

ESSENTIAL FINITE GENERATION OF EXTENSIONS OF VALUATION RINGS

RANKEYA DATTA

ABSTRACT. Given a generically finite local extension of valuation rings $V \subset W$, the question of whether W is the localization of a finitely generated V -algebra is significant for approaches to the problem of local uniformization of valuations using ramification theory. Hagen Knaf proposed a characterization of when W is essentially of finite type over V in terms of classical invariants of the extension of associated valuations. Knaf's conjecture has been verified in important special cases by Cutkosky and Novacoski using local uniformization of Abhyankar valuations and resolution of singularities of excellent surfaces in arbitrary characteristic, and by Cutkosky for valuation rings of function fields of characteristic 0 using embedded resolution of singularities. In this paper we prove Knaf's conjecture in full generality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let L/K be a finite field extension. Given a domain R with fraction field K , results that characterize when the integral closure of R in L is a finite type R -algebra have fundamental applications in algebraic geometry, commutative algebra and number theory. We investigate a local valuative analogue of the finite generation of integral closures in this paper. Suppose ω is a valuation of L with valuation ring $(\mathcal{O}_\omega, \mathfrak{m}_\omega, \kappa_\omega)$ and value group Γ_ω . Let ν be the restriction of ω to K with valuation ring $(\mathcal{O}_\nu, \mathfrak{m}_\nu, \kappa_\nu)$ and value group Γ_ν . Inclusion induces a local homomorphism

$$(\mathcal{O}_\nu, \mathfrak{m}_\nu, \kappa_\nu) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{O}_\omega, \mathfrak{m}_\omega, \kappa_\omega),$$

and the valuation ring \mathcal{O}_ω is a local ring of the integral closure of \mathcal{O}_ν in L [Bou98, Chap. VI, §8.6, Prop. 6]. Thus, as a local version of the question of the finite generation of integral closures, it is natural to ask when \mathcal{O}_ω is the localization of a finite type \mathcal{O}_ν -algebra. Knaf proposed the following necessary and sufficient condition in terms of classical invariants of the extension ω/ν [CN19, Conjecture 1.2].

Conjecture 1.1. *Let L/K be a finite field extension, ω be a valuation of L and ν be the restriction of ω to K . Let L^h (resp. K^h) denote the fraction field of the Henselization of \mathcal{O}_ω (resp. \mathcal{O}_ν). Then \mathcal{O}_ω is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν if and only if both the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) $[L^h : K^h] = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu][\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu]$.
- (2) $\epsilon(\omega|\nu) = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu]$, where $\epsilon(\omega|\nu)$ is the cardinality of $\{x \in \Gamma_{\omega, \geq 0} : x < y \text{ for all } y \in \Gamma_{\nu, > 0}\}$.

Here for a totally ordered abelian group Γ , we define

$$\Gamma_{\geq 0} := \{x \in \Gamma : x \geq 0\} \text{ and } \Gamma_{> 0} := \{x \in \Gamma : x > 0\}.$$

In ramification theory, $[\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu]$ is called the *ramification index*, $[\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu]$ the *inertia index* and $\epsilon(\omega|\nu)$ the *initial index* of the extension ω/ν . The first equality $[L^h : K^h] = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu][\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu]$ is the assertion that the extension ω/ν is *defectless*; see Definition 4.8 for the notion of defect. The second equality $\epsilon(\omega|\nu) = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu]$ just means that every element of the quotient Γ_ω/Γ_ν is the class of some element of $\Gamma_{\omega, \geq 0}$.

The question of the essential finite generation of extension of valuation rings arises naturally in approaches to the open problem of local uniformization of valuations using ramification theory. For example, an affirmative answer to this question for extensions of Abhyankar valuations is an important ingredient in Knaf and Kuhlmann's proof of the local uniformization of Abhyankar valuations [KK05]. In addition, the essential finite generation of extensions of valuation rings also features in Knaf and Kuhlmann's valuation-theoretic argument of the local uniformization of a valuation in a finite extension of its fraction field [KK09]. Conjecture 1.1 can be viewed as a generalization of the beautiful ramification-theoretic characterization of the module-finiteness of the integral closure of a valuation ring in a finite extension of its fraction field [Bou98, Chap. VI, §8.5, Thm. 2]. We refer the interested reader to [CN19, Cut19] for additional background on this problem.

Conjecture 1.1 is known in specific cases, often using different techniques. The necessity of conditions (1) and (2) for the essential finite generation of \mathcal{O}_ω over \mathcal{O}_ν was proved by Knaf; his argument is reproduced in [CN19, Thm. 4.1] (see also Remark 5.1 for a different approach using Zariski's Main Theorem). The sufficiency of conditions (1) and (2) for the essential finite generation of \mathcal{O}_ω over \mathcal{O}_ν is known when L/K is normal using the transitive action of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$ on the fibers of the integral closure of \mathcal{O}_ν in L [CN19, Cor. 2.2], when κ_ω/κ_ν is separable using the theory of Henselian elements [KN14, Thm. 1.3], when ω is the unique extension of ν to L using the theory of defect [CN19, Cor. 2.2], when ν is centered on an excellent local two dimensional domain with fraction field K using resolution of singularities for excellent surfaces [CN19, Thm. 1.4], when ν is an Abhyankar valuation of a function field K/k by [CN19, Thm. 1.5] and [Cut20, Thm. 1.7] using local uniformization of Abhyankar valuations, and when K is the function field over a field of characteristic 0 using an explicit form of embedded resolution of singularities [Cut19, Thm. 1.3].

We will give a uniform argument that settles Conjecture 1.1 in full generality. Recall that the implication that remains to be shown is that if conditions (1) and (2) of Conjecture 1.1 hold, then \mathcal{O}_ω is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν . We take as our starting point the veracity of Conjecture 1.1 for unique extensions of valuations [CN19, Cor. 2.2]. Note that if ω^h (resp. ν^h) is the valuation of L^h (resp. K^h) whose valuation ring is the Henselization \mathcal{O}_ω^h (resp. \mathcal{O}_ν^h), then ω^h is the unique extension of ν^h to L^h up to equivalence of valuations by the Henselian property (see Corollary 4.2). Moreover, Henselizations do not alter value groups [Sta20, Tag 0ASK] and residue fields, which means that the ramification, residue and inertia indexes of ω^h/ν^h coincide with those of ω/ν . Thus, assuming (1) and (2) in Conjecture 1.1, it follows that \mathcal{O}_ω^h is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν^h . Using this observation, we prove Conjecture 1.1 by establishing the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let L/K be a finite field extension. Suppose ω is a valuation of L with valuation ring $(\mathcal{O}_\omega, \mathfrak{m}_\omega, \kappa_\omega)$ and value group Γ_ω . Let ν be the restriction of ω to K with valuation ring $(\mathcal{O}_\nu, \mathfrak{m}_\nu, \kappa_\nu)$ and value group Γ_ν . Suppose the Henselization of \mathcal{O}_ω is \mathcal{O}_ω^h with fraction field L^h and that of \mathcal{O}_ν is \mathcal{O}_ν^h with fraction field K^h . The following are then equivalent.*

- (i) \mathcal{O}_ω is essentially of finite presentation over \mathcal{O}_ν .
- (ii) \mathcal{O}_ω is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν .
- (iii) $[L^h : K^h] = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu][\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu]$ and $\epsilon(\omega|\nu) = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu]$.
- (iv) \mathcal{O}_ω^h is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν^h .
- (v) \mathcal{O}_ω^h is a module finite \mathcal{O}_ν^h -algebra.

