1 Small prefix

Recall:

- L numberfield $:\iff$ L is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}$
  In particular: $L/\mathbb{Q}$ is separable $\Rightarrow$ $L/\mathbb{Q}$ is primitive, i.e. $L = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha), \mathbb{Q}[X] \ni f_\alpha =$ minimal polynomial of α over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $[L : \mathbb{Q}] = \deg(f_\alpha)$.
- $\mathcal{O} := \{\alpha \in L \mid f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$ is called *ring of integers* (generalization of $\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$).
  $\mathcal{O}$ is an integral domain.
- Goal: study the ring $\mathcal{O}$
- Questions:
  1. What is $\mathcal{O}^\times$? What is its structure?
  2. What are the prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}$?
  3. Do we have a unique prime factorization, i.e. is $\mathcal{O}$ a UFD?

1.1 Motivation

Problem 1.1.1 (Fermat's conjecture, ~ 1640). Show that the equation $x^n + y^n = z^n$ has no nontrivial integer solutions, i.e. solutions (x, y, z) with $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ for $n \geq 3$.

History:

- 1770: Euler found solution for $n = 3$
- 1825: Dirichlet and Legendre using Germain
- Kummer showed it for many primes, he showed as well that his idea doesn't work for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>2}$
- Conjecture was proved by Wiles in 1997

Remark 1.1.2. i) If Fermat's is true for n, then also for nk for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

ii) It is sufficient to prove Fermat's conjecture for $n = 4$ and all odd primes.

Proof. i) Suppose (x, y, z) is a nontrivial solution of $x^{nk} + y^{nk} = z^{nk} \Rightarrow (x^k, y^k, z^k)$ is a nontrivial solution to $x^n + y^n = z^n$.

ii) Follows from i).

□

Proposition 1.1.3 ($n = 2$)**.** *Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}, \gcd(x, y, z) = 1$*

i) x, y, z *are pairwise coprime if* $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$

ii) $x^2 + y^2 = z^2 \Rightarrow$ *either* x *or* y *is even*

iii) $x^2 + y^2 = z^2 \iff \exists\ r, s \in \mathbb{N}_0, \gcd(r, s) = 1$ *s.t.* $x = \pm 2rs, y = \pm(r^2 - s^2)$, $z = \pm(r^2 + s^2)$.

Proof. i) clear ✓

ii) One of x, y, z has to be even, since *odd + odd ≠ odd*. Suppose z is even. Then look at equation mod 4, this gives a contradiction. By i) only one of x and y is even.

iii) „⇐“: calculation
„⇒“: Wlog. assume $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}_0$, x even, y, z odd:

$$\Rightarrow x = 2u, z + y = 2v, z - y = 2w, \gcd(w, v) = 1 (y, z \text{ are coprime}), x^2 + y^2 = z^2$$
$$\Rightarrow 4u^2 = x^2 = z^2 - y^2 = (z - y)(z + y) = 4wv \Rightarrow u^2 = wv$$
$$\overset{\gcd(v,w)=1}{\Longrightarrow} v = r^2, w = s^2 \Rightarrow z = v + w = r^2 + s^2, y = v - w = r^2 - s^2$$
$$\text{and } x = 2u = 2\sqrt{vw} = 2rs$$

□

Remark. $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$ are called *pythagorean triples.*

Proposition 1.1.4 ($n = 4$)**.** *The equation $x^4 + y^4 = z^2$ (and $x^4 + y^4 = z^4$) have no nontrivial integer solutions.*

Proof. Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x^4 + y^4 = z^2, xyz \neq 0$. Wlog $x, y, z > 0, x, y, z$ coprime, $x = 2\tilde{x}$ for some $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose z minimal with this conditions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Prop. 1.2 } &\Rightarrow \exists r, s \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } x^2 = 2rs, y^2 = r^2 - s^2, z = r^2 + s^2 \text{ and } \gcd(r, s) = 1 \\
&\Rightarrow y^2 + s^2 = r^2 \text{ with } y, s, r \text{ coprime.} \\
\text{Prop. 1.2 } &\Rightarrow \exists a, b \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } s = 2ab, y = a^2 - b^2, r = a^2 + b^2 \text{ and } \gcd(a, b) = 1. \\
\text{plug in } &\Rightarrow x^2 = 4ab(a^2 + b^2) \\
&\Rightarrow \tilde{x}^2 = ab(a^2 + b^2) \text{ and } a, b, a^2 + b^2 \text{ pairwise coprime}
\end{aligned}$$

As in proof of Prop. 1.2 (they are coprime but a square number)

$$\Rightarrow \exists\ c, d, e \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } a = c^2, b = d^2, a^2 + b^2 = e^2$$
$$\Rightarrow c^4 + d^4 = a^2 + b^2 = e^2 \text{ and } e \leq a^2 + b^2 = r < z$$

$\lightning$ since z was chosen to be minimal. □

From now on: $n = p$ odd prime.

Idea 1.1.5 (by Germain)*.* Distinguish 2 cases in Fermat's problem:

1. „First case“: x, y, z with p does not divide xyz.

2. „Second case“: exactly one of x, y, z is divided by p.

Some approach:

- Use primitive p-th root of unity $\zeta = \zeta_p$.
- Reminder: $X^p - 1 = (X-1)(X-\zeta)\dots(X-\zeta^{p-1})$
- Setting $\tilde{y} = -y$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x^p + y^p = x^p - \tilde{y}^p &= \tilde{y}^p((\frac{x}{\tilde{y}})^p - 1) \\ &= \tilde{y}^p(\frac{x}{\tilde{y}} - 1)(\frac{x}{\tilde{y}} - \zeta)\dots(\frac{x}{\tilde{y}} - \zeta^{p-1}) \\ &= (x-\tilde{y})(x-\tilde{y}\zeta)\dots(x-\tilde{y}\zeta^{p-1}) \\ &= (x+y)(x+y\zeta)\dots(x+y\zeta^{p-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1.1.6. *For $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $x^p + y^p = z^p \iff (x+y)(x+y\zeta)\dots(x+y\zeta^{p-1}) = z^p$*

Idea: Look at prime divisors in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
Problem: Would be good to have unique prime factorization. This will not be true in general.

1.2 The ring $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$

Suppose ζ is a primitive n-th root of unity

Reminder 1.2.1. i) $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ is algebraic extension of degree $[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) : \mathbb{Q}] = \varphi(n)$

ii) $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ is a Galois extension. In particular:
$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}) = \{\sigma_i \text{ with } \sigma_i(\zeta) = \zeta^i \mid i \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times\} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$

iii) Consider the norm map $\mathcal{N} : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \to \mathbb{Q}$, $\alpha \mapsto \det(\gamma \mapsto \alpha\gamma)$. We have for $\alpha = r(\zeta)$ ($r \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ polynomial) with min. polynomial $f_\alpha = X^k + c_{k-1}X^{k-1} + \dots + c_0$:
   - If we have $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha) = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, then $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = (-1)^{\varphi(n)}c_0$
   - $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \prod_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})} \sigma(\alpha) = \prod_{i \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times} r(\zeta^i)$
   - $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \alpha^{\varphi(n)}$

iv) $X^{n-1} + X^{n-2} + \dots + 1 = \frac{X^n - 1}{X-1} = (X-\zeta)(X-\zeta^2)\dots(X-\zeta^{n-1})$
$\overset{X=1}{\Rightarrow} n = (1-\zeta)(1-\zeta^2)\dots(1-\zeta^{n-1})$

Reminder 1.2.2 (and preview). i) $\mathcal{O} := \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] := \{r(\zeta) \mid r \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$

ii) $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \mid f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$ (proof later)

iii) $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module with basis $\{1, \zeta, \ldots, \zeta^{d-1}\}$ with $d = \varphi(n)$ (proof later)

iv) $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$ (proof later)

v) $\{\alpha \in \mathcal{O} \mid |\alpha| = 1\}$ is finite (proof later)

Reminder 1.2.3. Suppose R is an integral domain:

i) $\alpha \in R$ is *irreducible* $:\iff$ If $\alpha = \alpha_1\alpha_2$ with $\alpha_i \in R$, then $\alpha_1 \in R^\times$ or $\alpha_2 \in R^\times$

ii) $\alpha, \alpha' \in R$ are *associated to each other* $:\iff \exists \varepsilon \in R^\times : \alpha = \varepsilon\alpha'$

iii) R is called *factorial* $:\iff$ each $\alpha \in R, \alpha \neq 0$ can be written in a unique way as $\alpha = \varepsilon\pi_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot \pi_r$ with π_i irreducible up to multiplication with $\varepsilon \in R^\times$

iv) $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in R$ are called *coprime* $:\iff$ If $\alpha' \in R$ with $\exists \beta_1, \beta_2 \in R : \alpha_1 = \alpha'\beta_1, \alpha_2 = \alpha'\beta_2$ then $\alpha' \in R^\times$.

Remark (and correction). 1. Recall: $L/\mathbb{Q}$ field extensions:

$$\mathcal{O} := \{\alpha \in L \mid f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$$

!! Here: f_α is by definition monic, i.e leading coefficient is 1.
Remark: $\mathcal{O} = \{\alpha \in L \mid \exists f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with f monic and $f(\alpha) = 0\}$
„$\subseteq$": clear
„$\supseteq$": Lemma of Gauss

2. Recall: Definition of field norm for L/K finite field extension How is norm defined?
$\mathcal{N} : L \to K$ defined as follows:
Suppose $\alpha \in L \Rightarrow \varphi_\alpha : \beta \mapsto \alpha\beta$ is linear map over K. Then:

$$\mathcal{N}_{L/K}(\alpha) := \det(\phi_\alpha)$$

Properties:

a) If $L = K(\alpha)$ and $X^n + c_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0$ is a minimal polynomial of α over K, then $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(\alpha) = (-1)^n c_0$.

b) $\mathcal{N}_{L/K}(\alpha) = (\prod_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\alpha))^q$ with $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$ and $q =$ inseparable degree, i.e. $[L : K] = [L : K]_s \cdot q$.

c) $\alpha \in K \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{L|K}(\alpha) = \alpha^d$ with $d = [L : K]$ (see Bosch „Algebra"4.7).

General reference: NEUKIRCH
This chapter: BOREVICH + SHAFEREVICH Chapter 3.1.

