

Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 13

2019

No. 10

Artin–Mazur–Milne duality for fppf cohomology

Cyril Demarche and David Harari



Artin–Mazur–Milne duality for fppf cohomology

Cyril Demarche and David Harari

We provide a complete proof of a duality theorem for the fppf cohomology of either a curve over a finite field or a ring of integers of a number field, which extends the classical Artin–Verdier Theorem in étale cohomology. We also prove some finiteness and vanishing statements.

1. Introduction

Let K be a number field or the function field of a smooth, projective, geometrically integral curve X over a finite field. In the number field case, set $X := \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$, where \mathcal{O}_K is the ring of integers of K . Let U be a nonempty Zariski open subset of X and denote by N a commutative, finite and flat group scheme over U with Cartier dual N^D . Assume that the order of N is invertible on U (in particular N is étale). The classical “étale” *Artin–Verdier Theorem* [Milne 1986, Corollary II.3.3] is a duality statement between étale cohomology $H_{\text{ét}}^*(U, N)$ and étale cohomology with compact support $H_{\text{ét},c}^*(U, N^D)$. It has been known for a long time that this theorem is especially useful in view of concrete arithmetic applications: for example it yields a very nice method to prove deep results like Cassels–Tate duality for abelian varieties and schemes [Milne 1986, Section II.5] and their generalizations to 1-motives [Harari and Szamuely 2005, Section 4]; Artin–Verdier’s Theorem also provides a “canonical” path to prove the Poitou–Tate’s Theorem and its extension to complex of tori [Demarche 2011b], which in turn turns out to be very fruitful to deal with local-global questions for (not necessarily commutative) linear algebraic groups [Demarche 2011a].

It is of course natural to try to remove the condition that the order of N is invertible on U . A good framework to do this is provided by fppf cohomology of finite and flat commutative group schemes over U , as introduced by J.S. Milne in the third part of his book [1986]. This includes the case of group schemes of order divisible by $p := \operatorname{Char} K$ in the function field case.

Such an fppf duality theorem was first announced by B. Mazur [1972, Proposition 7.2],¹ relying on work by M. Artin and himself. Special cases have also been proved by M. Artin and Milne [1976]. The precise statement of the theorem is as follows (see [Milne 1986], Corollary III.3.2 for the number field case and Theorem III.8.2 for the function field case):

MSC2010: primary 11G20; secondary 14H25.

Keywords: fppf cohomology, arithmetic duality, Artin approximation theorem.

¹Thanks to A. Schmidt for having pointed this out to us.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $j : U \hookrightarrow X$ be a nonempty open subscheme of X . Let N be a finite flat commutative group scheme over U with Cartier dual N^D . For all integers r with $0 \leq r \leq 3$, the canonical pairing*

$$H_c^{3-r}(U, N) \times H^r(U, N^D) \rightarrow H_c^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \cong \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$$

(where $H^r(U, N^D)$ is an fppf cohomology group and $H_c^{3-r}(U, N)$ an fppf cohomology group with compact support) induces a perfect duality between the profinite group $H_c^{3-r}(U, N)$ and the discrete group $H^r(U, N^D)$. Besides, these groups are finite in the number field case, and they are trivial for $r \geq 4$ and $r < 0$ (resp. for $r = 3$ if $U \neq X$) in the function field case.

For example, this extension of the étale Artin–Verdier Theorem is needed to prove the Poitou–Tate exact sequence over global fields of characteristic p [González-Avilés 2009, Theorems 4.8 and 4.11] as well as the Poitou–Tate Theorem over a global field without restriction on the order ([Česnavičius 2015a, Theorem 5.1], which in turn is used in [Rosengarten 2018, Sections 5.6 and 5.7]). Results of [Milne 1986, Section III.9] (which rely on the fppf duality Theorem) are also a key ingredient in the proof of some cases of the Birch and Swinnerton–Dyer conjecture for abelian varieties over global fields of positive characteristic, in [Bauer 1992, Section 4] and [Kato and Trihan 2003, Section 2] for instance. Our initial interest in Theorem 1.1 was to try to extend it to complexes of tori in the function field case, following the same method as in the number field case [Demarche 2011b]. Such a generalization should then provide results (known in the number field case) about weak and strong approximation for linear algebraic groups defined over a global field of positive characteristic.

However, as K. Česnavičius pointed out to us,² it seems necessary to add details to the proof in [Milne 1986], Sections III.3. and III.8, for two reasons:

- The functoriality of flat cohomology with compact support and the commutativity of several diagrams are not explained in [Milne 1986]. Even in the case of an imaginary number field, a definition of $H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F})$ as $H^r(X, j_! \mathcal{F})$ for an fppf sheaf \mathcal{F} (which works for the étale Artin–Verdier Theorem) would not be the right one, because it does not provide the key exact sequence [loc. cit., Proposition III.0.4.a] in the fppf setting: indeed the proof of this exact sequence relies on [loc. cit., Lemma II.2.4], which in turn uses [loc. cit., Proposition II.1.1]; but the analogue of the latter does not stand anymore with étale cohomology replaced by fppf cohomology, see also Remark 2.2 of the present paper.

It is therefore necessary to work with an ad hoc definition of compact support cohomology as in [loc. cit., Section III.0]. Since this definition involves mapping cones, commutativities of some diagrams have to be checked in the category of complexes and not in the derived category (where there is no good functoriality for the mapping cones). Typically, the isomorphisms that compute $C^\bullet(b)$, $C^\bullet(b \circ a)$ and $C^\bullet(c \circ b \circ a)$ in [loc. cit., Proposition III.0.4.c] are not canonical a priori. Hence the required compatibilities in [loc. cit., proof of Theorem III.3.1. and Lemma III.8.4] have to be checked carefully.

²In particular, he observed that the analogue of [Milne 1986, Proposition III.0.4.c] is by no means obvious when henselizations are replaced by completions. This analogue is actually false without additional assumptions, as shown by T. Suzuki [2018, Remark 2.7.9]

• In the positive characteristic case, it is necessary (as explained in [Milne 1986, Section III.8]) to work with a definition of cohomology with compact support involving *completions* of the local rings of points in $X \setminus U$ instead of their henselizations. The reason is that a local duality statement [loc. cit., Theorem III.6.10] is needed and this one only works in the context of complete valuation fields, in particular because the H^1 groups involved have to be locally compact (so that Pontryagin duality makes sense). It turns out that some properties of compact support cohomology (in particular [loc. cit., Proposition III.0.4.c]) are more difficult to establish in this context: for example the comparison between cohomology of the completion $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$ and of the henselization \mathcal{O}_v is not as straightforward as in the étale case.

The goal of this article is to present a detailed proof of Theorem 1.1 with special regards to the two issues listed above. Section 2 is devoted to general properties of fppf cohomology with compact support (Proposition 2.1), which involves some homological algebra (Lemma 2.3) as well as comparison statements between cohomology of \mathcal{O}_v and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$ (Lemma 2.6); besides, we make the link to classical étale cohomology with compact support (Lemma 2.10).

We also define a natural topology on the fppf compact support cohomology groups (see Section 3) and prove its basic properties. In Section 4, we follow the method of [Milne 1986, Section III.8] to prove Theorem 1.1 in the function field case. As a corollary, we get a finiteness statement (Corollary 4.9), which apparently has not been observed before this paper. The case of a number field is simpler once the functorial properties of Section 2 have been proved; it is treated in Section 5. Finally, we include two useful results in homological algebra in the Appendix.

One week after the first draft of this article was released, Takashi Suzuki kindly informed us that in his preprint [Suzuki 2018], he obtained (essentially at the same time as us) fppf duality results similar to Theorem 1.1 in a slightly more general context.³ His methods are somehow more involved than ours, they use the *rational étale site*, which he developed in earlier papers.

Notation. Let X be either a smooth projective curve over a finite field k of characteristic p , or the spectrum of the ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K of a number field K . Let $K := k(X)$ be the function field of X . Throughout the paper, schemes S are endowed with a big fppf site $(\mathrm{Sch}/S)_{\mathrm{fppf}}$ in the sense of [Stacks 2005–, Tag 021R, Tag 021S, Tag 03XB]. By construction, the underlying category in $(\mathrm{Sch}/S)_{\mathrm{fppf}}$ is small and the family of coverings for this site is a set. The corresponding topos is independent of the choices made thanks to [Stacks 2005–, Tag 00VY]. In contrast with [SGA 4_I 1972], the construction of the site $(\mathrm{Sch}/S)_{\mathrm{fppf}}$ in [Stacks 2005–] does not require the existence of universes. The reader who is ready to accept this axiom can replace the site $(\mathrm{Sch}/S)_{\mathrm{fppf}}$ by the big fppf site from [SGA 4_I 1972].

Unless stated otherwise, cohomology is fppf cohomology with respect to this site.

For any closed point $v \in X$, let \mathcal{O}_v (resp. $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$) be the henselization (resp. the completion) of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,v}$ of X at v . Let K_v (resp. \hat{K}_v) be the fraction field of \mathcal{O}_v (resp. $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$). Let U be a nonempty Zariski open subset of X and denote by $j : U \rightarrow X$ the corresponding open immersion. By [Matsumura 1970, Section 34],

³Note, however, that there is still some work to do to obtain our Theorem 1.1 from the very general Theorem 3.1.3 of [Suzuki 2018]; compare with Section 4.2 of [loc. cit.], where a similar task is fulfilled for abelian schemes instead of finite group schemes.

the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,v}$ of X at v is excellent (indeed $\mathcal{O}_{X,v}$ is either of mixed characteristic or the localization of a ring of finite type over a field); hence so are \mathcal{O}_v (by [EGA IV₄ 1967, Corollary 18.7.6]) as the henselization of an excellent ring, and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$ as a complete Noetherian local ring [Matsumura 1970, Section 34].

The piece of notation “ $v \notin U$ ” means that we consider all places v corresponding to closed points of $X \setminus U$ *plus the real places in the number field case*. If v is a real place, we set $K_v = \hat{K}_v = \mathcal{O}_v = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$ for the completion of K at v , and we denote by $H^*(K_v, M)$ the *Tate (or modified) cohomology groups* of a $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}_v/K_v)$ -module M .

If \mathcal{F} is an fppf sheaf of abelian groups on U , define the Cartier dual \mathcal{F}^D to be the fppf sheaf $\mathcal{F}^D := \underline{\text{Hom}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{G}_m)$. Notation as $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{F})$ stands for the group of sections of \mathcal{F} over U , and $\Gamma_Z(U, \mathcal{F})$ for the group of sections that vanish over $U \setminus Z$. If E is a field (e.g., $E = K_v$ or $E = \hat{K}_v$) and $i : \text{Spec } E \rightarrow U$ is an E -point of U , we will frequently write $H^r(E, \mathcal{F})$ for $H^r(\text{Spec } E, i^* \mathcal{F})$. Similarly for an open subset $V \subset U$, the piece of notation $H^r(V, \mathcal{F})$ (resp. $H_c^r(V, \mathcal{F})$) stands for $H^r(V, \mathcal{F}|_V)$ (resp. $H_c^r(V, \mathcal{F}|_V)$).

A finite group scheme N over a field E of characteristic $p > 0$ is *local* (or equivalently *infinitesimal*, as in [Demazure and Gabriel 1970, II.4.7.1]) if it is connected (in particular this implies $H^0(E', N) = 0$ for every field extension E' of E). Examples of such group schemes are μ_p (defined by the affine equation $y^p = 1$) and α_p (defined by the equation $y^p = 0$).

Let S be an \mathbb{F}_p -scheme. A finite S -group scheme N is of *height 1* if the relative Frobenius map $F_{N/S}$ [Milne 1986, Section III.0] is trivial.

For any topological abelian group A , let $A^* := \text{Hom}_{\text{cont.}}(A, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ be the group of continuous homomorphisms from A to \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} (where \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} is considered as a discrete group) equipped with the compact-open topology. A morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ of topological groups is *strict* if it is continuous, and the restriction $f : A \rightarrow f(A)$ is an open map (where the topology on $f(A)$ is induced by B). This is equivalent to saying that f induces an isomorphism of the topological quotient $A/\ker f$ with the topological subspace $f(A) \subset B$.

Concerning sign conventions in homological algebra, we tried to follow the conventions in [Stacks 2005–] throughout the text.

2. Fppf cohomology with compact support

Define

$$Z := X \setminus U \quad \text{and} \quad Z' := \coprod_{v \in Z} \text{Spec}(\hat{K}_v) \quad (\text{disjoint union}).$$

Then we have a natural morphism $i : Z' \rightarrow U$. Let \mathcal{F} be a sheaf of abelian groups on $(\text{Sch}/U)_{\text{fppf}}$. Let $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ be an injective resolution of \mathcal{F} over U . Denote by \mathcal{F}_v and $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_v$ their respective pullbacks to $\text{Spec } K_v$, for $v \notin U$.

Given a morphism of schemes $f : T \rightarrow S$, the fppf pullback functor f^* is exact (see [Stacks 2005–, Tag 021W, Tag 00XL]) and it admits an exact left adjoint $f_!$ (see [Stacks 2005–, Tag 04CC]), hence f^* maps injective (resp. flasque) objects to injective (resp. flasque) objects. Therefore $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_v$ is an injective resolution of \mathcal{F}_v .

