

GROTHENDIECK–SERRE FOR CONSTANT REDUCTIVE GROUP SCHEMES

NING GUO AND FEI LIU

ABSTRACT. The Grothendieck–Serre conjecture asserts that on a regular local ring there is no nontrivial reductive torsor becomes trivial over the fraction field. This conjecture is answered in the affirmative in the equicharacteristic case but is still open in the mixed characteristic case. In this article, we establish its generalized version over Prüfer bases for constant reductive group schemes. In particular, the Noetherian restriction of our main result settles a new case of the Grothendieck–Serre conjecture. Subsequently, we use this as a key input to resolve the variant of Bass–Quillen conjecture for torsors under constant reductive group schemes in our Prüferian context. Along the way, inspired by the recent preprint of Česnavičius [Čes22c], we also prove several versions of Nisnevich conjecture in our context.

1. Grothendieck–Serre on schemes smooth over Prüfer bases	2
Acknowledgements	5
2. Purity for reductive torsors on schemes smooth over Prüfer rings	5
3. Low dimensional cohomology of groups of multiplicative type	10
4. Geometric lemmata	13
5. Torsors on a smooth affine relative curve	18
6. Torsors under a reductive group scheme over a smooth projective base	22
7. Torsors under a constant reductive group scheme	24
8. The Bass–Quillen conjecture for torsors	25
Appendix A. Grothendieck–Serre on a semilocal Prüfer domain	28
A.1. Lifting maximal tori of reductive group schemes over semilocal rings	28
A.2. Harder’s weak approximation	29
A.3. Product formula over semilocal Prüfer domains	31
References	32

Date: January 31, 2023.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 14F22; Secondary 14F20, 14G22, 16K50.

Key words and phrases. purity, Grothendieck–Serre, Bass–Quillen, vector bundles, principal bundles, Prüfer rings, torsors, homogeneous spaces, group schemes, valuation rings.

1. GROTHENDIECK–SERRE ON SCHEMES SMOOTH OVER PRÜFER BASES

The Grothendieck–Serre conjecture predicts that every torsor under a reductive group scheme G over a regular local ring A is trivial if it becomes trivial over $\text{Frac } A$. In other words, the following map

$$H_{\text{ét}}^1(A, G) \rightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^1(\text{Frac } A, G)$$

between nonabelian cohomology pointed sets, has trivial kernel. The conjecture was settled in the affirmative when $\dim A = 1$, or when A contains a field (that is, A is of equicharacteristic). When A is of mixed characteristic, the conjecture holds when A is unramified and G is quasi-split, whereas most of the remaining scenarios are unknown, see the recent survey [Pan18, §5] for a detailed review of the state of the art, as well as §1.2 below for a summary. The present article aims to establish a new mixed characteristic case of the Grothendieck–Serre conjecture, in the following much more general non-Noetherian setup:

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 7.1 (i)). *For a semilocal Prüfer ring R , a reductive R -group scheme G , and an irreducible, affine, R -smooth scheme X , every generically trivial G -torsor on X is Zariski-semilocally trivial. In other words, if $A := \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{x}}$ is the semilocal ring of X at a finite subset $\mathbf{x} \subset X$, we have*

$$\ker(H_{\text{ét}}^1(A, G) \rightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^1(\text{Frac } A, G)) = \{*\}.$$

A ring is *Prüfer* if all its local rings are valuation rings, that are, integral domains V such that every $x \in (\text{Frac } V) \setminus V$ satisfies $x^{-1} \in V$. Noetherian valuation rings are exactly discrete valuation rings. Therefore, Theorem 1.1 specializes to a previously unsolved case of the Grothendieck–Serre in the sense that the aforementioned regular local ring A is taken as a local ring of a scheme smooth over a discrete valuation ring. By Popescu’s theorem [SP, 07GC], Theorem 1.1 still holds when A is a semilocal ring that is geometrically regular over a Dedekind ring.

1.2. Known cases of the Grothendieck–Serre conjecture. Since proposed by Serre [Ser58, page 31] and Grothendieck [Gro58, pages 26–27, Remarques 3], [Gro68a, Remarques 1.11 a)], the Grothendieck–Serre conjecture has already various known cases, as listed below.

- (i) The case when G is a torus was proved by Colliot-Thélène and Sansuc in [CTS87].
- (ii) The case when $\dim A = 1$, namely, A is a discrete valuation ring, was addressed by Nisnevich in [Nis82] and [Nis84], then is improved and generalized to the semilocal Dedekind case in [Guo22]. Several special cases were proved in [Har67], [BB70], [BTIII] over discrete valuation rings, and in [PS16], [BVG14], [BFF17], [BFFH20] for the semilocal Dedekind case.
- (iii) The case when A is Henselian was settled in [BB70] and [CTS79, Assertion 6.6.1] by reducing the triviality of G -torsors to residue fields then inducting on $\dim A$ to reach Nisnevich’s resolved case.
- (iv) The equicharacteristic case, namely, when A contains a field k , was established by Fedorov and Panin [FP15] when k is infinite (see also [PSV15], [Pan20b] for crucial techniques) and by Panin [Pan20a] when k is finite, which was later simplified by [Fed22a]. Before these, several equicharacteristic subcases were proved in [Oja80], [CTO92], [Rag94], [PS97], [Zai00], [Oja01], [Oja04], [Pan05], [Zai05], [Che10], [PSV15].
- (v) When A is of mixed characteristic, Česnavičius [Čes22a] settled the case when G is quasi-split and A is unramified (that is, for $p := \text{char}(A/\mathfrak{m}_A)$, the ring A/pA is regular). Priorly, Fedorov [Fed22b] proved the split case under additional assumptions. Recently, Česnavičius [Čes22c, Theorem 1.3] settled a generalized Nisnevich conjecture under certain conditions, which specializes to the equal and mixed characteristic cases of the Grothendieck–Serre proved in [FP15], [Pan20a], [Čes22a].
- (vi) There are sporadic cases where A or G are special (with possible mixed characteristic condition), see [Gro68a, Remarque 1.11 a)], [Oja82], [Nis89], [Fed22b], [Fir22], [BFFP22], [Pan21].

For arguing Theorem 1.1, we will use our Prüferian counterparts of the toral case [CTS87] (see Proposition 3.6 (i)) and the semilocal Dedekind case [Guo22] (see Theorem A.0.1) but no other known case of the Grothendieck–Serre Conjecture.

1.3. Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1. As an initial geometric step, similar to Česnavičius’s approach, one tries to use Gabber–Quillen type presentation lemma to fiber a suitable open neighbourhood

$U \subset X$ of \mathbf{x} into smooth affine curves $U \rightarrow S$ over an open

$$S \subset \mathbb{A}_R^{\dim(X/R)-1}$$

in such a way that a given small¹ closed subscheme $Y \subset X$ becomes *finite* over S . For us, Y could be any closed subscheme away from which the generically trivial torsor in question is trivial. Practically, this could be very hard (and even impossible) to achieve, partly due to the remaining mysterious of algebraic geometry in mixed characteristics; however, by the same reasoning as [Čes22a, Variant 3.7], it is indeed possible if our X admits a projective, flat compactification \overline{X} over R such that the boundary $\overline{Y} \setminus Y$ of Y is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in \overline{X} .

Assume for the moment that our compactification \overline{X} is even R -smooth. (Although this looks very limited, it is strong enough for our later application in which $\overline{X} = \mathbb{P}_R^d$.) Then, a key consequence of the purity for reductive torsors on scheme smooth over Prüfer schemes (which takes advantage of the fact that our G descends to R hence is defined over the whole \overline{X}) is that we can enlarge the domain X of our torsor so that $\overline{X} \setminus X$ is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in \overline{X} , see Corollary 2.10 for a more precise statement. In particular, since $\overline{Y} \setminus Y \subset \overline{X} \setminus X$, we can ensure that $\overline{Y} \setminus Y$ is also R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in \overline{X} , and it is therefore possible to run Panin–Fedorov–Česnavičius type arguments to finish the proof in the present case.

However, our R -smooth X from the beginning is arbitrary and need not have a smooth projective compactification. To circumvent this difficulty, we prove the following result, which is interesting in its own right: the pair (Y, X) Zariski-locally on X can be presented as an elementary étale neighbourhood of a similar pair (Y', X') , where X' is an open of some projective R -space, see Proposition 4.4 for a finer statement. Standard glueing techniques then allows us to replace (Y, X) by (Y', X') and to study generically trivial torsors on X' , but now X' has smooth projective compactifications, namely, the projective R -spaces, we come back to the situation already settled in the previous paragraph.

1.4. Nisnevich’s purity conjecture. Now, we turn to Nisnevich’s purity conjecture, where we require the total isotropicity of group schemes. A reductive group scheme G defined over a scheme S is *totally isotropic* at $s \in S$ if every G_i in the decomposition [SGA 3III_{new}, Exposé XXIV, Proposition 5.10 (i)]

$$G_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}^{\text{ad}} \cong \prod_i \text{Res}_{R_i/\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}(G_i)$$

contains a \mathbb{G}_{m,R_i} , equivalently, every G_i has a parabolic R_i -subgroup that is fiberwisely proper, see [SGA 3III_{new}, Exposé XXVI, Corollaire 6.12]. If this holds for all $s \in S$, then G is *totally isotropic*. Proposed by Nisnevich [Nis89, Conjecture 1.3] and modified due to the anisotropic counterexamples of Fedorov [Fed22b, Proposition 4.1], the Nisnevich conjecture predicts that, for a regular semilocal ring A , a regular parameter $r \in A$ (that is, $r \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$ for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$), and a reductive A -group scheme G such that $G_{A/rA}$ is totally isotropic, every generically trivial G -torsor on $A[\frac{1}{r}]$ is trivial, that is, the following map

$$H^1(A[\frac{1}{r}], G) \rightarrow H^1(\text{Frac } A, G) \quad \text{has trivial kernel.}$$

The case when A is a local ring of a regular affine variety over a field and $G = \text{GL}_n$ was settled by Bhatwadekar–Rao in [BR83] and was subsequently extended to arbitrary regular local rings containing fields by Popescu [Pop02, Theorem 1]. Nisnevich in [Nis89] proved the conjecture in dimension two, assuming that A is a local ring with infinite residue field and that G is quasi-split. For the state of the art, the conjecture was settled in equicharacteristic case and in several mixed characteristic case by Česnavičius in [Čes22c, Theorem 1.3] (previously, Fedorov [Fed21] proved the case when A contains an infinite field). Besides, the toral case and some low dimensional cases are known and surveyed in [Čes22b, Section 3.4.2 (1)] including Gabber’s result [Gab81, Chapter I, Theorem 1] for the local case $\dim A \leq 3$ when G is either GL_n or PGL_n . In this article, we prove several variants of Nisnevich conjecture over Prüfer bases, see Theorem 6.1 (ii) and Theorem 7.1 (ii).

1.5. Outline of the paper. In this §1.5, unless stated otherwise, R is a semilocal Prüfer ring, $S := \text{Spec } R$ is its spectrum, X is an irreducible, affine, R -smooth scheme, $A := \mathcal{O}_{X,\mathbf{x}}$ is the semilocal ring of X at a finite subset $\mathbf{x} \subset X$, and G is a reductive X -group scheme.

- (1) In §2, we establish purity of reductive torsors on schemes smooth over Prüfer rings. The global statement is Theorem 2.7 : if X is a smooth S -curve and if a closed subset $Z \subset X$ satisfies

$$Z_\eta = \emptyset \quad \text{for each generic point } \eta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } s \in S,$$

¹Typically, it is not so small, and is only R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 1 in X .

then restriction induces the following equivalence of categories of G -torsors

$$\mathbf{Tors}(X_{\text{ét}}, G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Tors}((X \setminus Z)_{\text{ét}}, G).$$

In particular, passing to isomorphism classes of objects, we have the following bijection of pointed sets

$$H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, G) \simeq H_{\text{ét}}^1(X \setminus Z, G).$$

In its local variant Theorem 2.8, we show that if $x \in X$ is a point such that

$$\text{either } x \in X_\eta \text{ with } \dim \mathcal{O}_{X_\eta, x} = 2, \quad \text{or } x \in X_s \text{ with } s \neq \eta \text{ and } \dim \mathcal{O}_{X_s, x} = 1,$$

then every G -torsor over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X, x} \setminus \{x\}$ extends uniquely to a G -torsor over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X, x}$. An immediate consequence is Corollary 2.10: every generically trivial G -torsor on $\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{x}}$ extends to a G -torsor on an open neighbourhood of \mathbf{x} whose complementary closed has codimension ≥ 3 (resp., ≥ 2) in the generic (resp., non-generic) S -fibers of X .

As for their proofs, the key case to treat is that of vector bundles, that is, $G = \text{GL}_n$, whose analysis ultimately depends on the estimate of the projective dimensions of reflexive sheaves on X and the equivalence of categories of reflexive sheaves on X and on $X \setminus Z$ (under suitable codimensional constraints on Z), both are essentially obtained by Gabber–Ramero [GR18].

- (2) In §3, based on the low-dimensional vanishing of local cohomology of tori, we prove the purity for cohomology of group schemes of multiplicative type over Prüfer bases, as well as the surjectivity of $H_{\text{ét}}^1(-, T)$ and the injectivity of $H_{\text{ét}}^2(-, T)$ upon restricting to opens for flasque tori T over an S -smooth scheme, see Theorem 3.3 for a more precise statement. After these preliminaries, we are able to prove the Prüferian counterparts of Colliot-Thélène–Sansuc’s results for tori and, in particular, the Grothendieck–Serre for tori, see Proposition 3.6 (i).
- (3) In §4, we first present the Prüferian analog of Česnavičius’s formulation of the geometric presentation lemma in the style of Gabber–Quillen, see Lemma 4.2. The rest of §4 is devoted to proving the following variant (in some aspect, a stronger form) of Lindel’s lemma which should be of independent interest: for an S -smooth scheme X and a closed subscheme $Y \subset X$ that avoids all the maximal points of the S -fibers of X , the pair (Y, X) Zariski-locally on X can be presented as an elementary étale neighbourhood of a similar pair (Y', X') , where X' is an open of some projective S -space, see Proposition 4.4 for a finer statement where one works Zariski semilocally on X .
- (4) The main result of §5 is the Section Theorem 5.1 on triviality of torsors on a smooth affine relative curve. The idea of the proof ultimately depends on the geometry of affine Grassmannians developed by Fedorov, who proved Theorem 5.1 (i) for $C = \mathbb{A}_R^1$.
- (5) In §6, we prove Theorem 1.1 under the additional assumption that X is R -projective, only assuming that G is a reductive X -group scheme (thus not necessarily descends to R). This result was proved by the second author and simultaneously by an unpublished work of Panin and the first author in the Noetherian case. As explained in §1.3, the proof crucially uses the results of §2 on purity for reductive torsors to extend the domain of the relevant torsors so that the geometric presentation Lemma 4.2 could apply. It turns out that, without much extra efforts, we could simultaneously obtain a version of Nisnevich statement as in Theorem 6.1 (ii).
- (6) In §7, we prove Theorem 1.1 as well as the corresponding Nisnevich statement Theorem 7.1 (ii). As mentioned in §1.3, the proof is via reduction to the case settled in §6 where X is an open of some projective R -space, using Proposition 4.4.
- (7) In §8, we prove the following Bass–Quillen statement for torsors: for a ring A that is smooth over a Prüfer ring R and a totally isotropic reductive R -group scheme G , a G -torsor on \mathbb{A}_A^N descends to A if it is Zariski-locally trivial, equivalently, if it is Nisnevich-locally trivial. For the proof, the key input is the main Theorem 1.1 as well as the purity Theorem 2.7 that we utilize to show that every generically trivial $G_{R(t)}$ -torsor is trivial for a reductive R -group scheme G (see Lemma 8.8). Granted them, we will closely follow the line of the proofs of the classical Bass–Quillen conjecture for vector bundles in the unramified case (as gradually developed by Quillen [Qui76], Lindel [Lin81] and Popescu [Pop89]): Quillen patching and the approximation Lemma 2.2 reduce us to the case of a finite-rank valuation ring R , inducting on $\text{rank}(R)$ and the number of variables involving Lemma 8.8 establishes the case A being a polynomial ring over R , an application of the

‘inverse’ to Quillen patching Lemma 8.4 settles the case A being a localization of a polynomial ring over R , and finally, by inducting on the pair $(\dim R, \dim A - \dim R)$ and using Theorem 1.1, a glueing argument involving Proposition 4.4 reduces the general case to the already settled case A being a localization of a polynomial ring.

- (8) In appendix A, we prove the Grothendieck–Serre on semilocal Prüfer rings (Theorem A.0.1), which simultaneously generalizes the main results of [Guo22] and [Guo20]. In essence, one has to prove a product formula for reductive groups scheme on semilocal Prüfer rings (Proposition A.3.1). The toral case is immediately obtained, thanks to the already settled Grothendieck–Serre for tori (see Proposition 3.6 (i)). The general case would follow from the similar arguments as in *loc. cit.*, once Harder’s weak approximation argument was carried out to establish the key Proposition A.2.3.

1.6. Notations and conventions. All rings in this paper are commutative with units, unless stated otherwise. For a point s of a scheme (resp., for a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of a ring), we let $\kappa(s)$ (resp., $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$) denote its residue field. For a global section s of a scheme S , we write $S[\frac{1}{s}]$ for the open locus where s does not vanish. For a ring A , we let $\text{Frac } A$ denote its total ring of fractions. For a morphism of algebraic spaces $S' \rightarrow S$, we let $(-)_S'$ denote the base change functor from S to S' ; if $S = \text{Spec } R$ and $S' = \text{Spec } R'$ are affine schemes, we will also write $(-)_{R'}$ for $(-)_{S'}$.

Let S be an algebraic space, and let G be an S -group algebraic space. For an S -algebraic space T , by a G -torsor over T we shall mean a $G_T := G \times_R T$ -torsor. Denote by $\mathbf{Tors}(S_{\text{fppf}}, G)$ (resp., $\mathbf{Tors}(S_{\text{ét}}, G)$) the groupoid of G -torsors on S that are fppf-locally (resp., étale-locally) trivial; specifically, if G is S -smooth (e.g., G is S -reductive), then every fppf-locally trivial G -torsor is étale-locally trivial, so we have

$$\mathbf{Tors}(S_{\text{fppf}}, G) = \mathbf{Tors}(S_{\text{ét}}, G).$$

Let X be a scheme. The category of invertible \mathcal{O}_X -modules is denoted $\mathbf{Pic}X$. Assume that X is locally coherent, for example, X could be locally Noetherian or locally finitely presented over a Prüfer ring. The category of reflexive \mathcal{O}_X -modules is denoted $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-Rflx}$.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Kęstutis Česnavičius and Ivan Panin for their constant encouragements. We thank Matthew Morrow and Colliot-Thélène for proposing the Grothendieck–Serre on smooth schemes over semilocal Prüfer rings during the defense of the first author. We thank Kęstutis Česnavičius for helping us to remove the assumptions on finite residue fields in our original formulation of the main Theorem 1.1. After an earlier version of this paper was finished, Kęstutis Česnavičius kindly sent to us his note which contained a sketch of a different proof of main Theorem 1.1 in the Noetherian case. On several occasions during the past few months, we talked about some aspects of this article with Kęstutis Česnavičius, Arnab Kundu, Shang Li, and Ivan Panin. We thank them for these conversations. We thank Jiandi Zou for useful suggestions about the article. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research, the innovation programme (grant agreement No. 851146), the grant 075-15-2022-289, and the excellent environment for research of the Euler International Mathematical Institute.

2. PURITY FOR REDUCTIVE TORSORS ON SCHEMES SMOOTH OVER PRÜFER RINGS

In this section, we recollect useful geometric properties on scheme over Prüfer bases.

Lemma 2.1. *For a Prüfer scheme S , an S -flat, finite type, irreducible scheme X , and a point $s \in S$,*

- (i) *all nonempty S -fibers have the same dimension;*
- (ii) *if $\mathcal{O}_{X_s, \xi}$ is reduced for a maximal point $\xi \in X_s$, then the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X, \xi}$ is a valuation ring such that the extension $\mathcal{O}_{S, s} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X, \xi}$ induces an isomorphism of value groups.*

Proof. For (i), see [ÉGA IV₃, Lemme 14.3.10]. For (ii), see [MB22, Théorème A]. □

Lemma 2.1.1. *For a valuation ring V , an essentially finitely presented (resp., essentially smooth) V -local algebra A , there are an extension of valuation rings V'/V with trivial extension of value groups, and an essentially finitely presented (resp., essentially smooth) V -map $V' \rightarrow A$ with finite residue fields extension.*

Proof. Assume $A = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ for an affine scheme X finitely presented over V and a point $x \in X$ lying over the closed point $s \in \text{Spec}(V)$. Let $t = \text{tr.deg}(\kappa(x)/\kappa(s))$. As $\kappa(x)$ is a finite extension of $l := \kappa(s)(a_1, \dots, a_t)$ for a transcendence basis $(a_i)_1^t$ of $\kappa(x)/\kappa(s)$, we have $t = \dim_l \Omega_{l/\kappa(s)}^1 \leq \dim_{\kappa(x)} \Omega_{\kappa(x)/\kappa(s)}^1$. Choose sections $b_1, \dots, b_t \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ such that $\overline{db_1}, \dots, \overline{db_t} \in \Omega_{\kappa(x)/\kappa(s)}^1$ are linearly independent over $\kappa(x)$, where the bar stands for their images in $\kappa(x)$. Define $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_V^t$ by sending the standard coordinates T_1, \dots, T_t of \mathbb{A}_V^t to b_1, \dots, b_t , respectively. Since $\overline{db_1}, \dots, \overline{db_t} \in \Omega_{\kappa(x)/\kappa(s)}^1$ are linearly independent, the image $\eta := p(x)$ is the generic point of $\mathbb{A}_{\kappa(s)}^t$, so $V' := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}_V^t, \eta}$ is a valuation ring whose value group is $\Gamma_{V'} \simeq \Gamma_V$. Note that $\kappa(x)/\kappa(\eta)$ is finite, the map $V' \rightarrow A$ induces a finite residue fields extension.

When $V \rightarrow A$ is essentially smooth, the images of $\overline{db_1}, \dots, \overline{db_t}$ under the map $\Omega_{X/V}^1 \otimes \kappa(x) \rightarrow \Omega_{\kappa(x)/\kappa(s)}^1$ are linearly independent, so are their images in $\Omega_{X/V}^1 \otimes \kappa(x)$. Hence, p is essentially smooth at x . \square

In the sequel, we will use the following limit argument repeatedly.

