

# An approach to the Tate conjecture for surfaces over a finite field

Bruno Kahn

Conference on algebraic geometry and its applications, Nanjing, May 2, 2025

# The Tate conjecture

$k$  finitely generated field,  $X$  smooth projective  $k$ -variety,  $l$  prime number  $\neq \text{char } k$ .

## Conjecture (Tate, 1964)

$n \geq 0$ ,  $CH^n(X)$  = Chow group of cycles of codimension  $n$  modulo rational equivalence: the cycle class map

$$CH^n(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_l \rightarrow H^{2n}(X_s, \mathbb{Q}_l(n))^G$$

is surjective.

Here  $G = \text{Gal}(k_s/k)$  for a separable closure  $k_s$  of  $k$  and  $X_s = X \otimes_k k_s$ .

- ①  $n = 1$ : abelian varieties (Tate, Zarhin/Mori, Faltings).
  - ②  $n = 1$ , stable under product and domination, birationally invariant.
  - ③  $n = 1$ ,  $k$  of char. 0 or finite or : K3 surfaces (Ramakrishnan, Nygaard-Ogus, Artin-Swinnerton Dyer, Charles. . .)
  - ④  $n > 1$ : several examples using Tannakian ideas.
- $k$  finite: the Tate conjecture (for a given  $X$ ) is independent of  $l$ .

## Theorem (Morrow, Ambrosi, K.)

*For  $n = 1$ , the Tate conjecture follows from the special case of surfaces over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{F}_p$ .*

# Main result

For any variety  $S$ , write  $H^i(S, j) := H_{\text{ét}}^i(S, \mathbb{Q}_l/\mathbb{Z}_l(j))$ .

## Theorem

$X$  smooth projective surface over  $k = \mathbb{F}_q$ ; assume that  $G$  acts trivially on  $\text{NS}(X_s)$ . Then, equivalent conditions:

- 1 The Tate conjecture holds for  $X$ .
- 2 For any affine open  $U \subset X$  such that  $\text{Pic}(U) = 0$ , one has  $H^3(U, 1) = 0$ .
- 3 For any affine open  $U \subset X$  such that  $\text{Pic}(U) = 0$  and any smooth irreducible divisor  $Z \subset U$ , the map  $H^3(U, 1) \rightarrow H^3(U - Z, 1)$  is injective.

(Hypothesis sufficient for the Tate conjecture.)

May assume  $X$  geometrically connected.

# The Brauer group of $X$

For any variety  $S$ ,  $\mathrm{Br}_l(S) := H_{\text{ét}}^2(S, \mathbb{G}_m)\{l\}$ , the  $l$ -primary part of the cohomological Brauer group.

Proposition (works in any dimension and over any f.g. field  $k$ )

*The Tate conjecture for  $X$  in codimension 1  $\iff \mathrm{Br}_l(X_s)^G$  is finite.*

Proof.

Kummer exact sequence yields short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathrm{NS}(X_s) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_l \rightarrow H^2(X_s, \mathbb{Q}_l(1)) \rightarrow V_l(\mathrm{Br}_l(X)) \rightarrow 0$$

Take Galois cohomology and observe that

$$H^1(G, \mathrm{NS}(X_s) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_l) = H^1(G, \mathrm{NS}(X_s)) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_l = 0,$$

so Tate  $\iff V_l(\mathrm{Br}_l(X))^G = 0$ . This is equivalent to finiteness of  $\mathrm{Br}_l(X_s)^G$  because  $\mathrm{Br}_l(X_s)$  is of cofinite type. □

# The Brauer group of $U$

Back to  $k$  finite and  $X$  surface.

$U \subset X$  open subset,  $Z$  closed complement (reduced): short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathrm{Br}_I(X_s) \rightarrow \mathrm{Br}_I(U_s) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{x \in Z \cap X^{(1)}} H^1((Z'_x)_s, 0)$$

where, for all  $x \in Z \cap X^{(1)}$ ,  $Z'_x$  = intersection of smooth locus of  $Z$  with its irreducible component corresponding to  $x$ .

