

THE GROTHENDIECK CONJECTURE FOR HYPERBOLIC POLYCURVES OF LOWER DIMENSION

YUICHIRO HOSHI

JULY 2014

ABSTRACT. In the present paper, we discuss Grothendieck's anabelian conjecture for *hyperbolic polycurves*, i.e., successive extensions of families of hyperbolic curves. One of the consequences obtained in the present paper is that the isomorphism class of a hyperbolic polycurve of dimension less than or equal to four over a sub- p -adic field is *completely determined* by its étale fundamental group [i.e., which we regard as being equipped with the natural outer surjection of the étale fundamental group onto a *fixed* copy of the absolute Galois group of the base field]. We also verify the *finiteness* of certain sets of outer isomorphisms between the étale fundamental groups of hyperbolic polycurves of *arbitrary dimension*.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Exactness of certain homotopy sequences	6
2. Étale fundamental groups of hyperbolic polycurves	13
3. Results on the Grothendieck conjecture for hyperbolic polycurves	31
4. Finiteness of the set of outer isomorphisms between étale fundamental groups of hyperbolic polycurves	50
References	58

INTRODUCTION

Let k be a field of characteristic zero, \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , and $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$ the absolute Galois group of k determined by the given algebraic closure \bar{k} of k . Let X be a variety over k [i.e., a scheme that is of finite type, separated, and geometrically connected over k — cf. Definition 1.4]. Then let us write Π_X for the *étale fundamental group* of X [for some choice of basepoint]. The group Π_X is a profinite group which is *uniquely determined*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 14H30; Secondary 14H10, 14H25.

[up to inner automorphisms] by the property that the category of discrete finite sets equipped with a continuous Π_X -action is equivalent to the category of finite étale coverings of X . Now since X is a variety over k , the structure morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } k$ induces a *surjection*

$$\Pi_X \longrightarrow G_k.$$

In particular, the assignment

$$\Pi: (X \rightarrow \text{Spec } k) \mapsto (\Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow G_k)$$

defines a *functor* from the category \mathcal{V}_k of varieties over k [whose morphisms are morphisms of schemes over k] to the category \mathcal{G}_k of profinite groups equipped with a surjection onto G_k [whose morphisms are outer homomorphisms of topological groups over G_k]. The following philosophy, i.e., *Grothendieck's anabelian conjecture* [or, simply, the “Grothendieck conjecture”], was proposed by Grothendieck [cf., e.g., [7], [8]].

For certain types of k , if one replaces \mathcal{V}_k by “the” subcategory \mathcal{A}_k of \mathcal{V}_k of “*anabelian varieties*” over k , then the restriction of the above functor Π to \mathcal{A}_k should be *fully faithful*.

Although we do not have any general definition of the notion of an “anabelian variety”, the following varieties have been regarded as typical examples of anabelian varieties:

- A hyperbolic curve [cf. Definition 2.1, (i)].
- A successive extension of families of anabelian varieties.

In particular, a successive extension of families of hyperbolic curves, i.e., a *hyperbolic polycurve* [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)], is one typical example of an anabelian variety. In the present paper, we discuss the *Grothendieck conjecture for hyperbolic polycurves*.

The following is one of the main results of the present paper [cf. Theorems 3.3, 3.14; Corollaries 3.15, 3.16].

Theorem A. *Let p be a prime number, k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , n a positive integer, X a **hyperbolic polycurve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of dimension n over k , and Y a **normal variety** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be an **open homomorphism** over G_k . Suppose that one of the following conditions (1), (2), (3), (4) is satisfied:*

- (1) $n = 1$.
- (2) *The following conditions are satisfied:*
 - (2-i) $n = 2$.
 - (2-ii) *The kernel of ϕ is **topologically finitely generated**.*

- (3) *The following conditions are satisfied:*
- (3-i) $n = 3$.
 - (3-ii) *The kernel of ϕ is **finite**.*
 - (3-iii) *Y is of **LFG-type** [cf. Definition 2.5].*
 - (3-iv) $3 \leq \dim(Y)$.
- (4) *The following conditions are satisfied:*
- (4-i) $n = 4$.
 - (4-ii) *ϕ is **injective**.*
 - (4-iii) *Y is a **hyperbolic polycurve** over k .*
 - (4-iv) $4 \leq \dim(Y)$.

Then ϕ arises from a **uniquely determined dominant morphism** $Y \rightarrow X$ over k .

Remark A.1.

- (i) Theorem A in the case where condition (1) is satisfied, k is *finitely generated over the field of rational numbers*, both X and Y are *affine hyperbolic curves* over k , and ϕ is an *isomorphism* was proved in [23] [cf. [23], Theorem (0.3)].
- (ii) Theorem A in the case where condition (1) is satisfied was essentially proved in [14] [cf. [14], Theorem A].
- (iii) Theorem A in the case where condition (2) is satisfied, Y is a *hyperbolic polycurve of dimension 2* over k , and ϕ is an *isomorphism* was proved in [14] [cf. [14], Theorem D].

One of the main ingredients of the proof of Theorem A is Theorem A in the case where condition (1) is satisfied [which was essentially proved by Mochizuki — cf. Remark A.1, (ii)]. Another important ingredient in the proof of Theorem A is the *elasticity* [cf. [18], Definition 1.1, (ii)] of the étale fundamental group of a hyperbolic curve over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. That is to say, if C is a hyperbolic curve over an algebraically closed field F of characteristic zero, then, for a closed subgroup $H \subseteq \Pi_C$ of the étale fundamental group Π_C of C , it holds that H is *open* in Π_C if and only if H is *topologically finitely generated*, *nontrivial*, and *normal* in an open subgroup of Π_C . An immediate consequence of this *elasticity* is as follows:

Let V be a variety over F and $\phi: \Pi_V \rightarrow \Pi_C$ a homomorphism. Suppose that the image of ϕ is *normal* in an open subgroup of Π_C . Then ϕ is *nontrivial* if and only if ϕ is *open*.

Let us observe that this equivalence may be regarded as a *group-theoretic analogue* of the following easily verified *scheme-theoretic fact*:

Let V be a variety over F and $f: V \rightarrow C$ a morphism over F . Then the image of f is *not a point* if and only if f is *dominant*.

The following result follows immediately from Theorem A [cf. Corollary 3.18 in the case where both X and Y are *hyperbolic polycurves*]. That is to say, roughly speaking, the isomorphism class of a hyperbolic polycurve of dimension less than or equal to four over a sub- p -adic field is *completely determined* by its étale fundamental group [i.e., which we regard as being equipped with the natural outer surjection of the étale fundamental group onto a *fixed* copy of the absolute Galois group of the base field].

Theorem B. *Let p be a prime number; k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1]; \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k ; X, Y **hyperbolic polycurves** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively;*

$$\text{Isom}_k(X, Y)$$

for the set of isomorphisms of X with Y over k ;

$$\text{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$$

for the set of isomorphisms of Π_X with Π_Y over G_k ; $\Delta_{Y/k}$ for the kernel of the natural surjection $\Pi_Y \twoheadrightarrow G_k$. Suppose that either X or Y is of **dimension** ≤ 4 . Then the natural map

$$\text{Isom}_k(X, Y) \longrightarrow \text{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{Y/k})$$

is **bijective**.

Next, let us observe that if X and Y are *hyperbolic polycurves* over a sub- p -adic field k , then the *finiteness* of the set of isomorphisms over k

$$\text{Isom}_k(X, Y)$$

may be easily verified [cf., e.g., Proposition 4.5]. Thus, if the natural map discussed in Theorem B is *bijective* for *arbitrary hyperbolic polycurves over sub- p -adic fields* [i.e., Theorem B without the assumption that “either X or Y is of dimension ≤ 4 ” holds], then it follows that the set

$$\text{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{Y/k})$$

is *finite*. Unfortunately, it is not clear to the author at the time of writing whether or not such a generalization of Theorem B holds. Nevertheless, the following result asserts that the above set is, in fact, *finite* [cf. Theorem 4.4].

Theorem C. *Let p be a prime number; k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1]; \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k ; X, Y **hyperbolic polycurves** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$;*

Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively; $\text{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$ for the set of isomorphisms of Π_X with Π_Y over G_k ; $\Delta_{Y/k}$ for the kernel of the natural surjection $\Pi_Y \twoheadrightarrow G_k$. Then the quotient set

$$\text{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{Y/k})$$

is **finite**.

In the notation of Theorem C, if k is finite over the field of rational numbers, then we also prove the finiteness of the set of outer isomorphisms of Π_X with Π_Y [cf. Corollary 4.6].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank *Shinichi Mochizuki* for helpful comments concerning Corollaries 3.20, (iii); 3.21. The author also would like to thank *Ryo Kinoshita* and *Chikara Nakayama* for pointing out some minor errors in an earlier version of this manuscript. The author would especially like to express his gratitude to the *referee* for numerous fruitful comments. This research was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), No. 24540016, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

1. EXACTNESS OF CERTAIN HOMOTOPY SEQUENCES

In the present §1, we consider the *exactness* of certain homotopy sequences [cf. Proposition 1.10, (i)] and prove that the kernel of the outer homomorphism between étale fundamental groups induced by a morphism of schemes that satisfies certain conditions is *topologically finitely generated* [cf. Corollary 1.11]. In the present §1, let k be a field of *characteristic zero*, \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , and $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$.

Definition 1.1. Let X be a *connected noetherian* scheme.

(i) We shall write

$$\Pi_X$$

for the étale fundamental group of X [for some choice of basepoint].

(ii) Let Y be a *connected noetherian* scheme and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a morphism. Then we shall write

$$\Delta_f = \Delta_{X/Y} \subseteq \Pi_X$$

for the kernel of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by f .

Lemma 1.2. Let X be a *connected noetherian normal* scheme. Write $\eta \rightarrow X$ for the generic point of X . Then the outer homomorphism $\Pi_\eta \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by the morphism $\eta \rightarrow X$ is **surjective**. In particular, if $U \subseteq X$ is a nonempty open subscheme, then the outer homomorphism $\Pi_U \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by the open immersion $U \hookrightarrow X$ is **surjective**.

Proof. This follows from [24], Exposé V, Proposition 8.2. \square

Lemma 1.3. Let X, Y be *connected noetherian* schemes and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a morphism. Suppose that Y is **normal**, and that f is **dominant** and of **finite type**. Then the outer homomorphism $\Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by f is **open**.

Proof. Since f is *dominant* and of *finite type*, it follows that there exists a *finite* extension K of the function field of Y such that the natural morphism $\text{Spec } K \rightarrow Y$ factors through f . Thus, it follows immediately from Lemma 1.2 that $\Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ is *open*. This completes the proof of Lemma 1.3. \square

Definition 1.4. Let X be a scheme over k . Then we shall say that X is a *variety* over k if X is of *finite type*, *separated*, and *geometrically connected* over k .

Lemma 1.5. Let X be a *variety* over k . Then the sequence of schemes $X \times_k \bar{k} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X \rightarrow \text{Spec } k$ determines an **exact** sequence of

profinite groups

$$1 \longrightarrow \Pi_{X \times_k \bar{k}} \longrightarrow \Pi_X \longrightarrow G_k \longrightarrow 1.$$

In particular, we obtain an **isomorphism** $\Pi_{X \times_k \bar{k}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{X/k}$ [which is well-defined up to Π_X -conjugation].

Proof. This follows from [24], Exposé IX, Théorème 6.1. \square

Lemma 1.6. *Let X, Y be connected noetherian schemes and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a morphism. Suppose that f is **of finite type, separated, dominant and generically geometrically connected**. Suppose, moreover, that Y is **normal**. Then the outer homomorphism $\Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by f is **surjective**.*

Proof. Write $\eta \rightarrow Y$ for the generic point of Y . Then since $X \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant and generically geometrically connected*, we obtain a commutative diagram of *connected* schemes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times_Y \eta & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ \eta & \longrightarrow & Y. \end{array}$$

Now since Y is *normal*, and [one verifies easily that] $X \times_Y \eta$ is a variety over η [i.e., over the function field of Y], it follows immediately from Lemmas 1.2; 1.5 that the outer homomorphism $\Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ is *surjective*. This completes the proof of Lemma 1.6. \square

Lemma 1.7. *Let X be a variety over k . Suppose that G_k is **topologically finitely generated** [e.g., the case where $k = \bar{k}$]. Then the profinite group Π_X is **topologically finitely generated**.*

Proof. Since [we have assumed that] k is of *characteristic zero*, this follows from [25], Exposé II, Théorème 2.3.1, together with Lemma 1.5. \square

Definition 1.8. Let X, Y be *integral* noetherian schemes and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a *dominant* morphism of *finite type*. Then we shall write

$$\text{Nor}(f) = \text{Nor}(X/Y) \longrightarrow Y$$

for the *normalization* of Y in [the necessarily finite extension of the function field of Y obtained by forming the algebraic closure of the function field of Y in the function field of] X . Note that it follows immediately from the various definitions involved that $\text{Nor}(f) = \text{Nor}(X/Y)$ is *irreducible and normal*, and that the morphism $\text{Nor}(f) = \text{Nor}(X/Y) \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant and affine*.

Lemma 1.9. *Let X, Y be integral noetherian schemes and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a **dominant** morphism of **finite type**. Suppose that X is **normal**. Then f factors through the natural morphism $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$,*

and the resulting morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Nor}(f)$ is **dominant and generically geometrically irreducible** [i.e., there exists a dense open subscheme $U \subseteq \text{Nor}(f)$ of $\text{Nor}(f)$ such that the geometric fiber of $X \times_{\text{Nor}(f)} U \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} U$ at any geometric point of U is **irreducible** — cf. [5], Proposition (9.7.8)]. If, moreover, X and Y are **varieties** over k , then the natural morphism $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ is **finite and surjective**, and $\text{Nor}(f)$ is a **normal variety** over k .

Proof. The assertion that f factors through the natural morphism $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ and the assertion that the resulting morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Nor}(f)$ is *dominant* follow immediately from the various definitions involved. The assertion that the resulting morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Nor}(f)$ is *generically geometrically irreducible* follows immediately from [4], Proposition (4.5.9). Finally, we verify that if, moreover, X and Y are *varieties* over k , then the natural morphism $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ is *finite and surjective*, and $\text{Nor}(f)$ is a *normal variety* over k . Now since Y is a *variety* over k , it follows immediately from the discussion following [12], §33, Lemma 2, that $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ is *finite*. Thus, since $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant* [cf. Definition 1.8], we conclude that $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ is *surjective*. On the other hand, since $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ is *separated* and of *finite type* [cf. the *finiteness* of $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$], to verify that $\text{Nor}(f)$ is a *normal variety* over k , it suffices to verify that $\text{Nor}(f)$ is *geometrically irreducible* over k . On the other hand, since $\text{Nor}(f) \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant*, this follows immediately from [4], Proposition (4.5.9), together with our assumption that X is *geometrically irreducible* over k [cf. the fact that X is a *normal variety* over k]. This completes the proof of Lemma 1.9. \square

Proposition 1.10. *Let S , X , and Y be connected noetherian **normal** schemes and $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ morphisms of schemes. Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) $Y \rightarrow X$ is **dominant** and induces an outer surjection $\Pi_Y \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_X$.
- (2) $X \rightarrow S$ is **surjective, of finite type, separated, and generically geometrically integral**.
- (3) $Y \rightarrow S$ is **of finite type, separated, faithfully flat, geometrically normal, and generically geometrically connected**.

Then the following hold:

- (i) Let $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$ be a geometric point of S that satisfies the following condition
 - (4) For any connected finite étale covering $X' \rightarrow X$ and any geometric point $\bar{s}' \rightarrow \text{Nor}(X'/S)$ of $\text{Nor}(X'/S)$ that lifts the geometric point \bar{s} of S , the geometric fiber $X' \times_{\text{Nor}(X'/S)} \bar{s}'$ of $X' \rightarrow \text{Nor}(X'/S)$ [cf. Lemma 1.9] at

$\bar{s}' \rightarrow \text{Nor}(X'/S)$ is **connected**. [Note that it follows from Lemma 1.9 that a geometric point of S whose image is the generic point of S satisfies condition (4).]

Then the sequence of connected schemes $X \times_S \bar{s} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X \rightarrow S$ [note that $X \times_S \bar{s}$ is connected by conditions (2), (4) — cf. also [4], Corollaire (4.6.3)] determines an **exact** sequence of profinite groups

$$\Pi_{X \times_S \bar{s}} \longrightarrow \Pi_X \longrightarrow \Pi_S \longrightarrow 1.$$

(ii) If, moreover, the function field of S is of **characteristic zero**, then $\Delta_{X/S}$ is **topologically finitely generated**.

Proof. Let us first observe that it follows from Lemma 1.7, together with the fact that a geometric point of S whose image is the generic point of S satisfies condition (4) [cf. condition (4)], that assertion (ii) follows from assertion (i). Thus, to verify Proposition 1.10, it suffices to verify assertion (i). Next, let us observe that since the composite $X \times_S \bar{s} \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ factors through $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$, it follows that the composite $\Pi_{X \times_S \bar{s}} \rightarrow \Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_S$ is *trivial*. On the other hand, it follows immediately from Lemma 1.6 that the outer homomorphism $\Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_S$ is *surjective*. Thus, it follows immediately from the various definitions involved that, to verify Proposition 1.10, it suffices to verify that the following assertion holds:

Claim 1.10.A: Let $X' \rightarrow X$ be a connected finite étale covering of X such that the natural morphism $X' \times_S \bar{s} \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{s}$ has a section. Then there exists a finite étale covering of S whose pull-back by $X \rightarrow S$ is isomorphic to X' over X .

To verify Claim 1.10.A, write $T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(X'/S) \rightarrow S$. Now let us observe that since X is *connected*, and $X' \rightarrow X$ is *finite* and *étale* [hence *closed* and *open*], it follows that $X' \rightarrow X$, hence also $Y' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y \times_X X' \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} Y$, is *surjective*.

Next, to verify Claim 1.10.A, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 1.10.A.1: $Y, Y_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y \times_S T$, and Y' are *irreducible* and *normal*.

Indeed, we have assumed that Y is *normal*. Thus, since $X' \rightarrow X$, hence also $Y' \rightarrow Y$, is *étale*, it follows that Y' is *normal*. On the other hand, since T is *normal*, and $Y \rightarrow S$, hence also $Y_T \rightarrow T$, is *geometrically normal*, it follows from [5], Proposition (11.3.13), (ii), that Y_T is *normal*.

Since Y_T and Y' are *normal*, to verify Claim 1.10.A.1, it suffices to verify that Y_T and Y' are *connected*. Now let us observe that the assertion that Y' is *connected* follows from our assumption that

the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *surjective*. Next, to verify that Y_T is *connected*, let $U \subseteq Y_T$ be a *nonempty* connected component of Y_T . Then since $Y \rightarrow S$, hence also $Y_T \rightarrow T$, is *flat* and of *finite presentation*, hence *open* [cf. [5], Théorème (11.3.1)], the images of U and $Y_T \setminus U$ in T are *open* in T . Thus, since $Y \rightarrow S$, hence also $Y_T \rightarrow T$, is *generically geometrically connected*, it follows that the image of $Y_T \setminus U$ in T , hence also $Y_T \setminus U$, is *empty*. This completes the proof of the assertion that Y_T is *connected*, hence also of Claim 1.10.A.1.

Next, to verify Claim 1.10.A, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 1.10.A.2: The natural morphism $T \rightarrow S$,
hence also $Y_T \rightarrow Y$, is *finite*.