Lemma 2.2. *Every semilocal Prüfer domain R is a filtered direct union of its subrings R_i such that:*

- (i) *for every i , R_i is a semilocal Prüfer domain of finite Krull dimension; and*
- (ii) *for i large enough, $R_i \rightarrow R$ induces a bijection on the sets of maximal ideals hence is fpqc.*

Proof. Write $\text{Frac}(R) = \cup_i K_i$ as the filtered direct union of the subfields of $\text{Frac}(R)$ that are finitely generated over its prime field \mathfrak{k} . For $R_i := R \cap K_i$, we have $R = \cup_i R_i$. It remains to see that every R_i is a semilocal Prüfer domain whose local rings have finite ranks. Let $\{\mathfrak{p}_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ be the set of maximal ideals of R . Then $R = \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq n} R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ is the intersection of the valuation rings $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$. Thus we have

$$R_i = \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq n} (K_i \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}).$$

Since K_i/\mathfrak{k} has finite transcendence degree, by Abhyankar's inequality, every $K_i \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ is a valuation ring of finite rank. By [BouAC, VI, §7, Proposition 1–2], R_i is a semilocal Prüfer domain, and its local rings at maximal ideals are precisely the minimal elements of the set $\{K_i \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}\}_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ under inclusion. This implies (i). For (ii), it suffices to show that for i large enough there are no strict inclusion relation between $K_i \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}_{j_1}}$ and $K_i \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}_{j_2}}$ for $j_1 \neq j_2$. Indeed, if $\pi_j \in \mathfrak{p}_j \setminus \bigcup_{j' \neq j} \mathfrak{p}_{j'}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, then (ii) holds for any i for which $\{\pi_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq n} \subset K_i$. \square

2.3. Coherence and reflexive sheaves. For a ring R , if an R -module M is finitely generated and its finitely generated submodules are all finitely presented, then M is a *coherent* R -module. The ring R is *coherent* if it is a coherent R -module. An \mathcal{O}_X -module \mathcal{F} on a scheme X is *coherent* if, for every affine open $U \subset X$, $\mathcal{F}(U)$ is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -module. A scheme X is *locally coherent* if \mathcal{O}_X is a coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module. For a locally coherent scheme X , an \mathcal{O}_X -module \mathcal{F} is coherent if and only if it is finitely presented ([SP, 05CX]), and if this is true then its dual $\mathcal{F}^\vee := \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is also coherent. Examples of locally coherent schemes include locally Noetherian schemes, Prüfer schemes and, more generally, any scheme flat and locally of finite type over them, see [GR71, Partie I, Théorème 3.4.6].

Let X be a locally coherent scheme. A coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module \mathcal{F} is *reflexive* if taking double dual $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{\vee\vee}$ is an isomorphism. For a reflexive \mathcal{O}_X -module \mathcal{F} , locally on X , taking dual of a finite presentation of \mathcal{F}^\vee yields a *finite copresentation* of $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{F}^{\vee\vee}$ of the form $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus m} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus n}$. Conversely, if \mathcal{F} admits such a copresentation, then $\mathcal{F} \simeq \text{coker}(\alpha^\vee)^\vee$, so by [SP, 01BY] is reflexive. Hence, a coherent sheaf on X is reflexive if and only if it is finitely cogenerated. As a consequence, we see that reflexivity is compatible with limit formalism in the following sense: if $X = \lim_i X_i$ is the limit of an inverse system (X_i) of qcqs locally coherent schemes with affine transition morphisms, then we have

$$\text{colim}_i \mathcal{O}_{X_i}\text{-Rflx} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_X\text{-Rflx}. \quad (2.3.0.1)$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $X \rightarrow S$ be a finite type morphism with regular fibers between topologically Noetherian schemes, let $j : U \hookrightarrow X$ be a quasi-compact open immersion with complement $Z := X \setminus U$ satisfying*

$$\text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 1 \text{ for every } s \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_\eta, X_\eta) \geq 2 \text{ for every generic point } \eta \in S,$$

and let \mathcal{F} be a reflexive \mathcal{O}_X -module. Assume that S is a cofiltered inverse limit of integral schemes $(S_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ with generic point η_λ and surjective transition maps. Then, there is a $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$, a finite type

morphism $X_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow S_{\lambda_0}$ with regular fibers such that $X_{\lambda_0} \times_{S_{\lambda_0}} S \simeq X$, a closed subscheme $Z_{\lambda_0} \subset X_{\lambda_0}$ such that $Z_{\lambda_0} \times_{S_{\lambda_0}} S \simeq Z$, the open immersion $j_{\lambda_0}: X_{\lambda_0} \setminus Z_{\lambda_0} \hookrightarrow X_{\lambda_0}$ is quasi-compact, and the following

$$\text{codim}((Z_{\lambda_0})_s, (X_{\lambda_0})_s) \geq 1 \text{ for every } s \in S_{\lambda_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}((Z_{\lambda_0})_{\eta_0}, (X_{\lambda_0})_{\eta_0}) \geq 2$$

is satisfied. Also, there is a reflexive $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\lambda_0}}$ -module \mathcal{F}_{λ_0} whose inverse image on X is \mathcal{F} .

Proof. The condition that X has regular S -fibers descends to X_{λ_0} by [ÉGA IV₂, Proposition 6.5.3]. The reflexive \mathcal{O}_X -module \mathcal{F} descends thanks to [ÉGA IV₃, Théorème 8.5.2] and by applying [ÉGA IV₃, Corollaire 8.5.2.5] to $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{F}^{\vee\vee}$. Because Z is constructible closed, by [ÉGA IV₃, Théorème 8.3.11], it descends to Z_λ such that $p_\lambda^{-1}(Z_\lambda) = Z$. For $f_\lambda: X_\lambda \rightarrow S_\lambda$, by the transversity of fibers and [ÉGA IV₂, Corollaire 4.2.6], Z_λ does not contain any irreducible components of $f_\lambda^{-1}(s_\lambda)$ for any $s_\lambda \in S_\lambda$. Finally, the image of the generic point $\eta \in S$ is the generic point $\eta_\lambda \in S_\lambda$. By [ÉGA IV₂, Corollaire 6.1.4], we have $\text{codim}((Z_\lambda)_{\eta_\lambda}, (X_\lambda)_{\eta_\lambda}) = \text{codim}(Z_\eta, X_\eta) \geq 2$. Finally, \mathcal{F} descends to a reflexive sheaf by (2.3.0.1). \square

Proposition 2.5. *For a semilocal Prüfer ring R and a flat, locally of finite type morphism $f: X \rightarrow S := \text{Spec } R$ of schemes with regular fibers, the following assertions hold.*

(i) *For every $x \in X$ and every coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module \mathcal{F} that is reflexive at x , we have*

$$\text{proj.dim}_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} \mathcal{F}_x \leq \max(0, n - 1), \quad \text{where} \quad n = \dim \mathcal{O}_{f^{-1}(f(x)), x}.$$

(ii) *For a closed subset $Z \subset X$ such that $j: X \setminus Z \hookrightarrow X$ is quasi-compact and satisfies the following*

$$\text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 1 \text{ for all } s \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_\eta, X_\eta) \geq 2 \text{ for the generic point } \eta \in S,$$

the restriction functors induce the following equivalences:

$$\mathcal{O}_X\text{-Rflx} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{X \setminus Z}\text{-Rflx} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Pic } X \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Pic } X \setminus Z \quad (2.5.0.2)$$

In particular, for every X -affine finite type scheme Y , we have a bijection of sets

$$Y(X) \simeq Y(X \setminus Z).$$

Proof. The assertion (i) is [GR18, Proposition 11.4.1 (iii)]. For the first assertion of (ii), by glueing, the equivalence is Zariski-local on X , so we may assume that X is affine and thus, by [Nag66, Theorem 3], $X \rightarrow S$ is finitely presented. By a standard limit argument involving Lemmata 2.2 and 2.4, we reduce to the case of a finite-dimensional S . Now since $|X|$ is the finite disjoint union of its S -fibers X_s , which are Noetherian spaces, we see that X is topologically Noetherian. In particular, every open subset of X is quasi-compact. By [GR18, Proposition 11.3.8 (i)], the functor (2.5.0.2) is essentially surjective. For the fully faithfulness, we let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be two reflexive \mathcal{O}_X -modules and need to show that restriction induces

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(\mathcal{F}|_U, \mathcal{G}|_U), \quad \text{where} \quad U := X \setminus Z.$$

Choose a finite presentation $\mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus m} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus n} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$. Then chasing the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus n}, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus m}, \mathcal{G}) \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(\mathcal{F}|_U, \mathcal{G}|_U) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(\mathcal{O}_U^{\oplus n}, \mathcal{G}|_U) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(\mathcal{O}_U^{\oplus m}, \mathcal{G}|_U) \end{array}$$

with exact rows reduces us first to the case when \mathcal{F} is free. Choose a finite copresentation $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus m'} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus n'}$ and chasing a similar commutative diagram reduces us further to the case \mathcal{G} is free. Thus we may assume that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{O}_X$ and need to show that $\mathcal{O}_X(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$. Through the terminology of [GR18, 10.4.19], our assumption on the fiberwise codimension of Z in X implies that $\delta'(z, \mathcal{O}_X) \geq 2$, see [GR18, Corollary 10.4.46], so we may apply [GR18, Proposition 11.3.8 (ii)] to $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{O}_X$ and deduce that $\mathcal{O}_X \simeq j_*(\mathcal{O}_U)$. Taking global sections yields the desired isomorphism.

For the second assertion of (ii), by glueing, the problem is Zariski-local on X , so we can assume that X is affine. Choose an embedding $Y \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_X^n$ over X for some integer n . Since U is schematically dense in X , for every morphism $\phi: U \rightarrow Y$, if ϕ extends uniquely to a morphism $\tilde{\phi}: X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_X^n$, then $\tilde{\phi}^{-1}(Y)$ is a closed subscheme of X containing U and, by [ÉGA IV₄, Lemme 20.3.8.8], must coincide with X . In other words, if $\tilde{\phi}$ exists uniquely, then it factorises as $X \xrightarrow{\psi} Y \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_X^n$ such that ψ is the unique extension

of ϕ . This reduces us to the case $Y = \mathbb{A}_X^n$. Now, by the reflexivity of \mathcal{O}_X and the full faithfulness of $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-Rflx} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_U\text{-Rflx}$, we have the desired bijection

$$\mathbb{A}_X^n(X) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus n}) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(\mathcal{O}_U, \mathcal{O}_U^{\oplus n}) = \mathbb{A}_X^n(U). \quad \square$$

Corollary 2.6. *For a semilocal affine Prüfer scheme S , an S -flat, locally of finite type scheme X with regular one-dimensional S -fibers, and its closed subset Z such that $j: X \setminus Z \hookrightarrow X$ is quasi-compact and*

$$Z_\eta = \emptyset \quad \text{for each generic point } \eta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } s \in S,$$

the restriction and the pushforward $j_(-)$ as inverse induce an equivalence of categories of vector bundles*

$$\mathbf{Vect}_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Vect}_{X \setminus Z}.$$

Proof. For vector bundles \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 on X , the scheme $Y := \underline{\text{Isom}}_X(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ is X -affine of finite type, so $Y(X \setminus Z) = Y(X)$ by Proposition 2.5(ii). This proves the full faithfulness. For the essential surjectivity, by Proposition 2.5(ii), every vector bundle \mathcal{E} on $X \setminus Z$ extends to a reflexive \mathcal{O}_X -module $j_*\mathcal{E}$. To show that the reflexive \mathcal{O}_X -module $j_*\mathcal{E}$ is a vector bundle, it suffices to exploit Proposition 2.5(i). \square

As a consequence, we obtain the following purity on regular one-dimensional relative curves for torsors under reductive group schemes.

Theorem 2.7. *For a semilocal affine Prüfer scheme S , an S -flat, locally of finite type scheme X with regular one-dimensional S -fibers, and a closed subset $Z \subset X$ such that $X \setminus Z \hookrightarrow X$ is quasi-compact and*

$$Z_\eta = \emptyset \quad \text{for each generic point } \eta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } s \in S,$$

and a reductive X -group scheme G , restriction induces the following equivalence of categories of G -torsors

$$\mathbf{Tors}(X_{\text{ét}}, G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Tors}((X \setminus Z)_{\text{ét}}, G). \quad (2.7.0.3)$$

In particular, passing to isomorphism classes of objects, we have an isomorphism

$$H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, G) \simeq H_{\text{ét}}^1(X \setminus Z, G).$$

Proof. It suffices to show that (2.7.0.3) is an equivalence. To show that (2.7.0.3) is fully faithful, we let \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 be two G -torsors, and consider $Y := \underline{\text{Isom}}_X(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)$, the functor on X -schemes parameterizing isomorphisms from \mathcal{P}_1 to \mathcal{P}_2 . By descent theory, Y is X -affine and of finite type, so $Y(X \setminus Z) = Y(X)$ by Proposition 2.5(ii). This proves the full faithfulness.

To show that (2.7.0.3) is essentially surjective, we pick a G -torsor \mathcal{P} on $X \setminus Z$ and need to show that \mathcal{P} extends to a G -torsor on X . Since the assumption on the fiber codimension still holds when we base change to every étale scheme X' over X , we obtain an equivalence $\mathbf{Tors}(X'_{\text{ét}}, G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Tors}((X' \setminus Z')_{\text{ét}}, G)$, where $Z' := Z \times_X X'$. Consequently, by glueing in the étale topology, it suffices to show that, étale locally on X , \mathcal{P} extends to a G -torsor on X . To see this, we may assume that X is affine and $G \subset \text{GL}_{n,X}$, then exploit the commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\text{GL}_{n,X}/G)(X) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, G) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, \text{GL}_{n,X}) \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (\text{GL}_{n,X}/G)(X \setminus Z) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^1(X \setminus Z, G) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^1(X \setminus Z, \text{GL}_{n,X}), \end{array}$$

where the bijectivity of the left vertical arrow follows from Proposition 2.5(ii) and, as G is reductive, $\text{GL}_{n,X}/G$ is affine over X by [Alp14, 9.4.1]. By Corollary 2.6, we may replace X by an affine open cover to assume that the induced $\text{GL}_{n,X \setminus Z}$ -torsor $\mathcal{P} \times^{G_{X \setminus Z}} \text{GL}_{n,X \setminus Z}$ is trivial. A diagram chase implies that there exists a G -torsor \mathcal{Q} on X such that $\mathcal{Q}|_{X \setminus Z} \simeq \mathcal{P}$, as claimed. \square

The following local variant of Theorem 2.7 is a non-Noetherian counterpart of [CTS79, Théorème 6.13].

Theorem 2.8. *For a finite-rank valuation ring R with spectrum (S, η) , an S -flat finite type scheme X with regular fibers, a reductive X -group scheme G , and a point x that is*

- (i) *either $x \in X_\eta$ with $\dim \mathcal{O}_{X_\eta, x} = 2$, or*
- (ii) *$x \in X_s$ with $s \neq \eta$ and $\dim \mathcal{O}_{X_s, x} = 1$,*

every G -torsor on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X, x} \setminus \{x\}$ extends uniquely to a G -torsor on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X, x}$.

Proof. It suffices to show that restriction induces an equivalence of categories of G -torsors on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ and on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \setminus \{x\}$. The argument of Theorem 2.7 reduces us to the case of vector bundles, namely, to the case $G = \text{GL}_n$. Now the case (i) is classical (see for instance, [Gab81, §1, Lemma 1]). For (ii), the finite-rank assumption on V guarantees X and hence also $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \setminus \{x\}$ to be topologically Noetherian and, in particular, quasi-compact. Therefore, by Proposition 2.5(ii), every vector bundle \mathcal{E} on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \setminus \{x\}$, extends to a reflexive sheaf $j_*(\mathcal{E})$ on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, which, by the assumption $\dim \mathcal{O}_{X_s,x} = 1$ and Proposition 2.5(i), is projective, hence the assertion follows. \square

Granted the purity Theorem 2.8, we extend reductive torsors outside a closed subset of higher codimension that is crucial for the proof of Theorem 7.1.

Proposition 2.9. *For a semilocal Prüfer affine scheme S , an S -flat finite type quasi-separated scheme X with regular S -fibers, a closed subset $Z \subset X$ such that $X \setminus Z \subset X$ is quasi-compact and satisfies*

$$\text{codim}(Z_\eta, X_\eta) \geq 2 \text{ for each generic point } \eta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 1 \text{ for all } s \in S,$$

a reductive X -group scheme G , and a G -torsor \mathcal{P} on $X \setminus Z$, there is a closed subset $Z' \subset Z$ satisfying

$$\text{codim}(Z'_\eta, X_\eta) \geq 3 \text{ for each generic point } \eta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z'_s, X_s) \geq 2 \text{ for all } s \in S,$$

and a G -torsor \mathcal{Q} on $X \setminus Z'$ such that $\mathcal{P} \simeq \mathcal{Q}|_{X \setminus Z}$.

Proof. By [Nag66, Theorem 3'], X is finitely presented over S , hence a limit argument involving Lemmata 2.2 and 2.4, we are reduced to the case when all local rings of R are valuation rings of finite ranks.

Let $\mathcal{P}_{X \setminus Z}$ be a G -torsor on $X \setminus Z$. Since $|S|$ is finite and each fiber X_s is Noetherian, there are finitely many points $x \in Z$ satisfying one of the assumptions (i)–(ii) of Theorem 2.8; among these points we pick a maximal one under the generalization, say x . The maximality of x implies that $(X \setminus Z) \cap \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x} = \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \setminus \{x\}$, so, by Theorem 2.8, the G -torsor $\mathcal{P}_{X \setminus Z}|_{(X \setminus Z) \cap \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x})}$ extends to a G -torsor \mathcal{P}_x on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. As X is topologically Noetherian, we may spread out \mathcal{P}_x to obtain a G -torsor \mathcal{P}_{U_x} over an open neighbourhood U_x of x such that $\mathcal{P}_{X \setminus Z}|_{(X \setminus Z) \cap U_x} \simeq \mathcal{P}_{U_x}|_{(X \setminus Z) \cap U_x}$ as G -torsors over $(X \setminus Z) \cap U_x$. Consequently, we may glue $\mathcal{P}_{X \setminus Z}$ with \mathcal{P}_{U_x} to extend $\mathcal{P}_{X \setminus Z}$ to a G -torsor on $U_1 := (X \setminus Z) \cup U_x$. Since $Z_1 := X \setminus U_1$ contains strictly fewer points x satisfying the assumptions (i) or (ii) of Theorem 2.8, we extend \mathcal{P} iteratively to find the desired closed subset $Z' \subset X$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{X \setminus Z}$ extends over $X \setminus Z'$. \square

Corollary 2.10. *For a semilocal Prüfer affine scheme S , an S -flat finite type quasi-separated scheme X with regular S -fibers, a finite subset $\mathfrak{x} \subset X$ contained in an single affine open, a nonzero $r \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\mathfrak{x}}$, and a reductive X -group scheme G , every generically trivial G -torsor on $\mathcal{O}_{X,\mathfrak{x}}[\frac{1}{r}]$ extends to a G -torsor on an open neighbourhood U of $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,\mathfrak{x}}[\frac{1}{r}]$ whose complementary closed $Z := X \setminus U$ satisfies the following*

$$\text{codim}(Z_\eta, X_\eta) \geq 3 \text{ for each generic point } \eta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 2 \text{ for all } s \in S.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 2.9, we may assume that S has finite Krull dimension; in particular, X is topologically Noetherian. Let \mathcal{P} be a generically trivial G -torsor on $\mathcal{O}_{X,\mathfrak{x}}[\frac{1}{r}]$. By spreading out, \mathcal{P} extends to a G -torsor \mathcal{P}_U on $U := \text{Spec } R[\frac{1}{r}]$ for an affine open neighbourhood $\text{Spec } R \subset X$ of \mathfrak{x} . It remains to extend U and \mathcal{P}_U to ensure that $Z := X \setminus U$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.9. Assume that Z contains a point z such that either

- (i) $z \in X_\eta$ and $\dim \mathcal{O}_{X,z} = 1$, in which case $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,z}) \cap U$ is a maximal point of X , or
- (ii) z is a maximal point of X_s with $s \neq \eta$, in which case $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X,z}$, and hence also $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,z}) \cap U$, is the spectrum of a valuation ring (Lemma 2.1 (ii)).

By the Grothendieck–Serre on valuation rings [Guo20], the generically trivial G -torsor $\mathcal{P}_U|_{\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,z}) \cap U}$ is trivial. Thus, as in the proof of Proposition 2.9, we can glue \mathcal{P}_U with the trivial G -torsor over a small enough open neighbourhood of z to extend \mathcal{P}_U across such a point $z \in Z$. Note that, due to the topologically Noetherianness of X , Z contains at most finitely many points z satisfying the above assumption (i) or (ii). Therefore, iteratively extend U and \mathcal{P}_U , we may assume that Z does not contain any point z satisfying (i) or (ii), whence Proposition 2.9 applies. \square

3.1. Vanishing of low-dimensional local cohomology of tori.

Proposition 3.2. *For a finite-rank valuation ring R with spectrum S and generic point $\eta \in S$, an S -flat finite type scheme X with regular S -fibers, a point $x \in X$, and an $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ -torus T ,*

- (i) *if either $x \in X_\eta$ with $\dim \mathcal{O}_{X_\eta, x} \geq 2$, or $x \in X_s$ with $s \neq \eta$ and $\dim \mathcal{O}_{X_s, x} \geq 1$, then we have*

$$H_{\{x\}}^i(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}, T) = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq 2;$$

- (ii) *otherwise, $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a valuation ring, and, in case T is flasque, we have*

$$H_{\{x\}}^2(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}, T) = 0.$$

Proof. In (i), by [ÉGA IV₃, Lemme 14.3.10], $\overline{\{x\}}$ is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 (resp., ≥ 1) in the generic fiber (resp., non-generic fiber) of X , so, by Proposition 2.5 (ii), for any open $U \subset X$ we have

$$H^i(U, \mathbb{G}_m) \simeq H^i(U \setminus \overline{\{x\}}, \mathbb{G}_m) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq 1.$$

The same is true with (U, x) replaced by any scheme (W, y) étale over it, so taking colimit yields

$$H_{\text{ét}}^i(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\text{sh}}, \mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \text{colim}_{(W,y)} H_{\text{ét}}^i(W, \mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \text{colim}_{(W,y)} H_{\text{ét}}^i(W \setminus \overline{\{y\}}, \mathbb{G}_m) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq 1.$$

By the finite-rank assumption on R , $\mathcal{O}_{W,y}$ and hence also $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\text{sh}}$ has quasi-compact punctured spectrum, so the rightmost term above identifies with $H_{\text{ét}}^i(\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\text{sh}}) \setminus \overline{\{x\}}, \mathbb{G}_m)$. Looking at the local cohomology exact sequence for the pair $(\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\text{sh}}), \bar{x})$ and $T \simeq \mathbb{G}_m^{\dim T}$, we deduce that

$$H_{\{\bar{x}\}}^i(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\text{sh}}, T) = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq 2.$$

By the local-to-global E_2 -spectral sequence [SGA 4_{II}, Exposé V, Proposition 6.4], this implies the desired vanishing.