Instead of using known cases of local uniformization or resolution of singularities, we prove Theorem 1.2 by analyzing the behavior of integral maps under base change along Henselizations. This consideration turns out to be independent of valuation theory and is carried out in Section 3. This section is the heart of our paper and does most of the heavy lifting for the proof of Theorem 1.2. The key is the approximation result of Corollary 3.7, which, combined the fact that valuation rings are maximal subrings of a field with respect to the partial order induced by domination of local rings, leads to a proof of Theorem 1.2.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we fix our conventions for the paper. Section 3 examines base change properties along Henselizations. In Section 4 we collect some basic results and definitions about extensions of valuation rings, Henselian valuation rings and the ramification theory of extensions of valuations. Finally, we prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 5.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Dale Cutkosky for helpful conversations.

2. CONVENTIONS AND BASIC TERMINOLOGY

All rings are commutative with a multiplicative identity. For a ring A , $\text{MaxSpec}(A)$ will denote the set of maximal ideals of A . Note that rings in this paper will rarely be noetherian.

The term *local ring* will mean a ring $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \kappa)$ with a unique maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} and residue field κ . Please note that local rings are not necessarily noetherian. We will use R^h to denote the Henselization of the local ring R with respect to the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} . Recall that R^h is a faithfully flat local extension of R whose maximal ideal is the expansion of the maximal ideal of R and whose residue field is isomorphic to the residue field of R [Sta20, Tag 07QM]. We will say that a local ring (B, \mathfrak{m}_B) *dominates* a local ring (A, \mathfrak{m}_A) if $A \subset B$ and $\mathfrak{m}_A = \mathfrak{m}_B \cap A$. Recall that a valuation ring of a field K is a local subring of K that is maximal in the

collection of local subrings of K under the partial order induced by domination of local rings. Whenever we talk about an extension of valuation rings $V \subset W$, we will always assume W dominates V .

Valuation rings also arise from valuations, which are denoted additively in this paper. We assume the reader is familiar with valuations and valuation rings, and we will skip their definitions.

Let B be an A -algebra. We say B is *essentially of finite type over A* if B is the localization of a finite type A -algebra. We say B is *essentially of finite presentation over A* if B is the localization of a finitely presented A -algebra.

While a finitely presented algebra is always of finite type, the converse is not true in a non-noetherian setting. However, the two notions often coincide in the valuative setting because of the following result and the fact that any torsion-free module over a valuation ring is free [Bou98, Chap. VI, §3.6, Lem. 1].

Lemma 2.1. [RG71, Cor. (3.4.7)] *Let A be a domain and B be a finite type A -algebra. If B is A -flat, then B is a finitely presented A -algebra.*

3. HENSELIZATION AND BASE CHANGE

In this section we establish some base change properties of integral maps along Henselizations. The results do not use any valuation theory. The non-valuative considerations of this section will provide the main ingredients for the proof of Theorem 1.2. We will frequently use the fact that the Henselization of a local ring is flat [Sta20, Tag 07QM], that flat maps satisfy the Going-Down property [Sta20, Tag 00HS] and that the property of being an integral ring map is preserved under base change [Sta20, Tag 02JK].

We first recall a characterization of Henselian local domains that will be important for the results that follow.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local domain. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) R is Henselian.
- (2) For every integral extension $R \hookrightarrow A$, if A is a domain then A is a local ring.

If the equivalent conditions hold, then any integral extension of R that is also a domain is Henselian.

Indication of proof. The equivalence follows from [Nag75, Chap. VII, Thm. (43.12)]. The fact that integral extension domains of R are Henselian follows by [Nag75, Chap. VII, Cor. (43.13)]. Note that in Nagata's terminology, an integral extension of a domain is automatically a domain [Nag75, Chap. I, Pg. 30]. \square

The next result highlights a key base change property along Henselizations.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring, $\varphi : R \rightarrow A$ be a ring map and $i : R \rightarrow R^h$ be the canonical map from R to its Henselization R^h . Suppose $\mathfrak{P} \in \text{Spec}(A)$ contracts to $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Spec}(R)$, that is, $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{P}) = \mathfrak{m}$. Consider the induced map $\text{id}_A \otimes i : A \rightarrow A \otimes_R R^h$.*

- (1) *The fiber of $\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i) : \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ over \mathfrak{P} is a singleton.*
- (2) *If \mathfrak{Q} is the unique prime ideal of $A \otimes_R R^h$ that contracts to \mathfrak{P} , then $((A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{Q}})^h \cong (A_{\mathfrak{P}})^h$.*

Proof. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes i} & A \otimes_R R^h \\ \uparrow \varphi & & \uparrow \varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h} \\ R & \xrightarrow{i} & R^h. \end{array} \tag{3.2.1}$$

Since i is faithfully flat, so is $\text{id}_A \otimes i$. Therefore, $\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i) : \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ is surjective.

(1) Let $\kappa(\mathfrak{P})$ (resp. $\kappa(\mathfrak{m})$) denote the residue field of \mathfrak{P} (resp. \mathfrak{m}). Then the fiber of $\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i)$ over \mathfrak{P} can be identified with $\text{Spec}(\kappa(\mathfrak{P}) \otimes_A (A \otimes_R R^h))$. Now,

$$\kappa(\mathfrak{P}) \otimes_A (A \otimes_R R^h) \cong \kappa(\mathfrak{P}) \otimes_R R^h \cong \kappa(\mathfrak{P}) \otimes_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})} (\kappa(\mathfrak{m}) \otimes_R R^h).$$

The maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}^h of R^h is $\mathfrak{m}R^h$ and that the induced map of residue fields $\kappa(\mathfrak{m}) \rightarrow \kappa(\mathfrak{m}^h)$ is an isomorphism [Sta20, Tag 07QM]. Therefore $\kappa(\mathfrak{m}) \otimes_R R^h = \kappa(\mathfrak{m}^h)$ and

$$\kappa(\mathfrak{P}) \otimes_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})} (\kappa(\mathfrak{m}) \otimes_R R^h) \cong \kappa(\mathfrak{P}),$$

that is, $\text{Spec}(\kappa(\mathfrak{P}) \otimes_A (A \otimes_R R^h))$ is the spectrum of a field. This proves (1).