Indeed, since $Y \rightarrow S$ is *geometrically normal*, one verifies easily that $Y' \rightarrow S$ is *geometrically reduced*. Thus, it follows from [4], Corollaire (4.6.3), that the [necessarily finite] extension of the function field of S obtained by forming the algebraic closure of the function field of S in the function field of Y' [cf. Claim 1.10.A.1], hence also in the function field of X' , is *separable*. In particular, since S is *normal* and *noetherian*, the natural morphism $T \rightarrow S$ is *finite* [cf., e.g., [12], §33, Lemma 1]. This completes the proof of Claim 1.10.A.2.

Next, to verify Claim 1.10.A, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 1.10.A.3: The natural morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$
is *finite* and *étale* [hence *closed* and *open*; thus,
 $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is *surjective* — cf. Claim 1.10.A.1].

Indeed, since Y' and Y_T are *finite* over Y [cf. Claim 1.10.A.2], and $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is a *morphism over Y* , one verifies easily that $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is *finite*. In particular, in light of the *surjectivity* of $Y' \rightarrow Y$ [cf. the discussion preceding Claim 1.10.A.1], hence also of $Y_T \rightarrow Y$, by considering the fibers of $Y' \rightarrow Y_T \rightarrow Y$ at the generic point of Y , together with Claim 1.10.A.1, we conclude that $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is *dominant*, hence *surjective*. On the other hand, since $Y' \rightarrow Y$ is *unramified*, it follows from [6], Proposition (17.3.3), (v), that $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is *unramified*. Thus, since Y_T is *normal* [cf. Claim 1.10.A.1], it follows from [24], Exposé I, Corollaire 9.11, that $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is *étale*. This completes the proof of Claim 1.10.A.3.

Next, to verify Claim 1.10.A, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 1.10.A.4: The morphism $Y_T \rightarrow Y$ is *finite*
and *étale*.

Indeed, the *finiteness* of $Y_T \rightarrow Y$ was already verified in Claim 1.10.A.2. Thus, since Y and Y_T are *irreducible* and *normal* [cf.

Claim 1.10.A.1], and $Y_T \rightarrow Y$ is *surjective* [cf. the proof of Claim 1.10.A.3], it follows from [24], Exposé I, Corollaire 9.11, that, to verify Claim 1.10.A.4, it suffices to verify that $Y_T \rightarrow Y$ is *unramified*. To this end, let Ω be a separably closed field and $\bar{y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Spec } \Omega \rightarrow Y$ a morphism of schemes. Then since $Y' \rightarrow Y$ is *unramified*, $Y' \times_Y \bar{y}$ is isomorphic to a disjoint union of finitely many copies of $\text{Spec } \Omega$. Thus, since $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is *surjective* and *étale* [cf. Claim 1.10.A.3], we conclude that $Y_T \times_Y \bar{y}$ is isomorphic to a disjoint union of finitely many copies of $\text{Spec } \Omega$, i.e., that $Y_T \rightarrow Y$ is *unramified*. This completes the proof of Claim 1.10.A.4.

Next, to verify Claim 1.10.A, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 1.10.A.5: The morphism $T \rightarrow S$, hence also $X_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times_S T \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X$, is *finite* and *étale*. Moreover, X_T is *connected*, and the natural morphism $X' \rightarrow X_T$ is *finite* and *étale* [hence *closed* and *open*; thus, $X' \rightarrow X_T$ is *surjective*].

Indeed, since [we have assumed that] the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ is *faithfully flat* and *quasi-compact*, it follows from Claims 1.10.A.2; 1.10.A.4, together with [6], Corollaire (17.7.3), (ii), that $T \rightarrow S$, hence also $X_T \rightarrow X$, is *finite* and *étale*. Thus, the *connectedness* of X_T follows immediately from the *surjectivity* of the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_S$ [cf. the discussion preceding Claim 1.10.A]. Finally, we verify that $X' \rightarrow X_T$ is *finite* and *étale*. The *finiteness* and *unramifiedness* of $X' \rightarrow X_T$ follow immediately from a similar argument to the argument used in the proof of the assertion that $Y' \rightarrow Y_T$ is *finite* and *unramified* [cf. the proof of 1.10.A.3]. On the other hand, since X' and X_T are *flat* over X , the *flatness* of $X' \rightarrow X_T$ follows immediately from [24], Exposé I, Corollaire 5.9, together with the *unramifiedness* of $X_T \rightarrow X$, which implies that the fiber of $X_T \rightarrow X$ at any point of X is isomorphic to a disjoint union of finitely many spectra of fields. This completes the proof of Claim 1.10.A.5.

Since $T \rightarrow S$ is a *finite étale covering* [cf. Claim 1.10.A.5], it is immediate that, to verify Proposition 1.10, i.e., to verify Claim 1.10.A, it suffices to verify that the *finite étale covering* $X' \rightarrow X_T$ [cf. Claim 1.10.A.5] is an *isomorphism*. On the other hand, let us observe that, since X' and X_T are *connected* [cf. Claim 1.10.A.5], to verify Claim 1.10.A, it suffices to verify that the finite étale covering $X' \rightarrow X_T$ is of *degree one*. Write d for the degree of the finite étale covering $T \rightarrow S$. Then since [we have assumed that] $X \times_S \bar{s}$ is *connected*, it follows immediately that the number of the connected components of $X_T \times_S \bar{s}$ is d . Moreover, it follows immediately from our choice of $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$ [cf. condition (4)] that the number

of the connected components of $X' \times_S \bar{s}$ is d . Thus, since $X' \rightarrow X_T$ is *surjective* [cf. Claims 1.10.A.5], the morphism $X' \rightarrow X_T$ determines a *bijection* between the set of the connected components of $X' \times_S \bar{s}$ and the set of the connected components of $X_T \times_S \bar{s}$. On the other hand, let us recall that we have assumed that the natural morphism $X' \times_S \bar{s} \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{s}$ has a section. Thus, by considering the connected component of $X' \times_S \bar{s}$ obtained by forming the image of a section of $X' \times_S \bar{s} \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{s}$, one verifies easily that the finite étale covering $X' \rightarrow X_T$ is of *degree one*. This completes the proof of Claim 1.10.A, hence also of Proposition 1.10. \square

Corollary 1.11. *Let S, X be connected noetherian **normal** schemes and $X \rightarrow S$ a morphism of schemes that is **surjective, of finite type, separated, and generically geometrically irreducible**. Suppose that the function field of S is of **characteristic zero**. Suppose, moreover, that one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

- (1) *There exists an open subscheme $U \subseteq X$ of X such that the composite $U \hookrightarrow X \rightarrow S$ is **surjective and smooth**.*
- (2) *There exist a connected **normal** scheme Y and a **modification** $Y \rightarrow X$ [i.e., $Y \rightarrow X$ is **proper, surjective, and induces an isomorphism between the respective function fields**] such that the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ is **smooth**.*

*Then $\Delta_{X/S}$ is **topologically finitely generated**.*

Proof. Suppose that condition (1) (respectively, (2)) is satisfied. Then, to verify Corollary 1.11, it follows from Proposition 1.10, (ii), that it suffices to verify that the scheme U (respectively, Y) over X in condition (1) (respectively, (2)) satisfies the conditions imposed on “ Y ” in the statement of Proposition 1.10. On the other hand, this follows immediately from Lemma 1.2. This completes the proof of Corollary 1.11. \square

2. ÉTALE FUNDAMENTAL GROUPS OF HYPERBOLIC POLYCURVES

In the present §2, we discuss generalities on the étale fundamental groups of *hyperbolic polycurves*. In the present §2, let k be a field of *characteristic zero*, \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , and $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$.

Definition 2.1. Let S be a scheme and X a scheme over S .

(i) We shall say that X is a *hyperbolic curve [of type (g, r)]* over S if there exist

- a pair of nonnegative integers (g, r) ;
- a scheme X^{cpt} which is smooth, proper, geometrically connected, and of relative dimension one over S ;
- a [possibly empty] closed subscheme $D \subseteq X^{\text{cpt}}$ of X^{cpt} which is finite and étale over S

such that

- $2g - 2 + r > 0$;
- any geometric fiber of $X^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow S$ is [a necessarily smooth proper curve] of genus g ;
- the finite étale covering $D \hookrightarrow X^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow S$ is of degree r ;
- X is isomorphic to $X^{\text{cpt}} \setminus D$ over S .

(ii) We shall say that X is a *hyperbolic polycurve [of relative dimension n]* over S if there exist a positive integer n and a [not necessarily unique] factorization of the structure morphism $X \rightarrow S$

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_2 \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow S = X_0$$

such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $X_i \rightarrow X_{i-1}$ is a hyperbolic curve [cf. (i)]. We shall refer to the above morphism $X \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ as a *parametrizing morphism* for X and refer to the above factorization of $X \rightarrow S$ as a *sequence of parametrizing morphisms*.

Remark 2.1.1. In the notation of Definition 2.1, (ii), suppose that S is a *normal* (respectively, *smooth*) variety of dimension m over k . Then one verifies easily that any *hyperbolic polycurve of relative dimension n* over S is a *normal* (respectively, *smooth*) variety of dimension $n + m$ over k .

Definition 2.2. In the notation of Definition 2.1, (i), suppose that S is *normal*. Then it follows from the argument given in the discussion entitled “Curves” in [15], §0, that the pair “ (X^{cpt}, D) ” of Definition 2.1, (i), is uniquely determined up to canonical isomorphism over S . We shall refer to X^{cpt} as the *smooth compactification* of X over S and refer to D as the *divisor of cusps* of X over S .

Proposition 2.3. *Let n be a positive integer, S a connected noetherian separated **normal** scheme over k , X a **hyperbolic polycurve** of relative dimension n over S ,*

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_2 \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow S = X_0$$

a sequence of parametrizing morphisms, and $Y \rightarrow X$ a connected finite étale covering of X . For each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, write $Y_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/X_i)$. Then the following hold:

- (i) *For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, Y_i is a **hyperbolic curve** over Y_{i-1} . Moreover, if we write Y_i^{cpt} for the smooth compactification of the hyperbolic curve Y_i over Y_{i-1} [cf. Definition 2.2], then the composite $Y_i^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow Y_{i-1} \rightarrow X_{i-1}$ is **proper** and **smooth**. Furthermore, if we write $Y_i^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow Z_{i-1} \rightarrow X_{i-1}$ for the Stein factorization of the proper morphism $Y_i^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow X_{i-1}$, then Z_{i-1} is isomorphic to Y_{i-1} over X_{i-1} .*
- (ii) *For each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, the natural morphism $Y_i \rightarrow X_i$ is a connected **finite étale covering**.*

*In particular, Y is a **hyperbolic polycurve** of relative dimension n over $\text{Nor}(Y/S)$, and the factorization*

$$Y = Y_n \longrightarrow Y_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow Y_1 \longrightarrow \text{Nor}(Y/S) = Y_0$$

is a sequence of parametrizing morphisms.

Proof. First, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.3.A: If $n = 1$, then Proposition 2.3 holds.

Indeed, write X^{cpt} for the smooth compactification of X over S [cf. Definition 2.2]; $D \subseteq X^{\text{cpt}}$ for the divisor of cusps of X over S [cf. Definition 2.2]; $Y^{\text{cpt}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/X^{\text{cpt}})$; E for the *reduced* closed subscheme of Y^{cpt} whose support is the complement $Y^{\text{cpt}} \setminus Y$ [cf. [3], Corollaire (4.4.9)]; $T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/S)$. Let us observe that since S and X^{cpt} are *normal schemes over k* , and k is of *characteristic zero*, the natural morphisms $T \rightarrow S$ and $Y^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$ are *finite* [cf., e.g., [12], §33, Lemma 1], and, moreover, the base-change by a geometric generic point of S of the natural morphism $Y^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$ is a *tamely ramified covering* along [the base-change by the geometric generic point of S of] $D \subseteq X^{\text{cpt}}$. [Note that it follows immediately from the definition of the term “hyperbolic curve” that D is a *divisor with normal crossings of X^{cpt} relative to S* — cf. [24], Exposé XIII, §2.1.] In particular, it follows immediately from Abhyankar’s lemma [cf. [24], Exposé XIII, Proposition 5.5] that Y^{cpt} is *smooth* over S , and, moreover, that E is *étale* over S . Write $Y^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow Z \rightarrow S$ for the Stein factorization of $Y^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow S$. [Note that since Y^{cpt} is *finite* over X^{cpt} , and X^{cpt} is *proper* over S , Y^{cpt} is *proper* over S .] Then since [one verifies easily that] Z and T are *irreducible* and *normal*, and the resulting morphism $Z \rightarrow T$ is *finite* and induces

an isomorphism between the respective function fields, it follows from [3], Corollaire (4.4.9), that Z is isomorphic to T over S . On the other hand, since Y^{cpt} is *proper* and *smooth* over S , it follows from [24], Exposé X, Proposition 1.2, that Z , hence also T , is a *finite étale covering* of S . In particular, it follows from [6], Proposition (17.3.4), together with the fact that Y^{cpt} (respectively, E) is *smooth* (respectively, *étale*) over S , that Y^{cpt} (respectively, E) is *smooth* (respectively, *étale*) over T . Now one verifies easily that the pair $(Y^{\text{cpt}}, E \subseteq Y^{\text{cpt}})$ satisfies the conditions listed in Definition 2.1, (i), for “ $(X^{\text{cpt}}, D \subseteq X^{\text{cpt}})$ ”. This completes the proof of Claim 2.3.A.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.3.B: For a fixed $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if assertion (i) holds in the case where we take “ i ” to be i_0 , then assertion (ii) holds in the case where we take “ i ” to be $i_0 - 1$.

Indeed, it follows from assertion (i) in the case where we take “ i ” to be i_0 that, to verify assertion (ii) in the case where we take “ i ” to be $i_0 - 1$, it suffices to verify that $Z_{i_0-1} \rightarrow X_{i_0-1}$ is a *finite étale covering*. On the other hand, since the composite $Y_{i_0}^{\text{cpt}} \rightarrow Y_{i_0-1} \rightarrow X_{i_0-1}$ is *proper* and *smooth* [cf. assertion (i) in the case where we take “ i ” to be i_0], this follows from [24], Exposé X, Proposition 1.2. This completes the proof of Claim 2.3.B.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.3.C: For a fixed $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if assertion (ii) holds in the case where we take “ i ” to be i_0 , then assertion (i) holds in the case where we take “ i ” to be i_0 .

Indeed, by applying Claim 2.3.A to the connected *finite étale covering* $Y_{i_0} \rightarrow X_{i_0}$ [cf. assertion (ii) in the case where we take “ i ” to be i_0] of the hyperbolic curve X_{i_0} over X_{i_0-1} , we conclude that assertion (i) in the case where we take “ i ” to be i_0 holds. This completes the proof of Claim 2.3.C.

Now let us observe that assertion (ii) in the case where we take “ i ” to be n is immediate. Thus, Proposition 2.3 follows immediately from Claims 2.3.B and 2.3.C. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.3. \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let $0 \leq m < n$ be integers, S a connected noetherian separated **normal** scheme over k , X a **hyperbolic polycurve** of relative dimension n over S , and*

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_2 \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow S = X_0$$

a sequence of parametrizing morphisms. Then the following hold:

- (i) For any geometric point $\bar{x}_m \rightarrow X_m$ of X_m , the sequence of connected schemes $X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X \rightarrow X_m$ determines an **exact** sequence of profinite groups

$$1 \longrightarrow \Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \longrightarrow \Pi_X \longrightarrow \Pi_{X_m} \longrightarrow 1.$$

In particular, we obtain an **isomorphism** $\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{X/X_m}$ [which is well-defined up to Π_X -conjugation].

- (ii) Let T be a connected noetherian separated **normal** scheme over S and $T \rightarrow X_m$ a morphism over S . Then the natural morphisms $X \times_{X_m} T \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X$ and $X \times_{X_m} T \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} T$ determine an **outer isomorphism**

$$\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} T} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_X \times_{\Pi_{X_m}} \Pi_T$$

and an **isomorphism**

$$\Delta_{X \times_{X_m} T/T} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{X/X_m}$$

[which is well-defined up to Π_X -conjugation].

- (iii) Δ_{X/X_m} is **nontrivial, topologically finitely generated, slim** [i.e., every open subgroup of Δ_{X/X_m} is **center-free**], and **torsion-free**. In particular, Δ_{X/X_m} is **infinite**.
- (iv) Δ_{X_{m+1}/X_m} is **elastic** [cf. [18], Definition 1.1, (ii)], i.e., the following holds: Let $N \subseteq \Delta_{X_{m+1}/X_m}$ be a **topologically finitely generated closed subgroup** of Δ_{X_{m+1}/X_m} that is **normal** in an open subgroup of Δ_{X_{m+1}/X_m} . Then N is **non-trivial** if and only if N is **open** in Δ_{X_{m+1}/X_m} .
- (v) Suppose that the hyperbolic curve X_{m+1} over X_m is of type (g, r) [cf. Definition 2.1, (i)]. Then the abelianization of Δ_{X_{m+1}/X_m} is a **free $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ -module of rank $2g + \max\{r - 1, 0\}$** ; Δ_{X_{m+1}/X_m} is a **free profinite group** if and only if $r \neq 0$.
- (vi) For any positive integer N , there exists an open subgroup $H \subseteq \Delta_{X_{m+1}/X_m}$ of Δ_{X_{m+1}/X_m} such that the abelianization of H is [a free $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ -module] of **rank $\geq N$** .

Proof. First, we verify assertion (i). Let us observe that it follows immediately from Lemma 1.6; Proposition 2.3, (i), together with the various definitions involved, that $(X_m, X, X, \bar{x}_m \rightarrow X_m)$ satisfies the four conditions (1), (2), (3), and (4) [for “ $(S, X, Y, \bar{s} \rightarrow S)$ ”] in the statement of Proposition 1.10. Thus, It follows immediately from Proposition 1.10, (i), that the sequence of profinite groups

$$\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \longrightarrow \Pi_X \longrightarrow \Pi_{X_m} \longrightarrow 1$$

is *exact*. Thus, to verify assertion (i), it suffices to verify that $\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *injective*. Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.4.A: If $n = 1$ [so $m = 0$], i.e., X is a *hyperbolic curve* over S , and the finite étale covering of S determined by the divisor of cusps of the hyperbolic curve X over S [cf. Definition 2.2] is *trivial*, then $\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *injective*.

Indeed, write (g, r) for the *type* of the hyperbolic curve X over S ; $\mathcal{M}_{g,r}$, $\mathcal{M}_{g,r+1}$ for the moduli stacks over k of ordered r -, $(r + 1)$ -pointed smooth proper curves of genus g , respectively; $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}_{g,r}}$, $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}_{g,r+1}}$ for the étale fundamental groups of $\mathcal{M}_{g,r}$, $\mathcal{M}_{g,r+1}$, respectively. Then since [we have assumed that] the finite étale covering of S determined by the divisor of cusps of the hyperbolic curve X over S is *trivial*, it follows immediately from the various definitions involved that there exists a morphism of stacks $s_X: S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{g,r}$ over k such that the fiber product of s_X and the morphism of stacks $\mathcal{M}_{g,r+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{g,r}$ over k obtained by forgetting the last marked point is isomorphic to X over S . Thus, we have a commutative diagram of profinite groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Pi_{X \times_S \bar{x}_0} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_X & \longrightarrow & \Pi_S & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ \wr \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_{g,r+1} \times \mathcal{M}_{g,r} \bar{x}_0} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_{g,r+1}} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{\mathcal{M}_{g,r}} \longrightarrow 1 \end{array}$$

— where the right-hand vertical arrow is the outer homomorphism induced by s_X , the left-hand vertical arrow is an *isomorphism*, and the horizontal sequences are *exact* [cf., e.g., [11], Lemma 2.1; the discussion preceding Claim 2.4.A]. In particular, it follows that $\Pi_{X \times_S \bar{x}_0} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *injective*. This completes the proof of Claim 2.4.A.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.4.B: If $n = 1$ [so $m = 0$], then $\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *injective*.