In (ii), either $x \in X_\eta$ with $\dim \mathcal{O}_{X_\eta, x} \leq 1$, then $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a discrete valuation ring, or x is a maximal point of some fiber of $X \rightarrow S$, then, by Lemma 2.1 (ii), $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a valuation ring. The desired vanishing is proven in [Guo20, Lemma 2.3]. \square

Proposition 3.2 has the following global consequence.

Theorem 3.3. *For a semilocal Prüfer scheme S , a flat, locally of finite type S -scheme X with regular S -fibers, a closed $Z \subset X$ with retrocompact $X \setminus Z$, and a finite type X -group M of multiplicative type,*

- (i) *if Z satisfies the following condition*

$$\text{codim}(Z_\eta, X_\eta) \geq 2 \text{ for every generic point } \eta \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}(Z_s, X_s) \geq 1 \text{ for all } s \in S,$$

then we have

$$H_{\text{fppf}}^i(X, M) \simeq H_{\text{fppf}}^i(U, M) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\text{fppf}}^2(X, M) \hookrightarrow H_{\text{fppf}}^2(U, M).$$

- (ii) *if X is qcqs and $M = T$ is an X -torus such that $T_{\mathcal{O}_{X,z}}$ is flasque for every $z \in Z$ for which $\mathcal{O}_{X,z}$ is a valuation ring, then we have*

$$H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, T) \twoheadrightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^1(U, T) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, T) \hookrightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^2(U, T);$$

in particular, if $K(X)$ denotes the total ring of fractions of X ,

$$\text{Pic } X \twoheadrightarrow \text{Pic } U \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Br}(X) \hookrightarrow \text{Br}(K(X)).$$

Proof. For (i), by the local cohomology exact sequence for the pair (X, Z) and the sheaf M , the statement is equivalent to the vanishings $H_Z^i(X, M) = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq 2$. By the spectral sequence in [ČS21, Lemma 7.1.1], it suffices to show the vanishings of $\mathcal{H}_Z^q(M)$, the étale-sheafification of the presheaf $X' \mapsto H_{Z'}^q(X', M)$ on $X_{\text{ét}}$, where $Z' := Z \times_X X'$. This problem is étale-local on X , so we may assume that X is affine, and M splits as \mathbb{G}_m or μ_n , and, since $\mu_n = \ker(\mathbb{G}_m \xrightarrow{\times n} \mathbb{G}_m)$, even $M = \mathbb{G}_m$. Now, X is qcqs and, by [Nag66, Theorem 3], is finitely presented over S , so a standard limit argument involving Lemmata

2.2 and 2.4 reduces us to the case R having finite Krull dimension; in particular, X is topologically Noetherian. Recall the coniveau spectral sequence [Gro68b, §10.1]

$$E_2^{pq} = \bigoplus_{z \in Z^{(p)}} H_{\{z\}}^{p+q}(M) \Rightarrow H_Z^{p+q}(X, M);$$

the topological Noetherianness of X allows us to identify

$$H_{\{z\}}^{p+q}(M) := \operatorname{colim} H_{\{z\} \cap U}^{p+q}(U, M) \quad \text{as} \quad H_{\{z\}}^{p+q}(\mathcal{O}_{X,z}, M),$$

where U runs over the open neighbourhoods of z in X . Therefore, it is enough to show $H_{\{z\}}^i(\mathcal{O}_{X,z}, \mathbb{G}_m) = 0$ for $z \in Z$ and $0 \leq i \leq 2$, which was settled by Proposition 3.2(i).

For (ii), the local cohomology exact sequence reduces us to show the vanishing $H_Z^2(X, T) = 0$. Similar to the above, as X is qcqs and $X \setminus Z \subset X$ is a qc open, a standard limit argument involving Lemma 2.2 reduces us to the case R having finite Krull dimension, in particular, X is topologically Noetherian. The coniveau spectral sequence reduces us to show $H_{\{z\}}^2(\mathcal{O}_{X,z}, T) = 0$, which was settled by Proposition 3.2. \square

3.4. Grothendieck–Serre type results for tori.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of schemes. Let \mathcal{L} be an invertible \mathcal{O}_X -module. If*

- (1) *Y is quasi-compact quasi-separated, integral, and normal,*
- (2) *there exist a smooth projective morphism $\bar{\phi} : \bar{X} \rightarrow Y$, with geometrically integral fibers, and a quasi-compact open immersion $X \hookrightarrow \bar{X}$ over Y , and*
- (3) *\mathcal{L} is trivial when restricted to the generic fiber of ϕ ,*

then $\mathcal{L} \simeq \phi^ \mathcal{N}$ for some invertible \mathcal{O}_Y -module \mathcal{N} .*

Proof. When Y is Noetherian, this follows from a much more general result [SP, 0BD6], where (2) can be replaced by the weaker assumption that $X \rightarrow Y$ is faithfully flat of finite presentation, with integral fibers. The general case follows from this via Noetherian approximations. Precisely, as Y is qcqs, we can use [SP, 01ZA] to write $Y = \lim_i Y_i$ for a filtered inverse system $\{Y_i\}$ of finite type integral \mathbf{Z} -schemes with affine transition morphisms. Since Y is normal and the normalization of a finite type integral \mathbf{Z} -scheme is again of finite type over \mathbf{Z} , we may assume that each Y_i is normal. Next, as ϕ is qcqs and of finite presentation, by [SP, 01ZM, 0C0C], for some i_0 there exist a finite type smooth morphism $\bar{\phi}_{i_0} : \bar{X}_{i_0} \rightarrow Y_{i_0}$ such that $\bar{X} \simeq \bar{X}_{i_0} \times_{Y_{i_0}} Y$ as Y -schemes, an open subscheme $X_{i_0} \subset \bar{X}_{i_0}$ whose pullback to \bar{X} identifies with X , and, by [SP, 0B8W], there is an invertible $\mathcal{O}_{X_{i_0}}$ -module \mathcal{L}_{i_0} whose pullback to X is isomorphic to \mathcal{L} . For any $i \geq i_0$ denote by $\phi_i : X_i := X_{i_0} \times_{Y_{i_0}} Y_i \rightarrow Y_i$ the base change of $\bar{\phi}_{i_0}|_{X_{i_0}}$ to Y_i , and denote by \mathcal{L}_i the pullback of \mathcal{L}_{i_0} to X_i . By [SP, 01ZM, 01ZP], any projective embedding of \bar{X} over Y descends to a projective embedding of \bar{X}_i over Y_i for large i ; in particular, $\bar{\phi}_i$ is projective for large i .

Since Y is normal, the assumption (2) implies that the Stein factorization of $\bar{\phi}$ is itself; in particular, $\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{\phi}_* \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}$. This implies that the finite extension $\mathcal{O}_{Y_{i_0}} \hookrightarrow \bar{\phi}_{i_0,*} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}_{i_0}}$ is an isomorphism, because its base change to the function field of Y is so and Y_{i_0} is normal. In particular, by Zariski’s main theorem, $\bar{\phi}_{i_0}$ has connected geometric fibers; as it is also smooth, all its fibers are even geometrically integral. By limit formalism, for large i , \mathcal{L}_i is trivial when restricted to the generic fiber of ϕ_i . Consequently, for large i , the morphism $\phi_i : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ and the invertible \mathcal{O}_{X_i} -module \mathcal{L}_i satisfy all the assumptions of the Lemma, so $\mathcal{L}_i \simeq \phi_i^* \mathcal{N}_i$ for some invertible \mathcal{O}_{Y_i} -module \mathcal{N}_i . Then $\mathcal{L} \simeq \phi^* \mathcal{N}$ for \mathcal{N} the pullback of \mathcal{N}_i to Y . \square

Proposition 3.6 (cf. [CTS87, 4.1–4.3]). *For a Prüfer domain R , an irreducible scheme X essentially smooth over R with function field $K(X)$, an X -group scheme M of multiplicative type, and a connected finite étale Galois covering $X' \rightarrow X$ splitting M , the restriction maps*

$$H_{\text{fppf}}^1(X, M) \rightarrow H_{\text{fppf}}^1(K(X), M) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\text{fppf}}^2(X, M) \rightarrow H_{\text{fppf}}^2(K(X), M)$$

are injective in each of the following cases:

- (i) $X = \operatorname{Spec} A$ for A a semilocal ring essentially smooth over R ;

(ii) For some essentially smooth semilocal R -algebra A , there exists a quasi-compact open immersion $X \hookrightarrow \overline{X}$, where \overline{X} is a smooth projective A -scheme, with geometrically integral fibers, such that $\text{Pic } X_L = 0$ for any finite separable fields extension $L/\text{Frac } A$, and $M = N_X$ for N an A -group of multiplicative type (for instance, X could be any quasi-compact open subscheme of \mathbb{P}_A^N);

(iii) any subcovering $X'' \rightarrow X$ of $X' \rightarrow X$ satisfies $\text{Pic } X'' = 0$.

Further, if M is a flasque X -torus, then in all cases (i)–(iii) the restriction map

$$H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, M) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_{\text{ét}}^1(K(X), M) \quad \text{is bijective.}$$

Proof. It is clear that (i) is a particular case of (ii). Let us show that (ii) is a particular case of (iii). Let $A \rightarrow B$ be a connected finite étale Galois covering that splits N . Take $X' := X \times_A B$. As A is normal and $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ is smooth, X is also normal. Then, since $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ has geometrically integral generic fiber, the natural map $\pi_1^{\text{ét}}(X) \rightarrow \pi_1^{\text{ét}}(\text{Spec } A)$ is surjective. This implies that any subcovering $X'' \rightarrow X$ of $X' \rightarrow X$ is of the form $X'' = X \times_A C$ for some subcovering $A \rightarrow C$ of $A \rightarrow B$. By assumption, $\text{Pic } X_{\text{Frac}(C)} = 0$, so we may apply Lemma 3.5 and the morphism $X \times_A C \rightarrow \text{Spec } C$ to deduce that

the pullback map $\text{Pic } C \rightarrow \text{Pic}(X \times_A C)$ is surjective.

Since C is semilocal, we conclude that $\text{Pic } C = 0 = \text{Pic}(X \times_A C)$.

It is thus enough to prove all assertions only for (iii). Assume first that $M = T$ is an X -torus. Take

$$\text{a flasque resolution} \quad 1 \rightarrow F \rightarrow P \rightarrow T \rightarrow 1,$$

where F is a flasque X -torus and P is a quasitrivial X -torus. This yields a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, P) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, T) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, F) \\ & & \downarrow \rho_1 & & \downarrow \rho_2 \\ & & H_{\text{ét}}^1(K(X), T) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^2(K(X), F) \end{array}$$

with exact rows. Now the quasitrivial torus P is isomorphic to a finite direct product of tori $\text{Res}_{X''/X} \mathbb{G}_{m, X''}$ for finite étale subcoverings $X'' \rightarrow X$ of $X' \rightarrow X$. Hence, assumption (iii) implies that $H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, P) = 0$, and so the injectivity of ρ_1 reduces to that of ρ_2 . To prove that ρ_2 is injective we pick $a \in H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, F)$ for which $a|_{K(X)} = 0$. By spreading out, we may assume that X is a localization of an irreducible, smooth, affine R -scheme \tilde{X} , $F = \tilde{F}_X$ for a flasque \tilde{X} -torus \tilde{F} , and $a = \tilde{a}|_X$ for some class $\tilde{a} \in H^2(\tilde{X}, \tilde{F})$. Since $\tilde{a}|_{K(X)} = 0$, for a proper closed subset $Z \subset \tilde{X}$,

$$\tilde{a}|_{\tilde{X} \setminus Z} = 0 \in H_{\text{ét}}^2(\tilde{X} \setminus Z, \tilde{F}).$$

By Theorem 3.3(ii), $\tilde{a} = 0$, so $a = \tilde{a}|_X = 0$. This proves the injectivity of ρ_2 and hence also of ρ_1 . Now let M be an arbitrary X -group of multiplicative type, then there is an X -subtorus $T \subset M$ such that $\mu := M/T$ is X -finite. Consequently, for any generically trivial M -torsor \mathcal{P} , the μ -torsor \mathcal{P}/T is finite over X ; as X is normal, this implies $(\mathcal{P}/T)(X) = (\mathcal{P}/T)(K(X))$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}/T \rightarrow X$ has a section that lifts to a generic section of $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow X$, that is, \mathcal{P} reduces to a generically trivial T -torsor \mathcal{P}_T . By the injectivity of ρ_1 , \mathcal{P}_T and hence also \mathcal{P} is trivial. This proves the injectivity of $H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, M) \rightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^1(K(X), M)$.

On the other hand, there is a short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow M \rightarrow F \rightarrow P \rightarrow 1$$

of X -groups of multiplicative type, where F is flasque and P is quasitrivial, both split after base change by $X' \rightarrow X$. This yields the following commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_{\text{fppf}}^1(X, P) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{fppf}}^2(X, M) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{fppf}}^2(X, F) \\ & & \downarrow \rho_3 & & \downarrow \rho_2 \\ & & H_{\text{fppf}}^2(K(X), M) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{fppf}}^2(K(X), F) \end{array}$$

Since we have already shown that $H_{\text{fppf}}^1(X, P) = 0$ and ρ_2 is injective, the injectivity of ρ_3 follows.

Finally, if M is a flasque X -torus, the bijectivity of $H_{\text{fppf}}^1(X, M) \rightarrow H_{\text{fppf}}^1(K(X), M)$ will follow if one proves its surjectivity, but the latter follows from Theorem 3.3(ii) via a limit argument. \square

4. GEOMETRIC LEMMATA

4.1. Geometric presentation lemma in the style of Gabber–Quillen. In both of the works of Fedorov and Česnavičius on mixed characteristic Grothendieck–Serre, a certain type geometric results in the style of Gabber–Quillen play a prominent role, see [Fed22b, Proposition 3.18] and [Čes22a, Variant 3.7], respectively. We begin with the following analog of *loc. cit.*

Lemma 4.2. *For a semilocal Prüfer ring R , a projective, flat R -scheme \overline{X} with fibers of pure dimension $d > 0$, an R -smooth open subscheme X , a finite subset $\mathbf{x} \subset X$, and a closed subscheme $Y \subset X$ that is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 1 such that $\overline{Y} \setminus Y$ is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in \overline{X} , there are affine opens $S \subset \mathbb{A}_R^{d-1}$ and $\mathbf{x} \subset U \subset X$ and a smooth morphism $\pi : U \rightarrow S$ of relative dimension 1 such that $Y \cap U$ is S -finite.*

Proof. This can be proved similarly as [Čes22a, Variant 3.7]. □

4.3. A variant of Lindel’s lemma. According to a lemma of Lindel [Lin81, Proposition 1 *et seq* Lemma], an étale extension of local rings $A \rightarrow B$ with trivial extension of residue fields induces isomorphisms

$$A/r^n A \xrightarrow{\sim} B/r^n B, \quad \text{where } n \geq 1,$$

for a well-chosen non-unit $r \in A$. In our context in which the prescribed B is essentially smooth over a valuation ring, we will prove the following variant of *loc. cit.* that allows us to fix the $r \in B$ in advance, at the cost of that A is a carefully-chosen local ring of an affine space over that valuation ring. This result will be the key geometric input for dealing with torsors under a reductive group scheme that descends to the Prüfer base ring, and, as the cited work of Lindel on the Bass–Quillen conjecture for vector bundles, it reduces us to studying torsors on opens of affine spaces.

Proposition 4.4. *Let Λ be a semilocal Prüfer domain, X an irreducible, Λ -smooth affine scheme of pure relative dimension $d > 0$, $Y \subset X$ a finitely presented closed subscheme that avoids all the maximal points of the Λ -fibers of X , and $\mathbf{x} \subset X$ a finite subset. Assume that for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ with finite residue field, there are at most $\max(\#\kappa(\mathfrak{m}), d) - 1$ points of \mathbf{x} lying over \mathfrak{m} . There are an affine open neighbourhood $W \subset X$ of \mathbf{x} , an affine open $U \subset \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d$, and an étale surjective Λ -morphism $f : W \rightarrow U$ such that the restriction $f|_{W \cap Y} : W \cap Y \rightarrow U$ is a closed immersion and f induces a Cartesian square:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W \cap Y & \hookrightarrow & W \\ \parallel & & \downarrow f \\ W \cap Y & \hookrightarrow & U. \end{array}$$

Remark 4.5. The assumption on the cardinality of \mathbf{x} holds, for instance, if either \mathbf{x} is a singleton or $d > \#\mathbf{x}$. The latter case will be critical for us to settle the general semilocal case of Theorem 7.1. On the other hand, the following finite field obstruction shows a certain assumption on $\#\mathbf{x}$ is necessary: if $d = 1$ and $\Lambda = k$ is a finite field, then the map f delivered from Proposition 4.4 gives a closed immersion $\mathbf{x} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$, which is impossible as soon as $\#\mathbf{x} > \#k$.

To prove Proposition 4.4, we begin with the following reduction to considering closed points.

Lemma 4.6. *The proof of Proposition 4.4 reduces to the case when \mathbf{x} consists of closed points of the closed Λ -fibers of X .*

Proof. First, by a standard limit argument involving Lemma 2.2, we can reduce to the case when Λ has finite Krull dimension. Next, if for each $x \in \mathbf{x}$ the closure $\overline{\{x\}}$ contains a closed point x' of the closed Λ -fibers of X and if the new collection $\{x' : x \in \mathbf{x}\}$ satisfies the same cardinality assumption on \mathbf{x} , we can simply replace each x by x' to complete the reduction process. However, it may happen that $\overline{\{x\}}$ does not contain any point of the closed Λ -fibers of X , and even if it does, the new collection $\{x' : x \in \mathbf{x}\}$ may not satisfy the cardinality assumption on \mathbf{x} . To overcome this difficulty, we will use a trick by adding auxiliary primes to $\text{Spec } \Lambda$ (and adding the corresponding fibers to X and Y) so that $\overline{\{x\}}$ contains closed points of the closed Λ -fibers of X for all $x \in \mathbf{x}$. More precisely, we will show that there are a semilocal Prüfer domain Λ' , an open embedding $\text{Spec } \Lambda \subset \text{Spec } \Lambda'$, an irreducible, affine, Λ' -smooth scheme X' of pure relative dimension d , a closed Λ' -subscheme $Y' \subset X'$ that avoids all the maximal points of the

Λ' -fibers of X' , and a Λ -isomorphism $X'_\Lambda \simeq X$ that identifies Y'_Λ with Y such that the assumptions of the second sentence of this paragraph hold for our new X' and Y' .

To construct the desired Λ' (and X', Y'), we can first use the specialization technique to reduce to the case when all points of \mathbf{x} are closed in the *corresponding* Λ -fibers of X , that is, if $x \in \mathbf{x}$ lies over $\mathfrak{p} \subset \Lambda$, then x is $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$ -finite. For the rest of proof we will assume, without lose of generality, that there is exactly one point of \mathbf{x} , say x , that lies over some *non-maximal* prime of Λ , say \mathfrak{p} . Write $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}} = \bigcup A$ as a filtered union of its finitely generated \mathbf{Z} -subalgebras A . By a standard limit argument ([SP, 0EY1, 0C0C]), for large enough A ,

- (a) $X_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ descends to an irreducible, affine, A -smooth scheme \mathcal{X} of pure relative dimension d ;
- (b) the finitely presented closed subscheme $Y_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}} \subset X_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ descends to a closed A -subscheme $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{X}$ which, upon enlarging A , avoids all the maximal points of the A -fibers of \mathcal{X} : by [ÉGA IV₃, Proposition 9.2.6.1], the subset

$$\{s \in \text{Spec } A : \dim \mathcal{Y}_s = d\} \subset \text{Spec } A \quad \text{is constructible,}$$

and its base change over $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}} = \lim_A A$ is empty, so we may assume that it is already empty;

- (c) the $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$ -finite point x descends to a A/\mathfrak{p}_A -finite closed subscheme $\tilde{x} \subset \mathcal{X}_{A/\mathfrak{p}_A}$, where $\mathfrak{p}_A := A \cap \mathfrak{p}$;

For any prime $\Lambda \supset \mathfrak{q} \supset \mathfrak{p}$ with $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{q}) = \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) + 1$, choose an element $a_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \mathfrak{q} \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. We assume that

- (d) $a_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1} \in A$ for all such \mathfrak{q} . (This guarantees the equality $A \cdot \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ containing \mathfrak{p} .)

Since a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ containing \mathfrak{p} gives rise to a non-trivial valuation ring $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}/\mathfrak{p}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ of $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$, we see that the field $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$ is not finite. As $\kappa(\mathfrak{p}) = \bigcup_A A/\mathfrak{p}_A$, by enlarging A we may assume that A/\mathfrak{p}_A is also not a finite, so we can find a nonzero prime $\mathfrak{p}' \subset A/\mathfrak{p}_A$.² Choose a valuation ring of $\kappa(\mathfrak{p}_A)$ with center \mathfrak{p}' in A/\mathfrak{p}_A , and then extend it to a valuation ring $V_{\mathfrak{p}'}$ of $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$. Let V be the composite of $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $V_{\mathfrak{p}'}$; explicitly, V is the preimage of $V_{\mathfrak{p}'}$ under the reduction map $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \kappa(\mathfrak{p})$. Then V is a valuation ring of $\text{Frac}(\Lambda)$, and, by the above assumption (d), the equality $V \cdot \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}} = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}$ holds for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ containing \mathfrak{p} . Therefore, by [BouAC, VI, §7, Propositions 1–2],

$$\Lambda' := \Lambda \cap V$$

is a semilocal Prüfer domain whose spectrum is obtained by glueing $\text{Spec } \Lambda$ with $\text{Spec } V$ along their common open $\text{Spec } \Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Consequently, we may glue X with \mathcal{X}_V along $X_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ to extend X to an irreducible, affine, Λ' -smooth scheme X' of pure relative dimension d , with a closed Λ' -subscheme $Y' \subset X'$ obtained by glueing Y with \mathcal{Y}_V along $Y_{\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}}$; by construction, Y' avoids all the maximal points of the Λ' -fibers of X' . Since the closed subscheme $\tilde{x}_V \subset \mathcal{X}_V$ is V -finite, we may specialize x to a point of $\tilde{x}_V \subset X'$ that lies over the closed point of $\text{Spec } V$. Hence, by replacing Λ by Λ' , X by X' and Y by Y' , we can reduce to the already treated case when all points of \mathbf{x} specialize to closed points of the closed Λ -fibers of X . \square

As the relative dimension of X/Λ is $d > 0$, the closed subset $\mathbf{x} \cup Y$ avoids all maximal points of the R -fibers of X . By prime avoidance, there is an $a \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ that vanishes on $\mathbf{x} \cup Y$ but does not vanish at any maximal points of Λ -fibers of X . Replacing Y by $V(a)$, we may assume the following in the sequel:

- for some $a \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, $Y = V(a)$ avoids all the maximal points of Λ -fibers of X ; and
- \mathbf{x} consists of closed points of the closed Λ -fibers of X and is contained in Y .

