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## Numdam

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme

# p-ADIC ESTIMATES <br> FOR EXPONENTIAL SUMS AND THE THEOREM OF CHEVALLEY-WARNING 

By Alan ADOLPHSON ( ${ }^{1}$ ) and Steven SPERBER ( ${ }^{2}$ )

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this article is to give an estimate for the $p$-divisibility of a general exponential sum over a finite field $k$ of characteristic $p$. Since exponential sums can be used, in a well-known manner, to count the number of rational points on a variety in characteristic $p$, we obtain as a corollary an estimate for the $p$-divisibility of the number of rational points. This estimate improves the classical theorem of ChevalleyWarning [17], which states that the number of common zeros in $k$ of polynomials $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$ of degrees $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{m}$ in $n$ variables with $\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{i}<n$ is divisible by $p$. Our work also improves recent work of Sperber [16] on exponential sums, and the application to counting points on a variety improves recent generalizations of the Chevalley-Warning Theorem due to Ax [4] and Katz [10].

These earlier results have the common feature of estimating the $p$-divisibility in terms of the number of variables and degrees of the polynomials involved. Let $k$ be the finite field with $q=p^{a}$ elements, let $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$ be polynomials over $k$ of degrees $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{m}$, respectively, and let V be the variety defined by the common vanishing of the $g_{i}$. Let $\mu$ be the least nonnegative integer $\geqq \mu_{0}$, where

$$
\mu_{0}=\frac{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{i}}{\max \left\{d_{i}\right\}}
$$

The theorem of Katz asserts that the number of $k$-rational points on V is divisible by $q^{\mu}$. This implies the earlier results of Ax and Chevalley-Warning.

[^0]Our work gives a qualitative improvement by taking into account which monomials actually occur in the given polynomials. Let $\Psi$ be a nontrivial additive character of $k$. For any polynomial $f \in k\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ we form the exponential sum

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{S}(f)=\sum_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in k} \boldsymbol{\Psi}\left(f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) \in \mathbf{Q}\left(\zeta_{p}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\zeta_{p}$ is a primitive $p$-th root of unity. We shall assume that $f$ is not a polynomial in some proper subset of the variables $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$. This involves no loss of generality, for if $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=g\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{a}\right)$ with $a<n$, then $S(f)=q^{n-a} S(g)$; so a $p$-adic estimate for $S(f)$ is a trivial consequence of a $p$-adic estimate for $S(g)$.

Let $\Delta(f)$ be the Newton polyhedron of $f$ (the definition of Newton polyhedron is recalled in section 2). Let $\omega(f)$ be the smallest positive rational number such that $\omega(f) \Delta(f)$, the dilation of $\Delta(\mathrm{f})$ by the factor $\omega(\mathrm{f})$, contains a lattice point with all coordinates positive. Let $\operatorname{ord}_{q}$ be an additive valuation on $\mathbf{Q}\left(\zeta_{p}\right)$, lying over $p$ and normalized by the condition $\operatorname{ord}_{q} q=1$. Our main result is:

Theorem 1.2. - If $f$ is not a polynomial in some proper subset of the variables $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, then

$$
\operatorname{ord}_{q} \mathbf{S}(f) \geqq \omega(f) .
$$

If $f$ has degree $d$, then $\omega(f) \geqq n / d$ (see section 5). Hence:
Corollary 1.3. - Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2, $\operatorname{ord}_{q} S(f) \geqq n / d$.
Theorem 1.2 will be shown to imply the theorems of Katz and Sperber.
Katz used his result to extract a lower bound for the slope of the first side of the Newton polygon of the primitive middle-dimensional factor of the zeta function of a smooth projective complete intersection. Deligne [6], using Hirzebruch's formula for the Hodge numbers of a complete intersection, had calculated the first nonvanishing primitive Hodge number, and Katz's result shows that the first slope of the Newton polygon is at least as large as the first slope of the Hodge polygon (see [10], Conjecture 2.9 for the definition of the Hodge polygon). Dwork [8], section 7, had already shown that the Newton polygon of the primitive middle-dimensional factor of the zeta function of a smooth projective hypersurface lies over its Hodge polygon, so Katz was led to conjecture that this relationship holds for smooth projective complete intersections as well. This conjecture was subsequently proved by Mazur [13].