Recall: Goal: prove for p prime and odd

$$x^p + y^p = z^p$$

has no non-trivial solutions. Last time:

$$x^p + y^p = z^p = (x + y)(x + y\zeta)(x + y\zeta^2) \ldots (x + y\zeta^{p-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$$

From now on: p odd prime, $\zeta = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p}}$ primitive $p-th$ root of unity $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

Proposition 1.2.4. *For the group of units $\mathcal{O}^\times$ of $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ we have:*

$$\mathcal{O}^\times = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O} \mid \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \pm 1\}$$

Notation: $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}}$ in this chapter.

Proof. „$\subseteq$"$\alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times \Rightarrow \exists \beta \in \mathcal{O}$ with $\alpha\beta = 1 \Rightarrow 1 = N(\alpha\beta) \overset{!}{=} \underbrace{\mathcal{N}(\alpha)}_{\in \mathbb{Z}} \underbrace{\mathcal{N}(\beta)}_{\in \mathbb{Z} \text{ by 2.2 v)}} \Rightarrow$ claim

„$\supseteq$": Suppose $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$ with $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \pm 1$.
$\Rightarrow \pm 1 = \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \prod_{\sigma \in Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)|\mathbb{Q})} \sigma(\alpha)$
Note: $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\zeta + \dots a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$
$\Rightarrow \sigma(\alpha) = a_0 + a_1\zeta^i + \dots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{i(p-2)}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\} \Rightarrow \sigma(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$
$\Rightarrow \alpha$ is a divisor of 1 in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times$. □

Lemma 1.2.5.

i) $\mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta^s) = p$ for $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $s \not\equiv 0 \mod p$

ii) $1 - \zeta$ is irreducible in $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

iii) $p = \varepsilon \cdot (1 - \zeta)^{p-1}$ with some $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$.

Proof. i) 2.1. iv) $\Rightarrow p = (1 - \zeta)(1 - \zeta^2)\dots(1 - \zeta^{p-1})$
2.1. iii) $\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta^s) = \prod_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})} \sigma(1 - \zeta^s) = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1}(1 - \zeta^{si}) = \prod_{j=1}^{p-1}(1 - \zeta^j) = p$

ii) We obtain from i) that $1 - \zeta \notin \mathcal{O}^\times$. Suppose $1 - \zeta = \alpha\beta$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{O}$
$\Rightarrow p = \mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta) = \mathcal{N}(\alpha)\mathcal{N}(\beta) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \pm 1$ or $\mathcal{N}(\beta) = \pm 1 \overset{\text{Prop 2.4}}{\Longrightarrow} \alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ or $\beta \in \mathcal{O}^\times$.

iii) Use: $1 - \zeta^s = (1 - \zeta)\underbrace{(1 + \zeta + \zeta^2 + \dots + \zeta^{s-1})}_{\varepsilon_s} = (1 - \zeta)\varepsilon_s$

$\Rightarrow p = \mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta^s) = \underbrace{\mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta)}_{=p} \cdot \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon_s) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon_s) = 1 \Rightarrow \varepsilon_s \in \mathcal{O}^\times$

Hence $p = \prod_{s=1}^{p-1}(1 - \zeta^s) = \prod_{s=1}^{p-1} \underbrace{\varepsilon_s}_{\in \mathcal{O}^\times}(1 - \zeta) = (1 - \zeta)^{p-1} \underbrace{\prod_{s=1}^{p-1} \varepsilon_s}_{\in \mathcal{O}^\times}$

□

Notation: $\varepsilon_s = 1 + \zeta + \dots + \zeta^s$.

Lemma 1.2.6.

i) $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 - \zeta$ divides a in $\mathcal{O} \Rightarrow p$ divides a.

ii) An n-th root of unity lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \iff n$ divides $2p$.

Proof. i) $a = (1 - \zeta)\beta$ with $\beta \in \mathcal{O} \Rightarrow a^{p-1} = \mathcal{N}(a) = p\mathcal{N}(\beta) \overset{(\mathcal{N}(\beta) \in \mathbb{Z})}{\Longrightarrow} p$ divides a.

ii) „$\Leftarrow$": $-1 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and thus $e^{\frac{2\pi i}{2p}} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$
„$\Rightarrow$": Consider $H := \{\omega \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \mid \omega$ is a root of unity$\}$

a) $H \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$: Suppose $\omega \in H \Rightarrow \omega^n - 1 = 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow f_\omega$ is a divisor of $X^n - 1 \Rightarrow f_\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[X] \overset{2.2ii)}{\Longrightarrow} \omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

b) $\tilde{\omega}$ some conjugate of $\omega \Rightarrow \tilde{\omega}$ is a root of $X^n - 1 \Rightarrow |\tilde{\omega}| = 1 \overset{2.2v)}{\Longrightarrow} H$ is finite $\Rightarrow H$ is a cyclic subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^\times$.
Choose some generator ω_0 of H and denote $m := \mathrm{ord}(\omega_0)$. Since $\zeta \in H$ and $\mathrm{ord}(\zeta) = p \Rightarrow p$ divides m. Decompose $m = p^s \cdot m'$ with $s \geq 1$ and $\gcd(m', p) = 1$. Consider the field extensions chain:

$$\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}(\omega_0) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$$

with degrees $[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) : \mathbb{Q}] = p - 1 = \varphi(p)$ and $[\mathbb{Q}(\omega_0) : \mathbb{Q}] = \varphi(m) = p^{s-1}(p-1)\varphi(m') \leq p - 1 \Rightarrow s = 1$ and $\varphi(m') = 1$ and thus $m' = 1, 2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{ord}(\omega_0) \leq 2p$.

$\square$

Notation 1.2.7.

1. L/K field extension, $\alpha \in L, \overline{K}$ given algebraic closure. The elements $\sigma(\alpha)$ with $\sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \bar{K})$ are called *conjugates of* α. In particular: L/K normal $\Rightarrow$ conjugates live in L.

2. R ring, I ideal in R, $p : R \to R/I$ canonical projection. For $\alpha, \beta \in R$ we denote $\alpha \equiv \beta \mod I :\Longleftrightarrow p(\alpha) = p(\beta)$.
If $I =< q >$ is a principal ideal, we denote $\alpha \equiv \beta \mod q :\Longleftrightarrow \alpha \equiv \beta \mod < q >$

Example 1.2.8. Consider $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ with $\zeta^p = 1, R = \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \alpha = a_0 + a_1\zeta + a_2\zeta^2 + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2}$

i) The conjugates of α are: $\alpha_h = a_0 + a_1\zeta^h + a_2\zeta^{2h} + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{h(p-2)}$ with $h \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$.

ii) Consider $\lambda = 1 - \zeta$ and $I =< \lambda >$.
$1 \equiv \zeta \mod \lambda$ and $\alpha \equiv a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{p-2} \mod \lambda (\in \mathbb{Z})$.

iii) $\alpha^p \equiv a_0^p + (a_1\zeta)^p + \cdots + (a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2})^p = \underbrace{a_0^p + a_1^p + \cdots + a_{p-1}^p}_{\in\mathbb{Z}} \mod p$

Theorem 1.2.9 (Kummer's Lemma)**.** *If $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a unit, i.e. $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^\times$,*

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{\varepsilon}} = \zeta^a \quad \textit{for some } a \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Here $\bar{\varepsilon} = \tau(\varepsilon)$, where τ is the complex conjugation.
Recall: $\tau \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. Denote $\varepsilon = a_0 + a_1\zeta + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2} = r(\zeta)$ with $r(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} a_i X^i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$.
Observe:

1. $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times \Rightarrow \exists \varepsilon' \in \mathcal{O}$ s.t. $\varepsilon\varepsilon' = 1 \Rightarrow \bar{\varepsilon}\bar{\varepsilon}' = 1 \Rightarrow \bar{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{O}^\times$
2. $\mu := \frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{\varepsilon}} = \frac{r(\zeta)}{r(\zeta^{-1})}$ and the conjugate μ_k of μ is $\frac{r(\zeta^k)}{r(\zeta^{-k})} = \frac{r(\zeta^k)}{\overline{r(\zeta^k)}}$. In particular $|\mu_k| = 1$.
   It follows that $\mu_k \in \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times \mid |\alpha| = 1\}$ which is by 2.2. v) a finite subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^\times \Rightarrow \mu$ is a root of unity
   Lemma 2.6 $\Rightarrow \mu = \pm\zeta^a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.
   <u>Claim:</u> $\mu = \zeta^a$
   <u>Proof of claim:</u> suppose $\mu = -\zeta^a$, i.e. $\varepsilon = -\bar{\varepsilon}\zeta^a \quad (\star)$
   <u>Idea:</u> calculation mod $\lambda = 1 - \zeta \quad \varepsilon = a_0 + a_1\zeta + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2}$
   Ex. 2.8.ii) $\Rightarrow \varepsilon \equiv \underbrace{a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{p-2}}_{=:M\in\mathbb{Z}} \equiv \bar{\varepsilon} \mod \lambda$
   $(\star) \Rightarrow \varepsilon \equiv -\bar{\varepsilon} \mod \lambda \Rightarrow M \equiv -M \mod \lambda \Rightarrow 2M \equiv 0 \mod \lambda \overset{\text{Lemma 2.6 i)}}{\Longrightarrow} p$ divides $2M$ in $\mathbb{Z} \overset{p \text{ odd}}{\Longrightarrow} p$ divides M.
   $\Rightarrow \lambda = 1 - \zeta$ divides M in $\mathcal{O}$ by Lemma 2.5.
   $\Rightarrow \varepsilon \equiv \bar{\varepsilon} \equiv M \equiv 0 \mod \lambda = 1 - \zeta \Rightarrow$Contradiction to ε is unit and $1 - \zeta$ is irreducible

□

Corollary 1.2.10. *ε unit in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \Rightarrow \varepsilon = r\zeta^s$ with some $r \in \mathbb{R}, s \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Prop 2.9 $\Rightarrow \exists\ a \in \mathbb{Z}, \varepsilon = \zeta^a \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}$.
Choose $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $2s \equiv a \mod p$
$\Rightarrow \frac{\varepsilon}{\zeta^s} = \zeta^s \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\zeta^{-s}} = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\bar{\zeta^s}} = r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon = r \cdot \zeta^s$. □