As noticed by A. Schmidt, the definition of the modified fppf cohomology groups in the number field case in [Milne 1986, III.0.6(a)] has to be written more precisely, because of the noncanonicity of the mapping cone in the derived category. We are grateful to him for the following alternative definition.

Let $\Omega_{\mathbb{R}}$ denote the set of real places of K . For $v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}$, let $a^v : (\text{Sch} / \text{Spec}(K_v))_{\text{fppf}} \rightarrow \text{Spec}(K_v)_{\text{ét}}$ be the natural morphism of sites, where $S_{\text{ét}}$ denotes the small étale site on a scheme S . Since K_v is a perfect field, the direct image functor a_*^v associated to a^v is exact. Hence, by [SGA 4₂ 1972, V, Remark 4.6 and Proposition 4.9], the functor a_*^v maps $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_v$ to a flasque resolution $a_*^v I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_v$ of $a_*^v \mathcal{F}_v$. Following [Geisser and Schmidt 2018, Section 2], there is a natural acyclic resolution $D^\bullet(a_*^v \mathcal{F}_v) \rightarrow a_*^v \mathcal{F}_v$ of the $\text{Gal}(\overline{K}_v/K_v) = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -module $a_*^v \mathcal{F}_v$ (identified with $\mathcal{F}_v(\text{Spec}(\overline{K}_v))$). Splicing the resolutions $D^\bullet(a_*^v \mathcal{F}_v)$ and $a_*^v I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_v$ together, one gets a complete acyclic resolution $\hat{I}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v)$ of the $\text{Gal}(\overline{K}_v/K_v)$ -module $a_*^v \mathcal{F}_v$, which computes the Tate cohomology of $a_*^v \mathcal{F}_v$. And by construction, there is a natural morphism $\hat{i}_v : a_*^v I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_v \rightarrow \hat{I}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v)$.

As suggested by [Milne 1986, Section III.0], define $\Gamma_c(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$ to be the following object in the category of complexes of abelian groups:

$$\Gamma_c(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := \text{Cone} \left(\Gamma(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \Gamma(Z', i^* I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \Gamma(K_v, \hat{I}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v)) \right)[-1],$$

and $H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) := H^r(\Gamma_c(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})))$. We will also denote by $R\Gamma_c(U, \mathcal{F})$ the complex $\Gamma_c(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$ viewed in the derived category of fppf sheaves. Observe that in the number field case the groups $H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F})$ may be nonzero even for negative r . In the function field case we have $H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ for $r < 0$, and also (by Proposition 2.1 below) $H_c^0(U, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ if we assume further $U \neq X$ (the map $H^0(U, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^0(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F})$ being injective for each $v \notin U$).

From now on, we will abbreviate $\text{Cone}(\dots)$ by $C(\dots)$.

Proposition 2.1. (1) *Let \mathcal{F} be a sheaf of abelian groups on U_{fppf} . There is a natural exact sequence, for all $r \geq 0$,*

$$\dots \rightarrow H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_c^{r+1}(U, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \dots$$

(2) *For any short exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$$

of sheaves of abelian groups on U , there is a long exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}') \rightarrow H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}'') \rightarrow H_c^{r+1}(U, \mathcal{F}') \rightarrow \dots$$

(3) *For any flat affine commutative group scheme \mathcal{F} of finite type over U , and any nonempty open subscheme $V \subset U$, there is a canonical exact sequence*

$$\dots \rightarrow H_c^r(V, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_c^{r+1}(V, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \dots,$$

and the following natural diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \bigoplus_{v \notin V} H^{r-1}(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \xleftarrow{i_2} & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^{r-1}(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & & \\
 & \nearrow i_1 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^{r-1}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^r(V, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \nearrow \\
 & & H^r(V, \mathcal{F}) & \xleftarrow{\text{Res}} & H^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 \bigoplus_{v \notin V} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & & & &
 \end{array}$$

where i_1 (resp. i_2) is obtained by putting 0 at the places $v \notin U$ (resp. $v \in U \setminus V$) and π is the natural projection.

- (4) If \mathcal{F} is represented by a smooth group scheme, then $H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \cong H_{\text{ét},c}^r(U, \mathcal{F})$ for $r \neq 1$, where $H_{\text{ét},c}^*$ stands for modified étale cohomology with compact support (as defined in [Geisser and Schmidt 2018, Section 2]). In particular for such \mathcal{F} we have $H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \cong H_{\text{ét}}^r(X, j_! \mathcal{F})$ in the function field case. If in addition the generic fiber \mathcal{F}_K is a finite K -group scheme, then $H_c^1(U, \mathcal{F}) \cong H_{\text{ét},c}^1(U, \mathcal{F})$ (which is identified with $H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, j_! \mathcal{F})$ in the function field case).

Remark 2.2. Unlike what happens in étale cohomology, the groups $H^1(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{F})$ and $H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F})$ cannot in general be identified with the group $H^1(k(v), F(v))$, where $k(v)$ is the residue field at v and $F(v)$ the fiber of \mathcal{F} over $k(v)$. For example this already fails for $\mathcal{F} = \mu_p$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v = \mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$, because by the Kummer exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mu_p \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_m \xrightarrow{\cdot p} \mathbf{G}_m \rightarrow 0$$

in fppf cohomology, the group $H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_v^* / \hat{\mathcal{O}}_v^{*p}$ is an infinite dimensional \mathbb{F}_p -vector space, while $H^1(k(v), F(v)) = k(v)^* / k(v)^{*p} = 0$. The situation is better for $r \geq 2$ by [Toën 2011, Corollary 3.4]: namely the natural maps from $H^r(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{F})$ and $H^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F})$ to $H^r(k(v), F(v))$ are isomorphisms.

Before proving Proposition 2.1, we need the following lemmas. We start with a lemma in homological algebra.

Lemma 2.3. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category with enough injectives and let $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{A})$ (resp. $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A})$) denote the category (resp. the derived category) of bounded below cochain complexes in \mathcal{A} . Consider a commutative diagram in $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{A})$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & B \oplus E \\
 f \downarrow & & \downarrow (\text{id}, g) \\
 A' & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & B \oplus E'
 \end{array}$$

and denote by π_B (resp. π'_B) the projection $B \oplus E \rightarrow B$ (resp. $B \oplus E' \rightarrow B$).

Assume that the natural morphism $C(f) \rightarrow C(g)$ in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Then there exists a canonical commutative diagram in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 (B \oplus E')[-1] & \xleftarrow{i'_B} & B[-1] & & B \oplus E \xrightarrow{(\text{id}, g)} B \oplus E' \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow i_E \\
 C(\alpha')[-1] & \longrightarrow & C(\pi_B \circ \alpha)[-1] & \longrightarrow & E \longrightarrow C(\alpha') \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow \pi_E \\
 A' & \xleftarrow{f} & A & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & B \oplus E \\
 \downarrow \alpha' & & \downarrow \pi_B \circ \alpha & & \\
 B \oplus E' & \xrightarrow{\pi'_B} & B & &
 \end{array}$$

where the second row and the first two columns are exact triangles.

Proof. The assumption that $C(f) \rightarrow C(g) \cong C(\text{Id} \oplus g)$ is a quasi-isomorphism implies that $C(\alpha) \rightarrow C(\alpha')$ is a quasi-isomorphism (see for instance Proposition 1.1.11 in [Beilinson et al. 1982] or Corollary A.14 in [Peters and Steenbrink 2008]).

Functoriality of the mapping cone in the category $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$ gives the following diagram in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$, where the second row (by [Milne 1986, Proposition II.0.10], or [Kashiwara and Schapira 2006, proof of Theorem 11.2.6]) and the columns are exact triangles in the derived category:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & (B \oplus E)[-1] & \xleftarrow{i_B} & B[-1] & \xrightarrow{=} & B[-1] \\
 & \swarrow (\text{id}, g) & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 (B \oplus E')[-1] & & C(\alpha)[-1] & \longrightarrow & C(\pi_B \circ \alpha)[-1] & \longrightarrow & C(\pi_B)[-1] \longrightarrow C(\alpha) \\
 \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \searrow \star \\
 C(\alpha')[-1] & & A & \xrightarrow{=} & A & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & B \oplus E \xrightarrow{\pi_E} E \xrightarrow{i_E} B \oplus E \\
 \downarrow & \swarrow f & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \pi_B \circ \alpha & & \downarrow \pi_B \\
 A' & & B \oplus E & \xrightarrow{\pi_B} & B & \xrightarrow{=} & B \\
 \downarrow \alpha' & \swarrow (\text{id}, g) & & & & & \\
 B \oplus E' & & & & & &
 \end{array}$$

As usual, notation as π_B , π_E denotes projections and i_B , i_E are given by putting 0 at the missing piece. Note also that due to our sign conventions, the horizontal map $C(\pi_B)[-1] \rightarrow C(\alpha)$ is given by the natural map with a (-1) -sign.

This diagram is commutative in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$, except the square \star which is commutative up to homotopy. Indeed, this square defines two maps $f, g : C(\pi_B)[-1] \rightarrow C(\alpha)$, which are given in degree n by two maps $f^n, g^n : B^{n-1} \oplus (B^n \oplus E^n) \rightarrow (B^n \oplus E^n) \oplus A^{n+1}$, where $f^n(b', b, e) := -(b, e, 0)$ and

$g^n(b', b, e) := -(0, e, 0)$. Consider now the maps $s^n : B^{n-1} \oplus (B^n \oplus E^n) \rightarrow (B^{n-1} \oplus E^{n-1}) \oplus A^n$ defined by $s^n(b', b, e) := (b', 0, 0)$. Then the collection (s^n) is a homotopy between f and g . Hence the square \star is commutative up to the homotopy (s^n) .

Since the map $C(\alpha) \rightarrow C(\alpha')$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and since the natural map $C(\pi_B)[-1] \rightarrow E$ is a homotopy equivalence, the lemma follows from the commutativity and the exactness of the previous diagram. \square

We now need the following result, for which we did not find a suitable reference:

Lemma 2.4. *Let A be a henselian valuation ring with fraction field K . Let \hat{A} be the completion of A for the valuation topology and $\hat{K} := \text{Frac } \hat{A}$. Assume that \hat{K} is separable over K :*

- (1) *Let G be a K -group scheme locally of finite type. Then the map $H^1(K, G) \rightarrow H^1(\hat{K}, G)$ has dense image.*
- (2) *Assume that \hat{A} is henselian. Let G be a flat A -group scheme locally of finite presentation. Then the map $H^1(A, G) \rightarrow H^1(\hat{A}, G)$ has dense image.*

Here the topology on the pointed sets $H^1(\hat{A}, G)$ and $H^1(\hat{K}, G)$ is provided by [Česnavičius 2015b, Section 3].

Remarks 2.5. • The assumption that \hat{K} is separable over K is satisfied if A is an excellent discrete valuation ring.

- In the second statement, the assumption that \hat{A} is henselian is satisfied if the valuation on A has height 1 (special case of [Ribenoim 1968, Section F, Theorem 4]). This assumption is used in the proof below to apply [Česnavičius 2015b, Theorem B.5]. Note also that in general, \hat{A} is not the same as the completion of A for the \mathfrak{m} -adic topology (where \mathfrak{m} denotes the maximal ideal of A).

Proof of Lemma 2.4. We prove both statements at the same time. Let E be either A or K , set $S = \text{Spec } E$. Let $\mathbf{B}G$ denote the classifying E -stack of G -torsors. We need to prove that $\mathbf{B}G(E)$ is dense in $\mathbf{B}G(\hat{E})$. It is a classical fact that $\mathbf{B}G$ is an algebraic stack [Stacks 2005–, Tag 0CQJ and Tag 06PL]. Let $x \in \mathbf{B}G(\hat{E})$ and $U \subset \mathbf{B}G(\hat{E})$ be an open subcategory (in the sense of [Česnavičius 2015b, 2.4]) containing x . We need to find an object $x' \in \mathbf{B}G(E)$ that maps to $U \subset \mathbf{B}G(\hat{E})$. Using [Česnavičius 2015b, Theorem B.5 and Remark B.6] (applied to the S -scheme $\text{Spec } R := \text{Spec } \hat{E}$), there exists an affine scheme Y , a smooth S -morphism $\pi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{B}G$ and $y \in Y(\hat{E})$ such that $\pi_{\hat{E}}(y) = x$, where $\pi_{\hat{E}} : Y(\hat{E}) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}G(\hat{E})$ is the map induced by π . In particular, $Y \rightarrow S$ is smooth because so are π and $\mathbf{B}G \rightarrow S$ (the latter by [Česnavičius 2015b, Proposition A.3]). Hence Y is locally of finite presentation over S . By assumption, $\pi_{\hat{E}}^{-1}(U) \subset Y(\hat{E})$ is an open subset containing y . Hence [Moret-Bailly 2012, Corollary 1.2.1] (in the discrete valuation ring case, it is Greenberg’s approximation theorem) implies that $Y(E) \cap \pi_{\hat{E}}^{-1}(U) \neq \emptyset$. Applying π_E , we get that the image of $\mathbf{B}G(E)$ meets U , which proves the required result. \square

The previous lemma is useful to prove the following crucial (in the function field case) statement. For a local integral domain A with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} , fraction field K and residue field κ , and \mathcal{F} an fppf sheaf

on $\mathrm{Spec} A$ with an injective resolution $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$, define

$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(A, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := \mathrm{Cone}(\Gamma(\mathrm{Spec} A, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathrm{Spec} K, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})))[-1]$$

and $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^r(A, \mathcal{F}) := H^r(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(A, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})))$ (the cohomology with support in $\mathrm{Spec} \kappa$). We have a localization long exact sequence [Milne 1986, Proposition III.0.3]

$$\cdots \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(K, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{r+1}(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \cdots$$

Lemma 2.6. *Let A be an excellent henselian discrete valuation ring, with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} . Let \mathcal{F} be a flat affine commutative group scheme of finite type over $\mathrm{Spec} A$. Then for all $r \geq 0$, the morphism $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^r(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is an isomorphism.*

Remark 2.7. Let $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ be an injective resolution of \mathcal{F} viewed as an fppf sheaf. Another formulation of Lemma 2.6 is that the natural morphism $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(A, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}(\hat{A}, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$ is an isomorphism in the derived category. The injective resolution $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ can be replaced by any complex of flasque fppf sheaves that is quasi-isomorphic to \mathcal{F} (indeed the fppf pullback functor f^* associated to $f : \mathrm{Spec} \hat{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} A$ sends flasque resolutions to flasque resolutions, because f^* is exact and preserves flasque sheaves).