By [4], section 1, our result may be interpreted as giving a lower bound for the first slope of the Newton polygon of the L-function associated to the exponential sum. In a future article we shall determine, under certain restrictions on the exponential sum (namely, that it be nondegenerate and commode in the sense of [11], which forces the Lfunction to be a polynomial), a lower bound for the entire Newton polygon of this Lfunction. We believe that this lower bound is also connected with Hodge theory.

Consider the equation $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\mathbf{N}$, where $f \in \mathbf{Z}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ has positive integer coefficients and N is a positive integer. Our work implies that when $\omega(f)>1$, the congruence $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \equiv \mathrm{N}(\bmod p)$ for any prime $p$ has at least $p^{\omega(f)-1}$ solutions, provided that it has at least one solution. We believe these congruences have so many

$$
4^{e} \text { SÉRIE - TOME } 20-1987-\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 4
$$

solutions because the equation $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\mathrm{N}$ has many solutions in positive integers. More precisely, we conjecture that if $\omega(f)>1$ and if there are no congruence obstructions, the number of solutions in positive integers of $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\mathbf{N}$ grows like $\mathrm{N}^{\omega(f)-1}$. We shall return to this question in a future article.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we derive two consequences of Theorem 1.2 (Theorems 2.11 and 2.14) which generalize the theorems of Katz and Sperber, respectively. We also give some examples to show that our work gives a strict improvement over previous results. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2. In section 5 we show how Corollary 1.3 and the theorems of Katz and Sperber follow from taking the largest possible Newton polyhedron that can occur in Theorems 1.2, 2.11, and 2.14 , respectively. Finally, in section 6, we discuss some connections with other recent work.

We would like to thank Pierrette Cassou-Nogues for some very helpful discussions.

## 2. Statement of further results

Let $\mathbf{N}$ denote the nonnegative integers and write $j=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \in \mathbf{N}^{n}, x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, $x^{j}=x_{1}^{j_{1}} \ldots x_{n}^{j_{n}}$. For $f \in k\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$, write

$$
\begin{equation*}
f=\sum_{j \in \mathbf{J}} a_{j} x^{j}, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where J is a finite subset of $\mathbf{N}^{n}$. Let $\mathscr{A}$ be the $(n \times|\mathrm{J}|)$-matrix whose columns are the $j=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \in \mathbf{J}$. Given $r \in \mathbf{N}^{n}$, consider the matrix equation

$$
\mathscr{A}\left(\begin{array}{c}
u_{1}  \tag{2.2}\\
\vdots \\
u_{|\mathrm{J}|}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
r_{1} \\
\vdots \\
r_{n}
\end{array}\right)
$$

We define a weight function $w_{f}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
w_{f}(r)=\inf \left\{u_{1}+\ldots+u_{|\mathrm{J}|}\right\} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the inf is taken over all nonnegative rational solutions $u=\left(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{|\mathrm{J}|}\right)$ of (2.2) and we put $w_{f}(r)=+\infty$ if there are no such solutions.

This inf can be calculated by standard techniques in linear programming, which also show that the infimum is in fact a minimum, but it seems more useful to have a geometric description of $w_{f}$. The Newton polyhedron $\Delta(f)$ is defined to be the convex hull in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ of the set $\mathbf{J} \cup\{(0, \ldots, 0)\}$. Let $\mathbf{R}_{+}\langle f\rangle$ denote the subset of $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ consisting of all linear combinations with nonnegative real coefficients of elements of $\mathbf{J}$. Then $\mathbf{R}_{+}\langle f\rangle$ is the union of all rays emanating from the origin and passing through $\Delta(f)$. Equation (2.2) has a solution $u$ whose components are nonnegative rational numbers if and only if $r \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\langle f\rangle$. Thus $w_{f}(r)=+\infty$ if and only if $r \notin \mathbf{R}_{+}\langle f\rangle$. If $r \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\langle f\rangle$, the ray emanating from the origin and passing through $r$ intersects $\Delta(f)$ in a face that does not contain the origin. Let $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i} X_{i}=1$ be the equation of a hyperplane passing through
this face (this hyperplane is not uniquely determined unless the face has dimension $n-1$ ). Then by standard arguments in linear programming,

$$
\begin{equation*}
w_{f}(r)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i} r_{i} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have immediately [3], Lemma 2.14:
Lemma 2.5. - (a) If $k$ is a nonnegative integer, then $w_{f}(k r)=k w_{f}(r)$.
(b) If $w_{f}(r), w_{f}\left(r^{\prime}\right)<+\infty$, then $w_{f}\left(r+r^{\prime}\right)<+\infty$. Furthermore,

$$
w_{f}\left(r+r^{\prime}\right) \leqq w_{f}(r)+w_{f}\left(r^{\prime}\right)
$$

(c) There exists a positive integer $\mathbf{M}$ such that $w_{f}\left(\mathbf{N}^{n}\right) \subseteq(1 / \mathbf{M}) \mathbf{N} \cup\{+\infty\}$.

