

# P-CONVEXLY VALUED RINGS

NICOLAS GUZY

ABSTRACT. In [3], L. Bélair developed a theory analogous to the theory of real closed rings in the  $p$ -adic context, namely the theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings. Firstly we use the property proved in Lemma (2.4) in [4] to express this theory in a language including a  $p$ -adic divisibility relation and we show that this theory admits definable Skolem functions in this language (in the sense of [17]). Secondly, we are interested in dealing with some questions similar to that of [1]; e.g. results about integral-definite polynomials over a  $p$ -adically closed integral ring  $A$  and a kind of "Nullstellensatz" using the notion of  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical.

*Keywords:*  $p$ -adically closed fields, model-completeness, definable Skolem functions, Nullstellensatz.

*Mathematics Subject Classification:* 03C10; 12J12.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

First we recall some notions, model-theoretic results and notations. Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{rings}}$  be the usual language of rings and let  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fields}}$  be the language of fields, i.e.  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{rings}} \cup \{-1\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$  be an expansion of the language of rings with a two-ary predicate  $\mathcal{D}(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Let  $A$  be an unitary commutative domain with a valuation  $v$  on its fraction field, denoted by  $Q(A)$ . Suppose that  $A$  is the valuation ring of  $\langle Q(A), v \rangle$ . Then we define a binary relation (which will be interpreted by the set of 2-tuples such that  $v(a) \leq v(b)$ ) as follows:

$\mathcal{D}$  is transitive,  $\neg\mathcal{D}(0, 1)$ , compatible with  $+$  and  $\cdot$  and either  $\mathcal{D}(a, b)$  or  $\mathcal{D}(b, a)$ . We can extend  $\mathcal{D}$  to the fraction field of  $A$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{c}{d}\right) \iff \mathcal{D}(ad, bc).$$

So the divisibility relation on  $Q(A)$  induces the initial valuation  $v$  by defining  $v(a) \leq v(b)$  if  $\mathcal{D}(a, b)$ . In the sequel, if  $\langle K, v \rangle$  is a valued field then the valuation ring, the valuation ideal, the residue field and the value group of  $\langle K, v \rangle$  are respectively denoted by  $\mathcal{O}_K$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_K$ ,  $k_K$  and  $v(K^\times)$ , and if  $A$  is a valuation ring then we denote the maximal ideal and the residue field of  $A$ , by  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and  $k_A$ , respectively. We denote the canonical residue map  $A \mapsto k_A$  by  $\bar{\cdot}$ . In order to specify the valuation  $v$  for which we consider these objects, we put a subscript  $v$ . For any ring  $A$ , we denote the set  $A \setminus \{0\}$  by  $A^\bullet$  and the set of its units by  $A^\times$ . For any elements  $a, b$  in  $A$ ,  $a|b$  means that there exists  $c$  in  $A$  such that  $ac = b$ . For any subsets  $B, C$  of a valued field  $\langle K, v \rangle$ , we say that  $v(B) < v(C)$  if for any  $b \in B, c \in C$  we have  $v(b) < v(c)$ .

---

*Date:* October 11, 2004.

<sup>1</sup> "Aspirant" at the "Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique".

<sup>2</sup> Partially supported by a grant of the National Bank of Belgium and by INTAS contract 2000-447.

Recall that a  $p$ -valued field  $\langle K, v \rangle$  of  $p$ -rank  $d$ , with  $p$  a prime number, is a valued field of characteristic 0, residue field of characteristic  $p$  and the dimension of  $\mathcal{O}_K/(p)$  over the prime field  $\mathbb{F}_p$  is equal to  $d$  ( $v$  is called a  $p$ -valuation of  $p$ -rank  $d$  on  $K$ ). An element of a  $p$ -valued field is called prime if its value is the least positive value of  $v(K^\times)$ .

Let  $K$  be a  $p$ -valued field of  $p$ -rank  $d$ . We say that a valued field extension  $L$  of  $K$  is a  $p$ -valued extension of  $p$ -rank  $d$  if the valuation of  $L$  is a  $p$ -valuation of  $p$ -rank  $d$  on  $L$  which extends the valuation of  $K$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}_L$  and  $\mathcal{M}_L \cap K = \mathcal{M}_K$ ). We say that  $K$  is a  $p$ -adically closed field of  $p$ -rank  $d$  if  $K$  does not admit any proper  $p$ -valued algebraic extension with the same  $p$ -rank  $d$ . In Theorems (3.1) and (3.2) of [12], a characterization of the  $p$ -adically closed fields of  $p$ -rank  $d$  is given and the notion of a  $p$ -adic closure is established with a criterion for uniqueness :  $K$  is  $p$ -adically closed if and only if  $K$  is henselian and, moreover its value group is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group; the necessary and sufficient condition for  $K$  to admit an unique  $p$ -adic closure up to  $K$ -isomorphism (i.e. an algebraic  $p$ -valued extension which is a  $p$ -adically closed field of  $p$ -rank  $d$ ) is that its value group is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group. For the notion of henselian valued fields and Henselization of a valued field, we can refer to [14] or [15]. In this paper, we restrict ourselves with  $p$ -valuations of  $p$ -rank 1 (i.e.  $v(p)$  is a prime element and the residue field is equal to  $\mathbb{F}_p$ ) like in the papers of [3] and [4]. However, many of our results remain valid for  $p$ -valued fields with fixed  $p$ -rank  $d$  ( $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ) after adequate enrichment of the language as the reader can easily check.

Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}^{P_\omega}$  be the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fields}} \cup \{\mathcal{D}\} \cup \{P_n; n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}\} \cup \{c_2, \dots, c_d\}$ ; this language is known as Macintyre's language (see [9]). In Theorem (5.6) of [12], Prestel and Roquette show that the  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}^{P_\omega}$ -theory  $pCF_d$  of  $p$ -adically closed fields of  $p$ -rank  $d$  admits quantifier elimination. In [2] L. Bélair gave an explicit axiomatization of the universal part of  $pCF_d$  in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}^{P_\omega}$ .

In the table below we summarize the analogies between “ $p$ -adic” and “real”; the first two items have been object of study for several decades, the last one is the main topic of this paper.

$p$ -adically closed field (pCF)	$\iff$	real closed field
$p$ -adically closed integral ring (Bélair)	$\iff$	real closed (valuation) ring (Cherlin-Dickmann)
$p$ -convexly valued ring (pCVR)	$\iff$	convexly ordered valuation ring (Becker).

Indeed, in Section (2), we introduce a notion of  $p$ -convexly valued domain which is the  $p$ -adic counterpart of Becker's convexly ordered valuation rings and give a set of axioms in a suitable language. We prove some analogues of results in [2]. We also give a variant of Bélair's set of axioms for the first-order theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings which are the  $p$ -adic counterpart of real closed valuation rings. By using a criterion due to van den Dries [17], we show that the first-order theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings has definable Skolem functions in a suitable extension of Macintyre's language for  $p$ -adic fields. In Section (3), we settle the analogue of Hilbert's seventeenth problem for  $p$ -adically closed integral rings by using a relative form of Kochen's operator. In Section (4), we prove a Nullstellensatz for  $p$ -adically

closed integral rings by using the notions of  $\mathcal{M}$ -radical of an ideal and of  $p$ -adic ideal (introduced by Srhir [16], this notion corresponds to that of real ideal). We close this paper by investigating the generalized notion of model-theoretic radical of an ideal in the context of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings similarly to [7].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In the sequel, we work with unitary commutative rings of characteristic zero. First we introduce the notion of  $p$ -convexity for domains with  $p$ -valued fraction fields. *Let us recall that we consider only  $p$ -valued fields of  $p$ -rank 1 throughout this paper.* We begin with a definition.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $A$  be a domain containing  $\mathbb{Q}$ . We say that  $A$  is a  $p$ -valued domain if  $A$  is not a field and its fraction field  $Q(A)$  is  $p$ -valued.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $F$  be a  $p$ -valued field, with its  $p$ -valuation denoted by  $v_p$ , and let  $A \subseteq B$  be two subsets of  $F$ . We say that  $A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $B$  if for all  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ ,  $v_p(a) \leq v_p(b)$  implies  $b \in A$ .

From now on, we prove some elementary results for  $p$ -valued domains in the style of [1].

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\langle F, v_p \rangle$  be a  $p$ -valued field and let  $A$  be a  $p$ -valued domain which is  $p$ -convex in  $F$ . Then  $A$  is a valuation ring and  $F = Q(A)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be in  $F$ . Then we have  $v_p(1) \leq v_p(f)$  or  $v_p(f) \leq v_p(1)$ ; this means  $f$  or  $f^{-1} \in A$  by  $p$ -convexity of  $A$  in  $F$ . This clearly shows that  $A$  is a valuation ring of  $F$ .  $\square$

*Notation 2.4.* The previous lemma shows that any  $p$ -convex subdomain  $A$  of a  $p$ -valued field  $F$  supports a valuation  $v$  which corresponds to a divisibility relation  $\mathcal{D}$  on the domain  $A$ . In the sequel the notation  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and  $k_A$  are relative to the valuation  $v$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -valued domain. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $Q(A)$ ;
- (2)  $A$  is a valuation ring and  $\mathcal{M}_A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $A$ ;
- (3)  $A$  is a valuation ring and  $\mathcal{M}_A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $Q(A)$ ;
- (4)  $A$  is a valuation ring and for every  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A$ ,  $v_p(a)$  is larger than the value of any rational number in  $Q(A)$ ;
- (5)  $A$  is a valuation ring and for every  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A$ ,  $v_p(a) > 0$ ;
- (6)  $A \models \forall x, y (v_p(x) \leq v_p(y) \rightarrow \exists z (xz = y))$ .