Lemma 1.2.11. *Suppose $x, y, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m \not\equiv n \mod p$. $x + y\zeta^n$ and $x + y\zeta^m$ are relatively prime $\iff$ (x and y are relatively prime) and ($x + y$ not divisible by p)*

Proof. „$\Rightarrow$":

- $d|x$ and $d|y \Rightarrow d|x + \zeta^n y$ and $d|x + \zeta^n y$ ↯
- „$p|x + y$" Recall: $p = \varepsilon(1 - \zeta)^{p-1}$ with $\varepsilon \in O^\times$
  $\Rightarrow x + \zeta^m y = \underbrace{x + y}_{\text{divisible by } p} + y \cdot \underbrace{(\zeta^m - 1)}_{(\zeta-1)(1+\zeta+\zeta^2\cdots+\zeta^{m-1})} \equiv 0 \mod 1 - \zeta$
  same way $x + \zeta^n y \equiv 0 \mod 1 - \zeta$ ↯

„$\Leftarrow$": <u>Idea:</u> show: $\exists \alpha_0, \beta_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ with:

$$1 = \alpha_0(x + \zeta^m y) + \beta(x + \zeta^n y)$$

Consider: $A := \{\alpha(x + \zeta^m y) + \beta(x + \zeta^n y) \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{O}\}$
A is an ideal in $\mathcal{O}$. We have:

1. $(x + \zeta^m y) - (x + \zeta^n y) = \zeta^m(1 - \zeta^{n-m})y = \underbrace{\zeta^n \varepsilon_{n-m}}_{\in\mathcal{O}^\times}(1 - \zeta)y \Rightarrow (1 - \zeta)y \in A$

2. $\zeta^n(x+\zeta^m y)-\zeta^m(x+\zeta^n y)=(\zeta^n-\zeta^m)x=\zeta^n\cdot(1-\zeta^{n-m})x=\underbrace{\zeta^n\varepsilon_{m-n}}_{\in\mathcal{O}^\times}\cdot(1-\zeta)x\Rightarrow$ $(1-\zeta)x\in A$.

3. $\gcd(x,y)=1\Rightarrow\exists\ a,b\in\mathbb{Z}$ with $1=ax+by\Rightarrow(1-\zeta)xa+(1-\zeta)yb=1-\zeta\overset{1.\&2.}{\Rightarrow}$ $1-\zeta\in A$

4. $x+y=\underbrace{x+\zeta^n y}_{\in A}+\underbrace{(1-\zeta^n)y}_{\in A}\in A$

5. $\gcd(p,x+y)=1\Rightarrow\exists\bar{a},\bar{b}\in\mathbb{Z}:1=\underbrace{\bar{a}p}_{\in A}+\bar{b}\underbrace{(x+y)}_{\in A}\in A.$

   $\Rightarrow$ Hence $x+\zeta^n y$ and $x+\zeta^m y$ are coprime.

$\square$

Remark 1.2.12. Suppose $\alpha=a_0+a_1\zeta+\cdots+a_{p-1}\zeta^{p-1}\in\mathcal{O}$ with $a_i\in\mathbb{Z}$ and at least one $a_j=0$.
If $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ with n divides α in $\mathcal{O}$, then n divides all a_i

Proof. Recall from 2.2 (preview): $1,\zeta,\zeta^2,\dots,\zeta^{p-2}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{O}$.
Furthermore: $1+\zeta+\cdots+\zeta^{p-1}=0$
$\Rightarrow\{1,\zeta,\dots,\zeta^{p-1}\}\setminus\{\zeta^j\}$ is a basis $\Rightarrow$ claim. $\square$

1.3 First case of Fermat in case of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a UFD (unique factorization domain)

Reference: BOREVICH + SHAFEREVIC + WASHINGTON Chapter 1
As before: p odd prime, $\zeta=e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p}}$ p-th root of unity.

Theorem 1.3.1. *Suppose that $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a UFD, then $x^p+y^p=z^p$ has no non-trivial solutions (x,y,z), such that neither x,y nor z is divisible by p.*

Theorem 1.3.2 ($p=3$)**.** *Suppose $x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}$ with $x^3+y^3=z^3\mod 9\Rightarrow 3$ divides x,y or z.*

Proof. Recall: Little Fermat's theorem $x^p\equiv x, y^p\equiv y, z^p\equiv z\mod p$.

$$\begin{aligned}x^3+y^3=z^3\mod 3&\Rightarrow x+y\equiv z\mod 3\\&\Rightarrow z=x+y+3u\text{ with }u\in\mathbb{Z}\\\Rightarrow\underline{x^3+y^3}\equiv(x+y+3u)^3&\equiv\underline{x^3+y^3}+3xy^2+3x^2y\mod 9\\&\Rightarrow 0\equiv xy^3+x^2y\equiv xy(x+y)\equiv xyz\mod 3\\&\Rightarrow x,y\text{ or }z\text{ is divisible by }3\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 1.3.3. *Let $p \geq 5$. Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x^p + y^p = z^p$. If $x \equiv y \equiv -z \mod p$, then $p|z$.*

Proof. $z \equiv z^p = x^p + y^p \equiv -2z^p \equiv -2z \mod p \Rightarrow 3z \equiv 0 \mod p \overset{p\neq 3}{\Longrightarrow} p|z$. □

Remark 1.3.4. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that in the first case of Fermat we may assume for $p \geq 5$ that $x \not\equiv y \mod p$ because we can replace $x^p + y^p = z^p$ by $x^p + (-z)^p = (-y)^p$ and $x \not\equiv -z \mod p$.

of Thm. 1. $p = 3 \Rightarrow$ claim follows from Prop 3.1.
Now: $p \geq 5$. Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with p divides neither x, y nor z, x, y, z are pairwise coprime and $x \not\equiv y \mod p$. Suppose $z^p = x^p + y^p = (x+y)(x+\zeta y)\dots(x+\zeta^{p-1}y)$.
Apply Lemma 2.11:

- $\gcd(x, y) = 1$ ✓
- Little Fermat $\Rightarrow x + y \equiv x^p + y^p \equiv z^p \not\equiv 0 \mod p$

$\overset{2.11}{\Longrightarrow} x + y, x + \zeta y, \dots, x + \zeta^{p-1}y$ are pairwise coprime.
$\overset{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]\text{ UFD}}{\Longrightarrow}$ „$x + \zeta^i y$ have to be p-power“ More precisely: $x + \zeta y = \varepsilon\alpha^p$ with $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times, \alpha \in \mathcal{O}$, since they are coprime factors of a p-th power.

1. Cor. 2.10 $\Rightarrow \varepsilon = r\zeta^s$ with $r \in \mathbb{R}, s \in \mathbb{Z}$
2. Example 2.8. iii) $\Rightarrow \exists a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\alpha^p \equiv a \mod p$.

$$\begin{aligned} x + \zeta y = r\zeta^s\alpha^p &\equiv r\zeta^s a \mod p \\ x + \zeta^{-1}y = \overline{x + \zeta y} &\equiv r\zeta^{-s}a \mod p \\ \Rightarrow \zeta^{-s}(x+\zeta y) \equiv ra &\equiv \zeta^s(x + \zeta^{-1}y) \mod p \\ \Rightarrow \underbrace{x + \zeta y - \zeta^{2s}x - \zeta^{2s-1}y}_{=x\cdot 1 + y\zeta - x\zeta^{2s} - y\zeta^{2s-1}} &\equiv 0 \mod p \end{aligned}$$

Idea: Use Rem. 2.12
Case 1: $1, \zeta, \zeta^{2s-1}, \zeta^{2s}$ are distinct $\overset{p\geq 5,\text{ Rem 2.12}}{\Longrightarrow} p|x$ and $p|y$. Contradiction to first case.

□

Recall: $L = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, where ζ is a p-th root of unity

Last time:

(1) $a_1 1 + a_2\zeta + \dots + a_p\zeta^{p-1} = \alpha$ and at least one $a_j = 0$
If α is divided by $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then all the a_i are divided by n.

(2) $x + y\zeta - x\zeta^{2s} - y\zeta^{2s-1} \equiv 0 \mod p$

Continuation of proof of Theorem 1. "Case 2" $1, \zeta, \ldots, \zeta^{2s}$ are not distinct.
Observe: $1 \neq \zeta$ and $\zeta^{2s-1} \neq \zeta^{2s}$

"Case 2A" $1 = \zeta^{2s} (\Leftrightarrow p|s)$.
(2) implies $y\zeta - y\zeta^{2s-1} \equiv 0 \mod p$ such that Remark 2.12 yields the contradiction $p|y$.

"Case 2B" $1 = \zeta^{2s-1} (\Leftrightarrow \zeta = \zeta^{2s})$.
(2) implies $(x-y)1 + (y-x)\zeta \equiv 0 \mod p$ such that Remark 2.12 yields $p|y-x$, which contradicts the assumption $x \not\equiv y \mod p$.

"Case 2C" $\zeta = \zeta^{2s-1}$.
(2) implies $x - x\zeta^2 \equiv 0 \mod p$ such that Remark 2.12 yields the contradiction $p|x$. □

Questions:

(1) Under which assumption is $\mathcal{O}$ a UFD?

(2) What can we do if $\mathcal{O}$ is not a UFD?
   → Idea of Kummer: "calculate with ideals"

Prospect: Theorem (Montgomery, Uchida, 1971)
$\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a UFD if and only if $p \leq 19$, p prime.

Preview: From Kummer's idea we obtain a better criterion for p called **regular**, which ensures that Fermat's conjecture holds for p.

Conjecture. *There are infinitely many regular primes.*

2 Ring of integers

In this chapter, all rings are assumed to be commutative with 1.

2.1 Integral ring extensions

Definition 2.1.1 ("ganze Ringerweiterungen")**.** Let $A \subset B$ be a ring extension.

(i) $b \in B$ is **integral** over A if there exists a monic polynomial $f(X) = X^n + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in A[X]$ with $f(b) = 0$.

(ii) B is **integral** over A if all $b \in B$ are integral over A.

Proposition 2.1.2. *Let $A \subset B$ be a ring extension and $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in B$. Then $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ are integral over A if and only if*

$$A[b_1, \ldots, b_n] = \{f(b_1, \ldots, b_n) \mid f \in A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]\}$$

is a finitely generated A-module.