(2) There exists a unique prime ideal \mathfrak{Q} of $A \otimes_R R^h$ that contracts to \mathfrak{P} by (1). By the commutativity of (3.2.1), \mathfrak{Q} contracts to \mathfrak{m}^h along $\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h} : R^h \rightarrow A \otimes_R R^h$ because \mathfrak{m}^h is the unique prime ideal of R^h that contracts \mathfrak{m} in R . The rest of (2) now follows from [Sta20, Tag 08HU]. \square

We now focus on the base change properties of integral ring maps along Henselizations. When we use the term ‘integral ring map’, we do not necessarily mean an integral extension.

Lemma 3.3. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring, $\varphi : R \rightarrow A$ be an integral ring map and $i : R \rightarrow R^h$ be the canonical map from (R, \mathfrak{m}) to its Henselization (R^h, \mathfrak{m}^h) . Then the map*

$$\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i) : \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$$

induced by $\text{id}_A \otimes i : A \rightarrow A \otimes_R R^h$ has the following properties:

- (1) *For every maximal ideal \mathfrak{M} of A , the fiber of $\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i)$ over \mathfrak{M} is a singleton.*
- (2) *Let $\mathfrak{Q} \in \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$. The following are equivalent:*
 - (2a) *\mathfrak{Q} is a maximal ideal of $A \otimes_R R^h$.*
 - (2b) *\mathfrak{Q} contracts to a maximal ideal of $\text{Spec}(A)$.*
 - (2c) *\mathfrak{Q} contracts to \mathfrak{m}^h .*
- (3) *$\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i)$ induces a bijection $\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h) \longleftrightarrow \text{MaxSpec}(A)$.*

Proof. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes i} & A \otimes_R R^h \\ \uparrow \varphi & & \uparrow \varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h} \\ R & \xrightarrow{i} & R^h. \end{array}$$

Since φ is integral, so is $\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h}$. Moreover, $\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i) : \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ is surjective because $\text{id}_A \otimes i$ is faithfully flat by base change.

- (1) $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{m}$ since φ is integral and \mathfrak{M} is maximal. Then (1) follows by part (1) of Lemma 3.2.
- (2) Suppose \mathfrak{Q} is a maximal ideal of $A \otimes_R R^h$. Then \mathfrak{Q} contracts to \mathfrak{m}^h in R^h along $\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h}$ because this map is integral. Thus, (2a) \Rightarrow (2c).

Suppose \mathfrak{Q} contracts to \mathfrak{m}^h in R^h , and hence to \mathfrak{m} in R . Then the contraction \mathfrak{Q}^c of \mathfrak{Q} to A must be maximal because \mathfrak{Q}^c contracts to \mathfrak{m} along the integral map φ , and only maximal ideals can contract to maximal ideals along integral maps. This proves (2c) \Rightarrow (2b).

Finally, suppose \mathfrak{Q} contracts to a maximal ideal \mathfrak{M} of A . Since $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{m}$, it follows by the commutativity of the above diagram that \mathfrak{Q} contracts to \mathfrak{m}^h along the integral ring map $\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h}$. Then \mathfrak{Q} must be maximal, thereby establishing (2b) \Rightarrow (2a).

- (3) The equivalent statements of part (2) tell us that the inverse image of $\text{MaxSpec}(A)$ under $\text{Spec}(\text{id}_A \otimes i)$ is precisely $\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$, and part (1) shows that the induced map $\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h) \rightarrow \text{MaxSpec}(A)$ is both injective and surjective. \square

An analogue of Lemma 3.3 exists for minimal primes.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be an integrally closed domain, and $\varphi : R \hookrightarrow A$ be an integral extension of domains. Then we have the following:*

- (1) *R^h is an integrally closed domain and $\text{Frac}(R) \otimes_R R^h = \text{Frac}(R^h)$.*
- (2) *Let $\mathfrak{Q} \in \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$. The following are equivalent:*
 - (2a) *\mathfrak{Q} is a minimal prime of $A \otimes_R R^h$.*

- (2b) \mathfrak{Q} lies over (0) in A .
- (2c) \mathfrak{Q} lies over (0) in R^h .
- (3) There is a bijection $\{\text{minimal prime of } A \otimes_R R^h\} \longleftrightarrow \text{Spec}(\text{Frac}(A) \otimes_{\text{Frac}(R)} \text{Frac}(R^h))$.
- (4) If $\text{Frac}(A)$ is a finite extension of $\text{Frac}(R)$, then $A \otimes_R R^h$ has finitely many minimal primes.

Proof. (1) That R^h is an integrally closed domain is a well-known permanence property of Henselization; see [Sta20, Tag 06DI]. Since R^h is a colimit of local étale extensions, $\text{Frac}(R^h)$ is an algebraic extension of $\text{Frac}(R)$. So $\text{Frac}(R) \otimes_R R^h$ is a field because it contains $\text{Frac}(R)$ and is contained in $\text{Frac}(R^h)$. Since $\text{Frac}(R) \otimes_R R^h$ is a localization of R^h , we get $\text{Frac}(R) \otimes_R R^h = \text{Frac}(R^h)$.

(2) Let $i : R \rightarrow R^h$ be the canonical map. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes i} & A \otimes_R R^h \\ \uparrow \varphi & & \uparrow \varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h} \\ R & \xrightarrow{i} & R^h. \end{array}$$

Since $\text{id}_A \otimes i : A \rightarrow A \otimes_R R^h$ is flat, a minimal prime of $A \otimes_R R^h$ must contract to the unique minimal prime (0) of A by Going-Down. This proves (2a) \Rightarrow (2b).

Suppose \mathfrak{Q} contracts to (0) in A . Then \mathfrak{Q} must contract to (0) in R because φ is injective. Let

$$\mathfrak{p} := (\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h})^{-1}(\mathfrak{Q}).$$

By the commutativity of the above diagram, \mathfrak{p} contracts to (0) in R . But (1) shows the generic fiber of i is a singleton, consisting of the unique minimal prime (0) of R^h . Consequently, $\mathfrak{p} = (0)$, proving (2b) \Rightarrow (2c).

Assume (2c). If \mathfrak{Q} is not a minimal prime of $A \otimes_R R^h$, then we can find $\mathfrak{Q}' \in \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$ such that

$$\mathfrak{Q}' \subsetneq \mathfrak{Q}.$$

Then $(\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h})^{-1}(\mathfrak{Q}') = (0)$, which is a contradiction because $\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h}$ is an integral extension, and integral extensions have zero dimensional fibers [Sta20, Tag 00GT]. Thus, (2c) \Rightarrow (2a).