*Proof.* (1) $\rightarrow$ (2): Suppose  $A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $Q(A)$ . By Lemma (2.3),  $A$  is a valuation ring. Let  $x$  in  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and  $y$  in  $A$  be such that  $v_p(x) \leq v_p(y)$  (we may assume  $x$  and  $y$  different from 0); hence  $v_p(1) = 0 \leq v_p(y/x)$  ( $y/x \in Q(A)$ ). Since  $A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $Q(A)$ , we have  $y/x \in A$  and so,  $y = x \cdot y/x \in \mathcal{M}_A$ .

(2) $\rightarrow$ (3): Let  $x$  in  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and  $u, v$  in  $A^\bullet$  be such that  $v_p(x) \leq v_p(u/v)$ . If  $u/v \in A$  then by  $p$ -convexity of  $\mathcal{M}_A$  in  $A$ ,  $u/v \in \mathcal{M}_A$ . Suppose  $u/v \notin A$ . Since  $A$  is a

valuation ring, we have  $v/u \in \mathcal{M}_A$ . So,  $x \cdot v/u \in \mathcal{M}_A$  and  $v_p(x \cdot v/u) \leq v_p(1) = 0$  implies  $1 \in \mathcal{M}_A$ , this is a contradiction.

(3)→(4): Suppose  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A$  such that  $v_p(a) \leq v_p(q)$  for some  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ ; so  $q \in \mathcal{M}_A$ , hence  $\frac{1}{q} \notin A$ , contradicting that  $A$  contains  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

(4)→(5): Trivial since  $v_p(p) = 1$ .

(5)→(6): Let  $x, y$  in  $A^\bullet$  be such that  $v_p(x) \leq v_p(y)$ . We have to show that  $y/x \in A$ . Otherwise  $x/y \in \mathcal{M}_A$  and, by (5),  $v_p(x/y) > 0$ , which contradicts the assumption.

(6)→(1): Suppose  $x, y, z \in A$ ,  $z \neq 0$  and  $v_p(x) \leq v_p(y/z)$ . Then  $v_p(xz) \leq v_p(y)$  implies  $xz|y$ , i.e. there exists  $c$  in  $A$  such that  $xzc = y$  and so,  $y/z = xc \in A$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.6.** A  $p$ -convexly valued domain  $A$  is a  $p$ -valued domain which satisfies one of the previous equivalent properties.

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the following expansion of the language of rings,  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}} \cup \{\mathcal{D}_p(\cdot, \cdot)\}$ . It is easy to see from the previous lemmas that, with  $\mathcal{D}$  interpreted as divisibility and  $\mathcal{D}_p(x, y)$  as  $v_p(x) \leq v_p(y)$ , any  $p$ -convexly valued domain satisfies the following set of  $\mathcal{L}$ -axioms:

- (1) Axioms for a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra;
- (2)  $\forall x, y [(xy = 0) \Rightarrow (x = 0) \vee (y = 0)]$ ;
- (3)  $\forall x, y [\mathcal{D}_p(x, y) \vee \mathcal{D}_p(y, x)]$ ;
- (4)  $\forall x, y, z [\mathcal{D}_p(x, y) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(y, z) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_p(x, z)]$ ;
- (5)  $\forall x, y, x', y' [\mathcal{D}_p(x, y) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(x', y') \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_p(xx', yy')]$ ;
- (6)  $\forall x, y, y' [\mathcal{D}_p(x, y) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(x, y') \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_p(x, y + y')]$ ;
- (7)  $\neg \mathcal{D}_p(p, 1)$ ;
- (8)  $\forall x [\mathcal{D}_p(1, x) \Rightarrow \bigvee \{\mathcal{D}_p(p, x - i) : 0 \leq i < p\}]$ ;
- (9)  $\forall x [\mathcal{D}_p(x, 1) \vee \mathcal{D}_p(p, x)]$ ;
- (10)  $\forall x, y [\mathcal{D}(x, y) \iff \exists z(x \cdot z = y)]$ ;
- (11)  $\exists z [\neg(\mathcal{D}(z, 1)) \wedge \neg(z = 0)]$ ;
- (12) the condition of divisibility compatibility for the  $p$ -valuation and the divisibility:

$$\forall x, y [\mathcal{D}_p(x, y) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}(x, y)].$$

It is not difficult to show that any model  $A$  of the previous set of axioms is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain: the first part of the list says that  $Q(A)$  is a  $p$ -valued field of  $p$ -rank 1 and the last three axioms enforce that  $A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $Q(A)$  (by using (6) of Lemma (2.5)). So this list is an axiomatization of the theory of  $p$ -convexly valued domains. This  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory is denoted by  $pCVR$  (this means  $p$ -convexly valued rings).

*Remark 2.7.* If  $A$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain then by definition, its fraction field  $Q(A)$  is a  $p$ -valued field. So we can interpret the two-ary predicate  $\mathcal{D}_p$  as the restriction of the  $p$ -divisibility relation with respect to the  $p$ -valuation on  $Q(A)$ . The condition of divisibility compatibility for  $p$ -convexly valued domains implies that it is a valuation ring and that the valuation is induced by divisibility in the domain. Note that the axioms which express that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a divisibility relation are included in

the universal part of  $pCVR$ , and by Axiom (11), the divisibility relation on a model of  $pCVR$  is never trivial.

*Notation 2.8.* In the sequel, if  $A$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain then we denote by  $v_p$  the corresponding  $p$ -valuation on  $Q(A)$  and by  $v$ , the valuation corresponding to divisibility in the domain  $A$ . We sometimes use the same  $v_p$  for an extension of the  $p$ -valuation.

We continue in the style of [1] in order to find conditions to determine when a  $p$ -convexly valued domain  $A$  is a  $\mathcal{L}$ -substructure of a  $p$ -convexly valued domain  $B$ . The next lemma yields such a criterion.

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be two  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures which are models of  $pCVR$  and  $B$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain extension of  $A$  (i.e.  $\langle A, \mathcal{D}_p \rangle \subseteq \langle B, \mathcal{D}_p \rangle$  or  $Q(A) \subseteq Q(B)$  as  $p$ -valued fields). Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{B}$ ;
- (2)  $A \cap \mathcal{M}_B = \mathcal{M}_A$ ;
- (3)  $Q(A) \cap B = A$ ;
- (4) for all  $a \in Q(A) \setminus A$  and  $b \in B$ ,  $v_p(b) > v_p(a)$ .

*Proof.* (1) $\rightarrow$ (2): Clearly we have  $A \cap \mathcal{M}_B \subseteq \mathcal{M}_A$ . Let  $a$  in  $A$  be such that  $B \models \neg \mathcal{D}(a, 1)$ . Since  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{B}$ , we have  $A \models \neg \mathcal{D}(a, 1)$  and we get  $A \cap \mathcal{M}_B \supseteq \mathcal{M}_A$ .

(2) $\rightarrow$ (3): Let  $a, b$  in  $A^\bullet$  be such that  $a/b \in B$ . If  $a/b \notin A$  then  $b/a \in \mathcal{M}_A$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}_A = \mathcal{M}_B \cap A$ , we have  $b/a \in \mathcal{M}_B$  and  $1 = b/a \cdot a/b \in \mathcal{M}_B$ , this is a contradiction.

(3) $\rightarrow$ (4): Let  $a$  be in  $Q(A) \setminus A$  and  $b \in B$ . Since  $Q(A) \cap B = A$ , we have  $a \notin B$  and so,  $a^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}_B$ , i.e.  $v_p(a^{-1}) > 0$ . Hence if  $v_p(b) \leq v_p(a)$  then we have  $v_p(b \cdot a^{-1}) \leq v_p(1)$  where  $b \cdot a^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}_B$ . Since  $B$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain, we get  $1 \in \mathcal{M}_B$ , this is a contradiction.

(4) $\rightarrow$ (1): Let  $a, b$  in  $A^\bullet$  be such that there exists  $c \in B$  satisfying  $ac = b$ . So  $c \in Q(A)$ . If  $c \notin A$  then  $c \in Q(A) \setminus A$  and so, we have  $v_p(c) > v_p(c)$  by (4).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -convexly valued domain  $A$ . Then  $v_p(A^\times)$  is a  $p$ -convex subgroup of  $v_p(Q(A)^\times)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x, y$  in  $A^\times$  and  $u, v$  in  $A$  be such that  $v \neq 0$  and  $v_p(x) \leq v_p(u/v) \leq v_p(y)$ . So we have that  $v_p(x \cdot v) \leq v_p(u)$ . By the condition of divisibility compatibility, there exists an element  $c$  of  $A$  such that  $x \cdot v \cdot c = u$ . Hence we obtain  $u/v = x \cdot c \in A$  and again by the condition of compatibility, there exists an element  $d$  of  $A$  such that  $y = d \cdot u/v$ . We conclude that  $u/v$  belongs to  $A^\times$  since  $y \in A^\times$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.11.* If  $A$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain then by  $p$ -convexity of  $\mathcal{M}_A$  in  $A$ , we have  $v_p(A^\times) < v_p(\mathcal{M}_A)$ .

So we can define a  $p$ -valuation on the residue field  $k_A$  of  $A$ , denoted by  $\tilde{v}_p$ , as follows: if  $x = 0$  in  $k_A$  then  $\tilde{v}_p(x) = \infty$ ; otherwise if  $x \neq 0$  in  $k_A$ , we take  $y \in A^\times$  such that  $\bar{y} = x$  and define  $\tilde{v}_p(x)$  as  $v_p(y)$ . By Remark (2.11),  $\tilde{v}_p$  is well-defined and  $k_A$  is a  $p$ -valued field by the axiom-schemes  $pCVR$ .

In the next paragraph we give a new axiomatization of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings which were introduced in [3]. Our candidate for such an axiomatization is the following list which will denote by  $pCIR$ .

