w - c) = \text{val}_i(z - cw) - \text{val}_i(w) > 0$. This implies $\text{res}_i(z/w) = \text{res}_i(c) = c$, contradicting the choice of c . \square

Let $(K, \text{val}_1, \dots, \text{val}_m)$ be a multi-valued field. Let \vec{x} be an n -tuple in K^n . Say that \vec{x} is *scrambled* if

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}_1(x_1) &= \text{val}_1(x_2) = \dots = \text{val}_1(x_n) \\ \text{val}_2(x_1) &= \text{val}_2(x_2) = \dots = \text{val}_2(x_n) \\ &\dots \\ \text{val}_m(x_1) &= \text{val}_m(x_2) = \dots = \text{val}_m(x_n). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mu \in GL_n(K)$, say that μ *scrambles* \vec{x} if $\mu \cdot \vec{x}$ is scrambled.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(K, \text{val}_1, \dots, \text{val}_m)$ be a multi-valued field. Then any n -tuple $\vec{x} \in K^n$ can be scrambled by an element of $GL_n(K_0)$.*

Proof. This follows by repeated applications of Lemma 3.1. In more detail, define the “discrepancy” of \vec{x} to be the size of the set

$$\{(i, j) \mid \exists k : \text{val}_i(x_j) > \text{val}_i(x_k)\}.$$

We may assume that \vec{x} has minimal discrepancy in the coset $GL_n(K_0) \cdot \vec{x}$. If \vec{x} has discrepancy 0, then it is scrambled and we are done. Otherwise, we may assume

$$\text{val}_1(x_1) > \text{val}_1(x_2).$$

By Lemma 3.1 there is $c \in K_0$ such that for all i ,

$$\text{val}_i(x_1 - cx_2) = \min(\text{val}_i(x_1), \text{val}_i(x_2)).$$

Let $\vec{y} = (x_1 - cx_2, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n)$. Then $\vec{y} \in GL_n(K_0) \cdot \vec{x}$, and \vec{y} has lower discrepancy, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.3. *For every n, m , there is a finite set $G_{n,m} \subseteq GL_n(K_0)$ with the following property. Let K be a field, and let $\text{val}_1, \dots, \text{val}_m$ be valuations on K . Then every n -tuple $\vec{x} \in K^n$ is scrambled by an element of $G_{n,m}$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.2 and compactness. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let R be a local integral domain. If $x_1, \dots, x_n \in R$ is an R -independent sequence in $\text{Frac}(R)$, and $\vec{y} \in GL_n(K_0) \cdot \vec{x}$, then y_1, \dots, y_n is also R -independent.*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal of R , and k be the residue field R/\mathfrak{m} . Let M be the R -submodule of $\text{Frac}(R)$ generated by the x_i . Let ξ_i be the image of x_i in the k -vector space $M/\mathfrak{m}M$. The ξ_i generate $M/\mathfrak{m}M$, and are R -independent by Nakayama's lemma. Therefore $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ has dimension n over k . Write \vec{y} as $\mu \cdot \vec{x}$ for some $\mu \in GL_n(K_0)$. Then y_1, \dots, y_n also generate M . Let $\{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$ be a minimal subset of $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ generating M . Then \vec{z} is R -independent. The Nakayama's lemma argument shows $m = \dim_k M/\mathfrak{m}M = n$. Therefore $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$, and the \vec{y} are R -independent. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let R be an integral domain of finite weight. Suppose $R \neq \text{Frac}(R) =: K$, and the induced topology on R is local of weight n . Let \tilde{R} be the integral closure of R . Write \tilde{R} as $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_m$, where the \mathcal{O}_i are pairwise incomparable valuation rings. Let val_i be the valuation associated to i . Then for any non-zero $a \in R$, we can find $y_1, \dots, y_n \in K$ such that*

- The tuple \vec{y} is scrambled with respect to $(K, \text{val}_1, \dots, \text{val}_n)$, i.e., $\text{val}_i(y_j) = \text{val}_i(y_k)$ for all i, j, k .
- For any i ,

$$a \cdot y_i \notin R \cdot y_1 + R \cdot y_2 + \dots + \widehat{R \cdot y_i} + \dots + R \cdot y_n.$$

Proof. Let K^* be an “ultrapower” of K , and let R' be the subring of K^* induced by τ_R . Note that R' is a local ring of weight n , and $R' \supseteq R^*$. Let $G_{n,m}$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Let $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be the formula in K^* expressing that for any $\vec{y} \in G_{n,m} \cdot \vec{x}$, we have

$$\forall i : \left(y_i \notin \sum_{j \neq i} R^* \cdot a^{-1} y_j \right).$$

Claim 3.6. Some tuple $\vec{z} \in (K^*)^n$ satisfies $\phi(\vec{x})$.

