

DIOPHANTINE PROBLEMS OVER TAMELY RAMIFIED FIELDS

KONSTANTINOS KARTAS

ABSTRACT. Assuming a certain form of resolution of singularities, we prove a general *existential* Ax-Kochen-Ershov principle for tamely ramified fields in all characteristics. This specializes to well-known results in residue characteristic 0 and unramified mixed characteristic. It also encompasses the conditional existential decidability results known for $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ and its finite extensions, due to Denef-Schoutens. On the other hand, it also applies to the setting of *infinite* ramification, providing us with an abundance of infinitely ramified extensions of \mathbb{Q}_p and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ that are existentially decidable.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Notation	3
1. Preliminaries from geometry	4
2. Valued fields	9
3. Theorem A	15
4. Applications	20
5. Revisiting Denef-Schoutens	23
Acknowledgements	26
References	27

INTRODUCTION

The decidability of the p -adic numbers \mathbb{Q}_p , established by Ax-Kochen [AK65] and Ershov [Ers65], still remains one of the highlights of model theory. It motivated several decidability results both in mixed and positive characteristic:

- In mixed characteristic, Kochen [Koc74] showed that \mathbb{Q}_p^{ur} , the maximal unramified extension of \mathbb{Q}_p , is decidable. More generally, by work of [Zie72], [Ers65], [Bas78], [Bél99] and more recently [AJ19], [Lee20] and

During this research, the author was funded by EPSRC grant EP/20998761 and was also supported by the Onassis Foundation - Scholarship ID: F ZP 020-1/2019-2020.

[LL21], we have a good understanding of the model theory of unramified and finitely ramified mixed characteristic henselian fields.

- In positive characteristic, our understanding is much more limited. Nevertheless, by work of Denef-Schoutens [DS03], we know that $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ is *existentially* decidable in $L_t = \{+, \cdot, -, 0, 1, t\}$, modulo resolution of singularities. In fact, Theorem 4.3 [DS03] applies to show that any finitely ramified extension of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ is existentially decidable relative to its residue field.

The situation is less clear for *infinitely* ramified extensions of \mathbb{Q}_p and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$. Macintyre discusses two such interesting extensions on pg.140 [Mac86]. The author has shown in [Kar20] that these fields are (existentially) decidable relative to their characteristic p analogues. However, to my knowledge, so far there has not been an example in the literature of an infinitely ramified *algebraic* extension of \mathbb{Q}_p (resp. $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$) which is (existentially) decidable in the language of rings L_r (resp. L_t), other than their algebraic or separable closures.

This paper addresses the case of *tamely* ramified extensions of \mathbb{Q}_p and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$, modulo resolution of singularities, including also the *infinitely* ramified ones. Let us first state the precise version of resolution of singularities that we will assume and then state our result:

Conjecture R (Log-Resolution). *Let X be a reduced, flat scheme of finite type over an excellent discrete valuation ring R . Then there exists a blow-up morphism $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ in a nowhere dense center $Z \subset X$ such that*

- (1) \tilde{X} is a regular scheme.
- (2) $\tilde{X}_s = \tilde{X} \times_{\text{Spec} R} \text{Spec}(R/\mathfrak{m}_R)$ is a strict normal crossings divisor.

Some background material on resolution of singularities is provided in §1.3. We obtain the following general result, from which all applications will be deduced:

Theorem A. *Assume Conjecture R. Suppose (K, v) and (L, w) are henselian and tamely ramified over a discrete valued field (F, v_0) with \mathcal{O}_F excellent. If $RV(K) \equiv_{\exists, RV(F)} RV(L)$, then $K \equiv_{\exists, F} L$ in L_r .*

It should be noted that our notion of a "tamely ramified extension" used in Theorem A is not restricted to algebraic extensions (see §2.2.9) but does indeed specialize to the ordinary notion in the case of an algebraic extension. Some background material on the RV-structures associated to a valued field is provided in §2.1.

Theorem A specializes to well-known Ax-Kochen-Ershov results in residue characteristic 0 and in the mixed characteristic *unramified* setting. Moreover, these Ax-Kochen-Ershov principles hold not only for the existential theories but also for the full-first order theories. The case of *finite* tame ramification in mixed characteristic and with perfect residue fields was proved recently in Corollary 5.9 [Lee20] (see also Remark 3.2.7).

At the same time, Theorem A implies conditional existential decidability results for $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ and its finite extensions, which were already known by the work of Denef-Schoutens [DS03]. Our proof does not use Greenberg's approximation theorem, which is an important ingredient in [DS03]. In fact, in the case of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ the proof can be significantly simplified as we explain in §5. Although Conjecture R is a more refined version of resolution than Conjecture 1 [DS03], the simpler proof explained in §5 uses only Conjecture 1 [DS03].

On the other hand, Theorem A applies also to the setting of *infinite* ramification, providing us with an abundance of examples of *infinitely* ramified extensions of \mathbb{Q}_p and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ whose theory is existentially decidable (see §4). We highlight the following example which is of arithmetic significance:

Corollary A. Assume Conjecture R. Then the maximal tamely ramified extensions of \mathbb{Q}_p and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ are existentially decidable in the language of rings.

More generally, assuming Conjecture R, we deduce in §4.1 general existential Ax-Kochen-Ershov principles in both mixed and positive characteristic (see Corollaries 4.1.2, 4.1.8).

NOTATION

- Let X be a scheme over a discrete valuation ring R with residue field κ and fraction field K . Let s be the closed point of $\text{Spec}R$ and η be its generic point. We denote by X_s the special fiber $X \times_{\text{Spec}R} \text{Spec}(\kappa)$ and by X_K the generic fiber $X \times_{\text{Spec}R} \text{Spec}K$. Given an R -algebra A , we denote by $X(A)$ the set of A -integral points. If $X = \text{Spec}B$, where B is a finitely generated R -algebra of the form $B = R[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(f_1, \dots, f_m)$, this can be identified with the set of tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^n$ such that $f_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \dots = f_m(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$.
- If (K, v) is a valued field, we denote by \mathcal{O}_v the valuation ring, Γ the value group and k the residue field.
- We also introduce the following notation:
 - L_r : The language of rings, i.e. $\{+, \cdot, -, 0, 1\}$.
 - L_{oag} : The language of ordered abelian groups, i.e. $\{+, <, 0\}$.
 - L_{val} : The language of valued fields, construed as a three-sorted language with sorts for the valued field, the value group, the residue field and symbols for the valuation and residue maps.
 - L_t : The language L_r , together with a constant symbol whose intended interpretation is a distinguished element t in \mathfrak{m}_v . It will always be clear from context what the intended interpretation of t is.

Given L -structures M, N with a common substructure A , we use the notation $M \equiv_{\exists, A} N$ to mean that the structures M and N are existentially elementary equivalent in L , enriched with constant symbols for the elements of A .

1. PRELIMINARIES FROM GEOMETRY

Since our approach is purely geometric, following the philosophy of [DS03] and [Den16], we shall review some basic concepts and facts from algebraic geometry. Let R be a discrete valuation ring with uniformizer π and $S = \text{Spec}R$. The basic examples to have in mind throughout the paper are $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ or \mathbb{Z}_p with $\pi = p$ and $R = \mathbb{F}_p[t]_{(t)}$ or $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ with $\pi = t$.

1.1. Regular schemes.

Definition 1.1.1. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring with residue field $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$. We say that A is regular if $\dim_k \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = \dim A$.

The concept of a "non-singular" scheme is formalized in the following:

Definition 1.1.2. Let X be a locally Noetherian scheme.

- (a) We say that X is regular at $x \in X$, or that x is a regular point of X , if $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a regular local ring.
- (b) We say that X is regular if it is regular at all $x \in X$.

If X is regular at $x \in X$, then a minimal set of generators for $\mathfrak{m}_{X,x}$ is said to be a *regular system* of parameters of X at x . We record here the following useful fact:

1.2. Normal Crossings.

1.2.1. *Definition.* A divisor D is said to be *strict normal crossings* if Zariski locally D_{red} is the union of non-singular hypersurfaces crossing transversely. More formally:

Definition 1.2.2. Let X be a locally Noetherian scheme and D be an effective Cartier divisor on X .

- (a) We say that D has *strict normal crossings* at a point $x \in X$ if X is regular at x and there exists a regular system of parameters f_1, \dots, f_n of X at x , an integer $0 \leq m \leq n$ and integers $e_1, \dots, e_m \geq 1$ such that D is cut out by $f_1^{e_1} \cdot f_2^{e_2} \cdot \dots \cdot f_m^{e_m}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. If D has strict normal crossings at all points $x \in X$, then D is a strict normal crossings divisor.
- (b) Let X be a regular scheme and $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$ a morphism to a discrete valuation ring. We will simply say that X has strict normal crossings if $X_s = X \times_{\text{Spec}R} \text{Spec}(R/\mathfrak{m}_R)$ is a strict normal crossings divisor.

The integers e_i in Definition 1.2.2(a) are the *multiplicities* of the irreducible components of D passing through x . Some examples are given below:

Example 1.2.3. (a) Let $R = \mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ and X be the affine R -scheme defined by $x^2y - t = 0$. Then $X_s = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[x, y]/(x^2y))$ is a strict normal crossings divisor whose irreducible components have multiplicities 2 and 1.

(b) Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ and X be the affine R -scheme defined by $xy^p - p(1 + x^3) = 0$. Then X_s is a strict normal crossings divisor whose irreducible components have multiplicities 1 and p .

1.2.4. *Normal crossings vs strict normal crossings.* Since the term "normal crossings" is used with subtly different meanings throughout the literature, we find it useful to clarify a few things. In addition to Definition 1.2.2, one has the following more general notion:

Definition 1.2.5. If X is a regular scheme and D is an effective Cartier divisor on X , we say that D has normal crossings if there exists an étale morphism $\pi : Z \rightarrow X$ such that the pullback π^*D has *strict* normal crossings.

However, sometimes authors use the term "normal crossings" for Definition 1.2.2 rather than the more general Definition 1.2.5 (see Remark 1.7, pg. 378 [Liu06]). Thanks to the following well-known fact, this distinction is not going to be important for our purposes:

Fact 1.2.6 (see Proposition 2.2.2 [Nic13], [Con16]). If D has normal crossings, one can always find a blow-up $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ so that f^*D has strict normal crossings.

Fact 1.2.6 is proved in Proposition 2.2.2 [Nic13] when $\dim X = 2$ but the general case is similar. It is explained in detail in [Con16]. We illustrate Fact 1.2.6 with an example:

Example 1.2.7. Let $p \neq 2$, $R = \mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ and X be the affine R -scheme defined by

$$x^2 - \alpha y^2 = t$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times - (\mathbb{F}_p^\times)^2$. Let $\beta \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ be such that $\beta^2 = \alpha$. After a base change $S' \rightarrow S$, corresponding to $R \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p(\beta)[[t]]$, the pullback of the divisor X_s has defining equation

$$(x - \beta y)(x + \beta y) = 0$$

and is thus a normal crossings divisor of $X_{S'} = X \times_S S'$. Blowing up the ideal (x, y, t) makes X_s into a strict normal crossings divisor, in accordance with Fact 1.2.6.