Also note that Lemma 2.6 is a variant of [Suzuki 2018, Proposition 2.6.2]: our result is slightly more general in the affine case, while the notion of cohomological approximation in [Suzuki 2018] is a priori a little stronger than the conclusion of Lemma 2.6. In addition, this lemma answers a variant of a question raised after [loc. cit., Proposition 2.6.2] (under a flatness assumption).

Proof of Lemma 2.6. ($r = 0$). Since \mathcal{F} is separated (as an affine scheme), the morphisms $H^0(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^0(K, \mathcal{F})$ and $H^0(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^0(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ are injective, which implies that

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A, \mathcal{F}) = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) = 0.$$

($r = 1$). Consider the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} H^0(A, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^0(K, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(A, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(K, \mathcal{F}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^0(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F}) \end{array} \quad (1)$$

Since A is excellent, Artin approximation [1969, Theorem 1.12] implies that the morphism $H^1(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^1(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is injective: indeed, given a $(\mathrm{Spec} A)$ -torsor \mathcal{P} under \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{P} is locally of finite presentation, and Artin approximation ensures that $\mathcal{P}(\hat{A}) \neq \emptyset$ implies that $\mathcal{P}(A) \neq \emptyset$.

The affine A -scheme of finite type \mathcal{F} is of the form $\mathrm{Spec}(A[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(f_1, \dots, f_r))$, where f_1, \dots, f_r are polynomials. Since the discrete valuation ring A satisfies $A = K \cap \hat{A} \subset \hat{K}$, the square on the left-hand side in (1) is cartesian.

Hence an easy diagram chase implies that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is injective.

By Proposition A.6 in [Gille and Pianzola 2008], the right-hand side square in (1) is cartesian. In addition, $H^0(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) \subset H^0(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ is open [Gabber et al. 2014, Proposition 3.3.4], and $H^0(K, \mathcal{F}) \subset H^0(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ is dense by [Gabber et al. 2014, Proposition 3.5.2] (weak approximation for \mathcal{F}).

Therefore, an easy diagram chase implies that the map $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is surjective.

($r = 2$). Consider the commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 H^1(A, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(K, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(A, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^2(A, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^2(K, \mathcal{F}) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 H^1(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^2(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^2(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})
 \end{array} \tag{2}$$

By [Toën 2011, Corollary 3.4], the map $H^2(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^2(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is an isomorphism. And we already explained (in the case $r = 1$) that the left-hand side square in (2) is cartesian. Hence a diagram chase proves that the map $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is injective.

Using [Gabber et al. 2014, Proposition 3.5.3.(3)], the map $H^2(K, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^2(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ is also an isomorphism. By [Česnavičius 2015b, Proposition 2.9(e)], the map $H^1(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^1(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ is open. Lemma 2.4 implies that the map $H^1(K, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^1(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ has dense image. By diagram chase, we get that the map $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is surjective.

($r \geq 3$). Corollary 3.4 in [Toën 2011] implies that the morphisms $H^{r-1}(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^{r-1}(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ and $H^r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ are isomorphisms. Proposition 3.5.3(3) in [Gabber et al. 2014] implies that the maps $H^{r-1}(K, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^{r-1}(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ and $H^r(K, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(\hat{K}, \mathcal{F})$ are isomorphisms. Therefore, the five-lemma proves that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^r(A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^r(\hat{A}, \mathcal{F})$ is an isomorphism. \square

Remark 2.8. We will apply the previous lemma to a finite and flat commutative group scheme N . As was pointed out to us by K. Česnavičius, it is then possible to argue without using Corollary 3.4 in [Toën 2011] (whose proof is quite involved): indeed there exists [Milne 1986, Theorem III.A.5] an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow G_1 \rightarrow G_2 \rightarrow 0$$

of affine A -group schemes such that G_1 and G_2 are smooth. Now for $i > 0$ we have $H^i(A, G_j) \cong H^i(\hat{A}, G_j)$ ($j = 1, 2$) by [Milne 1980, Remark III.3.11], because A and \hat{A} are henselian, and fppf cohomology coincides with étale cohomology for smooth group schemes. It remains to apply the five-lemma to get $H^i(A, N) \cong H^i(\hat{A}, N)$ for $i \geq 2$, which is the input from [Toën 2011] that we used in the proof.

The following lemma is a version of the excision property for fppf cohomology with respect to étale morphisms:

Lemma 2.9. *Let X, X' be schemes, $Z \hookrightarrow X$ (resp. $Z' \hookrightarrow X'$) be closed subschemes, $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$ be an étale morphism. Assume that π restricted to Z' is an isomorphism from Z' to Z and that $\pi(X' \setminus Z') \subset X \setminus Z$. Let \mathcal{F} be a sheaf on $(\text{Sch}/X)_{\text{fppf}}$. Then for all $r \geq 0$, the natural morphism $H_{\mathfrak{Z}}^r(X, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{Z}'}^r(X', \pi^* \mathcal{F})$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Since π^* is exact and maps injective objects to injective objects, the proof is exactly the same as the proof of [Milne 1980, Proposition III.1.27]. \square

We continue with a lemma comparing the definition of modified étale cohomology with compact support in [Geisser and Schmidt 2018] and our definition of modified fppf cohomology with compact support. For any scheme T , consider the morphisms of sites

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\mathrm{Sch}/T)_{\mathrm{fppf}} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_T} & (\mathrm{Sch}/T)_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}} & \xrightarrow{\pi_T} & T_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}, \\ & & \searrow a_T & \nearrow & \\ & & & & \end{array}$$

where $(\mathrm{Sch}/T)_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$ denotes the big étale site of T . Recall that $Z := X \setminus U$, $Z' := \coprod_{v \in Z} \mathrm{Spec}(\hat{K}_v)$, $j : U \rightarrow X$ is the open immersion and $i : Z' \rightarrow U$ is the natural morphism. Set $a := a_U$ and $\varepsilon := \varepsilon_U$.

Let \mathcal{F} be a sheaf on $U_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$, and let $\pi_X^* j_! \mathcal{F} \rightarrow J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ be an injective resolution in the big étale topos of X . By [Stacks 2005–, Tag 0758 and Tag 04BT], the restriction $J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$ of $J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ to the small étale site of X is an injective resolution of $j_! \mathcal{F}$. For every place $v \notin U$ of K , let \mathcal{F}_v be the pull-back of \mathcal{F} to $(\mathrm{Spec} K_v)_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$. As in the fppf case (explained in the beginning of Section 2), we have for v real a complete resolution $\hat{J}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v)$ of the $\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{K}_v/K_v)$ -module \mathcal{F}_v , which computes its Tate cohomology. Following [Geisser and Schmidt 2018, Section 2], we define

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},c}(U, J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := \mathrm{Cone} \left(\Gamma(X, J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \Gamma(K_v, \hat{J}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v)) \right)[-1],$$

and $H_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},c}^r(U, \mathcal{F}) := H^r(\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},c}(U, J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})))$.

Denote by $R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},c}(U, \mathcal{F})$ the complex $\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},c}(U, J^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$ (viewed in the derived category of abelian groups); similarly for v real, set $\widehat{R\Gamma}_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(K_v, \mathcal{F})$ (resp. $\widehat{R\Gamma}(K_v, a^* \mathcal{F})$) for the complex $\Gamma(K_v, \hat{J}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v))$ (resp. $\Gamma(K_v, \hat{I}^\bullet((a^* \mathcal{F})_v))$), where $I^\bullet(a^* \mathcal{F})$ is a flasque resolution of $a^* \mathcal{F}$, compare to the beginning of Section 2) in the derived category of étale sheaves (resp. fppf sheaves) over $\mathrm{Spec} K_v$. Finally, let $R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},Z}(X, j_! \mathcal{F})$ denote the complex

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},Z}(X, J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := \mathrm{Cone}(\Gamma(X, J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}) \rightarrow \Gamma(U, J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}))[-1].$$

Lemma 2.10. (1) *Let \mathcal{F} be a sheaf of abelian groups over $U_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$. Then there is a canonical commutative diagram in the derived category of abelian groups, where the rows are exact triangles:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},c}(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},Z}(X, j_! \mathcal{F})[1] \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \widehat{R\Gamma}_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(K_v, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},c}(U, \mathcal{F})[1] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ R\Gamma_c(U, a^* \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(U, a^* \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(Z', i^* a^* \mathcal{F}) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \widehat{R\Gamma}(K_v, a^* \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_c(U, a^* \mathcal{F})[1] \end{array}$$

Besides, the complex $R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t},Z}(X, j_! \mathcal{F})[1]$ is quasi-isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{v \in Z} R\Gamma_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(K_v, \mathcal{F})$.

- (2) Let G be a smooth commutative group scheme over U . Let \underline{G} denote the fppf sheaf associated to G and $G_{\text{ét}} := a_* \underline{G}$. Then there is a canonical commutative diagram in the derived category of abelian groups, where the rows are exact triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R\Gamma_{\text{ét},c}(U, G_{\text{ét}}) & \rightarrow & R\Gamma_{\text{ét}}(U, G_{\text{ét}}) & \rightarrow & R\Gamma_{\text{ét},Z}(X, j_! G_{\text{ét}})[1] \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \widehat{R\Gamma}_{\text{ét}}(K_v, G_{\text{ét}}) & \rightarrow & R\Gamma_{\text{ét},c}(U, G_{\text{ét}})[1] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 R\Gamma_c(U, \underline{G}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(U, \underline{G}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(Z', i^* \underline{G}) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \widehat{R\Gamma}(K_v, \underline{G}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_c(U, \underline{G})[1]
 \end{array}$$

Besides, the complex $R\Gamma_{\text{ét},Z}(X, j_! G_{\text{ét}})[1]$ is quasi-isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{v \in Z} R\Gamma_{\text{ét}}(K_v, G_{\text{ét}})$.

Proof. (1) Set $J := J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$. Since $j_! \mathcal{F} \rightarrow J_{\text{ét}} := J^\bullet(\mathcal{F})_{\text{ét}}$ is an injective resolution, we get an injective resolution $\mathcal{F} = j^* j_! \mathcal{F} \rightarrow j^* J_{\text{ét}}$ in $U_{\text{ét}}$. The functor ε^* is an exact functor that maps flasque étale sheaves to flasque fppf sheaves (see [Stacks 2005–, Tag 0DDU]), we get a flasque resolution $a^* \mathcal{F} \rightarrow I := \varepsilon^* j^* J_{\text{ét}}$. Let $\hat{J}_v := \hat{J}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v)$; define $\hat{I}_v = \hat{I}^\bullet((\varepsilon^* \mathcal{F})_v)$ (associated to the flasque resolution I of $\varepsilon^* \mathcal{F}$) as in the beginning of Section 2.

Consider now the following commutative diagram of complexes, where $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{ét},Z}(U, J)$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{ét},c}(U, J)$ are mapping cones defined such that the third and fourth rows are exact triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \Gamma_{\text{ét},c}(U, J_{\text{ét}}) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(U, j^* J_{\text{ét}}) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét},Z}(X, J_{\text{ét}})[1] \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(K_v, \hat{J}_{\text{ét},v}) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét},c}(U, J_{\text{ét}})[1] \\
 \uparrow \varphi_c & & \uparrow \varphi & & \uparrow \varphi' & & \uparrow \\
 \Gamma_{\text{ét},c}(U, J) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(U, j^* J) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét},Z}(X, J)[1] \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(K_v, \hat{J}_v) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét},c}(U, J)[1] \\
 \downarrow d' & & \downarrow = & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow \\
 \tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{ét},Z}(U, J) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(U, j^* J) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in Z} \Gamma_{\text{ét},v}(\mathcal{O}_v, J)[1] \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(K_v, \hat{J}_v) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{ét},Z}(U, J)[1] \\
 \uparrow b' & & \uparrow = & & \uparrow b & & \uparrow \\
 \tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{ét},c}(U, J) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(U, j^* J) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in Z} \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(K_v, J) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \Gamma_{\text{ét}}(K_v, \hat{J}_v) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{ét},c}(U, J)[1] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow c & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \Gamma_c(U, I) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(U, I) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(Z', i^* I) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \Gamma(K_v, \hat{I}_v) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, I)[1]
 \end{array}$$

In this diagram, the rows are exact triangles (by definition for the last three rows, using the proof of Lemma 2.7 in [Geisser and Schmidt 2018] for the first ones). The maps φ , φ' and φ_c are quasi-isomorphisms by [Stacks 2005–, Tag 0DDH]. In addition, the maps d and b (hence also d' and b') are quasi-isomorphisms: for the map d , this is the excision property for étale cohomology (see [Milne 1980, Proposition III.1.27]); for the map b , this is exactly [Milne 1986, Proposition II.1.1.(a)]. In addition, the map c is a quasi-isomorphism, using [Stacks 2005–, Tag 0DDU]. This proves the lemma.

