

$E_x^d \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}_e}$ the subfield generated by coefficients of P_x (Del-1)

$E_x^d \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}_e}$ generated by E_x^d , $\deg x \leq N$.

The number of points of bounded degree is finite, so

$[E_{\leq n}^d : \mathbb{Q}] < \infty$ by (i).

Thus we have an increasing sequence of finite extensions of \mathbb{Q} , and $E^d = \bigcup_{\leq n} E_{\leq n}^d$.

Want to prove that $E_{\leq n}^d = E^d$ if $n \geq n_0$.

If $\dim X = 1$ Lettorgue proved that $\exists n_0$,
 First step: in the case of curves, prove a quantitative version, i.e., give a bound for n_0

in terms of g .

Prop. A. Let $\dim X = 1$. Then $E_{\leq n}^d = E^d$ if $n \geq \log_{\sqrt{q}} g + \text{const}$ ($= 2 \log_q g + \text{const}$).

($\dim X$ arbitrary)
Prop. B. Let $x \in |X|$, $\deg x = N$. Then \exists geometrically irreducible curve $C \subset X$ such that $x \in C$ where \hat{C} is the normalization of C .

C is smooth at x , and $g_{\hat{C}} \leq aN$, $a = a(X)$.
 Moreover, one can choose such C so that \hat{C} is still geometrically irreducible.
 (ii) follows from Prop. A-B by descent.

Let $x \in |X|$, $\deg x = N$. Claim: if N is big enough then $E_x^d \subset E_{\leq n}^d$. Choose C as in Prop. B.

Apply Prop. A to its normalization \hat{C} (and to the pullback to \hat{C}). So note that $g_{\hat{C}} \leq g_C \leq aN$.

$E_x^d \subset E_{\leq n}^d$, $n \sim \log_{\sqrt{q}} (aN) + \text{const}$.

N large $\Rightarrow n < N$, q.e.d.

(Del-27)

Remarks for myself: ① The root of the equation $x = \log x + x$ approximately equals $x + \log x$ (if x is big).

② Deligne's idea was to give an estimate not for $[E^m, \mathbb{Q}]$ but for the degree of x required.

Remarks. a) Deligne gives a polynomial bound

for g rather than a linear one. This is still enough because of the log, ("All the roads lead to Rome.") The linear bound is contained in Esnault-Kerz.

b) Deligne and Esnault-Kerz prefer not to take care of ^{the} irreducibility of the pullback $M|_C$. Then the proof of Prop. B becomes easier, but the proof of Prop. A becomes longer. There are many choices here, and all the roads lead to Rome.

Remark. The linear bound for g follows from Hurwitz's formula. First, choose a finite morphism $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^m$ étale at x . Or, first choose a generically étale f , then choose x (we can shrink X !). [Note: $\deg f$ is bounded by some number depending on X but not x . Let $D \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ be the discriminant of f , (this ~~is~~ makes sense because f is flat).] Both Deligne and Esnault-Kerz choose C of the form $C = \bar{f}^{-1}(C')$, where $C' \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ is a rational curve passing through x , $\deg C' \leq n + \text{const}$ ("const" is necessary). to ensure the geometric irreducibility of $(\bar{f}^{-1}(C'))$ and the pullback of M to \hat{C} . Now Hurwitz formula gives
$$g_{\hat{C}} \leq -2 \cdot \deg f + \deg D \cdot \deg C'$$

Inequality rather than equality because we consider the normalization \hat{C} linear in n

Prop. A' (dim $X = 1$, \mathcal{L} geometrically irreducible) (Del-3)

If $\frac{g}{\sqrt{q}} \leq \frac{1}{4r^2}$ then $E^{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\leq 1}^{\mathcal{L}}$

(Applying this to $X \otimes \mathbb{F}_q$ for a suitable m , one gets almost immediately that $E^{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\leq n}^{\mathcal{L}}$ if $n \geq 1 + \log_{\sqrt{q}} (4r^2 g) = \log_{\sqrt{q}} g + \text{const}$, QED.)

More precisely, one applies Prop. A' for $m=n$ and $m=n-1$.)