Let $\mathbf{N}_{+}$denote the positive integers and set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega(f)=\min _{r \in\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n}}\left\{w_{f}(r)\right\} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equivalently, $\omega(f)$ is the smallest positive rational number such that $\omega(f) \Delta(f)$ contains a point of $\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n}$.

Let V be the variety over $k$ defined by the common vanishing of polynomials $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m} \in k\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ and let $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{V})$ be the number of $k$-rational points on V. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
q^{m} \mathrm{~N}(\mathrm{~V})=\sum_{\substack{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in k \\ y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in k}} \Psi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} y_{i} g_{i}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)\left(=\mathrm{S}\left(\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right)\right) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$ are not all polynomials in some proper subset of $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$. Then from Theorem 1.2 we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ord}_{q} \mathrm{~N}(\mathrm{~V}) \geqq \omega\left(\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right)-m \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

When V is a hypersurface, this estimate has a simple consequence:
Corollary 2.9. - Let $V$ be the hypersurface defined by the equation $g\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=0$. If $\Delta(y g)$ does not contain a point of $\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+1}$, then $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{V})$ is divisible by $q$.

To see that this is a strict improvement over Chevalley-Warning, suppose that $g$ has degree $n$, i. e., the number of variables equals the degree. Then Chevalley-Warning gives no information, but the hypothesis of the corollary will be satisfied when the point $(1, \ldots, 1)$ does not lie in the convex hull of the set of exponents of monomials of degree $n$ occuring in $g$. For example, if the only monomial of degree $n$ occuring in $g$ is $x^{j}$ and if $x^{j} \neq x_{1} \ldots x_{n}$, then this condition is satisfied so $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{V})$ is divisible by $q$.

We can say more about $\omega\left(\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right)$. If we let $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}$ correspond to the last $m$ rows of $\mathscr{A}$ and write the right-hand side of (2.2) as $\left(r_{1}, \ldots, r_{n} ; s_{1}, \ldots, s_{m}\right)^{t}$, then

$$
u_{1}+\ldots+u_{|\mathrm{J}|}=s_{1}+\ldots+s_{m}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega\left(\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right)=\min \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_{i} \mid(r ; s) \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\left\langle\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right\rangle \cap\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+m}\right\} . \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation (2.8) implies immediately:
Theorem 2.11. - If $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$ are not all polynomials in some proper subset of $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ord}_{q} \mathrm{~N}(\mathrm{~V}) \geqq \min \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_{i} \mid(r ; s) \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\left\langle\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right\rangle \cap\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+m}\right\}-m . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

For example, suppose $V$ is the hypersurface

$$
a_{1} x_{1}^{j_{1}}+\ldots+a_{n} x_{n}^{j_{n}}=0
$$

Set $d_{i}=\left(j_{i}, q-1\right)$. For $\alpha_{i} \in\left\{1 / d_{i}, \ldots,\left(d_{i}-1\right) / d_{i}\right\}$, let $\chi_{\alpha_{i}}$ be the multiplicative character on $k^{\times}$defined by sending a generator to $e^{2 \pi \sqrt{V}-1 \alpha_{i}}$. For each $n$-tuple $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)$, define a Jacobi sum $\mathrm{J}(\alpha)$ by

$$
\mathrm{J}(\alpha)=\sum_{u_{1}+\ldots u_{n}=0} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \chi_{\alpha_{i}}\left(u_{i}\right) .
$$

According to Weil's calculation [18],

$$
\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{~V})=q^{n-1}+\frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{\alpha_{1}+\ldots+\alpha_{n} \in \mathbf{Z}} \mathrm{~J}(\alpha) .
$$