Reminder 2.1.3 ("Adjunkte"). Let R be a ring and $A \in R^{n\times n}$

(i) $A^{\#} = (a^{\#}_{i,j})$ with $a^{\#}_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j}\det(A_{j,i})$, where $A_{j,i}$ is obtained from A by deleting the j-th row and i-th column of A.

(ii) We have $AA^{\#} = A^{\#}A = \det(A)I$. In particular, $Ax = 0$ implies $A^{\#}Ax = 0$ such that $\det(A)x = 0$.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. "$\Rightarrow$" If $n = 1$ and b is integral over A, then there is an $f \in A[X]$ with f monic such that $f(b) = 0$. Let $g \in A[X]$ be arbitrary. Then

$$g(X) = q(X)f(X) + r(X)$$

with $q, r \in A[X]$ and $\deg r < \deg f = d$. Hence $g(b) = r(b)$ with $\deg r < d$. Thus $\{1, b, \ldots, b^{d-1}\}$ generate $A[b]$ as an A-module. The case $n \geq 2$ follows by induction.

"$\Leftarrow$" $A[b_1, \ldots, b_n]$ is finitely generated as an A-module by $w_1, \ldots, w_r$. If $b \in A[b_1, \ldots, b_n]$ then

$$bw_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{j,i} w_j$$

such that

$$(bI - (a_{i,j}))\, w = 0.$$

Thus, $\det\left(bI - (a_{i,j})\right) w = 0$ and hence

$$\det\left(bI - (a_{i,j})\right) w_i = 0$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, r$. If we now use that

$$1 = c_1 w_1 + \cdots + c_r w_r$$

we can infer $\det\left(bI - (a_{i,j})\right) 1 = 0$. Consider

$$M = bI - (a_{i,j}) = \begin{pmatrix} b - a_{1,1} & -a_{1,2} & \cdots & -a_{1,r} \\ -a_{2,1} & b - a_{2,2} & \cdots & -a_{2,r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -a_{r,1} & -a_{r,2} & \cdots & b - a_{r,r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the Leibniz formula we have

$$\det(M) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{n} m_{\sigma(i),j}$$

which is a polynomial over b with leading coefficient 1. Hence b is integral over A. □

Corollary 2.1.4 (And Definition). *(i) If $A \subset B$ is an extension of rings then*

$$\overline{A} = \{b \in B \mid b \text{ is integral over } A\}$$

is a ring. It is called the ***integral closure*** *of A in B. If $\overline{A} = A$ then A is called* ***integrally closed*** *in B.*

(ii) We have transitivity, that is to say, if A, B, C are rings with $A \subset B \subset C$ such that C is integral over B and B is integral over A then C is integral over A.

(iii) The integral closure of A in B is integrally closed, i.e., $\overline{\overline{A}} = \overline{A}$.

Proof. "(i)" If $b_1, b_2 \in \overline{A}$ then $A[b_1], A[b_2]$ are finitely generated A-modules. Hence $A[b_1, b_2]$ is a finitely generated A-module. Thus, by Proposition 1.3, $b_1 + b_2$ and $b_1 b_2$ are integral, i.e., elements of $\overline{A}$.

"(ii)" If $c \in C$ then c is integral over B and hence there is a monic polynomial $f = X^n + b_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 \in B[X]$ with $f(b) = 0$. This shows that c is integral over $R = A[b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}]$ such that Proposition 1.3 shows that $R[c]$ is a finitely generated R-module. Furthermore, $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}$ are integral over A such that another application of Proposition 1.3 shows that R is a finitely generated A-module. Hence, $R[c]$ is a finitely generated A module such that c is integral over A by Proposition 1.3.

"(iii)" Follows from (ii). □

Definition 2.1.5 ("ganzer Abschluss und normaler Ring")**.** If A is an integral domain we call its integral closure $\overline{A}$ in $K = \mathrm{Quot}(A)$ the **normalization** or the **integral closure** of A. We say A is **integrally closed** if A is integrally closed in K.

Remark 2.1.6. If A is a UFD then A is integrally closed.

Proof. Suppose $b = \frac{a}{a'} \in \mathrm{Quot}(A)$ with $\gcd(a, a') = 1$ is integral over A. Then there exist $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ with

$$\left(\frac{a}{a'}\right)^n + a_{n-1}\left(\frac{a}{a'}\right)^{n-1} + a_{n-2}\left(\frac{a}{a'}\right)^{n-2} + \cdots + a_0 = 0$$

such that

$$a^n + a_{n-1}a'a^{n-1} + a_{n-2}{a'}^2a^{n-2} + \cdots + a_0{a'}^n = 0.$$

Let $a' = \varepsilon\pi_1 \cdots \pi_r$ be the prime factorization of a' with $\varepsilon \in A^\times$ and $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r$ primes. Since $\pi_i | a'$ the above equation shows that actually $\pi_i | a^n$. But this implies $\pi_i | a$ which is a contradiction to $\gcd(a, a') = 1$. Hence we have $a' = \varepsilon \in A^\times$ such that $b \in A$. □

2.2 Integral closures in field extensions

Setting:

- A is an integral domain.
- A is integrally closed.
- $K = \mathrm{Quot}(A)$.
- L/K is a finite field extension with $\overline{A}_K = A \subset K = \mathrm{Quot}(A) \hookrightarrow L \supset B = \overline{A}_L$.
- B is the integral closure of A in L. Observe: $B \cap K = A$

Remark 2.2.1. (i) B is integrally closed in L.

(ii) If $\beta \in L$ then there are $b \in B$ and $a \in A\backslash\{0\}$ such that $\beta = \frac{b}{a}$.
In particular, $L = \mathrm{Quot}(B)$.

(iii) For $\beta \in L$ we have $\beta \in B$ if and only if $f_\beta \in A[X]$, where f_β is the minimal polynomial of β over K.

Proof. "(i)" Follows from the transitivity in Corollary 1.4.

"(ii)" Choose $a \in A$ with $a^n f_\beta(X) = a^nX^n + a^{n-1}c_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0 \in A[X]$. Then we have

$$a^n\beta^n + c_{n-1}a^{n-1}\beta^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0 = 0$$

and hence

$$(a\beta)^n + c_{n-1}(a\beta)^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0 = 0$$

such that $a\beta$ is integral over A. Consequently, $b = a\beta \in B$ and $\beta = \frac{b}{a}$.

"(iii)" "$\Leftarrow$" Obvious. "$\Rightarrow$" Let β be a zero of $g(X) = X^n + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in A[X]$. Then f_β divides g. If $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$ are the zeros of f_β in $\overline{K}$ then they are also zeros of g and thus integral over A. Hence the coefficients of f_β are integral over A and are elements of K such that $f_\beta \in A[X]$ as claimed. $\square$

Reminder 2.2.2 (Trace, Norm). Let $K \subseteq L$ be a finite field extension. For α in L consider the map $T_\alpha : \beta \mapsto \alpha\beta$. The following holds

i) $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha) = \mathrm{Tr}(T_\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha) = \det(T_\alpha)$,

ii) If $L = K(\alpha)$ and $f_\alpha(X) = X^n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i X^i$ then

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha) = -a_{n-1} \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha) = (-1)^n \cdot a_0,$$

iii) Since $T_{\alpha+\beta} = T_\alpha + T_\beta$ and $T_{\alpha\cdot\beta} = T_\alpha \circ T_\beta$, we conclude that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}} : (L, +) \to (K, +) \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}} : (L^*, \cdot) \to (K^*, \cdot)$$

are group homomorphisms,

iv) Suppose $K \subseteq L$ is a seperable field extension with $L = K(\alpha)$. Further assume $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$. Then the following holds
   - $f_\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \sigma_i(\alpha))$,
   - $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(\alpha)$,
   - $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha) = \prod_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(\alpha))$,

v) Trace and norm are transitive, i.e., for field extensions $K \subseteq L \subseteq M$ it holds
   - $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}} \circ \mathcal{N}_{M/L} = \mathcal{N}_{M/K}$,
   - $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}} \circ \mathrm{Tr}_{M/L} = \mathcal{N}_{M/K}$.

Definition 2.2.3 (Discriminant)**.** Let $K \subseteq L$ be a seperable field extension and let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ be a K-basis of L. Further let $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$. Consider the matrix

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1(\alpha_1) & \sigma_1(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \sigma_1(\alpha_n) \\ \sigma_2(\alpha_1) & \sigma_2(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \sigma_2(\alpha_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \sigma_n(\alpha_1) & \sigma_n(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \sigma_n(\alpha_n) \end{pmatrix} = (\sigma_i(\alpha_j))_{i,j} \in L^{n \times n}.$$

We call $d(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n) := \det(A^2)$ the **discriminant** of L over K with respect to the basis $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n$.

Remark 2.2.4. In the situation of Definition (2.2.3) the following holds.

i) Consider the matrix $B = \left(\mathrm{Tr_{L/K}}(\alpha_i\alpha_j)\right)_{i,j}$ in $K^{n\times n}$. Then the discriminant is given by $d(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n) = \det(B)$. In particular, the discriminant $d(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ lies in K.

ii) Suppose we have Θ in L such that $1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1}$ forms a basis of L. Then the following equality holds

$$d(1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1}) = \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq n} (\Theta_i - \Theta_j)^2.$$

Here Θ_i denotes $\sigma_i(\Theta)$. If $L = K(\Theta)$ then $d(1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1})$ coincides with the discriminant of the minimal polynomial f_Θ. Note that we use the notion of discriminants for polynomials here.