(2) Consider the following commutative diagram of exact triangles in the derived category:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R\Gamma_{\acute{e}t,c}(U, G_{\acute{e}t}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_{\acute{e}t}(U, G_{\acute{e}t}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_{\acute{e}t,Z}(X, j_! G_{\acute{e}t})[1] \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \widehat{R\Gamma}_{\acute{e}t}(K_v, G_{\acute{e}t}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_{\acute{e}t,c}(U, G_{\acute{e}t})[1] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 R\Gamma_c(U, a^* G_{\acute{e}t}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(U, a^* G_{\acute{e}t}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(Z', i^* a^* G_{\acute{e}t}) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \widehat{R\Gamma}(K_v, a^* G_{\acute{e}t}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_c(U, a^* G_{\acute{e}t})[1] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 R\Gamma_c(U, \underline{G}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(U, \underline{G}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma(Z', i^* \underline{G}) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in \Omega_{\mathbb{R}}} \widehat{R\Gamma}(K_v, \underline{G}) & \longrightarrow & R\Gamma_c(U, \underline{G})[1]
 \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps between the first two rows come from the first point of this lemma, and the ones between the last two rows come from the adjunction morphism $a^* G_{\acute{e}t} = a^* a_* \underline{G} \rightarrow \underline{G}$ and from the functoriality of the triangle defining the complexes $R\Gamma_c(U, \cdot)$. Now [Grothendieck 1968, Theorem 11.7], ensures that the composed vertical morphism $R\Gamma_{\acute{e}t}(U, G_{\acute{e}t}) \rightarrow R\Gamma(U, \underline{G})$ is an isomorphism. Whence the required result. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.1. (1) This is immediate from the definitions.

(2) The claim follows from the definitions, from the exactness of the functors i^* , a_*^v and $D^*(\cdot)$ at the beginning of Section 2, and from the exactness of the cone functor on the category of complexes of abelian groups (see also [Milne 1986, III, Proposition 0.4.a and Remark 0.6.b]).

(3) As in the proof of [Milne 1986, III, Proposition 0.4.c], let $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ be an injective resolution of \mathcal{F} . In the number field case, the piece of notation $\Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$ will stand for $\Gamma(K_v, \hat{I}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v))$ when v is a real place of K , where $\hat{I}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_v)$ is the modified resolution constructed in the beginning of Section 2.

Consider the following commutative diagram of complexes in the category of bounded below complexes of abelian groups, where the maps are the natural ones:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \Gamma(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathcal{O}}} & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow (\text{id}, g) & \nearrow \pi_K & \\
 \Gamma(V, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & &
 \end{array}$$

Functoriality of the mapping cone in the category of complexes gives morphisms

$$\Gamma_{U \setminus V}(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma_v(\mathcal{O}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma_v(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})),$$

where

$$\Gamma_{U \setminus V}(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := C(f)[-1], \quad \Gamma_v(\mathcal{O}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := \Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}_v}(\mathcal{O}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$$

and

$$\Gamma_v(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := \Gamma_{\mathfrak{m}_v}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})).$$

The excision property (Lemma 2.9) implies that the first morphism above $\Gamma_{U \setminus V}(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma_v(\mathcal{O}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

Since for all $v \in X$, the ring \mathcal{O}_v is an excellent henselian discrete valuation ring, Lemma 2.6 ensures that the second map

$$\bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma_v(\mathcal{O}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma_v(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. Therefore, the natural morphism $C(f) \rightarrow C(g)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

Apply now Lemma 2.3 to get a commutative diagram in the derived category of abelian groups, where the second row and the first two columns are exact triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \left(\bigoplus_{v \notin V} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \right)[-1] & \xleftarrow{i_K} & \left(\bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \right)[-1] & & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \xrightarrow{(\text{id}, g)} & \bigoplus_{v \notin V} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow i'_\mathcal{O} & & \downarrow \\
 \Gamma_c(V, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(V, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))[1] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow \pi'_\mathcal{O} & & \downarrow \\
 \Gamma(V, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \xleftarrow{f} & \Gamma(U, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & & \\
 \downarrow \alpha' & & \downarrow \pi_\mathcal{O} \circ \alpha & & & & \\
 \bigoplus_{v \notin V} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & \xrightarrow{\pi_K} & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) & & & &
 \end{array} \tag{3}$$

Now the cohomology of this diagram gives the following canonical commutative diagram, with an exact second row (and the two first columns exact):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \bigoplus_{v \notin V} H^{r-1}(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \leftarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^{r-1}(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \rightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin V} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow & & \downarrow \\
 \cdots \longrightarrow & H_c^r(V, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+1}(V, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \cdots \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 H^r(V, \mathcal{F}) & \xleftarrow{\text{Res}} & H^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\
 \bigoplus_{v \notin V} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & & & &
 \end{array}$$

which proves the required exactness and commutativity.

(4) Lemma 2.10 gives a commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 H_{\text{ét}}^{r-1}(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H_{\text{ét}}^{r-1}(K_v, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét},c}^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_{\text{ét}}^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H_{\text{ét}}^r(K_v, \mathcal{F}) \\
 \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \\
 H^{r-1}(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^{r-1}(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & H^r(U, \mathcal{F}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F})
 \end{array}$$

Here $H_{\text{ét}}$ stands for étale cohomology (modified over K_v for v real) and $H_{\text{ét},c}$ for (modified) étale cohomology with compact support (as defined in [Geisser and Schmidt 2018, Section 2], or before Lemma 2.10; recall also that in the number field case, the piece of notation $v \notin U$ means that we consider the places corresponding to closed points of $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K) \setminus U$ and the real places).

By [Gabber et al. 2014, Lemma 3.5.3] and [Milne 1980, III.3], we have

$$H_{\text{ét}}^r(K_v, \mathcal{F}) \cong H_{\text{ét}}^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^r(\hat{K}_v, \mathcal{F})$$

for all $r \geq 1$ (resp. for all integers r if \mathcal{F}_K is finite; indeed K_v and \hat{K}_v have the same absolute Galois group via [Bourbaki 2006, Section 8, Corollary 4 to Theorem 2], and [Ribenoim 1968, Section F, Corollary 2 to Theorem 2]) and all places v of K . Therefore the five-lemma gives the result. \square

Remark 2.11. The definition of fppf compact support cohomology and its related properties are specific to schemes of dimension 1. To the best of our knowledge, there is no good analogue in higher dimension, unlike what happens for étale cohomology.

We will need the following complement to Proposition 2.1:

Proposition 2.12. *Let \mathcal{F} be a flat affine commutative group scheme of finite type over U . Let $V \subset U$ be a nonempty open subset. Then there is a long exact sequence*

$$\cdots \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H_v^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(V, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H_v^{r+1}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \cdots \quad (4)$$

Proof. The map $\bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H_v^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^r(U, \mathcal{F})$ is given by the identification of the first group with $H_Z^r(U, \mathcal{F})$, where $Z = U \setminus V$, via Lemmas 2.6 and 2.9. By the localization exact sequence [Milne 1986, Proposition III.0.3.c], this identification yields the required long exact sequence. \square

3. Topology on cohomology groups with compact support

With the previous notation, let us define a natural topology on the groups $H_c^*(U, N)$, where N is a finite flat commutative U -group scheme. Theorem 1.1 actually immediately implies that $H_c^2(U, N)$ is profinite, but this duality theorem will not be used in this paragraph. The “a priori” approach we adopt in this section answers a question raised by Milne [1986, Problem III.8.8].

We restrict ourselves to the function field case, because when K is a number field the groups involved are finite (see [Milne 1986, Theorem III.3.2]; see also Section 5 of this article). Recall that as usual (see

for example [Milne 1986, Section III.8]), the groups $H^*(U, N)$ are endowed with the discrete topology. Our first goal in this section is to define a natural topology on the groups $H_c^*(U, N)$.

Given an exact sequence of abelian groups

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0,$$

such that A is a topological group, there exists a unique topology on B such that B is a topological group, A is an open subgroup of B , and C is discrete when endowed with the quotient topology. Indeed, the topology on B is generated by the subsets $b + U$, where $b \in B$ and U is an open subset of A . In addition, given another abelian group B' with a subgroup $A' \subset B'$ that is a topological group, and a commutative diagram of abelian groups

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \hookrightarrow & B \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ A' & \hookrightarrow & B' \end{array}$$

then f is continuous if and only if g is continuous, for the aforementioned topologies. And f is open if and only if g is.

We can therefore topologize the groups $H_c^i(U, N)$ for $i \neq 2$, using the exact sequence (see Proposition 2.1(1))

$$\bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^{i-1}(\hat{K}_v, N) \rightarrow H_c^i(U, N) \rightarrow H^i(U, N).$$

Since the groups $H^{i-1}(\hat{K}_v, N)$ are finite for $i \neq 2$ [Milne 1986, Section III.6] and $H^i(U, N)$ is discrete, all groups $H_c^i(U, N)$ are discrete if $i \neq 2$.

Let us now focus on the case $i = 2$. Consider the exact sequence (Proposition 2.1(1))

$$H^1(U, N) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N) \rightarrow H^2(U, N). \quad (5)$$

For $i = 1, 2$, set

$$D^i(U, N) = \operatorname{Im}[H_c^i(U, N) \rightarrow H^i(U, N)] = \operatorname{Ker}[H^i(U, N) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^i(\hat{K}_v, N)].$$

By Proposition 2.1(1), there is an exact sequence

$$\bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^{i-1}(\hat{K}_v, N) \rightarrow H_c^i(U, N) \rightarrow D^i(U, N) \rightarrow 0. \quad (6)$$

The following result has been proved by Česnavičius [2017, Theorem 2.9].⁴

⁴Proposition 2.3 of [loc. cit.] uses the fppf duality Theorem 1.1, but this proposition is actually not needed to prove Theorem 3.1 because a discrete subgroup of a Hausdorff topological group is automatically closed by [Bourbaki 2007, Section 2, Proposition 5]

Theorem 3.1 (Česnavičius). *The map $H^1(U, N) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$ is a strict morphism of topological groups, that is: the image of $H^1(U, N)$ is a discrete subgroup of $\bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$. Besides, the group $D^1(U, N)$ is finite.*

Corollary 3.2. *The group $H_c^1(U, N)$ is finite.*

Proof. The group $\bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^0(\hat{K}_v, N)$ is finite (N being a finite U -group scheme). Thus the finiteness of $H_c^1(U, N)$ is equivalent to the finiteness of $D^1(U, N)$ by (6). \square

Put the quotient topology on $(\bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N))/\text{Im } H^1(U, N)$. Using Theorem 3.1, the previous facts define a natural topology on $H_c^2(U, N)$, so that morphisms in the exact sequence (5) are continuous (and even strict). This topology makes $H_c^2(U, N)$ a Hausdorff and locally compact group [Bourbaki 2007, Section 2, Proposition 18(a)].

To say more about the topology of $H_c^2(U, N)$, we need a lemma.

Lemma 3.3. (1) *Let $r : N \rightarrow N'$ be a morphism of finite flat commutative U -group schemes. Then the corresponding map $s : H_c^2(U, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N')$ is continuous. If we assume further that r is surjective, then s is open. If*

$$0 \rightarrow N' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N'' \rightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of finite flat commutative U -group schemes, then the connecting map $H_c^2(U, N'') \rightarrow H_c^3(U, N')$ is continuous.

(2) *Let $V \subset U$ be a nonempty open subset. Then the natural map $u : H_c^2(V, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N)$ is continuous.*

Proof. (1) By definition of the topology on the groups H_c^2 , it is sufficient to prove that for $v \notin U$, the map $H^1(\hat{K}_v, N) \rightarrow H^1(\hat{K}_v, N')$ is continuous (resp. open if r is surjective). Continuity follows from [Česnavičius 2015b, Proposition 4.2] and the openness statement from [Česnavičius 2015b, Proposition 4.3(d)]. Similarly, the last assertion follows from the continuity of the connecting map $H^1(K_v, N'') \rightarrow H^2(K_v, N')$ [Česnavičius 2015b, Proposition 4.2].