(3) By part (2), the set of minimal primes of $A \otimes_R R^h$ is precisely the generic fiber of $\text{id}_A \otimes i : A \rightarrow A \otimes_R R^h$, which is in bijection with $\text{Spec}(\text{Frac}(A) \otimes_A (A \otimes_R R^h))$. The assertion now follows because

$$\text{Frac}(A) \otimes_A (A \otimes_R R^h) \cong \text{Frac}(A) \otimes_{\text{Frac}(R)} (\text{Frac}(R) \otimes_R R^h) \cong \text{Frac}(A) \otimes_{\text{Frac}(R)} \text{Frac}(R^h),$$

where the last isomorphism is a consequence of part (1).

(4) If $\text{Frac}(A)$ is a finite extension of $\text{Frac}(R)$, then $\text{Frac}(A) \otimes_{\text{Frac}(R)} \text{Frac}(R^h)$ is a finite $\text{Frac}(R^h)$ -algebra. Consequently, $\text{Spec}(\text{Frac}(A) \otimes_{\text{Frac}(R)} \text{Frac}(R^h))$ is finite set. We are then done by part (3). \square

The next result is well-known. We include a proof for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 3.5. *Let A be a ring such that for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} of A , $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a domain.*

- (1) *If \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{q} are distinct minimal primes of A , then $\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{q} = A$.*
- (2) *If A has finitely many distinct minimal primes $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_n$, then the canonical map $A \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{p}_1 \times \dots \times A/\mathfrak{p}_n$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. (1) Suppose for contradiction that $\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{q} \subsetneq A$. Then there exists a maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A such that $\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$. Now both $\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and $\mathfrak{q}A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ are distinct minimal prime ideals of the domain $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$, which is impossible.

(2) The hypothesis implies that A is reduced, that is, $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_n = (0)$. Since $\mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}_j = A$ for $i \neq j$, the result now follows by the Chinese Remainder Theorem [Sta20, Tag 00DT]. \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local domain that is integrally closed in its fraction field K . Let L be a finite field extension of K and let A be the integral closure of R in L . We have the following:*

- (1) *A has finitely many maximal ideals, that is, A is semi-local.*
- (2) *$A \otimes_R R^h$ is a semi-local ring.*
- (3) *If \mathfrak{M} is a maximal ideal of $A \otimes_R R^h$, then $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an integrally closed domain.*
- (4) *$A \otimes_R R^h$ has finitely many minimal primes.*

- (5) Each maximal ideal \mathfrak{M} of $A \otimes_R R^h$ contains a unique minimal prime \mathfrak{p} , and conversely, \mathfrak{M} is the unique maximal ideal that contains \mathfrak{p} . Moreover, the canonical map $A \otimes_R R^h \rightarrow (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$ has kernel \mathfrak{p} and induces an isomorphism

$$\frac{A \otimes_R R^h}{\mathfrak{p}} \cong (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}.$$

Consequently, $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is Henselian.

- (6) If $\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ are the maximal ideals of A (assumed to be distinct), then

$$A \otimes_R R^h \cong (A_{\mathfrak{m}_1})^h \times \cdots \times (A_{\mathfrak{m}_n})^h.$$

Moreover, if \mathfrak{M}_i is the unique prime ideal of $A \otimes_R R^h$ that contracts to \mathfrak{m}_i , then \mathfrak{M}_i is maximal and

$$(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i} \cong (A_{\mathfrak{m}_i})^h.$$

- (7) The sets $\text{MaxSpec}(A)$, $\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$, $\text{Spec}(L \otimes_K \text{Frac}(R^h))$ and $\{\text{minimal prime of } A \otimes_R R^h\}$ have the same cardinality.

Proof. (1) The integral closure of an integrally closed domain in a finite extension of its fraction field has finite fibers [Bou98, Chap. V, §2.3, Cor. 2]. Since $\text{MaxSpec}(A)$ is the closed fiber of $R \subset A$, it is finite.

(2) $\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$ is in bijection with the finite set $\text{MaxSpec}(A)$ by Lemma 3.3.

(3) \mathfrak{M} contracts to a maximal ideal \mathfrak{P} in A by Lemma 3.3, and so, \mathfrak{P} contracts to \mathfrak{m} in R . Since $A_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is integrally closed, $(A_{\mathfrak{P}})^h$ is also an integrally closed domain [Sta20, Tag 06DI]. By Lemma 3.2,

$$(A_{\mathfrak{P}})^h \cong ((A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}})^h.$$

Since $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow ((A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}})^h$ is faithfully flat, descent of integral closedness [Sta20, Tag 033G] implies $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an integrally closed domain.

(4) This follows from part (4) of Lemma 3.4 because L is the fraction field of A .

(5) A maximal ideal $\mathfrak{M} \in A \otimes_R R^h$ contains a unique minimal prime because $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a domain by part (3). Let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_k$ be the minimal primes of $A \otimes_R R^h$. Then part (3) and Lemma 3.5 imply that

$$A \otimes_R R^h \cong (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \times \cdots \times (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{p}_k}. \quad (3.6.1)$$

Lemma 3.4 shows that a minimal prime of $A \otimes_R R^h$ contracts to (0) in R^h . Thus, the composition

$$R^h \xrightarrow{\varphi \otimes \text{id}_{R^h}} A \otimes_R R^h \rightarrow (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$$

is an integral extension for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, and so, each $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is a Henselian local domain by Lemma 3.1. Hence each minimal prime \mathfrak{p}_i is contained in a unique maximal ideal, say \mathfrak{M}_i . Since $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$ is a domain by part (3), the kernel of $A \otimes_R R^h \rightarrow (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$ has to be \mathfrak{p}_i . Moreover, $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is local with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{M}_i/\mathfrak{p}_i$, so the induced injection $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \hookrightarrow (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$ is an isomorphism. In particular, $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$ is a Henselian local domain.

(6) The uniqueness and maximality of \mathfrak{M}_i follow from Lemma 3.3, as does the fact that $\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h) = \{\mathfrak{M}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{M}_n\}$. The decomposition (3.6.1) and part (5) then show that

$$A \otimes_R R^h \cong (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_1} \times \cdots \times (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_n},$$

and that each $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$ is Henselian. Thus, $((A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i})^h \cong (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$. On the other hand, Lemma 3.2 implies that $((A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i})^h \cong (A_{\mathfrak{m}_i})^h$. Thus, $A \otimes_R R^h \cong (A_{\mathfrak{m}_1})^h \times \cdots \times (A_{\mathfrak{m}_n})^h$.