Proof. We begin by proving statement i). One computes

$$\det(A)^2 = \det(A^t) \cdot \det(A) = \det(A^t \cdot A).$$

The following calculation proves the claim

$$\begin{aligned} A^t \cdot A &= (\sigma_j(\alpha_i))_{i,j} \cdot (\sigma_k(\alpha_\ell))_{k,\ell} \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_j(\alpha_i) \cdot \sigma_j(\alpha_\ell)\right)_{i,\ell} \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_j(\alpha_i \cdot \alpha_\ell)\right)_{i,\ell} \\ &= (\mathrm{Tr_{L/K}}(\alpha_i \cdot \alpha_\ell))_{i,\ell} \\ &= B. \end{aligned}$$

For statement ii), we will compute the determinant of the following Vondermonde matrix

$$\det(A) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Theta_1 & \cdots & \Theta_1^{n-1} \\ 1 & \Theta_2 & \cdots & \Theta_2^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \Theta_n(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \Theta_n^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} =: V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n).$$

By induction, we prove that $V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n)$ is nonzero and that the following equality holds

$$V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n) = \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq n} (\Theta_j - \Theta_i).$$

For $n = 2$, we have

$$\det(A) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Theta_1 \\ 1 & \Theta_2 \end{pmatrix} = \Theta_2 - \Theta_1 \neq 0.$$

Hence the claim holds for $n = 2$. Now we assume that the claim holds for a $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. We want to prove that viewed as polynomials in Z the following equality holds

$$V_{n+1}(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n, Z) = V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} (Z - \Theta_i). \tag{2.1}$$

This implies that

$$V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_{n+1}) = V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\Theta_{n+1} - \Theta_i) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (\Theta_j - \Theta_i).$$

To show equality (2.1), recall that

$$V_{n+1}(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n, Z) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Theta_1 & \cdots & \Theta_1^n \\ 1 & \Theta_2 & \cdots & \Theta_2^n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \Theta_n(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \Theta_n^n \\ 1 & Z & \cdots & Z^n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Ones sees that the polynomials on both sides of equality (2.1) have degree n. Moreover, $\{\Theta_1, \cdots, \Theta_n\}$ is the set of zeros for both polynomials. Since the leading coefficient in both cases is $V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n)$, the polynomials are equal. This proves the claim. $\square$

Example 2.2.5. Consider $L = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ for a square free integer D different from 0 and 1. Then the following holds

- $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \{1, \sqrt{D}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of L.
- Define $\sigma_2 : L \to \overline{\mathbb{Q}}, a + b\sqrt{D} \mapsto a - b\sqrt{D}$. Then we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}}(L, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}) = \{\sigma_1 = \mathrm{id}, \sigma_2\}.$$

- $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/\mathbb{Q}}(a + b\sqrt{D}) = a + b\sqrt{D} + a - b\sqrt{D} = 2a.$
- $\mathcal{N}_{L/\mathbb{Q}}(a + b\sqrt{D}) = (a + b\sqrt{D}) \cdot (a - b\sqrt{D}) = a^2 - b^2 \cdot D.$
- $d(\mathfrak{B}_1) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{D} \\ 1 & -\sqrt{D} \end{pmatrix}^2 = (-2\sqrt{D}) = 4D.$
- We have

$$(\alpha_i \alpha_j)_{i,j} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{D} \\ \sqrt{D} & D \end{pmatrix}.$$

  Hence we compute

$$\det((\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_i \alpha_j))_{i,j}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2D \end{pmatrix} = 4D.$$

- Consider the $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of L given by $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \{1+\sqrt{D}, 1-\sqrt{D}\}$. Computing the discriminant for this basis yields

$$d(1+\sqrt{D}, 1-\sqrt{D}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1+\sqrt{D} & 1-\sqrt{D} \\ 1-\sqrt{D} & 1+\sqrt{D} \end{pmatrix}^2 = 16D.$$

  Hence we see that the discriminant depends on the basis we choose.

Proposition 2.2.6. *Let $K \subseteq L$ be a seperable field extension.*

i) The bilinear map

$$h : L^2 \to K,\ (x,y) \mapsto \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(xy)$$

is non degenerate, i.e., $h(x,y) = 0$ for all $y \in L$ implies that $x = 0$.

ii) If $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ forms a basis of L/K then $d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \neq 0$.

Proof. For statement i), we choose a primitive element Θ. Then $1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1}$ is a K-basis of L. Let B be the matrix representation of h with respect to this basis. We find

$$\begin{aligned} \det(B) &\overset{(2.4)\ i)}{=} d(1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1}) \\ &\overset{(2.4)\ ii)}{=} \prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} (\Theta_i - \Theta_j)^2 \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here Θ_i denotes $\sigma_i(\Theta)$. This shows that h is non degenerate. We now prove statement ii). Observe that the matrix $M = (\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha_i\alpha_j))_{i,j}$ is the matrix representation of h with respect to $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$. By Remark (2.4), we conclude

$$d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) = \det(M).$$

Now, i) implies that $\det(M)$ is nonzero. □

Remark 2.2.7. Let $A \subseteq B$ be an integral ring extension with $B \subseteq L$ and $A = B \cap K \subseteq K$. Assuming that $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\mathrm{id} = \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ the following holds

i) If $x \in B$ then $\sigma_i(x) \in B$ for all $1 \le i \le n$.

ii) For all $x \in B$ the trace $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(x)$ and the norm $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(x)$ lie in A.

iii) Let $x \in B$. Then x lies in B^* if and only if the norm $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(x)$ lie in A^*.

Proof. We start by proving i). Let x in B. By Remark (2.1), we have that the minimal polynomial f_x lies in $A[X]$. Since $\sigma(x)$ is also a zero of f_x, it is contained in B. This shows i). Now, statement ii) follows from i), Reminder (2.2) iv) and the fact that $A = B \cap K$. For iii), assume that x is a unit in B, i.e., we find y in B with $xy = 1$. Hence

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(x) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(y) = \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(xy) = 1.$$

Using ii), we deduce that $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(x)$ lies in A^*. This proves one direction. For the other direction, assume that $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(x)$ lies in A^*, i.e., we find $a \in A$ with

$$\begin{aligned} 1 =& a \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(x) \\ =& a \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i(x) \\ =& a \cdot x \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i=2}^{n} \sigma_i(x)}_{\in B,\ by\ i)} . \end{aligned}$$

Hence x lies in B^*. This proves iii). $\square$

Proposition 2.2.8. *Suppose $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in B$ forms a K-basis of L. Let d denote the discriminant $d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in A$. Then $d \cdot B$ is contained in $A\alpha_1 + \cdots + A\alpha_n$.*

Proof. Suppose $\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \alpha_i \in B$ for $c_i \in K$. We want to solve for $(c_1, \ldots, c_n)$. Applying the trace to the equalities

$$\alpha_i \alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \alpha_i \alpha_j,\ 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

we obtain

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha_i \alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \,\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha_i \alpha_j),\ 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Hence $x = (c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ is the solution of the linear system $Mx = y$, where

$$M = ((\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha_i \alpha_j)))_{i,j} \in A^{n \times n},\ y = (\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{L/K}}(\alpha_i \alpha))_i \in A^n.$$

By Reminder (1.3), we have

$$\det(M) \cdot x = M^{\#} M x = M^{\#} y \in A^n.$$

Using Remark (2.4), we know $\det(M) = d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) =: d$. We conclude that dc_i lies in A for $1 \leq i \leq n$, which proves the claim. $\square$

Definition 2.2.9 (Ganzheitsbasis)**.** Suppose $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n \in B$ forms a basis of B over A, i.e., every $\alpha \in B$ can be written in a unique way as an A-linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \omega_i$. Then $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n$ is called an **integral basis** of B over A.

Example 2.2.10. Same situation as in Ex. 2.5. $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{1, \sqrt{D}\} \subseteq B$. Consider:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}) &\Rightarrow 2\alpha = 1 + \sqrt{D} \\ \Rightarrow& (2\alpha - 1)^2 = D \Rightarrow 4\alpha^2 - 4\alpha + 1 = D \\ \Rightarrow& f_\alpha(X) = X^2 - X + \frac{1 - D}{4} \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $D \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \alpha \in B$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ is not an integral basis.

Proposition 2.2.11. *Let $D \in \mathbb{Z}$, D square-free, $D \neq 0, 1, B :=$ integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}) = L$.*

i) $D \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \{1, \sqrt{D}\}$ *is an integral basis of $B/\mathbb{Z}$ in particular $B = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}]$.*

ii) $D \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \{1, \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{D}+1)\}$ *is an integral basis of $B/\mathbb{Z}$. and $B = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}(1+\sqrt{D})]$.*

Proof. Consider $\alpha = a + b\sqrt{D} \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ with $a, b, \in \mathbb{Q}$.
$\Rightarrow f_\alpha = X^2 - 2aX + a^2 - b^2D$.
Rem 2.1: $\alpha \in B \iff f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X] \iff 2a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a^2 - b^2D \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(1) Show: $\alpha \in B \Rightarrow 2b \in \mathbb{Z}$.
$\alpha \in B \Rightarrow 4a^2 - 4b^2D = 4z$ with $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. Write $b = \frac{p}{q}$ with $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}, \gcd(p, q) = 1$
$\Rightarrow 4p^2D = ((2a)^2 - 4z)q^2 \quad (\star)$
$\Rightarrow q = 1$ or 2.

(2) Show: $q = 2 \Rightarrow D \equiv 1 \mod 4$
$(\star) \Rightarrow p^2D = (2a)^2 - 4z \equiv (2a)^2 \mod 4$
p is odd, hence $p^2 \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow (2a)$ is odd (i.e. $a = \frac{2n-1}{2} \in \mathbb{Q}$)
$\Rightarrow (2a)^2 \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow D \equiv 1 \mod 4$.

(3) It follows from (2) if $D \equiv 1 \mod 4$:
$\alpha \in B \iff \alpha = a + b\sqrt{D}$ or $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(a + b\sqrt{D})$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence we obtain:

$$B = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}] & \text{, if } D \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4 \\ \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}] & \text{, if } D \equiv 1 \mod 4 \end{cases}$$

For the second case observe that $\frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{2}\sqrt{D} = \frac{a-b}{2} + \frac{b}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}]$.
This implies the claim.

□

Proposition 2.2.12. *Suppose L/K separable and A is a principal ideal domain. Let $M \neq 0$ be a finitely generated B-submodule of $L \Rightarrow M$ is a free A-module. In particular: B is a free A-module of rank $n := [L : K]$.*

Reminder 2.2.13. Suppose A is a principal ideal domain and M_0 is a finitely generated free A-module.

i) Any submodule M of M_0 is free.

ii) $\operatorname{rank}(M_0) \geq \operatorname{rank}(M)$

of Prop 2.12. Let $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r \in M \subseteq L$ be generators of M as B-module and let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ be a basis of L/K in B and $d := d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in A$.
Recall: $L = \{\frac{b}{a} \mid b \in B, a \in A \setminus \{0\}\}$.