**Definition 2.12.**  $pCIR$  is the following set of  $\mathcal{L}$ -sentences:

- (1) the set of axioms for the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory of  $p$ -convexly valued rings;
- (2) for each integer  $n > 0$ ,  $\forall x \exists y [\mathcal{D}(x, y^n) \wedge \mathcal{D}(y^n, x)]$ ;
- (3) for each integer  $n > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} [\mathcal{D}(a_{n-1}, 1) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-2} \neg \mathcal{D}(a_i, 1)] \Rightarrow \\ \exists x [x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots + a_0 = 0 \wedge \mathcal{D}(x, 1)]; \end{aligned}$$

- (4) for each integer  $n > 0$ ,

$$\forall x \exists y [\mathcal{D}(x, 1)] \Rightarrow \bigvee_{0 \leq r < n} \{\mathcal{D}_p(y^n p^r, x) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(x, y^n p^r)\};$$

- (5) for each integer  $n > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} [\mathcal{D}_p(1, a_{n-1}) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(a_{n-1}, 1) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-2} \mathcal{D}_p(p, a_i)] \Rightarrow \\ \exists x [\neg \mathcal{D}(x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots + a_0, 1) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(1, x) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(x, 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

We now show that the models of  $pCIR$  are exactly the  $p$ -adically closed integral rings introduced in [3]. In order to prove it, we reformulate Proposition (2.2) and Corollary (2.3) of [3] in our terminology.

**Lemma 2.13.** *The models of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings correspond to henselian  $p$ -convexly valued rings with  $p$ -adically closed residue field and divisible ordered value group. Moreover, the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings is complete and model-complete; it has elimination of quantifiers in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{rings}$  equipped with predicates  $P_n$  for the  $n$ -th powers (we replace in the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $pCIR$  the predicate of  $p$ -divisibility relation by:  $\mathcal{D}_p(x, y) \iff P_\epsilon(x^\epsilon + py^\epsilon)$ ;  $\epsilon = 3$  if  $p = 2$ , otherwise  $\epsilon = 2$  (\*).).*

*Proof.* First we note that in the  $p$ -adically closed case membership to the valuation ring is definable by (\*)[2]. Let  $A$  be a model of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $pCIR$ . Then  $A$  is a valuation ring with respect to the divisibility predicate  $\mathcal{D}$  and is  $p$ -convex in its fraction field. The axioms (2) express that the value group is divisible and the axioms (3) say  $A$  is henselian (it is one of the equivalent forms of Hensel's Lemma, see [14]). The axiom-schemes (4) and (5) imply that the  $p$ -valued field  $\langle k_A, \tilde{v}_p \rangle$  is  $p$ -adically closed where  $\tilde{v}_p$  is the valuation defined as in Remark (2.11). The rest of the proof follows the lines of Corollary (2.3) in [3].  $\square$

We need the next two lemmas to extend  $p$ -convexly valued domains in the most natural way possible, i.e. we will use the previous characterization of  $p$ -convexly valued domains. Moreover, Lemma (2.9) will help us to build extensions of  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures.

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -valued domain and let  $\langle K, v_p \rangle$  be a  $p$ -valued field extension of  $Q(A)$  such that there exists an element of  $K$  of value lower than  $v_p(A^\bullet)$ . Then there exists a minimal  $p$ -convexly valued domain containing  $A$  whose fraction field is  $K$ . We will denote this minimal  $p$ -convexly valued domain extending  $A$  by  $pCH(A, K)$ . Furthermore, if  $A$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain then  $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} pCH(A, K)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $pcH(A, K)$  be the following set  $\{k \in K \mid \exists c \in A, K \models v_p(c) \leq v_p(k)\}$  which is different from  $K$  by hypothesis. Clearly it is a  $p$ -valued domain and it is  $p$ -convex in  $K$ . The minimality is deduced from the definition of  $pcH(A, K)$ . Let us denote  $pcH(A, K)$  by  $\tilde{A}$ . Lemma (2.3) implies that  $K$  is the fraction field of  $pcH(A, K)$ . For the second part, we have to show that  $A \cap \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{A}} = \mathcal{M}_A$  by Lemma (2.9). Suppose  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A$ . So,  $a^{-1} \notin A$  because  $A$  is a valuation ring. If  $a^{-1} \notin \tilde{A}$  then  $a \in \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{A}}$  and the proof is finished. So, suppose  $a^{-1} \in \tilde{A}$ . By definition, there exists  $b \in A$  such that  $v_p(b) \leq v_p(a^{-1})$ . Hence,  $v_p(b \cdot a) = v_p(b) + v_p(a) \leq v_p(a^{-1}) + v_p(a) = v_p(1)$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}_A$  is  $p$ -convex in  $A$ , we get  $1 \in \mathcal{M}_A$ , this is a contradiction.  $\square$

In the previous lemma, if  $A$  is already a  $p$ -convexly valued domain then the hypothesis of having an element of  $K$  of value lower than  $v_p(A^\bullet)$  is directly satisfied.

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -convexly valued domain and let  $\widetilde{Q(A)}$  be a  $p$ -adic closure of  $Q(A)$  for the  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$  on  $Q(A)$ . Then there exists a model  $\tilde{A}$  of  $pCIR$  such that  $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{A}$ . In addition, if the value group of  $Q(A)$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group then  $pcH(A, Q(A)^h)$  is a model of  $pCIR$  where  $Q(A)^h$  is the Henselization of  $Q(A)$  for the  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $H$  be the convex hull of the group  $v_p(A^\times)$  in  $v_p(\widetilde{Q(A)}^\times)$ . Then we consider the set  $\tilde{A} = \{x \in \widetilde{Q(A)} \mid \exists h \in H, \widetilde{Q(A)} \models v_p(x) \geq h\}$ . As in the proof of Proposition (2.5) in [3], we have that  $\tilde{A}$  is a model of  $pCIR$ . It remains to show that  $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{A}$ . By Lemma (2.9), it suffices to prove that  $A \cap \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{A}} = \mathcal{M}_A$ . Suppose  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A$ , so  $a^{-1} \notin A$ . If  $a^{-1} \notin \tilde{A}$  then  $a \in \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{A}}$  and the proof is finished. So we suppose  $a^{-1} \in \tilde{A}$ . By definition of  $\tilde{A}$  and  $H$ , there exists an element  $b$  of  $A^\times$  such that  $v_p(b) \leq v_p(a^{-1})$ . We conclude as in the proof of Lemma (2.14). For the second part, since  $Q(A)^h$  is an immediate extension of  $Q(A)$  for the valuation  $v_p$ , the value group of  $Q(A)^h$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group and so  $Q(A)^h$  is  $p$ -adically closed. By Remark (2.11) and Lemma (2.14), we have  $pcH(A, Q(A)^h) = \{x \in Q(A)^h \mid \exists h \in H, Q(A)^h \models v_p(x) \geq h\}$  where  $H$  is the convex hull of the group  $v_p(A^\times)$  in  $v_p(Q(A)^{h^\times})$ , i.e. it is  $v_p(A^\times)$ . The rest of the proof is the same as that of Proposition (2.5) in [3].  $\square$

**Lemma 2.16.** *Let  $A$  be a model of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings. Then its fraction field  $Q(A)$  is  $p$ -adically closed.*

*Proof.* Owing to the  $p$ -divisibility on  $A$ , we can define the  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$  of  $Q(A)$  as follows:

$$\forall a, b \in A \quad \forall c, d \in A^\bullet, \quad v_p(a/c) \leq v_p(b/d) \iff \mathcal{D}_p(ad, bc).$$

Clearly by the axioms of  $pCIR$ , the fraction field  $Q(A)$  is a  $p$ -valued field. It remains to show that its value group is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group and that it is henselian with respect to  $v_p$ . Since  $A$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain, it is  $p$ -convex in  $Q(A)$  and so,  $A$  contains the valuation ring  $\mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}$  of  $Q(A)$ . To prove that  $v_p(Q(A)^\times)$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group, it suffices to show that for any integer  $n > 0$  and any element  $x$  of  $Q(A)$  such that  $v_p(x) \geq 0$  (so  $x \in A$ ), there exists an element  $y$  of  $A$  and a positive integer  $r$  such that  $0 \leq r \leq n-1$  and  $v_p(x) = n \cdot v_p(y) + r$  (because  $p$  is a prime element of  $Q(A)$ ). Indeed, let  $x$  be in  $Q(A)$ . If  $v_p(x) < 0$  then  $v_p(x^{-1}) > 0$  implies  $x^{-1} \in A$ . Hence, by the axiom-scheme

(4) of  $pCIR$ , there exists an element  $y$  of  $A$  such that  $v_p(x^{-(n-1)}) = n \cdot v_p(y) + r$ . We conclude that  $v_p(x) = n \cdot (v_p(y) + v_p(x)) + r$  where  $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$ .

Let  $x$  in  $A$  be such that  $v_p(x) \geq 0$  then there exists an element  $z$  of  $A$  such that  $v(x) = v(z^n)$  by the axiom-scheme (2). So  $xz^{-n} \in A$  with  $v(xz^{-n}) = 0$  where  $v$  is the valuation determined by the divisibility predicate  $\mathcal{D}$ . We apply the axiom-scheme (4) of  $pCIR$  and we obtain the requirement. Now we show that  $Q(A)$  is henselian. Let  $Q(A)^h$  be the Henselization of  $Q(A)$  for the  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$ . By Lemma (2.15), we can consider the minimal  $p$ -convexly valued domain  $pcH(A, Q(A)^h)$  with fraction field  $Q(A)^h$ , denoted by  $\tilde{A}$ . By Lemma (2.14),  $\tilde{A}$  is a model of  $pCIR$  such that  $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{A}$ . Since the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $pCIR$  is modele-complete and  $\tilde{A}$  is  $p$ -convex in  $Q(\tilde{A})$ ,  $Q(A)$  satisfies Hensel's Lemma with respect to  $v_p$  on  $Q(A)$ . Let us check it.