If the $j_{i}$ are relatively prime, then so are the $d_{i}$ and there are no $n$-tuples $\alpha$ satisfying $\alpha_{1}+\ldots+\alpha_{n} \in \mathbf{Z}$. Hence $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{V})=q^{n-1}$ and $\operatorname{ord}_{q} \mathrm{~N}(\mathrm{~V})=n-1$. In general, Katz's theorem does not predict any divisibility by $p$ in this case. However, an easy calculation shows that the right-hand side of $(2.12)$ equals $n-1$, hence Theorem 2.11 is sharp in this example.
Finally, we note that we can generalize further to the case of an exponential sum on the variety V . Take $f \in k\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ and let $\mathrm{V}(k)$ be the set of $k$-rational points of V . Define

$$
\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{~V}, f)=\sum_{\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in \mathrm{V}(k)} \Psi\left(f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) .
$$

Then $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{V}, f)=q^{-m} \mathbf{S}\left(f+\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right)$ and an argument similar to the derivation of (2.10) shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega\left(f+\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right)=\min \left\{t+\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_{i} \mid(r ; s ; t) \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\left\langle z f+\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right\rangle \cap\left(\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+m} \times \mathbf{Q}_{+}\right)\right\}, \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_{+}$denotes the nonnegative rationals. Thus Theorem 1.2 implies:
Theorem 2.14. - If $f, g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$ are not all polynomials in some proper subset of $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, then

$$
\operatorname{ord}_{q} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~V}, f) \geqq \min \left\{t+\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_{i} \mid(r ; s ; t) \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\left\langle z f+\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right\rangle \cap\left(\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+m} \times \mathbf{Q}_{+}\right)\right\}-m .
$$

## 3. Trace formula

To prove Theorem 1.2 it is convenient to consider also the exponential sums $\mathrm{S}^{*}(f)$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}^{*}(f)=\sum_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in k^{\times}} \boldsymbol{\Psi}\left(f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

They are related to our basic exponential sums $\mathbf{S}(f)$ in the following way. Put $\mathrm{S}=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$. For any subset $\mathrm{A} \cong \mathrm{S}$, let $f_{\mathrm{A}}$ be the polynomial obtained from $f$ by setting $x_{i}=0$ for $i \in \mathrm{~A}$. Let $|\mathrm{A}|$ denote the cardinality of A . Then

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathbf{S}(f)=\sum_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{S}^{*}\left(f_{\mathrm{A}}\right)  \tag{3.2}\\
\mathbf{S}^{*}(f)=\sum_{\mathbf{A}}(-1)^{|\mathrm{A}|} \mathbf{S}\left(f_{\mathrm{A}}\right) . \tag{3.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

We recall some basic facts about the sums $\mathbf{S}^{*}\left(f_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$ from our earlier article [3]. These facts were proved there for the case $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{S}$, but the arguments in the general case are identical. Let $\Omega$ be the completion of an algebraic closure of the $p$-adic numbers $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$ and let "ord" denote the additive valuation on $\Omega$ normalized by ord $p=1$. Let $\mathrm{E}(t)$ be the Artin-Hasse exponential series:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}(t)=\exp \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^{p^{m}}}{p^{m}}\right) \in\left(\mathbf{Z}_{p} \cap \mathbf{Q}\right)[[t]] . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\gamma \in \Omega$ be a root of $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} t^{p^{m}} / p^{m}=0$ satisfying ord $\gamma=1 /(p-1)$. The series

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta(t)=\mathrm{E}(\gamma t)=\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \lambda_{m} t^{m} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a splitting function in Dwork's terminology [7], section 4 and its coefficients satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ord} \lambda_{m} \geqq \frac{m}{p-1}, \quad \lambda_{m} \in \mathbf{Q}_{p}(\gamma) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, one has $\mathbf{Q}_{p}(\gamma)=\mathbf{Q}_{p}\left(\zeta_{p}\right)$.

Let K denote the unramified extension of $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$ in $\Omega$ of degree $a$, where $q=p^{a}$. For $f$ as in (2.1), let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{f}=\sum_{j \in \mathbf{J}} \hat{a}_{j} x^{j} \in \mathrm{~K}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right] \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

be its Teichmüller lifting, i. e., $\left(\hat{a}_{j}\right)^{q}=\hat{a}_{j}$. Let $\tau$ be the Frobenius automorphism of K , which is extended to $K\left(\zeta_{p}\right)$ by defining $\tau\left(\zeta_{p}\right)=\zeta_{p}$. Set

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{F}(x)=\prod_{j \in \mathrm{~J}} \theta\left(\hat{a}_{j} x^{j}\right) \in \mathrm{K}\left(\zeta_{p}\right)[[x]]  \tag{3.8}\\
\mathrm{F}_{0}(x)=\prod_{i=0}^{a-1}{ }^{\tau_{i}} \mathrm{~F}\left(x^{p^{i}}\right) \in \mathrm{K}\left(\zeta_{p}\right)[[x]] \tag{3.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

We denote by $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\mathrm{F}_{0, \mathrm{~A}}$ the corresponding series in $\mathrm{K}\left(\zeta_{p}\right)\left[\left[\left\{x_{i}\right\}_{i \in S} \backslash \mathrm{~A}\right]\right]$ obtained by starting with $f_{\mathrm{A}}$ in place of $f$.