Indeed, since the divisor of cusps of X over S is a *finite étale covering* of S , there exists a connected finite étale covering $S' \rightarrow S$ of S such that the finite étale covering of S' determined by the divisor of cusps of the hyperbolic curve $X \times_S S'$ over S' is *trivial*. Thus, we have a commutative diagram of profinite groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{X \times_S \bar{x}_0} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{X \times_S S'} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{S'} \longrightarrow 1 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \Pi_{X \times_S \bar{x}_0} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_X & \longrightarrow & \Pi_S \longrightarrow 1 \end{array}$$

— where the vertical arrows are outer *open injections*, and the horizontal sequences are *exact* [cf. Claim 2.4.A; the discussion preceding Claim 2.4.A]. In particular, it follows that $\Pi_{X \times_S \bar{x}_0} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *injective*. This completes the proof of Claim 2.4.B.

Now, we verify the *injectivity* of $\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ by induction on $n - m$. If $n - m = 1$, then the *injectivity* of $\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ follows immediately from Claim 2.4.B. Suppose that $n - m \geq 2$, and that the *induction hypothesis* is in force. Let $\bar{x}_{n-1} \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ be a geometric point of X_{n-1} that lifts the geometric point $\bar{x}_m \rightarrow X_m$. Then it follows immediately from various definitions involved that we have a commutative diagram of profinite groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & & & 1 \\
 & & & & & & \downarrow \\
 1 & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{X \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{x}_{n-1}} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{X_{n-1} \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 1 & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{X \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{x}_{n-1}} & \longrightarrow & \Pi_X & \longrightarrow & \Pi_{X_{n-1}} ;
 \end{array}$$

moreover, since X , $X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m$, X_{n-1} are *hyperbolic polycurves* over X_{n-1} , $X_{n-1} \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m$, X_m of *relative dimension* 1, 1, $n - m - 1$, respectively, it follows immediately from the *induction hypothesis* that the two horizontal sequences and the right-hand vertical sequence of the above diagram are *exact*. Thus, one verifies easily that the homomorphism $\Pi_{X \times_{X_m} \bar{x}_m} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *injective*. This completes the proof of assertion (i). Assertion (ii) follows immediately from assertion (i), together with the ‘‘Five lemma’’. Next, we verify assertion (iii). Let us observe that it follows from assertion (i) that, to verify assertion (iii), we may assume without loss of generality that $m = n - 1$. On the other hand, if $m = n - 1$, i.e., X is a hyperbolic curve over X_m , assertion (iii) is well-known [cf., e.g., [23], Proposition 1.1, (i); [23], Proposition 1.6; [19], Proposition 1.4]. This completes the proof of assertion (iii). Assertion (iv) follows from [19], Theorem 1.5. Assertion (v) is well-known [cf., e.g., the statement of, as well as the discussion immediately preceding, [23], Corollary 1.2]. Assertion (vi) follows immediately from Hurwitz’s formula [cf., e.g., [9], Chapter IV, Corollary 2.4], together with assertions (iii), (v). This completes the proof of Proposition 2.4. \square

Definition 2.5 (cf. [10], §4.5). Let X be a variety over k . Then we shall say that X is of *LFG-type* [where the ‘‘LFG’’ stands for ‘‘large fundamental group’’] if, for any normal variety Y over \bar{k} and any morphism $Y \rightarrow X \times_k \bar{k}$ over \bar{k} that is not constant, the image of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_{X \times_k \bar{k}}$ is infinite. Note that one verifies easily that the issue of whether or not X satisfies this condition does *not depend* on the choice of ‘‘ \bar{k} ’’ [cf. also Lemma 1.5].

Remark 2.5.1. In the situation of Definition 2.5, suppose further that k' is a field extension of k , and that \bar{k}' is an algebraic closure

of k' . Then it follows immediately, by considering hyperplane sections [cf., e.g., the proof of [18], Proposition 2.2], that Y may, in fact, be taken to be a *hyperbolic curve*, in which case it is well-known [cf., e.g., [16], Proposition 2.3, (ii)], that Π_Y is naturally isomorphic to $\Pi_{Y \times_{\bar{k}} k'}$. In particular, one verifies easily, by considering models of the various objects involved over finitely generated k -subalgebras of k' , that X is of *LFG-type* if and only if $X \times_k k'$ is of *LFG-type*.

Lemma 2.6. *Let X, Y be varieties over k . Suppose that X is of **LFG-type**. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *Suppose that there exists a **quasi-finite** morphism $Y \rightarrow X$. Then Y is of **LFG-type**.*
- (ii) *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism over k . Suppose that the kernel Δ_f is **finite**. Then f is **quasi-finite**. If, moreover, f is **surjective**, then Y is of **LFG-type**.*

Proof. First, let us observe that, it follows from Lemma 1.5, together with the various definitions involved, that, by replacing k by \bar{k} , to verify Lemma 2.6, we may assume without loss of generality that $k = \bar{k}$. Now we verify assertion (i). Let Z be a normal variety over k and $Z \rightarrow Y$ a *nonconstant* morphism over k . Then since Y is *quasi-finite* over X , it follows that the composite $Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X$ is *nonconstant*. In particular, since X is of *LFG-type*, the image of the composite $\Pi_Z \rightarrow \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$, hence also $\Pi_Z \rightarrow \Pi_Y$, is *infinite*. This completes the proof of assertion (i).

Next, we verify assertion (ii). Let $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ be a k -valued geometric point of Y and F a connected component [which is necessarily a *normal variety* over k] of the normalization of the geometric fiber of $X \rightarrow Y$ at \bar{y} . Then one verifies easily that the outer homomorphism $\Pi_F \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by the natural morphism $F \rightarrow X$ over k factors through $\Delta_f \subseteq \Pi_X$; in particular, since Δ_f is *finite*, the image of $\Pi_F \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *finite*. Thus, since X is of *LFG-type*, one verifies easily that F is *finite* over k . This completes the proof of the fact that f is *quasi-finite*.

Finally, to verify that if, moreover, f is *surjective*, then Y is of *LFG-type*, let Z be a normal variety over k and $Z \rightarrow Y$ a *nonconstant* morphism over k . Then since f is a *quasi-finite surjection*, and $Z \rightarrow Y$ is *nonconstant*, one verifies easily that there exists a connected component C [which is necessarily a *normal variety* over k] of the normalization of $Z \times_Y X$ such that the natural morphism $C \rightarrow X$ over k is *nonconstant*. Thus, since X is of *LFG-type*, the image of $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_X$, hence also $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ [cf. the *finiteness* of Δ_f], is *infinite*. In particular, since the composite

$C \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$ factors through $Z \rightarrow Y$, we conclude that the image of $\Pi_Z \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ is *infinite*. This completes the proof of assertion (ii). \square

Proposition 2.7. *Let S be a normal variety over k which is either equal to $\text{Spec } k$ or of LFG-type. Then every hyperbolic polycurve over S is of LFG-type.*

Proof. First, let us observe that it follows from Lemma 1.5, together with the various definitions involved, that, by replacing k by \bar{k} , to verify Proposition 2.7, we may assume without loss of generality that $k = \bar{k}$. Let X be a hyperbolic polycurve of relative dimension n over S . Then it follows immediately from *induction on n* that, to verify Proposition 2.7, we may assume without loss of generality that $n = 1$. Let Y be a normal variety over k and $Y \rightarrow X$ a *nonconstant* morphism over k .

Now suppose that the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ is *nonconstant*, which thus implies that $S \neq \text{Spec } k$. Then it follows from our assumption that S is of *LFG-type* that the image of the composite $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_S$, hence also $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$, is *infinite*. This completes the proof of the *infiniteness* of the image of $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ in the case where the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ is *nonconstant*.

Next, suppose that the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ is *constant*. Write $\bar{s} \rightarrow S$ for the k -valued geometric point of S through which the *constant* morphism $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ factors [cf. the fact that Y is a *normal variety over k*]. Then it is immediate that the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ determines a *nonconstant*, hence *dominant*, morphism $Y \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{s}$ over k . Thus, since $\Pi_{X \times_S \bar{s}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{X/S}$ [cf. Proposition 2.4, (i)] is *infinite* [cf. Proposition 2.4, (iii)], it follows immediately from Lemma 1.3 that the image of $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_{X \times_S \bar{s}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{X/S} \hookrightarrow \Pi_X$ is *infinite*. This completes the proof of the *infiniteness* of the image of $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ in the case where the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow S$ is *constant*, hence also of Proposition 2.7. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let S be a connected noetherian separated normal scheme over k , X a hyperbolic curve over S , R a strictly henselian discrete valuation ring over S , K the field of fractions of R , and $\text{Spec } K \rightarrow X$ a morphism over S . Then it holds that the morphism $\text{Spec } K \rightarrow X$ factors through the open immersion $\text{Spec } K \hookrightarrow \text{Spec } R$ if and only if the image of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_{\text{Spec } K} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by the morphism $\text{Spec } K \rightarrow X$ is **trivial**.*

Proof. First, let us recall [cf., e.g., [6], Théorème (18.5.11)] that $\Pi_{\text{Spec } R} = \{1\}$. Thus, *necessity* is immediate; moreover, it follows immediately from Proposition 2.4, (ii), that, by replacing S by $\text{Spec } R$, to verify *sufficiency*, we may assume without loss of generality that $S = \text{Spec } R$. Moreover, one verifies immediately that

we may assume without loss of generality that R is *complete*, and that the given morphism $\mathrm{Spec} K \rightarrow X$ does *not factor* through $S = \mathrm{Spec} R$. Next, let us observe that, by considering the exact sequence (1-5) of [23] with respect to a suitable connected finite étale covering of X and applying Abhyankar's Lemma [cf. [24], Exposé XIII, Proposition 5.5], one verifies easily that, for each cusp c of the hyperbolic curve X over R , if we write X^{cpt} for the *smooth compactification* of X over S [cf. Definition 2.2] and X_c for the fiber product of X over X^{cpt} with the spectrum of the ring obtained by completing X^{cpt} along c , then the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_{X_c} \rightarrow \Pi_X = \Delta_{X/S}$ is *injective*. On the other hand, since R is complete, and the given morphism $\mathrm{Spec} K \rightarrow X$ does *not factor* through $S = \mathrm{Spec} R$, it follows immediately from the *valuative criterion of properness* applied to the morphism $X^{\mathrm{cpt}} \rightarrow S$ that the given morphism $\mathrm{Spec} K \rightarrow X$ *factors* through the natural morphism $X_c \rightarrow X$ associated to a suitable cusp c of X . Thus, if the image of the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_{\mathrm{Spec} K} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *trivial*, then it follows that the image of the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_{\mathrm{Spec} K} \rightarrow \Pi_{X_c}$ is *trivial*; but this contradicts the easily verified fact that *no nonzero element* of the maximal ideal of R is *divisible* in K^\times . This completes the proof of Lemma 2.8. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let S, Y, Z be **normal varieties** over k ; $Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow S$ morphisms over k ; X a **hyperbolic polycurve** over S ; $f: Z \rightarrow X$ a morphism over S . Thus, we have a commutative diagram as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & S. \end{array}$$

Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $Z \rightarrow Y$ is **dominant and generically geometrically irreducible**. [Thus, it follows from Lemma 1.6 that the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_Z \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ is **surjective**.]
- (2) $\Delta_{Z/Y} \subseteq \Delta_{Z/X}$. [Thus, it follows from the **surjectivity** of $\Pi_Z \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ — cf. (1) — that the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_Z \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by f determines an outer homomorphism $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$.]

*Then the morphism $f: Z \rightarrow X$ admits a **unique factorization** $Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X$.*

Proof. First, let us observe that, by *induction on the relative dimension* of X over S , to verify Lemma 2.9, we may assume without loss of generality that X is a *hyperbolic curve* over S . Also,

we observe that the asserted *uniqueness* of the factorization under consideration follows immediately from the fact that the morphism $Z \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant* [cf. condition (1)]. Write $\Gamma_0 \subseteq X \times_S Y$ for the scheme-theoretic image of the natural morphism $Z \rightarrow X \times_S Y$ over S and $\Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Z/\Gamma_0)$. [Note that one verifies easily that Γ_0 is an *integral variety* over k , and that the natural morphism $Z \rightarrow \Gamma_0$ is *dominant*.] Now let us observe that it follows from Lemma 1.9 that Γ is a *normal variety* over k , the resulting morphism $Z \rightarrow \Gamma$ is *dominant* and *generically geometrically irreducible*, and the natural morphism $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_0$ is *finite* and *surjective*.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.A: Let $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ be a geometric point of Y . Then the image of the morphism $Z \times_Y \bar{y} \rightarrow X \times_k \bar{y}$ determined by f consists of *finitely many closed points* of $X \times_k \bar{y}$.

Indeed, let $F \rightarrow Z \times_Y \bar{y}$ be a connected component [which is necessarily a *normal variety* over \bar{y}] of the normalization of $Z \times_Y \bar{y}$. Then it follows immediately from condition (2) that the image of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_F \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by the composite of natural morphisms $F \rightarrow Z \times_Y \bar{y} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} Z \rightarrow X$ is *trivial*. On the other hand, it is immediate that the composite of natural morphisms $F \rightarrow Z \times_Y \bar{y} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} Z \rightarrow X$ *factors* through the projection $X \times_S \bar{y} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X$. Thus, since the outer homomorphism $\Pi_{X \times_S \bar{y}} \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by the projection $X \times_S \bar{y} \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X$ is *injective* [cf. Proposition 2.4, (i)], it follows that the image of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_F \rightarrow \Pi_{X \times_S \bar{y}}$ induced by the morphism $F \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{y}$ is *trivial*. In particular, since $X \times_S \bar{y}$ is a *hyperbolic curve* over \bar{y} , hence of *LF G -type* [cf. Proposition 2.7], and the morphism $F \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{y}$ is a *morphism between varieties* over \bar{y} , one verifies easily that the image of the morphism $F \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{y}$ consists of a *closed point* of $X \times_S \bar{y}$. Thus, since the morphism $Z \times_Y \bar{y} \rightarrow X \times_k \bar{y}$ in question *factors* through $Z \times_S \bar{y} \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{y}$, we conclude that Claim 2.9.A holds. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.A.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.B: The composite $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} Y$, hence also the composite $\Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} Y$, is *dominant* and induces an *isomorphism* between the respective function fields.

Indeed, since $Z \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant* and *generically geometrically irreducible* [cf. condition (1)] and *factors* through the composite in question $\Gamma \rightarrow Y$, one verifies easily from [4], Proposition (4.5.9), that the composite in question $\Gamma \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant* and *generically geometrically irreducible*. Thus, one verifies easily that, to

verify Claim 2.9.B, it suffices to verify that $\Gamma \rightarrow Y$ is *generically quasi-finite*. To verify that $\Gamma \rightarrow Y$ is *generically quasi-finite*, let $\bar{\eta}_Y \rightarrow Y$ be a geometric point of Y whose image is the generic point of Y . Then since [one verifies easily that] the operation of forming the scheme-theoretic image commutes with base-change by a flat morphism, $\Gamma_0 \times_Y \bar{\eta}_Y$ is naturally isomorphic to the scheme-theoretic image of the natural morphism $Z \times_Y \bar{\eta}_Y \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{\eta}_Y$. On the other hand, since the natural morphism $X \times_S \bar{\eta}_Y \rightarrow X \times_k \bar{\eta}_Y$ is a *closed immersion*, it follows immediately from Claim 2.9.A that the image of the natural morphism $Z \times_Y \bar{\eta}_Y \rightarrow X \times_S \bar{\eta}_Y$ consists of *finitely many closed points* of $X \times_S \bar{\eta}_Y$. Thus, we conclude that the composite $\Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} Y$, hence [by the finiteness of $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_0$ — cf. the discussion preceding Claim 2.9.A] also the composite $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} Y$, is *generically quasi-finite*. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.B.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.C: $\Delta_{\Gamma/Y} \subseteq \Delta_{\Gamma/X}$.

Indeed, let us observe that since the morphism $Z \rightarrow \Gamma$ is *dominant* and *generically geometrically irreducible* with *normal* codomain [cf. the discussion preceding Claim 2.9.A], it follows immediately from Lemma 1.6 that the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_Z \rightarrow \Pi_\Gamma$ is *surjective*. Thus, one verify easily from condition (2) that Claim 2.9.C holds. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.C.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.D: Let $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ be a geometric point of Y . Then the image of the morphism $\Gamma \times_Y \bar{y} \rightarrow X \times_k \bar{y}$ determined by the composite $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_1} X$ consists of *finitely many closed points* of $X \times_k \bar{y}$.

Indeed, this follows immediately from Claim 2.9.C, together with a similar argument to the argument used in the proof of Claim 2.9.A. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.D.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.E: The composite $\Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} Y$ is an *open immersion*.

Indeed, let $\bar{y} \rightarrow Y$ be a geometric point of Y . Then let us first observe that it follows immediately from Claim 2.9.D that the image of the composite $\Gamma \times_Y \bar{y} \rightarrow \Gamma_0 \times_Y \bar{y} \hookrightarrow X \times_S \bar{y}$ consists of *finitely many closed points* of $X \times_S \bar{y}$. Thus, since $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_0$ is *surjective* [cf. the discussion preceding Claim 2.9.A], and the morphism $\Gamma_0 \times_Y \bar{y} \hookrightarrow X \times_S \bar{y}$ is a *closed immersion*, we conclude that $\Gamma_0 \times_Y \bar{y}$ is *quasi-finite* over \bar{y} . In particular, the composite $\Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} Y$ is *quasi-finite*. Thus, it follows immediately from Claim 2.9.B, together with [3], Corollaire (4.4.9), that the

composite $\Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{Pr}_2} Y$ is an *open immersion*. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.E.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.F: If X is *proper* over S , then $f: Z \rightarrow X$ factors through $Z \rightarrow Y$.

Indeed, if X is *proper* over S , then one verifies easily that the composite $\Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{Pr}_2} Y$ is *proper*. Thus, it follows immediately from Claim 2.9.E that $\Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow X \times_S Y \xrightarrow{\text{Pr}_2} Y$ is an *isomorphism*. In particular, we conclude that $f: Z \rightarrow X$ factors through $Z \rightarrow Y$. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.F.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.G: If the genus [i.e., the integer “ g ” in Definition 2.1, (i)] of the hyperbolic curve X over S is ≥ 2 , then f factors through $Z \rightarrow Y$.

Indeed, write X^{cpt} for the smooth compactification of the hyperbolic curve X over S [cf. Definition 2.2]. Then since [one verifies easily that] X^{cpt} is a *proper hyperbolic curve* over S , by applying Claim 2.9.F [where we take the data “ (S, Y, Z, X) ” to be $(S, Y, Z, X^{\text{cpt}})$], we conclude that the morphism $Z \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$ over S factors as a composite $Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$. Thus, to verify Claim 2.9.G, it suffices to verify that this morphism $Y \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$ factors through $X \subseteq X^{\text{cpt}}$. Note that since $Z \rightarrow Y$ is *dominant* by condition (1), it follows immediately that the morphism $Y \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$ maps some dense open subscheme of Y into X ; thus, by considering a suitable discrete valuation of the function field of Y [cf. [2], Proposition (7.1.7)], one verifies easily that, to verify that the morphism $Y \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$ maps Y into $X \subseteq X^{\text{cpt}}$, it suffices to verify that, for any strictly henselian discrete valuation ring R and any dominant morphism $\text{Spec } R \rightarrow Y$, it holds that the composite $\text{Spec } R \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X^{\text{cpt}}$ factors through $X \subseteq X^{\text{cpt}}$. On the other hand, since the composite $\eta_R \rightarrow \text{Spec } R \rightarrow Y$, where we write η_R for the spectrum of the quotient field of R , factors as a composite $\eta_R \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow Y$ [cf. Claim 2.9.B], this follows immediately from Claim 2.9.C, together with Lemma 2.8. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.G.

