

# Valuation fields

## 1 Absolute values and completion

**Definition 1.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a field. An *absolute value* on  $\mathbf{k}$  is a function  $\|\cdot\| : \mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying the following properties for all  $x, y \in \mathbf{k}$ :

- (a)  $\|x\| = 0$  if and only if  $x = 0$ ;
- (b)  $\|xy\| = \|x\| \cdot \|y\|$ ;
- (c)  $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$ .

A field  $\mathbf{k}$  equipped with an absolute value  $\|\cdot\|$  is called a *valuation field*.

**Remark 2.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a field. Recall that a *valuation* on  $\mathbf{k}$  is a function  $v : \mathbf{k}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

- $\forall x, y \in \mathbf{k}^\times, v(xy) = v(x) + v(y)$ ;
- $\forall x, y \in \mathbf{k}^\times, v(x + y) \geq \min\{v(x), v(y)\}$ .

We can extend  $v$  to the whole field  $\mathbf{k}$  by defining  $v(0) = +\infty$ . Fix a real number  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Then  $v$  induces an absolute value  $|\cdot|_v : \mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  defined by  $|x|_v = \varepsilon^{v(x)}$  for each  $x \in \mathbf{k}$ .

In some literature, the valuation  $v$  is called an *additive valuation* and the induced absolute value  $|\cdot|_v$  is called a *multiplicative valuation*. In this note, the term *valuation* always refers to the additive valuation.

**Example 3.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a field. The *trivial absolute value* on  $\mathbf{k}$  is defined as

$$\|x\| := \begin{cases} 0, & x = 0; \\ 1, & x \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

**Definition 4.** The *valuation group* of a valuation field  $(\mathbf{k}, \|\cdot\|)$  is defined as the subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  given by

$$|\mathbf{k}^\times| := \{\|x\| : x \in \mathbf{k}^\times\}.$$

Yang: To be revised.

**Definition 5.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a field. Two absolute values  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  on  $\mathbf{k}$  are said to be *equivalent* if there exists a real number  $c \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\|x\|_1 = \|x\|_2^c, \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{k}.$$

Note that equivalent absolute values induce the same topology on the field  $\mathbf{k}$ . Moreover, the following lemma shows that the converse is also true.

**Lemma 6.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a field and  $\|\cdot\|_1, \|\cdot\|_2$  be two absolute values on  $\mathbf{k}$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (a)  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  are equivalent;
- (b)  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  induce the same topology on  $\mathbf{k}$ ;
- (c) The unit disks  $D_1 = \{x \in \mathbf{k} : \|x\|_1 < 1\}$  and  $D_2 = \{x \in \mathbf{k} : \|x\|_2 < 1\}$  are the same.

*Proof.* The implications (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) is obvious. Now we prove (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). For any  $x \in D_1$ , we have  $x^n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  under the absolute value  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and thus under  $\|\cdot\|_2$ . Therefore,  $\|x\|_2^n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies that  $\|x\|_2 < 1$ , i.e.,  $x \in D_2$ . Similarly, we can prove that  $D_2 \subseteq D_1$ .

Finally, we prove (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a). If  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is trivial, then  $D_1 = \{0\}$  and thus  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is also trivial. In this case, they are equivalent. Suppose that both  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  are non-trivial. Pick any  $x, y \notin D_1 = D_2$ . Then there exist real numbers  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  such that  $\|x\|_1 = \|x\|_2^\alpha$  and  $\|y\|_1 = \|y\|_2^\beta$ . Suppose the contrary that  $\alpha \neq \beta$ . Consider the domain  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$  defined by

$$\begin{cases} n \log \|x\|_2 < m \log \|y\|_2; \\ n\alpha \log \|x\|_2 > m\beta \log \|y\|_2. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , the two lines defined by the equalities are not parallel. Thus  $\Omega$  is non-empty. Pick  $(n, m) \in \Omega$  and set  $z := x^n y^{-m}$ . Then we have  $\|z\|_2 < 1$  and  $\|z\|_1 > 1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Definition 7.** Let  $(\mathbf{k}, \|\cdot\|)$  be a valuation field. We say that  $\mathbf{k}$  is *complete* if the metric  $d(x, y) := \|x - y\|$  makes  $\mathbf{k}$  a complete metric space.

