

Weak admissibility of exponentially twisted cohomology associated with some nondegenerate functions

Peijiang Liu

January, 2025

Abstract

In this article, we study the filtered Φ -modules canonically attached to the exponentially twisted cohomology associated with some nondegenerate functions. Inspired by p -adic Hodge theory, we conjecture that those filtered Φ -modules are weakly admissible. We show that this expectation is correct under some assumptions using the theory of Adolphson and Sperber.

Contents

Introduction	1
1 Filtered Φ-modules	5
2 Exponentially twisted cohomology	9
3 Newton polyhedron modules	12
4 Weak admissibility	21
5 Examples and questions	29
References	33

Introduction

Let p be a prime number, and let K be a complete discrete valuation ring with mixed characteristic $(0, p)$. Let O be the ring of integers of K , and let k be the residue field of O . Let X be a smooth scheme over O , with the special fiber X_k over k , and the generic fiber X_K over K . The *Hodge filtration* on $H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_K)$ yields the *Hodge polygon* (cf. [9, 4.3.2]). If the Frobenius automorphism $a \mapsto a^p$ on k is lifted to an automorphism on K , then the absolute Frobenius endomorphism on X induces the Frobenius structure on $H^i(X_k/K)$, which yields the *Newton polygon* (cf. [9, 4.3.1]). By reformulating a conjecture of Katz in [10], Mazur conjectured in [14] that if X is proper and smooth over O , then the associated Newton polygon lies above the associated Hodge polygon. We call such property the *Newton-above-Hodge* property for X . In [15], Mazur proved his conjecture under certain assumptions. Since X is smooth and proper over O , the specialization map $H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_K) \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^i(X_k/K)$ is an isomorphism of K -vector spaces. Using this isomorphism, we can canonically associate a filtered Φ -module, namely a K -vector space

equipped with a filtration and a Frobenius structure, to X . Then, we may regard the Newton-above-Hodge property for X as a property for the associated filtered Φ -modules. However, the Newton-above-Hodge property for filtered Φ -modules is not a structural one. It is not stable under extensions and subquotients of filtered Φ -modules, and the full subcategory consisting of filtered Φ -modules that satisfies the Newton-above-Hodge property is not an abelian category. This deficit will be remediated by considering instead the *weakly admissible* property, introduced by Fontaine in [9, 4.1.4 Définition]. For a filtered Φ -module, being weakly admissible implies that it satisfies the Newton-above-Hodge property. Furthermore, the full subcategory consisting of weakly admissible filtered Φ -module is an abelian category. One of the main theorems of p -adic Hodge theory, which states that the filtered Φ -module associated with a proper and smooth scheme over O is weakly admissible, reveals the hidden relationship between the Hodge filtration on $H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_K)$ and the Frobenius structure on $H_{\text{rig}}^i(X_k/K)$.

Let \mathbb{A}^1 be the affine line over O , and let \mathbb{T}^n be the n -dimensional torus over O . Now, we consider purely positive characteristic situation. Let $f : \mathbb{T}_k^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$ be a morphism. Following Dwork's philosophy in [7], when f satisfies certain good properties (i.e. f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$, using notions that we introduce later), Adolphson and Sperber associated a Newton polygon and a Hodge polygon with f . In this introduction section, we call such polygons the *AS-Newton polygon* and the *AS-Hodge polygon* respectively. Adolphson and Sperber proved that the AS-Newton polygon lies above the AS-Hodge polygon (cf. [1, Corollary 3.11] or [2, Corollary 3.18]). However, giving a geometric interpretation to the mysterious combinatorially defined AS polygons is not straightforward. By a recent result of Li (cf. [12, Theorem 1.2]), the AS-Newton polygon is identified with the Newton polygon defined by the Frobenius structure on the exponentially twisted rigid cohomology V_{rig} over \mathbb{T}_k^n associated with f . It is then natural to ask for a way to interpret the AS-Hodge polygon into the Hodge polygon coming from a geometric object on the generic fiber \mathbb{T}_K^n . For this, we consider the exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology V_{dR} over \mathbb{T}_K^n associated with a morphism $\widehat{F} : \mathbb{T}_K^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^1$ determined by the Teichmüller lift of f . The idea is to find the relationship between the AS-Hodge polygon and the Hodge polygon defined by some Hodge filtration on V_{dR} . The first huge obstacle to realizing this naïve idea is that the exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology is not in the realm of Hodge theory, and Hodge filtration a priori does not make sense. Recently, Sabbah and Yu developed irregular Hodge theory (cf. [17]), generalizing Hodge theory. Irregular Hodge theory allows us to attach a canonical filtration, called the *irregular Hodge filtration*, to V_{dR} . Using a result of Yu in [18, §4], we can show that the AS-Hodge polygon and the Hodge polygon defined by the irregular Hodge filtration on V_{dR} coincide. In parallel with the story about p -adic Hodge theory, it is now natural to ask if we can explain this Newton-above-Hodge phenomenon discovered by Adolphson and Sperber by showing weak admissibility of some filtered Φ -module associated with the geometric information carried by f .

Let us explain our question in more detail. Let \mathbb{F}_q denote the finite field with q elements of characteristic p . Let $W(\mathbb{F}_q)$ denote the ring of Witt vectors over \mathbb{F}_q , and let K_0 be the field of fractions of $W(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Fix a primitive root of unity ζ_p , and let $K_1 = K_0(\zeta_p)$. Let O_1 be the ring of integers of K_1 . Fix a Dwork's uniformizer $\pi \in K_1$, namely the one satisfies $\pi^{p-1} + p = 0$. Let \mathcal{L}_π be the Dwork F-isocrystal over $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}_q}^1$. The exponentially twisted rigid cohomology, denoted by V_{rig} in the preceding paragraph, is the middle-degree rigid cohomology $H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{F}_q}^n/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi)$. The p -th power Frobenius automorphism on \mathbb{F}_q is canonically lifted to an automorphism on K_1 . Let ϕ_f be the Frobenius structure on V_{rig} induced by the absolute Frobenius endomorphism of $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{F}_q}^n$. Let \widehat{f} be the *Teichmüller lift* of f (cf. Eq. (2.2)), and let $\widehat{F} = \pi\widehat{f}$. Let $\nabla_{\widehat{F}}$ be the connection over $\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n$ defined by $\nabla_{\widehat{F}}(1) = \pi \otimes d\widehat{f}$. The exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology, denoted by V_{dR} in the preceding paragraph, is the middle-degree de Rham cohomology $H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})$. Let

F_{irr}^* denote the irregular Hodge filtration on V_{dR} . There is a canonical morphism $\iota_{\hat{F}} : V_{\text{dR}} \rightarrow V_{\text{rig}}$, which is often called the specialization map. Now, we are ready to state our question precisely in the following conjecture.

Conjecture 0.1. *If f, \hat{f} are nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$, then $\iota_{\hat{F}}$ is an isomorphism, and*

$$((V_{\text{rig}}, \phi_f), (V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{F}}) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1}^{\Phi}$$

is weakly admissible.

The definition of f, \hat{f} being nondegenerate can be found in Definition 3.1, and the definition of $\Delta(f)$ can be found at the beginning of Section 3. The tuple $((V_{\text{rig}}, \phi_f), (V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{F}})$ is not really a filtered Φ -module in the sense of Fontaine in [9, 1.2.1]. The filtration associated to a filtered Φ -module is required to be indexed by integers, while F_{irr}^* is indexed by real numbers. Furthermore, the base field of the vector space endowed with a Frobenius structure associated with a filtered Φ -module is K_0 , while V_{rig} has base field K_1 . Thus, in order to fit our situation, it is necessary to generalize Fontaine's definition of filtered Φ -modules. From now on, an object obtained by such generalization will be called a *filtered Φ -module* over K_1 , and a filtered Φ -module in the sense of Fontaine in [9] will be called an *integrally filtered Φ -module* over K_0 . The category consisting of filtered modules over K_1 is denoted by $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1}^{\Phi}$. The definition of weakly admissible property for integrally filtered Φ -module over K_0 can be naturally extended to filtered Φ -modules over K_1 . Moreover, the full subcategory consisting of weakly admissible filtered Φ -modules over K_1 is an abelian category. The main result of this article is a proof of Conjecture 0.1 under reasonable constraints. We now state the claim of our main result by the following Theorem.

Theorem 0.2. *Assume that $p \neq 2$. If f, \hat{f} are nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$, then $\iota_{\hat{F}}$ is an isomorphism, so that*

$$((V_{\text{rig}}, \phi_f), (V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{F}}) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1}^{\Phi}.$$

In addition, if $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^) \leq p - 2$, then $((V_{\text{rig}}, \phi_f), (V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{F}})$ is weakly admissible. Here, for a filtered module (V, F^*) over K_1 , we denote by $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V, F^*)$ the difference between its maximal Hodge-Tate weight and its minimal Hodge-Tate weight (cf. Definition 1.3).*

The proof of Theorem 0.2 can be found at the end of Section 4. We can actually compute $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*)$ combinatorially from f (cf. Remark 3.15). It is worth noting that when $n = 1$ and $p \neq 2$, the requirement $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*) \leq p - 2$ is always satisfied, and in this situation, Conjecture 0.1 is true without constraint (cf. Example 5.1). On the other hand, there are examples of f where Conjecture 0.1 is true but $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*) > p - 2$ (cf. Example 5.3).

Next, we introduce the idea of the proof of Theorem 0.2. Looking closely into Adolphson and Sperber's work in [1] and [2], we construct a K_1 -vector space V_{NP} and attach a Frobenius structure $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$ to V_{NP} . The Newton polygon defined by this Frobenius structure coincides with the AS-Newton polygon. By Li's work in [12], we obtain a canonical isomorphism $T_{\text{rig}} : V_{\text{NP}} \rightarrow V_{\text{rig}}$ compatible with the Frobenius structures. Using an algorithm similar to the one Adolphson and Sperber developed in [1] and [2], we decompose the specialization map $\iota_{\hat{F}} : V_{\text{dR}} \rightarrow V_{\text{rig}}$ into $\iota_{\text{dR}} : V_{\text{dR}} \rightarrow V_{\text{NP}}$ and $\iota_{\text{rig}} : V_{\text{NP}} \rightarrow V_{\text{rig}}$. Using a result of Bourgeois in [4], we can show that ι_{rig} is an isomorphism. In general ι_{rig} is not compatible with the Frobenius structures $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$ and ϕ_f . Furthermore, using another result of Adolphson and Sperber in [3], we can show that ι_{dR} is also an isomorphism. This proves the claim that the specialization map $\iota_{\hat{F}}$ is an isomorphism.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} V_{\text{dR}} & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\text{dR}}} & V_{\text{NP}} & \xrightarrow{T_{\text{NP}}} & V_{\text{NP}} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \iota_{\text{rig}} & \searrow T_{\text{rig}} & \downarrow \iota_{\text{rig}} \\ & & & & V_{\text{rig}} \\ & \searrow \iota_{\hat{F}} & & \searrow \sim & \\ & & & & V_{\text{rig}} \end{array}$$

Set $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}} := \iota_{\text{rig}}^{-1} \circ \phi_f \circ \iota_{\text{rig}}$, then it gives another Frobenius structure on V_{NP} that is different from $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$. Moreover, the work of Adolphson and Sperber in [1] and [2] yields a filtration F_{NP}^* on V_{NP} . Using a result of Yu in [18, §4], we can show that $\iota_{\hat{F}}(F_{\text{irr}}^*) = F_{\text{NP}}^*$. Now, we obtain two filtered Φ -modules $((V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}), (V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*), \text{id})$ and $((V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}), (V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*), \text{id})$, where

$$((V_{\text{rig}}, \phi_f), (V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{F}}) \cong ((V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}), (V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*), \text{id}).$$

We may abbreviate their notations to $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ and $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ respectively. Though there exists a natural automorphism $T_{\text{NP}} := \iota_{\text{rig}}^{-1} \circ T_{\text{rig}} \circ \iota_{\text{rig}}$ on V_{NP} that is compatible with $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$ and $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$, this automorphism is not compatible with the filtration F_{NP}^* . In other words, there is no morphism between $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ and $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in general.

We introduce a property, called the *NP-agreeable* property (cf. Definition 4.3), for filtered Φ -modules. A benefit of considering this property is that, despite its being stronger than the weakly admissible property, it is much easier to check. By elaborating the arguments of Adolphson and Sperber in [1] and [2] which show the Newton-above-Hodge property, we can show that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is NP-agreeable, so that it is weakly admissible. Now, the idea is to show that replacing the Frobenius structure $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$ with $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$ preserves the NP-agreeability. In order to do this, we need a good understanding of the automorphism T_{NP} on V_{NP} . By some careful estimate, we find that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is agreeable if $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*) \leq p - 2$. This implies the claim of Theorem 0.2.

Finally, we introduce the organization of this article. In Section 1, we generalize the definition of integrally filtered Φ -modules over K_0 by introducing filtered Φ -modules over extensions of K_0 , and extend the definition of weakly admissible property to these new objects. We also show that the full subcategory of weakly admissible filtered Φ -modules is an abelian category.

Section 2 is a review on exponentially twisted cohomology. We describe the exponentially twisted rigid cohomology V_{rig} by a chain complex, and construct the chain map that induces the Frobenius structure ϕ_f . We also describe the exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology V_{dR} by a chain complex, and construct the chain map which induces the specialization map.

Section 3 serves as a preparation for the proof of Theorem 0.2. We prove that the exponentially twisted cohomology associated with certain functions defines filtered Φ -modules over K_1 . The definition of $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ and $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ can also be found in this section.

In Section 4, we prove Theorem 0.2. In the first half, we show that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is NP-agreeable and, in particular, weakly admissible. In the second half, we estimate T_{NP} carefully and complete the proof.

In Section 5, we give three examples and make some further discussions. The first example shows that Conjecture 0.1 is true without extra constraints if $n = 1$ and $p \neq 2$. The second example clarifies that T_{NP} is not compatible with the filtration F_{NP}^* in general. The third example demonstrates that the condition $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{dR}}, F_{\text{irr}}^*)$ is not indispensable. After these examples, we raise some questions about how Conjecture 0.1 could be upgraded to fit more general setups.

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank Jeng-Daw Yu, Takahiro Saito, and Yichen Qin for their helpful discussions on irregular Hodge theory. I also want to thank Takeshi Tsuji (Tsuji-Sensei) for his kind discussion about p -adic Hodge theory, and I really appreciate his inspiring advice. Let me express my thanks to Joe Kramer-Miller for his valuable discussion, before which, Lemma 3.16 was only claiming a lower bound for the valuation. Without his pointing out that the valuation is actually computable, we were not even able to expect the constraint for the Hodge-Tate length in Theorem 0.2. Finally, please allow me to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor Tomoyuki Abe (Abe-Sensei). I am very grateful for the inspiring seminars with Abe-Sensei, and I am indebted to him for his generous advice and warm encouragement. It is such an honor for me to be a student of him.

1 Filtered Φ -modules

The goal of this section is to extend the weak admissible property to a generalized version of filtered Φ -modules. Originally, a filtered Φ -module in the sense of Fontaine in [9, 1.2.1] is a vector space over a certain base field equipped with two extra structures: a filtration that is integrally indexed, and a bijective semilinear endomorphism. We need to generalize this definition because of two reasons: one is that irregular Hodge filtrations are indexed by real numbers, and the other is that exponentially twisted cohomology groups are vector spaces over a larger base field. The weakly admissible property defined by Fontaine in [9, 4.1.4 Définition] is naturally extended to these new objects.

Let us fix some basic notations. Let \mathbb{F}_p be the finite field with p elements of characteristic p . Let k be an algebraic extension of \mathbb{F}_p , and let $W(k)$ denote the ring of Witt vectors over k . Let K_0 be the field of fractions of $W(k)$. For $a \in k$, we denote by $\hat{a} \in K_0$ its Teichmüller lift. The isomorphism $\text{Gal}(K_0/\mathbb{Q}_p) \cong \text{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_p)$ allows us to uniquely lift the absolute Frobenius automorphism $a \mapsto a^p$ on k to an automorphism on K_0 , which we call the *Frobenius automorphism*. Fix an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of \mathbb{Q}_p , and let \mathbb{C}_p be the completion of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. Let $\text{ord} : \mathbb{C}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be the additive p -adic valuation on \mathbb{C}_p normalized by $\text{ord} p = 1$, and let $|\lambda|_p = p^{-\text{ord} \lambda}$ denote the p -adic norm of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_p$ corresponding to this valuation.