(7) All the sets are finite because of parts (1), (4) and the bijections of Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4. It remains to check that $|\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h)| = |\{\text{minimal prime of } A \otimes_R R^h\}|$. This follows by part (5). \square

Corollary 3.7. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a local domain that is integrally closed in its fraction field K . Let L be a finite field extension of K and A be the integral closure of R in L . Suppose $\text{MaxSpec}(A) = \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n\}$ (the maximal ideals are assumed to be distinct).*

- (1) *Let Σ be the collection of finite (equivalently, finitely generated) R -subalgebras B of A such that $\text{Frac}(B) = \text{Frac}(A) = L$ and $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap B \neq \mathfrak{m}_j \cap B$, for $i \neq j$. Then Σ is filtered under inclusion and*

$$A = \text{colim}_{B \in \Sigma} B.$$

- (2) Let $\mathfrak{M} \in \text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$ and $B \in \Sigma$. If \mathfrak{M}_B is the contraction of \mathfrak{M} to the subring $B \otimes_R R^h$ of $A \otimes_R R^h$, then the induced map on local rings

$$(B \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B} \rightarrow (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$$

is injective, $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}$ is a Henselian domain, and

$$(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}} = \text{colim}_{B \in \Sigma} (B \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}.$$

Proof. (1) Since every element of Σ is integral over R , finitely generated is equivalent to being module finite as an R -algebra. Note that Σ is non-empty. Indeed, since $\text{Frac}(A) = L$ is a finite extension of K , one can choose a K -basis of L consisting of elements $b_1, \dots, b_m \in A$. By prime avoidance, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, choose $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}_i$ such that a_i is not contained in any of the other maximal ideals of A (here we need that A is semi-local). Then by construction, the R -subalgebra $R[a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m]$ of A is an element of Σ .

If $B \in \Sigma$, then any finitely generated B -subalgebra C of A is also in Σ . Therefore if $B_1, B_2 \in \Sigma$, then so is $B_1[B_2]$, that is, Σ is filtered under inclusion. Since A is the filtered union of finitely generated B -subalgebras for any $B \in \Sigma$ and $\Sigma \neq \emptyset$, we have $A = \text{colim}_{B \in \Sigma} B$.

(2) Fix $B \in \Sigma$. Since $B \hookrightarrow A$ is an integral extension, each $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap B$ is a maximal ideal of B . Furthermore, since every maximal ideal of B is contracted from a maximal ideal of A , we get

$$\text{MaxSpec}(B) := \{\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap B, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n \cap B\}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{M}_i \in \text{Spec}(A \otimes_R R^h)$ be the unique prime ideal that contracts to \mathfrak{m}_i . Then Lemma 3.3 shows that

$$\text{MaxSpec}(A \otimes_R R^h) = \{\mathfrak{M}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{M}_n\}.$$

If $(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B$ is the contraction of \mathfrak{M}_i to $B \otimes_R R^h$, then using the integrality of the extension $B \otimes_R R^h \hookrightarrow A \otimes_R R^h$ we conclude that

$$\text{MaxSpec}(B \otimes_R R^h) = \{(\mathfrak{M}_1)_B, \dots, (\mathfrak{M}_n)_B\}.$$

The defining property of Σ implies that for $i \neq j$, $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap B \neq \mathfrak{m}_j \cap B$. As $(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B$ lies over $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap B$ by the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & A \otimes_R R^h \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ B & \longrightarrow & B \otimes_R R^h, \end{array}$$

we have $(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B \neq (\mathfrak{M}_j)_B$ for $i \neq j$. In other words, $B \otimes_R R^h$ consists of n distinct maximal ideals $(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and \mathfrak{M}_i is the unique prime ideal of $A \otimes_R R^h$ that contracts to $(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B$.

Since B is a finite extension of R , $B \otimes_R R^h$ is a finite extension of R^h . The decomposition of finite extensions of Henselian local domains [Sta20, Tag 04GH] gives us that

$$B \otimes_R R^h \cong (B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_1)_B} \times \dots \times (B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_n)_B}, \quad (3.7.1)$$

and that each $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B}$ is a Henselian local ring. Moreover, $B \otimes_R R^h$ is a subring of $A \otimes_R R^h$, which is reduced because it decomposes as a finite product of domains by part (6) of Proposition 3.6. Thus, $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B}$ is reduced for all i .

Applying part (3) of Lemma 3.4 to the integral extension $R \hookrightarrow B$ we see that the number of minimal primes of $B \otimes_R R^h$ equals the cardinality of $\text{Spec}(L \otimes_K \text{Frac}(R^h))$. But

$$|\text{Spec}(L \otimes_K \text{Frac}(R^h))| = |\text{MaxSpec}(A)| = n$$

by part (7) of Proposition 3.6 and the fact that $\text{Frac}(A) = \text{Frac}(B) = L$. Consequently, each factor in the decomposition (3.7.1) has exactly one minimal prime. Combined with reducedness, it follows that each $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B}$ is a domain.

In particular, $(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B$ contains a unique minimal prime (which expands to the zero ideal in $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B}$). Using part (5) of Proposition 3.6, if \mathfrak{P}_i is the unique minimal prime of $A \otimes_R R^h$ contained in \mathfrak{M}_i , then

$$(\mathfrak{P}_i)_B := \mathfrak{P}_i \cap (B \otimes_R R^h)$$

must be the unique minimal prime of $B \otimes_R R^h$ contained in $(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B$. Indeed, by part (2) of Lemma 3.4, \mathfrak{P}_i contracts to (0) in R^h . Thus $(\mathfrak{P}_i)_B$ also contracts to (0) in R^h . Applying part (2) of Lemma 3.4 again, but this time to the integral extension $R \hookrightarrow B$, then shows that $(\mathfrak{P}_i)_B$ is a minimal prime of $B \otimes_R R^h$.

Using the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B \otimes_R R^h & \hookrightarrow & A \otimes_R R^h \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B} & \longrightarrow & (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}, \end{array}$$

it follows that $\mathfrak{P}_i(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$ must contract to $(\mathfrak{P}_i)_B(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B}$ in $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B}$. Since $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i}$ and $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B}$ are both domains (the former ring is a domain by Proposition 3.6), we have $\mathfrak{P}_i(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_i} = (0)$ and $(\mathfrak{P}_i)_B(B \otimes_R R^h)_{(\mathfrak{M}_i)_B} = (0)$. Thus, the bottom horizontal arrow is injective.

A maximal ideal \mathfrak{M} of $A \otimes_R R^h$ coincides with some \mathfrak{M}_i . Therefore the argument above shows that for any $B \in \Sigma$, $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}$ is a Henselian local domain and the induced local map

$$(B \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B} \rightarrow (A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$$

is injective. As tensor product commutes with filtered colimits, we have $A \otimes_R R^h = \operatorname{colim}_{B \in \Sigma} B \otimes_R R^h$ by part (1), and so, $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}} = \operatorname{colim}_{B \in \Sigma} (B \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}$. In this case the filtered colimit is actually a filtered union because $(B \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}$ is a subring of $(A \otimes_R R^h)_{\mathfrak{M}}$, for all $B \in \Sigma$. \square

4. HENSELIAN VALUATION RINGS AND SOME RAMIFICATION THEORY

This section discusses some background from the ramification theory of extensions of valuations relevant to Conjecture 1.1. We first recall how extensions of valuation rings arise in algebraic field extensions.