Let  $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}$  in  $Q(A)$  be such that  $v_p(a_{n-1}) = 0$  and  $v_p(a_i) \geq 1$  for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, n-2\}$ . Then each  $a_i$  belongs to  $A$  by  $p$ -convexity of  $A$  in  $Q(A)$ . Since  $Q(A)^h$  is henselian for the  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$ , there exists an element  $b$  in  $Q(A)^h$  such that  $b^n + a_{n-1} \cdot b^{n-1} + \dots + a_0 = 0$  and  $v_p(b) = 0$ . We have that  $b \in pcH(A, Q(A)^h)$  which is a model of  $pCIR$ .

Thus  $\tilde{A} \models \exists y [(y^n + a_{n-1}y^{n-1} + \dots + a_0 = 0) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(1, y) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(y, 1)]$ . By model-completeness of  $pCIR$ , we get that

$$A \models \exists y [(y^n + a_{n-1}y^{n-1} + \dots + a_0 = 0) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(1, y) \wedge \mathcal{D}_p(y, 1)]$$

and so,  $Q(A)$  is henselian with respect to  $v_p$ .  $\square$

Now we are interested in the existence of definable Skolem functions in the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings.

First recall a definition.

**Definition 2.17.** Let  $L$  be a first-order language. Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  be two  $L$ -structures. We say that  $\mathcal{B}$  is rigid over  $\mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{A}) = \{\text{id}\}$  where  $\text{id}$  is the identity automorphism.

Secondly let us recall a theorem of L. van den Dries which gives a criterion for rigidity.

**Theorem 2.18.** (see Theorem (2.1) in [17]) *Let  $L$  be a first-order language and let  $T$  be a  $L$ -theory which admits quantifier elimination. Then the following are equivalent:*

- $T$  has definable Skolem functions;
- each model  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $T_{\forall}$  has an extension  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \models T$  which is algebraic over  $\mathcal{A}$  (in the model-theoretic sense) and rigid over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_w}$  be an expansion of the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$  by predicates  $P_n$  for the  $n$ -th powers and a constant  $\underline{c}$ . We can reformulate the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $pCIR$  in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_w}$ . For example, the  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_w}$ -theory  $pCIR$  contains axioms which express that the models are not fields, i.e.  $\neg \mathcal{D}(c, 1)$  (this assures that the valuation on a  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_w}$ -substructure of a model of  $pCIR$  is never trivial),  $\forall x (P_n(x) \iff \exists y (y^n = x))$  and the  $p$ -divisibility relation  $\mathcal{D}_p$  is defined as in the statement of Lemma (2.13).

Let  $A$  be a model of  $pCIR$ , i.e. a  $p$ -adically closed integral ring. We can define a basis of a Hausdorff topology by:

$$\{D_{(a,b)} \mid a, b \in A, b \neq 0\} \text{ where } D_{(a,b)} \text{ is the set} \\ \{x \in A \mid A \models \mathcal{D}_p(b, x - a) \wedge \neg \mathcal{D}_p(x - a, b)\}.$$

It is called the  $p$ -valuation topology on  $A$ . So,  $\langle A, D_{(x,y)} \rangle$  is a first-order topological structure in the sense of [11, p. 765, example (e)].

Let us show topological results on the sets defined by the previous predicates.

**Lemma 2.19.** *Let  $A$  be a model of  $pCIR$ . Then the sets  $P_n^A = \{a \in A^\bullet \mid A \models P_n(a)\}$ , are clopen for the  $p$ -valuation topology on  $A$ , for each integer  $n > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Q(A)$  be the fraction field of  $A$  which is a  $p$ -adically closed field. Let us consider the set of  $n$ -th powers  $\overline{P_n}$  in  $Q(A)$  which extends the set  $P_n$  in  $A$  (i.e. if  $Q(A) \models \exists b (b^n = a)$  where  $a \in A$  then  $b \in A$  because  $A$  is integrally closed). It is well-known that the set  $\overline{P_n}$  in  $Q(A)^\bullet$  is clopen for the  $p$ -valuation topology on  $Q(A)$ . So, since  $A$  is a clopen set in  $Q(A)$ ,  $P_n^A$  is clopen for the topology on  $A$  induced by the  $p$ -valuation topology on  $Q(A)$ . It remains to show that  $P_n^A$  is clopen for the  $p$ -valuation topology on  $A$ . The fact that it is closed is clear by definition of topologies. Suppose  $a \in A$  is such that  $P_n^A(a)$ . By Lemma (2.3) of [8], we have that  $a \in \mathcal{D}_{(a,an^2)} \subseteq P_n^A$  and the proof is finished.  $\square$

The following lemma corresponds to Proposition (1.9) in [6].

**Lemma 2.20.** *Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -adically closed integral ring. Then:*

- (1) *The following subsets of  $A$  are open for the  $p$ -valuation topology:*  
 $\{x \in A \mid A \models \mathcal{D}(a, x)\}$  for all  $a \in A^\bullet$ ,  $\{x \in A \mid A \not\models \mathcal{D}(x, a)\}$ ,  $\{x \in A \mid A \not\models \mathcal{D}(a, x)\}$ ,  $\{x \in A \mid A \models \mathcal{D}(x, a)\}$  for all  $a \in A$ .
- (2) *The following subsets of  $A^2$  are open (when  $A^2$  is endowed with the product topology):*  
 $\{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid A \models \mathcal{D}(x, y)\} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ ,  $\{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid A \not\models \mathcal{D}(x, y)\}$ .

*Proof.* (1) Let  $X_a$  be one of the two first sets. Let  $b$  be an element of  $X_a$ . Then the axiom of divisibility compatibility implies that  $D_{(0,b)} \subseteq X_a$ . Therefore  $X_a$  is open. Let us consider the two last sets. Let  $Y_a$  be one of these sets and  $b \in Y_a$ . Then the set  $\{x \in A \mid \mathcal{D}_p(x, b)\}$  is included in  $Y_a$  which is clearly an open neighborhood of  $b$  for the  $p$ -valuation topology on  $A$ .

(2) Let  $D$  be the set  $\{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid A \models \mathcal{D}(x, y)\} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$  and let  $(x_0, y_0)$  be in  $D$ . Suppose  $v_p(x_0) \leq v_p(y_0)$  and  $y_0 \neq 0$ . By the axiom of divisibility compatibility, we get  $D_{(x_0, x_0)} \times D_{(y_0, y_0)} \subseteq D$ . It is the same argument as above for the case  $v_p(x_0) > v_p(y_0)$ . So suppose that  $y_0 = 0$  and  $x_0 \neq 0$ . Hence  $D_{(x_0, x_0)} \times D_{(0, x_0)} \subseteq D$ , again by using the axiom of divisibility compatibility.

Let  $D' = \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid A \not\models \mathcal{D}(x, y)\}$ . If  $(x_0, y_0) \in D'$  then  $y_0 \neq 0$ . Assume  $x_0 \neq 0$ . So  $\neg \mathcal{D}(x_0, y_0)$  implies  $v_p(x_0) > v_p(y_0)$ . It suffices to apply the arguments of (1) to show that there exists an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $(x_0, y_0)$  contained in  $D'$  for the  $p$ -valuation topology on  $A$ . If  $x_0 = 0$  then we choose an element  $\epsilon \in \mathcal{M}_A^\bullet$ . Hence,

the axiom of divisibility compatibility implies  $D_{(x_0, \epsilon y_0)} \times D_{(y_0, y_0)} \subseteq D'$ , which proves that  $D'$  is an open set of  $A^2$ .  $\square$

The above properties imply that the models of the  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_\omega}$ -theory  $pCIR$  are proper first-order topological structures (see Definition (2.2) in [10]). So this  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_\omega}$ -theory is unstable and has the strict order property (see [11]). Moreover, the models of  $pCIR$  are topological systems (see Definition (4.1) in [10]) and we can apply some results of [10] to our setting. For example, by Theorem (4.4) of [10],  $pCIR$  is model-theoretically bounded; let  $A$  be a model of  $pCIR$ , if  $B$  a subset of  $A$  then  $\text{acl}_A(B)$  is the field-theoretic algebraic closure of  $B$  in  $A$ ; moreover  $A$  is  $t$ -minimal (i.e. for every definable  $X \subseteq A$ , the set  $\text{bd}(X)$  of boundary points of  $X$  in  $A$  is finite).

Now we prove the existence of definable Skolem functions for the  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_\omega}$ -theory  $pCIR$ .

**Theorem 2.21.** *The  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_\omega}$ -theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings has definable Skolem functions.*

*Proof.* The proof follows the lines of Proposition (3.4) in [17]. By Theorem (2.18), it suffices to prove that each model  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $(pCIR)_\forall$  has an extension  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \models pCIR$  which is algebraic and rigid over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^* \models pCIR$  and define  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  as the substructure of  $\mathcal{A}^*$  whose members are the elements of  $A^*$  algebraic over the domain  $A$ . Write  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} = \langle \overline{A}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}(\cdot, \cdot), \underline{\mathcal{L}}, \overline{P}_2, \overline{P}_3, \dots \rangle$ . We claim that

$$(1) \quad \overline{\mathcal{A}} \models pCIR.$$

The underlying domain  $\overline{A}$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is integrally closed in  $A^*$ . Since  $A^*$  is henselian,  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  endowed with the restriction of the valuation of  $A^*$  is also henselian (let us remark that this restriction corresponds to  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ ).

Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_\omega}$ -substructure of  $\mathcal{A}^*$ , the valuation on  $A^*$  is an extension of the valuation on  $\mathcal{A}$  and so, on  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  also. Since  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is integrally closed in the underlying ring of  $\mathcal{A}^*$ , it follows that  $\overline{P}_n$  is the set of  $n$ -th powers of  $\overline{A}$ . Let  $x$  be in  $\overline{A}$ . Then there exists  $e \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}^* \models \exists y(y^n = ex)$ : indeed, since  $Q(A^*)$  is a  $p$ -adically closed field, we know that  $Q(A^*) \models \exists y(y^n = ex)$  and since  $A^*$  is integrally closed in its fraction field, this property holds in  $A^*$ . Since  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is integrally closed in  $A^*$  and is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra, the value group of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is divisible. Since  $A$  is a model of  $(pCIR)_\forall$ , the  $p$ -divisibility  $\mathcal{D}_p$  on  $A$  is defined as in (2.13) with universal axioms of  $pCVR$  and the condition of compatibility between  $\mathcal{D}_p$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  is satisfied in  $A$ . The same holds for  $A^*$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  which are  $p$ -convexly valued domains. Since  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}, P_\omega}} \mathcal{A}^*$ , the  $p$ -divisibility in  $A^*$  respects the  $p$ -divisibility in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  and so, we have  $\langle k_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}, \tilde{v}_p \rangle \subseteq \langle k_{A^*}, \tilde{v}_p \rangle$  (see Remark (2.11)). Let  $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}$  in  $\overline{A}$  be such that  $\tilde{v}_p(\overline{a}_{n-1}) = 0$  and  $\tilde{v}_p(\overline{a}_i) \geq 1$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n-2$ . We know that  $k_{A^*}$  is henselian with respect to  $\tilde{v}_p$ . So there exists  $b$  in  $A^*$  such that  $b^n + a_{n-1}b^{n-1} + \dots + a_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{A^*}$  and  $b \notin \mathcal{M}_{A^*}$ . Thus  $b \in \text{acl}_{A^*}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$  and we get  $b \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$  which implies that  $k_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}$  is henselian (because  $\mathcal{M}_{A^*} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{M}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}$ ).

Let us prove that the value group of the  $p$ -valuation  $\tilde{v}_p$  of  $k_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group. Let  $x$  be in  $k_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}$ . Choose an element  $y$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $\overline{y} = x$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}^*$  is a  $p$ -adically closed integral ring, there exists an element  $z$  of  $A^*$  such that  $z^n = ey$  for some  $e \in \mathbb{N}$  (as above). So there exists an element  $z'$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $z'^n = ey$  and we obtain  $\overline{z'^n} = \overline{e}x$

( $\bar{e} \neq 0$  because  $k_{\bar{A}}$  is of characteristic zero). We conclude that  $[\tilde{v}_p(k_{\bar{A}}^\times) : n\tilde{v}_p(k_{\bar{A}}^\times)] = n$ . So, (1) is proved.

It remains to prove that  $\bar{A}$  is rigid over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Suppose  $\sigma$  is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -automorphism of  $\bar{A}$ . Take the substructure of  $\bar{A}$  pointwise fixed by  $\sigma$ . Let us write it as  $\mathcal{A}^1 = \langle A^1, \mathcal{D}^1, \underline{c}, P_2^1, P_3^1, \dots \rangle$ . Then, for all  $n \geq 2$ , we have that  $P_n^1 = \{a^n \mid a \in A^1\}$ . First,  $\langle A^1, \mathcal{D}_p^1, \mathcal{D}^1 \rangle$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain where  $\mathcal{D}_p^1$  and  $\mathcal{D}^1$  are restrictions to  $A^1$  of divisibility relations  $\mathcal{D}_p$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\bar{A}$ . We consider the fraction field  $Q(\bar{A})$  of  $\bar{A}$  and extend the relations in a natural way: for every integer  $n \geq 2$  and for all  $a, b \in Q(\bar{A})^\bullet$ ,  $Q(\bar{A}) \models P_n(a/b)$  iff  $\bar{A} \models \exists z(z^n = ab^{n-1})$  (because  $\bar{A}$  is integrally closed in  $A^*$ ) and for all  $u, v \in A$  and  $s, t \in A^\bullet$ ,  $Q(\bar{A}) \models \mathcal{D}(u/v, s/t)$  iff  $\bar{A} \models \mathcal{D}(ut, sv)$ . We extend the automorphism  $\sigma$  of  $\bar{A}$  to an automorphism  $Q(\sigma)$  of  $Q(\bar{A})$ . For suppose  $a \in P_n^1$ ,  $a \neq 0$ . Let  $b$  be an  $n$ -th root of  $a$  in  $\bar{A}$ . Take an integer  $m \geq 2$ . As in the proof of (1), we find a rational  $q \neq 0$  with  $qb \in \bar{P}_m$ ; so in  $Q(\bar{A})$ , we have that  $\sigma(qb) \cdot (qb)^{-1} = \sigma(b) \cdot b^{-1} \in P_m(Q(\bar{A}))$ . Since  $Q(\bar{A})$  is a  $p$ -adically closed field and  $\sigma(b) \cdot b^{-1}$ , an  $n$ -th root of unity, is an  $m$ -th power in  $Q(\bar{A})$  for all  $m$ , we obtain  $\sigma(b) \cdot b^{-1} = 1$ , i.e.  $b \in A^1$ . By Lemma (2.16),  $Q(\bar{A})$  is a  $p$ -adically closed field and  $Q(A^1)$  is a  $p$ -valued field such that its value group is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -group (by a previous argument and the form of  $P_n^1$ ). So, we can extend the  $\mathcal{A}$ -automorphism  $\sigma$  of  $\bar{A}$  to a  $Q(\mathcal{A})$ -automorphism  $Q(\sigma)$  of  $Q(\bar{A})$  which has  $Q(A^1)$  as pointwise fixed subfield (because  $A^1$  is a valuation ring). As  $\langle Q(\bar{A}), \bar{v}_p \rangle$  is henselian for its  $p$ -valuation  $\bar{v}_p$  (which corresponds to the  $p$ -divisibility  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_p$ ), it contains an Henselization of  $\langle Q(\mathcal{A}), v_p \rangle$  and the universal property of the Henselization implies that it is fixed by  $Q(\sigma)$ , hence it is contained in  $\langle Q(A^1), v_p^1 \rangle$ . Therefore,  $\langle Q(A^1), v_p^1 \rangle$  is henselian. So,  $Q(A^1)$  is a  $p$ -adically closed field. As in the proof of Lemma (2.15),  $A^1$  is a  $p$ -adically closed integral ring with respect to  $\mathcal{D}_p^1$  and  $\mathcal{D}^1$ . By Lemma (2.3) of [17],  $\bar{A}$  is a minimal prime model extension of  $\mathcal{A}$ , as it is algebraic over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Therefore we have  $\mathcal{A}^1 = \bar{A}$ , i.e.  $\sigma$  is the identity automorphism.  $\square$

Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -adically closed integral domain. Since  $A$  is clopen for the  $p$ -valuation topology of its fraction field and  $A$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain, a corollary of the previous theorem is that the models of  $pCIR$  satisfy the property of Local Continuity as defined in [10]. Hence all required properties to guarantee the existence of a Cell decomposition in the sense of [10] are checked in the  $L_{\mathcal{D}, P_\omega}$ -theory of  $p$ -adically closed integral rings. In a subsequent paper we explore a more adequate Cell decomposition for this class of  $p$ -convexly valued rings.

### 3. HILBERT'S SEVENTEENTH PROBLEM FOR $p$ -CONVEXLY VALUED DOMAINS

In this section we determine the form of polynomials over a  $p$ -adically closed ring  $A$  which are integral-definite on  $A$  (see Definition (3.12)). It is the analogue of Theorem 2 in [7] for the  $p$ -adic case by using the same techniques as in [1], e.g. the model-completeness of  $pCIR$ . First we provide the tools needed to settle this.

In the whole section,  $A$  will be assumed a  $p$ -convexly valued domain. Then  $Q(A)$  is a  $p$ -valued field and  $\mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}$  denotes the valuation ring of  $Q(A)$  for the  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -valued domain and let  $B$  be a domain extension of  $A$  equipped with a valuation  $v$ . We say that  $B$  is a  $p$ -valued domain extension if  $v$  is a  $p$ -valuation on  $Q(B)$  over  $Q(A)$  (i.e  $v$  is a  $p$ -valuation on  $Q(B)$  which extends the  $p$ -valuation of  $Q(A)$ ).

*Remark 3.2.* For all  $a \in A$ , we have  $\gamma_p(a) \in A$  where  $\gamma_p(X)$  is the Kochen's operator defined by:

$$\gamma_p(X) = \frac{1}{p} \left[ \frac{X^p - X}{(X^p - X)^2 - 1} \right]$$

(where  $\gamma_p(a)$  is an element of  $Q(A)$ ). This is an immediate consequence of the next lemma. We will denote by  $\infty$  the value of  $\gamma_p(b)$  when this value does not exist at  $b$  in  $Q(A)$ .

Let us recall Lemma (6.2) of [12].

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $k$  be a  $p$ -valued field, let  $K$  be a field extension of  $k$  and let  $v$  be a valuation of  $K$  extending the given  $p$ -valuation of  $k$ . A necessary and sufficient condition for  $v$  to be a  $p$ -valuation over  $k$  (i.e.  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathcal{O}_K/(p)) = 1$ ) is that  $v(\gamma_p(K)) \geq 0$ .*

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $B$  be a domain extension, which is not a field, of the  $p$ -valued domain  $A$ . Let  $M$  be a subset of  $B$  such that  $v_p(M \cap A) \geq 0$ . A necessary and sufficient condition for  $B$  to be a  $p$ -valued domain extension of  $A$  such that  $v_p(M) \geq 0$  is that*

$$\frac{1}{p} \notin \mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}[\gamma_p(Q(A)), M]$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}[\gamma_p(Q(A)), M]$  denotes the subring of  $Q(B)$  generated by  $\gamma_p(Q(A)) \setminus \{\infty\}$  and  $M$  over the ring  $\mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to adapt the proof of [12, p. 100]. For necessity, we use in addition that  $v(M) \geq 0$  and the previous lemma. For sufficiency, we use the fact that the ideal generated by  $p$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}[\gamma_p(Q(A)), M]$  is proper and so, we can invoke the general existence theorem for valuations [13, p. 43]. The hypothesis  $v(M \cap A) \geq 0$  yields that it is an extension of the  $p$ -valuation.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *In the situation of the previous theorem, let  $v$  be a valuation of  $Q(B)$ . A necessary and sufficient condition for  $v$  to be a  $p$ -valuation over  $Q(A)$  such that  $v(M) \geq 0$  is that  $v$  lies above  $\mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}[\gamma_p(Q(A)), M]$  and is centered over  $p$ .*

*Proof.* It is just a reformulation of the previous theorem, it suffices to examine its proof.  $\square$

Now we introduce a particular ring which plays an important role in the extension of a  $p$ -valuation, namely to a valued domain extension of the  $p$ -valued domain  $A$ . It is an adaptation of the classical Kochen ring and of its role in the  $p$ -adically closed field case (see Section (6.2) of [12]).

