

**ERRATUM: THE GENERALIZED DE RHAM-WITT COMPLEX  
OVER A FIELD  
IS A COMPLEX OF ZERO-CYCLES**

KAY RÜLLING

At the end of the proof of [Ru07, Th. 3.6], page 148, line 4, I use a residue theorem [Ru07, Th. 2.19] to conclude. But there is a gap as Deligne pointed out to me, since the theorem [Ru07, Th. 2.19] is stated for smooth projective curves over a base field  $k$ , whereas in the proof of [Ru07, Th. 3.6] I use it for normal projective curves. In this erratum I show that after a slight modification of the definition of the residue, which replaces [Ru07, Def. 2.15], together with the results [HuKu94, Th. 1, Th. 4] the residue theorem in fact holds for regular projective curves. Furthermore the calculation of the residue in the course of the proof of [Ru07, Th. 3.6] is adjusted. These modifications are enough to conclude exactly as in [Ru07] and in particular Theorem 3.6 of [Ru07] and all other results are true and remain unchanged.

I am deeply grateful to Pierre Deligne for pointing out this mistake.

Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic exponent  $p \neq 2$ ,  $S$  a finite truncation set,  $C$  a regular curve over  $k$  (i.e. a one dimensional regular, integral, separated scheme of finite type over  $k$ ),  $K = k(C)$  the function field of  $C$  and  $P \in C$  a closed point.

The following construction is from [HuKu94], page 88.

Denote  $k(K^{p^n})$  by  $K_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Viewing  $K$  as a constant sheaf on  $C$  and  $\mathcal{O}_C$ ,  $K_n \subset K$  as subsheaves we define  $C_n = \mathbf{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_C \cap K_n)$ . Thus we obtain maps

$$C = C_0 \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow \dots$$

Since  $k(\mathcal{O}_C^{p^n}) \subset (\mathcal{O}_C \cap K_n) \subset \mathcal{O}_C$  it is clear that these maps induce isomorphisms of the underlying topological spaces and that each  $C_n$  is a separated integral scheme of finite type over  $k$  with function field  $K_n$ . Denote by  $P_n$  the image of  $P$  in  $C_n$ . Then for almost all  $n$ ,  $C_n$  is smooth over  $k$  and  $k(P_n)$  is the separable closure of  $k$  in  $k(P)$ , by [HuKu94, Th. 1, Th. 4]. Now [Ru07, Def. 2.15] must be replaced by the following definition (we use the notation of the article).

**Definition-Proposition 1** (cf. [Ku86], 17.4.). Let  $n$  be a natural number such that for all  $n' \geq n$  (in the above notation)  $C_{n'}$  is smooth over  $k$  and  $k(P_{n'})$  is the separable closure of  $k$  in  $k(P)$ . We write  $\kappa_n = k(P_n)$  and  $K_n = k(C_n) = k(K^{p^n})$ . Finally we denote by  $\widehat{K}_n$  the completion of  $K_n$  in  $P_n$ . Now the choice of a local parameter  $t$  in  $P_n$  determines a unique continuous isomorphism  $\kappa_n((t)) \xrightarrow{\cong} \widehat{K}_n$  of fields over  $k$  (this is an isomorphism over  $k$ , since  $\kappa_n \supset k$  is separable) and we have a natural inclusion  $\iota : K_n \hookrightarrow \kappa_n((t))$ . Take  $\omega \in \mathbb{W}_S \Omega_K^q$ , then we define the *residue of  $\omega$  in  $P$*  to be

$$(1) \quad \text{Res}_{P,S}(\omega) = \text{Res}_P(\omega) = \text{Tr}_{\kappa_n/k} \left( \text{Res}_{t,S}^q (\iota(\text{Tr}_{K/K_n}(\omega))) \right) \in \mathbb{W}_S \Omega_k^{q-1},$$

where the  $\text{Res}_{t,S}^q$  on the right hand side, is the residue on  $\mathbb{W}_S \Omega_{\kappa_n((t))}^q$  from [Ru07, Def. 2.11]. The residue is well defined, i.e. independent of the choice of the local parameter  $t$  and the number  $n$ .

The proof is exactly the one from [Ru07, Def. 2.15], except that we have to mention, that by the choice of  $n$ ,  $K_n$  is separable over  $k$  and thus by [Ku86, 5.10. Th.]  $K_{n+1} = k(K_n^p) \subset K_n$  is purely inseparable of degree  $p$ .

