

Duality for differential modules over complete non-archimedean valuation fields of characteristic zero

Shun Ohkubo *

April 26, 2024

Abstract

Let K be a complete non-archimedean valuation field of characteristic 0, with non-trivial valuation, equipped with (possibly multiple) commuting bounded derivations. We prove a decomposition theorem for finite differential modules over K , where decompositions regarding the extrinsic subsidiary ∂ -generic radii of convergence in the sense of Kedlaya-Xiao. Our result is a refinement of a previous decomposition theorem due to Kedlaya and Xiao. As a key step in the proof, we prove a decomposition theorem in a stronger form in the case where K is equipped with a single derivation. To achieve this goal, we construct an object $f_{0*}L_0$ representing the usual dual functor and study some filtrations of $f_{0*}L_0$, which is used to construct the direct summands appearing in our decomposition theorem.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	5
2.1	The category $Mod(A, Mod(B))$ and $Mod(A)$ -valued bifunctor . .	5
2.2	A base change lemma	6
2.3	The categories $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ and $Mod(R\langle T \rangle)$	6
2.4	More constructions	9
3	Duality	11
3.1	Subrings of the ring of formal power series	11
3.2	Kedlaya-Xiao morphism	12
3.3	The representability of the dual functor by $f_{0*}L_0$	13
3.4	The natural transformation $c : id_{Mod(K\langle T \rangle)} \rightarrow DD$	15

*Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Furocho, Chikusaku, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan. E-mail address: shun.ohkubo@gmail.com

4	The functors $F_{\pm}$	17
4.1	Subobjects of $f_{0*}L_0$	17
4.2	Definition of $F_{\pm}$	17
4.3	Example 1: Robba's construction	19
4.4	Example 2: Subrings of the ring of formal power series	20
4.5	Calculation of F_{π}	22
4.6	An analogue of Dwork's transfer theorem	24
5	A decomposition theorem in $Mod^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ when $p(K) > 0$	27
5.1	The injectivities of $f_{r*}L_r$ and $f_{r+*}L_{r+}$ when $p(K) > 0$	27
5.2	Statement and proof of the decomposition theorem when $p(K) > 0$	29
6	A decomposition theorem in $Mod^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ when $p(K) = 0$	31
7	Base change property of the function $m(-)$ and a rationality result	32
7.1	A base change property of the function m	32
7.2	A rationality result	34
8	A decomposition theorem in $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$	34
8.1	Basic definition	35
8.2	The functor $F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}$	36
8.3	Statement and proof of the decomposition theorem	36

1 Introduction

In this paper, we prove a decomposition theorem of finite differential modules over a complete non-archimedean valuation field K of characteristic 0, with non-trivial valuation, equipped with multiple commuting derivations, which are non-zero and bounded with respect to the given valuation. Precisely speaking, our decomposition is regarding the extrinsic subsidiary ∂ -generic radii of convergence in the sense of [11], which is an invariant generalizing the generic radii of convergence introduced by Dwork.

Let us state the main result of this paper. Let K be as above, $||$ denote the valuation of K , ∂_j for $j \in J$ with $J \neq \emptyset$ the derivations on K , which are commutative each other. Let $p(K)$ denote the characteristic of the residue field of K . We set $\omega(K) = |p(K)|^{1/(p(K)-1)}$ if $p(K) > 0$ and $\omega(K) = 1$ if $p(K) = 0$. We assume that the derivations ∂_j are bounded, i.e., the action of ∂_j on K has a finite operator norm. Let $r(K, \partial_j)$ denote the ratio $\omega(K)/|\partial_j|_{sp, K}$, where $|\partial_j|_{sp, K}$ denotes the spectral norm of the action of ∂_j on K . A finite differential module over K is a finite dimensional vector space over K equipped with a family of commuting differential operators relative to ∂_j for $j \in J$. For each $j \in J$, we can define the extrinsic subsidiary ∂_j -generic radii of convergence, by encoding the spectral norms of the differential operator relative to ∂_j , which is a set of $\dim V$ real numbers r with multiplicity taking values in $(0, r(K, \partial_j)]$. For each J -tuple $r_J = (r_j) \in \prod_{j \in J} (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$, there exists a maximum subspace

V_{r_J} of V such that for $j \in J$, V_{r_J} is stable under the action of ∂_j and the extrinsic subsidiary ∂_j -generic radii of convergence of V_{r_J} consists only of r_j 's.

Theorem 1.1. *Let V be a finite differential module over K .*

1. *There exist only finitely many $r_J \in \Pi_{j \in J}(0, r(K, \partial_j)]$ such that $V_{r_J} \neq 0$.*
2. *The obvious morphism $\bigoplus_{r_J \in \Pi_{j \in J}(0, r(K, \partial_j)]} V_{r_J} \rightarrow V$ is an isomorphism.*

Besides the above result, we also prove a base change property and a rationality result in an appropriate sense.

The decomposition in Theorem 1.1 is a refinement of the one stated in [11, Theorem 1.5.6], where $\#J < +\infty$ is assumed and the direct summands V_r are parametrized by $r \in (0, 1]$. Hence our decomposition can be applied to differential modules, which cannot be decomposed by previous decomposition results. Even in the case $\#J = 1$ and $p(K) > 0$, Theorem 1.1 is known only in the case where K is of rational type in the sense of [11] such as the completion of $\mathbb{Q}_p(X)$ with respect of some Gauss valuation equipped with derivation given by d/dX .

Decompositions as in Theorem 1.1 in the case of $p(K) > 0$ are studied in a context of p -adic differential equations by Dwork-Robba, Christol-Dwork, Kedlaya-Xiao, and Poineau-Pulita and so on ([6, 5, 11, 13]). Beside applications to p -adic differential equations, variations of such decompositions plays a fundamental role in the study of differential Swan conductors due to Kedlaya, Xiao ([9, 16]). Even in the case of $p(K) = 0$, related decompositions appear in the study of Hukuhara-Levelt-Turrittin type decompositions in the sense of Kedlaya ([8]).

Technical aspects

In the course of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we introduce an essential idea on a duality of differential modules over K in the case of $\#J = 1$.

Let us start with noting the subtlety in the proof of Theorem 1.1 occurring only in the case of $\#J > 1$. For a non-zero finite differential module over K , even if we have a nice decomposition $V = \bigoplus V_r$ regarding a single derivation ∂_j , it is not clear that the direct summands V_r are stable under the action of the other $\partial_{j'}$'s as they are not K -linear.

To overcome this difficulty, we prove Theorem 1.1 in the case of $\#J = 1$ in a stronger form so that we can prove Theorem 1.1. In the rest of the introduction, we consider only in the case of $\#J = 1$. We consider the category $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ of left modules over the ring $K\langle T \rangle$ of twisted polynomials over K instead of the category of differential modules over (K, ∂) , which are isomorphic to each other. We have a contravariant endofunctor D_0 on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ called a dual functor, which is constructed in an obvious way. The key ingredient in this paper is the object $f_{0*}L_0$ in the category $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle, \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle))$ of a left $K\langle T \rangle$ -objects in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, which “represents” D_0 . The construction of $f_{0*}L_0$ can be done by using a variant f_0 of the morphism f_{gen}^* introduced by Kedlaya-Xiao. We define a new dual functor D by $\text{Hom}(-, f_{0*}L_0)$. The underlying abelian group of $f_{0*}L_0$ is the direct product $K_+^{\mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathbb{N}$ -copies of the underlying

abelian group K_+ of K . Hence we can construct subobjects M_λ of $f_{0*}L_0$ by considering some convergence conditions on the formal power series $\sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i X^i$ associated to $(a_i) \in K_+^{\mathbb{N}}$. This part can be regarded as a generalization of the theory of Dwork-Robba. Then we study the differential modules of the form $\text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda)$ for $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, where we exploit a techniques developed by Dwork-Robba, Christol, and Poineau-Pulita ([6, 4, 13]). Then we regard $\text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda)$ and $\text{Hom}(DM, M_\lambda)$ as submodules of $\text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0) = DM$ and $\text{Hom}(DM, f_{0*}L_0) = DDM$ respectively. As in the case of vector spaces, we can define submodules F_-M and F_+M of M corresponding to the above two submodules respectively. By varying M_λ , we obtain submodules $F_{(0,r]}M$ and $F_{[r,r(K,\partial)]}M$ of M for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. We define $F_{[r,r]}M := F_{(0,r]}M \cap F_{[r,r(K,\partial)]}M$ and prove the desired decomposition $M \cong \bigoplus F_{[r,r]}M$.

By using the results explained as above, we prove Theorem 1.1 for all K satisfying the conditions in the beginning of the paper. However, we do not know, at this point, how to prove our rationality result by our method only. To prove our rationality result, we exploit a consequence of a theory of Christol-Dwork ([5]) after embedding K into another K' of rational type in the sense of [11], where the theory of Christol-Dwork is applicavle.

Acknowledgement

The author thanks Kiran Kedlaya for correspondence on the paper [11]. This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 22K03227 and Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 17K14161.

Notation and convention

In this paper, a ring is an associative ring with unit. When X is a ring, a field, or a left R -module for some ring R , unless otherwise is mentioned, we denote by X_+ the underlying abelian group of X in an obvious sense. For an abelian group A and a set S , we denote by A^S (resp. $A^{(S)}$) the abelian group of families $(a_i)_i$ in A indexed by S (resp. such that $a_i = 0$ for all but finitely many $i \in S$), where $(a_i)_i$ is denoted by (a_i) for simplicity. When X is an abelian group, a ring, a field, or a left R -module M , to denote an element x of the underlying set of M , we write $x \in M$ for simplicity.

When X is an abelian group, a ring, a field, or a left R -module for some ring R , X_u denote the underlying set of X . Furthermore, an ultrametric function $|| : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ refers to a morphism $|| : X_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of sets such that $|x - y| \leq \max\{|x|, |y|\}$ and $|0| = 0$ for $x, y \in X$. Assume $||^{-1}(\{0\}) = \{0\}$ and $X \neq 0$. Let $f : X_u \rightarrow X_u$ be a map such that there exists $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|f(x)| \leq C|x|$ for $x \in X$. We define the operator norm of f by $|f|_{op} = \sup\{|f(x)|/|x|; x \in X_u, x \neq 0\}$. Moreover we define the spectral norm of f by $|f|_{sp} = \inf\{|f^i|_{op}^{1/i}; i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}\}$. When would like to specify X , we denote $|f|_{op}, |f|_{sp}$ by $|f|_{op,X}, |f|_{sp,X}$ respectively.

Although Theorem 1.1 concerns finite differential modules when the base field K is equipped with (possibly) multiple derivations $\{\partial_j\}_{j \in J}$, except the last

section, we restrict to the case $\#J = 1$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall basic notions on categories and basic definitions and results on the category $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ of differential modules over differential rings R equipped with a single derivation ∂ .

2.1 The category $Mod(A, Mod(B))$ and $Mod(A)$ -valued bi-functor

We recall basic definitions on categories and modules. See [12] for details.

In this paper, unless otherwise is mentioned, a category is assumed to be locally small. Let $\mathcal{A}b$ denote the category of abelian groups. Let A be a ring and $\mathcal{C}$ an abelian category. We define the category $Mod(A, \mathcal{C})$ of left A -objects in the category $\mathcal{C}$. An object is a pair (X, ρ) , where $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\rho : A \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ is a ring homomorphism. A morphism $(X', \rho') \rightarrow (X, \rho)$ is a morphism $\alpha : X' \rightarrow X$ such that $\alpha \circ (\rho'(a)) = (\rho(a)) \circ \alpha$ for $a \in A$. We denote an object (X, ρ) of $Mod(A, \mathcal{C})$ by X when no confusion arises. The category $Mod(A, \mathcal{C})$ is an abelian category. We define the category $Mod(A)$ of left A -modules by $Mod(A, \mathcal{A}b)$, which coincides with the usual one. We will study the category of the form $Mod(A, Mod(B))$ with B a ring. In terms of [2, II, §1.14], an object of $Mod(A, Mod(B))$ is a (left) $((A, B), ())$ -multimodule. For an abelian category $\mathcal{D}$ and a functor $F : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow Mod(A)$, we denote by F_+ the functor given by the composition $()_+ F$.

Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be abelian categories and $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ a covariant functor. We define the functor $Mod(A, F) : Mod(A, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow Mod(A, \mathcal{D})$ associated to F , which is denoted by F if no confusion arises, by defining $Mod(A, F)(X, \rho) = (FX, F\rho)$ for $(X, \rho) \in Mod(A, \mathcal{C})$, where we define $(F\rho)(a) = F(\rho(a))$ for $a \in A$, and defining $Mod(A, F)\alpha = F\alpha$ for $\alpha : (X', \rho') \rightarrow (X, \rho)$ a morphism in $Mod(A, \mathcal{C})$. Let $T : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$ be an additive bifunctor which is contravariant in the first variable and covariant in the second one. Let $(X, \rho) \in Mod(A, \mathcal{C})$. Then $T(Y, X)$ for $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ is regarded as a left A -module via the ring homomorphism $A \rightarrow \text{End}(T(Y, X)); a \mapsto T(Y, \rho(a))$. For morphisms $\alpha : X' \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\beta : Y' \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{D}$, $T(\beta, \alpha)$ defines a morphism $T(Y', X) \rightarrow T(Y, X')$ in $Mod(A)$. In this way, T induces a bifunctor $\mathcal{D} \times Mod(A, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow Mod(A)$, which is denoted by T if no confusion arises. In this paper, we mainly consider the case where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D} = Mod(B)$ for some ring B and $T = \text{Hom}$. In this case, $\text{Hom} : Mod(B) \times Mod(A, Mod(B)) \rightarrow Mod(A)$ is additive and left exact as the forgetful functor $Mod(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$ is faithful.

For a ring homomorphism $f : R \rightarrow S$, we denote by $f^* : Mod(R) \rightarrow Mod(S)$, $f_* : Mod(S) \rightarrow Mod(R)$ the pull-back and push-out functors respectively: for a left S -module $N = (N_+, \rho)$, $f_* N$ is the left R -module given by $(N_+, f_* \rho)$, where we define $f_* \rho = \rho \circ f$. Let $\eta : f^* f_* \rightarrow id_{Mod(S)}$, $\varepsilon : id_{Mod(S)} \rightarrow$

f_*f^* denote the counit and unit for the adjoint functor (f^*, f_*) , which are natural transformations defined in an obvious way ([2, II,5.2]).

Finally we recall some terminology on natural transformations.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an abelian category. An endofunctor on $\mathcal{C}$ is a (covariant or contravariant) functor whose domain and codomain are $\mathcal{C}$. Let $F, G, H : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be endofunctors on $\mathcal{C}$, and $T : F \rightarrow G, S : G \rightarrow H$ natural transformations. We define the natural transformation $S \cdot T : F \rightarrow H$ by $(S \cdot T)_X = S_X \circ T_X$ for $X \in \mathcal{C}$. We call $S \cdot T$ the vertical composition of T followed by S .

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an abelian category. For $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ endofunctors on $\mathcal{C}$, and $T : F \rightarrow G, S : F \rightarrow G$ natural transformations, we define the natural transformation $S + T : F \rightarrow G$ by $(S + T)_X = S_X + T_X$ for $X \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an abelian category, $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ an endofunctor, which is assumed to be representable. By Yoneda's lemma, the class of natural transformations $\text{End}(F)$ forms a ring where the addition and multiplication given by $+, \cdot$ respectively defined as above.

2.2 A base change lemma

Definition 2.1. Let A, B, C, D be rings, $f : C \rightarrow D, g : A \rightarrow B, i : A \rightarrow C, j : B \rightarrow D$ ring homomorphism such that $j \circ g = f \circ i$. Let $\eta : id_{Mod(B)} \rightarrow j_*j^*$ be the unit for the adjoint functor (j^*, j_*) , and $\epsilon : i^*i_* \rightarrow id_{Mod(C)}$ the counit for the adjoint functor (i^*, i_*) , and $\varphi : j^*g^* \rightarrow f^*i^*$ the natural isomorphism defined by the vertical composition $j^*g^* \rightarrow (j \circ g)^* \rightarrow (f \circ i)^* \rightarrow f^*i^*$, where each arrow is an obvious one. We define the natural transformation $\delta : g^*i_* \rightarrow j_*f^*$ as the vertical composition $(j_*f^*\epsilon) \cdot (j_*\varphi i_*) \cdot (\eta g^*i_*) : g^*i_* \rightarrow j_*j^*g^*i_* \rightarrow j_*f^*i^*i_* \rightarrow j_*f^*$. For $M \in Mod(C)$, we have $\delta_M : g^*i_*M \rightarrow j_*f^*M$ coincides with the unique morphism satisfying, for $x \in M$, $\delta_M(1 \otimes x) = 1 \otimes x$. We consider left B -modules $B \otimes C, D$, where we regard B as a (B, A) -bimodule via id_B, g respectively, C as a left A -module via i , and D as a left B -module via j . We define the morphism $\delta_0 : B \otimes C \rightarrow D$ in $Mod(B)$ as the unique morphism satisfying, for $b \in B, c \in C$, $\delta_0(b \otimes c) = j(b)f(c)$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let notation be as above. Assume that δ_0 is an isomorphism. Then $\delta : g^*i_* \rightarrow j_*f^*$ is a natural isomorphism.*

Proof. We prove δ_C is an isomorphism. Let $\alpha : D \rightarrow j_*f^*C$ be the isomorphism defined by $\alpha(d) = d \otimes 1$. Since we have $g^*i_*C = B \otimes C$ by definition and $\delta_C = \alpha \circ \delta_0$, δ_C is an isomorphism.

Let $M \in Mod(C)$ be arbitrary. Let $\cdots \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow M$ be a free resolution of M . Since g^*i_* and j_*f^* commute with direct sum, $\delta_{P_1}, \delta_{P_2}$ are isomorphisms. By the right exactness of g^*i_* and j_*f^* , δ_M is an isomorphism. $\square$

2.3 The categories $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ and $Mod(R\langle T \rangle)$

We recall basic definitions and results on differential modules over differential rings in a point of view of categories. See [10, 11] for detail.

A differential ring is a commutative ring R equipped with a derivation, i.e., a morphism $\partial : R_+ \rightarrow R_+$ in $\mathcal{A}b$ satisfying $\partial(r' \cdot r) = \partial(r') \cdot r + r' \cdot \partial(r)$ for $r', r \in R$. The category of differential modules over R , which is denoted by $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ in this paper, is as follows. An object of $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ is an R -module V equipped a morphism $\partial : V_+ \rightarrow V_+$ in $\mathcal{A}b$ satisfying $\partial(r \cdot v) = \partial(r) \cdot v + r \cdot \partial(v)$ for $r \in R, v \in V$; a morphism of $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ is a morphism $\alpha : V' \rightarrow V$ in $\text{Mod}(R)$ such that $\alpha(\partial(v')) = \partial(\alpha(v'))$ for $v' \in V'$. The category $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ is an abelian category, where the addition $\text{Hom}(V', V) \times \text{Hom}(V', V) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(V', V)$ is given by $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(v') = \alpha_1(v') + \alpha_2(v')$ for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \text{Hom}(V', V), v' \in V'$. We define the forgetful functor $(\cdot)_+ : \mathcal{D}(R, \partial) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$ by, for $V \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$, defining V_+ as the underlying abelian group of V (we forget the derivation), and, for a morphism $\alpha : V' \rightarrow V$, defining $(\alpha)_+$ as α itself. The forgetful functor $(\cdot)_+$ is obviously faithful and exact.