Definition 1.1. Let K be a field. A *filtration* F^* on a K -vector space V is a collection $F^*V = \{F^iV\}_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ of K -subspaces of V such that $F^jV \subseteq F^iV$ for all $j > i$ in \mathbb{R} . Such a filtration is said to be *exhaustive* if $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{R}} F^iV = V$, and *separated* if $\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{R}} F^iV = 0$.

1. Let \mathbf{Mod}_K be the category of finite-dimensional K -vector spaces.
2. A *filtered module* over K is a pair (V, F^*) , where $V \in \mathbf{Mod}_K$, and F^* is a filtration on V that is exhaustive and separated.
3. Let (V, F^*) and (V', F^*) be filtered modules over K . A morphism $T : V' \rightarrow V$ in \mathbf{Mod}_K is said to be *filtration-compatible* if $T(F^iV') \subseteq F^iV$ for all $i \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let \mathbf{MF}_K be the category consisting of filtered modules over K and filtration-compatible morphisms. For an object $(V, F^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_K$, we sometimes omit F^* and denote it by V instead, if it causes no confusion.

Definition 1.2. 1. Let $T : (V', F^*) \rightarrow (V, F^*)$ be a morphism in \mathbf{MF}_K . We say that T is *strict* if $T(F^iV') = T(V') \cap F^iV$ for all $i \in \mathbb{R}$.

2. Let $(V', F^*) \rightarrow (V, F^*) \rightarrow (V'', F^*)$ be a sequence in \mathbf{MF}_K . We say that this sequence is *exact* if the morphisms are strict, and the associated sequence $V' \rightarrow V \rightarrow V''$ in \mathbf{Mod}_K is exact.

Definition 1.3. Let $(V, F^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_K$. For $i \in \mathbb{R}$, set $\text{gr}^i(V, F^*) = F^iV/F^{>i}V$, where $F^{>i}V = \bigcup_{j>i} F^jV$. We define the *associated graded module* of (V, F^*) to be $\text{gr}^*(V, F^*) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{R}} \text{gr}^i(V, F^*)$.

1. We say that $i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a *Hodge-Tate weight* of V if $\dim_K \text{gr}^i(V) \neq 0$. Let $\mathfrak{W}_{\text{HT}}(V, F^*)$ be the set of all Hodge-Tate weights of (V, F^*) .
2. We define the *Hodge-Tate length* of (V, F^*) to be

$$\ell_{\text{HT}}(V, F^*) = \max \mathfrak{W}_{\text{HT}}(V, F^*) - \min \mathfrak{W}_{\text{HT}}(V, F^*).$$

A filtered module over K in the sense of Fontaine in [9] is an object $V \in \mathbf{MF}_K$ such that $\mathfrak{W}_{\text{HT}}(V) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. We call such an object an *integrally filtered module* over K .

Definition 1.4. Let $V \in \mathbf{MF}_K$. We define the *Hodge number* of V to be

$$t_{\mathrm{H}}(V) = \sum_{i \in \mathfrak{W}_{\mathrm{HT}}(V)} i \cdot \dim_K \mathrm{gr}^i(V).$$

For $V \in \mathbf{MF}_K$, the tensor product filtration on $V^{\otimes \dim_K V}$ induces a filtration on $\det V$. We note that $t_{\mathrm{H}}(V) = t_{\mathrm{H}}(\det V)$. In Definition 1.5 we define a class of basis of and object in \mathbf{MF}_K that is useful for the proof of Theorem 0.2. In Definition 1.6, we fix a notation for later convenience. Lemma 1.7 serves as a preparation for the proof of Theorem 1.13.

Definition 1.5. Let $(V, F^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_K$, and let $d = \dim_K V$. A basis $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of V is said to be *filtration-generating* if $F^j V = \langle v_1, \dots, v_{d_j} \rangle_K$ for all $j \in \mathfrak{W}_{\mathrm{HT}}(V, F^*)$, where $d_i = \dim_K F^i V$.

Definition 1.6. Let $(V, F^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_K$. We define the *Hodge-Tate weight* of $v \in V$ to be

$$w_{\mathrm{HT}}(v) = \max\{i \in \mathfrak{W}_{\mathrm{HT}}(V, F^*) \mid v \in F^i V\}.$$

Lemma 1.7. Let $T : V' \rightarrow V$ be a morphism in \mathbf{MF}_K . If T is an isomorphism in \mathbf{Mod}_K , then $t_{\mathrm{H}}(V') \leq t_{\mathrm{H}}(V)$. This inequality is an equality if and only if T is an isomorphism in \mathbf{MF}_K .

Proof. We show the assertion by induction on $d = \dim_K V$. The assertion is obvious if $d = 1$. Assuming the assertion for $1 \leq d \leq r - 1$, we prove it for $d = r$. Pick $v' \in V' \setminus \{0\}$, and let $v = T(v')$. Then, we have the following commutative diagram of short exact sequences in \mathbf{MF}_K .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \langle v' \rangle_K & \longrightarrow & V' & \longrightarrow & V'/\langle v' \rangle_K & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & T \downarrow & & T \downarrow & & \overline{T} \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \langle v \rangle_K & \longrightarrow & V & \longrightarrow & V/\langle v \rangle_K & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Here $\langle v \rangle_K$ and $\langle v' \rangle_K$ are equipped with the subspace filtrations, while $V/\langle v \rangle_K$ and $V'/\langle v' \rangle_K$ are equipped with the quotient filtrations. Note that the vertical arrows are isomorphisms in \mathbf{Mod}_K . By the assertion for $d = 1$, we get $t_{\mathrm{H}}(\langle v' \rangle_K) \leq t_{\mathrm{H}}(\langle v \rangle_K)$, and by the assertion for $d = r - 1$, we get $t_{\mathrm{H}}(V'/\langle v' \rangle_K) \leq t_{\mathrm{H}}(V/\langle v \rangle_K)$. Those inequalities are equalities if and only if both $T : \langle v' \rangle_K \rightarrow \langle v \rangle_K$ and $\overline{T} : V'/\langle v' \rangle_K \rightarrow V/\langle v \rangle_K$ are isomorphisms in \mathbf{MF}_K . Thus

$$t_{\mathrm{H}}(V') = t_{\mathrm{H}}(\langle v' \rangle_K) + t_{\mathrm{H}}(V'/\langle v' \rangle_K) \leq t_{\mathrm{H}}(\langle v \rangle_K) + t_{\mathrm{H}}(V/\langle v \rangle_K) = t_{\mathrm{H}}(V),$$

with equality if and only if $T : V' \rightarrow V$ is an isomorphism in \mathbf{MF}_K . Hence, the assertion is true for $d = r$. By mathematical induction, we conclude that the assertion is true for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. \square

To define Φ -modules, we need a Frobenius automorphism on the base field. Since not all the extension of K_0 carries a Frobenius automorphism, we restrict our attention to a certain class of extensions of K_0 specified by the following definition.

Definition 1.8. Let K_* be a finite extension of K_0 with residue field k . If the Frobenius automorphism on K_0 extends to an automorphism σ on K_* , then we say that K_* is a *Frobenius extension* of K_0 with respect to σ .

Definition 1.9. Let K_* be a Frobenius extension of K_0 with respect to σ . An endomorphism ϕ on a K_* -vector space is said to be σ -semilinear if $\phi(\lambda \cdot v) = \sigma(\lambda) \cdot \phi(v)$ for all $\lambda \in K_*$ and $v \in V$.

1. A Φ -module over K_* is a pair (V, ϕ) , where $V \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}$, and ϕ is a σ -semilinear endomorphism on V that is bijective.

- Let (V, ϕ) and (V', ϕ') be Φ -modules over K_* . A morphism $T : V' \rightarrow V$ in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_*} is said to be *Frobenius-compatible* if $T \circ \phi' = \phi \circ T$.

Let $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}^\Phi$ be the category consisting of Φ -modules over K_* and Frobenius-compatible morphisms. For an object $(V, \phi) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}^\Phi$, we sometimes omit ϕ and denote it by V instead, if it causes no confusion.

A Φ -module in the sense of Fontaine in [9] is an object in $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_0}^\Phi$.

Definition 1.10. Let $(V, \phi) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}^\Phi$

- If $\dim_K V = 1$, pick $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$. Let $\lambda \in K_*$ be characterized by $\phi(v) = \lambda \cdot v$. We define the *Newton number* of (V, ϕ) to be $t_N(V, \phi) = \text{ord } \lambda$, which is independent of the choice of such v .
- We define the *Newton number* of (V, ϕ) to be $t_N(V, \phi) = t_N(\det V, \det \phi)$.

Definition 1.11. Let K be a complete discrete valuation field extending K_* with a perfect residue field of characteristic p . We define the category of *filtered Φ -modules* over K/K_* to be

$$\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^\Phi = \mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}^\Phi \times_{\mathbf{Mod}_K} \mathbf{MF}_K.$$

An object in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ consists of three data: a Φ -module $(V, \phi) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}^\Phi$, a filtered module $(V_K, F^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_K$, and an isomorphism $\iota : V_K \rightarrow K \otimes_{K_*} V$ in \mathbf{Mod}_K . We denote such an object by $((V, \phi), (V_K, F^*), \iota)$. We also denote this object abstractly by \mathbf{V} . The *dimension* of \mathbf{V} is defined to be $\dim \mathbf{V} = \dim_{K_*} V = \dim_K V_K$. Furthermore, the *Hodge number* of \mathbf{V} is defined to be $t_H(\mathbf{V}) = t_H(V_K, F^*)$, and the *Newton number* of \mathbf{V} is defined to be $t_N(\mathbf{V}) = t_N(V, \phi)$. For objects $\mathbf{V} = ((V, \phi), (V_K, F^*), \iota)$ and $\mathbf{V}' = ((V', \phi'), (V'_K, F^*), \iota')$ in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ , a morphism $\mathbf{T} : \mathbf{V}' \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ is a pair (T, T_K) such that $T_K = \iota^{-1} \circ (1 \otimes T) \circ \iota'$, where $T : V' \rightarrow V$ gives a morphism in $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}^\Phi$, and $T_K : V'_K \rightarrow V_K$ gives a morphism in \mathbf{MF}_K . We say that \mathbf{T} is *strict* if T_K is strict. Moreover, for an object $((V, \phi), (V_K, F^*), \iota) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^\Phi$, if $V_K = K \otimes_{K_*} V$, namely ι is the identity map, then we denote it by (V, ϕ, F^*) . The full subcategory of \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ consisting of such objects, denoted by $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \text{id}}$, is equivalent to \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . Natural objects associated with exponentially twisted cohomology are in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ , but it is more convenient to use objects in $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \text{id}}$ for certain proof, which is the reason why we introduce this full subcategory here. Furthermore, let $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \text{id}}$ be the full subcategory of $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \text{id}}$ consisting of objects (V, ϕ, F^*) such that (V_K, F^*) is an integrally filtered. We note that $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \text{id}}$ coincides with the category of filtered Φ -modules defined by Fontaine in [9, 1.2.2].

Definition 1.12. Let $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^\Phi$. We say that \mathbf{V} is *weakly admissible* if $t_N(\mathbf{V}') \geq t_H(\mathbf{V}')$ for all subobject \mathbf{V}' of \mathbf{V} in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ , with equality when $\mathbf{V}' = \mathbf{V}$. Let $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \text{w.a.}}$ denote the full subcategory of \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ consisting of weakly admissible objects.

Definition 1.12 extends the weakly admissible property for objects in $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \text{id}}$ given by Fontaine in [9, 4.1.4 Définition] to objects in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . The following theorem is a generalized version of [9, 4.2.1 Proposition]. Even though the proof is parallel, we include it for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 1.13. *1. Let $0 \rightarrow \mathbf{V}' \rightarrow \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}'' \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . If two of the three terms are weakly admissible, then so is the third one.*

2. Let $\mathbf{T} : \mathbf{V}' \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ be a morphism in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . If \mathbf{V}' and \mathbf{V} are weakly admissible, then \mathbf{T} is strict, and $\ker \mathbf{T}$ and $\operatorname{coker} \mathbf{T}$ are weakly admissible.

3. The category $\mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^{\Phi, \mathbf{w.a.}}$ is an abelian category.

Proof. We start from the first assertion. It is straightforward to verify that \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{V}' being weakly admissible implies that \mathbf{V}'' is weakly admissible, and that \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{V}'' being weakly admissible implies that \mathbf{V}' is weakly admissible. Therefore, it remains to show that if \mathbf{V}' and \mathbf{V}'' being weakly admissible, then \mathbf{V} is weakly admissible. Let \mathbf{W} be a subobject of \mathbf{V} . Let $\mathbf{W}' = \mathbf{W} \cap \mathbf{V}'$, and let $\overline{\mathbf{W}}'' = \mathbf{W}/\mathbf{W}'$. Then, we get a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbf{W}' \rightarrow \mathbf{W} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{W}}'' \rightarrow 0$$

in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . Write $\overline{\mathbf{W}}'' = ((W'', \phi''), (W''_K, \overline{F}^*), \iota'')$, where \overline{F}^* denotes the quotient filtration. Replace \overline{F}^* with the subspace filtration F^* and let $\mathbf{W}'' = ((W'', \phi''), (W''_K, F^*), \iota'')$, then \mathbf{W}'' is a subobject of \mathbf{V}'' in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . Note that the identity map $W''_K \rightarrow W''_K$ gives a morphism $(W''_K, \overline{F}^*) \rightarrow (W''_K, F^*)$ in \mathbf{MF}_K . By Lemma 1.7, we get $t_H(W''_K, \overline{F}^*) \leq t_H(W''_K, F^*)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} t_H(\mathbf{W}) &= t_H(\mathbf{W}') + t_H(W''_K, \overline{F}^*) \leq t_H(\mathbf{W}') + t_H(W''_K, F^*) \\ &\leq t_N(\mathbf{W}') + t_N(W'', \phi'') = t_N(\mathbf{W}). \end{aligned}$$

When $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{V}$, we have $t_H(\mathbf{V}) = t_H(\mathbf{V}') + t_H(\mathbf{V}'') = t_N(\mathbf{V}') + t_N(\mathbf{V}'') = t_N(\mathbf{V})$. Thus \mathbf{V} is weakly admissible.

Note that the third assertion follows straightforwardly from the second one, so we only need to consider the second assertion. To show that \mathbf{T} is strict, it suffices to show $\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T} \cong \operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}$ in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . Here $\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T} = ((\operatorname{coim} T, \phi'), (\operatorname{coim} T_K, \overline{F}^*), \iota')$ and $\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T} = ((\operatorname{im} T, \phi), (\operatorname{im} T_K, F^*), \iota)$, where \overline{F}^* denotes the quotient filtration, and F^* denotes the subspace filtration. Note that the canonical isomorphisms $\operatorname{coim} T \rightarrow \operatorname{im} T$ and $\operatorname{coim} T_K \rightarrow \operatorname{im} T_K$ in of vector spaces give a morphism $\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}$ in \mathbf{MF}_K^Φ . By Lemma 1.7, we get $t_H(\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T}) \leq t_H(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T})$. This inequality is an equality if and only if $\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}$ is an isomorphism in \mathbf{MF}_K^Φ . Since \mathbf{V}' is weakly admissible, we have $t_N(\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T}) \leq t_H(\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T})$. Since \mathbf{V} is weakly admissible, we have $t_N(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}) \geq t_H(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T})$. Combining those inequalities, we get

$$t_N(\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T}) \leq t_H(\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T}) \leq t_H(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}) \leq t_N(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}) \quad (1.1)$$

At the same time, note that the canonical isomorphism $\operatorname{coim} T \rightarrow \operatorname{im} T$ gives an isomorphism $(\operatorname{coim} T, \phi') \rightarrow (\operatorname{im} T, \phi)$ in $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_*}^\Phi$. Thus $t_N(\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T}) = t_N(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T})$, which implies that all inequalities in Eq. (1.1) are equalities. In particular, we get $t_H(\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T}) = t_H(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T})$, which implies $\operatorname{coim} \mathbf{T} \cong \operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}$ in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ . Thus \mathbf{T} is strict. Now, by the first assertion, to show that $\ker \mathbf{T}$ and $\operatorname{coker} \mathbf{T}$ are weakly admissible, it suffices to show that $\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}$ is weakly admissible. Since $\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}$ is a subobject of a weakly admissible object in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ , we only need to prove $t_N(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T}) = t_H(\operatorname{im} \mathbf{T})$, which we have already shown. \square

In the following definition, we define a class of basis of an object in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^Φ that is useful for the proof of Theorem 0.2.