Proof. Because R' has weight n , there is an R' -independent sequence z_1, \dots, z_n . We claim that $\phi(\vec{z})$ holds. If $\vec{y} \in G_{n,m} \cdot \vec{z} \subseteq GL_n(K_0) \cdot \vec{z}$, then \vec{y} is R' -independent by Lemma 3.4. Therefore

$$y_i \notin \sum_{j \neq i} R' \cdot y_j.$$

But $R^* \cup \{a^{-1}\} \subseteq R^* \cup K \subseteq R'$. Therefore

$$y_i \notin \sum_{j \neq i} R^* \cdot a^{-1} \cdot y_j. \quad \square_{\text{Claim}}$$

Now $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a formula over K , so it is satisfied by some tuple $z_1, \dots, z_n \in K^n$. By choice of $G_{n,m}$ in Lemma 3.3, there is at least one $\vec{y} \in G_{n,m} \cdot \vec{z}$ such that \vec{y} is scrambled. By definition of ϕ , the vector \vec{y} has the desired properties. \square

3.2 Density in the Jacobson radical

Lemma 3.7. *Let R be a local integral domain of weight n , inducing a W -topology on $K = \text{Frac}(R)$ that is also local of weight n . Let \tilde{R} be the integral closure of R . Then R is dense in the Jacobson radical of \tilde{R} , with respect to the topology induced by \tilde{R} .*

Proof. Let τ and $\tilde{\tau}$ denote the topologies induced by R and \tilde{R} . Then $\tilde{\tau}$ is coarser than τ .

Write \tilde{R} as an intersection of pairwise incomparable valuation rings $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_m$. The Jacobson radical is $\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{m}_m$, where \mathfrak{m}_i is the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_i . Let x be an element of the Jacobson radical of \tilde{R} . For any $U \in \tilde{\tau}$, we must show that $x + U$ intersects R .

By taking a small enough with respect to τ , we can find non-zero a such that

- $a \in R$
- $ax \in R$
- a is in the Jacobson radical $\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{m}_m$.
- $a\tilde{R} \subseteq U$.

Indeed, the first two requirements cut out τ -neighborhoods of 0, the third and fourth requirements cut out $\tilde{\tau}$ -neighborhoods of 0, and τ is finer than $\tilde{\tau}$.

By Lemma 3.5, there are $y_1, \dots, y_n \in K$ such that

- For every $j \leq m$, we have $\text{val}_j(y_1) = \text{val}_j(y_2) = \cdots = \text{val}_j(y_n)$.
- For every $i \leq n$, we have

$$a^2 y_i \notin \sum_{j \neq i} R y_j.$$

Scaling the \vec{y} 's, we may assume $y_1 = 1$. Then $\text{val}_j(y_i) = 0$ for all i, j . In particular, $y_i \in \tilde{R}$.

Now $\text{wt}(R) < n + 1$, so the set $\{1, x, ay_2, ay_3, \dots, ay_n\}$ cannot be R -independent. One of three things happens:

- 1 is in the R -module generated by $x, ay_2, ay_3, \dots, ay_n$. But this cannot happen, as the elements $x, ay_2, ay_3, \dots, ay_n$ have positive valuation with respect to any of the val_i 's, and $R \subseteq \mathcal{O}_i$.
- Say, ay_2 is in the R -module generated by $1, x, ay_3, ay_4, \dots, ay_n$. Then

$$ay_2 \in R + Rx + \sum_{j=3}^n R ay_j$$

$$a^2 y_2 \in Ra + Rax + \sum_{j=3}^n Ra^2 y_j.$$

But $a, ax \in R$, and $a^2 \in R$, so that

$$a^2 y_2 \in Ra + Rax + \sum_{j=3}^n Ra^2 y_j \subseteq R + R + \sum_{j=3}^n Ry_j = Ry_1 + \sum_{j=3}^n Ry_j = \sum_{j \neq 2} Ry_j,$$

contradicting the choice of the y 's.

