

ON FAKE SUBFIELDS OF NUMBER FIELDS

JOACHIM KÖNIG

ABSTRACT. We investigate the failure of a local-global principle with regard to “containment of number fields”; i.e., we are interested in pairs of number fields (K_1, K_2) such that K_2 is not a subfield of any algebraic conjugate K_1^σ of K_1 , but the splitting type of any single rational prime p unramified in K_1 and in K_2 is such that it cannot rule out the containment $K_2 \subseteq K_1^\sigma$. Examples of such situations arise naturally, but not exclusively, via the well-studied concept of arithmetically equivalent number fields. We give some systematic constructions yielding “fake subfields” (in the above sense) which are not induced by arithmetic equivalence. This may also be interpreted as a failure of a certain local-global principle related to zeta functions of number fields.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

Two number fields K_1 and K_2 are called arithmetically equivalent if they have the same zeta function. This is equivalent to the property that all primes of \mathbb{Q} which are unramified in K_1 and K_2 have the same splitting pattern in those two fields, i.e., their Frobenius has the same cycle type in the two induced permutation actions. In other words, K_1 and K_2 are in some sense indistinguishable by purely local investigation. Such number fields have featured prominently in the context of several arithmetic problems, such as the Davenport-Lewis-Schinzel problem on reducibility of variable separated equations, and the investigation of pairs of Kronecker conjugate polynomials, most notably by Fried (e.g. [6]) and Müller ([11]). See, e.g., [12] for an introduction as well as some systematic nontrivial examples of arithmetically equivalent number fields. Recently, stronger versions of arithmetic equivalence (e.g., [13], [15]) have also been studied, and links to other problems in field arithmetic were explored e.g. in [10]. In this paper, we consider a natural generalization of this notion: two fields K_1 and K_2 for which purely local investigations (namely, of the splitting types of unramified primes) are insufficient to rule out the possibility that K_2 is a subfield of K_1 . We say that K_2 is *locally sub- K_1* in this case. Concretely, whenever p is unramified in K_1 and K_2 , and $Frob_p(K_1/\mathbb{Q})$ and $Frob_p(K_2/\mathbb{Q})$ denote the Frobenius classes (defined a priori via the Galois closures, but viewed in the respective permutation actions of degree $n := [K_1 : \mathbb{Q}]$ and $m := [K_2 : \mathbb{Q}]$), then we demand there exists an element σ in the imprimitive wreath product $S_d \wr \text{Gal}(K_2/\mathbb{Q}) \leq S_n$ (with $d := n/m$) whose cycle structure is the same as that of $Frob_p(K_1/\mathbb{Q})$, whereas the cycle structure of its projection onto $\text{Gal}(K_2/\mathbb{Q})$ (via action of the wreath product on blocks) is the same as that of $Frob_p(K_2/\mathbb{Q})$.¹

This is indeed a natural generalization of arithmetic equivalence, the latter being exactly the case of two fields being mutually locally subfields of each other; in other words, our notion yields an order relation on the set equivalence classes of number fields modulo arithmetic equivalence.

¹The occurrence of the wreath product in this definition is due to its well-known relation with towers of field extensions: if $K \subseteq F \subseteq L$ are finite separable extensions, then the Galois group of the Galois closure of L/K acts as a subgroup of the wreath product of the Galois groups of the two “parts”.

When K_2 is locally sub- K_1 , but not contained in any conjugate K_1^σ of K_1 ($\sigma \in \text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$), we shall also call K_2 a *fake subfield* of K_1 .²

It is clear from the definition that any field K_2 arising from K_1 via arbitrary iteration of “taking subfields” and “taking arithmetically equivalent fields” will automatically be locally sub- K_1 . A natural question is therefore whether all examples of fake subfields arise from arithmetic equivalence. The answer is quickly seen to be “no”. After reviewing the situation in small degrees in Section 3, the main purpose of this article is to provide explicit infinite families of counterexamples. In particular, we show the following:

Theorem 1.1. *For all odd primes p , the following hold:*

- a) *Every degree $p + 2$ number field K with symmetric Galois group S_{p+2} occurs as the fake subfield of some number field F .*
- b) *There exist infinitely many solvable number fields of degree $2p$ occurring as the fake subfield of some number field F .*

Furthermore, all these examples may be chosen such that they are not induced by arithmetic equivalence.

We will prove the two parts of Theorem 1.1 separately as Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 5.2. In the remaining sections, we consider fake subfields of fields having no nontrivial subfields (Section 6), a strengthened version of our main notions (Section 7), and some open problems (Section 8).

2. SOME PREPARATIONS

The following famous result, due to Gassmann ([7]), turns the problem of arithmetic equivalence into a purely group-theoretical problem.

Proposition 2.1. *Two number fields K_1 and K_2 are arithmetically equivalent if and only if the following hold: 1) the Galois closure of K_1/\mathbb{Q} and of K_2/\mathbb{Q} is the same, say Ω ; and 2) the subgroups $U := \text{Gal}(\Omega/K_1)$ and $V := \text{Gal}(\Omega/K_2)$ of $G := \text{Gal}(\Omega/\mathbb{Q})$ fulfill that each conjugacy class of G intersects U and V in the same number of elements, i.e., for all $g \in G$ one has $|g^G \cap U| = |g^G \cap V|$. (In this case, U and V are also said to be Gassmann-equivalent in G .)*

Corollary 2.2. *Let K_1 and K_2 be arithmetically equivalent number fields, with joint Galois closure $\Omega \supseteq \mathbb{Q}$. Let $G := \text{Gal}(\Omega/\mathbb{Q})$, and consider any transitive permutation action of G . Then $U_1 := \text{Gal}(\Omega/K_1)$ and $U_2 := \text{Gal}(\Omega/K_2)$ have the same number of orbits in this action.*

Proof. By Gassmann’s criterion (Proposition 2.1), U_1 and U_2 in particular contain the same amount of elements having exactly d fixed points in the given action, for each $d \geq 0$. By the Cauchy-Frobenius formula, this means that U_1 and U_2 have the same number of orbits. \square

We now turn to our notion of fake subfields.

