COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

MARIUS VAN DER PUT

De Rham cohomology of affinoid spaces

Compositio Mathematica, tome 73, n° 2 (1990), p. 223-239
<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1990__73_2_223_0>

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1990, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (http://http://www.compositio.nl/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM
Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

Compositio Mathematica **73**: 223–239, 1990.
© *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.*

De Rham cohomology of affinoid spaces

MARIUS VAN DER PUT
Mathematisch Instituut, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Postbus 800, Groningen, The Netherlands

Received 29 April 1984; accepted in revised form 23 July 1989

The singular cohomology groups $H^*(X, \mathbb{C})$ of a non-singular algebraic variety X over $\mathbb{C}$ can be obtained from the algebraic de Rham complex ([8]). For a non-singular variety Y over a finite field k this de Rham complex does not give the "correct" groups. A construction to remedy this has been proposed and carried out by Dwork, Monsky, Washnitzer, Berthelot and others. It can be described as follows. The affine non-singular variety Y is lifted to an affinoid space X over $K =$ the field of fractions of $W(k)$. Let A denote the ring of holomorphic functions on X. The de Rham complex $\Omega^\cdot$ of the holomorphic differential forms on X still does not give the correct cohomology groups. One refines the construction by introducing a subring $A^\dagger \subset A$ of overconvergent holomorphic functions. The de Rham complex $\Omega^\cdot(A^\dagger)$ of overconvergent differential forms has in many cases the correct cohomology.

In this paper one studies the de Rham cohomology for general affinoid spaces $X = \mathrm{spm}(A)$ over a field K of characteristic o. Such a space can be seen as a lift of an affine space $Y = \mathrm{spec}(\bar{A})$ over the residue field of K. In general Y has singularities and one can no longer apply the Monsky-Washnitzer theory. In particular an affinoid algebra A need not have an overconvergent presentation.

In section 1 one uses Artin-approximation in order to show that the de Rham-cohomology groups of an affinoid space $X = \mathrm{spm}(A)$ where A has an overconvergent presentation φ, do not depend on the choice of φ. Further it is shown that any non-singular X (the affine space Y can have arbitrary singularities) has at least locally for the Grothendieck topology on X an overconvergent presentation. This enables us to define de Rham cohomology sheaves on X.

In the special case that X is non-singular, connected and $\dim X = 1$, one uses an embedding of X in a non-singular projective curve over K to obtain an overconvergent presentation. In section 2 the same embedding is used for an explicit formula of $\dim \mathrm{H}^1_{DR}(X)$. For certain families of one-dimensional affinoid spaces $X \to S$ the method above gives the rank of the $\mathcal{O}(S)$-module $H^1_{DR}(XS)$. This resembles a result of Adolphson [1] and recent work of Baldassarri [3].

For affinoid spaces X with $\dim X > 1$ we have only some results in the case "X is the complement of a hypersurface $t = o$". In case $\bar{t} = 0$ defines a non-

singular hypersurface over the residue field of K, the Monsky–Washnitzer theory has a residue map and a Gysin exact sequence ([11]) and one knows that $\dim H^{\cdot}_{DR}(X) < \infty$. In section 3 we allow $\bar{t} = 0$ (and also $t = 0$) to have singularities. A residue map is constructed and a Gysin-exact sequence. This leads to some results on $H^{\cdot}_{DR}(X)$. For the cohomology theory of Dwork, Monsky and Washnitzer we refer to [10, 11, 14, 15] and for affinoid spaces to [5, 6, 7].

Section 1. Overconvergence

In this section K is complete with respect to a non-archimedean valuation. Let $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle$ denote the free affinoid algebra over K in the explicitly given variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. An element $f = \sum a_\alpha X^\alpha \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle$ is called *overconvergent* if for some $\lambda > 1$ one has $\lim |a_\alpha| \lambda^{|\alpha|} = 0$. The subring of overconvergent elements is denoted by $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$.

LEMMA 1.1. *Weierstrass preparation and division is valid for* $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$.

Proof. We follow the by now classical method (see [6] p. 55, 56). Let $F \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ have norm 1. A linear substitution $X_i \to \sum \lambda_{ij} X_j$ with $(\lambda_{ij}) \in \mathrm{Gl}(n, K^\circ)$ (where K° is the valuationring of K) or a substitution of the form $X_i \to X_i + X_n^{e_i} (i = 1, \ldots, n-1)$ and $X_n \to X_n$ makes F regular in X_n of some degree d. The substitution leaves $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ invariant. For a suitable integer $N \geqslant 1$ and all $\lambda > 1, \lambda \in \sqrt{|K^*|}$ and λ close enough to 1, the element F remains regular in X_n of degree d on the polydisk $\{(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \in K^n \| X_i| \leqslant \lambda$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and $|X_n| \leqslant \lambda^N\}$. An element $G \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ extends to such a polydisk and hence in the usual Weierstrass division $G = QF + R$, the elements Q and R belong to $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$.

Among other properties of $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ one can derive from (1.1) the following:

COROLLARY 1.2 (Monsky and Washnitzer [10]). $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ *is noetherian.*

DEFINITION. Let A be an affinoid algebra over K. An overconvergent presentation φ of A is a surjective K-algebra homomorphism $\varphi: K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle \to A$ such that the kernel of φ is generated by overconvergent elements. We define $(\varphi, A)^\dagger$ as $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger / (\ker \varphi) \cap K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$.

LEMMA 1.3.

(1) $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger \hookrightarrow K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle$ *is faithfully flat.*

(2) *Let* φ *be an overconvergent presentation of the affinoid algebra* A. *If* $(f_1, \ldots, f_m) = \ker \varphi$ *with* $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ *then* $(\varphi, A)^\dagger = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger / (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$. *Further* $(\varphi, A)^\dagger \to A$ *is faithfully flat.*

Proof. (1) For any maximal ideal $\underline{m}$ of $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ one shows with the

aid of (1.1) that $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger/\underline{m}$ is a finite extension of K. (see [4] (II. 3.5)). Hence there exists a unique maximal ideal M of $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle$ with $M\cap K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger=\underline{m}$. The completions of $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger$ localized at $\underline{m}$ and $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle$ localized at M are isomorphic and so $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger\to K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle$ is faithfully flat.

(2) is an immediate consequence of (1).

PROPOSITION (1.4) (S. Bosch [4]). *Let the complete field K have either characteristic 0 or satisfy $[K:K^p]<\infty$ with $0\neq p=\operatorname{char}K$, then $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger$ has the Artin approximation property.*

Commentary. The statement of the Artin approximation in this case reads: "Let $f_1,\ldots,f_m$ belong to $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_a,Y_1,\ldots,Y_b\rangle^\dagger$, let $\varepsilon>0$ and let $\bar{y}_1,\ldots,\bar{y}_b$ in $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_a\rangle$ have norms $\leqslant 1$ and satisfy $f_i(X_1,\ldots,X_a,\bar{y}_1,\ldots,\bar{y}_b)=0$ $(i=1,\ldots,m)$ Then there are $y_1,\ldots,y_b\in K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_a\rangle^\dagger$ with $\|y_i-\bar{y}_i\|\leqslant\varepsilon$ and $f_i(X_1,\ldots,X_a,y_1,\ldots,y_b)=0$ for $i=1,\ldots,m$".