We finally warn the reader that in several places in the literature (e.g. 2.2.2 [Tem11]), the term strict normal crossings divisor means that the divisor is *reduced*. However, our Definition 1.2.2 allows non-reduced divisors as well. In fact, the reader should have the non-reduced case in mind as the typical case throughout the paper.

1.3. Resolution of singularities. For the rest of the paper, unless otherwise stated, we will assume a certain form of resolution of singularities. Before we state precisely the form that we shall use, let us first discuss the notion of a quasi-excellent ring.

1.3.1. *(Quasi-)excellent rings.* The concept of a quasi-excellent ring first appeared in §7.9 [Gro65]. Grothendieck showed in 7.9.5 [Gro65] that if R is a ring such that every integral scheme of finite type over R admits a resolution of singularities, then R is quasi-excellent. Recall that a resolution of singularities of a scheme X is a proper and birational morphism $X' \rightarrow X$, with X' regular (Definition 8.3.39 [Liu06]). Let us now state the definition:

Definition 1.3.2 (see 2.3.1 [Tem11]). Let R be a Noetherian ring. We say that R is quasi-excellent if the following two conditions (after Nagata and Grothendieck) hold:

(N) For any finitely generated R -algebra A , the subspace of regular points $\text{Spec}(A)_{reg}$ is open in $\text{Spec}(A)$.

(G) For any point $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$, the completion morphism $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \widehat{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is regular.¹

More generally, a scheme X is called quasi-excellent if it admits an open covering by spectra of quasi-excellent rings. Some properties and examples of quasi-excellent rings may be found in §2.3.3 [Tem11].

We record the following construction, due to F. K. Schmidt, which will appear again in Remark 2.2.16. It is a classical example of a non quasi-excellent ring and also of a valuation ring whose fraction field admits defect extensions:

Example 1.3.3 (see Examples 2.3.5 [Tem11], 3.1 [Kuh11]). Let $y = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \alpha_i x^i \in \mathbb{F}_p[[x^p]]$ be transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_p(x)$ and let $K = \mathbb{F}_p(x, y)$. Consider the embedding $K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}_p((x))$ and the restriction of the x -adic valuation on K . Let \mathcal{O}_K be the valuation ring of K with respect to this valuation. The morphism $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[[x]]) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ is not regular since the fiber corresponding to the generic point of $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ is not geometrically reduced. Note that $K(y^{1/p})/K$ is a defect extension.

Definition 1.3.4. (a) A commutative ring R is said to be catenary if for any prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ there exists an integer bounding the lengths of all finite chains of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_0 \subset \mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{p}_e = \mathfrak{q}$ and all maximal such chains have the same length.

(b) A Noetherian ring R is said to be universally catenary if every finitely generated R -algebra is catenary.

¹A morphism of schemes $X \rightarrow Y$ is regular if it is flat and for every $y \in Y$, the fiber X_y is geometrically regular over $\kappa(y)$, i.e. $X_y \times_{\text{Spec}(\kappa(y))} \text{Spec}(k)$ is regular for every finitely generated extension $k/\kappa(y)$. A morphism of rings $R \rightarrow S$ is said to be regular if $\text{Spec}S \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$ is a regular morphism of schemes.

(c) A Noetherian ring R is said to be *excellent* if it is quasi-excellent and universally catenary.

More generally, a scheme X is called excellent if it admits an open covering by spectra of excellent rings. We collect some facts and properties about (quasi)-excellent rings:

Fact 1.3.5. (a) Dedekind domains of characteristic 0 are excellent. Complete Noetherian local rings are excellent.

(b) If X is an excellent locally Noetherian scheme, then any scheme locally of finite type over X is also excellent.

(c) Any Dedekind domain R is universally catenary.

Proof. For (a) see Corollary 8.2.40, Theorem 2.39(a) [Liu06]. For (b) see Theorem 8.2.39 (c) [Liu06]. For (c) see Tag 00NM [Sta] for a more general statement. \square

For the rest of the paper, our base ring R will (almost) always be a DVR. In view of Fact 1.3.5(c), whether one says that R is quasi-excellent or excellent amounts to the same thing. We shall use the latter for brevity.

1.3.6. *Resolution of singularities.* Grothendieck conjectured that the converse of 7.9.5 [Gro65] is also true, i.e. every integral quasi-excellent scheme admits a resolution of singularities (see 7.9.6 [Gro65]). In practice, one usually asks for stronger variants of resolution, some of which are discussed in §2.5 [Tem11].² In this paper, we will assume the validity of the following statement:

Conjecture R (Log-Resolution). *Let X be a reduced, flat scheme of finite type over an excellent discrete valuation ring R . Then there exists a blow-up morphism $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ in a nowhere dense center $Z \subset X$ such that*

- (1) \tilde{X} is a regular scheme.
- (2) $\tilde{X}_s = \tilde{X} \times_{\mathrm{Spec} R} \mathrm{Spec}(R/\mathfrak{m}_R)$ is a strict normal crossings divisor.

Condition (1) is the one predicted by Grothendieck's conjecture. A desingularization of X which also satisfies condition (2) is often called a desingularization of the pair (X, X_s) (see 2.5.3 [Tem11])³ or a log-resolution of (X, X_s) . We emphasize that X_s will typically be non-reduced. In residue characteristic 0, one can also

²These variants are mostly discussed in the characteristic 0 context, where we have proven results. However, in 2.3.2 [Tem11] Temkin explains that the stronger variants discussed in §2.5 are expected to be true for *general* quasi-excellent schemes.

³In the terminology of 2.5.3 [Tem11] a desingularization of (X, X_s) is only required to make X_s into a normal crossings divisor but this is not really important in view of Fact 1.2.6. We warn the reader that in [Tem11] the term "monomial divisor" is used for what we called "normal crossings divisor" in Definition 1.2.5. In Temkin's terminology a normal crossings divisor is required to be reduced (see 2.2.2 [Tem11]). Note also that 2.5.3 [Tem11] asks for some control over the centers of the blow-ups but this is not going to be important for us.

make X_s reduced, at the cost of replacing R with a finite extension (see 3.1.4 [Tem11]).

1.3.7. *Evidence for Conjecture R.* We refer to §8.3.4 [Liu06], §3 [Tem11] for more information on established desingularization results. See also §3.6-§3.8 [Spi20] for a more up-to-date survey.

Fact 1.3.8 (Residue characteristic 0). Conjecture R is known when the residue field of R is of characteristic 0 by work of Hironaka (see Main Theorem I, pg. 132 and Corollary 3, pg.146 [Hir64]). These results are phrased for varieties over fields of characteristic 0 but on pg. 151 [Hir64] Hironaka explains that similar results hold more generally over quasi-excellent local rings of residue characteristic 0.⁴ To obtain Conjecture R in residue characteristic 0, one splits the desingularization of the pair (X, X_s) into an ordinary desingularization $X' \rightarrow X$ and an *embedded* desingularization of $X'_s \subset X'$. Theorem 1.1 [Tem08] proves a more general result for *general* quasi-excellent schemes. We note that the above cited results are stated for integral (rather than reduced) schemes but this is not very important (see Remark 2.3.8 [Tem08]).

In positive characteristic, Conjecture R and other variants of resolution are widely open. We nevertheless have some partial results:

Fact 1.3.9 (Positive characteristic). (a) First, in a series of papers Abhyankar proved resolution of singularities for the case of varieties of dimension at most 3, over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p > 5$ (see [Abh66]). Cutkovsky gave a simplified and self-contained version of Abhyankar's proof in [Cut09]. In [CP08] and [CP09], Cossart and Piltant removed the restriction on the characteristic and generalized it for base fields k satisfying a very mild assumption (namely that $[k : k^p] < \infty$).

(b) Lipman showed that reduced, excellent, Noetherian schemes of dimension 2 can be desingularized, but his result does include a divisor condition (see Theorem 3.44, pg.362 [Liu06]). More recently, Cossart and Piltant [CP19] proved a strong desingularization result for general quasi-excellent schemes of dimension at most 3. Conjecture R for $\dim(X) = 3$ can be deduced from Theorem 1.1 [CP19] (one needs to desingularize the generic fiber first, so that $X_s \subset \text{Sing}(X)$).

Fact 1.3.10. A.J. de Jong proved a *weaker* statement than Conjecture R with alterations, in the case where R is a complete DVR (see Theorem 6.5 [dJ96]).

For a concrete and detailed calculation of a desingularization of $X = \text{Spec}(R[x, y]/(xy - a))$ with $a \in R$, which also makes X_s into a normal crossings divisor, see Example 3.53, pg.365 [Liu06].

⁴This is also explained in the introduction of [Tem08]. The notion of "quasi-excellence" does not actually appear in Hironaka's paper but was later introduced by Grothendieck.

2. VALUED FIELDS

2.1. RV-structures. We now provide an overview of the RV-structures associated to a valued field (K, v) .

2.1.1. History. The RV-structures (also known as Krasner's hyperfields due to [Kra56]) first appeared in a model-theoretic context in the work of Scanlon [Sca99] (by the name *leading terms*) and were studied by his student Flenner in [Fle11]. These structures are simplified versions of Kuhlmann's earlier *amc-congruences*⁵ (see [Kuh94]), which in turn were inspired by Basarab's foundational work in [Bas91]. Basarab [Bas91] introduced his *mixed structures* to obtain relative quantifier elimination and relative completeness results for *general henselian* valued fields of characteristic 0 (see Theorems A, B [Bas91]). However, his results require an *infinite* family of such residual structures, which in practice makes it difficult to use for decidability purposes.

2.1.2. Definition. Let (K, v) be a valued field with residue field k and value group Γ . Consider the following short exact sequence of abelian groups

$$0 \rightarrow k^\times \xrightarrow{\iota} K^\times / (1 + \mathfrak{m}) \xrightarrow{v} \Gamma \rightarrow 0$$

where $\iota(a)$ is the equivalence class in $K^\times / (1 + \mathfrak{m})$ of any lift $\tilde{a} \in \mathcal{O}_K$ of a . We introduce the structure $\text{RV}(K) = K^\times / (1 + \mathfrak{m})$, and write $\text{rv} : K^\times \rightarrow K^\times / (1 + \mathfrak{m})$ for the natural map that sends $a \in K^\times$ to its equivalence class in $K^\times / (1 + \mathfrak{m})$. As with the value group, it will be convenient to include an element ∞ in $\text{RV}(K)$ and extend rv to K by requiring that $\text{rv}(0) = \infty$.

Apart from its natural multiplicative structure, inherited from K^\times , one usually equips $\text{RV}(K)$ with additional structure.

- We have a ternary relation \oplus for (multi-valued) addition among elements of $\text{RV}(K)$, so that $\oplus(a, b, c)$ holds if there are $x, y, z \in K$ such that $\text{rv}(x) = a, \text{rv}(y) = b, \text{rv}(z) = c$ and $x + y = z$. We shall simply write $a + b = c$ when c is *unique* such that $\oplus(a, b, c)$.
- We equip $\text{RV}(K)$ with a binary relation $R(a, b) \iff vx \leq vy$, where $\text{rv}(x) = a$ and $\text{rv}(y) = b$.