Lemma 2.3. *If K_2 is locally sub- K_1 , then the following hold:*

- 1) $[K_2 : \mathbb{Q}]$ divides $[K_1 : \mathbb{Q}]$.
- 2) *The Galois closure of K_2/\mathbb{Q} is contained in the one of K_1/\mathbb{Q} .*

In particular, any number field can have only finitely many fake subfields.

²This notion is inspired by a recent article of Corvaja [2] on “fake values” of polynomials, dealing with a failure of local-global principles similar in spirit to the one considered here, but with regard to value sets of polynomials.

Proof. 1) is obvious from the definition. As for 2), if the Galois closure of K_2 is not contained in the one of K_1 , then there exists an element of the joint Galois closure acting trivially on the Galois closure of K_1/\mathbb{Q} , but not on the one of K_2/\mathbb{Q} . Now it suffices to note that being locally sub- K_1 forces any prime totally split in the Galois closure of K_1 to be totally split in the Galois closure of K_2 . \square

In view of our definition of “locally sub- K_1 ” via cycle types of permutations in wreath products, the following terminology is useful: given a permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ consisting of exactly d disjoint cycles of length $c_1 \geq \dots \geq c_d$ (for short: cycle type $\lambda := (c_1, \dots, c_d)$), and a total of d cycle types $\mu_1 = (e_{1,1}, \dots, e_{1,r_1}), \dots, \mu_d = (e_{d,1}, \dots, e_{d,r_d})$ of permutations in S_d , define the concatenation of λ and (μ_1, \dots, μ_d) to be the cycle type (in S_{mn}) of the form $(c_1 \cdot e_{1,1}, \dots, c_1 \cdot e_{1,r_1}, \dots, c_d \cdot e_{d,1}, \dots, c_d \cdot e_{d,r_d})$. This corresponds exactly to the following situation in the context of splitting of prime ideals in number fields: If $K_1 \supseteq K_2 \supseteq \mathbb{Q}$ are number fields with $m = [K_2 : \mathbb{Q}]$ and $n = [K_1 : K_2]$, such that the rational prime p decomposes into d primes $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_d$ of degrees c_1, \dots, c_d in K_2 , and each \mathfrak{p}_i decomposes into r_i primes of degree $e_{i,1}, \dots, e_{i,r_i}$ in K_1 , then the cycle type of Frobenius at p in K_1 is exactly the concatenation defined above. In particular, a field K being locally sub- F is equivalent to the following: for each prime p unramified in F/\mathbb{Q} , let λ_1 and λ_2 , respectively, be the cycle type of Frobenius at p in the Galois group of (the Galois closure of) K/\mathbb{Q} and F/\mathbb{Q} respectively; then there exists a tuple $\underline{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d)$ of cycle types such that the concatenation of λ_1 with $\underline{\mu}$ equals λ_2 .

One reason for the relevance of the notion of arithmetic equivalence is that arithmetically equivalent fields have the same zeta function. Below, we translate the more general notion of being “locally sub- K_1 ” into a property of zeta functions. Recall that the (Dedekind) zeta function of a number field K has an Euler product $\zeta_K(s) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \frac{1}{1 - N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{p})^{-s}}$, with the product being over all prime ideals \mathfrak{p} of O_K . For a finite set \mathcal{S} of rational primes, by the *contribution at \mathcal{S} to ζ_K* , we mean the product of all terms corresponding to primes extending some prime in \mathcal{S} . Of course, the contribution at unramified rational primes is completely determined by the cycle structure of their Frobenius.

Lemma 2.4. *The following are equivalent for number fields K_1, K_2 :*

- 1) K_2 is locally sub- K_1 .
- 2) For every finite set \mathcal{S} of prime numbers, away from some fixed finite set depending only on K_1 and K_2 , there exists an extension $F := F_{\mathcal{S}}$ of K_2 such that the contributions at \mathcal{S} to the zeta functions of F and of K_1 are the same.

Proof. 2) \Rightarrow 1) is obvious. For the converse, one may use the following: since the symmetric groups have generic extension over all number fields, it is possible (e.g., as a special case of a result by Saltman [14, Theorem 5.9]), given any finite collection of primes \mathfrak{p} of K_2 and for each such \mathfrak{p} a cycle type in S_n with $n := \frac{[K_1:\mathbb{Q}]}{[K_2:\mathbb{Q}]}$, to find an S_n -extension $F \supseteq K_2$ having Frobenius class given by the prescribed cycle type at all those primes \mathfrak{p} . Concretely, choose as the finite set of primes \mathfrak{p} exactly those extending the given rational primes $p \in \mathcal{S}$ in K_2 , and choose the cycle types such that, for each such $p \in \mathcal{S}$, the cycle type of the Frobenius at p in K_1/\mathbb{Q} and in F/\mathbb{Q} is the same (this is possible via suitable concatenation of cycle types, by the definition of “locally sub- K_1 ”). Then F achieves the claim of 2) for the given finite set of prime numbers. \square

Remark 1. Unlike in the case of arithmetically equivalent fields, the finite set can in general not be removed from the characterizing condition 2) above. To give just one example, the group $G = \text{TransitiveGroup}(12,32)$ in Magma’s database gives rise to sextic number fields being fake subfields of certain degree-12 number fields (as will be shown in Theorem 3.3b)). On the other

hand, this group possesses a subgroup $U \cong C_2 \times C_2$ with the following properties: U has a (normal) subgroup $N \cong C_2$ generated by a fixed point free involution, and exactly one pair of orbits of N are joined by the action of U ; on the other hand, in the degree 6 action leading to the fake subfield, two pairs of orbits of N (the latter all being trivial, since N is in the kernel of that action) are joined by the action of U . This means that if Ω/\mathbb{Q} is a Galois extension with group G , and there exists some ramified prime with inertia group N and decomposition group U (it is indeed not difficult to show the existence of such extensions, since G is a solvable group of a rather simple structure), then, in the degree 6 extension K_2 mentioned above, p is extended by two primes of inertia degree 2 (and primes of degree 1 otherwise), but in the degree 12 extension K_1 , it is extended by only one prime of degree 2 (and degree 1 primes otherwise). Clearly, no overfield of K_2 can have the same inertia degrees over p as K_1 , and hence no overfield of K_2 can have the same contribution to the zeta function at p as K_1 . Compare, however, Section 7 for a few observations on situations where one *can* in fact extend the results to the ramified primes.