Definition 1.14. Let $\mathbf{V} = ((V, \phi), (V_K, F^*), \iota) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K/K_*}^\Phi$, and let $d = \dim \mathbf{V}$. By saying a basis of \mathbf{V} , we mean a basis of V .

1. A basis $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of \mathbf{V} is said to be *filtration-generating* if $\{v_{K,i}\}_{i=1}^d$ is a filtration-generating basis of V_K , where $v_{K,i} = \iota^{-1}(1 \otimes v_i)$.

2. Let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a filtration generating basis of \mathbf{V} . We say that $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is *agreeable* if $\text{ord } A_\phi(v_i, v_j) \geq w_{\text{HT}}(v_{K,j})$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, where $A_\phi(v_i, v_j) \in K_*$ is characterised by

$$\phi(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^d A_\phi(v_i, v_j) \cdot v_j.$$

Proposition 1.15. *If $\mathbf{V} \in \overline{\text{MF}}_{K/K_*}^\Phi$ admits an agreeable basis, then $t_{\text{N}}(\mathbf{V}) \geq t_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{V})$.*

Proof. Let $d = \dim \mathbf{V}$, and let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be an agreeable basis of \mathbf{V} . Let \mathbf{A}_ϕ denote the $d \times d$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is equal to $A_\phi(v_i, v_j)$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, d$. Note that $t_{\text{N}}(\mathbf{V}) = \text{ord det } \mathbf{A}_\phi$, where

$$\text{ord det } \mathbf{A}_\phi \geq \min \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^d \text{ord } A_\phi(v_{i_j}, v_j) \mid i_1, \dots, i_d = 1, \dots, d \right\} \geq \sum_{j=1}^d w_{\text{HT}}(v_{K,j}).$$

The first inequality follows from the definition of determinants, and the second inequality follows from the assumption that $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is agreeable. Since $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is also filtration-generating, we have $t_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{V}) = \sum_{j=1}^d w_{\text{HT}}(v_{K,j})$. Therefore, we get

$$t_{\text{N}}(\mathbf{V}) = \text{ord det } \mathbf{A}_\phi \geq \sum_{i=1}^d w_{\text{HT}}(v_{K,i}) = t_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{V}). \quad \square$$

2 Exponentially twisted cohomology

This section is a preliminary to the arguments in Section 3. The goal of this section is to recollect some knowledge of exponentially twisted cohomology, and clarify how it relates to the categories defined in Section 1. We recall firstly the exponentially twisted rigid cohomology, and secondly the exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology. We also consider a canonical map between them, which is often called the specialization map.

From this section, we fix $k = \mathbb{F}_q$. Fix a primitive p -th root of unity ζ_p , and let $K_1 = K_0(\zeta_p)$. The isomorphism $\text{Gal}(K_1/\mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)) \cong \text{Gal}(K_0/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ implies that the Frobenius automorphism on K_0 is uniquely extended to an automorphism σ on K_1 such that $\sigma(\zeta_p) = \zeta_p$. Then K_1 is a Frobenius extension of K_0 with respect to σ . Let O_1 be the ring of integers of K_1 .

We begin with the exponentially twisted rigid cohomology. First, we review some basic theory of overconvergent F -isocrystals over affine smooth varieties. Let Γ_0 be a finitely generated smooth O_1 -algebra presented by $\Gamma_0 = O_1[\mathbf{y}]/I_0$, where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_r)$, and I_0 is an ideal of $O_1[\mathbf{y}]$. For $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r$, let $|\mathbf{v}| = \sum_{i=1}^r v_i$, and let $\mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{v}} = y_1^{v_1} \dots y_r^{v_r}$. Let

$$O_1[\mathbf{y}]^\dagger = \bigcup_{\lambda > 1} \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} A_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{v}} \in O_1[[\mathbf{y}]] \mid |A_{\mathbf{v}}|_p \lambda^{|\mathbf{v}|} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |\mathbf{v}| \rightarrow \infty \right\},$$

and let $\Gamma_0^\dagger = O_1[\mathbf{y}]^\dagger / I_0 \cdot O_1[\mathbf{y}]^\dagger$. Let $\Gamma = K_1 \otimes_{O_1} \Gamma_0$, and let $\Gamma^\dagger = K_1 \otimes_{O_1} \Gamma_0^\dagger$. Let $\overline{\Gamma} = k \otimes_{O_1} \Gamma_0$, and let $X_k = \text{Spec } \overline{\Gamma}$. Let $\varphi : \Gamma^\dagger \rightarrow \Gamma^\dagger$ denote the lift of the absolute Frobenius on $\overline{\Gamma}$. An *overconvergent F -isocrystal* over X_k consists of three data: a projective Γ^\dagger -module \mathcal{E} of finite type, an integrable connection $\nabla : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \otimes_{\Gamma^\dagger} \Omega_{\Gamma^\dagger/K_1}^1$, and an isomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{E}^\varphi \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ of Γ^\dagger -modules such that $\Phi \circ \nabla^\varphi = \nabla \circ \Phi$. Here \mathcal{E}^φ denotes the extension of scalars of \mathcal{E} along φ , and

∇^φ is the connection on \mathcal{E}^φ induced by ∇ . We denote such an overconvergent F-isocrystal by $(\mathcal{E}, \nabla, \Phi)$. We often omit ∇ and Φ , and write \mathcal{E} instead, if it causes no confusion. Let $\mathrm{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}, \nabla)$ denote the de Rham complex of the connection ∇ on \mathcal{E} . For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, the i -th degree *rigid cohomology* of the overconvergent F-isocrystal \mathcal{E} over X_k is given by

$$H_{\mathrm{rig}}^i(X_k/K_1, \mathcal{E}) = H^i(\mathrm{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}, \nabla)).$$

At the same time, note that Φ yields a chain map $\phi : \mathrm{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}, \nabla) \rightarrow \mathrm{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}, \nabla)$, which induces a bijective σ -semilinear endomorphism on $H_{\mathrm{rig}}^i(X_k/K_1, \mathcal{E})$. Denoting this endomorphism still by ϕ , we get

$$(H_{\mathrm{rig}}^i(X_k/K_1, \mathcal{E}), \phi) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^\Phi.$$

The terminology exponentially twisted rigid cohomology means the rigid cohomology of certain type of overconvergent F-isocrystals: the pullbacks of the Dwork F-isocrystal over the affine line. We recollect some fact of the Dwork F-isocrystal. By [7, Lemma 4.1], there exists a unique $\pi \in \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)$ satisfying $\pi + \frac{\pi^p}{p} = 0$, such that

$$\pi \equiv \zeta_p - 1 \pmod{(\zeta_p - 1)^2}.$$

Note that π is a uniformizer of K_1 and $\mathrm{ord} \pi = \frac{1}{p-1}$. Let $\mathbb{A}^1 = \mathrm{Spec} O_1[t]$ be the affine line over O_1 . The *Dwork F-isocrystal* \mathcal{L}_π over \mathbb{A}_k^1 associated with π is the overconvergent F-isocrystal over \mathbb{A}_k^1 presented by $(\mathcal{L}_\pi, \nabla_{\pi t}, \Phi_t)$, where $\mathcal{L}_\pi = K_1[t]^\dagger$ is the free $K_1[t]^\dagger$ -module of rank 1, the connection $\nabla_{\pi t}$ on \mathcal{L}_π is defined by $\nabla_{\pi t}(1) = \pi \otimes dt$, and $\Phi_t : \mathcal{L}_\pi^\varphi \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi$ is defined by $\Phi_t(1) = \exp(\pi(t^p - t))$. We explain more in detail about this formulation. Firstly Φ_t is well-defined, because by [8, 21.1 Proposition], we have $\exp(\pi(t^p - t)) \in K_1[t]^\dagger$. Secondly, the connection $\nabla_{\pi t}^\varphi$ on \mathcal{L}_π^φ is defined by $\nabla_{\pi t}^\varphi(1) = \pi p t^{p-1} \otimes dt$, and it is straightforward to verify $\Phi_t \circ \nabla_{\pi t}^\varphi = \nabla_{\pi t} \circ \Phi_t$. Now, we are ready to recall the exponentially twisted rigid cohomology. Let $A_0 = O_1[x_1, \dots, x_n, (x_1 \dots x_n)^{-1}]$, and let $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathrm{Spec} A_0$ be the n -dimensional torus over O_1 . For $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, let $|\mathbf{u}| = \sum_{i=1}^n |u_i|$, and let $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} = x_1^{u_1} \dots x_n^{u_n}$. Note that

$$A^\dagger = \bigcup_{\lambda > 1} \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid A_{\mathbf{u}} \in K_1, |A_{\mathbf{u}}|_p \lambda^{|\mathbf{u}|} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |\mathbf{u}| \rightarrow \infty \right\}.$$

Let $f : \mathbb{T}_k^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$ be the morphism defined by $t \mapsto f(\mathbf{x})$, where

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \alpha_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in \bar{A} := k \otimes_{O_1} A_0 \quad (2.1)$$

is a Laurent polynomial. We define the *Teichmüller lift* of $f(\mathbf{x})$ to be

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in A := K_1 \otimes_{O_1} A_0, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \in K_0$ denotes the Teichmüller lift of $\alpha_{\mathbf{u}} \in k$. Let $\hat{F} = \pi \hat{f}$. We present the overconvergent F-isocrystal $f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi$ over \mathbb{T}_k^n by the triple $(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}}, \Phi_f)$, where $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}} = A^\dagger$ is the free A^\dagger -module of rank 1, the connection $\nabla_{\hat{F}}$ on $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}$ is defined by $\nabla_{\hat{F}}(1) = \pi \otimes d\hat{f}$, and $\Phi_f : \mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}^\varphi \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}$ is defined by $\Phi_f(1) = \exp(\pi(\varphi(\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x})))$. Here, we note that φ is defined by the endomorphism of A^\dagger given by

$$\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \sigma(A_{\mathbf{u}}) \mathbf{x}^{p\mathbf{u}}.$$

Note that Φ_f is well-defined, because we have $\exp(\pi(\varphi(\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}))) \in A^\dagger$ by the proof of [7, Lemma 4.1]. The connection $\nabla_{\hat{F}}^\varphi$ on $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}^\varphi$ is defined by $\nabla_{\hat{F}}^\varphi(1) = \pi \otimes d\varphi(\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}))$, and it is straightforward to verify that $\Phi_f \circ \nabla_{\hat{F}}^\varphi = \nabla_{\hat{F}} \circ \Phi_f$. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, the i -th degree rigid cohomology of $f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi$ over \mathbb{T}^k is given by

$$H_{\text{rig}}^i(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi) = H^i(\text{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}})).$$

More explicitly, the de Rham complex $\text{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}})$ is the chain complex defined by setting

$$\text{DR}^l(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}}) = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq n} A^\dagger dx_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_l}$$

for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, with the differential $\text{DR}^l(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}}) \rightarrow \text{DR}^{l+1}(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}})$ given by

$$\xi dx_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_l} \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n (\partial_i \xi + \pi \xi \partial_i \hat{f}) dx_i \wedge dx_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{i_l}$$

for $\xi \in A^\dagger$ and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq n$. Here, we set $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Furthermore, the isomorphism Φ_f is represented by the map $\phi_f : A^\dagger \rightarrow A^\dagger$ given by $\xi(\mathbf{x}) \mapsto \exp(\pi(\varphi(\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}))) \cdot \varphi(\xi(\mathbf{x}))$. We observe that

$$\nabla_{\hat{F}} \circ \phi_f = p \cdot (\phi_f \circ \nabla_{\hat{F}}),$$

which implies that ϕ_f induces a chain map $\phi_f : \text{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}}) \rightarrow \text{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}})$. We denote the induced bijective σ -semilinear endomorphism on $H^i(\text{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{F}}, \nabla_{\hat{F}}))$ still by ϕ_f . Then, we get

$$(H_{\text{rig}}^i(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^\Phi.$$

Next, we move on to the exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology. We first go back to the setup considered at the beginning of this section and review some general theory. Recall that $X_{K_1} = \text{Spec } \Gamma$ is an affine smooth variety over K_1 . Let E be a projective Γ -module of finite type, and let $\nabla : E \rightarrow E \otimes_\Gamma \Omega_{\Gamma/K_1}^1$ be an integrable connection. Let $\text{DR}^*(E, \nabla)$ denote the de Rham complex of the connection ∇ on E . For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, the i -th degree *de Rham cohomology* of ∇ over X_{K_1} is given by

$$H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_{K_1}, \nabla) = H^i(\text{DR}^*(E, \nabla)).$$

If ∇ is not regular, then it is not clear how to attach a Hodge theoretic filtration on $H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_{K_1}, \nabla)$. In order to attach a canonical filtration to $H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_{K_1}, \nabla)$, a generalized version of the Hodge filtrations is expected. This issue is first raised by Deligne in [6], where he attached some sensible filtrations on the de Rham cohomology of exponentially twisted connections over curves. Later, irregular Hodge theory is established by Sabbah and Yu (cf. [17]). More explicitly, Sabbah defined the category **irrMHM** of *irregular mixed Hodge modules* containing the category **MHM** of *mixed Hodge modules* as a full subcategory (cf. [17, Theorem 0.2 (1)]). An object in **irrMHM** is equipped with a filtration indexed by real numbers, called the *irregular Hodge filtration* (cf. [17, Definition 2.22]). The irregular Hodge filtration generalizes the Hodge filtration, in the sense that the irregular Hodge filtration associated with an object in **MHM** coincides with the associated Hodge filtration (cf. [17, Theorem 0.3 (1)]).

Now, we explain how irregular Hodge theory allows us to attach a canonical filtration on the exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology. Assume that X_{K_1} is smooth and quasi-projective, and let F be a global regular function on X_{K_1} . For a pair (X_{K_1}, F) who admits a *good compactification* (cf. [18, §1]), Yu provided a way in [18] to construct the irregular Hodge filtration on the

exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology $H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_{K_1}, \nabla_F)$. Here ∇_F denotes the exponentially twisted connection over X_{K_1} associated with F , namely the connection over X_{K_1} defined by $\nabla_F(1) = 1 \otimes dF$. Note that Yu was assuming the base field to be \mathbb{C} , but his construction of the irregular Hodge filtration (cf. [18, p. 110 Definition]) can be applied without change in our situation. Denoting the irregular Hodge filtration by F_{irr}^* , we get

$$(H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_{K_1}, \nabla_F), F_{\text{irr}}^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1}.$$

If F is a regular function on $\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n$ that is nondegenerate (cf. Definition 3.1), then the pair (\mathbb{T}_k^n, F) admits a good compactification (cf. [18, §4]), and the irregular Hodge filtration F_{irr}^* is in particular defined on $H_{\text{dR}}^i(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_F)$.

Finally, we consider the relationship between the exponentially twisted rigid cohomology and the exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology. If $(\mathcal{E}, \nabla) = (\Gamma^\dagger \otimes_\Gamma E, 1 \otimes \nabla)$, then the inclusion $\Gamma \hookrightarrow \Gamma^\dagger$ induces a chain map $\text{DR}^*(E, \nabla) \rightarrow \text{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}, \nabla)$. For each i , this chain map induces the specialization map $H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_{K_1}, \nabla) \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^i(X_k/K_1, \mathcal{E})$, which is a morphism in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1} . In particular, considering the exponentially twisted cohomology over the n -dimensional torus, the inclusion $A \hookrightarrow A^\dagger$ induces the specialization map

$$\iota_{\widehat{F}} : H_{\text{dR}}^i(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}) \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^i(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi). \quad (2.3)$$

In the following section, we prove that $\iota_{\widehat{F}}$ is an isomorphism under certain conditions for f .

3 Newton polyhedron modules

This section is a preparation for the proof of Theorem 0.2. We first prove that the morphism in Eq. (2.3) is an isomorphism under certain conditions, so that we can associate a filtered Φ -module to f . Secondly, we construct two filtered Φ -modules, one of them can be directly compared with the exponentially twisted cohomology, and the other one is closely related to the work of Adolphson and Sperber in [1] and [2]. Those filtered Φ -modules are useful for the proof of Theorem 0.2.