Artin's proof in [2] can be adapted to the above case without any surprises. In case char $K=p\neq 0$ one has to add a verification of Lemma (2.2) [2] page 283. In the local analytic case such a verification is provided in [12] Section 8. This proof in the local case carries over to the case of overconvergent power series.

As in [2] Theorem (1.5a) we have the following consequences.

COROLLARY 1.5. *Suppose that* $\operatorname{char}K=0$ *or* $\operatorname{char}K=p\neq 0$ *and* $[K:K^p]<\infty$. *Let A and B denote affinoid algebra's with overconvergent presentations φ and ψ. Let $u\colon A\to B$ be a morphism and let $\varepsilon>0$. Then there exists a morphism $u'\colon A\to B$ with $\|u-u'\|\leqslant\varepsilon$ and such that u' maps $(\varphi,A)^\dagger$ into $(\psi,B)^\dagger$. In particular if φ_1 and φ_2 are two overconvergent presentations of A and for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists an automorphism u of A with $\|u-1\|\leqslant\varepsilon$ and $u((\varphi_1,A)^\dagger)=(\varphi_2,A)^\dagger$.*

COROLLARY 1.6. *$A=K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle/I$ has an overconvergent presentation if and only if there exists an automorphism σ of $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle$ such that $\sigma(I)$ is generated by elements of $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger$.*

Proof (1.5) follows from (1.4) along the lines of [2]. The only new thing one uses is: if $u\colon A\to A$ satisfies $\|u-1\|<1$ then u is an isomorphism. (1.6) The "if" parts as obvious. Suppose that A has an overconvergent presentation φ. Then there exists $u'\colon K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle\to A$ with $\|u'-u\|\leqslant\varepsilon<1$ and $u'(K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger)\subseteq(\varphi,A)^\dagger$. With the help of the Weierstrass-Theorem 1.1 one shows that $u'\colon K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle^\dagger\to(\varphi,A)^\dagger$ is actually surjective. The faithful flatness implies that $\ker(u')$ is generated by overconvergent elements. So u' is also an overconvergent presentation. Further $u'=u\sigma$ for some automorphism of $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n\rangle$. This proves (1.6).

PROPOSITION 1.7. *Every reduced one-dimensional affinoid algebra has an overconvergent presentation.*

Proof. Let A denote the normalisation of this algebra. It suffices to show that every connected component of A has an overconvergent presentation. According to [13] a regular, connected, one-dimensional affinoid space can be embedded into a complete non-singular curve. This means a presentation by polynomial equations and hence an overconvergent presentation.

PROPOSITION 1.8. *Suppose that the affinoid algebra A is smooth over K. Then $X = \mathrm{Sp}(A)$ has a finite covering by rational subspaces $X_i = \mathrm{Sp}(A_i)$ such that each A_i carries an overconvergent presentation.*

Proof. Let B have an overconvergent presentation φ then every rational subspace U of $\mathrm{Sp}(B)$ carries an induced overconvergent presentation, since

$$\mathcal{O}(U) = B\langle T_1, \ldots, T_m\rangle/(f_1 - f_0 T_1, \ldots, f_m - f_0 T_m)$$

where $f_0, \ldots, f_m \in B$ can be chosen in the dense subring $(\varphi, B)^\dagger$ of B. According to Kiehl ([9] Folgerung (1.14)) a smooth X has locally the form $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, 1/t\rangle[Y]/(P) = B$ where $t \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle$ is an element with norm 1 and P is a monic polynomial in Y with coefficients in $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle$ such that $\mathrm{d}P/\mathrm{d}Y$ is invertible in B. Of course we may truncate t without changing B. Newton's method on approximation of roots shows that a monic polynomial $Q \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle[Y]$ which is close enough to P defines an affinoid algebra isomorphic to B. So we are allowed to truncate the coefficients of P and we obtain that B can be defined by polynomial equations. The proposition follows.

In the sequel of this paper we assume that K has characteristic 0. Let A/K be a connected, non-singular, affinoid algebra of Krull-dimension n, which has an overconvergent presentation φ. By $\Omega^1(\varphi, A)^\dagger$ or $\Omega^1(A^\dagger)$ we denote the module of continuous differentials of $(\varphi, A)^\dagger$. If φ induces the isomorphism $(\varphi, A)^+ \cong K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_a\rangle^\dagger/(f_1, \ldots, f_b)$ then $\Omega^1(\varphi, A)^\dagger$ is an $(\varphi, A)^\dagger$-module generated by $\mathrm{d}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{d}x_a$ and the relations between the generators are given by

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_1}\mathrm{d}x_1 + \cdots + \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_a}\mathrm{d}x_a = 0 \ (i = 1, \ldots, b).$$

Clearly $\Omega^1(\varphi, A)^\dagger \otimes A$ is isomorphic to the usual module of continuous differentials of A/K. Further $\Omega^1(A, \varphi)^\dagger$ is a projective module of rank n. Put $\Omega^p(\varphi, A)^\dagger = \Lambda^p \Omega^1(\varphi, A)^\dagger$, then we have a De Rham complex $\Omega^\cdot(\varphi, A)^\dagger$. This complex depends on the choice of φ. The cohomology groups however do not depend on φ according to (1.5).

We will write $H^\cdot_{DR}(\varphi, A)$ or $H^\cdot_{DR}(X)$ or $H^\cdot_{DR}(\varphi, X)$, where $X = \mathrm{Spm}(A)$, for the cohomology of the de Rham complex $\Omega^\cdot(\varphi, A)^\dagger$. We will need a stronger version of the independence of φ. Let ε denote $p^{1/(p-1)}$ if the residue characteristic of K is $p \neq 0$ and 1 otherwise.

PROPOSITION 1.9. *Let A/K be as above and let φ and ψ denote two overconvergent presentations of A. Let u and v be automorphisms of A with $\|u-1\|, \|v-1\| < \varepsilon$ such that u and v are bijections $(\varphi, A)^\dagger \to (\psi, A)^\dagger$. Then u and v induce the same bijections $H^\cdot_{DR}(\varphi, A) \to H^\cdot_{DR}(\psi, A)$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that an automorphism u of A with $u(\varphi, A)^\dagger = (\varphi, A)^\dagger$ and $\|u-1\| < \varepsilon$ induces the identity on $H^\cdot_{DR}(\varphi, A)$.

One defines $D = \log(1+(u-1)) = \sum(-1)^n(u-1)^{n+1}/n+1$ as endomorphism of A. Then D is a derivation of A over K and $\|D\| < \varepsilon$ and $u = \exp(D) = \sum_{n\geqslant 0}(D^n/n!)$. Consider the morphism of affinoid algebra $F: A \to A\langle T\rangle$ given by the formula

$$F(a) = \sum_{N\geqslant 0} \frac{D^n(a)}{n!} T^n.$$

Let $\alpha_0, \alpha_1: (\varphi, A)^\dagger\langle T\rangle^\dagger \to (\varphi, A)^\dagger$ denote the $(\varphi, A)^\dagger$-algebra homomorphism given by $\alpha_0(T) = 0$ and $\alpha_1(T) = l$. One easily verifies that F maps $(\varphi, A)^\dagger$ into $(\varphi, A)^\dagger\langle T\rangle^\dagger$ and that $\alpha_0.F = \mathrm{id}$ and $\alpha_1.F = u$.