## Proposition

*The groups  $H^1((Z'_x)_s, 0)^G$  are finite.*

## Proof.

Follows from Weil's Riemann hypothesis applied to the smooth completions of the  $Z'_x$ . □

# The Brauer group of $U$ (continued)

## Proposition

$Tate \iff \forall U \operatorname{Br}_I(U_S)^G \text{ is finite} \iff \exists U \operatorname{Br}_I(U_S)^G \text{ is finite.}$  □

## Proposition

$\operatorname{Br}_I(U_S)^G \text{ finite} \iff \operatorname{Br}_I(U_S)_G \text{ finite.}$

True for any  $G$ -module of cofinite type (because  $G$  is procyclic).



## Passing from $\mathrm{Br}_I(U_s)_G$ to $H^3(U, 1)$

If  $\mathrm{NS}(U_s)$  is torsion, then  $H^2(U_s, 1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Br}_I(U_s)$ , hence short exact sequence (Hochschild-Serre):

$$0 \rightarrow \mathrm{Br}_I(U_s)_G \rightarrow H^3(U, 1) \rightarrow H^3(U_s, 1)^G \rightarrow 0.$$

### Lemma

*If moreover  $U$  is affine, then isomorphism of divisible groups*

$$\mathrm{Br}_I(U_s)_G \xrightarrow{\sim} H^3(U, 1).$$

### Proof.

Follows from M. Artin's "affine Lefschetz" ( $cd_I(U_s) = 2$ ) applied twice!  $\square$

# The condition $\text{Pic}(U) = 0$

## Lemma

*Suppose that  $G$  acts trivially on  $\text{NS}(X_s)$ . Then  $\text{Pic}(U) = 0 \Rightarrow \text{NS}(U_s)$  is torsion.*

## Proof.

If  $G$  acts trivially on  $\text{NS}(X_s)$ , it acts trivially on its quotient  $\text{NS}(U_s)$ ; also  $\text{Pic}^0(X_s) \rightarrow \text{Pic}^0(U_s)$  is surjective hence  $\text{Pic}^0(U_s)$  is torsion. Finally,  $\text{Coker}(\text{Pic}(U) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(U_s)^G)$  is torsion by a transfer argument. Conclusion is easy.  $\square$

## Remark

Can always reduce to this case after finite extension of  $k$  since  $\text{NS}(X_s)$  is finitely generated. Sufficient for the Tate conjecture.

# Proof of $1 \iff 2$

## Hypotheses

$G$  acts trivially on  $\text{NS}(X_s)$ ,  $U$  affine and  $\text{Pic}(U) = 0$ .

$\text{Tate} \iff \text{Br}_I(X_s)^G = 0 \iff \text{Br}_I(U)_G \text{ finite} \iff \text{Br}_I(U)_G = 0$   
(because divisible)  $\iff H^3(U, 1) = 0$ .

## Remarks

- a) Quasi-affine is not sufficient: by purity,  $H^3(\mathbb{A}^2 - \{0\}, 1) = H^0(k, -1)$ ,  $\neq 0$  in general.
- b)  $\exists U$  because  $\text{Pic}(X)$  finitely generated.

Still assume  $G$  acts trivially on  $\text{NS}(X_s)$  (blanket assumption now).

A.

Condition 2 equivalent to: For any affine open  $U \subset X$  such that  $\text{Pic}(U) = 0$ , and any open  $V \subseteq U$ , the map  $H^3(U, 1) \rightarrow H^3(V, 1)$  is injective..

If true, then  $H^3(U, 1) \hookrightarrow H^3(K, 1)$  ( $K = k(X) = k(U)$ ), but

Theorem (K., 1991 Lake Louise K-theory proceedings)

$H^3(K, 1) = 0$ .