- x is in the R -module generated by $1, ay_2, ay_3, \dots, ay_n$. Then there are $b, c_2, \dots, c_n \in R$ such that

$$x = b + ac_2 y_2 + ac_3 y_3 + \dots + ac_n y_n.$$

But the $c_i \in R \subseteq \tilde{R}$, and the $y_i \in \tilde{R}$, so we see

$$b - x \in a\tilde{R} \subseteq U.$$

Then $b \in (x + U) \cap R$. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let R be a local integral domain of weight n , inducing a W -topology on $K = \text{Frac}(R)$ that is also local of weight n . Let \tilde{R} be the integral closure of R . Write \tilde{R} as $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_m$ for incomparable valuation rings \mathcal{O}_i . Suppose the \mathcal{O}_i are pairwise independent. Then there is $a \in K^\times$ such that for every $b \in K^\times$,*

$$R \cap b\mathcal{O}_2 \not\subseteq a\mathcal{O}_1.$$

Proof. Let \mathfrak{m}_i be the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_i . Then $\bigcap_i \mathfrak{m}_i$ is the Jacobson radical of \tilde{R} . Take non-zero $c \in \bigcap_i \mathfrak{m}_i$. By the approximation theorem for V -topologies, we can find $a \in K$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}_1(a) &> \text{val}_1(c) \\ \text{val}_i(a) &= \text{val}_i(c), \text{ for } i > 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for every $b \in K^\times$, there is $u \in K^\times$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}_1(u) &= \text{val}_1(c) > 0 \\ \text{val}_i(u) &> \max(\text{val}_i(b), \text{val}_i(c)) > 0, \text{ for } i > 1, \end{aligned}$$

by the approximation theorem for V -topologies. Then $u \in \bigcap_i \mathfrak{m}_i$. By Lemma 3.7, there are elements of R arbitrarily close to u with respect to the \tilde{R} -topology. In particular, moving u , we can take $u \in R$. Then $u \in R$ and $u \in b\mathcal{O}_2$, but $u \notin a\mathcal{O}_1$, since $\text{val}_1(u) = \text{val}_1(c) < \text{val}_1(a)$. □

4 Local components and V -topological coarsenings

4.1 The local case

Lemma 4.1. *Let (K, τ) be a local topological field of weight n . Let τ_1, τ_2 be two distinct V -topological coarsenings of τ . Then for all $U \in \tau$ there is $V \in \tau_1$ such that for all $W \in \tau_2$,*

$$U \cap W \not\subseteq V.$$

Proof. The desired condition can be expressed as a local sentence in $(K, \tau, \tau_1, \tau_2)$. Let K^* be an “ultrapower” of K . Let R, R_1, R_2 be the rings induced by τ, τ_1, τ_2 , and let $\tau^*, \tau_1^*, \tau_2^*$ be the corresponding topologies on K^* . Then $(K^*, \tau^*, \tau_1^*, \tau_2^*)$ is locally equivalent to $(K, \tau, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, by Proposition 2.2. So we may work in K^* instead. Then τ^* is induced by R , and τ_i^* is induced by R_i . Note that R is a local ring of weight n , inducing a local topology of weight n . By Proposition 2.10, R_i is one of the valuation rings whose intersection is the integral closure \tilde{R} . We must show

$$\forall c \neq 0 \exists a \neq 0 \forall b \neq 0 : cR \cap bR_2 \not\subseteq aR_1.$$

Up to rescaling, we may assume $c = 1$, and then this is the content of Lemma 3.8 (with K and K_0 being K^* and K , respectively). \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let (K, τ) be a local topological field of weight n . Let K^* be an “ultrapower” of K . Let R be the subring of K^* induced by τ . Let \tilde{R} be the integral closure of R , and let $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_n$ be its decomposition into incomparable valuation rings. Let \mathfrak{m}_i be the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_i . Then*

$$\mathfrak{m}_i \cap R \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}_j \cap R,$$

for $i \neq j$.

Proof. Let τ_i be the topology corresponding to \mathcal{O}_i . Let $U \in \tau$ be a bounded neighborhood. Let i, j be given. By Lemma 4.1, there is $V \in \tau_j$ such that for all $W \in \tau_i$,

$$U \cap W \not\subseteq V.$$

By saturation, there is $\epsilon \in U^* \cap \bigcap_{W \in \tau_i} W^*$ with $\epsilon \notin V^*$. Then ϵ is a τ_i -infinitesimal, so $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{m}_1$ by Lemma 2.6. Additionally, $\epsilon \in U^*$, so ϵ is τ -bounded, and $\epsilon \in R$. On the other hand, $\epsilon \notin V^*$, so ϵ is not a τ_j -infinitesimal, and $\epsilon \notin \mathfrak{m}_j$. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let (K, τ) be a local W -topological field.*

1. τ has a unique V -topological coarsening.
2. If K^* is an “ultrapower,” if $R \subseteq K^*$ is the ring induced by τ , and \tilde{R} is its integral closure, then \tilde{R} is a valuation ring.