Of course, if in Lemma 2.4, the fields F did *not* depend on the chosen set \mathcal{S} of primes, one would indeed have arithmetic equivalence between F and K_1 . It is therefore natural to search for examples of fake subfields that do not arise from arithmetic equivalence; in the context of Lemma 2.4, this may then be seen as the failure of a local-global principle (namely, for the zeta functions). The following is an elementary, but useful criterion to find or exclude candidates for this.

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that K is a fake subfield of some number field F , and let G be the Galois group of the Galois closure of K/\mathbb{Q} in its induced degree $[K:\mathbb{Q}]$ action. Then G possesses some subgroup U with the following properties:*

- 1) U does not fix a point, but
- 2) every element of U has at least one fixed point.

Proof. Let Ω be the Galois closure of F/\mathbb{Q} , $\Gamma := \text{Gal}(\Omega/\mathbb{Q})$ and $V := \text{Gal}(\Omega/F)$. Let π be the projection from Γ to G and $U := \pi(V)$ (this makes sense due to Lemma 2.3). Since every $\sigma \in V$ has a fixed point in the degree- $[F:\mathbb{Q}]$ action of Γ , the fact that K is locally sub- F forces σ to also have a fixed point in the degree- $[K:\mathbb{Q}]$ action of G , i.e., $\pi(\sigma) \in U$ has a fixed point. On the other hand, U itself cannot fix a point, or otherwise, up to algebraic conjugates, the fixed field of U , and hence a fortiori the fixed field of V (i.e., F) would contain K , contradicting the notion of “fake subfield”. \square

Note that permutation groups $U \leq S_n$ possessing no fixed point, but in which every element has a fixed points, have been considered in the context of “intersective polynomials”, i.e., polynomials having a root in (almost) every \mathbb{Q}_p , but not in \mathbb{Q} itself. For essentially the same reason, they feature prominently in the context of “fake values” of morphisms studied in [2].

Corollary 2.6. *If K/\mathbb{Q} is a Galois extension, then K is not a fake subfield of any number field.*

Proof. This follows directly from the previous lemma, upon noting that no non-identity element in the regular permutation action of a group has a fixed point. \square

3. EXTENSIONS OF SMALL DEGREE

We begin our investigation of concrete examples of fake subfields by considering number fields of small degree.

Corollary 3.1. *If $[K : \mathbb{Q}] \leq 4$, then K cannot be a fake subfield of any number field.*

Proof. By direct inspection from Lemma 2.5. This also reflects the well-known fact that there are no non-trivially intersective polynomials of degree less than 5. \square

3.1. Quintic fields. For quintic fields K/\mathbb{Q} , the question of whether K is a fake subfield of some number field is completely resolved by the solvability or non-solvability of the Galois group.

Theorem 3.2. a) *Every S_5 and every A_5 -quintic field occurs as the fake subfield of some number field, in a way not induced by arithmetic equivalence.*
 b) *No solvable quintic field occurs as the fake subfield of a number field.*

Proof. Since b) can again be derived straightaway by inspection using Lemma 2.5 (or alternatively, from Lemma 5.1), it suffices to prove a).

First, let K be an S_5 quintic number field, Ω the Galois closure of K/\mathbb{Q} , and let $U := \langle (1, 2, 3), (2, 3)(4, 5) \rangle (\cong S_3) \leq S_5$. We claim that a) K is a fake subfield of the fixed field Ω^U of U , and b) this relation is not induced by arithmetic equivalence. Indeed, the pairs of cycle structures of non-identity elements of S_5 in the two coset actions are exactly $((2, 1^3), (2^{10}))$, $((2^2, 1), (2^8, 1^4))$, $((3, 1^2), (3^6, 1^2))$, $((4, 1), (4^4, 2^2))$, $((5), (5^4))$ and $((3, 2), (6^3, 2))$, all of which are compatible with K being a fake subfield of Ω^U .

Furthermore, the overgroups of U of order dividing $24 = |\text{Gal}(\Omega/K)|$ are exactly U itself and $S_3 \times S_2$ (the full 2-set stabilizer). None of these have Gassmann equivalent subgroups inside S_5 ; for example, the only other subgroup (up to conjugacy) of order 12 other than $S_3 \times S_2$ is A_4 , which cannot be equivalent to the 2-set stabilizer, since it contains no transposition; and the only other subgroups of order 6 other than U are $\langle (1, 2, 3), (1, 2) \rangle \cong S_3$ and $\langle (1, 2, 3)(4, 5) \rangle \cong C_6$; neither can be equivalent to U , since they contain no double transposition. In other words, there is no way to “jump” from U to $\text{Gal}(\Omega/K) \cong S_4$ via containment and arithmetic equivalence.

Next, let K be an A_5 -quintic field. Now the analog of the above construction with $U = \langle (1, 2, 3), (2, 3)(4, 5) \rangle \leq A_5$ does not quite work; notably, in the (degree-10) action of A_5 on cosets of U , the 3-cycle has cycle structure $(3^3, 1)$, which is not compatible with $(3, 1^2)$. Instead, the following succeeds.