Let $L(b)$ be the space of all power series $\sum_{r \in \mathbf{Z}^{n}} A_{r} x^{r} \in \Omega[[x]]$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { ord } \mathrm{A}_{r} \geqq b w_{f}(r)+O(1) \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, this means $\mathrm{A}_{r}=0$ if $w_{f}(r)=+\infty$. By [3], section 2,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F} \in \mathrm{~L}\left(\frac{1}{p-1}\right), \quad \mathrm{F}_{0} \in \mathrm{~L}\left(\frac{p}{q(p-1)}\right) \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define an operator $\psi$ on power series by

$$
\psi\left(\sum \mathrm{A}_{r} x^{r}\right)=\sum \mathrm{A}_{p r} x^{r}
$$

Let $\mathrm{t}: \mathrm{L}(p /(p-1)) \subsetneq \mathrm{L}(p / q(p-1))$ be the canonical injection and denote by $\alpha$ the composition

$$
\mathrm{L}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right) \stackrel{\iota}{\leftrightarrows} \mathrm{L}\left(\frac{p}{q(p-1)}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{F}_{0}}{\rightarrow} \mathrm{~L}\left(\frac{p}{q(p-1)}\right) \stackrel{\psi^{a}}{\rightarrow} \mathrm{~L}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)
$$

where the middle arrows means "multiplication by $\mathrm{F}_{0}$ ". It follows from Serre [15] that the trace $\operatorname{Tr}(\alpha \mid \mathrm{L}(p /(p-1)))$ is well-defined. The Dwork trace formula asserts that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}^{*}(f)=(q-1)^{n} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha \left\lvert\, \mathrm{L}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)\right.\right) \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the nontrivial additive character implicit on the left-hand side is derived from the splitting function $\theta(t)$.

A similar formula is valid for $S^{*}\left(f_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$. Denote by $\mathrm{L}_{(\mathrm{A})}(b)$ the space of power series $\sum \mathrm{A}_{r} x^{r} \in \Omega\left[\left[\left\{x_{i}\right\}_{i \in \mathrm{~S} \backslash \mathrm{~A}}\right]\right]$ satisfying the growth condition (3.10) (note that $\left.\left.w_{f}\right|_{\mathbf{R}^{n-|A|}}=w_{f_{\mathrm{A}}}\right)$, and denote by $\alpha_{\mathrm{A}}$ the endomorphism of $\mathrm{L}_{(\mathbf{A})}(p /(p-1))$ defined in analogy with $\alpha$ using $\mathrm{F}_{0, \mathrm{~A}}$ in place of $\mathrm{F}_{0}$. Then one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}^{*}\left(f_{\mathrm{A}}\right)=(q-1)^{n-|\mathrm{A}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{A}} \left\lvert\, \mathrm{L}_{(\mathbf{A})}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)\right.\right) \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

By repeating the argument of [14], Lemma 7.4 (2), one can derive from (3.13) a trace formula for $\mathbf{S}(f)$ itself. Set

$$
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)=\left\{\left.\sum_{j \in \mathbf{N}^{n}} \mathrm{~A}_{j} x^{j} \in \mathrm{~L}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right) \right\rvert\, j_{i}>0 \text { for all } i \in \mathrm{~A}\right\}
$$

Note that $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}(p /(p-1))$ is stable under $\alpha$ and that $\operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}(p /(p-1))\right)$ is well-defined. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}(f)=\sum_{\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{S}}(-1)^{|\mathrm{A}|} q^{n-|\mathrm{A}|} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathbf{A}}(p /(p-1))\right) \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

