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## Introduction

Let $F$ be the quotient field of a Dedekind domain $\mathfrak{O}_{F}$ having finite residue fields $\mathfrak{O}_{F} / \mathfrak{p}$ for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathfrak{O}_{F}$ (e.g., a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$ ). Let $K, K^{\prime}$ and $L$ be finite extensions of $F$ such that $L / F$ is normal, $K K^{\prime} \subseteq L$ and $K \cap K^{\prime}=F$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{Q}_{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\mathfrak{O}_{\mathrm{K}}+\mathfrak{A}=\mathfrak{D}_{K^{\prime}}+\mathfrak{A}$, then $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ and $\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}$ are said to have corresponding residue systems mod $\mathfrak{A}$. We are interested in finding $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, the unique minimal ambiguous ( $\operatorname{over} F$ ) ideal of $\mathfrak{Q}_{\mathrm{L}}$ so that $\mathfrak{Q}_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}+$ $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$. In this paper, we will usually focus on the (local) case where $F$ is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_{p}, L / F$ is totally ramified, and $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ are normal extensions. In this case, $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ is a power of $\mathfrak{P}$, the unique maximal ideal of $\mathfrak{O}_{L}$, so our task is to find $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, the largest integer $m$ so that $\mathfrak{O}_{K}+\mathfrak{P}^{m}=\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}+\mathfrak{P}^{m}$. The method developed by the author utilizes canonical invariants of the field towers $L / K / F$ and $L / K^{\prime} / F$, which are determined by the $i$ th elementary symmetric functions on the sets $\{(\sigma \pi-\pi) / \pi: \sigma \in G\}$ and $\left\{\left(\sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}-\pi^{\prime}\right) / \pi^{\prime}: \sigma^{\prime} \in G^{\prime}\right\}$, where $\pi$ (resp. $\pi^{\prime}$ ) is an arbitrary prime element of $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{K}}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{O}_{\mathrm{K}^{\prime}}$ ). We see that these invariants can be computed in terms of $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)$, but are actually independent of the choice of $\pi$. By comparing the invariants associated to $L / K / F$ and $L / K^{\prime} / F$, we show that

$$
M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \geq p^{n}(t+1)-t p^{n-1}
$$

where $t=\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}$, and $t_{1}(K / F)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right)$ denotes the first breakpoint in the Hilbert ramification sequence for $\operatorname{Gal}(K / F)$ (resp. $\operatorname{Gal}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)$ ). In addition, we prove that if $1=t_{1}(K / F)<t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)$, then $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ can be computed completely in terms of the coefficients of $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)$, where again $\pi$ is any prime element of $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$. This, together with a previous result of the author, provides a method for determining $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ whenever $\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}=1$. As a final consequence, we "globalize" our results in order to sharpen previous lower bounds for the highest power of $\mathfrak{P}$ dividing $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ when $F$ is an algebraic number field.

In this article, we intend to expand on the results of [1], where the author's methods were introduced. As in [1] then, unless otherwise specified, we will assume that $F$
is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$ and that $L / F$ is a normal, totally ramified extension with normal subextensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ satisfying $K K^{\prime}=L, K \cap K^{\prime}=F$ and $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{n}$. Denote by $\mathfrak{P}_{K}$ and $\mathfrak{P}_{K^{\prime}}$ the maximal ideals of $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ and $\mathfrak{V}_{K^{\prime}}$, respectively.

Stout showed in 3.1 and 4.1 of [6] that, under these hypotheses,

$$
\begin{align*}
p^{n}\left(t_{1}(L / F)+1\right)-p^{n-1} t_{1}(L / F) & \leq M_{\imath}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq \min \left\{\begin{array}{l}
p^{n}\left(t_{1}(K / F)+1\right)-t_{1}\left(L / K^{\prime}\right), \\
p^{n}\left(t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)+1\right)-t_{1}(L / K) .
\end{array}\right\} \tag{0.1}
\end{align*}
$$

If, in addition, $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ are cyclic extensions, then McCulloh and Stout proved (in Theorem 3.1 of [3] and Theorem A of [4])

$$
M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=p^{n}(t+1)-p^{n-1} t_{1}(L / F)
$$

where, as above, $t=\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}$.
In Chapter V of [7], Vogt constructed a finite extension $F$ of $\mathbb{Q}_{2}$ and an elementary abelian, totally ramified extension $L / F$ of degree 16 such that the Hilbert sequence for $L / F$ had a unique breakpoint at 1 . Therefore, the sequences for all subextensions also had unique breakpoints at 1 . However, he then exhibited subfields $K, K^{\prime}$ and $K^{\prime \prime}$ of $L$ such that $K \cap K^{\prime}=K^{\prime} \cap K^{\prime \prime}=F$ and $K K^{\prime}=K^{\prime} K^{\prime \prime}=L$, but $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \neq$ $M_{\mathrm{L}}\left(K^{\prime}, K^{\prime \prime}\right)$, showing that the knowledge of the ramification numbers alone does not suffice, in general, if one is interested in computing $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$.