Proof. The two statements are equivalent by Proposition 2.10; we prove the second one. Take the canonical decomposition $\tilde{R} = \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{O}_n$. Let \mathfrak{m}_i denote the maximal ideal of \mathfrak{m} . For each i , the intersection $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap R$ is a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}_i \in \text{Spec } R$. By Lemma 4.2, the \mathfrak{p}_i are pairwise incomparable.

Let \mathfrak{p} be the maximal ideal of the local ring R . By Chevalley’s theorem, there is a valuation ring \mathcal{O} with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} , such that $\mathcal{O} \supseteq R$ and $\mathcal{O} \cap R = \mathfrak{m}$. Now $\mathcal{O} \supseteq R$ implies $\mathcal{O} \supseteq \tilde{R}$, which in turn implies $\mathcal{O} \supseteq \mathcal{O}_i$ for some i ([7], Corollary 6.8). Then

$$\mathcal{O} \supseteq \mathcal{O}_i \implies \mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_i \implies \mathfrak{m} \cap R \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_i \cap R.$$

Thus $\mathfrak{p}_i \supseteq \mathfrak{p}$. As \mathfrak{p} is the maximal ideal, we have $\mathfrak{p}_i = \mathfrak{p}$. Then

$$\mathfrak{p}_i = \mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{p}_j$$

for all j , contradicting the pairwise incomparability of the \mathfrak{p}_i —unless $n = 1$. \square

4.2 Some commutative algebra

Let R be a domain. We let $\text{MaxSpec } R$ denote the set of maximal ideals in R .

Definition 4.4. A *key localization* of R is a localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{MaxSpec } R$.

We view $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ as a subring of $K = \text{Frac}(R)$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let R be a domain.*

1. R equals the intersection of its key localizations.
2. If $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2$ are two distinct maximal ideals of R , then $R_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$ is incomparable to $R_{\mathfrak{p}_2}$.
3. If $A \subseteq K$ is a local ring containing R , then A contains a key localization of R .

Therefore, the key localizations of R are the minimal local subrings of K containing R , and they are in bijection with the maximal ideals of R .

Proof. 1. Let R' be the intersection of the key localizations. Clearly $R \subseteq R'$. Conversely, suppose $x \notin R$. Let $I = \{y \in R : xy \in R\}$. Then I is a proper ideal in R , because $1 \notin I$. Take a maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} containing I . We claim $x \notin R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Otherwise, $x = a/s$ for some $a \in R$ and $s \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. Then $s \in I$, contradicting $I \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Thus $x \notin R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and $x \notin R'$.

2. Suppose $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2$ are distinct. Then $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2$ are incomparable. Take $x \in \mathfrak{p}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{p}_2$. Then $1/x \in R_{\mathfrak{p}_2}$. If $1/x \in R_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$, then $1/x = a/s$ for some $a \in R$ and $s \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}_1$. But then $s = ax \in \mathfrak{p}_1$, a contradiction. So $1/x$ shows that $R_{\mathfrak{p}_2} \not\subseteq R_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$. By symmetry, $R_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \not\subseteq R_{\mathfrak{p}_2}$.

3. Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal of A . Then $\mathfrak{m} \cap R$ is a prime ideal in R , so $\mathfrak{m} \cap R \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ for some $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{MaxSpec } R$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x \in R &\implies x \in A \\ x \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p} &\implies x \in A \setminus \mathfrak{m} \implies x^{-1} \in A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $R_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq A$. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let R be a domain. Let R_1, \dots, R_n be among the key localizations of R . Let $R' = \bigcap_{i=1}^n R_i$. Then the key localizations of R' are exactly R_1, \dots, R_n .*

Proof. Let $K = \text{Frac}(R)$. By Proposition 4.5, it suffices to prove the following: if A is a local subring of $K = \text{Frac}(R)$, and $A \supseteq R'$, then $A \supseteq R_i$ for some i .

Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal of A . Then $\mathfrak{m} \cap R$ is a prime ideal in R . Let \mathfrak{p}_i be the maximal ideal of R whose localization is R_i . By the prime avoidance lemma, one of two things happens:

- $\mathfrak{m} \cap R \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i . Then $R_i \subseteq A$ as in the proof of Proposition 4.5(3).