**Definition 3.6.** For any domain extension  $B$  of  $A$  which is not a field and  $M$  a subset of  $B$ , the  $M$ -Kochen ring  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  is defined as the subring of  $Q(B)$  consisting of quotients of the form

$$a = \frac{b}{1 + pd} \text{ with } b, d \in \mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}[\gamma_p(Q(B)), M] \text{ and } 1 + pd \neq 0.$$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $A$  be a model of  $p$ CIR and let  $a$  be an element of  $A$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}_p(1, a)$  if and only if there exists an element  $b$  in  $A$  such that  $a = \gamma_p(b)$ . Moreover, an element  $a$  of  $A$  satisfies  $\mathcal{D}_p(1, a)$  if and only if  $\exists y (y^\epsilon = 1 + pa^\epsilon)$ ;  $\epsilon = 3$  if  $p = 2$ , otherwise  $\epsilon = 2$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly, since  $Q(A)$  is a  $p$ -valued field, if there exists an element  $b$  in  $A$  such that  $a = \gamma_p(b)$  then  $v_p(a) \geq 0$ , i.e.  $A \models \mathcal{D}_p(1, a)$ . On the other hand, if we consider the polynomial  $f(X) = ap[(X^p - X)^2 - 1] - (X^p - X)$  then  $f(X)$  admits 1 as a simple zero in the residue field of  $Q(A)$ . By Hensel's lemma,  $f(X)$  has a zero  $b$  in  $A$ , whence  $a = \gamma_p(b)$ . For the second part of the statement, it is satisfied in the  $p$ -valued fraction field  $Q(A)$  and it holds in  $A$  because  $A$  is an integrally closed ring (see Lemma (2.13)).  $\square$

So by the preceding result, the elements of the  $M$ -Kochen ring  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  of  $B$  over the  $p$ -adically closed integral domain  $A$  have the following form:

$$a = \frac{b}{1 + pd} \text{ with } b, d \in \mathbb{Z}[\gamma_p(Q(B)), M] \text{ and } 1 + pd \neq 0.$$

The fraction field of the  $M$ -Kochen ring  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  is  $Q(B)$  by Merckel's Lemma (see Appendix in [12]).

**Theorem 3.8.** *Suppose that  $p$  is not a unit in  $\mathcal{O}_{Q(A)}[\gamma_p(Q(B)), M]$ , in view of Theorem (3.4) this is equivalent to saying that  $Q(B)$  is a  $p$ -valued field over  $Q(A)$  such that  $v_p(M) \geq 0$ . Then*

- (1)  $p$  is not a unit in  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$ . Every maximal ideal of  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  contains  $p$  and every prime ideal of  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  containing  $p$  is maximal.
- (2) The  $p$ -valuations of  $Q(B)$  over  $Q(A)$  such that  $M$  belongs to the corresponding valuation ring can be characterized as being those valuations of  $Q(B)$  which lie above  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  and are centered at some maximal ideal of  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$ .

*Proof.* It is an easy adaptation of the proof of Theorem (6.8) in [12], it suffices to replace  $R$  by  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  and to use the corresponding previous results.  $\square$

**Definition 3.9.** For any non empty set  $S$  of valuations of  $Q(B)$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{O}_S$  the intersection of their valuation rings:

$$\mathcal{O}_S = \bigcap_{v \in S} \mathcal{O}_v \text{ where } \mathcal{O}_v \text{ is the valuation ring corresponding to } v.$$

$\mathcal{O}_S$  is called the holomorphy ring of  $S$  in  $Q(B)$ . Every such holomorphy ring is integrally closed in  $Q(B)$ .

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $P$  be a maximal ideal of the  $M$ -Kochen ring  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  of  $B$  over  $A$  and let  $v$  be a valuation of  $Q(B)$  lying above  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  and centered at  $P$ . Then  $v$  is the only valuation of  $Q(B)$  which lies over  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  and is centered at  $P$ . Further,  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)/P$  is the residue field of  $Q(B)$  with respect to  $v$  and  $\mathcal{O}_v = R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)_P$  where  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)_P$  is the localization of the  $M$ -Kochen ring over  $B$  at the maximal ideal  $P$ .*

*Proof.* By the previous theorem,  $v$  is a  $p$ -valuation over  $Q(A)$  such that  $v(M) \geq 0$ , the results are just now a transposition of Corollary (6.9), Lemma (6.10), Lemma (6.12) and Lemma (6.13) of [12].  $\square$

**Theorem 3.11.** *Under the hypothesis of Lemma (3.10), the subring  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(B)$  of  $Q(B)$  is the intersection of the valuation rings  $\mathcal{O}_v$  where  $v$  ranges over the  $p$ -valuations of  $Q(B)$  which extend the  $p$ -valuation of  $Q(A)$  such that  $M$  belongs to  $\mathcal{O}_v$ .*

Now we define the notion of integral-definite polynomial over a  $p$ -convexly valued domain  $A$  and so, we can prove the following theorem, which provides a solution to the analogue Hilbert's seventeenth problem for  $p$ -adically closed integral rings.

**Definition 3.12.** Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -convexly valued domain and let  $F(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  be an element of  $A[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , the ring of polynomials in  $n$  indeterminates over  $A$ . Then  $F$  is called integral-definite on  $A$  if and only if for all  $\bar{a} \in A^n$ , we have  $A \models \mathcal{D}_p(1, F(\bar{a}))$ , i.e.  $F(\bar{a})$  is in the range of  $\gamma_p$  on  $A$ .

From now on, we will denote the polynomial ring in  $n$  indeterminates over  $A$  by  $A[\underline{X}]$  and its fraction field by  $Q(A)(\underline{X})$ .

**Theorem 3.13.** *Let  $A$  be a model of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $pCIR$  and let  $F$  be an element of  $A[\underline{X}]$ . Then  $F$  is integral-definite on  $A$  if and only if  $F$  belongs to the  $M$ -Kochen ring  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(A[\underline{X}])$  of  $A[\underline{X}]$  over  $A$  where  $M$  is the ideal  $\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]$  of  $A[\underline{X}]$  and the elements of  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(A[\underline{X}])$  have the following form:*

$$(2) \quad \frac{b}{1 + pd} \text{ with } b, d \in \mathbb{Z}[\gamma(Q(A)), \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]] \text{ and } 1 + pd \neq 0.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\langle A, \mathcal{D}_p, \mathcal{D} \rangle \models pCIR$  and  $F \in A[\underline{X}]$ , where  $F$  is not of the form given by (2). By Theorem (3.11), there exists a  $p$ -valuation, denoted by  $v_p$ , on  $Q(A)(\underline{X})$  which extends the  $p$ -valuation on the  $p$ -valued field  $Q(A)$  such that  $v_p(F) < 0$  and  $v_p(m) > 0$  for all  $m \in \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]$ . We denote by  $A'$  the ring  $A[\underline{X}]$ . Let  $B = pcH(A', Q(A'))$  (see Lemma (2.14)). Then, for every  $a \in A'$  and for every  $m \in \mathcal{M}_A$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_p(m^{-1}, p \cdot a)$ . Hence,  $B$  is not a field and by definition,  $B$  is a  $p$ -convexly valued domain (see Lemma (2.5)). By Lemma (2.9),  $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} B$ . Let  $\tilde{B} = pcH(B, K)$  where  $K$  is a  $p$ -adic closure of  $Q(B) = Q(A)(\underline{X})$ . It is a model of  $pCIR$  by Lemma (2.15). Since  $pCIR$  is model-complete, we get that  $A \prec \tilde{B}$ . Now  $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{B}$  and  $\tilde{B} \models \exists \bar{x}(\neg(\mathcal{D}_p(1, F(\bar{x}))))$ . By model-completeness,  $A \models \exists \bar{x}(\neg(\mathcal{D}_p(1, F(\bar{x}))))$ . Hence  $F$  is not integral-definite on  $A$ , which contradicts our hypothesis.  $\square$

*Remark 3.14.*  $\bullet$  In the previous proof, we have used the following fact: if  $A$  is a  $p$ -valued domain then  $A[\underline{X}]$  can be considered as a  $p$ -valued domain; it

suffices to consider the natural  $p$ -valuation  $w_p$  of  $Q(A)(\underline{X})$  which extends the  $p$ -valuation of  $Q(A)$  (see Example (1.2) in [16]). Moreover we have  $w_p(\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]) \geq 0$ .

- In the previous proof,  $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} B$  is justified by the following statement of Lemma (2.9):  $\mathcal{M}_B \cap A = \mathcal{M}_A$ . Indeed, we get:
  - $(\subseteq)$  is trivial.
  - $(\supseteq)$ : we know  $B$  satisfies  $\mathcal{D}_p(m^{-1}, pa)$  for all  $m \in \mathcal{M}_A$  and  $a \in A[\underline{X}]$ . By definition, it implies  $m^{-1} \notin pcH(A', Q(A')) = B$  and the conclusion follows.

Now we prove an analogue of Theorem (3) in [1].