It suffices now to show that α_0 and α_1 induce the same maps in the de Rham cohomology. We will show that α_0 and α_1 are homotopic. The space $\Omega^q(\varphi, A)^\dagger\langle T\rangle^\dagger)$ is the direct sum of $(\varphi, A)^\dagger\langle T\rangle^\dagger \otimes_{(\varphi,A)^\dagger} \Omega^q(\varphi, A)^\dagger$ and $(\varphi, A)^\dagger\langle T\rangle^\dagger \mathrm{d}T \otimes_{(\varphi,A)^\dagger} \Omega^{q-1}(\varphi, A)^\dagger$. The homotopy $\{\delta_q\}$ between $(\alpha_0)^*$ and $(\alpha_1)^*$ is given by: δ_q is zero on the first vectorspace and δ_q is integration from 0 to 1 with respect to T on the second vectorspace. This proves 1.9.

1.10. Sheaves of de Rham cohomology

Let again A/K denote a non-singular, affinoid algebra of Krull-dimension n. Let $X = \mathrm{Spm}(A)$ denote the associated affinoid space and let $U \subset X$ be a rational subset. Then there are $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_m \in A$ generating the unit ideal such that

$$U = \{x \in X \mid \|f_0(x)\| \geqslant |f_i(x)| \quad \text{for all } i\}.$$

Moreover

$$\mathcal{O}_X(U) = \mathcal{O}(U) = A\langle T_1, \ldots, T_m\rangle/(f_1 - f_0 T_1, \ldots, f_m - f_0 T).$$

For an overconvergent presentation φ of A one can choose $f_0, \ldots, f_m \in (\varphi, A)^\dagger$ and one finds an overconvergent presentation of $\mathcal{O}(U)$ not depending on the choices of $f_0, \ldots, f_m \in (\varphi, A)^\dagger$ but only depending on φ. We write $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}(U)^\dagger)$ for the corresponding subring of $\mathcal{O}(U)$ and $\Omega^q(\varphi, \mathcal{O}(U))^\dagger$ for the corresponding

differential forms on U. The complex of sheaves $U \to \Omega^{\cdot}(\varphi, \mathcal{O}(U)^{\dagger})$ on X has sheaves of cohomology $U \to \mathcal{H}^{\cdot}(\varphi)(U)$ associated with the pre-sheave $U \to H^{\cdot}_{DR}(\varphi, U)$. We will consider the dependence on φ.

Let ψ be another overconvergent presentation of A and let $U \subset X = \mathrm{Spm}(A)$ be a rational subset. There is an $\varepsilon > 0$ (depending on U) such that for any automorphism u of A with $\| u - 1 \| < \varepsilon$ the identity $u(U) = U$ holds. Choose u such that $\| u - 1 \| < \varepsilon$ and $u(\varphi, A)^{\dagger} = (\psi, A)^{\dagger}$. Then $u(\varphi, \mathcal{O}(U))^{\dagger} = (\psi, \mathcal{O}(U))^{\dagger}$ and u induces a bijection $l^{\cdot}(U): H^{\cdot}_{DR}(\varphi, U) \to H^{\cdot}_{DR}(\psi, U)$ depending only on φ, ψ, U. The resulting isomorphisms of sheaves $l^{\cdot}: \mathcal{H}^{\cdot}(\varphi) \to \mathcal{H}^{\cdot}(\psi)$ depend only on φ and ψ. Further $H^{\cdot}_{DR}(\varphi, X)$ can be recovered from $\mathcal{H}^{\cdot}(\varphi)$ with the spectral sequence $\{H^k(X, \mathcal{H}^l(\varphi)\}$.

The above enables us to define *the sheaves of the de Rham conomology for any rigid analytic space X over K which is non-singular and pure of dimension n.*

Indeed by (1.8), X has an admissible covering $\{X_i\}$ by affinoid spaces having overconvergent presentations $\{\varphi_i\} = \varphi$. The sheaves $\mathcal{H}^{\cdot}(\varphi_i)$ on X_i have canonical isomorphisms $\mathcal{H}^{\cdot}(\varphi_i)|X_i \cap X_j \to \mathcal{H}^{\cdot}(\varphi_j)|X_i \cap X_j$. So we find sheaves $(\mathcal{H}^{\cdot}, \varphi)$ on X. For another admissible covering of X and another family of overconvergent presentations ψ one finds a canonical isomorphism $(\mathcal{H}^{\cdot}, \varphi) \to (\mathcal{H}^{\cdot}, \psi)$.

The hypercohomology of the usual de Rham complex $\Omega^{\cdot}$ on X gives rise to a spectral sequence $E_r \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^{\cdot}(\Omega^{\cdot})$ with $E_2^{p,q} = H^p(X, \mathcal{H}^q)$. It is possible to construct an overconvergent version $(E, \varphi)_r, r \geqslant 1$, of this spectral sequence with $(E, \varphi)_2^{p,q} = H^p(X, (\mathcal{H}^q, \varphi))$. This might lead to a definition of overconvergent de Rham cohomology on X as above.

In many cases, e.g. X is proper or X is an algebraic variety or $\dim X = 1$, the overconvergent presentations $\varphi = \{\varphi_i\}$ can be chosen such that φ_i and φ_j coincide on $X_i \cap X_j$ for all i, j. In such a case there is an overconvergent de Rham complex $(\Omega^{\cdot}, \varphi)$ and the overconvergent de Rham cohomology is defined as the hypercohomology of $(\Omega^{\cdot}, \varphi)$. (and does not depend on φ).

(1.11) AN EXAMPLE. Let $Z = \mathrm{Spm}(K\langle X, Y\rangle/(Y^2 - X(X - \pi)(X - 1)))$ where $0 < |\pi| < 1$. We take the obvious overconvergent presentation. The spectral sequence implies the exactness of

$$0 \to H^1(Z, (\mathcal{H}^0, \varphi)) \to H^1_{DR}(Z) \to H^0(Z, (\mathcal{H}^1, \varphi)) \to 0.$$

$(\mathcal{H}^0, \varphi)$ is the constant sheaf with stalk K and the bad reduction of Z implies $H^1(Z, K) = K$. Using Section 2 one can calculate $\dim H^1_{DR}(Z) = 2$ and so $\dim H^0(Z, (\mathcal{H}^1, \varphi)) = 1$.

Section 2. Dimension one

The field K is supposed to have characteristic 0 and to be algebraically closed.

THEOREM 2.1. (Compare [1]). *Let X be a connected, non-singular, one-dimensional affinoid space. Then X can be embedded in a complete non-singular curve $\hat{X}$ of genus g such that $X = \hat{X} - (B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_n)$ where the B_i are distinct open subspaces of $\hat{X}$ isomorphic to $\{z \in K \mid |z| < 1\}$. The de Rham cohomology groups of X are:*

$$H^0_{DR}(X) = K; H^1_{DR}(X) = K^{2g+(n-1)}; H^i_{DR}(X) = 0 \quad \text{for } i > 1.$$

Proof. The embedding $X \hookrightarrow \hat{X}$ is constructed in [13]. We consider first the case $n = 1$. Let $\tau: \{z \in K \mid |z| < 1\} \xrightarrow{\sim} B_1$ be an analytic isomorphism. Choose a sequence $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < \ldots$ in $|K^*|$ with $\lim \rho_m = 1$. Put $X_m = \hat{X} - \tau\{z \in K \mid |z| < \rho_m\}$ and $\partial X_m = \tau\{z \in K \mid |z| = \rho_m\}$. Then $\mathcal{O}(X)^\dagger = \varinjlim \mathcal{O}(X_m)$ and $\Omega^1(X_m)^\dagger = \varinjlim \Omega^1(X_m)$ are provided with the direct limit topology. The kernel of the continuous map $d: \mathcal{O}(X)^\dagger \to \Omega^1(X)^\dagger$ consists of the constant functions on X, (i.e. K) and we have only to show that coker(d) has dimension $2g$.