Let $\Gamma = A_5 \times C_3$, and consider the order 6 subgroup $U = \langle (1, 2, 3), (2, 3)(4, 5) \rangle \leq A_5$ (i.e., $[\Gamma : U] = 30$). This is clearly not contained in an index-5 subgroup $V \cong A_4 \times C_3$ of Γ . Since elements of cycle structure $(3, 1^2)$ did indeed constitute the *only* obstruction to the fixed field of V being a fake subfield of the fixed field of $U \times C_3$, it suffices to verify that all preimages of such elements in Γ no longer constitute an obstruction to the fixed field of V being a fake subfield of the fixed field of U . Those preimages either have cycle structure $(3^9, 1^3)$ (namely, elements of order 3 inside A_5 , and hence contained in some conjugate of U) or (3^{10}) (namely, elements of the form (σ, τ) , where $\sigma \in A_5$ and $\tau \in C_3$ are each of order 3; these are not contained in any conjugate of U). Clearly, there is no obstruction arising from either of these cycle structures together with the “small” cycle structure $(3, 1^2)$. Also, once again, it is easy to verify that the “fake subfield” relation is not induced by arithmetic equivalence (in fact, the only non-trivially Gassmann equivalent subgroups inside Γ are pairs of subgroups of order 12 both projecting to a point stabilizer A_4 inside A_5 , i.e., arithmetic equivalence cannot be used to jump from an overfield of a degree-5 field to a field containing no such subfield). \square

3.2. Sextic fields.

Theorem 3.3. a) *All sextic number fields with Galois group S_6 or A_6 are fake subfields of certain number fields, but this relation is always induced by arithmetic equivalence.*
 b) *There exist infinitely many solvable sextic fields which occur as fake subfields of some number field, in a way not induced by arithmetic equivalence.*

Proof. Regarding a), one can verify that the only subgroups U of S_6 fulfilling the conditions of Lemma 2.5 are of order 4, and up to conjugacy equal to $\langle(1, 2)(3, 4), (3, 4)(5, 6)\rangle$ (i.e., containing three double involutions, and having three orbits of length 2). But then, if F is a field having a sextic S_6 - or A_6 number field K as a fake subfield, as in Lemma 2.5, F has to contain the fixed field of U . This, however, is arithmetically equivalent to the fixed field of $\langle(1, 2)(3, 4), (1, 3)(2, 4)\rangle$ (by Gassmann’s criterion, since this group also contains three double transpositions), but since the latter group fixes two points, its fixed field contains some conjugate of K .

Regarding b), let $G = \text{TransitiveGroup}(12, 32) \cong (C_2)^4 \rtimes C_3$ (in Magma’s database) and U_1 be a point stabilizer in G . One may verify (by hand or with computer assistance) that there is an index-6 subgroup $U_2 \leq G$ such that action of G on cosets of U_2 induces A_4 acting transitively on 6 points, and furthermore, U_1 projects to the order-4 subgroup of A_4 in this action. This subgroup may be written as $\langle(1, 2)(3, 4), (3, 4)(5, 6)\rangle$, i.e., at least the necessary condition for fake subfields arising from lemma 2.5 is fulfilled. One may now compare the cycle structures in the degree-6 and the degree-12 action to verify that one indeed obtains fake subfields from this scenario; concretely, the pairs of cycle structures of non-identity elements of G are exactly $((1^6), (2^6))$, $((2^2 \cdot 1^2), (2^4 \cdot 1^4))$, $((2^2 \cdot 1^2), (2^6))$ and $((3^2), (3^4))$. Furthermore, this “fake subfield” relation is not induced by arithmetic equivalence, notably because U_1 has three orbits of length 2 in the degree-6 action, whereas the U_2 has four, whence Corollary 2.2 is applicable. \square

From the observations so far, one also immediately obtains:

Corollary 3.4. *The smallest degree $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$ of a number field K possessing a fake subfield not induced by arithmetic equivalence is 12.*

4. EXTENSIONS WITH SYMMETRIC GALOIS GROUP

We now progress to more systematic examples of fake subfields. In view of our definition of fake subfields, the following notion is useful: Let K_1 and K_2 be two number fields, Ω the Galois closure of the compositum of K_1 and K_2 and $\sigma \in G := \text{Gal}(\Omega/\mathbb{Q})$. Let λ_i be the cycle structure of σ in the action induced by K_i/\mathbb{Q} ($i = 1, 2$). If there exists a tuple $\underline{\mu}$ of cycle types such that the concatenation of λ_2 with $\underline{\mu}$ equals λ_1 , then we say that σ does not pose an obstruction to K_2 being locally sub- K_1 (resp., to K_2 being a fake subfield of K_1 , if additionally no conjugate of K_2 is contained in K_1). If σ does not pose an obstruction to either K_1 being locally sub- K_2 and K_2 being locally sub- K_1 (in which case, of course, the cycle structures of σ in the two actions must be the same), then we say that σ does not pose an obstruction to K_1 and K_2 being arithmetically equivalent.

The following elementary observation was already known to Gassmann (and is, in fact, crucial to his criterion).

Lemma 4.1. *Assume K_0, K_1, K_2 are number fields with K_2 contained in K_0 , but not in any conjugate of K_1 . Let Ω/\mathbb{Q} be the Galois closure of the compositum $K_0 \cdot K_1$ over \mathbb{Q} , and let $G := \text{Gal}(\Omega/\mathbb{Q})$ and $U_i := \text{Gal}(\Omega/K_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. Assume that $\sigma \in G$ is such that the following holds: for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of fixed points of σ^k in the action on cosets of U_0*

and of U_1 is the same. Then σ does not pose an obstruction to K_0 and K_1 being arithmetically equivalent. In particular, σ does not pose an obstruction to K_2 being a fake subfield of K_1 .

We now extend the above results about quintic S_5 number fields to infinite families of Galois groups.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $p \geq 3$ be a prime number and K a (degree- $p+2$) S_{p+2} -number field. Then K is a fake subfield of some number field, in a way not induced by arithmetic equivalence.*

Proof. Choose subgroups $U_0, U_1, U_2 \leq S_{p+2}$ as follows: U_2 is the stabilizer of a point (in the natural action of S_{p+2}), $U_0 \cong D_p$ is a dihedral group of order $2p$ contained in the two-point stabilizer of S_{p+2} (in particular, up to conjugates, contained in U_2), and $U_1 \cong D_p$ is a dihedral group with orbit lengths p and 2 (in particular, not being contained in U_2 , even up to conjugates). This means that all non-identity elements of U_0 are p -cycles or involutions with three fixed points, and all non-identity elements of U_1 are p -cycles or involutions with one fixed point. Letting Ω/\mathbb{Q} be any Galois extension with Galois group S_{p+2} , we will verify that there exists no element $\sigma \in S_{p+2}$ posing an obstruction to K_2 being a fake subfield of K_1 , where K_i denotes the fixed field of U_i for $i = 0, 1, 2$. We distinguish the following cases:

- i) σ powers to a p -cycle. In this case σ is necessarily either itself a p -cycle, or has cycles of length p and 2 . Since U_0 and U_1 are of the same order containing the same number of p -cycles, every p -cycle is contained in the same number of conjugates of U_0 and of U_1 , meaning that p -cycles have the same number of fixed points in the two coset actions. Also, elements of cycle type $(p, 2)$ are contained in no conjugate of U_0 and U_1 , thus have no fixed point in either action. By Lemma 4.1, the elements σ considered here pose no local obstruction to K_2 being a fake subfield of K_1 .
- ii) σ powers to an involution with exactly one fixed point. We claim that, in the action on cosets of U_1 , σ has only cycles of length d and $d/2$, where $d := \text{ord}(\sigma)$. Indeed, $\sigma^{d/2}$ and $\sigma^d = id$ are necessarily the only powers of σ contained in some conjugate of U_1 , readily yielding the claim. We next determine the proportion of $d/2$ -cycles of σ in this coset action. All that will be needed in order to ensure the absence of an obstruction coming from σ is that the proportion of cycles of length $d/2$ in the above coset action is “not too large”, concretely, that a fraction of at most $\frac{1}{p+2}$ of the cosets are contained in these “short” cycles. But note that the cosets contained in such cycles are exactly those which are fixed by $\sigma^{d/2}$.

A well-known formula gives the number of fixed points of $\tau \in G$ in the action on cosets of U as $\frac{|G:U| \cdot |\tau^G \cap U|}{|\tau^G|}$. Evaluating with $G = S_{p+2}$, $U = U_1 \cong D_p$ as above, and τ an involution with one fixed point, yields $2^{a-1} \cdot a!$ with $a := \frac{p+1}{2}$. This is bounded from above by $\frac{1}{p+2}[G : U] = \frac{(p+1)!}{2p}$, for all $p \geq 3$. One may therefore form a cycle type in the symmetric group on $|U_2|/|U_1| = \frac{(p+1)!}{2p}$ letters comprising as many $d/2$ -cycles as contained in the above coset representation of σ , and only d -cycles otherwise (the fact that this adds up to the required permutation degree is due to the fact that not only the large permutation degree $\frac{(p+2)!}{2p}$, but also the quotient $\frac{(p+2)!/(2p)}{p+2} \frac{(p+1)!}{2p}$ of the two permutation degrees is necessarily divisible by d ; indeed, this follows readily from the fact that σ is a permutation in S_{p+1} of order coprime to p).

Then, concatenating the fixed point of σ with the thus constructed cycle type, as well as concatenating all other cycles of σ (say, of length m) in the natural action by a partition consisting only of cycles of length d/m , yields exactly the cycle structure of σ in the action on cosets of U_1 , showing that there is no obstruction coming from σ .

- iii) σ powers to an involution with exactly three fixed points. In this case, since we may already assume $p > 3$ due to Theorem 3.2, no non-identity power of σ fixes a point in the action on cosets of U_1 , i.e., all cycle lengths of σ in this action are identical (hence, equal to $d := \text{ord}(\sigma)$). Clearly, σ then does not pose an obstruction either (just concatenate any given cycle of length $e|d$ in the natural action by an element of $S_{|U_2|/|U_1|}$ with suitably many cycles of length d/e . This is possible since d necessarily divides the quotient of the two permutation degrees, as in Case ii.)
- iv) σ is none of the above. In this case, no non-identity power of σ fixes any point in the action on cosets of either U_0 or U_1 , meaning that Lemma 4.1 can be applied again.

Finally, assume that the above relation is induced by (containment of fields and) arithmetic equivalence. By Corollary 2.2, together with the fact that U_2 and U_1 have orbit lengths $(p+1, 1)$ and $(p, 2)$ respectively, this can only happen if U_1 has some intransitive overgroup V_1 (i.e., still with orbits of length p and 2) which is Gassmann-equivalent to a subgroup V_2 with orbit lengths $(p+1, 1)$. Gassmann equivalence means in particular that every element of V_1 has a fixed point (since every element of V_2 does). Clearly, V_1 acts faithfully on its orbit of length p (otherwise it would contain a p -cycle and a transposition with disjoint support, the product of which would yield a fixed point free element). In this situation, Theorem 3.3 of [4] yields the existence of a normal subgroup $N \triangleleft V_1$ of index 2 such that every element in $V_1 \setminus N$ has exactly one fixed point on the length p orbit. In particular, every 2-point stabilizer of V_1 on this orbit is contained in N , which in particular means that N cannot act 2-transitively on this orbit. So N is a transitive, but not 2-transitive group of prime degree p . By a classical result due to Burnside ([1]), N – and hence also V_1 – is then solvable, i.e., more concretely, is isomorphic to a subgroup of $AGL_1(p) \cong C_p \rtimes C_{p-1}$. On the other hand, V_2 acts transitively on its orbit of length $p+1$ and contains a p -cycle, i.e., is 2-transitive. Hence $|V_2| \geq p(p+1)$, whereas $|V_1| \leq p(p-1)$, contradicting their Gassmann equivalence. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 2. The degree restriction in Theorem 4.2 should not be expected to be necessary at all for the conclusion to hold; in fact, it may reasonable to conjecture the same result for all S_n -extensions of sufficiently large degree n , although a proof might be combinatorially and group-theoretically intricate.

5. SOLVABLE NUMBER FIELDS

We now consider the phenomenon of fake subfields among solvable number fields.