- $\mathfrak{m} \cap R \not\subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i$. In this case, take $x \in (\mathfrak{m} \cap R) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i$. Then $1/x \in R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ for all i , so $1/x \in R' \subseteq A$. But this contradicts the fact that $x \in \mathfrak{m} = A \setminus A^\times$. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Let R be a local domain with maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} . If the integral closure \widetilde{R} is a local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{q} , then $\mathfrak{q} \cap R = \mathfrak{p}$.*

Proof. The intersection $\mathfrak{q} \cap R$ is a prime ideal in R , so $\mathfrak{q} \cap R \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. If equality does not hold, take $x \in \mathfrak{p} \setminus \mathfrak{q}$. Then $x \notin \mathfrak{q} \implies 1/x \in \widetilde{R}$, so there exist $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in R$ such that

$$x^{-n} + a_{n-1}x^{-(n-1)} + \dots + a_1x^{-1} + a_0 = 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$-1 = a_{n-1}x + a_{n-2}x^2 + \dots + a_1x^{n-1} + a_0x^n.$$

The right side is in \mathfrak{p} and the left is not, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Let R be a domain with finitely many maximal ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_n$. Suppose that for each key localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$, the integral closure $\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is a valuation ring. Then*

1. *For each key localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, the integral closure $\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a key localization of the integral closure \widetilde{R} .*
2. *This map establishes a bijection from the key localizations of R to the key localizations of \widetilde{R} .*

Proof. The integral closure \widetilde{R} is the intersection of all valuation rings on $\text{Frac}(R)$ containing R . If \mathcal{O} is a valuation ring, the following are equivalent:

- $\mathcal{O} \supseteq R$
- $\mathcal{O} \supseteq R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ for some i , by Proposition 4.5(3).
- $\mathcal{O} \supseteq \widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$, since \mathcal{O} is integrally closed.

Therefore, the $\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ are the minimal valuation rings containing R , and

$$\widetilde{R} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}.$$

Claim 4.9. The $\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ are pairwise incomparable.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{m}_i be the maximal ideal of the valuation ring $\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$. By Lemma 4.7, \mathfrak{m}_i restricts to the maximal ideal on $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$, and then to the ideal \mathfrak{p}_i on R . That is, $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap R = \mathfrak{p}_i$. Then for any i, j

$$\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \subseteq \widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_j} \iff \mathfrak{m}_i \supseteq \mathfrak{m}_j \implies \mathfrak{m}_i \cap R \supseteq \mathfrak{m}_j \cap R \iff \mathfrak{p}_i \supseteq \mathfrak{p}_j.$$

The \mathfrak{p}_i are pairwise incomparable, being maximal ideals, and so the claim is proven. \square_{Claim}

Therefore, the $\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ are pairwise incomparable valuation rings, with intersection \widetilde{R} . By Proposition 6.2(7) in [7], the $\widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ are the key localizations of \widetilde{R} . The map $R_{\mathfrak{p}} \mapsto \widetilde{R}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is injective by the Claim. \square

4.3 The non-local case

Theorem 4.10. *Let τ be a W -topology on K . Let τ_1, \dots, τ_n be the local components of τ , in the sense of Definition 2.9.*

- *Each τ_i has a unique V -topological coarsening.*
- *This establishes a bijection between the local components of τ and the V -topological coarsenings of τ .*

Proof. The first point follows by Theorem 4.3. For the second point, take an “ultrapower” K^* . Let R and R_i be the \vee -definable rings induced by τ and τ_i . By Definition 2.9, the R_i are the key localizations of R . By Theorem 4.3, each integral closure \widetilde{R}_i is a valuation ring, corresponding to the unique V -topological coarsening of τ_i . By Lemma 4.8, the \widetilde{R}_i are pairwise distinct, and are exactly the key localizations of \widetilde{R} . By Proposition 2.10, the key localizations of \widetilde{R} correspond exactly to the the V -topological coarsenings of τ . \square

Definition 4.11. Let $\tau, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$ be topologies on K . Then τ is an *independent sum* of τ_1, \dots, τ_n if the diagonal map

$$(K, \tau) \rightarrow (K, \tau_1) \times \cdots \times (K, \tau_n)$$

is a homeomorphism onto its image, and the image is dense.

More explicitly, this means that the following conditions hold:

- The following is a filter basis for τ :

$$\{U_1 \cap \cdots \cap U_n : U_1 \in \tau_1, U_2 \in \tau_2, \dots, U_n \in \tau_n\}.$$

- If $a_i \in K$ and $U_i \in \tau_i$ for all i , then $\bigcap_{i=1}^n (a_i + U_i) \neq \emptyset$.

In other words, the τ_i are jointly independent, and they generate τ .