Since $\text{rv}(x) = \text{rv}(y) \implies vx = vy$, the relation R is well-defined. It will be harmless and also convenient to write $va \leq vb$ in place of $R(a, b)$. The "higher" RV-structures described in §2 [Fle11] will not be important for us.

2.1.3. Language. This gives rise to the following language for valued fields:

Definition 2.1.4. The language L_{RV} is a two-sorted language having the following sorts and symbols:

- (1) a VF-sort, which uses the language of rings $L_r = \{+, -, \cdot, 0, 1\}$.

⁵See the discussion on pg. 6 [Fle11] for a comparison between the two formalisms. We also note that "amc" is an abbreviation for "additive and multiplicative".

(2) an RV-sort, which uses the group language $\{1, \times\}$, a constant symbol for ∞ , a ternary predicate for \oplus and a binary predicate intended for the relation $va \leq vb$ (see 2.1.2).

(3) a function symbol $\text{rv} : \text{VF} \rightarrow \text{RV}$ for the natural map $\text{rv} : K \rightarrow \text{RV}(K)$. Recall from 2.1.2 that by convention $\text{rv}(0) = \infty$.

Fact 2.1.5 (cf. Proposition 2.8 [Fle11]). The residue field $(k, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ and the value group $(\Gamma, +, <, 0)$ are *existentially* interpretable in $\text{RV}(K)$ with the structure described in Definition 2.1.4(2).

Proof. Proposition 2.8 [Fle11] for $\delta = 0$, states that Γ and k are interpretable in $\text{RV}(K)$ (the parameter d in the statement of Proposition 2.8 [Fle11] can be taken to be 1). The proof of Flenner also shows that the formulas required for the interpretation are existential. \square

Lemma 2.1.6. Let (F, v) be a valued field. Then the natural inclusion map $\text{RV}(F) \hookrightarrow \text{RV}(F^h)$ (resp. $\text{RV}(F) \hookrightarrow \text{RV}(\widehat{F})$) is an isomorphism.

Proof. Since $(F^h, v)/(F, v)$ is immediate, we have the commutative diagram below, consisting of two short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \kappa^\times & \longrightarrow & \text{RV}(F) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \kappa^\times & \longrightarrow & \text{RV}(F^h) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

It follows that the natural inclusion $\text{RV}(F) \hookrightarrow \text{RV}(F^h)$ is an isomorphism of abelian groups. Finally, note that this morphism respects the additional structure. The same proof applies verbatim for the completion $(\widehat{F}, \widehat{v})$. \square

2.1.7. *Cross-section.* A right inverse $s : \Gamma \rightarrow K^\times$ of $v : K^\times \rightarrow \Gamma$ is called a cross-section and makes the exact sequence of 2.1.2 split. Therefore, if such a cross-section exists, it allows us to identify the abelian group $\text{RV}(K)$ with $k^\times \times \Gamma$. Explicitly, we identify $(a, \gamma) \in k^\times \times \Gamma$ with $\iota(a) \cdot s(\gamma) \in \text{RV}(K)$.

We add to $k^\times \times \Gamma$ an additional symbol ∞ and equip $(k^\times \times \Gamma) \cup \{\infty\}$ with the following structure:

- A multiplication \cdot , which restricts to the natural group operation on $k^\times \times \Gamma$ and satisfies $\infty \cdot (a, \gamma) = (a, \gamma) \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot \infty = \infty$ for all $a \in k^\times, \gamma \in \Gamma$.
- A ternary relation \oplus for (multi-valued) addition, defined by $\oplus((a, \gamma), (b, \delta), (c, \epsilon))$ whenever (1) $\gamma < \delta$ and $c = a, \epsilon = \gamma$ or (2) $\delta < \gamma$ and $c = b, \epsilon = \delta$ or (3) $\gamma = \delta, a + b \neq 0$ and $c = a + b, \epsilon = \gamma$ or (4) $\gamma = \delta, a + b = 0$ and $\epsilon > \gamma$.
- A binary relation $R((a, \gamma), (b, \delta)) \iff \gamma \leq \delta$.

The structure $(\text{RV}(K), \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$ described in 2.1.2 is isomorphic to the structure $((k^\times \times \Gamma) \cup \{\infty\}, \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$ described above.

2.1.8. *Multiplicative residues.* Now fix a valuation ring A with fraction field K . We consider the set $\text{RV}(A) = \{x \in \text{RV}(K) : vx \geq 0\}$ equipped with the induced structure from $\text{RV}(K)$ and readily seen to be quantifier-free interpretable in the latter.⁶ Note that the residue map $\text{res} : \text{RV}(A) \rightarrow k$, mapping the equivalence class of $a \in A$ in $\text{RV}(A)$ to \bar{a} (and ∞ to 0), induces an isomorphism from $\text{RV}(A)^\times$, the invertible elements of $\text{RV}(A)$, to the multiplicative group of the residue field and is also a left inverse of $\iota : k^\times \rightarrow \text{RV}(A)$.

2.2. Tamely ramified extensions.

2.2.1. *Algebraic tamely ramified extensions.* We briefly review some facts on algebraic tamely ramified extensions. More details can be found in Chapter II, §7 [Neu13], §5 [Lan94], §1 [Kuh16] and [Kuh11].

For valued fields (K, v) and (L, w) , we shall abbreviate the residue fields by k and l respectively, and the value groups by Γ and Δ respectively.

Definition 2.2.2 (§7.1 [Kuh]). (a) The henselian defect (or simply the defect) of a finite valued field extension $(L, w)/(K, v)$ is defined by

$$d = \frac{[L^h : K^h]}{[\Delta : \Gamma] \cdot [l : k]}$$

where L^h denotes a henselization of (L, w) and K^h a henselization of (K, v) inside (L^h, w) .

(b) If $d = 1$, we say that $(L, w)/(K, v)$ is h -defectless (or simply defectless).

(c) A valued field (K, v) is said to be defectless if every finite valued field extension $(L, w)/(K, v)$ is defectless.

Remark 2.2.3 (Lemmas 11.10, 11.2 [Kuh]). Let (K, v) be a valued field.

(a) If L/K is finite and w_1, \dots, w_r are the extensions of v to L , one has $n = \sum_{i=1}^r d_i \cdot e_i \cdot f_i$, where d_i is the defect of $(L, w_i)/(K, v)$.

(b) A defectless valued field (K, v) is equivalently one such that whenever L/K is a finite field extension, we have that the fundamental equality $n = \sum_{i=1}^r e_i \cdot f_i$ holds, where $e_i = e(w_i/v)$ and $f_i = f(w_i/v)$ are the ramification and inertia degrees associated to w_i/v .

Definition 2.2.4. (a) A finite valued field extension $(L, w)/(K, v)$ is said to be tamely ramified if it is defectless, l/k is separable and $p \nmid [\Delta : \Gamma]$, where $p = \text{char}(k)$.

(b) An algebraic valued field extension $(L, w)/(K, v)$ is said to be tamely ramified if every finite subextension is tamely ramified.

(c) If $[L : K] = [\Delta : \Gamma] = e$ and $p \nmid e$, we say that L/K *totally* tamely ramified of degree e .

⁶In [Den16] this is denoted by $\text{MR}(A)$ and is called the structure of multiplicative residues of A .

Remark 2.2.5. (a) We do not assume that (K, v) is henselian, or even that w is the unique extension of v to L . However, if we restrict ourselves to that setting, Definition 2.2.4 agrees with the definition of a *tame* extension given on pg.2 [Kuh16] and also Definition 7.6, Chapter II [Neu13].

(b) The requirement on $(L, w)/(K, v)$ being defectless does not appear in the definitions given in [Lan94] and [CF67] but these textbooks study tamely ramified extensions over local fields and these are automatically defectless.

Example 2.2.6. (a) The extension $(\mathbb{Q}(p^{1/n}), v_p)/(\mathbb{Q}, v_p)$ is tamely ramified if and only if $p \nmid n$.

(b) Any unramified extension of \mathbb{Q}_p or $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ is automatically tamely ramified.

(c) If l is a prime different than p , then $\mathbb{F}_p((t))(t^{1/l^\infty})$ is tamely ramified over $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$.

One can give an explicit description of the *maximal* tamely ramified extension of \mathbb{Q}_p and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$:

Fact 2.2.7 (Corollary 1, pg. 32 [CF67]). We have that:

(a) $\mathbb{Q}_p^{tr} = \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_{\infty'}, p^{1/\infty'}) = \mathbb{Q}_p(\{\zeta_n, p^{1/n} : (p, n) = 1\})$.

(b) $\mathbb{F}_p((t))^{tr} = \varinjlim \mathbb{F}_{p^n}((t))(t^{1/\infty'})$.

Proposition 2.2.8 (cf. Proposition 12 [Lan94]). Let (K, v) be a henselian discrete valued field and L/K be a totally tamely ramified extension of degree e . Then $L = K(\pi^{1/e})$ for some uniformizer $\pi \in \mathcal{O}_K$.

Proof. Proposition 12 [Lan94] is stated for complete valued fields but the same proof goes through in the henselian setting. \square

2.2.9. *Transcendental tamely ramified extensions.* For our model-theoretic purposes, we need to extend the notion of a tamely ramified field extension to the context of transcendental valued field extensions:

Definition 2.2.10. A valued field extension $(L, w)/(K, v)$ is said to be tamely ramified if l/k is separable⁷, the quotient group Δ/Γ has no p -torsion, where $p = \text{char}(k)$, and every finite subextension is defectless.

Remark 2.2.11. (a) O. Endler also defines tamely ramified valued field extensions in the transcendental setting (pg. 180 [End72]) but does not impose that every finite subextension is defectless.

(b) Definition 2.2.10 specializes to Definition 2.2.4 in the case of algebraic extensions.

Example 2.2.12. (a) Every valued field extension is tamely ramified when the residue characteristic is zero.

⁷A field extension l/k (not necessarily algebraic) is said to be separable if l is linearly disjoint from k^{1/p^∞} (see §2.6 [FJ04]).

(b) The valued field extension $(\mathbb{Q}_p(p^{1/n}), v_p)/(\mathbb{Q}, v_p)$ is tamely ramified if and only if $p \nmid n$.

(c) Let $\mathbb{F}_p((t^\Gamma))$ be the Hahn series field with residue field \mathbb{F}_p and value group Γ . The valued field extension $(\mathbb{F}_p((t^\Gamma)), v_t)/(\mathbb{F}_p(t), v_t)$ is tamely ramified if and only if 1 is not p -divisible in Γ .

Convention 2.2.13. For the rest of the paper, unless otherwise stated, a valued field extension will be said to be tamely ramified if it is tamely ramified in the generalized sense of Definition 2.2.10.

2.2.14. *First step towards Theorem A.* We shall prove Corollary 2.2.17, which will be our first evidence towards Theorem A.