Let \mathfrak{K} be a field. For a Laurent polynomial

$$\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathfrak{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n, (x_1 \dots x_n)^{-1}],$$

we define the *support* of \mathfrak{f} to be the finite set $\text{supp } \mathfrak{f} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{u}} \neq 0\}$. Let $\Delta(\mathfrak{f})$ denote the convex hull of $\text{supp } \mathfrak{f} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ in \mathbb{R}^n , which we call the *Newton polyhedron* of \mathfrak{f} . Let $\dim \Delta(\mathfrak{f})$ denote the dimension of the smallest linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^n that contains $\Delta(\mathfrak{f})$. Let $\text{vol}(\mathfrak{f})$ denote the $\dim \Delta(\mathfrak{f})$ -dimensional volume of $\Delta(\mathfrak{f})$ relative to the induced lattice. For a face $\tau \in \Delta(\mathfrak{f})$, let

$$\mathfrak{f}_\tau(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \tau \cap \text{supp } \mathfrak{f}} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}.$$

Definition 3.1. Let \mathfrak{K} be a field, and let $\overline{\mathfrak{K}}$ be an algebraic closure of \mathfrak{K} . A Laurent polynomial $\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathfrak{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n, (x_1 \dots x_n)^{-1}]$ is said to be *nondegenerate*, if for every face τ of $\Delta(\mathfrak{f})$ that does not contain $\mathbf{0}$, the Laurent polynomials $\partial_1 \mathfrak{f}_\tau(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \partial_n \mathfrak{f}_\tau(\mathbf{x})$ have no common zero in $(\overline{\mathfrak{K}}^\times)^n$.

We retain the notations from Section 2. Recall that $f(\mathbf{x})$ is the Laurent polynomial defined in Eq. (2.1), and \widehat{f} is its Teichmüller lift. Recall that $\widehat{F} = \pi \widehat{f}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that $p \neq 2$. If f, \hat{f} are nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$, then the specialization map $\iota_{\hat{f}}$ in Eq. (2.3) is an isomorphism, so that we get an object*

$$((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\hat{f}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{f}}) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi.$$

Remark 3.3. Assume that $p \neq 2$. Let $F(\mathbf{x}) \in A_0 = O_1[x_1, \dots, x_n, (x_1 \dots x_n)^{-1}]$ be a nondegenerate Laurent polynomial. If $\pi^{-1}F \in A_0$ and the reduction of $\pi^{-1}F$ by π coincides with f , then we still have a canonical map $\iota_F : H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_F) \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi)$. If we assume in addition that $\Delta(F) = \Delta(f)$, and the p -adic distance between $\pi^{-1}F$ and \hat{f} is less than $p^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$, then by a strategy similar to that in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we can show that ι_F is an isomorphism, so that we obtain an object $((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_F), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_F)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi$.

The proof of Theorem 3.2 can be found right after Corollary 3.11. Now, we make some preparation for the proof. Let $\text{cone } f$ be the conical hull of $\text{supp } f$ in \mathbb{R}^n . Define the *weight* of $\mathbf{u} \in \text{cone } f$ to be

$$w(\mathbf{u}) = \inf\{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \mathbf{u} \in w \cdot \Delta(f)\}.$$

Let $M(f) = \mathbb{Z}^n \cap \text{cone } f$, and let $\mathbf{x}^{M(f)}$ denote the multiplicative monoid $\{\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in M(f)\}$. Let $R = k[\mathbf{x}^{M(f)}]$ be the monoid algebra spanned by $\mathbf{x}^{M(f)}$ over k . By [2, Lemma 1.13.(c)], there exists a positive integer m , such that $w(M(f)) \subseteq m^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. For $i \in m^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, set

$$R^i = \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in M(f)} a_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in R \mid w(\mathbf{u}) \leq -i \text{ if } a_{\mathbf{u}} \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Let $\bar{R} = \bigoplus_{i \in m^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} R^i$, where $R^i = R^i/R^{i+\frac{1}{m}}$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\bar{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) \in R^{(-1)}$ denote the image of $x_i \partial_i f(\mathbf{x}) \in R^{-1}$ in \bar{R} , and let $D_{\bar{f}_i} = x_i \partial_i + \bar{f}_i$. Define a chain complex $C^*(\bar{R}, \bar{f})$ by setting

$$C^l(\bar{R}, \bar{f}) = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq n} \bar{R} \frac{dx_{i_1}}{x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{dx_{i_l}}{x_{i_l}}$$

for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, with the differential $C^l(\bar{R}, \bar{f}) \rightarrow C^{l+1}(\bar{R}, \bar{f})$ given by

$$\bar{\xi} \frac{dx_{i_1}}{x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{dx_{i_l}}{x_{i_l}} \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\bar{f}_i} \bar{\xi} \frac{dx_i}{x_i} \wedge \frac{dx_{i_1}}{x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{dx_{i_l}}{x_{i_l}}$$

for $\bar{\xi} \in \bar{R}$ and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq n$.

Theorem 3.4 ([1, Theorem 2.18]). *Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$.*

1. *If $i \neq n$, then $\dim_k H^i(C^*(\bar{R}, \bar{f})) = 0$.*
2. *There exists a finite subset $M_{\text{NP}} \subseteq M(f)$, such that*

$$\bar{R} = \bar{V}_{\text{NP}} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\bar{f}_i} \bar{R},$$

where $\bar{V}_{\text{NP}} = \langle \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}} \rangle_k$. Furthermore, we have $|M_{\text{NP}}| = n! \text{vol}(f)$. \square

Remark 3.5. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let $\bar{I}_{\bar{f}}$ denote the ideal of \bar{R} generated by $\bar{f}_1, \dots, \bar{f}_n$. For $i \in m^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, there exists a finite subset

$$M_{\text{NP}}^{(i)} \subseteq \{\mathbf{u} \in M(f) \mid w(\mathbf{u}) = i\},$$

such that $\overline{V}_{\text{NP}}^{(i)} = \langle \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}^{(i)} \rangle_k$ is complimentary to $R^{(i)} \cap \overline{T}_{\tilde{f}}$ in $R^{(i)}$, namely

$$R^{(i)} = \overline{V}_{\text{NP}}^{(i)} \oplus (R^{(i)} \cap \overline{T}_{\tilde{f}}).$$

Setting $M_{\text{NP}} = \bigcup_{i \in m^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} M_{\text{NP}}^{(i)}$, we get $\overline{V}_{\text{NP}} = \bigoplus_{i \in m^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} \overline{V}_{\text{NP}}^{(i)}$ and $\overline{R} = \overline{V}_{\text{NP}} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\tilde{f},i} \overline{R}$.

Fix a m -th root π_m of π , and let $K_m = K_1(\pi_m)$. Note that by setting $\sigma(\pi_m) = \pi_m$, we obtain an extension of σ to K_m . Let O_m be the ring of integers of K_m . For $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$L(b, c) = \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in M(f)} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid A_{\mathbf{u}} \in K_m, \text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}} \geq b \cdot w(\mathbf{u}) + c \right\}.$$

For $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, let $L(b) = \bigcup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} L(b, c)$. Let $\varpi = p^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \in \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$B = \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in M(f)} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid A_{\mathbf{u}} \in K_m, |A_{\mathbf{u}}|_p \varpi^{w(\mathbf{u})} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } w(\mathbf{u}) \rightarrow \infty \right\},$$

$$B_0 = \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in M(f)} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid A_{\mathbf{u}} \in \pi^{w(\mathbf{u})} O_m, |A_{\mathbf{u}}|_p \varpi^{w(\mathbf{u})} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } w(\mathbf{u}) \rightarrow \infty \right\}.$$

For $b > \frac{1}{p-1}$, we have $A \subseteq L(b) \subseteq B \subseteq L(\frac{1}{p-1}) \subseteq A_m^\dagger$. In addition, if $c \geq 0$, then $L(b, c)_m \subseteq B_0$. Here $A_m^\dagger = K_m \otimes_{K_1} A^\dagger$. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \{L(b) \mid b > 0\} \cup \{A_m^\dagger, B\}$. For $b > 0$, set

$$\mathfrak{A}^b = \{\Lambda \in \mathfrak{A} \mid L(b) \subseteq \Lambda\}.$$

By [7, Lemma 4.1], there exists a unique $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^{p^i}}{p^i} = 0$, such that

$$\gamma \equiv \zeta_p - 1 \pmod{(\zeta_p - 1)^2}.$$

Note that $\text{ord } \gamma = \frac{1}{p-1}$. For $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, set $\gamma_l = \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{\gamma^{p^i}}{p^i}$. Let $\theta(t) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \gamma_l t^{p^l}$, and let

$$\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f} \theta(\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}).$$

For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \tilde{F}\}$, we define an operator $D_{F,i} = x_i \partial_i + x_i \partial_i F$. For $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{A}^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \cup \{A^\dagger, B_0\}$ and $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \tilde{F}\}$, we define a chain complex $C^*(\Lambda, F)$ by setting

$$C^l(\Lambda, F) = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq n} \Lambda \frac{dx_{i_1}}{x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{dx_{i_l}}{x_{i_l}}$$

for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, with differential $C^l(\Lambda, F) \rightarrow C^{l+1}(\Lambda, F)$ given by $\omega \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n D_{F,i} \omega \wedge \frac{dx_i}{x_i}$. Note that $C^*(\Lambda, F)$ is well-defined, because by Lemma 3.6, we have $x_i \partial_i F(\mathbf{x}) \in L(\frac{p}{p-1}, -1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, the inclusion $\Lambda \hookrightarrow A_m^\dagger$ induces a chain map $\iota_\Lambda : C^*(\Lambda, F) \rightarrow C^*(A_m^\dagger, F)$. Here ι_Λ is written as $\hat{\iota}_\Lambda$ if $F = \widehat{F}$, and as $\tilde{\iota}_\Lambda$ if $F = \tilde{F}$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, this chain map induces a morphism

$$\iota_\Lambda : H^i(C^*(\Lambda, F)) \rightarrow H^i(C^*(A_m^\dagger, F)) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_m}. \quad (3.1)$$

For $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\hat{\iota} : C^l(A^\dagger, \widehat{F}) \rightarrow \mathrm{DR}^l(\mathcal{E}_{\widehat{F}}, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})$ be the map given by

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dx_{i_1}}{x_{i_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{dx_{i_l}}{x_{i_l}} \mapsto x_1^{-1} \cdots x_n^{-1} \xi(\mathbf{x}) dx_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{i_l}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\hat{\iota}$ is an isomorphism, and $\hat{\iota} \circ \nabla_{\widehat{F}} = \nabla_{\widehat{F}} \circ \hat{\iota}$. Thus $\hat{\iota}$ induces an isomorphism $\hat{\iota} : C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F}) \rightarrow \mathrm{DR}^*(\mathcal{E}_{\widehat{F}}, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})$ of chain complexes. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, this chain map induces an isomorphism

$$\hat{\iota} : H^i(C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F})) \rightarrow H_{\mathrm{rig}}^i(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}. \quad (3.2)$$

Lemma 3.6. *Let $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \widetilde{F}\}$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have $x_i \partial_i F(\mathbf{x}) \in L(\frac{p}{p-1}, -1)$.*

Proof. We first consider the case where $F = \widehat{F}$. In this situation, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$x_i \partial_i \widehat{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{supp} f} \pi u_i \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}},$$

where u_i is characterized by $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$. Note that $w(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$ if $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{supp} f$. Thus, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}(\pi u_i \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}) \geq \mathrm{ord} \pi = \frac{1}{p-1} = \frac{p}{p-1} - 1 \geq \frac{p}{p-1} \cdot w(\mathbf{u}) - 1$$

for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{supp} f$, which shows the assertion. Next, we consider the case where $F = \widetilde{F}$ and show that $x_i \partial_i \widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) \in L(\frac{p}{p-1}, -1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. In this situation, we have

$$x_i \partial_i \widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{supp} f} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \gamma_l p^l u_i \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^{p^l} \mathbf{x}^{p^l \mathbf{u}}.$$

Note that for $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have $\mathrm{ord} \gamma_l = \mathrm{ord} \frac{\gamma_{p^{l+1}}}{p^{l+1}} = \frac{p^{l+1}}{p-1} - l - 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}(\gamma_l p^l u_i \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^{p^l}) \geq \mathrm{ord}(\gamma_l p^l) = \frac{p^{l+1}}{p-1} - 1 \geq \frac{p}{p-1} \cdot w(p^l \mathbf{u}) - 1$$

for $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{supp} f$, which shows the assertion. \square

Lemma 3.7. *The map $\rho : B_0 \rightarrow \overline{R}$ given by*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{M}(f)} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{M}(f)} a_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}},$$

is a ring homomorphism, where $a_{\mathbf{u}} \in k$ is the reduction of $\pi^{-w(\mathbf{u})} A_{\mathbf{u}} \in O_m$ modulo π .

Proof. The proof is parallel to that in [1, Lemma 2.10]. We say that \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{u}' in $\mathrm{M}(f)$ are *cofacial* if $w(\mathbf{u})^{-1} \mathbf{u}$ and $w(\mathbf{u}')^{-1} \mathbf{u}'$ lie on the same closed face of $\Delta(f)$. By [1, Lemma 1.9.(c)], we have $w(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}') \leq w(\mathbf{u}) + w(\mathbf{u}')$ for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in \mathrm{M}(f)$. This inequality is an equality if and only if \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{u}' are cofacial. On the other hand, by [1, (1.11)], the multiplication in \overline{R} is given by

$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}'} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}'} & \text{if } \mathbf{u} \text{ and } \mathbf{u}' \text{ are cofacial,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the assertion follows from the observation for $\pi \in \{\pi, \gamma\}$ and $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in \mathrm{M}(f)$ that

$$\pi^{w(\mathbf{u})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}')} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}'} = \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}) + w(\mathbf{u}') - w(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}')} \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}')} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}'}. \quad \square$$

Remark 3.8. Note that R and \bar{R} are identical as k -modules, but not as k -algebras. Regarding ρ as a map from B_0 to R does not give a homomorphism of rings.

Proposition 3.9. *Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let $M_{\text{NP}} \subseteq M(f)$ be the finite subset given by Theorem 3.4. Let $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \widetilde{F}\}$.*

1. *If $i \neq n$, then $H^i(C^*(B, F)) = 0$.*
2. *Set $V_{\text{NP},m} = \langle \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}} \rangle_{K_m}$. Then, we have $B = V_{\text{NP},m} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{F,i}B$.*

Proof. If $F = \widetilde{F}$, then the assertion is given by the proof of [1, Theorem 2.9]. Next, we consider the case where $F = \widehat{F}$. Note that for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$D_{\widehat{F},i} \circ \rho = \rho \circ D_{\widehat{F},i},$$

which yields a chain map $C^*(B_0, \widehat{F}) \rightarrow C^*(\bar{R}, \widehat{F})$. Note that B_0 is a *flat separated complete* O_1 -module in the sense of Monsky in [16, p. 91], with respect to the norm on B_0 given by

$$\|\xi\| = \sup\{|A_{\mathbf{u}}|_p \mid \mathbf{u} \in M(f)\}$$

for $\xi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in M(f)} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in B_0$. By Theorem 3.4.1 and [16, Theorem 8.5 (1)], for $i \neq n$, we have $H^i(C^*(B, F)) = 0$. By Theorem 3.4.2 and the proof of [1, Theorem A.1], we get

$$B = V_{\text{NP},m} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{F,i}B. \quad \square$$

Proposition 3.10. *Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let $\frac{1}{p-1} \leq b \leq \frac{p}{p-1}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Set $V(b, c) = V_{\text{NP},m} \cap L(b, c)$, and let $e = b - \frac{1}{p-1}$. Let $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \widetilde{F}\}$. Then, we have*

$$L(b, c) = V(b, c) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_{F,i}L(b, c + e).$$

Proof. If $F = \widetilde{F}$, then the assertion is the same as [1, Proposition 3.6]. It remains to show the assertion for $F = \widehat{F}$. We first consider the case where $b > \frac{1}{p-1}$. For $\xi(\mathbf{x}) \in L(b, c)$, by [1, Proposition 3.2], there exists $v_0(\mathbf{x}) \in V(b, c)$ and $\eta_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \eta_{n,1}(\mathbf{x}) \in L(b, c + e)$, such that

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) = v_0(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \pi \widehat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \eta_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Setting $\xi_1(\mathbf{x}) = -\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \partial_i \eta_{i,1}(\mathbf{x})$, we have $\xi_1(\mathbf{x}) \in L(b, c + e)$ and