To any $f \in \mathcal{O}(X_m)$ we associate $f \circ \tau$ defined on $\{z \in K \mid \rho_m \leqslant |z| < 1\}$ and its expansion $f \circ \tau = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} a_n z^n$.

LEMMA 2.2. $\| f \|_m :=$ *the supremum-norm of f on X_m is equal to* $\max_{n \leqslant 0} |a_n| \rho_m^n$.

Proof. In the canonical reduction $X_m \to \bar{X}_m$ the subset $X_m - \partial X_m$ is mapped to one point. So for every $f \in \mathcal{O}(X_m)$ we have that $\| f \|_m$ equals the supremum norm on $\partial X_m = \max_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}(|a_n| \rho_m^n)$.

This expression decreases when ρ_m increases. It follows that $|a_k| \rho_m^k < \max_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |a_n| \rho_m^n$ for every $k > 0$. This proves (2.2).

LEMMA 2.3. *The image of $d: \mathcal{O}(X)^\dagger \to \Omega^1(X)^\dagger$ is closed.*

Proof. Let E denote the image. We have to show that $E \cap \Omega^1(X_m)$ is closed for every m. Choose a converging sequence $\omega_i \in E \cap \Omega^1(X_m)$. Let $f_i \in \mathcal{O}(X)^\dagger$ satisfy $\mathrm{d}f_i = \omega_i$. The expansion of $f_i \circ \tau$ is $\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} a_n(i) z^n$ where we have chosen $a_0(i) = 0$. It is convergent on $\rho_m < |z| < 1$ since $\omega_i \circ \tau = d(f_i \circ \tau) = \sum n a_n(i) z^{n-1} \, \mathrm{d}z$ converges on $\rho_m \leqslant |z| < 1$.

Further $f_i \circ \tau$ is a Cauchy sequence for the supremum norm on $\{z \in K \mid |z| = \rho_{m+1}\}$. Indeed, according to (2.2)

$$\begin{aligned} &\| f_i \circ \tau - f_{i+1} \circ \tau \|_{|z| = \rho_{m+1}} \\ &\quad = \max_{n < 0} |a_n(i) - a_n(i+1)| \rho_{m+1}^n \\ &\quad = \max_{n < 0} (|n a_n(i) - n a_n(i+1)| \rho_m^{n-1} (|n|^{-1} \rho_m^{1-n} \rho_{m+1}^n)); \end{aligned}$$

let the constant c satisfy $c \geqslant |n|^{-1} \rho_m^{1-n} \rho_{m+1}^n$ for all $n < 0$ then one finds

$$\| f_i \circ \tau - f_{i+1} \circ \tau \|_{|z| = \rho_{m+1}} \leqslant c \| \omega_i - \omega_{i+1} \|_m.$$

So $\{f_i\}$ is according to (2.2) a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{O}(X_{m+1})$. Then $f_\infty = \lim f_i \in \mathcal{O}(X_{m+1})$ satisfies $d(f_\infty) = \lim \omega_i$. Hence $\lim \omega_i \in E \cap \Omega^1(X_m)$.

We continue now the proof of (2.1). Let $\mathcal{O}_a(\hat{X} - \tau(0))$ and $\Omega^1_a(\hat{X} - \tau(0))$ denote the meromorphic (or rational) functions and differential forms on $\hat{X}$ with only a pole in $\tau(0)$.

The differentiation $\mathrm{d}_1 : \mathcal{O}_a(\hat{X} - \tau(0)) \to \Omega^1_a(\hat{X} - \tau(0))$ has a cokernel H of dimension $2g$ as one easily computes with the help of Riemann–Roch. This yields an injective map $H \to H^1_{DR}(X) = \mathrm{coker}(\mathrm{d}: \mathcal{O}(X)^\dagger \to \Omega^1(X)^\dagger)$.

The vectorspace $H^1_{DR}(X)$ provided with the topology induced by $\Omega^1(X)^\dagger$ is a locally convex Hausdorff space. It induces on H the usual topology since $\dim H < \infty$ and the topology is Hausdorff. So H is complete as a subspace of $H^1_{DR}(X)$. Since $\Omega^1_a(\hat{X} - \tau(0))$ is dense in $\Omega^1(X)^\dagger$ one finds that H is dense in $H^1_{DR}(X)$. This implies $H = H^1_{DR}(X)$ and it proves the case $n = 1$.

The exact and commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 \to & \mathcal{O}(\hat{X}) & \to & \mathcal{O}(\hat{X} - B_1)^\dagger \oplus \mathcal{O}(\hat{X} - B_2)^\dagger & \to & \mathcal{O}(\hat{X} - B_1 \cup B_2)^\dagger & \to & H^1(\hat{X}, \mathcal{O}) & \to 0 \\
& \downarrow d & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow d & & & \\
0 \to & \Omega^1(\hat{X}) & \to & \Omega^1(\hat{X} - B_1)^\dagger \oplus \Omega^1(\hat{X} - B_2)^\dagger & \to & \Omega^1(\hat{X} - B_1 \cup B_2)^\dagger & \to & H^1(\hat{X}, \Omega^1) & \to 0
\end{array}$$

and $H^1(\hat{X}, \Omega^1) \cong K; H^1(\hat{X}, \mathcal{O}) \cong K^g$ implies the case $n = 2$ of the theorem. By induction, with a similar proof of the induction step, one obtains the general statement.

EXAMPLE 2.4. Let X be the affinoid subspace of $\mathbb{P}^1$ of the form $X = \{z \in K \mid |z| \leqslant 1\} - B_1 \cup B_2 \ldots B_n$, where the B_i's are disjoint open discs of radii $|\pi_i|$ and with centers a_i.

Every element f of $\mathcal{O}(X)$ has a unique expression

$$f = \sum_{m \geqslant 0} a_m(0) z^m + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{m > 0} a_m(i) \left(\frac{\pi_i}{z - a_i} \right)^m$$

in which each $\sum_{m \geqslant 0} a_m(i) T^m (i = 0, \ldots, n)$ is a power series with $\lim a_m(i) = 0$. The element f is overconvergent if and only if each $\sum a_m(i) T^m$ is overconvergent. An easy calculation shows that the images of the differential forms $(\pi_i / z - a_i)\, \mathrm{d}z (i - 1, \ldots, n)$ form a basis of $H^1_{DR}(X)$.