Proposition 4.1. *Let L/K be an algebraic extension of fields. Let V be a valuation ring of K and A be the integral closure of V in L . Then localization $\mathfrak{m} \mapsto A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ induces a bijection*

$$\operatorname{MaxSpec}(A) \longleftrightarrow \{\text{valuation rings of } L \text{ that dominate } V\}.$$

In particular, if L/K is finite, then there are finitely many valuation rings of L that dominate V .

Indication of proof. For the bijection see [Bou98, Chap. VI, §8.6, Prop. 6]. If L/K is finite, then A has finitely many maximal ideals by part (1) of Proposition 3.6. That there are finitely many valuation rings of L that dominate V now follows from the bijection of this Proposition. \square

As a consequence of the Henselian property, one can now deduce:

Corollary 4.2. *Let V be a valuation ring of a field K . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *V is Henselian.*
- (2) *If L is an algebraic extension of K and A is the integral closure of V in L , then A is the unique valuation ring of L that dominates V .*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) By Lemma 3.1, A must be a local ring. By the bijection of Proposition 4.1 it follows that A must be the unique valuation ring of L that dominates V .

Conversely, assume (2). Let B be a domain that is an integral extension of V . By Lemma 3.1 again, it suffices to show that B is local. Let $L = \operatorname{Frac}(B)$. Then L/K is algebraic. If A is the integral closure of V in L , then $B \subset A$ is integral. Since A is local by (2), Lying Over and the fact that only maximal ideals of A can contract to maximal ideals of B imply that B must also be local. \square

Remark 4.3. In terms of valuations, Corollary 4.2 can be reinterpreted as saying that if ν is a valuation of a field K , then the valuation ring of ν is Henselian if and only if for every algebraic extension L/K , there exists a unique valuation ω of L (up to equivalence) that extends ν .

The Henselization of a valuation ring admits a purely valuation theoretic description. However, for the purposes of this paper, it is more helpful to think of Henselizations as filtered colimits of local étale extensions that induce isomorphisms on residue fields. One then has the following result.

Lemma 4.4. *Let ν be a valuation of a field K with valuation ring \mathcal{O}_ν and value group Γ_ν . Then the Henselization \mathcal{O}_ν^h of \mathcal{O}_ν is a valuation ring whose associated valuation ν^h also has value group Γ_ν .*

Proof. See [Sta20, Tag 0ASK]. The main points are that local étale extensions of valuation rings are valuation rings and a filtered colimit of valuation rings is a valuation ring. \square

Notation 4.5. The fraction field of \mathcal{O}_ν^h will be denoted by K^h . Thus, ν^h is a valuation of K^h whose valuation ring is \mathcal{O}_ν^h .

We record a descent result that we will need in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\varphi : V \rightarrow W$ be a ring map and W be a valuation ring. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *V is a valuation ring and φ is an injective local map.*
- (2) *φ is faithfully flat.*
- (3) *φ is cyclically pure, that is, for all ideals I of V , the induced map $V/I \rightarrow W/IW$ is injective.*

Proof. Assume (1). If φ is injective, then W , being a domain, is a torsion-free V -module, hence flat [Bou98, Chap. VI, §3.6, Lem. 1]. Since φ is local, φ is faithfully flat. Thus, (1) \Rightarrow (2). Furthermore, (2) \Rightarrow (3) is a property of faithfully flat maps; see [Bou98, Chap. I, §3.5, Prop. 9].

Assume (3). Taking $I = (0)$, we see that φ is injective. Thus, V is a domain because W is. To show that V is a valuation ring, it is enough to show that for all $x, y \in V$, $xV \subseteq yV$ or $yV \subseteq xV$. Since W is a valuation ring, we must have $xW \subseteq yW$ or $yW \subseteq xW$. Cyclic purity of φ implies that $\varphi^{-1}(IW) = I$, for any ideal I of V . Thus, if $xW \subseteq yW$, then $xV = \varphi^{-1}(xW) \subseteq \varphi^{-1}(yW) = yV$. Similarly, $yV \subseteq xV$ if $yW \subseteq xW$. Finally, φ is local because if \mathfrak{m}_V is the maximal ideal of the valuation ring V , then injectivity of $V/\mathfrak{m}_V \rightarrow W/\mathfrak{m}_V W$ shows $\mathfrak{m}_V W \neq W$. \square

Conjecture 1.1 relates essential finite generation of extensions of valuation rings to fundamental invariants from the ramification theory of extensions of valuations. We now briefly introduce these invariants. Let L/K be a field extension, ω be a valuation of L with value group Γ_ω and ν be its restriction to K with value group Γ_ν . Inclusion induces a local homomorphism of the corresponding valuation rings

$$(\mathcal{O}_\nu, \mathfrak{m}_\nu, \kappa_\nu) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{O}_\omega, \mathfrak{m}_\omega, \kappa_\omega).$$

Note that Γ_ν is a subgroup of Γ_ω and κ_ν is a subfield of κ_ω .

Fix a finite field extension L/K . One has the fundamental inequality [Bou98, Chap. VI, §8.1, Lem. 2]

$$[\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu][\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu] \leq [L : K]. \quad (4.6.1)$$

In particular, $[\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu]$ and $[\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu]$ are finite invariants of ω/ν . This leads to the following definition.

Definition 4.7. Suppose L/K is a finite extension and consider the extension of valuations ω/ν .

- (a) The *ramification index* of ω/ν , denoted $e(\omega|\nu)$, is $[\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu]$.
- (b) The *inertia index* of ω/ν , denoted $f(\omega|\nu)$, is $[\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu]$.
- (c) The *initial index* of ω/ν , denoted $\epsilon(\omega|\nu)$, is the cardinality of the set $\{x \in \Gamma_{\omega, \geq 0} : x < \Gamma_{\nu, > 0}\}$.

The finiteness of the initial index follows from the inequality

$$\epsilon(\omega|\nu) \leq e(\omega|\nu),$$

which holds because if $x, y \in \Gamma_{\omega, \geq 0}$ are distinct elements such that $x, y < \Gamma_{\nu, > 0}$, then $x + \Gamma_\nu \neq y + \Gamma_\nu$ in Γ_ω/Γ_ν . Indeed, assume without loss of generality that $0 \leq x < y$. Then $y - x \in \Gamma_{\omega, > 0}$ and $y - x \leq y < \Gamma_{\nu, > 0}$, that is, $y - x \notin \Gamma_\nu$.

By Lemma 4.4, if ω/ν is an extension of valuations, then for the extension of Henselizations ω^h/ν^h , we have $e(\omega|\nu) = e(\omega^h|\nu^h)$, $f(\omega|\nu) = f(\omega^h|\nu^h)$ and $\epsilon(\omega|\nu) = \epsilon(\omega^h|\nu^h)$ because Henselizations do not alter value groups

and residue fields. In addition, one can use the isomorphism of part (6) of Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 4.1 to conclude that $L \otimes_K K^h$ is a finite product of fields, one of which coincides with L^h , the fraction field of \mathcal{O}_ω^h . Thus,

$$[L^h : K^h] \leq [L : K] < \infty. \quad (4.7.1)$$

Using these observations we introduce the notion of the defect of ω/ν , which measures to what extent equality fails in (4.6.1), at least when ω is the unique extension of ν to L .