The invariants introduced in [1] (and mentioned briefly above) are computed as follows: Recall that if $\pi$ is any prime element of $\mathfrak{P}_{k}$, then an element $\sigma \in G$ $(=\operatorname{Gal}(K / F))$ is in the $i$ th ramification subgroup $G_{i}$ of $G$ if and only if $\sigma \pi-$ $\pi \in \mathfrak{P}_{k}^{i+1}$. Let $t=t_{1}(K / F)=\min \left\{i: G_{i} \neq G_{i+1}\right\}$ (the first breakpoint in the ramification sequence, which will be greater than or equal to 1 in this case). Note that since $L / F$ is totally ramified and $[L: K]=p^{n}$, we have $\mathfrak{P}_{K}^{i} \mathfrak{D}_{L}=\mathfrak{P}^{i p^{n}}$. For $i=1, \ldots, p^{n}-1$, we define $\varepsilon_{i} \in \mathfrak{P}^{i t p^{n}} / \mathfrak{P}^{i t p^{n}+1}$ to be the $i$ th elementary symmetric function on the set $\left\{(\sigma \pi-\pi) / \pi+\mathfrak{P}^{t p^{n}+1}: \sigma \in G\right\}$ (Alternatively, one can think of $\varepsilon_{\xi}$ as the canonical image (in $\mathfrak{P}^{\text {itp }} / \mathfrak{P}^{i t p^{n+1}}$ ) of the $i$ th elementary symmetric function of $\{(\sigma \pi-\pi) / \pi\}$ ). The author showed in [1] that each $\varepsilon_{1}$ is independent of the choice of $\pi$ and is thus an invariant of the extension $L / K / F$. We similarly define the invariant $\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{P}^{i t^{\prime} p^{n}} / \mathfrak{P}^{i t^{\prime} p^{n}+1}$ to be the $i$ th elementary symmetric function on the set $\left\{\left(\sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}-\pi^{\prime}\right) / \pi^{\prime}+\mathfrak{P}^{t^{\prime} p^{n}+1}: \sigma^{\prime} \in G^{\prime}\right\}$, where $\pi^{\prime}$ is a prime element of $\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}$, and $t^{\prime}=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)$. Under the additional hypothesis that $t_{1}(K / F)=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)=1$, the author showed in Theorem 3.1 of [1] that $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=p^{n}+i$, where $i$ is the smallest integer satisfying $\varepsilon_{i} \neq \varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}\left(\right.$ in fact, it was shown that $i$ will always take the form $p^{n}-p^{k}$ for some $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ ).

In this article, we will eliminate the assumption that $t_{1}(K / F)=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)=1$ and use our invariants to determine (or provide bounds for) $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$. Toward this
end, in the following section, we review some background material concerning our invariants and obtain necessary preliminary results.

## 1. Preliminary results

In this preliminary section, we will present several results which will be needed in both of the succeeding sections. We shall assume throughout that $F$ is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$ and that $L, K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are normal, totally ramified extensions of $F$ satisfying $K \cap K^{\prime}=F, K K^{\prime}=L$ and $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=[L: K]=p^{n}$. Recall that, if $\mathfrak{P}$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathfrak{O}_{L}$, then $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ is defined to be the largest rational integer $m$ so that $\mathfrak{O}_{K}+\mathfrak{P}^{m}=\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}+\mathfrak{P}^{m}$. As was demonstrated in [1], there is a connection between $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ and the coefficients of $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)$ and $\operatorname{irr}_{F}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)$, where $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ are prime elements of $\mathfrak{O}_{k}$ and $\mathfrak{V}_{K^{\prime}}$, respectively. By (1.1) and (1.2) of [1], we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=\max \left\{v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right): \pi \mathfrak{O}_{K}=\mathfrak{P}_{K} \text { and } \pi^{\prime} \mathfrak{Y}_{K^{\prime}}=\mathfrak{P}_{K^{\prime}}\right\} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=\min \left\{v_{k}\left(a_{i}-a_{i}^{\prime}\right)+i: 0 \leq i \leq p^{n}-1\right\} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

if we define $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=a_{0}+a_{1} x+\cdots+a_{p^{n}-1} x^{p^{n}-1}+x^{p^{n}}$ and $\operatorname{irr}_{F}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)=a_{0}^{\prime}+a_{1}^{\prime} x+$ $\cdots+a_{p^{n}-1}^{\prime} x^{p^{n}-1}+x^{p^{n}}$.

Next, we illustrate the connection between the invariants $\left\{\varepsilon_{i}: 1 \leq i \leq p^{n}-1\right\}$ and the coefficients of $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)$ by stating, without proof, Proposition 2.1 of [1].
(1.3) LEMMA. Let $\pi$ be a prime element of $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ with $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=a_{0}+a_{1} x+\cdots+x p^{n}$ and define $a_{p^{n}}=1$. For $1 \leq i \leq p^{n}-1$ and $t=t_{1}(K / F)$, let $0 \leq j \leq p^{n}-1$ satisfy $j \equiv i t\left(\bmod p^{n}\right)$. Then
$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}}=(-1)^{i} a_{j}\binom{j}{p^{n}-i} \pi^{j-p^{n}}+\mathfrak{P}^{i t p^{n}+1} \quad\left(\right.$ where $j<p^{n}-i$ implies $\left.\binom{j}{p^{n}-i}=0\right)$.
Furthermore, for all $\left.l, v_{k}\left(\begin{array}{c}l \\ a_{1} \\ p^{n}-i\end{array}\right) \pi^{l-p^{n}}\right) \geq$ it with equality only if $l \equiv$ it $\left(\bmod p^{n}\right)$.