(2) Since (by definition of the topology) the image I of $A := \bigoplus_{v \notin V} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$ is an open subgroup of $H_c^2(V, N)$, it is sufficient to show that the restriction of u to I is continuous. As I is equipped with the quotient topology (induced by the topology of A), this is equivalent to showing that the natural map $s : A \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N)$ is continuous. Now we observe that A is the direct sum of $A_1 := \bigoplus_{v \notin U} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$ and $A_2 := \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$. The restriction of s to A_1 is continuous by the commutative diagram of Proposition 2.1(3). Therefore it only remains to show that the restriction s_2 of s to A_2 is continuous. By [loc. cit.], the restriction of s_2 to $\bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^1(\hat{O}_v, N)$ is zero. Since $\bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^1(\hat{O}_v, N)$ is an open subgroup of $\bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$ [Česnavičius 2015b, Proposition 3.10], the result follows. \square

Recall also the following (probably well-known) lemma:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a continuous morphism of topological groups, with B Hausdorff:*

- (1) *Assume that A is profinite. Then f is strict.*
- (2) *Assume that f is injective and A is compact. Then f is strict.*
- (3) *Let*

$$0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \rightarrow 0$$

be an exact sequence of topological groups with i strict and π continuous. If A and C are completely disconnected, then so is B .

Proof. (1) Since f is continuous and B Hausdorff, the image of f is a compact subspace of B , so we can assume that B is compact and f is onto. The topology of A has a basis consisting of open subgroups, so it is sufficient to show that the image of such a subgroup U is open. As U is closed (hence compact) and of finite index in A , its image $f(U)$ is also compact and of finite index in B , hence it is an open subgroup of B .

(2) Since A is compact and B is Hausdorff, we get that i is a closed map (because the image of a compact subspace of A is compact), hence it induces a homeomorphism from i onto the subspace $i(A) \subset B$. This means that i is strict.

(3) Let D be a connected subset of B . Then $\pi(D)$ is connected, hence is a singleton. Thus, by translating, one can assume that $D \subset i(A)$; as i is strict, the subset $i^{-1}(D) \subset A$ is connected, so it is reduced to a point, hence D is a singleton. This proves the statement. \square

Proposition 3.5. *For every integer i with $0 \leq i \leq 3$, the topology on $H_c^i(U, N)$ is profinite.*

Proof. The only nontrivial case is $i = 2$. We first observe that if there is an exact sequence of finite flat commutative U -group schemes

$$0 \rightarrow N' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N'' \rightarrow 0,$$

then it is sufficient to prove that $H_c^2(U, N')$ and $H_c^2(U, N'')$ are profinite to get the same result for $H_c^2(U, N)$. Indeed by Proposition 2.1, 3., there is an exact sequence

$$H_c^1(U, N'') \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N') \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N'').$$

The group $H_c^1(U, N'')$ is finite by Corollary 3.2; besides, all maps are continuous and the map $H_c^2(U, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N'')$ is open (in particular it is strict, and its image is profinite as soon as $H_c^2(U, N'')$ is) by Lemma 3.3(1). Therefore if $H_c^2(U, N')$ and $H_c^2(U, N'')$ are profinite, then $H_c^2(U, N)$ is profinite as an extension

$$0 \xrightarrow{i} A \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N) \xrightarrow{\pi} B \rightarrow 0$$

of two profinite groups A, B such that the map π is open (the map i is strict by Lemma 3.4, 2.; the group $H_c^2(U, N)$ is completely disconnected by Lemma 3.4 3., and its compactness follows from the fact that π is a proper map by [Bourbaki 2007, Section 4, Corollary 2 to Proposition 2]).

This being said, note now that Proposition 2.1(4) implies the result when the order of N is prime to p by [Milne 1986, Corollary II.3.3] (in this case $H_c^2(U, N)$ is even finite). One can therefore assume by devissage that the order of N is a power of p . The generic fiber N_K of N is a finite commutative group scheme over K . By [Demazure and Gabriel 1970, IV, Section 3.5], N_K admits a composition series whose quotients are étale (with a dual of height one), local (of height one) with étale dual, or α_p . The schematic closure in N of this composition series provides a composition series defined over U . Thus, using the same devissage argument as above, one reduces to the case where the generic fiber N_K or its dual N_K^D has height one.

Proposition III.B.4 and Corollary III.B.5 in [Milne 1986] now imply that there exists a nonempty open subset $V \subset U$ such that $N|_V$ extends to a finite flat commutative group scheme \tilde{N} over the proper k -curve X .

Then Proposition 2.1(3) gives an exact sequence

$$H_c^1(X, \tilde{N}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in X \setminus V} H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \tilde{N}) \rightarrow H_c^2(V, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(X, \tilde{N}) \quad (7)$$

and since we are in the function field case with X proper over k , we have $H_c^i(X, \tilde{N}) = H^i(X, \tilde{N})$ for every positive integer i .

By Proposition 2.1(3), the map $\bigoplus_{v \in X \setminus V} H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \tilde{N}) \rightarrow H_c^2(V, N)$ factors through $\bigoplus_{v \in X \setminus V} H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$, hence it is continuous. By Lemma 3.3, all maps in (7) are continuous. In addition, the groups $H_c^1(X, \tilde{N}) = H^1(X, \tilde{N})$ and $H_c^2(X, \tilde{N}) = H^2(X, \tilde{N})$ are finite by [Milne 1986, Lemma III.8.9]. Besides, $\bigoplus_{v \in X \setminus V} H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \tilde{N})$ is profinite by [loc. cit, Section III.7]; hence $H_c^2(V, N)$ is profinite as an extension (the maps being strict by Lemma 3.4(2)) of a finite group by a profinite group.

Since $H^2(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N) = 0$ for every $v \in U$ [Milne 1986, Section III.7], Proposition 2.1(3) gives an exact sequence of groups

$$\bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(V, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N) \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies that $H_c^2(U, N)$ is profinite, the map $H_c^2(V, N) \rightarrow H_c^2(U, N)$ being continuous by Lemma 3.3(2), hence strict by Lemma 3.4(1), because $H_c^2(V, N)$ is profinite and $H_c^2(U, N)$ is Hausdorff. \square

The following statement will be useful in the next section:

Proposition 3.6. *Assume that $\mathcal{F} = N$, $\mathcal{F}' = N'$ and $\mathcal{F}'' = N''$ are finite and flat commutative group schemes over U . Then all the maps in Proposition 2.1 are strict (in particular continuous).*

Proof. For the maps in assertion 1 of Proposition 2.1, this follows from the definition of the topology and Theorem 3.1.

Let us consider the maps in assertion 2. The finiteness of the H_c^1 groups (Corollary 3.2) implies that it only remains to deal with the maps between H_c^2 's and the connecting map $H_c^2(U, \mathcal{F}'') \rightarrow H_c^3(U, \mathcal{F}')$. All these maps are continuous by Lemma 3.3, hence strict by Lemma 3.4 1. and Proposition 3.5.

Finally, it has already been proven (see the proof of Proposition 3.5) that the maps in the exact sequence of assertion 3 are continuous. They are strict via Lemma 3.4(1) because $H_c^1(U, \mathcal{F})$ is finite, $H_c^2(U, \mathcal{F})$ (resp. $\bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F})$) is profinite, and the other groups are discrete. \square

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1 in the function field case

In this section K is the function field of a projective, smooth and geometrically integral curve X defined over a finite field k of characteristic p . The proof follows the same lines as the proof of [Milne 1986, Theorem III.8.2], replacing Proposition III.0.4 in [Milne 1986] by Proposition 2.1 and using the results of Section 2.

For every nonempty open subset $V \subset U$, the natural map $H_c^3(V, \mathbf{G}_m) \xrightarrow{s} H_c^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m)$ is an isomorphism, and the trace map identifies $H_c^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m)$ with \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} (this identification being compatible with s). Indeed since \mathbf{G}_m is a smooth group scheme we can apply Proposition 2.1(4) and [Milne 1986, Section II.3].

For an fppf sheaf \mathcal{F} on U , let us first define the pairing of abelian groups

$$H_c^{3-r}(U, \mathcal{F}) \times H^r(U, \mathcal{F}^D) \rightarrow H_c^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \cong \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

Since the cohomology groups with compact support are defined via a mapping cone construction, we need to construct this pairing carefully at the level of complexes in order to be able to prove the compatibilities that follow (see Lemmas 4.3 and 4.7 for instance).

Lemma 4.1. *Let A and B be two fppf sheaves of abelian groups on U . Then there exists a canonical pairing in the derived category of abelian groups*

$$R\Gamma_c(U, A) \otimes^L R\Gamma(U, B) \rightarrow R\Gamma_c(U, A \otimes B).$$

Moreover, this pairing is functorial in A and B .

Proof. For any complex C of fppf sheaves, let $G(C)$ denote the Godement resolution of C (see for instance [SGA 4₃ 1973, XVII, 4.2.9]; Godement resolutions exist on the big fppf site because this site has enough points, see Remark 1.6 of [Gabber and Kelly 2015] or [Stacks 2005–, Tag 06VX]).

Then there is a commutative diagram of complexes of sheaves (see [Godement 1958, II.6.6] or [Friedlander and Suslin 2002, Appendix A]):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \otimes B & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \\ \text{Tot}(G(A) \otimes G(B)) & \longrightarrow & G(A \otimes B) \end{array}$$

The horizontal morphism induces a morphism of complexes of abelian groups

$$\text{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) \rightarrow \Gamma(U, G(A \otimes B))$$

hence a canonical morphism in the derived category of abelian groups

$$\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes^L \Gamma(U, G(B)) \rightarrow \Gamma(U, G(A \otimes B)).$$

Considering the local versions of the previous pairings, one gets a commutative diagram of complexes of abelian groups

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(U, G(A \otimes B)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \prod_{v \notin U} \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(A \otimes B)) \end{array}$$

and functoriality of cones gives a canonical morphism of complexes (via Proposition A.1 in the Appendix)

$$\mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma_c(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(U, G(A \otimes B)). \quad (8)$$

Since Godement resolutions are acyclic (see [SGA 4₃ 1973, XVII, Proposition 4.2.3]), we know that $R\Gamma(U, C) \cong \Gamma(U, G(C))$ in the derived category, for any fppf sheaf C . Hence the pairing (8) gives the required morphism in the derived category

$$R\Gamma_c(U, A) \otimes^L R\Gamma(U, B) \rightarrow R\Gamma_c(U, A \otimes B).$$

The functoriality of Godement resolutions implies the functoriality of the pairing in A and B . \square

Using Lemma 4.1, [Stacks 2005–, Tag 068G] gives a natural pairing

$$H_c^r(U, A) \times H^s(U, B) \rightarrow H_c^{r+s}(U, A \otimes B),$$

whence we deduce the required canonical pairings, for any sheaf \mathcal{F} on $(\mathrm{Sch}/U)_{\mathrm{fppf}}$

$$H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \times H^s(U, \mathcal{F}^D) \rightarrow H_c^{r+s}(U, \mathbf{G}_m), \quad (9)$$

using the canonical map $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}^D = \mathcal{F} \otimes \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{G}_m) \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_m$.

Let us describe explicitly the pairing above: the map

$$\mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma_c(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(U, G(A \otimes B))$$

is given by maps

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{r-1}(A)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_r(A)) \right) \otimes \Gamma(U, G_s(B)) &\rightarrow \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{r+s-1}(A \otimes B)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_{r+s}(A \otimes B)) \\ (a_{r-1}, a_r) \otimes b_s &\mapsto (a_{r-1} \cup \beta(b_s), a_r \cup b_s), \end{aligned}$$

where the maps denoted by \cup are the natural pairings, and $\beta : \Gamma(U, G_s(B)) \rightarrow \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_s(B))$ is the localization map.

In the following, we will need an alternative version of the above pairing: with the same notation as above, one defines a pairing in the derived category

$$R\Gamma(U, A) \otimes^L R\Gamma_c(U, B) \rightarrow R\Gamma_c(U, A \otimes B).$$

The definition is similar to the one in Lemma 4.1: the commutative diagram of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(U, G(A \otimes B)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \prod_{v \notin U} \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(A \otimes B)) \end{array}$$

and Proposition A.1 in the Appendix gives a morphism of complexes

$$\mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma_c(U, G(B))) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(U, G(A \otimes B)). \quad (10)$$

Taking into account the signs in Proposition A.1, one can describe the pairing $\mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma_c(U, G(B))) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(U, G(A \otimes B))$ explicitly as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(U, G_r(A)) \otimes \left(\prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{s-1}(B)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_s(B)) \right) &\rightarrow \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{r+s-1}(A \otimes B)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_{r+s}(A \otimes B)) \\ a_r \otimes (b_{s-1}, b_s) &\mapsto ((-1)^r \alpha(a_r) \cup b_{s-1}, a_r \cup b_s), \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha : \Gamma(U, G_r(A)) \rightarrow \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_r(A))$ is the localization map.