Definition 4.8. Let L/K be a finite field extension and ν be a valuation of K . If ω is the unique extension of ν to L , then the *defect of ω/ν* , denoted $d(\omega|\nu)$, is defined to be

$$d(\omega|\nu) = \frac{[L : K]}{e(\omega|\nu)f(\omega|\nu)}.$$

If the extension of valuations ω/ν is not necessarily unique, the *defect of ω/ν* is defined to be the defect of the extension of Henselizations ω^h/ν^h , that is,

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

We say ω/ν is *defectless* if $d(\omega|\nu) = 1$, that is, if $[L^h : K^h] = e(\omega|\nu)f(\omega|\nu)$.

Remark 4.9.

- (1) If L/K is a finite extension, then ω^h is the unique extension of ν^h to L^h by Corollary 4.2 and (4.7.1). Thus, the definition of the defect of an extension of valuations that is not necessarily unique in terms of the defect of the extension of henselizations makes sense.
- (2) If ω is the unique extension ν to L , then $d(\omega|\nu) = d(\omega^h|\nu^h)$. Thus, the two notions of defect are consistent for unique extensions of valuations. The only thing we need to check is that $[L^h : K^h] = [L : K]$. By Proposition 4.1 and uniqueness of the extension ω/ν , the integral closure of \mathcal{O}_ν in L must be \mathcal{O}_ω . Then by part (6) of Proposition 3.6 applied to $R = \mathcal{O}_\nu$ and $A = \mathcal{O}_\omega$, we get

$$\mathcal{O}_\omega \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h \cong \mathcal{O}_\omega^h.$$

Consequently, $L \otimes_K K^h \cong L^h$, and so, $[L^h : K^h] = [L : K]$.

- (3) If κ_ν has characteristic 0, then we always have $d(\omega|\nu) = 1$, and if κ_ν has characteristic $p > 0$, then $d(\omega|\nu) = p^n$, for some integer $n \geq 0$ [Kuh11, Pg. 280–281]. Thus, the notion of defect is only interesting in residue characteristic $p > 0$, that is, when \mathcal{O}_ν has prime or mixed characteristics. Furthermore, $d(\omega|\nu)$ is always a positive integer.
- (4) Rephrased in terms of defect, Conjecture 1.1 asserts that \mathcal{O}_ω is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν if and only if ω/ν is defectless and $e(\omega|\nu) = e(\omega|\nu)$.

Example 4.10. Let K be a field of characteristic $p > 0$ for which $[K : K^p] < \infty$ and ν be a valuation of K . If ν^p denotes the restriction of ν to the subfield K^p of K , then using pure inseparability of the extension K/K^p one can verify that ν is the unique extension of ν^p to K . Then

$$d(\nu|\nu^p) = \frac{[K : K^p]}{[\Gamma_\nu : p\Gamma_\nu][\kappa_\nu : \kappa_\nu^p]}.$$

The defect of ν/ν^p controls interesting properties of ν . For example, it is shown in [DS16, Proof of Thm. 5.1] (see also [Dat18, Cor. IV.23]) that if K is a function field of a variety over a ground field k , and ν is a valuation of K/k , then ν/ν^p is defectless if and only if ν is an Abhyankar valuation of K/k .

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We recall the statement of Theorem 1.2 for the reader's convenience.

Theorem 1.2. *Let L/K be a finite field extension. Suppose ω is a valuation of L with valuation ring $(\mathcal{O}_\omega, \mathfrak{m}_\omega, \kappa_\omega)$ and value group Γ_ω . Let ν be the restriction of ω to K with valuation ring $(\mathcal{O}_\nu, \mathfrak{m}_\nu, \kappa_\nu)$ and value group Γ_ν . Suppose the Henselization of \mathcal{O}_ω is \mathcal{O}_ω^h with fraction field L^h and that of \mathcal{O}_ν is \mathcal{O}_ν^h with fraction field K^h . The following are equivalent.*

- (i) \mathcal{O}_ω is essentially of finite presentation over \mathcal{O}_ν .
- (ii) \mathcal{O}_ω is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν .

- (iii) $[L^h : K^h] = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu][\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu]$ and $\epsilon(\omega/\nu) = [\Gamma_\omega : \Gamma_\nu]$.
- (iv) \mathcal{O}_ω^h is essentially of finite type over \mathcal{O}_ν^h .
- (v) \mathcal{O}_ω^h is a module finite \mathcal{O}_ν^h -algebra.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is clear, and (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) was established by Knaf [CN19, Thm. 4.1] (see also Remark 5.1). Since ω^h is the unique extension of ν^h to L^h by Corollary 4.2, the implication (iii) \Rightarrow (v) follows by [CN19, Cor. 2.2] because \mathcal{O}_ω^h is the integral closure of \mathcal{O}_ν^h in L^h . Furthermore, clearly (v) \Rightarrow (iv).

It remains to show that (v) \Rightarrow (i). Let A be the integral closure of \mathcal{O}_ν in L . By Proposition 4.1, let \mathfrak{m} be the unique maximal ideal of A such that

$$\mathcal{O}_\omega = A_{\mathfrak{m}}.$$

Let Σ be the collection of finite \mathcal{O}_ν -subalgebras B of A as in Corollary 3.7, and we let

$$\mathfrak{m}_B := \text{the maximal ideal } \mathfrak{m} \cap B \text{ of } B.$$

Then for all $B \in \Sigma$,

$$A_{\mathfrak{m}} \text{ dominates } B_{\mathfrak{m}_B} \text{ and } B_{\mathfrak{m}_B} \text{ dominates } \mathcal{O}_\nu.$$

By Lemma 3.3, let

$$\mathfrak{M} := \text{the unique prime (equivalently, maximal) ideal of } A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h \text{ that contracts to } \mathfrak{m}.$$

For all $B \in \Sigma$, let \mathfrak{M}_B denote the contraction of \mathfrak{M} to the \mathcal{O}_ν^h -subalgebra $B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h$ of $A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h$ (it is a subalgebra by flatness of \mathcal{O}_ν^h). Then by the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ B & \longrightarrow & B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h, \end{array}$$

and Lemma 3.3 again, \mathfrak{M}_B is the unique prime (equivalently, maximal) ideal of $B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h$ that contracts to the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_B of B .