Lemma 5.1. *If the Galois group of the Galois closure of K/\mathbb{Q} acts as a Frobenius group,³ then K is not a fake subfield of any number field. In particular, no solvable number field of prime degree occurs as a fake subfield of any number field.*

Proof. Let G be a Frobenius group with Frobenius kernel N , and assume that a subgroup $U \leq G$ as in Lemma 2.5 exists. Since all elements of $N \setminus \{1\}$ are fixed point free, $U \cap N = \{1\}$, and UN is again a Frobenius group. But it is well-known that in such a group, all complements to N are conjugate to each other, meaning that U is in fact a point stabilizer of $UN \leq G$, contradicting its definition. The second assertion is immediate from the first, since solvable groups of prime degree are cyclic or Frobenius groups. \square

Theorem 5.2. *For every odd prime p , there exist (infinitely many) solvable number fields of degree $2p$ which occur as the fake subfield of some number field, in a way not induced by arithmetic equivalence.*

³Frobenius groups are often, but not always solvable.

Proof. Since the case $p = 3$ has been dealt with, we may assume $p \geq 5$, and let $G = C_2 \wr C_p \leq S_{2p}$ be the imprimitive wreath product. Upon relabelling the elements of $\{1, \dots, 2p\}$ suitably, G is generated by the transposition $(1, 2)$ together with the double- p -cycle $(1, 3, 5, \dots, 2p - 1)(2, 4, 6, \dots, 2p)$. Consider now the subgroup U of G generated by the two involutions $(1, 2)(3, 4) \dots (p, p+1)$ and $(p, p+1)(p+2, p+3) \dots (2p-1, 2p)$. We will show that the fixed field K_2 of a point stabilizer in $G \leq S_{2p}$ is a fake subfield of the fixed field K_1 of U (of course, there are then infinitely many such fields, since the solvable group G is well-known to occur as the Galois group of infinitely many Galois extensions of \mathbb{Q}). To find out about the cycle structures in the action of G on cosets on U , note first that the only cycle structures in $G(\leq S_{2p})$ are those of powers of the $2p$ -cycle, as well as involutions with any number of transpositions between 1 and p . Elements $x \in G$ such that no non-identity power of x is contained in a conjugate of U clearly consist only of cycles of length $\text{ord}(x)$ in that coset action, and then it is obvious that such an element does not pose an obstruction to K_2 being a fake subfield of K_1 . On the other hand, the only elements which do have nontrivial powers inside a conjugate of U (and, in fact, are themselves contained), are involutions with $\frac{p+1}{2}$ transpositions (namely two of them inside U , and clearly conjugate to each other in G via a suitable power of the double- p -cycle) and with $p-1$ transpositions (namely, one of them inside U). We show that none of these pose an obstruction either; since $[K_1 : \mathbb{Q}]/[K_2 : \mathbb{Q}]$ is a 2-power, it is sufficient to show that the proportion of fixed points of these elements in the action on cosets of U is no more than the proportion of fixed points in the degree- $2p$ action (as indeed, one can then pass from the cycle type in the “small” action to the one in the “large” one, simply by concatenating each fixed point of the given involution $x \in G$ with an involution with the right amount of fixed points).

Using again the expression $\frac{|G:U| \cdot |x^G \cap U|}{|x^G|}$ for the fixed point number of x in the action on cosets of U , the fixed point *proportion* obviously becomes $\frac{|x^G \cap U|}{|x^G|}$. In our case, we are reduced to $|x^G \cap U| \in \{1, 2\}$, with the case $|x^G \cap U| = 1$ obviously not posing an obstruction to the required proportion; in the other case (namely, x an involution with $\frac{p+1}{2}$ transpositions), it suffices to note that the point stabilizer in the degree- $2p$ action also contains at least two conjugates of x , which is obvious, as soon as $p > 3$: indeed, this point stabilizer is, up to conjugacy, equal to $\langle (3, 4), (5, 6), \dots, (2p-1, 2p) \rangle$, which has $\binom{p-1}{(p+1)/2}$ involutions of the required cycle type; this is $\geq p-1$ as soon as $p > 3$.

Moreover, due to Corollary 2.2, if the above relation were induced by (containment and) arithmetic equivalence, then U would necessarily have at least as many orbits as the point stabilizer in the degree- $2p$ action. However, U has p orbits (all of length 2), whereas the point stabilizer has two fixed points and orbit lengths 2 otherwise, i.e., has $p+1$ orbits. \square

6. FAKE SUBFIELDS OF FIELDS WITH PRIMITIVE GALOIS GROUP

We so far mainly focussed on the question whether certain fields can *occur* as fake subfields of other fields. In this section, we take a moment to consider the opposite viewpoint, i.e., we ask whether certain fields can *have* fake subfields. A particularly interesting case seems to be the one where a field K_1 has no non-trivial subfields $\mathbb{Q} \subsetneq F \subsetneq K_1$. In terms of the Galois group, the latter is equivalent to saying that $U := \text{Gal}(\Omega/K_1)$ is a maximal subgroup of $G := \text{Gal}(\Omega/\mathbb{Q})$, where Ω denotes the Galois closure of K_1/\mathbb{Q} ; equivalently, G acts primitively on cosets of U . It is well-known that such a field K_1 can nevertheless have arithmetically equivalent fields not conjugate to K_1 (notably, for $d \geq 3$, the group $PGL(d, q)$ has two Gassmann equivalent classes of maximal subgroups of index $\frac{q^d-1}{q-1}$, corresponding to the stabilizer of a line and a hyperplane

in $GL(d, q)$. Below we give an example where K_1 has no nontrivial arithmetically equivalent fields, but nevertheless possesses fake subfields; in other words, while K_1/\mathbb{Q} has no nontrivial intermediate fields, purely local observations would suggest the existence of such subfields.