Lemma 4.7. *For k a finite product of fields, a finite type affine k -scheme X' , a closed subscheme $Y' \subset X'$ of pure dimension $e > 0$, a finite subset of closed points $\mathbf{x} \subset Y' \cap X'^{\text{sm}}$, and an element $(t(x)) \in \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \kappa(x)$, there is a k -morphism $h : X' \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$ that is smooth at \mathbf{x} such that*

$$h|_{Y'} \text{ has fiber dimension } e - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad h(x) = t(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbf{x}.$$

Proof. Assume that k is a field. Pick a finite subset of closed points $\mathbf{y} \subset Y'$ that is disjoint from \mathbf{x} and meets each irreducible component of Y' in exactly one point. For every integer $n > 0$ denote by $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$

²We use the following fact: a prime ideal of a finite type \mathbf{Z} -algebra is maximal if and only if its residue field is finite.

(resp., $\mathbf{y}^{(n)}$) the n^{th} infinitesimal neighbourhood of \mathbf{x} (resp., \mathbf{y}) in X' . Pick $h_{\mathbf{x}} \in H^0(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}})$ such that

$$h_{\mathbf{x}}(x) = t(x) \quad \text{and} \quad dh_{\mathbf{x}}(x) \neq 0 \in \mathfrak{m}_{X',x}/\mathfrak{m}_{X',x}^2 \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbf{x}. \quad (4.7.0.4)$$

Pick an $h_{\mathbf{y}} \in H^0(X', \mathcal{O}_{X'})$ such that its restriction to every irreducible component of Y'_{red} is not identically zero. By the faithfully flatness of the completion map

$$\mathcal{O}_{Y'_{\text{red}},\mathbf{y}} = \prod_{y \in \mathbf{y}} \mathcal{O}_{Y'_{\text{red}},y} \rightarrow \prod_{y \in \mathbf{y}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{Y'_{\text{red}},y}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H^0(\mathbf{y}^{(n)} \cap Y'_{\text{red}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}^{(n)} \cap Y'_{\text{red}}}),$$

we see that for large n , the restriction of $h_{\mathbf{y}}$ to every component of $\mathbf{y}^{(n)} \cap Y'_{\text{red}}$ is nonzero. Let $h \in H^0(X', \mathcal{O}_{X'})$ be an element whose restriction to $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ is $h_{\mathbf{x}}$ and whose restriction to $\mathbf{y}^{(n)}$ is congruent to $h_{\mathbf{y}}$. As X' is k -smooth at \mathbf{x} , (4.7.0.4) implies that the morphism $h : X' \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$ (obtained by sending the standard coordinate of \mathbb{A}_k^1 to h) is smooth at \mathbf{x} and $h(x) = t(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbf{x}$. For large n , as the restriction of h to each irreducible component of $\mathbf{y}^{(n)} \cap Y'_{\text{red}}$ and hence also to Y'_{red} is nonzero, the morphism h is non-constant on each irreducible component of Y' , so $h|_{Y'}$ has fiber dimension $e - 1$. \square

Lemma 4.8. *With the setup in Lemma 4.6, there exists a Λ -morphism $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\Lambda}^{d-1}$ such that*

- (i) *it is smooth of relative dimension 1 at \mathbf{x} ;*
- (ii) *the restriction $g|_Y$ is quasi-finite at \mathbf{x} ; and*
- (iii) *for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ and every $x \in \mathbf{x}$ lying over \mathfrak{m} , one has $\kappa(\mathfrak{m}) = \kappa(g(x))$.*

In addition, if $d > \#(\mathbf{x} \cap X_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})})$ for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ with finite residue field, then we may find such a morphism g under which all points of \mathbf{x} have pairwise distinct images.

Proof. We first reduce the lemma to the case when $\Lambda = k$ is a field. Assume that for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ there exists a $\kappa(\mathfrak{m})$ -morphism $g_{\mathfrak{m}} : X_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^{d-1}$ that is smooth at $\mathbf{x} \cap X_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ such that the restriction $g_{\mathfrak{m}}|_{Y_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}}$ is quasi-finite at $\mathbf{x} \cap X_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$. We then use Chinese remainder theorem to lift the maps $\{g_{\mathfrak{m}}\}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ simultaneously to obtain a Λ -morphism $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\Lambda}^{d-1}$ which would verify the first assertion of the lemma: only the flatness of g at \mathbf{x} need to be checked, but this follows from the fibral criterion of flatness [ÉGA IV₃, Théorème 11.3.10]. In addition, if all points of $\mathbf{x} \cap X_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ have pairwise distinct images under $g_{\mathfrak{m}}$, then the resulting morphism g verifies the second assertion of the lemma.

Assume now that $\Lambda = k$ is a field. Given a collection of maps $t_1, \dots, t_{d-1} : \mathbf{x} \rightarrow k$, taking products yields maps $(t_1, \dots, t_i) : \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^i(k) = k^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. We now apply Lemma 4.7 inductively to show:

Claim 4.8.1. For $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, there exists a k -morphism $g_i : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^i$ such that

- g_i is smooth at \mathbf{x} with $g_i|_{\mathbf{x}} = (t_1, \dots, t_i)$; and
- every irreducible component of $(g_i|_Y)^{-1}(g_i(\mathbf{x}))$ intersecting \mathbf{x} has dimension $d-1-i$.

Proof of the claim. Set $g_0 : X \rightarrow \text{Spec } k$, the structural morphism. Assume the morphism g_{i-1} has been constructed. We apply Lemma 4.7, with k being the ring k' of global sections of $g_{i-1}(\mathbf{x})$ here, X' being $g_{i-1}^{-1}(g_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}))$, Y' being the union of all the irreducible components of $(g_{i-1}|_Y)^{-1}(g_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}))$ meeting \mathbf{x} , and t being $t_i|_{k'}$, to obtain a k' -morphism $h : g_{i-1}^{-1}(g_{i-1}(\mathbf{x})) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{k'}^1$ that is smooth at \mathbf{x} such that $h|_{Y'}$ has fiber dimension $d-1-i$ and such that $h|_{\mathbf{x}} = t_i|_{k'}$, where $t_i|_{k'} : \mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{t_i} k \rightarrow k'$. It remains to take $g_i := (g_{i-1}, \tilde{h}) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^i = \mathbb{A}_k^{i-1} \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1$ for any lifting $\tilde{h} \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ of

$$h \in H^0(g_{i-1}^{-1}(g_{i-1}(\mathbf{x})), \mathcal{O}_{g_{i-1}^{-1}(g_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}))}). \quad \square$$

Starting from any map $(t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}) : \mathbf{x} \rightarrow k^{d-1}$, the morphism $g := g_{d-1}$ from Claim 4.8.1 immediately settles the first assertion of the lemma. For the second assertion, it suffices to note that, under the stated assumption, there always exists an injection $\mathbf{x} \hookrightarrow k^{d-1}$: for an infinite field k , the cardinality of k^{d-1} is infinite, and, for a finite field k , we have $\#(k^{d-1}) \geq d-1$. \square

Consider the morphism $(g, a) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\Lambda}^d = \mathbb{A}_{\Lambda}^{d-1} \times_{\Lambda} \mathbb{A}_{\Lambda}^1$. By construction, it is quasi-finite at \mathbf{x} , and, by the openness of the quasi-finite locus of a finite type morphism, up to shrinking X , we may assume that it is already quasi-finite; since the generic Λ -fibers of its domain and codomain are irreducible varieties

of the same dimension d , it is also dominant. Consequently, by Zariski's main theorem [ÉGA IV₄, Corollaire 18.12.13], the morphism $(g, a): X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d$ factors as

$$X \xrightarrow{j} \overline{X} \xrightarrow{h_1} \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d,$$

where \overline{X} is an integral affine scheme, j is an open immersion, and h_1 is finite, dominant. Denote $\overline{g} := \text{pr}_1 \circ h_1$, where $\text{pr}_1: \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^{d-1}$ is the projection onto the first $(d-1)$ -coordinates, and let $\overline{a} \in \Gamma(\overline{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}})$ be the pullback of the last standard coordinate of \mathbb{A}_Λ^d . Then $h_1 = (\overline{g}, \overline{a})$, and \overline{g} (resp., \overline{a}) restricts to g (resp., a) on X . In what follows, we shall identify $j(x)$ with x for every $x \in \mathbf{x}$.

Write $S \subset \text{Spec } \Lambda$ for the union of the closed points of $\text{Spec } \Lambda$ (with the reduced structure).

Lemma 4.9. *There exists an element $b \in \Gamma(\overline{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}})$ such that the morphism*

$$h_2 := (\overline{g}, b): \overline{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d = \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^{d-1} \times_\Lambda \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^1$$

has the following properties:

- (i) *set-theoretically we have $h_1^{-1}(h_1(\mathbf{x})) \cap h_2^{-1}(h_2(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x}$;*
- (ii) *h_2 is étale around \mathbf{x} and induces a bijection $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{\sim} h_2(\mathbf{x})$; and*
- (iii) *h_2 induces an isomorphism of residue fields $\kappa(h_2(x)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \kappa(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbf{x}$.*

Proof. Since h_1 is finite, surjective, we see that $\overline{g}^{-1}(g(\mathbf{x}))$ is an S -curve that contains $g^{-1}(g(\mathbf{x}))$ as an open subcurve, so it is S -smooth around \mathbf{x} . For a point $x \in \mathbf{x}$ lying over a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$, its first infinitesimal neighbourhood in $\overline{g}^{-1}(g(\mathbf{x}))$ is isomorphic to $\text{Spec}(\kappa(x)[u_x]/(u_x^2))$, where u_x is a uniformizer of $\overline{g}^{-1}(g(\mathbf{x}))$ at x . Recall that the residue field of a point on a smooth curve over a field is a simple extension of that field, see [Čes22a, Lemma 6.3]. It follows that, for $x \in \mathbf{x}$ lying over \mathfrak{m} , there exists a closed $\kappa(\mathfrak{m})$ -immersion $x^{(1)} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1 = \mathbb{A}_{g(x)}^1$. For a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset \Lambda$ with finite residue field, under the assumption that $\#\mathbf{x} \cap X_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})} < \max(\#\kappa(\mathfrak{m}), d)$, either \mathbf{x} contains at most $\#\kappa(\mathfrak{m}) - 1$ points lying over \mathfrak{m} or every fiber of $g_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ contains at most 1 point of \mathbf{x} (Lemma 4.8). Consequently, we may arrange the above immersions so that they jointly give a closed immersion over \mathbb{A}_Λ^{d-1} :

$$\bigsqcup_{x \in \mathbf{x}} x^{(1)} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_{g(\mathbf{x})}^1 \subset \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{A}_\Lambda^{d-1}}^1 = \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d, \quad (4.9.0.5)$$

where we regard $g(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^{d-1}$ as a closed subscheme. Note that the complement of the image of the morphism (4.9.0.5) in \mathbb{A}_Λ^d has at least 1 rational point fiberwisely over \mathbb{A}_Λ^{d-1} . Thus, by sending any $y \in (h_1^{-1}(h_1(\mathbf{x})) \setminus \mathbf{x})$ to a suitable rational point of $\mathbb{A}_{g(y)}^1$, we may further extend (4.9.0.5) to a \mathbb{A}_Λ^{d-1} -morphism

$$u: Z := \left(\bigsqcup_{x \in \mathbf{x}} x^{(1)} \right) \bigsqcup \left(\bigsqcup_{y \in h_1^{-1}(h_1(\mathbf{x})) \setminus \mathbf{x}} y \right) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d$$

such that $u(\mathbf{x}) \cap u(h_1^{-1}(h_1(\mathbf{x})) \setminus \mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, or, equivalently,

$$h_1^{-1}(h_1(\mathbf{x})) \cap u^{-1}(u(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x}. \quad (4.9.0.6)$$

Let $b \in \Gamma(\overline{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}})$ be a lifting of $u^*(t) \in \Gamma(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z)$, where t is the standard coordinate on \mathbb{A}_Λ^1 .

Consider the morphism $h_2 := (\overline{g}, b): \overline{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d = \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^{d-1} \times_\Lambda \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^1$. Viewing \overline{X} as a \mathbb{A}_Λ^{d-1} -scheme via \overline{g} , the base change of h_2 to $g(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^{d-1}$ restricts to u on Z , so h_2 is unramified at \mathbf{x} . Now (i) follows from (4.9.0.6) and (iii) is a consequence of our choice of the morphism (4.9.0.5). For (ii), it suffices to argue that h_2 is flat at \mathbf{x} ; however, since the domain and the codomain of h_2 are Λ -flat of finite presentation, the fibral criterion of flatness [ÉGA IV₃, Théorème 11.3.10] reduces us to checking the flatness of the Λ -fibers of h_2 at \mathbf{x} , while the latter follows from the flatness criterion [ÉGA IV₂, Proposition 6.1.5]. \square

Let $\Lambda[h_1^*(t_1), \dots, h_1^*(t_{d-1}), a, b] \subset \Gamma(\overline{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}})$ be the Λ -subalgebra generated by a, b and $h_2^*(t_i) (= h_1^*(t_i) = \overline{g}^*(t_i))$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. We introduce the following notations.

- Let $V := \text{Spec}(\Lambda[h_1^*(t_1), \dots, h_1^*(t_{d-1}), a, b])$, and let $h_3: \overline{X} \rightarrow V$ be the morphism induced by the inclusion $\Lambda[h_1^*(t_1), \dots, h_1^*(t_{d-1}), a, b] \subset \Gamma(\overline{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}})$.
- Let $v_1: V \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d$ be the morphism such that $v_1^*(t_i) = h_1^*(t_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $v_1^*(t_d) = a$.

- Let $v_2 : V \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d$ be the morphism such that $v_2^*(t_i) = h_1^*(t_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $v_2^*(t_d) = b$. Note that there is a natural surjection

$$\Lambda[h_1^*(t_1), \dots, h_1^*(t_{d-1}), b] \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda[h_1^*(t_1), \dots, h_1^*(t_{d-1}), a, b]/(a) = \Gamma(V, \mathcal{O}_V)/(a);$$

this implies that v_2 induces a closed immersion

$$\bar{v}_2 : \text{Spec}(\Gamma(V, \mathcal{O}_V)/(a)) \hookrightarrow V \xrightarrow{v_2} \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d.$$

We have the following commutative diagram of morphisms of affine schemes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{j} & \bar{X} & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d \\ & & \searrow^{h_3} & \searrow & \uparrow^{v_2} \\ & & V & \xrightarrow{v_2} & \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d \\ & \searrow^{h_1} & \downarrow^{v_1} & & \\ & & \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d & & \end{array}$$

Lemma 4.10. *The morphism h_3 induces a bijection $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{\sim} h_3(\mathbf{x})$ and $h_3^{-1}(h_3(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x}$. Further, h_3 induces an isomorphism of semilocal rings*

$$\mathcal{O}_{V, h_3(\mathbf{x})} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}, \mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{x}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.9 (ii)–(iii), we see that h_3 induces a bijection $\mathbf{x} \xrightarrow{\sim} h_3(\mathbf{x})$ and an isomorphism of residue fields $\kappa(h_3(\mathbf{x})) \xrightarrow{\sim} \kappa(\mathbf{x})$ for every $x \in \mathbf{x}$. Chasing the above diagram we see that

$$h_3^{-1}(h_3(\mathbf{x})) \subset h_1^{-1}(h_1(\mathbf{x})) \cap h_2^{-1}(h_2(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x},$$

where the last equality is Lemma 4.9 (i). As h_3 is finite, surjective, we see that $h_3^{-1}(h_3(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x}$. By Lemma 4.9 (ii), h_3 is unramified at \mathbf{x} . It follows that the base change of h_3 to $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{V, h_3(\mathbf{x})}$ is

$$\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}, \mathbf{x}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{V, h_3(\mathbf{x})},$$

and it is actually an isomorphism: letting J be the Jacobson radical of the semilocal ring $\mathcal{O}_{V, h_3(\mathbf{x})}$, since the natural map

$$\prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \kappa(h_3(x)) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{V, h_3(\mathbf{x})}/J \xrightarrow{h_3^*} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}, \mathbf{x}}/J \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}, \mathbf{x}} \simeq \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \kappa(x)$$

is an isomorphism (in particular, surjective), an application of Nakayama lemma shows

$$h_3^* : \mathcal{O}_{V, h_3(\mathbf{x})} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}, \mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{x}}. \quad \square$$

4.11. Proof of Proposition 4.4. Define $f := h_2 \circ j : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d$, which we may assume to be étale upon replacing X by an affine open neighbourhood of \mathbf{x} . By Lemma 4.10, there exists an affine open neighbourhood $W'_0 \subset V$ of $h_3(\mathbf{x})$ such that $W_0 := h_3^{-1}(W'_0) \subset j(X)$ and $h_3|_{W_0} : W_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} W'_0$. We shall identify W_0 as an open subscheme of X via j . As noted above, v_2 induces a closed immersion

$$\bar{v}_2 : Y' := \text{Spec}(\Gamma(V, \mathcal{O}_V)/(a)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d.$$

In particular, the topology of Y' is induced from that of \mathbb{A}_Λ^d via \bar{v}_2 . Note also that, since a vanishes on \mathbf{x} , $h_3(\mathbf{x}) \subset Y' \subset V$. Consequently, there exists an affine open neighbourhood $U \subset \mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d$ of $f(\mathbf{x}) = v_2(h_3(\mathbf{x}))$ such that $\bar{v}_2^{-1}(U) \subset W'_0$. Therefore, f induces a closed immersion of affine schemes

$$Y_U := f^{-1}(U) \cap Y = (h_3 \circ j)^{-1}(v_2^{-1}(U) \cap Y') = (h_3 \circ j)^{-1}(\bar{v}_2^{-1}(U)) \simeq \bar{v}_2^{-1}(U) \hookrightarrow U.$$

Since f is separated and étale, any section of $f \times_{\mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d, f} Y_U$, such as the one s induced by the above inclusion $Y_U \hookrightarrow U$, is an inclusion of a clopen, so

$$X \times_{\mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d, f} Y_U = \tilde{Y}_1 \sqcup \tilde{Y}_2 \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{Y}_1 = \text{im}(s) \xrightarrow{\sim} Y_U.$$

Let $W \subset f^{-1}(U)$ be an affine open whose preimage in $X \times_{\mathbb{A}_\Lambda^d, f} Y_U$ is \tilde{Y}_1 . Then $f|_W : W \rightarrow U$ is étale such that $f|_{W \cap Y} : W \cap Y \hookrightarrow U$ is a closed immersion and such that $W \times_{U, f} (W \cap Y) \xrightarrow{\sim} W \cap Y$. As étale maps are open, we may shrink U around $f(\mathbf{x})$ to ensure that $f|_W : W \rightarrow U$ is also surjective. \square

In this section we prove the following result concerning triviality of torsors on a smooth affine relative curve. A similar result can also be found in the recent preprint [Čes22c, Theorem 4.4].

Theorem 5.1 (Section theorem). *For a semilocal domain R with geometrically unibranch³ local rings, a smooth affine R -curve C with a section $s \in C(R)$, a reductive C -group scheme G , an R -algebra A , and a G -torsor \mathcal{P} over $C_A := C \times_R A$ that trivializes over $C_A \setminus Z_A$ for an R -finite closed subscheme $Z \subset C$, if*

- (i) *either A is semilocal,*
- (ii) *or $s_A^*(G)$ is totally isotropic,*

then the pullback $s_A^(\mathcal{P})$ is a trivial $s_A^*(G)$ -torsor, where s_A denotes the image of s in $C_A(A)$.*

To prove Theorem 5.1, we first use Lemma 5.3 to reduce to the case when G is the base change of a reductive R -group scheme, and then to the case when $C = \mathbb{A}_R^1$, see Lemma 5.4. As for the latter, one can approach it via the geometry of affine Grassmannians.

5.2. Reduction to the case when $C = \mathbb{A}_R^1$ and G is constant. We start with the following result for equating reductive group schemes, which was already known to experts, see also [Čes22c, Lemma 3.5].

Lemma 5.3 (Equating reductive group schemes). *For a semilocal ring B with geometrically unibranch local rings, reductive B -group schemes G_1 and G_2 whose geometric B -fibers have the same type, maximal B -tori $T_1 \subset G_1$ and $T_2 \subset G_2$, and an ideal $I \subset B$, if there is an isomorphism of B/I -group schemes*

$$\iota : (G_1)_{B/I} \xrightarrow{\sim} (G_2)_{B/I} \quad \text{such that} \quad \iota((T_1)_{B/I}) = (T_2)_{B/I}.$$

then, there are a faithfully flat, finite, étale B -algebra B' , a section $s : B' \rightarrow B/I$, and an isomorphism of B' -group schemes $\iota' : (G_1)_{B'} \simeq (G_2)_{B'}$ such that $\iota'((T_1)_{B'}) = (T_2)_{B'}$ and whose s -pullback is ι .

Proof. By [SGA 3III new, Exposé XXIV, Corollaire 2.2], the condition on geometric B -fibers ensures that

$$\text{the functor} \quad X := \underline{\text{Isom}}_B((G_1, T_1), (G_2, T_2))$$

parameterizing the isomorphisms of the pairs (G_1, T_1) and (G_2, T_2) is representable by a B -scheme and is an $H := \underline{\text{Aut}}_B((G_1, T_1))$ -torsor. We need to show that, for any $\iota \in X(B/I)$, there are a faithfully flat, finite, étale B -algebra B' , an $\iota' \in X(B')$, and a section $s : B' \rightarrow B/I$ such that $s(\iota') = \iota \in X(B/I)$.