EXAMPLE 2.5. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a compact subset of $\mathbb{P}^1$ not containing ∞ and let X denote the open subspace $\mathbb{P}^1 - \mathscr{L}$ of $\mathbb{P}^1$. The kernel of $\mathrm{d}: \mathcal{O}(X) \to \Omega^1(X)$ is of course K. The cokernel of d can be identified with the finite additive K-valued measures μ on $\mathscr{L}$ with total measure $\mu(\mathscr{L}) = 0$. Equivalently one can describe the cokernel of d as the K-vectorspace of K-valued currents on the tree of the reduction of X. Let $\omega \in \Omega^1(X)$. The measure μ corresponding to ω can be described as follows. Let $U \subset \mathscr{L}$ be a compact open subset. There exists a connected affinoid $Y \subset X$ containing ∞, such that $\mathbb{P}^1 - Y = B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_n$, the

$B_1, \ldots, B_n$ are open discs and the corresponding closed discs are still disjoint. Further it can be arranged such that $(B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_s) \cap \mathscr{L} = U$.
Then

$$\mu(U) := \sum_{i=1}^{s} \operatorname{res}_{\partial B_i}(\omega).$$

The Example 2.4 shows that $\mu = 0$ is equivalent to ω is exact. On the other hand, a construction analogous to [6] I.8.9. shows that every such measure μ is the image of a differential form ω.

REMARK 2.6. The condition "K algebraically closed" in Theorem 2.1 is superfluous. In general for a finite extension L of the field K one sees that $H^i_{DR}(X) \otimes_K L \cong H^i_{DR}(X \otimes_K L)$. If X is absolutely non-singular and connected of dimension 1 then there exists a finite extension L of K such that $X \otimes_K L$ can be embedded in a complete, non-singular curve Y over L such that $Y - X \otimes_K L$ is the disjoint union of n subspaces isomorphic to $\{z \in L \mid |z| < 1\}$. The proof of (2.1) yields $H^1_{DR}(X \otimes_K L) = L^{2g+(n-1)}$ and this determines $H^1_{DR}(X)$.

COROLLARY 2.7. *Let $X, \hat{X}, B_1, \ldots, B_n$ be as in* (2.1). *Choose $a_i \in B_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then the natural maps of the algebraic De Rham cohomology groups $H^i_{DR}(\hat{X} - \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\})$ into the analytic De Rham cohomology groups $H^i_{DR}(X)$ are isomorphisms.*

Proof. For $i = 0$, this is obvious. For $i = 1$, both spaces have dimension $2g + (n-1)$ and one has to show that the map is injective. Let ω be an algebraic differential form on $\hat{X} - \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ and suppose that $\omega = \mathrm{d}f$ for some $f \in \mathscr{O}(X)^\dagger$. There are open discs $B_i' \subsetneqq B_i (i = 1, \ldots n)$ such that f is holomorphic on $X' = \hat{X} - (B_1' \cup \cdots \cup B_n')$ and $\omega = \mathrm{d}f$ holds on X'. Using isomorphisms $\tau_i \colon B_i \xrightarrow{\sim} \{z \in K \mid |z| < 1\}$ such that $\tau_i(a_i) = 0$ and $\tau_i(B_i') = \{z \in K \mid |z| < \rho_i\}$ for some $\rho_i < 1$ we find that $\omega|_{B_i}$ has the form $\sum_{n \gg -\infty} a_{n,i} \tau_i^n d_i$. The terms $a_{-1,i}$ are zero since $\omega = \mathrm{d}f$ holds on $\rho_i < |\tau_i| < 1$ and $f = \text{constant} + \sum_{n \neq -1} (a_{n,i}/n+1) \tau_i^{n+1}$ extends to a meromorphic function on B_i with possibly a pole at a_i. So f is a rational function on $\hat{X}$ with poles $\subseteq \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$. This shows that the map between the H^1_{DR}-groups is injective.

2.8. *A generalization of theorem 2.1.*

For certain families $\rho \colon X \to S$ of one-dimensional affinoid spaces we will generalize (2.1). Here X and S are connected affinoid spaces, ρ is smooth, the fibres of ρ have dimension one and ρ has an overconvergent presentation. The last statement means that $\mathscr{O}(X)$ can be written in the form $\mathscr{O}(S)\langle T_1, \ldots, T_n \rangle / (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ where each f_i is overconvergent w.r.t. $T_1, \ldots, T_n$. The problem is to determine $\ker(d)$ and $\operatorname{coker}(d) = H^1_{DR}(X/S)$ for

$$d \colon \mathscr{O}(X)^\dagger \to \Omega^\dagger_{X/S}.$$

We suppose that X/S is obtained from a curve $\tilde{X}/S$ by deleting open, disjoint discs $B_1, \ldots, B_n$. This means the following:

$\tilde{X}/S$ is a connected and smooth curve of genus g. The open disc B_i is the image of an open immersion $u_i: S \times \{t \in K \mid |t| < 1\} \to \tilde{X}$ such that $\rho \circ u_i$ is the projection onto S. Further $X = \tilde{X} - B_i \cup \cdots \cup B_n$. The embedding $X \subset \tilde{X}$ induces an obvious overconvergent presentation for $X \to S$. One easily verifies that the proof of (2.1) extends to the new situation. One finds as result: $\ker(d) = \mathcal{O}(S)$ and $\operatorname{coker}(d)$ is a projective $\mathcal{O}(S)$-module of rank $2g + (n-1)$.

EXAMPLES 2.9.

(1) $S = \operatorname{Spm}(K\langle\lambda, (1/\lambda(1-\lambda)\rangle)$ and

$$X = \operatorname{Spm}(\mathcal{O}(S)\langle X, Y\rangle/(Y^2 - X(X-1)(X-\lambda))).$$

Then $H^1_{DR}(X/S)$ is a free $\mathcal{O}(S)$-module of rank 2

(2) S as above and X the affinoid space with algebra:

$\mathcal{O}(S)\langle X, (1/X(X-1)(X-\lambda)), Y\rangle/(Y^N - X^A(X-1)^B(X-\lambda)^C)$, where $(N, A, B, C) = 1$ and $0 < A, B, C < N$.

Then $H^1_{DR}(X/S)$ is a free $\mathcal{O}(S)$-module of rank $2N + 1$.

In the examples above the Gauss–Manin connection can be defined on $H^1_{DR}(X/S)$. This differential equation is a direct sum of hypergeometric equations.

3. The complement of a hypersurface

In this section we do some calculations on the de Rham cohomology of the affinoid space $X = \operatorname{Sp}(A)$ in which A has the form $A = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle$ and $t \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle$ is an element with norm 1. The algebra A depends only on the zero-set of the residue class $\bar{t} \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ of t. So we may suppose that t and $\bar{t}$ are polynomials of degree d and that $\bar{t}$ has no multiple factors. Further $X = \operatorname{Sp}(A)$ is an affinoid subset of $\{X \in K^n \mid t(X) \neq 0\}$ = the complement of the hypersurface.

In the special case where $\bar{t} = 0$ is a non-singular variety in $\bar{K}^n$ one can apply the Gysin exact sequence of [11] II p. 231.

$$\to H^{i-2}_{DR}(B) \to H^i_{DR}(A') \to H^i_{DR}(A) \to H^{i-1}_{DR}(B) \to \cdots$$

with $A' = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle$; $A = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle$; $B = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle/(t)$.