Lemma 6.1. *There exist infinitely many number fields of degree 234 possessing no nontrivial subfields and no nontrivial arithmetically equivalent fields, but possessing fake subfields of degree 13.*

Proof. The claim can be verified by considering subgroups of $G = PSL(3, 3)$ (which is known to occur as the Galois group of infinitely many Galois extensions of \mathbb{Q}). This group possesses maximal subgroups $U \cong S_4$, and there is no subgroup of G Gassmann-equivalent to U other than the conjugates of U (e.g., the only other class of order-24 subgroups of $PSL_3(3)$ has elements of order 6, which S_4 does not). Nevertheless, comparing the natural (degree 13) permutation action of $PSL(3, 3)$ with the degree-234 ($= 13 \cdot 18$) action on cosets of U yields that the fixed fields of the index-13 subgroups are fake subfields of the fixed field of U (and since the latter fields have neither nontrivial subfields nor nontrivially arithmetically equivalent fields, this relation cannot be induced by arithmetic equivalence). Indeed, computation with Magma yields that the pairs of cycle structures of non-identity elements of G in both actions are as follows: $((2^4 \cdot 1^5), (2^{108} \cdot 1^{18}))$, $((3^3 \cdot 1^4), (3^{78}))$, $((3^4 \cdot 1), (3^{77} \cdot 1^3))$, $((4^2 \cdot 2^2 \cdot 1), (4^{54} \cdot 2^8 \cdot 1^2))$, $((6 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1^2), (6^{36} \cdot 3^6))$, $((8 \cdot 4 \cdot 1), (8^{27} \cdot 4^4 \cdot 2))$ and $((13), (13^{18}))$; now it is an easy exercise to compose the “small” cycle structures with suitable cycle structures in S_{18} to obtain all the “large” cycle structures. \square

Remark 3. a) An exhaustive search of the Magma database of primitive groups confirms that the examples in Lemma 6.1 are indeed smallest possible, both with regard to the degree of the “larger” and of the “smaller” field involved. For such computations, it is useful to note that, under the given assumptions, both fields must have the same Galois closure. Indeed, if the Galois closure of the “small” field were strictly smaller, the point stabilizer in the large degree action, having no nontrivial overgroups, would have to surject onto the whole group under projection to the smaller Galois group, which is incompatible with Lemma 2.5. Such considerations also eventually help to obtain the conclusion that examples as the above can no longer exist if the assertion of primitivity of the Galois group is strengthened to 2-transitivity, although I do not know any “natural” argument for this; rather, doubly transitive groups have been classified in full as a result of the classification of finite simple groups (see, e.g., [3, Chapter 7.7]). These are either affine, or almost simple groups in an explicit list (with some either alternating, linear, symplectic, unitary, Suzuki or Ree group, along with a few sporadic examples), together with explicit permutation degrees. It just so happens that none of these has a faithful transitive action of degree strictly dividing this permutation degree (for the affine groups, any other faithful primitive faithful action would have to be affine of the same degree, whereas for the almost simple groups, the known classification of their maximal subgroups confirms the claim), whence no candidate for a fake subfield can arise.

b) It would be interesting to exhibit not only an infinite family of fields, but an infinite family of groups leading to examples as in Lemma 6.1. They seem to be rare among primitive groups, although I have computationally verified $PSL_3(p)$ to yield examples for $p = 3, 5, 7$. Verifying whether this generalizes to all odd primes p might be feasible, although beyond the scope of this article.

7. TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE RAMIFIED PRIMES

While the exclusion of ramified primes in our main definitions is convenient due to the arising reductions to group theory, it is of course natural (in particular, in the context of local-global principles and their failure) to strengthen the definitions to include also the ramified primes. The natural way to do this is as follows: say that K_2 is *strongly locally sub- K_1* , if for each rational prime p , the following holds: if $K_{2,\mathfrak{p}_1}, \dots, K_{2,\mathfrak{p}_r}$ are the completions of K_2 at all the primes \mathfrak{p}_i extending p , and $K_{1,\mathfrak{q}_1}, \dots, K_{1,\mathfrak{q}_s}$ are the completions of K_1 at all the primes \mathfrak{q}_j extending p , then there exists a partition of $\{1, \dots, s\}$ into r subsets M_i ($i = 1, \dots, r$) such that for all $j \in M_i$, the field K_{1,\mathfrak{q}_j} contains (some conjugate of) K_{2,\mathfrak{p}_i} , and additionally $\sum_{j \in M_i} [K_{1,\mathfrak{q}_j} : K_{2,\mathfrak{p}_i}]$ equals the same value (namely, automatically $[K_1 : \mathbb{Q}]/[K_2 : \mathbb{Q}]$) for all $i = 1, \dots, r$. Clearly, when restricting to unramified primes, this definition becomes equal to our previous definition, due to unramified extensions of \mathbb{Q}_p being uniquely identified by their degree. The analogous strengthening has also been considered in the setting of arithmetic equivalence, the strengthened notion being denoted as “locally equivalent”, e.g., in [9]. In both cases, it is not difficult to find examples demonstrating that the “weak” version in general does not imply the “strong” one (and hence, systematically finding examples for the strong version may require not only investigation of the structure of the Galois group, but also solution of additional arithmetic problems).

At least, we can show the following:

Theorem 7.1. *Assume that K_2 is locally sub- K_1 , and K_1 is “locally cyclic”, i.e., all primes ramifying in the Galois closure of K_1/\mathbb{Q} have cyclic decomposition group. Then K_2 is strongly locally sub- K_1 .*

Proof. Let p be a prime ramifying in K_1 , let σ be a generator of the decomposition group at any prime extending p in the Galois closure Ω of K_1/\mathbb{Q} , and let λ_i be the cycle structure of σ in the action on cosets of $\text{Gal}(\Omega/K_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). Cycles of λ_i are then in one-to-one correspondence with primes extending p in K_i , with the cycle length equaling the degree over \mathbb{Q}_p of the respective completion. Since K_2 is locally sub- K_1 , λ_1 can be written as a concatenation of λ_2 with some $\underline{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$ (where r is the number of primes \mathfrak{p}_i extending p in K_2). In this way, each \mathfrak{p}_i is assigned a finite set of primes $\mathfrak{q}_{i,j}$ of K_1 with the property that the degree $[(K_1)_{\mathfrak{q}_{i,j}} : \mathbb{Q}_p]$ of each completion is a multiple of $[(K_2)_{\mathfrak{p}_i} : \mathbb{Q}_p]$. But since the completion at any prime extending p in all of Ω is a cyclic extension of \mathbb{Q}_p , subextensions are uniquely identified by their degree, meaning that divisibility of degrees automatically implies containment of fields. This proves the assertion. \square

Certain heuristics in inverse Galois theory suggest that locally cyclic Galois extensions of \mathbb{Q} should exist for every finite group, but this is of course a hard problem. Among the groups we have considered so far, we can conclude the following.