The key to (1.3), as was proved in [1], is that $\varepsilon_{i}$ is independent of the choice of prime element $\pi$. As $K / F$ is totally ramified and $\pi$ is a prime element of $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$, we know that $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)$ is an Eisenstein polynomial, and therefore, the constant term $a_{0}$ satisfies $v_{K}\left(a_{0}\right)=[K: F]=p^{n}$. The next two propositions use (1.3) to provide lower bounds for the degree of divisibility of the other coefficients of $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)$ by $\mathfrak{P}_{K}$. The next proposition is a restatment of (2.6) from [1].
(1.4) Proposition. Let $K / F$ be a normal, totally ramified extension of degree $p^{n}$ with $t=t_{1}(K / F)<p$. Suppose $\pi$ is a prime element of $\mathfrak{D}_{K}$ with $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=$ $\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i} x^{i}$. If $0<l<p^{n}$ and $v_{p}(l)=k$, then

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
v_{k}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq(t+1) p^{n} & \text { if } l<p^{n}-t p^{k}, \\
v_{k}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq t p^{n} & \text { if } l \geq p^{n}-t p^{k} .
\end{array}
$$

In particular, when $t=1$,(1.4) gives us

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
v_{\kappa}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq 2 p^{n} & \text { if } l<p^{n}-p^{k} \\
v_{\kappa}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq p^{n} & \text { if } l=p^{n}-p^{k} \tag{1}
\end{array}
$$

In this article, we will not necessarily assume that $t_{1}(K / F)<p$, so we need to prove the following generalization of (1.4).
(1.6) Proposition. Suppose $K / F$ is a normal, totally ramified extension with $[K: F]=p^{n}$ and $t=t_{1}(K / F)$. Let $\pi$ be a prime element of $\mathfrak{D}_{K}$ with $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=$ $\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i} x^{i}$. If $0<l<p^{n}$ and $v_{p}(l)=k$, then

$$
y_{k}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq t p^{n}-(t-1) p^{k} .
$$

Proof. Let $l$ be given and suppose $v_{p}(l)=k$. By (2.5) of [1], we know that $v_{p}\left(\binom{l}{p^{k}}\right)=0$, so $v_{k}\left(\binom{l}{p^{k}}\right)=0$, as well. Letting $i=p^{n}-p^{k}$ in (1.3), we have

$$
\left(p^{n}-p^{k}\right) t \leq v_{K}\left(a_{l}\binom{l}{p^{k}} \pi^{l-p^{n}}\right)=v_{K}\left(a_{l}\right)+l-p^{n}
$$

Observing that $l \leq p^{n}-p^{k}$, the proposition follows immediately.
A fact which will prove to be useful in the section which follows is that if $t>1$, then $t p^{n}-(t-1) p^{k}-\left(2 p^{n}-p^{k}\right)=(t-2)\left(p^{n}-p^{k}\right) \geq 0$, so $t p^{n}-(t-1) p^{k} \geq\left(2 p^{n}-p^{k}\right)$. Therefore, by (1.6), if $v_{p}(l)=k$, then $v_{k}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq 2 p^{n}-p^{k}$. Finally, since $a_{l} \in F$ for each $l$, we know that $v_{K}\left(a_{t}\right)$ is an integral multiple of $p^{n}$, so we may conclude:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { If } t>1 \text {, then } v_{K}\left(a_{t}\right) \geq 2 p^{n}, \text { for all } 0<l<p^{n} \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 2. The case $\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}=1$

In this section, $L / F$ is a normal, totally ramified extension of degree $p^{2 n}$ with normal subextensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ satisfying $K \cap K^{\prime}=F, K K^{\prime}=L$ and $[K: F]=$ $\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{n}$. We will also assume that $\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}=1$. For ease of notation, we shall denote $t=t_{1}(K / F)$ and $t^{\prime}=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)$. Recall that the case $t=t^{\prime}=1$ was addressed in [1], so we shall assume that $t=1$ and $t^{\prime}>1$.

The following theorem provides a method of computing $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ in terms of the canonical invariants $\varepsilon_{i}$ of $K / F$.
(2.1) THEOREM. If $1=t<t^{\prime}$, then $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=2 p^{n}-p^{k}$, where $p^{n}-p^{k}=$ $\min \left\{i: \varepsilon_{i} \neq 0+\mathfrak{P}^{i p^{n}+1}\right\}$.