Indeed, $\bar{A}'$ and $\bar{A}'/(\bar{t})$ are non-singular complete intersections. This gives a reduction in the dimenson for the calculation of the H^i_{DR}. In the special case $n = 2$ one finds the following:

Let $(\bar{t} = 0) \subset \bar{K}^2$ have s components $Y_1, \ldots, Y_s$. Let g_i denote the genus of $\hat{Y}_i$ and $n_i = \#(\hat{Y}_i - Y_i)$. Then:

$$\dim H^i_{DR}(K\langle X_1, X_2, t^{-1}\rangle) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = 0 \\ s & \text{for } i = 1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{s} (2g_i + (n_i - 1)) & \text{for } i = 2 \end{cases}$$

This follows from the Gysin sequence and Theorem (2.1).

In this section we try to give calculations for the dimensions if "$\bar{t} = 0$" and even "$t = 0$" have singularities. In order to do this we give a detailed description of the residue map.

A general linear transformation of the coordinates (for convenience we suppose that $\bar{K}$ is infinite) brings $\bar{t}$ in the form: $\bar{t}$ is a monic polynomial in X_n of degree d and the gcd. of $\bar{t}$ and $\partial\bar{t}/\partial X_n$ is 1. Lifting $\bar{t}$ to t we may suppose that t is a polynomial of total degree d; t is monic in X_n of degree d and the discriminant $\Delta \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$ of t wrt. X_n has norm 1 as an element of $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}\rangle$.

We want to define a residue map $\mathrm{Res}: A^\dagger \to B^\dagger$, where B denotes $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}\rangle/(t)$, which generalizes the usual residues of meromorphic differential forms in one variable. First we make a formal computation.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $t_0, \ldots, t_{d-1}$ denote indeterminates; let $t \in \mathbb{Z}[t_0, \ldots, t_{d-1}][X]$ denote the polynomial $X^d + t_{d-1}X^{d-1} + \cdots + t_0$; let Δ denote the discriminant of t and let $[n]$ denote the least common multiple of $1, 2, \ldots, n$.*

Then every rational expression $(\sum_{i<md} a_i X^i)t^{-m}$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}[t_0, \ldots, t_{d-1}]$ can uniquely be written as

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_i X^i\right) t^{-1} + \frac{d}{dx}\left(\left(\sum_{i<(m-1)d} c_i X^i\right) t^{-m+1}\right).$$

The coefficients satisfy $\Delta^{dm} b_i$ and $[m-1]\Delta^{dm} c_j$ belong to $\mathbb{Z}[t_0, \ldots, t_{d-1}]$.

Proof. Introduce indeterminates $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d$ such that $t = (X - \lambda_1)\ldots(X - \lambda_d)$ and $\mathbb{Z}[t_0, \ldots, t_{d-1}]$ is seen as a subring of $\mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d]$. The given expression can uniquely be written in the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sum_{n=1}^{m} \frac{c(i,n)}{(X - \lambda_i)^n}$$

where $\Delta^{dm}c(i,n)$ belong to $\mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_d]$. Indeed Δ belongs to the ideal $(t/(X-\lambda_1),\ldots,t/(X-\lambda_d))$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_d]$ and so

$$\Delta^{dm}\in\left(\frac{t}{X-\lambda_1},\ldots,\frac{t}{X-\lambda_d}\right)^{dm}\subseteq\left(\left(\frac{t}{X-\lambda_1}\right)^m,\ldots,\left(\frac{t}{X-\lambda_d}\right)^m\right).$$

This implies that t^{-m} has the required form and the same holds for Pt^{-m} where P is a polynomial of degree $<md$. There is a unique decomposition as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{c(i,1)}{X-\lambda_i}+\frac{d}{dx}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}\sum_{n=2}^{m}\frac{c(i,n)}{(1-n)(X-\lambda_i)^{n-1}}\right).$$

Rewriting this in the form

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}b_iX^i\right)t^{-1}+\frac{d}{dx}\left(\left(\sum_{i<(m-1)d}c_iX^i\right)t^{-m+1}\right)$$

one finds that $\Delta^{dm}b_i$ and $[m-1]\Delta^{dm}c_j$ belong to $\mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_d]$. Those elements are invariant under the permutations of $\{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_d\}$ and so $\Delta^{md}b_i,\Delta^{md}[m-1]c_j\in\mathbb{Z}[t_0,\ldots,t_{d-1}]$.

DEFINITION OF RES 3.2.

Res: $K[X_1,\ldots,X_n,t^{-1}]\to K[X_1,\ldots,X_n,\Delta^{-1}]/(t)$ is given by using (3.1) with $\mathbb{Z}[t_0,\ldots,t_{d-1}]$ replaced by $K[X_1,\ldots,X_{n-1}]$ and X by X_n and

$$\mathrm{Res}\left(\left(\sum_{i<md}a_iX_n^i\right)t^{-m}\right)=\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}b_iX_n^i \text{ modulo}(t).$$

In order to extend this to: $K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n,t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger=A^\dagger\to K\langle X_1,\ldots,X_n,\Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger/(t)=B^\dagger$, we introduce some norms.

For any $\lambda>1$, $\|\ \|_\lambda$ on $K[X_1,\ldots,X_n,t^{-1}]$ is the supremumnorm on the set

$$\{(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\in K^n\,|\,|x_1|\leqslant\lambda,\ldots,|x_n|\leqslant\lambda,|t^{-1}|\leqslant\lambda\}.$$

(For notational convenience we assume K algebraically closed). For any $\rho>1$ we define $\|\ \|_\rho$ on $K[X_1,\ldots,X_n,\Delta^{-1}]/(t)$ as the norm induced by the supremumnorm on $K[X_1,\ldots,X_n,\Delta^{-1}]$ with respect to the set

$$\{(X_1,\ldots,X_n)\in K^n\,|\,|X_1|\leqslant\rho,\ldots,|X_n|\leqslant\rho,|\Delta^{-1}|\leqslant\rho\}.$$

Similar for $K[X_1,\ldots,X_n,\Delta^{-1},t^{-1}]$.

We apply 3.1 to $X_n^i t^{-m} (0 \leqslant i < d$ and $m \geqslant 1)$. One calculates then that there exists a constant c such that $\Delta^{md} b_i$ and $[m-1]\Delta^{md} c_j$ are polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[t_0, \ldots, t_d]$ of total degree $\leqslant m.c$. It follows that $\|b_i\|_\rho \leqslant \rho^{mc'}$ and

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i<(m-1)d} c_i X^i \right) t^{-m+1} \right\|_\rho \leqslant m\rho^{mc''}$$

for some constants $c', c'' > 0$ since $|[m-1]|^{-1} < m$. Let $L: K[X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}] \to K[X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}, \Delta^{-1}]$ be the $K[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$-linear map given by the formula:

$$a = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_i X_n^i \right) t^{-1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial X_n}(L(a)) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Res}(a) = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_i X_n^i \bmod(t).$$

If $\rho > 1$ is chosen small enough with respect to $\lambda > 1$ then one calculates from the estimates above that $\|\operatorname{Res}(a)\|_\rho \leqslant C\|a\|_\lambda$ and $\|L(a)\|_\rho \leqslant C\|a\|_\lambda$ for some constant $C > 0$. So Res and L can be extended by continuity to maps on the completions with respect to $\| \ \|_\rho$ and $\| \ \|_\lambda$. Taking the direct limit over all $\lambda > 1$ and $\rho = \rho(\lambda) > 1$ one finds (continuous) maps

$$\operatorname{Res}: K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to (K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}\rangle/(t))^\dagger$$
$$L: K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger.$$