[Ru07, Rem 2.16] remains unchanged, in [Ru07, Rem 2.17] write  $C_n$  instead of  $C^{(p^n)}$ , [Ru07, Prop. 2.18] remains unchanged. [Ru07, Th. 2.19] now becomes

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $C$  be a regular projective curve over  $k$  with function field  $K$ . Then*

$$\sum_{P \in C} \text{Res}_P(\omega) = 0, \text{ for all } \omega \in \mathbb{W}_S \Omega_K^q, q \geq 1.$$

(Notice, that  $\text{Res}_P(\omega) = 0$ , if  $\omega$  has no pole in  $P$ , thus the sum is finite.)

The proof remains the same, except that at the beginning we insert the following sentence: Since  $\text{Res}_P(\omega)$  is non-zero for only a finite number of points we can assume by [HuKu94, Th. 1, Th. 4] and [Ru07, Rem. 2.16] that  $C$  is smooth over  $k$  and the points  $P$  with  $\text{Res}_P(\omega) \neq 0$  are étale over  $k$ . In the original proof a line like this appears on page 139, line (-12) to (-10), this one has to be cancelled.

We want to take the opportunity to correct a misprint. The formula on page 139, line (-3) should be

$$\text{Res}_P(\omega) = \sum_j \text{Res}_{Q_j}(\omega_j) \quad \text{in } W_n(\bar{k}),$$

where the  $Q_j$ 's are the preimages of  $P$  in  $C \times_k \bar{k}$ .

Now in the proof of [Ru07, Th. 3.6] the first paragraph remains unchanged and the beginning of the second, line (-15) to line (-9) on page 146, has to be replaced with the following (we use notation of the article):

Take  $P \in \nu^{-1}(y_n = 0) \cap \Sigma$  and denote  $\kappa = k(P)$ . Write  $K$  for the function field of  $\tilde{C}$  and  $K_i = k(K^{p^i})$ ,  $i \geq 0$ . Furthermore denote  $\mathbf{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} \cap K_i)$  by  $\tilde{C}_i$  and let  $P_i$  be the image of  $P$  in  $\tilde{C}_i$ . Choose  $l \geq 0$ , such that for all  $l' \geq l$   $\tilde{C}_{l'}$  is smooth over  $k$  and  $\kappa_{l'} := k(P_{l'}) \supset k$  is separable. Let  $e_P$  be the ramification index of  $P$  over  $P_l$  and  $f_P = [\kappa : \kappa_l]$  and write

$$e_P = p^r, \quad f_P = p^s, \quad [K : K_l] = p^j.$$

Then by [Ku86, 5.10 Th., a)] and [Se68, I, §4, Prop. 10]

$$(3.6.1) \quad j = r + s \geq l.$$

(In the article we wrongly wrote an equal sign here.)

Now in the following calculation, line (-8) on page 146 to line (-8) on page 147, replace  $F^j(P)$  by  $P_l$ ,  $K_j$  by  $K_l$  and  $\kappa_j$  by  $\kappa_l$ , but the  $j$ 's appearing in the powers of  $p$  (such as  $p^{j(n-1)+r}$  etc.) stay the same. Then the whole proof of the formula in (3.6.3) goes through, since  $x^{p^j} \in K_l$  for  $x \in K$ .

Finally at the end of the proof of [Ru07, Th. 3.6], page 148, line 4, one now refers to Theorem 2 instead of [Ru07, Th. 2.19].

The rest of the paper remains unchanged.

REFERENCES

- [HuKu94] R. Hübel, E. Kunz, On algebraic varieties over fields of prime characteristic. Arch. Math. (Basel) 62, no. 1, 1994, 88-96.
- [Ku86] E. Kunz, Kähler differentials. Advanced Lectures in Mathematics. Braunschweig/Wiesbaden: Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn. VII, 1986.
- [Ru07] K. Rülling, The generalized de Rham-Witt complex over a field is a complex of zero-cycles. J. Algebraic Geom. 16, 2007, 109-169.
- [Se68] J.-P. Serre, Corps locaux. Deuxième édition. Hermann, Paris, 1968.

UNIVERSITÄT DUISBURG-ESSEN, ESSEN, FB6, MATHEMATIK, 45117 ESSEN, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* [kay.ruelling@uni-essen.de](mailto:kay.ruelling@uni-essen.de)