By *loc. cit.*, H is an extension of an étale locally constant B -group scheme by T_1^{ad} , the quotient of T_1 by the center of G_1 . According to [SGA 3III new, Exposé XXIV, Proposition 2.6], T_1^{ad} acts freely on X and

$$\text{the fppf quotient} \quad \overline{X} := X/T_1^{\text{ad}}$$

is representable by a faithfully flat B -scheme that is étale locally constant on B . As all local rings of B are geometrically unibranch, by [SGA 3III new, Exposé X, Corollaire 5.14], every connected component of \overline{X} is finite étale over B . As the image of $\iota : \text{Spec}(B/I) \rightarrow X \rightarrow \overline{X}$ intersects only finitely many connected components of \overline{X} , the union of these components is the spectrum of a finite étale B -algebra A , and there are an $\bar{\iota} \in \overline{X}(A)$ and a section $t : A \rightarrow B/I$ such that $t(\bar{\iota}) = \iota$. By adding more connected components of \overline{X} into $\text{Spec } A$ if needed, we may assume that A is faithfully flat over B . Consider the fiber product

$$Y := X \times_{\overline{X}, \bar{\iota}} \text{Spec } A;$$

it is a T_A^{ad} -torsor equipped with a point $\iota \in Y(A/J) \subset X(A/J)$, where $J := \ker(A \rightarrow B/I)$. By [Čes22b, Corollary 6.3.2], there are a faithfully flat, finite, étale A -algebra B' , a section

$$s' : B' \rightarrow A/J \simeq B/I,$$

and an $\iota' \in Y(B') \subset X(B')$ such that $s'(\iota') = \iota$. □

Lemma 5.4. *The proof of the Theorem 5.1 reduces to the case when $C = \mathbb{A}_R^1$ and G is the base change of a reductive R -group scheme.*

³According to [SP, 0BPZ], a local ring A is *geometrically unibranch* if its reduction $A_{\text{red}} := A/\sqrt{(0)}$ is a domain, and if the integral closure of A_{red} in its fraction field is a local ring whose residue field is purely inseparable over that of A . By [SP, 06DM], A is geometrically unibranch if and only if its strict Henselization A^{sh} has a unique minimal prime.

Proof. Let B be the semilocal ring of C at the closed points of $\text{im}(s) \cup Z$; its local rings are geometrically unibranch. By abuse of notation, we may view $s : B \rightarrow R$ as a section of the R -algebra B . As B is semilocal, by [SGA 3_{II}, Exposé XIV, Corollaire 3.20], G_B admits a maximal B -torus T_B . Since the pullbacks of the pairs (G_B, T) and $((s^*G)_B, (s^*T)_B)$ along s are the same, by Lemma 5.3, there are a faithfully flat, finite, étale B -algebra B' , a section $s' : B' \rightarrow R$ that lifts s , and a B' -isomorphism

$$\iota : (G_{B'}, T_{B'}) \xrightarrow{\sim} ((s^*(G))_{B'}, (s^*(T))_{B'})$$

whose s -pullback is the identity. We spread out $\text{Spec } B' \rightarrow \text{Spec } B$ to obtain a finite étale cover $C' \rightarrow U$ of a small affine open neighbourhood U of $\text{im}(s) \cup Z$ in C . Shrinking U if necessary, we may assume that the isomorphism ι is defined over C' . In both cases of Theorem 5.1 we may replace C by C' , Z by $C' \times_C Z$, s by s' , and \mathcal{P} by $\mathcal{P}|_{C'_A}$ to reduce to the case when G is the base change of the reductive R -group scheme $s^*(G)$.

Next, in order to apply glueing [Čes22a, Lemma 7.1] to achieve that $C = \mathbb{A}_R^1$, we need to modify C so that Z embeds into \mathbb{A}_R^1 . For this, we first replace Z by $Z \cup \text{im}(s)$ to assume that s factors through Z . Then we apply Panin's 'finite field tricks' [Čes22a, Proposition 7.4] to obtain a finite morphism $\tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ that is étale at the points in $\tilde{Z} := \tilde{C} \times_C Z$ such that s lifts to $\tilde{s} \in \tilde{C}(R)$, and there are no finite fields obstruction to embedding \tilde{Z} into \mathbb{A}_R^1 in the following sense: for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R$,

$$\#\{z \in \tilde{Z}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})} : [\kappa(z) : \kappa(\mathfrak{m})] = d\} < \#\{y \in \mathbb{A}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1 : [\kappa(y) : \kappa(\mathfrak{m})] = d\} \quad \text{for every } d \geq 1.$$

Then, by [Čes22a, Lemma 6.3], there are an affine open $C'' \subset \tilde{C}$ containing $\text{im}(\tilde{s})$, a quasi-finite, flat R -map $C'' \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$ that maps Z isomorphically to a closed subscheme $Z' \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1$ with

$$Z \simeq Z' \times_{\mathbb{A}_R^1} C''.$$

(Actually, $C'' \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1$ can be étale by shrinking C'' around $\text{im}(\tilde{s})$). For both cases of Theorem 5.1, since $\mathcal{P}|_{C''_A}$ is a G -torsors that trivializes over $C''_A \setminus \tilde{Z}'_A$, we may use [Čes22a, Lemma 7.1] to glue $\mathcal{P}_{C''_A}$ with the trivial G -torsor over \mathbb{A}_A^1 to obtain a G -torsor \mathcal{P}' over \mathbb{A}_A^1 that trivializes over $\mathbb{A}_A^1 \setminus Z'_A$. Let $s' \in \mathbb{A}_R^1(R)$ be the image of \tilde{s} ; then $s'^*(\mathcal{P}') \simeq s^*(\mathcal{P})$. It remains to replace C by \mathbb{A}_R^1 , Z by Z' , s by s' , and \mathcal{P} by \mathcal{P}' . \square

5.5. Studying torsors on \mathbb{P}_R^1 via affine Grassmannian. The analysis of torsors on \mathbb{A}_R^1 ultimately depends on the geometry of affine Grassmannians. A nice summary of and complement on the relevant techniques can be found in [Čes22b, §5.3]. In particular, we will use the following slight variant of [Čes22b, Proposition 5.3.6], which in turn is a mild generalization of [Fed22b, Theorem 6].

Proposition 5.6. *For a semilocal ring R with connected spectrum and a reductive R -group scheme G , let*

$$G^{\text{ad}} \simeq \prod_i \text{Res}_{R_i/R}(G_i)$$

be the canonical decomposition of the adjoint quotient G^{ad} in [SGA 3_{III new}, Exposé XXIV, Proposition 5.10], where G_i is a simple adjoint R_i -group scheme, and R_i is a finite, étale R -algebra with connected spectrum⁴. Let $Y \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1$ be a R -finite, étale, closed subscheme with the following properties:

- (i) *for every i , there is a clopen $Y_i \subset Y \times_R R_i$ such that $(G_i)_{Y_i}$ contains a copy of \mathbb{G}_{m, Y_i} ;*
- (ii) *$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1}(1)$ is trivial on $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1 \setminus (Y_i)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ for each maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R_i$ such that $(G_i)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ is isotropic;*
- (iii) *$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_R^1}(1)$ is trivial on $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y$.*

Let \mathcal{P} be a G -torsor over \mathbb{P}_R^1 that trivializes over $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Z$ for some R -finite closed subscheme $Z \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus Y$. Assume that for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R$ the G^{ad} -torsor over $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1$ induced by \mathcal{P} lifts to a generically trivial $(G^{\text{ad}})^{\text{sc}}$ -torsor over $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1$. Then the restriction $\mathcal{P}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y}$ is trivial.

By [SGA 3_{III new}, Exposé XXVI, Corollaire 6.12], (i) is equivalent to that the base change of $(G_i)_{Y_i}$ to every connected component of Y_i contains proper parabolics. For instance, if G is quasi-split, we can take $Y_i = Y \times_R R_i$ to ensure (i). In practice, we achieve (i) by guaranteeing base changes of $(G_i)_{Y_i}$ to connected components of Y_i contain proper parabolics. For (ii), we can take Y_i so that $Y_i(\kappa(\mathfrak{m})) \neq \emptyset$ for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R_i$ with $(G_i)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ isotropic. For (iii), we just choose Y so that it contains

⁴To ensure that the R_i 's have connected spectra, we decompose $R_i \simeq \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} R_{ij}$, where R_{ij} have connected spectra, and then use the canonical isomorphism $\text{Res}_{R_i/R}(G_i) \simeq \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} \text{Res}_{R_{ij}/R}(G_{i, R_{ij}})$.

finite étale R -schemes of degrees d and $d + 1$ for some $d \geq 1$, then $\mathcal{O}(d)$ and $\mathcal{O}(n + 1)$ are both trivial on $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y$, and so is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. We will deduce Proposition 5.6 from (the proof of) a particular case of [Čes22b, Proposition 5.3.6]. (We remind that the assumption (ii) of *loc. cit.* should read as ‘ $(G_i)_{Y_i}$ contains a copy of \mathbb{G}_{m, Y_i} ’, as its proof shows.)

The R -finite étale Y is the vanishing locus of a monic polynomial t in the standard coordinate of \mathbb{A}_R^1 ; namely, t is the characteristic polynomial of this standard coordinate acting on $\tilde{R} := \Gamma(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$. The formal completion of \mathbb{P}_R^1 along Y has coordinate ring $\tilde{R}[[t]]$. Recall that, by formal glueing, a G -torsor over \mathbb{P}_R^1 can be viewed as the glueing of its restriction to $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y$ and to $\tilde{R}[[t]]$ along the ‘intersection’ $\tilde{R}((t))$; since our torsor \mathcal{P} is trivial over an open neighbourhood $U \subset \mathbb{P}_R^1$ of Y , both of the restriction $\mathcal{P}|_{U \setminus Y}$ and $\mathcal{P}|_{\tilde{R}[[t]]}$ are trivial, and once a trivialization of the former was chosen, all such glueings are parameterized by elements of $G(\tilde{R}((t)))/G(\tilde{R}[[t]])$. In particular, since $G(\tilde{R}((t)))$ acts on $G(\tilde{R}((t)))/G(\tilde{R}[[t]])$ (via left multiplication), an element of $G(\tilde{R}((t)))$ yields a modification of \mathcal{P} along Y : it is the G -torsor over \mathbb{P}_R^1 whose restriction to $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y$ and to $\tilde{R}[[t]]$ are the same as \mathcal{P} , but their corresponding glueings, viewed as elements of $G(\tilde{R}((t)))/G(\tilde{R}[[t]])$, differ by a left translation by the element of $G(\tilde{R}((t)))$ we choose.

Denote by \mathcal{P}^{ad} the G^{ad} -torsor over \mathbb{P}_R^1 induced by \mathcal{P} . Since the formation of $H^1(\mathbb{P}_R^1, -)$ commutes with taking products, \mathcal{P}^{ad} corresponds to a collection $(\mathcal{P}_i^{\text{ad}})$, where $\mathcal{P}_i^{\text{ad}}$ is a $\text{Res}_{R_i/R}(G_i)$ -torsor over $\mathbb{P}_{R_i}^1$ satisfying the analogous assumptions (i)–(iii) of the Proposition 5.6. Since $R \rightarrow R_i$ is finite étale and G_i is R_i -smooth, we have $R^1 f_* G_i = 1$ for the map $f: \text{Spec } R_i \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ induced by $R \rightarrow R_i$. We have the following exact sequence of nonabelian pointed sets from [Gir71, Chapitre V, Proposition 3.1.3]

$$1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{P}_R^1, \text{Res}_{R_i/R}(G_i)) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{P}_{R_i}^1, G_i) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{P}_R^1, R^1 f_* G_i).$$

Thus $\mathcal{Q} \mapsto \text{Res}_{R_i/R}(\mathcal{Q})$ defines a bijection of pointed sets $H^1(\mathbb{P}_{R_i}^1, G_i) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(\mathbb{P}_R^1, \text{Res}_{R_i/R}(G_i))$. In particular, each $\mathcal{P}_i^{\text{ad}}$ corresponds to a G_i -torsor \mathcal{Q}_i over $\mathbb{P}_{R_i}^1$. As one can see now, the assumptions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 5.6 for the $\text{Res}_{R_i/R}(G_i)$ -torsor $\mathcal{P}_i^{\text{ad}}$ translate into the assumptions [Čes22b, Proposition 5.3.6] (i)–(iv) for the G_i -torsor \mathcal{Q}_i over $\mathbb{P}_{R_i}^1$. By the proof of *loc. cit.* (using the condition that over closed fibers of \mathbb{P}_R^1 , the simply-connected lifting of the torsor induced by \mathcal{P} is generically trivial), for some

$$\alpha_i \in \text{im}(G_i^{\text{sc}}((\tilde{R} \otimes_R R_i)((t))) \rightarrow G_i((\tilde{R} \otimes_R R_i)((t))),$$

the corresponding modification of \mathcal{Q}_i along $Y \times_R R_i$ is trivial. We can view the element

$$\alpha := (\alpha_i) \in \text{im}((G^{\text{ad}})^{\text{sc}}(\tilde{R}((t))) \rightarrow G^{\text{ad}}(\tilde{R}((t)));$$

as $(G^{\text{ad}})^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow G^{\text{ad}}$ factors through $(G^{\text{ad}})^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow G$, α lifts to $\tilde{\alpha} \in G(\tilde{R}((t)))$. Denote by \mathcal{Q} the modification of \mathcal{P} along Y using $\tilde{\alpha}$. By construction, the G^{ad} -torsor \mathcal{Q}^{ad} over \mathbb{P}_R^1 induced by \mathcal{Q} corresponds to the collection of modifications of the $\mathcal{P}_i^{\text{ad}} = \text{Res}_{R_i/R}(\mathcal{Q}_i)$ along Y using $\alpha_i \in G_i((\tilde{R} \otimes_R R_i)((t))) = \text{Res}_{R_i/R} G_i(\tilde{R}((t)))$, which are trivial, so that \mathcal{Q}^{ad} is trivial, to the effect that \mathcal{Q} reduces to a torsor over \mathbb{P}_R^1 under the center Z_G of G . Now, as the last paragraph of the proof of [Čes22b, Proposition 5.3.6] showed, any Z_G -torsor over \mathbb{P}_R^1 is isomorphic to the sum of a constant torsor (i.e., the pullback of a Z_G -torsor over R) and $\lambda_*(\mathcal{O}(1))$ for a unique cocharacter λ of Z_G . Therefore, by assumption (iii), $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y}$ is a constant torsor, and, by checking along the infinity section, it is even trivial, so is $\mathcal{P}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y} = \mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y}$, as desired. \square

The following helps us to construct the desired R -finite, étale schemes Y_i and Y in Proposition 5.6.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $R \rightarrow R_1$ be a finite étale ring map of semilocal rings with connected spectra, let $W \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1$ be an R -finite closed scheme, and let G_1 be a simple R_1 -group scheme. There is an R_1 -finite étale scheme Y_1 and a closed immersion $Y_1 \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W$ over R such that $(G_1)_{Y_1}$ contains a copy of \mathbb{G}_{m, Y_1} , and, for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R_1$ with $(G_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ isotropic, the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1}(1)$ is trivial over $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1 \setminus (Y_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$.⁵ In addition, there is an R_1 -finite, étale scheme \tilde{Y} and a closed immersion $\tilde{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W$ over R such that the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_R^1}(1)$ is trivial over $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus \tilde{Y}$.*

⁵Note that Y_1 is a clopen of $Y_1 \times_R R_1$, thus naturally embeds into $\mathbb{A}_{R_1}^1$.

Proof. Let $\text{Par}' \rightarrow \text{Spec } R_1$ be the scheme parameterizing *proper* parabolic subgroup schemes of the reductive R_1 -group scheme G_1 ; it is smooth projective over R_1 ([SGA 3III new, Exposé XXVI, Corollaire 3.5]). Fix an embedding $\text{Par}' \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{R_1}^N$ over R_1 . Write $\text{Par}' = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^t P_t$ as a disjoint union of its connected components; every P_t has a constant relative dimension d_t over R_1 . For every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R_1$ with $(G_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ isotropic, a proper parabolic subgroup of $(G_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ gives a point $b_{\mathfrak{m}} \in \text{Par}'(\kappa(\mathfrak{m}))$.

Fix an $i = 1, \dots, t$. For every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R_1$, by Bertini theorems (including Poonen's version [Poo05, Theorem 1.2] over finite fields), one can find a hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^N$ of large enough degree such that it passes through all points $b_{\mathfrak{m}}$ that lies in P_i and has smooth intersection with $(P_i)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$. We may assume that the above hypersurfaces have the same degree for all \mathfrak{m} . By the Chinese Remainder theorem, one can lift these simultaneously to get a hypersurfaces $H \subset \mathbb{P}_{R_1}^N$. Then $H \cap P_i$ is a smooth projective R_1 -scheme of pure relative dimension $d_i - 1$, and $b_{\mathfrak{m}} \in H \cap P_i$ whenever $b_{\mathfrak{m}} \in P_i$. The same argument can be applied to the hypersurface section $H \cap P_i$. Continuing in this way, we finally arrive at an R_1 -finite, étale, closed subscheme $Y_i \subset P_i$ such that $b_{\mathfrak{m}} \in Y_i$ whenever $b_{\mathfrak{m}} \in P_i$. Denote $Y'_1 := \bigsqcup_{i=1}^t Y_i$. Unfortunately, Y'_1 may not embed into $\mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W$. So we first modify Y'_1 by using Panin's 'finite field tricks'.

For large enough integers $d > 0$, we can choose a monic polynomial $h_{\mathfrak{n}'} \in \kappa(\mathfrak{n}')[u]$ of degree $2d + 1$ for each maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n}' \subset \Gamma(Y'_1, \mathcal{O}_{Y'_1})$ such that:

- (1) if $\kappa(\mathfrak{n}')$ is finite, $h_{\mathfrak{n}'}$ is a product of two irreducible polynomials of degrees d and $d+1$ ⁶, respectively;
- (2) if $\kappa(\mathfrak{n}')$ is infinite, $h_{\mathfrak{n}'}$ is a separable polynomial and has at least one root in $\kappa(\mathfrak{n}')$.

Let $h \in \Gamma(Y'_1, \mathcal{O}_{Y'_1})[u]$ be a common monic lifting of $h_{\mathfrak{n}'}$ for all $\mathfrak{n}' \subset \Gamma(Y'_1, \mathcal{O}_{Y'_1})$. Define

$$Y_1 := \text{Spec}(\Gamma(Y'_1, \mathcal{O}_{Y'_1})[u]/(h));$$

it is finite, étale over Y'_1 , and hence also over R_1 . By (1), for each maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n} \subset R$ with finite residue field, $(Y_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{n})}$ has at most $2 \deg(Y'_1/R)$ points, each of degree $\geq d$ over \mathfrak{n} , so, there is no finite fields obstruction to embedding Y_1 into $\mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W$ over R in the following sense: for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n} \subset R$,

$$\#\{z \in (Y_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{n})} : [\kappa(z) : \kappa(\mathfrak{n})] = e\} \leq \#\{z \in \mathbb{A}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{n})}^1 \setminus W : [\kappa(z) : \kappa(\mathfrak{n})] = e\} \quad \text{for every } e \geq 1,$$

because the left hand side is zero for $e < d$ and is uniformly bounded for $e \geq d$, but the right hand side is asymptotically $(\#\kappa(\mathfrak{n}))^e/e$, which tends to infinity as e grows. Consequently, for such d , there exists

$$\text{a closed immersion } \bigsqcup_{\mathfrak{n} \subset R} (Y_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{n})} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W \quad \text{over } R;$$

by Nakayama lemma, any of its lifting $Y_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W$ over R (which exists since Y_1 is affine) is also a closed immersion. By construction, the restriction of $(G_1)_{Y'_1}$ to every connected component of Y'_1 contains a proper parabolic subgroup scheme, so, by [SGA 3III new, Exposé XXVI, Corollaire 6.12], $(G_1)_{Y'_1}$ contains \mathbb{G}_{m, Y'_1} , and also $(G_1)_{Y_1}$ contains \mathbb{G}_{m, Y_1} . For every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R_1$ with $(G_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ isotropic, by construction, there exists a point $\mathfrak{n}' := b_{\mathfrak{m}} \in Y'_1$, that is, $\kappa(\mathfrak{m}) = \kappa(\mathfrak{n}')$. Thus, in case (1) (resp., in case (2)), $(Y_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ contains points of both degrees d and $d+1$ (resp., a point of exact degree 1) over \mathfrak{m} , so the line bundles $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1}(d)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1}(d+1)$ are trivial over $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1 \setminus (Y_1)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$, hence so is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1}(1)$.

To construct \tilde{Y} , it suffices to produce, for a large d , R -finite, étale, closed subschemes $\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2 \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1$ of R -degrees d and $d+1$ which are disjoint from W , and then take $\tilde{Y} := \tilde{Y}_1 \sqcup \tilde{Y}_2$. To achieve this, one just need to imitate the above procedure for constructing Y_1 from Y'_1 . Details omitted. \square

5.8. Proof of Theorem 5.1. Lemma 5.4 reduces us to the case when $C = \mathbb{A}_R^1$ and G is a reductive R -group scheme. Up to shifting we may assume that $s = 0_R \in \mathbb{A}_R^1(R)$ is the zero section, and base changing to A reduces us further to the case $A = R$ at the cost of that R need not be a domain or geometrically unibranch. Thus, in case (i), our R is semilocal, and, in case (ii), our G is totally isotropic.

For both cases (i)–(ii), by glueing \mathcal{P} with the trivial G -torsor over $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Z$ we extend \mathcal{P} to a G -torsor \mathcal{Q} over \mathbb{P}_R^1 . By [Fed22b, Proposition 2.3] or [Čes22b, Lemma 5.3.5], up to replacing \mathcal{Q} and Z by their pullbacks by $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_R^1, t \mapsto t^d$, where d is divisible by the R -fibril degrees of the simply-connected central cover $(G^{\text{ad}})^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow G^{\text{ad}}$, we may assume that for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R$ the G^{ad} -torsor over $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1$ induced by \mathcal{Q} lifts to a generically trivial $(G^{\text{ad}})^{\text{sc}}$ -torsor over $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1$.

⁶This follows from the following fact: for a finite field k , there are asymptotically $(\#k)^d/d$ points on \mathbb{A}_k^1 of exact degree d .

Claim 5.8.1. In both cases (i)–(ii), assume that R is semilocal. For any R -finite closed subscheme $W_0 \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1$, there exists an R -finite, étale, closed subscheme $Y \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W_0$ such that $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y}$ is trivial.