Definition 2.3. We define the object $G(R, \partial) \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$, denoted by G if no confusion arises, as the left R -module given by $(R_+^{(\mathbb{N})}, \xi : R \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(R_+^{(\mathbb{N})}); c \mapsto ((q_i)_i \mapsto (cq_i)_i))$ equipped with the differential operator given by $\partial((q_i)_i) = (\partial(q_i) + q_{i-1})_i$, where we set $q_{-1} = 0$. Let $\text{Hom}(G(R, \partial), -) : \mathcal{D}(R, \partial) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$ be the covariant morphism functor given by $G(R, \partial)$. Let $e = (1, 0, 0, \dots) \in G(R, \partial)_+$. We define the natural transformations $\varphi : \text{Hom}(G(R, \partial), -) \rightarrow (-)_+, \psi : (-)_+ \rightarrow \text{Hom}(G(R, \partial), -)$. We define φ as the natural transformation corresponding to $e \in G(R, \partial)_+$ in the sense of Yoneda's lemma. Precisely speaking, φ_V for $V \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ coincides with $\varphi_V : \text{Hom}(G(R, \partial), V) \rightarrow V_+; c \mapsto s(e)$. We define ψ_V for $V \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ by $\psi_V(x)((q_i)) = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} q_i \partial^i(x)$ for $x \in V, (q_i) \in G(R, \partial)$. We can easily verify that φ and ψ are inverse each other. Consequently, $G(R, \partial)$ is a projective generator for $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ ([12, Proposition 15.3]).

Definition 2.4. We have the isomorphisms $\psi_G : G_+ \rightarrow \text{Hom}(G, G), \varphi_G : \text{Hom}(G, G) \rightarrow G_+$ with inverse each other. Let $\cdot : G_+ \times G_+ \rightarrow G_+$ denote the bilinear map given by $x \cdot y = \varphi_G(\psi_G(y) \circ \psi_G(x))$. Then ψ_G, φ_G define ring isomorphisms $(G_+, \cdot) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(G, G)^{op}, \text{Hom}(G, G)^{op} \rightarrow (G_+, \cdot)$ respectively inverse each other. By a straightforward calculation, we have $(q'_i)_i \cdot (q_i)_i = (\sum_{j=0}^i \sum_{h \geq j} q'_h \binom{h}{j} \partial^{h-j}(q_{i-j}))_i$ for $(q'_i)_i, (q_i)_i \in G_+$. Hence the ring $(G_+, \cdot)$ is nothing but the ring of twisted polynomials associated to the differential ring R in the sense of [10, Definition 5.5.1]. Hence we call the ring $(G_+, \cdot)$ the ring of twisted polynomials associated to (R, ∂) , which is denoted by $R\langle T \rangle$. Thus we denote $(G_+, \cdot)$ by $R\langle T \rangle$. We use the twisted polynomial notation: we set $T = (0, 1, 0, \dots) \in R\langle T \rangle$. We define the ring homomorphism $i : R \rightarrow R\langle T \rangle$ by $i(q) = (q, 0, \dots)$ for $q \in R$. Then, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $i(q)T^j = (0, \dots, 0, q, 0, \dots)$, where q sits at the j -th entry, and we can express $(q_i) \in R\langle T \rangle$ as $x = \sum_{i=0}^n i(q_i)T^i$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies the condition that $q_j = 0$ for $j > n$. Consequently, $R\langle T \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i(R) \cup \{T\}$ as a ring.

Definition 2.5. Let $M \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$. Assume that i_*M is finite free. For simplicity, $e_1, \dots, e_m \in M$ is a basis of M if $e_1, \dots, e_m$ is a basis of i_*M . An arbitrary $x \in M$ is uniquely expressed as $\sum_{i=0}^m i(c_j) \cdot e_j$ with $c_1, \dots, c_m \in R$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the matrix $G_k = (g_{k,ij}) \in M_m(R)$ by $T^k \cdot e_k = \sum_{h=1}^m i(g_{k,ij}) \cdot e_h$

for all k . We repeat a similar construction for $M' \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$ such that i_*M' is finite free with a basis $e'_1, \dots, e'_n \in M'$. Let $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ be a morphism. We define the matrix $X \in M_{mn}(R)$ by $\alpha(e_k) = \sum_{h=1}^n i(x_{kh}) \cdot e'_h$ for all k . Then we have $XG'_1 + \partial(X) = G_1X$.

Definition 2.6. Since the forgetful functor $()_+ : \mathcal{D}(R, \partial) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$ is representable by G , the class $\text{End}(()_+)$ of natural transformations $()_+ \rightarrow ()_+$ is a ring by Yoneda's lemma. We define the ring homomorphism $\rho : R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}(()_+)$ by the vertical composition $\rho(x) = \varphi \cdot \text{Hom}(\psi_G(x), -) \cdot \psi : ()_+ \rightarrow ()_+$ for $x \in R\langle T \rangle$. For $V \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$, we define the ring homomorphism $\rho_V : R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(V_+)$ by $\rho_V(x) = \rho(x)_V$ for $x \in R\langle T \rangle$. At this point, we can prove Lemma 2.7 below, which asserts the ring $R\langle T \rangle$ satisfies a universal property.

We define the functor $\mathbf{M} : \mathcal{D}(R, \partial) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$ by $\mathbf{M}V = (V_+, \rho_V)$ for $V \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ and $\mathbf{M}\alpha = \alpha$ for a morphism $\alpha : V' \rightarrow V$. We define the functor $\mathbf{V} : \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ by $\mathbf{V}M = i_*M \in \text{Mod}(R)$ for $M \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$ equipped with the differential operator given by $\rho(T) \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}((i_*M)_+) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(M_+)$ and $\mathbf{V}\alpha = i_*\alpha$ for a morphism $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$. We have $\mathbf{V} \circ \mathbf{M} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)}$ and $\mathbf{M} \circ \mathbf{V} = \text{id}_{\text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)}$ by using Lemma 2.7. Let $V \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ and $\xi : R \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(V_+)$ denote the left R -module structure of V . Then, in $\text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}((\mathbf{M}V)_+) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(V_+)$, we have $\xi(c) = \rho_V(i(c))$ for $c \in R$ and $\rho(T) \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}((\mathbf{M}V)_+) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(V_+)$ coincides with the differential operator of V .

Lemma 2.7. *Let R be a differential ring. We consider the data (U, μ, u) where U is a ring, $\mu : R \rightarrow U$ is a ring homomorphism, $u \in U$ such that $u \cdot \mu(r) = \mu(r) \cdot u + \mu(\partial(r))$ for $r \in R$. Then there exists a unique ring homomorphism $f : R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow U$ such that $\mu = f \circ i$ and $f(T) = u$. Moreover, we have $f((q_i)) = \sum_i \mu(q_i)u^i$ for $(q_i) \in R\langle T \rangle$.*

The ring homomorphism $f : R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow U$ is called the ring homomorphism corresponding to the data (U, μ, u) .

Proof. The uniqueness follows from the fact that $R\langle T \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i(R) \cup \{T\}$ as a ring. We define the object $MU' \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ by μ_*U equipped with the differential operator given by the left multiplication by $u \in U$. Let $\rho : R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(U_+)$ denote the structure morphism of MU' . We define the ring homomorphism $\tau : U \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(U_+)$ by $\tau(x)(y) = x \cdot y$ for $x, y \in U_+$. Then τ is an injection by $\tau(x)(1) = x$ for $x \in U_+$. We have $\tau \circ \mu = \rho \circ i$, $\rho(T) = \tau(u)$ by the definition of the functor M . Since $R\langle T \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i(R) \cup \{T\}$ as a ring, we have $\rho(R\langle T \rangle) \subset \tau(U)$. Hence there exists a unique ring homomorphism f such that $\rho = \tau \circ f$. We can easily see that f satisfies the desired condition. $\square$

Lemma 2.8. *Let notation be as above. Assume R is a field.*

1. *The ring $R\langle T \rangle$ is an integral domain.*
2. *The ring admits a left (resp. right) division theorem. Consequently, any left (resp. right) ideal of $R\langle T \rangle$ is principal. For any non-zero left (resp. right) ideal of $R\langle T \rangle$, there exists uniquely a generator $P \in R\langle T \rangle$ of the form $P = T^i + \sum_{j < i} q_j T^j$ with $i \in \mathbb{N}$.*

3. Let $P \in R\langle T \rangle$ be non-zero. We write $P = q_i T^i + \sum_{j < i} q_j T^j$ with $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q_i \in R^\times$. Then $\dim i_*(R\langle T \rangle / R\langle T \rangle \cdot P) = i$.
4. Let $M \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$. Then M is of finite length if and only if $i_* M$ is of finite dimension.
5. Let $M \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$ be of finite length. Then there exists an exact sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$. As a consequence of part 1, the second morphism is given by the multiplication by some element $P \in R\langle T \rangle$ by right.

Proof. See [10, Proposition 5.2, Theorem 5.3, Remark 5.5] for parts 1, 2, 5. Part 3 is proved by using the left division theorem. To see part 4, note that $R\langle T \rangle$ is not irreducible as a left $R\langle T \rangle$ -module by $0 \subsetneq R\langle T \rangle \cdot T \subsetneq R\langle T \rangle$. $\square$

Definition 2.9. 1. We regard the R -module R as a left R -object in $\text{Mod}(R)$ via the ring homomorphism $R \rightarrow \text{End}(R_+); x \mapsto (y \mapsto x \cdot y)$ given by the multiplication on R . Let $M \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$. Let $\xi : R \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(\text{Hom}(i_* M, R))$ be the ring homomorphism defined by the left R -structure on R . Let $u \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(\text{Hom}(i_* M, R))$ be the endomorphism defined by $u(\chi)(m) = \partial(\chi(m)) - \chi(T \cdot m)$ for $\chi \in \text{Hom}(i_* M, R)$ and $m \in M$. Then the data $(\text{End}(\text{Hom}(i_* M, R)), \xi, u)$ satisfies a compatibility condition as in 2.7. We define $D_0 M$ as the left $R\langle T \rangle$ -module given by $\text{Hom}(i_* M, R) \in \mathcal{A}b$ equipped with the ring homomorphism $R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(\text{Hom}(i_* M, R))$ corresponding to the above data obtained in this way. We can see that for a morphism $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$, the morphism $\text{Hom}(i_* \alpha, R)$ defines a morphism $D_0 M \rightarrow D_0 M'$. By definition, $(D_0 M)_+ = \text{Hom}(i_* M, R)$ and we have $(i(r) \cdot \chi)(m) = r \cdot \chi(m)$ and $(T \cdot \chi)(m) = \partial(\chi(m)) - \chi(T \cdot m)$ for $q \in R$ and $\chi \in \text{Hom}(i_* M, R)$ and $m \in M$.

2. For $M \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$, we define the morphism $c_{0,M} : M \rightarrow D_0 D_0 M$ by $c_{0,M}(x)(\chi) = \chi(x)$ for $\chi \in D_0 M$ and $x \in M$.

Definition 2.10. We define the object $L(R, \partial) \in \text{Mod}(R\langle T \rangle)$ as $\mathbf{M}R$, where R is regarded as an object of $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial)$ in an obvious way. Note that we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow R\langle T \rangle \rightarrow L(R, \partial) \rightarrow 0$, where the second morphism is given by the right multiplication by T , the third one is given by the unique morphism sending $1 \in R\langle T \rangle$ to $1 \in L(R, \partial)_+ = R_+$.

2.4 More constructions

Let K be a complete non-archimedean valuation field of characteristic 0 with non-trivial valuation equipped with a bounded non-zero derivation. We define $p(K), \omega(K)$ as in the introduction.

We say that $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ is of finite dimension if $i_* M$ is of finite dimension $\text{Mod}(K)$. Let $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ denote the full subcategory of $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ consisting of objects of finite dimension. The category $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ is an abelian subcategory of $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$.

Definition 2.11. For $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, we define the map $m(M) : (0, r(K, \partial)] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. When $M = 0$, we define $m(M)(r) = 0$ for all r . When M is irreducible, we choose an ultrametric function $|\cdot| : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ which gives a norm on i_*M . Then we define $m(M)(r) = \dim M$ if $r = \omega(K)/|T \cdot|_{sp}$, where $T \cdot : M_+ \rightarrow M_+$ denotes the endomorphism on M_+ given by the left multiplication by T , and $m(M)(r) = 0$ otherwise. When M is arbitrary, let $\{M_j\}_{j \in S}$ be a finite family of objects in $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ such that the isomorphic class of $\{M_j\}_{j \in S}$ gives a Jordan-Holder factors of M with multiplicity. We define $m(M)(r) = \sum_{j \in S} m(M_j)(r)$ for all r . Note that $m(M)(r)$ coincides with the multiplicity of r (resp. $r/r(K, \partial)$) in the extrinsic (resp. intrinsic) subsidiary generic ∂ -radii of convergence ([11, Definition 1.2.8]). Hence $m(M)$ is a function possessing the same information as the extrinsic subsidiary generic ∂ -radii of convergence. It is known that the function $m(M)$ is independent of the choices of the $\{M_j\}$ and the ultrametric function. We define the support of $m(M)$ as $\text{supp } m(M) = \{r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]; m(M)(r) \neq 0\}$.

Lemma 2.12. Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$.

1. The support $\text{supp } m(M)$ is a finite set and $\#\text{supp } m(M) \leq \dim M$.
2. The function $M \mapsto m(M)$ is additive on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, where the addition of functions $m_1, m_2 : [0, r(K, \partial)) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ are given by $(m_1 + m_2)(r) = m_1(r) + m_2(r)$.
3. We have $\sum_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} m(M)(r) = \dim M$.
4. We have $m(D_0 M) = m(M)$.

Proof. Parts 1,3 are obvious. Parts 1,4 are [11, Lemma 1.2.9 (a),(b)] □

Definition 2.13. Let Y be a subset of $(0, r(K, \partial)]$. Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. We consider the subset $S(M; Y)$ of submodules of M consisting of M' such that $\text{supp } m(M') \subset Y$, which is equipped with the partial order with respect to the inclusion relation. For $M', M'' \in S(M; Y)$, the submodule $M' + M''$ of M generated by M' and M'' belongs to $S(M; Y)$ as $M' + M'' \cong (M' \oplus M'')/M' \cap M''$ and the additivity of $m(-)$. Since M is Artinian, there exists a maximal element N in $S(M; Y)$. For $M' \in S(M; Y)$, we have $M' \subset N$ by $N \subset M' + N$ and $M' + N \in S(M; Y)$. Hence N is the maximum element in $S(M; Y)$, which is denoted by $F_{sp, Y} M$. We have the canonical injection $F_{sp, Y} M \rightarrow M$ by definition, which is denoted by $I(Y)_M$.

Let $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ be a morphism in $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. By $\alpha(F_{sp, Y} M') \subset F_{sp, Y} M$, we can define a morphism $F_{sp, Y} \alpha : F_{sp, Y} M' \rightarrow F_{sp, Y} M$ in an obvious way. The function $F_{sp, Y}$ defines an endofunctor on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ and $I(Y)$ defines a natural transformation $F_{sp, Y} \rightarrow \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)}$.

Let $X = \{X_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a partition of $(0, r(K, \partial)]$. For $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, there exists finitely many $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $F_{sp, X_\lambda} M \neq 0$ by Lemma 2.12. Hence we can define the direct sum endofunctor $\oplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} F_{sp, X_\lambda}$ on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ and the natural transformation $I(X) : \oplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} F_{sp, X_\lambda} \rightarrow \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)}$ defined by the $I(X_\lambda)$'s in an obvious way.

Lemma 2.14. Let $X = \{X_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be as above.

1. The natural transformation $I(X)$ is a pointwise monomorphism, that is, $I(X)_M$ is a monomorphism for $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$.
2. For $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, the following are equivalent.
 - (a) The morphism $I(X)_M$ is an isomorphism.
 - (b) For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\dim F_{sp, X_\lambda} M \geq \sum_{r \in X_\lambda} m(M)(r)$.

Proof. 1. Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be distinct elements of Λ . Then $F_{sp, X_{\lambda_1}} M \cap (F_{sp, X_{\lambda_2}} M + \dots + F_{sp, X_{\lambda_n}} M) = 0$ since $\text{supp } m(F_{sp, X_{\lambda_1}} M \cap (F_{sp, X_{\lambda_2}} M + \dots + F_{sp, X_{\lambda_n}} M)) \subset \text{supp } m(F_{sp, X_{\lambda_1}} M) \cup \text{supp } m(F_{sp, X_{\lambda_2}} M + \dots + F_{sp, X_{\lambda_n}} M) \subset X_{\lambda_1} \cap (X_{\lambda_2} \cup \dots \cup X_{\lambda_n}) = \emptyset$.

2. Assume (a) holds. We have $m(M) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} m(F_{sp, X_\lambda} M)$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have $m(M)(r) = m(F_{sp, X_\lambda} M)(r)$ for $r \in X_\lambda$. Hence, $\dim F_{sp, X_\lambda} M = \sum_{r \in X_\lambda} m(F_{sp, X_\lambda} M)(r) = \sum_{r \in X_\lambda} m(M)(r)$.

Assume (b) holds. We have $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \dim F_{sp, X_\lambda} M \geq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{r \in X_\lambda} m(M)(r) = \sum_{r \in \cup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} X_\lambda} m(M)(r) = \sum_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} m(M)(r) = \dim M$. Hence $I(X)_M$ is an isomorphism by part 1. $\square$

We define the natural transformation $I_{sp} : \oplus_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} F_{sp, [r, r]} \rightarrow id_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)}$ by $I(X)$ for the family $X = \{[r, r]\}_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]}$. Note that, by Lemma 2.14, I_{sp} is a pointwise monomorphism. Also note that for $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, $I_{sp, M}$ is an isomorphism if and only if $\dim F_{sp, [r, r]} M \geq m(M)(r)$ for all $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$.

3 Duality

In this section, we construct a contravariant endofunctor D on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, which is represented by an object $f_{0*} L_0$ of $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle, \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle))$ and is naturally isomorphic to the endofunctor D_0 . We also construct a natural transformation $c : id_{\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)} \rightarrow DD$. We give calculations on D and c used in the rest of the paper.

Convention. In the rest of the paper, except the last section §8, let K be a complete non-archimedean valuation field of characteristic 0 equipped with a derivation, where the valuation $|\cdot|$ is non-trivial and the derivation is non-zero and bounded with respect to the valuations $|\cdot|$.

3.1 Subrings of the ring of formal power series

We recall the definition of various subrings defined in [10].

We define the ring $K[[X]]$ of formal power series over K as the abelian group $K_+^{\mathbb{N}}$ equipped with the multiplication given by the convolution. We use the notation $(a_i)_i$, (a_i) for simplicity, to denote an element of $K[[X]]$ rather than the power series notation $\sum_i a_i X^i$. Let $r \in (0, +\infty)$. Let $K[[X/r]]_0$ denote the subring of $K[[X]]$ consisting of (a_i) satisfying the condition $\sup_i |a_i| r^i < +\infty$. Let $K\{X/r\}$ be the subring of $K[[X]]$ defined by $\cap_{s \in (0, r)} K[[X/s]]_0$. Let $K\{X/r+\}$ be the subring of $K[[X]]$ defined by $\cup_{s \in (r, +\infty)} K[[X/s]]_0$. We have $K[[X/r]]_0 \subset$

$K\{X/r\} \subset K\{X/r+\}$ and, for $s \leq r$, $K[[X/r]]_0 \subset K[[X/s]]_0$, $K\{X/r\} \subset K\{X/s\}$, $K\{X/r+\} \subset K\{X/s+\}$. We define the r -Gauss valuation $||_r$ as the ultrametric function $| \cdot |_r : K[[X/r]]_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ given by $|(a_i)|_r = \sup_i |a_i| r^i$; the multiplicativity can be seen by $|(a_i) \cdot (b_i)|_r = \lim_{s \rightarrow r-0} |(a_i) \cdot (b_i)|_s = \lim_{s \rightarrow r-0} (|(a_i)|_s |(b_i)|_s) = \lim_{s \rightarrow r-0} |(a_i)|_s \lim_{s \rightarrow r-0} |(b_i)|_s$, where we regard $K[[X/r]]_0$ as a subring of the subring $K\langle X/s \rangle$ of $K[[X]]$ consisting of $(a_i) \in K_+^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $|a_i| r^i \rightarrow 0$ ($i \rightarrow +\infty$). Recall that a non-archimedean analogue of Hadamard formula for the radius of convergence holds, that is, for $(a_i) \in K[[X]]$, we have $(a_i) \in K\{X/r\}$ if and only if $1/\limsup_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}} |a_i|^{1/i}$, where we set $|0|^{1/i} = 0$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ and $1/+\infty = 0$ and $1/0 = +\infty$ (see [15, Chapter 6, §1, Proposition 1]: although K is assumed to be a subfield of $\mathbb{C}_p$ in the reference, the proof is valid for all K).