Lemma 2.2.15 (Embedding Lemma). Suppose (K, v) and (L, w) are henselian and tamely ramified over a discrete valued field (F, v_0) . If $\text{RV}(K) \equiv_{\exists, \text{RV}(F)} \text{RV}(L)$, and $(K_1, v_1)/(F, v_0)$ is a finite subextension of $(K, v)/(F, v_0)$, then (K_1, v_1) embeds into (L, w) over (F, v_0) .

Proof. The uniqueness of henselization (up to isomorphism) together with Lemma 2.1.6 allow us to assume that (F, v_0) itself is henselian.

Let K_1/F be as in the assumption and K_0/F be the maximal unramified subextension of K_1/F . Let κ be the residue field of (F, v_0) and k_0 be the residue field of K_0 , which is also the residue field of K_1 . Let $f(v) \in \kappa[v]$ be the irreducible polynomial of k_0 over κ and $F(v) \in \mathcal{O}_F[v]$ be a lift. Write $k_0 = \kappa(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{K_0} = \mathcal{O}_F[a]$ with $F(a) = 0$ and $\bar{a} = \alpha$.

Since K/F is defectless, we see that K_1/K_0 is totally tamely ramified. Since F is henselian, so is K_0 . We thus have by Proposition 2.2.8 that $K_1 = K_0(\varpi^{1/e})$, for some e such that $p \nmid e$ and some uniformizer ϖ of \mathcal{O}_{K_0} . We may write $\varpi = \pi \cdot u$, where π is a uniformizer of \mathcal{O}_F and u is a unit of \mathcal{O}_{K_0} . Since $\mathcal{O}_{K_0} = \mathcal{O}_F[a]$, we will have $u = p(a)$, where $p(v) \in \mathcal{O}_F[v]$. Now $\text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_K)$ satisfies the following sentence with parameters from $\text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_F)$

$$\exists x, y (x^e = \text{rv}(\pi) \cdot \text{rv}(p)(y) \wedge \iota(f)(y) = \infty)$$

where $\text{rv}(p)(v)$ is the "polynomial" in $\text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_F)$ obtained by applying rv to each of the coefficients of $p(v)$ and similarly $\iota(f)(v)$ is the "polynomial" in $\text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_F)$ obtained by applying ι to its of the coefficients of $f(v) \in \kappa[v]$.⁸

By assumption, we have that $\text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_L)$ also satisfies this sentence. In particular, there are $a \in \mathcal{O}_L$, $u' \in \mathcal{O}_L^\times$, and a 1-unit $u_1 \in U_1^L$ such that $a^e = \pi \cdot p(u') \cdot u_1$ and $f(\bar{u}') = 0$. By Hensel's Lemma, there exists $u'' \in \mathcal{O}_L$ so that $F(u'') = 0$ and $\bar{u}'' = \bar{u}'$. Since $\text{res} : \text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_L) \rightarrow l$ is an isomorphism when restricted to units, we see that u' and u'' give rise to the same equivalence class in $\text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_L)$ and we may therefore assume that $F(u') = 0$ to begin with.

⁸Recall that addition \oplus in RV is merely a relation and the "equality" $x^e = \text{rv}(\pi) \cdot \text{rv}(p)(y)$ has to be replaced with nested \oplus -relations. Similarly for $\iota(f)(y) = \infty$.

We now have an F -isomorphism $\sigma : K_0 \rightarrow L_0$, sending $u \mapsto u'$, where L_0 is a finite unramified extension of F contained in L . Since $p \nmid e$, another application of Hensel's Lemma shows that $u_1 \in (\mathcal{O}_L^\times)^e$. It follows that there is an element $\beta \in \mathcal{O}_L$ such that $\beta^e = \pi \cdot p(u')$, which allows us to extend the F -embedding σ to K_1 . \square

If we ask that K, L are only "tamely ramified" in the weak sense of Endler (pg. 180 [End72]), then Lemma 2.2.15 does not hold:

Example 2.2.16. Let R be the discrete valuation ring that was introduced in Example 1.3.3, for which there exists $\alpha \in R$ such that $\alpha^{1/p} \in \widehat{R} - R^h$. Set $K = \text{Frac}(R^h)$, $L = \text{Frac}(\widehat{R})$ and $F = \text{Frac}(R)$. Let also $K_1 = F(\alpha^{1/p})$, which is a finite subextension of K/F . We have that K_1 does not embed in L over F , although $\text{RV}(K) \cong_{\text{RV}(F)} \text{RV}(L)$ (see Fact 2.1.6).

Corollary 2.2.17 (Base Case). *Suppose (K, v) and (L, w) are henselian and tamely ramified over a discrete valued field (F, v_0) . Let $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_F)$ be a finite type morphism with $\dim(X_F) = 0$ and $W \subset X_F$ a Zariski open subset. If $\text{RV}(K) \cong_{\exists, \text{RV}(F)} \text{RV}(L)$ and $P \in X(\mathcal{O}_K)$ with $P_K \in W(K)$, then there exists $Q \in X(\mathcal{O}_L)$ with $Q_L \in W(L)$.*

Proof. We may assume that X is reduced by passing to its reduced underlying scheme.⁹ We may also assume that X is irreducible, replacing X with one of its irreducible components which contains the scheme-theoretic image of $P : \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K) \rightarrow X$. In addition, it is enough to focus on the affine case, so that $X = \text{Spec}(B)$ and B is a finitely generated \mathcal{O}_F -algebra of the form

$$B = \mathcal{O}_F[x_1, \dots, x_n] / (f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, f_m(x_1, \dots, x_n))$$

for some $f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{O}_F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

The inclusion $\mathcal{O}_F \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ factors as $\mathcal{O}_F \rightarrow B \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{O}_K$ and so $\mathcal{O}_F \rightarrow B$ must be injective. Since B is an integral domain, the ring $B_F = B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_F} F \cong B[\frac{1}{\pi}]$ is also an integral domain. By assumption, we get that $\dim(B_F) = 0$, which forces B_F to be an Artinian domain, therefore a field. We necessarily have $W = X_F$ because the underlying set of $X_F = \text{Spec}(B_F)$ is a singleton and W is non-empty as $P_K \in W(K)$. We get that $X = \text{Spec}(B)$, where B is a Noetherian domain with $\dim(B_F) = 0$ and $W = X_F$.

Now $P : B \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ corresponds to a tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in (\mathcal{O}_K)^n$, where $a_i = P(x_i)$. Since $\dim(B_F) = 0$, we get that $\text{tr.deg}_F(B_F) = 0$ (see Theorem 5.6 [Mat87]). In particular, each a_i is algebraic over F . Setting $K_1 = F(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and letting

⁹To see this, note that \mathcal{O}_K is reduced and therefore the integral point $P : \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K) \rightarrow X$ factors (uniquely) as $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K) \xrightarrow{P'} X_{\text{red}} \rightarrow X$. We have an equality $|X| = |X_{\text{red}}|$ of underlying topological spaces and $P'(\eta_K) = P(\eta_K)$, where η_K is the generic point of $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)$. In particular, $P'(\eta_K) \in W$. It would then suffice to prove the Corollary for X_{red} in place of X , so that we may assume $X = X_{\text{red}}$ to begin with.

v_1 be the restriction of v to K_1 , we will have that $(K_1, v_1)/(F, v_0)$ is a finite subextension of $(K, v)/(F, v_0)$. By Lemma 2.2.15, we may find a valued field embedding $\sigma : (K_1, v_1) \hookrightarrow (L, w)$ over (F, v_0) . Then the n -tuple $(b_1, \dots, b_n) = (\sigma(a_1), \dots, \sigma(a_n)) \in (\mathcal{O}_L)^n$ corresponds to an \mathcal{O}_L -integral point of X . \square

Remark 2.2.18. The relation of Corollary 2.2.17 to Theorem A will become apparent once we reformulate Theorem A in geometric terms (see 3.2.1). Corollary 2.2.17 is not, strictly speaking, necessary for the proof of Theorem A but see Remark 3.2.5.

3. THEOREM A

3.1. Hensel's Lemma.

3.1.1. *Motivation.* Let $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$ be a *smooth* morphism, where R is a henselian local ring R with residue field κ . The *classical* geometric version of Hensel's Lemma allows us to lift κ -rational points of X_s to R -integral points of X (see e.g. Corollary 2.13, pg. 224 [Liu06]).

Proposition 3.1.7 is an analogue of the above fact for the case where $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$ is not necessarily smooth but has *strict normal crossings*. In that case, one may lift RV-points of X to integral points of X , at least when one of the multiplicities of the irreducible components of X_s is not p -divisible. For lack of a suitable reference, we shall spell out the details.

3.1.2. *Hensel's Lemma for étale morphisms.* Towards proving Proposition 3.1.7, we will need the following geometric variant of Hensel's Lemma for étale morphisms. The proof is essentially the same as the proof of Hensel's Lemma (cf. Corollary 2.13, pg. 224 [Liu06]).

Lemma 3.1.3 (Hensel's Lemma for étale morphisms). Let $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of schemes over a henselian local ring R with residue field κ . Let $P \in Y(R)$ and suppose that the induced κ -rational point $y \in Y_s(\kappa)$ lifts to $x \in X_s(\kappa)$ and suppose that π is étale at x . Then P lifts to an R -integral point of X , which specializes to x .

Proof. Let $S = \text{Spec}R$ and s be its unique closed point. Consider the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow \text{ét} & & \downarrow \pi \\ S & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array}$$

where $Z = X \times_Y S$ and $S \rightarrow Y$ is the morphism corresponding to the point $P \in Y(R)$. Note that $Z \rightarrow S$ is étale by base change. Working now as in Corollary 2.13 [Liu06], we get an R -integral point of X lifting x . \square

Remark 3.1.4. Although Corollary 2.13, pg. 224 [Liu06] is stated with a completeness assumption, Remark 2.14, pg.224 [Liu06] explains that henselianity is sufficient.

3.1.5. *RV-Hensel's Lemma.* In this section, the ring R is a *discrete* valuation ring R with uniformizer π and residue field κ and A is a *henselian* valuation ring extending R with residue field k .

We will eventually reduce Proposition 3.1.7 to the following special case:

Lemma 3.1.6. Let $f(x) \in \kappa[x]$ be irreducible and separable and $F(x) \in R[x]$ be any lift. Consider the affine scheme $Y = \text{Spec}(R[X_1, \dots, X_m, v]/(v \cdot X_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot X_n^{e_n} - \pi, F(v)))$ and the point $y \in Y_s$ at the origin, corresponding to the maximal ideal (π, X_1, \dots, X_m) . Suppose that $p \nmid e_1$ and there exist $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ and $u \in A^\times$ such that $\text{rv}(u \cdot a_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot a_n^{e_n}) = \text{rv}(\pi)$ and $f(\bar{u}) = 0$. Then Y has an A -integral point lifting y .

Proof. Hensel's Lemma allows us to choose $u' \in A^\times$ so that $F(u') = 0$ and $\bar{u}' = \bar{u}$. Recall that $\text{res} : \text{RV}(A) \rightarrow k$ is an isomorphism when restricted to equivalence classes of elements in A^\times . It follows that u and u' give rise to the same equivalence class in $\text{RV}(A)$ and we may therefore assume that $F(u) = 0$ to begin with.