Proof. As $\varepsilon_{i}$ is independent of the choice of prime element $\pi$ of $\mathfrak{V}_{K}$, let us assume that we have chosen $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ so that $\eta_{2}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, and let $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i} x^{i}$ and $\operatorname{irr}_{F}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i}^{\prime} x^{i}$. Let $0<l<p^{n}$ and suppose that $v_{p}(l)=k$. Since $t=1$, (1.5) gives us

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
v_{k}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq 2 p^{n} & \text { if } l \neq p^{n}-p^{k}, \\
v_{k}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq p^{n} & \text { if } l=p^{n}-p^{k} .
\end{array}
$$

In particular, if $l \neq p^{n}-p^{k}$, then $a_{l} \in \mathfrak{P}^{2 p^{2 n}}$, so $\varepsilon=0+\mathfrak{P}^{l p^{n}+1}$ by (1.3).
Since $t^{\prime}>1$, (1.7) gives us $v_{K^{\prime}}\left(a_{t}^{\prime}\right) \geq 2 p^{n}$. As $a_{t}^{\prime} \in F$, and the extensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ are totally ramified of equal degree, we have $v_{k}\left(a_{t}^{\prime}\right)=v_{K^{\prime}}\left(a_{l}^{\prime}\right) \geq 2 p^{n}$. Therefore, if $l \neq p^{n}-p^{k}$, then $v_{K}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right) \geq \min \left\{v_{K}\left(a_{l}\right), v_{K}\left(a_{l}^{\prime}\right)\right\} \geq 2 p^{n}$, which implies $v_{K}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right)+l>2 p^{n}$. However, by (1.2) and (0.1), $2 p^{n}-1 \geq \psi^{2}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=$ $\min \left\{v_{k}\left(a_{i}-a_{i}^{\prime}\right)+i: 0 \leq i \leq p^{n}-1\right\}$, and we may conclude that $M_{k}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \neq$ $v_{k}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right)+l$ for such $l$. To summarize, we have proven that, if $v_{p}(l)=k$ and $l \neq p^{n}-p^{k}$, then $\varepsilon_{1}=0+\mathfrak{P}^{l p^{n}+1}$ and $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \neq u_{k}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right)+l$. Note that, by $(0.1), M_{\iota}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \geq 2 p^{n}-p^{n-1}$, so $\min \left\{v_{k}\left(a_{i}-a_{i}^{\prime}\right)+i\right\} \geq 2 p^{n}-p^{n-1}$, by (1.2). In particular, $v_{k}\left(a_{0}-a_{0}^{\prime}\right)+0 \geq 2 p^{n}-p^{n-1}$. Therefore, since $a_{0}-a_{0}^{\prime} \in F$, $v_{\kappa}\left(a_{0}-a_{0}^{\prime}\right) \geq 2 p^{n}\left(>M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)\right)$. Hence

$$
M_{乙}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=\min \left\{v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)+p^{n}-p^{k}: 0 \leq k \leq n-1\right\}
$$

Next, we shall investigate the case $l=p^{n}-p^{k}$.
Suppose that $l=p^{n}-p^{k}$ for some $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. Then, by (1.3),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}} \neq 0+\mathfrak{P}^{p^{2 n}-p^{k+n}+1} \Longleftrightarrow v_{( }\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}\right)<p^{2 n}+1 \\
& \quad\left(\text { since } v_{L}\left(\binom{p^{n}-p^{k}}{p^{k}}\right)=0\right) \\
& \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}\right)<p^{n}+1 \\
& \quad\left(\text { since } v_{L}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}\right)=p^{n} \cdot v_{\kappa}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}\right)\right) \\
& \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}\right)=p^{n} \quad\left(\text { since } a_{p^{n}-p^{k}} \in \mathfrak{O}_{F}\right) \\
& \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)=p^{n} \quad\left(\text { since } v_{K}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}\right) \geq 2 p^{n}\right) \\
& \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)+p^{n}-p^{k}=2 p^{n}-p^{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

We have shown, then, that

$$
\varepsilon_{p^{n-p^{k}}} \neq 0+\mathfrak{P}^{p^{2 n}-p^{k+n}+1} \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)+p^{n}-p^{k}=2 p^{n}-p^{k}
$$

As $2 p^{n}-1 \geq M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=\min \left\{v_{K}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)+p^{n}-p^{k}\right\}$, we know that

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)= & v_{K}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)+p^{n}-p^{k} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i: v_{K}\left(a_{i}-a_{i}^{\prime}\right)=p^{n}\right\} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i: \varepsilon_{i} \neq 0+\mathfrak{P}^{i p^{n}+1}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

and the theorem is proved.
Notice that, in the midst of the above proof, we demonstrated another technique for computing $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, for we showed that if $\pi$ is chosen (along with $\pi^{\prime}$ ) to satisfy $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)$, then

$$
\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}} \neq 0+\mathfrak{P}^{p^{2 n}-p^{k+n}+1} \Longleftrightarrow u_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-p^{k}}\right)=p^{n} .
$$

However, since each $\varepsilon_{i}$ is independent of the choice of $\pi$, the proof of (2.1) actually shows that if $\bar{\pi}$ is any prime element of $\mathfrak{V}_{K}$ and $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\bar{\pi})=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} b_{i} x^{i}$, then

$$
\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}} \neq 0+\mathfrak{P}^{p^{2 n}-p^{k+n}+1} \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(b_{p^{n}-p^{k}}\right)=p^{n} .
$$