The domain of definition of Res and L can also be extended to $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. We note that for any $a \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ one has again

$$a = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_i X_n^i \right) t^{-1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial X_n}(L(a)) \quad \text{where} \quad \operatorname{Res}(a) = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_i X_n^i \bmod(t). \qquad (*)$$

PROPOSITION (3.3). *The following sequences are exact.*

$$0 \to K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}\rangle^\dagger \to K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \xrightarrow{\partial/\partial X_n}$$
$$K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n^{-1}\rangle^\dagger/(t),$$
$$0 \to K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \xrightarrow{\partial/\partial X_n}$$
$$K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger/(t) \to 0.$$

Proof. The exactness of the second sequence follows easily from (*), with the exception of the calculation of kernel $\partial/\partial X_n$. Write $b \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$

in the form

$$b = b_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \sum_{m \geqslant 1} b(i,m) X_n^i t^{-m}$$

with $b_0 \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ and all $b(i,m) \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. Put $X_n^i(\partial/\partial X_n)t = A_i t + B_i$ with A_i, B_i polynomials of degree $< d$ wrt. X_n. Then $(\partial/\partial X_n)(b)$ has the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial X_n}(b_0) + \sum_{m \geqslant 1} t^{-m}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} b(i,m)(iX_n^{i-1} - mA_i) + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} (1-m)b(i,m-1)B_i\right).$$

We note that $A_i (i \neq 0)$ has the form $\mathrm{d}X_n^{i-1}$ + lower degree and that $B_0 = \mathrm{d}X_n^{d-1}$ + lower degree terms.

If $(\partial/\partial X_n)(b) = 0$ then $(\partial/\partial X_n)(b_0) = 0$ and every coefficient of t^{-m} is zero. Hence $b_0 \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. For $m = 1$ one finds $b(i,1) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d-1$. For $m = 2$ one finds $b(i,2) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d-1$ and $b(0,1) = 0$ etc. So all $b(i,m) = 0$ and $b = b_0$ has the required form. A similar argument yields: if $(\partial/\partial X_n)(b)$ lies in $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ and $b_0 = 0$ then $b \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$.

This shows that in the first exact sequence one has $\ker(\mathrm{Res}) = \mathrm{im}(\partial/\partial X_n)$. The remaining verifications are easy.

NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS 3.4. $A = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$; $B = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger/(t)$; $C = K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}\rangle^\dagger$ and $A' = A\langle\Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$; $C' = C\langle\Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. For every $p \geqslant 0$ one defines a residue map $\mathrm{Res}_p: \Omega^p(A') \to B \otimes_C \Omega^{p-1}(C)$ by the formule

$$\mathrm{Res}_p\left(\sum a_\alpha \, \mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_p}\right) = \sum_{\alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_p = n} \mathrm{Res}(a_\alpha)\mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_{p-1}}.$$

Put $M = \mathrm{Res}(A)$, this is a C-submodule of B and for each p one has $\mathrm{Res}(\Omega^p(A)) = M \otimes \Omega^{p-1}(C)$.

We note that $B \otimes_C \Omega^{p-1}(C)$ equals $B \otimes_{C'} \Omega^{p-1}(C')$. Define $\nabla: B \to B \otimes \Omega^1(C')$ such that $\nabla \circ \mathrm{Res}_1 = \mathrm{Res}_2 \circ d^1$. One easily verifies that ∇ exists and is unique, and that ∇ is a connection. Using ∇ one defines maps $\nabla^q: B \otimes \Omega^q(C') \to B \otimes \Omega^{q+1}(C')$ by

$$\nabla^q\left(\sum b_\alpha \, \mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_q}\right) = \sum \nabla(b_\alpha) \wedge \mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathrm{d}X_{\alpha_q}.$$

A straight-forward verification shows that: $\nabla^{q-1} \circ \mathrm{Res}_q = \mathrm{Res}_{q+1} \circ d^q$ for all $q \geqslant 1$. In particular it follows that ∇ is an integrable connection and that

$\{B \otimes \Omega^q(C'), \nabla^q\}$ is the de Rham-complex associated to ∇. Also $\{M \otimes \Omega^q(C), \nabla^q\}$ is the De Rham-complex associated to $\nabla: M \to M \otimes \Omega^1(C)$.

COROLLARIES. 3.5.

(i) *The canonical morphisms* $\Omega^\cdot(C) \to \ker(\Omega^\cdot(A) \xrightarrow{\alpha} M \otimes \Omega^\cdot(C))$ *and* $\Omega^\cdot(C') \to \ker(\Omega^\cdot(A') \xrightarrow{\alpha'} B \otimes \Omega^\cdot(C'))$ *are quasi-isomorphisms.*

(ii) $H^i_{DR}(A) \cong H^{i-1}(M \otimes \Omega^\cdot(C))$.

(iii) $\dim H^1_{DR}(A) \leqslant d$.

(iv) *The complex* $\{B \otimes \Omega^\cdot(C'), \nabla^\cdot\}$ *is quasi-isomorphic to* $\{\Omega^\cdot(B), d^\cdot\}$.

(v) *For* $n = 2$ *the dimensions of* $H^i_{DR}(A)$ *are finite.*

Proof. (i) Let $\omega \in \Omega^p(A)$ have $\alpha(\omega) = \mathrm{Res}(\omega) = 0$ and $d(\omega) = 0$. Then ω has the form

$$\sum \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}(b_\alpha)\, dX_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_{\alpha_{p-1}} \wedge dX_n + \sum_{\beta p < n} a_\beta\, dX_{\beta_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_{\beta_p}$$

with all $b_\alpha \in A$ (follows from (3.3))

With $\eta = (-1)^p \sum b_\alpha\, dX_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_{\alpha_{p-1}}$ one has

$$\omega - d\eta = \sum_{\alpha_p < n} c_\alpha\, dX_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_{\alpha_p}.$$

Each $\partial c_\alpha / \partial x_n = 0$ and according to (3.3) each $c_\alpha \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}\rangle^\dagger$.

So $\omega = d\eta^+$ an element of $\Omega^p(C)$. The same argument proves the second statement.

(ii) is obvious from (i).

(iii) $H^1_{DR}(A) \cong H^0(M \otimes \Omega^\cdot(C)) = \ker \nabla \subseteq \ker(\nabla: B \to B \otimes \Omega'(C'))$. The last ∇ is a differential equation of order d over C' and the vectorspace of solutions has dimension $\leqslant d$.

(iv) From (i) it follows that $D = \Omega^\cdot(A')/\Omega^\cdot(K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger) \to B \otimes \Omega^\cdot(C')$ is a quasi-isomorphism. The well known morphism $\Omega^\cdot(B) \to D$ given by $\omega \mapsto \tilde{\omega} \wedge dt/t$ where $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega^\cdot(A')$ is a lift of ω, is also a quasi-isomorphism. This follows of course from [11] II. But in this case it follows easily from (3.3). Indeed $\omega \in \Omega^p(A)$ can be written as

$$d(\eta) + \sum_{\alpha_p < n} a_\alpha\, dX_{\alpha_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_{\alpha_p} + \sum_{\beta_{p-1} < n} b_\beta\, dX_{\beta_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_{\beta_{p-1}} \wedge \frac{dt}{t}$$

in which $b_\beta \in K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger[X_n]$ has degree $< d$ in X_n. If $d(\omega) = 0$ then all $\partial(a_\alpha)/\partial X_n = 0$ and the a_α lie in $K\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. This shows that the map $H^{p-1}(\Omega^\cdot(B)) \to H^p(D)$ is surjective. The injectivity follows also from (3.3).

