

Title

D. Zack Garza

Table of Contents

Contents

Table of Contents	2
1 Lecture 11	3
1.1 Pushforwards (Continued)	3

1 | Lecture 11

1.1 Pushforwards (Continued)

Last time: we saw the Leray spectral sequence, but no examples yet, so that's what we'll do now. We had $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ to which we associated the spectral sequence $R^i f_* R^j f_* (\cdot) \Rightarrow R^{i+j} (g \circ f)_* (\cdot)$. To deduce existence we used that pushforwards preserve injectives, and we looked at some E_2 differentials.

Example 1.1.1(?): Let $X \xrightarrow{\pi} Z := \text{Spec } k$, where $k \neq \bar{k}$ necessarily. The spectral sequence for the functors π_*, Γ yields the Leray spectral sequence $H^i(k, R^j \pi_* \mathcal{F}) \Rightarrow H^{i+j}(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathcal{F})$. The LHS is the étale cohomology of $\text{Spec } k$, i.e. Galois cohomology. The Galois module corresponding to $R^j \pi_* \mathcal{F}$ is $H^j(X_{k^s}, \mathcal{F})$ by taking the \bar{k} points of this functor. So the Leray spectral sequence yields

$$H^i(k, H^j(X_{k^s, \text{ét}}, \mathcal{F})) \Rightarrow H^{i+j}(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathcal{F}).$$

Consider k a finite field and X/k a smooth projective variety. Then the Galois cohomology is given by

$$H^i(k, V) = \begin{cases} V^G & i = 0 \\ V_G & i = 1 \\ 0 & i > 1 \end{cases} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{the invariants} \\ \text{the coinvariants} \end{array}$$

This follows from computing the cohomology of $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$. Supposing we knew that the cohomological dimension of a smooth projective variety was $2n$ over \bar{k} (e.g. taking $\mathcal{F} := \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$ above), then the cohomological dimension of X would be $2n+1$. This follows from E_2 vanishing for $i > 1$ in this case.

Remark 1.1.2: A general fact about the Leray spectral sequence for smooth proper morphisms: let $X \xrightarrow{\pi} Y$ such a morphism, then there is a spectral sequence

$$H^i(Y, R^j \pi_* \mathbb{Q}) \Rightarrow H^{i+j}(X, \mathbb{Q}).$$

A fact due to Deligne is that this degenerates at E_2 , which is proved with ℓ -adic cohomology (going through Weil II) using the theory of weights. Note that this is false for smooth proper morphisms between manifolds! Instead, for varieties, they behave more like products instead of “twisted” things.

We'll now be explicit about what these pushforwards are, so we'll give another description of them:

Proposition 1.1.3(?).

Let $X \xrightarrow{\pi} Y$, then $R^i \pi_* \mathcal{F}$ is the sheaf associated to the presheaf $U \rightarrow H^i(\pi^{-1}(U)_{\text{ét}}, \mathcal{F})$.

Proof (?).

Choose an injective resolution $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^\cdot$, then $\mathcal{H}^i(\pi_* \mathcal{I}^\cdot) := R^i \pi_* \mathcal{F}$. Let's compute this pushforward in another way: we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Presh}(X_{\text{ét}}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_*} & \text{Presh}(Y_{\text{ét}}) \\ \uparrow f=\text{forget} & & \downarrow a=\text{sheafification} \\ \text{Sh}(X_{\text{ét}}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_*} & \text{Sh}(Y_{\text{ét}}) \end{array}$$

Here the induced map on presheaves is exact although the forgetful functor may not be. This is because a sequence of presheaves is exact iff it's exact on every open, but π_* just pulls back opens. This diagram commutes since what you get in the top-right corner is already a sheaf, and sheafification is the identity on sheaves. We can thus factor π_* to obtain

$$R^i \pi_* \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}^i \circ \pi_* \mathcal{I}^\cdot = \mathcal{H}^i(a \circ \pi \circ f(\mathcal{I}^\cdot)) = a \circ \pi_* (\mathcal{H}^i(f(\mathcal{I}^\cdot))).$$

where we've used the fact that π_* , s are exact. Why isn't the inner term zero, since \mathcal{I}^\cdot is an exact complex of sheaves? Epimorphisms are different in the categories of sheaves and presheaves, so it may not be exact when viewed as a complex of presheaves. These terms are explicitly the functors $U \rightarrow H^i(U, \mathcal{F})$, since $\mathcal{I}^\cdot|_U$ is an injective resolution of \mathcal{F} . We can now evaluate this on an open of Y , so we get

$$a\left((U \xrightarrow{\text{ét}} Y) \rightarrow H^i(\pi^{-1}(U), \mathcal{F})\right),$$

which is sheafifying the functor we want. ■

Example 1.1.4(?): Suppose X is an integral scheme and $\eta \xhookrightarrow{\iota} X$ is its generic point. Suppose $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Sh}(\eta_{\text{ét}})$. How to we understand $R^i \iota_* \mathcal{F}$? We can compute its stalks: suppose $\bar{x} \rightarrow X$ is a geometric point, then


$$\begin{aligned} (R^i \iota_* \mathcal{F})_{\bar{x}} &= \varinjlim_{(U, \bar{u})} (R^i \iota_* \mathcal{F})(U) \\ &= H^i(U_\eta, \mathcal{F}|_{U_\eta}). \end{aligned}$$

where we take limits over $U \xrightarrow{\text{ét}} X$ and $\bar{u} \rightarrow U$ is a geometric point above \bar{x} .

Exercise 1.1.5(Important, must-do): Let $\mathcal{O}_{X, \bar{x}}^1$ be the stalk of \mathcal{O}_X at \bar{x} and $K_{\bar{x}}^2$ be its fraction field. Then

$$(R^i \iota_* \mathcal{F})_{\bar{x}} = H^i(K_{\bar{x}}, \mathcal{F}|_{K_{\bar{x}}}),$$

where the RHS is either the Galois cohomology of k or the étale cohomology of $\text{Spec } k$.

Idea: these are the étale local rings, and this says you can compute the stalk of a cohomology sheaf in terms of these strictly Henselian local rings. 

¹The **strictly Henselian ring** of X at \bar{x} .

²The **strictly Henselian field** of X at \bar{x} .

Goal: we want to understand $H^{>1}(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$ where X/k is a curve over $k = k^s$ which is separably closed. We'll reduce this to questions in Galois cohomology.

Proposition 1.1.6(?).

Let X/k be a regular (integral) variety and $\eta \hookrightarrow X$ is the generic point.