Corollary 7.2. *There are infinitely many degree- n S_n -number fields for $n \in \{5, 7, 9\}$, and infinitely many solvable number fields of degree $2p$ for every prime $p \geq 3$, which are fake subfields in the strong sense of some number field.*

Proof. As seen in the proof of Theorems 4.2 and 5.2, these number fields all occur as fake subfields of some number field with Galois group S_{p+2} ($p \in \{3, 5, 7\}$) or a solvable group, respectively. The assertion now follows from Theorem 7.1, together with the observation that all these groups are realizable as the Galois group of infinitely many locally cyclic extensions of \mathbb{Q} (Theorems 5.1 and 5.4 in [8]; in fact, the claim about solvable groups is already known due to Shafarevich’s method for realizing solvable groups as Galois groups). \square

8. OPEN QUESTIONS

Due to Gassmann’s criterion, the question whether a given number field K has any non-trivially arithmetically equivalent fields translates to a pure question about the Galois group of its Galois closure over \mathbb{Q} . Is this also true for the question whether K occurs as a fake subfield of some number field? This does not seem automatic, even though I do not know of any counterexamples. Indeed, we have an elementary necessary group-theoretical condition for a number field K to occur as the fake subfield of some number field F (Lemma 2.5), but it remains unclear whether this condition is also sufficient. We have at least seen (e.g., in the case $G = A_5$ in Theorem 3.2, and in the case $G = A_4$ acting on six points, in Theorem 3.3b)) that it may of course in general be necessary to look for fields F outside of the Galois closure of K/\mathbb{Q} . Looking a bit closer at such examples, one sees that, in the case $G = A_5$, the obstruction for finding a fake overfield inside the same Galois closure was relatively “harmless”: it came from the cycle type (3.1^2) , which had cycle structure $(3^3.1)$ in the only possible (namely, degree-10) candidate action of A_5 . The obstruction arises essentially from the two degrees being too close to each other - it vanishes once the cycles in the second cycle type are simply repeated sufficiently many times (for example, three times, leading to the cycle structure $(3^9.1^3)$, which is exactly what happens when passing from the above degree-10 action of A_5 to the degree-30 action of $A_5 \times C_3$, as we did in the proof of Theorem 3.2). Other cases require more intricate solutions. Notably, if there is an element $\sigma \in G$ whose fixed point proportion in the “small” (i.e., candidate for a fake subfield) permutation action is smaller than in the action on cosets of U (in the notation of Lemma 2.5), then this will remain an obstruction even after arbitrarily repeating all the cycles from the second permutation action; in other words, passing to a direct product cannot get rid of the obstruction in such a case, nor can passing to a full wreath product. There are, of course, many other possibilities to embed G as a quotient into an imprimitive group whose blocks action equals the action on cosets of U , and it may well be possible to give some inductive construction to successively get rid of obstructions, but the group theory should become rather delicate in the process.

On a related note, in the case where one has to go beyond the Galois closure of K/\mathbb{Q} in search of fields containing K as a fake subfield, one has to solve certain embedding problems, corresponding to group extensions $1 \rightarrow N \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow G = \text{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow 1$. It seems worth wondering whether it could ever happen that all group extensions leading to fields containing K as a fake subfield have to be *non-split* extensions of the Galois group of K/\mathbb{Q} . In such a case, the solvability of the embedding problem would in general depend on the behavior of primes in K/\mathbb{Q} , i.e., it could happen that, among such fields with the same Galois group, some occur as fake subfields whereas others don’t. Whether this phenomenon can indeed occur, I do not know.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Burnside, *On the properties of groups of odd order*. Proc. London Math. Soc. 33 (1900), 162–185.
- [2] P. Corvaja, *On the local-to-global principle for value sets*. Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma 13 (2022), 47–72.
- [3] J. D. Dixon, B. Mortimer, *Permutation groups*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 163. Springer, 1996.
- [4] C. Elsholtz, B. Klahn, M. Technau, *On polynomials with roots modulo almost all primes*. Acta Arithm. 205 (2022), 251–263.
- [5] B. Fein, W. M. Kantor, M. Schacher, *Relative Brauer groups II*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 328 (1981), 39–57.

- [6] M. D. Fried, *The field of definition of function fields and a problem in the reducibility of polynomials in two variables*. Illinois J. Math. 17 (1973), 128–146.
- [7] F. Gassmann, *Bemerkungen zur vorstehenden Arbeit von Hurwitz (Über Beziehungen zwischen den Primidealen eines algebraischen Körpers und den Substitutionen seiner Gruppe)*. Math. Z. 25 (1926), 665–675.
- [8] K.-S. Kim, J. König, *On Galois extensions with prescribed decomposition groups*. J. Number Theory 220 (2021), 266–294.
- [9] B. Linowitz, D. B. MacReynolds, N. Miller, *Locally equivalent correspondences*. Ann. Inst. Fourier 67(2) (2017), 451–482.
- [10] A. Lubotzky, D. Neftin, *Sylow-conjugate number fields*. Preprint (2021). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2201.04103>.
- [11] P. Müller, *Kronecker conjugacy of polynomials*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 350 (5) (1998), 1823–1850.
- [12] R. Perlis, *On the equation $\zeta_k(s) = \zeta_{k'}(s)$* . J. Number Theory 9 (3) (1977), 342–360.
- [13] D. Prasad, *A refined notion of arithmetically equivalent number fields, and curves with isomorphic Jacobians*. Adv. Math. 312 (2017), 198–208.
- [14] D. J. Saltman, *Generic Galois extensions and problems in field theory*. Adv. Math. 43 (1982), 250–283.
- [15] A. V. Sutherland, *Stronger arithmetic equivalence*. Discrete Analysis 2021:23 (2021), 23 pp.

KOREA NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, 28173 CHEONGJU, SOUTH KOREA