By (2.1), we have $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=2 p^{n}-p^{k}$, where $p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i: \varepsilon_{i} \neq 0+\mathfrak{P}^{i p^{n}+1}\right\}$, so we know that

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=2 p^{n}-p^{k} & \Longleftrightarrow p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i>0: v_{K}\left(b_{i}\right)=p^{n}\right\} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i>0: v_{F}\left(b_{i}\right)=1\right\} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i>0: b_{i} \notin \mathfrak{p}^{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathfrak{p}$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathfrak{V}_{F}$. Hence, we have proven the following:
(2.2) COROLLARY. Suppose $1=t<t^{\prime}$ and that $\pi$ is a prime element of $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ with $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i} x^{i}$. If $\mathfrak{p}$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathfrak{O}_{F}$, then $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=2 p^{n}-p^{k}$ where $p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i>0: a_{i} \notin \mathfrak{p}^{2}\right\}$.

We conclude this section by noting that we can consolidate (2.1) above and (3.1) of [1] by making a slight change in the definition of $\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}$ when $t^{\prime}>1$. Let $\overline{\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}}$ be defined as follows:

$$
\overline{\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}}= \begin{cases}\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime} & \text { if } t^{\prime}=1 \\ 0+\mathfrak{P}^{i p^{n}+1} & \text { if } t^{\prime}>1\end{cases}
$$

In Theorem (3.1) of [1], we showed that, if $t=t^{\prime}=1$, then $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=2 p^{n}-p^{k}$, where $p^{n}-p^{k}$ is the smallest integer $i$ such that $\varepsilon_{i} \neq \varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}$. This result, along with (2.2), gives us a method of determining $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ whenever $\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}=1$.
(2.3) ThEOREM. If $L / F$ is a normal, totally ramified extension of degree $p^{2 n}$ with normal subextensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ satisfying $K \cap K^{\prime}=F, K K^{\prime}=L$, $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{n}$ and $t_{1}(K / F)=1$, then

$$
M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=2 p^{n}-p^{k}, \quad \text { where } p^{n}-p^{k}=\min \left\{i: \varepsilon_{i} \neq \overline{\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}}\right\}
$$

## 3. The general case

In this section, we will continue to assume that $F$ is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$ and that $L / F$ is a normal, totally ramified extension of degree $p^{2 n}$ with normal subextensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ satisfying $K \cap K^{\prime}=F, K K^{\prime}=L$ and $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{n}$. We will also continue to use the notation $t=\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}$ with the additional observation that, without loss of generality, we may assume that $t=t_{1}(K / F)$. We will also use the abbreviation $t^{\prime}=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)$ and let $\mathfrak{P}$ denote the maximal ideal of $\mathfrak{O}_{L}$. In (3.3), we will sharpen the previously computed (see (0.1)) lower bounds for $M_{\ell}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$. First we show that, under our hypotheses, $p^{n}$ cannot divide $M_{乙}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, generalizing a result found in the proof of Theorem (3.1) of [3].
(3.1) PROPOSITION. Let $L / F$ be a normal, totally ramified extension of degree $p^{2 n}$ with normal subextensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ satisfying $K K^{\prime}=L, K \cap K^{\prime}=F$ and $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{n}$. Then $p^{n}$ does not divide $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$.

Proof. Define $M=M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ and let $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ be prime elements of $\mathfrak{O}_{k}$ and $\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}$ so that $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=M$. Since $L / K$ is totally ramified, we have $v_{L}(\pi)=p^{n}$. Assume, by way of contradiction, that $p^{n} \mid M$. Then $\pi^{M / p^{n}} \in \mathfrak{O}_{K}$ and $\psi\left(\pi^{M / p^{n}}\right)=M$. Since $L / F$ is totally ramified, the residue fields $\mathfrak{O}_{L} / \mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{O}_{F} / \mathfrak{p}$ are equal, so there is a $\gamma \in \mathfrak{D}_{F}$ satisfying $\pi-\pi^{\prime} \equiv \gamma \pi^{M / p^{n}}\left(\bmod \mathfrak{P}^{M+1}\right)$. Therefore, $\pi^{\prime}=\pi+\pi^{\prime}-\pi \equiv$ $\pi-\gamma \pi^{M / p^{n}}\left(\bmod \mathfrak{P}^{M+1}\right)$. Defining $\rho=\pi-\gamma \pi^{M / p^{n}}$, we see that $\rho$ is an element of $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ satisfying $\underline{q}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\rho-\pi^{\prime}\right) \geq M+1>p^{n}=\underline{y}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)$, so we must have $\underline{q}_{\mathcal{L}}(\rho)=p^{n}$. Thus, $\rho$ is a prime element of $\mathfrak{Q}_{k}$ satisfying $\underline{q}_{2}\left(\rho-\pi^{\prime}\right)>M$, contradicting (1.1). Hence, $p^{n}$ cannot divide $M$.