## Proof.

Hochschild-Serre  $\Rightarrow$  exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^2(Kk_s, 1)_G \rightarrow H^3(K, 1) \rightarrow H^3(Kk_s, 1)^G \rightarrow 0.$$

Right hand side 0 because  $cd(Kk_s) = 2$ ; For left hand side, *Bloch-Kato theorem*

$$K_2(Kk_s)/I^\nu \twoheadrightarrow H^2(Kk_s, \mu_{I^\nu}^{\otimes 2}) \quad \forall \nu \geq 1$$

(predates Merkurjev-Suslin!), hence

$$(K_2(Kk_s) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_I/\mathbb{Z}_I(-1))_G \twoheadrightarrow H^2(Kk_s, 1)_G$$

but left hand side is 0 by Tate's lemma. □

B.

A. equivalent to same statement, but with  $Z := (U - V)_{\text{red}}$  irreducible of dimension 1.

Proof.

$D_1, \dots, D_n$  irreducible components of codimension 1 of  $Z$ . For  $0 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $U_i$  inductively defined as  $U_{i-1} \setminus D_i$ , with  $U_0 = U$ . Chain of open subsets

$$U \supset U_1 \supset \dots U_n \supseteq V$$

each  $U_i$  affine since  $D_i$  principal,  $\text{Pic}(U_i) = 0$ , and  $U_n - V$  of codimension  $\geq 2$  in  $U_n$ . By B.,  $H^3(U_i, 1) \hookrightarrow H^3(U_{i+1}, 1)$  for all  $i$ , and also  $H^3(U_n, 1) \hookrightarrow H^3(V, 1)$  by cohomological purity. □

# End of proof that 2 $\iff$ 3

C.

B. equivalent to same statement, but with  $Z$  smooth.

Proof.

$\bar{Z}$  closure of  $Z$  in  $X$ ,  $F$  its singular locus. By Poonen (Bertini theorems over finite fields),  $\exists C_0 \subset X$  smooth projective curve containing  $F$ ; a fortiori,  $C = C_0 \cap U$  is smooth. Apply C. to  $(U, C)$  and then to  $(U - C, Z \setminus C)$  (note that  $Z \setminus C$  is smooth): we get that the composition

$$H^3(U, 1) \rightarrow H^3(U - C, 1) \rightarrow H^3(U - (C \cup Z), 1)$$

is injective. A fortiori,  $H^3(U, 1) \rightarrow H^3(U - Z, 1)$  is injective. □

Gysin exact sequence

$$H^2(V, 1) \xrightarrow{\partial} H^1(Z, 0) \xrightarrow{i_*} H^3(U, 1) \xrightarrow{j^*} H^3(V, 1)$$

## Proposition

*In this sequence,*

- a) Image of  $\partial$  contains image of  $i^* : H^1(U, 0) \rightarrow H^1(Z, 0)$ .*
- b)  $i_*$  factors through the finite group  $H^1(Z_s, 0)^G$ .*
- c)  $i_* = 0$  (hence  $j^*$  injective) for  $l \geq l_0$ , where  $l_0$  prime number depending on  $Z$ .*



# Proof of a)

$f \in \Gamma(U, \mathbb{G}_a)$  equation of  $Z$  in  $U$ . Then  $f$  is invertible on  $V$ .  
 $(f) \in H^1(V, \mathbb{Z}_l(1))$  its Kummer class: composition

$$H^1(U, 0) \xrightarrow{j^*} H^1(V, 0) \xrightarrow{\cup(f)} H^2(V, 1) \xrightarrow{\partial} H^1(Z, 0)$$

equals  $i^*$  (follows from definition of the purity isomorphism).

# Proof of b)

$k_Z$  field of constants of  $Z$ . Commutative diagram of exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(Z_s, 0)_G & \longrightarrow & H^1(Z, 0) & \longrightarrow & H^1(Z_s, 0)^G \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \uparrow i^* & & \uparrow i^* & & \uparrow i^* \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(U_s, 0)_G & \longrightarrow & H^1(U, 0) & \longrightarrow & H^1(U_s, 0)^G \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where left vertical arrow = multiplication by  $[k_Z : k]$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_I/\mathbb{Z}_I$ , hence surjective. By a), image of  $\partial$  contains  $H^0(Z_s, 0)_G$ .