(v) Using (i) and (iv) one finds the Gysin-exact sequence for the cohomologies

of the rings $K\langle X_1, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger, K\langle X_1, X_2, \Delta^{-1}, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$, $K\langle X_1, X_2, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger/(t)$. The first and the last ring have dimension 1 and hence their DR-cohomology is finite dimensional. So the DR-cohomology of $K\langle X_1, X_2, \Delta^{-1}, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ is finite dimensional. The next step is to construct a Gysin sequence for the rings $K\langle X_1, X_2, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger, K\langle X_1, X_2, t^{-1}, \Delta^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ and $K\langle X_1, X_2, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger/(\Delta)$. From this (v) follows.

Of course we can replace Δ by an element δ of the form $(X_1 - \lambda_1)\dots(X_1 - \lambda_s)$ where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in \bar{K}$ are distinct. Applying the method of (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) to δ and X_1 (the discriminant is 1 in this case) one obtains the required exact sequence.

3.6. In a rather special case we can calculate M = the image of Res. It is the case where t has the form $X_n^d - a$ with $|d| = 1$ and $a \in K\langle X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}\rangle^\dagger$ with norm 1. The discriminant Δ equals d.a. An easy calculation shows that $\mathrm{Res}_1(X_n^{d-1} t^{-m}\, dX_n) = 0$ for $m > 1$ and that

$$\mathrm{Res}_1(X_n^i t^{-m}\, dX_n) = (-1)^{m-1} \binom{m-1-\frac{i+1}{d}}{m-1} a^{1-m} X_n^i$$

for $m \geqslant 1$ and $i \leqslant d-2$. It follows that

$$M = \sum_{i=0}^{d-2} K\langle X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}, a^{-1}\rangle^\dagger X_n^i + K\langle X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}\rangle^\dagger X_n^{d-1} \bmod(t).$$

We continue this example for the case $n = 2$; write X, Y for the two variables and $t = Y^d - a$. After identifying M and $M dX$, the operator $\nabla: M \to M$ has the form

$$\nabla(m_0, \dots, m_{d-1}) = (m_0^1, \dots, m'_{d-1}) +$$

$$+ \left(\frac{1-d}{d}\frac{a'}{a} m_0, \frac{2-d}{d}\frac{a'}{a} m_1, \dots, \frac{-1}{d}\frac{a'}{a} m_{d-2}, 0\right)$$

where $m_0, \dots, m_{d-2} \in K\langle X, a^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ and $m_{d-1} \in K\langle X\rangle^\dagger$.

For this operator ∇ we have to calculate ker and coker. We note that a and $b \in K\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ will give the same answer if $\bar{a} = \bar{b}$. This means that a can be supposed to have the form $\lambda(X - \lambda_1)^{n_1}\dots(X - \lambda_s)^{n_s}$ with $|\lambda| = 1, |\lambda_i| \leqslant 1$ and $|\lambda_i - \lambda_j| = 1$ for $i \neq j$.

LEMMA 3.6.1. *Let a be as above. The differential operator L on $K\langle X, a^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$*

given by $L(m) = m' - (i/d)(a'/a)m$ *and* $0 < i < d$ *satisfies*:

(i) $\dim(\ker L) = 1$ *if* d *divides all* $in_1, \ldots, in_s$. *Otherwise* $\ker L = 0$
(ii) $\dim(\ker L) - \dim(\operatorname{coker} L) = -s + 1$.

Proof (i) is rather obvious.

(ii) If $\ker L \neq 0$ then $m \mapsto b^{-1}L(bm)$, where $b \neq 0$ satisfies $L(b) = 0$, is the ordinary differentiation on $K\langle X, a^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ and we have already shown (ii) in that case. If $\ker L = 0$ then one can show that the image of L is closed in $K\langle X, a^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. The cokernel of L: $K[X, a^{-1}] \to K[X, a^{-1}]$ has dimension $s - 1$ and is represented by a basis $1/X - \lambda_1, \ldots, 1/X - \lambda_{s-1}$. The cokernel of L on $K\langle X, a^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ has the same dimension.

COROLLARY (3.6.2.). *The de Rham cohomology groups of* $K\langle X, Y, t^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ *with* $t = Y^d - \lambda(X - \lambda_1)^{n_1} \ldots (X - \lambda_s)^{n_s}$ *have the following dimensions*:

$\dim H^0_{DR} = 1$, $\dim H'_{DR} = \gcd(d, n_1, \ldots, n_s)$ *and* $\dim H^2_{DR}$ *equals* $1 + (d-1)(s-1) - \gcd(d, n_1, \ldots, n_s)$.

References

1. A. Adolphson, An index theorem for p-adic differential operators. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 216 (1976), 269–293.
2. M. Artin, On the solutions of analytic equations. *Invent. Math.* 5, (1968), 277–291.
3. F. Baldassarri, Comparison entre la cohomologie algébrique et la cohomologie p-adique rigide à coefficients dans un module différentiel I. (Cas des courbes) *Invent. Math* '87, (1987), 83–99.
4. S. Bosch, A rigid analytic version of M. Artin's theorem on analytic equations. *Math. Ann.* 255, (1981), 395–404.
5. S. Bosch, U. Güntzer and R. Remmert, Non-Archimedean Analysis Grundlehren der math. *Wissenschaften* Vol 261, Springer Verlag 1984.
6. J. Fresnel and M. van der Put, Géométrie analytique rigide et applications. *Progress in Math.* Vol 18, Birkhäuser Verlag 1981.
7. L, Gerritzen and M. van der Put, Schottky groups and Mumford curves. *Lect. Notes in Math.* 817, Springer Verlag 1980.
8. A. Grothendieck, On the de Rham cohomology of algebraic varieties. *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* 29, 1966.
9. R. Kiehl, Die De Rham Kohomologie Algebraïscher Mannigfaltigkeiten über einem bewerteten Körper. *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S* 33, 1968.
10. P. Monsky and G. Washnitzer, Formal cohomology I. *Annals of Math.* 1968, 181–217.
11. P. Monsky, Formal cohomology II and III. *Annals of Math.* 1968, 218–238 and Annals of Math. 1971, 315–343.
12. M. Van der Put, A problem on coefficient fields and equations over local rings. *Compositio Math.* 30, 3, 1975, 235–258.
13. M. Van der Put, The class group of a one-dimensional affinoid space. *Ann. de l'Inst. Fourier* 30, 1980, 155–164.
13. M. Van der Put, The cohomology of Monsky and Washnitzer. *Soc. Math. de France*, 2e Série, Mémoire no. 23, 1986, 33–60.
15. Ph. Robba, Une introduction naïve aux cohomologies de Dwork. *Soc. Math. de France*, 2e Série, Mémoire no. 23, 1986, 61–105.