Lemma 4.12. *If σ is an independent sum of $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n-1}$, and τ is an independent sum of σ and τ_n , then τ is an independent sum of τ_1, \dots, τ_n .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be the class of topological embeddings with dense image. Then \mathcal{F} is closed under composition. Additionally, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is in \mathcal{F} and Z is another topological space, then $X \times Z \rightarrow Y \times Z$ is in \mathcal{F} . By assumption, the diagonal maps

$$\begin{aligned} (K, \sigma) &\rightarrow (K, \tau_1) \times \cdots \times (K, \tau_{n-1}) \\ (K, \tau) &\rightarrow (K, \sigma) \times (K, \tau_n) \end{aligned}$$

are in \mathcal{F} . Therefore \mathcal{F} also contains the composition

$$(K, \tau) \rightarrow (K, \sigma) \times (K, \tau_n) \rightarrow (K, \tau_1) \times \cdots \times (K, \tau_{n-1}) \times (K, \tau_n),$$

which is the diagonal map. \square

Theorem 4.13. *Let τ be a W-topology on a field K . Let τ_1, \dots, τ_n be the local components of τ . Then τ is an independent sum of the τ_i .*

Proof. Fix an “ultrapower” K^* of K . Let R, R_1, \dots, R_n be the \vee -definable rings corresponding to $\tau, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$. The R_i are the key localizations of R . For $i \leq n$, let $S_i = R_1 \cap \dots \cap R_i$. Each S_i is a K -algebra that is \vee -definable over K . Moreover, $S_i \supseteq R$, so each S_i is a W_n -ring (Lemma 2.7 in [9]). By Proposition 2.5, each S_i corresponds to a W-topology σ_i . Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= R_1 \\ S_n &= R_1 \cap \dots \cap R_n = R, \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 4.5(1). Thus $\sigma_1 = \tau_1$, and $\sigma_n = \tau$. By Lemma 4.6, the key localizations of S_i are R_1, \dots, R_i , and so the local components of σ_i are τ_1, \dots, τ_i .

Claim 4.14. σ_i is an independent sum of σ_{i-1} and τ_i .

Proof. We first prove independence. Let $\widetilde{\tau}_j$ denote the unique V-topological coarsening of τ_j . By Theorem 4.10,

- the V-topological coarsenings of σ_{i-1} are $\{\widetilde{\tau}_1, \dots, \widetilde{\tau}_{i-1}\}$,
- the V-topological coarsenings of τ_i are $\{\widetilde{\tau}_i\}$,

and these two sets do not overlap. So σ_{i-1} and τ_i have no common V-topological coarsenings. As τ_i and σ_{i-1} are both coarsenings of the original W-topology τ , Theorem 7.16 of [9] applies, and τ_i and σ_{i-1} are independent.

It remains to show that σ_{i-1} and τ_i generate σ_i . Consider the topologies $\sigma_{i-1}^*, \tau_i^*, \sigma_i^*$ on K^* induced by S_{i-1}, R_i , and S_i , respectively. Note $S_i = S_{i-1} \cap R_i$. For any non-zero a , there are non-zero b, c such that

$$bS_{i-1} \cap cR_i \subseteq aS_i.$$

Indeed, if we take $b = c = a$, then equality holds. This proves the local sentence

$$\forall U \in \sigma_i^* \exists V \in \sigma_{i-1}^* \exists W \in \tau_i^* : V \cap W \subseteq U. \quad (3)$$

Conversely,

$$\forall V \in \sigma_{i-1}^* \forall W \in \tau_i^* \exists U \in \sigma_i^* : U \subseteq V \cap W, \quad (4)$$

because we can take $U = V \cap W$. (Both V and W are in σ_i^* , because σ_i^* is finer than σ_{i-1}^* and τ_i^* .) Equations (3) and (4) are local sentences, so they hold for σ_{i-1}, τ_i , and σ_i , by Proposition 2.2(3). That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall U \in \sigma_i \exists V \in \sigma_{i-1} \exists W \in \tau_i : V \cap W \subseteq U \\ \forall V \in \sigma_{i-1} \forall W \in \tau_i \exists U \in \sigma_i : U \subseteq V \cap W. \end{aligned}$$

This expresses that σ_i is generated by σ_{i-1} and τ_i , finishing the proof of the Claim. □_{Claim}

Combining the Claim with Lemma 4.12, we see by induction on i that σ_i is an independent sum of τ_1, \dots, τ_i . Taking $i = n$, we get the desired result. \square

Corollary 4.15. *Let (K, τ) be a W -topological field.*

1. *If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ and the squaring map $K^\times \rightarrow K^\times$ is an open map, then τ is local and has a unique V -topological coarsening.*
2. *If $\text{char}(K) = p > 0$ and the Artin-Schreier map $K \rightarrow K$ is an open map, then τ is local and has a unique V -topological coarsening.*