(1) Prop 2.7 $\Rightarrow dB \subseteq A\alpha_1 + \cdots + A\alpha_n$

(2) $\exists a \in A : a\mu_1, \ldots, a\mu_r \in B$

Hence: $daM \subseteq dB \subseteq A\alpha_1 + \cdots + A\alpha_n =: M_0$
(M_0 is a free A-module, since $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are basis of L/K).
Reminder 2.13 $\Rightarrow$ adM is a free A-module $\Rightarrow$ M is a free A-module.
Furthermore: $\mathrm{rank}(M) = \mathrm{rank}(adM) \overset{Rem.2.13}{\leq} \mathrm{rank}(M_0) = n$.
Suppose that $M = B$. So far we got that B is a free A-module and $\mathrm{rank}(B) \leq n$.
Show: $\mathrm{rank}(B) \geq n$.
Let $\mu_1, \ldots \mu_r$ be a basis of B as A-module. By $L = \{\frac{b}{a} \mid b \in B, a \in A \setminus \{0\}\}$ we have that $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r$ generate L over K. □

Hence: if A is a principal ideal domain, then B has always an integral basis.

Proposition 2.2.14. *Suppose we are in the following situation:*

- *L/K and L'/K are Galois extensions of degree n and m in some field E*
- *A a subring of K such that $K = \mathrm{Quot}(A)$ and B and B' are the integral closures of A in L and L'.*
- *$\{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n\}$ and $\{\omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_m\}$ are integral basis for B/A and B'/A.*
- *$d := d(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n)$ and $d' := d(\omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_m) \in A$ with d and d' are coprime in A, i.e. $\exists x, x' \in A$ with $1 = dx + d'x'$.*
- *$K = L \cap L'$*

Then we have: $\{\omega_i\omega'_j \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\}$ is an integral basis and its discriminant is $d^m(d')^n$.

Proof. Recall: $L \cap L' = K \Rightarrow [LL' : K] = nm$ and $\{\omega_i\omega'_j\}$ is a basis of the field extension LL'/K.
$\mathrm{Gal}(L/K) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ and $\mathrm{Gal}(L'/K) = \{\sigma'_1, \ldots, \sigma'_m\}$
$\Rightarrow$ obtain unique lifts $\hat{\sigma}_i \in \mathrm{Gal}(LL'/L')$ and $\hat{\sigma}'_j \in \mathrm{Gal}(LL'/L)$ and $\mathrm{Gal}(LL'/K) = \{\hat{\sigma}_i\hat{\sigma}'_j \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\}$.
Consider: $\alpha \in \tilde{B} :=$ integral closure of A in LL'.
Write $\alpha = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}\omega_i\omega'_j = \sum_j \beta_j\omega'_j$ with $\alpha_{i,j} \in K$ and $\beta_j = \sum_i \alpha_{i,j}\omega_i \in L$.
$\Rightarrow \hat{\sigma}'_i(\alpha) = \sum_j \beta_j\hat{\sigma}'_i(\omega'_j)$, since $\hat{\sigma}'_i \in \mathrm{Gal}(LL'/L)$.
$\Rightarrow$ We have a linear system:

$$a = Tb \text{ with } a = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}'_1(\alpha) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\sigma}'_m(\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \in \tilde{B}^m \ , \ b = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_m \end{pmatrix} \in L^m \ , \ T = (\hat{\sigma}'_i(\omega'_j))_{(i,j)} \in \tilde{B}^{m\times m}$$

Observe: $\det(T)^2 = d'$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\&Rightarrow \det(T)b = T^{\#}Tb = T^{\#}a \in \tilde{B}^m &\Rightarrow d'b \in \tilde{B}^m \\
&\Rightarrow \forall j : d'\beta_j = \sum_i d'\alpha_{i,j}\omega_i \in \tilde{B} \cap L = B \\
&\Rightarrow d'\alpha_{i,j} \in A, \text{ since } \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n\} \text{ is an integral basis.} \\
&\Rightarrow d\alpha_{i,j} \in A \text{ in the same way} \\
&\Rightarrow \alpha_{i,j} = (x'd' + xd)\alpha_{i,j} = x'd'\alpha_{i,j} + xd\alpha_{i,j} \in A.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence: $\{\omega_i\omega'_j \mid (i,j) \in \{(1,1), \ldots, (n,m)\}\}$ is an integral basis of $\tilde{B}/A$.
For calculating the discrimant consider the matrix $M = (\hat{\sigma}_k \circ \hat{\sigma}'_l(\omega_i\omega'_j))_{(k,l),(i,j)} = (\hat{\sigma}_k(\omega_i)\hat{\sigma}'_l(\omega'_j))$.
Consider $Q = (\hat{\sigma}_k(\omega_i))$

$$
\Rightarrow M = \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ldots & 0 & Q \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} I \cdot \hat{\sigma}'_1(\omega'_1) & \cdots & I\cdot & \hat{\sigma}'_1(\omega'_1) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \\ I \cdot \hat{\sigma}'_1(\omega'_m) & \cdots & I\cdot & \hat{\sigma}'_m(\omega'_m) \end{pmatrix}
$$

<u>Observe:</u>

(1) $\det(Q)^2 = d(\omega_1, \omega_n) = d$

(2) The second matrix can be transformed by switching rows and columns to $\begin{pmatrix} Q' & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ldots & 0 & Q' \end{pmatrix}$

with $Q' = (\sigma'_l(\omega'_j))$ and $\det(Q') = d'$

$\Rightarrow \det(M)^2 = \det(Q)^{2m} \cdot \det(Q')^{2n} = d^m d'^n$. □

Remark 2.2.15 (and Definition). Suppose $K = \mathbb{Q}, A = \mathbb{Z}$, L a number field and $B = \mathcal{O}_k$.

(i) There is always an integral basis $w_1, \ldots, w_n$.

(ii) The **discriminant** $d_k = d_k(\mathcal{O}_k) = d(w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ does not depend on the choice of integral basis.

Proof. "(i)" Proposition 2.12 "(ii)" Let $w'_1, \ldots, w'_n$ be another integral basis. Then there exists a base change matrix $T \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with

$$
\begin{pmatrix} w'_1 \\ \vdots \\ w'_n \end{pmatrix} = T \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_n \end{pmatrix}.
$$

Hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma(w_1') \\ \vdots \\ \sigma(w_n') \end{pmatrix} = T \begin{pmatrix} \sigma(w_1) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma(w_n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

such that

$$d(w_1', \dots, w_n') = \underbrace{\det T}_{\in\{1,-1\}}{}^2 d(w_1, \dots, w_n) = d_k.$$

□

Example 2.2.16. Let $L = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ with $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ square-free. By Proposition 2.14 we have:

(i) $\mathcal{O}_k = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}]$ and $\{1, \sqrt{D}\}$ is an integral basis for $D \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4$ and $d_k = 4D$.

(ii) $\mathcal{O}_k = \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1+\sqrt{D}}{2}\right]$ and $\left\{1, \frac{1+\sqrt{D}}{2}\right\}$ is an integral basis for $D \equiv 1 \mod 4$ and $d_k = D$.

In particular, this holds for $D = -1$, i.e., the Gaussian integers $\mathbb{Z}[i]$.

2.3 Ideals

Let R be a commutative ring with 1.
Problem: O_k is not a UFD in many cases, e.g. in $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$ we have

$$(1 + \sqrt{-5})(1 - \sqrt{-5}) = 1 + 5 = 6 = 2 \cdot 3,$$

that is, two different ways to factor 6 in irreducible elements.

Idea:

(1) Maybe we have too few elements, i.e.,

$$1 + \sqrt{-5} = p_1 p_2, 1 - \sqrt{-5} = p_3 p_4 \text{ and } 2 = p_2 p_3, 3 = p_1 p_4$$

for some primes p_i.

(2) An element is determined (up to units) by the set of elements it divides, e.g.

$$p_i \longleftrightarrow \{x \in \mathcal{O}_k;\, p_i | x\} = p_i \mathcal{O}_k \text{ (this is an ideal).}$$

Notation 2.3.1. Let $I, J \subset R$ be ideals. We define

- $I + J = \{a + b;\, a \in I, b \in J\}$,
- $IJ = \{\sum_i a_i b_i;\, a_i \in I, b_i \in J\}$.

Definition 2.3.2 (and Reminder)**.** Let $I \subsetneq R$ be an ideal.

(a) I is called **prime** if for all $a, b \in R$ with $ab \in I$ we already have $a \in I$ or $b \in I$.
$\Leftrightarrow$ For all ideals $A, B \subset R$ with $AB \subset I$ we have $A \subset I$ or $B \subset I$.

(b) I is called **maximal** if for any ideal $I \subset J \subset R$ we have $J = I$ or $J = R$.
$\Leftrightarrow$ R/I is a field.

(c) R is called **Noetherian** if every ascending chain of ideals

$$I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots$$

becomes stationary, i.e., if there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $I_n = I_N$ for alls $n \geq N$.
$\Leftrightarrow$ Every ideal in R is finitely generated.

(d) R is called a **Dedekind domain** if
- R is an integral domain,
- R is integrally closed,
- R is Noetherian, and
- every prime ideal in R is maximal.

Proposition 2.3.3. *If $\mathcal{O}$ is the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in a number field then $\mathcal{O}$ is a Dedekind domain.*

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{O}$ is an integral domain and integrally closed. Furthermore, by Proposition 2.12 each $\mathbb{Z}$-submodule is finitely generated as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, thus also as an $\mathcal{O}$-module. Hence $\mathcal{O}$ is Noetherian.
Now, let $I \subset \mathcal{O}$ be a prime ideal. Then $I \cap \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ is a prime ideal such that $\mathbb{Z}/(I \cap \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{F}_p$. Using $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[w_1, \dots, w_n]$ we conclude

$$\mathcal{O}/I = \mathbb{Z}/(I \cap \mathbb{Z})[w_1', \dots, w_n'] = \mathbb{F}_p[w_1', \dots, w_n'] = \mathbb{F}_p(w_1', \dots, w_n'),$$

where $w_i' \equiv w_i \mod I$. Thus $\mathcal{O}/I$ is a field ad hence I maximal. □

From now on: Let $\mathcal{O}$ denote a Dedekind domain.

Theorem 2.3.4. *Every ideal $0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O}$ has a unique factorization*

$$I = P_1 \cdots P_n$$

into prime ideals $P_i \subset \mathcal{O}$.