# Proof of c)

Needs

## Lemma

*The order of  $H^1(Z_s, 0)^G$  is bounded independently of  $l$ .*

## Proof.

Again, follows from Riemann hypothesis applied to smooth completion of  $Z$  (bound depends on  $k_Z$ , the genus and the divisor at infinity).  $\square$

# First idea fails

Recall: the Tate conjecture is independent of  $l$ . So we won! No, because  $l_0$  a priori not bounded independently of  $Z$ .

## Second idea

Inspired by Gillet's proof of Gersten's conjecture for  $\mathrm{dvr}$ 's (for  $K$ -theory with finite coefficients), J. Alg., 1986.

In three parts: first two parts work but not last.

# Motivation: Gabber rigidity

## Theorem (Gabber)

$(A_h, I)$  Henselian pair,  $U_h = \operatorname{Spec}(A_h)$ ,  $Z = \operatorname{Spec}(A_h/I)$ ,  $i : Z \hookrightarrow U_h$  the closed immersion. Then for any torsion abelian étale sheaf  $F$  on  $U_h$  and for all  $q > 0$ ,  $H^q(U_h, F) \xrightarrow{i^*} H^q(Z, F)$  is bijective.

Coming back to our  $(U, Z)$ : recall Nisnevich neighbourhood of  $Z \hookrightarrow U$ :  
Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_1 & \xrightarrow{j_1} & U_1 \\ p \downarrow & & q \downarrow \\ V & \xrightarrow{j} & U \end{array} \quad (1)$$

$q$  étale and  $q^{-1}(Z) \xrightarrow{\sim} Z$ .

$(U_h, Z)$  henselisation of pair  $(U, Z)$ : filtering colimit of such Nisnevich squares.

## Second idea: first part

### Corollary

$\exists (U_1, q)$  such that  $H^1(U_1, 0) \rightarrow H^1(Z, 0)$  is surjective. Therefore  $\partial_1 : H^2(V_1, 1) \rightarrow H^1(Z, 0)$  surjective (see proposition p. 16).

Unfortunately, not sufficient: how do we go down? No push-forward for  $p$ .

# Normalising (1)

$\bar{U}_1$  normalisation of  $U$  in  $q$ ; more complicated diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & \bar{V}_1 & \xrightarrow{\bar{j}_1} & \bar{U}_1 & \xleftarrow{\bar{i}_1} \bar{Z} \\
 & \nearrow j' & & \nearrow j'' & \nearrow u \\
 V_1 & \xrightarrow{\bar{p}} & U_1 & \xleftarrow{i_1} & Z \\
 \downarrow p & & \downarrow q & & \downarrow = \\
 V & \xrightarrow{j} & U & \xleftarrow{i} & Z \\
 & & & & \nwarrow \bar{r}
 \end{array}
 \tag{2}$$

$j''$  open immersion,  $\bar{q}$  fini (since  $q$  étale),  $\bar{V}_1 = V \times_U \bar{U}_1$ ,  $\bar{Z} = \bar{U}_1 - \bar{V}_1$  and other arrows follow. In particular,  $j'$  and  $u$  also open immersions,  $\bar{Z}$  closed and  $\bar{p}$ ,  $\bar{r}$  also finite.



Note:

- Finite  $\Rightarrow$  affine, hence  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{V}_1$  are affine. All vertices of (2) are affine.
- In particular, closed immersion  $\bar{i}_1$  purely of codimension 1.
- $\bar{r}$  separated  $\Rightarrow$  open immersion  $u$  is also closed, hence  $\bar{Z} = Z \coprod T$  for some other closed subset  $T$ .
- $\bar{U}_1$  and  $\bar{V}_1$  normal surfaces  $\Rightarrow \bar{p}$  and  $\bar{q}$  flat (Serre's normality criterion  $\Rightarrow$  Cohen-Macaulay, etc.).