Proof. Let τ_1, \dots, τ_n be the local components of τ . By Theorem 4.13, τ is an independent sum of τ_1, \dots, τ_n . By Theorem 4.10, n is the number of V -topological coarsenings. Suppose for a contradiction that $n > 1$. If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, then the squaring map is not open, by the proof of Claim 6.9 in [9]. Essentially, one chooses x to be infinitesimally close to 1 with respect to $\tau_1, \tau_3, \tau_5, \dots$, and infinitesimally close to -1 with respect to $\tau_2, \tau_4, \tau_6, \dots$. Then $x \not\approx 1$ and $x^2 \approx 1$ with respect to τ , which contradicts squaring being an open map. The Artin-Schreier case is similar, using 0, 1 instead of 1, -1 . \square

Corollary 4.16.

1. *If $(K, +, \cdot, \dots)$ is an unstable dp -finite field, then the canonical topology on K is a local W -topology.*
2. *If $(K, +, \cdot, \dots)$ is an unstable dp -finite field, then K admits a unique definable V -topology.*
3. *If $(K, +, \cdot, v)$ is a dp -finite valued field, then v is henselian.*
4. *If $(K, +, \cdot)$ is a dp -finite field that is neither finite, nor algebraically closed, nor real closed, then K admits a non-trivial definable henselian valuation.*
5. *The conjectural classification of dp -finite fields holds, as in Theorem 3.11 of [4].*

Proof. The canonical topology on K is a W -topology by Theorem 6.3 in [9]. By Proposition 5.17(4-5) in [7] and compactness, the canonical topology has the following properties:

- For every neighborhood $U \ni 1$ there is a neighborhood $V \ni 1$ such that

$$V \subseteq \{x^2 : x \in U\}.$$

Equivalently, the squaring map $K^\times \rightarrow K^\times$ is an open map.

- If $\text{char}(K) = p$, then for every neighborhood $U \ni 0$ there is a neighborhood $V \ni 0$

$$V \subseteq \{x^p - x : x \in U\}.$$

Equivalently, the Artin-Schreier map $K \rightarrow K$ is an open map.

By Corollary 4.15, the canonical topology is local and has a unique V-topological coarsening. This proves part 1. By Theorem 6.6 in [9], the V-topological coarsenings of the canonical topology are exactly the definable V-topologies. This proves part 2. The remaining points then follow by (the proof of) Proposition 6.4 in [8]. \square

We note another characterization of local W-topologies.

Proposition 4.17. *Let τ be a W-topology on a field K . The following are equivalent:*

1. τ is not local.
2. τ is an independent sum of two W-topologies.
3. τ is an independent sum of finitely many W-topologies.

Proof. The implication (1) \implies (2) follows by the Theorem 4.13, or rather by Claim 4.14 in the proof. In the notation of the proof, τ equals σ_n , which is an independent sum of σ_{n-1} and τ_n .

The implication (2) \implies (3) is trivial. It remains to prove (3) \implies (1). Suppose τ is an independent sum of τ_1, \dots, τ_n , but τ is local.

Claim 4.18. If B_i is τ_i -bounded for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $\bigcap_{i=1}^n B_i$ is τ -bounded.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1(e) in [10], a set B is bounded if for every neighborhood U , there is a neighborhood V such that $B \cdot V \subseteq U$. Let $U_1 \cap \dots \cap U_n$ be a basic neighborhood in τ , so that each U_i is a neighborhood in τ_i . Then there are $V_i \in \tau_i$ such that $B_i \cdot V_i \subseteq U_i$. Then

$$\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n B_i \right) \cdot \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n V_i \right) \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i,$$

and $\bigcap_{i=1}^n V_i$ is in τ . \square Claim

For each i , take a τ_i -bounded set B_i containing both 0 and 1 in its interior (i.e., $B_i \in \tau_i$ and $B_i - 1 \in \tau_i$). Let $B = B_1 \cap \dots \cap B_n$. Then B is τ -bounded, by the Claim. Because τ is local, there is a τ -bounded set C such that

$$\forall x \in B : (1/x \in C \text{ or } 1/(1-x) \in C).$$

The fact that τ is finer than τ_i implies that τ has fewer bounded sets, so C is τ_i -bounded for each i .

For each i , take small enough $D_i \in \tau_i$ to ensure that

- $D_i \cdot C$ is contained in the neighborhood $K \setminus \{1\}$, i.e., $1 \notin D_i \cdot C$.
- $D_i \subseteq B_i$ and $1 - D_i \subseteq B_i$.

By independence, there is $x \in (1 - D_1) \cap D_2 \cap D_3 \cap \dots \cap D_n$. Then $x \in B_1 \cap \dots \cap B_n = B$, so one of two things happens:

- $1/x \in C$. But $x \in D_2$, so then $1 = x \cdot (1/x) \in D_2 \cdot C$, a contradiction.
- $1/(1-x) \in C$. But $1-x \in D_1$, so then $1 = (1-x) \cdot (1/(1-x)) \in D_1 \cdot C$, a contradiction. \square

5 Remaining questions

We leave the following natural questions to future work.

1. By Theorem 4.13 and Proposition 4.17, every W -topology decomposes into an independent sum of indecomposable W -topologies. Is this decomposition unique?
2. If a W -topology τ decomposes as an independent sum of τ_1, \dots, τ_n , is it true that $\text{wt}(\tau) = \text{wt}(\tau_1) + \dots + \text{wt}(\tau_n)$?
3. If τ_1, \dots, τ_n are jointly independent W -topologies, do they generate a W -topology?
4. If τ_1, τ_2 are two W -topologies without any common V -topological coarsenings, then are τ_1, τ_2 necessarily independent?
5. Local topologies of weight 2 on fields of characteristic 0 are exactly the “DV-topologies” of ([8], Definition 8.18). This follows by the classification in §8.2 of [9]. Can this sort of classification be generalized to higher ranks, or positive characteristic?
6. Let (K, τ) be a W -topological field, and K^* be an “ultrapower.” Let R be the associated V -definable ring of K -bounded elements in K^* . Let I be the type-definable ideal of K -infinitesimal elements in K^* . Is R/I always an artinian ring of length equal to $\text{wt}(\tau)$?
7. In several places, we used the special properties of the rings $R = R_\tau$ arising in Proposition 2.1. For example,
 - If $\text{wt}(R) = n$, then R induces a topology of weight exactly n .
 - R is local if and only if R induces a local W -topology.

Is there a natural algebraic condition implying these properties, and satisfied by the rings R_τ of Proposition 2.1? If so, there may be a more natural class of rings hidden inside the W_n -rings. This natural class would probably include multi-valuation rings $\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{O}_n$ for which the \mathcal{O}_i are pairwise *independent*, as well as the ring R of §8.4 in [8].

8. Do the global fields \mathbb{Q} and $\mathbb{F}_p(t)$ support any local W -topologies other than the usual V -topologies?
9. If K is an unstable dp-finite field, does every heavy definable set have non-empty interior? How much “tame topology” can we prove?
10. Do the techniques used to analyze dp-finite fields have any generalizations to finite-burden fields, or strongly dependent fields?
11. Let $(K, +, \cdot, \dots)$ be an NIP field, possibly with extra structure. Must every definable Hausdorff non-discrete field topology on K be a W -topology?

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Meng Chen for hosting the author at Fudan University, where this research was carried out. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award No. DMS-1803120. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

References

- [1] Alfred Dolich and John Goodrick. A characterization of strongly dependent ordered abelian groups. arXiv:1707.06344v1 [math.LO], 2017.
- [2] Rafel Farré. Strong ordered abelian groups and dp-rank. arXiv:1706.05471v1 [math.LO], 2017.
- [3] Yatir Halevi and Assaf Hasson. Strongly dependent ordered abelian groups and henselian fields. arXiv:1706.03376v3 [math.LO], 2017.
- [4] Yatir Halevi, Assaf Hasson, and Franziska Jahnke. A conjectural classification of strongly dependent fields. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 25(2):182–195, June 2019.
- [5] Yatir Halevi, Assaf Hasson, and Franziska Jahnke. Definable V-topologies, henselianity and NIP. arXiv:1901.05920v2 [math.LO], 2019.
- [6] Will Johnson. Dp-finite fields I: infinitesimals and positive characteristic. arXiv:1903.11322v2 [math.LO], March 2019.
- [7] Will Johnson. Dp-finite fields II: the canonical topology and its relation to henselianity. arXiv:1910.05932v2 [math.LO], October 2019.
- [8] Will Johnson. Dp-finite fields IV: the rank 2 picture. arXiv:2003.09130v1 [math.LO], March 2020.
- [9] Will Johnson. Dp-finite fields V: topological fields of finite weight. arXiv:2004.14732v1 [math.LO], April 2020.
- [10] Alexander Prestel and Martin Ziegler. Model theoretic methods in the theory of topological fields. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, pages 318–341, 1978.