Finally, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 2.9.H: f factors through $Z \rightarrow Y$.

Indeed, one verifies easily that there exists a connected finite étale Galois covering $X' \rightarrow X$ of X such that the genus [i.e., the integer “ g ” in Definition 2.1, (i)] of the hyperbolic curve X' over $S' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(X'/S)$ [cf. Proposition 2.3] is ≥ 2 . Write $Y' \rightarrow Y$ for the connected finite étale Galois covering of Y corresponding to

$X' \rightarrow X$ [relative to the outer homomorphism $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ — cf. condition (2)]; $Z' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z \times_Y Y' \rightarrow Z$ for the connected [cf. condition (1)] finite étale Galois covering of Z corresponding to $Y' \rightarrow Y$. Then, by applying Claim 2.9.G [where we take the data “ (S, Y, Z, X) ” to be (S', Y', Z', X')], we conclude that the natural morphism $Z' \rightarrow X'$ over S' factors as a composite $Z' \rightarrow Y' \rightarrow X'$; in particular, the natural morphism $Z' \rightarrow X$ over S factors *uniquely* as a composite $Z' \rightarrow Y' \rightarrow X$, which, moreover, is, in light of this *uniqueness*, *compatible* with the natural actions of $\text{Gal}(Z'/Z) \simeq \text{Gal}(Y'/Y)$. This compatibility with Galois actions thus implies that we obtain a factorization $Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X$ as desired. This completes the proof of Claim 2.9.H, hence also of Lemma 2.9. \square

Lemma 2.10. *Let S, Y be normal varieties over k ; $Y \rightarrow S$ a morphism; X a hyperbolic polycurve over S ; $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ a homomorphism. Write $\eta \rightarrow Y$ for the generic point of Y . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The homomorphism ϕ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over S .*
- (2) *There exists a morphism $\eta \rightarrow X$ over S such that the outer homomorphism $\Pi_\eta \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by this morphism $\eta \rightarrow X$ coincides with the composite of the outer surjection [cf. Lemma 1.2] $\Pi_\eta \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by $\eta \rightarrow Y$ and the outer homomorphism determined by ϕ .*

Proof. The implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) is immediate; thus, it remains to verify the implication (2) \Rightarrow (1). Suppose that condition (2) is satisfied. Then it follows immediately that there exists a nonempty open subscheme $U \subseteq Y$ of Y such that the morphism $\eta \rightarrow X$ in condition (2) *extends* to a morphism $U \rightarrow X$ over S . Moreover, it follows immediately from Lemma 1.2 that the outer homomorphism $\Pi_U \rightarrow \Pi_X$ induced by this morphism $U \rightarrow X$ coincides with the composite of the outer surjection [cf. Lemma 1.2] $\Pi_U \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by the natural open immersion $U \hookrightarrow Y$ and the outer homomorphism determined by ϕ . Thus, in light of Lemma 1.2, we may apply Lemma 2.9 [where we take the data “ (S, Y, Z, X) ” in the statement of Lemma 2.9 to be (S, Y, U, X)] to conclude that condition (1) is satisfied. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.10. \square

Lemma 2.11. *Let X be a hyperbolic curve over k , Y a normal variety over k , and $f: Y \rightarrow X$ a morphism over k . Write $\phi_f: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ for the outer homomorphism induced by f . Consider the following conditions:*

- (1) *f is surjective, smooth, and generically geometrically connected.*

- (2) ϕ_f is **surjective**, and the kernel Δ_f of ϕ_f is **topologically finitely generated**.
- (3) f is **surjective and generically geometrically connected**.
- (4) Let C be a **hyperbolic curve** over k and $C \rightarrow X$ a morphism over k . Then if f factors through $C \rightarrow X$, then $C \rightarrow X$ is an **isomorphism**.

Then we have implications and an equivalence:

$$(1) \implies (2) \implies (3) \iff (4).$$

Proof. The implication $(1) \implies (2)$ follows immediately from Lemma 1.6 and Corollary 1.11. Next, we verify the implication $(2) \implies (4)$. Suppose that condition (2) is satisfied. First, let us observe that it follows immediately from Lemma 1.5 that, by replacing k by \bar{k} , to verify that condition (4) is satisfied, we may assume without loss of generality that $k = \bar{k}$. Let C be a hyperbolic curve over k and $C \rightarrow X$ a morphism over k . Suppose that f admits a factorization $Y \rightarrow C \rightarrow X$. Note that since X and C are *hyperbolic curves*, the surjectivity of ϕ_f implies, in light of Proposition 2.4, (iii), that f , hence also the morphism $Y \rightarrow C$, are *dominant*. In particular, we conclude from Lemma 1.3 that the induced outer homomorphism $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_C$ is *open*. Now since ϕ_f is *surjective*, it follows formally that the induced outer homomorphism $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *surjective*. On the other hand, since the kernel of ϕ_f is *topologically finitely generated*, it follows from the openness of $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_C$ that the kernel of $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_X$ [admits an open subgroup which is topologically finitely generated, hence] is *topologically finitely generated*. Thus, it follows immediately from Proposition 2.4, (iii), (iv), that $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is an *outer isomorphism*. In particular, it follows immediately from Proposition 2.4, (v), together with Hurwitz's formula [cf., e.g., [9], Chapter IV, Corollary 2.4], that $C \rightarrow X$ is an *isomorphism*. This completes the proof of the implication $(2) \implies (4)$.

Next, we verify the implication $(3) \implies (4)$. Suppose that condition (3) is satisfied. Let C be a hyperbolic curve over k and $C \rightarrow X$ a morphism over k . Suppose that f factors through $C \rightarrow X$. Then since f is *surjective*, $C \rightarrow X$ is *surjective*, hence *quasi-finite*. On the other hand, since f is *generically geometrically connected*, and k is of *characteristic zero*, one verifies easily that $C \rightarrow X$ induces an *isomorphism between the respective function fields*. Thus, since X and C are *irreducible and normal*, it follows from [3], Corollaire (4.4.9), that $C \rightarrow X$ is an *isomorphism*. This completes the proof of the implication $(3) \implies (4)$.

Finally, we verify the implication $(4) \implies (3)$. Suppose that condition (3) is *not satisfied*. If f is *not surjective*, then one verifies

easily that f factors through the natural open immersion from a suitable nonempty open subscheme of X which is $\neq X$. [Note that one verifies easily that every nonempty open subscheme of a hyperbolic curve over k is a *hyperbolic curve over k* .] Thus, condition (4) is *not satisfied*. On the other hand, if f is *surjective but not generically geometrically connected*, then the morphism $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/X) \rightarrow X$ over k is *not an isomorphism*; moreover, f factors through this morphism $C \rightarrow X$ [cf. Lemma 1.9]. Since [one verifies easily that] C is a *hyperbolic curve over k* , we conclude that condition (4) is *not satisfied*. This completes the proof of the implication (4) \Rightarrow (3), hence also of Lemma 2.11. \square

Lemma 2.12. *In the notation of Lemma 2.11, suppose, moreover, that Y is of **LFG-type**. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *The following conditions are equivalent:*
 - (i-1) f is a **finite étale covering**.
 - (i-2) ϕ_f is an **outer open injection**.
 - (i-3) ϕ_f is **open**, and, moreover, the kernel Δ_f of ϕ_f is **finite**.
- (ii) *The following conditions are equivalent:*
 - (ii-1) f is an **isomorphism**
 - (ii-2) ϕ_f is an **outer isomorphism**.
 - (ii-3) ϕ_f is **surjective**, and, moreover, the kernel Δ_f of ϕ_f is **finite**.

Proof. First, we verify assertion (ii). The implications (ii-1) \Rightarrow (ii-2) \Rightarrow (ii-3) are immediate; thus, it remains to verify the implication (ii-3) \Rightarrow (ii-1). To verify this implication, suppose that condition (ii-3) is satisfied. Then it follows from the implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) of Lemma 2.11 that f is *surjective and generically geometrically connected*. On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 2.6, (ii), that f is *quasi-finite*. Thus, it follows from [3], Corollaire (4.4.9), that f is an *isomorphism*. This completes the proof of the implication (ii-3) \Rightarrow (ii-1), hence also of assertion (ii).

Finally, we verify assertion (i). The implications (i-1) \Rightarrow (i-2) \Rightarrow (i-3) are immediate; thus, it remains to verify the implication (i-3) \Rightarrow (i-1). To verify this implication, suppose that condition (i-3) is satisfied. Then, by replacing X by a connected finite étale covering of X corresponding to the image of [an open homomorphism that lifts] ϕ_f , we may assume without loss of generality that ϕ_f is *surjective*. Thus, the implication (i-3) \Rightarrow (i-1) follows from the implication (ii-3) \Rightarrow (ii-1) of assertion (ii). This completes the proof of assertion (i). \square

Lemma 2.13. *In the notation of Lemma 2.11, suppose, moreover, that Y is a **hyperbolic curve over k** . Then the following hold:*

(i) *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i-1) f is a **finite étale covering**.

(i-2) ϕ_f is an **outer open injection**.

(i-3) ϕ_f is **open**, and, moreover, the kernel Δ_f of ϕ_f is **topologically finitely generated**.

(ii) *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(ii-1) f is an **isomorphism**

(ii-2) ϕ_f is an **outer isomorphism**.

(ii-3) ϕ_f is **surjective**, and, moreover, the kernel Δ_f of ϕ_f is **topologically finitely generated**.

Proof. First, we verify assertion (ii). The implications (ii-1) \Rightarrow (ii-2) \Rightarrow (ii-3) are immediate; thus, it remains to verify the implication (ii-3) \Rightarrow (ii-1). To verify this implication, suppose that condition (ii-3) is satisfied. Now let us observe that it follows immediately from Lemma 1.5 that, by replacing k by \bar{k} , to verify that condition (ii-1) is satisfied, we may assume without loss of generality that $k = \bar{k}$. Then it follows from Proposition 2.4, (iii), together with the *surjectivity* of ϕ_f , that the image of ϕ_f is *infinite*, i.e., Δ_f is *not open* in Π_Y . Thus, since Y is a *hyperbolic curve* over k , and Δ_f is *topologically finitely generated*, it follows from Proposition 2.4, (iv), that ϕ_f is *injective*. In particular, it follows from the implication (ii-2) \Rightarrow (ii-1) of Lemma 2.12, together with Proposition 2.7, that f is an *isomorphism*. [Alternatively, one may reason as in the final portion of the proof of the implication (2) \Rightarrow (4) of Lemma 2.11, i.e., by applying Proposition 2.4, (v), and Hurwitz's formula.] This completes the proof of the implication (ii-3) \Rightarrow (ii-1), hence also of assertion (ii).

Finally, we verify assertion (i). The implications (i-1) \Rightarrow (i-2) \Rightarrow (i-3) are immediate; thus, it remains to verify the implication (i-3) \Rightarrow (i-1). To verify this implication, suppose that condition (i-3) is satisfied. Then, by replacing X by a connected finite étale covering of X corresponding to the image of [an open homomorphism that lifts] ϕ_f , we may assume without loss of generality that ϕ_f is *surjective*. Thus, the implication (i-3) \Rightarrow (i-1) follows from the implication (ii-3) \Rightarrow (ii-1) of assertion (ii). This completes the proof of the implication (i-3) \Rightarrow (i-1), hence also of assertion (i). \square

Lemma 2.14. *Suppose that $k = \bar{k}$. Let n be a positive integer, X a **hyperbolic polycurve** over k , F a **normal variety** over k of **dimension** $\geq n$, and $F \rightarrow X$ a **quasi-finite morphism** over k . [Thus, it holds that $n \leq \dim(F) \leq \dim(X)$.] Write $\Pi_{F \rightarrow X} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_F / \Delta_{F/X}$. Then there exists a sequence of **normal closed subgroups** of $\Pi_{F \rightarrow X}$*

$$\{1\} = H_0 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq H_{n-1} \subseteq H_n = \Pi_{F \rightarrow X}$$

such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the closed subgroup H_i is **topologically finitely generated**, and, moreover, the quotient H_i/H_{i-1} is **infinite**.

Proof. Write $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(X)$. Let

$$X = X_d \longrightarrow X_{d-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow \text{Spec } k = X_0$$

be a sequence of parametrizing morphisms. For each $j \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, write $F[j] \rightarrow X_j$ for the normalization in F of the scheme-theoretic image of the composite $F \rightarrow X \rightarrow X_j$. Then it follows immediately from the various definitions involved, together with Lemma 1.9, that we obtain a commutative diagram of *normal varieties over k*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F & \longrightarrow & F[d] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & F[1] & \longrightarrow & \text{Spec } k = F[0] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ X & \xrightarrow{=} & X_d & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & X_1 & \longrightarrow & \text{Spec } k = X_0 \end{array}$$

— where the horizontal arrows are *dominant and generically geometrically connected*, and the vertical arrows are *finite*, which implies that $F[i]$ is of *dimension* $\leq i$, and that $0 \leq \dim(F[i+1]) - \dim(F[i]) \leq 1$ [cf. also [4], Proposition (5.5.2)]. Now since F is of *dimension* $\geq n$, one verifies easily that there exists a uniquely determined subset $\{D_0, \dots, D_{n-1}\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ of cardinality n such that, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, the normal variety $F[D_i+1]$ is of *dimension* $i+1$, but the normal variety $F[D_i]$ is of *dimension* i . Write $F[D_n] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F$. Next, let us observe that since k is of *characteristic zero*, and the horizontal arrows in the above commutative diagram of normal varieties over k are *dominant and generically geometrically connected*, one verifies easily that, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, there exists a *nonempty* open subscheme $U[D_i] \subseteq F[D_i]$ of $F[D_i]$ such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the image of $U[D_i] \subseteq F[D_i]$ by $F[D_i] \rightarrow F[D_{i-1}]$ is contained in $U[D_{i-1}] \subseteq F[D_{i-1}]$, and, moreover, the resulting morphism $U[D_i] \rightarrow U[D_{i-1}]$ is *surjective, smooth, and geometrically connected*. Thus, we obtain a commutative diagram of *normal varieties over k*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U[D_n] & \longrightarrow & U[D_{n-1}] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & U[D_1] & \longrightarrow & \text{Spec } k = U[D_0] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ F[D_n] & \longrightarrow & F[D_{n-1}] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & F[D_1] & \longrightarrow & \text{Spec } k = F[D_0] \end{array}$$

— where the vertical arrows are *open immersions*, and the upper horizontal arrows are *surjective, smooth, and geometrically connected*.

Now, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, let us write $N_i \subseteq \Pi_F$ for the *normal* closed subgroup obtained by forming the image of the *normal* closed subgroup $\Delta_{U[D_n]/U[D_{n-i}]} \subseteq \Pi_{U[D_n]}$ via the outer *surjection*

$\Pi_{U[D_n]} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_F$ [cf. Lemma 1.2]; $H_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N_i / (N_i \cap \Delta_{F/X}) \subseteq \Pi_{F \rightarrow X}$. [Thus, one verifies easily that $N_0 = \{1\}$; $H_0 = \{1\}$; $N_n = \Pi_F$; $H_n = \Pi_{F \rightarrow X}$.] The rest of the proof of Lemma 2.14 is devoted to verifying that this sequence of normal closed subgroups of $\Pi_{F \rightarrow X}$

$$H_0 = \{1\} \subseteq H_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq H_{n-1} \subseteq H_n = \Pi_{F \rightarrow X}$$

satisfies the condition in the statement of Lemma 2.14.

First, let us observe that it follows from Corollary 1.11 that $\Delta_{U[D_n]/U[D_{n-i}]}$, hence also H_i , is *topologically finitely generated*. Thus, it remains to verify that, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, the quotient H_{i+1}/H_i is *infinite*. To verify this, let $\bar{a} \rightarrow U[D_{n-i-1}]$ be a k -valued geometric point of $U[D_{n-i-1}]$. Write $U_{D_{n-i}/D_{n-i-1}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U[D_{n-i}] \times_{U[D_{n-i-1}]} \bar{a}$ [which is a *smooth variety over k of dimension 1* (respectively, $\dim(F) - n + 1$) if $i \neq 0$ (respectively, $i = 0$) by our choices of $U[D_{n-i}]$ and $U[D_{n-i-1}]$]. Then one verifies easily from Proposition 1.10, (i), applied to the morphism $U[D_{n-i}] \rightarrow U[D_{n-i-1}]$, that the natural morphism $U_{D_{n-i}/D_{n-i-1}} \rightarrow X_{D_{n-i}}$ [where we write $X_{D_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X$] determines a sequence of profinite groups

$$\Pi_{U_{D_{n-i}/D_{n-i-1}}} \longrightarrow H_{i+1}/H_i \longrightarrow \Pi_{X_{D_{n-i}}}.$$

On the other hand, since [one verifies easily that] the natural morphism $U_{D_{n-i}/D_{n-i-1}} \rightarrow X_{D_{n-i}}$ is *quasi-finite*, hence *nonconstant*, and $X_{D_{n-i}}$ is of *LFG-type* [cf. Proposition 2.7], the image of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_{U_{D_{n-i}/D_{n-i-1}}} \rightarrow \Pi_{X_{D_{n-i}}}$, hence also the image of $H_{i+1}/H_i \rightarrow \Pi_{X_{D_{n-i}}}$, is *infinite*. Thus, we conclude that H_{i+1}/H_i is *infinite*. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.14. \square

3. RESULTS ON THE GROTHENDIECK CONJECTURE FOR HYPERBOLIC POLYCURVES

In the present §3, we prove some results on the Grothendieck conjecture for hyperbolic polycurves [cf. Theorems 3.3, 3.7, 3.8, 3.11, 3.14; Corollaries 3.12, 3.15, 3.16, 3.18, 3.20, 3.21]. In the present §3, let k be a field of *characteristic zero*, \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , and $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$.

Definition 3.1 (cf. [14], Definition 15.4, (i)). Let p be a prime number. Then we shall say that k is *sub- p -adic* if k is isomorphic to a subfield of a finitely generated extension of the p -adic completion of the field of rational numbers.

Proposition 3.2. *Let X be a hyperbolic polycurve over k and Y an integral variety over k . Then the following hold:*

- (i) Write $\text{Hom}_k^{\text{dom}}(Y, X) \subseteq \text{Hom}_k(Y, X)$ for the subset of **dominant** morphisms from Y to X over k and $\text{Hom}_{G_k}^{\text{open}}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X) \subseteq \text{Hom}_{G_k}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)$ for the subset of **open** homomorphisms from Π_Y to Π_X over G_k . Then the natural map

$$\text{Hom}_k^{\text{dom}}(Y, X) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_k}^{\text{open}}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$$

[cf. Lemma 1.3] is **injective**.

- (ii) Suppose that k is **sub- p -adic** for some prime number p . Then the natural map

$$\text{Hom}_k(Y, X) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_k}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$$

is **injective**.

Proof. Write $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(X)$. First, we verify assertion (i). Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.2.A: If $n = 1$, then assertion (i) holds.