Why $\frac{g}{\sqrt{q}}$? We want $E^{\mathcal{L}}$ to be generated by $E_x^{\mathcal{L}}$, $x \in X(\mathbb{F}_q)$; so we definitely want $X(\mathbb{F}_q) \neq \emptyset$.

$$A. \text{ Weil: } |X(\mathbb{F}_q) - \underbrace{q - 1}_{\substack{\text{"principal"} \\ \text{term}}} \underbrace{\leq 2g\sqrt{q}}_{\substack{\text{"error term"} \\ \text{justified if } \frac{g}{\sqrt{q}} \ll 1}}$$

Want $2g\sqrt{q} \leq q$, i.e., $\frac{g}{\sqrt{q}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$

"strangeness of X "

Prop. A. Same assumptions on X, \mathcal{L} . Suppose we have $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ satisfying the same assumptions. If

$$\text{Tr}(F_x, \mathcal{L}) = \text{Tr}(F_x, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}) \quad \forall x \in X(\mathbb{F}_q) \quad \text{then } \mathcal{L} \cong \tilde{\mathcal{L}}$$

Why Prop. A \Rightarrow Prop. A'. By Galois theory, to prove that

$$E^{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\leq 1}^{\mathcal{L}}, \text{ we have to show that } \sigma(P_x) = P_x \text{ for}$$

all $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{F}_q)$ (here $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} < \overline{\mathbb{Q}_e}$). Now we use

part (iii) of Deligne's conjecture for curves, proved by Lafforgue. It says that $\sigma(P_x) = P_x^{\sigma \mathcal{L}}$, where $\sigma \mathcal{L}$ is the " σ -companion"

of \mathcal{L} . Now apply Proposition A to $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \sigma \mathcal{L}$.

(Del-4)

Proof of Prop. A. Define $f, \tilde{f}: X(\mathbb{F}_q) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,

$$f(x) := \text{Tr}(F_x, \mathcal{M}), \quad \tilde{f}(x) := \text{Tr}(F_x, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}).$$

Claim. If $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and \mathcal{M} are not "geometrically isomorphic" then $|(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f})| < (f, f)$ (in fact, f and \tilde{f} are "almost orthogonal" if the "strangeness" of X is small).

Comment. The definition of scalar product involves the complex conjugation corresponding to some embedding $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The claim holds for any such embedding.

[For myself: the true statement is that the totally real number $(f, f)^2 - |(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f})|^2$ is totally positive.]

Proof of the claim: it is based on the Lefschetz formula and the sheaf-theoretic analog of the Weil estimate proved by Deligne in Weil-II.

$\mathcal{M}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ ~~have~~ ^{are pure of} weight 0. $\tilde{f}(x) = \text{Tr}(F_x, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^*)$

$$(f, \tilde{f}) = \sum_i (-1)^i \text{Tr}(F_i, H^i(X \otimes \mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{M} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^*)).$$

$\mathcal{M}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ not geometrically isomorphic $\Rightarrow H^0 = H^2 = 0$.

$\dim H^1 = (2g-2)r^2$. Their ^{Frobenius} eigenvalues on H^1 have abs. value \sqrt{q} .

(by Weil-II), so $|(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f})| \leq (2g-2)r^2 \sqrt{q} < 2gr^2 \sqrt{q}$

Similarly, $|(f, f) - q - 1| \leq A\sqrt{q}$, $A = (2g-2)r^2 + 2 \leq 2gr^2 \sqrt{q}$

where $q+1$ comes from H^2 and H^0 , which are 1-dimensional

$$\frac{q}{\sqrt{q}} \text{ small} \Rightarrow |(f, \tilde{f})| < |(f, f)|.$$

End of the proof. Thus $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is geometrically isomorphic to \mathcal{M} , so $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is a twist of \mathcal{M} (by some 1-dimensional local system on $\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_q$). If the twist is nontrivial then $\tilde{f} = \alpha f$ for $\alpha \neq 1$. On the other hand, $\tilde{f} = f$ by assumption. So $f = 0$. But we already saw that $(f, f) > 0$.