Lemma 2.3.5. *For every ideal $0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O}$ there exist nonzero prime ideals $P_i \subset \mathcal{O}$ such that*

$$P_1 \cdots P_n \subset I.$$

Proof. Set $M = \{0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O} \text{ ideal}; I \text{ does not have such } P_i\}$ and suppose $M \neq \emptyset$. Then M is partially ordered by inclusion and since $\mathcal{O}$ is Noetherian, every chain in M has an upper bound. Thus, the Lemma of Zorn yields a maximal element $I_0 \in M$. Since I_0 cannot be prime there are $a, b \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $ab \in I_0$ but $a, b \notin I_0$. Consider the ideals $I_1 = (a) + I_0$ and $I_2 = (b) + I_0$ which satisfy $I_0 \subsetneq I_1$, $I_0 \subsetneq I_2$ and $I_1 I_2 \subset I_0$. Since I_0 is a maximal ideal in M, we have $I_{1,2} \notin M$ hence we find prime ideals $P_1, \ldots, P_n, P_1', \ldots, P_m' \subset \mathcal{O}$ with

$$P_1 \ldots P_n \subset I_1 \text{ and } P_1' \ldots P_m' \subset I_2.$$

Finally, we conclude $P_1 \ldots P_n P_1' \ldots P_m' = I_1 I_2 \subset I_0 \Rightarrow I_0 \notin M \not\Rightarrow M = \emptyset$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3.6. *Let $0 \neq P \subset \mathcal{O}$ be a prime ideal, $I \subset \mathcal{O}$ an ideal and $K = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O})$. Then:*

(i) $P^{-1} := \{x \in K; xP \subset \mathcal{O}\} \supsetneq \mathcal{O}$

(ii) $I \subsetneq P^{-1} I := \{\sum_i a_i x_i;\, a_i \in I, x_i \in P^{-1}\}$

Proof. "(i)" Let $0 \neq a \in P$, $P_1 \cdots P_n \subset (a) \subset P$ as in Lemma 3.5 with n minimal.

Claim: Without loss of generality we can assume that $P_1 = P$.
Proof of the claim: Since $P_1 \cdots P_n \subset P$ and P is prime, there is an index i such that $P_i \subset P$, by reindexing we may assume that $i = 1$. However, we assumed $\mathcal{O}$ to be Dedekind, hence P_1 is a maximal ideal in $\mathcal{O}$. Thus, $P_1 \subset P \subsetneq \mathcal{O}$ implies that $P_1 = P$ as claimed.

Now, since n was chosen minimal we have $P_2 \cdots P_n \not\subset (a)$, i.e, there exists an element $b \in (a) \backslash P_2 \cdots P_n$. On the one hand we thus have

$$a^{-1} b \notin \mathcal{O}$$

and on the other hand $bP \subset (a)$ such that $a^{-1} bP \subset \mathcal{O}$ and hence

$$a^{-1} b \in P^{-1}.$$

Both of this together shows that $P^{-1} \supsetneq \mathcal{O}$.

"(ii)" Assume there is an ideal $I \subset \mathcal{O}$ such that $P^{-1} I \subset I$. Let $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \subset I$ be a generating set and choose $x \in P^{-1} \backslash \mathcal{O}$. Then,

$$x\alpha_i = \sum_j a_{ij} \alpha_j$$

for some $a_{ij} \in \mathcal{O}$. Consider the matrix $A = xE_n - (a_{ij})_{i,j}$, which satisfies

$$A \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_n \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Since $A^{\#} A = \det A$ we conclude $\det A = 0$ such that x is a zero of the monic polynomial $\det\Big(XE_n - (a_{ij})_{i,j}\Big)$ over $\mathcal{O}$. But since $\mathcal{O}$ is integrally closed this implies $x \in \mathcal{O}$, a contradiction. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.4. **Existence of a factorization:** Let

$$M = \{0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O} \text{ ideal; } I \text{ has no factorization}\}$$

and assume that $M \neq \emptyset$. As in Lemma 3.5, let $I_0 \in M$ be a maximal element and let $P \supset I_0$ be a maximal ideal containing I_0. Since I_0 is not prime we have $I_0 \neq P$ such that by Lemma 3.6,

$$I_0 \subsetneq P^{-1}I_0 \subset P^{-1}P = \mathcal{O}.$$

Note that $I_0 = I_0\mathcal{O} = I_0P^{-1}P$ and $I_0 \neq P$ imply $P^{-1}I_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{O}$. Since I_0 was maximal in M we thus have $P^{-1}I_0 \notin M$, i.e., there are prime ideals $P_1, \ldots, P_n \subset \mathcal{O}$ with $P^{-1}I = P_1 \cdots P_n$. This leads to the contradiction $I = PP_1 \cdots P_n$.

Uniqueness of the factorization: Suppose that

$$I = P_1 \cdots P_n = Q_1 \cdots Q_m$$

are two prime factorizations. Then $P_1 \supset I = Q_1 \cdots Q_m$, hence without loss of generality we can assume that $Q_1 \subset P_1$. Since $\mathcal{O}$ is Dedekind we conclude $Q_1 = P_1$ such that

$$P_2 \cdots P_n = P_1^{-1}I = Q_2 \cdots Q_m.$$

The claim follows by induction. □

Definition 2.3.7. We call two ideals $0 \neq I, J \subset \mathcal{O}$ **coprime** $:\Leftrightarrow I + J = \mathcal{O}$. For example, one could take two distinct prime ideals in a Dedekind ring.

Remark 2.3.8. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n \subset \mathcal{O}$ be pairwise coprime. Then P_1 and $P_2 \cdots P_n$ are coprime and we have $\prod_{i=1}^n P_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^n P_i$.

Proof. Induction on n: The case $n = 2$ is clear. Let $n > 2$. Since P_1 and P_2 are coprime, $\exists p_1 \in P_1$, $p_2 \in P_2$, such that we can write $1 = p_1 + p_2$. By induction hypothesis, $\exists p_1' \in P_1$, $p \in P_3 \cdots P_n$, such that $1 = p_1' + p$. It follows

$$1 = p_1 + p_2 \cdot (p_1' + p) = \underbrace{p_1 + p_2p_1'}_{\in P_1} + \underbrace{p_2p}_{\in P_2 \cdots P_n},$$

which yields the first claim.

For the second claim, first note that $\prod P_i \subset \bigcap P_i$ is clear.
For the converse, let $a \in \bigcap P_i$, which of course implies that $a \in P_i$ for all i. As above, we write $1 = p_1 + p$, $p_1 \in P_1$, $p \in P_2 \cdots P_n$. We get $a = ap_1 + ap$, which implies that $a \in aP_1 + P_1 \cdot \prod_{i=2}^n P_i$ for all i and by induction hypothesis, we get $a \in \prod P_i$. □

Theorem 2.3.9 (Chinese Remainder Theorem)**.** *Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n \subset \mathcal{O}$ bet pairwise coprime ideals, $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n P_i$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{O}/I \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}/P_i$$

Proof. Consider the map

$$\phi : \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}/P_i, \quad a \mapsto \bigoplus_i a \mod P_i.$$

Obviously, $\ker(\phi) = I$. It remains to show, that ϕ is surjective. Let first $n = 2$: For $p_1 \in P_1$, $p_2 \in P_2$ let $1 = p_1 + p_2$ and for any a_1, $a_2 \in \mathcal{O}$ write $a = a_2 p_1 + a_1 p_2$. Then $\phi(a) = a_1 \oplus a_2 \in \mathcal{O}/P_1 \oplus \mathcal{O}/P_2$.

In general, by **3.8**, we know that $\exists y_i \in \mathcal{O}$ with $y_i \equiv 1 \mod P_i$ and $y_i \equiv 0 \mod \bigcap_{j \neq i} P_i$. Hence the element $a = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i y_i$ is mapped to $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n a_i \mod P_i$ □

Definition 2.3.10. A **fractional ideal** of K is a finitely generated $\mathcal{O}$-module $0 \neq I$ of K. Since $\mathcal{O}$ is noetherian, this is equivalent to: $\exists c \in \mathcal{O}$, such that $c \cdot I \subset \mathcal{O}$ is an ideal (since every submodule of $\mathcal{O}$ is finitely generated). The product of two fractional ideals is denoted in the same way as introduced in **3.3**. Ideals in $\mathcal{O}$ are called **integral ideals**.

Theorem 2.3.11. *The fractional ideals of K, together with the product, form an abelian group, which we denote by $\mathcal{J}_K$.*

Proof. Commutativity and associativity are clear. The unit in $\mathcal{J}_K$ is given by $\mathcal{O}$. We define $I^{-1} := \{x \in K \mid x \cdot I \subset K\}$ and show, that this defines an inverse for all $I \in \mathcal{J}_K$.

For a prime ideal $P \subset \mathcal{O}$, we have already seen in **3.4** that $P^{-1}P = \mathcal{O}$ and for an integral ideal $I = P_1 \cdots P_n$, we have $J = P_1^{-1} \cdots P_n^{-1}$ as an inverse:

$J \subset I^{-1}$ is clear. For the converse, let $x \in I^{-1}$, we then have $x \cdot IJ \subset \mathcal{O}$, with $x \cdot I \subset \mathcal{O}$ and $IJ = \mathcal{O}$, therefore $x \cdot 1 \in J$ and $I^{-1} \subset J$ follows.
Let now I be fractional. Then $\exists c \in \mathcal{O}$, such that cI is integral. But then $(cI)^{-1} = c^{-1}I^{-1}$ and hence $II^{-1} = (cI)(c^{-1}I^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}$ □

Corollary 2.3.12. *Every fractional ideal I has a unique factorization $I = \prod P_i^{n_i}$, with $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $P_i \subset \mathcal{O}$ distinct prime ideals and only finitely many $n_i \neq 0$. In particular, $\mathcal{J}_K$ is a free abelian group on the prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. By **3.11**, every element $I \in \mathcal{J}_K$ can be written as $I = AB^{-1}$ for some integral ideals $A, B \subset \mathcal{O}$. Therefore, by **3.4**, we get $I = \prod P_i^{n_i}$ and by multiplying denominators, we see that this presentation is unique. □

Definition 2.3.13. The principle ideals generate a subgroup $\mathcal{P}_K$ of $\mathcal{J}_K$. We call the quotient group $\mathrm{Cl}_K := \mathcal{J}_K/\mathcal{P}_K$ the **ideal class group**. We have an exact sequence of groups

$$1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times \longrightarrow K^\times \overset{a \mapsto a\mathcal{O}}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{J}_K \longrightarrow \mathrm{Cl}_K \longrightarrow 1.$$

2.4 Lattices and Minkowski

Definition 2.4.1. Let V be an n-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-vector space. A **lattice** $\Lambda \subset V$ is a subgroup of the form $\mathbb{Z}v_1 + \ldots \mathbb{Z}v_m$, where $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ are linearly independent over V. We call $(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$ a **basis** of Λ and $\phi := \left\{x_1v_1 + \ldots x_mv_m \;\middle|\; x_i \in [0,1)\right\}$ a **fundamental domain** of Λ. We call Λ **complete**, if $n = m$.