Indeed, since k is of *characteristic zero*, it follows that Y contains a *schematically dense* open subscheme which is *smooth* over k . Thus, by replacing Y by such an open subscheme, we may assume without loss of generality that Y is *smooth* over k . Now if k is *sub- p -adic* for some prime number p , then Claim 3.2.A, follows from [14], Theorem A. Since $\Delta_{X/k}$ is *slim* [cf. Proposition 2.4, (iii)], Claim 3.2.A for arbitrary k then follows by thinking of such an arbitrary k as a direct limit of subfields that are finitely generated over \mathbb{Q} [hence *sub- p -adic* for any prime number p]. This completes the proof of Claim 3.2.A.

Next, we verify assertion (i) by *induction on n* . If $n = 1$, then assertion (i) follows from Claim 3.2.A. Now suppose that $n \geq 2$, and that the *induction hypothesis* is in force. Let $X \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ be

a parametrizing morphism for X ; $f, g: Y \rightarrow X$ dominant morphisms over k that induce the *same* $\Delta_{X/k}$ -conjugacy class of homomorphisms $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$. Then since the composites $f_{n-1}: Y \xrightarrow{f} X \rightarrow X_{n-1}$, $g_{n-1}: Y \xrightarrow{g} X \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ induce the *same* $\Delta_{X_{n-1}/k}$ -conjugacy class of homomorphisms $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_{X_{n-1}}$, it follows from the *induction hypothesis* that $f_{n-1} = g_{n-1}$. Let $\bar{\eta} \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ be a geometric point of X_{n-1} whose image is the generic point of X_{n-1} and $C \subseteq Y \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{\eta}$ [where we take the implicit morphism $Y \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ to be $f_{n-1} = g_{n-1}$] an irreducible component of $Y \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{\eta}$. Write $C_{\text{red}} \subseteq Y \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{\eta}$ for the reduced closed subscheme of $Y \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{\eta}$ whose support is $C \subseteq Y \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{\eta}$. [Thus, C_{red} is an *integral variety* over $\bar{\eta}$.] Then, in light of the easily verified fact that the natural morphism $C_{\text{red}} \rightarrow Y$ is *schematically dense*, by replacing $(\text{Spec } k, X, Y)$ by $(\bar{\eta}, X \times_{X_{n-1}} \bar{\eta}, C_{\text{red}})$ and applying Proposition 2.4, (ii), (iii), we conclude that, to verify assertion (i), it suffices to apply assertion (i) in the case where $n = 1$, which has already been verified. [Here, we note that it is necessary to apply the fact that $\Delta_{X_{n-1}/k}$ is *center-free* [cf. Proposition 2.4, (iii)] in order to pass from $\Delta_{X/k}$ -conjugacy classes to $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}$ -conjugacy classes.] This completes the proof of assertion (i).

Next, we verify assertion (ii). Write $\eta \rightarrow Y$ for the generic point of Y . Fix a homomorphism $\Pi_\eta \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ arising from the natural morphism $\eta \rightarrow Y$. Then we have a natural Π_X -conjugacy class of isomorphisms $\Delta_{X \times_k \eta / \eta} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{X/k}$, [cf. Proposition 2.4, (ii)], a natural outer isomorphism $\Pi_{X \times_k \eta} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_X \times_{G_k} \Pi_\eta$ [cf. Proposition 2.4, (ii)], and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_k(Y, X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{G_k}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X) / \text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Hom}_\eta(\eta, X \times_k \eta) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\Pi_\eta}(\Pi_\eta, \Pi_{X \times_k \eta}) / \text{Inn}(\Delta_{X \times_k \eta / \eta}) \end{array}$$

— where the left-hand vertical arrow is *injective* [cf. the fact that the natural morphism $\eta \rightarrow Y$ is *schematically dense*]. Thus, by replacing k by the function field of Y [i.e., of η] and Y by $\text{Spec } k$, to verify assertion (ii), we may assume without loss of generality that $Y = \text{Spec } k$. Then — in light of Proposition 2.4, (ii) — assertion (ii) follows immediately from [14], Theorem C, together with *induction on n* . This completes the proof of assertion (ii). \square

Theorem 3.3. *Let p be a prime number, k a sub- p -adic field [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , X a **hyperbolic curve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (i)] over k , and Y a **normal variety** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be an*

open homomorphism over G_k . Then ϕ arises from a **uniquely determined dominant morphism** $Y \rightarrow X$ over k .

Proof. Since there exists a dense open subscheme of Y which is *smooth* over k , this follows immediately from [14], Theorem A, together with Lemma 2.10; Proposition 3.2, (i). \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let n be a positive integer; S, Y **normal varieties** over k ; X a **hyperbolic polycurve** over S of relative dimension n ; $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ an **open homomorphism** over G_k . Suppose that the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_S$ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow S$ over k . Write $S' \subseteq S$ for the scheme-theoretic image of the morphism $Y \rightarrow S$, $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/S')$, and $\eta \rightarrow Z$ for the generic point of Z . Then the following hold:*

- (i) *The morphism $Y \rightarrow Z$ [cf. Lemma 1.9] over k is **dominant and generically geometrically connected**. In particular, $Y_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y \times_Z \eta$ is a [nonempty] **normal variety** over η .*
- (ii) *There exist **nonempty open subschemes** $U_Y \subseteq Y$, $U_Z \subseteq Z$ of Y , Z , respectively, such that the image of $U_Y \subseteq Y$ by the natural morphism $Y \rightarrow Z$ is contained in $U_Z \subseteq Z$, and, moreover, the resulting morphism $U_Y \rightarrow U_Z$ is **surjective, smooth, and geometrically connected**.*
- (iii) *The image of the composite $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{Y_\eta} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_S$ [cf. (i)] is **trivial**. In particular, we obtain a natural Π_X -conjugacy class of homomorphisms $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X/S}$.*
- (iv) *If, moreover, $n = 1$, k is **sub- p -adic**, and the image of some homomorphism that belongs to the Π_X -conjugacy class of homomorphisms $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X/S}$ of (iii) is **nontrivial**, then ϕ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k .*

Proof. Assertion (i) follows from Lemma 1.9. Assertion (ii) follows immediately from the fact that k is of *characteristic zero*, together with assertion (i). Assertion (iii) follows immediately from the definition of $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta}$, together with the fact that the composite $Y_\eta \hookrightarrow Y \rightarrow S$ factors through the natural morphism $\eta \rightarrow S$. Finally, we verify assertion (iv). Let us observe that since ϕ is *open*, $\Pi_{Y_\eta} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y$ is *surjective* [cf. Lemma 1.2], and the subgroup $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \subseteq \Pi_{Y_\eta}$ is *normal*, it follows that the image of the arrow $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X/S}$ of assertion (iii) is *nontrivial* [by assumption!] and *normal* in an open subgroup of $\Delta_{X/S}$; in particular, it follows from Proposition 2.4, (iv), together with Lemmas 1.5; 1.7, that the image of the arrow $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X/S}$ of assertion (iii) is *open*. Write $X_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times_S \eta$. Let us fix an isomorphism $\Pi_{X_\eta} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_X \times_{\Pi_S} \Pi_\eta$ [cf. Proposition 2.4, (ii)] over Π_η arising from morphisms $X_\eta \rightarrow X$, $X_\eta \rightarrow \eta$ over S ; a homomorphism $\Pi_{Y_\eta} \rightarrow \Pi_Y \times_{\Pi_Z} \Pi_\eta$ over Π_η arising from morphisms $Y_\eta \rightarrow Y$,

$Y_\eta \rightarrow \eta$ over Z . Then the open homomorphism $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ determines a homomorphism $\phi_\eta: \Pi_{Y_\eta} \rightarrow \Pi_Y \times_{\Pi_Z} \Pi_\eta \rightarrow \Pi_X \times_{\Pi_S} \Pi_\eta \xleftarrow{\sim} \Pi_{X_\eta}$ over Π_η . On the other hand, since [we have already verified that] the image of the arrow $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X/S}$ of assertion (iii) is *open*, it follows immediately from Proposition 2.4, (ii), together with the various definitions involved, that the homomorphism ϕ_η over Π_η is *open*. Thus, since X_η is a *hyperbolic curve* over η , it follows from Theorem 3.3 that ϕ_η arises from a morphism $Y_\eta \rightarrow X_\eta$ over η . In particular, it follows immediately from Lemma 2.10 that ϕ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . This completes the proof of assertion (iv). \square

Lemma 3.5. *In the notation of Lemma 3.4, suppose, moreover, that $\dim(X)$ ($= \dim(S) + n$) $\leq \dim(Y)$. Write $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$ for the **normal** closed subgroup of Π_Y obtained by forming the image of the normal closed subgroup $\Delta_{U_Y/U_Z} \subseteq \Pi_{U_Y}$ [cf. Lemma 3.4, (ii)] of Π_{U_Y} by the outer surjection [cf. Lemma 1.2] $\Pi_{U_Y} \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by the natural open immersion $U_Y \hookrightarrow Y$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *The image of the composite $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{Y_\eta} \rightarrow \Pi_Y$, hence also the composite $\Pi_{Y_\eta} \rightarrow \Pi_{Y_\eta} \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ [cf. Lemma 1.5; Lemma 3.4, (i)], **coincides** with $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$.*
- (ii) *If, moreover, Y is of **LFG-type**, then N is **infinite**.*
- (iii) *If, moreover, Y is a **hyperbolic polycurve** over k , then there exists a sequence of **normal** closed subgroups of N*

$$\{1\} = H_0 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq H_{\dim(Y) - \dim(S) - 1} \subseteq H_{\dim(Y) - \dim(S)} = N$$

*such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \dim(Y) - \dim(S)\}$, the closed subgroup H_i is **topologically finitely generated**, and, moreover, the quotient H_i/H_{i-1} is **infinite**.*

Proof. Let $\bar{\eta} \rightarrow U_Z$ be a geometric point of U_Z whose image is the generic point η of U_Z . Write $Y_{\bar{\eta}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y \times_Z \bar{\eta}$ and $(U_Y)_{\bar{\eta}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U_Y \times_{U_Z} \bar{\eta}$. [Note that $Y_{\bar{\eta}}$ (respectively, $(U_Y)_{\bar{\eta}}$) is a *normal* (respectively, *smooth*) variety over $\bar{\eta}$ of dimension $\geq \dim(Y) - \dim(S)$ by Lemma 3.4, (i) (respectively, our choice of (U_Y, U_Z)) — cf. also [4], Théorème (5.5.8).] First, we verify assertion (i). It follows from Lemma 1.5 that we have a natural Π_{Y_η} -conjugacy class of *isomorphisms* $\Pi_{Y_{\bar{\eta}}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta}$; moreover, it follows from Proposition 1.10, (i), together with our choice of (U_Y, U_Z) , that there exists a natural Π_{U_Y} -conjugacy class of *surjections* $\Pi_{(U_Y)_{\bar{\eta}}} \rightarrow \Delta_{U_Y/U_Z}$. Thus, one verifies easily from the *surjectivity* of $\Pi_{(U_Y)_{\bar{\eta}}} \rightarrow \Pi_{Y_{\bar{\eta}}}$ [cf. Lemma 1.2] that the image of the composite $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{Y_\eta} \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ coincides with $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$. This completes the proof of assertion (i). Next, we verify assertion (ii). It follows immediately from our choice of (U_Y, U_Z) that the geometric fiber F of $U_Y \rightarrow U_Z$ at

a \bar{k} -valued geometric point of U_Z is a *smooth variety* over \bar{k} of *dimension* $\geq \dim(Y) - \dim(S) > 0$. In particular, one verifies easily that the natural morphism $F \rightarrow Y \times_k \bar{k}$ over \bar{k} is *nonconstant*. Thus, since [we have assumed that] Y is of *LFG-type*, it follows immediately from Lemma 1.5 that the image of $\Pi_F \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by the natural morphism $F \rightarrow Y$ is *infinite*. On the other hand, one verifies easily that $\Pi_F \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ factors through the composite $\Delta_{U_Y/U_Z} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{U_Y} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y$. Thus, it follows immediately from the definition of N that N is *infinite*. This completes the proof of assertion (ii). Finally, we verify assertion (iii). Observe that the natural morphism $Y_{\bar{\eta}} \rightarrow Y$ factors through a natural *closed immersion* $Y_{\bar{\eta}} \hookrightarrow Y \times_k \bar{\eta}$. Thus, since $Y \times_k \bar{\eta}$ is a *hyperbolic polycurve* over $\bar{\eta}$, it follows from Lemma 2.14 that the image of $\Pi_{Y_{\bar{\eta}}} \rightarrow \Pi_{Y \times_k \bar{\eta}}$ admits a sequence of closed subgroups as in the statement of assertion (iii). On the other hand, any homomorphism $\Pi_{Y \times_k \bar{\eta}} \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ that arises from the morphism $Y \times_k \bar{\eta} \xrightarrow{\text{pt}} Y$ determines an *isomorphism* $\Pi_{Y \times_k \bar{\eta}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{Y/k}$ [cf. Lemma 1.5; Proposition 2.4, (ii)]. Thus, it follows immediately from assertion (i) that assertion (iii) holds. This completes the proof of assertion (iii). \square

Definition 3.6. Let X, Y be *normal* varieties over k and $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ a homomorphism over G_k .

- (i) We shall say that ϕ is *nondegenerate* if ϕ is open, and, moreover, for any open subscheme $U \subseteq Y$, any normal variety Z over k such that $\dim(Z) < \dim(X)$, and any smooth, geometrically connected, surjective morphism $U \rightarrow Z$ over k , the composite $\Pi_U \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_U \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y$ induced by the open immersion $U \hookrightarrow Y$ and the outer homomorphism $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ determined by ϕ does not factor through the outer homomorphism $\Pi_U \rightarrow \Pi_Z$ induced by the morphism $U \rightarrow Z$.
- (ii) Suppose that X is a *hyperbolic polycurve* of relative dimension n over k . Then we shall say that the homomorphism ϕ is *poly-nondegenerate* if there exists a sequence of parametrizing morphisms

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow \text{Spec } k = X_0$$

such that, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, the composite $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_i}$ of the outer homomorphism $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ determined by ϕ and the natural outer homomorphism $\Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_i}$ is nondegenerate [cf. (i)].

Theorem 3.7. Let p be a prime number, k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , X a **hyperbolic polycurve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] over k , and Y a **normal variety** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the

*étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively; $\Delta_{X/k} \subseteq \Pi_X$ for the kernel of the natural surjection $\Pi_X \rightarrow G_k$; $\text{Hom}_k^{\text{dom}}(Y, X)$ for the set of **dominant** morphisms from X to Y over k ; $\text{Hom}_k^{\text{PND}}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)$ for the set of **poly-nondegenerate** homomorphisms [cf. Definition 3.6, (ii)] from Π_Y to Π_X over G_k . Then the natural map*

$$\text{Hom}_k^{\text{dom}}(Y, X) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_k}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$$

*determines a **bijection***

$$\text{Hom}_k^{\text{dom}}(Y, X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{G_k}^{\text{PND}}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k}).$$

Proof. First, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.7.A: Any [necessarily *open* — cf. Lemma 1.3] homomorphism $\phi_f: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ over G_k that arises from a *dominant* morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ over k is *poly-nondegenerate*.

Indeed, suppose that there exist a sequence of parametrizing morphisms

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow \text{Spec } k = X_0,$$

an integer $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, an open subscheme $U \subseteq Y$ of Y , a normal variety Z over k , and a smooth, geometrically connected, surjective morphism $U \rightarrow Z$ over k such that the composite $\Pi_U \rightarrow \Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi_f} \Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_{X_i}$ factors through $\Pi_U \rightarrow \Pi_Z$. Then, by applying Lemma 2.9 [where we take the data “ (S, Y, Z, X, f) ” in the statement of Lemma 2.9 to be $(\text{Spec } k, Z, U, X_i, U \hookrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{f} X \rightarrow X_i)$], we conclude that the composite $U \hookrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{f} X \rightarrow X_i$ factors through $U \rightarrow Z$. In particular, since f is *dominant*, it holds that $\dim(Z) \geq i$. This completes the proof of Claim 3.7.A.

It follows from Claim 3.7.A, together with Proposition 3.2, (ii), that, to verify Theorem 3.7, it suffices to verify the *surjectivity* of the natural map

$$\text{Hom}_k^{\text{dom}}(Y, X) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_k}^{\text{PND}}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k}).$$

Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be a *poly-nondegenerate* homomorphism over G_k and

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow \text{Spec } k = X_0$$

a sequence of parametrizing morphisms as in Definition 3.6, (ii). Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.7.B: Suppose that there exists a morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ over k from which ϕ arises. Then f is *dominant*.

Indeed, assume that f is *not dominant*. Write $X' \subseteq X$ for the scheme-theoretic image of f and $S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/X')$. Then since the natural morphism $Y \rightarrow S$ over k is *dominant and generically geometrically irreducible* [cf. Lemma 1.9], and k is of *characteristic zero*, one verifies easily that there exist open subschemes $U_Y \subseteq Y$, $U_S \subseteq S$ of Y , S , respectively, such that the image of $U_Y \subseteq Y$ by $Y \rightarrow S$ is *contained* in $U_S \subseteq S$, and, moreover, the resulting morphism $U_Y \rightarrow U_S$ is *surjective, smooth, and geometrically connected*. On the other hand, since f is *not dominant*, one verifies easily that X' , hence also U_S , is of *dimension* $< \dim(X)$. Thus, since ϕ is *poly-nondegenerate*, we obtain a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 3.7.B.

Next, let us observe that, to verify that ϕ arises from a dominant morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k , it suffices to verify that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.7.C: For each $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, if the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_i}$ arises from a dominant morphism $Y \rightarrow X_i$ over k , then the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_{i+1}}$ arises from a dominant morphism $Y \rightarrow X_{i+1}$ over k .

The rest of the proof of Theorem 3.7 is devoted to verifying Claim 3.7.C.

Write $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/X_i)$; $\eta \rightarrow Z$ for the generic point of Z , $Y_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y \times_Z \eta$. Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.7.C.1: The image of any homomorphism that belongs to the $\Pi_{X_{i+1}}$ -conjugacy class of homomorphisms $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X_{i+1}/X_i}$ of Lemma 3.4, (iii) [where we take the data “ (S, Y, X) ” in the statement of Lemma 3.4 to be (X_i, Y, X_{i+1})], is *nontrivial*.

Indeed, assume that the arrow $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X_{i+1}/X_i}$ of Lemma 3.4, (iii), is *trivial*. Then it follows immediately from Lemma 3.4, (ii); Lemma 3.5, (i), that there exists a *nonempty* open subschemes $U_Y \subseteq Y$, $U_Z \subseteq Z$ such that the natural morphism $Y \rightarrow Z$ induces a morphism $U_Y \rightarrow U_Z$ which is *surjective, smooth, and geometrically connected*, and, moreover, the image of the composite $\Delta_{U_Y/U_Z} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{U_Y} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_{i+1}}$ is *trivial*. [Here, we note that it follows immediately from the existence of the *poly-nondegenerate* homomorphism ϕ , together with the definition of *poly-nondegeneracy*, that $\dim(X) \leq \dim(Y)$.] Thus, it follows immediately that the composite $\Pi_{U_Y} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_{i+1}}$ factors through $\Pi_{U_Y} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{U_Z}$. On the other hand, since $\dim(Z) = i < i+1 = \dim(X_{i+1})$, and ϕ

is *poly-nondegenerate*, we obtain a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 3.7.C.1.