Let ∂_X be the derivation on $K[[X]]$ defined by $\partial_X((a_i)) = ((i+1)a_{i+1})$. The derivation ∂_X induces derivations on $K[[X/r]]_0$, $K\{X/r\}$, $K\{X/r+\}$, which we denote by ∂_X for simplicity.

We denote the left $K[[X]]\langle T \rangle$ -module $L(K[[X]], \partial_X)$ by L_0 . Similarly we denote the left $K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle$ -module $L(K\{X/r\}, \partial_X)$ (resp. $K[[X/r]]_0\langle T \rangle$ -module $L(K[[X/r]]_0, \partial_X)$, $K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle$ -module $L(K\{X/r+\}, \partial_X)$) by L_r (resp. $L_{r,bd}, L_{r+}$).

3.2 Kedlaya-Xiao morphism

We recall a ring homomorphism defined by Kedlaya-Xiao in [11] and give its variants.

We define the ring homomorphism $g_0 : K \rightarrow K[[X]]$ by $g_0(c) = (\partial^i(c)/i!)_i$.

Lemma 3.1. 1. For $r \in (0, +\infty)$, we have $K[[X/r]]_0^\times = K\{X/r\}^\times$.

2. For $c \in K$, we have $g_0(c) \in K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0$.

3. For all $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $c \in K$, we have $|c| = |(\partial^i(c)/i!)|_r$.

4. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $|\partial^i/i!|_{op,K} \leq 1/r(K, \partial)^i$.

Proof. Part 1 is a basic fact. For parts 2,3,4, see [11, Lemma 1.2.12, Corollary 1.2.13]. We give quick proofs.

1. Let $y \in (K\{X/r\})^\times$. We have $\sup_{s \in (0, r)} |y|_s = \sup_{s \in [r/2, r)} |y|_s = \sup_{s \in [r/2, r)} |y|_s^{-1} = \sup_{s \in [r/2, r)} |y|_s^{-1} \leq |y|_{r/2}^{-1}$. Hence $y \in K[[X/r]]_0$.

2. For $x \in K^\times$, we have $g_0(x) \in K\{X/r(K, \partial)\}$ by non-archimedean Hadamard formula, which implies $x \in K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0$ by part 1.

3. For $c \in K^\times$, $|c^\pm| \leq |g_0(c^\pm)|_r$. Hence $|c| \geq |g_0(c)|_r \geq |c|$.

4. It follows from part 3 with $r = r(K, \partial)$. $\square$

The ring homomorphism g_0 induces ring hom.'s $K \rightarrow K[[X/r]]_0$, $K \rightarrow K\{X/r\}$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $K \rightarrow K\{X/r+\}$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$, which is denoted by $g_{r,bd}$, g_r , g_{r+} respectively. Since these ring homomorphisms commute with the ∂ and ∂_X , we define the ring homomorphisms $f_0 : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K[[X]]\langle T \rangle$, $f_{r,bd} : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K[[X/r]]_0\langle T \rangle$, $f_r : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle$, $f_{r+} : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle$.

$K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$ as the ones associated to $g_0, g_{r,bd}, g_r, g_{r+}$ respectively. Thus we obtain the left $K\langle T \rangle$ -modules $f_{0*}L_0, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}, f_{r*}L_r$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $f_{r+*}L_{r+}$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$. Note that we have, as subobjects of $f_{r*}L_r = \cap_{t \in (0, r)} f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd}$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $f_{r+*}L_{r+} = \cup_{t \in (r, r(K, \partial))} f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd} = \cup_{t \in (r, r(K, \partial))} f_{t*}L_t$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$.

We write $f_{0*}L_0 = (K_+^{\mathbb{N}}, \rho : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}_{\text{Ab}}(K_+^{\mathbb{N}}))$. Then $\rho(i(c))((a_i)_i) = (\sum_{i=j+k} (\partial^k(c)/k!) a_j)_i$ for $c \in K$ and $\rho(T)((a_i)_i) = ((i+1)a_{i+1})_i$. By definition, the left $K\langle T \rangle$ -modules $f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}, f_{r*}L_r$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $f_{r+*}L_{r+}$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$ are submodules of $f_{0*}L_0$, where the underlying abelian groups coincide with those of $K[[X/r]]_0, K\{X/r\}, K\{X/r+\}$ respectively.

Convention. In the rest of the paper except §8, when we consider $K\{X/r\}, K[[X/r]]_0$, we tacitly assume that $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$; when we consider $K\{X/r+\}$, we tacitly assume that $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$.

3.3 The representability of the dual functor by $f_{0*}L_0$

Lemma 3.2. 1. For a morphism $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ and $x \in K\langle T \rangle$, the diagram in Ab below commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}(i_*M, R) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}(i_*\alpha, R)} & \text{Hom}(i_*M', R) \\ \downarrow \rho_{D_0M}(x) & & \downarrow \rho_{D_0M'}(x) \\ \text{Hom}(i_*M, R) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}(i_*\alpha, R)} & \text{Hom}(i_*M', R). \end{array}$$

2. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ and $x \in K\langle T \rangle$, the diagram in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ below commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{c_{0,M}} & D_0D_0M \\ \downarrow \rho_M(x) & & \downarrow \rho_{D_0D_0M}(x) \\ M & \xrightarrow{c_{0,M}} & D_0D_0M. \end{array}$$

3. For a morphism $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ and $x \in K\langle T \rangle$, the diagram in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ below commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M' & \xrightarrow{c_{0,M'}} & D_0D_0M' \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow D_0D_0\alpha \\ M & \xrightarrow{c_{0,M}} & D_0D_0M. \end{array}$$

4. Let $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle), \chi \in D_0M$. The morphism $\Psi_M(\chi) : M_+ \rightarrow K_+^{\mathbb{N}}; x \mapsto (\chi(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot x))_i$ in Ab defines a morphism $M \rightarrow f_{0*}L_0$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$.

Proof. To prove parts 1,2, we have only to prove the assertion for $x \in i(K) \cup \{T\}$, in which case the assertion follows from a straightforward calculation. Part 3 is obvious.

We prove part 4. We have only to prove that for $x \in M$ and $c \in i(K) \cup \{T\}$, we have $\Psi_M(\chi)(c \cdot x) = c \cdot (\Psi_M(\chi)(x))$; if this is the case then $\Psi_M(\chi)(c \cdot x) = c \cdot (\Psi_M(\chi)(x))$ for $x \in M$ and $c \in K\langle T \rangle$. Let $c \in K$. We have $\Psi_M(\chi)(i(c) \cdot x) = (\chi(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (i(c) \cdot x)))$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\chi(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (i(c) \cdot x)) = \chi((\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot i(c)) \cdot x) = \chi(\sum_{i=j+k}(\frac{1}{i!}\binom{i}{j}i(\partial^k(c))T^j) \cdot x) = \chi(\sum_{i=j+k}(i(\frac{1}{k!}\partial^k(c)) \cdot (\frac{1}{j!}T^j) \cdot x)) = \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{1}{k!}\partial^k(c) \cdot \chi((\frac{1}{j!}T^j) \cdot x)$. Hence $\Psi_M(\chi)(i(c) \cdot x) = i(c) \cdot \Psi_M(\chi)(x)$. We have $\Psi_M(\chi)(T \cdot x) = (\chi(\frac{1}{T!}T^i \cdot (T \cdot x))) = (\chi(\frac{i+1}{(i+1)!}T^{i+1} \cdot x)) = ((i+1)\chi(\frac{1}{(i+1)!}T^{i+1} \cdot x)) = T \cdot (\Psi_M(\chi)(x))$. $\square$

Definition 3.3. The function D_0 defines a contravariant endofunctor on $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ by Lemma 3.2. Note that the composition $D_0 D_0$ of D_0 followed by D_0 defines the covariant endofunctor on $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$. By Lemma 3.2 again, the function c_0 defines a natural transformation $id_{Mod(K\langle T \rangle)} \rightarrow D_0 D_0$.

- Definition 3.4.** 1. We define the functor $D_+ : Mod(K\langle T \rangle) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$ by $D_+ = \text{Hom}(-, f_{0*}L_0)$. We define the morphism $\theta : i_{0*}f_{0*}L_0 \rightarrow K$ in $Mod(K)$ by the morphism $K_+^{\mathbb{N}} = (i_{0*}f_{0*}L_0)_+ \rightarrow K_+$; $(a_i) \mapsto a_0$ in $\mathcal{A}b$.
2. We define the natural transformation $\Phi : D_+ \rightarrow (D_0)_+$ as the following vertical composition $\Phi = \text{Hom}(i_*-, \theta) \cdot i_* : \text{Hom}(-, f_{0*}L_0) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(i_*-, i_*f_{0*}L_0) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(i_*-, K)$.
3. We define the natural transformation $\Psi : (D_0)_+ \rightarrow D_+$ by the function as in Part 4 of Lemma 3.2, which forms a natural transformation as we can see easily.

Lemma 3.5. *The natural transformation Φ, Ψ are natural isomorphisms with $\Phi^{-1} = \Psi$.*

Proof. Let $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$. Let $\chi \in (D_0)_+M$. Let $x \in M$. Then $(\Phi \cdot \Psi)_M(\chi)(x) = (\Phi_M \circ \Psi_M)(\chi)(x) = \Phi_M(\Psi_M(\chi))(x) = \theta(\Psi_M(\chi)(x)) = \chi(\frac{1}{0!}T^0 \cdot x) = \chi(x)$. Hence $\Phi_M \circ \Psi_M = id_{D_0M}$.

Let $s \in D_+M$. Let $x \in M$. Then $(\Psi \cdot \Phi)_M(s)(x) = (\Psi_M \circ \Phi_M)(s)(x) = \Psi_M(\Phi_M(s))(x) = (\Phi_M(s)(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot x)) = (\theta(s(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot x))) = (\theta(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (s(x)))) = s(x)$. Hence $\Psi_M \circ \Phi_M = id_{DM}$. $\square$

Corollary 3.6. *The functor $(D_0)_+$ is represented by $f_{0*}L_0$. In particular, the left $K\langle T \rangle$ -module $f_{0*}L_0$ is an injective cogenerator in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$.*

Definition 3.7. Let $\text{End}((D_0)_+), \text{End}(D_+)$ denote the classes of natural transformations of $(D_0)_+, D_+$ respectively. By Lemma 3.5 and Yoneda's lemma, $\text{End}((D_0)_+), \text{End}(D_+)$ form rings, where the multiplications are given by vertical composition. By Lemma 3.2, the map $\tilde{\rho}_0 : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}((D_0)_+); x \mapsto (M \mapsto (\rho_{D_0M}(x) : (D_0)_+M \rightarrow (D_0)_+M))$ is a ring homomorphism. We define the ring homomorphism $\tilde{\rho} : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}(f_{0*}L_0)$ by $\tilde{\rho}(c) = \Psi \cdot \tilde{\rho}_0(c) \cdot \Phi$ for $c \in K\langle T \rangle$. We define the ring homomorphism $\rho^\# : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}(f_{0*}L_0)$ by $\rho^\#(c) = \tilde{\rho}(c)_{f_{0*}L_0}(id_{f_{0*}L_0})$ for $c \in K\langle T \rangle$. Then $(f_{0*}L_0, \rho^\#)$ is an object of $Mod(K\langle T \rangle, Mod(K\langle T \rangle))$, which is denoted by $f_{0*}L_0$ for simplicity. We define the contravariant endofunctor D on $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ by $D(-) = \text{Hom}(-, f_{0*}L_0)$.

Lemma 3.8. For $(a_i)_i \in K_+^{\mathbb{N}}$, we have $\rho^\#(i(c))((a_i)) = (ca_i)$ for $c \in K$ and $\rho^\#(T)((a_i)) = (\partial(a_i) - (i+1)a_{i+1})$.

Proof. For $x \in K\langle T \rangle$, we have $\rho^\#(x) = \Psi_{f_{0*}L_0} \circ \tilde{\rho}_0(x)_{f_{0*}L_0} \circ \Phi_{f_{0*}L_0}(id_{f_{0*}L_0})$. Let $c \in K$. We have $\rho^\#(i(c))((a_i)) = \Psi_{f_{0*}L_0} \circ \tilde{\rho}_0(i(c))_{f_{0*}L_0} \circ \Phi_{f_{0*}L_0}(id_{f_{0*}L_0})((a_i)) = (\tilde{\rho}_0(i(c))_{f_{0*}L_0}(\Phi_{f_{0*}L_0}(id_{f_{0*}L_0})(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i)))) = (\tilde{\rho}_0(i(c))_{f_{0*}L_0}(\theta)(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i))) = (c \cdot (\theta(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i)))) = (c \cdot a_i)$. We have $\rho^\#(T)((a_i)) = \Psi_{f_{0*}L_0} \circ \tilde{\rho}_0(T)_{f_{0*}L_0} \circ \Phi_{f_{0*}L_0}(id_{f_{0*}L_0})((a_i)) = (\tilde{\rho}_0(T)_{f_{0*}L_0}(\Phi_{f_{0*}L_0}(id_{f_{0*}L_0})(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i)))) = (\tilde{\rho}_0(T)_{f_{0*}L_0}(\theta)(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i))) = (\partial(\theta(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i)) - \theta(T \cdot \frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i)))) = (\partial(\theta(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (a_i)) - \theta(\frac{i+1}{(i+1)!}T^{i+1} \cdot (a_i)))) = (\partial(a_i) - (i+1)a_{i+1}). $\square$$

Lemma 3.9. For $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, the isomorphisms $\Phi_M : D_+M \rightarrow (D_0)_+M$, $\Psi_M : (D_0)_+M \rightarrow D_+M$ define morphisms $DM \rightarrow D_0M$, $D_0M \rightarrow DM$ respectively, which are denoted by Φ_M and Ψ_M respectively. Furthermore $\Phi_M : DM \rightarrow D_0M$ and $\Psi_M : D_0M \rightarrow DM$ are isomorphisms and inverse to each other. The functions Φ and Ψ defines natural isomorphisms $\Phi : D \rightarrow D_0$ and $\Psi : D_0 \rightarrow D$ respectively.

Proof. It follows from the construction. $\square$

3.4 The natural transformation $c : id_{Mod(K\langle T \rangle)} \rightarrow DD$

Definition 3.10. Let $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$. We define the morphisms $(\Phi \circ \Psi)_M : DDM \rightarrow D_0D_0M$, $(\Psi \circ \Phi)_M : D_0D_0M \rightarrow DDM$ in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ by $(\Phi \circ \Psi)_M = \Phi_{D_0M} \circ D\Psi_M = D_0\Psi_M \circ \Phi_{DM}$, $(\Psi \circ \Phi)_M = \Psi_{DM} \circ D_0\Phi_M = D\Phi_M \circ \Psi_{D_0M}$ in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$. Then the above functions define the natural transformations $\Phi \circ \Psi : DD \rightarrow D_0D_0$, $\Psi \circ \Phi : D_0D_0 \rightarrow DD$, which are inverse each other.

Notation. For a left $K\langle T \rangle$ -module M and $s \in DM$, $x \in M$, we denote $s(x) \in M'$ by $\langle s, x \rangle = (\langle s, x \rangle_i)_i$.

Lemma 3.11. 1. Let $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, $\chi \in D_0M$, $x \in M$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have $(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot \chi)(x) = \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\chi(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x))$.

2. Let $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$. Let $x \in M$, $s \in DM$. We have $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle = (\sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\langle s, x \rangle_j))_i$.

Proof. 1. We prove by induction on i . In the base case $i = 0$, we have nothing to prove. In the case $i = 1$, we have $(\frac{1}{1!}T \cdot \chi)(x) = \partial(\chi(x)) - \chi(T \cdot x)$ by the definition of D_0 . In the induction step,

$$\begin{aligned} (\frac{1}{(i+1)!}T^{i+1} \cdot \chi)(x) &= \frac{1}{i+1}(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (T \cdot \chi))(x) = \frac{1}{i+1} \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k((T \cdot \chi)(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)) \\ &= \frac{1}{i+1} \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\{\partial(\chi(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)) - \chi(T \cdot \frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)\}) = \frac{1}{i+1} \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j(k+1)}{(k+1)!} \partial^{k+1}(\chi(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{i+1} \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\chi(\frac{j+1}{(j+1)!}T^{j+1} \cdot x)) = \frac{1}{i+1} \sum_{i+1=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\chi(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{i+1} \sum_{i+1=j+k} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}j}{k!} \partial^k(\chi(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)) = \sum_{i+1=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\chi(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)). \end{aligned}$$

2. We have $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle = \langle (\Psi \circ \Phi)_M(c_{0,M}(x)), s \rangle = \langle (D\Phi_M \circ \Psi_{D_0M})(c_{0,M}(x)), s \rangle = \langle D\Phi_M(\Psi_{D_0M}(c_{0,M}(x))), s \rangle = \langle \Psi_{D_0M}(c_{0,M}(x)), \Phi_M(s) \rangle = (c_{0,M}(x)(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (\Phi_M(s))))_i$.

Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $c_{0,M}(x)(\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (\Phi_M(s))) = (\frac{1}{i!}T^i \cdot (\Phi_M(s)))(x) = \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\Phi_M(s)(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x)) = \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\theta(s(\frac{1}{j!}T^j \cdot x))) = \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\langle s, x \rangle_j) \cdot (s(x))) = \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\langle s, x \rangle_j)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.12. 1. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $x \in M$, $s \in DM$, we have $\langle s, x \rangle = \langle c_{DM}(s), c_M(x) \rangle$.

2. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $x \in M$, $s \in DM$, the following are equivalent.

- (a) We have $\langle s, x \rangle = 0$.
- (b) We have $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle = 0$.

Proof. 1. We have $\langle c_{DM}(s), c_M(x) \rangle = (\sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\langle c_M(x), s \rangle_j))$.

Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $\sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\langle c_M(x), s \rangle_j) = \sum_{i=j+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\sum_{j=g+h} \frac{(-1)^g}{h!} \partial^h(\langle s, x \rangle_g)) = \sum_{i=j+k} \sum_{j=g+h} \frac{(-1)^{j+g}}{k!h!} \partial^{k+h}(\langle s, x \rangle_g) = \sum_{i=j+k} \sum_{j=g+h} (-1)^h \binom{k+h}{h} \frac{1}{(k+h)!} \partial^{k+h}(\langle s, x \rangle_g) = \sum_{i=f+g} \sum_{f=h+k} (-1)^h \binom{f}{h} \frac{1}{f!} \partial^f(\langle s, x \rangle_g) = \sum_{i=f+g} 0^f \frac{1}{f!} \partial^f(\langle s, x \rangle_g) = \langle s, x \rangle_i$.

Hence $\langle c_{DM}(s), c_M(x) \rangle = \langle s, x \rangle$.

2. For any M , (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) holds by Lemma 3.11.

(b)(a) Assume $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle = 0$. By applying (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) to DM , we have $\langle c_{DM}(s), c_M(x) \rangle = 0$. Hence $\langle s, x \rangle = \langle c_{DM}(s), c_M(x) \rangle = 0$ by part 1. $\square$

Lemma 3.13. 1. The natural transformations c_0, c are pointwise monomorphisms.