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) = v_0(\mathbf{x}) + \xi_1(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} \eta_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Applying the same argument for $\xi(\mathbf{x})$ as above to $\xi_1(\mathbf{x})$ and proceeding recursively, we obtain a sequence $\{(v_l(\mathbf{x}), \xi_l(\mathbf{x}), \eta_{1,l}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \eta_{n,l}(\mathbf{x}))\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ in $V(b, c + l \cdot e) \times L(b, c + l \cdot e)^{n+1}$ satisfying

$$\xi_l(\mathbf{x}) = v_l(\mathbf{x}) + \xi_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} \eta_{i,l+1}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Since $b > \frac{1}{p-1}$, we have $e = b - \frac{1}{p-1} > 0$, which implies that $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} v_l(\mathbf{x})$ has a limit in $V(b, c)$, and that $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \eta_{i,l}(\mathbf{x})$ has a limit in $L(b, c)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $v(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} v_l(\mathbf{x})$, and for $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\eta_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \eta_{i,l}(\mathbf{x})$. Then, we have

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) = v(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} \eta_i(\mathbf{x}) \in V(b, c) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b, c + e).$$

Now, we consider the case where $b = \frac{1}{p-1}$. In this situation, we have $e = 0$, so the argument above does not apply. We may assume $c = 0$, since $L(b, c) = \varpi^c \cdot L(b, 0)$, where we recall that $\varpi = p^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$. For $\xi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in M(f)} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in L(b, 0)$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let

$$\xi^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{w(\mathbf{u}) \leq l} A_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}.$$

Note that $\xi^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}) \in B_0$ for $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, so by the proof of Proposition 3.9, there exist $v^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}) \in V(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0)$ and $\eta_1^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \eta_n^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}) \in B_0$, such that

$$\xi^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}) = v^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} \eta_i^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Now, we get a sequence $\{(v^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}), \eta_1^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \eta_n^{(l)}(\mathbf{x}))\}_{l=0}^{\infty}$ in the space $V(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0) \times L(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0)^n$, which is compact in the topology of coefficient-wise convergence. Therefore, this sequence has a limit point $(v(\mathbf{x}), \eta_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \eta_n(\mathbf{x}))$ in $V(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0) \times L(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0)^n$ that satisfies

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) = v(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} \eta_i(\mathbf{x}). \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.11. *Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{A}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$.*

1. *We have $\Lambda = V_{\text{NP},m} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} \Lambda$.*
2. *If $p \neq 2$, then we have $\Lambda = V_{\text{NP},m} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widetilde{F},i} \Lambda$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.9, the assertion is true if $\Lambda = B$. Proposition 3.9 also implies that the inclusion $V_{\text{NP},m} \hookrightarrow B$ induces an isomorphism $V_{\text{NP},m} \rightarrow H^n(C^*(B, F))$ for $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \widetilde{F}\}$. We first consider the first assertion. By the proof of [12, Theorem 3.2], we know that the map $\tilde{\iota}_B : H^n(C^*(B, \widetilde{F})) \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A_m^\dagger, \widetilde{F}))$ induced by the inclusion $B \hookrightarrow A_m^\dagger$ is an isomorphism. Therefore, the inclusion $V_{\text{NP},m} \hookrightarrow A_m^\dagger$ induces an isomorphism

$$\tilde{\iota}_{\text{NP},m} : V_{\text{NP},m} \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A_m^\dagger, \widetilde{F})).$$

Hence, the first assertion is true for $\Lambda = A_m^\dagger$. For $B \subseteq \Lambda \subseteq A_m^\dagger$, namely $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{A}^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \cup \{B\}$, by an argument similar to that in the proof of [12, Proposition 3.1], we can prove that the inclusion $B \hookrightarrow \Lambda$ induces a surjection $H^n(C^*(B, \widetilde{F})) \rightarrow H^n(C^*(\Lambda, \widetilde{F}))$, which implies the first assertion. For $\frac{1}{p-1} < b \leq \frac{p}{p-1}$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} B$, since $L(b) \subseteq B$. This gives $V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) \subseteq V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} B$. Since the first assertion is true $\Lambda = B$, we have $V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) = 0$, which implies $V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) = 0$. Therefore, Proposition 3.10 gives the first assertion for $\Lambda = L(b)$ with $\frac{1}{p-1} < b \leq \frac{p}{p-1}$. The argument above shows the first assertion.

Next, we deal with the second assertion. By [4, Théorème 1.4.(2)], if $p \neq 2$, then the map $\hat{\iota}_B : H^n(C^*(B, \widehat{F})) \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A_m^\dagger, \widehat{F}))$ induced by the inclusion $B \hookrightarrow A_m^\dagger$ is an isomorphism. Therefore, if $p \neq 2$, then the inclusion $V_{\text{NP},m} \hookrightarrow A_m^\dagger$ induces an isomorphism

$$\hat{\iota}_{\text{NP},m} : V_{\text{NP},m} \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A_m^\dagger, \widehat{F})).$$

Hence, the second assertion is true for $\Lambda = A_m^\dagger$. For $B \subseteq \Lambda \subseteq A_m^\dagger$, namely $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{A}_{p-1}^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \cup \{B\}$, by an argument similar to that in the proof of [4, Corollary 1.3], we can prove that the inclusion $B \hookrightarrow \Lambda$ induces an surjection $H^n(C^*(B, \widehat{F})) \rightarrow H^n(C^*(\Lambda, \widehat{F}))$, which implies the first assertion. For $\frac{1}{p-1} < b \leq \frac{p}{p-1}$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} B$, since $L(b) \subseteq B$. This gives $V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) \subseteq V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} B$. The second assertion for $\Lambda = B$ gives $V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) = 0$, so $V_{\text{NP},m} \cap \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L(b) = 0$. Then, by Proposition 3.10, the second assertion is true for $\Lambda = L(b)$ with $\frac{1}{p-1} < b \leq \frac{p}{p-1}$. The argument above shows the second assertion. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let $V_{\text{NP}} = \langle \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}} \rangle_{K_1}$, then we have $V_{\text{NP},m} = K_m \otimes_{K_1} V_{\text{NP}}$. Since $p \neq 2$, by Corollary 3.11.2, we have $A_m^\dagger = V_{\text{NP},m} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} A_m^\dagger$. It is straightforward to verify that $D_{\widehat{F},i} A_m^\dagger = K_m \otimes_{K_1} D_{\widehat{F},i} A^\dagger$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus $A^\dagger = V_{\text{NP}} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} A^\dagger$. This implies that the inclusion $V_{\text{NP}} \hookrightarrow A^\dagger$ induces an isomorphism

$$\hat{\iota}_{\text{NP}} : V_{\text{NP}} \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F})).$$

For $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we consider a map $\text{DR}^l(A, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}) \rightarrow C^l(A^\dagger, \widehat{F})$ given by

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) dx_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{i_l} \mapsto x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_l} \xi(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dx_{i_1}}{x_{i_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{dx_{i_l}}{x_{i_l}}$$

for $\xi(\mathbf{x}) \in A$ and $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_l \leq n$. It is straightforward to verify that this map is compatible with the differentials, so that we obtain a chain map $\text{DR}^*(A, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}) \rightarrow C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F})$. This chain map induces a morphism $H^n(\text{DR}^*(A, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})) \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F}))$ in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1} . Note that the specialization map $\iota_{\widehat{F}}$ is the composition of $\hat{\iota}$ and this morphism, where $\hat{\iota} : H^n(C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F})) \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi)$ is the isomorphism given by Eq. (3.2). To show that $\iota_{\widehat{F}}$ is an isomorphism, it suffices to show that the morphism $H^n(\text{DR}^*(A, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})) \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F}))$ is an isomorphism. Since $V_{\text{NP}} \subseteq A$, the morphism is surjective. On the other hand, by [3, Theorem 1.4], we have $\dim_{K_1} H^n(\text{DR}^*(A, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})) = n! \text{vol}(\widehat{F})$. Since $\Delta(\widehat{F}) = \Delta(f)$, we have $\text{vol}(\widehat{F}) = \text{vol}(f)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.4.2 and Corollary 3.11, we get

$$\dim_{K_1} H^n(\text{DR}^*(A, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})) = \dim_{K_1} H^n(C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F})).$$

This implies that the surjective morphism $H^n(\text{DR}^*(A, \nabla_{\widehat{F}})) \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A^\dagger, \widehat{F}))$ is an isomorphism, and hence the $\iota_{\widehat{F}}$ is an isomorphism. \square

Remark 3.12. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. By Corollary 3.11.1, we have $A_m^\dagger = V_{\text{NP},m} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} A_m^\dagger$. Note that for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have $D_{\widehat{F},i} A_m^\dagger = K_m \otimes_{K_1} D_{\widehat{F},i} A^\dagger$. Thus $A^\dagger = V_{\text{NP}} \oplus \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} A^\dagger$, which implies that the inclusion $V_{\text{NP}} \hookrightarrow A^\dagger$ induces an isomorphism

$$\tilde{\iota}_{\text{NP}} : V_{\text{NP}} \rightarrow H^n(C^*(A^\dagger, \widetilde{F})).$$

Next, we construct two filtered Φ -modules which are useful for the proof of Theorem 0.2. For $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \widetilde{F}\}$, let $\phi_F : A^\dagger \rightarrow A^\dagger$ be the endomorphism given by

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) \mapsto \exp(\varphi(F(\mathbf{x})) - F(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \varphi(\xi(\mathbf{x})).$$

It is straightforward to verify that $D_{F,i} \circ \phi_F = p \cdot (\phi_F \circ D_{F,i})$ for $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \widetilde{F}\}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. This yields a chain map $\phi_F : C^*(A^\dagger, F) \rightarrow C^*(A^\dagger, F)$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\phi_F : H^i(C^*(A^\dagger, F)) \rightarrow H^i(C^*(A^\dagger, F))$ denote the induced endomorphism. We note that ϕ_F is σ -semilinear and bijective.

Definition 3.13. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let $F \in \{\widehat{F}, \widetilde{F}\}$.

1. Let $\phi_{\text{NP}} = \iota_{\text{NP}}^{-1} \circ \phi_F \circ \iota_{\text{NP}}$, which is a bijective σ -semilinear endomorphism on V_{NP} . Here, we write $\phi_{\text{NP}}, \iota_{\text{NP}}$ as $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\iota}_{\text{NP}}$ if $F = \widehat{F}$, and as $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\iota}_{\text{NP}}$ if $F = \widetilde{F}$.
2. Define an exhaustive separated filtration F_{NP}^* , which we call the *Newton polyhedron filtration*, on V_{NP} by setting $F_{\text{NP}}^i V_{\text{NP}} = \langle \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}, w(\mathbf{u}) \leq -i \rangle_{K_1}$ for $i \in \mathbb{R}$.

We call the filtered Φ -module $(V_{\text{NP}}, \phi_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi$ the *Newton polyhedron module* associated with F .

Proposition 3.14. Assume that $p \neq 2$ and f, \hat{f} are nondegenerate with $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Then

$$((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\widehat{F}}) \cong (V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi.$$

Proof. Let $\iota_{\text{rig}} = \hat{\iota} \circ \hat{\iota}_{\text{NP}}$. Note that $\iota_{\text{rig}} : V_{\text{NP}} \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi)$ is an isomorphism. It is straightforward to verify that $\hat{\iota} \circ \hat{\phi}_{\widehat{F}} = \phi_f \circ \hat{\iota}$, which implies $\iota_{\text{rig}} \circ \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}} = \phi_f \circ \iota_{\text{rig}}$. Thus ι_{rig} gives an isomorphism

$$\iota_{\text{rig}} : (V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) \rightarrow (H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^\Phi.$$

On the other hand, let $\iota_{\text{dR}} = \iota_{\text{rig}}^{-1} \circ \iota_{\widehat{F}}$. Note that $\iota_{\text{dR}} : H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}) \rightarrow V_{\text{NP}}$ is an isomorphism. By [18, p. 126 footnote], we have $\iota_{\text{dR}}(F_{\text{irr}}^*) = F_{\text{NP}}^*$. This implies that ι_{dR} gives an isomorphism

$$\iota_{\text{dR}} : (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) \rightarrow (V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1}.$$

Thus $\iota : ((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\widehat{F}}) \rightarrow (V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi$, where $\iota = (\iota_{\text{rig}}^{-1}, \iota_{\text{dR}})$. \square

Remark 3.15. Assume that $p \neq 2$ and f, \hat{f} are nondegenerate with $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. By Proposition 3.14, we have $\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) = \ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. By Definition 3.13, we have

$$\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = \max\{w(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}\},$$

since $\min\{w(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}\} = 0$. Therefore, Remark 3.5 provides an algorithm to compute the Hodge-Tate length $\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*)$ combinatorially.

We consider the relationship between $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ and $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. For $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{A}^{\frac{p-1}{p}}$, let $T_f : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ be the endomorphism given by

$$\xi(\mathbf{x}) \mapsto \exp(\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \widehat{F}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \xi(\mathbf{x}),$$

which is well-defined by Lemma 3.17. It is straightforward to verify that T_f is an isomorphism. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, Note that $D_{\widehat{F},i} \circ T_f = T_f \circ D_{\widetilde{F},i}$. This yields an isomorphism $T_f : C^*(\Lambda, \widetilde{F}) \rightarrow$

$C^*(\Lambda, \widehat{F})$ of chain complexes. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $T_f : H^i(C^*(\Lambda, \widetilde{F})) \rightarrow H^i(C^*(\Lambda, \widehat{F}))$ the induced map, which is an isomorphism in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1} . Furthermore, it is straightforward to verify that $\phi_{\widehat{F}} \circ T_f = T_f \circ \phi_{\widetilde{F}}$, which implies that T_f gives an isomorphism

$$T_f : (H^i(C^*(\Lambda, \widetilde{F})), \phi_{\widetilde{F}}) \rightarrow (H^i(C^*(\Lambda, \widehat{F})), \phi_{\widehat{F}}) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^{\Phi}.$$

Lemma 3.16. *We have $\text{ord}(\gamma - \pi) = p - 1 + \frac{1}{p-1}$.*

Proof. Let $\delta = \frac{\gamma}{\pi}$. It suffice to show that $\text{ord}(\delta - 1) = p - 1$, since $\text{ord} \pi = \frac{1}{p-1}$. Recall that

$$\gamma \equiv \pi \equiv \zeta_p - 1 \pmod{(\zeta_p - 1)^2}, \quad (3.3)$$

which implies that $\text{ord} \gamma = \frac{1}{p-1}$. Thus $\text{ord} \delta = 0$. Eq. (3.3) also implies that $\text{ord}(\delta - 1) \geq \frac{1}{p-1}$, since it gives $\gamma - \pi \equiv 0 \pmod{(\zeta_p - 1)^2}$. Recall that $\pi + \frac{\pi^p}{p} = 0$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^{p^i}}{p^i} = 0$. Thus

$$1 - \delta^{p-1} = 1 + \frac{\gamma^{p-1}}{p} = \gamma^{-1} \left(\gamma + \frac{\gamma^p}{p} \right) = \gamma^{-1} \left(- \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^{p^i}}{p^i} \right).$$

Note that $\text{ord}(\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^{p^i}}{p^i}) = \text{ord} \frac{\gamma^{p^2}}{p^2} = \frac{p^2}{p-1} - 2$. Therefore, we have

$$\text{ord}(1 - \delta^{p-1}) = -\text{ord} \gamma + \text{ord} \left(\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^{p^i}}{p^i} \right) = -\frac{1}{p-1} + \frac{p^2}{p-1} - 2 = p - 1.$$

If $p = 2$, then this shows $\text{ord}(1 - \delta) = p - 1$. Next, we deal with the case where $p \neq 2$. Note that

$$1 - \delta^{p-1} = (1 - \delta)(1 + \dots + \delta^{p-2}).$$

By Eq. (3.3), we have $\delta \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{(\zeta_p - 1)^2}{\pi}}$, which gives $1 + \dots + \delta^{p-2} \equiv p - 1 \equiv -1 \pmod{\frac{(\zeta_p - 1)^2}{\pi}}$. Thus $\text{ord}(1 + \dots + \delta^{p-2}) = 0$, which implies that $\text{ord}(1 - \delta) = \text{ord}(1 - \delta^{p-1}) = p - 1$. \square

Lemma 3.17. *We have $\exp(\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \widehat{F}(\mathbf{x})) \in L(\frac{p-1}{p}, 0)$.*

Proof. Note that $\exp(\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \widehat{F}(\mathbf{x})) = \prod_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f} \exp((\gamma - \pi)\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \exp(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \gamma_l \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^{p^l} \mathbf{x}^{p^l \mathbf{u}})$. By the proof of [12, Proposition 2.1], we have $\exp(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \gamma_l \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^{p^l} \mathbf{x}^{p^l \mathbf{u}}) \in L(\frac{p-1}{p}, 0)$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f$. Next, we show that $\exp((\gamma - \pi)\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) \in L(p-1, 0)$. For $\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f$, we have

$$\exp((\gamma - \pi)\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\gamma - \pi)^i \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^i}{i!} \cdot \mathbf{x}^{i\mathbf{u}}.$$

Note that $\text{ord}(i!) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\lfloor \frac{i}{p^j} \right\rfloor \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{i}{p^j} = \frac{i}{p-1}$, where $\lfloor \lambda \rfloor$ denotes the maximal integer that is less or equal to $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, for $\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord} \left(\frac{(\gamma - \pi)^i \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^i}{i!} \right) &= i \text{ord}(\gamma - \pi) - \text{ord}(i!) \geq i \cdot \left(p - 1 + \frac{1}{p-1} \right) - \frac{i}{p-1} \\ &= i \cdot (p - 1) \geq (p - 1) \cdot w(i\mathbf{u}). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\exp((\gamma - \pi)\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) \in L(p-1, 0)$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f$. Therefore, the assertion follows, since we have $\frac{p-1}{p} < 1 \leq p - 1$. \square

Proposition 3.18. *Assume that $p \neq 2$ and f is nondegenerate with $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Then*

$$(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) \cong (V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^{\Phi}.$$

Proof. Let $T_{\text{NP}} = \hat{\iota}_{\text{NP}}^{-1} \circ T_f \circ \tilde{\iota}_{\text{NP}}$, which is an automorphism on V_{NP} . It is straightforward to verify that $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}} \circ T_{\text{NP}} = T_{\text{NP}} \circ \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$, which implies that T_{NP} gives an isomorphism

$$T_{\text{NP}} : (V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) \rightarrow (V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^{\Phi}. \quad \square$$

Remark 3.19. Assume that $p \neq 2$ and f is nondegenerate with $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. We note that T_{NP} cannot be extended to an isomorphism in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^{\Phi}$ from $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ to $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in general. If this were true, we would have Conjecture 0.1 right away. See Example 5.2 for an example where T_{NP} is not even filtration-compatible with respect to F_{NP}^* .