By assumption, there exist $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $u \cdot a_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot a_n^{e_n} = \pi \cdot \epsilon$, with $\epsilon \in (1 + \mathfrak{m})$. Since $p \nmid e_1$, Hensel's lemma provides us with $\alpha \in A^\times$ such that $\alpha^{e_1} = \epsilon$. Replacing a_1 with $a_1 \cdot \alpha$ gives us an A -integral point of Y . \square

Proposition 3.1.7 (RV-Hensel's Lemma). Let $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$ be a finite type morphism so that X is a regular scheme with strict normal crossings.¹⁰ Suppose $x \in X_s$ is a closed point and write $\pi = h \cdot x_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_n^{e_n}$, where $h \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x}^\times$ and $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is part of a regular system of parameters for $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. Set \bar{h} for the image of h in $\kappa(x)$. We further assume that $\kappa(x)/\kappa$ is separable and $p \nmid e_1$. Then X has an A -integral point lifting x if and only if $x \in X_s(k)$ and there exist $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $\iota(\bar{h}) \cdot \text{rv}(a_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot a_n^{e_n}) = \text{rv}(\pi)$ in $\text{RV}(A)$.¹¹

Proof. " \Rightarrow " : Clear.

" \Leftarrow " : We first prove the following:

Claim: There is a common étale neighborhood (U, u) of (X, x) and (Y, y) , where (Y, y) is as in Lemma 3.1.6.

Proof. Shrinking X , if necessary, we may assume that X is an affine scheme, say $X = \text{Spec}(B)$, and that the x_i 's are regular functions on all of X . Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset B$ be the maximal ideal corresponding to x . Let $f(v) \in \kappa[v]$ be the irreducible polynomial of \bar{h} over κ , which is separable by assumption, and $F(v) \in R[v]$ be any lift of $f(v)$ in R .

¹⁰Recall Definition 1.2.2(b).

¹¹Recall the definition of ι from §2.1.2. Note that $\iota(\bar{h})$ is well-defined because $x \in X_s(k)$ and therefore $\kappa(x) \subset k$.

We pass to an étale neighborhood (U, u) of (X, x) , where $U = \text{Spec}(C)$ with $C = B[w, v]/(v \cdot w^{e_1} - h, F(v))$ and u is the point of U_s corresponding to $\mathfrak{q} = (\mathfrak{p}, v - h, w - 1)$. Note that $\kappa(u) = \kappa(x)$. The étaleness of $U \rightarrow X$ at u may be verified by computing the determinant of the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_1 w^{e_1-1} & w^{e_1} \\ 0 & F'(v) \end{pmatrix}$$

which is equal to $e_1 \cdot w^{e_1-1} \cdot F'(v)$. By assumption, we have that $p \nmid e_1$ and that $f(v)$ is separable, which implies that $F'(v) \notin \mathfrak{q}$.¹² Moreover, the element $w \in C$ is a unit in $C_{\mathfrak{q}}$ because it divides the unit h . Therefore, we will have that $e_1 \cdot w^{e_1-1} \cdot F'(v) \notin \mathfrak{q}$ and the morphism $U \rightarrow X$ is étale at u by Tag 02GU(8) [Sta]. In particular, U is regular at u by Tag 025N [Sta].

We introduce $Y = \text{Spec}(R[X_1, \dots, X_m, v]/(v \cdot X_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot X_n^{e_n} - \pi, F(v))$, which is a regular scheme. Consider the morphism $U \rightarrow Y$, which corresponds contravariantly to the ring homomorphism sending $X_1 \mapsto x_1 \cdot w$ and $X_i \mapsto x_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, m$. The point u maps to the origin y of Y_s , corresponding to the prime ideal (π, X_1, \dots, X_m) .

We shall argue that the morphism $U \rightarrow Y$ is étale at u . Note that $\{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$ is a regular system of parameters for Y at y and maps via $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{U,u}$ to $\{x_1 \cdot w, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$, which is a regular system of parameters for U at u . Moreover, since $\kappa(u) = \kappa(x)$, we have that $\kappa(u)/\kappa(y)$ is separable, being a subextension of $\kappa(x)/\kappa$. Étaleness of $U \rightarrow Y$ at u may now be verified using Lemma 2.1.4 [Nic13]. □_{Claim}

Choose $v \in A^\times$ such that $\bar{v} = \bar{h}$, using that $x \in X_s(k)$ and hence $\kappa(x) \subset k$. By assumption, we may find $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $\text{rv}(v \cdot a_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot a_n^{e_n}) = \text{rv}(\pi)$ in $\text{RV}(A)$ and $f(\bar{v}) = 0$ in k . Lemma 3.1.6 implies the existence of an A -integral point of Y lifting y . This lifts to an A -integral point of U lifting u by applying Lemma 3.1.3 to the morphism $U_A \rightarrow Y_A$, induced from $U \rightarrow Y$ by base change, which is étale at u_A . Finally, this induces an A -integral point of X lifting x , corresponding to the composite morphism $\text{Spec} A \rightarrow U \rightarrow X$, . □

The assumption that one of the multiplicities is not p -divisible is necessary:

Example 3.1.8. Let $R = \mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ and $A = \mathbb{F}_p[[t^{1/p}]]$. Consider $X = \text{Spec}(R[x]/((1+x) \cdot x^p - t))$. Let P be the point at the origin of the special fiber, corresponding to the maximal ideal (x, t) . Although, $P \in X_s(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $x = t^{1/p}$ has the property that $(1+x) \cdot x^p \equiv t$ in $\text{RV}(A)$, one sees that X has no A -integral point lifting P . Indeed, this would yield a solution of $(1+x) \cdot x^p = t^p$ in $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ with $v_t x > 0$. This would then imply that $1+x \in \mathbb{F}_p[[t^p]]$ and therefore $x \in \mathbb{F}_p[[t^p]]$. Setting $x = y^p$ and taking p -th roots,

¹²Otherwise, we would have $F'(v) \in \mathfrak{q} \cap B = \mathfrak{p}$, or equivalently $f'(v) = 0$, which is contrary to the assumption that $f(v) \in \kappa[v]$ is separable.

we get $(1 + y) \cdot y^p = t$, which is impossible since the left hand side has p -divisible valuation.

Remark 3.1.9. A computation with logarithmic Jacobians shows that the condition of Proposition 3.1.7 that requires one of the multiplicities e_i to not be p -divisible is equivalently stated by saying that the morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$ is log-smooth at $x \in X_s$ with respect to $(X_s)_{red} \subset X$, $\{s\} \subset \text{Spec}R$, in the sense of Definition 3.1 [Den16].

3.2. Proof of Theorem A.

Theorem A. *Assume Conjecture R. Suppose (K, v) and (L, w) are henselian and tamely ramified over a discrete valued field (F, v_0) with \mathcal{O}_F excellent. If $RV(K) \equiv_{\exists, RV(F)} RV(L)$, then $K \equiv_{\exists, F} L$ in L_r .*

3.2.1. *Geometric Reformulation.* We first reformulate the statement of Theorem A in geometric terms. Using the disjunctive normal form and replacing conjunctions $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n f_i(x) \neq 0$ with a single inequation $\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x) \neq 0$, every existential L_r -sentence with parameters from F is equivalent to a disjunction of sentences of the form

$$\phi = \exists x_1, \dots, x_m (f_1(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \dots = f_n(x_1, \dots, x_m) = 0 \wedge g(x_1, \dots, x_m) \neq 0)$$

We may also assume that $f_i(x_1, \dots, x_m), g(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathcal{O}_F[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, after clearing denominators. It is enough to focus on one such disjunct. We now define the affine \mathcal{O}_F -algebra

$$B = \mathcal{O}_F[x_1, \dots, x_m] / (f_1(x_1, \dots, x_m), \dots, f_n(x_1, \dots, x_m))$$

and let $X = \text{Spec}(B)$ be the associated affine scheme over $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_F)$. In addition, we let $W \subset X_F$ be the (basic) Zariski open subset of the generic fiber, defined by the extra condition $g(x_1, \dots, x_m) \neq 0$. A witness of ϕ corresponds to an integral point $P \in X(\mathcal{O}_K)$ whose underlying rational point satisfies $P_K \in W(K)$. Consider the following problem:

Geometric reformulation: Let X be a scheme of finite type over \mathcal{O}_F and $W \subset X_F$ be a Zariski open subset. If there exists $P \in X(\mathcal{O}_K)$ with $P_K \in W(K)$, then there also exists $Q \in X(\mathcal{O}_L)$ with $Q_L \in W(L)$.

Exchanging the roles of K and L , it is clear that it suffices to solve the above geometric problem. Our proof first treats the case where X is regular with strict normal crossings and $W = X_F$. We then treat the general case using Conjecture R and an inductive argument on $\dim(X)$.

3.2.2. *Strict normal crossings case.* First assume that $W = X_F$ and X is regular with strict normal crossings. Let $x \in X_s$ be the closed point where P meets the special fiber. By assumption, there exists a regular system of parameters

$\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ such that $x_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_n^{e_n} = \pi h$, where π is a uniformizer of \mathcal{O}_F , $h \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x}^\times$.

The point P corresponds to a *local* \mathcal{O}_F -algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{X,x} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ mapping $f \mapsto f(P)$. Taking valuations in the equation $x_1^{e_1}(P) \cdot \dots \cdot x_n^{e_n}(P) = \pi h(P)$, noting that $h(P)$ is a unit in \mathcal{O}_K , yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^n e_i v x_i(P) = v \pi$$

Since \mathcal{O}_K is tamely ramified over \mathcal{O}_F , we will have that $\Gamma/\mathbb{Z}v\pi$ has no p -torsion elements and also that k/κ is separable. In particular, we get that $p \nmid e_i$, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and also that $\kappa(x)/\kappa$ is separable, being a subextension of k/κ . Suppose $p \nmid e_1$, without loss of generality. Since $\text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_K) \cong_{\exists, \text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_F)} \text{RV}(\mathcal{O}_L)$, and hence also $k \cong_{\exists, \kappa} l$ (see Fact 2.1.5), Proposition 3.1.7 applies to give us an \mathcal{O}_L -integral point of X specializing to x .

3.2.3. General case. Our analysis of the general case follows the line of reasoning of the proof of Theorem 4.3 [DS03]. Let X be a scheme of finite type over \mathcal{O}_F and $W \subset X_F$ be Zariski open. We shall argue by induction on $\dim(X)$ that if there exists $P \in X(\mathcal{O}_K)$ with $P_K \in W(K)$, then there also exists $Q \in X(\mathcal{O}_L)$ with $Q_L \in W(L)$. The base case $\dim(X) = 0$ holds vacuously because there cannot exist $P \in X(\mathcal{O}_K)$ when $\dim(X) = 0$. We only need to explain how the inductive step works.