Proof of the claim. Restricting ourselves on each connected component, we may assume that $\text{Spec } R$ is connected. Write the canonical decomposition of G^{ad} as in Proposition 5.6. Replace W_0 by $W_0 \cup Z$ to assume that $Z \subset W_0$. Applying Lemma 5.7 separately to each simple R_i -group scheme G_i (with appropriate choices of W 's), we get R_i -finite, étale schemes Y_i such that $(G_i)_{Y_i}$ are totally isotropic, and a closed immersion $\bigsqcup_i Y_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W_0$ over R such that, for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset R_i$ with $(G_i)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$ isotropic, the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1}(1)$ is trivial over $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}^1 \setminus (Y_i)_{\kappa(\mathfrak{m})}$. Applying the second part of Lemma 5.7 to $W := (\bigsqcup_i Y_i) \sqcup W_0$, we obtain an R -finite, étale, closed subscheme

$$Y' \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus ((\bigsqcup_i Y_i) \sqcup W_0)$$

such that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_R^1}(1)$ is trivial over $\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y'$. Denote $Y := Y' \sqcup (\bigsqcup_i Y_i)$. Then all the assumptions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 5.6 are verified, so we conclude that $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y}$ is trivial. \square

For (i), we take $W_0 = Z \cup 0_R$, then Claim 5.8.1 gives a R -finite étale closed $Y \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus W_0$ such that $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Y}$ is trivial. Since $Y \cap 0_R = \emptyset$, we deduce that the pullback of \mathcal{Q} along $s = 0_R$ is also trivial, as wanted.

For (ii), we will follow [Čes22c, Lemma 4.3] to show that both $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{A}_R^1}$ and $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus 0_R}$ descend to G -torsors over R , and then we are done: both of these descendants agree with the restriction of \mathcal{Q} along $1_R \in \mathbb{A}_R^1(R)$, so they agree with the restriction of \mathcal{Q} along ∞_R , which is trivial, and hence they must be trivial. By Quillen patching [Čes22b, Corollary 5.1.5 (b)], for the descent claim we may replace R by its localizations at maximal ideals to assume that R is local.

Now, since R is local, we apply Claim 5.8.1 to $W_0 = 0_R$ to get a R -finite étale closed $Z' \subset \mathbb{A}_R^1 \setminus 0_R$ such that $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus Z'}$ is trivial. It remains to apply Proposition 5.6 twice using that G is totally isotropic, with $Y = 0_R$ (resp., $Y = \infty_R$) and $Y_i = Y \times_R R_i$, to show that both $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus 0_R}$ and $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathbb{P}_R^1 \setminus \infty_R}$ are trivial. \square

6. TORSORS UNDER A REDUCTIVE GROUP SCHEME OVER A SMOOTH PROJECTIVE BASE

The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 6.1. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R , an $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$, an irreducible, smooth, projective R -scheme X , a finite subset $\mathfrak{x} \subset X$ with semilocal ring $A := \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathfrak{x}}$, and a reductive X -group scheme G ,*

(i) *any generically trivial G -torsor over A is trivial, that is,*

$$\ker(H^1(A, G) \rightarrow H^1(\text{Frac } A, G)) = \{*\};$$

(ii) *if $G_{A[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is totally isotropic, then any generically trivial G -torsor over $A[\frac{1}{r}]$ is trivial, that is,*

$$\ker(H^1(A[\frac{1}{r}], G) \rightarrow H^1(\text{Frac } A, G)) = \{*\}.$$

The case (i) is a version of the Grothendieck–Serre conjecture in the case the relevant reductive group scheme G_A has a reductive model over some smooth projective compactification of $\text{Spec } A$. The case (ii) provides a version of Nisnevich conjecture for such ‘nice’ reductive groups satisfying the total isotropicity assumption: if R is a discrete valuation ring with uniformizer r and if $R \rightarrow A$ is a local homomorphism of local rings, then $r \in \mathfrak{m}_A \setminus \mathfrak{m}_A^2$, and (ii) says that any generically trivial G -torsor over $A[\frac{1}{r}]$ is trivial (the isotropicity assumption on G_A is essential, see, for instance, [Fed21]).

Remark 6.2. An inspection of the proof below shows that Theorem 6.1 still holds provided that X is only a flat projective R -scheme such that $X \setminus X^{\text{sm}}$ is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in X , $\mathfrak{x} \subset X^{\text{sm}}$, and G is a reductive X^{sm} -group scheme, where X^{sm} denotes the smooth locus of $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$.

To prove Theorem 6.1, we first derive from Corollary 2.10 and Lemma 4.2 the following key result, which reduces the proof of Theorem 6.1 to studying torsors on a smooth affine relative curve.

Lemma 6.3. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, an irreducible, smooth, projective R -scheme X of pure relative dimension $d > 0$, a finite subset $\mathfrak{x} \subset X$, and a reductive X -group scheme G , the following assertions hold.*

(i) *Given a generically trivial G -torsor \mathcal{P} over $A := \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathfrak{x}}$, there are*

- a smooth, affine A -curve C , an A -finite closed subscheme $Z \subset C$, and a section $s \in C(A)$;
- a reductive C -group scheme \mathcal{G} satisfying $s^*\mathcal{G} \simeq G_A$ and a \mathcal{G} -torsor \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{F}|_{C \setminus Z}$ is trivial and $s^*\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{P}$.

(ii) Given an $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and a generically trivial G -torsor $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ over $A[\frac{1}{r}]$, there are

- a smooth, affine A -curve C , an A -finite closed subscheme $Z \subset C$, and a section $s \in C(A)$;
- a reductive C -group scheme \mathcal{G} such that $s^*\mathcal{G} \simeq G_A$, a \mathcal{G} -torsor $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ over $C[\frac{1}{r}] := C \times_A A[\frac{1}{r}]$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{C[\frac{1}{r}] \setminus Z[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is trivial and $(s|_{A[\frac{1}{r}]})^*(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.

Proof. By Corollary 2.10, \mathcal{P} (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$) extends to a G -torsor \mathcal{P}_0 (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0$) over an open neighbourhood $W \subset X$ of \mathbf{x} (resp., an open neighbourhood $\tilde{W} \subset X$ of $\text{Spec}(A[\frac{1}{r}])$) such that

$$\text{codim}((X \setminus W)_K, X_K) \geq 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}((X \setminus W)_s, X_s) \geq 2 \text{ for all } s \in \text{Spec}(R);$$

and

$$\text{codim}((X \setminus \tilde{W})_K, X_K) \geq 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{codim}((X \setminus \tilde{W})_s, X_s) \geq 2 \text{ for all } s \in \text{Spec}(R).$$

Here, K is the fraction field of R . Let $\mathbf{z} \subset X$ be the set of maximal points of the R -fibers of X ; the above codimension bounds implies $\mathbf{z} \subset W$ (resp., $\mathbf{z} \subset \tilde{W}$). By Lemma 2.1(ii), the semilocal ring $\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{z}}$, and hence also $\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{z}}[\frac{1}{r}]$, is a Prüfer domain. By the Grothendieck–Serre on semilocal Prüfer schemes (Theorem A.0.1), the generically trivial G -torsor $(\mathcal{P}_0)|_{\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{z}}}$ (resp., $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0)|_{\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{z}}[\frac{1}{r}]}$) is actually trivial. Thus there exists a closed subscheme $Y \subset X$ (resp., $\tilde{Y} \subset X$) that avoids all the maximal points of R -fibers of X such that the restriction $(\mathcal{P}_0)|_{X \setminus Y}$ (resp., $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0)|_{(X \setminus \tilde{Y})[\frac{1}{r}]}$) is trivial; such a Y (resp., \tilde{Y}) is R -fiberwise of codimension > 0 in X . Now, we treat the two cases (i)–(ii) separately.

For (i), by the above, $X \setminus W$ is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in X ; *a fortiori*, the same codimension bound holds for $Y \setminus W$ in X . Consequently, we can apply Lemma 4.2 to obtain an affine open $S \subset \mathbb{A}_R^{d-1}$, an affine open neighbourhood $U \subset W$ of \mathbf{x} , and a smooth morphism $\pi: U \rightarrow S$ of pure relative dimension 1 such that $U \cap Y$ is S -finite.

Let $\tau: C := U \times_S \text{Spec } A \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ be the base change of π to $\text{Spec } A$. Let Z and \mathcal{F} be the pullbacks of $U \cap Y$ and $(\mathcal{P}_0)|_U$ under $\text{pr}_1: C \rightarrow U$, respectively. Then, via τ , C is a smooth affine A -curve, $Z \subset C$ is a A -finite closed subscheme, and \mathcal{F} is a $\mathcal{G} := \text{pr}_1^*(G_U)$ -torsor that trivializes over $C \setminus Z$. Finally, the diagonal in C induces a section $s \in C(A)$ with $s^*\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{P}$ (as $s^*\mathcal{G} = G_A$ -torsors).

For (ii), since $\text{Spec}(A[\frac{1}{r}])$ consists of points of $X[\frac{1}{r}] := X \times_R R[\frac{1}{r}]$ that specializes to some point of \mathbf{x} , we deduce from the inclusion $\text{Spec } A[\frac{1}{r}] \subset \tilde{W}$ that no points of $(X \setminus \tilde{W})[\frac{1}{r}] = X[\frac{1}{r}] \setminus \tilde{W}[\frac{1}{r}]$ specializes to any points of \mathbf{x} . Hence, the closure $\overline{(X \setminus \tilde{W})[\frac{1}{r}]}$ (in X) is disjoint from \mathbf{x} , so $\tilde{W}' := X \setminus \overline{(X \setminus \tilde{W})[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is an open neighbourhood of \mathbf{x} . Notice that, since $\text{Spec } R$ has finite Krull dimension, X is topological Noetherian. Since $(X \setminus \tilde{W})[\frac{1}{r}]$ is $R[\frac{1}{r}]$ -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in $X[\frac{1}{r}]$, by Lemma 2.1(i) applied to the closures of the (finitely many) maximal points of $(X \setminus \tilde{W})[\frac{1}{r}]$, the closure $\overline{(X \setminus \tilde{W})[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is R -fiberwise of codimension ≥ 2 in X ; *a fortiori*, the same holds for $\tilde{Y} \setminus \tilde{W}'$ in X . Consequently, we can apply Lemma 4.2 to obtain an affine open $\tilde{S} \subset \mathbb{A}_R^{d-1}$, an affine open neighbourhood $\tilde{U} \subset \tilde{W}'$ of \mathbf{x} , and a smooth morphism $\tilde{\pi}: \tilde{U} \rightarrow \tilde{S}$ of pure relative dimension 1 such that $\tilde{U} \cap \tilde{Y}$ is \tilde{S} -finite. Notice that $\tilde{U}[\frac{1}{r}] \subset \tilde{W}'[\frac{1}{r}] = \tilde{W}[\frac{1}{r}]$, so we have the restriction $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0)|_{\tilde{U}[\frac{1}{r}]}$.

Let $\tau: C := \tilde{U} \times_{\tilde{S}} \text{Spec } A \rightarrow \text{Spec } A$ be the base change of $\tilde{\pi}$ to $\text{Spec } A$. Let Z be the pullback of $\tilde{U} \cap \tilde{Y}$ under $\text{pr}_1: C \rightarrow \tilde{U}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ be the pullback of $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0)|_{\tilde{U}[\frac{1}{r}]}$ under $\text{pr}_1: C[\frac{1}{r}] \rightarrow \tilde{U}[\frac{1}{r}]$. Then, via τ , C is a smooth affine A -curve, $Z \subset C$ is a A -finite closed subscheme, and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is a $\mathcal{G} := \text{pr}_1^*(G_{\tilde{U}})$ -torsor over $C[\frac{1}{r}]$ that trivializes over $C[\frac{1}{r}] \setminus Z[\frac{1}{r}]$. Finally, the diagonal in C induces a section $s \in C(A)$ such that $s^*\mathcal{G} = G_A$ and $s^*_{A[\frac{1}{r}]}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. \square

6.4. Proof of Theorem 6.1. By a standard limit argument involving Lemma 2.2, one easily reduces to the case when R has finite Krull dimension. Now, let \mathcal{P} (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$) be a generically trivial G -torsor over $A := \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{x}}$ (resp., over $A[\frac{1}{r}]$) that we want to trivialize. Let d be the relative dimension of X over R . If

$d = 0$, then A and $A[\frac{1}{r}]$ are semilocal Prüfer domains, so, by the Grothendieck–Serre on semilocal Prüfer schemes (Theorem A.0.1), the torsors \mathcal{P} and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ are trivial. Hence we may assume that $d > 0$. Then, by Lemma 6.3, there are a smooth, affine A -curve C , an A -finite closed subscheme $Z \subset C$, a section $s \in C(A)$, a reductive C -group scheme \mathcal{G} with $s^*\mathcal{G} \simeq G_A$,

- a \mathcal{G} -torsor \mathcal{F} over C that trivializes over $C \setminus Z$ such that $s^*\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{P}$, and
- a \mathcal{G} -torsor $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ over $C[\frac{1}{r}]$ that trivializes over $C[\frac{1}{r}] \setminus Z[\frac{1}{r}]$ such that $(s|_{A[\frac{1}{r}]})^*(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.

By Theorem 5.1 (i), the G -torsor $s^*\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{P}$ is trivial. By Theorem 5.1 (ii), in case $(s|_{A[\frac{1}{r}]})^*(\mathcal{G}) \simeq G_{A[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is totally isotropic, the $G_{A[\frac{1}{r}]}$ -torsor $(s|_{A[\frac{1}{r}]})^*(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is trivial. \square

7. TORSORS UNDER A CONSTANT REDUCTIVE GROUP SCHEME

In this section we prove the first main result of this paper, namely, the Grothendieck–Serre conjecture and a version of Nisnevich conjecture, for ‘constant’ reductive group schemes. The proof uses a variant of Lindel’s Lemma (Proposition 4.4) and glueing techniques to reduce to the resolved case Theorem 6.1.

Theorem 7.1. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R , an $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$, an irreducible affine R -smooth scheme X , a finite subset $\mathbf{x} \subset X$, and a reductive R -group scheme G ,*

- (i) *any generically trivial G -torsor over $A := \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{x}}$ is trivial, that is,*

$$\ker(H^1(A, G) \rightarrow H^1(\text{Frac } A, G)) = \{*\};$$

- (ii) *if $G_{R[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is totally isotropic, then any generically trivial G -torsor over $A[\frac{1}{r}]$ is trivial, that is,*

$$\ker(H^1(A[\frac{1}{r}], G) \rightarrow H^1(\text{Frac } A, G)) = \{*\}.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$) be a generically trivial G -torsor over A (resp., over $A[\frac{1}{r}]$). By shrinking X around \mathbf{x} , we may assume that \mathcal{P} is defined on the whole X (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is defined on the whole $X[\frac{1}{r}] := X \times_R R[\frac{1}{r}]$). Let d be the relative dimension of X over R . As pointed out by Česnavičius, since it suffices to argue that \mathcal{P} (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$) is trivial Zariski-semilocally on X , we may replace X by $X \times_R \mathbb{A}_R^N$ for large N to assume that $d > \#\mathbf{x}$: by pulling back along the zero section $X \rightarrow X \times_R \mathbb{A}_R^N$, the Zariski-semilocal triviality of $\mathcal{P}_{X \times_R \mathbb{A}_R^N}$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{X[\frac{1}{r}] \times_R \mathbb{A}_R^N}$) on $X \times_R \mathbb{A}_R^N$ implies that of \mathcal{P} (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$) on X .

Our goal is to show that $\mathcal{P}|_A$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{A[\frac{1}{r}]}$) is trivial. A limit argument involving Lemma 2.2 reduces us to the case when R has finite Krull dimension. By specialization, we can assume that each point of \mathbf{x} is closed in its *corresponding* R -fiber of X (but not necessarily lies in the closed R -fibers of X).

If $d = 0$, then A (resp., $A[\frac{1}{r}]$) is a semilocal Prüfer domain, so, by Theorem A.0.1, the torsor $\mathcal{P}|_A$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{A[\frac{1}{r}]}$) is trivial. Thus we may assume that $d > 0$ for what follows.

Let \mathbf{y} be the set of maximal points of the R -fibers of X .

Claim 7.1.1. No points of \mathbf{x} specializes to any point of \mathbf{y} , that is, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \cap \mathbf{y} = \emptyset$.

Proof of the claim. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow S := \text{Spec } R$ be the structural morphism. If not, say $x \in \mathbf{x}$ specializes to $y \in \mathbf{y}$, then, by Lemma 2.1(i),

$$\dim \overline{\{x\}}_{\pi(x)} = \dim \overline{\{x\}}_{\pi(y)},$$

which is $\geq \dim \overline{\{y\}}_{\pi(y)} = d$ (because y is a maximal point in the fiber $\pi^{-1}(\pi(y))$ which has pure dimension d). Since $\dim \pi^{-1}(\pi(x)) = d > 0$, x can not be a closed point of the fiber $\pi^{-1}(\pi(x))$, a contradiction. \square

By Lemma 2.1 (ii) again, the semilocal ring $\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{y}}$, and hence also $\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{y}}[\frac{1}{r}]$, are Prüfer domains, so, by Theorem A.0.1, the G -torsor $\mathcal{P}|_{\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{y}}}$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{\mathcal{O}_{X, \mathbf{y}}[\frac{1}{r}]}$) is trivial. Therefore, using the above claim and prime avoidance, we can find an element $a \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ such that, if denote $Y := V(a) \subset X$, then $\mathbf{x} \subset Y$, $\mathbf{y} \cap Y = \emptyset$, and the restriction $\mathcal{P}|_{X \setminus Y}$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{(X \setminus Y)[\frac{1}{r}]}$) is trivial. (We just take $a = a_1 a_2$, where a_1 is such that $\mathbf{y} \cap V(a_1) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{P}|_{X \setminus V(a_1)}$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{(X \setminus V(a_1))[\frac{1}{r}]}$) is trivial, and a_2 is delivered from prime avoidance utilizing the fact $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \cap \mathbf{y} = \emptyset$, so that $\mathbf{x} \subset V(a_2)$ and $\mathbf{y} \cap V(a_2) = \emptyset$.)

Since $d > \#\mathbf{x}$, we may apply Proposition 4.4 to obtain an affine open neighbourhood $W \subset X$ of \mathbf{x} , an affine open subscheme $U \subset \mathbb{A}_R^d$, and an étale surjective R -morphism $f : W \rightarrow U$ such that the restriction $f|_{W \cap Y}$ is a closed immersion and f induces a Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W \cap Y & \hookrightarrow & W \\ \parallel & & \downarrow f \\ W \cap Y & \hookrightarrow & U. \end{array}$$

Applying $(-)\times_R R[\frac{1}{r}]$ yields a similar Cartesian square. By glueing [Čes22a, Lemma 7.1],

- (i) we may (non-canonically) glue $\mathcal{P}|_W$ and the trivial G -torsor over $U \setminus f(W \cap Y)$ to descend $\mathcal{P}|_W$ to a G -torsor \mathcal{Q} over U that trivializes over $U \setminus f(W \cap Y)$. Since U has a smooth, projective compactification \mathbb{P}_R^d , we may apply Theorem 6.1 (i) to deduce that $\mathcal{Q}|_{\mathcal{O}_{U,f(\mathbf{x})}}$ is trivial, so $\mathcal{P}|_A = \mathcal{P}|_{\mathcal{O}_{W,\mathbf{x}}}$ is trivial, as desired.
- (ii) we may (non-canonically) glue $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{W[\frac{1}{r}]}$ and the trivial G -torsor over $(U \setminus f(W \cap Y))[\frac{1}{r}]$ to descend $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{W[\frac{1}{r}]}$ to a G -torsor $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ over $U[\frac{1}{r}]$ that trivializes over $U[\frac{1}{r}] \setminus f(W \cap Y)[\frac{1}{r}]$. Since U has a smooth, projective compactification \mathbb{P}_R^d , we may apply Theorem 6.1 (ii) to conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}|_{\mathcal{O}_{U,f(\mathbf{x})}[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is trivial, so $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{A[\frac{1}{r}]} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}|_{\mathcal{O}_{W,\mathbf{x}}[\frac{1}{r}]}$ is trivial, as desired. \square

8. THE BASS–QUILLEN CONJECTURE FOR TORSORS

In this section, we prove the following variant of Bass–Quillen conjecture for torsors:

Theorem 8.1. *For a ring A that is smooth over a Prüfer ring R , a totally isotropic reductive R -group scheme G , then, via pullback,*

$$H_{\text{Nis}}^1(A, G) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_{\text{Nis}}^1(\mathbb{A}_A^N, G) \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad H_{\text{Zar}}^1(A, G) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_{\text{Zar}}^1(\mathbb{A}_A^N, G).$$

We notice that very special instances of Theorem 8.1 for $G = \text{GL}_n$ (that is, for vector bundles) was already known: Simis–Vasconcelos in [SV71] considered the case when A is a valuation ring and $N = 1$, and Lequain–Simis in [LS80] treated the case when A is a Prüfer ring. Apart from that, we are not aware of any instance of Theorem 8.1 even for $G = \text{GL}_n$ in our non-Noetherian context.

Remark 8.2. By Theorem 7.1, for a reductive R -group scheme G , a G -torsor on \mathbb{A}_R^N is Nisnevich-locally trivial, if and only if it is generically trivial, if and only if it is Zariski-locally trivial. This implies the equivalence of the formulation of Theorem 8.1 for the topologies ‘Nis’ and ‘Zar’.

8.3. The ‘inverse’ to Quillen patching. Compared to Quillen patching [Čes22b, Corollary 5.1.5], the following ‘inverse’ to Quillen patching is more elementary but is also useful. Its case when $G = \text{GL}_n$ and $A = R[t_1, \dots, t_N]$ is due to Roitman [Roi79, Proposition 2].

Lemma 8.4. *Let R be a ring, let G be a quasi-affine, flat, finitely presented R -group scheme, let $A = \bigoplus_{i_1, \dots, i_N \geq 0} A_{i_1, \dots, i_N}$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\oplus N}$ -graded R -algebra (resp., a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\oplus N}$ -graded domain over R) such that $R \xrightarrow{\sim} A_{0, \dots, 0}$, and suppose that every G -torsor on A (resp., every generically trivial G -torsor on A) descends to a G -torsor on R . Then, for any multiplicative subset $S \subset R$, every G -torsor on A_S (resp., every generically trivial G -torsor on A_S) whose restriction to each local ring of $(A_{0, \dots, 0})_S \simeq R_S$ extends to a G -torsor on R descends to a G -torsor on R_S .*

(The relevant case for us is when $A = R[t_1, \dots, t_N]$.)

Proof. We focus on the part on generically trivial torsors, since the other is [Čes22b, Proposition 5.1.10].