4 Weak admissibility

We retain the notations from Section 3. In this section, we prove Theorem 0.2. There are two steps: the first step is to prove that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible (cf. Theorem 4.5), and the second step is to show under certain conditions that the automorphism $T_{\text{NP}} : V_{\text{NP}} \rightarrow V_{\text{NP}}$ preserves being weakly admissible.

In this section, assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f)$. For $v \in V_{\text{NP}, m}$, we may write

$$v = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}} A_{\mathbf{u}}(v) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$$

with unique $A_{\mathbf{u}}(v) \in K_m$. We define the *order* of v to be $\text{ord } v = \min\{\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}}(v) \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}\}$. Define the *weight* of v to be $w(v) = \max\{w(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}, A_{\mathbf{u}}(v) \neq 0\}$. We note that

$$w(v) = -w_{\text{HT}}(v).$$

Here $w_{\text{HT}}(v)$ is the Hodge-Tate weight of v with respect to F_{NP}^* defined in Definition 1.6. Let $d_{\text{NP}} = \dim_{K_1} V_{\text{NP}}$. Sort M_{NP} and write $M_{\text{NP}} = \{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{d_{\text{NP}}}\}$ so that

$$w(\mathbf{u}_1) \geq \dots \geq w(\mathbf{u}_{d_{\text{NP}}})$$

Note that $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = w(\mathbf{u}_1)$. Define an order on M_{NP} by setting $\mathbf{u}_{d_{\text{NP}}} \prec \dots \prec \mathbf{u}_1$. Then, for $v \in V_{\text{NP}}$, we define its *leading power* to be

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}(v) = \max\{\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}, \text{ord } v = \text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}}(v)\}.$$

Note that $w(v) \geq w(\boldsymbol{\mu}(v))$.

Definition 4.1. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f)$. Let V be a K_m -subspace of $V_{\text{NP}, m}$, and let $d = \dim_{K_m} V$. A basis $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of V is called a *quasi-NP basis*, if it is filtration-generating with respect to F_{NP}^* , and satisfies

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_i)}(v_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j, \\ 0 & i \neq j \text{ and } w(v_i) \leq w(v_j), \\ \text{anything} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f)$. Any subobject of $(V_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in \mathbf{MF}_{K_m} admits a quasi-NP basis.*

Proof. Let $V \subseteq V_{\text{NP},m}$ be a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$, and let $d = \dim_{K_m} V$. We show by induction on d that V admits a quasi-NP basis. If $d = 1$, pick $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$, and let

$$v_1 = A_{\mu(v)}(v)^{-1} \cdot v.$$

Note that $\mu(v_1) = \mu(v)$, so that $A_{\mu(v_1)}(v_1) = A_{\mu(v)}(v)^{-1} \cdot A_{\mu(v)}(v) = 1$. Thus $\{v_1\}$ is a quasi-NP basis of V .

Next, Assuming the assertion for $1 \leq d \leq r-1$, we show that the assertion is true for $d = r$. Sort $\mathfrak{W}_{\text{HT}}(V, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ and write $\mathfrak{W}_{\text{HT}}(V, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}$ such that $i_1 > \dots > i_l$. For $h = 1, \dots, l$, let $d_h = \dim_{K_m} F^{i_h} V$. Pick an $(r-1)$ -dimensional K_m -subspace W of V such that $F^{>i_h} V \subseteq W$. By the inductive hypothesis, there exists a quasi-NP basis $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{r-1}$ of W . Extend $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{r-1}$ to a basis $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{r-1} \cup \{v\}$ of V . We construct a sequence $\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(l)}\}$ in V . We set the first term to be

$$v^{(1)} = v - \sum_{i=1}^{d_1} A_{\mu(w_i)}(v) \cdot w_i.$$

For $h = 1, \dots, l-2$, suppose $v^{(h)}$ is already given, we define the next term of the sequence by

$$v^{(h+1)} = v^{(h)} - \sum_{i=d_h+1}^{d_{h+1}} A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h)}) \cdot w_i.$$

By this, we obtain $v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(l-1)}$. Now, we define the last term of the sequence to be

$$v^{(l)} = v^{(l-1)} - \sum_{i=d_{l-1}+1}^{r-1} A_{\mu(w_i)}(v) \cdot w_i.$$

Let $v_r = A_{\mu(v^{(l)})}(v^{(l)})^{-1} \cdot v^{(l)}$, then we have $\mu(v_r) = \mu(v^{(l)})$ and $A_{\mu(v_r)}(v_r) = 1$. We now show that $A_{\mu(w_i)}(v_r) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r-1$. Since $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{r-1}$ is a quasi-NP basis, for $i, j = 1, \dots, d_1$, we have $A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) = 1$ if $i = j$, and $A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(1)}) &= A_{\mu(w_i)}(v) - \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} A_{\mu(w_j)}(v) \cdot A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) \\ &= A_{\mu(w_i)}(v) - A_{\mu(w_i)}(v) \cdot 1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $h = 1, \dots, l-2$, suppose that $A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h)}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, d_h$, we show $A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h+1)}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, d_{h+1}$. Since $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{r-1}$ is a quasi-NP basis, we have $A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, d_h$ and $j = d_h + 1, \dots, d_{h+1}$. Therefore, for $i = 1, \dots, d_h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h+1)}) &= A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h)}) - \sum_{j=d_h+1}^{d_{h+1}} A_{\mu(w_j)}(v^{(h)}) \cdot A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) \\ &= A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h)}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $i, j = d_h + 1, \dots, d_{h+1}$, we have $A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) = 1$ if $i = j$, and $A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h+1)}) &= A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h)}) - \sum_{j=d_h+1}^{d_{h+1}} A_{\mu(w_j)}(v^{(h)}) \cdot A_{\mu(w_i)}(w_j) \\ &= A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h)}) - A_{\mu(w_i)}(v^{(h)}) \cdot 1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The argument above shows $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l-1)}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, d_{l-1}$. Since $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{r-1}$ is a quasi-NP basis, we have $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(w_j) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, d_{l-1}$ and $j = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$. Therefore, for $i = 1, \dots, d_{l-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l)}) &= A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l-1)}) - \sum_{j=d_{l-1}+1}^{r-1} A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_j)}(v^{(l-1)}) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(w_j) \\ &= A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l-1)}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $i, j = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$, we have $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(w_j) = 1$ if $i = j$, and $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(w_j) = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l)}) &= A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l-1)}) - \sum_{j=d_{l-1}+1}^{r-1} A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_j)}(v^{(l-1)}) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(w_j) \\ &= A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l-1)}) - A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l-1)}) \cdot 1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $i = 1, \dots, r - 1$, we have $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v_r) = A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(v^{(l)})^{-1} \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v^{(l)}) = 0$. For $i = 1, \dots, d_{l-1}$, set $v_i = w_i$. For $i = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$, let

$$v_i = w_i - A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_i) \cdot v_r.$$

Next, we show that $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^r$ is a quasi-NP-basis of V . For $i = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$, we have

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v_i) = A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(w_i) - A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_i) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v_r) = A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(w_i) = 1.$$

For $i = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \text{M}_{\text{NP}}$, we show that $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}}(v_i) > 0$ if $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i) \prec \mathbf{u}$. Supposing the contrary, then there exists $i' \in \{d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1\}$ and $\mathbf{u}' \in \text{M}_{\text{NP}}$, such that $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_{i'}) \prec \mathbf{u}'$ and $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_{i'}) = 0$. The assumption $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_{i'}) \prec \mathbf{u}'$ implies $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}'}(w_{i'}) > \text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_{i'})}(w_{i'}) = 0$. Therefore, the assumption $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_{i'}) = 0$ implies $\text{ord}(A_{\mathbf{u}'}(w_{i'}) - A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_{i'})) = 0$. Note that

$$A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_{i'}) = A_{\mathbf{u}'}(w_{i'}) - A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_{i'}) \cdot A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_r).$$

Thus $\text{ord}(A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_{i'}) \cdot A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_r)) = \text{ord}(A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_{i'}) - A_{\mathbf{u}'}(w_{i'})) = 0$, which implies $\text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_{i'}) = \text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_r) = 0$, since we have $\text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_{i'}) \geq 0$ and $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_r) \geq 0$. Now $\text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_{i'}) = 0$ gives $\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r) \preceq \boldsymbol{\mu}(w_{i'})$, and $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}'}(v_r) = 0$ gives $\mathbf{u}' \preceq \boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)$. Thus, we obtain $\mathbf{u}' \preceq \boldsymbol{\mu}(w_{i'})$, which contradicts the premise $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_{i'}) \prec \mathbf{u}'$. Hence, for $i = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \text{M}_{\text{NP}}$, we have $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}}(v_i) > 0$ if $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i) \prec \mathbf{u}$. This implies $\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_i) \preceq \boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)$. Recall that we have already shown that $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v_i)$, which implies $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i) \preceq \boldsymbol{\mu}(v_i)$. Thus $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(v_i)$. Now, for $i = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$, we have $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_i)}(v_i) = A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v_i) = 1$. For $i = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, d_{l-1}$, we have

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_j)}(v_i) = A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_j)}(w_i) - A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_i) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_j)}(v_r) = 0.$$

For $i, j = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$ where $i \neq j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_j)}(v_i) &= A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_j)}(w_i) - A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_i) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_j)}(v_r) \\ &= A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_j)}(w_i) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $i = d_{l-1} + 1, \dots, r - 1$, we have $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_i)}(v_r) = A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_i)}(v_r) = 0$, and

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(v_i) = A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_i) - A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(w_i) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_r)}(v_r) = 0.$$

So far, we have verified all the requirements for $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^r$ to be a quasi-NP basis. In other words, we have shown that the assertion is true for $d = r$. By mathematical induction, we know that the assertion is true for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. \square

Definition 4.3. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let ϕ be a bijective σ -semilinear endomorphism on $V_{\text{NP},m}$. We may write

$$\phi(\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i,j) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j}$$

with unique $A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i,j) \in K_m$. We say that ϕ is *NP-agreeable* if for all $i, j = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$\text{ord } A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i,j) \geq -w(\mathbf{u}_j).$$

Moreover, if ϕ is NP-agreeable, then we say that $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \phi, F_{\text{NP}}^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$ is *NP-agreeable*.

Lemma 4.4. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f)$. Let ϕ be a NP-agreeable bijective σ -semilinear endomorphism on $V_{\text{NP},m}$. Let $V \subseteq V_{\text{NP},m}$ be a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \phi, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$. Any quasi-NP basis of V is an agreeable basis.

Proof. Let $d = \dim_{K_m} V$, and let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a quasi-NP basis of V . For $i = 1, \dots, d$, we may write

$$\phi(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^d A_\phi(v_i, v_j) \cdot v_j$$

with unique $A_\phi(v_i, v_j) \in K_m$. Then, for $\mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$, we have

$$A_{\mathbf{u}}(\phi(v_i)) = \sum_{j=1}^d A_\phi(v_i, v_j) \cdot A_{\mathbf{u}}(v_j).$$

At the same time, for $i = 1, \dots, d$, since $v_i = \sum_{i'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} A_{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}(v_i) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_{i'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(v_i) &= \sum_{i'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} \sigma(A_{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}(v_i)) \cdot \phi(\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_{i'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}) \\ &= \sum_{i'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} \sigma(A_{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}(v_i)) \cdot A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i',j') \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_{j'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{j'}}. \end{aligned}$$

this gives $A_{\mathbf{u}_{j'}}(\phi(v_i)) = \sum_{i'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} \sigma(A_{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}(v_i)) \cdot A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i',j')$ for $j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$. Since ϕ is NP-agreeable, for $i', j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$\text{ord } A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i',j') \geq -w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}).$$

Note that for $\mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$, we have $\text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}}(v_i) \geq 0$. Therefore, for $i = 1, \dots, d$ and $j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord } A_{\mathbf{u}_{j'}}(\phi(v_i)) &\geq \min\{\text{ord}(\sigma(A_{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}(v_i)) \cdot A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i',j')) \mid i' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}\} \\ &\geq \min\{\text{ord } A_{\text{NP},\phi}(i',j') \mid i' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}\} \geq -w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}). \end{aligned}$$

For $i = 1, \dots, d$, let $\mathfrak{Bad}_\phi(i) = \{j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \mid \text{ord } A_\phi(v_i, v_j) < -w(v_j)\}$. To show that $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is agreeable, it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{Bad}_\phi(i) = \emptyset$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Supposing the contrary,

then there exists $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, such that $\mathfrak{Bad}_\phi(i_0) \neq \emptyset$. Let $j_0 = \min \mathfrak{Bad}_\phi(i_0)$. Since $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is a quasi-NP basis, for $j = 1, \dots, d$, we have $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(v_j) = 0$ if $w(v_j) \geq w(v_{j_0})$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(\phi(v_{i_0})) &= \sum_{j=1}^d A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_j) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(v_j) \\ &= A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_{j_0}) + \sum_{w(v_j) < w(v_{j_0})} A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_j) \cdot A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(v_j). \end{aligned}$$

We show that $\text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(\phi(v_{i_0})) = \text{ord } A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_{j_0})$. If $w(v_{j_0}) = \min\{w(v_j) \mid j = 1, \dots, d\}$, then $A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(\phi(v_{i_0})) = A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_{j_0})$. If $w(v_{j_0}) > \min\{w(v_j) \mid j = 1, \dots, d\}$, then there exists $j_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, such that $w(j_1) < w(j_0)$. Since $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is filtration-generating, we have $j_1 < j_0$, which implies $j_1 \notin \mathfrak{Bad}_\phi(i_0)$. Therefore, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $w(v_j) < w(v_{j_0})$, we have

$$\text{ord } A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_j) \geq -w(v_j) > -w(v_{j_0}) > \text{ord } A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_{j_0}),$$

which implies $\text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(\phi(v_{i_0})) = \text{ord } A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_{j_0})$. On the other hand, we have already shown

$$\text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(\phi(v_{i_0})) \geq -w(\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})),$$

which implies $\text{ord } A_{\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})}(\phi(v_{i_0})) \geq w(v_{j_0})$, since $w(\boldsymbol{\mu}(v_{j_0})) \leq w(v_{j_0})$. However, this contradicts the premise that $\text{ord } A_\phi(v_{i_0}, v_{j_0}) < -w(v_{j_0})$. Therefore, we have $\mathfrak{Bad}_\phi(i) = \emptyset$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$, and hence $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is agreeable. \square