As in the proof of Corollary 2.2.17, we may assume that X is integral and affine, say $X = \text{Spec}(B)$ with B a Noetherian integral domain such that $\mathcal{O}_F \rightarrow B$ is injective, where $\mathcal{O}_F \rightarrow B$ corresponds to the structure morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_F)$. It follows that B is a torsion-free \mathcal{O}_F -module and therefore flat by Tag 0539 [Sta]. By Conjecture R, we will have a blow-up morphism $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ with \tilde{X} regular with strict normal crossings and f an isomorphism outside a nowhere-dense closed subscheme $Z \subset X$, the center of the blow-up. If $P_K \in Z_K(K)$, then P is an integral point of Z and since $\dim(Z) < \dim(X)$, the conclusion follows from our induction hypothesis. Otherwise, we will have that $P_K \in X_F(K) - Z_F(K)$ and P_K lifts to $\tilde{P}_K : \text{Spec}(K) \rightarrow \tilde{X}$, using that $f_F : \tilde{X}_F \rightarrow X_F$ is an isomorphism outside $Z_F \subset X_F$. By the valuative criterion of properness, the integral point P lifts to an \mathcal{O}_K -integral point of \tilde{X} as in the diagram below

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Spec} K & \xrightarrow{\tilde{P}_K} & \tilde{X} \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \exists & \downarrow f \\ \text{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K & \xrightarrow{P} & X \end{array}$$

By the analysis of the strict normal crossings case, one also gets an \mathcal{O}_L -integral point of \tilde{X} . Now $W - Z_F$ is a Zariski dense open subset of the integral scheme

X_F . By Theorem 2.4 [DS03], the \mathcal{O}_L -integral point of \tilde{X} can be chosen so that its underlying L -rational point is in $f_F^{-1}(W) - f_F^{-1}(Z_F)$, which is a Zariski dense open subset of $\tilde{X}_F - f_F^{-1}(Z_F)$. This point induces an \mathcal{O}_L -integral point of $Q \in X(\mathcal{O}_L)$ with $Q_L \in W(L)$ via composition with f , which is what we wanted to show.

3.2.4. *Some remarks on Theorem A.*

Remark 3.2.5. Alternatively, one may argue by induction on $\dim(X_F)$ and use Corollary 2.2.17 as the base case. This arguably leads to a more illuminating proof as the base case now has non-trivial content (it essentially corresponds to the case $\dim(X) = 1$).

Remark 3.2.6. By Fact 1.3.8, Conjecture R holds when the residue characteristic is 0 and the above proof becomes unconditional. In that case, it becomes automatically true that \mathcal{O}_F excellent (see Fact 1.3.5(a)) and that the valued field extensions are tamely ramified (see Example 2.2.12(1)). Therefore, one recovers the *existential* version of Ax-Kochen-Ershov in residue characteristic 0. In [Den16], Denef manages to recover the full first-order Ax-Kochen-Ershov theorem in residue characteristic 0 using weak toroidalization of morphisms.¹³

In the case of *finite* tame ramification in mixed characteristic and perfect residue fields, the full first-order version of Theorem A was proved *unconditionally* by J. Lee:

Remark 3.2.7 (see Corollary 5.9 [Lee20]). When $(K, v), (L, w)$ are henselian valued fields, finitely and tamely ramified over (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) , then J. Lee proves *unconditionally* that $\text{RV}(K) \equiv \text{RV}(L)$ implies $K \equiv L$ in L_r .

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1. Decidability.

4.1.1. *Mixed characteristic.* In Remark 7.6 [AF16], the authors write:

"At present, we do not know of an example of a mixed characteristic henselian valued field (K, v) for which k and (Γ, vp) are \exists -decidable but (K, v) is \exists -undecidable."

The existence of such an example is proved in Observation 1.2.2 [Kar20]. However, if we restrict ourselves to the tamely ramified setting and require that (K, v) admits a cross-section extending a cross-section of (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) , we indeed get such an Ax-Kochen style statement (see Corollary 4.1.5). We first prove:

Corollary 4.1.2 (Mixed characteristic). *Assume Conjecture R. Suppose (K, v) and (L, w) are henselian and tamely ramified over (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) , admitting cross-sections that restrict to the same cross-section of (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) . If $k \equiv_{\exists} l$ in L_r*

¹³This result fails in characteristic p .

and $(\Gamma, vp) \equiv_{\exists} (\Delta, wp)$ in L_{oag} with a constant symbol for the value of p , then $K \equiv_{\exists} L$ in L_r .

Proof. We may replace (L, w) with a $|K|^+$ -saturated elementary extension in the language L_{val} with a cross-section. In particular, the residue field l and the value group Δ are themselves $|k|^+$ -saturated and $|\Gamma|^+$ -saturated respectively. Since $k \models Th_{\exists} l$ and $(\Gamma, vp) \models Th_{\exists}(\Delta, wp)$ we get a ring embedding $\rho : k \hookrightarrow l$ and an embedding of ordered abelian groups $\sigma : \Gamma \hookrightarrow \Delta$ fixing the value of p .

The structure $(RV(K), \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$ (resp. $(RV(L), \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$) described in 2.1.2 is isomorphic to the structure $((k^{\times} \times \Gamma) \cup \{\infty\}, \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$ (resp. $((l^{\times} \times \Delta) \cup \{\infty\}, \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$) via the identification described in 2.1.7. Moreover, these identifications are compatible with the identification of $(RV(\mathbb{Q}), \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$ with $((\mathbb{F}_p^{\times} \times \mathbb{Z}vp) \cup \{\infty\}, \oplus, \cdot, \leq, 1, \infty)$, as the cross-sections of K and L extend the one of \mathbb{Q} . The maps ρ and σ combine to give us an embedding of RV-structures $RV(K) \hookrightarrow RV(L)$ over $RV(\mathbb{Q})$. Reversing the roles of K and L , we deduce that $RV(K) \equiv_{\exists, RV(\mathbb{Q})} RV(L)$ and the conclusion follows from Theorem A. \square

The cross-section condition of Corollary 4.1.2 is crucial. Indeed, we may have (K, v) and (L, w) henselian and tamely ramified over (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) with $k \equiv_{\exists} l$ in L_r and $(\Gamma, vp) \equiv_{\exists} (\Delta, wp)$ in L_{oag} but with $K \not\equiv_{\exists} L$ in L_r :

Example 4.1.3. Take $p \neq 2$ such that $2 \notin (\mathbb{F}_p^{\times})^2$ (e.g. $p = 3$). Let $(K, v) = (\mathbb{Q}_p(p^{1/2}), v_p)$ and $(L, w) = (\mathbb{Q}_p((2p)^{1/2}), v_p)$. It is clear that $k = l = \mathbb{F}_p$ and $(\Gamma, vp) = (\Delta, wp) \cong (\mathbb{Z}, 2)$. On the other hand, we have that $K \not\equiv_{\exists} L$ in L_r . Indeed, if $p^{1/2} \in L$ this would imply that $2 \in (\mathbb{F}_p^{\times})^2$.

Remark 4.1.4. When (K, v) is *unramified*, then there always exists an elementary extension which admits a cross-section extending the standard cross-section $n \mapsto p^n$ of (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) . This follows from Proposition 5.4 [vdD12]. In particular, one can drop the cross-section condition in Corollary 4.1.2 in the unramified setting.

Corollary 4.1.5. *Suppose (K, v) is henselian and tamely ramified over (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) with a cross-section that extends a cross-section of (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) . Then K is existentially decidable in L_r relative to k in L_r and (Γ, vp) in L_{oag} with a constant for the value of p .*

Proof. Assume k (resp. (Γ, vp)) is existentially decidable in L_r (resp. L_{oag} with a constant for vp). Let L be the language L_{val} (see notation) together with a symbol for a cross-section and let $T = \text{Hen} \cup Th_{\exists}(k) \cup Th_{\exists}(\Gamma, vp) \cup \text{Diag}_K(\mathbb{Q})$, where Hen is the usual axiom-schema capturing Hensel's Lemma and $\text{Diag}_K(\mathbb{Q})$ is the atomic diagram of \mathbb{Q} in the L -structure K . Note that T is *recursively axiomatizable*.

Claim: For every existential sentence $\phi \in L_r$, we have $T \models \phi \iff K \models \phi$.

Proof. Indeed, let $(L, w, s_L) \models T$ with residue field l , value group Δ and cross-section $s_L : L^{\times} \rightarrow \Delta$. Note that $\Delta/\mathbb{Z}vp$ has no p -torsion elements, using that

$(\Delta, wp) \equiv_{\exists} (\Gamma, vp)$ and that this holds for $\Gamma/\mathbb{Z}vp$. Moreover, the field \mathbb{F}_p is perfect and therefore l/\mathbb{F}_p is separable. The valued field (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) is defectless and we conclude that (L, w) is tamely ramified over (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) . Since $L \models \text{Diag}_K(\mathbb{Q})$, we have that s_L and s_K restrict to the same cross-section of (\mathbb{Q}, v_p) . By Corollary 4.1.2, we see that $L \models \phi$. \square_{Claim}

In particular, the theory T is existentially complete, meaning that for every existential sentence $\phi \in L_r$ either $T \models \phi$ or $T \models \neg\phi$. A brute-force enumeration of all proofs from the axioms of T now yields an effective procedure for deciding whether $K \models \phi$, for any existential sentence $\phi \in L_r$. \square

Once again, the cross-section condition cannot be omitted from Corollary 4.1.5:

Example 4.1.6. Let $p > 2$ and choose $u \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ such that $\bar{u} \notin (\mathbb{F}_p^\times)^2$. For each $\alpha \in 2^\omega$, we define a tamely ramified algebraic extension K_α of \mathbb{Q}_p as follows. Set $\pi_{\alpha(0)} = p$ and $K_{\alpha(0)} = \mathbb{Q}_p$. We now define inductively:

- (1) $K_{\alpha(n)} = K_{\alpha(n-1)}(\pi_{\alpha(n-1)}^{1/2})$ and $\pi_{\alpha(n)} = \pi_{\alpha(n-1)}^{1/2}$ if $\alpha(n) = 0$ or
- (2) $K_{\alpha(n)} = K_{\alpha(n-1)}((u\pi_{\alpha(n-1)})^{1/2})$ and $\pi_{\alpha(n)} = (u\pi_{\alpha(n-1)})^{1/2}$ if $\alpha(n) = 1$.

We let $K_\alpha = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_{\alpha(n)}$. For every $\alpha \in 2^\omega$, we have that K_α is henselian, being an algebraic extension of \mathbb{Q}_p . It has value group $(\Gamma_\alpha, vp) = (\frac{1}{2^\infty}\mathbb{Z}, 1)$ and residue field $k_\alpha = \mathbb{F}_p$, both of which are decidable. If $\alpha \neq \beta$, then $K_\alpha \not\equiv_{\exists} K_\beta$ in L_r . Indeed, let $n \in \omega$ be least such that $\alpha(n) \neq \beta(n)$. Note that for each $n \in \omega$, the elements $\pi_{\alpha(n)}, \pi_{\beta(n)}$ are algebraic over \mathbb{Q} . Now if $K_\alpha \equiv_{\exists} K_\beta$, we would have that $\pi_{\alpha(n-1)}^{1/2}, (u\pi_{\alpha(n-1)})^{1/2} \in K_\alpha$. This would imply that $\bar{u} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^\times)^2$, which is a contradiction. Since 2^ω is uncountable and there are countably many Turing machines, there must exist an $\alpha \in 2^\omega$ such that K_α is \exists -undecidable in L_r .