**Theorem 3.15.** *Let  $A$  be a model of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $pCIR$  and let  $F_1, \dots, F_r, G$  be in  $A[\underline{X}]$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $A \models \forall \bar{x} [\bigwedge_{i=1}^r \mathcal{D}_p(1, F_i(\bar{x})) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_p(1, G(\bar{x}))]$ ;
- (2)  $G$  belongs to the  $M$ -Kochen ring  $R_{\gamma_p}^M(A[\underline{X}])$  of  $A[\underline{X}]$  where  $M$  is the ideal of  $A[\underline{X}]$  generated by  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and the polynomials  $F_1, \dots, F_r$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the one of Theorem (3.13). It suffices to modify the  $M$  of Theorem (3.13) such that  $M$  becomes (in this case) the ideal generated by  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and the polynomials  $F_1, \dots, F_r$ .  $\square$

#### 4. NULLSTELLENSATZ FOR $p$ -ADICALLY CLOSED INTEGRAL RINGS

In this last section, we consider the question to establish a Nullstellensatz-type result for  $p$ -adically closed integral rings  $A$ , similar to the Nullstellensatz provided by Theorem (2) of [1]. To this effect, we introduce the notion of  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical of a polynomial ideal over  $A$  motivated by the notion of  $p$ -adic ideal as defined in [16, Definition (3.1)] thanks to which A. Srhir reproves the Nullstellensatz for  $p$ -adically closed fields.

In the sequel we denote by  $R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}]) \cdot A[\underline{X}]$  the subring of  $Q(A)(\underline{X})$  generated by  $A[\underline{X}]$  and the  $(\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}])$ -Kochen ring of  $A[\underline{X}]$ .

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -convexly valued domain and let  $J$  be an ideal of the polynomial ring  $A[\underline{X}]$  over  $A$ .

- (1) The ideal  $J$  is called a  $p$ -adic ideal of  $A[\underline{X}]$  if for any integer  $s \geq 1$ , for any elements  $g_1, \dots, g_s$  in  $J$ , any elements  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$  of  $R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}])$  and any  $h \in A[\underline{X}]$  such that  $h = \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i \cdot g_i$ , we have  $h \in J$ .
- (2) The  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical of an ideal  $J$  of  $A[\underline{X}]$  is defined as the set of elements  $h$  of  $A[\underline{X}]$  verifying the condition:

$$a^* h^l = \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i g_i$$

for some  $a^* \in \mathcal{M}_A^\bullet \cup \{1\}$ , some positive integers  $s, l$ , some elements  $g_1, \dots, g_s \in J$  and some elements  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}])$ .

We denote this set by  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{J}$ .

Now we prove some properties of the  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical of an ideal  $J$  in  $A[\underline{X}]$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -convexly valued domain and let  $\mathcal{M}_A$  be its maximal ideal. Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $A[\underline{X}]$ . Then we have the following properties:*

- (1)  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{I}$  is an ideal containing  $I$ .
- (2) if  $J$  is an ideal containing  $I$  then  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{J}$  contains  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{I}$ .
- (3)  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{{}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{I}} = {}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{I}$ .

*Proof.* Easy calculations. □

So the  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical of an ideal is also an ideal and we can define a notion of radical ideal.

**Definition 4.3.** We say that an ideal  $J$  of  $A[\underline{X}]$  is  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical if  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{J} = J$ .

So, if  $J$  is a  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical ideal containing an ideal  $I$  then we get  $J \supseteq {}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{I}$ . With this terminology, we prove the main result of this section.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $A$  be a  $p$ -adically closed integral ring and let  $f_1, \dots, f_r, q$  be elements of  $A[\underline{X}]$ . Then  $q$  vanishes at every common zero of  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  in  $A^n$  if and only if there exists a positive integer  $l$ , an element  $a^*$  of  $\mathcal{M}_A^\bullet \cup \{1\}$  and  $r$  elements  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$  of the subring  $R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}]) \cdot A[\underline{X}]$  of  $Q(A)(\underline{X})$  such that*

$$(3) \quad a^* \cdot q^l = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \cdot f_i;$$

*i.e.  $q$  belongs to the  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical ideal of the ideal generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  in  $A[\underline{X}]$ .*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ): This direction is a trivial consequence of the definition of the  $\lambda_i$  and Theorem (3.4) which asserts that in this case  $\frac{1}{p} \notin \mathbb{Z}[\gamma_p(Q(A)), M]$  (the same kind of argument is given in more details in the proof of (5.5)).

( $\Rightarrow$ ): We proceed ab absurdo. Suppose that there is no positive integer  $l$  and elements  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A^\bullet \cup \{1\}$  so that  $a \cdot q^l$  is of the form (3). Let  $S$  be the following multiplicative subset of  $A[\underline{X}]$ :  $\{aq^l \mid l \in \mathbb{N}^\bullet, a \in (\mathcal{M}_A^\bullet) \cup \{1\}\}$ . Let  $I$  be the ideal of  $A[\underline{X}]$  generated by the polynomials  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . We can suppose  $I \cap A = (0)$ , otherwise  $I = (1)$  or  $I \cap \mathcal{M}_A \neq \emptyset$  and  $aq \in I$  for some  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A^\bullet$ , and in both cases the theorem is proved. Let us consider the following set  $\mathcal{J}$  of ideals of  $A[\underline{X}]$

$$\mathcal{J} = \{I' \text{ proper } \mathcal{M}_A\text{-radical ideal of } A[\underline{X}] \text{ containing } I \text{ and disjoint from } S\}.$$

Since  $q$  does not satisfy the equation (3) and  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{I}$  is proper (otherwise the theorem is trivially satisfied),  $\mathcal{J}$  is a non-empty set. By Zorn's Lemma, the set  $\mathcal{J}$  contains a maximal element denoted by  $J$ . So  $J$  is a proper  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical ideal of  $A[\underline{X}]$  containing  $I$ . Let us show that  $J$  is a prime ideal of  $A[\underline{X}]$ . So we assume that  $f \cdot h \in J$  for some  $f, h \in A[\underline{X}] \setminus J$ . By maximality of the element  $J$  in  $\mathcal{J}$ , we get that  ${}^{\mathcal{M}}\sqrt{\langle f, J \rangle} \cap S \neq \emptyset$

and  ${}^{\mathcal{M}_A}\sqrt{\langle h, J \rangle} \cap S \neq \emptyset$ . So we have that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 \cdot q^{k_1} &= \lambda \cdot f + \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \lambda_i \cdot g_i \\ a_2 \cdot q^{k_2} &= \lambda' \cdot h + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \lambda'_j \cdot g'_j \end{aligned}$$

for some  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{M}_A^\bullet \cup \{1\}$ ,  $g_i, g'_j \in J$ ,  $\lambda, \lambda', \lambda_i, \lambda'_j \in R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}])$  and some positive integers  $k_1, k_2, n_1, n_2$ .

Hence we obtain

$$a_1 \cdot a_2 \cdot q^{k_1+k_2} = \lambda \cdot \lambda' \cdot (fh) + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda^*_i \cdot g_i^*$$

for some  $g_i^* \in J$ ,  $\lambda_i^* \in R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}])$  and some positive integer  $N$ . Since  $g_i^* \in J$  and  $J$  is a  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical ideal of  $A[\underline{X}]$ , we get that  $S \cap J \neq \emptyset$ , this is a contradiction. So  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  is a domain which is not a field and we are going to show that we can extend the  $p$ -valuation of  $Q(A)$  to a  $p$ -valuation, denoted by  $v_p$ , of  $Q(A[\underline{X}]/J)$  such that  $v_p(\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J) \geq 0$ . Let us denote  $Q(A[\underline{X}]/J)$  by  $Q(A)(J)$ . As in the proof of (3.8), it is sufficient to show that  $\frac{1}{p} \notin R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J}(A[\underline{X}]/J)$ . We know  $A \hookrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{rings}}} A[\underline{X}]/J$ . Let us denote by  $\bar{\cdot}$  the residue map :  $A[\underline{X}] \mapsto A[\underline{X}]/J$ . Suppose  $\frac{1}{p} \in R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J}(A[\underline{X}]/J)$ , i.e. there exists  $\frac{\bar{f}}{\bar{g}}, \frac{\bar{h}}{\bar{l}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\gamma_p(Q(A)(J)), \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J]$  such that

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\frac{\bar{f}}{\bar{g}}}{1 + p \cdot \frac{\bar{h}}{\bar{l}}} \text{ for some elements } f, g, h, l \in Q(A)(\underline{X}).$$

So,  $\frac{f}{g}$  and  $\frac{h}{l}$  can be chosen such that  $\frac{f}{g}, \frac{h}{l} \in \mathbb{Z}[\gamma_p(Q(A)(\underline{X})), \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]]$  and we obtain the equality

$$\overline{gl + p \cdot (gh - fl)} = 0.$$

This implies  $gl + p \cdot (gh - fl) \in J$ . We know that  $Q(A)(\underline{X})$  is formally  $p$ -adic over  $Q(A)$  with respect to  $\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]$  (i.e. we can extend the  $p$ -valuation of  $Q(A)$  to a  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$  of  $Q(A)(\underline{X})$  such that  $v_p(\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]) \geq 0$ ). Hence  $1 + p \cdot (\frac{h}{l} - \frac{f}{g}) \neq 0$ . So, we can write

$$gl = \frac{1}{1 + p \cdot (\frac{h}{l} - \frac{f}{g})} \cdot j \text{ where } j \in J.$$

We have that  $\lambda = \frac{1}{1 + p \cdot (\frac{h}{l} - \frac{f}{g})} \in R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}])$ . Hence  $g \cdot l = \lambda \cdot j$ . Since  $J$  is a  $p$ -adic ideal (because  $J$  is a  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical ideal), we have  $g \cdot l \in J$ . But  $J$  is prime and so,  $g \in J$  or  $l \in J$  which gives a contradiction. So, we have a  $p$ -valuation  $v_p$  on  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  which extends the  $p$ -valuation on  $A$  such that  $v_p(\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J) > 0$ . Up to now we have built a  $p$ -valued domain  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  which is a  $p$ -valued extension of  $A$ . Moreover it contains a common zero of  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  which is not a zero of  $q$ . We repeat the same proof as for Theorem (3.13) by building a  $p$ -adically closed integral ring extending  $A[\underline{X}]/J$ . We have the final contradiction by model-completeness of  $pCIR$ .  $\square$

## 5. MODEL-THEORETIC RADICAL IDEAL

Throughout this section,  $A$  will stand for an arbitrary model of  $pCIR$ . All embeddings of rings extending  $A$  will be  $A$ -embeddings, i.e. embeddings leaving  $A$  pointwise fixed.