We now compare the two pairings defined above:

Lemma 4.2. *The following diagram of complexes commutes up to homotopy:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma_c(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(A \otimes B)) \\ \uparrow = & & \uparrow \\ \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma_c(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma_c(U, G(B))) & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\ \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma_c(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(A \otimes B)) \end{array}$$

Proof. Using the explicit descriptions above, one needs to prove that the map $\varphi_{r,s}$ from

$$\left(\prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{r-1}(A)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_r(A)) \right) \otimes \left(\prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{s-1}(B)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_s(B)) \right)$$

to

$$\prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{r+s-1}(A \otimes B)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_{r+s}(A \otimes B))$$

given by

$$(a_{r-1}, a_r) \otimes (b_{s-1}, b_s) \mapsto ((-1)^r \alpha(a_r) \cup b_{s-1} - a_{r-1} \cup \beta(b_s), 0)$$

is homotopically trivial. To prove this, consider the maps

$$\left(\prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{r-1}(A)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_r(A)) \right) \otimes \left(\prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{s-1}(B)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_s(B)) \right) \\ \xrightarrow{h_{r,s}} \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G_{r+s-2}(A \otimes B)) \oplus \Gamma(U, G_{r+s-1}(A \otimes B))$$

given by $h_{r,s} : (a_{r-1}, a_r) \otimes (b_{s-1}, b_s) \mapsto (0, (-1)^r a_{r-1} \cup b_{s-1})$. Then these maps define an homotopy equivalence between the map $\bigoplus_{r+s=n} \varphi_{r,s}$ and the zero map, proving the lemma. \square

We now prove that the pairing is compatible with coboundary maps in cohomology coming from short exact sequences:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow C' \rightarrow B' \rightarrow A' \rightarrow 0$ be two exact sequences of fppf sheaves on U , and let $B \otimes B' \rightarrow D$ be a morphism of fppf sheaves. Assume that the induced morphism $A \otimes C' \rightarrow D$ is trivial.*

Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_c^r(U, C) \times H^{s+1}(U, C') & \xrightarrow{\cup} & H_c^{r+s+1}(U, D) \\ \downarrow \partial_r & \uparrow \partial'_s & \downarrow = \\ H_c^{r+1}(U, A) \times H^s(U, A') & \xrightarrow{\cup} & H_c^{r+s+1}(U, D) \end{array}$$

where the horizontal morphisms are induced by the pairings in Lemma 4.1 and by the morphism $B \otimes B' \rightarrow D$, and the vertical maps are the coboundary morphisms.

Then for all $c \in H_c^r(U, C)$ and $a' \in H^s(U, A')$, we have

$$\partial_r(c) \cup a' + (-1)^r c \cup \partial'_s(a') = 0.$$

Proof. For all fppf sheaves E , let $\partial_i^E : G_i(E) \rightarrow G_{i+1}(E)$ denote the coboundary map in the Godement complex $G(E)$.

Consider the diagram induced by $B \otimes B' \rightarrow D$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Gamma(U, G_r(B)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G_{s+1}(B')) & \xrightarrow{\cup} & \Gamma(U, G_{r+s+1}(D)) \\ \downarrow \partial_r^B & \uparrow \partial_s^{B'} & \downarrow = \\ \Gamma(U, G_{r+1}(B)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G_s(B')) & \xrightarrow{\cup} & \Gamma(U, G_{r+s+1}(D)) \end{array}$$

together with the similar diagrams over $\text{Spec } \hat{K}_v$, for all $v \notin U$.

By compatibility of the Godement resolution with tensor product [Friedlander and Suslin 2002, Appendix A], the pairing $\text{Tot}(G(B) \otimes G(B')) \rightarrow G(D)$ is a morphism of complexes. Hence for all $b \in \Gamma(U, G_r(B))$ and $b' \in \Gamma(U, G_s(B'))$, we have

$$\partial_r^B(b) \cup b' + (-1)^r b \cup \partial_s^{B'}(b') = \partial_{r+s}^D(b \cup b').$$

This formula, its analogue over $\text{Spec } \hat{K}_v$ for $v \notin S$, together with the definition of the connecting maps in cohomology via Godement resolutions (recall that for all n , the functor $\mathcal{F} \mapsto G_n(\mathcal{F})$ is exact, see [SGA 4₃ 1973, XVII, Proposition 4.2.3]), implies Lemma 4.3. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let N be a finite flat commutative U -group scheme of order n , then the pairings (9)*

$$H_c^r(U, N) \times H^s(U, N^D) \rightarrow H_c^{r+s}(U, \mu_n)$$

are continuous.

Proof. The pairings (9) are defined via the cup-product on U and the local duality pairings $H^a(\hat{K}_v, N) \times H^b(\hat{K}_v, N^D) \rightarrow H^{a+b}(\hat{K}_v, \mu_n)$. These local pairings are continuous [Česnavičius 2015b, Theorems 5.11 and 6.5]. Hence the lemma follows from the definition of the topologies on the cohomology groups (see Section 3). \square

Remark 4.5. In [Milne 1986] (see for example Theorem III.3.1), the pairings are defined via the Ext groups, which is quite convenient for the definition itself but makes the required commutativities of diagrams more difficult to check. Nevertheless, Proposition V.1.20 in [Milne 1980] provides a similar comparison between both definitions: see the details in Proposition A.2 of the Appendix.

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we now need to show that the induced map $H_c^{3-r}(U, N) \rightarrow H^r(U, N^D)^*$ is an isomorphism (of topological groups) for every finite flat commutative group scheme N over U and every $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ (recall that the groups $H^r(U, N^D)$ are equipped with the discrete topology).

We first recall the following lemma [Milne 1986, Lemma III.8.3]:

Lemma 4.6. *Let*

$$0 \rightarrow N' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N'' \rightarrow 0$$

be an exact sequence of finite flat commutative group schemes over U . If Theorem 1.1 is true for N' and N'' , then it is true for N .

Proof. Using Proposition 2.1(2), the exactness of Pontryagin duality for discrete groups and the pairing in Lemma 4.1, one gets a diagram of long exact sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_c^{3-r}(U, N') & \longrightarrow & H_c^{3-r}(U, N) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{3-r}(U, N'') \longrightarrow \cdots \\ & & \star & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \star \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & H^r(U, N'^D)^* & \longrightarrow & H^r(U, N^D)^* & \longrightarrow & H^r(U, N''^D)^* \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

The functoriality of the pairing (see Lemma 4.1) implies that both central squares in the diagram are commutative. Lemma 4.3 implies that both extreme squares (denoted \star) are commutative up to sign. By Lemma 3.4(1), Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 4.4, all the maps in this diagram are continuous. Hence the lemma follows from the five-lemma. \square

We now want to show that it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.1 for a smaller open subset $V \subset U$. To do this, we need to check the compatibility of the pairing in Theorem 1.1 with restriction to an open subset of U and with the local duality pairing (see Lemma 4.7 below).

We first define the maps that appear in this lemma. Let \mathcal{F} be a flat affine commutative U -group scheme of finite type and let $V \subset U$ be a nonempty open subset. Let W denote $U \setminus V$. In diagram (11) below, the first column is the long exact sequence of Proposition 2.1(3), and the second column is the localization exact sequence from Proposition 2.12. The horizontal pairings are either the local duality pairings from [Milne 1986, Theorem III.7.1] (first and last rows), using the same sign convention as in the pairing (10), or the global pairings from Lemma 4.1 (second and third rows). The proof of Proposition 2.12 provides an isomorphism $H_W^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \cong \bigoplus_{v \in W} H_v^3(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathbf{G}_m)$, and the natural morphism of complexes $\Gamma_W(U, I^\bullet(\mathbf{G}_m)) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(V, I^\bullet(\mathbf{G}_m))$ gives a morphism $H_W^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \rightarrow H_c^3(V, \mathbf{G}_m)$, whence natural morphisms $\bigoplus_{v \in W} H_v^3(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathbf{G}_m) \rightarrow H_c^3(V, \mathbf{G}_m) \rightarrow H_c^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m)$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} be flat affine commutative group schemes of finite type on U , together with a pairing $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_m$. Let $V \subset U$ be a nonempty open subscheme and $W := U \setminus V$. Then the following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \bigoplus_{v \in W} H^{2-r}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \times \bigoplus_{v \in W} H^{r+1}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in W} H_v^3(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathbf{G}_m) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 H_c^{3-r}(V, \mathcal{F}) \times H^r(V, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^3(V, \mathbf{G}_m) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim \\
 H_c^{3-r}(U, \mathcal{F}) \times H^r(U, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \\
 \downarrow & & \uparrow \\
 \bigoplus_{v \in W} H^{3-r}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \times \bigoplus_{v \in W} H^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in W} H_v^3(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathbf{G}_m)
 \end{array} \tag{11}$$

In addition, if \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are finite and flat group schemes, then all the maps in the diagram are continuous.

Proof. (1) We first prove the commutativity of the top rectangle. It is sufficient to prove that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathrm{Tot}(\bigoplus_{v \in W} \Gamma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, G(\mathcal{F}))[-1] \otimes \bigoplus_{v \in W} \Gamma_v(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, G(\mathcal{G}))[1]) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in W} \Gamma_v(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \\
 \downarrow & & \uparrow \\
 \mathrm{Tot}(\bigoplus_{v \in W} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(\mathcal{F}))[-1] \otimes \bigoplus_{v \in W} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in W} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(\mathbf{G}_m))[-1] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma_c(V, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(V, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(V, G(\mathbf{G}_m))
 \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are the natural ones and the horizontal pairings are defined earlier. The top rectangle is commutative because of the definition of the pairing involving cohomology with support in a closed subscheme, taking into account the sign conventions in Proposition A.1 in the Appendix. The bottom one is commutative by definition of the pairing involving compact support cohomology.

Assume now that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are finite flat group schemes. Then the following maps are continuous: the pairing $H_c^2(V, \mathcal{F}) \times H^1(V, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow H_c^3(V, \mathbf{G}_m)$ (see Lemma 4.4), the pairing $H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \times H_v^2(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow H_v^3(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathbf{G}_m)$ [Milne 1986, Theorem III.7.1] and the map $\bigoplus_{v \in W} H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H_c^2(V, \mathcal{F})$ (see Proposition 3.6).

(2) We now prove the commutativity of the rectangle in the middle. Let

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(U, G(\mathcal{F})) := \text{Cone}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(\mathcal{F})) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} \Gamma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, G(\mathcal{F})))[-1].$$

Then functoriality of the cone gives a commutative diagram (similar to (3), where $I^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ is replaced by $G(\mathcal{F})$ and by $G(\mathbf{G}_m)$) of complexes of abelian groups:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Tot}(\Gamma_c(V, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(V, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(V, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \\ \uparrow q & & \uparrow & & \uparrow q \\ \text{Tot}(\tilde{\Gamma}(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{\Gamma}(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow = & & \downarrow \\ \text{Tot}(\Gamma_c(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \end{array}$$

Here the maps denoted by q are quasi-isomorphisms (see Remark 2.7 and the proof of the third point in Proposition 2.1, which uses Lemma 2.4). This diagram gives a commutative diagram in the derived category of abelian groups (where all the maps are either the natural ones or the ones constructed above):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_c(V, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes^L \Gamma(V, G(\mathcal{G})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(V, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes^L \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{G})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \end{array}$$

Taking cohomology of this diagram gives a commutative diagram of abelian groups:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_c^r(V, \mathcal{F}) \times H^s(V, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(V, \mathbf{G}_m) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \times H^s(U, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \end{array}$$

which implies the required commutativity.

The continuity of the maps in the case where \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are finite flat group schemes is a consequence of Lemma 4.4 and of Lemma 3.3.

(3) We now need to prove the commutativity of the bottom rectangle. By Lemma 4.2, the following diagram commutes in the derived category:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes^L \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{G})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \\ \downarrow & \uparrow & \downarrow = \\ \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes^L \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathcal{G})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \end{array}$$

Computing cohomology gives a commutative diagram of abelian groups:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_c^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \times H^s(U, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \\ \downarrow & \uparrow & \downarrow = \\ H^r(U, \mathcal{F}) \times H_c^s(U, \mathcal{G}) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(U, \mathbf{G}_m) \end{array}$$

Let $\Gamma_W(U, G(\mathcal{G})) := \text{Cone}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{G})) \rightarrow \Gamma(V, G(\mathcal{G})))[-1]$. In order to prove the required commutativity, it is enough to prove that the natural diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes^L \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathcal{G})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \\ \uparrow = & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes^L \Gamma_W(U, G(\mathcal{G})) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_W(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \end{array}$$

commutes in the derived category, where the pairing on the bottom row is defined in a similar way as the pairing (10). Consider the following diagram in the category of complexes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Gamma(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ & \text{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(V, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Gamma(V, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) & \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\ \prod_{v \notin U} \text{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod_{v \notin U} \Gamma(\hat{K}_v, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) & & \end{array}$$

This diagram is commutative, hence, using Proposition A.1, it induces a commutative diagram of complexes at the level of cones:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \text{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Gamma_c(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \text{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma_W(U, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Gamma_W(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Gamma(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & \text{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(\mathcal{G}))) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Gamma(U, G(\mathbf{G}_m)) & \end{array}$$

The commutativity of the upper face of this last diagram concludes the proof.

Assume now that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are finite flat group schemes. The only possibly nondiscrete groups in the diagram are $H_c^2(U, \mathcal{F})$ (in the case $r = 1$) and $H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F})$ (in the case $r = 2$). If $r = 1$, the pairing $H_c^2(U, \mathcal{F}) \times H^1(U, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow H_c^3(U, \mathbf{G}_m)$ is continuous by Lemma 4.4 and $H^2(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ for all $v \in W$ (see for instance [Milne 1986, Lemma 1.1]), hence all maps are continuous in this case. If $r = 2$, then the local pairings $H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{F}) \times H_v^2(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow H_v^3(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \mathbf{G}_m)$ are continuous by [Milne 1986, Theorem III.7.1]. All the other maps are obviously continuous.