CAUTION: For many people, lattices are always complete!

Example 2.4.2. (a) $\mathbb{Z}\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix} + \mathbb{Z}\begin{pmatrix}0\\1\end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a complete lattice

(b) $\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\sqrt{2} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is not a lattice, since 1 and $\sqrt{2}$ are not linearly independent.

(c) $\mathbb{Z}\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{2}\\1\end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a non-complete lattice.

Proposition 2.4.3. *A subgroup $\Lambda \subset V$ is a lattice $\Leftrightarrow$ Λ is a discrete subgroup of V.*

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$": Take $\left\{\lambda + x_1v_1 + \cdots + x_nv_n + \text{rest of basis} \;\middle|\; |x_n| < 1\right\}$ as a neighbourhood for $\lambda \in \Lambda$.
"$\Leftarrow$": Let $V_0 = \langle\Lambda\rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then we can choose a basis $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ of V_0 in Λ, such that $\Lambda_0 := \mathbb{Z}v_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}v_m$ is a lattice in V_0.

Claim: The index $[\Lambda : \Lambda_0]$ is finite.
Proof of the claim: Since Λ_0 is complete, $V = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_0} \phi_0 + \lambda$. Since Λ is discrete and ϕ_0 bounded, $\Lambda \cap \phi_0$ is finite. Hence we have only finitely many residue classes $\lambda + \Lambda_0$ of Λ and therefore $[\Lambda : \Lambda_0] =: d < \infty$.

From this follows, that $\Lambda \subset \frac{1}{d}\Lambda_0 = \mathbb{Z}(\frac{1}{d}v_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}(\frac{1}{d}v_m)$. Therefore, Λ has a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $w_1 = v_1n_1, \ldots, w_r = v_rn_r$ for some $n_i \in \frac{1}{d}\mathbb{N}$ and since Λ spans V_0, we get $r = m$ and they are linearly independent. □

Let $\Gamma = v_1\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + v_n\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a complete lattice. We define

$$\operatorname{vol}\Gamma = \operatorname{vol}\phi = |\det(v_1, \ldots, v_n)|\,.$$

Note that this definition is independent of the chosen basis since for a transformation

$$A(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = (v_1', \ldots, v_n')$$

between two bases we have $\det A = \pm 1$.

Theorem 2.4.4 (Minkowski)**.** *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex, symmetric central (i.e., $x \in X$ implies $-x \in X$) subset and let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a complete lattice. If*

$$\operatorname{vol}X > 2^n \operatorname{vol}\Gamma$$

then there exists some $\gamma \in \Gamma\backslash\{0\}$ such that $\gamma \in X$.

Proof. **Claim:** It suffices to show that there are $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$, $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$, such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma_1\right) \cap \left(\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma_2\right) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof of claim: Let $x = \frac{1}{2}x_1 + \gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}x_2 + \gamma_2$ with some $x_1, x_2 \in X$. Then

$$y = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 - x_2) = \gamma_2 - \gamma_1 \in \Gamma \backslash \{0\}$$

with $y \in X$ since X is symmetrical central.

Now let us assume that the family $\left(\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma\right)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ is pairwise disjoint. Then

$$\left(\left[\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma\right] \cap \phi\right)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$$

also consists of pairwise disjoint sets such that we obtain the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{vol}\Gamma = \operatorname{vol}\phi &\geq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \operatorname{vol}\left(\left[\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma\right] \cap \phi\right) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \operatorname{vol}\left(\frac{1}{2}X \cap [\phi - \gamma]\right) \\ &= \operatorname{vol}\left(\frac{1}{2}X\right) = \frac{1}{2^n}\operatorname{vol}X. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.5 Minkowski theory

Let $[K:\mathbb{Q}] = n$ be a field extension, $\tau_i\colon K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ different embeddings and consider the embedding

$$j\colon K \hookrightarrow K_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{\tau_i} \mathbb{C},\ a \mapsto (\tau_1(a), \ldots, \tau_n(a)).$$

Define a hermitian scalar product on $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by

$$\langle (x_{\tau_i}), (y_{\tau_i}) \rangle = \sum_{\tau_i} x_{\tau_i} \overline{y_{\tau_i}}$$

and consider the complex conjugation $F \in \operatorname{Gal}(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R})$ given by $\mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \overline{z}$. Let

$$F(\tau) = \overline{\tau}\colon a \mapsto \overline{\tau(a)}$$

and extend it to $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by

$$F\colon K_{\mathbb{C}} \to K_{\mathbb{C}},\ (x_\tau) \mapsto (\overline{x}_{\overline{\tau}}).$$

Example. Let $D > 0$ be square-free. Consider

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(\sqrt{D}\right) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}\left(\sqrt{D}\right)_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{\tau_i} \mathbb{C}$$

with

$$\tau_1\left(a + b\sqrt{D}\right) = a + b\sqrt{D} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tau_2\left(a + b\sqrt{D}\right) = a - b\sqrt{D}.$$

Then

$$j\left(a + b\sqrt{D}\right) = \left(a + b\sqrt{D}, a - b\sqrt{D}\right)$$

and $F(\tau_1) = \tau_1, F(\tau_2) = \tau_2$ such that

$$F\left(x_{\tau_1}, x_{\tau_1}\right) = \left(\overline{x}_{\tau_1}, \overline{x}_{\tau_2}\right).$$

Remark.

- $F(\langle x, y\rangle) = \langle F(x), F(y)\rangle$
- $\operatorname{Tr}\colon K_{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathbb{C}$, $(x_\tau) \mapsto \sum_\tau x_\tau$ such that $(\operatorname{Tr} \circ j)(a) = \operatorname{Tr}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(a)$

Now define the F-invariant $\mathbb{R}$-vector space

$$K_{\mathbb{R}} = K_{\mathbb{C}}^{+} = \{x \in K_{\mathbb{C}} \mid F(x) = x\} = \{x \in K_{\mathbb{C}} \mid x_{\overline{\tau}} = \overline{x_\tau} \text{ for all } \tau\}.$$

Since $\overline{\tau}(a) = \overline{\tau(a)}$ for all $a \in K$ and all τ, we have $j(K) \subset K_{\mathbb{R}}$. We call $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ the **Minkowski space** and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\big|_{K_{\mathbb{R}}}$ the **canonical metric**.

Remark. Note that $j\colon K \to K_{\mathbb{R}} \cong K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$, where the isomorphism is given by $a \otimes x \mapsto j(a)x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Explicit description of $K_{\mathbb{R}}$: Let $n = r + 2s$, where r and s are the number of embeddings

$$\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_r\colon K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$\sigma_1, \overline{\sigma_1}, \ldots, \sigma_s, \overline{\sigma_s}\colon K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C},$$

respectively. Notice that $F(\varphi_i) = \varphi_i$ and $F(\sigma_j) = \overline{\sigma_j}$. Then elements of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ are of the form

$$x = \left(x_{\varphi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\varphi(r)}, x_{\sigma_1}, x_{\overline{\sigma_1}}, \ldots, x_{\sigma_s}, x_{\overline{\sigma_s}}\right)$$

with

$$F(x) = \left(\overline{x_{\varphi_1}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{\varphi_r}}, \overline{x_{\overline{\sigma_1}}}, \overline{x_{\sigma_1}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{\overline{\sigma_s}}}, \overline{x_{\sigma_s}}\right).$$

Hence we have

$$K_{\mathbb{R}} = \left\{x \in K_{\mathbb{C}} \,\middle|\, x_{\varphi_i} \in \mathbb{R}, x_{\overline{\sigma_j}} = \overline{x_{\sigma_j}}\right\}.$$

Proposition 2.5.1. *The map*

$$f\colon K_{\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{R}^{r+2s} = \prod_\tau \mathbb{R},$$
$$x \mapsto (x_{\varphi_1}, \dots, x_{\varphi_r}, \operatorname{Re} x_{\sigma_1}, \operatorname{Im} x_{\sigma_1}, \dots, \operatorname{Re} x_{\sigma_s}, \operatorname{Im} x_{\sigma_s}.)$$

is an isomorphism. It transforms the canonical metric into the scalar product

$$\langle x, y\rangle = \sum_\tau \alpha_\tau x_\tau y_\tau,$$

where

$$\alpha_\tau = \begin{cases} 1, & \tau = \varphi_i \textit{ for some } i, \\ 2, & \tau = \sigma_j \textit{ for some } j. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Obviously, f is an isomorphism. For $x = (x_\tau), y = (y_\tau) \in K_{\mathbb{R}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, y\rangle\big|_{K_{\mathbb{R}}} &= \sum_\tau x_\tau \overline{y_\tau} \\ &= \sum_{\varphi_i} x_{\varphi_i} y_{\varphi_i} + \sum_{\sigma_j} x_{\sigma_j}\overline{y_{\sigma_j}} + \sum_{\overline{\sigma_j}} \overline{\left(x_{\sigma_j}\overline{y_{\sigma_j}}\right)} \\ &= \dots = (f(x), f(y)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark.

- The canonical metric induces a volume $\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{can}}$ on $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ and thus on $\mathbb{R}^{r+2s}$.
- If we denote the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{r+2s}$ by $\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{Leb}}$ then, for $X \subset K_{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$2^s \operatorname{vol}_{\mathrm{Leb}} f(X) = \operatorname{vol}_{\mathrm{can}} X.$$

- We will thus consider $K \supset U \xrightarrow{j} j(U) \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{R}^{r+2s}$.