By Corollary 3.7, for all $B \in \Sigma$,

$$(B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}$$

is a \mathcal{O}_ν^h -subalgebra of

$$(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}},$$

and

$$(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}} = \text{colim}_{B \in \Sigma} (B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}.$$

Note that the filtered colimit is a filtered union. By part (6) of Proposition 3.6, we have that

$$(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}} \cong (A_{\mathfrak{m}})^h = \mathcal{O}_\omega^h.$$

Since \mathcal{O}_ω^h is a module-finite \mathcal{O}_ν^h -algebra by the hypothesis of (v), we can find $B \in \Sigma$ such that

$$(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}} = (B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}.$$

Therefore $(B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}$ is a Henselian valuation ring, and by part (2) of Lemma 3.2, we conclude

$$(B_{\mathfrak{m}_B})^h \cong ((B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B})^h = (B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{M}_B}.$$

In other words, $(B_{\mathfrak{m}_B})^h$ is a valuation ring, so by descent (Lemma 4.6), $B_{\mathfrak{m}_B}$ is a valuation ring as well. By the definition of the collection Σ , we have

$$\text{Frac}(B_{\mathfrak{m}_B}) = \text{Frac}(B) = L,$$

that is, $B_{\mathfrak{m}_B}$ is a valuation ring of L . Since $\mathcal{O}_\omega = A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is also a valuation ring of L that dominates $B_{\mathfrak{m}_B}$, we must have

$$\mathcal{O}_\omega = B_{\mathfrak{m}_B}$$

because valuation rings are maximal with respect to domination of local rings. Thus, \mathcal{O}_ω is the localization of the finite \mathcal{O}_ν -algebra B . But B is \mathcal{O}_ν -flat since it is a torsion-free \mathcal{O}_ν -module [Bou98, Chap. VI, §3.6, Lem. 1]. Therefore, B is a finitely presented \mathcal{O}_ν -algebra by Lemma 2.1. This completes the proof of (v) \Rightarrow (i), hence also of the Theorem. \square

The proof of Theorem 1.2 establishes the stronger result that if conditions (1) and (2) of Conjecture 1.1 hold, then \mathcal{O}_ω is the localization of a finite \mathcal{O}_ν -algebra B contained in the integral closure of \mathcal{O}_ν in L . Since a finitely generated torsion-free module over a valuation ring is free, B is a free \mathcal{O}_ν -module of finite rank.

Remark 5.1. One can prove (i) \Rightarrow (v) (or, (ii) \Rightarrow (v)) using Zariski's Main Theorem. Suppose \mathcal{O}_ω is the localization of a finite type \mathcal{O}_ν -algebra B at a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} . Then

$$[\kappa(\mathfrak{p}) : \kappa_\nu] = [\kappa_\omega : \kappa_\nu] \leq [L : K] < \infty,$$

where the first inequality follows from (4.6.1). Moreover,

$$\dim(B_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{m}_\nu B_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \dim(\mathcal{O}_\omega/\mathfrak{m}_\nu \mathcal{O}_\omega) = 0$$

because \mathfrak{m}_ω is the only prime ideal of \mathcal{O}_ω that contracts to \mathfrak{m}_ν (if not, a non-maximal prime of \mathcal{O}_ω that contracts to \mathfrak{m}_ν will give a non-maximal prime of the integral closure A of \mathcal{O}_ν in L that contracts to the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_ν). Thus, B is quasi-finite at \mathfrak{p} by part (6) of [Sta20, Tag 00PK]. Then Zariski's Main Theorem [Sta20, Tag 00QB] implies that there exists a finite \mathcal{O}_ν -subalgebra B' of B such that \mathcal{O}_ω is a localization of B' at a maximal ideal \mathfrak{q} of B' (\mathfrak{q} is maximal because it contracts to \mathfrak{m}_ν). By Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{O}_\omega^h = (B')_{\mathfrak{q}}^h$ is the Henselization of $(B' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{Q}}$, where \mathfrak{Q} is the unique prime ideal of $B' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h$ that contracts to \mathfrak{q} . But \mathfrak{q} is maximal, so \mathfrak{Q} is a maximal ideal as well by Lemma 3.3. Since $B' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h$ is a finite \mathcal{O}_ν^h -algebra, it decomposes as a finite product of finite Henselian local rings [Sta20, Tag 04GG]. Then $(B' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ must coincide with one these local factors, that is, $(B' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ is Henselian and finite. Consequently, $\mathcal{O}_\omega^h \cong ((B' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{Q}})^h = (B' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\nu} \mathcal{O}_\nu^h)_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ is a finite \mathcal{O}_ν^h -algebra, proving (v). Once we know that \mathcal{O}_ω^h is a module-finite \mathcal{O}_ν^h algebra, part (iii) of Theorem 1.2 now follows by [Bou98, Chap. VI, §8.5, Thm. 2]. This gives a different proof of [CN19, Thm. 4.1].

REFERENCES

- [Bou98] N. Bourbaki, *Commutative Algebra. Chapters 1-7*, Translated from the French, Reprint of the 1989 English translation. Elements of Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1998), pp. xxiv+625. MR1727221 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5.1
- [CN19] S.D. Cutkosky and J. Novakoski, *Essentially finite generation of extensions of valuation rings in terms of classical invariants*, arXiv:1907.01859, July 2019. *To appear in Math. Nachrichten.* 1, 1, 5, 5.1
- [Cut19] S.D. Cutkosky, *Essential finite generation of valuation rings in characteristic zero algebraic function fields*, arXiv:1912.03546, Dec. 2019. 1
- [Cut20] ———, *Local uniformization of Abhyankar valuations*, arXiv:2003.06374, Dec. 2020. 1
- [Dat18] R. Datta, *A tale of valuation rings in prime characteristic*, Ph.D. thesis (2018), <http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/146066>, viii+195 pp. 4.10
- [DS16] R. Datta and K.E. Smith, *Frobenius and valuation rings*, Algebra Number Theory **10**(5) (2016), pp. 1057–1090. MR3531362. 4.10
- [KK05] H. Knaf and F.-V. Kuhlmann, *Abhyankar places admit local uniformization in any characteristic*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **38**(6) (2005), pp. 833–846. MR2216832. 1
- [KK09] ———, *Every place admits local uniformization in a finite extension of the function field*, Adv. Math. **221**(2) (2009), pp. 428–453. MR2508927. 1
- [KN14] F.V. Kuhlmann and J. Novakoski, *Henselian elements*, J. Algebra **418** (2014), pp. 44–65. MR3250440. 1
- [Kuh11] F.V. Kuhlmann, *The defect*, Commutative algebra—Noetherian and non-Noetherian perspectives, Springer, New York (2011), pp. 277–318. MR2762515 3
- [Nag75] M. Nagata, *Local Rings*, Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., Huntington, N.Y., Corrected reprint (1975), pp. xiii+234. MR0460307. 3
- [RG71] M. Raynaud and L. Gruson, *Critères de platitude et de projectivité. Techniques de “platification” d’un module*, Invent. Math. **13** (1971), pp. 1–89. MR308104. 2.1
- [Sta20] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2020. 1, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 4, 5.1