2. The functors D_0, D are faithful and exact. Moreover D_0, D preserve dimension.

3. Let D_0^f, D^f denote the endfunctors on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ induced by D_0, D respectively. Let $c_0^f : \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)} \rightarrow D_0^f D_0^f, c^f : \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)} \rightarrow D^f D^f$ denote the natural transformations induced by c_0, c respectively. Then c_0^f, c^f are natural isomorphisms.

4. The functors D^f, D_0^f preserve length. In particular, for $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, M is irreducible if and only if so is $D_0^f M$ or $D^f M$.

Proof. Since D_0, D are naturally isomorphic and we have $c = (\Psi \circ \Phi) \cdot c_0$ and $\Psi \circ \Phi$ is a natural isomorphism, we have only to prove the assertion for D_0, c_0 . Then one can prove easily by using the forgetful functor $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(K)$ appropriately. $\square$

Lemma 3.14. Let $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ be a morphism in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $x' \in M', s \in DM$. Then we have $\langle c_M(\alpha(x')), s \rangle = \langle c_{M'}(x'), s \circ \alpha \rangle$.

Proof. Since c is a natural transformation, $DD\alpha \circ c_{M'} = c_M \circ \alpha$. Hence the assertion follows from $\langle DD\alpha \circ c_{M'}(x'), s \rangle = \langle c_{M'}(x'), s \circ \alpha \rangle, \langle c_M \circ \alpha(x'), s \rangle = \langle c_M(\alpha(x')), s \rangle$. $\square$

4 The functors $F_{\pm}$

We construct two endofunctors $F_{\pm}$ on $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ associated to a subobject of $f_{0*}L_0$. We give examples of such subobjects. First examples are certain p -adic Banach spaces, whose construction is based on an idea of Robba ([14]). Second examples are given by push-outs of differential rings, which is related to Dwork-Robba's work ([6]). Then we calculate the associated functors F_+, F_- at some level.

4.1 Subobjects of $f_{0*}L_0$

In this section, we consider the object M_{λ} satisfying condition (ST).

(ST) M_{λ} is a submodule of the left $K\langle T \rangle$ -module $f_{0*}L_0$ which is stable under the action of $\rho(x)$ for $x \in K\langle T \rangle$.

Note that we may replace the condition $x \in K\langle T \rangle$ by $x \in i(K) \cup \{T\}$ since $K\langle T \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i(K) \cup \{T\}$ as a ring. Assume M_{λ} satisfies (ST). Then M_{λ} is regarded as an object of $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ in an obvious way. Moreover M_{λ} is regarded as an object of $Mod(K\langle T \rangle, Mod(K\langle T \rangle))$ with respect to the ring homomorphism $K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}(M_{\lambda})$ induced by ρ . Furthermore the canonical injection $M_{\lambda} \rightarrow f_{0*}L_0$ in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ is a morphism in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle, Mod(K\langle T \rangle))$, which is again a monomorphism in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle, Mod(K\langle T \rangle))$. Thus we obtain a monomorphism $M_{\lambda} \rightarrow f_{0*}L_0$ in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle, Mod(K\langle T \rangle))$.

4.2 Definition of $F_{\pm}$

Definition 4.1. 1. For $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, we define the object F_-M in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ by $F_-M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in \text{Hom}(M, M_{\lambda}), c_M(x)(s) = 0\}$. For a morphism $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, by using Lemma 3.14, α induces a unique morphism $F_-M' \rightarrow F_-M$ of subobjects of M , which is denoted by $F_- \alpha$. The function F_- forms an endofunctor on $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$. We have an obvious natural transformation $I_- : F_- \rightarrow id_{Mod(K\langle T \rangle)}$ by definition, which is a pointwise monomorphism.

2. For $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, we define the object F_+M in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$ by $F_+M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0), c_M(x)(s) \in M_{\lambda}\}$. For a morphism $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, by using Lemma 3.14, α induces a unique morphism $F_+M' \rightarrow F_+M$ of subobjects of M , which is denoted by $F_+ \alpha$. The function F_+ forms an endofunctor on $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$. We have an obvious natural transformation $I_+ : F_+ \rightarrow id_{Mod(K\langle T \rangle)}$ by definition, which is a pointwise monomorphism.

Note that for $M \in Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, we have the exact sequences in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(M, M_{\lambda}) \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} DM \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} DM/\text{Hom}(M, M_{\lambda}) \longrightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(DM, M_{\lambda}) \xrightarrow{\beta_1} DDM \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \text{Hom}(DM, f_{0*}L_0/M_{\lambda}),$$

where α_1, β_1 are induced by the morphism $M_\lambda \rightarrow f_{0*}L_0$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle, \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle))$, α_2 is the canonical surjection, β_2 is induced by the obvious morphism $f_{0*}L_0 \rightarrow f_{0*}L_0/M_\lambda$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle, \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle))$. Moreover we have the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow D(DM/\text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda)) \xrightarrow{D\alpha_2} DDM \xrightarrow{D\alpha_1} D\text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda).$$

Proposition 4.2. 1. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, we have $F_-M = \cap_{s \in \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda)} \ker s$.

2. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, there exists a unique morphism $c_{-,M} : F_-M \rightarrow D(DM/\text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda))$ making the square commutative in the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F_-M & \xrightarrow{I_{-,M}} & M & & \\ \downarrow c_{+,M} & & \downarrow c_M & & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & D(DM/\text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda)) & \xrightarrow{D\alpha_1} & DDM & \xrightarrow{D\alpha_2} D\text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Moreover the square is a pull-back.

3. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, there exists a unique morphism $c_{+,M} : F_+M \rightarrow \text{Hom}(DM, M_\lambda)$ such that the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F_+M & \xrightarrow{I_{+,M}} & M & & \\ \downarrow c_{+,M} & & \downarrow c_M & & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(DM, M_\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\beta_1} & DDM & \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \text{Hom}(DM, f_{0*}L_0/M_\lambda). \end{array}$$

Moreover the square is a pull-back.

4. For $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, the morphisms $c_{+,M}, c_{-,M}$ are isomorphisms.
5. For $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, we have $\dim F_-M + \dim \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda) = \dim M$ and $\dim F_+M = \dim \text{Hom}(DM, M_\lambda)$.
6. Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. Let $J_{-,M} : M \rightarrow M/F_-M$ be the canonical surjection. Then $\text{Hom}(J_{-,M}, M_\lambda) : \text{Hom}(M/F_-M, M_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda)$ is an isomorphism and the morphism $\text{Hom}(I_{-,M}, M_\lambda) : \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(F_-M, M_\lambda)$ is equal to 0.
7. We have $F_-(M/F_-M) = 0$ and $\dim \text{Hom}(M/F_-M, M_\lambda) = \dim M/F_-M$.

Proof. 1. By Lemma 3.12, $F_-M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda), \langle c_M(x), s \rangle = 0\} = \{x \in M; \forall s \in \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda), \langle s, x \rangle = 0\} = \cap_{s \in \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda)} \ker s$.

2. The uniqueness is obvious. We can see that the underlying sets F_-M coincides with the kernel of $D\alpha_2 \circ c_M$, which implies the rest of assertion.
3. The uniqueness is obvious. We can see that the underlying sets F_+M coincides with the kernel of $\beta_2 \circ c_M$, which implies the rest of assertion.
4. This is a consequence of parts 2 and 3.
5. It follows from the left exactness of the functor $\text{Hom}(-, M_\lambda)$ and part 1.
6. By applying part 3 to M/F_-M and M and using part 4, we have $\dim F_-(M/F_-M) = \dim M/F_-M - \dim \text{Hom}(M/F_-M, M_\lambda) = \dim M/F_-M - \dim \text{Hom}(M, M_\lambda) = 0$.
7. It follows from parts 5 and 6. $\square$

4.3 Example 1: Robba's construction

Let $\pi = (\pi_i)$ be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ satisfying condition (C).

(C) The sequence (π_{i+1}/π_i) is non-decreasing sequence and $\sup \pi_{i+1}/\pi_i \leq r(K, \partial)$.

For example, $\pi(t) = (t^i)$ for $t \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ satisfies the condition (see [14]).

Lemma 4.3. *We have $\pi_i \pi_j / (r(K, \partial)^h \pi_0 \pi_k) \leq 1$ for $h, i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \geq j$ and $i = h + k - j$.*

Proof. We have $\pi_i = (\pi_i/\pi_{i-1}) \cdots (\pi_{i-h+1}/\pi_{i-h}) \pi_{i-h} \leq r(K, \partial)^h \pi_{i-h} = r(K, \partial)^h \pi_{k-j}$. If $j > 0$ then we have $\pi_j/\pi_k \leq \pi_{j-1}/\pi_{k-1}$ by $\pi_j/\pi_k = (\pi_{k-1}/\pi_k)(\pi_j/\pi_{k-1}) \leq (\pi_{k-2}/\pi_{k-1})(\pi_{j-1}/\pi_{k-2}) = \pi_{j-1}/\pi_{k-1}$. Repeating a similar argument, $\pi_j/\pi_k \leq \pi_0/\pi_{k-j}$. Hence $\pi_i \pi_j / \pi_k \leq r(K, \partial)^h \pi_0$. $\square$

Let $t_{r(K, \partial), bd} : K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0 \langle T \rangle \rightarrow K[[X]] \langle T \rangle$ be the ring homomorphism associated to the obvious ring homomorphism $K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0 \rightarrow K[[X]]$. Let $i_{r(K, \partial), bd} : K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0 \rightarrow K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0 \langle T \rangle; x \mapsto xT^0$ be the ring homomorphism as before. Recall that the underlying abelian group of the left $K \langle T \rangle$ -module $f_* L_0$ is given by the direct product $K_+^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let B_π be the subgroup of $K_+^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined by $\{(a_i) \in K_+^{\mathbb{N}}, \sup |a_i| \pi_i < +\infty\}$. Then B_π is a submodule of $t_{r(K, \partial), bd} L_0$.*

Proof. Let $(a_i) \in B_\pi$. For $(c_i) \in K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0$, $|\sum_{i=j+k} c_k a_j| \pi_i \leq \max_{i=j+k} |c_k| |a_j| \pi_i \leq \max_{i=j+k} |c_k| r(K, \partial)^k |a_j| \pi_j \leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |c_k| r(K, \partial)^k \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |a_j| \pi_j$. Hence $i_{r(K, \partial), bd}((c_i)) \cdot (a_i) \in B_\pi$. We have $|(i+1)a_{i+1}| \pi_i \leq |a_{i+1}| \pi_{i+1} (\pi_i/\pi_{i+1}) \leq |a_{i+1}| \pi_{i+1} (\pi_0/\pi_1)$. Hence $T \cdot (a_i) \in B_\pi$. Since $K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0 \langle T \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i_{r(K, \partial), bd}(K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0) \cup \{T\}$, $x \cdot (a_i) \in B_\pi$ for $x \in K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0 \langle T \rangle$. $\square$

Definition 4.5. We define $N_\pi \in \text{Mod}(K[[X/r(K, \partial)]]_0 \langle T \rangle)$ as the submodule of L_0 given by B_π . The left $K \langle T \rangle$ -module $f_{r(K, \partial), bd} N_\pi$ is a submodule of $f_{0*} L_0$ since $f_{r(K, \partial), bd} N_\pi$ is regarded as a submodule of $f_{r(K, \partial), bd} t_{r(K, \partial), bd} L_0 = f_{0*} L_0$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $(a_i) \in f_* N_\pi$. We have $\rho^\#(x)((a_i)) \in f_* N_\pi$ for $x \in K \langle T \rangle$.*

Proof. By definition, we have $\rho^\#(i(c))((a_i)) = (ca_i) \in f_*N_\pi$ for $c \in K$ and $\rho^\#(T)((a_i)) = (\partial(a_i) - (i+1)a_{i+1})$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\partial(a_i) - (i+1)a_{i+1}|\pi_i \leq \max(|\partial(a_i)|, |(i+1)a_{i+1}|)\pi_i \leq \max(|\partial|_{op,K}|a_i|\pi_i, |a_{i+1}|\pi_i) \leq \max(|\partial|_{op,K}|a_i|\pi_i, |a_{i+1}|\pi_{i+1}(\pi_0/\pi_1))$. Hence we have $\sup_i |\partial(a_i) - (i+1)a_{i+1}|\pi_i \leq \max(|\partial|_{op,K}, \pi_0/\pi_1) \sup_i |a_i|\pi_i < +\infty$. Therefore $\rho^\#(T)((a_i)) \in f_*N_\pi$. Since $\rho^\#$ is a ring homomorphism and $K\langle T \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i(K) \cup \{T\}$, we have $\rho^\#(x)((a_i)) \in f_*N_\pi$ for $x \in K\langle T \rangle$. $\square$

Definition 4.7. Let π be as above. We define the endofunctors F_π, F^π on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ as F_- and F_+ obtained by applying the result of 3.1 to $f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi$.

Lemma 4.8. Let π be as above. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $x \in M$ and $s \in DM$, the following are equivalent..

- (a) We have $\langle s, x \rangle \in f_*N_\pi$.
- (b) We have $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle \in f_*N_\pi$.

Proof. For any M , we prove (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b). Assume $\langle s, x \rangle \in f_*N_\pi$. We set $C := \sup_i |\langle s, x \rangle_i|\pi_i$. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 3.1 and 3.11 and 4.3, we have $|\langle c_M(x), s \rangle_i|\pi_i \leq |\sum_{j=i+k} \frac{(-1)^j}{k!} \partial^k(\langle s, x \rangle_j)|\pi_i \leq \max_{i=j+k} |\frac{1}{k!} \partial^k(\langle s, x \rangle_j)|\pi_i \leq \max_{i=j+k} \frac{1}{\tau(K,\partial)^k} |\langle s, x \rangle_j|\pi_j \leq \max_{i=j+k} |\langle s, x \rangle_j|\pi_j \leq C$. Hence $\sup |\langle c_M(x), s \rangle_i|\pi_i \leq C$. Therefore $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle \in f_*N_\pi$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Assume (b) holds. By applying (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) to DM , $\langle c_{DM}(s), c_M(x) \rangle \in f_*N_\pi$. By Lemma 3.12, $\langle s, x \rangle = \langle c_{DM}(s), c_M(x) \rangle \in f_*N_\pi$. $\square$

Corollary 4.9. Let π be as above. For $M \in C$, $F^\pi M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in DM, \langle s, x \rangle \in f_*N_\pi\}$.

4.4 Example 2: Subrings of the ring of formal power series

Lemma 4.10. 1. For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, we have $f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_{\pi(r)} = f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$.

2. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $(a_i) \in f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$ (resp. $f_{r*}L_r, f_{r+*}L_{r+}$). We have $\rho^\#(x)((a_i)) \in f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$ (resp. $f_{r*}L_r, f_{r+*}L_{r+}$) for $x \in K\langle T \rangle$.

Proof. 1. The both sides are submodules of $f_{0*}L_0 \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, whose underlying sets are given by $B_{\pi(r)}$.

2. In the case of $f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$, it follows from part 1 and Lemma 4.6. This case implies the assertion in the rest of the case. $\square$

Definition 4.11. 1. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. We define the endofunctors $F_{(0,r)}, F_{[r,r(K,\partial)]}$ on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ as F_- and F_+ for $M_\lambda = f_{r*}L_r$.

2. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. We define the endofunctor $F_{(0,r]}$ on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ as F_- for $M_\lambda = f_{r+*}L_{r+}$.

3. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. We define the endofunctor $F_{[r,r]}$ on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ as $F_{(0,r]} \cap F_{[r,r(K,\partial)]}$.

Lemma 4.12. Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$.

1. For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, there exists $r_0 \in (0, r)$ such that for $t \in [r_0, r)$, the obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd})$ is an isomorphism in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$.
2. For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$, there exists $r_0 \in (r, r(K, \partial))$ such that for $t \in (r, r_0]$, the obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{t*}L_t) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*}L_{r+})$ is an isomorphism in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$.

Proof. The family $\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u,bd*}L_{u,bd})\}_{u \in (0, r)}$ (resp. $\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u*}L_u)\}_{u \in [r, r(K, \partial))}$) of objects in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ forms a projective system (resp. injective system) with respect to the obvious transition morphisms. The obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) \rightarrow \lim\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u,bd*}L_{u,bd})\}_{u \in (0, r)}$ (resp. $\text{colim}\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u*}L_u)\}_{u \in [r, r(K, \partial))} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*}L_{r+})$) is an isomorphism since Hom commutes with colimit (resp. since M is finite).

Since the transition morphisms of the projective system (resp. injective system) are injective, there exists $r_0 \in (0, r)$ (resp. $(r, r(K, \partial))$) such that the transition morphism of the projective system $\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u,bd*}L_{u,bd})\}_{u \in [r_0, r)}$ (resp. the injective system $\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u*}L_u)\}_{u \in [r_0, r(K, \partial))}$) are isomorphisms by $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{u,bd*}L_{u,bd}) \leq \dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0) = \dim M$ (resp. $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{u*}L_u) \leq \dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0) = \dim M$). For any r_0 with this property, the obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd})$ for $t \in [r_0, r)$ (resp. $\text{Hom}(M, f_{t*}L_t) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*}L_{r+})$ for $t \in [r_0, r(K, \partial))$) coincides with the composition $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) \rightarrow \lim\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u,bd*}L_{u,bd})\}_{u \in (0, r)} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd})$ (resp. $\text{Hom}(M, f_{t*}L_t) \rightarrow \text{colim}\{\text{Hom}(M, f_{u*}L_u)\}_{u \in (r, r(K, \partial))} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*}L_{r+})$), which is an isomorphism. $\square$

Lemma 4.13. 1. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $x \in M$ and $s \in DM$, the following are equivalent..

- (a) We have $\langle s, x \rangle \in f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$.
- (b) We have $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle \in f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$.

2. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $x \in M$ and $s \in DM$, the following are equivalent..

- (a) We have $\langle s, x \rangle \in f_{r*}L_r$.
- (b) We have $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle \in f_{r*}L_r$.

3. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$. For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $x \in M$ and $s \in DM$, the following are equivalent..

- (a) We have $\langle s, x \rangle \in f_{r+*}L_{r+}$.
- (b) We have $\langle c_M(x), s \rangle \in f_{r+*}L_{r+}$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.10, we can prove the assertion as an application of Lemma 4.8. $\square$

Corollary 4.14. For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $F_{[r, r(K, \partial))}M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in DM, \langle s, x \rangle \in f_{r*}L_r\}$.

4.5 Calculation of F_π

Let π be as in Example 1 in §4.3. We define the ultrametric function $|\cdot|_\pi : f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; (a_i) \mapsto \sup\{|a_i|_\pi; i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. The map defines the metric topology on the underlying set of $f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi$. Recall that $f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi$ as a topological space is complete ([1, 2.3.3/4]). We define the ultrametric function $||\cdot||_\pi : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; (q_i) \mapsto \sup\{|i!q_i|_\pi/\pi_i; i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. The map defines the metric topology on the underlying set of $K\langle T \rangle$.

- Lemma 4.15.** 1. For $(q_i) \in K\langle T \rangle$, $(a_i) \in f_{0*}L_0$, $(q_i) \cdot (a_i) = (\sum_{i=h+k-j, k \geq j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)a_k)_i$.
2. For $h, i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i = h + k - j, k \geq j$, $|\binom{k}{j} \frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)a_k|_\pi \leq |j!q_j|(\pi_0/\pi_j)|a_k|_\pi \leq |j!q_j|(\pi_0/\pi_j)|(a_i)|_\pi \leq |(q_i)|_\pi |(a_i)|_\pi$.
3. For $P \in K\langle T \rangle$, $||P||_\pi = 0$ if and only if $P = 0$.
4. For $P, Q \in K\langle T \rangle$, $||P \pm Q||_\pi \leq \max\{||P||_\pi, ||Q||_\pi\}$.
5. For $P \in K\langle T \rangle$, $||P||_\pi = \sup\{|P \cdot x|_\pi/|x|_\pi; x \in f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi, x \neq 0\}$.
6. For $P, Q \in K\langle T \rangle$, $||P \cdot Q||_\pi \leq ||P||_\pi \cdot ||Q||_\pi$.