For convenience we denote $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}(p /(p-1))$ by $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$. From equation (3.14) it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ord}_{q} \mathbf{S}(f) \geqq \min _{\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{S}}\left\{n-|\mathbf{A}|+\operatorname{ord}_{q} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha \mid \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\right\} . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We first estimate $\operatorname{ord}_{q} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha \mid L_{A}\right)$.
By Lemma 2.5(c), we may define for each $A \subseteq S$ a function $W_{A}: N \rightarrow N$ by

$$
\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{A}}(k)=\operatorname{card}\left\{r \in \mathbf{N}^{n} \left\lvert\, w_{f}(r)=\frac{k}{\mathrm{M}}\right. \text { and } r_{i}>0 \text { for all } i \in \mathrm{~A}\right\} .
$$

The series

$$
\operatorname{det}\left(\mathrm{I}-t \alpha \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}\right) \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \exp \left(-\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha^{m} \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}\right) \frac{t^{m}}{m}\right)
$$

is a $p$-adic entire function, i. e., it converges for all $t \in \boldsymbol{\Omega}$ ([15], see also [3], section 2 ).
Proposition 4.2. - For $\mathrm{A} \subseteq \mathrm{S}$, the Newton polygon of $\operatorname{det}\left(\mathrm{I}-t \alpha \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$ computed with respect to $\operatorname{ord}_{q}$ lies above the polygon with vertices $(0,0)$ and

$$
\left(\sum_{k=0}^{l} \mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{A}}(k), \frac{1}{\mathrm{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{l} k \mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{A}}(k)\right), \quad l=0,1,2, \ldots
$$

Proof. - The case $\mathrm{A}=\varnothing$ is the content of [3], Proposition 3.13. The general case is proved by an identical argument.

Set

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{A}}(f)=\min \left\{w_{f}(r) \mid r \in \mathbf{N}^{n} \text { and } r_{i}>0 \text { for all } i \in \mathrm{~A}\right\} .
$$

Since $-\operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$ is the coefficient of $t$ in $\operatorname{det}\left(\mathrm{I}-t \alpha \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$ we have immediately:
Corollary 4.3. $-\operatorname{ord}_{q} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\alpha \mid \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}\right) \geqq \omega_{\mathrm{A}}(f)$.
From (4.1) we then have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ord}_{q} \mathbf{S}(f) \geqq \min _{\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{S}}\left\{n-|\mathrm{A}|+\omega_{\mathbf{A}}(f)\right\} . \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\omega_{\mathrm{s}}(f)=\omega(f)$, Theorem 1.2 will be established if we can show that the minimum on the right-hand side of (4.4) occurs for $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{S}$. But this is an immediate consequence of:

Lemma 4.5. - Suppose $\mathrm{A} \cong \mathrm{S}$ and $\beta \in \mathrm{S} \backslash \mathrm{A}$. Then

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{A} \cup\{B\}}(f) \leqq \omega_{\mathrm{A}}(f)+1 .
$$

Proof. - From the definitions of $\omega_{\mathrm{A}}(f)$ and $w_{f}$, there exists a $|\mathrm{J}|$-tuple $u=\left(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{|\mathrm{J}|}\right)$ of nonnegative rational numbers and an $n$-tuple $r=\left(r_{1}, \ldots, r_{n}\right)$ of nonnegative integers with $r_{i}>0$ for $i \in \mathrm{~A}$ such that $\mathscr{A} u=r$ and

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{A}}(f)=u_{1}+\ldots+u_{|J|} .
$$

If $r_{\beta} \neq 0$, then from the definition of $\omega_{\mathrm{A} \cup\{\beta\}}(f)$ we have $\omega_{\mathrm{A} \cup\{\beta\}}(f)=\omega_{\mathrm{A}}(f)$. Suppose $r_{\beta}=0$. Not all entries in the $\beta$-th row of $\mathscr{A}$ can vanish, since we assumed $f$ could not be written as a polynomial in some proper subset of the variables $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$. Suppose the entry in column $v$, row $\beta$ is $>0$. Since $r_{\beta}=0$ we must have $u_{v}=0$. Let $u^{\prime}$ be the $|J|-$ tuple obtained from $u$ by putting 1 in the $v$-th entry and leaving the other entries unchanged. Define $r^{\prime}=\left(r_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, r_{n}^{\prime}\right)$ by $r^{\prime}=\mathscr{A} u^{\prime}$. Then $r_{i}^{\prime} \geqq r_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$, and $r_{\beta}^{\prime}>0$, so

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{A} \cup\{\beta\}}(f) \leqq \sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{|\mathrm{J}|} u_{i}^{\prime}=\omega_{\mathrm{A}}(f)+1 .
$$