The  $pCIR$ -radical of an ideal  $I \subseteq A[\underline{X}]$  is defined as follows:

$$pCIR - rad(I) = \bigcap \{J \mid J \text{ is an ideal of } A[\underline{X}], I \subseteq J, J \cap A = \{0\} \\ \text{and } A[\underline{X}]/J \text{ is } A\text{-embeddable in a model } B \\ \text{of the } \mathcal{L}\text{-theory } pCIR\}.$$

*Remark 5.1.* An ideal  $J$  satisfying the requirements of the preceding definition is necessarily prime since  $A[\underline{X}]/J \subseteq B$  and  $B$  is an integral domain. Moreover, if  $J$  is prime,  $J \cap A = \{0\}$  is equivalent to the following condition: for every  $Q \in A[\underline{X}]$  and  $b \in \mathcal{M}_A$ ,  $b \neq 0$ , we have:  $bQ \in J \Rightarrow Q \in J$ .

In the sequel, for any set  $I$  of polynomials in  $A[\underline{X}]$ , we denote by  $V_A(I)$  the set of elements of  $A^n$  which are common zeroes of  $I$ .

**Proposition 5.2.** *For a finitely generated ideal  $I \subseteq A[\underline{X}]$  and  $P \in A[\underline{X}]$ , the following are equivalent:*

- $V_A(I) \subseteq V_A(P)$ ;
- $P \in pCIR - rad(I)$ .

*Proof.* It is an easy transposition of Proposition (2.2) in [7] using the model-completeness of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $pCIR$ .  $\square$

Now we study more closely the condition:

$$(*) \quad A[\underline{X}]/J \text{ is } A\text{-embeddable in a model } B \text{ of } pCIR \\ \text{such that } A \prec_{\mathcal{L}} B, \text{ where } J \supseteq I, J \cap A = \{0\}.$$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Condition (\*) is equivalent to*

$$(**) \quad A[\underline{X}]/J \text{ admits a } p\text{-divisibility relation } \mathcal{D}_p \text{ which extends the } p\text{-divisibility} \\ \text{relation of } A \text{ and such that } \mathcal{D}_p(1, aP/J) \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{M}_A, P \in A[\underline{X}].$$

*Proof.*  $(*) \Rightarrow (**)$ : Let  $C = A[\underline{X}]/J$ . If  $B \models pCIR$ ,  $C \subseteq_{\mathcal{L}} B$ ,  $A \prec_{\mathcal{L}} B$ , then, in the  $p$ -divisibility relation that  $B$  induces on  $C$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_p(1, aP/J)$  since this holds for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}_B$  and  $a \in \mathcal{M}_A \subseteq \mathcal{M}_B$  implies  $aP/J \in \mathcal{M}_B$ .

$(**) \Rightarrow (*)$ : Endow  $C$  with a  $p$ -divisibility relation  $\mathcal{D}_p$  as in (\*\*). Let  $K$  be the fraction field of  $C$  endowed with the  $p$ -valuation induced by the  $p$ -divisibility of  $C$ . Let  $\tilde{K}$  be a  $p$ -adic closure of  $K$  and let  $\tilde{B} = pcH(B, \tilde{K})$ . As in the proof of Theorem (3.13), we conclude that  $\tilde{B} \models pCIR$  and so,  $A \prec_{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{B}$ .  $\square$

Now we give an algebraic characterization of the  $pCIR$ -radical of an ideal  $I$  of the integral domain  $A[\underline{X}]$  where  $A$  is a model of  $pCIR$ . In particular we get

**Proposition 5.4.** *For a finitely generated ideal  $I \subseteq A[\underline{X}]$ , the following equality holds:*

$$pCIR - rad(I) = \mathcal{M}\sqrt[p]{I}.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem (4.4) and Proposition (5.2), we obtain our requirement.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** *If  $I \subseteq A[\underline{X}]$  is a  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical then  $I = pCIR - rad(I)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $I$  is finitely generated then the result is trivial by using the definition of  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical ideal and Proposition (5.4). In the general case, Proposition (5.3) and Remark (5.1) prove that  $pCIR - rad(I)$  is the intersection of all prime ideals  $J$  containing  $I$  such that  $J \cap A = \{0\}$  and  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  admits a  $p$ -divisibility relation  $\mathcal{D}_p$  such that  $\mathcal{D}_p(1, \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J)$ . If  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  admits a  $p$ -divisibility relation  $\mathcal{D}_p$  such that  $\mathcal{D}_p(1, \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J)$  where  $J \cap A = \{0\}$  and  $J$  is a proper prime ideal containing  $I$  then  $J$  is a  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical ideal. Indeed, assume that we have the following equation

$$(4) \quad a^* \cdot F = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \cdot j_i$$

where  $j_i \in J$ ,  $a^* \in \mathcal{M}_A^\bullet \cup \{1\}$ ,  $\lambda_i \in R_{\gamma_p}^{\mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]}(A[\underline{X}])$ ,  $F \in A[\underline{X}] \setminus J$  and  $n$  is a positive integer.

In  $Q(A)(J)$ , we can consider the equation (4) because the  $\lambda_i$ 's have the form  $\frac{a_i}{1+p \cdot b_i}$  where  $a_i, b_i$  are elements of  $\mathbb{Z}[\gamma_p(Q(A)(\underline{X})), \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]$  and  $1+p \cdot b_i$  is different from zero modulo  $J$  by Theorem (3.4) (since  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  admits a  $p$ -divisibility relation with the required properties). So we get that  $a^* \cdot F \equiv 0 \pmod{J}$  in  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  and  $J \cap A = \{0\}$  implies that  $F \equiv 0 \pmod{J}$ . So  $pCIR - rad(I)$  is a  $\mathcal{M}_A$ -radical containing  $I$  and thus  $I = \sqrt[p]{I} \subseteq pCIR - rad(I)$ . Let us assume that  $P \notin \sqrt[p]{I}$ . We have to show that there exists a proper prime ideal  $J$  of  $A[\underline{X}]$  such that  $A \cap J = \{0\}$ ,  $J \not\supseteq P$  and  $A[\underline{X}]/J$  admits a  $p$ -divisibility relation  $\mathcal{D}_p$  so that we have  $\mathcal{D}_p(1, \mathcal{M}_A \cdot A[\underline{X}]/J)$ . To this effect we proceed as in the first step of the proof of Theorem (4.4).  $\square$

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is part of the current Ph. D. thesis project of the author under the supervision of F. Point and C. Michaux. I thank the referee for detailed and constructive suggestions for improvements of the paper.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Becker T., Real closed rings and ordered valuation rings, *Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math.* 29 (1983), no. 5, pp. 417–425.
- [2] Bélair L., Substructures and uniform elimination for  $p$ -adic fields, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 39 (1988), pp. 1–17.
- [3] Bélair L., Anneaux  $p$ -adiquement clos et anneaux de fonctions continues, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 56 (1991), no. 2, pp. 539–553.
- [4] Bélair L., Anneaux de fonctions  $p$ -adiques, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 60 (1995), no. 2, pp. 484–497.
- [5] Cherlin G., Dickmann M., Real closed rings. II. Model theory. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 25 (1983), no. 3, pp. 213–231.
- [6] Dickmann M., Quantifier elimination for ordered valuation rings, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 52 (1987), no. 1, pp. 116–128.
- [7] Dickmann M., On polynomials over real closed rings, *Model theory of algebra and arithmetic* (Proc.Conf., Karpacz, 1979), *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 834, Springer, Berlin-New-York, 1980, pp. 117–135.

- [8] Haskell D., MacPherson D., A version of  $o$ -minimality for the  $p$ -adics, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 62 (1997), no. 4, pp. 1075–1092.
- [9] Macintyre A., On definable subsets of  $p$ -adic fields, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 41 (1976), no. 3, pp. 605–610.
- [10] Mathews L., Cell decomposition and dimension functions in first-order topological structures, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* (3) 70, 1995, no. 1, pp. 1–32.
- [11] Pillay A., First-order topological structures and theories, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 52 (1987), pp. 763–778.
- [12] Prestel A., Roquette R., *Formally  $p$ -adic fields*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 1050, 1984.
- [13] Ribenboim P., *Théorie des valuations*, Les presses de l'Université Montréal, 1969.
- [14] Ribenboim P., Equivalent forms of Hensel's lemma, *Expositiones Mathematicae* 3 (1985), pp. 3–24.
- [15] Ribenboim P., *The theory of classical valuations*, Springer monographs in mathematics, Springer, 1999.
- [16] Srhir A.,  $p$ -adic ideals of  $p$ -rank  $d$  and the  $p$ -adic Nullstellensatz, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 180 (2003), pp. 299–311.
- [17] van den Dries L., Algebraic theories with definable Skolem functions, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 49 (1984), pp. 625–629.

NICOLAS GUZY, INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUE ET INFORMATIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONS-HAINAUT, LE PENTAGONE, 6, AVENUE DU CHAMP DE MARS, B-7000 MONS, BELGIUM  
*E-mail address:* Nicolas.Guzy@umh.ac.be