**Lemma 8.** Let  $(\mathbf{k}, \|\cdot\|)$  be a valuation field and  $(\widehat{\mathbf{k}}, \|\cdot\|)$  its completion as a metric space. Then the operations of addition and multiplication on  $\mathbf{k}$  can be extended to  $\widehat{\mathbf{k}}$  uniquely, making  $(\widehat{\mathbf{k}}, \|\cdot\|)$  a complete valuation field containing  $\mathbf{k}$  as a dense subfield.

*Proof.* Simple analysis.  $\square$

**Example 9.** Let  $|\cdot|_\infty$  be the usual absolute value on the field  $\mathbb{Q}$  of rational numbers. Then  $(\mathbb{Q}, |\cdot|_\infty)$  is a valuation field. Its completion is the field  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers equipped with the usual absolute value.

**Example 10.** Let  $p$  be a prime number. For any non-zero rational number  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ , we can write it as  $x = p^n \frac{a}{b}$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  are integers not divisible by  $p$ . The  $p$ -adic absolute value on  $\mathbb{Q}$  is defined as

$$|x|_p := \begin{cases} 0, & x = 0; \\ p^{-n}, & x = p^n \frac{a}{b} \text{ as above.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $(\mathbb{Q}, |\cdot|_p)$  is a valuation field. Its completion is the field

$$\mathbb{Q}_p = \left\{ \sum_{n=k}^{+\infty} a_n p^n : k \in \mathbb{Z}, a_n \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\} \right\}$$

of  $p$ -adic numbers equipped with the  $p$ -adic absolute value.

Unlike the real number field  $\mathbb{R}$ , even a valuation field is complete, we can not expect the theorem of nested intervals to hold.

**Definition 11.** A valuation field  $(\mathbf{k}, \|\cdot\|)$  is called *spherically complete* if every decreasing sequence of closed balls in  $\mathbf{k}$  has a non-empty intersection.

**Example 12.** The field  $\mathbb{C}_p$  of  $p$ -adic complex numbers is not spherically complete, see Yang: to be added.

## 2 Non-archimedean fields

**Definition 13.** Let  $(\mathbf{k}, \|\cdot\|)$  be a valuation field. We say that  $\mathbf{k}$  is *non-archimedean* if its absolute value  $\|\cdot\|$  satisfies the *strong triangle inequality*:

$$\|x + y\| \leq \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbf{k}.$$

Otherwise, we say that  $\mathbf{k}$  is *archimedean*.

Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a non-archimedean field. Then easily see that  $\{x \in \mathbf{k} : \|x\| \leq 1\}$  is a subring of  $\mathbf{k}$ . Moreover, it is a local ring whose maximal ideal is  $\{x \in \mathbf{k} : \|x\| < 1\}$ .

**Definition 14.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a non-archimedean field. The *ring of integers* of  $\mathbf{k}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{k}^\circ := \{x \in \mathbf{k} : \|x\| \leq 1\}.$$

Its maximal ideal is

$$\mathbf{k}^{\circ\circ} := \{x \in \mathbf{k} : \|x\| < 1\}.$$

The *residue field* of  $\mathbf{k}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}} := \tilde{\mathbf{k}} := \mathbf{k}^\circ / \mathbf{k}^{\circ\circ}.$$

**Definition 15.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a non-archimedean field. The *residue absolute value* on the residue field  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}}$  is defined as

$$|x| := \inf_{y \in \varphi^{-1}(x)} \|y\|, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}},$$

where  $\varphi : \mathbf{k}^\circ \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}}$  is the canonical projection.

**Proposition 16.** Let  $\mathbf{k}$  be a non-archimedean field. Then the residue absolute value on the residue field  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}}$  is trivial.

*Proof.* For any  $x \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}}$ , if  $x = 0$ , then by definition  $|x| = 0$ . If  $x \neq 0$ , then  $\forall y \in \varphi^{-1}(x)$ , we have  $y \in \mathbf{k}^\circ \setminus \mathbf{k}^{\circ\circ}$ , i.e.,  $\|y\| = 1$ . Thus by definition  $|x| = 1$ .  $\square$