It follows from Claim 3.7.C.1, together with Lemma 3.4, (iv), that the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_{i+1}}$ arises from a [necessarily *dominant* — cf. Claim 3.7.B] morphism $Y \rightarrow X_{i+1}$ over k . This completes the proof of Claim 3.7.C, hence also of Theorem 3.7. \square

Theorem 3.8. *Let p be a prime number; k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1]; \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k ; Y, S **normal varieties** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k ; X a **hyperbolic curve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (i)] over S . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y, Π_S for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y, S , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be a homomorphism over G_k . Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) *The composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_S$ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow S$ over k .*
- (2) *ϕ is **open**, and its kernel is **finite**.*
- (3) *Y is of **LFG-type** [cf. Definition 2.5].*
- (4) *$\dim(X) (= \dim(S) + 1) \leq \dim(Y)$.*

*Then ϕ arises from a **quasi-finite dominant** morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . In particular, $\dim(X) = \dim(Y)$.*

Proof. Let us observe that, in light of Lemma 2.6, (ii), by applying Lemmas 3.4, (iv); 3.5, (i) [where we take the data “ (S, Y, X, ϕ) ” in the statement of Lemma 3.4 to be (S, Y, X, ϕ)], to verify that ϕ arises from a *quasi-finite* morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k [which is necessarily *dominant* by condition (4)], it suffices to verify that the image of the closed subgroup $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$ defined in the statement of Lemma 3.5 by $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *nontrivial*. On the other hand, since Y is of *LFG-type*, it follows from Lemma 3.5, (ii), that N is *infinite*. Thus, it follows from condition (2) that the image of $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$ by $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ is *nontrivial*. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.8. \square

Definition 3.9. Let n be a positive integer. Then we shall say that the *assertion (\dagger_n) holds* if, for any hyperbolic polycurve X of dimension n over \bar{k} , Π_X does not admit a sequence of closed subgroups of Π_X

$$\{1\} = H_0 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq H_n \subseteq H_{n+1} = \Pi_X$$

such that, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, the closed subgroup H_i is *topologically finitely generated* and *normal* in H_{i+1} , and, moreover, the quotient H_{i+1}/H_i is *infinite*.

Lemma 3.10. *The assertion (\dagger_1) [cf. Definition 3.9] holds.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 2.4, (iv). \square

Theorem 3.11. *Let n be a positive integer, p a prime number, k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , S a **normal variety** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k , X a **hyperbolic polycurve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of **relative dimension n** over S , and Y a **hyperbolic polycurve** over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y, Π_S for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y, S , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be a homomorphism over G_k . Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) *The composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_S$ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow S$ over k .*
- (2) *ϕ is an **open injection**.*
- (3) *$\dim(X) (= \dim(S) + n) \leq \dim(Y)$.*
- (4) *For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, the assertion (\dagger_i) [cf. Definition 3.9] holds.*

*Then ϕ arises from a **quasi-finite dominant morphism** $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . In particular, $\dim(X) = \dim(Y)$.*

Proof. Let

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_2 \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow S = X_0$$

be a sequence of parametrizing morphisms. Fix a *surjection* [cf. Proposition 2.4, (i)] $\Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_1}$ over G_k that arises from the morphism $X \rightarrow X_1$ over k . First, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.11.A: If $n \geq 2$, then the composite $\Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_{X_1}$ of $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ and the fixed surjection $\Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_1}$ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow X_1$ over k .

Indeed, write $S' \subseteq S$ for the scheme-theoretic image of the morphism $Y \rightarrow S$ [cf. condition (1)], $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(Y/S')$; $\eta \rightarrow Z$ for the generic point of Z ; $Y_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y \times_Z \eta$. Then, to verify Claim 3.11.A, by applying Lemmas 3.4, (iv); 3.5, (i) [where we take the data “ (S, Y, X, ϕ) ” in the statement of Lemma 3.4 to be “ $(S, Y, X_1, \Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_1})$ ”], it suffices to verify that the image of $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$ defined in the statement of Lemma 3.5 in Π_{X_1} is *nontrivial*. To verify this, assume that the image of $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$ in Π_{X_1} is *trivial*, i.e., that the image of $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$ in Π_X is contained in $\Delta_{X/X_1} \subseteq \Pi_X$. On the other hand, since $N \subseteq \Pi_Y$ is *normal* in Π_Y , and ϕ is an *open injection*, it follows that the image of N in Π_X is *normal* in an open subgroup of Π_X . In particular, again since ϕ is an *open injection*, we conclude that there exists an open subgroup $U \subseteq \Delta_{X/X_1}$ of Δ_{X/X_1} such that if, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \dim(Y) - \dim(S)\}$, we write $H_i^U \subseteq \Delta_{X/X_1}$ for the image, via ϕ , in Δ_{X/X_1} of the subgroup “ H_i ” in the statement of Lemma 3.5, (iii), for our “ N ”, then

- $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)}^U \subseteq U$ [so we obtain a sequence of closed subgroups of U

$$\{1\} = H_0^U \subseteq H_1^U \subseteq \cdots \subseteq H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)-1}^U$$

$$\subseteq H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)}^U \subseteq H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)+1}^U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U,$$

- for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \dim(Y) - \dim(S) + 1\}$, the closed subgroup H_i^U is *topologically finitely generated*,
- for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \dim(Y) - \dim(S)\}$, the closed subgroup H_i^U is *normal* in $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)}^U$,
- the closed subgroup $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)}^U \subseteq H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)+1}^U$ is *normal* in $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)+1}^U$, **and**,
- for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \dim(Y) - \dim(S)\}$, the quotient H_i^U / H_{i-1}^U is *infinite*.

Now let us recall that we have assumed that $n \leq \dim(Y) - \dim(S)$, and that the assertion (\dagger_{n-1}) holds. Moreover, it follows immediately from Propositions 2.3; 2.4, (ii), that U may be regarded as the “ Π_X ” associated to a hyperbolic polycurve over \bar{k} of dimension $n - 1$. Thus,

- if $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)+1}^U / H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)}^U$ is *finite*, then by replacing $U (= H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)+1}^U)$ by $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)}^U$ and, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, taking the “ H_i ” in Definition 3.9 [in the case where we take the “ Π_X ” in Definition 3.9 to be U — cf. the above discussion] to be $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)-n+i}^U$, and
- if $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)+1}^U / H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)}^U$ is *infinite*, then, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, by taking the “ H_i ” in Definition 3.9 [in the case where we take the “ Π_X ” in Definition 3.9 to be U — cf. the above discussion] to be $H_{\dim(Y)-\dim(S)-n+1+i}^U$,

we obtain a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 3.11.A.

By applying Claim 3.11.A inductively and replacing S by X_{n-1} , to verify Theorem 3.11, we may assume without loss of generality that X is a *hyperbolic curve* over S . Then it follows from Theorem 3.8, together with Proposition 2.7, that ϕ arises from a *quasi-finite dominant* morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . This completes the proof of Theorem 3.11. \square

Corollary 3.12. *Let p be a prime number, k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , S a **normal variety** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k , X a **hyperbolic polycurve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of **dimension 2** over S , and Y a **hyperbolic polycurve** over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y, Π_S for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y, S , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be*

a homomorphism over G_k . Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) The composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_S$ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow S$ over k .
- (2) ϕ is an **open injection**.
- (3) $\dim(X) (= \dim(S) + 2) \leq \dim(Y)$.

Then ϕ arises from a **quasi-finite dominant** morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . In particular, $\dim(X) = \dim(Y)$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3.11, together with Lemma 3.10. \square

Lemma 3.13. Let G_1, G_2 be profinite groups; $H_1 \subseteq G_1, H_2 \subseteq G_2$ closed subgroups; $\phi: G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ a homomorphism. Suppose that $\phi(H_1) \subseteq H_2$. Then the homomorphism $H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ induced by ϕ is **surjective** if and only if the following condition is satisfied: For any open subgroup $U \subseteq G_2$ of G_2 and any normal open subgroup $N \subseteq U$ of U , if the composite $H_2 \cap U \hookrightarrow U \twoheadrightarrow U/N$ is **surjective**, then the composite $H_1 \cap \phi^{-1}(U) \hookrightarrow \phi^{-1}(U) \xrightarrow{\phi} U \twoheadrightarrow U/N$ is **surjective**.

Proof. This follows immediately from the various definitions involved. \square

Theorem 3.14. Let p be a prime number, k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , X a **hyperbolic polycurve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of **dimension 2** over k , and Y a **normal variety** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be an **open homomorphism** over G_k . Suppose that the kernel of ϕ is **topologically finitely generated**. Then ϕ arises from a **uniquely determined dominant** morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . In particular, Y is of **dimension ≥ 2** .

Proof. First, let us observe that it follows from Proposition 2.3 that, by replacing X by the connected finite étale covering of X corresponding to the image of ϕ , to verify Theorem 3.14, we may assume without loss of generality that ϕ is *surjective*. Let $X \rightarrow X_1$ be a parametrizing morphism for X . Then since both the kernel of ϕ [by assumption] and the kernel Δ_{X/X_1} of the outer *surjection* [cf. Proposition 2.4, (i)] $\Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_1}$ [by Proposition 2.4, (iii)] are *topologically finitely generated*, it follows from Theorem 3.3, together with the implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) of Lemma 2.11, that the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_1}$ arises from a morphism $Y \rightarrow X_1$ over k which is *surjective* and *generically geometrically connected*. Write $\eta \rightarrow X_1$ for the generic point of X_1 ; $Y_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y \times_{X_1} \eta$; $X_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times_{X_1} \eta$. [Thus, Y_η is a *normal variety* over η .]

Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.14.A: Any homomorphism that belongs to the Π_X -conjugacy class of homomorphisms $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \rightarrow \Delta_{X/X_1}$ of Lemma 3.4, (iii) [where we take the data “ (S, Y, X) ” in the statement of Lemma 3.4 to be “ (X_1, Y, X) ”], is *surjective*.

Indeed, it follows immediately from Lemma 3.13 that, to verify Claim 3.14.A, it suffices to verify that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.14.A.1: Let $X' \rightarrow X$ be a connected finite étale covering of X and $X'' \rightarrow X'$ a connected finite étale *Galois* covering of X' . Write $Y' \rightarrow Y$ for the connected finite étale covering of Y corresponding to $X' \rightarrow X$ via ϕ ; $Y'' \rightarrow Y'$ for the connected finite étale *Galois* covering of Y' corresponding to $X'' \rightarrow X'$ via ϕ . Write, moreover, $Y'_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y' \times_{X_1} \eta (= Y' \times_Y Y_\eta)$; $Y''_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y'' \times_{X_1} \eta (= Y'' \times_{Y'} Y'_\eta)$. [Here, let us observe that since the natural morphism $Y_\eta \rightarrow Y$ induces an outer *surjection* $\Pi_{Y_\eta} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_Y$ — cf. Lemma 1.2 — it holds that Y'_η and Y''_η are *connected*.] Suppose that the composite $\Delta_{X/X_1} \cap \Pi_{X'} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{X'} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X'}/\Pi_{X''}$ is *surjective*. Then the composite $\Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \cap \Pi_{Y'_\eta} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{Y'_\eta} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{Y'_\eta}/\Pi_{Y''_\eta}$ is *surjective*.

Now, to verify Claim 3.14.A.1, let us observe that, in the notation of Claim 3.14.A.1, it follows immediately from Proposition 2.3 that the sequence of schemes $X' \rightarrow X'_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(X'/X_1) \rightarrow X'_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Nor}(X'/\text{Spec } k)$ determines a structure of *hyperbolic poly-curve of dimension 2* on X' , and, moreover, the natural morphisms $X'_1 \rightarrow X_1$, $\eta' \rightarrow \eta$ — where we write $\eta' \rightarrow X'_1$ for the generic point of X'_1 — are connected *finite étale coverings*. In particular, one verifies easily that the natural inclusions $\Pi_{X'} \hookrightarrow \Pi_X$, $\Pi_{Y'_\eta} \hookrightarrow \Pi_{Y_\eta}$ determine equalities

$$\Delta_{X/X_1} \cap \Pi_{X'} = \Delta_{X'/X'_1}, \quad \Delta_{Y_\eta/\eta} \cap \Pi_{Y'_\eta} = \Delta_{Y'_\eta/\eta'}.$$

Thus, to verify Claim 3.14.A, i.e., Claim 3.14.A.1, by replacing X by X' , it suffices to verify that the following assertion holds [cf. also Lemma 1.5; Proposition 2.4, (ii)]:

Claim 3.14.A.2: In the notation of Claim 3.14.A.1, let $\bar{\eta} \rightarrow X_1$ be a geometric point of X_1 whose image is the generic point η . Suppose that $X'' \rightarrow X$ is *Galois*, and that $X'' \times_{X_1} \bar{\eta}$ is *connected*. Then $Y''_\eta \times_\eta \bar{\eta} (= Y'' \times_{X_1} \bar{\eta})$ is *connected*.

Now, to verify Claim 3.14.A.2, let us observe that since $X'' \times_{X_1} \bar{\eta}$ is *connected*, i.e., $X'' \rightarrow X_1$ is *generically geometrically connected*, and [one verifies easily that] the composite $X'' \rightarrow X \rightarrow X_1$ is *smooth* and *surjective*, it follows from the implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) of Lemma 2.11 that the composite $\Pi_{X''} \hookrightarrow \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_1}$ is *surjective*, and its kernel is *topologically finitely generated*. Thus, since [we have assumed that] the kernel of ϕ is *topologically finitely generated*, it follows immediately that the composite $\Pi_{Y''} \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X''} \hookrightarrow \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_1}$ [where the first arrow is the *surjection* induced by ϕ] is *surjective*, and its kernel is *topologically finitely generated*. Therefore, by the implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) of Lemma 2.11, we conclude that the natural morphism $Y'' \rightarrow X_1$ is *surjective* and *generically geometrically connected*; in particular, $Y'' \times_{X_1} \bar{\eta}$ is *connected*. This completes the proof of Claim 3.14.A.2, hence also of Claim 3.14.A.

It follows from Claim 3.14.A, together with Lemma 3.4, (iv), that ϕ arises from a *uniquely determined* [cf. Proposition 3.2, (ii)] morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . On the other hand, since the composite $Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow X_1$ is *dominant*, one verifies easily from Claim 3.14.A, together with Proposition 2.4, (iii), that this morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ is *dominant*. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.14. \square

Remark 3.14.1. The argument given in the proof of Theorem 3.14 is essentially the same as the argument applied in [14] to prove [14], Theorem D.

Corollary 3.15. *Let p be a prime number, k a sub- p -adic field [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , Y a normal variety [cf. Definition 1.4] over k , and X a hyperbolic polycurve [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of dimension 3 over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be a homomorphism over G_k . Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) ϕ is **open**, and its kernel is **finite**.
- (2) Y is of **LFG-type** [cf. Definition 2.5].
- (3) $3 \leq \dim(Y)$.

Then ϕ arises from a uniquely determined quasi-finite dominant morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . In particular, Y is of dimension 3.

Proof. Let $X \rightarrow X_2$ be a parametrizing morphism for X . Then it follows immediately from condition (1), together with Proposition 2.4, (iii), that the kernel of the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_2}$ is *topologically finitely generated*. Thus, it follows from Theorem 3.14 that the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_2}$ arises from a uniquely determined dominant morphism $Y \rightarrow X_2$ over k . In particular, it follows from Proposition 3.2, (ii); Theorem 3.8, together

with Lemma 2.6, (ii), that ϕ arises from a *uniquely determined quasi-finite dominant* morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . This completes the proof of Corollary 3.15. \square

Corollary 3.16. *Let p be a prime number, k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , X a **hyperbolic polycurve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of **dimension 4** over k , and Y a **hyperbolic polycurve** over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be a homomorphism over G_k . Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) ϕ is an **open injection** (respectively, **isomorphism**).
- (2) $4 \leq \dim(Y)$.

*Then ϕ arises from a **uniquely determined finite étale covering** (respectively, **uniquely determined isomorphism**) $Y \rightarrow X$ over k . In particular, $\dim(Y) = 4$.*

Proof. First, let us observe that, to verify Corollary 3.16, by replacing Π_X by the image of ϕ [cf. condition (1); Proposition 2.3], we may assume without loss of generality that ϕ is an *isomorphism* over G_k . Let $X \rightarrow X_3$ be a parametrizing morphism for X and $X_3 \rightarrow X_2$ a parametrizing morphism for X_3 . Then it follows immediately from our assumption that ϕ is an *isomorphism*, together with Proposition 2.4, (iii), that the kernel of the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_2}$ is *topologically finitely generated*. Thus, it follows from Theorem 3.14 that the composite $\Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow \Pi_{X_2}$ arises from a uniquely determined dominant morphism $Y \rightarrow X_2$ over k . Moreover, it follows from Corollary 3.12 that ϕ arises from a *quasi-finite dominant* morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k ; thus, it holds that $4 = \dim(X) = \dim(Y)$. Therefore, in light of Proposition 3.2, (ii), by applying a similar argument to the above argument to ϕ^{-1} , we conclude that the morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ is an *isomorphism*. This completes the proof of Corollary 3.16. \square

Definition 3.17. Let n be a positive integer and X an algebraic stack over k . Then we shall say that X is a *hyperbolic orbipolycurve* of dimension n over k if X admits a dense open substack that is a scheme, is geometrically connected over k , and, moreover, admits a finite étale Galois covering that is a hyperbolic polycurve of dimension n over some finite extension of k .

Corollary 3.18. *Let p be a prime number; n_X, n_Y positive integers; k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1]; \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k ; X, Y **hyperbolic orbipolycurves** of dimension n_X, n_Y over k , respectively [cf. Definition 3.17]. Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively; $\text{Isom}_k(X, Y)$*

for the set of isomorphisms of X with Y over k ; $\text{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$ for the set of isomorphisms of Π_X with Π_Y over G_k ; $\Delta_{Y/k}$ for the kernel of the natural surjection $\Pi_Y \twoheadrightarrow G_k$. Suppose that either $n_X \leq 4$ or $n_Y \leq 4$. Then the natural map

$$\text{Isom}_k(X, Y) \longrightarrow \text{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{Y/k})$$

is **bijjective**.

Proof. First, let us observe that the *injectivity* in question follows immediately from Propositions 2.3; 3.2, (ii), together with the definition of a *hyperbolic orbi-polycurve*. Thus, it remains to verify the *surjectivity* in question. Let $\phi: \Pi_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_Y$ be an isomorphism over G_k . Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.18.A: If X and Y are *hyperbolic polycurves* over k , then ϕ arises from an isomorphism $X \xrightarrow{\sim} Y$ over k .

Indeed, let us first observe that, to verify that ϕ arises from an isomorphism $X \xrightarrow{\sim} Y$ over k , by replacing (X, Y, ϕ) by (Y, X, ϕ^{-1}) if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $n_X \geq n_Y$; in particular, since [we have assumed that] either $n_X \leq 4$ or $n_Y \leq 4$, it holds that $n_Y \leq 4$. Thus, it follows from Theorem 3.8; Corollaries 3.12, 3.15, 3.16, together with Proposition 2.7, that ϕ arises from a *uniquely determined quasi-finite dominant* morphism $X \rightarrow Y$ over k . In particular, we obtain that $n_X = n_Y \leq 4$. Thus, again by applying Theorem 3.8; Corollaries 3.12, 3.15, 3.16, together with Proposition 2.7, to ϕ^{-1} , we conclude from Proposition 3.2, (ii), that the morphism $X \rightarrow Y$ is an *isomorphism*. This completes the proof of Claim 3.18.A.

Next, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.18.B: ϕ arises from an isomorphism $X \xrightarrow{\sim} Y$ over k .