Theorem 4.5. *If f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$, then $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi$ is weakly admissible.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m} = \sigma \otimes \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$, which is a bijective σ -semilinear endomorphism on $V_{\text{NP}, m}$. We first show that $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}$ is NP-agreeable. For $\mathbf{u} \in M_{\text{NP}}$, we have $\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in L(\frac{p}{p-1}, 0)$. By the proof of [7, Lemma 4.1], we have $\exp(\varphi(\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) \in L(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0)$, which implies that

$$\exp(\varphi(\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in L\left(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0\right)$$

For $i = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, there exist unique $\tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, 1), \dots, \tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, d_{\text{NP}}) \in K_m$, such that

$$\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}(\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} \tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, j) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j},$$

where, by Corollary 3.11, we know that $\tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, j), \dots, \tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, d_{\text{NP}})$ are characterized by

$$\exp(\varphi(\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) - \tilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} \tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, j) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j} \pmod{\sum_{l=1}^n D_{\tilde{F}, i} L\left(\frac{1}{p-1}\right)}.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.10, for $i = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} \tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, j) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j} \in V\left(\frac{1}{p-1}, 0\right).$$

This means $\text{ord}(\tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, j) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)}) \geq \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot w(\mathbf{u}_j)$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, namely

$$\text{ord} \tilde{A}_{\text{NP}}(i, j) \geq \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot w(\mathbf{u}_j) - \text{ord} \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)} = -w(\mathbf{u}_j).$$

This shows that $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}$ is NP-agreeable. Next, we show that $(V_{\text{NP}, m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible. Let $V \subseteq V_{\text{NP}, m}$ be a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP}, m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$. By Lemma 4.2, we know that V admits a quasi-NP basis with respect to F_{NP}^* . By Lemma 4.4, we know that a quasi-NP basis of V is agreeable with respect to $\tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}$ and F_{NP}^* . Thus V admits an agreeable basis, so by Proposition 1.15, we get $t_{\text{N}}(V, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}) \geq t_{\text{H}}(V, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. By the proof of [2, Theorem 3.17], we get $t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP}, m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. Thus $(V_{\text{NP}, m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible as an object in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$. Finally, we show that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible. If $(W, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F^*)$ is a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi$, then $(W_m, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP}, m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$, where $W_m = K_m \otimes_{K_1} W$. This implies that $t_{\text{N}}(W, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) = t_{\text{N}}(W_m, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}) \geq t_{\text{H}}(W_m, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = t_{\text{H}}(W, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. On the other hand, we note that $t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) = t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP}, m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}, m}) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP}, m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. Therefore, we obtain that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible. \square

Definition 4.6. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let $T : V_{\text{NP}, m} \rightarrow V_{\text{NP}, m}$ be an automorphism in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_m} . For $i, i' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we may write

$$T(\pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} T(i, j) \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j}$$

with unique $T(i, j) \in K_m$. We say that T is *NP-dominating* if for $i, j, i', j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$\text{ord} T(i, j) + \text{ord} T^{-1}(i', j') \geq w(\mathbf{u}_j) - w(\mathbf{u}_i).$$

Lemma 4.7. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$. Let ϕ and ϕ' be bijective σ -semilinear endomorphisms on $V_{\text{NP}, m}$. Let $T : (V_{\text{NP}, m}, \phi') \rightarrow (V_{\text{NP}, m}, \phi)$ be an isomorphism in $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_m}^\Phi$. If ϕ' is NP-agreeable and T is NP-dominating, then ϕ is NP-agreeable.

Proof. We first fix some notations. For $i, i' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} A(i, j) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j}, \\ \phi'(\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_{i'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}) &= \sum_{j'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} A'(i', j') \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_{j'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{j'}}, \end{aligned}$$

with unique $A(i, j)$ and $A'(i', j')$ in K_m . Since T is an isomorphism in $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_m}^\Phi$, it is Frobenius-

compatible, which means $\phi = T^{-1} \circ \phi' \circ T$. Therefore, for $i = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i}) &= T^{-1}(\phi'(T(\pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_i)}))) \\ &= \sum_{i'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} T^{-1}(\phi'((-p)^{w(\mathbf{u}_i)} T(i, i') \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_{i'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{i'}})) \\ &= \sum_{i', j'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} (-p)^{w(\mathbf{u}_i)} \sigma(T(i, i')) T^{-1}((-p)^{-w(\mathbf{u}_{i'})} A'(i', j') \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_{j'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{j'}}) \\ &= \sum_{i', j', j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} (-p)^{w(\mathbf{u}_i) - w(\mathbf{u}_{i'}) + w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}) - w(\mathbf{u}_j)} \sigma(T(i, i')) A'(i', j') T^{-1}(j', j) \cdot \pi^{pw(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $i, j = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$A(i, j) = \sum_{i', j'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} (-p)^{w(\mathbf{u}_i) - w(\mathbf{u}_{i'}) + w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}) - w(\mathbf{u}_j)} \sigma(T(i, i')) A'(i', j') T^{-1}(j', j)$$

Since ϕ' is NP-agreeable, we have $\text{ord } A'(i', j') \geq -w(\mathbf{u}_{j'})$ for all $i', j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$. Since T is dominating, we have $\text{ord } T(i, i') + \text{ord } T^{-1}(j', j) \geq w(\mathbf{u}_{i'}) - w(\mathbf{u}_i)$ for all $i, j, i', j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{ord} \left\{ (-p)^{w(\mathbf{u}_i) - w(\mathbf{u}_{i'}) + w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}) - w(\mathbf{u}_j)} \sigma(T(i, i')) A'(i', j') T^{-1}(j', j) \right\} \\ &= w(\mathbf{u}_i) - w(\mathbf{u}_{i'}) + w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}) - w(\mathbf{u}_j) + \text{ord } A'(i', j') + \text{ord } T(i, i') + \text{ord } T^{-1}(j', j) \\ &\geq w(\mathbf{u}_i) - w(\mathbf{u}_{i'}) + w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}) - w(\mathbf{u}_j) - w(\mathbf{u}_{j'}) + w(\mathbf{u}_{i'}) - w(\mathbf{u}_i) = -w(\mathbf{u}_j). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $i, j = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have $\text{ord } A_{\text{NP}}(i, j) \geq -w(\mathbf{u}_j)$, so that ϕ is NP-agreeable. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Assume that $p \neq 2$. We have $\exp(\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{F}(\mathbf{x})) - 1 \in L(\frac{1}{p-1}, p-2)$*

Proof. Note that $\exp(\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{F}(\mathbf{x})) = \prod_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f} \exp((\gamma - \pi) \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \exp(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \gamma_l \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^{p^l} \mathbf{x}^{p^l \mathbf{u}})$. By the proof of Lemma 3.17, for $\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f$, we have $\exp((\gamma - \pi) \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) \in L(p-1, 0)$, which implies

$$\exp((\gamma - \pi) \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) - 1 \in L\left(\frac{1}{p-1}, p-2\right),$$

since $p-1 \geq \frac{1}{p-1} + p-2 \geq \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot w(\mathbf{u}) + p-2$. For $l \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f$, we have

$$\exp(\gamma_l (\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}})^{p^l}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma_l^i \hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}}^{p^l i}}{i!} \cdot \mathbf{x}^{p^l i \cdot \mathbf{u}}.$$

Since $w(\mathbf{u}) \leq 1$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \text{supp } f$, to show that $\exp(\gamma_l (\hat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}})^{p^l}) - 1 \in L(\frac{1}{p-1}, p-2)$, it suffices to show $\text{ord } \frac{\gamma_l^i}{i!} \geq \frac{p^l i}{p-1} + p-2$ for $i \geq i$ and $l \geq 1$. If $i = 1$, this assertion follows from the observation

$$\text{ord } \gamma_l = \frac{p^{l+1}}{p-1} - l - 1 \geq \frac{p^l}{p-1} + p-2$$

for $l \geq 1$. For $i \geq 2$ and $l \geq 1$, the assertion follows from the observation

$$\text{ord } \frac{\gamma_l^i}{i!} \geq \left(\frac{p^{l+1}}{p-1} - l - 1 - \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \cdot i \geq \frac{p^l i}{p-1} + p-2. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 0.2. By Theorem 3.2, we know that $\iota_{\widehat{F}}$ is an isomorphism, so that we obtain an object

$$((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\widehat{F}}) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi.$$

By Proposition 3.14, we get an isomorphism

$$((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\widehat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\widehat{F}}) \cong (V_{\text{NP}}, \widehat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$$

in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi$. Therefore, in order to prove the theorem, it suffices to show that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \widehat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible. Let $\widehat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m} = \sigma \otimes \widehat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}$, which is a bijective σ -semilinear endomorphism on $V_{\text{NP},m}$. We first show that $\widehat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}$ is NP-agreeable. By the proof of Theorem 4.5, we know that $\widetilde{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}$ is NP-agreeable. By Proposition 3.18, the automorphism $T_{\text{NP},m} = 1 \otimes T_{\text{NP}}$ on $V_{\text{NP},m}$ gives an isomorphism $T_{\text{NP},m} : (V_{\text{NP},m}, \widetilde{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}) \rightarrow (V_{\text{NP},m}, \widehat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m})$ in $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^\Phi$. By Lemma 4.7, we only need to show that $T_{\text{NP},m}$ is NP-dominating. For $i, i' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\text{NP},m}(\pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} T_{\text{NP},m}(i, j) \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j}, \\ T_{\text{NP},m}^{-1}(\pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_{i'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{i'}}) &= \sum_{j'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} T_{\text{NP},m}^{-1}(i, j') \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_{j'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{j'}}, \end{aligned}$$

with unique $T(i, j)$ and $T^{-1}(i, j)$ in K_m , which, by Corollary 3.11, are characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \widehat{F}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_i)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_i} &\equiv \sum_{j=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} T_{\text{NP},m}(i, j) \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j} \pmod{\sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L \left(\frac{1}{p-1} \right)}, \\ \exp(\widehat{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_{i'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{i'}} &\equiv \sum_{j'=1}^{d_{\text{NP}}} T_{\text{NP},m}^{-1}(i, j') \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_{j'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{j'}} \pmod{\sum_{i=1}^n D_{\widehat{F},i} L \left(\frac{1}{p-1} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have $T_{\text{NP},m}(i, i) = 1$ and $T_{\text{NP},m}(j, j) = 1$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$. By Lemma 4.8, we have $\exp(\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \widehat{F}(\mathbf{x})) - 1 \in L(\frac{1}{p-1}, p-2)$, which implies $\exp(\widehat{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) \in L(\frac{1}{p-1}, p-2)$. By Proposition 3.10, for $i, j, i', j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$ where $i \neq i'$ and $j \neq j'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\text{NP},m}(i, j) \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_j)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_j} &\in L \left(\frac{1}{p-1}, p-2 \right), \\ T_{\text{NP},m}^{-1}(i', j') \cdot \pi^{w(\mathbf{u}_{j'})} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}_{j'}} &\in L \left(\frac{1}{p-1}, p-2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\text{ord } T_{\text{NP},m}(i, j) \geq p-2$ and $\text{ord } T_{\text{NP},m}^{-1}(i', j') \geq p-2$. As a summary, for $i, j, i', j' = 1, \dots, d_{\text{NP}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord } T_{\text{NP},m}(i, j) &= \begin{cases} = 0 & i = j, \\ \geq p-2 & i \neq j, \end{cases} \\ \text{ord } T_{\text{NP},m}^{-1}(i', j') &= \begin{cases} = 0 & i' = j', \\ \geq p-2 & i' \neq j', \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which gives $\text{ord } T_{\text{NP},m}(i, j) + \text{ord } T_{\text{NP},m}^{-1}(i', j') \geq p-2 \geq \ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) \geq w(\mathbf{u}_j) - w(\mathbf{u}_i)$. Here, we note that $\ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = \ell_{\text{HT}}(V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. This shows that $T_{\text{NP},m}$ is NP-dominating, and

hence $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}$ is NP-agreeable. Next, we show that $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible as an object in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$. Let $V \subseteq V_{\text{NP},m}$ be a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$. By Lemma 4.2, we know that V admits a quasi-NP basis with respect to F_{NP}^* . By Lemma 4.4, a quasi-NP basis of V is agreeable with respect to $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}$ and F_{NP}^* . Thus V admits an agreeable basis, so by Proposition 1.15, we get $t_{\text{N}}(V, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}) \geq t_{\text{H}}(V, F_{\text{NP},m}^*)$. Since $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP},m})$ and $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m})$ are isomorphic in $\mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^\Phi$, their Newton numbers are equal. By Theorem 4.5, we have $t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, \tilde{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. This implies $t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$, and hence $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible. Finally, we show that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible. Let $(W, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F^*)$ be a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi$, and let $W_m = K_m \otimes_{K_1} W$. Note that $(W_m, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is a subobject of $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_m/K_m}^\Phi$. This implies that $t_{\text{N}}(W, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) = t_{\text{N}}(W_m, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}) \geq t_{\text{H}}(W_m, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = t_{\text{H}}(W, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. On the other hand, note that $t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}) = t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. Thus $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible. \square

Remark 4.9. Assume that $p \neq 2$. Let $F \in A_0 = O_1[x_1, \dots, x_n, (x_1 \dots x_n)^{-1}]$ be a nondegenerate Laurent polynomial such that $\pi^{-1}F \in A_0$ and the reduction of $\pi^{-1}F$ by π coincides with f . If we assume in addition that $\Delta(F) = \Delta(f)$ and the p -adic distance between $\pi^{-1}F$ and \hat{f} is small enough, then by a strategy similar to that in the proof of Theorem 0.2, we can show that the filtered Φ -module defined in Remark 3.3 is weakly admissible.

5 Examples and questions

Example 5.1. Assume that $p \neq 2$. Let us consider the case where $n = 1$ and $f : \mathbb{T}_k^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$ is defined by $t \mapsto f(x) \in k[x, x^{-1}]$. Here $\mathbb{T}_k^1 = \text{Spec } k[x, x^{-1}]$ is the 1-dimensional torus over k . In this situation, if f is nondegenerate, then so is \hat{f} . Assume that f is nondegenerate, we show that

$$\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^1(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^1, \nabla_{\hat{f}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) \leq 1.$$

In particular, this implies that Conjecture 0.1 is true.

If $f(x)$ is a polynomial, namely $f(x) \in k[x]$, then $\Delta(f) = [0, d]$, where $d = \deg f$. The point d is the only face of $[0, d]$ not containing the origin, so f is nondegenerate if and only if $p \nmid d$. Assume that f is nondegenerate. Note that $M(f) = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have $w(u) = \frac{u}{d}$. Let \bar{x} denote the image of x in \overline{R} , then the image of $x \frac{d}{dx} f$ in \overline{R} is $d\alpha_d \cdot \bar{x}^d$. This implies that $M_{\text{NP}} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. By Remark 3.15, we get

$$\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^1(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^1, \nabla_{\hat{f}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) = w(d-1) = \frac{d-1}{d} < 1.$$

If $f(x) \in k[x, x^{-1}]$ is a Laurent polynomial with positive degree d_1 and negative degree d_2 , then we have $\Delta(f) = [-d_2, d_1]$. The points $-d_2$ and d_1 are the only faces of $[-d_2, d_1]$ not containing the origin, so f is nondegenerate if and only if $p \nmid d_1 d_2$. Assume that f is nondegenerate. Note that $M(f) = \mathbb{Z}$. For $u \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$w(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{u}{d_1} & u \geq 0, \\ -\frac{u}{d_2} & u < 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that the image of $x \frac{d}{dx} f$ in \overline{R} is equal to $d_1 \alpha_{d_1} \cdot \bar{x}^{d_1} - d_2 \alpha_{d_2} \cdot \bar{x}^{-d_2}$. This implies that we can set $M_{\text{NP}} = \{-d_2 + 1, \dots, 0, \dots, d_1\}$. By Remark 3.15, we get

$$\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^1(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^1, \nabla_{\hat{f}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) = w(d_1) = 1.$$

Example 5.2. Assume that $p \neq 2$. We look at an example where $n = 1$ and $f(x) = x^2 + x$. As is mentioned in Remark 3.19, we show that the automorphism T_{NP} on V_{NP} is not filtration-compatible with respect to F_{NP}^* .

Note that $\Delta(f) = [0, 2]$, and $M(f) = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have $w(u) = \frac{u}{2}$. As is discussed in Example 5.1, we have $M_{\text{NP}} = \{0, 1\}$, so that $V_{\text{NP}} = \langle x^0, x^1 \rangle_{K_1}$. Note that $F_{\text{NP}}^0 V_{\text{NP}} = \langle x^0 \rangle_{K_1}$. Our goal is to show that $T_{\text{NP}}(x^0) \notin F_{\text{NP}}^0 V_{\text{NP}} = \langle x^0 \rangle_{K_1}$. We may write

$$T_{\text{NP},2}(x^0) = T_0 \cdot x^0 + T_1 \cdot \pi^{\frac{1}{2}} x^1$$

with unique $T_0, T_1 \in K_2$. It suffices to show that $T_1 \neq 0$. More precisely, we show $\text{ord} T_1 < \infty$. Note that $\widehat{F}(x) = \pi(x^2 + x)$ and $\widetilde{F}(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \gamma_l(x^{2p^l} + x^{p^l})$. Let $D_{\widehat{F}} = x \frac{d}{dx} f + 2\pi x^2 + \pi x$. By Corollary 3.11, we know that T_0 and T_1 are characterized by

$$\exp(\widetilde{F}(x) - \widehat{F}(x)) \equiv T_0 + T_1 \cdot \pi^{\frac{1}{2}} x \pmod{D_{\widehat{F}} L \left(\frac{1}{p-1} \right)}.$$

Note that $\exp(\widetilde{F}(x) - \widehat{F}(x)) = \exp((\gamma - \pi)(x^2 + x)) \cdot \exp(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \gamma_l(x^{2p^l} + x^{p^l}))$. We may write

$$\begin{aligned} E(x) &= \exp(\widetilde{F}(x) - \widehat{F}(x)) = \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} A_u \cdot x^u, \\ E_1(x) &= \exp((\gamma - \pi)(x^2 + x)) = \sum_{u_1=0}^{\infty} A_{1,u_1} \cdot x^{u_1}, \\ E_2(x) &= \exp\left(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \gamma_l(x^{2p^l} + x^{p^l})\right) = \sum_{u_2=0}^{\infty} A_{2,u_2} \cdot x^{u_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have $A_u = \sum_{u_1+u_2=u} A_{1,u_1} A_{2,u_2}$. By Corollary 3.11, for $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, there exists unique $R_u \in K_2$, such that

$$\pi^{\frac{u}{2}} x^u \equiv R_u \cdot \pi^{\frac{1}{2}} x \pmod{D_{\widehat{F}} L \left(\frac{1}{p-1} \right)}.$$

Note that $T_1 = \sum_{u=1}^{\infty} \pi^{\frac{u}{2}} A_u R_u$. By the proof of Lemma 4.8, we have $E_2(x) \in L(p-1, 0)$, which implies $\text{ord} A_{1,u_1} \geq (p-1) \cdot \frac{u_1}{2}$ for $u_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. By the proof of [12, Proposition 2.1], we have $E_2(x) \in L(\frac{p-1}{p}, 0)$, which implies $\text{ord} A_{2,u_2} \geq \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{u_2}{2}$ for $u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Therefore, for $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$\text{ord}\left(\pi^{-\frac{u_1+u_2}{2}} A_{1,u_1} A_{2,u_2}\right) \geq \left(p-1 + \frac{1}{p-1}\right) \cdot \frac{u_1}{2} + \left(\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1}\right) \cdot \frac{u_2}{2}.$$

Since $p \neq 2$, we have $p \geq 3$, which implies $\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1} > 0$ and $p-1 - \frac{1}{p-1} > p-2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, for $u_1 \geq 2$ and $u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$\text{ord}\left(\pi^{-\frac{u_1+u_2}{2}} A_{1,u_1} A_{2,u_2}\right) \geq p-1 - \frac{1}{p-1} > p-2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

By Lemma 3.16, we have $\text{ord} A_{1,1} = \text{ord}(\gamma - \pi) = p-1 + \frac{1}{p-1}$. Therefore, for $u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$\text{ord}\left(\pi^{-\frac{1+u_2}{2}} A_{1,1} A_{2,u_2}\right) \geq p-1 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} > p-2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

For $u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have $A_{2,u_2} = 0$ if $p \nmid u_2$. Therefore, for $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ such that $p \nmid u$, we have

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u}{2}} A_u) > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

When $u = p$, we note that $A_p = A_{1,0}A_{2,p} + A_{1,p}A_{2,0}$, so that

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{p}{2}} A_p) = \text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{p}{2}} \gamma_1) = p - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

When $u = 2p$, we note that $A_{2p} = A_{1,0}A_{2,2p} + A_{1,p}A_{2,p} + A_{1,2p}A_{2,0}$, so that

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-p} A_{2p}) = \text{ord}(\pi^{-p} \gamma_1) = p - 2.$$

If $p \neq 3$, namely $p \geq 5$, then we have

$$\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1} > \frac{2}{3p} \cdot \left(p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Therefore, for $u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $u_2 \geq 3p$, we have $\frac{u_2}{2} \geq \frac{3p}{2} > (p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}) / (\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1})$, so that

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u_2}{2}} A_{2,u_2}) \geq \left(\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \cdot \frac{u_2}{2} > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence, for $u \in p\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $u \geq 3p$, we have

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u}{2}} A_u) > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

If $p = 3$, then $\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1} = \frac{2}{15}(p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{21}{2})$. Thus, for $u_2 > 15$, we have $\frac{u_2}{2} > \frac{15}{2} = (p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}) / (\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1})$, so that

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u_2}{2}} A_{2,u_2}) \geq \left(\frac{p-1}{p} - \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \cdot \frac{u_2}{2} > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, for $u \in p\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $u > 15$, we have

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u}{2}} A_u) > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that for $u = 12, 15$, we also have

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u}{2}} A_u) > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

As a summary, when $p \neq 2$, for $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \setminus \{2p\}$, we have $\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u}{2}} A_u) > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, we have $R_0 = 0$ and $R_1 = 1$. For $u \geq 2$, we have

$$\text{ord} R_u = \min \left\{ \text{ord} R_{u-2} + \text{ord}(u-2), \text{ord} R_{u-1} + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Therefore, for $1 \leq u \leq p-1$, we have $R_u = \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1+(-1)^u}{4}$. Since $p \neq 2$ so that $2 \nmid p$, we have $\text{ord} R_p = 0$ and $\text{ord} R_{p+1} = \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}$. Thus $\text{ord} R_{p+2} = \frac{1}{p-1}$. For $p+1 \leq u \leq 2p+1$, we have $\text{ord} R_u = \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{3-(-1)^u}{4}$. Since $2 \mid 2p$, we have $\text{ord} R_{2p} = \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, we have

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-p} A_p R_p) = p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}.$$

By Proposition 3.10, we know that $\text{ord } R_u \geq 0$ for $u \in \mapsto Z_{\geq 0}$. Hence, for $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq} \setminus \{2p\}$, we have

$$\text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u}{2}} A_u R_u) \geq \text{ord}(\pi^{-\frac{u}{2}} A_u) > p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \text{ord}(\pi^{-p} A_p R_p).$$

This implies that $\text{ord } T_1 = \text{ord}(\pi^{-p} A_p R_p) = p - 2 + \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} < \infty$, so that $T_1 \neq 0$. \square

Example 5.3. Assume that $p \neq 2$. Let $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$ with $f_i(x_i) \in k[x_i, x_i^{-1}]$. Assume that f is nondegenerate and $\dim \Delta(f) = n$, then f_1, \dots, f_n are nondegenerate. Since $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{f}_i(x_i)$, we know that \hat{f} is nondegenerate. We show that Conjecture 0.1 is true for f without requiring $\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\hat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) \leq p - 2$. Note that

$$f^* \mathcal{L}_{\pi} \cong f_1^* \mathcal{L}_{\pi} \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes f_n^* \mathcal{L}_{\pi},$$

where $f_i : \mathbb{T}_k^1 = \text{Spec } k[x_i, x_i^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$ is the morphism defined by $t \mapsto f_i(x_i)$. This gives

$$(H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_{\pi}), \phi_f) \cong \bigotimes_{i=1}^n (H_{\text{rig}}^1(\mathbb{T}_k^1/K_1, f_i^* \mathcal{L}_{\pi}), \phi_{f_i}) \in \mathbf{Mod}_{K_1}^{\Phi}.$$

At the same time, note that $\nabla_{\hat{F}} \cong \nabla_{\hat{F}_1} \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \nabla_{\hat{F}_n}$. Here $\hat{F}_i = \pi \hat{f}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. By [5, Theorem 1], this gives

$$(H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\hat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) \cong \bigotimes_{i=1}^n (H_{\text{dR}}^1(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^1, \nabla_{\hat{F}_i}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1}.$$

Combining the argument above, we obtain an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} & ((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^* \mathcal{L}_{\pi}), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\hat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{F}}) \\ & \quad \cong \\ & \bigotimes_{i=1}^n ((H_{\text{rig}}^1(\mathbb{T}_k^1/K_1, f_i^* \mathcal{L}_{\pi}), \phi_{f_i}), (H_{\text{dR}}^1(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^1, \nabla_{\hat{F}_i}), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_{\hat{F}_i}) \end{aligned}$$

in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^{\Phi}$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $(V_i, \hat{\phi}_i, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ be the Newton polyhedron module associated with f_i , and let $M_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be the finite subset such that $V_1 = \langle x_i^u \mid u \in M_i \rangle_{K_1}$. It is straightforward to verify that $M_{\text{NP}} = M_1 \times \dots \times M_n$. Note that the map defined by

$$x_1^{u_1} \otimes \dots \otimes x_n^{u_n} \mapsto x_1^{u_1} \dots x_n^{u_n}$$

gives an isomorphism $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n (V_i, \hat{\phi}_i, F_{\text{NP}}^*) \rightarrow (V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ in $\mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^{\Phi}$. By the proof of Theorem 0.2 and Example 5.1, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we know that $(V_{i,m}, \hat{\phi}_{i,m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is NP-agreeable, where $V_{i,m} = K_m \otimes_{K_1} V_i$ and $\hat{\phi}_{i,m} = 1 \otimes \hat{\phi}_i$. For $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in M(f)$, we note that $w(\mathbf{u}) = w_1(u_1) + \dots + w_n(u_n)$, where w_i is the weight defined with respect to f_i . For $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in M(f)$, we also note that $\hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}) = \hat{\phi}_1(x_1^{u_1}) \dots \hat{\phi}_n(x_n^{u_n})$. Then, it is straightforward to verify that $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is NP-agreeable. Note that for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have $t_{\text{N}}(V_{i,m}, \hat{\phi}_{i,m}) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{i,m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. This implies that $t_{\text{N}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}) = t_{\text{H}}(V_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$. Thus $(V_{\text{NP},m}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP},m}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible, so that $(V_{\text{NP}}, \hat{\phi}_{\text{NP}}, F_{\text{NP}}^*)$ is weakly admissible.

Now, we consider a specific example where $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^d$. In this situation, we have

$$\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\hat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) = \frac{d-1}{d} \cdot n.$$

If we assume in addition that $n > \frac{d}{d-1} \cdot (p-2)$, then $\ell_{\text{HT}}(H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_{\hat{F}}), F_{\text{irr}}^*) > p - 2$. However, the argument above shows that Conjecture 0.1 is true for f . This means that our constraints in Theorem 0.2 is not indispensable.

Let us conclude this article by raising some questions. To be parallel to the story of p -adic Hodge theory, we change our perspective and start from a nondegenerate function $F : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ over O_1 . Assume that $\pi^{-1}F$ also gives a regular function over O_1 , and its reduction by π gives a nondegenerate function $f : \mathbb{T}_k^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$, then it still makes sense to consider the specialization map

$$\iota_F : H_{\text{dR}}^i(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_F) \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^i(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi).$$

However, this may not always be an isomorphism. As is mentioned in Remark 3.3, if $\Delta(F) = \Delta(f)$ and the p -adic distance between $\pi^{-1}F$ and \hat{f} is less than $p^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$, then the specialization map ι_F is still an isomorphism. In this situation, we obtain an object

$$((H_{\text{rig}}^n(\mathbb{T}_k^n/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi), \phi_f), (H_{\text{dR}}^n(\mathbb{T}_{K_1}^n, \nabla_F), F_{\text{irr}}^*), \iota_F) \in \mathbf{MF}_{K_1/K_1}^\Phi.$$

It is then natural to ask whether this object is weakly admissible. As is mentioned in Remark 4.9, when the p -adic distance between $\pi^{-1}F$ and \hat{f} is small enough, we can show that this object is weakly admissible. Our question is that, what could be a sensible constraint for F , so that we can expect the associated object to be weakly admissible.

Moreover, we consider a global regular function F on a smooth quasi-projective scheme X over O_1 such that the pair (X_{K_1}, F) admits a good compactification in the sense of Yu in [18, §1]. Assume further that $\pi^{-1}F$ is a global regular function over O_1 and the reduction of $\pi^{-1}F$ by π gives a regular function $f : X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$. Then, it makes sense to consider the specialization map

$$\iota_{X,F} : H_{\text{dR}}^i(X_{K_1}, \nabla_F) \rightarrow H_{\text{rig}}^i(X_k/K_1, f^*\mathcal{L}_\pi).$$

Our question is: what could be the condition for (X, F) to be deserved to be called a *good reduction*, namely $\iota_{X,F}$ is an isomorphism and the associated exponentially twisted cohomology gives a weakly admissible filtered Φ -module. The result in [13] provides a class of pairs (X, F) where $\iota_{X,F}$ is an isomorphism. We can use their result to address these questions. There is also a result concerning the Newton-above-Hodge property given by Kramer-Miller (cf. [11]). Updating this result to weakly admissible filtered Φ -modules is an interesting question.

References

- [1] Alan Adolphson and Steven Sperber, *Exponential sums and Newton polyhedra: cohomology and estimates*, Annals of Mathematics **130** (1989), no. 2, 367–406.
- [2] ———, *Twisted exponential sums and Newton polyhedra.*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik **435** (1993), 151–178.
- [3] ———, *On twisted de Rham cohomology*, Nagoya mathematical journal **146** (1997), 55–81.
- [4] Pierre Bourgeois, *Annulation et pureté des groupes de cohomologie rigide associés à des sommes exponentielles*, Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics **328** (1999), no. 8, 681–686.
- [5] Kai-Chieh Chen and Jeng-Daw Yu, *The Künneth formula for the twisted de Rham and Higgs cohomologies*, SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications **14** (2018).
- [6] Pierre Deligne, *Théorie de Hodge irrégulière (mars 1984 & août 2006)*. *Singularités irrégulières, Correspondance et documents*, Documents mathématiques **5**, 109–114.
- [7] Bernard Dwork, *On the zeta function of a hypersurface*, Publications Mathématiques de l'IHÉS **12** (1962), 5–68.
- [8] ———, *Lectures on p -adic Differential Equations*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften (1982).
- [9] Jean-Marc Fontaine, *Modules galoisiens, modules filtrés et anneaux de Barsotti-Tate*, Astérisque **65** (1979), 3–80.
- [10] Nicholas Michael Katz, *On a theorem of Ax*, American Journal of Mathematics **93** (1971), no. 2, 485–499.

- [11] Joe Kramer-Miller, *p-adic estimates of exponential sums on curves*, Algebra & Number Theory **15** (2021), no. 1, 141–171.
- [12] Peigen Li, *Exponential sums and rigid cohomology*, Finite Fields and Their Applications **81** (2022), 102031.
- [13] Shizhang Li and Dingxin Zhang, *Exponentially twisted de Rham cohomology and rigid cohomology*, Mathematische Annalen **390** (2024), no. 1, 639–670.
- [14] Barry Mazur, *Frobenius and the Hodge filtration*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **78** (1972), no. 5, 653–667.
- [15] ———, *Frobenius and the Hodge filtration (estimates)*, Annals of Mathematics **98** (1973), no. 1, 58–95.
- [16] Paul Monsky, *p-adic Analysis and Zeta Functions*, Vol. 4, Kinokuniya, 1970.
- [17] Claude Sabbah and Jeng-Daw Yu, *Irregular Hodge Theory*, Mémoires de la Société mathématique de France **156** (2018), 1–131.
- [18] Jeng-Daw Yu, *Irregular Hodge filtration on twisted de Rham cohomology*, Manuscripta Mathematica **1** (2014), no. 144, 99–133.