4.1.7. Positive characteristic.

Corollary 4.1.8 (Positive characteristic). *Assume Conjecture R. Suppose (K, v) and (L, w) are henselian and tamely ramified over $(\mathbb{F}_p(t), v_t)$, admitting cross-sections that restrict to the same cross-section of $(\mathbb{F}_p(t), v_t)$. If $k \equiv_{\exists} l$ in L_r and $(\Gamma, vt) \equiv_{\exists} (\Delta, wt)$ in L_{oag} with a constant for the value of t , then $K \equiv_{\exists} L$ in L_t .*

Proof. Similar to Corollary 4.1.2. \square

Remark 4.1.9. As in Remark 4.1.4, the cross-section condition can be eliminated in the *unramified* case. In particular, assuming Conjecture R, we deduce that if (K, v) is a henselian valued field extending $(\mathbb{F}_p(t), v_t)$ with $k \equiv_{\exists} \mathbb{F}_p$ in L_r and $(\Gamma, vt) \equiv_{\exists} (\mathbb{Z}, 1)$ in L_{oag} with a constant for the value of t , then $K \equiv_{\exists, \mathbb{F}_p(t)} \mathbb{F}_p((t))$ in L_r .

Remark 4.1.10. If we do not ask that K, L are tamely ramified over $\mathbb{F}_p(t)$, the conclusion of Corollary 4.1.8 may fail (see Example 4.2.1).

Corollary 4.1.11. *Suppose (K, v) is henselian and tamely ramified over $(\mathbb{F}_p(t), v_t)$, with a cross-section extending a cross-section of $(\mathbb{F}_p(t), v_t)$. Then K is existentially decidable in L_t relative to k in L_r and (Γ, vt) in L_{oag} with a constant for the value of t .*

Proof. Similar to Corollary 4.1.5. □

4.1.12. *Proof of Corollary A.* Among the fields that are existentially decidable, the maximal tamely ramified extensions of \mathbb{Q}_p and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ are of arithmetic significance.

Corollary A (Ramification fields). Assume Conjecture R. Then the fields \mathbb{Q}_p^{tr} and $\mathbb{F}_p((t))^{tr}$ are existentially decidable in L_r .

Proof. From Fact 2.2.7, one sees that both of these fields have residue field $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ and value group $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. The field $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ is (existentially) decidable in L_r and $(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}, 1)$ is (existentially) decidable in L_{oag} with a constant symbol for 1. Moreover, the field \mathbb{Q}_p^{tr} (resp. $\mathbb{F}_p((t))^{tr}$) admits a cross-section mapping $\gamma \mapsto p^\gamma$ (resp. $\gamma \mapsto t^\gamma$). The conclusion follows from Corollaries 4.1.2 and 4.1.8. □

4.2. **Tweaking Abhyankar's example.** For an application of a different kind, we present a tame variant of the following famous example, essentially due to Abhyankar [Abh56]. It is also presented by Kuhlmann in a model-theoretic context in Example 3.13 [Kuh11]:

Example 4.2.1. Let $(K, v) = (\mathbb{F}_p((t))^{1/p^\infty}, v_t)$ and $(L, w) = (\mathbb{F}_p((t^{1/p^\infty})), v_t)$ be the Hahn series field with value group $\frac{1}{p^\infty}\mathbb{Z}$ and residue field \mathbb{F}_p . We observe that $\text{RV}(K) \cong_{\text{RV}(\mathbb{F}_p((t)))} \text{RV}(L)$ but $(K, v) \not\equiv_{\exists, \mathbb{F}_p((t))} (L, w)$ since the Artin-Schreier equation $x^p - x - \frac{1}{t} = 0$ has a solution in L but not in K . Note that both K, L admit a cross-section which sends $\gamma \mapsto t^\gamma$. This example therefore demonstrates why Corollary 4.1.8 is not true without the tameness assumption.

Our version of Abhyankar's example is obtained by replacing p -power roots of t with l -power roots and exhibits a totally different behaviour:

Example 4.2.2. Fix any prime $l \neq p$. Consider the valued fields $(K, v) = (\mathbb{F}_p((t))(t^{1/l^\infty}), v_t)$ and $(L, w) = (\mathbb{F}_p((t^{1/l^\infty})), v_t)$, with the latter being the Hahn series field with value group $\frac{1}{l^\infty}\mathbb{Z}$ and residue field \mathbb{F}_p . We observe that $\text{RV}(K) \cong \text{RV}(L)$ and by Theorem A we get that $(K, v) \equiv_{\mathbb{F}_p((t^{1/l^n})), \exists} (L, w)$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $\mathbb{F}_p((t))(t^{1/l^\infty}) \prec_{\exists} \mathbb{F}_p((t^{1/l^\infty}))$ in L_r .

5. REVISITING DENEFS-SCHOUTENS

5.1. **Overview of Denef-Schoutens.** Denef-Schoutens proved in Theorem 4.3 [DS03] the existential decidability of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ in L_t , assuming resolution of singularities for schemes over fields (Conjecture 1 [DS03]). Using Conjecture 1 [DS03],

they eventually reduce the problem of existential decidability of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ in L_t to the problem of deciding whether a given scheme Y of finite type over $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ has an $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral point (see the proof of Theorem 4.3 [DS03]). They solve the latter problem using an *effective* Greenberg approximation theorem (Theorems 3.2, 6.1 [BDLvdD79]). In particular, they prove *unconditionally* that the *positive* existential theory of $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ is decidable in L_t (Proposition 3.5 [DS03]).

5.2. Comparison with Denef-Schoutens. Assuming Conjecture R, our Theorem A also implies the existential decidability of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ in L_t (see Corollary 4.1.11). Moreover, using Corollary 4.1.8 and Remark 4.1.9 we have a precise and simple system of axioms which captures the existential theory of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ in L_t . Note that our proof does not make use of Greenberg's approximation theorem. On the other hand, Conjecture R is more refined than Conjecture 1 [DS03]. We shall now provide a simplified proof in the case of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$, which only relies on Conjecture 1 [DS03].

5.3. Simplified proof for $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$. Let X_0 be a scheme of finite type over $\mathbb{F}_p[t]$ and W a Zariski open subset of the generic fiber. We shall also write $X = X_0 \times_{\text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[t])} \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$ for the base change via $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[t])$.

Our task is to decide whether there exists $P \in X(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$ such that $P_\eta \in W(\mathbb{F}_p((t)))$, where P_η is the underlying $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ -rational point.

5.3.1. Non-singular case. Our proof relies on the observation that one can avoid using the effective Greenberg approximation theorem to check if X has an $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral point, in case X is *regular* at all points $x \in X_s$. Instead, one can use the following more elementary fact:¹⁴

Proposition 5.3.2. Let R be a local ring with residue field κ and $f : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$ a morphism of finite type.

(a) Suppose R is a DVR and κ is perfect. Let P be an R -integral point of X , meeting the special fiber at $x \in X_s(\kappa)$ and suppose that X is regular at x . Then f is smooth at x .

(b) If f is smooth at $x \in X_s(\kappa)$ and R is henselian, then x lifts to an R -integral point of X .

Proof. (a) Replacing X with $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x})$, we may assume that $X = \text{Spec}(A)$, where A is a regular local ring. An integral point $P : \text{Spec}R \rightarrow X$ corresponds to a section of $f : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}R$. The maps f and P induce ring homomorphisms $f^* : R/\mathfrak{m}_R \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}_A$ and $P^* : A/\mathfrak{m}_A \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{m}_R$ such that $P^* \circ f^* = \text{id}$. The latter condition means that P^* is surjective. On the other hand, a ring homomorphism between fields is always injective, whence $P^* : A/\mathfrak{m}_A \xrightarrow{\cong} R/\mathfrak{m}_R = \kappa$ is an isomorphism. Since R is a DVR, we may consider $\mathfrak{m}_R/\mathfrak{m}_R^2$ as a 1-dimensional κ -vector

¹⁴The proof of (a) is an elaborated version of the proof of Theorem 5.4 [Lou]. Since we were not able to find a reference in published literature, we shall spell out the details.

subspace of $\mathfrak{m}_A/\mathfrak{m}_A^2$, spanned by $\pi + \mathfrak{m}_A^2$, where π is a uniformizer of R . One may extend $\{\pi + \mathfrak{m}_A^2\}$ to a basis of $\mathfrak{m}_A/\mathfrak{m}_A^2$, say $\{\pi + \mathfrak{m}_A^2, x_1 + \mathfrak{m}_A^2, \dots, x_n + \mathfrak{m}_A^2\}$ with $x_i \in \mathfrak{m}_A$.

Let $B = A \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{m}_R \cong A/\pi A$ be the local ring of the special fiber at x . We will then have that $\{x_1 + \mathfrak{m}_B^2, \dots, x_n + \mathfrak{m}_B^2\}$ is a κ -basis for $\mathfrak{m}_B/\mathfrak{m}_B^2$. In particular, since $\dim(B) = \dim(A) - 1$, the local ring B is regular, i.e. X_s is regular at x . Since κ is perfect, we get that X_s is also smooth at x (Corollary 3.33, pg. 142 [Liu06]). To conclude the proof, we need to verify that f is flat at x . Since A is a regular Noetherian local ring, it is also an integral domain (Proposition 4.2.11 [Liu06]). Since X admits an R -integral point, we get that $R \rightarrow A$ is injective. We conclude that A is a torsion-free R -module and therefore flat by Tag 0539 [Sta].
 (b) This is just the geometric form of Hensel's Lemma (Corollary 2.13, pg. 224 [Liu06]). \square

Corollary 5.3.3. *Let $X_0 \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[t])$ be a morphism with X_0 regular and $X = X_0 \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[t])} \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$. Then:*

- (a) *If $X_0 \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[t])$ is of finite type, then there is an algorithm that decides whether X has an $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral point.*
- (b) *If $P \in X(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$, then X is regular at P_η , where P_η is the underlying $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ -rational point of P .*

Proof. Note that the special fibers of X_0 and X are canonically identified. By Tag 0BG6(2) [Sta] and our assumption, we get that X is regular at all points $x \in X_s$.

(a) By base change, we get that X is also of finite type over $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ and thus X_s has finitely many \mathbb{F}_p -rational points. Fix one such $x \in X_s(\mathbb{F}_p)$. To check whether x lifts to an $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral point, we use Proposition 5.3.2 and check if $X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$ is smooth at x . Checking whether x is a smooth \mathbb{F}_p -rational point of X_s can be done using the Jacobian criterion for smoothness (Theorem 2.19 [Liu06]). Checking that $X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$ is flat at x amounts to verifying that $\dim_x(X) = \dim_x(X_s) + 1$ (see Tag 0034 [Sta]).