## 5. Theorems of Katz and Sperber

For any convex polyhedron $\Delta$ in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ with one vertex at the origin, let $\omega(\Delta)$ be the smallest positive rational number such that $\omega(\Delta) \Delta$ contains a point of $\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n}$. If $\Delta(f) \cong \Delta$, then we have clearly $\omega(f) \geqq \omega(\Delta)$, so by Theorem 1.2

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ord}_{q} S(f) \geqq \omega(\Delta) . \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For example, if $f$ has degree $d$, then $\Delta(f)$ is contained in the simplex $\Delta$ whose vertices are the origin and the points $d \mathbf{e}_{1}, \ldots, d \mathrm{e}_{n}$, where $\mathrm{e}_{j}$ is the point with 1 in the $j$-th coordinate and zeros elsewhere. Clearly, $(1, \ldots, 1) \in(n / d) \Delta$ but $(\kappa \Delta) \cap\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n}=\varnothing$ if $\kappa<n / d$, hence $\omega(\Delta)=n / d$. Thus (5.1) implies Corollary 1.3.

The theorem of Katz can be derived in similar fashion. In the notation of Theorem 2.11, if $g_{i}$ has degree $d_{i}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{j}, j=1, \ldots, n$ (resp. $\mathbf{e}_{i}^{\prime}, i=1, \ldots, m$ ) denotes the point in $\mathbf{R}^{n+m}$ with coordinate 1 in the $j$-th entry [resp. the ( $n+i$ )-th entry] and zeros elsewhere, then $\Delta\left(\sum y_{i} g_{i}\right) \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+m}$ lies in the polyhedron $\Delta$ with vertices at the origin, $\mathbf{e}_{i}^{\prime}(i=1, \ldots, m)$, and $d_{i} \mathbf{e}_{j}+\mathbf{e}_{i}^{\prime}(j=1, \ldots, n ; i=1, \ldots, m)$. In fact, $\Delta$ is the largest polyhedron that can occur as the Newton polyhedron of some $\sum y_{i} g_{i}$, given the number of variables and the degrees of the $g_{i}$. We have from (2.8)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ord}_{q} N(V) \geqq \omega(\Delta)-m . \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\mu$ be the least nonnegative integer $\geqq \mu_{0}$, where

$$
\mu_{0}=\frac{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{i}}{\max \left\{d_{i}\right\}}
$$

We shall show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega(\Delta)=\mu+m \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence (5.2) implies the theorem of Katz.
The polyhedron $\Delta$ is bounded by the hyperplanes $x_{j}=0, y_{i}=0$, and the two hyperplanes $y_{1}+\ldots+y_{m}=1$ (which contains all vertices except the origin) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1}+\ldots+x_{n}=d_{1} y_{1}+\ldots+d_{m} y_{m} \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(which contains all vertices except the $\mathbf{e}_{i}^{\prime}$ ). Let $\mathbf{R}_{+}\langle\Delta\rangle$ be the cone defined by the inequalities $x_{j} \geqq 0, y_{i} \geqq 0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1}+\ldots+x_{n} \leqq d_{1} y_{1}+\ldots+d_{m} y_{m} \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The same argument that proved (2.10) shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega(\Delta)=\min \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_{i} \mid(r ; s) \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\langle\Delta\rangle \cap\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+m}\right\} . \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose for convenience that $d_{m}=\max \left\{d_{i}\right\}$. Inequality (5.5) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{j}+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(d_{m}-d_{i}\right) y_{i}}{d_{m}} \leqq y_{1}+\ldots+y_{m} \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The min of the left-hand side of (5.7) on $\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+m}$ occurs when all $x_{j}$ and $y_{i}$ equal 1 , hence by (5.6), $\omega(\Delta) \geqq \mu+m$. But the point $x_{j}=1$ for $j=1, \ldots, n, y_{i}=1$ for $i=1, \ldots, m-1, y_{m}=\mu+1$ satisfies (5.7) [hence satisfies (5.5)], therefore lies in $\mathbf{R}_{+}\langle\Delta\rangle \cap\left(\mathbf{N}_{+}\right)^{n+m}$. It then follows from (5.6) that $\omega(\Delta) \leqq \mu+m$ also, so (5.3) is established.