Indeed, it follows from the definition of a *hyperbolic orbi-polycurve*, together with Proposition 2.3, that there exist a finite extension $k_Z (\subseteq \bar{k})$ of k and an normal open subgroup $H_X \subseteq \Pi_X$ of Π_X such that the connected finite étale Galois coverings $Z_X \rightarrow X$, $Z_Y \rightarrow Y$ corresponding to $H_X \subseteq \Pi_X$, $H_Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi(H_X) \subseteq \Pi_Y$ are *hyperbolic polycurves* over k_Z . Then it follows from Claim 3.18.A that the isomorphism $H_X \xrightarrow{\sim} H_Y$ induced by ϕ arises from an isomorphism $Z_X \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_Y$ over k_Z . On the other hand, since [we already verified that] the natural map in question is *injective*, and the isomorphism ϕ is *compatible* with the natural outer actions of $\Pi_X/H_X = \text{Gal}(Z_X/X)$, $\Pi_Y/H_Y = \text{Gal}(Z_Y/Y)$ on H_X , H_Y , respectively — relative to the isomorphism $\Pi_X/H_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_Y/H_Y$ induced by ϕ — we conclude that the isomorphism $Z_X \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_Y$ is *compatible* with the natural actions of $\Pi_X/H_X = \text{Gal}(Z_X/X)$,

$\Pi_Y/H_Y = \text{Gal}(Z_Y/Y)$ on Z_X, Z_Y , respectively — relative to the isomorphism $\Pi_X/H_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_Y/H_Y$ induced by ϕ . Thus, by descending the isomorphism $Z_X \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_Y$, we obtain an isomorphism $X \xrightarrow{\sim} Y$ over k , which, by the various definitions involved [cf. also the *slimness* property discussed in Proposition 2.4, (iii)], *belongs* to the $\Delta_{Y/k}$ -conjugacy class of isomorphisms $\Pi_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_Y$ determined by ϕ . This completes the proof of Claim 3.18.B, hence also of Corollary 3.18. \square

Remark 3.18.1. It seems most likely to the author that the assertion (\dagger_n) [cf. Definition 3.9] holds for every positive integer n . However, it is not clear to the author at the time of writing whether or not there exists an integer $n > 1$ for which the assertion (\dagger_n) can be proven. Here, let us observe that if one proves that the assertion (\dagger_n) holds for every positive integer n , then it follows immediately from a similar argument to the argument applied in the proof of Corollary 3.18 — except that instead of applying Theorem 3.8; Corollaries 3.12, 3.15, 3.16, one applies Theorem 3.11 — that the conclusion of Corollary 3.18 holds without the assumption made in the statement of Corollary 3.18 that “either $n_X \leq 4$ or $n_Y \leq 4$ ”.

Proposition 3.19. *Let k_X, k_Y be finitely generated extension fields of the field of rational numbers; \bar{k}_X, \bar{k}_Y algebraic closures of k_X, k_Y , respectively. Write $G_{k_X} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}_X/k_X)$ and $G_{k_Y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}_Y/k_Y)$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *Let $H \subseteq G_{k_X}$ be a closed subgroup of G_{k_X} . Suppose that H is **topologically finitely generated** and **normal** in an open subgroup of G_{k_X} . Then H is **trivial**.*
- (ii) *Write $\text{Isom}(\bar{k}_X/k_X, \bar{k}_Y/k_Y)$ for the set of isomorphisms $\bar{k}_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{k}_Y$ that determine isomorphisms $k_X \xrightarrow{\sim} k_Y$. Then the natural map*

$$\text{Isom}(\bar{k}_X/k_X, \bar{k}_Y/k_Y) \longrightarrow \text{Isom}(G_{k_Y}, G_{k_X})$$

is bijective.

Proof. Assertion (i) follows from [1], Theorem 13.4.2; [1], Proposition 16.11.6. Assertion (ii) follows from the main result of [20] [cf. also [22] for a survey on [20]]. \square

Corollary 3.20. *Let k_X, k_Y fields of characteristic zero; \bar{k}_X, \bar{k}_Y algebraic closures of k_X, k_Y , respectively; n a positive integer; X a **hyperbolic polycurve** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of dimension n over k_X ; Y a **normal variety** [cf. Definition 1.4] over k_Y . Write $G_{k_X} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}_X/k_X)$; $G_{k_Y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}_Y/k_Y)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively. Let $\phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_X$ be an **open***

homomorphism. Suppose that one of the following conditions (1), (2), (3), (4) is satisfied:

- (1) $n = 1$.
- (2) The following conditions are satisfied:
 - (2-i) $n = 2$.
 - (2-ii) The kernel of ϕ is **topologically finitely generated**.
- (3) The following conditions are satisfied:
 - (3-i) $n = 3$.
 - (3-ii) The kernel of ϕ is **finite**.
 - (3-iii) Y is of **LFG-type** [cf. Definition 2.5].
 - (3-iv) $3 \leq \dim(Y)$.
- (4) The following conditions are satisfied:
 - (4-i) $n = 4$.
 - (4-ii) ϕ is **injective**.
 - (4-iii) Y is a **hyperbolic polycurve** over k_Y .
 - (4-iv) $4 \leq \dim(Y)$.

Then the following hold:

- (i) Suppose that both k_X, k_Y are **finitely generated over the field of rational numbers**. Then the open homomorphism ϕ lies over an open homomorphism $G_{k_Y} \rightarrow G_{k_X}$.
- (ii) In the situation of (i), suppose that the homomorphism $G_{k_Y} \rightarrow G_{k_X}$ obtained in (i) is **injective**. Then ϕ arises from a **dominant morphism** $Y \rightarrow X$.
- (iii) Suppose that both k_X, k_Y are **finite extensions of the p -adic completion of the field of rational numbers** for some prime number p . Suppose, moreover, that one of the following three conditions is satisfied:
 - (iii-a) The open homomorphism ϕ lies over an open homomorphism $G_{k_Y} \rightarrow G_{k_X}$ that **arises** from a homomorphism $k_X \hookrightarrow k_Y$ of fields.
 - (iii-b) There exist hyperbolic curves [cf. Definition 2.1, (i)] $Z_X \rightarrow \text{Spec } k_X, Z_Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } k_Y$ of **quasi-Belyi type** [cf. [17], Definition 2.3, (iii)] and morphisms $X \rightarrow Z_X, Y \rightarrow Z_Y$ over k_X, k_Y , respectively, such that if we write Π_{Z_X}, Π_{Z_Y} for the étale fundamental groups of Z_X, Z_Y , respectively, then the homomorphism ϕ lies over an **isomorphism** $\Pi_{Z_Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_{Z_X}$.
 - (iii-c) The open homomorphism ϕ lies over an open homomorphism $G_{k_Y} \rightarrow G_{k_X}$, and, moreover, there exist a hyperbolic curve Z over k_X and a **dominant morphism** $X \rightarrow Z$ over k_X such that if we write Π_Z for the étale fundamental group of Z , then the extension Π_Z of G_{k_X} is of **A-qLT-type** [cf. [18], Definition 3.1, (v)].

Then ϕ arises from a **dominant morphism** $Y \rightarrow X$.

Proof. Assertion (i) follows immediately, by considering the composite $\Delta_{Y/k_Y} \hookrightarrow \Pi_Y \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \rightarrow G_{k_X}$, from Lemmas 1.5, 1.7; Proposition 3.19, (i). Next, we verify assertion (ii). Let us first observe that, in light of Proposition 2.3, by replacing Π_X by the image of ϕ , to verify assertion (ii), we may assume without loss of generality that ϕ , hence also the injection $G_{k_Y} \hookrightarrow G_{k_X}$ obtained by assertion (i), is *surjective*. Then it follows from Proposition 3.19, (ii), that the isomorphism $G_{k_Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} G_{k_X}$ arises from an isomorphism $\bar{k}_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{k}_Y$ that determines an isomorphism $k_X \xrightarrow{\sim} k_Y$. In particular, to verify assertion (ii), by replacing (X, k_X, \bar{k}_X) by $(X \times_{k_X} k_Y, k_Y, \bar{k}_Y)$ and applying Proposition 2.4, (ii), we may assume without loss of generality that $(k_X, \bar{k}_X) = (k_Y, \bar{k}_Y)$. On the other hand, since $(k_X, \bar{k}_X) = (k_Y, \bar{k}_Y)$, assertion (ii) follows from Theorems 3.3, 3.14; Corollaries 3.15, 3.16. This completes the proof of assertion (ii).

Finally, we verify assertion (iii). Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 3.20.A: If either condition (iii-b) or condition (iii-c) holds, then condition (iii-a) holds.

Indeed, suppose that condition (iii-b) is satisfied. Then let us observe that it follows from [17], Corollary 2.3, that the isomorphism $\Pi_{Z_Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_{Z_X}$ arises from an isomorphism $Z_Y \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_X$ of schemes, which thus implies [cf., e.g., the discussion concerning the term *isogenous* given in “Curves” of [17], §0] that condition (iii-a) is satisfied.

Next, suppose that condition (iii-c) is satisfied. Let $\psi: \Pi_X \rightarrow \Pi_Z$ be a homomorphism over G_{k_X} that arises from the dominant morphism $X \rightarrow Z$ over k_X . Then one verifies easily that the composite $\psi \circ \phi: \Pi_Y \rightarrow \Pi_Z$ is *open* [cf. Lemma 1.3] and, moreover, lies over an open homomorphism $G_{k_Y} \rightarrow G_{k_X}$ [cf. condition (iii-c)]. Thus, it follows immediately from [18], Theorem 3.5, (iii), that condition (iii-a) is satisfied. This completes the proof of Claim 3.20.A. In particular, to verify assertion (iii), it suffices to verify assertion (iii) in the case where condition (iii-a) is satisfied.

Suppose that condition (iii-a) is satisfied. Then, in light of Proposition 2.3, by replacing Π_X by the image of ϕ , to verify assertion (iii) in the case where condition (iii-a) is satisfied, we may assume without loss of generality that ϕ , hence also the homomorphism $G_{k_Y} \rightarrow G_{k_X}$ of condition (iii-a), is *surjective*. In particular, we conclude that the homomorphism $G_{k_Y} \rightarrow G_{k_X}$ of condition (iii-a) arises from an isomorphism $k_X \xrightarrow{\sim} k_Y$. Thus, by replacing (X, k_X, \bar{k}_X) by $(X \times_{k_X} k_Y, k_Y, \bar{k}_Y)$ and applying Proposition 2.4, (ii), we may assume without loss of generality that $(k_X, \bar{k}_X) = (k_Y, \bar{k}_Y)$. On the other hand, since $(k_X, \bar{k}_X) = (k_Y, \bar{k}_Y)$, assertion (iii) follows

from Theorems 3.3, 3.14; Corollaries 3.15, 3.16. This completes the proof of assertion (iii). \square

Corollary 3.21. *Let p be a prime number and n a positive integer. Write \mathbb{S} for the set consisting of the set of all prime numbers, \mathbb{F} for the set of isomorphism classes of **sub- p -adic** fields [cf. Definition 3.1], \mathbb{V} for the set of isomorphism classes of **hyperbolic orbi-polycurves** of dimension n over sub- p -adic fields [cf. Definition 3.17], and $\mathbb{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{S}$. Suppose that $n \leq 4$. Then the hypotheses of [18], Theorem 4.7, (i), (ii), are **satisfied** relative to this \mathbb{D} .*

Proof. First, let us recall from [14], Lemma 15.8, that the *absolute Galois group of a sub- p -adic field* is *slim* [i.e., every open subgroup of the absolute Galois group of a sub- p -adic field is *center-free*]. The fact that \mathbb{D} is *chain-full* [cf. [18], Definition 4.6, (i)] is immediate. The *rel-isom DGC* [cf. [18], Definition 4.6, (ii)], as well as the *slimness* of the “ Δ_i ” in the statement of [18], Theorem 4.7, follows immediately from Corollary 3.18 [cf. also the proof of Corollary 3.20] and Proposition 2.4, (iii). \square

4. FINITENESS OF THE SET OF OUTER ISOMORPHISMS
BETWEEN ÉTALE FUNDAMENTAL GROUPS OF HYPERBOLIC
POLYCURVES

In the present §4, we discuss the *finiteness* of a certain set of outer isomorphisms between the étale fundamental groups of hyperbolic polycurves of arbitrary dimension [cf. Theorem 4.4 below]. In the case where the base field is *finite over the field of rational numbers*, we also prove the *finiteness* of the set of outer isomorphisms between the étale fundamental groups of hyperbolic polycurves [cf. Corollary 4.6 below]. In the present §4, let k be a field of *characteristic zero*, \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , and $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a profinite group, $H \subseteq G$ an open subgroup of G , A a group, and $A \rightarrow \text{Aut}(G)$ a homomorphism to the group of automorphisms $\text{Aut}(G)$ of G . Write $A_H \subseteq A$ for the subgroup of A consisting of $a \in A$ such that the automorphism of G obtained by forming the image of a in $\text{Aut}(G)$ **preserves** $H \subseteq G$. Suppose that G is **topologically finitely generated**. Then A_H is of **finite index** in A .*

Proof. Write $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [G : H]$. Then since G is *topologically finitely generated*, the set S of open subgroups of G of index d is *finite*. On the other hand, the homomorphism $A \rightarrow \text{Aut}(G)$ naturally determines an action of A on S , and $A_H \subseteq A$ coincides with the stabilizer of $H \in S$. Thus, A_H is of *finite index* in A . This completes the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let n be a positive integer, X a **hyperbolic polycurve** of dimension n over k , and*

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow \text{Spec } k = X_0$$

a sequence of parametrizing morphisms. Then the following hold:

- (i) *There exists an open subgroup $H \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}$ such that, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, if we write $H_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H \cap \Delta_{X/X_i}$ [thus, we have a sequence of **normal** closed subgroups of H*

$$H_n = \{1\} \subseteq H_{n-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq H_2 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq H_0 = H$$

*and a natural **injection** $H_i/H_{i+1} \hookrightarrow \Delta_{X_{i+1}/X_i}$ for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ — cf. Proposition 2.4, (i)], then, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, it holds that*

$$\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}\left((H_i/H_{i+1})^{\text{ab}}\right) < \text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}\left((H_{i-1}/H_i)^{\text{ab}}\right).$$

- (ii) *Let ϕ be an automorphism of $\Delta_{X/k}$. Suppose that ϕ preserves an open subgroup $H \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}$ as in (i). Then, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, it holds that $\phi(\Delta_{X/X_i}) = \Delta_{X/X_i}$.*

- (iii) Let ψ be an automorphism of Π_X over G_k . Suppose that ψ preserves an open subgroup $H \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}$ as in (i), and that k is **sub- p -adic** [cf. Definition 3.1] for some prime number p . Then ψ arises from an **automorphism** of X over k .

Proof. First, we verify assertion (i) by *induction on n* . If $n = 1$, then assertion (i) is immediate. Now suppose that $n \geq 2$, and that the *induction hypothesis* is in force. Then since one may regard Δ_{X/X_1} as the “ $\Delta_{X/k}$ ” of a hyperbolic polycurve over k of dimension $n - 1$ [cf. Proposition 2.4, (ii)], by the *induction hypothesis*, there exists an open subgroup $H^* \subseteq \Delta_{X/X_1}$ of Δ_{X/X_1} such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if we write $H_i^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H^* \cap \Delta_{X/X_i}$, then, for each $i \in \{2, \dots, n - 1\}$, it holds that

$$\text{rank}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} \left((H_i^*/H_{i+1}^*)^{\text{ab}} \right) < \text{rank}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} \left((H_{i-1}^*/H_i^*)^{\text{ab}} \right).$$

Now since the profinite group Δ_{X/X_1} is *normal* in $\Delta_{X/k}$ and *topologically finitely generated* [cf. Proposition 2.4, (iii)], it follows from Lemma 4.1 [where we take the data “ (G, H, A) ” in the statement of Lemma 4.1 to be $(\Delta_{X/X_1}, H^*, \Delta_{X/k})$ and the action of “ A ” on “ G ” in the statement of Lemma 4.1 to be the action by conjugation] that $N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)$ is *open* in $\Delta_{X/k}$.

Since $H^* \subseteq N_{\Delta_{X/X_1}}(H^*) (= N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*) \cap \Delta_{X/X_1})$, and H^* is *open* in Δ_{X/X_1} , we have a natural *surjection*

$$N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/H^* \longrightarrow N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/N_{\Delta_{X/X_1}}(H^*)$$

whose kernel is *finite*. Thus, there exists an *open* subgroup $Q \subseteq N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/H^*$ of $N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/H^*$ such that the composite

$$Q \xrightarrow{\subseteq} N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/H^* \longrightarrow N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/N_{\Delta_{X/X_1}}(H^*)$$

is *injective*. In particular, Q may be regarded as an *open* subgroup of

$$N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/N_{\Delta_{X/X_1}}(H^*) \xrightarrow{\subseteq} \Delta_{X/k}/\Delta_{X/X_1} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_{X_1/k}$$

[cf. Proposition 2.4, (i)]. Thus, it follows immediately from Proposition 2.4, (vi), that there exists an *open* subgroup $Q_H \subseteq Q$ such that

$$\text{rank}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} \left((H_1^*/H_2^*)^{\text{ab}} \right) < \text{rank}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} (Q_H^{\text{ab}}).$$

Let us write $H \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}$ for the open subgroup of $\Delta_{X/k}$ obtained by forming the inverse image of $Q_H \subseteq N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/H^*$ by the natural surjection $N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*) \twoheadrightarrow N_{\Delta_{X/k}}(H^*)/H^*$; thus, H fits into an *exact* sequence of profinite groups

$$1 \longrightarrow H^* \longrightarrow H \longrightarrow Q_H \longrightarrow 1.$$

Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 4.2.A: This open subgroup $H \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}$ satisfies the condition appearing in the statement of assertion (i).

Indeed, let us first observe that, by our choice of (H^*, Q_H) , one verifies easily that, to verify Claim 4.2.A, it suffices to verify that $H \cap \Delta_{X/X_1} = H^*$. To this end, let us observe that since H^* is *open* in Δ_{X/X_1} , and $H^* \subseteq H \cap \Delta_{X/X_1}$, we have a natural surjection $H/H^* \twoheadrightarrow H/(H \cap \Delta_{X/X_1})$ whose kernel is *finite*. On the other hand, since $H/H^* \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_H$ may be regarded as an open subgroup of $\Delta_{X_1/k}$ [cf. the discussion preceding Claim 4.2.A], it follows from Proposition 2.4, (iii), that H/H^* is *torsion-free*. Thus, we conclude that $H \cap \Delta_{X/X_1} = H^*$. This completes the proof of Claim 4.2.A, hence also of assertion (i).

Next, we verify assertion (ii). Now since [one verifies easily that] the image of the composite $H \hookrightarrow \Delta_{X/k} \twoheadrightarrow \Delta_{X_{n-1}/k}$ satisfies the condition appearing in the statement of assertion (i) for “ H ”, by *induction on n* , to verify assertion (ii), it suffices to verify that the following assertion holds:

Claim 4.2.B: $\phi(\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}) = \Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}$.

Now I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 4.2.B.1: $\phi(H_{n-1}) = H_{n-1}$.