(b) By Fact 1.3.5(a), (b), we get that $\mathrm{Reg}(X)$ is open. Let x be the point where P meets X_s and note that X is regular at x by Proposition 5.3.2(a). The conclusion follows because P_η lies in any open neighborhood of x . \square

5.3.4. *General case.* We now sketch the general case, which follows again by induction on $\dim(X_0)$. If $\dim(X_0) = 0$, then X_0 cannot possibly have any $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral points. For the inductive step, we first view X_0 as a reduced \mathbb{F}_p -scheme of finite type, via $X_0 \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[t]) \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p)$. One may compute *algorithmically* $(X_0)_{red}$ and replace X_0 with $(X_0)_{red}$, so that X_0 can be taken reduced to begin with (cf. Lemma 4.2 [DS03]). Now the scheme-theoretic image of any $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral point is contained in one of the irreducible components of X_0 . It is

possible to calculate effectively the irreducible components of X_0 (see e.g. Theorem 9 [Sei78]). To sum up, we may take X_0 to be an integral \mathbb{F}_p -scheme of finite type and W a *non-empty* Zariski open subset of the generic fiber.¹⁵

Now Conjecture 1 [DS03] provides us with a blow-up morphism $Y_0 \rightarrow X_0$ in a nowhere dense center $Z \subset X_0$, with Y_0 regular. We may check if $Y = Y_0 \times_{\text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[t])} \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$ has an $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral point by Corollary 5.3.3(a). Moreover, if Y has an $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ -integral point, its underlying rational point is also a regular point of Y , by Corollary 5.3.3(b). Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4.3 [DS03], we see that there are two scenarios: (1) Either $Y(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]) \neq \emptyset$, which implies the existence of $P \in X(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$ with $P_\eta \in W(\mathbb{F}_p((t)))$ or (2) The problem is reduced to the lower-dimensional scheme Z which can be solved by our induction hypothesis.

Remark 5.3.5. In Theorem 4.3 [DS03], Denef-Schoutens desingularize the *generic* fiber of X . As a consequence, the scheme Y produced in the proof of Theorem 4.3 [DS03] has regular generic fiber but its special fiber need not be regular. On the other hand, by desingularizing X_0 , our scheme Y has regular special fiber. This simplifies the task of deciding whether $Y(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]) = \emptyset$, thanks to Corollary 5.3.3.

Remark 5.3.6. (a) One defect of this method is that it does not provide us with an *unconditional* proof of the decidability of the *positive* existential theory of $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ in L_t .

(b) One advantage of this method is that once an *effective* desingularization algorithm is known in characteristic p , the above proof can be converted into an actually effective (not merely theoretically terminating) algorithm. On the other hand, the effective Greenberg approximation theorem used by Denef-Schoutens (see Theorem 3.1, Remark 3.3 [DS03]) is only effective in theory, as it ultimately relies on a brute-force algorithm explained in the proof of Theorem 6.1 [BDLvD79]. This last remark also applies to the proofs of Corollaries 4.1.5, 4.1.11.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to the anonymous referee for several comments that improved the quality of this paper. I would like to thank E. Hrushovski and J. Koenigsmann for invaluable guidance. I also thank M. Temkin for answering my questions related to resolution of singularities and F.-V. Kuhlmann for informing me about the history around the RV-structures and also resolution of singularities.

¹⁵The case $W = \emptyset \iff W(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p((t))}) = \emptyset$ can be checked by effective elimination of quantifiers in ACF_p . In that case, the output of our algorithm is that there does not exist $P \in X(\mathbb{F}_p[[t]])$ with $P_\eta \in W(\mathbb{F}_p((t)))$.

REFERENCES

- [Abh56] Shreeram Abhyankar. Two notes on formal power series. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 903-905*, 1956.
- [Abh66] Shreeram Abhyankar. *Resolution of singularities of embedded algebraic surfaces*. Academic Press, New York, 1966.
- [AF16] Sylvie Anscombe and Arno Fehm. The existential theory of equicharacteristic henselian valued fields. *Algebra & Number Theory Volume 10, Number 3 (2016), 665-683.*, 2016.
- [AJ19] Sylvie Anscombe and Franziska Jahnke. The model theory of Cohen rings. *ArXiv <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.08297>*, (2019).
- [AK65] James Ax and Simon Kochen. Diophantine problems over local fields II. *Amer. J. Math.* 87, 1965.
- [Bas78] Serban A. Basarab. Some model theory for henselian valued fields. *Journal of Algebra*, 1978.
- [Bas91] Serban A. Basarab. Relative elimination of quantifiers for henselian valued fields. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 53, (1991).
- [BDLvdD79] J. Becker, J. Denef, L. Lipshitz, and L. van den Dries. Ultraproducts and approximation in local rings I. *Inventiones math.* 51,189-203, 1979.
- [Bél99] Luc Bélair. Types dans les corps valués munis d'applications coefficients. *Illinois J. Math.* 43(2):410- 425, 1999.
- [CF67] J.W.S Cassels and A. Fröhlich. *Algebraic Number Theory*. Proceedings of an Instructional Conference Organized by the London Mathematical Society, 1967.
- [Con16] Brian Conrad. From normal crossings to strict normal crossings. *available at <http://math.stanford.edu/~conrad/249BW17Page/handouts/crossings.pdf>*, (2016).
- [CP08] Vincent Cossart and Olivier Piltant. Resolution of singularities of threefolds in positive characteristic. I.: Reduction to local uniformization on artin-schreier and purely inseparable coverings. *Journal of Algebra Volume 320, Issue 3, Pages 1051-1082*, 2008.
- [CP09] Vincent Cossart and Olivier Piltant. Resolution of singularities of threefolds in positive characteristic. II. *Journal of Algebra Volume 321, Issue 7, Pages 1836-1976*, 2009.
- [CP19] Vincent Cossart and Olivier Piltant. Resolution of singularities of arithmetical threefolds. *Journal of Algebra Volume 529, 1 July 2019, Pages 268-535*, 2019.
- [Cut09] Steven Dale Cutkosky. Resolution of singularities for 3-folds in positive characteristic. *American J. of Math.* 131, 59-127., 2009.
- [Den16] Jan Denef. Geometric proofs of Ax-Kochen and Ershov. *American Journal of Mathematics* 138(1):181-199, (2016).
- [dJ96] Aise Johan de Jong. Smoothness, semi-stability and alterations. *Publications mathématiques de l'Université de Strasbourg, tome 83, p. 51-93*, (1996).
- [DS03] Jan Denef and Hans Schoutens. On the decidability of the existential theory of $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$. *Fields Institute Communications Volume 00, 0000*, (2003).
- [End72] Otto Endler. *Valuation theory*. Berlin ; New York: Springer-Verlag, 1972.
- [Ers65] Ju.L. Ershov. On elementary theories of local fields. *Algebra i Logika* 4, No. 2, 5-30, 1965.
- [FJ04] Michael D. Fried and Moshe Jarden. *Field Arithmetic*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. 11 (2nd revised and enlarged ed.). Springer-Verlag, 2004.

- [Fle11] Joseph Flenner. Relative decidability and definability in henselian valued fields. *J. Symbolic Logic* 76(4): 1240-1260, 2011.
- [Gro65] Alexander Grothendieck. *Éléments de géométrie algébrique : IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas, Seconde partie*. Publications mathématiques de l' I.H.É.S., tome 24, p. 5-231, 1965.
- [Hir64] Heisuke Hironaka. Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero: I. *Annals of Mathematics, Second Series, Vol. 79, No. 1*, 1964.
- [Kar20] Konstantinos Kartas. Decidability via the tilting correspondence. *ArXiv <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.04424>*, (2020).
- [Koc74] Simon Kochen. The model theory of local fields. *ISILC Logic Conference (Proc. Internat. Summer Inst. and Logic Colloq., Kiel, 1974)*, pp. 384-425. *Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 499, Springer, Berlin, 1975.*, 1974.
- [Kra56] Marc Krasner. Approximation des corps valués complets de caractéristique p par ceux de caractéristique 0. *Colloque d'Algebre Superleure Bruxelles*, 1956.
- [Kuh] Franz-Viktor Kuhlmann. *Book on Valuation Theory (in preparation)*.
- [Kuh94] Franz-Viktor Kuhlmann. Quantifier elimination for henselian fields relative to additive and multiplicative congruences. *Israel Journal of Mathematics volume 85, pages 277-306*, 1994.
- [Kuh11] Franz-Viktor Kuhlmann. The Defect. *Commutative algebra - Noetherian and non-Noetherian perspectives, 277-318, Springer, New York*, 2011.
- [Kuh16] Franz Victor Kuhlmann. The algebra and model theory of tame valued fields. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 2016.
- [Lan94] Serge Lang. *Algebraic Number Theory*. Springer, Graduate Texts in Mathematics book series (GTM, volume 110), 1994.
- [Lee20] Junguk Lee. Hyperfields, truncated DVRs, and valued fields. *Journal of Number Theory, Volume 212, July 2020, Pages 40-71*, 2020.
- [Liu06] Qing Liu. Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves. *Oxford University Press*, (2006).
- [LL21] Junguk Lee and Wan Lee. On the structure of certain valued fields. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic Volume 172, Issue 4*, 2021.
- [Lou] Daniel Loughran. Rational points on varieties. *Online notes*.
- [Mac86] Angus Macintyre. Twenty years of p -adic model theory. *Logic Colloquium '84 Elsevier Science Publishers B. K (North-Holland)*, 1986.
- [Mat87] H. Matsumura. *Commutative Ring Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [Neu13] Jürgen Neukirch. *Algebraic Number Theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Nic13] Johannes Nicaise. Geometric criteria for tame ramification. *Mathematische Zeitschrift volume 273, pages 839-868*, 2013.
- [Sca99] Thomas Scanlon. Quantifier elimination for the relative Frobenius. *Valuation Theory and Its Applications Volume II, Conference proceedings of the International Conference on Valuation Theory (Saskatoon)*, 1999.
- [Sei78] Abraham Seidenberg. Constructions in a polynomial ring over the ring of integers. *American Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 100, pp. 685-703*, 1978.
- [Spi20] Mark Spivakovsky. *Resolution of Singularities: An Introduction*. Chapter 3 of the book: Handbook of Geometry and Topology of Singularities I, Springer International Publishing, 2020.

- [Sta] The Stacks Project Authors. *Stacks Project*. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>.
- [Tem08] Michael Temkin. Desingularization of quasi-excellent schemes in characteristic zero. *Advances in Mathematics* 219, pp. 488-522, 2008.
- [Tem11] Michael Temkin. Absolute desingularization in characteristic zero. *Motivic integration and its interactions with model theory and non-archimedean geometry, Volume II London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 384* 213-250, 2011.
- [vdD12] Lou van den Dries. *Lectures on the Model Theory of Valued Fields*. Chapter 5 in the book "Model Theory in Algebra, Analysis and Arithmetic", Cetraro, Italy, 2012.
- [Zie72] Martin Ziegler. *Die elementare Theorie der henselschen Körper*. Dissertation thesis, 1972.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, WOODSTOCK ROAD, OXFORD OX2 6GG.

E-mail address: kartas@maths.ox.ac.uk