Let X be a generically trivial G -torsor on A_S whose restriction to each local ring of $(A_{0, \dots, 0})_S \simeq R_S$ extends to a G -torsor on R . By Quillen patching [Čes22b, Corollary 5.1.5], we may enlarge S to reduce to the case when R_S is local. Then, by assumption, the restriction of X to $(A_{0, \dots, 0})_S \simeq R_S$ extends to a G -torsor X_0 on R . A limit argument reduces us further to the case when $S = \{r\}$ is a singleton at the cost of R_S no longer being local. Notice that the projection onto the $(0, \dots, 0)$ -th component

$$R \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \neq (0, \dots, 0)} A_{i_1, \dots, i_N} \left[\frac{1}{r} \right] \right) \simeq A \left[\frac{1}{r} \right] \times_{R \left[\frac{1}{r} \right]} R \rightarrow R$$

induces an isomorphism both modulo r^n and on r^n -torsion for every $n > 0$. So, by [Čes22b, Proposition 4.2.2], we can glue the G -torsor X on $A[\frac{1}{r}]$ with the G -torsor X_0 on R to obtain a generically trivial G -torsor \tilde{X} on $A[\frac{1}{r}] \times_{R[\frac{1}{r}]} R$. However, since

$$A[\frac{1}{r}] \times_{R[\frac{1}{r}]} R \simeq \operatorname{colim}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A,$$

where the transition maps $A \rightarrow A$ are given by multiplications by $r^{i_1 + \dots + i_N}$ on the degree (i_1, \dots, i_N) -part A_{i_1, \dots, i_N} , so, by a standard limit argument, \tilde{X} descends to a generically trivial G -torsor on some copy of A in the direct colimit. Therefore, by assumption, it descends further to a G -torsor on R . The base change to R_S of this final descendant gives a desired descendant of X to a G -torsor on R_S . \square

8.5. Torsors on \mathbb{A}_R^N under reductive R -group schemes. The following was conjectured in [Čes22b, Conjecture 3.5.1] and settled recently in [Čes22c, Theorem 2.1(a)].

Theorem 8.6. *For a ring R and a totally isotropic reductive R -group scheme G , any G -torsor on \mathbb{A}_R^N that is trivial away from some R -finite closed subscheme of \mathbb{A}_R^N is trivial.*

Lemma 8.7. *For a normal domain A , an A -group M of multiplicative type, the pullback*

$$H_{\text{fppf}}^1(A, M) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_{\text{fppf}}^1(\mathbb{A}_A^n, M) \quad \text{is bijective.}$$

Proof. When A is Noetherian, this is [CTS87, Lemma 2.4]. For a general normal domain A , we write it as a filtered union of its finitely generated \mathbf{Z} -subalgebras A_i , and, by replacing A_i with its normalizations (which is again of finite type over \mathbf{Z}), we may assume that each A_i is normal, so we may conclude from the Noetherian case via a limit argument, because M is finitely presented over A . \square

For any commutative unital ring A , denote by $A(t)$ the localization of $A[t]$ with respect to the multiplicative system of *monic* polynomials.

Lemma 8.8. *Let R be a semilocal Prüfer domain and G a reductive R -group scheme.*

Every G -torsor over $R(t)$ is trivial if and only if it is generically trivial.

Proof. Let \mathcal{E} be a generically trivial G -torsor over $R(t)$. Denote by \mathfrak{m} the maximal ideal of R . We observe that $R(t)$ is the local ring of the projective t -line \mathbb{P}_R^1 over R at $\infty \in \mathbb{P}_{V/\mathfrak{m}}^1$, with $s := \frac{1}{t}$ inverted:

$$R(t) = (R[s])_{(\mathfrak{m}, s)} \left[\frac{1}{s} \right].$$

Hence, \mathcal{E} spreads out to a G -torsor \mathcal{E}_{U° over $U^\circ := U \setminus \{s = 0\}$ for an affine open $U \subset \mathbb{P}_R^1$ containing ∞ . The fiber of $\{s = 0\}$ over $\operatorname{Frac} R$ is the singleton $\{\xi\}$, where ξ denotes the generic point of $\{s = 0\}$, and

$$W \cap \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_R^1, \xi} = \{\text{the generic point of } \mathbb{P}_R^1\}.$$

Since \mathcal{E}_{U° is generically trivial and U° is affine hence quasi-compact, there is an open neighbourhood $U_\xi \subset U$ of ξ such that $\mathcal{E}_{U^\circ}|_{U^\circ \cap U_\xi}$ is trivial. Consequently, we may (non-canonically) glue \mathcal{E}_{U° with the trivial G -torsor over U_ξ to obtain a G -torsor $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ over the open subset $U^\circ \cup U_\xi$ of U . By construction, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}|_{U^\circ} \cong \mathcal{E}_{U^\circ}$. Now the complementary closed $Z := U \setminus (U^\circ \cup U_\xi)$ is contained in $\{s = 0\} \setminus \{\xi\}$. In particular,

$$Z \times_R \operatorname{Frac} R = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{codim}(Z_s, U_s) \geq 1 \text{ for all } s \in \operatorname{Spec} R.$$

By purity Theorem 2.7 of reductive torsors on smooth relative curves, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ extends to a G -torsor, which is also denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$, over entire U . As $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is generically trivial, by Theorem 7.1 (i), its restriction to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_R^1, \infty} = (R[s])_{(\mathfrak{m}, s)}$, and its further restriction to $R(t)$, is trivial, that is, $\mathcal{E}|_{R(t)} \cong \tilde{\mathcal{E}}|_{R(t)}$ is trivial. \square

8.9. Proof of Theorem 8.1. Since any section of $\mathbb{A}_A^N \rightarrow \operatorname{Spec} A$ induces sections to the pullback maps in Theorem 8.1, these pullback maps are injective, so it suffices to show that they are surjective. By Quillen patching [Čes22b, Corollary 5.1.5], we may replace R by its localizations to assume that R is a valuation ring. By a limit argument involving Lemma 2.2, we reduce to the case of a finite-rank R .

Step 1: *A is a polynomial ring over R .*

It suffices to show that every generically trivial G -torsor \mathcal{E} over $R[t_1, \dots, t_N]$ is trivial; *a fortiori*, it descends to a G -torsor over R . To prove this we will argue by double induction on the pair $(N, \operatorname{rank}(R))$.

If $N = 0$, then by convention $R[t_1, \dots, t_N] = R$, we know from [Guo20] that a generically trivial G -torsor over R is trivial. Now assume $N \geq 1$ and set $A' := R(t_N)[t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}]$.

Claim 8.9.1. The $G_{A'}$ -torsor $\mathcal{E}_{A'}$ descends to a $G_{R(t_N)}$ -torsor \mathcal{E}_0 .

Proof of the claim. Consider the natural projection $\pi : \text{Spec } R(t_N) \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$. Since by definition, $R(t_N)$ is the localization of $R[t_N]$ with respect to the multiplicative system of monic polynomials, the closed fiber of π consists of the singleton $\{\mathfrak{p}_0\}$; further, the local ring $R(t_N)_{\mathfrak{p}_0}$ is a valuation ring of $\text{Frac}(R)(t_N)$ whose valuation restricts to the Gauss valuation associated to R on $R[t_N]$:

$$R[t_N] \rightarrow \Gamma_R, \quad \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i t_N^i \mapsto \min_i v(a_i),$$

where $v : R \rightarrow \Gamma_R$ is the (additive) valuation on R . In particular, R and $R(t_N)_{\mathfrak{p}_0}$ have the same value group. To apply the Quillen patching [Čes22b, Corollary 5.1.5] and conclude, it suffices to show that the base change of $\mathcal{E}_{A'}$ to $R(t_N)_{\mathfrak{p}}[t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}]$ is trivial for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \subset R(t_N)$. Indeed, if $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_0$, then the above discussion implies $\text{rank}(R_{\pi(\mathfrak{p})}) = \text{rank}(R)$, so the desired triviality of the base change follows from induction hypothesis. If $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{p}_0$, then $\pi(\mathfrak{p}) \in \text{Spec } R$ is not the closed point and $\text{rank}(R_{\pi(\mathfrak{p})}) < \text{rank}(R)$, so, by induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{E}_{R_{\pi(\mathfrak{p})}[t_1, \dots, t_N]}$ and hence also its further base change along $R_{\pi(\mathfrak{p})}[t_1, \dots, t_N] \rightarrow R(t_N)_{\mathfrak{p}}[t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}]$ is trivial. \square

Since \mathcal{E} is generically trivial, by considering the pullback of $\mathcal{E}_{A'}$ along a general section $s \in \mathbb{A}_{R(t_N)}^{N-1}(R(t_N))$, we see that \mathcal{E}_0 is also generically trivial. By Lemma 8.8, \mathcal{E}_0 , and hence also $\mathcal{E}_{A'}$, is trivial. Consequently, \mathcal{E} is trivial away from the R -finite closed subset $\{f(t_N) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{A}_R^N$ for some monic polynomial $f \in R[t_N]$. By Theorem 8.6, \mathcal{E} is trivial. This completes the induction process.

Step 2: A is the localization of a polynomial ring $\tilde{R} := R[u_1, \dots, u_d]$ with respect to some multiplicative subset $S \subset \tilde{R}$.

We wish to apply the ‘inverse’ to Quillen patching Lemma 8.4, with R being \tilde{R} here and A being $\tilde{R}[t_1, \dots, t_N]$. It remains to check the assumptions of *loc. cit.* Firstly, by Step 1, a generically trivial G -torsor over $\tilde{R}[t_1, \dots, t_N]$ descends to a G -torsor over \tilde{R} . Secondly, for any multiplicative subset $S \subset \tilde{R}$ and any generically trivial G -torsor \mathcal{E} over $\tilde{R}_S[t_1, \dots, t_N]$, the restriction of \mathcal{E} to each local ring of the closed subscheme

$$\text{Spec } \tilde{R}_S := \{t_1 = \dots = t_N = 0\} \subset \mathbb{A}_{\tilde{R}_S}^N$$

is trivial (so trivially extends to a G -torsor over \tilde{R}): by Bass–Quillen in the field case, the restriction of \mathcal{E} to $\text{Frac}(\tilde{R}_S)[t_1, \dots, t_N]$ is trivial. Thus the restriction $\mathcal{E}|_{\tilde{R}_S}$ is generically trivial and hence, by Theorem 7.1(i), is Zariski locally trivial. All assumptions of Lemma 8.4 are thus verified.

Step 3: A is an arbitrary smooth R -algebra.

Let \mathcal{E} be a generically trivial G -torsor over \mathbb{A}_A^N . We need to show that \mathcal{E} descends to a G -torsor over A . By Quillen patching [Čes22b, Corollary 5.1.5], we may assume that A is an essentially smooth local algebra over a valuation ring R . By localizing R , we assume that the homomorphism $R \rightarrow A$ is local.

We will argue by double induction on the pair $(\dim R, \dim A - \dim R)$ to show that \mathcal{E} is even trivial. If $\dim R = 0$, then R is a field and we come back to the classical already settled case. If $\dim A = \dim R$, by Lemma 2.1(ii), then A is a valuation ring, and we come back to the case already settled in Step 1. Assume now $\dim R > 0$ and $\dim A - \dim R > 0$.

By Lemma 2.1.1, up to enlarging R (without changing $\dim R$) we may assume that $A = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, where X is an irreducible affine R -smooth scheme of pure relative dimension $d > 0$, and $x \in X$ is a *closed* point in the *closed* R -fiber. Then necessarily we have $d = \dim A - \dim R$. By Proposition 4.4, up to shrinking X , there are an étale R -morphism $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^d$ and an element $r_0 \in A_0 := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}_R^d, f(x)}$ such that

$$f \quad \text{induces} \quad A_0/r_0 A_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} A/r_0 A.$$

On the other hand, our induction hypothesis implies that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{A}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}}^N$ is trivial for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } A \setminus \{\mathfrak{m}_A\}$ (thus descends to the trivial G -torsor over $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$):

- either \mathfrak{p} lies over a non-maximal ideal $\mathfrak{q} \subset R$, in which case $R_{\mathfrak{q}} \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a local homomorphism,

$$\dim R_{\mathfrak{q}} < \dim R, \quad \text{and} \quad \dim A_{\mathfrak{p}} - \dim R_{\mathfrak{q}} \leq d = \dim A - \dim R;$$

- or $R \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a local homomorphism, in which case

$$\dim A_{\mathfrak{p}} - \dim R < \dim A - \dim R.$$

By Quillen patching, we deduce that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{A}_{A[\frac{1}{r_0}]}}^N$ descends to a G -torsor \mathcal{F} over $A[\frac{1}{r_0}]$. However, \mathcal{F} must be trivial, because it extends to a generically trivial G -torsor over A , such as the restriction of \mathcal{E} along any section $s \in \mathbb{A}_A^N(A)$, and, by Theorem 7.1(i), any such an extension is trivial. Now by the [Ces22a, Lemma 7.1] applied to the Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{A}_{A/r_0A}^N & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{A}_A^N \\ \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{A}_{A_0/r_0A_0}^N & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{A}_{A_0}^N, \end{array}$$

we may glue \mathcal{E} with the trivial G -torsor over $\mathbb{A}_{A_0[\frac{1}{r_0}]}^N$ to obtain a G -torsor \mathcal{E}_0 over $\mathbb{A}_{A_0}^N$ that trivializes over $\mathbb{A}_{A_0[\frac{1}{r_0}]}^N$. By Step 2, \mathcal{E}_0 is trivial, so \mathcal{E} is trivial as well. \square

APPENDIX A. GROTHENDIECK–SERRE ON A SEMILOCAL PRÜFER DOMAIN

The main result of this section is the following generalization of the main results of [Guo22] and [Guo20].

Theorem A.0.1. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R and a reductive R -group scheme G , we have*

$$\ker(H_{\text{ét}}^1(R, G) \rightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^1(\text{Frac } R, G)) = \{*\}.$$

A.0.2. Setup. We fix the following notations. For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, all the maximal ideals $(\mathfrak{m}_i)_{i=1}^r$ of R , the local rings $\mathcal{O}_i := R_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$, an element $a \in R$ such that $V(a) = \{\mathfrak{m}_i\}_{i=1}^r$, let \widehat{R} (resp., $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$) denote the a -adic completion of R (resp., of \mathcal{O}_i). Then $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ is an a -adic complete valuation ring of rank 1, and we have $\widehat{R} \simeq \prod_{i=1}^r \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$, compatibly with the topologies. Denote $\widehat{K}_i := \text{Frac } \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i[\frac{1}{a}]$. Topologize $R[\frac{1}{a}]$ by declaring $\{\text{im}(a^n R \rightarrow R[\frac{1}{a}])\}_{n \geq 1}$ to be a fundamental system of open neighbourhood of 0; the associated completion is

$$R[\frac{1}{a}] \rightarrow \widehat{R}[\frac{1}{a}] \simeq \prod_{i=1}^r \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i[\frac{1}{a}] = \prod_{i=1}^r \widehat{K}_i,$$

where each \widehat{K}_i is a complete valued field, with pseudo-uniformizer (the image of) a . In particular, for an R -scheme X , we have a map

$$\Phi_X: X(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r X(\widehat{K}_i).$$

If X is locally of finite type over R , we endow the right hand side with the product topology where each $X(\widehat{K}_i)$, by, for example, Conrad, has a natural topology induced from that of \widehat{K}_i , which we will call the a -adic topology. If moreover X is affine, we can canonically topologize $X(R[\frac{1}{a}])$ by choosing a closed embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^N$ and endowing $X(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \hookrightarrow R[\frac{1}{a}]^N$ with the subspace topology (this is independent of the choices of the embeddings), then Φ_X is a continuous map.

A.1. Lifting maximal tori of reductive group schemes over semilocal rings

Without any difficulty, one can generalize the lifting of maximal tori [Guo20] to semilocal case.

Lemma A.1.1. *For a semilocal scheme S and an S -smooth finitely presented group scheme G whose S -fibers are connected and affine. Assume that*

- (i) *for each residue field $\kappa(s)$ of S at a closed point s , the fiber $G_{\kappa(s)}$ is a $\kappa(s)$ -reductive group; and*
- (ii) *$\#\kappa(s) \geq \dim(G_{\kappa(s)}/Z_{\kappa(s)})$ for the center $Z_{\kappa(s)} \subset G_{\kappa(s)}$,*

then the following natural map is surjective

$$\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(S) \twoheadrightarrow \prod_{s \in S \text{ closed}} \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\kappa(s)).$$

Lemma A.1.2. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, we use the notations in the setup §A.0.2. For a reductive R -group scheme G , the scheme $\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)$ of maximal tori of G , and the a -adic topology on $\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)$, the image of the following map is dense:*

$$\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i).$$

A.2. Harder's weak approximation

Lemma A.2.1. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, we use the setup §A.0.2. For a $R[\frac{1}{a}]$ -torus T , let L_i/\widehat{K}_i be minimal Galois field extensions splitting $T_{\widehat{K}_i}$ and consider the norm map*

$$N_i: T(L_i) \rightarrow T(\widehat{K}_i).$$

Then, the image U of $\prod_{i=1}^r N_i$ is open and is contained in $\overline{\text{im}(T(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r T(\widehat{K}_i))}$.

Proof. The proof proceeds as the following steps.

Step 1. The image U is open. For each i , there is a short exact sequence of tori

$$1 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_i \rightarrow \text{Res}_{L_i/\widehat{K}_i} T_{L_i} \rightarrow T_{\widehat{K}_i} \rightarrow 1$$

and the norm map $N_i: (\text{Res}_{L_i/\widehat{K}_i} T_{L_i})(\widehat{K}_i) \rightarrow (\text{Res}_{L_i/\widehat{K}_i} T_{L_i}/\mathcal{T}_i)(\widehat{K}_i)$, which by [Čes15, Proposition 4.3 (a) and §2.8 (2)] is a -adically open. As a product of open subsets, U is open in $\prod_{i=1}^r T(\widehat{K}_i)$.

Step 2. We prove that U is contained in the closure of $\text{im}(T(R[\frac{1}{a}]))$. Equivalently, we show that every $u \in U$ and every open neighbourhood $B_u \subset U$ satisfy that $B_u \cap \text{im}(T(R[\frac{1}{a}])) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\widetilde{R}/R[\frac{1}{a}]$ be a minimal Galois cover splitting T . Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(\widetilde{R}) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i=1}^r T(L_i) \\ N_{\widetilde{R}/R[\frac{1}{a}]} \downarrow & & \downarrow \prod_{i=1}^r N_i \\ T(R[\frac{1}{a}]) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i=1}^r T(\widehat{K}_i). \end{array}$$

Take a preimage $v \in (\prod_{i=1}^r N_i)^{-1}(u) \subset \prod_{i=1}^r T(L_i)$ and let $B_v \subset \prod_{i=1}^r T(L_i)$ be the preimage of B_u . Since $T_{\widetilde{R}}$ splits, the image of $T(\widetilde{R})$ in $\prod_{i=1}^r T(L_i)$ is dense, hence $T(\widetilde{R}) \times_{\prod_{i=1}^r T(L_i)} B_v \neq \emptyset$, namely, there is $r \in T(\widetilde{R})$ whose image is in B_v . Let $s := N_{\widetilde{R}/R[\frac{1}{a}]}(r) \in T(R[\frac{1}{a}])$, then the image of s under the map $T(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r T(\widehat{K}_i)$ is contained in B_u , so the assertion follows. \square

Lemma A.2.2. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, we use the setup §A.0.2. For a reductive R -group scheme G and for each i a fixed maximal torus $T_i \subset G_{\widehat{K}_i}$ with minimal Galois field extension L_i/\widehat{K}_i splitting T_i , consider the following norm map*

$$N_i: T_i(L_i) \rightarrow T_i(\widehat{K}_i).$$

Then the image U of the map $\prod_{i=1}^r N_i$ is an open subgroup of $\prod_{i=1}^r T_i(\widehat{K}_i)$ and is contained in $\overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))}$, the closure of $\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i))$.

Proof. By the same argument in Lemma A.2.1, the image U is open in $\prod_{i=1}^r T_i(\widehat{K}_i)$. It remains to show that $U \subset \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))}$, which proceeds as the following steps.

Step 1. The map $\phi_i: G(\widehat{K}_i) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)$ defined by $g \mapsto gTg^{-1}$ is a -adically open for each i . Since the image of $\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)$ is dense, for every open neighbourhood $W \subset \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$ of id , we have $((\prod_{i=1}^r \phi_i)(W)) \cap \text{im}(\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, there exist a torus $T' \in \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R[\frac{1}{a}])$ and a $(g_i)_{i=1}^r \in W$ such that $g_i T_i g_i^{-1} = T'_{\widehat{K}_i}$ for all i .

Step 2. For any $u \in U$, consider the map $\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$ defined by $g \mapsto g^{-1}ug$. Then, we apply the Step 1 to the preimage W of U under this map: there is a $\gamma = (\gamma_i)_{i=1}^r \in W$ and a torus $T' \in \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R[\frac{1}{a}])$ such that $\gamma_i T_i \gamma_i^{-1} = T'_{\widehat{K}_i}$ for each i . Then, $u \in \gamma U \gamma^{-1} = \gamma(\prod_{i=1}^r N_i(T_i(L_i)))\gamma^{-1}$, which by transport of structure, is $\prod_{i=1}^r N_i(T'_{\widehat{K}_i}(L_i))$. By Lemma A.2.1, the last term is contained in the closure of $\text{im}(T'(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r T'(\widehat{K}_i))$, so is contained in $\overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))}$. \square

Proposition A.2.3. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, we use the setup §A.0.2. For a reductive R -group scheme G , the closure $\overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]])}$ of the image of $G(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$,*

$$\overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]])} \quad \text{contains an open normal subgroup } N \text{ of } \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i).$$

Proof. The proof proceeds in the following steps.

- (i) For each i , we fix a maximal torus $T_i \subset G_{\widehat{K}_i}$. Then Lemma A.2.2 provides the open subgroup $U \subset \prod_{i=1}^r T_i(\widehat{K}_i)$. Since each component of the norm map defining U is the image of the \widehat{K}_i -points of $\text{Res}_{L_i/\widehat{K}_i}(T_i, L_i) \rightarrow T_i$, and $\text{Res}_{L_i/\widehat{K}_i}(T_i, L_i)$ is a Zariski dense open subset of an affine space over \widehat{K}_i , we have $U \cap \prod_{i=1}^r T_i^{\text{reg}}(\widehat{K}_i) \neq \emptyset$.
- (ii) For any $\tau = (\tau_i)_{i=1}^r \in U \cap \prod_{i=1}^r T_i^{\text{reg}}(\widehat{K}_i)$, by [SGA 3II, Exposé XIII, Corollaire 2.2], for each i ,

$$f_i: G_{\widehat{K}_i} \times T_i \rightarrow G_{\widehat{K}_i}, \quad (g, t) \mapsto gtg^{-1} \quad \text{is smooth at } (\text{id}, \tau_i).$$

Hence, there is a Zariski open neighbourhood $B \subset \prod_{i=1}^r (G_{\widehat{K}_i} \times T_i)$ of (id, τ) such that

$$(\prod_{i=1}^r f_i)|_B: B \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G_{\widehat{K}_i} \quad \text{is smooth.}$$

By [GGMB14, Proposition 3.1.4], the map $B(\prod_{i=1}^r \widehat{K}_i) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$ is open. In particular, since $(\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)) \times U$ is an open neighbourhood of (id, τ) , $E := (\prod_{i=1}^r f_i)((\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)) \times U)$ contains a non-empty open subset of $\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$. Define N as the subgroup of $\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$ generated by E ; it is open. By construction, E is stable under conjugations by $\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$, thus N is normal.

- (iii) We prove that N is in the closure of $\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i))$. As E is the union of conjugates of U , which are contained in $\overline{G(R[\frac{1}{a}])}$ by Lemma A.2.2, so E is in this closure, and so is N . \square

Corollary A.2.4. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, we use the setup §A.0.2. For a reductive group scheme G over R , a maximal torus $T_i \subset G_{\widehat{O}_i}$ for each i , and any open neighbourhood W of $\text{id} \in \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$ such that $W \subset \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]])} \cap \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{O}_i)$, there exist $g = (g_i)_i \in W$ and a maximal torus $T \in \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R)$ such that for every i , we have*

$$T_{\widehat{K}_i} = g_i T_{i, \widehat{K}_i} g_i^{-1}.$$

Proof. By Proposition A.2.3, $\overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]])} \cap \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{O}_i)$ is an a -adically open neighbourhood of $\text{id} \in \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$, so it makes sense to take its subset W such that W is a neighbourhood of id . Now consider the a -adically open map $\phi: \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)$ defined by $g_i \mapsto g_i T_{i, \widehat{K}_i} g_i^{-1}$. Then $\phi(W)$ is an a -adically open neighbourhood of $(T_i)_i \in \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)$. Since $\prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{O}_i) \subset \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)$ is also an a -adically open neighbourhood of $(T_i)_i$, we have an open intersection $\phi(W) \cap \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{O}_i) \neq \emptyset$. Then the density of the image of $\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)$ provided by Lemma A.1.2 yields

$$T \in \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R) \xrightarrow{\sim} \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \times_{\prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{K}_i)} \prod_{i=1}^r \underline{\text{Tor}}(G)(\widehat{O}_i),$$

thanks to the identification $R \xrightarrow{\sim} R[\frac{1}{a}] \times_{\prod_{i=1}^r \widehat{K}_i} \prod_{i=1}^r \widehat{O}_i$ and the affineness of $\underline{\text{Tor}}(G)$ over R . Then T is a maximal R -torus of G satisfying the conditions. \square

Lemma A.2.5. *With the notations in Proposition A.2.3, we have*

$$\overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]])} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{O}_i) = \text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{O}_i).$$

A.3. Product formula over semilocal Prüfer domains

The goal of this section is to prove the following product formula for reductive group schemes:

Proposition A.3.1. *For a semilocal Prüfer domain R of finite Krull dimension, we use the notations in the setup §A.0.2. For a reductive R -group scheme G , we have*

$$\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) = \text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}])) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i).$$

Before proceeding, we recall the following consequence of the Beauville-Laszlo type glueing of torsors:

Lemma A.3.2. *The G -torsors on R that trivialize both on $R[\frac{1}{a}]$ and on $\widehat{R} \simeq \prod_{i=1}^r \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ are in bijection with the following double cosets*

$$\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}])) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \backslash \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) / \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i).$$

Corollary A.3.3.

- (i) *Proposition A.3.1 holds when G is an R -group scheme of multiplicative type.*
- (ii) *Proposition A.3.1 implies Theorem A.0.1.*

Proof. By Lemma A.3.2, (i) follows from Proposition 3.6 (i), since then no nontrivial G -torsor on R trivializes on $R[\frac{1}{a}]$. For (ii), by the approximation Lemma 2.2, we may assume that the ring R in Theorem A.0.1 has finite Krull dimension. The case $\dim R = 0$ is trivial, so we assume $\dim R > 0$ for what follows. Since $R[\frac{1}{a}]$ is also a semilocal Prüfer domain and $\dim R[\frac{1}{a}] < \dim R$, by induction on $\dim R$, we may assume that every generically trivial G -torsor on R trivializes on $R[\frac{1}{a}]$ and, by [Guo20], also on each $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ (since $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ is a rank-one valuation ring). Therefore, once the product formula in Proposition A.3.1 holds for G , Lemma A.3.2 would imply that every generically trivial G -torsor on R is itself trivial. \square

Proof of Proposition A.3.1. We will proceed verbatim as in [Guo20, §4]. We choose a minimal parabolic $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ -subgroup P_i for each $G_i := G \times_R \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i$. Denote $U_i := \text{rad}^u(P_i)$.

- (i) For the maximal split torus $T_i \subset P_i$, we have $\prod_{i=1}^r T_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}])) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i)$. By [SGA 3III new, Exposé XXVI, Corollaire 6.11], there is a maximal torus \widetilde{T}_i of G_i containing T_i . In particular, $\widetilde{T}_{i, \widehat{K}_i}$ is a maximal torus of $G_{\widehat{K}_i}$. Then we apply Corollary A.2.4 to all \widetilde{T}_i : there are a $g = (g_i)_i \in \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))} \cap \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i)$ and a maximal torus $T_0 \subset G$ such that $T_{0, \widehat{K}_i} = g_i \widetilde{T}_{i, \widehat{K}_i} g_i^{-1}$ for every i , which combined with Corollary A.3.3 (i) for T_0 yields

$$\prod_{i=1}^r \widetilde{T}_i(\widehat{K}_i) = g^{-1} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r T_0(\widehat{K}_i) \right) g \subset g^{-1} \left(\overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i) \right) g.$$

Since $g \in \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))} \cap \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i)$, the inclusion displayed above implies that $\prod_{i=1}^r \widetilde{T}_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i)$. Therefore, by Lemma A.2.5, we obtain the following inclusion

$$\prod_{i=1}^r T_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \prod_{i=1}^r \widetilde{T}_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i).$$

- (ii) We prove $\prod_{i=1}^r U_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))}$. Consider the T_i -action on G_i defined by

$$T_i \times G_i \rightarrow G_i, \quad (t, g) \mapsto tgt^{-1}.$$

Recall the open normal subgroup $N \subset \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)$ constructed in Proposition A.2.3, then each $N \cap U_i(\widehat{K}_i)$ is open in $U_i(\widehat{K}_i)$. The dynamic argument in [Guo20] shows that $U_i(\widehat{K}_i) = N \cap U_i(\widehat{K}_i)$, hence $U_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset N$ for each i . Therefore, we have $\prod_{i=1}^r U_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))}$.

- (iii) We prove $\prod_{i=1}^r P_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}])) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i)$. The quotient $H_i := L_i/T_i$ is anisotropic, therefore we have $H_i(\widehat{K}_i) = H_i(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i)$ for every i . Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T_i(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i) & \longrightarrow & L_i(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i) & \longrightarrow & H_i(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i) \longrightarrow H^1(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i, T_i) = 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_i(\widehat{K}_i) & \longrightarrow & L_i(\widehat{K}_i) & \longrightarrow & H_i(\widehat{K}_i) \longrightarrow H^1(\widehat{K}_i, T_i) = 0 \end{array}$$

with exact rows. By diagram chase, we have $L_i(\widehat{K}_i) = T_i(\widehat{K}_i) \cdot L_i(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i)$ for every i . Subsequently, the combination of (i) and (ii) yields the inclusion

$$\prod_{i=1}^r P_i(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}])) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i).$$

- (iv) Recall [SGA 3_{III new}, Exposé XXVI, Théorème 4.3.2 and Corollaire 5.2] that for each P_i , there is a parabolic subgroup Q_i of G_i such that $P_i \cap Q_i = L_i$ fitting into the following surjection

$$\text{rad}^u(P_i)(\widehat{K}_i) \cdot \text{rad}^u(Q_i)(\widehat{K}_i) \twoheadrightarrow G(\widehat{K}_i)/P_i(\widehat{K}_i).$$

This surjection, combined with the result of (ii) gives an inclusion

$$\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \subset \overline{\text{im}(G(R[\frac{1}{a}]))} \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r P_i(\widehat{K}_i).$$

Combined with (iii) and Lemma A.2.5, this yields the following desired product formula

$$\prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i) = \text{im}\left(G(R[\frac{1}{a}])) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{K}_i)\right) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r G(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i). \quad \square$$

REFERENCES

- [BouAC] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Commutative algebra. Chapters 1–7*, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. Translated from the French, Reprint of the 1989 English translation.
- [ÉGA IV₂] Alexander Grothendieck and Jean Dieudonné, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. II*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **24** (1965), 231 (French). MR0199181 (33 #7330)
- [ÉGA IV₃] A. Grothendieck and J. Dieudonné, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **28** (1966), 255. MR0217086 (36 #178)
- [ÉGA IV₄] Alexander Grothendieck and Jean Alexandre Eugène Dieudonné, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas IV*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **32** (1967), 361 (French). MR0238860 (39 #220)
- [SGA 3_{II}] *Schémas en groupes. II: Groupes de type multiplicatif, et structure des schémas en groupes généraux*, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1962/64 (SGA 3). Dirigé par M. Demazure et A. Grothendieck. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 152, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1970 (French). MR0274459 (43 #223b)
- [SGA 3_{III new}] Philippe Gille and Patrick Polo (eds.), *Schémas en groupes (SGA 3). Tome III. Structure des schémas en groupes réductifs*, Documents Mathématiques (Paris) [Mathematical Documents (Paris)], 8, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2011 (French). Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1962–64. [Algebraic Geometry Seminar of Bois Marie 1962–64]; A seminar directed by M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck with the collaboration of M. Artin, J.-E. Bertin, P. Gabriel, M. Raynaud and J.-P. Serre; Revised and annotated edition of the 1970 French original. MR2867622
- [SGA 4_{II}] *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas. Tome 2*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 270, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972 (French). Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois-Marie 1963–1964 (SGA 4); Dirigé par M. Artin, A. Grothendieck et J. L. Verdier. Avec la collaboration de N. Bourbaki, P. Deligne et B. Saint-Donat. MR0354653 (50 #7131)
- [Alp14] Jarod Alper, *Adequate moduli spaces and geometrically reductive group schemes*, Algebr. Geom. **1** (2014), no. 4, 489–531, DOI 10.14231/AG-2014-022.
- [BFF17] Eva Bayer-Fluckiger and Uriya A. First, *Rationally isomorphic Hermitian forms and torsors of some non-reductive groups*, Adv. Math. **312** (2017), 150–184, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2017.03.012 (English).
- [BFFH20] Eva Bayer-Fluckiger, Uriya A. First, and Mathieu Huruguen, *Orders that are étale-locally isomorphic*, St. Petersburg. Math. J. **31** (2020), no. 4, 573–584, DOI 10.1090/spmj/1615 (English).
- [BFFP22] Eva Bayer-Fluckiger, Uriya A. First, and R. Parimala, *On the Grothendieck–Serre conjecture for classical groups*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society, posted on 2022, DOI 10.1112/jlms.12651. online, available at <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms.12651>.
- [BVG14] Sofie Beke and Jan Van Geel, *An isomorphism problem for Azumaya algebras with involution over semilocal Bézout domains*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **17** (2014), no. 6, 1635–1655, DOI 10.1007/s10468-013-9463-6.
- [BR83] S. M. Bhatwadekar and R. A. Rao, *On a question of Quillen*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **279** (1983), 801–810, DOI 10.2307/1999568 (English).
- [BB70] Andrzej Białynicki-Birula, *Rationally trivial homogeneous principal fibrations of schemes*, Invent. Math. **11** (1970), 259–262, DOI 10.1007/BF01404652 (English).
- [BT_{III}] F. Bruhat and J. Tits, *Groupes algébriques sur un corps local. Chapitre III. Compléments et applications à la cohomologie galoisienne*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **34** (1987), no. 3, 671–698.
- [Čes15] Kęstutis Česnavičius, *Topology on cohomology of local fields*, Forum Math. Sigma **3** (2015), e16, 55, DOI 10.1017/fms.2015.18. MR3482265
- [Čes22a] ———, *Grothendieck–Serre in the quasi-split unramified case*, Forum Math. Pi **10** (2022), no. e9, 30, DOI 10.1017/fmp.2022.5.
- [Čes22b] ———, *Problems about torsors over regular rings*, Acta Math. Vietnam. **47** (2022), no. 1, 39–107, DOI 10.1007/s40306-022-00477-y (English).
- [Čes22c] ———, *Torsors on the complement of a smooth divisor*, Available at <https://www.imo.universite-paris-saclay.fr/~cesnavicius/torsors-complement.pdf> (2022).

- [ČS21] Kęstutis Česnavičius and Peter Scholze, *Purity for flat cohomology*, 2021. arXiv:1912.10932; available at <https://www.imo.universite-paris-saclay.fr/~cesnavicius/flat-purity.pdf>.
- [Che10] V. Chernousov, *Variations on a theme of groups splitting by a quadratic extension and Grothendieck-Serre conjecture for group schemes F_4 with trivial g_3 invariant*, Doc. Math. **Extra Vol.** (2010), 147–169 (English).
- [CTS79] Jean-Louis Colliot-Thélène and Jean-Jacques Sansuc, *Fibrés quadratiques et composantes connexes réelles*, Math. Ann. **244** (1979), no. 2, 105–134, DOI 10.1007/BF01420486.
- [CTS87] ———, *Principal homogeneous spaces under flasque tori: applications*, J. Algebra **106** (1987), no. 1, 148–205, DOI 10.1016/0021-8693(87)90026-3. MR878473
- [CTO92] Jean-Louis Colliot-Thélène and Manuel Ojanguren, *Locally trivial principal homogeneous spaces*, Publ. Math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci. **75** (1992), 97–122, DOI 10.1007/BF02699492 (French).
- [FP15] Roman Fedorov and Ivan Panin, *A proof of the Grothendieck-Serre conjecture on principal bundles over regular local rings containing infinite fields*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **122** (2015), 169–193, DOI 10.1007/s10240-015-0075-z. MR3415067
- [Fed21] Roman Fedorov, *On the purity conjecture of Nisnevich for torsors under reductive group schemes*, Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2109.10332.pdf> (2021).
- [Fed22a] ———, *On the Grothendieck-Serre conjecture about principal bundles and its generalizations*, Algebra Number Theory **16** (2022), no. 2, 447–465, DOI 10.2140/ant.2022.16.447 (English).
- [Fed22b] ———, *On the Grothendieck-Serre conjecture on principal bundles in mixed characteristic*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **375** (2022), no. 1, 559–586, DOI 10.1090/tran/8490 (English).
- [Fir22] U. A. First, *An 8-periodic exact sequence of Witt groups of Azumaya algebras with involution*, Manuscripta Math. (2022). to appear. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03232v2>.
- [Gab81] Ofer Gabber, *Some theorems on Azumaya algebras*, 1981 (English).
- [GR18] Ofer Gabber and Lorenzo Ramero, *Foundations for almost ring theory*, Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0409584> (2018).
- [GGMB14] Ofer Gabber, Philippe Gille, and Laurent Moret-Bailly, *Fibrés principaux sur les corps valués henséliens*, Algebr. Geom. **1** (2014), no. 5, 573–612 (French, with English and French summaries). MR3296806
- [Gir71] Jean Giraud, *Cohomologie non abélienne* (1971), ix+467. Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 179.
- [Gro58] Alexander Grothendieck, *Torsion homologique et sections rationnelles*, Anneaux de Chow et applications, Séminaire Chevalley, 2e année, Secrétariat mathématique, Paris (1958).
- [Gro68a] ———, *Le groupe de Brauer. II. Théorie cohomologique*, Dix exposés sur la cohomologie des schémas, 1968, pp. 67–87.
- [Gro68b] ———, *Le groupe de Brauer. III. Exemples et compléments*, Dix Exposés sur la Cohomologie des Schémas, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968, pp. 88–188 (French). MR0244271 (39 #5586c)
- [GR71] Laurent Gruson and Michel Raynaud, *Critères de platitude et de projectivité. Techniques de "platification" d'un module. (Criterial of flatness and projectivity. Technics of "flatification of a module.)*, Invent. Math. **13** (1971), 1–89, DOI 10.1007/BF01390094 (French).
- [Guo22] N. Guo, *The Grothendieck-Serre conjecture over semilocal Dedekind rings*, Transform. Groups **27** (2022), no. 3, 897–917, DOI 10.1007/s00031-020-09619-8 (English).
- [Guo20] Ning Guo, *The Grothendieck-Serre conjecture over valuation rings*, Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.02767> (2020).
- [Har67] Günter Harder, *Halbeinfache Gruppenschemata über Dedekindringen*, Invent. Math. **4** (1967), 165–191, DOI 10.1007/BF01425754 (German).
- [LS80] Yves Lequain and Aron Simis, *Projective modules over $R[X_1, \dots, X_n]$, R a Prüfer domain*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **18** (1980), 165–171, DOI 10.1016/0022-4049(80)90127-9 (English).
- [Lin81] Hartmut Lindel, *On the Bass-Quillen conjecture concerning projective modules over polynomial rings*, Invent. Math. **65** (1981), 319–323, DOI 10.1007/BF01389017 (English).
- [MB22] Laurent Moret-Bailly, *A construction of weakly unramified extensions of a valuation ring*, Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Padova **147** (2022), 139–151, DOI 10.4171/RSMUP/94 (French).
- [Nag66] Masayoshi Nagata, *Finitely generated rings over a valuation ring*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **5** (1966), 163–169, DOI 10.1215/kjm/1250524533.
- [Nis82] Yevsey A. Nisnevich, *Étale cohomology and arithmetic of semisimple groups*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1982. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Harvard University.
- [Nis84] ———, *Espaces homogènes principaux rationnellement triviaux et arithmétique des schémas en groupes réductifs sur les anneaux de Dedekind*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **299** (1984), no. 1, 5–8 (French, with English summary). MR756297
- [Nis89] ———, *Rationally trivial principal homogeneous spaces, purity and arithmetic of reductive group schemes over extensions of two-dimensional regular local rings*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **309** (1989), no. 10, 651–655 (English, with French summary). MR1054270
- [Oja80] Manuel Ojanguren, *Quadratic forms over regular rings*, J. Indian Math. Soc., New Ser. **44** (1980), 109–116 (English).
- [Oja82] ———, *Unités représentées par des formes quadratiques ou par des normes réduites*, 1982 (French).
- [Oja01] Manuel and Panin Ojanguren Ivan, *Rationally trivial Hermitian spaces are locally trivial*, Math. Z. **237** (2001), no. 1, 181–198, DOI 10.1007/PL00004859 (English).
- [Oja04] M. and Panin Ojanguren I. and Zainoulline, *On the norm principle for quadratic forms*, J. Ramanujan Math. Soc. **19** (2004), no. 4, 289–300 (English).
- [Pan05] Ivan Panin, *Purity for multipliers.*, Algebra and number theory. Proceedings of the silver jubilee conference, Hyderabad, India, December 11–16, 2003, 2005, pp. 66–89 (English).

- [Pan18] ———, *On Grothendieck-Serre conjecture concerning principal bundles*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. II. Invited lectures, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018, pp. 201–221. MR3966763
- [Pan21] I. Panin, *Notes on a Grothendieck-Serre conjecture in mixed characteristic case*, J. Math. Sci., New York **252** (2021), no. 6, 841–848, DOI 10.1007/s10958-021-05204-w (English).
- [Pan20a] Ivan A. Panin, *Proof of the Grothendieck-Serre conjecture on principal bundles over regular local rings containing a field*, Izv. Math. **84** (2020), no. 4, 780–795, DOI 10.1070/IM8982 (English).
- [Pan20b] ———, *Two purity theorems and the Grothendieck-Serre conjecture concerning principal \mathbf{G} -bundles*, Sb. Math. **211** (2020), no. 12, 1777–1794, DOI 10.1070/SM9393 (English).
- [PS97] I. A. Panin and A. A. Suslin, *On a Grothendieck conjecture for Azumaya algebras*, St. Petersburg. Math. J. **9** (1997), no. 4, 1 (English).
- [PSV15] I. Panin, A. Stavrova, and N. Vavilov, *On Grothendieck-Serre’s conjecture concerning principal G -bundles over reductive group schemes: I*, Compos. Math. **151** (2015), no. 3, 535–567, DOI 10.1112/S0010437X14007635 (English).
- [PS16] Ivan Panin and A. K. Stavrova, *On the Grothendieck-Serre conjecture concerning principal G -bundles over semi-local Dedekind domains*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **443** (2016), no. Voprosy Teorii Predstavlenii Algebr i Grupp. 29, 133–146, DOI 10.1007/s10958-017-3316-5. Reprinted in J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.) **222**, (2017), no. 4, 453–462.
- [Poo05] Bjorn Poonen, *Bertini theorems over finite fields*, Ann. Math. (2) **160** (2005), no. 3, 1099–1127, DOI 10.4007/annals.2004.160.1099 (English).
- [Qui76] Daniel Quillen, *Projective modules over polynomial rings*, Invent. Math. **36** (1976), 167–171, DOI 10.1007/BF01390008 (English).
- [Rag94] M. S. Raghunathan, *Principal bundles admitting a rational section*, Invent. Math. **116** (1994), no. 1-3, 409–423, DOI 10.1007/BF01231567 (English).
- [Roi79] Moshe Roitman, *On projective modules over polynomial rings*, J. Algebra **58** (1979), 51–63, DOI 10.1016/0021-8693(79)90188-1 (English).
- [Pop02] Dorin Popescu, *On a question of Quillen*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roum., Nouv. Sér. **45** (2002), no. 3-4, 209–212 (English).
- [Pop89] ———, *Polynomial rings and their projective modules*, Nagoya Math. J. **113** (1989), 121–128, DOI 10.1017/S0027763000001288 (English).
- [Ser58] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Espaces fibrés algébriques*, Séminaire Claude Chevalley **3** (1958), 1–37.
- [SV71] A. Simis and W. Vasconcelos, *Projective modules over $R[X]$, R a valuation ring, are free*, Notices. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (1971) (English).
- [SP] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, 2018. [SP](#).
- [Zai00] K. Zainullin, *On Grothendieck’s conjecture about principal homogeneous spaces for some classical algebraic groups*, St. Petersburg. Math. J. **12** (2000), no. 1, 1 (English).
- [Zai05] K. Zainoulline, *On Knebusch’s norm principle for quadratic forms over semi-local rings*, Math. Z. **251** (2005), no. 2, 415–425, DOI 10.1007/s00209-005-0809-6 (English).

ST. PETERSBURG BRANCH OF V. A. STEKLOV MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, FONTANKA 27, 191023 ST. PETERSBURG, RUSSIA
Email address: guo.ning@eimi.ru

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SHENZHEN, CHINA
Email address: liufei54@pku.edu.cn