## Second idea, second part

Since  $\bar{\rho}$ ,  $\bar{q}$  finite and flat, trace maps available in étale cohomology;  
commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 H^2(V, 1) & \xleftarrow{\bar{\rho}_*} & H^2(\bar{V}_1, 1) & \xrightarrow{j'^*} & H^2(V_1, 1) \\
 \downarrow \partial & & \downarrow \bar{\partial}_1 & & \downarrow \partial_1 \\
 H_Z^3(U, 1) & \xleftarrow{\bar{q}_*} & H_Z^3(\bar{U}_1, 1) \oplus H_T^3(\bar{U}_1, 1) & \xrightarrow{j''^*} & H_Z^3(U_1, 1) \\
 & \nwarrow \sim & \uparrow a & \nearrow \sim & \\
 & & H^1(Z, 0) & & 
 \end{array} \quad (3)$$

where  $\partial_1$  surjective (as seen) and  $a$ , an isomorphism on first summand defined by excision ( $H_Z^3(\bar{U}_1, 1) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_Z^3(U_1, 1)$ ), and 0 on second. Left square commutes e.g. by proper (finite) base change.

### Corollary

$$\mathrm{Im} \partial \supseteq \mathrm{Im}(\bar{q}_* \circ \bar{\partial}_1).$$

## Second idea, third part

If could show that  $\text{Im } \bar{\partial}_1 \supseteq \text{Im } a$ , would win. Would like to use surjectivity of  $\partial_1$ , but not sufficient. Would work if

- 1 the composition

$$\bar{i}_{1,Z}^* : H^1(\bar{U}_1, 0) \xrightarrow{j''^*} H^1(U_1, 0) \xrightarrow{i_1^*} H^1(Z, 0)$$

is surjective, and

- 2  $\exists f_1 \in \Gamma(\bar{U}_1, \mathbb{G}_a)$  such that  $Z$  principal of equation  $f_1$  in  $\bar{U}_1$ , and  $f_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{T}$ .

2 looks very expensive, but maybe 1 can be achieved (by enlarging  $U_1$ ). Note that it is true for  $l$  large enough, because this holds for  $i^*$  (see again prop. p. 16).

## Third idea: from below

Inspired by Gabber's geometric presentation lemma to prove Gersten's conjecture.

Suppose that we can construct an “ante-Nisnevich neighbourhood” of  $i$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{i} & U \\ & \searrow i_1 & \downarrow v \\ & & U_1 \end{array} \quad (4)$$

$i_1$  closed immersion,  $v$  Nisnevich neighbourhood of  $Z$ ,  $U_1$  affine open in smooth projective surface for which Tate's conjecture is known. Then  $(i_1)_* = 0$ , hence  $i_* = v^*(i_1)_* = 0$  (functoriality of Gysin maps).

In fact, “Nisnevich neighbourhood” not necessary: by the functoriality of Gysin morphisms,  $v$  may be any morphism such that

$$Z = v^{-1}(\overline{v(Z)}), \quad Z \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{v(Z)} \quad (5)$$

(scheme-theoretically). Moreover,  $v(Z)$  is constructible by Chevalley, but  $Z$  curve, hence  $v(Z)$  open in its closure.

Gabber's lemma: this with  $U_1 = \mathbb{A}^2$ , but up to an open subset. Version over finite fields by Hogadi-Kulkarni (Crelle 2020):

### Proposition

$\exists v : U \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^2$  and open subset  $W \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2$  such that

- ①  $v|_{v^{-1}(W)}$  is étale
- ②  $Z \cap v^{-1}(W) \xrightarrow{v} W$  is a closed immersion.

But cannot afford to “lose” a closed subset in  $U$  (of codimension 2, à la rigueur. . . ) So look at situation for  $v$  on the whole of  $U$ . Second condition of (5) is (essentially) achieved, but not first: can be extra components – and will be in general, because  $v$  has generic degree  $> 1$  unless birational. . .

Similar problem as in second idea!

*That's all!*