With (3.1) in mind, if $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ have been chosen so that $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, then $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)$ cannot be a multiple of $p^{n}$. However, (1.2) gives us $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=$ $\min \left\{v_{k}\left(a_{i}-a_{i}^{\prime}\right)+i: 0 \leq i \leq p^{n}-1\right\}$, where $a_{i}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.a_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ is the coefficient of $x^{i}$ in $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)\left(\operatorname{resp} . \operatorname{irr}_{F}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)\right)$. As $v_{K}\left(a_{i}-a_{i}^{\prime}\right)+i \equiv i\left(\bmod p^{n}\right)$, (3.1) shows that the minimum cannot occur when $i=0$, and we have the following corollary:
(3.2) COROLLARY. Along with the hypotheses of (3.1), suppose that $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ are chosen so that $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)$. If $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=a_{0}+a_{1} x+\cdots+x^{p^{n}}$ and $\operatorname{irr}_{F}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)=a_{0}^{\prime}+a_{1}^{\prime} x+\cdots+x^{p^{n}}$, then $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)<v_{K}\left(a_{0}-a_{0}^{\prime}\right)$.

As a final note on (3.1) and (3.2), we insert a note of caution. Notice that if $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ are chosen to be arbitrary prime elements of $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ and $\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}$, then we cannot guarantee that $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)$ is not a multiple of $p^{n}$. However, as was shown in (3.1) of [1], if $t_{1}(K / F)=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)=1$ and $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ are chosen so that $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)$ is not a multiple of $p^{n}$, then $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$. Whether this result generalizes to other cases is not known to the author.

We now come to the main result of this section. We show that if $L, K, K^{\prime}$ and $F$ are as above and $t=\min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}$, then $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \geq p^{n}(t+1)-p^{n-1} t$, sharpening the lower bound given in ( 0.1 ). To see that this is, indeed, a sharpening of the previous lower bound, recall that $t_{1}(L / F) \leq \min \left\{t_{1}(K / F), t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}=t$, so that
$p^{n}(t+1)-p^{n-1} t \geq p^{n}\left(t_{1}(L / F)+1\right)-p^{n-1} t_{1}(L / F) \quad(=$ the lower bound of $(0.1))$.
(3.3) THEOREM. Let $L / F$ be a normal, totally ramified extension of degree $p^{2 n}$ with normal subextensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ satisfying $K K^{\prime}=L, K \cap K^{\prime}=F$ and $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{n}$. If $t=t_{1}(K / F) \leq t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)$, then $p^{n}(t+1)-p^{n-1} t \leq$ $M_{\iota}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, with equality only if $t$ is not divisible by $p$.

Proof. Choose $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ so that $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)$, and suppose $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=$ $\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i} x^{i}$ and $\operatorname{irr}_{F}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i}^{\prime} x^{i}$. By an intermediate step in the proof of (1.6), if $0<l<p^{n}$, then

$$
v_{K}\left(a_{l}\right) \geq p^{n}\left(t_{1}(K / F)+1\right)-p^{v_{p}(l)} t_{1}(K / F)-l
$$

and

$$
v_{K^{\prime}}\left(a_{l}^{\prime}\right) \geq p^{n}\left(t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)+1\right)-p^{v_{p}(l)} t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)-l .
$$

Since $a_{t}^{\prime} \in F$, we have $v_{K}\left(a_{t}^{\prime}\right)=v_{K^{\prime}}\left(a_{l}^{\prime}\right)$. Hence,
$v_{\kappa}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right)+l \geq \min \left\{v_{\kappa}\left(a_{l}\right), v_{\kappa}\left(a_{l}^{\prime}\right)\right\}+l \geq(t+1) p^{n}-p^{v_{p}(l)} t-l+l=t p^{n}-t p^{v_{p}(l)}$.
Moreover, since $0 \leq v_{p}(l) \leq n-1$, we have shown that

$$
v_{k}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right)+l \geq(t+1) p^{n}-t p^{n-1} \quad \text { for all } 0<l<p^{n}
$$

Now, recall that, by (1.1) and (1.2), we have $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=\min \left\{v_{K}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right)+\right.$ $\left.l: 0 \leq l \leq p^{n}-1\right\}$. However, (3.2) shows that this minimum cannot occur for $l=0$. Therefore,

$$
M_{\iota}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=\min \left\{v_{K}\left(a_{l}-a_{l}^{\prime}\right)+l: l \neq 0\right\} \geq p^{n}(t+1)-p^{n-1} t
$$

In view of (3.1), we see that this lower bound can only be attained if $t$ is not divisible by $p$, and the proof is complete.

## 4. The case $t=t^{\prime}<p$

With (3.3) in hand, we now make the additional assumption that $t_{1}(K / F)=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)$ $<p$, thus obtaining some partial results concerning the connection between our invariants and $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$.
(4.1) Proposition. Let L/F be anormal, totally ramified extension of degree $p^{2 n}$ having normal subextensions $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$ satisfying $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{n}$, $K \cap K^{\prime}=F, K K^{\prime}=L$ and $t=t_{1}(K / F)=t_{1}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)<p$, and choose $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ so that $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$. If $\operatorname{irr}_{F}(\pi)=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i} x^{i}$ and $\operatorname{irr}_{F}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{n}} a_{i}^{\prime} x^{i}$, then for $0 \leq k \leq n-1$,

$$
\varepsilon_{p^{n-p^{k}}} \neq \varepsilon_{p^{n-p^{k}}}^{\prime} \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)=t p^{n}
$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ be given. By hypothesis (and (3.1)), we know $v_{L}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)=M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)>p^{n}$, so $\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right) \in \mathfrak{P}^{p^{n}+1}$, which implies $\frac{\pi}{\pi^{\prime}} \equiv 1(\bmod \mathfrak{P})$, and therefore $\left(\frac{\pi}{\pi^{\prime}}\right)^{t p^{k}} \equiv 1(\bmod \mathfrak{P})$. In light of this, we will define $\alpha=\left(\pi / \pi^{\prime}\right)^{t p^{k}}-1 \in$ $\mathfrak{P}$. Since $t<p$, we know $v_{p}\left(p^{n}-t p^{k}\right)=k$, so $v_{p}\left(\binom{p^{n}-t p^{k}}{p^{k}}\right)=0$. Therefore, (1.3) gives us

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}}=\varepsilon_{p^{n-p^{k}}}^{\prime} & \Longleftrightarrow \frac{a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}}{\pi^{t p^{k}}}-\frac{a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}}{\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)^{t p^{k}}} \in \mathfrak{P}^{t p^{2 n}-t p^{n+k}+1} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}(1+\alpha) \in \mathfrak{P}^{t p^{2 n}+1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

As $a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{P}^{t p^{2 n}}$ and $\alpha \in \mathfrak{P}$, we have $\alpha a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{P}^{t p^{2 n}+1}$, and therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}}=\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime} & \Longleftrightarrow a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{P}^{t p^{2 n}+1} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{P}_{k}^{t p^{n}+1} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow v_{\kappa}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)>t p^{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

By (1.4), $v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}\right) \geq t p^{n}$ and $v_{K}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}\right) \geq t p^{n}$, so we have proven that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}} \neq \varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime} & \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}\right) \leq t p^{n} \\
& \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)=t p^{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

We conclude this section with two corollaries of (4.1). The first provides a method for computing an upper bound for $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ whenever $t=t^{\prime}<p$. The second provides a necessary and sufficient condition for $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ to take the value of the lower bound given in (3.3).
(4.2) COROLLARY. With the hypotheses of (4.1), if $\varepsilon_{p^{p}-p^{k}} \neq \varepsilon_{p^{k}-p^{k}}^{\prime}$, then $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ $\leq p^{n}(t+1)-t p^{k}$.

Proof. If $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ are chosen so that $M_{2}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=\mathcal{y}_{2}\left(\pi-\pi^{\prime}\right)$, then (4.1) shows that

$$
\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}} \neq \varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime} \Longleftrightarrow v_{k}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)+p^{n}-t p^{k}=2 p^{n}-t p^{k}
$$

Therefore, if $\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}} \neq \varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{k}}^{\prime}$, then
$p^{n}(t+1)-t p^{k}=v_{K}\left(a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}-a_{p^{n}-t p^{k}}^{\prime}\right)+p^{n}-t p^{k} \geq \min \left\{v_{K}\left(a_{i}-a_{i}^{\prime}\right)+i\right\}=M_{\mathcal{L}}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, and our inequality is established.
(4.3) Corollary. With the hypotheses of (4.1),

$$
\varepsilon_{p^{n-p^{n-1}}} \neq \varepsilon_{p^{n-p^{n-1}}}^{\prime} \Longleftrightarrow M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=p^{n}(t+1)-t p^{n-1}
$$

Proof. By (4.2), if $\varepsilon_{p^{n}-p^{n-1}} \neq \varepsilon_{p^{n-p^{n-1}}}^{\prime}$, then $M_{\varepsilon}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \leq p^{n}(t+1)-t p^{n-1}$. By (3.2), however, $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \geq p^{n}(t+1)-t p^{n-1}$, and therefore, we must have $M_{L}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=p^{n}(t+1)-t p^{n-1}$ 。

## 5. Global consequences

The notion of corresponding residue systems was introduced by Butts and Mann in [2] under the hypothesis that $F$ was a number field. We will suppose here that $F$ is the quotient field of a Dedekind domain having characteristic 0 and finite residue fields for every prime ideal in $\mathfrak{D}_{F}$ (a number field, for example) and that $L$ is a finite extension of $F$. Recall that if $\mathfrak{A}$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{Q}_{\mathcal{L}}$, then $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ and $\mathfrak{V}_{K^{\prime}}$ (or $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ ) have corresponding residue systems mod $\mathfrak{A}$ if $\mathfrak{O}_{K}+\mathfrak{A}=\mathfrak{D}_{K^{\prime}}+\mathfrak{A}$, and $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ is defined to be the unique minimal ambiguous ideal of $\mathfrak{O}_{L}$ so that $\mathfrak{O}_{K}$ and $\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}$ have corresponding residue systems mod $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$.

Of course, in order to compute $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, we need only find its factorization as a product of prime ideals in $\mathfrak{Q}_{L}$. To this end, for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{P}$ of $\mathfrak{O}_{L}$ we compute max $\left\{m \in \mathbb{Z}: \mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \subseteq \mathfrak{P}^{m}\right\}$. As $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ is ambiguous, if $\mathfrak{P}^{m}$ divides $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$, then so does $\overline{\mathfrak{P}}^{m}$, where $\overline{\mathfrak{P}}$ is any conjugate of $\mathfrak{P}$, so the highest power of $\mathfrak{P}$ dividing $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ is the same as the highest power of $\overline{\mathfrak{P}}$ dividing $\mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$. Hence, we turn our attention to computing

$$
\begin{aligned}
M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right) & =\max \left\{m \in \mathbb{Z}: \mathfrak{M}\left(K, K^{\prime}\right) \subseteq\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}\right)^{m}\right\} \\
& =\max \left\{m \in \mathbb{Z}: \mathfrak{O}_{k}+\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}\right)^{m}=\mathfrak{O}_{K^{\prime}}+\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}\right)^{m}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathfrak{P}^{\#}$ is the product of the distinct conjugates of $\mathfrak{P}$ in $\mathfrak{Q}_{L}$. If we lete $=e(\mathfrak{P}: L / F)$ the (relative) ramification index of $\mathfrak{P}$ over $F$, then McCulloh and Stout showed in Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 of [3] that $M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right)>0$ if and only if $\mathfrak{P}$ is totally ramified in $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$. In this case,

$$
M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right) \geq \min \left\{\frac{e}{[K: F]}, \frac{e}{\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]}\right\}
$$

with equality unless $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{r}$ for some $r$ where $p$ is the characteristic of the residue field $\mathfrak{O}_{L} / \mathfrak{P}$. Hence, we will assume that $[K: F]=\left[K^{\prime}: F\right]=p^{r}$ for some positive integer $r$. Under these hypotheses, Stout further showed, in Theorems 3.1 and 4.1 of [6] that

$$
M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right) \geq p^{r}\left(t_{1}(\mathfrak{P}: L / F)+1\right)-p^{r-1} t_{1}(\mathfrak{P}: L / F)
$$

where $t_{1}(\mathfrak{P}: L / F)$ is the first breakpoint in the Hilbert ramification sequence of the subgroups of $\operatorname{Gal}(L / F)$ with respect to $\mathfrak{P}$. We are now ready to prove the following theorem, a global version of (3.3), sharpening the above lower bound for $M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right)$ :
(5.1) THEOREM. Let $F$ be the quotient field of a Dedekind domain having characteristic 0 and assume that the residue field $\mathfrak{O}_{F} / \mathfrak{p}$ is finite for for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathfrak{D}_{F} .^{1}$ Let $L$ be an extension of $F$ of degree $p^{2 n}$ which is totally ramified at the prime $\mathfrak{P}$ of $\mathfrak{O}_{L}$ (a divisor of the rational prime $p$ ). Suppose $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are normal extensions of $F$ satisfying $K \cap K^{\prime}=F$ and $L=K K^{\prime}$ and let $t_{1}\left(\mathfrak{R}_{K}: K / F\right)($ resp . $\left.t_{1}\left(\mathfrak{P}_{K^{\prime}}: K^{\prime} / F\right)\right)$ denote the first breakpoint in the ramification sequence of subgroups of $\operatorname{Gal}(K / F)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\operatorname{Gal}\left(K^{\prime} / F\right)\right)$ with respect to $\mathfrak{P}_{\kappa}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\mathfrak{P}_{\kappa^{\prime}}\right)$. Then

$$
M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right) \geq p^{n}(t+1)-p^{n-1} t
$$

where $t=\min \left\{t_{1}\left(\mathfrak{P}_{\kappa}: K / F\right), t_{1}\left(\mathfrak{P}_{K^{\prime}}: K^{\prime} / F\right)\right\}$.
Proof. As $\mathfrak{P}$ is totally ramified in $L / F$ (and therefore in $K / F$ and $K^{\prime} / F$, as well), then $\mathfrak{P}^{\#}=\mathfrak{P}$ and we may assume that $L$ is complete with respect to $\mathfrak{P}$, since $\operatorname{Gal}(L / F)$ and the lattice of intermediate fields (and therefore the sequence of ramification groups) are unchanged if $L$ and $F$ are replaced by their completions $\hat{L}$ and $\hat{F}$ (with respect to $\mathfrak{P}$ ). Furthermore, since a field is dense in its completion, $M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right)$ is unchanged if $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are replaced by their completions $\hat{K}$ and $\hat{K}^{\prime}$. That is, $M\left(\mathfrak{P}^{\#}: K, K^{\prime}\right)=M_{\dot{L}}\left(\hat{K}, \hat{K}^{\prime}\right)$.

Since the characteristic of $F$ is 0 and $\mathfrak{D}_{F} / \mathfrak{p}$ is finite (where $\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{P} \cap \mathfrak{D}_{F}$ ), $\mathfrak{D}_{F}$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ module of finite rank (see [5], p. 36), and therefore, we may regard $F$ as a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$. But this is the case addressed in the earlier sections, so we may use (3.3), and the theorem is proved.

[^0]
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In fact, we need not assume that every residue field of $F$ is finite, only that $\mathfrak{Q}_{F} / \mathfrak{p}$ is finite when $\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{P} \cap \mathfrak{D}_{\boldsymbol{F}}$.