Assume the notation and hypotheses of Theorem 2.14, and let degree $f=d_{0}$. Sperber's theorem is the assertion that $\operatorname{ord}_{q} S(V, f) \geqq \mu^{\prime}$, where $\mu^{\prime}$ is the least element of $d_{0}^{-1} \mathbf{N}$ that is $\geqq \mu_{0}^{\prime}$, where

$$
\mu_{0}^{\prime}=\frac{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{i}}{\max \left\{d_{i}\right\}_{i=0}^{m}} .
$$

It can be derived similarly, by considering the largest possible Newton polyhedron that can occur in Theorem 2.14 when the degrees of the given polynomials are specified.
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## 6. Connections with recent work

Lemma 6.1. - Suppose every face of $\Delta(f)$ of codimension 1 that does not contain the origin lies in a hyperplane $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i} X_{i}=1$ (a so-called hyperplane of support) where all $\alpha_{i} \geqq 0$. Suppose also that $(1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\langle f\rangle$. Then $\omega(f)=\omega_{f}(1, \ldots, 1)$.

Proof. - Set $\mathrm{P}_{0}=(1, \ldots, 1), O=(0, \ldots, 0)$. Let $\Gamma$ be the hyperplane of support intersecting the ray $O \mathrm{P}_{0}$, say, in the point Q . Let $\Gamma_{0}$ be the hyperplane passing through $P_{0}$ parallel to $\Gamma$. If $P$ is any other point in $\mathbf{Z}^{n}$ with all coordinates positive then $\Gamma_{0}$ separates $O$ and P . Let the ray $O$ P intersect the hyperplane $\Gamma_{0}$ in $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ (so $\left|O \mathrm{R}_{0}\right| \leqq|O \mathrm{P}|$ ). Suppose proceeding along the ray $O \mathrm{P}$ from $O$ that the first hyperplane of support that $O P$ intersects is $\tilde{\Gamma}$, say, in the point $\tilde{\mathrm{R}}$. Suppose it intersects $\Gamma$ in the point R . Then the convexity of $\Delta(f)$ implies that $|O \tilde{\mathrm{R}}| \leqq|O \mathrm{R}|$. Hence

$$
w_{f}\left(\mathrm{P}_{0}\right)=\left|O \mathrm{P}_{0}\right||O \mathrm{Q}|=\left|O \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{o}}\right| /|O \mathrm{R}| \leqq|O \mathrm{P}|| | O \tilde{\mathrm{R}} \mid=w_{f}(\mathrm{P})
$$

As a consequence we have the following immediate results:

1. Let $n=2$ and let $f$ be as in (2.1). Let $\hat{f}$ be a lifting of $f$ to $\mathbf{C}[x]$ whose coefficients are algebraic integers with positive real parts. Suppose that $\Delta(f)=\Delta(\hat{f})$ and that every face of $\Delta(f)$ that does not contain the origin lies on a line $\alpha_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1}+\alpha_{2} \mathrm{X}_{2}=1$ with $\alpha_{1}$, $\alpha_{2} \geqq 0$. If $\hat{f}$ is nondegenerate and commode in the sense of [11], then $\omega(f)$ is the abscissa of convergence of the Dirichlet series ( $s \in \mathbf{C}$ )

$$
\mathrm{Z}(f, s)=\sum_{m_{1}, m_{2} \geqq 1} \frac{1}{f\left(m_{1}, m_{2}\right)^{s}}
$$

studied by Cassou-Nogues [5].
2. Now let $n$ be arbitrary. Let $\hat{f}$ be a quasi-homogeneous polynomial with an isolated singularity at the origin, defined over some number field, and let $f$ be the reduction of $\hat{f}$ modulo some prime ideal. Then $\Delta(\hat{f})$ has only one hyperplane of support $\sum \alpha_{i} X_{i}=1$, and we assume all $\alpha_{i} \geqq 0$. If we assume that $\Delta(f)$ has dimension $n$, that $(1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbf{R}_{+}\langle f\rangle$, that $\hat{f}$ is nondegenerate in the sense of [11], and that $\Delta(\hat{f})=\Delta(f)$, then it follows from Ehlers-Lo [9] * that $\omega(f)$ is the negative of the maximal root of the Bernstein polynomial associated with $\hat{f}$. (The Ehlers-Lo result does not require quasihomogeneity. This condition is to insure that our definition of Newton polyhedron coincides with theirs.)

At present we do not have an explanation for these apparent connections, other than the fact that they all involve the Newton polyhedron of $f$ in some way. For a relation with the local zeta function of Igusa, see Lichtin-Meuser [12]. Newton polyhedra and local zeta functions are also the topic of a forthcoming paper by J. Denef.

[^1]
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