This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.7. \square

We can now prove the following lemma [Milne 1986, Lemma III.8.4]:

Lemma 4.8. *Let $V \subset U$ be a nonempty open subscheme. Let N be a finite flat commutative group scheme over U . Then Theorem 1.1 holds for N over U if and only if it holds for $N|_V$ over V .*

Proof. Propositions 2.1(3), 2.12, and 3.6 and Lemma 4.7 give a commutative diagram of long exact sequences of topological groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_c^{3-r}(V, N) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{3-r}(U, N) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^{3-r}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N) \longrightarrow \cdots \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & H^r(V, N^D)^* & \longrightarrow & H^r(U, N^D)^* & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H_v^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N^D)^* \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are defined via the pairings (9) and the local duality pairings of [Milne 1986, III.7.1]. In particular, the maps $H^{3-r}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N) \rightarrow H_v^r(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N^D)^*$ are isomorphisms by [Milne 1986, Theorem III.7.1]. The middle vertical map is strict by Lemmas 4.4 and 3.4. Therefore the five-lemma gives the result. \square

The end of the proof of Theorem 1.1 (which implies in particular that by duality the groups $H^r(U, N^D)$ are zero for $r \geq 4$, resp. for $r = 3$ if $U \neq X$) is exactly the same as the end of the proof of Theorem III.8.2 in [Milne 1986]. Let $U \subset X$ be a nonempty open subset and N be a finite flat commutative group scheme over U :

- If the order of N is prime to p , then Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of Proposition 2.1(4) and étale Artin–Verdier duality (Corollary II.3.3 in [Milne 1986] or Theorem 4.6 in [Geisser and Schmidt 2018]). Note that it requires to compare the pairing defined in Lemma 4.1 with the Artin–Verdier pairing using Ext groups as defined in [Milne 1986] or [Geisser and Schmidt 2018]: this is explained for instance in Proposition A.2 of the Appendix. Hence by Lemma 4.6, it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.1 when the order of N is a power of p .
- If the order of N is a power of p , the proof of Proposition 3.5 implies that N admits a composition series such that the generic fiber of each quotient is either of height one or the dual of a group of height one. By Lemma 4.6, it is therefore sufficient to prove Theorem 1.1 in the case N_K or N_K^D have height one.
- If N_K or N_K^D have height one, Proposition B.4 and Corollary B.5 in [Milne 1986] imply that there exists a nonempty open subset $V \subset U$ such that $N|_V$ extends to a finite flat commutative group scheme \tilde{N}

over the proper k -curve X , such that \tilde{N} or \tilde{N}^D have height one. Using Lemma 4.8 twice, it is enough to prove Theorem 1.1 when $U = X$ and N or N^D have height one.

- Lemma III.8.5 in [Milne 1986] proves Theorem 1.1 for $U = X$ and N (resp. N^D) of height one, by reduction to the classical Serre duality for vector bundles over the smooth projective curve X . Indeed, Proposition V.1.20 in [Milne 1980] proves that the pairings $R\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}^D) \otimes^L R\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow R\Gamma(X, \mathbf{G}_m)$ defined via Godement resolutions in the proof of Lemma 4.1 are compatible with the classical pairings using Ext groups that appear in Serre duality.

As observed in [Milne 1986, Section III.8] (remark before Lemma 8.9), the group $H^1(U, N)$ is in general infinite if $U \neq X$ and by duality, the same is true for $H_c^2(U, N)$. However, the situation is better for H^2 and H_c^1 .

Corollary 4.9. *Let N be a finite and flat commutative group scheme over a nonempty Zariski open subset U of X . Then the groups $H^2(U, N)$ and $H_c^1(U, N)$ are finite.*

Proof. The statement about $H_c^1(U, N)$ is Corollary 3.2. The finiteness of $H^2(U, N)$ follows by the duality Theorem 1.1. \square

The previous corollary can be refined in some cases.

Proposition 4.10. *Let N be a finite and flat commutative group scheme over a nonempty affine open subset $U \subset X$, such that the generic fiber N_K is local. Then $H_c^1(U, N) = 0$.*

Proof. By the valuative criterion of properness, the restriction map $H^1(U, N) \rightarrow H^1(K, N)$ is injective. It is sufficient to show that if we choose $v \notin U$, the restriction map $H^1(K, N) \rightarrow H^1(\hat{K}_v, N)$ is injective when N_K is local. Indeed this implies that $D^1(U, N) = 0$, hence $H_c^1(U, N) = 0$ by exact sequence (6) because $H^0(\hat{K}_v, N) = 0$ for every completion \hat{K}_v of K .

We also reduce to showing that for every finite subextension L/K of \hat{K}_v/K , the restriction map $r : H^1(K, N) \rightarrow H^1(L, N)$ is injective (indeed a K -torsor under the finite K -group scheme N_K is of finite type over K , hence it has a point over an extension K' of K if and only if it has a point over a finite subextension of K'). To do this, we argue as in [Česnavičius 2015b, Lemma 5.7(a)]. Since by [Ribenoim 1968, Section F, Theorem 2], L is a separable extension of K , the K -algebra $E := L \otimes_K L$ is reduced. As N_K is finite and connected, the group $N(E)$ is trivial. Let $C^1 := \mathbf{R}_{E/K}(N \times_K E)$ (where \mathbf{R} denotes Weil's restriction of scalars) be the scheme of 1-cochains with respect to L/K , we obtain that $C^1(K)$ is trivial, which in turn implies that $\ker r$ is trivial by [Česnavičius 2015b, Section 5.1]. \square

Remark 4.11. The finiteness of $H_c^1(U, N)$ (Corollary 3.2) relies on the finiteness of $D^1(U, N)$ proven in [Česnavičius 2017, Theorem 2.9]. An alternative argument is actually available. By [Milne 1986, Lemma III.8.9], we can assume that $U \neq X$, namely that U is affine. By [loc. cit., Theorem II.3.1] and Proposition 2.1(4), we can also assume that the order of N is a power of p . Let N_K be the generic fiber of N , it is a finite group scheme over K . By [Demazure and Gabriel 1970, IV, Section 3.5], and Proposition 2.1(2), it is sufficient to prove the required finiteness in the following cases: N_K is étale, N_K is

local with étale dual, $N_K = \alpha_p$. The last two cases are taken care of by Proposition 4.10, so we can suppose that N_K is étale. Let $V \subset U$ be a nonempty open subset. By Proposition 2.1, we have an exact sequence

$$H_c^1(V, N) \rightarrow H_c^1(U, N) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in U \setminus V} H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N).$$

Since the generic fiber of N is étale, the group $H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N)$ is finite by [Milne 1986, Remark III.7.6] (this follows from the fact that $H^1(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, N)$ is a compact subgroup of the discrete group $H^1(K_v, N)$), hence the finiteness of $H_c^1(U, N)$ is equivalent to the finiteness of $H_c^1(V, N)$, which in turn is equivalent to the finiteness of $D^1(V, N)$. The latter holds for V sufficiently small: either apply [González-Avilés 2009, Lemma 4.3] (which relies on an embedding of N_K into an abelian variety) or reduce (as in [Milne 1986, Lemma III.8.9]) to the case when N^D is of height one. Indeed by [loc. cit., Corollary III.B.5], the assumption that N^D is of height one implies that for V sufficiently small, the restriction of N to V extends to a finite and flat commutative group scheme \tilde{N} over X . Then the finiteness of $H_c^1(X, \tilde{N})$ implies the finiteness of $H_c^1(V, \tilde{N}) = H_c^1(V, N)$ by Proposition 2.1(3), because the groups $H^0(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v, \tilde{N})$ are finite.

5. The number field case

Assume now that K is a number field and set $X = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$. Let U be a nonempty Zariski open subset of X . Let n be the order of the finite and flat commutative group scheme N . To prove Theorem 1.1 in this case, one follows exactly the same method as in [Milne 1986, Theorem III.3.1 and Corollary III.3.2], once Proposition 2.1 has been proved. Namely Proposition 2.1(4) shows that on $U[1/n]$, Theorem 1.1 reduces to the étale Artin–Verdier Theorem [Milne 1986, II.3.3] or [Geisser and Schmidt 2018, Theorem 4.6]. Here we can use a definition of the pairings similar to Lemma 4.1, or a definition via the Ext pairings as in [loc. cit.] (the two definitions coincide, the argument being the same as in Proposition A.2 of the Appendix). Now Proposition 2.1(3) gives a commutative diagram as in the end of the proof of [Milne 1986, Theorem III.3.1] (with completions $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$ instead of henselizations \mathcal{O}_v). Theorem 1.1 follows by the five-lemma, using the result on $U[1/n]$ and the local duality statement [Milne 1986, Theorem III.3.1].

Remark 5.1. In the number field case, one can as well (as in [Milne 1986, Section III.3]) work from the very beginning with henselizations \mathcal{O}_v and not with completions $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_v$ to define cohomology with compact support. Indeed the local theorem [loc. cit., Theorem III.3.1] still holds with henselian (not necessarily complete) discrete valuation ring with finite residue field when the fraction field is of characteristic zero. Hence the only issue here is commutativity of diagrams. Nevertheless, we felt that it was more convenient to have a uniform statement (Proposition 2.1) in both characteristic 0 and characteristic p situations.

Appendix

A.1. Cone and tensor products.

Proposition A.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be the category of fppf sheaves over a scheme T . Let A, B and C be three complexes in \mathcal{A} . Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a morphism of complexes. Then there are commutative diagrams*

(where \otimes denotes the total tensor product of complexes) such that the vertical maps are isomorphisms of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 A \otimes C & \xrightarrow{f \otimes 1} & B \otimes C & \xrightarrow{i \otimes 1} & \text{Cone}(f) \otimes C & \xrightarrow{-\pi \otimes 1} & A[1] \otimes C \\
 \downarrow = & & \downarrow = & & \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \sim \\
 A \otimes C & \xrightarrow{f \otimes 1} & B \otimes C & \xrightarrow{i'} & \text{Cone}(f \otimes 1) & \xrightarrow{-\pi} & (A \otimes C)[1]
 \end{array}$$

where the vertical isomorphisms involve no signs, and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 C \otimes A & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes f} & C \otimes B & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes i} & C \otimes \text{Cone}(f) & \xrightarrow{-1 \otimes \pi} & C \otimes A[1] \\
 \downarrow = & & \downarrow = & & \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \sim \\
 C \otimes A & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes f} & C \otimes B & \xrightarrow{i'} & \text{Cone}(1 \otimes f) & \xrightarrow{-\pi} & (C \otimes A)[1]
 \end{array}$$

where the two last vertical maps involve a sign $(-1)^r$ on the factor $C_r \otimes A_s$.

Proof. In the first diagram, define the nonobvious map $\text{Cone}(f) \otimes C \rightarrow \text{Cone}(f \otimes 1)$ (resp. $A[1] \otimes C \rightarrow (A \otimes C)[1]$) by the isomorphism $(B_r \oplus A_{r+1}) \otimes C_s \rightarrow (B_r \otimes C_s) \oplus (A_{r+1} \otimes C_s)$ (resp. by the identity of $A_{r+1} \otimes C_s$). In the second diagram, the nonobvious map $C \otimes \text{Cone}(f) \rightarrow \text{Cone}(1 \otimes f)$ (resp. $C \otimes A[1] \rightarrow (C \otimes A)[1]$) is given by the isomorphism $C_r \otimes (B_s \oplus A_{s+1}) \rightarrow (C_r \otimes B_s) \oplus (C_r \otimes A_{s+1})$ that maps $c \otimes (b, a)$ to $(c \otimes b, (-1)^r c \otimes a)$ (resp. by the automorphism of $C_r \otimes A_{s+1}$ given by $c \otimes a \mapsto (-1)^r c \otimes a$). The proposition is then straightforward. \square

A.2. Comparison of two pairings. Let U be a nonempty Zariski open subset of a smooth, projective, geometrically integral curve defined over a finite field.

Proposition A.2. *Let A, B and C be three fppf sheaves on U , endowed with a pairing $A \otimes B \rightarrow C$. Then there is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 H^r(U, A) \otimes H_c^s(U, B) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(U, C) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\
 \text{Ext}_U^r(B, C) \otimes H_c^s(U, B) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(U, C)
 \end{array}$$

where the top pairing is the one from (10) and the bottom one is the pairing from [Milne 1986, Proposition III.0.4.e]. The same holds for étale sheaves instead of fppf sheaves if we replace fppf cohomology (resp. compact support fppf cohomology) by étale cohomology (resp. compact support étale cohomology); in the étale case the bottom pairing is the one from [loc. cit., Proposition II.2.5] (or [Geisser and Schmidt 2018]).

Proof. We prove the statement for fppf sheaves (the étale case is similar). Consider the natural morphisms

of complexes

$$\mathrm{Tot}(G(A) \otimes G(B)) \rightarrow G(A \otimes B) \rightarrow G(C).$$

Using [Stacks 2005–, Tag 0A90], one gets a natural morphism of complexes $G(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om^\bullet(G(B), G(C))$ and a commutative diagram of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Tot}(G(A) \otimes G(B)) & \longrightarrow & G(A \otimes B) & \longrightarrow & G(C) \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow = \\ \mathrm{Tot}(\mathcal{H}om^\bullet(G(B), G(C)) \otimes G(B)) & \longrightarrow & & \longrightarrow & G(C) \end{array}$$

where the second pairing is the natural one. All morphisms in this diagram involve no extra-sign.

Let $G(C) \rightarrow I$ be an injective resolution. Then one gets a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Tot}(G(A) \otimes G(B)) & \longrightarrow & G(A \otimes B) & \longrightarrow & G(C) \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Tot}(\mathcal{H}om^\bullet(G(B), I) \otimes G(B)) & \longrightarrow & & \longrightarrow & I \end{array}$$

Taking global sections, one gets a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(U, G(C)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim \\ \mathrm{Tot}(\mathrm{Hom}_U^\bullet(G(B), I) \otimes \Gamma(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(U, I) \end{array} \quad (1)$$

Taking cohomology, one gets a commutative diagram comparing the pairing from the beginning of Section 4 to the classical Ext-pairing:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^r(U, A) \otimes H^s(U, B) & \longrightarrow & H^{r+s}(U, C) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\ \mathrm{Ext}_U^r(B, C) \otimes H^s(U, B) & \longrightarrow & H^{r+s}(U, C) \end{array}$$

Applying functoriality of cone to (1) and to the similar pairing over completions of K , one gets a commutative diagram of complexes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tot}(\Gamma(U, G(A)) \otimes \Gamma_c(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, G(C)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim \\ \mathrm{Tot}(\mathrm{Hom}_U^\bullet(G(B), I) \otimes \Gamma_c(U, G(B))) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_c(U, I) \end{array}$$

Taking cohomology, we get the required commutative diagram. \square

Remarks A.3. (1) A similar diagram holds with compact support cohomology groups on the left and Ext-groups on the right. In this case, one gets a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_c^r(U, A) \otimes H^s(U, B) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(U, C) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\ H_c^r(U, A) \otimes \mathrm{Ext}_U^s(A, C) & \longrightarrow & H_c^{r+s}(U, C) \end{array}$$

where the first pairing is the one from Lemma 4.1, while the vertical map and the bottom pairing both involve a $(-1)^{rs}$ sign.

(2) Similar commutative diagrams hold over an arbitrary basis, with compact support cohomology replaced by cohomology with support in a closed subscheme (with a similar proof).

Acknowledgments

We thank K. Česnavičius, C. Pépin, A. Schmidt and T. Szamuely for enlightening comments on the first draft of this paper. We also thank T. Suzuki for sharing his preprint [Suzuki 2018]. We warmly thank the anonymous referee for his/her very thorough reading of the article and for having made numerous interesting suggestions.

References

- [Artin 1969] M. Artin, “Algebraic approximation of structures over complete local rings”, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **36** (1969), 23–58. MR Zbl
- [Artin and Milne 1976] M. Artin and J. S. Milne, “Duality in the flat cohomology of curves”, *Invent. Math.* **35** (1976), 111–129. MR Zbl
- [Bauer 1992] W. Bauer, “On the conjecture of Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer for abelian varieties over function fields in characteristic $p > 0$ ”, *Invent. Math.* **108**:2 (1992), 263–287. MR Zbl
- [Beilinson et al. 1982] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, and P. Deligne, “Faisceaux pervers”, pp. 5–171 in *Analysis and topology on singular spaces, I* (Luminy, France, 1981), Astérisque **100**, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982. MR Zbl
- [Bourbaki 2006] N. Bourbaki, *Algèbre commutative, Chapitres V–VII*, chapter VI, Springer, 2006. Definitive edition (chapters V–VII) published by Hermann, Paris, 1964; translated as *Commutative algebra*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1972.
- [Bourbaki 2007] N. Bourbaki, *Topologie générale, Chapitres I–IV*, chapter III, Springer, 2007. Definitive edition (chapters I–IV) published by Hermann, Paris, 1960; translated as *General topology*, Springer, 1971.
- [Česnavičius 2015a] K. Česnavičius, “Poitou–Tate without restrictions on the order”, *Math. Res. Lett.* **22**:6 (2015), 1621–1666. MR Zbl
- [Česnavičius 2015b] K. Česnavičius, “Topology on cohomology of local fields”, *Forum Math. Sigma* **3** (2015), art. id. e16. MR Zbl
- [Česnavičius 2017] K. Česnavičius, “ p -Selmer growth in extensions of degree p ”, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (2) **95**:3 (2017), 833–852. MR Zbl
- [Demarche 2011a] C. Demarche, “Le défaut d’approximation forte dans les groupes linéaires connexes”, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) **102**:3 (2011), 563–597. MR Zbl
- [Demarche 2011b] C. Demarche, “Suites de Poitou–Tate pour les complexes de tores à deux termes”, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2011**:1 (2011), 135–174. MR Zbl

- [Demazure and Gabriel 1970] M. Demazure and P. Gabriel, *Groupes algébriques, I: Géométrie algébrique, généralités, groupes commutatifs*, Masson & Cie, Paris, 1970. MR Zbl
- [EGA IV₄ 1967] A. Grothendieck, “Eléments de géométrie algébrique, IV: Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas, IV”, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **32** (1967), 5–361. MR Zbl
- [Friedlander and Suslin 2002] E. M. Friedlander and A. Suslin, “The spectral sequence relating algebraic K -theory to motivic cohomology”, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* (4) **35**:6 (2002), 773–875. MR Zbl
- [Gabber and Kelly 2015] O. Gabber and S. Kelly, “Points in algebraic geometry”, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **219**:10 (2015), 4667–4680. MR Zbl
- [Gabber et al. 2014] O. Gabber, P. Gille, and L. Moret-Bailly, “Fibrés principaux sur les corps valués henséliens”, *Algebr. Geom.* **1**:5 (2014), 573–612. MR Zbl
- [Geisser and Schmidt 2018] T. H. Geisser and A. Schmidt, “Poitou–Tate duality for arithmetic schemes”, *Compos. Math.* **154**:9 (2018), 2020–2044. MR Zbl
- [Gille and Pianzola 2008] P. Gille and A. Pianzola, “Isotriviality and étale cohomology of Laurent polynomial rings”, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **212**:4 (2008), 780–800. MR Zbl
- [Godement 1958] R. Godement, *Topologie algébrique et théorie des faisceaux*, Actual. Sci. Ind. **1252**, Hermann, Paris, 1958. MR Zbl
- [González-Avilés 2009] C. D. González-Avilés, “Arithmetic duality theorems for 1-motives over function fields”, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **632** (2009), 203–231. MR Zbl
- [Grothendieck 1968] A. Grothendieck, “Le groupe de Brauer, III: Exemples et compléments”, pp. 88–188 in *Dix exposés sur la cohomologie des schémas*, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **3**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968. MR Zbl
- [Harari and Szamuely 2005] D. Harari and T. Szamuely, “Arithmetic duality theorems for 1-motives”, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **578** (2005), 93–128. MR Zbl
- [Kashiwara and Schapira 2006] M. Kashiwara and P. Schapira, *Categories and sheaves*, Grundlehren der Math. Wissenschaften **332**, Springer, 2006. MR Zbl
- [Kato and Trihan 2003] K. Kato and F. Trihan, “On the conjectures of Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer in characteristic $p > 0$ ”, *Invent. Math.* **153**:3 (2003), 537–592. MR Zbl
- [Matsumura 1970] H. Matsumura, *Commutative algebra*, Benjamin, New York, 1970. MR Zbl
- [Mazur 1972] B. Mazur, “Rational points of abelian varieties with values in towers of number fields”, *Invent. Math.* **18** (1972), 183–266. MR Zbl
- [Milne 1980] J. S. Milne, *Étale cohomology*, Princeton Math. Series **33**, Princeton Univ. Press, 1980. MR Zbl
- [Milne 1986] J. S. Milne, *Arithmetic duality theorems*, Perspect. Math. **1**, Academic Press, Boston, 1986. MR Zbl
- [Moret-Bailly 2012] L. Moret-Bailly, “An extension of Greenberg’s theorem to general valuation rings”, *Manuscripta Math.* **139**:1-2 (2012), 153–166. MR Zbl
- [Peters and Steenbrink 2008] C. A. M. Peters and J. H. M. Steenbrink, *Mixed Hodge structures*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik (3) **52**, Springer, 2008. MR Zbl
- [Ribenoim 1968] P. Ribenoim, *Théorie des valuations*, Sémin. Math. **9**, Univ. Montreal, 1968. MR Zbl
- [Rosengarten 2018] Z. Rosengarten, “Tate duality in positive dimension over function fields”, preprint, 2018. arXiv
- [SGA 4₁ 1972] M. Artin, A. Grothendieck, and J. L. Verdier, *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas, Tome 1: Théorie des topos, Exposés I–IV* (Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1963–1964), Lecture Notes in Math. **269**, Springer, 1972. MR Zbl
- [SGA 4₂ 1972] M. Artin, A. Grothendieck, and J. L. Verdier, *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas, Tome 2: Exposés V–VIII* (Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1963–1964), Lecture Notes in Math. **270**, Springer, 1972. MR Zbl
- [SGA 4₃ 1973] M. Artin, A. Grothendieck, and J. L. Verdier, *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas, Tome 3: Exposés IX–XIX* (Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1963–1964), Lecture Notes in Math. **305**, Springer, 1973. MR Zbl

- [Stacks 2005–] P. Belmans, A. J. de Jong, et al., “The Stacks project”, electronic reference, 2005–, Available at <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>.
- [Suzuki 2018] T. Suzuki, “Duality for cohomology of curves with coefficients in abelian varieties”, *Nagoya Math. J.* (online publication December 2018).
- [Toën 2011] B. Toën, “Descente fidèlement plate pour les n -champs d’Artin”, *Compos. Math.* **147**:5 (2011), 1382–1412. MR Zbl

Communicated by Bjorn Poonen

Received 2018-05-01 Revised 2019-07-03 Accepted 2019-08-01

cyril.demarche@imj-prg.fr

*Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche, Sorbonne Université,
Paris, France*

david.harari@math.u-psud.fr

Laboratoire de Mathématiques d’Orsay, Université Paris-Sud, Orsay, France

Algebra & Number Theory

msp.org/ant

EDITORS

MANAGING EDITOR

Bjorn Poonen
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, USA

EDITORIAL BOARD CHAIR

David Eisenbud
University of California
Berkeley, USA

BOARD OF EDITORS

Bhargav Bhatt	University of Michigan, USA	Raman Parimala	Emory University, USA
Richard E. Borcherds	University of California, Berkeley, USA	Jonathan Pila	University of Oxford, UK
Antoine Chambert-Loir	Université Paris-Diderot, France	Irena Peeva	Cornell University, USA
J-L. Colliot-Thélène	CNRS, Université Paris-Sud, France	Anand Pillay	University of Notre Dame, USA
Brian D. Conrad	Stanford University, USA	Michael Rapoport	Universität Bonn, Germany
Samit Dasgupta	Duke University, USA	Victor Reiner	University of Minnesota, USA
Hélène Esnault	Freie Universität Berlin, Germany	Peter Sarnak	Princeton University, USA
Gavril Farkas	Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany	Joseph H. Silverman	Brown University, USA
Hubert Flenner	Ruhr-Universität, Germany	Michael Singer	North Carolina State University, USA
Sergey Fomin	University of Michigan, USA	Christopher Skinner	Princeton University, USA
Edward Frenkel	University of California, Berkeley, USA	Vasudevan Srinivas	Tata Inst. of Fund. Research, India
Wee Teck Gan	National University of Singapore	J. Toby Stafford	University of Michigan, USA
Andrew Granville	Université de Montréal, Canada	Shunsuke Takagi	University of Tokyo, Japan
Ben J. Green	University of Oxford, UK	Pham Huu Tiep	University of Arizona, USA
Joseph Gubeladze	San Francisco State University, USA	Ravi Vakil	Stanford University, USA
Christopher Hacon	University of Utah, USA	Michel van den Bergh	Hasselt University, Belgium
Roger Heath-Brown	Oxford University, UK	Akshay Venkatesh	Institute for Advanced Study, USA
János Kollár	Princeton University, USA	Marie-France Vignéras	Université Paris VII, France
Philippe Michel	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne	Kei-Ichi Watanabe	Nihon University, Japan
Susan Montgomery	University of Southern California, USA	Melanie Matchett Wood	University of California, Berkeley, USA
Shigefumi Mori	RIMS, Kyoto University, Japan	Shou-Wu Zhang	Princeton University, USA
Martin Olsson	University of California, Berkeley, USA		

PRODUCTION

production@msp.org
Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor


See inside back cover or msp.org/ant for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2019 is US \$385/year for the electronic version, and \$590/year (+\$60, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to MSP.

Algebra & Number Theory (ISSN 1944-7833 electronic, 1937-0652 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840 is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

ANT peer review and production are managed by EditFlow® from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2019 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 13 No. 10 2019

The elliptic KZB connection and algebraic de Rham theory for unipotent fundamental groups of elliptic curves	2243
MA LUO	
Moments of random multiplicative functions, II: High moments	2277
ADAM J HARPER	
Artin–Mazur–Milne duality for fppf cohomology	2323
CYRIL DEMARCHE and DAVID HARARI	
Betti numbers of Shimura curves and arithmetic three-orbifolds	2359
MIKOŁAJ FRĄCZYK and JEAN RAIMBAULT	
Combinatorial identities and Titchmarsh’s divisor problem for multiplicative functions	2383
SARY DRAPPEAU and BERKE TOPACOGULLARI	
The construction problem for Hodge numbers modulo an integer	2427
MATTHIAS PAULSEN and STEFAN SCHREIEDER	



1937-0652(2019)13:10;1-#