Proof. 1. We have $(q_i) \cdot (a_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} q_j T^0 \cdot (j! \binom{i+j}{j} a_{i+j})_i = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} (\sum_{i=h-j+k, k \geq j} \frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)a_k)_i = (\sum_{i=h-j+k, k \geq j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)a_k)_i$.

2. By Lemma 3.1 and 4.3, $|\binom{k}{j} \frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)a_k|_\pi \leq |\binom{k}{j}| |\frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)| |a_k|_\pi \leq |\frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)| |a_k|_\pi \leq |j!q_j| |a_k|_\pi / r(K, \partial)^h = |j!q_j|(\pi_0/\pi_j) |a_k|_\pi \leq |j!q_j|(\pi_0/\pi_j) |a_k|_\pi \leq |j!q_j|(\pi_0/\pi_j) |a_k|_\pi$. The rest of assertion is obvious.

3,4. It is obvious.

5. Fix $(q_i)_i \in K\langle T \rangle$. For any $(a_i) \in f_{0*}L_0$, we have $|(q_i) \cdot (a_i)|_\pi \leq |(q_i)|_\pi |(a_i)|_\pi$ by parts 1 and 2. Let j_0 denote the minimum j such that $|(q_i)|_\pi = |j!q_j|(\pi_0/\pi_j)$. Let (a_i) denote the j_0 -th fundamental vector in $f_{0*}L_0$. Then $|(q_i)|_\pi |(a_i)|_\pi = |j_0!q_{j_0}|_\pi$. By part 3, $(q_i) \in K\langle T \rangle$, $(a_i) \in f_{0*}L_0$, $(q_i) \cdot (a_i) = (\sum_{i=h+j_0-j, j_0 \geq j} \binom{j_0}{j} \frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)a_{j_0})_i$. By part 1, $|\sum_{i=h+j_0-j, j_0 \geq j} \binom{j_0}{j} \frac{1}{h!} \partial^h(j!q_j)a_{j_0})_i|_\pi < |j_0!q_{j_0}|_\pi$. By $|(\binom{j_0}{i} \frac{1}{i!} \partial^i(j!q_j)a_{j_0})_i|_\pi \geq |(\binom{j_0}{0} \frac{1}{0!} \partial^0(j!q_j)a_{j_0})|_\pi = |j_0!q_{j_0}|_\pi$, $|(q_i) \cdot (a_i)|_\pi \geq |(q_i)|_\pi |(a_i)|_\pi = |j_0!q_{j_0}|_\pi$.

6. We may assume there exists $x \in f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi$ such that $Q \cdot x \neq 0$; otherwise, $||P \cdot Q||_\pi = 0$ by part 5. By part 5, $||P \cdot Q||_\pi \leq \sup\{|(P \cdot Q) \cdot x|_\pi/|x|_\pi; x \in f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi, Q \cdot x \neq 0\} \sup\{|Q \cdot x|_\pi/|x|_\pi; x \in f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi, Q \cdot x \neq 0\} \leq \sup\{|P \cdot x|_\pi/|x|_\pi; x \in f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi, x \neq 0\} \sup\{|Q \cdot x|_\pi/|x|_\pi; x \in f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi, x \neq 0\} = ||P||_\pi ||Q||_\pi$. $\square$

Corollary 4.16. Let I be a left ideal of $K\langle T \rangle$. The closure $cl_\pi I$ of I with respect to the topology as above is a left ideal of $K\langle T \rangle$.

Proof. We choose a generator P of I . Let $Q, R \in cl_\pi I$. Then there exist sequences $(Q_i), (R_i)$ converging to Q, R respectively. Then the sequences $(Q_i - R_i), (Q_i R_i)$ converge to $Q - R, QR$ by parts 4,5 of Lemma 4.15. $\square$

Lemma 4.17. *Let I be a left ideal of $K\langle T \rangle$. We define the ultrametric function $\|\cdot\|_{\pi, I} : K\langle T \rangle/I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by $\|P + I\|_{\pi, I} = \inf\{\|P + R\|_{\pi}; R \in I\}$. For $P \in K\langle T \rangle$, $x \in K\langle T \rangle/I$, $\|P \cdot x\|_{\pi, I} \leq \|P\|_{\pi} \|x\|_{\pi, I}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.15, we have $\|P \cdot x\|_{\pi, I} = \inf\{\|R\|_{\pi}; R \in K\langle T \rangle, R + I = P \cdot x\} \leq \inf\{\|P \cdot Q\|_{\pi}; Q \in K\langle T \rangle, Q + I = x\} \leq \inf\{\|P\|_{\pi} \|Q\|_{\pi}; Q \in K\langle T \rangle, Q + I = x\} = \|P\|_{\pi} \|x\|_{\pi, I}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.18. *Let I be a non-zero left ideal of $K\langle T \rangle$, $\|\cdot\|_{\pi, I} : K\langle T \rangle/I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as above. Assume $cl_{\pi} I = I$. For an arbitrary morphism $\chi : i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I) \rightarrow K$ in $Mod(K)$, there exists C such that $|\chi(x)| \leq C \|x\|_{\pi, I}$ for $x \in K\langle T \rangle/I$.*

Proof. We regard $\|\cdot\|_{\pi}, \|\cdot\|_{\pi, I}$ as ultrametric functions on $i_* K\langle T \rangle, i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I)$ respectively. Then $\|\cdot\|_{\pi}$ is a norm on $i_* K\langle T \rangle$ by definition and $\|\cdot\|_{\pi, I}$ is a semi-norm on $i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I)$ as in the previous lemma. Since K is complete, K is weakly cartesian ([1]). Since $i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I)$ is of finite dimension, $\|\cdot\|_{\pi, I}$ is equivalent to any norm on $i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I)$. We choose a basis $e_1, \dots, e_m$ of $i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I)$, and define the norm $|\cdot|'$ on $i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I)$ by $|c_1 e_1 + \dots + c_m e_m|' = \max_i |c_i|$. Then there exists $C' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\cdot|' \leq C' \|\cdot\|_{\pi, I}$. We set $C := C' \max |\chi(e_i)|$. For $x \in i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I)$, we write $x = c_1 e_1 + \dots + c_m e_m$. Then $|\chi(x)| = |\chi(c_1 e_1 + \dots + c_m e_m)| = |c_1 \chi(e_1) + \dots + c_m \chi(e_m)| \leq \max_i |c_i| |\chi(e_i)| \leq \max\{|c_i|\} \max\{|\chi(e_i)|\} = |x|' \max\{|\chi(e_i)|\} \leq C' \|x\|_{\pi, I} \max\{|\chi(e_i)|\} \leq C \|x\|_{\pi, I}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.19. *Let I be a left ideal of $K\langle T \rangle$. Assume $cl_{\pi} I = I$. Then $\dim \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_{\pi}) = \dim K\langle T \rangle/I$.*

Proof. We set $n = \dim K\langle T \rangle/I$. We prove that for $s \in \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{0*} L_0)$ and $x \in K\langle T \rangle/I$, $s(x) \in f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_{\pi}$. We apply Lemma 4.18 to the morphism $\chi := \Phi_{K\langle T \rangle/I}(s) \in \text{Hom}(i_*(K\langle T \rangle/I), K)$ in $Mod(K)$. Then there exists C such that $|\chi(x)| \leq C \|x\|_{\pi, I}$ for $x \in K\langle T \rangle/I$. Let $x \in K\langle T \rangle/I$. We have $s(x) = \Psi_{K\langle T \rangle/I}(\chi)(x) = (\chi(\frac{T^i}{i!} \cdot x))_i$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\chi(\frac{T^i}{i!} \cdot x)|_{\pi_i} \leq C \|\frac{T^i}{i!} \cdot x\|_{\pi, I} \pi_i \leq C \|\frac{T^i}{i!}\|_{\pi} \|x\|_{\pi, I} \pi_i = C(\pi_0/\pi_i) \|x\|_{\pi, I} \pi_i = C \pi_0 \|x\|_{\pi, I}$ by Lemma 4.15. Hence $\sup_i |\chi(\frac{T^i}{i!} \cdot x)|_{\pi_i} \leq C \pi_0 \|x\|_{\pi, I} < +\infty$. Therefore $s(x) \in f_{r*} N_{\pi}$. Hence the obvious injection $\text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_{\pi}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{0*} L_0)$ is a surjection. Therefore $\dim \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_{\pi}) = \dim \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{0*} L_0) = \dim K\langle T \rangle/I$ by Lemma 3.13. $\square$

Proposition 4.20. *Let I be a non-zero left ideal of $K\langle T \rangle$, $cl_{\pi} I$ as in Corollary 4.16. We regard $F_{\pi}(K\langle T \rangle/I), cl_{\pi} I/I$ as subobjects of $K\langle T \rangle/I$ in an obvious way. Then $F_{\pi}(K\langle T \rangle/I) = cl_{\pi} I/I$ as subobjects of $K\langle T \rangle/I$.*

Proof. We prove $cl_{\pi} I/I \subset F_{\pi}(K\langle T \rangle/I) \dots (1)$. Let $s \in \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_{\pi})$. Let $s' : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_{\pi}$ be the composition of the canonical surjection $K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K\langle T \rangle/I$ followed by s . Then $|s'(P)|_{\pi} = |P \cdot s'(1)|_{\pi} \leq \|P\|_{\pi} |s'(1)|_{\pi}$ by Lemma 4.15. We endow the underlying sets of $K\langle T \rangle, f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_{\pi}$ with

the topology associated to the norm $\|\cdot\|_\pi, |\cdot|_\pi$ respectively. Then s' is continuous. Since $f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi$ is Hausdorff and $s'(I) = 0$, $s'(cl_\pi I) = 0$. Hence $s(cl_\pi I/I) = 0$. Therefore $cl_\pi I/I \subset F_\pi(K\langle T \rangle/I)$ by Proposition 4.2.

By Lemma 4.19 and Proposition 4.2, we have $\dim F_\pi(K\langle T \rangle/I) = \dim K\langle T \rangle/I - \dim \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi) \leq \dim K\langle T \rangle/I - \dim \text{Hom}(K\langle T \rangle/cl_\pi I, f_{r(K,\partial),bd*}N_\pi) = \dim K\langle T \rangle/I - \dim K\langle T \rangle/cl_\pi I = \dim cl_\pi I/I$. Together with (1), we obtain the assertion. $\square$

4.6 An analogue of Dwork's transfer theorem

Lemma 4.21. *Let $r \in (0, +\infty)$. Let I be any principal ideal of $K[[X/r]]_0$ such that $\partial(I) \subset I$. Then either $I = 0$ or $I = K[[X/r]]_0$. A similar assertion holds when we replace $K[[X/r]]_0$ by $K\{X/r\}$ or $K\{X/r+\}$.*

Proof. An analogous property for $K\langle X/s \rangle$ is known, where $K\langle X/s \rangle$ denotes the subring of $K[[X]]$ consisting of $(a_i) \in K_+^\mathbb{N}$ such that $|a_i|r^i \rightarrow 0$ ($i \rightarrow +\infty$) equipped with the derivation induced by ∂_X ([10, Lemma 9.11]). In the case of $R = K\{X/r\}$, let x denote a generator of I . Since $K\{X/r\} = \cap_{t \in (0,r)} K\langle X/t \rangle$ and $\partial_X(K\langle X/t \rangle \cdot x) \subset K\langle X/t \rangle \cdot x$ for $t \in (0,r)$, we have $x \in \cap_{t \in (0,r)} (K\langle X/t \rangle)^\times = K\{X/r\}^\times$. In the case of $K[[X/r]]_0$, by applying the previous case to the ideal $K\{X/r\} \cdot x$, $x \in K\{X/r\}^\times = K[[X/r]]_0^\times$. In the case of $K\{X/r+\}$, we choose $t \in (r, +\infty)$ such that $x \in K\{X/t\}$ and $\partial_X(x) \in K\{X/t\}$. Then $\partial_X(K\{X/t\} \cdot x) \subset K\{X/t\} \cdot x$, which implies $x \in K\{X/t\}^\times \subset K\{X/r+\}^\times$. $\square$

We recall results of [4, 6.6] in the following special case. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. We define the ring homomorphism $\kappa_{r,bd} : K \rightarrow K[[X/r]]_0$; $c \mapsto cX^0$. For $G = (g_{ij}) \in M_m(K[[X/r]]_0)$, we define the complex $C_{r,bd}(G)$ in $\text{Mod}(K)$ concentrated at degree 0 and 1 by

$$\dots \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow (\kappa_{r,bd*}K[[X/r]]_0)^m \xrightarrow{(\partial_X - G)} (\kappa_{r,bd*}K[[X/r]]_0)^m \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow \dots,$$

where $(\partial_X - G) \cdot (x_i) = (\partial_X(x_i) - \sum_{j=1}^m g_{ij}x_j)$; note that ∂_X defines an endomorphism on $\kappa_{r,bd*}K[[X/r]]_0$. We give similar definitions for $K\{X/r\}$, $K\{X/r+\}$.

Lemma 4.22. *Let notation be as above.*

1. Let $G', G \in M_m(K[[X/r]]_0)$, $U \in GL_m(K[[X/r]]_0)$ such that $\partial_X(U) + UG = G'U$. Then $C_{r,bd}(G) \cong C_{r,bd}(G')$.
2. Let 0_m denote the zero matrix in $M_m(K[[X/r]]_0)$. Then $\dim H^0(C_{r,bd}(0_m)) = m$ and $\dim H^1(C_{r,bd}(0_m)) = +\infty$ if $p(K) > 0$ and $\dim H^1(C_{r,bd}(0_m)) = 0$ if $p(K) = 0$.
3. Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, G_1 denote the matrix of the action of T on M for a given basis. Then there exists an isomorphism $i_* \text{Ext}^j(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \cong H^j(C_{r,bd}(g_{r,bd}(G_1)))$ in $\text{Mod}(K)$ for $j = 0, 1$.

Similar assertion for $K\{X/r\}$, $K\{X/r+\}$ hold except that in part 2, the result should be replaced by $\dim H^0(C_r(0_m)) = \dim H^0(C_{r+}(0_m)) = m$ and $\dim H^1(C_r(0_m)) = \dim H^1(C_{r+}(0_m)) = 0$ regardless of $p(K)$.

Proof. 1. The morphism $(\kappa_{r,bd*}K[[X/r]]_0)^m \rightarrow (\kappa_{r,bd*}K[[X/r]]_0)^m$ defined by the left multiplication by U induces the desired isomorphism.

2. The assertion for H^0 is obvious. The assertion for H^1 is due to [4, Proposition 15.1] in the case of $K[[X/r]]_0$ and obvious in the other cases.

3. We recall the construction of [4, 6.6]. We consider the projective resolution of M given by

$$\dots \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m \xrightarrow{(T-GT^0)} K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m \longrightarrow M,$$

where $K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m$ denote the left $K\langle T \rangle$ -module given by the row vectors of length m with entries in $K\langle T \rangle$, $\cdot(T-GT^0)$ denotes the right multiplication by the matrix $T-GT^0$, i.e., $(P_1, \dots, P_m) \cdot (T-GT^0) = (P_1 \cdot T - P_1 g_{11} - P_2 g_{21} - \dots, \dots)$ and the last morphism sends the j -th fundamental vector e_j of $K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m$ to the j -th basis of M . By applying the endofunctor $\text{Hom}(-, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})$ on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, we obtain the complex C in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ concentrated at degree 0 and 1 $C : \dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots$. We have the isomorphism $\alpha : \text{Hom}(K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})_+ \rightarrow (K[[X/r]]_0^m)_+; s \mapsto (s(e_j))$. By the definition of $\kappa_{r,bd}$, this isomorphism extends to an isomorphism $i_*\text{Hom}(K\langle\tilde{T}\rangle^m, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow (\kappa_{r,bd*}K[[X/r]]_0)^m$. We can see that as a complex in $\mathcal{A}b$, C is isomorphic to $C_{r,bd}(g_{r,bd}(G_1))$ via α . Hence the complex i_*C obtained by applying i_* to each term of C is isomorphic to $C_{r,bd}(g_{r,bd}(G_1))$. Since the bifunctor Ext^i is naturally isomorphic to the i -th partial derived functor of Hom with only the first variable active ([3, Theorem 8.1]), $i_*\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})$ is isomorphic to $H^1(C)$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, which implies the assertion. $\square$

Proposition 4.23. *Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$.*

1. *There exists an isomorphism $f_{r,bd}^*\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow L_{r,bd}^{\dim\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})}$ in $\text{Mod}(K[[X/r]]_0\langle T \rangle)$.*
2. *The following are equivalent.*
 - (a) *We have $\dim\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = \dim M$.*
 - (b) *There exists an isomorphism $f_{r,bd}^*M \rightarrow L_{r,bd}^{\dim M}$ in $\text{Mod}(K[[X/r]]_0\langle T \rangle)$.*

In both parts 2 and 3, a similar assertion holds when we replace $f_{r,bd}, L_{r,bd}, \text{Mod}(K[[X/r]]_0\langle T \rangle)$ by $f_r, L_r, \text{Mod}(K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle)$ respectively or $f_{r+}, L_{r+}, \text{Mod}(K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle)$ respectively.

Proof. We give a proof for $K[[X/r]]_0$. For the other cases, a similar proof works.

1. We set $m = \dim M$. We may assume that $\dim\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = m$ by Proposition 4.2 after replacing M by $M/F_{\pi(r)}M$. Hence the obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0)$ is an isomorphism by comparing dimension. Since $i_{0*}f_0^*\text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0)$ is a finite $K[[X]]$ -module, it is known that there exists an isomorphism $\beta'_0 : f_0^*\text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0) \rightarrow L_0^m$ in $\text{Mod}(K[[X]]\langle T \rangle)$. Let $\beta_0 : \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0) \rightarrow f_{0*}(L_0^m)$ denote the morphism corresponding to β_0

under the adjunction isomorphism. Let $\beta_0^{(i)} : \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0) \rightarrow f_{0*}L_0$ be the composition of β followed by the i -th projection. Then there exists a unique $x_i \in M$ such that $\beta_0^{(i)} = c_M(x_i)$ as c_M is an isomorphism. Hence β_0 coincides with the morphism $s \mapsto (c_M(x_1)(s), \dots, c_M(x_m)(s))$. We consider the composition of the obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0)$ followed by β_0 . By Lem 4.13, the morphism factors through $f_{r,bd*}(L_{r,bd}^m)$. Let $\beta_{r,bd} : \text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow f_{r,bd*}(L_{r,bd}^m)$ denote the morphism obtained in this way. Let $\beta'_{r,bd} : f_{r,bd}^* \text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow L_{r,bd}^m$ denote the morphism corresponding to $\beta_{r,bd}$ under the adjunction isomorphism. We consider the matrix $G_{r,bd}$ of the action T on $f_{r,bd}^* \text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})$ and the matrix $X_{r,bd}$ (resp. X_0) of $\beta'_{r,bd}$ (resp. β'_0) with respect to the following basis: we choose an arbitrary basis $e_1, \dots, e_m$ of $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})$ and consider the $1 \otimes e_i$'s as a basis of $f_{r,bd}^* \text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})$ (resp. $f_0^* \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0)$); we consider the standard basis of $L_{r,bd}^m$ (resp. L_0^m). Then we have $\partial_X(X_{r,bd}) = G_{r,bd}X_{r,bd}$ and $X_{r,bd} = X_0$. We have $\det(X_0) \neq 0$ by assumption. Hence we have $\det(X_{r,bd}) \neq 0$. We have $\partial_X(\det(X_{r,bd})) = \text{tr}(G_{r,bd})\det(X_{r,bd})$ by calculating the determinant of $\partial_X(X_{r,bd})X'_{r,bd} = G_{r,bd}X_{r,bd}X'_{r,bd}$, where $X'_{r,bd}$ denotes adjugate matrix of $X_{r,bd}$. Hence the ideal $K\{X/r\} \cdot \det(X_{r,bd})$ of $K\{X/r\}$ is non-zero and satisfies $\partial_X(K\{X/r\} \cdot \det(X_{r,bd})) \subset K\{X/r\} \cdot \det(X_{r,bd})$. Therefore $\det(X_{r,bd}) \in (K\{X/r\})^\times$ by Lemma 4.21, which implies that $\beta_{r,bd}$ is an isomorphism.

2. Let $m = \dim M$.

(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) Assume (a) holds. By assumption, the obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \rightarrow DM$ is an isomorphism by comparing dimension. By part 1, $f_{r,bd}^*DM \cong f_{r,bd}^* \text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \cong L_{r,bd}^m$. Hence $f_{r,bd}^*D_0M \cong L_{r,bd}^m$. Let G_1 be a matrix of the action of T on M for a fixed basis of M . The matrix of the action of T on D_0M is given by $g_{r,bd}(-^tG_1)$, where the matrix is taken with respect to the dual basis of the fixed basis of M . The existence of the above isomorphism implies that there exists a matrix $X \in GL_m(K[[X/r]]_0)$ such that $\partial_X(X) = g_{r,bd}(-^tG_1)X$. Then $\partial(^tX^{-1}) = g_{r,bd}(G_1)^tX^{-1}$. Hence $^tX^{-1}$ defines an isomorphism $f_{r,bd}^*M \rightarrow L_{r,bd}^m$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) Assume (b) holds. Let notation be as in Lemma 4.22. By assumption, there exists a matrix $U \in GL_n(K[[X/r]]_0)$ such that $\partial(U) = g_{r,bd}(G_1)U$. As before, we have $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = \dim \text{Ext}^0(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = \dim H^0(C_{r,bd}(G_1)) = \dim H^0(C_{r,bd}(0_{\dim M})) = m$. $\square$

Proposition 4.24. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, the following are equivalent.*

1. We have $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) = \dim M$.
2. There exists an isomorphism $f_r^*M \rightarrow L_r^{\dim M}$ in $\text{Mod}(K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle)$.
3. We have $\text{supp } m(M) \subset [r, r(K, \partial)]$.
4. The obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, f_{0*}L_0)$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ is an isomorphism.

5. Let $e_1, \dots, e_m$ be any elements of M which forms a basis of i_*M . Let (G_k) denote the family of matrices where G_k for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the matrix of the multiplication by T^k on M with respect to the e_i 's. Then $\omega / \limsup_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} |G_i|^{1/i} \geq r$.

6. We have $F_{(0,r)}M = 0$.

Proof. The equivalences $2 \Leftrightarrow 3$ and $3 \Leftrightarrow 5$ are due to [11, Proposition 1.2.14] and [10, Lemma 6.2.5] respectively.

The equivalence $1 \Leftrightarrow 2$ is a part of Proposition 4.23.

The equivalence $1 \Leftrightarrow 4$ follows from $\dim DM = \dim M$.

The equivalence $1 \Leftrightarrow 6$ follows by Proposition 4.2. $\square$

5 A decomposition theorem in $Mod^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ when $p(K) > 0$

We prove a decomposition theorem in $Mod^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ when $p(K) > 0$, which is regarded as a stronger form of Theorem 1.1. Besides an analogue of Dwork transfer theorem, the point is to prove that $f_{r*}L_r$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ is an injective object in $Mod(K\langle T \rangle)$, where we use calculations of Christol developed in [4].

5.1 The injectivities of $f_{r*}L_r$ and $f_{r+*}L_{r+}$ when $p(K) > 0$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. Assume $F_{(0,r)}M = 0$. Then $\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$.*

Proof. Let G_1 denote the matrix of the action of T on M with respect to a given basis. By Propositions 4.2 and 4.24, there exists an isomorphism $f_r^*M \cong L_r^m$ with $m = \dim M$. This implies that there exists $U \in GL_m(K\{X/r\})$ such that $\partial(U) = f_r(G_1)U$. By Lemma 4.22, we have $i_*\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r*}L_r) \cong H^1(C_r(f_r(G_1))) \cong H^1(C_r(0_m)) = 0$. $\square$

Corollary 5.2. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. $\text{Ext}^1(M/F_{(0,r)}M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$, $\text{Ext}^0(F_{(0,r)}M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$, $\text{Hom}(F_{(0,r)}M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$.*

Proof. The assertion follows from Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 5.1. $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *Assume $p(K) > 0$. Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *We have $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = 0$.*
- (b) *We have $\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = 0$.*
- (c) *We have $F_{\pi(r)}M = M$*

Proof. The equivalence between conditions (a) and (c) proved in Proposition 4.24.

Assume (a) does not hold. We have $\dim \text{Ext}^0(F_{\pi(r)}M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = \dim \text{Hom}(F_{\pi(r)}M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \leq \dim F_{\pi(r)}M < +\infty$. We set $n = \dim M/F_{\pi(r)}M$. By assumption and Proposition 4.2, $n \geq 1$ and $F_{\pi(r)}(M/F_{\pi(r)}M) = 0$. By Proposition 4.24, $f_{r,bd}^*(M/F_{\pi(r)}M) \cong L_{r,bd}^n$. By a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, $\dim \text{Ext}^1(M/F_{\pi(r)}M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = \dim H^1(C_{r,bd}(0_n)) = +\infty$. Hence $\dim \text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = +\infty$.

(a) $\Leftrightarrow$ (b)

Assume (a) holds. We may assume $M = K\langle T \rangle/I$ with I a non-zero left ideal of $K\langle T \rangle$. By assumption and Proposition 4.2, $\dim F_{\pi(r)}M = \dim M$. We fix $P \in K\langle T \rangle$ such that $I = K\langle T \rangle \cdot P$. By $cl_{\pi(r)}I = K\langle T \rangle$, there exists $Q \in K\langle T \rangle$ such that $\|Q \cdot P - 1\|_{\pi(r)} < 1$. Note that $Q \neq 0$. We define $M', M'' \in \mathcal{C}$ by $M' = K\langle T \rangle/K\langle T \rangle \cdot (Q \cdot P)$, $M'' = K\langle T \rangle \cdot P/K\langle T \rangle \cdot (Q \cdot P)$. Then $M', M'' \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ and we have an isomorphism $K\langle T \rangle/K\langle T \rangle \cdot Q \cong M'$ induced by $K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow M'; 1 \mapsto P$. Moreover, we have an exact sequence $E : 0 \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$. For $x \in f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$, $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} (1 - Q \cdot P)^n \cdot x$ converges in $f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$ with respect to the topology defined by $\|\cdot\|_{\pi(r)}$ since $\|(1 - Q \cdot P)^n \cdot x\|_{\pi(r)} \leq \|(1 - Q \cdot P)\|_{\pi(r)}^n \|x\|_{\pi(r)}$ by Lemma 4.15. Hence $x = (Q \cdot P) \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} (1 - Q \cdot P)^n \cdot x$ for $x \in f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}$, which implies that the multiplication map $(Q \cdot P) \cdot : (f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})_+ \rightarrow (f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})_+$ is surjective. Therefore we have $\text{Ext}^1(M', f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = 0$. We apply the functor $\text{Hom}(-, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd})$ to E . Then $\text{Ext}^1(M'', f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = 0$. By (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a), which is proved above, we have $\text{Ext}^0(M'', f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) \cong \text{Hom}(M'', f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = 0$. Hence $\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r,bd*}L_{r,bd}) = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 5.4. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. Assume $p(K) > 0$ and $F_{(0,r)}M = M$. Then $\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$.*

Proof. We have $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$ by assumption. By Lemma 4.12, there exists $r_0 \in (0, r)$ such that $\text{Hom}(M, f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd}) = 0$ for $t \in [r_0, r)$. In the following, let $t \in [r_0, r)$. By Lemma 5.3, $\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd}) = 0$ for $t \in [r_0, r)$. We fix an isomorphism $M \cong K\langle T \rangle/K\langle T \rangle \cdot P$ for $P \in K\langle T \rangle$. Then, for $M' \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$, $\text{Ext}^1(M, M')$ is isomorphic to the cokernel of the morphism $P \cdot : M'_+ \rightarrow M'_+$. Since we have $\text{Hom}(M, f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd}) = 0$, the morphism $P \cdot : (f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd})_+ \rightarrow (f_{t,bd*}L_{t,bd})_+$ is an isomorphism. By taking limit, $P \cdot : (f_{r*}L_r)_+ \rightarrow (f_{r*}L_r)_+$ is an isomorphism, which implies the assertion. $\square$

Proposition 5.5. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. Assume $p(K) > 0$. For an arbitrary $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, $\text{Ext}^1(M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$.*

Proof. Since we have $F_{(0,r)}F_{(0,r)}M = F_{(0,r)}M$ by Proposition 4.2 and Corollary 5.2, $\text{Ext}^1(F_{(0,r)}M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$ by Lemma 5.4. Hence Corollary 5.2 implies the assertion. $\square$

Theorem 5.6. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. Assume $p(K) > 0$. We regard $f_{r*}L_r$ as an object of $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ by forgetting the structure of the left $K\langle T \rangle$ -object. Then $f_{r*}L_r$ is an injective object in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$.*

Proof. For any left ideal I of $K\langle T \rangle$, we have $\text{Ext}^1(K\langle T \rangle/I, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$ by Proposition 5.5 in the case of $I \neq 0$ and by the projectivity of $K\langle T \rangle$ in the case of $I = 0$. $\square$

Corollary 5.7. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$. Assume $p(K) > 0$. We regard $f_{r+*}L_{r+}$ as an object of $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ by forgetting the structure of the left $K\langle T \rangle$ -object. Then $f_{r+*}L_{r+}$ is an injective object in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$.*

Proof. It follows from the existence of an isomorphism $f_{r+}L_{r+} \cong \text{colim}\{f_{s*}L_s\}_{s \in (r, r(K, \partial)]}$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$. $\square$

5.2 Statement and proof of the decomposition theorem when $p(K) > 0$

Throughout this subsection, we assume $p(K) > 0$.

Convention. In the rest of the paper except §8, for an endofunctor F on $\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$ equipped with a natural transformation $F \rightarrow \text{id}_{\text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)}$ which is a pointwise monomorphism, we denote by F^f the endofunctor on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ induced by F . By definition, the functor F^f is equipped with a natural transformation $F^f \rightarrow \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)}$ which is a pointwise monomorphism.

Proposition 5.8. 1. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, the functor $\text{Hom}(-, f_{r*}L_r)$ is exact.*

2. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$, the functor $\text{Hom}(-, f_{r+*}L_{r+})$ is exact.*

3. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, the functors $F_{(0,r)}^f, F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}^f$ are exact.*

4. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$, the functor $F_{(0,r]}^f$ is exact.*

Proof. Parts 1, 2 follow from Theorem 5.6, Corollary 5.7 respectively. Parts 3, 4 are consequences of parts 1, 2 and Lemma 3.13 and Proposition 4.2. $\square$

Corollary 5.9. 1. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, the following are equivalent.*

(a) $\text{supp } m(M) \subset (0, r)$.

(b) $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) = 0$.

2. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$ and $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, the following are equivalent.*

(a) $\text{supp } m(M) \subset (0, r]$.

(b) $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*}L_{r+}) = 0$.

Proof. 1. The negation of (b), i.e., $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) \neq 0$ is equivalent to the condition that there exists a Jordan-Hölder factor M^f of M such that $\text{Hom}(M^f, f_{r*}L_r) \neq 0$ by Proposition 5.8; note that if this is the case then $\dim \text{Hom}(M^f, f_{r*}L_r) = \dim M^f$ by Proposition 4.2 and 4.24. Hence the last condition is equivalent to the one that there exists a Jordan-Hölder factor M^f of M such that $\text{supp } m(M) \not\subset (0, r)$ by Proposition 4.24.

2. By part 1, condition (a) is equivalent to the condition that for all $t \in (r, r(K, \partial)]$, $\text{Hom}(M, f_{t*}L_t) = 0$, which is equivalent to condition (b) by Lemma 4.12. $\square$

Proposition 5.10. *Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ and $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$.*

1. *We have $\text{supp } m(\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r)) \subset [r, r(K, \partial)]$.*
2. *We have $\text{supp } m(F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M) \subset [r, r(K, \partial)]$.*
3. *We have $\text{supp } m(F_{(0, r)}M) \subset (0, r)$.*
4. *Assume $r \neq r(K, \partial)$. $\text{Hom}(F_{(0, r]}M, f_{r+*}L_{r+}) = 0$.*
5. *Assume $r \neq r(K, \partial)$. $\text{supp } m(F_{(0, r]}M) \subset (0, r]$.*

Proof. 1. We may assume $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r) = \dim M$ after replacing M by $M/F_{(0, r)}M$ by Proposition 4.2. Hence the assertion follows from Proposition 4.24.

2. The assertion follows from $F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M \cong \text{Hom}(DM, f_{r*}L_r)$ and part 1.
3. The assertion follows from Corollary 5.2 and 5.9.
4. It follows from Propositions 4.2 and 5.8.
5. The assertion follows from Corollary 5.9 and part 4. □

Lemma 5.11. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$.*

1. *For $r \neq r(K, \partial)$, we have $F_{[r, r]} = F_{(0, r]}F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}$.*
2. *The functor $F_{[r, r]}^f$ is exact.*
3. *For $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, we have $\dim F_{[r, r]}^f M \geq m(M)(r)$.*

Proof. 1. Let $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T \rangle)$. We have $F_{(0, r]}F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M \subset F_{(0, r]}M \cap F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M$. We prove the converse. Let $x \in F_{(0, r]}M \cap F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M$. Let $s \in \text{Hom}(F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M, f_{r+*}L_{r+})$. By Corollary 5.7, s extends to a morphism $s^f : M \rightarrow f_{r+*}L_{r+}$. By $x \in F_{(0, r]}M$, we have $s^f(x) = 0$. Hence $s(x) = 0$. Therefore $x \in F_{(0, r]}F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M$.

2. It follows from part 1 and Proposition 5.8.

3. By part 2 and the additivity of $m(-)$, we may assume M is irreducible. We have $\text{supp } m(M) = \{s\}$ for $s \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$. In the case of $s \neq r$, the assertion holds by $m(M)(r) = 0$. In the case of $s = r$, we have $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*}L_{r+}) = 0$ by Corollary 5.9. Hence $F_{(0, r]}M = M$ by Proposition 4.2. We have $\dim F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M = \dim \text{Hom}(DM, f_{r*}L_r) = \dim DM = \dim M$ by $\text{supp } m(DM) = \text{supp } m(M) = \{r\}$ and Propositions 4.2 and 4.24. Hence $F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M = M$. Thus $F_{[r, r]}^f M = M$. Hence $\dim F_{[r, r]}^f M = \dim M = m(M)(r)$. □

Theorem 5.12. 1. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, we have $F_{sp, [r, r]} = F_{[r, r]}^f$.*

2. *The natural transformation $I_{sp} : \oplus_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} F_{sp, [r, r]} \rightarrow \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)}$ is a natural isomorphism.*

Proof. We have $\text{supp } m(F_{[r,r]}^f M) \subset \text{supp } m(F_{(0,r]}^f M) \cap \text{supp } m(F_{[r,r(K,\partial)]}^f M) = (0, r] \cap [r, r(K, \partial)] = \{r\}$ by Proposition 5.10. Hence $F_{[r,r]}^f M \subset F_{sp, [r,r]} M$. By Lemma 5.11, $\dim M \geq \sum_{t \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} \dim F_{sp, [t,t]} M \geq \sum_{t \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} \dim F_{[t,t]}^f M \geq \sum_{t \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} m(M)(t) = \dim M$, which implies that $I_{sp, M}$ is an isomorphism. The inequalities also imply $\dim F_{sp, [r,r]} M = \dim F_{[r,r]}^f M$. $\square$

Corollary 5.13. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, the functor $F_{[r,r]}^f$ is exact.*

6 A decomposition theorem in $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ when $p(K) = 0$

We prove a decomposition theorem in $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ when $p(K) = 0$, which is regarded as a stronger form of Theorem 1.1. The reader note that Theorem 1.1 is proved in [7]. Our result is to give a description of the direct summands appearing in the decomposition.

Throughout this section, we assume $p(K) = 0$.

Theorem 6.1. *The obvious natural transformation $I_{sp} : \oplus_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} F_{sp, [r,r]} \rightarrow \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)}$ is a natural isomorphism.*

Proof. See [7, Proposition 1.6.3] $\square$

Corollary 6.2. *For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, the functor $F_{sp, [r,r]}^f$ is exact.*

Corollary 6.3. *1. For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *We have $\text{supp } m(M) \subset (0, r)$.*
- (b) *We have $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r) = 0$.*

2. For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$ and $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$, the following are equivalent.

- (a) *We have $\text{supp } m(M) \subset (0, r]$.*
- (b) *We have $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*} L_{r+}) = 0$.*

Proof. 1. We may assume $M \neq 0$. Since $m(-)$ is additive and $\text{Hom}(-, f_{r*} L_r)$ commutes with finite direct sum, we may assume $\# \text{supp } m(M) = 1$ by Cor. 6.1.

(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) Assume $\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r) \neq 0$. We have $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r) = \dim \text{Hom}(M/F_{(0,r)} M, f_{r*} L_r) = \dim M/F_{(0,r)} M > 0$ by Proposition 4.2. Hence $\text{supp } m(M/F_{(0,r)} M) \subset [r, r(K, \partial)]$ by Proposition 4.24. Therefore $\text{supp } m(M)$ contains an element of $[r, r(K, \partial)]$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) Assume $\text{supp } m(M) \not\subset (0, r)$. We write $\text{supp } m(M) = \{s\}$ for $s \in [r, r(K, \partial)]$. By Proposition 4.24, $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r) = \dim M > 0$.

2. We can prove as in the proof of Corollary 5.9. $\square$

Proposition 6.4. *Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ and $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$.*

1. *We have $\text{supp } m(\text{Hom}(M, f_{r*}L_r)) \subset [r, r(K, \partial)]$.*
2. *We have $\text{supp } m(F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M) \subset [r, r(K, \partial)]$.*
3. *We have $\text{supp } m(F_{(0, r)}M) \subset (0, r)$.*

Proof. Parts 1, 2 are proved by a similar way as in the proof of Proposition 5.10.

3. The assertion follows from Corollary 5.2 and Proposition 6.3. $\square$

Theorem 6.5. *For all $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, we have $F_{sp, [r, r]} = F_{[r, r]}^f$.*

Proof. We prove $F_{[r, r]}M \subset F_{sp, [r, r]}M$. In the case of $r = r(K, \partial)$, the assertion follows from Proposition 6.4. We assume $r \neq r(K, \partial)$. We have $F_{(0, r]}M \subset \cap_{t \in (r, r(K, \partial)]} F_{(0, t)}M$ as we have an obvious monomorphism $f_{t*}L_t \rightarrow f_{r+*}L_{r+}$ for $t \in (r, r(K, \partial)]$. Hence we have $\text{supp } m(F_{[r, r]}M) \subset \text{supp } m(F_{(0, r]}M) \cap \text{supp } m(F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M) \subset \cap_{t \in (r, r(K, \partial)]} \text{supp } m(F_{(0, t)}M) \cap \text{supp } m(F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M) \subset \cap_{t \in (r, r(K, \partial)]} (0, t) \cap [r, r(K, \partial)] = \{r\}$ by Proposition 6.4.

We prove $F_{sp, [r, r]}M \subset F_{[r, r]}M$. By Proposition 4.24, the obvious morphism $\text{Hom}(F_{sp, [r, r]}M, f_{r*}L_r) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(F_{sp, [r, r]}M, f_{0*}L_0)$ is an isomorphism. Hence, for $s \in DM$, $s(F_{sp, [r, r]}M) \subset f_{r*}L_r$. Therefore $F_{sp, [r, r]}M \subset F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}M$. Assume $r \neq r(K, \partial)$. By Proposition 6.3, $\text{Hom}(F_{sp, [r, r]}M, f_{r+*}L_{r+}) = 0$. Hence, for $s \in \text{Hom}(M, f_{r+*}L_{r+}) = 0$, $s(F_{sp, [r, r]}M) = 0$. Therefore $F_{sp, [r, r]}M \subset F_{(0, r]}M$. Thus $F_{sp, [r, r]}M \subset F_{[r, r]}M$. $\square$

Corollary 6.6. *The functor $F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}$ for $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$ is exact.*

7 Base change property of the function $m(-)$ and a rationality result

We prove two properties of the function $m(-)$. One is a base change property and another concerns the values $r^{m(M)(r)}$ for $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. The results of this section is not used in the proof of Theorem 8.8.

7.1 A base change property of the function m

Let K' be a complete non-archimedean valuation field of characteristic 0 with non-trivial valuation equipped with a bounded non-zero derivation, which is denoted by ∂ for simplicity. Let $\sigma : K \rightarrow K'$ be a ring homomorphism preserving the valuations and commuting the derivations. Note that we have $p(K') = p(K)$, $\omega(K') = \omega(K)$, $r(K', \partial) \leq r(K, \partial)$, where $r(K', \partial)$ defined as before. Let $i' : K \rightarrow K'\langle T \rangle$ denote the ring homomorphism as before and $\tau : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K'\langle T \rangle$ the ring homomorphism corresponding to the data $(K'\langle T \rangle, i' \circ \sigma, T)$ in the sense of Lemma 2.7. We repeat the basic constructions as before after replacing K by K' . In this way, we obtain $g'_0 : K \rightarrow K'[[X]]$, $f'_0 : K \rightarrow K'[[X]]\langle T \rangle$, $L'_r = L_r(K'\{X/r\}, \partial)$, N'_π and so on. We denote the functors $F_{sp, [r, r]}$, $F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]}$ and so on for K' by $F_{sp, [r, r]}$, $F_{[r, r(K', \partial)]}$ and so on for simplicity. Note that if $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ then $\tau^*M \in \text{Mod}^f(K'\langle T \rangle)$ by Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$.*

1. *For π satisfying condition (C) for K' , we have $\dim \text{Hom}(\tau^* M, f'_{r(K', \partial), bd*} N'_\pi) \leq \dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_\pi)$.*
2. *For $r \in (0, r(K', \partial)]$, $\dim \text{Hom}(\tau^* M, f'_{r*} L'_r) \leq \dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r)$.*

Proof. 1. We may assume M is of the form $K\langle T \rangle / K\langle T \rangle \cdot P$ with $P \in K\langle T \rangle$. We have an isomorphism $\tau^* M \cong K'\langle T \rangle / K'\langle T \rangle \cdot P$. Let Q, Q' denote the monic generator of $cl_\pi(K\langle T \rangle \cdot P), cl_\pi(K'\langle T \rangle \cdot \tau(P))$ respectively. Then $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r(K, \partial), bd*} N_\pi) = \deg(Q), \dim \text{Hom}(\tau^* M, f'_{r(K', \partial), bd*} N'_\pi) = \deg(Q')$ by the result of §4.5, where $\deg(X)$ for $X \in K\langle T \rangle$ denotes the degrees of X regarded as the usual polynomial in $K[T]$. Since the ultrametric functions $|||_\pi$ on $K\langle T \rangle$ and $K'\langle T \rangle$ are invariant under $\tau : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K'\langle T \rangle$, $\tau(cl_\pi(K\langle T \rangle \cdot P)) \subset cl_\pi \tau(K\langle T \rangle \cdot P) \subset cl_\pi(K'\langle T \rangle \cdot \tau(P))$. Hence $\tau(Q) \in K'\langle T \rangle \cdot Q'$. Therefore $\deg(\tau(Q)) = \deg(Q) \geq \deg(Q')$.

2. It follows from Lemma 4.12 and part 1. $\square$

Lemma 7.2. *Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. For $r \in (0, r(K, \partial)]$, we have $\dim \text{Hom}(DM, f_{r*} L_r) = \dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.12 and Corollary 6.1 and Proposition 4.2, we have $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r) = \dim \text{Hom}(\oplus_{t \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} F_{sp, [t, t]} M, f_{r*} L_r) = \sum_{t \in (0, r(K, \partial)]} \dim \text{Hom}(F_{sp, [t, t]} M, f_{r*} L_r) = \sum_{t \in (r, r(K, \partial)]} \dim \text{Hom}(F_{sp, [t, t]} M, f_{0*} L_0) = \sum_{t \in [r, r]} m(M)(t)$. Hence $\dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r) = \sum_{t \in [r, r]} m(M)(t)$. Since we also have a similar equality for DM , the assertion follows from $m(DM) = m(D)$. $\square$

Proposition 7.3. *Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. For $r \in (0, r(K', \partial)]$, $m(\tau^* M)(r) = m(M)(r)$ if $r \neq r(K', \partial)$ and $m(\tau^* M)(r) = \sum_{r \in [r(K', \partial), r(K, \partial)]} m(M)(r)$ if $r = r(K', \partial)$.*

Proof. By Theorems 5.12 and 6.5 and Corollary 6.1, we have $m(M)(r) = \dim F_{sp, [r, r]} M = \dim F_{sp, [r, r(K, \partial)]} M - \lim_{s \rightarrow r+0} \dim F_{sp, [s, r(K, \partial)]} M = \dim F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M - \lim_{s \rightarrow r+0} \dim F_{[s, r(K, \partial)]} M$ for $r \in (r, r(K', \partial))$ and $\sum_{r \in [r(K', \partial), r(K, \partial)]} m(M)(r) = \dim M - \sum_{r \in (0, r(K', \partial))} m(M)(r)$ for $r \in (r, r(K', \partial))$. Similarly, $m(\tau^* M)(r) = \dim F_{[r, r(K', \partial)]} \tau^* M - \lim_{s \rightarrow r+0} \dim F_{[s, r(K', \partial)]} \tau^* M$ for $r \in (r, r(K', \partial))$, and $m(\tau^* M)(r(K', \partial)) = \dim M - \sum_{r \in (0, r(K', \partial))} m(\tau^* M)(r)$ for $r \in (r, r(K', \partial))$. Hence we have only to prove $\dim F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M = \dim F_{[r, r(K', \partial)]} \tau^* M$.

Let $\tau_r : K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K'\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle$ be the ring homomorphism associated to the ring homomorphism $K\{X/r\} \rightarrow K'\{X/r\}; (a_i) \mapsto (\sigma(a_i))$. By $f'_r \circ \tau = \tau_r \circ f_r$ and Proposition 4.24 and Theorems 5.12 and 6.5, $(f'_r)^* \tau^* F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M \cong \tau_r^* f_r^* F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M \cong \tau_r^* (L_r^n) \cong (\tau_r^* L_r)^n \cong (L'_r)^n$ with $n = \dim F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M$. By Proposition 4.24, $\text{supp } m(\tau^* F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M) \subset [r, r(K', \partial)]$. Hence $\dim F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M = \dim \tau^* F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M \leq \dim F_{sp, [r, r(K', \partial)]} \tau^* M = \dim F_{[r, r(K', \partial)]} \tau^* M$ by Theorems 5.12 and 6.5. By Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2, $\dim F_{[r, r(K', \partial)]} \tau^* M = \dim \text{Hom}(D\tau^* M, f'_{r*} L'_r) = \dim \text{Hom}(\tau^* M, f'_{r*} L'_r) \leq \dim \text{Hom}(M, f_{r*} L_r) = \dim \text{Hom}(DM, f_{r*} L_r) = \dim F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M$. Hence $\dim F_{[r, r(K, \partial)]} M = \dim F_{[r, r(K', \partial)]} \tau^* M$. $\square$

7.2 A rationality result

In this subsection, we regard $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as a subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^\times$. Moreover we endow $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with the unique structure of $\mathbb{Q}$ -module. For a non-empty subset G of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we denote $G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp. $G^{\mathbb{Q}}$) the subgroup (resp. the $\mathbb{Q}$ -submodule) of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ generated by G .

For $r \in (0, +\infty)$, we define the complete non-archimedean valuation field $K(X)_s$ of characteristic 0 as the completion of the rational function field $K(X)$ with respect to the s -Gauss valuation $\|\cdot\|_s$. By abuse of notation, let ∂_X denote the derivation on $K(X)_s$ defined as the unique extension of the derivation $K[X] \rightarrow K[X]; \sum_i a_i X^i \mapsto \sum_i (i+1)a_{i+1}X^i$. Note that $K(X)_s$ is of rational type in the sense of [11] and $r(K(X)_s, \partial_X) = s$ and $|K(X)_s^\times|_s = |K(X)^\times|_s = |K^\times| \{s\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Lemma 7.4. *For $s \in (0, r(K, \partial))$, there exists a ring homomorphism $g_{s,\eta} : K \rightarrow K(X)_s$ satisfying the following conditions.*

1. *The ring homomorphism $g_{s,\eta}$ commutes with the ∂ and ∂_X .*
2. *The ring homomorphism $g_{s,\eta}$ is isometric.*

Proof. For $c \in K, i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $|\partial^i(c)/i!|_s \leq |c|_s^i / r(K, \partial)^i = (s/r(K, \partial))^i |c|_s$ by Lemma 3.1. By using this inequality, we can define the ring homomorphism $g_{s,\eta} : K \rightarrow K(X)_s$ by $g_{s,\eta}(c) = \sum_i \frac{\partial^i(c)}{i!} X^i$. Part 1 holds obviously and part 2 follows from Lemma 3.1 with $r = s$. $\square$

Proposition 7.5. *Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T \rangle)$. If $r \in (0, r(K, \partial))$ satisfies $m(M)(r) \neq 0$, then $r \in |K^\times|^{\mathbb{Q}}$ if $p(K) > 0$, $r \in |K^\times|$ if $p(K) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $s \in (r, r(K, \partial))$ be arbitrary. Let $g_{s,\eta} : K \rightarrow K(X)_s$ be a ring homomorphism as in Lemma 7.4. Let $f_{s,\eta} : K\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K(X)_s\langle T \rangle$ be the ring hom. associated to $g_{s,\eta}$. Let λ denote $\mathbb{Q}$ when $p(K) > 0$ and (empty) when $p(K) = 0$. Then we have $(r/s)^{m(f_{s,\eta}^* M)(r)} \in |K(X)_s^\times|^\lambda = (|K^\times| \{s\}^{\mathbb{Z}})^\lambda$ by applying [11, Thm.1.4.21] to the finite differential module $Vf_{s,\eta}^* M$ over $K(X)_s$. Hence $r^{m(M)(r)} = r^{m(f_{s,\eta}^* M)(r)} \in (|K^\times| \{s\}^{\mathbb{Z}})^\lambda \dots (1)$ by Proposition 7.3. As the valuation of K is non-trivial, the subgroup $|K^\times|$ of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is either of finite free of rank 1 or dense in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, where $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is regarded as a topological abelian group with respect to Euclidean topology.

Case 1: $|K^\times|$ is of finite free of rank 1.

We choose $s_0 \in |K^\times|$ such that $|K^\times| = \{s_0\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. We choose $s_1 \in (r, r(K, \partial)) \setminus \{s_0\}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $s_2 \in (r, r(K, \partial)) \setminus \{s_0, s_1\}^{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then s_0, s_1, s_2 is linearly independent in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. By applying (1) to $s = s_1, s_2$, we have $r^{m(M)(r)} \in \{s_0\}^\lambda \{s_1\}^{\mathbb{Q}} \cap \{s_0\}^\lambda \{s_2\}^{\mathbb{Q}} = \{s_0\}^\lambda = |K^\times|^\lambda$.

Case 2: $|K^\times|$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

We choose $s \in (r, r(K, \partial)) \cap |K^\times|$. By (1), we have $r^{m(M)(r)} \in |K^\times|^\lambda$. $\square$

8 A decomposition theorem in $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$

In this section, for a differential field (K, ∂_J) as in the introduction, we recall the definition of the ring $K\langle T_J \rangle$, which is an analogue of $K\langle T \rangle$, and recall basic

facts on the category $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, including the fact that $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$ is isomorphic to the category of differential modules over (K, ∂_J) . Then we prove a decomposition theorem in $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$ corresponding to Theorem 1.1. The point of the proof is that we can lift the previous decomposition theorem to $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$ by using the idea of internal Hom.

8.1 Basic definition

Let R be a commutative ring equipped with a family $\{\partial_j\}_{j \in J}$ of commuting derivations indexed by a non-empty set J . We use the multi-index notation, for example, we denote by ∂_J the family $\{\partial_j\}_{j \in J}$. A differential module over R is an R -module V equipped with a family of commuting differential operators relative to ∂_j for $j \in J$.

We repeat a similar construction as in §2.3 in the above setup. Let $\mathbb{N}^{(J)}$ denote the monoid of maps $J \rightarrow \mathbb{N}; j \mapsto n_j$ such that $n_j = 0$ for all but finitely many $j \in J$. We denote the map $(j \mapsto n_j)$ by $n_J = (n_j)$. Let 0_J denote the element of $\mathbb{N}^{(J)}$ given by the map $(j \mapsto 0)$. Let e_j denote the element n_J of $\mathbb{N}^{(J)}$ defined by $n_j = 1$ and $n_{j'} = 0$ for $j \neq j'$. Let $G(R, \partial_J)$ be the differential module over R given by the free R -module $R^{(\mathbb{N}^{(J)})}$ equipped with the differential operators relative to ∂_j for $j \in J$ defined by $\partial_j((q_{n_J})) = (\partial_j(q_{n_J}) + q_{n_J - e_j})$ for $j \in J$, where we set $q_{n_J - e_j} = 0$ if $n_j = 0$. We denote by e the element of $G(R, \partial_J)$ given by $e(0_J) = 1$ and $e(n_J) = 0$ for $n_J \neq 0_J$. We denote by T_j for $j \in J$ the element of $G(R, \partial_J)$ given by $T_j(e_j) = 1$ and $T_j(n_J) = 0$ for $n_J \neq e_j$. The functor $\text{Hom}(G(R, \partial_J), -)$ represents the forgetful functor $()_+ : \mathcal{D}(R, \partial_J) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$. Precisely speaking, we have an isomorphism $\text{Hom}(G(R, \partial_J), V) \rightarrow V_+; s \mapsto s(e)$ for $V \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial_J)$, whose inverse is given by $V_+ \rightarrow \text{Hom}(G(R, \partial_J), V); x \mapsto ((q_{n_J}) \mapsto \sum_{n_J} q_{n_J} \partial^{n_J}(x))$. Thus $G(R, \partial_J)$ is a projective generator of $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial_J)$. We define the ring $R\langle T_J \rangle$ as the abelian group $R_+^{(\mathbb{N}^{(J)})}$ equipped with the unique multiplication such that the isomorphism $\text{Hom}(G(R, \partial_J), G(R, \partial_J)) \rightarrow R_+^{(\mathbb{N}^{(J)})}$ extends to an isomorphism $\text{Hom}(G(R, \partial_J), G(R, \partial_J))^{op} \rightarrow R\langle T_J \rangle$ of rings. As in §2.3, the category $Mod(R\langle T_J \rangle)$ of left $R\langle T_J \rangle$ -modules is isomorphic to the category of differential modules $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial_J)$ over R , where we can define the isomorphism in an obvious way. Since we can easily translate results on $Mod(R\langle T_J \rangle)$ in terms of $\mathcal{D}(R, \partial_J)$ as in §2.3, we will study $Mod(R\langle T_J \rangle)$. As in §2.3, by writing elements of $R\langle T_J \rangle$ as $\sum q_{n_J} T_J^{n_J}$, we can calculate the multiplication in $R\langle T_J \rangle$ by using the relation $(qT_j) \cdot (q'T_{j'}) = q\partial_j(q')T_{j'} + qq'T_jT_{j'}, T_j \cdot T_{j'} = T_{j'} \cdot T_j$ and $qT_j^{0_J} \cdot q'T_j^{0_J} = q'T_j^{0_J} \cdot qT_j^{0_J} = (qq')T_j^{0_J}$ for $j, j' \in J, q, q' \in R$.

Let $i_J : R \rightarrow R\langle T_J \rangle; q \mapsto qT_J^0$ be the ring homomorphism.

Lemma 8.1. *Let R be as above. We consider the data $(U, \mu, \{u_j\}_{j \in J})$ where U is a ring, $\mu : R \rightarrow U$ is a ring homomorphism, $u_j \in U$ for $j \in J$ such that $u_j u_{j'} = u_{j'} u_j$ for $j, j' \in J$ and $u_j \cdot \mu(r) = \mu(r) \cdot u_j + \mu(\partial_j(r))$ for $r \in R$ and $j \in J$. Then there exists a unique ring homomorphism $f : R\langle T_J \rangle \rightarrow U$ such that $\mu = f \circ i_J$ and $f(T_j) = u_j$ for $j \in J$. Moreover, we have $f((q_{n_J})) = \sum_{n_J} \mu(q_{n_J}) u_j^{n_J}$ for $(q_{n_J}) \in R\langle T_J \rangle$.*

The ring homomorphism $f : R\langle T_J \rangle \rightarrow U$ is called the ring homomorphism corresponding to the data $(U, \mu, \{u_j\}_{j \in J})$.

Proof. A similar proof as in the proof of Lemma 2.7 works, where we define the object $MU' \in \mathcal{D}(R, \partial_J)$ by μ_*U equipped with the differential operators relative to ∂_j for $j \in J$ given by the left multiplication by $u_j \in U$. $\square$

Let $\xi : R \rightarrow \text{End}(R_+)$ be the ring homomorphism given by the multiplication of R . We define the left $R\langle T_J \rangle$ -module $L(R, \partial_J)$ by $R_+ \in \mathcal{A}b$ equipped with the ring homomorphism $R\langle T_J \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}(R_+)$ corresponding to the data $(\text{End}(R_+), \xi, \{\partial_j\}_{j \in J})$.

8.2 The functor $F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}$

We consider the case where R is a complete non-archimedean valuation field K of characteristic 0 with non-trivial valuation $|\cdot|$. We assume that the derivations ∂_j are non-zero and bounded, i.e., the action ∂_j on K has a finite operator norm. We define $p(K)$ and $\omega(K)$ as before. Let $r(K, \partial_j)$ denote the ratio $\omega(K)/|\partial_j|_{sp, K}$. We define the dimension $\dim M$ of a left $K\langle T_J \rangle$ -module M as that of $i_{J*}M$. We say that M is of finite dimension if $\dim M < +\infty$. We denote the category of finite dimensional left $K\langle T_J \rangle$ -modules by $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$. The category is an abelian full subcategory of $\text{Mod}(K\langle T_J \rangle)$.

Let $(0, r(K, \partial_J)]$ denote the set $\prod_{j \in J} (0, r(K, \partial_j)] \subset \mathbb{R}^J$. Let $r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J)]$. Let $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$. As in §2.3, there exists a maximum submodule N of M such that $\text{supp } m(h_{j*}N) \subset \{r_j\}$ for all $j \in J$, which we denote by $F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}M$. For a morphism $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ in $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, we can define the morphism $F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}\alpha : F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}M' \rightarrow F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}M$ by $\alpha(F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}M') \subset F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}M$. Then $F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}$ is an endofunctor on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, which is equipped with the obvious natural transformation $F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} \rightarrow \text{id}_{\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)}$. Note that in the case of $\#J > 1$, the definition does not immediately implies that for $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, we have $F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]}M = 0$ for all but finitely many $r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J)]$.

8.3 Statement and proof of the decomposition theorem

Definition 8.2. 1. Let $j \in J$. We endow $K[[X]]$ with the family of derivations $\partial_{j, J} = \{\partial_{j, j'}\}_{j' \in J}$ defined by $\partial_{j, j}((a_i)) = \partial_X((a_i)) = ((i+1)a_{i+1})$ and $\partial_{j, j'}((a_i)) = (\partial_{j'}(a_i))$ for $j' \in J$ such that $j' \neq j$. Then $(K[[X]], \partial_{j, J})$ is a differential ring. We denote by $K[[X]]\langle T_{j, J} \rangle$ the ring of twisted polynomials associated to the differential ring $(K[[X]], \partial_{j, J})$. Let $L_{j, 0}$ denote the left $K[[X]]\langle T_{j, J} \rangle$ -module $L(K[[X]], \partial_{j, J})$. We define the ring homomorphism $g_{j, 0} : K \rightarrow K[[X]]$ by $x \mapsto (\partial_j^i(x)/i!)$. We define the ring homomorphism $f_{j, 0} : K\langle T_J \rangle \rightarrow K[[X]]\langle T_{j, J} \rangle$ as the one corresponding to the data $(K[[X]], g_{j, 0}, \{T_j\}_{j \in J})$. We obtain the left $K\langle T_J \rangle$ -modules $f_{j, 0*}L_{j, 0}$.

2. Let $j \in J$ and $r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$ (resp. $r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$). We endow $K\{X/r\}$ (resp. $K\{X/r+\}$) with the family of derivations $\partial_{j, J} =$

$\{\partial_{j,j'}\}_{j' \in J}$ defined by $\partial_{j,j}((a_i)) = \partial_X((a_i)) = ((i+1)a_{i+1})$ and $\partial_{j,j'}((a_i)) = (\partial_{j'}(a_i))$ for $j' \in J$ such that $j' \neq j$. Then $(K\{X/r\}, \partial_{j,j})$ is a differential ring. We denote by $K\{X/r\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$ (resp. $K\{X/r+\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$) the ring of twisted polynomials associated to the differential ring $(K\{X/r\}, \partial_{j,j})$ (resp. $(K\{X/r+\}, \partial_{j,j})$). Let $L_{j,r}$ (resp. $L_{j,r+}$) denote the left $K\{X/r\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$ -module $L(K\{X/r\}, \partial_{j,j})$ (resp. the left $K\{X/r+\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$ -module $L(K\{X/r+\}, \partial_{j,j})$). We define the ring homomorphism $g_{j,r} : K \rightarrow K\{X/r\}$ (resp. $g_{j,r+} : K \rightarrow K\{X/r+\}$) by $x \mapsto (\partial_j^i(x)/i!)$. We define the ring homomorphisms $f_{j,r+} : K\langle T_j \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r+\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$, $f_{j,r} : K\langle T_j \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$ as the one corresponding to the data $(K\{X/r\}, g_{j,r}, \{T_j\}_{j \in J})$ (resp. $(K\{X/r+\}, g_{j,r+}, \{T_j\}_{j \in J})$). We obtain the left $K\langle T_j \rangle$ -modules $f_{j,r+*}L_{j,r+}, f_{j,r*}L_{j,r}$.

3. For $j \in J$, we denote the ring of twisted polynomials associated to (K, ∂_j) by $K\langle T_j \rangle$. For $r \in (0, +\infty)$, we repeat the construction as before for the differential ring $(K[[X]], \partial_X)$ (resp. $(K\{X/r\}, \partial_X), (K\{X/r+\}, \partial_X)$). We denote the ring of twisted polynomials associated to $(K[[X]], \partial_X)$ (resp. $(K\{X/r\}, \partial_X), (K\{X/r+\}, \partial_X)$) by $K[[X]]\langle T \rangle$ (resp. $K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle, K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle$).
4. Let $j \in J$ and $r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$ (and, without mentioning, assume $r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$ when the construction involves $K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle$ as before). We define the ring homomorphisms $\mathbf{f}_{j,0} : K\langle T_j \rangle \rightarrow K[[X]]\langle T \rangle$, $\mathbf{f}_{j,r} : K\langle T_j \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle$, $\mathbf{f}_{j,r+} : K\langle T_j \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle$ associated to $g_{j,0}, g_{j,r}, g_{j,r+}$ respectively by using the universality of $K\langle T_j \rangle$.

Let $j \in J$ and $r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$. We define the ring homomorphism $h_j : K\langle T_j \rangle \rightarrow K\langle T_j \rangle$ (resp. $h_{j,r} : K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$, $h_{j,r+} : K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle \rightarrow K\{X/r+\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle$) as the one corresponding to the data $(K\langle T_j \rangle, i_j, T_j)$ (resp. $(K\{X/r\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle, K\{X/r\} \rightarrow K\{X/r\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle; x \mapsto xT_{j,j}^0, T_{j,j})$, $(K\{X/r+\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle, K\{X/r+\} \rightarrow K\{X/r+\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle; x \mapsto xT_{j,j}^0, T_{j,j})$).

Let $\mathbf{L}_0$ (resp. $\mathbf{L}_r, \mathbf{L}_{r+}$) denote the left $K[[X]]\langle T \rangle$ -module $L(K[[X]]\langle T \rangle, \partial_X)$ (resp. the left $K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle$ -module $L(K\{X/r\}, \partial_X)$, the left $K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle$ -module $L(K\{X/r+\}, \partial_X)$). We obtain the left $K\langle T_j \rangle$ -modules $\mathbf{f}_{j,0}\mathbf{L}_0, \mathbf{f}_{j,r+*}\mathbf{L}_{r+}, \mathbf{f}_{j,r*}\mathbf{L}_r$.

We have the following commutative diagram by construction. We have similar commutative diagrams when $K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle$ is replaced by $K\{X/r+\}\langle T \rangle, K[[X]]\langle T \rangle$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K & \xrightarrow{i_j} & K\langle T_j \rangle & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_{j,r}} & K\{X/r\}\langle T \rangle \\ \downarrow = & & \downarrow h_j & & \downarrow h_{j,r} \\ K & \xrightarrow{i_j} & K\langle T_j \rangle & \xrightarrow{f_{j,r}} & K\{X/r\}\langle T_{j,J} \rangle \end{array}$$

Lemma 8.3. *Fix $j \in J$ and $M', M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle T_j \rangle)$. For $j' \in J, j' \neq j$ and $s \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M', h_{j*}M)$, we define the morphism $\Delta_{j'}(s) : M'_+ \rightarrow M_+$ in Ab by $\Delta_{j'}(s)(x) = T_{j'} \cdot (s(x)) - s(T_{j'} \cdot x)$ for $x \in M'$. Then $\Delta_{j'}(s)$ is a morphism $h_{j*}M' \rightarrow h_{j*}M$ in $\text{Mod}(K\langle T_j \rangle)$.*

Proof. Since the ring $K\langle \mathbf{T}_j \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i_j(K) \cup \{\mathbf{T}_j\}$ as a ring, we have only to prove that for $x \in h_{j*}M'$, $\Delta_{j'}(s)(c \cdot x) = c \cdot (\Delta_{j'}(s)(x))$ for $c \in i_j(K) \cup \{\mathbf{T}_j\}$. This follows from straightforward calculation. $\square$

By Lemma 8.3, we obtain the family of endomorphisms $\Delta_{j'} \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{A}b}(\text{Hom}(h_{j*}M', h_{j*}M))$ for $j' \in J, j' \neq j$.

Definition 8.4. 1. For $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle), j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$, we define the subset $F_{j,[r,r]}M$ of M by $F_{j,[r,r]}M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M, h_{j*}f_{j,r+*}L_{j,r+}), s(x) = 0, \forall s \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M, h_{j*}f_{j,0*}L_{j,0}), s(x) \in h_{j*}f_{j,r*}L_{j,r}\}$.

2. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$, we define the endofunctor $\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f : \text{Mod}^f(K\langle \mathbf{T}_j \rangle) \rightarrow \text{Mod}^f(K\langle \mathbf{T}_j \rangle)$ by repeating the construction of the endofunctor $F_{[r,r]}^f$ for the differential field (K, ∂_j) . For $M \in \text{Mod}(K\langle \mathbf{T}_j \rangle)$, $\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in \text{Hom}(M, \mathbf{f}_{j,r+*}\mathbf{L}_{r+}), s(x) = 0, \forall s \in \text{Hom}(M, \mathbf{f}_{j,0*}\mathbf{L}_0), s(x) \in \mathbf{f}_{j,r*}\mathbf{L}_r\}$.

Lemma 8.5. 1. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$, $h_{j*}f_{j,r+*}L_{j,r+} = \mathbf{f}_{j,r+*}\mathbf{L}_{j,r+}, h_{j*}f_{j,r*}L_{j,r} = \mathbf{f}_{j,r*}\mathbf{L}_r, h_{j*}f_{j,0*}L_{j,0} = \mathbf{f}_{j,0*}\mathbf{L}_0$.

2. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$ and $M \in \text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, $F_{j,[r,r]}M$ is a submodule of M .

3. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$ and $\alpha : M' \rightarrow M$ a morphism in $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, we have $\alpha(F_{j,[r,r]}M') \subset F_{j,[r,r]}M$. Consequently, α induces a morphism $F_{j,[r,r]}M' \rightarrow F_{j,[r,r]}M$, which is denoted by $F_{j,[r,r]}\alpha$.

4. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$, the function $F_{j,[r,r]}$ forms an endofunctor on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$.

Proof. 1. It follows from $h_{j,r*}L_{j,r} = \mathbf{L}_r, h_{j,r+*}L_{j,r+} = \mathbf{L}_{r+}, h_{j,0*}L_{j,0} = \mathbf{L}_0$.

2. The ring $K\langle T_J \rangle$ is generated by the subset $i_J(K) \cup \{T_j\}_{j \in J}$ as a ring. By part 1, we have $F_{j,[r,r]}M = \{x \in M; \forall s \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M, \mathbf{f}_{j,r+*}\mathbf{L}_{j,r+}), s(x) = 0, \forall s \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M, \mathbf{f}_{j,0*}\mathbf{L}_{j,0}), s(x) \in \mathbf{f}_{j,r*}\mathbf{L}_{j,r}\} = \mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f h_{j*}M$ as subsets of M . Since $\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f h_{j*}M$ is stable under the action of $K\langle \mathbf{T}_j \rangle$ on $h_{j*}M$ and $i_J(K) \cup \{T_j\} \subset h_j(K\langle \mathbf{T}_j \rangle)$, $F_{j,[r,r]}M$ is stable under the action of $i_J(K) \cup \{T_j\} \subset K\langle T_J \rangle$ on M . Let $j' \in J, j' \neq j$ and $x \in F_{j,[r,r]}M$. We prove $T_{j'} \cdot x \in F_{j,[r,r]}M$. Let $s \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M, h_{j*}f_{j,r+*}L_{j,r+})$. By Lemma 8.3, $\Delta_{j'}(s) \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M, h_{j*}f_{j,r+*}L_{j,r+})$. Hence $\Delta_{j'}(s)(x) = 0$. By the definition of $\Delta_{j'}(s)$ and $x \in F_{j,[r,r]}M$, we have $s(T_{j'} \cdot x) = 0$. Let $s \in \text{Hom}(h_{j*}M, h_{j*}f_{j,0*}L_{j,0})$. By an argument as above, $\Delta_{j'}(s)(x) \in h_{j*}f_{j,r*}L_{j,r}$ and $s(T_{j'} \cdot x) \in h_{j*}f_{j,r*}L_{j,r}$. Hence $T_{j'} \cdot x \in F_{j,[r,r]}M$.

3. Since $\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f h_{j*}$ is a functor, we have $\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f h_{j*} \alpha(\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f h_{j*} M') \subset \mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f h_{j*} M$. We obtain the assertion by using part 1 and applying the forgetful functor $\text{Mod}(K\langle \mathbf{T}_j \rangle) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}b$.

4. This is easily seen by part 3. $\square$

- Lemma 8.6.** 1. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$, $h_{j*}F_{j,[r,r]} = \mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f h_{j*}$.
2. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$, the functor $F_{j,[r,r]}$ is exact.
3. For $j \in J$, the obvious natural transformation $I_{j,sp} : \bigoplus_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))} F_{j,[r,r]} \rightarrow id_{Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)}$ is a natural isomorphism.
4. Assume $M \in Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$ is irreducible. Then $\text{supp } m(h_{j*}M)$ for $j \in J$ is a one-point set, say, $\{r_j\}$ with $r_j \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$. Furthermore we have $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}M = M$ and $F_{sp,[r'_J,r'_J]}M = 0$ if $r'_J \neq r_J$.

Proof. Part 1 follows from Lemma 8.5. Part 2 follows from the faithfulness and exactness of h_{j*} , the exactness of $\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f$ and part 1. To prove part 3, we may replace $F_{j,[r,r]}, I_{j,sp}$ by $h_{j*}F_{j,[r,r]}, h_{j*}I_{j,sp}$ respectively. By part 1, part 3 are reduced to the exactness of $\mathbf{F}_{j,[r,r]}^f$ and our previous decomposition theorem for $Mod(K\langle T_J \rangle)$. Let $M \in Mod^f(K\langle T \rangle)$ be irreducible. For $j \in J$, there exists a unique $r_j \in (0, r(K, \partial_j))$ such that $M = F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M$ by part 3. By part 1, $\text{supp } m(h_{j*}M) \subset \{r_j\}$. The rest of assertion is obvious. $\square$

- Lemma 8.7.** 1. For $r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J))$ and $j \in J$, we have $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}F_{j,[r_j,r_j]} = F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}$.
2. For $r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J))$, the functor $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}$ is exact.

Proof. 1. Let $M \in Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$. We have $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M \subset F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}M$ by applying $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}$ to $F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M \subset M$. We have $h_{j*}F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}M \subset \mathbf{F}_{j,[r_j,r_j]}^f h_{j*}M = h_{j*}F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M$ by Theorems 5.12 and 6.5 and Lemma 8.6. Hence $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}M \subset F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M$ by applying the forgetful functor $Mod(K\langle T_J \rangle) \rightarrow Set$. We obtain $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}M \subset F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M$ by applying $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}$ to both sides.

2. For $E : 0 \rightarrow M^{(1)} \rightarrow M^{(2)} \rightarrow M^{(3)} \rightarrow 0$ an exact sequence in $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, we prove by induction on the sum n of dimension of the $M^{(i)}$'s. For a covariant endofunctor F on $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$ and a diagram D on $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, we denote by FD the diagram obtained by applying F to D in an obvious way. In the base case $n = 0$, we have nothing to prove. In the induction step, if there exists $j \in J$ such that $F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M^{(i)} \neq M^{(i)}$ for some i . We choose such a j . The sequence $E' = F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}E$ is exact by Lemma 8.6. Moreover the sequence $E'' = F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}E'$ is exact by the induction hypothesis. By part 1, $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}E$ is exact. If $F_{j,[r_j,r_j]}M^{(i)} = M^{(i)}$ for all i and $j \in J$ then $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}M^{(i)} = M^{(i)}$ for all i by definition. Hence the assertion is true in the induction step. $\square$

Theorem 8.8. 1. For $M \in Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$, we have $F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]}M = 0$ for all but finitely many $r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J))$.

2. The obvious natural transformation $I_{sp} : \bigoplus_{r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J))} F_{sp,[r_J,r_J]} \rightarrow id_{Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)}$ is a natural isomorphism.

Proof. Note that any object M in $Mod^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$ is of finite length as M is an Artinian left $K\langle T_J \rangle$ -module. By Lemma 8.7, we can reduce both parts to part 4 of Lemma 8.6. $\square$

Definition 8.9. We define the function $m : (0, r(K, \partial_J)] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $m(M)(r_J) = \dim F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} M$ for $r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J)]$. We also define the support of $m(M)$ by $\text{supp } m(M) := \{r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J)]; m(M)(r_J) \neq 0\}$.

Corollary 8.10. 1. The set $\text{supp } m(M)$ is a finite set with $\#\text{supp } m(M) \leq \dim M$.

2. The function $M \mapsto m(M)$ is additive on $\text{Mod}^f(K\langle T_J \rangle)$.

3. We have $\sum_{r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J)]} m(M)(r_J) = \dim M$.

4. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$, there exists a natural isomorphism $I_{j,r} : \oplus_{r_J: r_J=r} F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} \rightarrow F_{j, [r, r]}$.

5. For $j \in J, r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$, we have $\sum_{r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J)]; r_J=r} m(M)(r_J) = m(h_{j*} M)(r)$.

6. Let notation be as in §4.2. If $m(M)(r_J) \neq 0$, then, for $j \in J$ such that $r < r(K, \partial_j)$, we have $r^{\sum_{r_J \in (0, r(K, \partial_J)]; r_J=r} m(M)(r_J)} \in |K^\times|^\lambda$, where $\lambda = \mathbb{Q}$ when $p(K) > 0$ and $\lambda = (\text{empty})$ when $p(K) = 0$.

Proof. Parts 1,2,3 are consequences of Lemma 8.7 and Theorem 8.8. We prove part 4. We fix j . Let $r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]$ be arbitrary. As subobjects of $h_{j*} M$, we have $\oplus_{r_J: r_J=r} h_{j*} F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} M \subset \mathbf{F}_{j, [r, r]}^f h_{j*} M$ by Theorems 5.12 and 6.5. Hence $\sum_{r_J: r_J=r} \dim F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} M \leq \dim F_{j, [r, r]} M$ and $\oplus_{r_J: r_J=r} F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} M \subset F_{j, [r, r]} M$ as subobjects of M by Lemma 8.6. Since we have $\sum_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]} \sum_{r_J: r_J=r} \dim F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} M = \sum_{r \in (0, r(K, \partial_j)]} \dim F_{j, [r, r]} M = \dim M$ by Theorem 8.8 and Lemma 8.6, $\oplus_{r_J: r_J=r} F_{sp, [r_J, r_J]} M = F_{j, [r, r]} M$. Part 5 is a consequence of part 4 and Lemma 8.6. Part 6 follows from part 5 and Proposition 7.5. $\square$

References

- [1] S. Bosch, U. Guntzer, R. Remmert, Non-Archimedean analysis, A systematic approach to rigid analytic geometry, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., 261, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984. xii+436 pp.
- [2] N. Bourbaki, Algebra I. Chapters 1–3.(English summary), Translated from the French. Reprint of the 1989 English translation, Elem. Math., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. xxiv+709 pp.
- [3] H. Cartan, S. Eilenberg, Homological algebra, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1956. xv+390 pp.
- [4] G. Christol, Le théorème de Turritin p -adique, unpublished.
- [5] G. Christol, B. Dwork, Effective p -adic bounds at regular singular points, Duke Math. J. 62 (1991), 689–720.

- [6] B. Dwork, P. Robba, On ordinary linear p -adic differential equations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 231 (1977), 1–46.
- [7] K. Kedlaya, Good formal structures for flat meromorphic connections, I: Surfaces, Duke Math. J. 154 (2010), 343–418; erratum, *ibid.* 161 (2012), 733–734.
- [8] K. Kedlaya, Good formal structures for flat meromorphic connections, II: excellent schemes, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 24(2011), no.1, 183–229.
- [9] K. Kedlaya, Swan conductors for p -adic differential modules, I: A local construction, Algebra and Number Theory 1 (2007), 269–300.
- [10] K. Kedlaya, p -adic differential equations second edition, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 125. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2022). xviii+380 pp.
- [11] K. Kedlaya-L. Xiao, Differential modules on p -adic polyannuli. J. Inst. Math. Jussieu 9 (2010), no.1, 155–201.
- [12] B. Mitchell, Theory of categories, Pure Appl. Math., Vol. XVII, Academic Press, New York-London, 1965. xi+273 pp.
- [13] J. Poineau, A. Pulita, The convergence Newton polygon of a p -adic differential equation III : Global decomposition, preprint.
- [14] P. Robba, On the index of p -adic differential operators. I, Ann. of Math. (2) 101(1975), 280–316.
- [15] A.M. Robert, A Course in p -adic Analysis, Graduate Texts in Math. 198, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [16] L. Xiao, On ramification filtrations and p -adic differential equations, I: the equal characteristic case, Algebra and Number Theory 4 (2010), 969–1027.