Indeed, it is immediate that there exists a *unique* integer $0 \leq m \leq n-1$ such that the image of the composite $H_{n-1} \hookrightarrow H \xrightarrow{\phi} H \twoheadrightarrow H/H_{m+1}$ is *nontrivial*, but the image of the composite $H_{n-1} \hookrightarrow H \xrightarrow{\phi} H \twoheadrightarrow H/H_m$ is *trivial*; thus, $H_{n-1} \hookrightarrow H \xrightarrow{\phi} H \twoheadrightarrow H/H_{m+1}$ determines a *nontrivial* homomorphism $H_{n-1} \rightarrow H_m/H_{m+1}$. Now since the composite $H \xrightarrow{\phi} H \twoheadrightarrow H/H_{m+1}$ is *surjective*, and $H_{n-1} \subseteq H$ is *normal* in H , one verifies easily that the image of the *nontrivial* homomorphism $H_{n-1} \rightarrow H_m/H_{m+1}$ is *normal*; thus, since H_{n-1} is *topologically finitely generated* [cf. Propositions 2.3; 2.4, (iii)], it follows from Proposition 2.4, (iv), that the image of the *nontrivial* homomorphism $H_{n-1} \rightarrow H_m/H_{m+1}$ is *open*, which implies that

$$\text{rank}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} \left((H_m/H_{m+1})^{\text{ab}} \right) \leq \text{rank}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} (H_{n-1}^{\text{ab}}).$$

Thus, it follows from the condition appearing in the statement of assertion (i) that $m = n-1$, i.e., $\phi(H_{n-1}) \subseteq H_{n-1}$. Moreover, by applying a similar argument to the above argument to ϕ^{-1} , we conclude that $\phi(H_{n-1}) = H_{n-1}$. This completes the proof of Claim 4.2.B.1.

Finally, we verify Claim 4.2.B. To verify Claim 4.2.B, write N for the intersection of all $\Delta_{X/k}$ -conjugates of H_{n-1} . Then it is immediate that N is *normal* in $\Delta_{X/k}$. Moreover, since $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}$ is

topologically finitely generated [cf. Proposition 2.4, (iii)] and normal in $\Delta_{X/k}$, and $H_{n-1} \subseteq \Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}$ is open in $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}$, one verifies easily that N is open in $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}$. Thus, $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}/N \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}/N$ is a finite subgroup of $\Delta_{X/k}/N$; in particular, since $\Delta_{X_{n-1}/k}$ is torsion-free [cf. Proposition 2.4, (iii)], $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}/N \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}/N$ is the unique maximal torsion subgroup of $\Delta_{X/k}/N$. On the other hand, it follows from Claim 4.2.B.1 that ϕ determines an automorphism of $\Delta_{X/k}/N$. Thus, we conclude that the automorphism of $\Delta_{X/k}/N$ determined by ϕ preserves $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}/N$, hence that ϕ preserves $\Delta_{X/X_{n-1}}$. This completes the proof of Claim 4.2.B, hence also of assertion (ii).

Finally, we verify assertion (iii). It follows immediately from assertion (ii), together with Proposition 2.4, (i), that, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, ψ induces an automorphism ψ_i of Π_{X_i} over G_k . [Thus, $\psi_0 = \text{id}_{G_k}$, and $\psi_n = \psi$.] Now it is immediate that, by induction on i , to verify assertion (iii), it suffices to verify that the following assertion holds:

Claim 4.2.C: For each $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, if the automorphism ψ_i arises from an automorphism f_i of X_i over k , then ψ_{i+1} arises from an automorphism of X_{i+1} over k .

To verify Claim 4.2.C, write $\eta \rightarrow X_i$ for the generic point of X_i , $(X_{i+1})_\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X_{i+1} \times_{X_i} \eta$, and $(X_{i+1})'_\eta$ for the base-change of the natural morphism $X_{i+1} \rightarrow X_i$ by the composite $\eta \rightarrow X_i \xrightarrow{f_i} X_i$. Then it follows immediately from assertion (ii), together with Proposition 2.4, (ii), that ψ_{i+1} induces an isomorphism $\Pi_{(X_{i+1})_\eta} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_{(X_{i+1})'_\eta}$ over Π_η . Thus, it follows from Theorem 3.3, together with the equivalence (ii-1) \Leftrightarrow (ii-2) of Lemma 2.13, that the isomorphism $\Pi_{(X_{i+1})_\eta} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Pi_{(X_{i+1})'_\eta}$ arises from an isomorphism $(X_{i+1})_\eta \xrightarrow{\sim} (X_{i+1})'_\eta$ over η . In particular, it follows from Lemma 2.10 that ψ_{i+1} arises from an endomorphism of X_{i+1} over k . Therefore, by applying a similar argument to the above argument to ψ_{i+1}^{-1} , we conclude from Proposition 3.2, (ii), that ψ_{i+1} arises from an automorphism of X_{i+1} over k . This completes the proof of Claim 4.2.C, hence also of assertion (iii). \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let n be a positive integer, p a prime number, k a sub- p -adic field [cf. Definition 3.1], \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k , X a hyperbolic polycurve [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] of dimension n over k , and*

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow \text{Spec } k = X_0$$

a sequence of parametrizing morphisms. Write $G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$, Π_X for the étale fundamental group of X , and $\Delta_{X/k}$ for the kernel of

the natural surjection $\Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow G_k$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, write, moreover, (g_i, r_i) for the type of the hyperbolic curve X_i over X_{i-1} [cf. Definition 2.1, (i)]. Suppose that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$,

$$2g_{i+1} + \max\{r_{i+1} - 1, 0\} < 2g_i + \max\{r_i - 1, 0\}.$$

Then the natural map

$$\mathrm{Aut}_k(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)/\mathrm{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$$

is **bijective**, i.e., every automorphism of Π_X over G_k arises from a **uniquely determined automorphism** of X over k .

Proof. The *injectivity* of the map in question follows from Proposition 3.2, (ii). The *surjectivity* of the map in question follows from Lemma 4.2, (iii), together with Proposition 2.4, (v). This completes the proof of Theorem 4.3. \square

Theorem 4.4. Let p be a prime number; k a **sub- p -adic field** [cf. Definition 3.1]; \bar{k} an algebraic closure of k ; X, Y **hyperbolic polycurves** [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] over k . Write $G_k \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$; Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively; $\mathrm{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$ for the set of isomorphisms of Π_X with Π_Y over G_k ; $\Delta_{Y/k}$ for the kernel of the natural surjection $\Pi_Y \twoheadrightarrow G_k$. Then the set

$$\mathrm{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\mathrm{Inn}(\Delta_{Y/k})$$

is **finite**.

Proof. If $\mathrm{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y) = \emptyset$, then Theorem 4.4 is immediate. Thus, to verify Theorem 4.4, we may assume without loss of generality that $\mathrm{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$ is *nonempty*. Then let us observe that any element of $\mathrm{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$ determines a bijection between $\mathrm{Isom}_{G_k}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\mathrm{Inn}(\Delta_{Y/k})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)/\mathrm{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$. Thus, to verify Theorem 4.4, by replacing Y by X , we may assume without loss of generality that $X = Y$. Let $H \subseteq \Delta_{X/k}$ be an open subgroup of $\Delta_{X/k}$ which satisfies the condition appearing in the statement of Lemma 4.2, (i), with respect to a sequence of parametrizing morphisms

$$X = X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spec} k = X_0.$$

Then, by applying Lemma 4.1 [where we take the data “ (G, H, A) ” in the statement of Lemma 4.1 to be $(\Delta_{X/k}, H, \mathrm{Aut}(\Delta_{X/k}))$], we conclude that there exists a subgroup $A \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\Delta_{X/k})$ of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Delta_{X/k})$ of *finite index* such that, for each $\phi \in A$, it holds that $\phi(H) = H$. Write $B \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)$ for the inverse image of $A \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\Delta_{X/k})$ via the natural homomorphism $\mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(\Delta_{X/k})$. [Thus, $B \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)$ is of *finite index* in $\mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)$.] Then it follows immediately from Lemma 4.2, (iii), that every element of B arises from an automorphism of X over k , i.e., the image of the composite $B \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)/\mathrm{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$ is contained in the

image of the natural injection $\text{Aut}_k(X) \hookrightarrow \text{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$ [cf. Proposition 3.2, (ii)]. In particular, it follows from Proposition 4.5 below that the image of the composite $B \hookrightarrow \text{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$ is *finite*. On the other hand, since B is of *finite index* in $\text{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)$, we thus conclude that $\text{Aut}_{G_k}(\Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Delta_{X/k})$ is *finite*. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.4. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Let S, Y be integral varieties over k ; $Y \rightarrow S$ a dominant morphism over k ; X a **hyperbolic polycurve** over S . Then the set $\text{Hom}_S^{\text{dom}}(Y, X)$ of **dominant morphisms** from Y to X over S is **finite**.*

Proof. Write n for the relative dimension of X over S . First, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 4.5.A: If $n = 1$, then Proposition 4.5 holds.

Indeed, let $\bar{\eta} \rightarrow S$ be a geometric point of S whose image is the generic point of S and F a connected component of the *normalization* of $Y \times_S \bar{\eta}$. [Here, we note that since k is of *characteristic zero*, $Y \times_S \bar{\eta}$ is necessarily *reduced*.] Thus, F is a *normal variety* over $\bar{\eta}$. Then since Y is *integral*, and $Y \rightarrow S$ is *dominant*, one verifies easily that the composite of natural maps $\text{Hom}_S^{\text{dom}}(Y, X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\bar{\eta}}(Y \times_S \bar{\eta}, X \times_S \bar{\eta}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\bar{\eta}}(F, X \times_S \bar{\eta})$ is *injective* [cf. the easily verified fact that the composite $F \rightarrow Y \times_S \bar{\eta} \rightarrow Y$ is *schematically dense*] and *factors* through the subset $\text{Hom}_{\bar{\eta}}^{\text{dom}}(F, X \times_S \bar{\eta})$. Thus, by replacing S, Y by $\bar{\eta}, F$, respectively, to verify Claim 4.5.A, we may assume without loss of generality that $k = \bar{k}$ and $S = \text{Spec } k$.

Next, to verify Claim 4.5.A, I claim that the following assertion holds:

Claim 4.5.A.1: If Y is of *dimension one* [and $n = 1$], then Proposition 4.5 holds.

Indeed, let us first observe that one verifies easily that there exist a nonnegative integer N and a connected finite étale Galois covering $X' \rightarrow X$ of X over k of degree N such that the genus [i.e., the integer “ g ” in Definition 2.1, (i)] of the hyperbolic curve X' over k is ≥ 2 . Then it is immediate that, for each *dominant* morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ over k , there exist a connected finite étale Galois covering $Y' \rightarrow Y$ of Y over k of degree $\leq N$ and a *dominant* morphism $Y' \rightarrow X'$ which lies over the given *dominant* morphism $Y \rightarrow X$. Thus, in light of the fact that $Y' \rightarrow Y$ is *schematically dense*, since the set of isomorphism classes of connected finite étale Galois coverings of Y over k of degree $\leq N$ is *finite* [cf. Lemma 1.7], by replacing (X, Y) by (X', Y') , to verify Claim 4.5.A.1, we may assume without loss of generality that X is of genus ≥ 2 . Then Claim 4.5.A.1 follows immediately from de Franchis’ theorem [cf., e.g., [13], p. 227]. This completes the proof of Claim 4.5.A.1.

It follows from Claim 4.5.A.1 that, to verify Claim 4.5.A, we may assume without loss of generality that Y is of *dimension* ≥ 2 . Next, let us observe that, by replacing Y by a suitable affine open subscheme of Y , to verify Claim 4.5.A, we may assume without loss of generality that Y is *regular*, and that Y may be embedded into a projective space P over k [of suitable dimension]. Thus, by applying Bertini's theorem [cf., e.g., the easily verified quasi-projective version of [9], Theorem 8.18] and [21], §V, Corollaire 7.3, inductively [i.e., by considering suitable hyperplane sections], we conclude that there exist a *smooth variety* C of *dimension one* over k and a morphism $C \rightarrow Y$ over k such that the induced outer homomorphism $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_Y$ is *surjective*. Now let us consider the natural commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_k^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}^{\mathrm{open}}(\Pi_Y, \Pi_X)/\mathrm{Inn}(\Pi_X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Hom}_k(C, X) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(\Pi_C, \Pi_X)/\mathrm{Inn}(\Pi_X) \end{array}$$

[cf. Lemma 1.3]. Since the upper horizontal arrow is *injective* [cf. Proposition 3.2, (i)], and the right-hand vertical arrow is *injective* [cf. the *surjectivity* of $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_Y$], it holds that the left-hand vertical arrow is *injective*. On the other hand, again by the *surjectivity* of $\Pi_C \rightarrow \Pi_Y$, it follows immediately that the left-hand vertical arrow factors through the subset $\mathrm{Hom}_k^{\mathrm{dom}}(C, X) \subseteq \mathrm{Hom}_k(C, X)$ [cf. also Proposition 2.4, (iii)]. Thus, to verify Claim 4.5.A, it suffices to verify the *finiteness* of $\mathrm{Hom}_k^{\mathrm{dom}}(C, X)$, which follows from Claim 4.5.A.1. This completes the proof of Claim 4.5.A.

Finally, we verify Proposition 4.5 by *induction on* n . If $n = 1$, then Proposition 4.5 follows from Claim 4.5.A. Now suppose that $n \geq 2$, and that the *induction hypothesis* is in force. Let $X \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ be a parametrizing morphism for X . Then since the *finiteness* of $\mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X_{n-1})$ follows from the *induction hypothesis*, to verify the *finiteness* of $\mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X)$, it suffices to verify that, for any $f_{n-1} \in \mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X_{n-1})$, the inverse image of $\{f_{n-1}\} \subseteq \mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X_{n-1})$ by the natural map $\mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X_{n-1})$ [induced by the morphism $X \rightarrow X_{n-1}$] is *finite*. In other words, to verify the *finiteness* of $\mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X)$, it suffices to verify that, for any $f_{n-1} \in \mathrm{Hom}_S^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X_{n-1})$, the set $\mathrm{Hom}_{X_{n-1}}^{\mathrm{dom}}(Y, X)$ — where we take the structure morphism $Y \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ to be f_{n-1} — is *finite*. On the other hand, since $X \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ is a *hyperbolic curve*, this *finiteness* in question follows from Claim 4.5.A. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.5. \square

Corollary 4.6. *Let k_X, k_Y be finite extensions of the field of rational numbers; X, Y hyperbolic polycurves [cf. Definition 2.1, (ii)] over k_X, k_Y , respectively. Write Π_X, Π_Y for the étale fundamental groups of X, Y , respectively; $\text{Isom}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$ for the set of isomorphisms of Π_X with Π_Y . Then the set*

$$\text{Isom}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\text{Inn}(\Pi_Y)$$

is finite.

Proof. If $\text{Isom}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y) = \emptyset$, then Corollary 4.6 is immediate. Suppose that $\text{Isom}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y) \neq \emptyset$. Then since any element of $\text{Isom}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)$ determines a bijection between the set $\text{Isom}(\Pi_X, \Pi_Y)/\text{Inn}(\Pi_Y)$ and the set $\text{Out}(\Pi_X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Aut}(\Pi_X)/\text{Inn}(\Pi_X)$, to verify Corollary 4.6, by replacing Y by X , we may assume without loss of generality that $X = Y$.

Now let us observe that, for each $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\Pi_X)$, by considering the composites $\Delta_{X/k_X} \hookrightarrow \Pi_X \xrightarrow{\phi} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow G_{k_X}, \Delta_{X/k_X} \hookrightarrow \Pi_X \xrightarrow{\phi^{-1}} \Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow G_{k_X}$ and applying Propositions 2.4, (iii); 3.19, (i), we conclude that ϕ lies over a(n) [uniquely determined] automorphism of G_{k_X} . Thus, we have a natural exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \text{Aut}_{G_{k_X}}(\Pi_X) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\Pi_X) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(G_{k_X}).$$

Write $N \subseteq \text{Out}(\Pi_X)$ for the [necessarily normal] subgroup of $\text{Out}(\Pi_X)$ obtained by forming the image of $\text{Aut}_{G_{k_X}}(\Pi_X) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\Pi_X)$ in $\text{Out}(\Pi_X)$. Then since $\Pi_X \twoheadrightarrow G_{k_X}$ is surjective, one verifies easily that the sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow \text{Out}(\Pi_X) \longrightarrow \text{Out}(G_{k_X}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Aut}(G_{k_X})/\text{Inn}(G_{k_X})$$

induced by the above exact sequence is exact. Thus, since N is finite [cf. Theorem 4.4], and $\text{Out}(G_{k_X})$ is finite [cf. Proposition 3.19, (ii)], we conclude that $\text{Out}(\Pi_X)$ is finite. This completes the proof of Corollary 4.6. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. D. Fried and M. Jarden, *Field arithmetic*, Second edition. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. **3**. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, **11**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [2] A. Grothendieck, Eléments de géométrie algébrique. II. Étude globale élémentaire de quelques classes de morphismes, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* No. **8** 1961.
- [3] A. Grothendieck, Eléments de géométrie algébrique. III. Étude cohomologique des faisceaux cohérents. I. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* No. **11** 1961.
- [4] A. Grothendieck, Eléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. II. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* No. **24** 1965.
- [5] A. Grothendieck, Eléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* No. **28** 1966.
- [6] A. Grothendieck, Eléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas IV. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* No. **32** 1967.
- [7] A. Grothendieck, Sketch of a program, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., **242**, *Geometric Galois actions*, 1, 243–283, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [8] A. Grothendieck, Letter to G. Faltings, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., **242**, *Geometric Galois actions*, 1, 285–293, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [9] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. **52**. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.
- [10] J. Kollár, *Shafarevich maps and automorphic forms*, M. B. Porter Lectures. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995.
- [11] M. Matsumoto and A. Tamagawa, Mapping-class-group action versus Galois action on profinite fundamental groups, *Amer. J. Math.* **122** (2000), no. **5**, 1017–1026.
- [12] H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory*, Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **8**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [13] B. Mazur, Arithmetic on curves. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **14** (1986), no. **2**, 207–259.
- [14] S. Mochizuki, The local pro- p anabelian geometry of curves, *Invent. Math.* **138** (1999), no. **2**, 319–423.
- [15] S. Mochizuki, The absolute anabelian geometry of hyperbolic curves, *Galois theory and modular forms*, 77–122, Dev. Math., **11**, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Boston, MA, 2004.
- [16] S. Mochizuki, The absolute anabelian geometry of canonical curves, *Kazuya Kato's fiftieth birthday. Doc. Math.* 2003, Extra Vol., 609–640.
- [17] S. Mochizuki, Absolute anabelian cuspidalizations of proper hyperbolic curves, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **47** (2007), no. **3**, 451–539.
- [18] S. Mochizuki, Topics in absolute anabelian geometry I: Generalities, *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* **19** (2012), no. **2**, 139–242.
- [19] S. Mochizuki and A. Tamagawa, The algebraic and anabelian geometry of configuration spaces, *Hokkaido Math. J.* **37** (2008), no. **1**, 75–131.

- [20] F. Pop, On Grothendieck's conjecture of anabelian birational geometry II, Heidelberg–Mannheim Preprint Reihe Arithmetik II, No. **16**, Heidelberg 1995.
- [21] M. Raynaud, Théorèmes de Lefschetz en cohomologie cohérente et en cohomologie étale, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, Mém. No. **41**. Supplément au Bull. Soc. Math. France, Tome **103**. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1975.
- [22] T. Szamuely, Groupes de Galois de corps de type fini (d'après Pop), *Astérisque* No. **294** (2004), ix, 403–431.
- [23] A. Tamagawa, The Grothendieck conjecture for affine curves, *Compositio Math.* **109** (1997), no. **2**, 135–194.
- [24] *Revêtements étales et groupe fondamental* (SGA 1), Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1960–1961. Directed by A. Grothendieck. With two papers by M. Raynaud. Documents Mathématiques (Paris), **3**. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2003.
- [25] *Groupes de monodromie en géométrie algébrique. I* (SGA 7 I), Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois-Marie 1967–1969. Dirigé par A. Grothendieck. Avec la collaboration de M. Raynaud et D. S. Rim. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **288**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1972.

(Yuichiro Hoshi) RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,
KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

E-mail address: `yuichiro@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp`