

ON THE p -ADIC INTEGRATION OVER IGUSA TOWERS OF SIEGEL MODULAR VARIETIES

M. A. SEVESO

ABSTRACT. We develop an explicit p -adic integration theory for Igusa towers of modular Siegel manifolds, which finds applications to explicit reciprocity laws.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Integral truncated dual BGG complexes and representations of symplectic groups	7
2.1. Preliminary results and notations	7
2.2. Induced modules and the dual BGG complex	10
2.3. The degree filtration on the induced modules in the symplectic case	15
2.4. The isomorphism $\mathrm{Sym}_W^{2,\vee}(1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{u}^-$	19
2.5. The isomorphism $J' \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}^{\vee}$	19
3. Automorphic sheaves attached to representations of symplectic groups	22
4. q -expansion and degeneration at the 0-dimensional cusps	29
5. p -depletions and p -adic integration over the Igusa tower	32
5.1. Description of the de Rham complex	33
5.2. Acyclicity of p -depleted de Rham complexes	36
References	45

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to develop an explicit p -adic integration theory for Igusa towers of Siegel modular varieties. In the genus $g = 1$ case, this theory is (well known and) elementary. For higher genus it is richer and much more involved and interesting. Our main motivation in developing this theory is to provide a key tool for proving explicit reciprocity laws: this is well known in the case $g = 1$ and, when $g = 2$, an explicit form of the theorem stated below will be used in a forthcoming work by F. Andreatta, M. Bertolini, R. Venerucci and the author.

Suppose that X is a modular curve of prime to p level and that f_0 is a modular form of weight $k \geq 2$. It is naturally a section of $H^0(X, \mathcal{W}_k)$, which appears inside the de Rham cohomology $H_{\mathrm{dR}}^1(X, \mathcal{L}_{k-2})$ with coefficients in the automorphic sheaf $\mathcal{L}_{k-2} := \mathrm{Sym}^{k-2}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1)$. Here $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$ is the relative de Rham cohomology of the universal (generalized) elliptic curve and, if ω_{dR} denotes its relative Lie algebra, then $\mathcal{W}_k := \omega_{\mathrm{dR}}^k$. One can associate to f_0 a p -depletion $f_0^{[p]}$ by considering the modular form whose q -expansion is given by

$$f_0^{[p]}(q) = \sum_{p \nmid n} a_n q^n.$$

One advantage of the p -depletion is that a certain derivation appearing in the description of the Gauss-Manin connection, the so called Serre theta operator θ (which equals $q \frac{d}{dq}$ at the cusp) can be inverted. Indeed, these operations of taking the p -depletion and considering the theta operator θ make sense, more generally, for any section f of the Igusa tower X_0 . The effect is that, if we pull-back the de Rham complex to the Igusa tower and consider the subcomplex of those forms that are p -depleted, then this complex becomes acyclic

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11F33, 11F46; Secondary 11G18, 20G30.

Key words and phrases. Siegel modular forms, p -adic modular forms.

in degree one by means of an inductive explicit process of integration obtained from the theta operators as follows. First of all, since we work over the Igusa tower, there is a canonical global section δ of ω_{dR} and, setting $\eta := \nabla(\theta)\delta$ (for the Gauss-Manin connection ∇), we get another global section of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}}^1$ trivializing it. It follows that every section F of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}}^1$ can be written in the form

$$F = F_0 \delta^{k-2} \eta^0 + F_1 \delta^{k-3} \eta^1 + \dots + F_i \delta^{k-2-i} \eta^i + \dots + F_{k-3} \delta^1 \eta^{k-3} + F_{k-2} \delta^0 \eta^{k-2}$$

for a weight i section F_i of \mathcal{O}_{X_0} . Furthermore, the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism identifies ω_{dR}^2 with $\Omega_{X_0}^1$ and, hence, δ^2 defines a canonical section ω of $\Omega_{X_0}^1$ (which is $\frac{dq}{q}$ at the cusp). Using the relations

$$\nabla \delta = \eta \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega, \quad \nabla \eta = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad ds = q \frac{ds}{dq} \frac{dq}{q} = \theta(s) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega,$$

(where s is a global section of \mathcal{O}_{X_0}) one computes

$$\nabla \left(s \delta^{k-2-i} \eta^i \right) = \left(\theta(s) \delta^{k-2-i} \eta^i + (k-2-i) s \delta^{k-3-i} \eta^{i+1} \right) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega,$$

from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F &= [\theta(F_0) \delta^{k-2} \eta^0 + (\theta(F_1) + (k-2)F_0) \delta^{k-3} \eta^1 + \dots + (\theta(F_i) + (k-1-i)F_{k-i-1}) \delta^{k-2-i} \eta^i \\ &\quad + \dots + (\theta(F_{k-2}) + F_{k-3}) \delta^0 \eta^{k-2}] \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega. \end{aligned}$$

The image of $f_0 \cdot \delta^k \in H^0(X_0, \mathcal{W}_k)$ in $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{L}_{k-2} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0}^1)$ is $f_0 \cdot \delta^{k-2} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega$ and, consequently, one is lead to consider the system of differential equations

$$\theta(F_0) = f, \quad \theta(F_1) = -(k-2)F_0, \dots, \theta(F_i) = -(k-1-i)F_{k-i-1}, \dots, \theta(F_{k-2}) = -F_{k-3}.$$

When f is p -depleted, as explained, we can consider $F_0 := \theta^{-1}f$ and then, noticing that F_0 is again p -depleted, define $F_1 := -(k-2)\theta^{-1}F_0$ and, hence, recursively solve the equation $\nabla F = f_0 \delta^{k-2} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega$. Indeed, more generally, a similar process shows that one can solve the equation $\nabla F = f$ for every $f \in H^0(X_0, \mathcal{L}_{k-2} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0}^1)$ as long as all the components f_i of

$$f = \left[f_0 \delta^{k-2} \eta^0 + \dots + f_i \delta^{k-2-i} \eta^i + \dots + f_{k-2} \delta^0 \eta^{k-2} \right] \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega$$

are p -depleted. This kind of explicit primitives appear in the proof of several reciprocity laws.

In order to prepare us for the higher genus case, let us reinterpret the above calculation from a more representation theoretic perspective. To this end, let us start by considering the standard representation $\text{Std}_2 = \mathbb{Z}^2$ of $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GL}_2$, where we view the elements of Std_2 as column vectors on which \mathbf{GL}_2 acts from the left and consider the canonical basis given by the elements $e_1 := (1, 0)^t$ and $e_2 := (0, 1)^t$. Let us write $\mathbb{Z}[Y]$ for the space of polynomials and, writing $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{GL}_2$ for the upper triangular Borel subgroup, consider the \mathbf{Q} -action on $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(e_1^{k-2})[Y] := e_1^{k-2} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[Y]$ defined by the formula $\gamma(e_1^{k-2} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} f) := a^{k-2} e_1^{k-2} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} f(a^{-1}(b + Yd))$ for $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$. Then, the \mathbf{Q} -module $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(e_1^{k-2})[Y]$ acquires a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module structure and a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -equivariant inclusion

$$\text{Sym}_2^{k-2} := \text{Sym}^{k-2}(\text{Std}_2) \hookrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(e_1^{k-2})[Y]$$

by formally setting $Y := \frac{e_2}{e_1}$ as follows. First of all, when $k = 2$, writing ∂ for the matrix whose only non-zero entry is in the lower left position and equals 1, it can be enriched to a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module by setting $\partial(Y) := -Y^2$.

In general, we send $e_1^{k-2-i} e_2^i = e_1^{k-2} \left(\frac{e_2}{e_1} \right)^i$ to $e_1^{k-2} Y^i$ for every $i = 0, \dots, k-2$ and then compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(e_1^{k-2} Y^i) &= (k-2) e_1^{k-3} \partial(e_1) Y^i + i e_1^{k-2} Y^{i-1} \partial(Y) = (k-2) e_1^{k-3} e_2 Y^i - i e_1^{k-2} Y^{i+1} \\ &= (k-2) e_1^{k-2} Y^{i+1} - i e_1^{k-2} Y^{i+1} = (k-2-i) e_1^{k-2} Y^{i+1} \end{aligned}$$

in order to justify our definition $\partial(e_1^{k-2} Y^i) := (k-2-i) e_1^{k-2} Y^{i+1}$. In this way, the above inclusion of Sym_2^{k-2} in $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(e_1^{k-2})[Y]$ becomes an inclusion of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules. Going back to the geometric picture, the basis $\{\delta, \eta\}$ yields an isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{X_0}^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}}^1$ and, hence, $\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \text{Sym}_2^{k-2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{L}_k$ sending $e_1^{k-2-i} e_2^i = e_1^{k-2} Y^i$ to $\delta^{k-2-i} \eta^i$ for every $i = 0, \dots, k-2$. Hence, we find an inclusion

$$\mathcal{L}_{k-2} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(e_1^{k-2})[Y] =: \mathcal{V}_{k-2}$$

and, from this point of view, we see that, setting $\Theta(s\delta^{k-2-i}\eta^i) := \theta(s)\delta^{k-2-i}\eta^i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega$ and $\Delta := 1_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}} \partial \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega$, we have

$$\nabla(s\delta^{k-2-i}\eta^i) = \Theta(s\delta^{k-2-i}\eta^i) + \Delta(s\omega^{k-2-i}\eta^i).$$

In this way, we have given an interpretation of the multiplication by $(k-2-i)$ map appearing in the above expression of the ∇ operator which is uniform for varying k 's: it is just given by the action of ∂ . Indeed, setting

$$\Theta(se_1^{k-2}Y^i) := \theta(s)e_1^{k-2}Y^i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega, \Delta := 1_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}} \partial \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega$$

and then $\nabla := \Theta + \Delta$ yields a connection on \mathcal{V}_{k-2} and, in this way, one can promote the inclusion of \mathcal{L}_{k-2} in \mathcal{V}_{k-2} to an inclusion of modules with connection. Then, the above integration process obtained by solving the successive differential equations

$$\Theta(F_i e_1^{k-2}Y^i) = f_0 e_1^{k-2}Y^i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega, \dots, \Theta(F_i e_1^{k-2}Y^i) + \Delta(F_{i-1} e_1^{k-2}Y^{i-2}) = f_i e_1^{k-2}Y^i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega, \dots$$

essentially works in $(\mathcal{V}_{k-2}, \nabla)$ if the sections f_i of \mathcal{O}_{X_0} are all p -depleted. Here “essentially” just means that, after having solved the equations recursively thus getting the infinite family of sections F_i 's, we would like to be able to write $F := \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} F_i$ in order to get a solution of $\nabla F = f$.

The aim of this paper is to generalize this integration process in the framework of Siegel modular varieties. Hence, introduce an analogue of the notion of p -depletion and, for any p -depleted m -form f (with $m > 0$) of the pull-back to the Igusa tower of de Rham complex with coefficients in an automorphic sheaf, define an indefinite integral

$$F = \int f$$

that should be an $m-1$ -form in the same p -depleted de Rham complex. Note that, in this setting, modular forms are sections of $H^0(X, \mathcal{W}_\lambda)$ appearing inside the de Rham cohomology $H_{\text{dR}}^{d_g}(X, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ of middle degree $d_g := \frac{g(g+1)}{2}$ and, hence, one may first try to integrate d_g -forms. Here, λ is a dominant weight of $\mathbf{G} := \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$ (the symplectic group being defined as in Example 2.12, to fix ideas), that can also be regarded as a dominant weight of the Levi subgroup $\mathbf{M} := \mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m$ of the standard Siegel parabolic subgroup $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{G}$ with opposite parabolic subgroup \mathbf{Q}^- , the sheaf \mathcal{L}_λ looks locally (and globally after a pull-back to the Igusa tower) like the irreducible representation of \mathbf{G} of highest weight λ and, similarly, \mathcal{W}_λ looks like the irreducible representation of \mathbf{M} of highest weight λ . Let us now write X for a Siegel modular variety (we admit level and certain paramodular structures, but assume that p is prime to the level and the degree of the parametrization - see Remark 1.3 below for possible generalizations) and, again, let us denote by X_0 the Igusa tower. Let us write $\mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}$ for the \mathbb{Z} -module of symmetric g -by- g matrices with coefficients in \mathbb{Z} and let $\mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{even}}$ be the \mathbb{Z} -submodule of those matrices whose diagonal entries are even. Let us write $\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ for the symmetric matrix whose unique upper triangular non-zero entry is 1 at position (i, j) and, if $\beta \in \mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}$ has $\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ -component $\beta_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and define $q_{ij} := q^{\underline{\beta}_{ij}}$. With these notations, every global sections f of \mathcal{O}_{X_0} admits, at every cusp, a q -expansion of the form

$$f(q) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{even}}} a_f(\beta) q^{N^{-1}\beta} \text{ for } q^{N^{-1}\beta} := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq g} q_{ij}^{N^{-1}\beta_{ij}}$$

for a suitable N . Furthermore, the q -expansion principle holds, up to considering a cusp for each geometrically connected component of the ordinary locus. (Here we follow the classical convention, in the higher genus case, of using the parameter $q_{ij} = \exp(\pi i z_{ij})$ at the infinite cusp: using $q_{ii}^2 = \exp(2\pi i z_{ii})$ when $i = j$ would give back the usual convention in the $g = 1$ case, see (4.3)). Then one can define d_g theta operators as follows: for every $1 \leq i \leq j \leq g$, we can consider the unique derivation θ_{ij} of $\mathcal{O}_{X_0}(X_0)$ which on q -expansions is given by the formulas $\theta_{ii}(q^\beta) = \frac{1}{2}\beta_{ii}q^\beta$ and $\theta_{ij}(q^\beta) = \beta_{ij}q^\beta$ for every $i < j$. More generally, choose any polynomial

$$P \in \mathbb{Z}_p[T_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq g]$$

and, setting $\theta = (\theta_{ij})$, consider the differential operator

$$\theta_P := P(\theta) : H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}) \longrightarrow H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}).$$

One checks that, if $P'(T_{11}, \dots, T_{gg}, T_{ij} : i < j) = P(2^{-1}T_{11}, \dots, 2^{-1}T_{gg}, T_{ij} : i < j)$, then

$$\theta_P(f)(q) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{even}}} a_f(\beta) P'(\beta) q^\beta$$

(see Lemma 5.4) we have). It follows that, if

$$f^{[P]}(q) := \sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{even}} : p \nmid P'(\beta)} a_f(\beta) q^{N^{-1}\beta},$$

and we write $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})^{[P]}$ for the subset of those sections of $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$ that are such that $f = f^{[P]}$ (we say that f is P -depleted, in this case), then θ_P is a derivation which is invertible on $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})^{[P]}$. So far we have introduced the representations L_λ and W_λ . To be more precise, let us write $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ and $W_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ for an irreducible representation of highest weight λ/\mathbb{Q} of \mathbf{G}/\mathbb{Q} and, respectively, \mathbf{M}/\mathbb{Q} (they are unique up to isomorphism and an isomorphism is uniquely determined up to a non-zero scalar factor). Then we can define $L_\lambda := \text{Dist}(\mathbf{G}) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ and, respectively, $W_\lambda := \text{Dist}(\mathbf{M}) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$, where $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G}) \subset U(\mathfrak{g}/\mathbb{Q})$ denotes the distribution algebra of \mathbf{G} over \mathbb{Z} and similarly for \mathbf{M} and where $v_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}} \in W_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}} \subset L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ is a highest weight vector, the latter inclusion being canonical if we realize $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ as a parabolic induction $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}} = \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}})$. Then $L_\lambda \subset L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ is a \mathbf{G} -stable lattice in $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ and similarly for W_λ . If we work over a ring \mathbb{k} such that the level and the degree of the polarization are invertible, we can associate to W_λ and L_λ a sheaf \mathcal{W}_λ and, respectively, a module with a connection $(\mathcal{L}_\lambda, \nabla)$: we will assume that \mathbb{k} is a Dedekind domain which contains appropriate roots of unity (in order to have q -expansions) and that it contains \mathbb{Z}_p when working over X_0 . They can be defined over X and, after a pull-back to X_0 , these sheaves can be trivialized and we can define P -depleted sections $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p)^{[P]}$ similarly as we have done in the $g = 1$ case. (Here, if one wants to work with compactified objects, one has really to use the appropriate logarithmic de Rham modules $\Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p$). Indeed, one can show that $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p)^{[P]}$ is a complex. We will prove the following result (see Corollary 5.18).

Theorem 1.1. *For every P such that $P(0) = 0$, the complex $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p)^{[P]}$ is acyclic in degree $p = 1, \dots, d_g$.*

Let us now sketch a proof of the above result. As suggested by the $g = 1$ case, the first step is to replace \mathcal{L}_λ by larger sheaves, which can be done as follows. There is a BGG (dual) exact complex whose first three terms are of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}} \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-/\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathbf{G}/\mathbb{Q}}(W_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}})[\mathbf{Y}/\mathbb{Q}] \xrightarrow{d} \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}} : l(w)=1} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-/\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathbf{G}/\mathbb{Q}}(W_{w \cdot \lambda/\mathbb{Q}})[\mathbf{Y}/\mathbb{Q}].$$

Here, $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-/\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathbf{G}/\mathbb{Q}}(W_\mu)[\mathbf{Y}/\mathbb{Q}]$ is a $(\mathfrak{g}/\mathbb{Q}, \mathbf{Q}/\mathbb{Q})$ -module. Indeed, we prove that this exact sequence admits a model

$$(1.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow L_\lambda \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\lambda)[\mathbf{Y}] \xrightarrow{d} \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}} : l(w)=1} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w \cdot \lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$$

over \mathbb{Z} . For p -small weights, this could be probably deduced by dualizing the results of [21], which give models over \mathbb{Z} of the entire (non-dual) weak BGG complex (note, however, that we will need a model of the truncated strong dual BGG complex). However, such a kind of condition is not pleasant in our setting because, in the applications to the calculation of primitives appearing in the proof of reciprocity laws, one usually thinks of p as being fixed and λ as varying. More precisely, we show in Theorem 2.9 that these kind of models exist for every split reductive group \mathbf{G} over a Dedekind domain with characteristic zero fraction field relative to any parabolic subgroup \mathbf{Q} , at least if one is satisfied with a model of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{Q}}$ as a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module and then we verify that L_λ is actually a \mathbf{G} -module in our symplectic case (see Proposition 2.15). (Strictly speaking, because as explained just below one can associate to every $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module a sheaf with a connection, for our purposes it is not so important to know that L_λ is more than a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module). At the level of underlying \mathbf{M} -modules these induced modules $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\mu)[\mathbf{Y}]$ can be identified with a tensor product $W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]$ where $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]$ denotes the free polynomial ring in the d_g variables $Y_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq g$ that one can think of as being parameters for the unipotent subgroup $\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbf{Q}$ (which is isomorphic to the

symmetric g -by- g matrices): the action of $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$ (with $a, b, c \in \mathbf{M}_g$) on $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]$ sends a symmetric matrix Y to $a^{-1}(b + Yd)$. Thanks to a beautiful construction due to Z. Liu, we can associate to the above exact sequence of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules an exact sequence of sheaves with a connection

$$(1.2) \quad 0 \longrightarrow (\mathcal{L}_\lambda, \nabla) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{V}_\lambda, \nabla) \xrightarrow{d} \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} (\mathcal{V}_{w \cdot \lambda}, \nabla).$$

We recall this result in Theorem 3.7, briefly explaining why Liu's construction extends from the field case to the case of a Dedekind domain. (The main point is that the underlying \mathbb{k} -modules of the representations of interest to us are flat and, hence, as representations of \mathbf{Q} they are a colimit of representations whose underlying \mathbb{k} -module is finitely generated and projective and these kind of representations can be obtained from the standard representation in the usual way). Using the inclusion appearing in (1.2) one is essentially reduced, as in the $g = 1$ case, to work with the sheaves with connection $(\mathcal{V}_\lambda, \nabla)$ which “looks always the same for varying λ 's” (being modelled on $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]$). Here we say “essentially” because, as we are going to explain, the above sheaves admits filtrations that are split after a pull-back to the Igusa tower and we would like the first inclusion appearing in (1.2) to be compatible with these splitting without introducing denominators. In the case $g = 1$, this problem does not exist because the natural basis of Sym_2^{k-2} is a subset of that of $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(e_1^{k-2})[\mathbf{Y}]$.

To this this end, we first remark that, writing $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r}$) for the space of polynomials that are of degree $\leq r$ (resp. $= r$), then $\mathrm{Fil}_r(W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]) := W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$ is a \mathbf{Q} -submodule of $W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]$. Because one is able to attach to a \mathbf{Q} -module a sheaf, one gets an increasing filtration $\{\mathrm{Fil}_r(\mathcal{V}_\lambda)\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ by taking the sheaf associated to $\mathrm{Fil}_r(W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}])$. (Although not needed, it turns out that the opposite filtration $\mathrm{Fil}^r(\mathcal{V}_\lambda) := \mathrm{Fil}_{-r}(\mathcal{V}_\lambda)$ intersected with \mathcal{L}_λ equals the Hodge filtration, up to a translation). This filtration is split, namely one has

$$(1.3) \quad \mathrm{Fil}_i(W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]) = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{gr}_{i-j}(W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathrm{gr}_{i-j}(W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]) = W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{=i-j}.$$

When working over the Igusa tower, one can again split $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$ by means of a canonical basis $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_g, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_g\}$ that one can use in order to introduce P -depleted de Rham complexes by imposing componentisely this condition. Furthermore, the span $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^{1, \varphi=1}$ of the η_i 's yields the so called unit root splitting $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1 = \omega_{\mathrm{dR}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^{1, \varphi=1}$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$. Although the relationship between the standard representation Std_{2g} and the representation $\mathbf{J} := \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}$ viewed as representations of \mathbf{Q} is not so transparent as in the $g = 1$ case (where $(\mathrm{Std}_2 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{Std}_1)^\vee = \mathbf{J}$ for $\mathrm{Std}_1 = \mathbb{Z}e_1$), one can identify \mathbf{J} as being obtained from the standard exact sequence having Std_{2g} as a middle term by taking a pull-back, then a push-out and then a dual as \mathbf{Q} -representations (see Proposition 2.17): this allow ones to spread out the unit root splitting from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$ to every \mathcal{V}_λ . Now, the unit root splitting of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$ comes from the splitting of Std_{2g} under the action of an element $m_0 \in \mathbf{M}$ which acts on $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r}$ as the multiplication by p^{-r} : we deduce from this fact that the unit root splitting of \mathcal{V}_μ is a splitting of the filtration $\{\mathrm{Fil}_r(\mathcal{V}_\mu)\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$. Setting $\mathcal{W}_{\mu, i} := \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{=i}$, we have

$$(1.4) \quad \mathrm{Fil}_i(\mathcal{V}_\mu) \simeq \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{W}_{\mu, j-i} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V}_\mu \simeq \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{W}_{\mu, i}$$

(see Lemma 5.12). Of course, \mathcal{L}_λ receives a filtration from \mathcal{V}_λ by setting $\mathrm{Fil}_r(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) := \mathcal{L}_\lambda \cap \mathrm{Fil}_r(\mathcal{V}_\lambda)$ and this filtration is split, but only a priori at the cost of introducing denominators. In order to make everything work at an integral level, we realize the degree filtration in terms of the underlying \mathbf{Q} -modules as follows. For every algebraic representation M of \mathbf{U} (i.e. an $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U})$ -comodule), define a filtration by setting $\mathrm{Fil}_0(M) := M^{\mathbf{U}}$ and, by recursion, define $\mathrm{Fil}_r(M)$ to be the inverse image of $\left(\frac{M}{\mathrm{Fil}_{r-1}(M)}\right)^{\mathbf{U}}$ in M . Then the degree filtration is obtained in this way and, because taking the \mathbf{U} -invariant is a left exact operation (indeed exact, for unipotent groups), (1.1) and, hence, (1.2) is promoted to an exact sequence of filtered objects. Because $W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{=i}$ is realized as an isotypic component under the action of m_0 and $\mathcal{W}_{\mu, i} := \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} W_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{Y}]_{=i}$, it follows from (1.2) viewed as a sequence of filtered objects that, because these isotypic components split the second and the third term of the sequence thanks to (1.4), then they also provide a splitting of the first term. In this way, we get an analogous decomposition of \mathcal{L}_λ and, hence, we can really forget about the sheaves $(\mathcal{L}_\lambda, \nabla)$ and work in $(\mathcal{V}_\lambda, \nabla)$.

The next step consists in realizing that, as in the $g = 1$ setting, using the decomposition (1.4) one can still write

$$\nabla^p : H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p \right) \rightarrow H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1} \right),$$

when restricted to $H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\lambda,i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)$, as a sum of two contributions

$$\nabla^p(F) = \Theta^p(F) + \Delta_i^p(F) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\lambda,i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1} \right) \oplus H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\lambda,i+1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1} \right)$$

where Θ^p gives the “horizontal” contribution of ∇^p whereas, as in the case $g = 1$, the “vertical” contribution Δ_i^p is obtained by \mathcal{O}_{X_0} -linear extension of operators in Lie algebra \mathfrak{u}^- of the unipotent radical \mathbf{U}^- of \mathbf{Q}^- operating on $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}^-}(\mathcal{W}_\lambda)[\mathbf{Y}]$ (see Lemma 5.13). This relies on two ingredients. First, by Liu’s construction, one is reduced to understand the Gauss-Manin connection. In this case, the claim is equivalent to verifying that the expression of the Gauss-Manin connection in terms of the basis $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_g, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_g\}$ at the cusps is obtained as follows. Let us write ∂_{ij} for the matrix in \mathfrak{u}^- whose lower left g -by- g entry is the symmetric matrix whose upper triangular part has all zero except a 1 in (i, j) -entry. Then

$$\nabla(\theta_{i,j})(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_g, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_g)^t = \partial_{ij}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_g, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_g)^t.$$

This is proved by T. J. Fonseca in [9, Proposition 5.17, Remark 5.18 and Theorem 6.4] (although the lower left g -by- g entry is essentially the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism at the cusps). (In Lemma 5.7 we explain why one can also include a paramodular level).

As we have already said, the sheaves with connection $(\mathcal{V}_\lambda, \nabla)$ which “looks always the same for varying λ ’s”. In order to formalize this fact, which is an empty statement in the $g = 1$ because there is only one $\Theta^p = \Theta^0$, we show that $\Theta^p \circ \Theta^{p-1} = 0$ and, furthermore, that there is an isomorphism of complexes

$$\left(H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\lambda,i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right), \Theta \right) \simeq \left(\mathcal{W}_{\lambda,i} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} H^0 \left(X_0, \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right), 1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} d \right).$$

(see Lemma 5.14). Everything we have written so far holds by placing an superscript $(-)^{[P]}$ everywhere.

As a final step, thanks to the above discussion, one is reduced to showing that the complex $H^0 \left(X_0, \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right)^{[P]}$ is acyclic for every P such that $P(0) = 0$. To this end, we interpret θ_P as a kind of “Laplace operator”: indeed, for every such polynomial, we construct an operator ∂^\cdot of degree -1 satisfying

$$d^\cdot \circ \partial^\cdot + \partial^\cdot \circ d^\cdot = \theta_P.$$

In particular, restricting the above equality to cocycles yields $d^\cdot \circ \partial^\cdot = \theta_P$ and, because θ_P is invertible on P -depleted sections, the wanted acyclicity follows. We remark that this result is deduced in §5.15 by a very general method.

Remark 1.2. *We have so far remained silent on one hypothesis. Because of Proposition 2.17, we must assume that the prime p is not 2. If $p = 2$, the acyclicity result is true a priori only after extending the scalars to \mathbb{Q}_p .*

Remark 1.3. *The precise compact subgroups of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{A}_f)$ that we admit are defined at the beginning of §3: this includes the more basic paramodular levels. At the cost of slightly extending the calculation on q -expansions of §4, one can also include the more general levels of Remark 3.1. The cases where p is allowed to divide either the level or the degree of the polarization are much more delicate, as one needs models for which Liu’s construction works (cfr. also Remark 3.11).*

Remark 1.4. *The method described in this paper is rather general and we expect that it could be extended to cover more general PEL setting, at least as long as the ordinary locus is non-empty.*

Acknowledgments. It is a pleasure to thank F. Andreatta, M. Bertolini and R. Venerucci: without them, this work would never have existed.

2. INTEGRAL TRUNCATED DUAL BGG COMPLEXES AND REPRESENTATIONS OF SYMPLECTIC GROUPS

2.1. Preliminary results and notations. Suppose that \mathbf{G} is an affine and flat group scheme over a ring \mathbb{k} (all schemes in §2 will be understood to be defined over \mathbb{k} , except when differently stated) and that $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{G}$ is a flat subgroup scheme.

We say that a functor V on \mathbb{k} -algebras is valued in modules if, for every morphism of \mathbb{k} -algebras $R \rightarrow R'$, then $V(R) = V_R$ is an R -module and $V_R \rightarrow V_{R'}$ is a morphism of R -modules. Denote by $\underline{\text{Mod}}$ the category of functors on the \mathbb{k} -algebras R that are module valued and such that V_R defines a sheaf on the affine Zariski site of $\mathbf{Spec}(R)$ (i.e. with coverings $\{\mathbf{Spec}(R_f) \rightarrow \mathbf{Spec}(R)\}_{f \in R}$). Let $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$ be the full subcategory of those $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}$ having the property that the canonical morphism $R' \otimes_R V_R \rightarrow V_{R'}$ is an isomorphism for every R -algebra R' . (Of course, the above Zariski sheaf condition could be omitted in the definition of $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$). If $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$, we will call $V_{\mathbb{k}}$ the underlying \mathbb{k} -module. Write $\underline{\text{Mod}}_f$ for the full subcategory of those $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$ with the property that $V_{\mathbb{k}}$ is finitely generated and projective. If we need to specify the base \mathbb{k} , we will write $\underline{\text{Mod}}_?(\mathbb{k})$. The functor taking the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_R := \ker(\mathbf{G}(R[\varepsilon]) \rightarrow \mathbf{G}(R))$ of \mathbf{G} is an example of functor in $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$ (see [5, Proposition 3.4]) and \mathfrak{g}_R is naturally a Lie algebra over R (see [5, Proposition 3.4, §3.5.1, Proposition 3.6, p.68-70 and Corollaire 1 to Proposition 4.8], taking into account that \mathbf{G} , being representable, is a “bon R -group” by [5, Example after Definitoin 4.6, based on Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 3.3]). Writing \mathfrak{q} for the functors obtained from \mathbf{Q} , we have that $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a subfunctor such that $\mathfrak{q}_R \subset \mathfrak{g}_R$ is a Lie subalgebra. We have a natural notion of exactness in $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$ making it an abelian category obtained by looking at the underlying \mathbb{k} -module $V_{\mathbb{k}}$. We note that this notion of exactness is different, in general, from the notion of exactness for module valued functors: an exact sequence in $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$ gives rise to an exact sequence of R -modules when evaluated at R -points for every \mathbb{k} -flat algebra R (hence every R , when \mathbb{k} is field); when \mathbb{k} is not a field, to be a exact as a functor is in general a stronger condition.

We let $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{G})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{g})$) be the category of couples (ρ, V) (resp. (δ, V)), sometimes denoted simply by ρ or V (resp. δ or V) with the property that $\rho : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(V)$ (resp. $\delta : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$) is a morphism of functors such that $\rho_R : \mathbf{G}(R) \rightarrow \text{Aut}_R(V_R)$ is a group homomorphism (resp. $\delta_R : \mathfrak{g}_R \rightarrow \text{End}_R(V_R)$ is a morphism of Lie algebras) for every \mathbb{k} -algebra R . Let us write $\text{Rep}_?(\mathbf{G})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}_?(\mathfrak{g})$) for the full-subcategory consisting of those (σ, V) (resp. (δ, V)) that are such that $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_?$: for example, writing $\text{Ad}_{\mathbf{G}} : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ for the action obtained by conjugation (via $\mathbf{G}(R[\varepsilon]) \simeq \mathbf{G}(R) \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_R$), we have $\mathfrak{g} \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$. The action of the objects of $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{G})$ can be differentiated: this gives rise to a functor from $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{G})$ to $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g})$ sending (ρ, V) to $(d\rho, V)$. We can refine this operation as follows. Let $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ be the category of triples (δ, ρ, V) such that $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$, $d\rho = \delta|_{\mathfrak{u}}$ and $\rho_R(q) \delta_R(X) \rho_R(q)^{-1} = \delta_R(\text{Ad}_{\mathbf{G}, R}(q)(X))$ holds in $\text{End}_R(V_R)$ for every $q \in \mathbf{Q}(R)$ and $X \in \mathfrak{g}_R$. Then, sending (ρ, V) to $(d\rho, \rho|_{\mathbf{Q}}, V)$ yields a functor from $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{G})$ to $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$. Unless otherwise stated, the categories $\text{Rep}_{alg}(?)$ will be regarded as exact categories by looking at the underlying object in $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$, i.e. the underlying \mathbb{k} -module: they are abelian because the (co)kernels in $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$ really belongs to $\text{Rep}_{alg}(?)$, as we are going to explain. The category $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g})$ is an abelian category just because the $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -action on the underlying \mathbb{k} -modules $V_{\mathbb{k}}$ of the (co)kernels V of a morphism in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g})$ extends by linearity to an action of $\mathfrak{g}_R = R \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ on $V_R = R \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} V_{\mathbb{k}}$ for every \mathbb{k} -algebra R . The category of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ -comodules is identified with $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{G})$ (as \mathbf{G} is affine), which is an abelian category (due to our flatness assumption, see [22]). Combining these two arguments, we deduce that $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ is also abelian.

The following result will be crucial in the proof of Theorem 3.7 below.

Theorem 2.1. *The following facts hold.*

- (1) *If $(\rho, V) \in \text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{G})$ is a representation of \mathbf{G} which whose underlying \mathbb{k} -module is free which is given by a closed immersion*

$$\rho : \mathbf{G} \longrightarrow \text{GL}_V,$$

then every $W \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$ can be constructed from V by forming tensor products, direct sums, duals, and subquotients.

- (2) *If \mathbb{k} is noetherian, then every object of $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{G})$, regarded as an $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ -comodule, is a filtered union of its $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ -subcomodules that are of finite type over \mathbb{k} . In particular, when \mathbb{k} is a Dedekind domain, then every $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{G})$ whose underlying \mathbb{k} -module is torsion free is a filtered union of its subobjects that are in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$.*

Proof. (1) This follows from the fact that the proof of [19, Theorem 4.14] holds in this more general setting. Indeed, first we can assume that $W_{\mathbb{k}}$ is free of finite rank, by adding a \mathbb{k} -module promoted to an object of \mathbf{G} by means of the trivial action. Then [19, Corollary 4.13] holds unchanged, implying that W is an $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ -subcomodule of a finite direct sum of copies of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}) := (\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}), \Delta)$ (here is where we use the \mathbb{k} -freeness). Then, with the notations of loc.cit. we can replace W by its image W_i in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ and, hence, suppose that $W \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ is still a \mathbb{k} -module of finite type (but no longer free). Then the proof is the same.

(2) See [22, §1.5 Corollaire]. \square

We will need to consider the operation of taking \mathbf{G} -invariants. On the one hand, for every $(\rho, V) \in \text{Rep}(\mathbf{G})$, we can consider the functor of fixed points $(\rho, V)^{h\mathbf{G}} = V^{h\mathbf{G}}$ such that $(\rho, V)^{\mathbf{G}}(R)$ is the set of those $v \in V_R$ such that $v_{R'} \in V_{R'}^{\mathbf{G}(R')}$ for every R -algebra R' , where $v_{R'}$ denotes the image of v in $V_{R'}$. On the other hand, when \mathbf{G} is affine and $(\rho, V) \in \text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G})$, we can consider $V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}} \subset V_{\mathbb{k}}$, defined to be the set of those $v \in V_{\mathbb{k}}$ such that $\rho^{\#}(v) = v \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} 1$ if $\rho^{\#} : V_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow V_{\mathbb{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ denotes the comodule structure: writing $\mu_{V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}}} : V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}} \rightarrow V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G})$ for the canonical morphism sending v to $v \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} 1$, the inclusion $V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}} \subset V_{\mathbb{k}}$ yields a comodule morphism from $(\mu_{V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}}}, V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}})$ to (ρ, V) . Let us write $(\rho, V)^{\mathbf{G}} = V^{\mathbf{G}} \in \text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G})$ for the corresponding functor. There is always a morphism of functors $V^{\mathbf{G}} \rightarrow V^{h\mathbf{G}}$ and, for every \mathbb{k} -flat algebra R (hence $R = \mathbb{k}$ and every R , when \mathbb{k} is field), one has

$$(2.1) \quad V^{\mathbf{G}}(R) \xrightarrow{\sim} V^{h\mathbf{G}}(R)$$

(see [12, (2.10)] or [19, proof of Proposition 4.33]). We note that, when \mathbf{G} is affine, irreducible and connected and \mathbb{k} is a infinite perfect field, then $V_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathbf{G}} = (V_{\mathbb{k}})^{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{k})}$ (see [19, After Proposition 4.32]).

Suppose that X is a scheme and that V is a module valued functor on the \mathbb{k} -algebras R (for example, suppose that $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}$). If $U \subset X_{/R}$ is an open subset, we let $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)$ be the module valued functor on R -algebras such that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)_{R'}$ is the set of morphisms of functors $f : U_{/R'} \rightarrow V_{/R'}$, where $Y_{/R'}$ denotes the base change $Y_{/R'}(R'') := Y(R'')$ on R' -algebras. According to Lemma 2.2 below we have, indeed, that it belongs to $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{\text{alg}}$ when $U \subset X$ is affine and $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$. In particular, when $U \subset \mathbf{G}$ is such that $U\mathbf{Q} \subset U$, it makes sense to consider the left action by right multiplication of \mathbf{Q} on $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)$ and we get an object of $\text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{Q})$. Indeed, essentially due to the fact that derivations localizes, we can enrich the structure of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)$ to that of an object in $\text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ by means of Lemma 2.3 below. In order to make this further structure explicit, it will be convenient to consider the module valued functor $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(X, V)[\eta]$ classifying rational functions defined as follows. If $U_1 \subset U_2 \subset X_{/R}$ is an inclusion of open subsets of a scheme X and V is a module valued functor, then there is a map $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U_2, V)_R \rightarrow \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U_1, V)_R$ and we define $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(X, V)[\eta]$ to be the module valued functor on \mathbb{k} -algebras R defined by means of the formula $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(X, V)[\eta]_R := \lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ U \rightarrow}} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)_R$, the limit being taken over all dense open subsets U of $X_{/R}$ (note that the intersection of finitely many dense open subsets is a dense open subset and the transition morphisms are injective). Suppose now that $U \subset \mathbf{G}$ is such that $U\mathbf{Q} \subset U$ and $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$. Then we have a \mathbf{G} -module action on $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ (again given by right multiplication) and a morphism from $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)$ to $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ which is \mathbf{Q} -equivariant (and injective, when $U \subset \mathbf{G}$ is dense). Moreover, as remarked above $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)$ is in $\text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$: it would be natural to conjecture that the inclusion can be promoted to a morphism of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules. However, it makes no sense, a priori, to differentiate the \mathbf{G} -action of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$. This issue can be fixed by considering an intermediate category between $\text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G})$ and $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{G})$ to which $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ belongs and admitting a functor to some category of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules defined as follows.

For a \mathbb{k} -algebra R and an R -module M , we let $R_M[\varepsilon] := R \oplus M$ with the unique R -algebra structure making M a square zero ideal and set $R[\varepsilon] := R_R[\varepsilon]$: it comes equipped with a morphism of R -algebras $i_{R_M[\varepsilon]} : R \rightarrow R_M[\varepsilon]$ (resp. $\pi_{R_M[\varepsilon]} : R_M[\varepsilon] \rightarrow R$) defined by the rule $i_{R_M[\varepsilon]}(r) := (r, 0)$ (resp. $\pi_{R_M[\varepsilon]}(r, m) := r$) and we have $\pi_{R_M[\varepsilon]} \circ i_{R_M[\varepsilon]} = 1_R$. In particular, setting $T_M(\mathbf{G})(R) := \mathbf{G}(R[\varepsilon])$, we deduce that $T_M(\mathbf{G})(R) \simeq \mathbf{G}(R) \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_R$. Let $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{gd}$ be the full subcategory of those $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}$ having the property that the canonical morphism $R_M[\varepsilon] \otimes_R V_R \rightarrow V_{R_M[\varepsilon]}$ is an isomorphism for every R -module M and every \mathbb{k} -algebra R . The full subcategories $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathbf{G})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathfrak{g})$) of $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{G})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{g})$) are then defined by requiring the underlying \mathbb{k} -module to be in $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{gd}$. The action of the objects (σ, V) of $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathbf{G})$ can

be differentiated to give an object $(d\sigma, V)$ of $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathfrak{g})$ as follows. If $X \in \mathfrak{g}_R$ is regarded as an element of $\mathbf{G}(R[\varepsilon]) \simeq \mathbf{G}(R) \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_R$, then we suggestively write it as $1 + \varepsilon X$. We have that $V_{R[\varepsilon]} \xleftarrow{\sim} R[\varepsilon] \otimes_R V_R$ and, because $\pi_{R[\varepsilon]} \circ i_{R[\varepsilon]} = 1_R$, we see that $V_{R[\varepsilon]} \simeq V_R \oplus \varepsilon V_R$ (as an R -module), the inclusion $V_R \subset V_{R[\varepsilon]}$ being given by $i_{R[\varepsilon]}$ whereas $\varepsilon V_R \simeq \ker(\pi_{R[\varepsilon]} : V_{R[\varepsilon]} \rightarrow V_R)$. Because $\pi_{R[\varepsilon]} \circ \sigma_{R[\varepsilon]} = \sigma_R \circ \pi_{R[\varepsilon]}$, we also deduce that $\sigma(1 + \varepsilon X)(i_{R[\varepsilon]}(v)) - i_{R[\varepsilon]}(v)$ belongs to the kernel εV_R of $\pi_{R[\varepsilon]}$. Hence, identifying v with its image $i_{R[\varepsilon]}(v)$, the endomorphism $d\sigma_R(X)$ can be defined by means of the formula

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sigma_{R[\varepsilon]}(1 + \varepsilon X)v = v + \varepsilon d\sigma_R(X)(v) \text{ for every } v \in V_R \subset V_R \oplus \varepsilon V_R \simeq V_{R[\varepsilon]}, \\ & \text{i.e. } d\sigma_R(X)(v) = \frac{\sigma_{R[\varepsilon]}(1 + \varepsilon X)v - v}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from [5, Corollaire 2 to Proposition 4.8] that the resulting morphism of functors $d\rho$ yields an element $(d\rho, V) \in \text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathfrak{g})$ (and (2.2) should be quite convincing). Let us write $\text{Ad}_{\mathbf{G}} : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ for the action obtained by conjugation (via $\mathbf{G}(R[\varepsilon]) \simeq \mathbf{G}(R) \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_R$) and let $\text{ad}_{\mathbf{G}} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathfrak{g})$ be $d\text{Ad}_{\mathbf{G}}$: then $[X, Y] := \text{ad}_{\mathbf{G}}(X)(Y)$ and the proof that \mathfrak{g} is a Lie algebra and that $d\rho$ is of Lie algebras is essentially obtained by functoriality reducing to the case $\mathbf{G} = \text{Aut}(V)$ for which $\mathfrak{g} = \text{End}(V)$.

We are now going to show that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ is in $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathbf{G})$ when $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$ and that $U \subset X$ is an affine open subset of an affine scheme X . Then $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V) \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{\text{alg}}$ and $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(X, V)[\eta] \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{gd}$.*

Proof. After noticing that the categories $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{\text{alg}}$ and $\underline{\text{Mod}}_{gd}$ are closed under taking factors of direct sums in $\underline{\text{Mod}}$ and using the fact that $V_{\mathbb{k}}$ is a finitely generated and projective over \mathbb{k} , we can assume that $V \simeq \mathbf{G}_a^d$ and then that $V = \mathbf{G}_a$. In this case, $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)_R = \mathcal{O}(U/R)$ and $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(X, V)[\eta]_R$ equals the ring $K(X/R)$ of rational functions on X/R . The fact that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V) \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{\text{alg}}$ follows from the fact that $R' \otimes_R \mathcal{O}(U/R) \simeq \mathcal{O}(U/R')$ holds for every affine scheme. If Y is a scheme with finitely many irreducible components, it follows from (the proof of) Lemma 31.23.6 (6) of The Stack Project that $K(-)$ is a sheaf on the open subsets of Y : this applies to every affine scheme Y , as it is X/R . In particular, suppose that $\{\mathfrak{S}_{\text{pec}}(R_f) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{\text{pec}}(R)\}_{f \in R}$ is a covering: then $\{X/R_f \rightarrow X/R\}_{f \in R}$ is an open covering and, hence, the above discussion implies that $K(X/-)$ satisfies the sheaf property with respect to $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}_{i \in I}$, as wanted. When $R' = R_M[\varepsilon]$, then X/R and X/R' have the same underlying topological space and, hence, the open subsets of X/R and X/R' are the same. Taking into account that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V) \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{\text{alg}}(R)$ thanks to what we have proved applied to $U \subset X/R$, we deduce that, if $R' = R_M[\varepsilon]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} R' \otimes_R \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(X, V)[\eta]_R &= R' \otimes_R \left(\lim_{U \rightarrow} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)_R \right) = \lim_{U \rightarrow} (R' \otimes_R \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)_R) \\ &= \lim_{U \rightarrow} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)_{R'} = \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)[\eta]_{R'}. \end{aligned}$$

□

When $X = \mathbf{G}$ and $g \in \mathbf{G}(R)$, for every open subset $U \subset X$, the right (resp. left) multiplication by g morphism r_g (resp. l_g) sends U/Rg^{-1} (resp. $g^{-1}U$) to U/R and, in this way, we get a left (resp. right) action of \mathbf{G} on $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ making it an object of $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{G})$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ is in $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathbf{G})$ and, consequently, it makes sense to regard it as an object of $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$ and that \mathbf{G} is affine. For every affine open subset $U \subset \mathbf{G}$, we have that the canonical morphism from $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)$ to $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ is in $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathfrak{g})$. In particular, when U is dense subset, it realizes $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)$ as a subobject of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ in $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. Again we can assume that $V = \mathbf{G}_a$: then $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)_R = \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}/R)$, $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V)_R = \mathcal{O}(U/R)$ and $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]_R = K(\mathbf{G}/R)$. One identifies \mathfrak{g}_R with the space of \mathbf{G} -invariant derivations (for the left action by right multiplication, sending $1 + \varepsilon X = (e_{\mathbf{G}/R}, X) \in \mathbf{G}(R) \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_R$ to $D_X := (1_{\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}/R)} \otimes_R X) \circ \Delta$, where Δ denotes the colagebra structure). Then one checks that $d\sigma_R(X)(f) = D_X(f)$ if $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}/R)$. In particular, because the derivations localize, the \mathfrak{g}_R -action on $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}/R)$ uniquely extends to $\mathcal{O}(U/R)$.

Because $K(\mathbf{G}/R) := \lim_{U \rightarrow} \mathcal{O}(U/R)$, we deduce that it also uniquely extends to $K(\mathbf{G}/R)$: hence, the \mathfrak{g}_R -action on $\mathcal{O}(U/R)$ uniquely extends to $K(\mathbf{G}/R)$. But because the morphism from $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}/R)$ to $K(\mathbf{G}/R)$ is of \mathbf{G}/R -modules, the \mathfrak{g}_R -action on $K(\mathbf{G}/R)$ obtained from the \mathbf{G} -module structure of $K(\mathbf{G})$ also extends the \mathfrak{g}_R -action of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{G}/R)$. It follows that these two \mathfrak{g}_R -actions coincide and, hence, that the morphism from $\mathcal{O}(U/R)$ to $K(\mathbf{G}/R)$ is in $\text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathfrak{g})$. \square

We will now suppose that \mathbf{G} is affine and we will regard $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ as a left \mathbf{G} -module by right multiplication. Assume that $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$ and that $U \subset \mathbf{G}$ is a dense affine open subset such that $U\mathbf{Q} \subset U$: then Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 together imply that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U] := \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(U, V) \in \text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ is a subobject of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta] \in \text{Rep}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$. Suppose in addition that \mathbf{Q}^- is another affine group scheme that acts on $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ from the right making it an object of $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{Q}^-)$ in such a way that the $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -action commute with the \mathbf{Q}^- -action and that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U] \subset \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$ is also a subobject in $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{Q}^-)$. Applying $(-)^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$, we get that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$ is a subobject of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$ in both $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{Q})^1$. Also, the canonical morphism from $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U]^{\mathbf{Q}^-}$ to $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$ is equivariant for both actions of \mathfrak{g} and \mathbf{Q} . Summarizing, the composition

$$(2.3) \quad \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U]^{\mathbf{Q}^-} \longrightarrow \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}} \subset \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$$

is a morphism both of \mathfrak{g} -modules and \mathbf{Q} -modules and we have $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U]^{\mathbf{Q}^-} \in \text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$.

2.2. Induced modules and the dual BGG complex. Suppose that \mathbf{G} is connected, split and reductive and that \mathbf{Q} is a parabolic subgroup with unipotent radical \mathbf{U} , Levi component \mathbf{M} which is connected, split and reductive and opposite parabolic subgroup \mathbf{Q}^- having unipotent radical \mathbf{U}^- (all of them are smooth, the unipotent groups by [2, Corollary 5.2.5] and the other by definition, see [2, Definition 3.1.1 and Definition 5.2.1]). The projection $\mathbf{Q}^- \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ allows us to regard representations of \mathbf{M} as representations of \mathbf{Q}^- : we have a functor

$$(2.4) \quad \text{Rep}_?(\mathbf{M}) \longrightarrow \text{Rep}_?(\mathbf{Q}^-) \text{ for } ? \in \{ \phi, alg, f \}.$$

Let us now specify relevant $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules associated to representations of \mathbf{Q}^- and, via (2.4), of \mathbf{M} : to this end, we need a dense affine open subset $U \subset \mathbf{G}$ such that $\mathbf{Q}^-U\mathbf{Q} \subset U$. Then, if $\rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}^-)$, we define functors

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho) \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[U] \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta]$$

as follows. We regard the functor $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[U]$ (resp. $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\eta]$) as a right \mathbf{Q}^- -module by means of the rule $(fq)(x) := \rho(q)^{-1}f(qx)$ for morphisms of R -schemes $f : U/R \rightarrow \rho/R$ (resp. $f : U \rightarrow \rho/R$ for some dense open subset $U \subset \mathbf{G}/R$), $q \in \mathbf{Q}^-(R)$ and $x \in U(R)$. Then we set $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho) := \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\mathbf{G}]^{\mathbf{Q}^-}$, $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[U] := \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[U]^{\mathbf{Q}^-}$ and $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta] := \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\eta]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$. We remark that $\mathbf{Q}(R)$ (resp. $\mathbf{G}(R)$) acts by right translation $(gf)(x) := f(xg)$ on $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[U]$ (resp. $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta]$ and $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)$). Indeed, by differentiating the \mathbf{G} -action, we get a monomorphism $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho) \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[U]$ in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ and $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta]$ is both a \mathfrak{g} -module and \mathbf{Q} -module in such a way that the morphism from $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[U]$ to $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta]$ is equivariant (thanks to (2.3)).

Because $\mathbf{Q}^- \setminus \mathbf{G}$ is proper, it is also true that $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho) \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$ when \mathbb{k} is a field (by interpreting the elements of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)(R)$ as global section of a suitable vector bundle on $\mathbf{Q}^- \setminus \mathbf{G}$, cfr. (2.1)). The multiplication map identifies $\mathbf{U}^- \times \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{U}$ with an open subscheme $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{Y} \subset \mathbf{G}$ (see [2, Theorem 4.1.7 4.]) and, hence, the above discussion applies with $U = \mathbf{Y}$.

¹Although, strictly speaking, we can not talk about $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules because it may not be possible a priori to differentiate the \mathbf{Q} -action, $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[U]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$ and $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$ are equivariantly for both actions subfunctors of the $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, V)[\eta]$.

Remark 2.4. *The decomposition*

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbf{U}^- \times \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{U} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Y}$$

implies that the restriction map yields an isomorphism (for every $\rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}^-)$)

$$(2.6) \quad \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}] \simeq \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[U]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho)$$

which is evidently \mathbf{U} -equivariant if we let \mathbf{U} act on the right hand side via the formula $(uf)(y) := f(yu)$. In fact, the \mathbf{Q} -action on \mathbf{Y} given by right multiplication descend to a right action $*$ on $\mathbf{Q}^- \backslash \mathbf{Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}$: because for every $mu \in \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{M} \ltimes \mathbf{U}$ and $y \in \mathbf{U}$ we have that ymu is equivalent to $m^{-1}ymu$ and $m^{-1}ym \in \mathbf{U}$, we see that

$$(2.7) \quad y * mu = m^{-1}ymu.$$

It follows that the \mathbf{Q} -action on the right hand side of (2.6) is given by

$$(muf)(y) = \rho(m)f(m^{-1}ymu) \text{ if } mu \in \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{M} \ltimes \mathbf{U} \text{ and } y \in \mathbf{U}.$$

There is a canonical monomorphism

$$(2.8) \quad \rho \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$$

which is \mathbf{Q} -equivariant: under the \mathbf{Q} -equivariant identification (2.6), it sends $w \in \rho$ to the constant function $w(u) = w$, hence $w(y) = w(u_y^- m_y u_y^+) = m_y w$ for every $y \in \mathbf{Y}$ written in the form $y = u_y^- m_y u_y^+$.

Proof. The only non-obvious fact is that the canonical morphism

$$(2.9) \quad \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\mathbf{Y}]^{\mathbf{Q}^-} \longrightarrow \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\mathbf{Y}]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$$

is an isomorphism of functors. To this end, we first note that the decomposition (2.5) first implies that

$$(2.10) \quad \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\mathbf{Y}]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho).$$

In particular, we deduce that $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\mathbf{Y}]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}} \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{\text{alg}}$ (thanks to Lemma 2.2). But then, in order to show that (2.9) is an isomorphism, it suffices to show that this holds at the level of the underlying \mathbb{k} -modules. In view of (2.1) (applied to the affine group scheme \mathbf{Q}^-), this follows from (2.10) taking the \mathbb{k} -points. \square

We deduce from (2.6) and (2.3) that we have, indeed,

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho) \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}] \hookrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta]$$

(and that the R -points of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[U]$ can be explicitly described, using the fixed point functor, as the set of those morphism of R -scheme $f : U/R \rightarrow \rho/R$ such that $f(qx) = \rho(q)f(x)$ holds for every $q \in \mathbf{Q}^-(R')$, every $x \in U/R(R') = U(R')$ and every R -algebra R').

Remark 2.5. *If we view $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}^-)$ as an exact subcategory of $\text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{Q}^-)$, then the formation of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ is exact in ρ .*

Proof. In view of (2.6), this is a consequence of the identification $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho) \simeq \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho$ in $\underline{\text{Mod}}$, which holds because $\rho \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$, and the flatness of \mathbf{U} over \mathbb{k} . \square

We set

$$V_{\rho} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}], \text{ for } \rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M}) \text{ (using (2.4)).}$$

When $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{G}}$ is a Borel subgroup, we have $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{T}$, a maximal torus of \mathbf{G} , and we let $X^*(\mathbf{T}) := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{gr}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{G}_m)$ be the character group of \mathbf{T} . Choosing \mathbf{B} in such a way that $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{B}$ (as it is possible up to conjugation on \mathbf{B}), one has $\mathbf{T} \subset \mathbf{M}$. We define the set of dominant weights $X_{\mathbf{G},+} \subset X^*(\mathbf{T})$ (resp. $X_{\mathbf{M},+} \subset X^*(\mathbf{T})$) as the subset of those $\lambda \in X^*(\mathbf{T})$ such that $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{G}}}^{\mathbf{G}}(\lambda) \neq 0$ (resp. $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{M}}}^{\mathbf{M}}(\lambda) \neq 0$). Then $X_{\mathbf{G},+} \subset X_{\mathbf{M},+}$ and, when \mathbb{k} is a characteristic zero field, by the theory of highest weight vectors, there is a bijection between $X_{\mathbf{G},+}$ (resp. $X_{\mathbf{M},+}$) and (the isomorphism classes of) the irreducible objects of $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$): in this case, we set

$$L_{\lambda} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{G}}}^{\mathbf{G}}(\lambda) \text{ and } W_{\lambda} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{M}}}^{\mathbf{M}}(\lambda).$$

Let us write $W_{\mathbf{G}} := \frac{N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{T})}{\mathbf{T}}$ (resp. $W_{\mathbf{M}} := \frac{N_{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{T})}{\mathbf{T}}$) for the Weyl group of \mathbf{G} (resp. \mathbf{M}) and let $W^{\mathbf{M}} \subset W_{\mathbf{G}}$ be the subset of those $w \in W_{\mathbf{G}}$ such that $w(\lambda) \in X_{\mathbf{M},+}$ for every $\lambda \in X_{\mathbf{G},+}$ (which can be shown to be the set of minimal length right coset representatives for $W_{\mathbf{M}} \backslash W_{\mathbf{G}}$). We also set $w \cdot \lambda := w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$, where ρ is half the sum of the positive roots.

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that \mathbb{k} is a characteristic zero field, that $\lambda \in X_{\mathbf{G},+} \subset X_{\mathbf{M},+}$ and let l be the greatest length of any element in $W^{\mathbf{M}}$. Then there is an exact complex (dual BGG-complex) of algebraic $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules in $\text{Rep}_{\text{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$:*

$$(2.11) \quad 0 \longrightarrow L_{\lambda} \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] \xrightarrow{d} \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w \cdot \lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] \longrightarrow \dots \\ \dots \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=i} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w \cdot \lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=l} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w \cdot \lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] \longrightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, the inclusion (2.8) of W_{λ} in $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] =: V_{\lambda}$ factors through the inclusion of L_{λ} in V_{λ} given by the above exact sequence:

$$(2.12) \quad W_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow L_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow V_{\lambda}.$$

Proof. Although the result is surely well known to the experts, let us briefly recall how to deduce it from the (more standard non) dual BGG complex. First of all we remark that, by definition of the exactness, one is essentially reduced to the assertion at the level of the underlying \mathbb{k} -modules and, hence, we first concentrate on them. The key observation is that there is an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -modules

$$(2.13) \quad \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\mu})[\mathbf{Y}]_{\mathbb{k}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^{\vee} \right)^{\vee}$$

where the duality $(-)^{\vee}$, exchanging the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ and the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}}$ BGG categories, is defined considering the sum of the isotypic components under the action of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{k}}$ of \mathbf{M} (hence, it agrees with the usual duality on finite dimensional $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -modules in the BGG categories - here, for the $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -actions, we follow the conventions of [13, §3] and not those of [11, §3.2 and §9.3 Proposition], implying that $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ and the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}}$ are exchanged). Indeed, because \mathbf{U} is unipotent, one has an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -modules

$$(2.14) \quad C^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, V)_{\mathbb{k}} \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(U(\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}), V_{\mathbb{k}})^{\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}^{\infty}}$$

for every $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_f$, where $(-)^{\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}^{\infty}}$ denotes the subspace those v such that there exists some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X_1, \dots, X_k \in \mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}$ such that $X_1 \dots X_k v = 0$, obtained sending f to the homomorphism sending $u \in U(\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}})$ to $(uf)(1)$ (see [7, Lemma 2.5.3]). When $W \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$, it can be enhanced to an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -modules

$$(2.15) \quad \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\mathbb{k}} \simeq \text{Hom}_{U(\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-)}(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}), W_{\mathbb{k}})^{\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}^{\infty}}$$

using (2.6) and the identification of the right hand side of (2.14) with the right hand side of (2.15) provided by Poincaré–Birkhoff–Witt Theorem. Also, for every finite dimensional $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-$ -module $W_{\mathbb{k}}$, one has an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ -modules

$$(2.16) \quad \text{Hom}_{U(\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-)}(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}), W_{\mathbb{k}}) \simeq \left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mathbb{k}}^{\vee} \right)^*,$$

where we write $(-)^*$ for the usual duality (see [6, Ch. 5, 5.5.4 Proposition], applied to the dual $W_{\mathbb{k}}^{\vee}$ of $W_{\mathbb{k}}$, $W_{\mathbb{k}}$ being of finite dimension). Then (2.13) is obtained noticing that $(-)^{\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}^{\infty}} = (-)^{\vee}$ on the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ BGG category (cfr. [13, Lemma 6]). This beautiful argument is taken from O. T. R. Jones (which considered the Borel case): we have included it as it will play a significant role later. Because $(-)^{\vee}$ establishes an antiequivalence between the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ and the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}}$ BGG categories (cfr. [13, Lemma 2]), the claimed exact sequence (2.11) is obtained, at the level of the underlying modules, by dualizing [11, §9.16, Theorem]. Because \mathbb{k} is a field, one gets in this way an exact sequence of \mathfrak{g}_R -modules for any \mathbb{k} -algebra R applying the exact functor $R \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} -$ and the claim follows noticing that the morphisms are \mathbf{Q} -equivariant, as it follows from [12, Part I, §7.10 (1) and 7.16 Lemma], which applies because \mathbf{Q} is infinitesimally flat and integral since it is smooth and connected (cfr. [12, Part I, §7.17]). \square

In order to work integrally some caution is needed. Suppose, until the end of §2.2, that \mathbb{k} is a Dedekind domain with characteristic zero fraction field \mathbb{k}_{fr} and let $? \in \{\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{G}, (\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})\}$. For every algebraic module

V in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbb{k})$ whose underlying \mathbb{k} -module is torsion free, the base changed functor V/\mathbb{k}_{f_r} (defined via $V/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}(R) := V(R)$ on \mathbb{k}_{f_r} -algebras) belongs to $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$ and the underlying \mathbb{k} -module of V functorially injects into that of V/\mathbb{k}_{f_r} (which is $\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} V$) and spans it over \mathbb{k}_{f_r} . In the opposite direction, if V_{f_r} is in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$, any object V of $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbb{k})$ whose underlying \mathbb{k} -module is torsion free and such that $V/\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \simeq V_{f_r}$ will be called a \mathbb{k}_{f_r} -model of V .

Remark 2.7. Suppose that ρ in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}^-)$ is a \mathbf{Q}^- -model of ρ_{f_r} in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}_{/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}^-)$. Then $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ is a (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}) -model of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}_{/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}^-}^{\mathbf{G}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}(\rho_{f_r})[\mathbf{Y}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}]$.

Proof. The result follows from the fact that, as noticed in the proof of Remark 2.5, $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ is identified with $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho$ in $\underline{\text{Mod}}$ and, similarly, for the base changed objects. \square

Fix any \mathbf{M} -model $W_{\lambda} \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$ of $W_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{M}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}^-}^{\mathbf{M}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}(\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$: because \mathbb{k} is a Dedekind domain it exists (see [12, Part I, §10.4 Lemma]) and, writing $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{M})$ for the distribution algebra of \mathbf{M} (see [12, Part I, §7.1]), one could be more canonical choosing $W_{\lambda} := \text{Dist}(\mathbf{M}) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ for a highest weight vector $v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ of $W_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ (see [12, Part II, §8.3]). It then follows that $V_{\lambda} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$ is a (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}) -model of $V_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}_{/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}^-}^{\mathbf{G}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}(W_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}})[\mathbf{Y}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}]$ (by Remark 2.7). In order to appropriately define L_{λ} as the inverse image of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}^-}^{\mathbf{G}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}(\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$ in V_{λ} taken in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q})$, some explanation is needed (cfr. [12, Part I, §10.1]).

We start with the easy observation that every V in $\underline{\text{Mod}}(\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$ gives rise to $V|_{\mathbb{k}}$ in $\underline{\text{Mod}} = \underline{\text{Mod}}(\mathbb{k})$ via $V|_{\mathbb{k}}(R) := V(\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} R)$ on \mathbb{k} -algebras and $V|_{\mathbb{k}} \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}$ if $V \in \underline{\text{Mod}}_{alg}(\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$, the underlying \mathbb{k} -module being $V_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ viewed as a \mathbb{k} -module. If V is in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{Q}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$), then $V|_{\mathbb{k}}$ is in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{Q})$) just because the source of $\mathbf{g}_R \rightarrow \mathbf{g}_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} R}$ (resp. $\mathbf{Q}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} R) = \mathbf{Q}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}(\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} R)$) acts on $V|_{\mathbb{k}}(R) = V(\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} R)$ for every \mathbb{k} -algebra R (and the underlying $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Q})$ -comodule is given by the $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Q}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$ -comodule structure followed by the identification $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Q}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} V_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} = \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} V_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$). We deduce that $V|_{\mathbb{k}}$ is in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ when $V|_{\mathbb{k}}$ is in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}, \mathbf{Q}/\mathbb{k}_{f_r})$. Finally, if V is in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q})$, the canonical morphism $V \rightarrow V/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}|_{\mathbb{k}}$ is in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q})$. Hence, because $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ is an abelian category, it makes sense to form in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ the following cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L_{\lambda} & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}|_{\mathbb{k}} & \longrightarrow & V_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}|_{\mathbb{k}}. \end{array}$$

Concretely, at the level of underlying \mathbb{k} -modules we form the cartesian diagram which defines $L_{\lambda, \mathbb{k}}$ and then $L_{\lambda}(R) = R \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} L_{\lambda, \mathbb{k}}$, that we know to come equipped with a (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}) -module structure; we have that $L_{\lambda}(R)$ equals the R -points of the inverse image of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ in V_{λ} as a functor for every \mathbb{k} -flat algebra R (hence every R , when \mathbb{k} is field).

Lemma 2.8. We have, indeed, that L_{λ} is a (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}) -model of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q})$. Furthermore, if $v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ is a highest weight vector $v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ contained in L_{λ} (which exists), then we have

$$L_{\lambda, \mathbf{g}} := U(\mathfrak{u}^-) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} \subset L_{\lambda} \subset \text{Dist}(\mathbf{U}^-) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} =: L_{\lambda, \mathbf{G}},$$

and $L_{\lambda, \mathbf{G}} = \text{Dist}(\mathbf{G}) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ (resp. $L_{\lambda, \mathbf{g}}$) is a \mathbf{G} -model (resp. \mathbf{g} -model) of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$ (resp. $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{g})$).

Proof. In order to prove the first assertion, we are just left to check that the underlying \mathbb{k} -module of L_{λ} is a lattice in $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$. Using the identifications $V_{\lambda}(R) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}/R) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda, R}$ and $V_{\lambda}(R_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}) = \mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}/R) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}}$

$W_{\lambda,R}$ (see the proof of Remark 2.7), we have to consider the following cartesian diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r},\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}. \end{array}$$

Because the upper arrow is injective by definition and the right vertical arrow is injective, we deduce that the left vertical arrow is also injective (so that all the arrows are injective). Since $\mathbf{U} \simeq \mathbf{G}_a^d$ as scheme, we can find a basis \mathcal{B} of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U})$ as a \mathbb{k} -module that can be written as an increasing nested union of finite subsets $\mathcal{B}_r \subset \mathcal{B}$ indexed by $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Setting $\mathcal{O}_r := \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}_r} \mathbb{k}b$, we see that $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ is an increasing nested union of the $\mathcal{O}_r \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$'s and $\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ a union of the $\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_r \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$'s. Because $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r},\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ is finite dimensional, it is contained in some $\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_r \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$. But using the basis \mathcal{B} one sees that $\mathcal{O}_r \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ is the inverse image of $\mathbb{k}_{f_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_r \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$. It follows that, by definition, $L_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ is contained in $\mathcal{O}_r \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ and, hence, it is a finitely generated \mathbb{k} -module. In order to show that L_{λ} generates $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r},\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ as a \mathbb{k}_{f_r} -module, we first note that, by definition of L_{λ} as the inverse image of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r},\mathbb{k}}$ in V_{λ} (thought in the category Mod_{alg}), it contains W_{λ} because this is contained in V_{λ} (by means of (2.8)) and mapped to $W_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} \subset L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$. Because W_{λ} is a model of $W_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$, it contains a highest weight vector: as this vector as weight λ/\mathbb{k}_{f_r} , by highest weight theory it is also a highest weight vector of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ and the \mathbb{k}_{f_r} -span $\mathbb{k}_{f_r}L_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}} \subset L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r},\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ of $L_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ equals $L_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$, being a $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ -submodule.

Having checked that $L_{\lambda,\mathbb{k}}$ is a lattice in $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r},\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$, we can take a highest weight vector $v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}} \in L_{\lambda} \cap L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$. Then the inclusions and the other assertions can be deduced from the fact that $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G}) = \text{Dist}(\mathbf{U}^-) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Dist}(\mathbf{Q})$ (see [12, Part II, §1.12 (2)] for the equality) is an algebra over $U(\mathfrak{g}) = U(\mathfrak{u}^-) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} U(\mathfrak{q})$ (the equality holds by Poincaré–Birkhoff–Witt Theorem) and $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G}) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ is a \mathbf{G} -model of $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$ thanks to [12, Part II, §8.3]. \square

We can now prove the following result.

Theorem 2.9. *We can find \mathbf{M} -models $W_{w,\lambda} \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$ of $W_{w,\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ for every $w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}$ such that $l(w) = 1$ for which there is a left exact sequence in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$*

$$(2.17) \quad 0 \longrightarrow L_{\lambda} \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] \xrightarrow{d} \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w,\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$$

which is a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -model of the first three term of the dual BGG-complex (2.11). Moreover, the inclusion (2.8) of W_{λ} in $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] =: V_{\lambda}$ factors through the inclusion of L_{λ} in V_{λ} given by the above exact sequence:

$$(2.18) \quad W_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow L_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow V_{\lambda},$$

which is a model of (2.12).

Proof. We have already remarked in the proof of Lemma 2.8 that we have (2.18), which is a model of (2.12) in view of Lemma 2.8 and the discussion preceding it. By definition, L_{λ} is a subobject of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$ in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ and, hence, we only need to prolong this inclusion to a left exact sequence furnishing a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -model of (2.11). To this end we choose, for every $w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}$ such that $l(w) = 1$ a model $W_{w,\lambda} \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$ of $W_{w,\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ (see [12, Part I, §10.4 Lemma]). Then Remark 2.7 tells us that $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w,\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$ is a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -model of $V_{w,\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$. Indeed, it follows from the proof of this remark that, we also have $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\pi_w W_{w,\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] = \pi_w \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w,\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$ in $V_{w,\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ for every $\pi_w \in \mathbb{k}$. Then

$$C := \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\pi_w W_{w,\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}] = \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} \pi_w \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{w,\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$$

is a model of $C/\mathbb{k}_{f_r} := \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} V_{w,\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{f_r}}$ for every family $\{\pi_w : l(w) = 1\}$ and we will show that a suitable choice of such a family gives a model of C/\mathbb{k}_{f_r} containing the image of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$ in C/\mathbb{k}_{f_r} via the morphism d appearing in (2.11). This fact, together with the Remark at the end of the proof, will give the result.

To this end, let us first define integral BGG categories $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ and $\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathbb{k}}}$ naively as in [11, §9.3], but over the ring \mathbb{k} rather than a field and replacing condition $(\mathcal{O}^{\mathfrak{p}2})$ of loc.cit. by the requirement that, viewed as a $U(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{k}})$ -module, an object M of this category should be the direct sum of $U(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{k}})$ -modules M_i that are

finitely generated and projective as \mathbb{k} -modules and such that $\mathbb{k}_{fr} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} M_i$ is a simple $U(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{k}})$ -module. Define a duality (exchanging the categories $\mathcal{O}^{q_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ and $\mathcal{O}^{q_{\mathbb{k}}}$) by setting $M^\vee := \bigoplus_i M_i^*$ where $(-)^*$ denotes the \mathbb{k} -dual. Then we claim that (2.13) generalizes to an inclusion

$$(2.19) \quad \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\mu)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\mathbb{k}} \hookrightarrow \left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee \right)^\vee.$$

Indeed, (2.14) is still injective (because $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{U})$ does not have \mathbb{Z} -torsion, since \mathbf{U} is flat over \mathbb{k} which is \mathbb{Z} -torsion free) and the proof of [6, Ch. 5, 5.5.4 Proposition] shows that (2.16) is an isomorphism as long as we assume that $W_{\mathbb{k}}^\vee$ is finitely generated and projective over \mathbb{k} (which is true for $W_{\mathbb{k}} = W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}$). Then we note that $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee = U(\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee$ belongs to the integral BGG category $\mathcal{O}^{q_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ and that the proof of the fact that $(-)^{*, \mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}^\infty} = (-)^\vee$ on the $\mathcal{O}^{q_{\mathbb{k}}^-}$ BGG category given in [13, Lemma 6] still works over \mathbb{k} (or can be deduced from it by extension of the scalars). Hence, we have the following commutative diagram, where the right vertical arrow takes a \mathbb{k} -linear morphism from $X := U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee$ to \mathbb{k} of the source to its linear extension to \mathbb{k}_{fr} -linear morphism from $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}_{fr}}^\vee = \mathbb{k}_{fr} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} X$ to \mathbb{k}_{fr} (the equality in view of $U(\mathfrak{g}_?) \otimes_{U(q_?^-)} W_?^\vee = U(\mathfrak{u}_?) \otimes_? W_?^\vee$):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\mu)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\mathbb{k}} & \hookrightarrow & \left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee \right)^\vee \\ \cap & & \cap \\ \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\mu)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}_{fr}}^\vee \right)^\vee. \end{array}$$

It follows that we can canonically identify $\left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee \right)^\vee$ with a \mathbb{k} -submodule of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\mu)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}}$ containing $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\mu)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\mathbb{k}}$. Hence, we can just check that there is a family $\{\pi_w : l(w) = 1\}$ such that the resulting C has underlying \mathbb{k} -module containing the image of $\left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee \right)^\vee$ for $\mu = \lambda$. But we have that $\left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee \right)^\vee$ contains a \mathbb{k} -submodule isomorphic to $W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee$ such that $U(\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}) \cdot W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee = \left(U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee \right)^\vee$ (because $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{U(q_{\mathbb{k}}^-)} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee = U(\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee$) and $W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee$ is a finitely generated \mathbb{k} -module: it follows that there is a choice of the family $\{\pi_w : l(w) = 1\}$ such that the underlying \mathbb{k} -module of C contains this copy of $W_{\mu, \mathbb{k}}^\vee$, implying that it contains $U(\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbb{k}}) \cdot W_{\mathbb{k}}^\vee$ and, hence, proving the result.

Remark. Suppose that \mathbf{H} is a flat affine group scheme over a domain \mathbb{k} with fraction field \mathbb{k}_{fr} and that V_1, V_2 in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{H})$ are such that $V_{2, \mathbb{k}}$ is \mathbb{k} -torsion free. If $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(V_{1, \mathbb{k}}, V_{2, \mathbb{k}})$ is such that its (injective, by torsion freeness of $V_{2, \mathbb{k}}$) image in $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}}(V_{1, \mathbb{k}_{fr}}, V_{2, \mathbb{k}_{fr}})$ belongs to $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{H}_{/\mathbb{k}_{fr}})$, then f itself belongs to $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{H})$.

Proof. Writing $\rho_i^\#$ for the comodule structure of V_i , we have to show that the equality $\rho_2^\# \circ f = f \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} 1 \circ \rho_1^\#$ holds in $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(V_{1, \mathbb{k}}, V_{2, \mathbb{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H}))$. Because $V_{2, \mathbb{k}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{H})$ is \mathbb{k} -torsion free, the equality can be checked in $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}}(V_{1, \mathbb{k}_{fr}}, V_{2, \mathbb{k}_{fr}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}_{fr}} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Q}))$, where it holds by assumption. \square

Remark 2.10. By definition, if $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\lambda)[\mathbf{Y}]$ happens to be a $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G})$ -module, then $L_\lambda = \text{Dist}(\mathbf{G}) v_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{fr}}$ is also $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G})$ -module and, hence, an object of $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$ because (the underlying \mathbb{k} -module of) L_λ is a lattice in (the underlying \mathbb{k}_{fr} -module of) the finite dimensional representation $L_{\lambda/\mathbb{k}_{fr}}$ of $\mathbf{G}_{/\mathbb{k}_{fr}}$ (see [12, Part II, §8.3]). Furthermore, because $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G}) = \text{Dist}(\mathbf{U}^-) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Dist}(\mathbf{Q})$ (see [12, Part II, §1.12 (2)] for the equality) and $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\lambda)[\mathbf{Y}]$ is a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module, it is a $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G})$ -module if and only if it is a $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{U}^-)$ -module. We will use this observation in order to verify that $L_\lambda = L_{\lambda, \mathbf{G}}$ in case $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$ (see Proposition 2.15 below).

2.3. The degree filtration on the induced modules in the symplectic case. It will be convenient to introduce the following assumption.

Assumption 2.11. There is an isomorphism of pointed \mathbb{k} -schemes

$$u : \mathbf{G}_a^d \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}$$

with the property that the action of \mathbf{Q} on \mathbf{G}_a^d obtained by transport from its action (2.7) on \mathbf{U} is given by affine transformations and its restriction to $\mathbf{M} \subset \mathbf{Q}$ is given by linear transformations.

Assumption 2.11 allows us to define \mathbf{Q} -subrepresentations (resp. \mathbf{M} -stable direct summands) of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ as follows (for $\rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}^-)$): for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r} \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ (resp. $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r} \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$) be the \mathbf{Q} -subrepresentation (resp. \mathbf{M} -subrepresentation) which corresponds to the \mathbf{Q} -subrepresentation $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho)_{\leq r} \subset \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho)$ (resp. $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho)_{=r} \subset \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho)$) of ρ -valued polynomials that are of degree $\leq r$ (resp. $= r$) with respect to the coordinates induced by $\mathbf{G}_a^d \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}$. Then $\{\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}\}$ is an increasing exhaustive filtration of $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ by \mathbf{Q} -subrepresentations and

$$(2.20) \quad \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}] = \bigoplus_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r} \text{ as an } \mathbf{M}\text{-representations.}$$

For every $r_1, r_2, r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\phi\}$, consider the natural \mathbf{Q} -equivariant multiplication map

$$\cdot : \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r_1} \otimes \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_2)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r_2} \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r_1 + r_2}, (f_1 \cdot f_2)(y) := f_1(y) \otimes f_2(y).$$

When $\rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}^-)$, using the isomorphism $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}] \simeq \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}_a^d, \rho)$ induced by (2.6) and $\mathbf{G}_a^d \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}$, we see that it induces, for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$, an isomorphism of \mathbf{Q} -representations

$$(2.21) \quad \rho \otimes \text{Sym}^r(\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}.$$

Suppose that V is a finite free \mathbb{k} -module of rank $2g$, endowed with a symplectic pairing ψ (meaning that it is perfect and alternating) and define $\mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ via

$$\mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)(R) := \{\gamma \in \mathbf{GL}(R \otimes V) : \exists \nu(\gamma) \in R^\times \text{ s.t. } \psi(\gamma v_1, \gamma v_2) = \nu(\gamma) \psi(v_1, v_2), \forall v_1, v_2 \in R \otimes V\}.$$

We remark that $\nu(\gamma)$ is well defined and, indeed, using Yoneda's lemma once checks that the rule sending γ to $\nu(\gamma)$ defines a morphism of group schemes from $\mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ to \mathbf{G}_m : we let $\mathbf{Sp}(V, \psi)$ be the kernel. We also assume that $W \subset V$ is a maximal isotropic \mathbb{k} -submodule such that $\frac{V}{W}$ is locally free (it always exists, when \mathbb{k} is local, see [9, Lemma 1.5])²: then there exists a maximal isotropic \mathbb{k} -submodule \overline{W} of V such that $V = W \oplus \overline{W}$ and every basis $\mathcal{B}_W := \{w_1, \dots, w_g\}$ uniquely extend to a basis $\mathcal{B}_{\overline{W}} := \{\overline{w}_1, \dots, \overline{w}_g\}$ of \overline{W} such that $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_W \cup \mathcal{B}_{\overline{W}}$ is symplectic-Hodge basis of V , where symplectic means that $\psi(w_i, w_j) = \psi(\overline{w}_i, \overline{w}_j) = 0$ and $\psi(w_i, \overline{w}_j) = \delta_{i,j}$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ and Hodge refers to the fact that the first g -elements belongs to W (see [9, Proposition 1.9 (2)]). We fix a symplectic-Hodge basis \mathcal{B} , so that the first g -vectors span W (or equivalently, we fix a maximal isotropic subspace \overline{W} which is a complement of W and a basis \mathcal{B}_W of W). Sometime, we write $w_i := \overline{w}_{g+i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, g\}$. We let $\mathbf{Q}_W \subset \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ be the stabilizer of $W \subset V$ in $\mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$. It is a parabolic subgroup, called a Siegel parabolic subgroup, and we write \mathbf{U}_W (resp. \mathbf{M}_W) for its unipotent radical (resp. its Levi component), which is identified with the set of those elements of \mathbf{Q}_W inducing the identity on W . The choice of \overline{W} allows us to view \mathbf{M}_W as the subgroup of those elements of $\mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ preserving the decomposition $V = W \oplus \overline{W}$, thus realizing \mathbf{Q}_W as a semidirect product $\mathbf{U}_W \rtimes \mathbf{M}_W$ and then the corresponding opposite parabolic subgroup $\mathbf{Q}_{\overline{W}}$ is identified with the stabilized $\mathbf{Q}_{\overline{W}}$ of \overline{W} .

Example 2.12. Suppose that $(V, \psi) = (\mathbb{k}^{2g}, \psi_g)$, where the elements of \mathbb{k}^{2g} are viewed as column vectors

and $\psi_g(v_1, v_2) = v_1^t \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1_g \\ -1_g & 0 \end{pmatrix} v_2$. Then we write $\mathbf{GSp}_{2g} := \mathbf{GSp}(\mathbb{k}^{2g}, \psi_g)$ and $\mathbf{Sp}_{2g} := \mathbf{Sp}(\mathbb{k}^{2g}, \psi_g)$.

In this case, we can take $W \subset V$ to be the inclusion $\mathbb{k}^g \subset \mathbb{k}^{2g}$ given by the first g -coordinates. Then the standard basis $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1, \dots, e_g, e_{g+1}, \dots, e_{2g}\}$ is the symplectic-Hodge basis which corresponds to the standard basis $\mathcal{B}_W = \{e_1, \dots, e_g\}$ of W and the complement \overline{W} provided by the inclusion $\mathbb{k}^g \subset \mathbb{k}^{2g}$ given by the second set of g -coordinates. Setting $\mathbf{Q}_g := \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{k}^g}$, we see that

$$\mathbf{Q}_g = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{GL}_{2g} : d = a^{-t} \nu, \nu \in \mathbf{G}_m, ab^t = ba^t \right\}.$$

²In geometric language, W is a subbundle of V over $\mathbb{S}\text{pec}(K)$. This extra generality will be needed only later in order to consider symplectic basis in coherent cohomology.

Let us write \mathbf{S}_g for the functor of symmetric matrices, regarded as an additive group scheme. Then $\mathbf{Q}_g = \mathbf{M}_g \ltimes \mathbf{U}_g$ (where $\mathbf{M}_g := \mathbf{M}_{\mathbb{k}^g}$ and $\mathbf{U}_g := \mathbf{U}_{\mathbb{k}^g}$) and the above description of \mathbf{Q}_g shows that there are isomorphism of group schemes

$$(2.22) \quad \mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{M}_g \text{ and } \mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}_g$$

by means of the rule sending (a, ν) to $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0_g \\ 0_g & a^{-t}\nu \end{pmatrix}$ and, respectively, Y to $\begin{pmatrix} 1_g & Y \\ 0 & 1_g \end{pmatrix}$. Similarly, we also have $\mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}_g^-$ sending Y to $\begin{pmatrix} 1_g & 0 \\ Y & 1_g \end{pmatrix}$.

The symplectic-Hodge basis \mathcal{B} of a more general V yields an identification $\theta : (\mathbb{k}^{2g}, \psi_g) \xrightarrow{\sim} (V, \psi)$ sending e_i to w_i and, hence, an isomorphism $c_\theta : \mathbf{GSp}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ (restricting to $\mathbf{Sp}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Sp}(V, \psi)$) given by $c_\theta(\gamma) = \theta\gamma\theta^{-1}$ identifying $\mathbf{Q}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Q}_W$. When $V = \mathbb{k}^{2g}$, then ψ is given by a matrix in $\mathbf{M}_{2g}(\mathbb{k})$ and $\theta \in \mathbf{GL}_{2g}(\mathbb{k})$ by a matrix θ such that $\theta^t\psi\theta = \psi_g$.

We suppose from now on that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$, we write $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{G}$ for the stabilizer of $W \subset V$ in \mathbf{G} and omit the subscript W in the notation for the group schemes introduced just before Example 2.12. If $\mathbf{H} \subset \mathbf{G}$, we also set $\mathbf{H}^\circ := \mathbf{H} \cap \mathbf{Sp}(V, \psi)$. It follows from Example 2.12 that there are isomorphism (the composition $c_\theta \circ (2.22)$):

$$(2.23) \quad \mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{M} \text{ and } \mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}.$$

Lemma 2.13. *If we take u the composition of the isomorphism of group schemes $\mathbf{G}_a^d \simeq \mathbf{S}_g$ with $d = \frac{g(g+1)}{2}$ obtained by the matrix coordinates of \mathbf{S}_g followed by the above identification $\mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}$ given by (2.23), then Assumption 2.11 holds. In particular, the isomorphism (2.21) is force for every $\rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q}^-)$.*

Proof. We can assume $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$. For future reference, we remark that then \mathbf{Y} is the set of those

$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$ such that $\det(a) \neq 0$ and (2.5) is given by

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ ca^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & d - ca^{-1}b \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a^{-1}b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

In particular, for every $(\gamma, Y) \in \mathbf{G} \times \mathbf{S}_g$ with $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ such that $a + Yc \in \mathbf{GL}_g$ (a Zariski open condition), once checks that (2.24) gives

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c(a + Yc)^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a + Yc & 0 \\ 0 & d - c(a + Yc)^{-1}(b + Yd) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (a + Yc)^{-1}(b + Yd) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Specializing (2.25) to the $c = 0$ case shows that, under the identification $\mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}_g \xleftarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Q}_g^- \setminus \mathbf{Y}$, the $*$ -action induced by the right multiplication by an element of \mathbf{Q}_g on \mathbf{Y} (cfr. (2.7)) is given by the following formula verifying formula Assumption 2.11:

$$(2.26) \quad Y\gamma := a^{-1}(b + Yd) \text{ if } \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{Q}_g.$$

□

If $\rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m)$, then \mathbf{GSp}_{2g} acts on $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)[\eta]$ by means of the rule

$$(\gamma f)(Y) := \rho(a + Yc, \nu(\gamma)) f\left((a + Yc)^{-1}(b + Yd)\right) \text{ for every } \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{G}.$$

(In order to see that the above formula defines an action on $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)[\eta]$, suffices to check that, setting $j(\gamma, Y) := (a + Yc, \nu(\gamma))$ and $Y\gamma := (a + Yc)^{-1}(b + Yd)$, one has $j(\gamma_2\gamma_1, Y) = j(\gamma_2, Y)j(\gamma_1, Y\gamma_2)$ and $Y(\gamma_2\gamma_1) = (Y\gamma_2)\gamma_1$ on the Zariski open subset of those (γ, Y) in $\mathbf{G} \times \mathbf{S}_g$ such that, if $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$, then

$\det(a) \neq 0$, $\det(a + Yc) \neq 0$ and $\det(Y) \neq 0$. This claim follows looking at the decomposition (2.25), noticing that $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & Y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\gamma_2 \gamma_1) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & Y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \gamma_2 \right) \gamma_1$. Using the first isomorphism of (2.23) and then (2.4), we can regard ρ as a representation of \mathbf{Q}^- and then form $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[U]$ for $U = \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Q}}$ or $U = \eta$.

Lemma 2.14. *The restriction morphism induced by $\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbf{G}$ and the second isomorphism of (2.23) yield isomorphisms*

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta] \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho)[\eta] \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)[\eta],$$

where the first identification extends (2.6). Furthermore, the above composition has the following properties.

- (1) It is $\mathbf{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$ -equivariant (the isomorphism being induced by c_{θ}^{-1}).
- (2) It identifies $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ with $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)$, implying by (1) that we have an identification of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q}) \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathfrak{gsp}_{2g}, \mathbf{Q}_g)$ -modules (the isomorphism being induced by c_{θ}^{-1}):

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}] \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho).$$

- (3) If $X \in \mathfrak{u}^-$, then $X \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=0} = 0$ and $X \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r} \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r+1}$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$.

Proof. As usual, we can assume that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$. The isomorphism $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{U}, \rho)[\eta] \simeq \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)[\eta]$ comes from (2.23). The analogue of (2.6) for the rational functions can be checked using the fact that $\mathbf{Q}_{/R}^- \times V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Q}_{/R}^- V \subset \mathbf{Y}_{/R}$ is an open subset of $\mathbf{G}_{/R}$ for every open subset $V \subset \mathbf{U}_{/R}$ (thanks to (2.5)). The equivariance in (1) uses (2.25) and then, in view of (2.6), (2) follows. Then, in order to check (3), according to Lemma 2.13 suffices to show that $X \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{=r} \subset \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{=r+1}$, where $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{=r} \subset \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)$ denote the \mathbf{M} -subrepresentation of ρ -valued polynomials that are of degree $= r$. According to (1), $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)[\eta]$ is isomorphic to the \mathbf{G} -module $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\eta] = \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\eta]^{h_{\mathbf{Q}^-}}$, which is a subobject of $(\sigma, V) := \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \rho)[\eta] \in \text{Rep}_{gd}(\mathbf{G})$. We can therefore use (2.2) and the resulting inclusion of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)$ in V (induced by the restriction obtained from $\mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U} \subset \mathbf{G}$) in order to compute the \mathfrak{g} -action. To this end, we write $X \in \mathfrak{u}^-$ in the form $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ with $x \in \mathbf{S}_g$, so that $1 + \varepsilon X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \varepsilon x & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then, noticing that $\rho(1 + \varepsilon Yx) = 1$ because $\rho \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$ and $(1 + \varepsilon Yx)^{-1} = 1 - \varepsilon Yx$, we see that

$$((1 + \varepsilon X)f)(Y) = \rho(1 + \varepsilon Yx)f\left((1 + \varepsilon Yx)^{-1}Y\right) = f(Y - \varepsilon YxY),$$

$$(2.27) \quad \text{so that (2.2) yields } (Xf)(Y) = \frac{f(Y - \varepsilon YxY) - f(Y)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Because the underlying \mathbb{k} -module of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{=r} \subset V$ is freely generated by the expressions $Y^{\mathbf{i}} := \prod_{i \leq j} Y_{i,j}^{i_{i,j}}$ for $\mathbf{i} = (i_{i,j})_{i \leq j} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ such that $|\mathbf{i}| := \sum_{i \leq j} i_{i,j} = r$, suffices to check that $Xf \in \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{=r+1}$ for every $f = Y^{\mathbf{i}}$ (where $Y_{i,j}$ is viewed in V as the restriction of the appropriate coordinate function of \mathbf{G}). It follows from (2.27) that we have $X \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=0} = 0$ and, because $\frac{Y - \varepsilon YxY - Y}{\varepsilon} = -YxY$, taking $f = Y_{i,j}$ in (2.27) proves that $X \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=1} \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=2}$. We now assume that $r \geq 2$ and apply the Leibnitz rule to the derivation X to $Y^{\mathbf{i}}$ with $|\mathbf{i}| = r$:

$$(2.28) \quad X(Y^{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{(i,j)} \left(i_{i,j} X(Y_{i,j}) Y_{i,j}^{i_{i,j}-1} \prod_{(i_o, j_o) \neq (i,j)} Y_{i_o, j_o}^{i_{i_o, j_o}} \right).$$

Because $X \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=1} \subset \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=2}$, we see that $X(Y_{i,j}) \in \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=2}$. Since

$$Y_{i,j}^{i_{i,j}-1} \prod_{(i_o, j_o) \neq (i,j)} Y_{i_o, j_o}^{i_{i_o, j_o}} \in \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r-1},$$

(2.28) proves that $X(Y^{\mathbf{i}}) \in \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=r+1}$. □

In view of the fact that one can attach sheaves to (algebraic) $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -modules, the following fact is not so important for our purposes.

Proposition 2.15. *In our symplectic setting, we know that $L_{\lambda} = L_{\lambda, \mathbf{G}}$ is in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$.*

Proof. As usual, we can assume that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$. According to Remark 2.10, it suffices to check that $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\lambda)[\mathbf{Y}]$ is a $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{U}^-)$ -module. For every $1 \leq k \leq l \leq g$, let us write $\partial_{k,l}$ for the unique matrix in \mathbf{u}^- whose lower left g -by- g entry is the symmetric matrix $x_{k,l}$ whose upper triangular part has all zero except a 1 in (k,l) -entry. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.14 (3), if $\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{k}_{k,l})_{k \leq l}$ write $\partial^{\mathbf{k}} := \prod_{k \leq l} \partial_{k,l}^{\mathbf{k}_{k,l}}$ (the ordering being not relevant, since \mathbf{u}^- is commutative) and set $\mathbf{k}! := \prod_{k \leq l} \mathbf{k}_{k,l}!$: then $\text{Dist}(\mathbf{G})$ is freely generated as a \mathbb{k} -module by the expressions $\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{k}}}{\mathbf{k}!}$ (cfr. [12, Part II, §1.12 discussion showing (4)], although here we use the coordinates from $\mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{U}^-$ rather than the simple roots). Because, using the multi-index notation $\mathbf{i} = (\mathbf{i}_{i,j})_{i \leq j}$ for the Y 's variables, the expressions $Y^{\mathbf{i}} := \prod_{i \leq j} Y_{i,j}^{\mathbf{i}_{i,j}}$ are a basis of the underlying \mathbb{k} -module of $\text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)$, we have to check that $\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{k}}}{\mathbf{k}!}(Y^{\mathbf{i}}) \in \text{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{\mathbb{k}}$ for every \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{k} . Using the formula $Y_{i,j}x_{k,l}Y_{i,j} = \delta_{k,l}^{i,j}Y_{k,l}^2$ for the Kronecker delta function $\delta_{k,l}^{i,j}$ which is non-zero if and only if $(i,j) = (k,l)$, one verifies that $\partial_{k,l}(Y_{i,j}) = -\delta_{k,l}^{i,j}Y_{k,l}^2$. Using (2.28) and then an inductive argument proves that $\partial^{\mathbf{k}}(Y^{\mathbf{i}}) = 0$ if there exists (k,l) such that $\mathbf{k}_{k,l} > 0$ but $\mathbf{i}_{k,l} = 0$ and, otherwise, $\partial^{\mathbf{k}}(Y^{\mathbf{i}}) = -\mathbf{k}!Y^{\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{k}}$. The claim follows. \square

2.4. The isomorphism $\text{Sym}_W^{2,\vee}(1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{u}^-$. Suppose first that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$. If $g \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\text{Std}_g \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{GL}_g)$ be the representation of \mathbf{GL}_g given by column vectors of length g on which \mathbf{GL}_g acts from the left by matrix multiplication: we write $e_i \in \text{Std}_g$ for the column vector whose entries are all zero except for the i -row which equals 1. We then identify Std_g^\vee with the row vectors on which \mathbf{GL}_g acts from the right again by matrix multiplication (and regard it as a left \mathbf{GL}_g as usual by means of $ax := xa^{-1}$, if needed): the evaluation pairing $\langle -, - \rangle$ corresponds to the matrix multiplication (of a row by a column of the same length) and satisfies $\langle la, x \rangle = \langle l, ax \rangle$ for every $l \in \text{Std}_g^\vee, x \in \text{Std}_g$ and $a \in \mathbf{GL}_g$, so that it gives rise to a morphism of (left or right) representations $\text{Std}_g^\vee \otimes \text{Std}_g \rightarrow 1$. We remark that there is an isomorphism (here and below \mathbf{M}_g denotes the g -by- g matrix functor, not to be confused with the Levi):

$$(2.29) \quad \varsigma : (\text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_g)^\vee \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{M}_g \text{ via } \varsigma(b) := (b(e_i, e_j)) \text{ such that } \varsigma(ba) = a^t \varsigma(b) a.$$

The symmetric quotient $\text{Sym}_g^2 := \text{Sym}^2(\text{Std}_g)$ of $\text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2}$ yields a monomorphism $\text{Sym}_g^{2,\vee} \hookrightarrow (\text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2})^\vee$ and (2.29) restricts to an isomorphism

$$(2.30) \quad \varsigma : \text{Sym}_g^{2,\vee} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{S}_g \text{ such that } \varsigma(ba) = a^t \varsigma(b) a.$$

We remark that \mathbf{M} acts by conjugation on \mathbf{U}^- and, hence, differentiating this action yields an action Ad of \mathbf{M} on \mathbf{u}^- . We view the representations of \mathbf{GL}_g as representations of $\mathbf{M} \simeq \mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m$ by restriction along the projection onto the \mathbf{GL}_g -component.

Lemma 2.16. *The identification $\varsigma : \text{Sym}_g^{2,\vee}(1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{S}_g$ and the isomorphism $\mathbf{S}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{u}^-$ mapping x to $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ are $\mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m$ -equivariant.*

Proof. Left to the reader. \square

For a more general $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$, applying $\theta : (\mathbb{k}^{2g}, \psi_g) \xrightarrow{\sim} (V, \psi)$ and $c_\theta : \mathbf{GSp}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ one gets, setting $\text{Sym}_W^2 := \text{Sym}^2(W)$, an \mathbf{M} -equivariant isomorphism $\text{Sym}_W^{2,\vee}(1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{u}^-$ (cfr. the end of Example 2.12).

2.5. The isomorphism $J' \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}^\vee$. Suppose first that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$. We remark that there is an isomorphism $\text{Std}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Std}_g^\vee$ mapping x to x^t , satisfying $(ax)^t = x^t a^t$ when $a \in \mathbf{GL}_g$. It induces a morphism $\text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Std}_g^{\vee \otimes 2}$ satisfying the same equivariance property. Then we identify $\text{Std}_g^{\vee \otimes 2} \xrightarrow{\sim} (\text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2})^\vee$ mapping $l_1 \otimes l_2$ to $\lambda_{l_1 \otimes l_2}$ such that $\lambda_{l_1 \otimes l_2}(v_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} v_2) = l_1(v_1)l_2(v_2)$. This is \mathbf{GL}_g -equivariant under the natural right action. Finally, we identify $(\text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2})^\vee$ with \mathbf{M}_g via (2.29), thus getting

$$(2.31) \quad \text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_g \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{M}_g \text{ such that } \tau(ax) = a\tau(x)a^t.$$

We remark that, if M is a module over a ring R , then we always have a canonical morphism $\text{Sym}_R^2(M) \rightarrow M \otimes_R M$ which is induced by the endomorphism of $M \otimes_R M$ sending $m_1 \otimes m_2$ to $m_1 \otimes m_2 + m_2 \otimes m_1$: when M is a free R -module, it is injective. Let us write $\mathbf{S}_g^{\text{even}} \subset \mathbf{S}_g$ for the subfunctor of those matrices

whose diagonal entries are multiplies of 2. The map sending $x_1 \otimes x_2$ to $x_2 \otimes x_1$ in $\text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2}$ corresponds to the transposition in \mathbf{M}_g up to the isomorphism (2.31) and $\mathbf{S}_g^{\text{even}} \subset \mathbf{M}_g$ is the subfunctor of those matrices of the form $X + X^t$ with $X \in \mathbf{M}_g$. It follows that (2.31) restricts on $\text{Sym}_g^2 \rightarrow \text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2}$ to an isomorphism

$$(2.32) \quad \tau : \text{Sym}_g^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{S}_g^{\text{even}} \text{ such that } \tau(ax) = a\tau(x)a^t.$$

We can therefore define a morphism of \mathbf{GL}_g -representations

$$(2.33) \quad \text{Sym}_g^2 \rightarrow (\mathbf{S}_g)^{\vee\vee} = \mathbf{C}^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, 1)_{=1}^{\vee} \simeq \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=1}^{\vee}$$

mapping $x \in \text{Sym}_g^2$ to the evaluation at $\tau(x) \in \mathbf{S}_g^{\text{even}} \subset \mathbf{S}_g$: it is an isomorphism when $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ because then $\mathbf{S}_g^{\text{even}} = \mathbf{S}_g$ and (2.33) is the biduality morphism $\text{Sym}_g^2 \rightarrow (\text{Sym}_g^2)^{\vee\vee}$, up to the identification τ .

Consider the \mathbf{Q}_g -equivariant exact sequence

$$(2.34) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Std}_g \rightarrow \text{Std}_{2g} \rightarrow \frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \rightarrow 0.$$

Because Std_g is isotropic, then natural symplectic pairing ψ_g induces the morphism of \mathbf{Q} -representations

$$(2.35) \quad \frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \otimes \text{Std}_g \rightarrow 1(1), \text{ which gives } \text{Std}_g(-1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \right)^{\vee}.$$

Consider the following diagram of \mathbf{Q} -representations that we are going to describe:

$$(2.36) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1) & \rightarrow & \text{Std}_{2g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1) & \rightarrow & \frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1) & \rightarrow & \mathbf{J}'' & \rightarrow & 1 \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Sym}_g^2(-1) & \rightarrow & \mathbf{J}' & \rightarrow & 1 \rightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

The first row is obtained applying $-\otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$ to the exact sequence (2.34). Then dualize the evaluation pairing $\left(\frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \right)^{\vee} \otimes \frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \rightarrow 1$ to get, using (2.35), the morphism

$$(2.37) \quad 1 \rightarrow \left(\frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \right)^{\vee\vee} \otimes \left(\frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \right)^{\vee} \xleftarrow{\sim} \frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1).$$

We pull-back the first row via (2.37) to get the second row. Finally, we push-out the second row via the canonical quotient morphism from $\text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2}(-1)$ to $\text{Sym}_g^2(-1)$ in order to get the third row. By construction, the diagram (2.36) is commutative with exact rows.

Proposition 2.17. *If we suppose that $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$, then there is an isomorphism of \mathbf{Q} -representations*

$$\mathbf{J}' \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{J}^{\vee}, \text{ where } \mathbf{J} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}.$$

It is uniquely determined as a morphism of \mathbf{Q}° -representations up to non-zero scalar factors and its restriction to $\text{Sym}_g^2(-1)$ agrees with (2.33) up to non-zero scalar factors. In particular, the third row of (2.36) is uniquely up to non-zero scalar factors identified with the short exact sequence of \mathbf{Q} -representations obtained dualizing the exact sequence of \mathbf{Q} -representations

$$(2.38) \quad 0 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow \mathbf{J} \rightarrow \frac{\mathbf{J}}{1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Existence. Let us write $\langle -, - \rangle$ for the symplectic pairing ψ_g . Let us write $\langle -, - \rangle$ for the symplectic pairing ψ_g . As a basis of Std_{2g} we may take the symplectic-Hodge basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_{2g}\}$ and we set $f_i = e_{g+i}$, so that $\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. Then every element v of $\text{Std}_{2g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$ can be uniquely written in the form

$$v = \tilde{x}(v) + \sum_{i,j=1}^g \lambda_{i,j}(v) f_i \otimes e_j, \text{ where } \tilde{x}(v) \in \text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1) \text{ and } \lambda_{i,j}(v) \in \mathbf{G}_a.$$

Because the dual of e_i under the pairing (2.35) induced by ψ_g is the image \bar{f}_i of f_i in $\frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g}$, we see that $\lambda \in 1$ maps via (2.37) to

$$\lambda \cdot \sum_{i=1}^g \bar{f}_i \otimes e_i = \sum_{i=1}^g \lambda \bar{f}_i \otimes e_i.$$

Since the span Std'_g of $\{f_i \otimes e_j\}_{i,j=1,\dots,g}$ maps isomorphically onto $\frac{\text{Std}_{2g}}{\text{Std}_g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} J'' &= \{(v, \lambda) \in \text{Std}_{2g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1) \times 1 : \lambda_{i,j}(v) = \lambda \delta_{i,j}\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\sim} \{v \in \text{Std}_{2g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1) : v = \tilde{x}(v) + \lambda(v) \sum_{i=1}^g f_i \otimes e_i\} \end{aligned}$$

In order to obtain the identification between the third row of (2.36) and the dual of (2.38) we have to define a \mathbf{Q} -equivariant morphism

$$\mathcal{L} : J'' \longrightarrow C^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{\leq 1}^{\vee}$$

whose restriction to $\text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$ induces the isomorphism (2.33) and with the property that the induced morphism $1 \rightarrow 1$ between the third terms of the third row of (2.36) and the dual of (2.38) is an isomorphism.

We claim that, writing $x(v) \in \text{Sym}_g^2(-1)$ for the image of $\tilde{x}(v) \in \text{Std}_g^{\otimes 2}(-1)$ (so that $\tau(x(v)) \in \mathbf{S}_g^{\text{even}} \subset \mathbf{S}_g$), the rule

$$\mathcal{L}(v)(f) := f_1(\tau(x(v))) - 2\lambda(v)f_0, \text{ where } f_0 = f(0) \text{ and } f_1 = f - f_0,$$

works. First of all, because the evaluation at a point and the association mapping f to f_1 are linear, $\mathcal{L}(v) \in C^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{\leq 1}^{\vee}$. Also, because f_1 and the associations mapping v to $\tau(x(v))$ and v to $\lambda(v)$ are linear, \mathcal{L} is linear. By definition, \mathcal{L} induces the isomorphism (2.33) when restricted to $\text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$ and maps $c := \sum_{i=1}^g f_i \otimes e_i$ to $-2ev_0$ for the evaluation at zero map $ev_0 \in C^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{\leq 1}^{\vee}$, so that it also induces $-2 : 1 \rightarrow 1$, which is an isomorphism because $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. Let us check the \mathbf{Q} -equivariance of \mathcal{L} , i.e. that $(\gamma\mathcal{L}(v))(f) = \mathcal{L}(\gamma v)(f)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma\mathcal{L}(v))(f) &= \mathcal{L}(v)(\gamma^{-1}f) = (\gamma^{-1}f)_1(\tau(x(v))) - 2\lambda(v)(\gamma^{-1}f)_0, \\ (2.39) \quad \mathcal{L}(\gamma v)(f) &= f_1(\tau(x(\gamma v))) - 2\lambda(\gamma v)f_0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define $c' := \sum_{i=1}^g e_i \otimes f_i$ in $\text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}_{2g}(-1)$. Because the dual of f_i with respect to ψ_g is $-e_i$, the element $c - c' \in \text{Std}_{2g} \otimes \text{Std}_{2g}(-1)$ is the image of $1 \in 1$ under the dual of the symplectic pairing ψ_g and, hence, it is \mathbf{G} -invariant. We deduce that

$$\gamma c - c = \gamma c' - c' \text{ for every } \gamma \in \mathbf{G}.$$

We remark that $c \in \text{Std}'_g \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$ and $c' \in \text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}'_g(-1)$: if we take $\gamma \in \mathbf{M}$ we see that we also have $\gamma c \in \text{Std}'_g \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$ and $\gamma c' \in \text{Std}_g \otimes \text{Std}'_g(-1)$. Because $\text{Std}_g \cap \text{Std}'_g = 0$, the above equation implies that

$$(2.40) \quad \gamma c - c = \gamma c' - c' = 0 \text{ for every } \gamma \in \mathbf{M}, \text{ so that } \gamma c = c \text{ in } \text{Std}_{2g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1).$$

Suppose now that $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$ so that $\gamma_{\mathbf{M}} := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{M}$ (see (2.24)). Then we have, using the symbols γ and $\gamma_{\mathbf{M}}$ for the action in $\text{Std}_{2g} \otimes \text{Std}_g(-1)$ and writing $a \otimes a$, $b \otimes a$ and $d \otimes a$ for the tensor product of the matrix multiplications:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma v &= \nu(\gamma)^{-1} a \otimes a(\tilde{x}(v)) + \lambda(v) \sum_i^g \nu(\gamma)^{-1} b e_i \otimes a e_i + \lambda(v) \sum_i^g \nu(\gamma)^{-1} d f_i \otimes a e_i \\ &= \nu(\gamma)^{-1} a \otimes a(\tilde{x}(v)) + \lambda(v) \sum_i^g \nu(\gamma)^{-1} b e_i \otimes a e_i + \lambda(v) \gamma_{\mathbf{M}} c \\ &\stackrel{(2.40)}{=} \nu(\gamma)^{-1} a \otimes a(\tilde{x}(v)) + \lambda(v) \sum_i^g \nu(\gamma)^{-1} b e_i \otimes a e_i + \lambda(v) c. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}(\gamma v) &= \nu(\gamma)^{-1} (a \otimes a(\tilde{x}(v)) + \lambda(v) \sum_i^g b \otimes a(e_i \otimes e_i)), \\ (2.41) \quad \lambda(\gamma v) &= \lambda(v). \end{aligned}$$

We now make the observation that (2.29) satisfies, more generally, the equivariance property $\varsigma(b \cdot a_1 \otimes a_2) = a_1^t \varsigma(b) a_2$ for every $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbf{GL}_g$, implying that τ satisfies the rule

$$\tau(a_1 \otimes a_2 \cdot x) = a_1 \tau(x) a_2^t.$$

Since $\tau(e_i \otimes e_i)$ is the matrix whose entries are all zero except for the (i, i) -entry which equals 2, then it follows from (2.41) that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x(\gamma v)) &= \nu(\gamma)^{-1} (a \tau(x(v)) a^t + \lambda(v) \sum_i^g b \tau(e_i \otimes e_i) a^t) \\ (2.42) \quad &= \nu(\gamma)^{-1} (a \tau(x(v)) a^t + 2\lambda(v) b a^t). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that $b = 0$ and let us prove the \mathbf{M} -equivariance of \mathcal{L} . Because \mathbf{M} acts by means of linear transformations on \mathbf{S}_g in view of Lemma 2.13, it preserves degrees and we see that $(\gamma^{-1}f)_0 = f(0\gamma^{-1}) = f_0$ and $(\gamma^{-1}f)_1(Y) = f_1(Y\gamma^{-1})$. Taking into account (2.26) and the fact that $d = a^{-t}\nu(\gamma)$, we find

$$(\gamma^{-1}f)_0 = f_0 \text{ and } (\gamma^{-1}f)_1(Y) = f_1(aYd^{-1}) = \nu(\gamma)^{-1}f_1(aYa^t).$$

Then the first equation of (2.39) becomes

$$(\gamma\mathcal{L}(v))(f) = \nu(\gamma)^{-1}f_1(a\tau(x(v))a^t) - 2\lambda(v)f_0.$$

In view of (2.41) and (2.42), the above left hand side equals the left hand side of the second equation of (2.39). The \mathbf{M} -equivariance follows.

Suppose now that $a = d = 1$ and let us prove the \mathbf{U} -equivariance of \mathcal{L} . If $f = f_0 + \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j} Y_{i,j}$, then according to (2.26) we have $Y_{i,j}\gamma^{-1} = -b + Y_{i,j}$, so that $Y_{i,j}$ maps to $-b_{i,j} + Y_{i,j}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma^{-1}f)(Y) &= f(Y\gamma^{-1}) = f_0 - \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j} b_{i,j} + \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j} Y_{i,j} = f(-b) + f_1, \\ \text{so that } (\gamma^{-1}f)_0 &= f(-b) \text{ and } (\gamma^{-1}f)_1 = f_1. \end{aligned}$$

Then the first equation of (2.39) becomes

$$(\gamma\mathcal{L}(v))(f) = f_1(\tau(x(v))) - 2\lambda(v)f(-b).$$

On the other hand, in view of (2.41) and (2.42), the second equation of (2.39) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\gamma v)(f) &= f_1(\tau(x(v)) + 2\lambda(v)b) - 2\lambda(v)f_0 \\ &= f_1(\tau(x(v))) - 2\lambda(v)f_1(-b) + 2\lambda(v)f_0 \\ &= f_1(\tau(x(v))) - 2\lambda(v)f(-b). \end{aligned}$$

The \mathbf{U} -equivariance follows and, with it, the claimed \mathbf{Q} -equivariance.

Uniqueness. Suppose that $\varphi : J' \xrightarrow{\sim} J^\vee$ is an isomorphism of \mathbf{Q}° -representations. The restriction of the third row of (2.36) to the reductive group \mathbf{GL}_g splits as the direct sum of two non-isomorphic irreducible representations. The same is true for the dual of (2.38), in view of the \mathbf{GL}_g -equivariant isomorphism (2.33). Hence φ is of the form $\varphi = \mu_1\varphi_1 \oplus \mu_2\varphi_2$, where φ_1 is (2.33), $\varphi_2 = 1_1$ and μ_i is a non-zero scalar factor for $i = 1, 2$. In order to make φ_2 more explicit, let us write $ev_0 \in J^\vee$ for the evaluation at 0: because \mathbf{M} acts by means of linear transformations on \mathbf{S}_g in view of Lemma 2.13, we see that ev_0 is \mathbf{GL}_g -invariant and non-zero. Hence we may assume that $\varphi_2(1) = ev_0$ when we view $1 \subset J^\vee$. Let us now write φ' for the composition of $J'' \rightarrow J'$ followed by φ . The above description of φ_1 and φ_2 implies that

$$\varphi'(v)(f) = \mu_1 f_1(\tau(x(v))) + \mu_2 \lambda(v) f_0 \text{ for every } f \in C^{\text{alg}}(\mathbf{S}_g, \rho)_{\leq 1}.$$

Then the proof of the \mathbf{U} -equivariance of \mathcal{L} in the existence part shows that we must have $\mu_2 = -2\mu_1$ in order for φ' being \mathbf{U} -equivariant. \square

For a more general $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$, applying $\theta : (\mathbb{k}^{2g}, \psi_g) \xrightarrow{\sim} (V, \psi)$ and $c_\theta : \mathbf{GSp}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ one gets an \mathbf{M} -equivariant morphism $\text{Sym}_W^2 \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=1}^\vee$ which is an isomorphism when $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. Then the obvious analogue of Proposition 2.17 holds, after replacing (2.36) with its obvious analogue involving $W \subset V$ rather than $\text{Std}_g \subset \text{Std}_{2g}$. (Cfr. the end of Example 2.12).

3. AUTOMORPHIC SHEAVES ATTACHED TO REPRESENTATIONS OF SYMPLECTIC GROUPS

Let us fix $(g, N) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^2$ and $d = (d_1, \dots, d_g) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^g$ such that $(d_1 \dots d_g, N) = 1$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} K_{d,N} &: = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}(\mathbb{A}_f) \cap \prod_{l|d_1 \dots d_g} \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) & \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) \Delta \\ \Delta^{-1} \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) & \Delta^{-1} \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) \Delta \end{array} \right) \\ &\quad \prod_{l|N} \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 + N \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) & N \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) \\ N \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) & 1 + N \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) \end{array} \right) \prod_{l|d_1 \dots d_g N} \mathbf{M}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_l), \end{aligned}$$

which is an open and compact subgroup of $\mathbf{GSp}_{2g}(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Then, writing $\mathbf{GSp}_{2g}^+(\mathbb{Q}) \subset \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Q})$ for the subgroup of those elements having positive symplectic multiplies, one knows that, for every open and compact subgroup $K \subset \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}(\mathbb{A}_f)$ such that $K_{d,N} \subset K \subset K_{d,1}$, the double quotient space

$$\mathbf{GSp}_{2g}^+(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash (\mathbf{GSp}_{2g}(\mathbb{A}_f) \times \mathcal{H}_g) / K$$

admits the structure of a coarse moduli scheme Y_K classifying quadruples (A, λ, ψ) where A is an abelian scheme of dimension g , $\lambda : A \rightarrow A^t$ is a polarization of type d and ψ is a level K -structure compatible with the standard symplectic pairing for some choice of an N -root of unity (see [3, Ch. VII, §1]). Indeed, one has a fine moduli scheme quasi-projective over $\mathbf{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$ when $N > 6^g d_1 \dots d_g \sqrt{g!}$ which is smooth over $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N]$ (see [20, Theorem 7.9]) and finer results are available: for example, when $g \in \{1, 2\}$ suffices to take $N \geq 3$ (see [17, Corollary 3.3]). The works of Faltings-Chai and Lan provide toroidal compactifications $X_K = X_K^\Sigma$ of Y_K depending on suitable polyhedral decompositions Σ .

Remark 3.1. *If in the definition of $K_{d,N}$ one replaces the local condition at $l \mid d_1 \dots d_g$ with the stronger condition of being in*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 + \Delta \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) & \Delta \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) \Delta \\ \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) & 1 + \Delta \mathbf{M}_g(\mathbb{Z}_l) \end{pmatrix},$$

then one gets moduli and fine moduli schemes classifying quadruples $(A, \lambda, \psi', \psi)$ where (A, λ, ψ) is as above and ψ' is a suitable symplectic isomorphism of the kernel of λ (see [3, Ch. VII, Proposition 3.3]).

For a more general $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$, one defines the groups $K_{d,N}$ applying the isomorphism $c_\theta : \mathbf{GSp}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ of Example 2.12 to those previously defined and, again, one gets varieties classifying the same kind of moduli problem.

Let us fix a level K as above and simply write $X = X_K$, $Y = Y_K$ and $D := X - Y$. Let $\pi : A \rightarrow Y$ be the universal abelian scheme (resp. $\pi : G \rightarrow X$ the universal semiabelian scheme extending A acting on the compactification A_X/X of A/X , the latter having a normal crossing divisor D_{A_X} lying over D , also depending on Σ compatible with Σ as in [8, Ch. VI, §1, 1.1 Theorem and 1.3 Definition]) and consider the canonical extension

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1 := \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X}^1 := R^1 \pi_* \left(\Omega_{A_X/X}^1 (\log(D_{A_X}/D)) \right) \subset (Y \subset X)_* \left(R^1 \pi_* \left(\Omega_{A/Y}^1 \right) \right)$$

of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},Y}^1 := R^1 \pi_* \left(\Omega_{A/Y}^1 \right)$ to X . Setting $\omega_{\mathrm{dR}} = \omega_{\mathrm{dR},X} := R^0 \pi_* \left(\Omega_{A_X/X}^1 (\log(D_{A_X}/D)) \right) \simeq \omega(G/X)$ (the sheaf of invariant differentials of G , see [8, Ch. VI, §1, 1.1 Theorem] for the isomorphism) and $\mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR}}^t = \mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR},X}^t := R^1 \pi_* \left(\Omega_{A_X/X}^1 (\log(D_{A_X}/D)) \right) \simeq \omega(G^t/X)^\vee(-1)$ (the relative Lie algebra of the dual semiabelian scheme G^t , see [8, Ch. VI, §1, 1.1 Theorem] for the isomorphism, which extends [9, proof of Lemma 2.3] from Y to X)³, the sheaf $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$ comes equipped with the Hodge filtration

$$0 \longrightarrow \omega_{\mathrm{dR}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR}}^t \longrightarrow 0,$$

a symplectic \mathcal{O}_X -bilinear pairing

$$(3.1) \quad \langle -, - \rangle : \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(-1)$$

under which ω_{dR} is maximal isotropic (arising by duality from the symplectic pairing of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^{1,\vee}$ obtained by evaluation at the first Chern class $c_{1,\mathrm{dR}}(\mathcal{L}) \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^2 \simeq \wedge^2 \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$ of the relatively ample line bundle \mathcal{L} giving

³Here (and below in §3, when considering the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism and other identifications induced by it) the twist by -1 is purely formal. Indeed, all the associations $\rho \mapsto \mathcal{E}_\rho$ from representations to sheaves considered below will not depend on the twists by the symplectic multiplier ν and one could equally well work with representations of $\mathbf{M}^\circ \simeq \mathbf{GL}_g$ and $\mathbf{G}^\circ = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$ (taking into account [8, pag. 230], when defining the filtration). However, the further data of the twist can be introduced in order to keep track of other additional data. For example, the symplectic multiplier introduced in the definition of automorphic forms, in order to make the natural association sending a modular form f to the section ω_f Hecke equivariant. In other contexts, it may be useful to account for possible Tate twists. In §5.2 below, it will be useful in order to take into account the twists under the Frobenius denoted by φ (defined before Lemma 5.11 below). Then, the proof of Lemma 5.12 shows that, if we denote by $\mathcal{E}(1)$ a twist that indicates that, at the level of sheaves, we multiply the Frobenius of \mathcal{E} by p^{-1} , the equality $\mathcal{E}_{\rho(-1)} = \mathcal{E}_\rho(1)$ holds for the representation $\rho(-1) := \rho \otimes \nu^{-1}$.

rise to the polarization) and the Gauss-Manin connection

$$\nabla : \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/K}^1$$

(see [9, §2.1, §2.2 and the proof of Lemma 2.2] for the results over Y , which extends to X using G). We remark that, because ω_{dR} is maximal isotropic, the symplectic pairing yields an isomorphism $\mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR}}^t \simeq \omega_{\mathrm{dR}}^\vee(1)$ which composed with the isomorphism $\omega_{\mathrm{dR}}^\vee \simeq \omega(G^t/X)^\vee$ induced by the polarization gives the above identification $\mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR}}^t \simeq \omega(G^t/X)^\vee(-1)$ (cfr. [9, proof of Lemma 2.3]).

On the other hand, let us consider the algebraic group $\mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ acting on $V \simeq \mathbb{k}^{2g}$ and fix a maximal isotropic subspaces W and \overline{W} such that $V = W \perp \overline{W}$. Let us write $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$ (resp. $\mathbf{M} \subset \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$) for the subgroup of those elements which preserves W (resp. the decomposition $W \perp \overline{W}$). Then, setting $\mathcal{O}_X^\circ := \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} ?$, we see that \mathcal{O}_X^V comes equipped with a filtration

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^W \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^V \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^{V/W} \longrightarrow 0$$

and a symplectic pairing $1_{\mathcal{O}_X} \otimes_K \psi$ under which \mathcal{O}_X^W is maximal isotropic. Furthermore, the natural action of \mathbf{Q} on \mathcal{O}_X^V preserves the symplectic pairing and the filtration.

Writing $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times := \mathcal{I}som_{\mathcal{O}_X, ss, Hdg}(\mathcal{O}_X^V, \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1)$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times := \mathcal{I}som_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X^W, \omega_{\mathrm{dR}}) \times \mathbf{G}_{m, X}$) for the Zariski sheaf whose sections over $U \subset X$ are the isomorphisms of \mathcal{O}_U -modules $\mathcal{O}_U^V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, U}^1$ respecting the symplectic pairing up to similitude and the filtration (resp. isomorphisms of \mathcal{O}_U -modules $\mathcal{O}_U^W \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\mathrm{dR}, U}$ times $\mathbf{G}_{m, U}$), we have a natural \mathbf{Q} -action via

$$g^{-1}\alpha = \alpha g := \alpha \circ g \text{ (resp. } g^{-1}(\alpha, \nu) = (\alpha, \nu)g := (\alpha \circ g, \nu g)).$$

Because an isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{O}_U^V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, U}^1$ naturally induces isomorphisms $\mathcal{O}_U^W \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\mathrm{dR}, U}$ and it has an associated multiplier $\nu_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_X^\times(U)$ characterized by the equality $\langle \alpha(x), \alpha(y) \rangle = \nu_\alpha \langle x, y \rangle$, we have a morphism of sheaves of \mathbf{Q} -sets

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times.$$

Remark 3.2. Consider the Zariski sheaf $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^{\circ \times} := \mathcal{I}som_{\mathcal{O}_X, s, Hdg}(\mathcal{O}_X^V, \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1)$ classifying isomorphisms of \mathcal{O}_U -modules $\mathcal{O}_U^V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, U}^1$ respecting the symplectic pairing and the filtration, so that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^{\circ \times} \subset \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$. Then, to give a section α of the pull-back of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^{\circ \times}$ to $S \rightarrow X$ (a morphism of schemes) is the same thing as to give an ordered symplectic-Hodge basis \mathcal{B} of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, S}^1$: after fixing once and for all a symplectic-Hodge \mathcal{B}_V of V , we associate to the section α the ordered basis $\alpha(\mathcal{B}_V)$ and, to the basis \mathcal{B} , we associate the unique isomorphism $\alpha_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{O}_S^V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, S}^1$ sending the ordered basis \mathcal{B}_V to \mathcal{B} . Then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^{\circ \times}$ is a \mathbf{Q}° -torsor over X (see [9, Theorem 4.5 and Lemma 4.6]).

Indeed, one sees that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$ is a \mathbf{Q} -torsor over X , the action of \mathbf{Q} on $\mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$ factors through the quotient map $\mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ making $\mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$ an \mathbf{M} -torsor over X and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$ is a \mathbf{U} -torsor over $\mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$. Hence, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$ admits sections Zariski locally on X and, if $\alpha_0 : \mathcal{O}_{X|U}^V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, U}^1$ locally on U , then $\mathbf{Q}_{/U} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}|U}^\times$ and we have

$$\mathbf{Q}_{/U} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}|U}^\times \text{ via } g \mapsto \alpha_0 \circ g = \alpha_0 g.$$

Similarly, locally on X we have

$$\mathbf{M}_{/U} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}|U}^\times.$$

We can now define a functor

$$\mathcal{E} : \mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$$

from the category $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{Q})$ to the category $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$ of \mathcal{O}_X -modules as follows (cfr. [18, §2.1] and [24, §7]):

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho := \mathcal{H}om_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times, \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho),$$

where $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathbf{Q}}$ denotes the sheaf whose section over $U \subset X$ are the morphisms of sheaves of sets $f : \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}|U}^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_U \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho$ such that $f(\alpha g) = g^{-1}f(\alpha)$ for every $g \in \mathbf{Q}(U)$ and every local section α defined over an open subset of U . Here we remark that, by definition of $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{Q})$, we know that ρ is a Zariski sheaf on $\mathbf{Spec}(\mathbb{k})$ and $\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho$ denotes its pull-back to X .

Remark 3.3. Suppose that $X_0 \rightarrow X$ is a morphism of locally ringed spaces with the property that the pull-back $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, X_0}^1$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$ to X_0 (as an \mathcal{O}_{X_0} -module) comes equipped with an isomorphism $\alpha_0 : \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, X_0}^1$. Then $\mathbf{Q}_{/X_0} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}|X_0}^\times$ (via $g \mapsto \alpha_0 g$, as above) and, hence,

$$\vartheta_{\alpha_0} : \mathcal{E}_{\rho|X_0} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{Q}_{/X_0}, \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho \text{ via } f \mapsto [g \mapsto f(\alpha_0 g)] \mapsto f(\alpha_0).$$

The identification depends on the fixed choice of α_0 and is canonical in the variable ρ : this will give rise to the coherent trivializations for varying ρ .

On the other hand, there is a unique (iso)morphism

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}} : \mathcal{E}_V \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}}^1$$

with the property that, if $X_0 \rightarrow X$ and $\alpha_0 : \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, X_0}^1$ are as above, then $\vartheta_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}|X_0}(f) := \alpha_0(f(\alpha_0))$:

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}|X_0} : \mathcal{E}_{V|X_0} \xrightarrow{\vartheta_{\alpha_0}} \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho = \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^V \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR}, X_0}^1.$$

Indeed, if $\alpha'_0 = \alpha_0 g$ is another trivialization over X_0 , then

$$\alpha'_0(f(\alpha'_0)) = \alpha_0 g f(\alpha_0 g) = \alpha_0 f(\alpha_0 g g^{-1}) = \alpha_0(f(\alpha_0)).$$

Hence $\vartheta_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}|X_0}$ is well defined and, because $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$ is a \mathbf{Q} -torsor, this implies that the ϑ_{α_0} 's obtained from a suitable Zariski covering of X glue together to give $\vartheta_{\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{dR}}$.

We recall that $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{U} \rtimes \mathbf{M}$, implying that the representations of \mathbf{M} can be regarded as representations of \mathbf{Q} by restriction via the canonical quotient map

$$\mathbf{Q} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}.$$

We get in this way a functor $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{Q})$ and, if $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{M})$, we write again ρ for its image in $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{Q})$ and consider \mathcal{E}_ρ . We can give an alternative description of the functor \mathcal{E}_ρ in this case as follows. We define

$$\mathcal{W} : \mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{M}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$$

via the rule

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{M}}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times, \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho).$$

Remark 3.4. The analogue of Remark 3.3 holds for the functor \mathcal{W} : we will write $\vartheta_{\alpha_0} : \mathcal{W}_{\rho|X_0} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho$ and $\vartheta_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}} : \mathcal{W}_W \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\mathrm{dR}}$ for the analogous isomorphisms (the notations being the same).

We have

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho = \mathcal{E}_\rho \text{ canonically for } \rho \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{M})$$

via the canonical morphism of sheaves $\mathcal{W}_\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_\rho$ induced by $\mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\omega, \mathrm{dR}}^\times$: since the isomorphism can be checked locally, this indeed a consequence of Remark 3.3 and Remark 3.4. Then, we deduce from Remark 3.4 that there is a canonical identification

$$\mathcal{E}_W = \mathcal{W}_W = \omega_{\mathrm{dR}}.$$

Let us write $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{fl}\text{-}\mathrm{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ for the full subcategory of those objects of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ whose underlying \mathbb{k} -module is flat. We will show below that, if we start with an algebraic $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -module $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{fl}\text{-}\mathrm{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$, then we can get more structure on the underlying sheaf \mathcal{E}_ρ . Namely, assuming that \mathbb{k} is any Dedekind domain containing $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N]$ (this assumption will be in force until the end of §3), we are going to define a functor

$$\mathcal{E} : \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{fl}\text{-}\mathrm{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{FMIC}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$$

from the category $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathrm{fl}\text{-}\mathrm{alg}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ to the category of filtered modules endowed with an integrable connection satisfying the Griffith transversality condition whose underlying \mathcal{O}_X -module is \mathcal{E}_ρ as defined above. Let us write $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathrm{log}}(\mathcal{O}_X) := \mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{O}_X)(\log(D))$ for the Zariski sheaf whose sections over $U \subset X$ are the \mathbb{k} -linear derivations of \mathcal{O}_U onto itself (with logarithmic poles at the boundary) and, for an \mathcal{O}_X -module \mathcal{E} , let $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{E})$ be the sheaf whose sections over $U \subset X$ are the \mathbb{k} -linear endomorphisms of $\mathcal{E}|_U$: both of them are \mathcal{O}_X -modules and sheaves of Lie algebras over \mathbb{k} . Note that $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}^{\mathrm{log}}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ is canonically isomorphic, as an \mathcal{O}_X -module, to

the sheaf $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X} \left(\Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^1 (\log(D)), \mathcal{O}_X \right)$ whose sections over $U \subset X$ are the morphisms of \mathcal{O}_U -modules from $\Omega_{U/\mathbb{k}}^{\log,1} := \Omega_{U/\mathbb{k}}^1 (\log(D))$ to \mathcal{O}_U : it follows that a connection $\nabla : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{\log,1}$ give rise to a morphism of \mathcal{O}_X -modules ∇ from $\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to $\mathcal{E}nd_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{E}_{\rho})$ sending a section D to $\nabla(D) := (1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} D) \circ \nabla$ and the Leibnitz rule for ∇ implies that

$$(3.2) \quad \nabla(D)(ax) = D(a)x + a\nabla(D)(x)$$

for sections D, a and x of $\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)$, \mathcal{O}_X and, respectively, \mathcal{E} ; furthermore, if the connection is integrable, then the resulting morphism of \mathcal{O}_X -modules is of Lie algebras. When $\Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{\log,1}$ is locally free of finite type, we can go in the opposite direction: to give a morphism of \mathcal{O}_X -modules ∇ from $\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to $\mathcal{E}nd_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{E})$ such that (3.2) holds is the same as to give a connection ∇ and, under this correspondence, the connection is integrable if and only if the morphism of \mathcal{O}_X -modules is of Lie algebras.

Remark 3.5. *Indeed, without any assumption on \mathbb{k} , we will endow \mathcal{E}_{ρ} with a morphism of \mathcal{O}_X -modules ∇_{ρ} from $\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to $\mathcal{E}nd_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{E}_{\rho})$ which is of Lie algebras and such that $\nabla_{\rho}(D)(\text{Fil}^r \mathcal{E}_{\rho}) \subset \text{Fil}^{r-1} \mathcal{E}_{\rho}$. When \mathbb{k} contains $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N]$, then X is smooth over \mathbb{k} and, consequently, $\Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{\log,1}$ is locally free of finite type and, hence, \mathcal{E} can be regarded as taking values in $\text{FMIC}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$.*

Fix once and for all an ordered symplectic-Hodge basis $\{w_1, \dots, w_g, w_{g+1}, \dots, w_{2g}\}$ of V (for example, the standard basis when $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$). We are going to define a morphism of sheaves

$$X : \mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X) \times \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \text{dR}}^{\times} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathfrak{g}$$

sending a section $(D, \alpha) \in \mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)(U) \times \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \text{dR}}^{\times}(U)$ to $X(D, \alpha)$ defined as follows. Suppose now that $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \text{dR}}^{\times}(U)$, set $\omega_i := \alpha(w_i)$ and, using the fact that $\{\omega_i : i = 1, \dots, 2g\}$ is an \mathcal{O}_U -basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, U}^1$, define $X_g(D, \alpha) = (X_g(D, \alpha)_{j,i}) \in \mathbf{M}_{2g}(\mathcal{O}_X(U)) = \mathcal{O}_X(U) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathfrak{gl}_{2g}$ by means of the rule

$$\nabla(D)(\omega_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{2g} X_g(D, \alpha)_{j,i} \omega_j,$$

where here ∇ is the Gauss-Manin connection. The identification $\theta : (\mathbb{k}^{2g}, \psi_g) \xrightarrow{\sim} (V, \psi)$ of at the end of Example 2.12 yields $c_{\theta} : \mathbf{GL}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{GL}(V)$ and, hence, a morphism $c_{\theta} : \mathfrak{gl}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{gl}_V$: we write $X(D, \alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_X(U) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathfrak{gl}_V$ for the image of $X_g(D, \alpha)$.

Lemma 3.6. *We have that $X(D, \alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_X(U) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. We (may) assume that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$ and we write $I = (\langle w_i, w_j \rangle)_{i,j}$ for the matrix representing the symplectic pairing ψ in the basis $\{w_i : i = 1, \dots, 2g\}$. Then we have

$$\mathfrak{g}_R = \{X \in \mathbf{M}_{2g}(R) : \exists \lambda \in R \text{ s.t. } X^t I + IX = \lambda I\}.$$

We remark that, for every section D of $\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ and every section $x, y \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}}^1$, we have that

$$(3.3) \quad D(\langle x, y \rangle) = \langle \nabla(D)(x), y \rangle + \langle x, \nabla(D)(y) \rangle$$

as it follows from the fact that the first Chern class of the Poincaré line bundle is horizontal for the Gauss-Manin connection, since it comes from a de Rham class of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}}^2(G_U \times_U G_U^t/\mathbb{k})$ (cfr. [9, (5.5)]). Let $\nu_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{O}_X^{\times}(U)$ be characterized by the equality $\langle \alpha(x), \alpha(y) \rangle = \nu_{\alpha} \langle x, y \rangle$. Then

$$\langle \omega_i, \omega_j \rangle = \langle \alpha(w_i), \alpha(w_j) \rangle = \nu_{\alpha} \langle w_i, w_j \rangle.$$

In particular, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla(D)(\omega_i), \omega_j \rangle + \langle \omega_i, \nabla(D)(\omega_j) \rangle &= \sum_{k=1}^{2g} X(D, \alpha)_{k,i} \langle \omega_k, \omega_j \rangle + \sum_{l=1}^{2g} X(D, \alpha)_{l,j} \langle \omega_i, \omega_l \rangle \\ &= \nu_{\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^{2g} X(D, \alpha)_{k,i} \langle w_k, w_j \rangle + \nu_{\alpha} \sum_{l=1}^{2g} X(D, \alpha)_{l,j} \langle w_i, w_l \rangle = \nu_{\alpha} \left(X(D, \alpha)^t I \right)_{i,j} + \nu_{\alpha} (IX(D, \alpha))_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$

and that, because $\langle w_i, w_j \rangle \in \mathbb{k}$,

$$D(\langle \omega_i, \omega_j \rangle) = D(\nu_{\alpha}) \langle w_i, w_j \rangle.$$

It then follows from (3.3) applied to $(x, y) = (\omega_i, \omega_j)$ that, setting $\lambda_\alpha := \frac{D(\nu_\alpha)}{\nu_\alpha}$, we have

$$X(D, \alpha)^t I + IX(D, \alpha) = \lambda_\alpha I.$$

□

If now $\rho \in \text{Rep}_{fl\text{-}alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ and $f \in \mathcal{E}_\rho(U) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, dR|U}^\times, \mathcal{O}_U \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho)$, we let $\nabla_\rho(D)(f)$ be the morphism of sheaves in $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, dR|U}^\times, \mathcal{O}_U \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho)$ defined by means of the rule

$$\nabla_\rho(D)(f)_{U'}(\alpha) := D \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} 1_\rho(f_{U'}(\alpha)) + X(D, \alpha)(f_{U'}(\alpha))$$

for every open subset $U' \subset U$ and every $(D, \alpha) \in \text{Der}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)(U') \times \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, dR}^\times(U')$. Here, thanks to Lemma 3.6, we let $X(D, \alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_X(U') \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathfrak{g}$ acts on $f_{U'}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_X(U') \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho$ via its Lie algebra action. We will later discuss the filtrations: for the moment, we write $\text{MIC}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$ for the category of modules with an integrable connection and we prove the following result.

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose that \mathbb{K} is any Dedekind domain containing $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N]$ and that $\rho \in \text{Rep}_{fl\text{-}alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$. We have that $\nabla_\rho(D)(f) \in \mathcal{E}_\rho(U)$ and, in this way, we get $(\mathcal{E}_\rho, \nabla_\rho)$ which belongs to (the objects of) $\text{MIC}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$. This rule defines a functor from $\text{Rep}_{fl\text{-}alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ to $\text{MIC}_{\mathcal{O}_X}$ with the property that $(\mathcal{E}_V, \nabla_V) = (\mathcal{H}_{dR}^1, \nabla)$ equals the Gauss-Manin connection, the identification being given by $\vartheta_{\mathcal{H}, dR}$ (see Remark 3.3).*

Proof. We (may) assume that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$. When \mathbb{K} is a field, the result is proved in [18, Proposition 2.4] and here we just indicate why we can assume that \mathbb{K} is a Dedekind domain. Let us set $D_\rho := D \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} 1_\rho$ and, if $g = (g_{i,j}) \in \mathbf{M}_{2g}(\mathcal{O}_X(U'))$ for some open subset $U' \subset U$, define $D(g) := (D(g_{j,i})) \in \mathbf{M}_{2g}(\mathcal{O}_X(U'))$. Then the third of the chain of equalities appearing in [18, pag. 2448] uses the following equality

$$D_\rho(gx) = g(D_\rho(x)) + D(g)(x)$$

for $g \in \mathbf{Q}(U')$ and $x \in \mathcal{O}_X(U') \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho$ (with our notations, it needs to be applied to $x = f(\alpha g)$). Because $\rho \in \text{Rep}_{fl\text{-}alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ and \mathbb{K} is a Dedekind domain, it follows from Theorem 2.1 that ρ is a colimit in $\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{Q})$ of representations in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{Q})$, each of them being constructed from $V = \text{Std}_{2g}$ by forming tensor products, direct sums, duals, and subquotients. This allows us to check the equality in the $\rho = V$ case, which is easy. The other calculations are the same. □

As promised, it remains to discuss the filtration. As explained in [8, pag. 230], one can define it by looking at the effect of the action of the diagonal element $(0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathfrak{g}$ when acting on ρ : the sum $F_p(\rho)$ of the generalized eigenspaces for eigenvalues $\geq p$ gives rise to decreasing filtration by \mathbf{Q} -submodules which yields a filtration on \mathcal{E}_ρ satisfying the Griffith transversality condition and giving rise to a mixed Hodge structure when ρ is in $\text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{G})$ (see [8, Ch. VI, §5, 5.5 Theorem]). For our purposes, however, it suffices to define such a filtration in the case $\rho = \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_0)[\mathbf{Y}]$ for some $\rho_0 \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$. For these specific representations, we may use the \mathbf{Q} -module filtration provided by the (opposite of the) increasing degree filtration $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_0)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$ (cfr. Lemma 2.13), that we will check to satisfy Griffith transversality in Lemma 3.10 below.

Remark 3.8. *One can check that $F_{-r}(\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_0)[\mathbf{Y}]) = \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_0)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$ implying that, in this way, when \mathbb{K} is a field we get the same filtration as in [8, Ch. VI, §5, 5.5 Theorem] by viewing an irreducible representation inside such a kind of induced module by means of the inclusion (2.12). We will not need this fact.*

If \mathcal{C} is an exact category (say understood as a full subcategory of an abelian category with the resulting notion of exactness), let us write $\text{Fil}(\mathcal{C})$ to denote the subcategory of \mathbb{Z} -filtered objects with filtered morphisms. The exactness of sequences E in $\text{Fil}(\mathcal{C})$ is defined by requiring the sequences E and $\text{Fil}^i(E)$ to be exact when viewed in \mathcal{C} for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 3.9. *Also, we note that $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_0)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$ can be recursively defined by looking at the successive invariants under the \mathbf{U} -module action (by Lemma 2.13). In this way, we see that the (dual) BGG complex (2.11) (when \mathbb{K} is a field) and its truncated integral version (2.17) (when \mathbb{K} is a Dedekind domain) can be promoted to exact sequences in $\text{Fil}(\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q}))$.*

Proof. Let us write $F : \text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{U}) \rightarrow \text{Fil}(\text{Rep}_{alg}(\mathbf{U}))$ for the functor which takes the filtration recursively defined by looking at the successive invariants under the \mathbf{U} -module action. Taking the invariants by an affine group scheme is always a left exact operation: hence, by induction, one deduces that F is a left exact functor. This proves the assertion for the truncated integral version (2.17), which is everything we need in what follows. One checks that, indeed, for unipotent groups taking the invariants is an exact operation and, hence, F is exact from which the assertion for (2.11) follows. \square

We now discuss the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism, again assuming that \mathbb{k} is a Dedekind domain which contains $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N]$ (being a Dedekind domain is not needed until Lemma 3.10 below). Consider the following chain of morphisms of \mathcal{O}_X -modules

$$\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}nd_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{H}_{dR}^1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\omega_{dR}, \text{Lie}_{dR}^t),$$

where the first arrow is obtained applying the above discussion to the Gauss-Manin connection $(\mathcal{E}, \nabla) = (\mathcal{H}_{dR}^1, \nabla)$ and the second arrow, which is obtained by precomposition with the restriction to ω_{dR} and post-composition with the projection onto Lie_{dR}^t , takes values in $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}$ (rather than $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathbb{k}}$) thanks to the Griffiths transversality condition. We remark that the target is identified with $\text{Lie}_{dR}^t \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega_{dR}^{\vee} \simeq \omega(G^t/X)^{\vee} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega(G/X)^{\vee}(-1)$ and, hence, we get in this way a morphism from $\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to $\omega(G^t/X)^{\vee} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega(G/X)^{\vee}(-1)$ whose dual is the so called Kodaira-Spencer morphism from $\omega(G^t/X) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega(G/X)(1)$ to $\Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{\log, 1}$. Because \mathbb{k} contains $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N]$, the universal polarization λ yields an isomorphism

$$(3.4) \quad \lambda^* \otimes 1 : \frac{\omega(G^t/X) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega(G/X)}{(y \otimes \lambda^*(z) - z \otimes \lambda^*(y) : y, z \in \omega(G^t/X))} \longrightarrow \text{Sym}^2(\omega(G/X)) =: \text{Sym}^2(\omega_{dR})$$

and it is known that the Kodaira-Spencer morphism factors through the target of the above arrow and induces an isomorphism

$$KS_X : \text{Sym}^2(\omega_{dR})(1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{\log, 1}$$

(see [16, Proposition 2.3.5.2 and Proposition 6.2.5.18] and [8, Ch. III, discussion before 9.3 Lemma and 9.8 Corollary and Ch. IV, 3.1 Proposition (vi)]). Dually, we have the isomorphism

$$KS_X^{\vee} : \mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Sym}^2(\omega_{dR}^{\vee})(-1)$$

whose composition with the inclusion from $\text{Sym}^2(\omega_{dR}^{\vee})$ to $\omega_{dR}^{\vee} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega_{dR}^{\vee}$ (sending the element represented by $x \otimes y$ to $x \otimes y + y \otimes x$) is the original morphism from $\mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to $\omega(G/X)^{\vee} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \omega(G^t/X)^{\vee}$ followed by the isomorphism $\lambda_* \otimes 1$. Taking into account the canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{W}_W = \omega_{dR}$ inducing $\mathcal{W}_{\text{Sym}^2(W)(-1)} = \text{Sym}^2(\omega_{dR})(1)$ we see that, for every $X_0 \rightarrow X$ and α_0 as in Remark 3.4, we get

$$(3.5) \quad KS_{\alpha_0} := KS_X \circ \vartheta_{\alpha_0}^{-1} : \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Sym}^2(W)(-1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{\log, 1}.$$

Dually, we have

$$(3.6) \quad KS_{\alpha_0}^{\vee} : \mathcal{D}er_{\mathbb{k}}^{\log}(\mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Sym}^2(W^{\vee})(1).$$

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that $\rho_0 \in \text{Rep}_f(\mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m)$ and consider $\rho := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_0)[\mathbf{Y}]$, which comes equipped with the \mathbf{Q} -module filtration $\rho_{\leq r} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho_0)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$. Setting $F^r(\mathcal{V}_{\rho}) := \mathcal{E}_{\rho_{\leq r}}$ we have $\nabla_{\lambda}(F^r(\mathcal{V}_{\rho})) \subset F^{r+1}(\mathcal{V}_{\rho})$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.14 (3) that every $\partial \in \mathfrak{u}^-$ increase the degree by one for every $v \in \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$. On the other hand, because $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$ is a \mathbf{Q} -submodule, we know that every $\partial \in \mathfrak{q}$ preserves the filtration. Because $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u}^- \oplus \mathfrak{q}$, the result follows from (3.6) and the definition of $\nabla_{\lambda} = \nabla_{\rho}$ for $\rho = \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]$. \square

When $\lambda \in X_{\mathbf{G},+}$, applying \mathcal{E}_{\cdot} to the inclusions (2.18) (and recalling that $\mathcal{E}_{\rho} = \mathcal{W}_{\rho}$ for every $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\mathbf{M})$ regarded as a \mathbf{Q} -module by means of the canonical morphism $\mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$, so that $\mathcal{E}_{W_{\lambda}} = \mathcal{W}_{W_{\lambda}} =: \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}$) yields (setting $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda} := \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}_{\lambda}}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda} := \mathcal{E}_{\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_{\lambda})[\mathbf{Y}]}$):

$$\mathcal{W}_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\lambda}$$

such that the first inclusion is of sheaves while the latter is of integrable modules with connection ∇_λ . Hence we also have an inclusion of de Rham complexes

$$(3.7) \quad dR(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \hookrightarrow dR(\mathcal{V}_\lambda).$$

We have defined in Lemma 3.10 a filtration on \mathcal{V}_λ . Setting $L_{\lambda, \leq r} := L_\lambda \cap \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(W_\lambda)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq r}$ and then $F^r(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) := \mathcal{E}_{L_{\lambda, \leq r}}$ yields a filtration on \mathcal{L}_λ such that $F^0(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) = \mathcal{W}_\lambda$, $\nabla_\lambda(F^r(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)) \subset F^{r+1}(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ and which promotes (3.7) to a morphism of filtered complexes (as can be checked locally using Remark 3.3).

Remark 3.11. *The above discussion requires the flatness of X over \mathbb{k} (which is true because we assume that \mathbb{k} contains $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N]$). Indeed, as discussion in §2.1, the exactness in Mod_{alg} differs from the exactness as a functor; however, an exact sequence in Mod_{alg} gives rise to an exact sequence of R -modules when evaluated at R -points for every \mathbb{k} -flat algebra R . Applying this observation to (the ring of functions) of an open affine subset of X and using Remark 3.3 we deduce that the functor \mathcal{E}_- is exact.*

4. q -EXPANSION AND DEGENERATION AT THE 0-DIMENSIONAL CUSPS

Let suppose that $\phi : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ is an injective morphism with finite cokernel between free \mathbb{Z} -modules of finite rank g . Consider the tori $\mathbf{T}_\mathbb{W} := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{gr}(\mathbb{W}, \mathbf{G}_m)$, where $\mathbb{W} \in \{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}\}$ is regarded as an fppf sheaf over a base scheme such that $\# \frac{\mathbb{X}}{\phi(\mathbb{Y})}$ is invertible⁴. We remark that the datum of a morphism (of sheaves) of groups $Q : \mathbb{Y} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_m$ is equivalent to that of a morphism $M_Q = [\mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X}]$ or, in other words, a (1-)motive with maximal torus rank g (see [23, Définition 1.2.1]). The dual motive is $M_Q^t := [\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{Y}]$, again obtained from Q . The datum of ϕ gives rise to a morphism $\phi^t : \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{Y}$ and $\phi^*(Q) := Q \circ (1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \phi)$ is symmetric if and only if $\lambda_\phi := (\phi^t, \phi) : M_Q \rightarrow M_Q^t$ is a morphism of motives, which is then a polarization because ϕ is injective with finite cokernel (see [23, Définition 1.2.3.3]). One can consider the functor classifying 4-tuples $(M, \lambda, \alpha, \beta)$ where $M = [Y \rightarrow T]$ is a motive with maximal torus rank g , $\lambda = (\phi_Y, \phi_Y^t)$ is a polarization and $\alpha : \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X} \xrightarrow{\sim} T$ and $\beta : \mathbb{Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} Y$ are isomorphisms such that ϕ equals the composition

$$\mathbb{Y} \xrightarrow{\beta} Y \xrightarrow{\phi_Y} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{gr}(T, \mathbf{G}_m) \xrightarrow{\underline{\text{Hom}}_{gr}(\alpha, \mathbf{G}_m)} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{gr}(\mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X}, \mathbf{G}_m) = \mathbb{X}.$$

Indeed the above discussion shows that, if

$$Q_\phi : \mathbb{Y} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X} \longrightarrow \frac{\mathbb{Y} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X}}{(y \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \phi(z) - z \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \phi(y) : y, z \in \mathbb{Y})} =: \mathbb{S}_\phi$$

is the canonical quotient map, then $\mathbf{E}_\phi := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{gr}(\mathbb{S}_\phi, \mathbf{G}_m)$ classifies these quadruples: a point of \mathbf{E}_ϕ defined over a scheme is a morphism (of sheaves) of groups $x : \mathbb{S}_\phi \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_m$ (over that scheme), which gives rise (and is equivalent) to $Q_x := x \circ Q_\phi$ to which the above discussion applies giving to the equivalent datum of the 4-tuple $(M_{Q_x}, \lambda_\phi, 1_{\mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X}}, 1_{\mathbf{T}_\mathbb{Y}})$ (cfr. [23, Définition 1.4.3 and Proposition 1.4.4]). In particular \mathbf{E}_ϕ , comes equipped with a universal motive $\mathbf{M}_\phi \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_\phi$ with maximal torus rank g .

Remark 4.1. *Using the universal trivializations α^{univ} and β^{univ} to change \mathbf{M}_ϕ by a (unique) isomorphism, we may assume that $\mathbf{M}_\phi = [\mathbb{Y}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbf{E}_\phi}]$ and $\mathbf{M}_\phi^t = [\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{Y}, \mathbf{E}_\phi}]$ (and the universal trivialization are given by the identity). We have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}(\mathbf{E}_\phi) = \mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{S}_\phi]$ and, if $\omega_{dR, \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X}/\mathbf{E}_\phi}$ denotes the sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}$ -modules given by the invariant differentials, then $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X} \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{dR, \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X}/\mathbf{E}_\phi}$ by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}$ -linear extension of the rule sending $s \in \mathbb{X}$ to $d \log(s)$ (which is a priori a section of the pushforward of $\Omega_{\mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X}/\mathbf{E}_\phi}^1$ to \mathbf{E}_ϕ , easily checked to be invariant). Similarly, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{dR, \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{Y}/\mathbf{E}_\phi}$. Using the universal vectorial extensions one can define, for every motive M , a Kodaira-Spencer map KS_M which extends the definition for abelian schemes (see [8, Ch. III, discussion after Proposition 9.2]). According to [8, Ch. III, discussion before Lemma 9.3], in the specific case of a motive having maximal torus rank such as \mathbf{M}_ϕ , this morphism*

$$KS_{\mathbf{M}_\phi} : \omega_{dR, \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{X}, \mathbf{E}_\phi / \mathbf{E}_\phi} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}} \omega_{dR, \mathbf{T}_\mathbb{Y} / \mathbf{E}_\phi}(-1) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}^1$$

⁴Strictly speaking the invertibility assumption is not needed in the following discussion. However, the toroidal compactifications require this assumption and, hence, the hypothesis allows us to interpret the discussion below in this framework.

admits the following simple description. Identifying the source with $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Y} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X})$, it is the $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}$ -linear extension of

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{Y} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X} \xrightarrow{Q_\phi} \mathbb{S}_\phi \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}^\times \xrightarrow{-\mathrm{dlog}} \Omega_{\mathbf{E}_\phi}^1.$$

We remark that the cocharacter group $\mathbb{B}_\phi := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{S}_\phi, \mathbb{Z})$ of \mathbf{E}_ϕ is a free \mathbb{Z} -module of rank $d_g := \frac{g(g+1)}{2}$. We let $\mathbb{C}_\phi \subset \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{S}_\phi, \mathbb{R})$ be the closed cone consisting of those bilinear forms $Q : \mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi^*(Q) := Q \circ (1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \phi)$ has rational kernel (i.e. admits a basis in $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Y}$, equivalently the analogous condition holds for the two kernels of Q) and is positive semidefinite definite. In other words, \mathbb{C}_ϕ is the inverse image of the closed cone of positive semidefinite definite bilinear forms $\mathbb{C}_{1_Y} \subset \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{S}_{1_Y}, \mathbb{R})$ with rational kernel under the natural map $\mathbb{B}_\phi \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{1_Y}$ sending b to $\phi^*(b) := b \circ (1 \otimes \phi)$. Consider the set GL_ϕ of couples $(\gamma_Y, \gamma_X) \in GL(\mathbb{Y}) \times GL(\mathbb{X})$ such that $\gamma_X \circ \phi = \phi \circ \gamma_Y$. It is easily checked to be a subgroup⁵. Using the integral structure provided by \mathbb{B}_ϕ , one can extend the notions of smooth $GL(\mathbb{Y})$ -admissible polyhedral cone decomposition of \mathbb{C}_{1_Y} and their related notions (see [8, Ch. IV, §2]) to smooth GL_ϕ -admissible polyhedral decompositions Σ and similar results hold (see [8, pag. 99] and [16, §6.1])⁶. In particular, if $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is a cone (required to be open in the smallest subspace it generates, contained in \mathbb{C}_ϕ and smooth), then we get a torus embedding

$$\mathbf{E}_\phi \hookrightarrow \mathbf{E}_{\phi, \sigma},$$

where $\mathbf{E}_{\phi, \sigma}$ is the spectrum of the monoid algebra $R'_{\phi, \sigma} := \mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{S}_\phi \cap \sigma^\vee]$, if $\sigma^\vee \subset \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{S}_\phi$ is the set of those $s \in \mathbb{S}_\phi$ such that $\langle s, b \rangle \geq 0$ for every $b \in \sigma$. Let $I_{\phi, \sigma} \subset R'_{\phi, \sigma}$ be the ideal generated by those $s \in \mathbb{S}_\phi$ such that $\langle s, b \rangle > 0$ for every $b \in \sigma$ and define $R_{\phi, \sigma}$ to be the $I_{\phi, \sigma}$ -adic completion of $R'_{\phi, \sigma}$. Actually, this give the “correct definition” only when σ is contained in the interior of \mathbb{C}_ϕ : in this case, the bilinear form Q_ϕ satisfies the positivity condition that $\phi^*(Q_\phi)(y, y) \in I_{\phi, \sigma}$ for every $y \in \mathbb{Y} - \{0\}$ ⁷. Then, as we are going to explain, Mumford’s construction provides a semiabelian scheme $\mathbf{G}_{\phi, \sigma} \rightarrow \mathbf{Spec}(R_{\phi, \sigma})$ whose formal completion along (the closed subscheme defined by) $I_{\phi, \sigma}$ is canonically isomorphic to the $I_{\phi, \sigma}$ -adic completion of $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbf{E}_{\phi, \sigma}}$ and whose generic fiber is a polarized abelian scheme.

We recall Mumford’s construction M_{pol} in the special case of motives of maximal torus rank. Suppose that S is an affine normal and excellent scheme which is complete with respect to a reduced closed subscheme S_0 defined by an ideal I and set $U := S - S_0$: then one consider the category $\mathrm{Mum}_{U, S, S_0, pol, +}^{tor}$ of 4-tuples (T, Y, M, λ) such that T is a torus, Y is an étale sheaf which is locally constant with values in a free \mathbb{Z} -module of finite rang, $M = [Y_U \rightarrow T_U]$ is a (1-)motive (of maximal torus rank) and $\lambda : M \rightarrow M^t$ is a polarization satisfying the following positivity condition (see [23, Définition 1.3.3.1] and [8, pag. 103-104]). Suppose first that Y and $X := \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(T, \mathbf{G}_m)$ are constant. Then, as remarked above, $M = [Y_U \rightarrow T_U]$ is equivalent to $Q : Y \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} X \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{m, U}$ and $\phi^*(Q)$ on U -points yields $\phi^*(Q) : Y \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_U^\times(U)$: we require that $\phi^*(Q)(y, y) \in I$ for every $y \in Y - \{0\}$. In general, we require this condition étale locally. On the other hand, one can consider the category $\mathrm{Deg}_{U, S, S_0, pol}^{tor}$ consisting of semi-abelian S -schemes that are polarized and abelian over U and whose reduction modulo I is a torus. Then M_{pol} is a functor from $\mathrm{Mum}_{U, S, S_0, pol, +}^{tor}$ to $\mathrm{Deg}_{U, S, S_0, pol}^{tor}$ realizing an equivalence (see [23, Théorème 1.3.3.3] and [8, Ch. III, §7]): if $G = M_{pol}(T, Y, M, \lambda)$, then the formal completion along S_0 of $G \rightarrow S$ is canonically isomorphic to the I -adic completion of T . Now take $(S, I) = (\mathbf{Spec}(R_{\phi, \sigma}), R_{\phi, \sigma} I_{\phi, \sigma})$. because $I_{\phi, \sigma}$ is the ideal which defines $\mathbf{E}_{\phi, \sigma} - \mathbf{E}_\phi$ (see [8, pag. 101-102]), the open immersion $U \hookrightarrow S$ is the pull-back of $\mathbf{E}_\phi \hookrightarrow \mathbf{E}_{\phi, \sigma}$ via $S \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_{\phi, \sigma}$ and, hence, we can pull-back the polarized motive $(\mathbf{M}_\phi, \lambda_\phi)$ over \mathbf{E}_ϕ to $(\mathbf{M}_{\phi, U}, \lambda_{\phi, U})$ over U . On the other

⁵Note also that, because ϕ is injective (resp. ϕ has finite cokernel), γ_Y (resp. γ_X) is uniquely determined by γ_X (resp. γ_Y) and, hence, the projection onto the second (resp. first) component is injective and identifies $GL(\phi)$ with a subgroup of those elements γ of $GL(\mathbb{X})$ (resp. $GL(\mathbb{Y})$) such that $\gamma(\phi(\mathbb{Y})) \subset \phi(\mathbb{Y})$ (resp. such that the scalar extension $\gamma_{Y, \mathbb{Q}} \in GL(\mathbb{Y}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ of γ_Y preserves \mathbb{X}).

⁶We remark that the morphism $1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \phi$ yields a morphism $\phi_* : \mathbb{S}_{1_Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_\phi$ such that $\phi_* \circ Q_{1_Y} = Q_\phi \circ (1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \phi) =: \phi^*(Q_\phi)$ and, dually, we have $\mathbb{B}_\phi \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{1_Y}$ sending b to $\phi^*(b) := b \circ (1 \otimes \phi)$. These relationships can be used in order to reduce some of the statement below to the case $\phi = 1_Y$.

⁷Indeed, with reference to the previous footnote, we have $\phi^*(Q_\phi) = \phi_* \circ Q_{1_Y}$, implying that $\phi^*(Q_\phi)(y, y) = \phi_*(Q_{1_Y}(y, y))$ and, hence, $\langle \phi^*(Q_\phi)(y, y), b \rangle = \langle Q_{1_Y}(y, y), b \rangle$. By definition, we have $\mathbb{C}_\phi = (\phi^*)^{-1}(\mathbb{C}_{1_Y})$ and the boundary of \mathbb{C}_ϕ is defined by the condition that $\phi^*(b) \in \mathbb{C}_{1_Y}$ is not definite. Because σ is contained in the interior of \mathbb{C}_ϕ we deduce that, for every $b \in \sigma$, the form b is positive definite, which means that $\langle Q_{1_Y}(y, y), b \rangle = b(y, y) > 0$. (Cfr. [8, pag. 103-104] or [23, §2.1]).

hand, since \mathbb{Y} and \mathbb{X} are constant, we can extend $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and \mathbb{Y} to S . Hence, we can define

$$(\mathbf{G}_{\phi,\sigma}/\mathfrak{Spec}(R_{\phi,\sigma}), \lambda_{\phi,\sigma}) := \mathbf{M}_{pol}(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{X},S}, \mathbb{Y}_S, \mathbf{M}_{\phi,U}, \lambda_{\phi,U}) \in \text{Deg}_{U,S,S_0,pol}^{tor}.$$

We can consider more general level structures as follows. Suppose that $f : M \rightarrow M'$ is a morphism between motives, viewed as complexes (of fppf sheaves) concentrated in degrees $[-1, 0]$: then $\ker(f) := H^{-1}(\text{Cone}(f))$; when f is an isogeny, $\ker(f)$ is a finite flat group scheme which comes equipped with a filtration (see [23, §1.2.4]). In the special case where $f = n$ and $M = [Y \rightarrow T]$ has maximal torus rank g , we write $M[n] := \ker(f)$ and everything reduces to the connected-étale exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T[n] \longrightarrow M[n] \longrightarrow \frac{Y}{nY} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Furthermore, if $(T, Y, M, \lambda) \in \text{Mum}_{U,S,S_0,pol,+}^{tor}$ and $G := \mathbf{M}_{pol}(T, Y, M, \lambda)$, then $M[n]$ is canonically identified with $G_U[n]$ (see [23, Théorème 1.3.3.3] and [8, Ch. III, §7]) and, hence (applying the above discussion to $M = [Y_U \rightarrow T_U]$), we see that there is a canonical exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_U[n] \longrightarrow G_U[n] \longrightarrow \frac{Y}{nY} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Also, $M^t[n]$ is the Cartier dual of $M[n]$ and, hence, $G_U^t[n]$ is the Cartier dual of $G_U[n]$. In particular, when $\lambda = (\phi_Y, \phi_Y^t)$ is such that $\#_{\phi(Y)}^X$ is prime to n (where $X := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{gr}(T, \mathbf{G}_m)$), then λ yields an isomorphism $M[n] \xrightarrow{\sim} M^t[n]$.

We apply this discussion in two ways as follows.

- (i) Suppose that $n = N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ is prime to $\#_{\phi(Y)}^{\mathbb{X}}$ and that $N \cdot \#_{\phi(Y)}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is invertible. Then we can replace the 4-tuples considered above by 5-tuples $(M, \lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ in which we have added the datum of a symplectic isomorphism (of fppf sheaves) $\gamma : \frac{\mathbb{Z}^{2g}}{N\mathbb{Z}^{2g}} \xrightarrow{\sim} M[N]$. Then this moduli problem is relatively representable over the 4-tuples by a finite étale morphism, namely the torus $\mathbf{E}_{\phi,N} := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{gr}(N^{-1}\mathbb{S}_{\phi}, \mathbf{G}_m) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_{\phi}$. More generally, suppose that $K \subset \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}(\mathbb{A}_f)$ is any open compact subgroup as at the beginning of §3, i.e. we have $K_{d,N} \subset K \subset K_{d,1}$. Then one can consider K -level structures and one gets a torus $\mathbf{E}_{\phi,K}$ étale over \mathbf{E}_{ϕ} with character group $\mathbb{S}_{\phi,K} \supset \mathbb{S}_{\phi}$ and $\mathbb{B}_{\phi,K} := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{S}_{\phi,K}, \mathbb{Z})$ can be used as an integral structure in order to define $GL_{\phi,K}$ -invariant polyhedral decompositions. More precisely, one should consider conical complexes obtained by considering several γ 's (cfr. [8, pag. 129]): however, if one content itself to work with a single geometrically connected component of the K -level Shimura variety (determined by the choice of a primitive N -root of unity), then one can fix a single γ and work with smooth GL_{ϕ} -admissible polyhedral decompositions (cfr. [8, pag. 126]). We get \mathbf{M}_{ϕ} , a ring $R_{\phi,K,\sigma}$ and $(\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma}/\mathfrak{Spec}(R_{\phi,K,\sigma}), \lambda_{\phi,K,\sigma})$ and the fact that $M[n]$ is canonically identified with $G_U[n]$ under Mumford construction yields a canonical K -level structure $\gamma_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}$ on $\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}$ where U is defined similarly as above.
- (ii) Suppose that $n = p^m$ is a prime such that $p \nmid N \cdot \#_{\phi(Y)}^{\mathbb{X}}$ and that $N \cdot \#_{\phi(Y)}^{\mathbb{X}}$ is invertible. Then taking the inverse limit of the canonical isomorphisms $\frac{\mathbb{X}}{p^m\mathbb{X}} \simeq \mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}^t[p^m]^{\text{ét}}$ yields a canonical isomorphism

$$\psi_{\phi,K,\sigma,U} : \mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X} \xrightarrow{\sim} T\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}^t[p^{\infty}]^{\text{ét}}.$$

In particular, we see that $x_{\phi,K,\sigma,U} := (\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}, \lambda_{\phi,K,\sigma}, \gamma_{\phi,K,\sigma,U})$ is ordinary at p (meaning that $\#\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}[p](k(u)) \geq g$ for every geometric point $u = \mathfrak{Spec}(k(u))$ of U) and $(x_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}, \psi_{\phi,K,\sigma,U})$ defines a point of the Igusa tower classifying (over the K -level Shimura variety) isomorphisms between $\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X}$ and $TA^t[p^{\infty}]^{\text{ét}}$. Equivalently, for every fixed isomorphism $\psi_o : \mathbb{Z}_p^g \simeq \mathbb{Z}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X}$, we can lift $x_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}$ to a point $(x_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}, \psi_{\phi,K,\sigma,U} \circ \psi_o)$ of the standard Igusa tower.

Let now $U \subset S = \mathfrak{Spec}(R_{\phi,K,\sigma})$ be as in (i) above. It follows from Mumford's construction that there is a canonical morphism from $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{X},U}$ to $\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}$ (the “quotient by \mathbb{Y} ”) inducing an isomorphism $\omega_{\text{dR},\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}/U} \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\text{dR},\mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{X},U}}$ and similarly for the dual semi-abelian scheme $\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma}^t$ (which is related to $\mathbf{M}_{\phi,K}^t$). As a consequence of Remark 4.1, we find canonical isomorphisms

$$(4.2) \quad \alpha_{\phi,K,\sigma}^t : \mathcal{O}_U \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\text{dR},\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}/U}^t \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\phi,K,\sigma} : \mathcal{O}_U \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{X} \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\text{dR},\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}/U}.$$

Proposition 4.2. *Up to the identifications provided by (4.2), we have that $KS_{\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma,U/U}}$ equals the \mathcal{O}_U -linear extension (of the analogue) of (4.1) (with \mathbb{S}_{ϕ} replaced by $\mathbb{S}_{\phi,K}$ and \mathbf{E}_{ϕ} by $\mathbf{E}_{\phi,K}$).*

Proof. In view of Remark 4.1, the result follows from [8, Ch. III, 9.4 Theorem]. \square

We now focus on the Siegel modular variety $X = X_K$ which is the compactification of the moduli space classifying abelian schemes of dimension g , polarizations of type d and K -level structure, where K is as at the beginning of §3, i.e. we have $K_{d,N} \subset K \subset K_{d,1}$ and we always work over a ring \mathbb{k} containing $\mathbb{Z}[1/d_1 \dots d_g N, \zeta_N]$, ζ_N being a primitive N -root of unity: we then take $\phi = \Delta : \mathbb{Z}^g \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^g$ where Δ is the diagonal matrix with diagonal given by a vector $d = (d_1, \dots, d_g)$ (indeed, by the Elementary Divisor Theorem, we can always find an isomorphism of ϕ with such a Δ).

For each geometrically connected component ∞ of X , we get a cusp

$$x_{\infty} : X_{\infty} = \mathfrak{Spec}(R_{\phi,K,\sigma}) \longrightarrow X$$

equipped with $(\mathbf{G}_{\phi,K,\sigma}/\mathfrak{Spec}(R_{\phi,K,\sigma}), \lambda_{\phi,K,\sigma}, \gamma_{\phi,K,\sigma,U}^{\infty})$ as above and a canonical trivialization $\alpha_{\phi,K,\sigma}$ (see (4.2)). We remark that $R_{\phi,K,\sigma}$ and $R_U := \mathcal{O}_U(U)$ are both contained in $\mathbb{k}[[N^{-1}\mathbb{S}_{\phi}]]$, that the morphism $\phi \otimes 1$ sends $N^{-1}\mathbb{S}_{\phi}$ injectively into $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathbb{X}) = \mathrm{Sym}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^2$ and that, thanks to (2.32), we have $N^{-1}\mathrm{Sym}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} N^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^{\mathrm{even}}$. It follows that there are inclusions

$$R_{\phi,K,\sigma} \subset R_U \subset \mathbb{k}[[N^{-1}\mathbb{S}_{\phi}]] \hookrightarrow \mathbb{k}[[N^{-1}\mathrm{Sym}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^2]] \simeq \mathbb{k}[[N^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^{\mathrm{even}}]] \subset \mathbb{k}[[N^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}]],$$

Evaluating $f \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{W}_{\rho})$ at $(x_{\infty}, \alpha_{\phi,K,\sigma})$ we get a q -expansion

$$(4.3) \quad f(x_{\infty}, \alpha_{\phi,K,\sigma}) = \sum_{s \in \mathrm{Sym}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^2} a_f(s) q^{N^{-1}s} = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{S}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^{\mathrm{even}}} a_f(\beta) q^{N^{-1}\beta} \in R_U \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho,$$

where we adopt the convention of writing $q^{N^{-1}s}$ (resp. $q^{N^{-1}\beta}$) for the element $N^{-1}s$ (resp. $N^{-1}\beta$) viewed in the corresponding group ring. One has that $f \in H^0(X, \mathcal{W}_{\rho})$ if and only if the q -expansion is supported at semipositive definite β 's and the Koecher principle implies that, when $g \geq 2$, then $H^0(Y, \mathcal{W}_{\rho}) = H^0(X, \mathcal{W}_{\rho})$. For every $i \leq j$, let us write $\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ for the symmetric matrix whose unique upper triangular non-zero entry is 1 at position (i, j) and set $q_{ij} := q^{\underline{\beta}_{ij}}$. Then

$$q^{N^{-1}\beta} = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq g} q_{ij}^{N^{-1}\beta_{ij}}$$

if $\beta \in \mathbf{S}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}$ has $\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ -component $\beta_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Recall the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism $KS_{\alpha_{\phi,K,\sigma}}$ of (3.5).

Corollary 4.3. *We have $KS_{\alpha_{\phi,K,\sigma}}(e_i e_j) = (1 + \delta_{ij}) \frac{dq_{ij}}{q_{ij}}$.*

Proof. Note that (2.32) sends $e_i e_j \in \mathrm{Sym}_{g,\mathbb{Z}}^2$ to $\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ when $i \neq j$ and $2\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ when $i = j$. Hence, the result is just a consequence of Proposition 4.2 and the definition of $KS_{\alpha_0} := KS_X \circ \vartheta_{\alpha_0}^{-1}$. \square

5. p -DEPLETIONS AND p -ADIC INTEGRATION OVER THE IGUSA TOWER

In this section, we let $X = X_K$ be the Siegel modular variety which is the compactification of the moduli space $Y = Y_K$ classifying abelian schemes of dimension g , polarizations of type d and K -level structure, where K is as at the beginning of §3, i.e. we have $K_{d,N} \subset K \subset K_{d,1}$. We work over the ring of integers \mathbb{k} of a finite extension of \mathbb{Q}_p such that Y is defined over it (we can always take $\mathbb{k} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_N)}$ for a primitive N -root of unity ζ_N), where $p \nmid d_1 \dots d_g N$. We let $X^{\mathrm{ord}} \subset X$ (resp. $Y^{\mathrm{ord}} \subset Y$) be the open subscheme obtained as the complement of the non-ordinary locus $X_{\mathbb{k}_p}$ (resp. $Y_{\mathbb{k}_p}$) for the residue field \mathbb{k}_p of \mathbb{k} , so that $X^{\mathrm{ord}} = X[1/H]$ (resp. $Y^{\mathrm{ord}} = Y[1/H]$) for a suitable p -power H of the Hasse invariant (at p). Write $\mathfrak{X}^{\mathrm{ord}} \subset \mathfrak{X}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{Y}^{\mathrm{ord}} \subset \mathfrak{Y}$) for the open immersion obtained by considering the formal completion of $X^{\mathrm{ord}} \subset X$ (resp. $Y^{\mathrm{ord}} \subset Y$). Over the formal scheme $\mathfrak{Z}^{\mathrm{ord}}$ for $\mathfrak{Z} \in \{\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{Y}\}$ there is a Igusa tower $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathfrak{Z}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}^{\mathrm{ord}}$ classifying isomorphisms of proétale sheaves $\mathbb{Z}_p^g \xrightarrow{\sim} TB^t[p^{\infty}]^{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$ over $\mathfrak{Z}^{\mathrm{ord}}$ where $B = G$ (resp. $B = A$) for $\mathfrak{Z} = \mathfrak{X}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{Z} = \mathfrak{Y}$). The Hodge-Tate map yields a canonical isomorphism of proétale sheaves $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Z}^{\mathrm{ord}}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} TB^t[p^{\infty}]^{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\mathfrak{Z}^{\mathrm{ord}}, \mathrm{dR}}$ (cfr. [15, §3.3]), where $\omega_{\mathfrak{Z}^{\mathrm{ord}}, \mathrm{dR}} = \omega_{\mathfrak{B}/\mathfrak{Z}^{\mathrm{ord}}, \mathrm{dR}}$ denotes the relative dual Lie

algebra and $\mathfrak{B}/\mathfrak{Z}^{\text{ord}}$ is the p -adic completion of $B_{Z^{\text{ord}}}/Z^{\text{ord}} = G_{X^{\text{ord}}}/X^{\text{ord}}$ (resp. $B_{Z^{\text{ord}}}/Z^{\text{ord}} = A_{Y^{\text{ord}}}/Y^{\text{ord}}$) for $\mathfrak{Z} = \mathfrak{X}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{Z} = \mathfrak{Y}$). Hence, we get a canonical trivialization

$$\alpha_{\mathfrak{Z}_3} : \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Z}_3}^g \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{\mathfrak{Z}_3, \text{dR}}.$$

Let $X_{\infty} \rightarrow X$ be a cusp and let $\mathfrak{X}_{\infty} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ be the p -adic formal completion (hence X_{∞} and \mathfrak{X}_{∞} have the same global sections, but they are different as topological spaces). As explained in §4 (ii), the morphism $\mathfrak{X}_{\infty} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ canonically lift to $\mathfrak{X}_{\infty} \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}_{\mathfrak{X}} =: \mathfrak{J}$. Thanks to the irreducibility of the Igusa tower, the q -expansion principle also holds for the sections of the Igusa tower, up to considering a cusp $x_{\infty} : \mathfrak{X}_{\infty} \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}$ for each geometrically connected component of $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{ord}}$ (see [10, Corollary 8.17]): it implies that, as it is for $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{ord}}$, a section of a sheaf that is a direct sum of locally free finite \mathcal{O}_{X_0} -modules is uniquely determined by its pull-backs to the cusps x_{∞} .

Notation 5.1. We will write $X_0 \rightarrow X$ for one between the morphisms (of locally ringed spaces) between $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{ord}} \rightarrow X$, $\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow X$, $X_{\infty} \rightarrow X$ or $\mathfrak{X}_{\infty} \rightarrow X$ and, for $X_0 \in \{\mathfrak{J}, X_{\infty}, \mathfrak{X}_{\infty}\}$, we let $\alpha_0 : \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^g \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{X_0, \text{dR}}$ be the corresponding trivialization, namely $\alpha_0 = \alpha_{\mathfrak{J}}$ over \mathfrak{J} , $\alpha_0 = \alpha_{\infty} := \alpha_{\phi, K, \sigma}$ over X_{∞} (see (4.2)) or the trivialization induced by α_{∞} over \mathfrak{X}_{∞} , denoted again α_{∞} : there will be no fear of confusion because these trivializations are compatible under the pull-back with respect to the natural morphisms between the various X_0 's described above. If \mathcal{F} is a sheaf on X , we will simply write $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}(X_0)$ for the global section of the pull-back of \mathcal{F} to X_0 . Finally, we will explicit mention when a result is specific for a subset of $\{\mathfrak{X}^{\text{ord}}, \mathfrak{J}, X_{\infty}, \mathfrak{X}_{\infty}\}$.

We will work with the (partially) compactified spaces, but everything we will prove below also holds for the respective non-compactified spaces. However, we will use the abbreviation $\Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p$ for $\Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^{\log, p}$ and similarly for the derivations.

Remark 5.2. For psicological reasons, we will work with $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}_{2g}$. For a more general $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GSp}(V, \psi)$, suffices to replace everywhere the standard symplectic basis with its image in V under the isomorphism θ of Example 2.12 and then to replace $\partial, \partial_i \in \mathfrak{gsp}_{2g}$ with their image in \mathfrak{g} under the isomorphism $c_{\theta} : \mathfrak{gsp}_{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{g}$ (cfr. the definition of $X(D, \alpha)$ before Lemma 3.6).

5.1. Description of the de Rham complex. For every representation $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m)$, we have (see Remark 3.4)

$$(5.1) \quad \vartheta_{\alpha_0} : \mathcal{W}_{\rho}(X_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{X_0}(X_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho =: R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho.$$

We view the objects of $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{GL}_g)$ in $\text{Rep}(\mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m)$ by restriction with respect to the projection from $\mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m$ to \mathbf{GL}_g . Let us write e_i for the standard basis vector in Std_g whose only non zero component is 1 in the i -position, where Std_g is the standard representation of \mathbf{GL}_g given by column vectors on which \mathbf{GL}_g acts from the left, and define $\delta_i := \alpha_0(e_i) \in \omega_{X_0, \text{dR}}$. Fix a bijection $\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq g\} \simeq \{1, \dots, d_g\}$ such that (i, i) corresponds to i . The Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism allows us to define, for every $X_0 \in \{\mathfrak{J}, X_{\infty}, \mathfrak{X}_{\infty}\}$, the canonical differentials

$$(5.2) \quad \omega_i := KS(\delta_i^2) \in \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^1 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, g \text{ and } \omega_i := KS(\delta_k \delta_l) \in \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^1 \text{ for } g < i \leq d_g,$$

where (k, l) corresponds to i under our fixed bijection.

Recall that we view q -expansions as taking values in $\mathbb{k}[[N^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}]]$ and that we write $q^{N^{-1}\beta}$ for $N^{-1}\beta \in N^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}$ viewed in this ring. Also, if $i \leq j$, we defined $\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ to be the symmetric matrix whose unique upper triangular non-zero entry is 1 at position (i, j) and, if $\beta \in \mathbf{S}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}$, we defined $\beta_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ as being the $\underline{\beta}_{ij}$ -component of β . Similarly as above, it will be convenient to set $\beta_i := \beta_{ii}$ (resp. $q_i := q_{ij}$) for $i = 1, \dots, g$ and $\beta_i := \beta_{kl}$ (resp. $q_i := q_{kl}$) for $i > g$ where (k, l) corresponds to i .

Remark 5.3. We can reformulate Corollary 4.3 by saying that, if $X_0 \in \{X_{\infty}, \mathfrak{X}_{\infty}\}$, then $\omega_i = 2 \frac{dq_i}{q_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$ and $\omega_i = \frac{dq_i}{q_i}$ for $i > g$. Since

$$\nabla^1 \left(\frac{dq_i}{q_i} \right) = d \left(\frac{1}{q_i} \right) \wedge dq_i = -\frac{1}{q_i^2} dq_i \wedge dq_i = 0,$$

we have $d^1(\omega_i) = 0$.

The following result is a restatement of Remark 5.3.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that $X_0 \in \{X_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty\}$ and consider the \mathbb{k} -linear derivations $\theta_i : R_0 \rightarrow R_0$ defined by the rule $\theta_i(q^\beta) = \frac{1}{2}\beta_i q^\beta$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$ and $\theta_i(q^\beta) = \beta_i q^\beta$ otherwise for $i > g$. Then $\{\theta_i : i = 1, \dots, d_g\}$ is the dual basis of $\{\omega_i : i = 1, \dots, d_g\}$.*

Of course, we remark that the definition of θ_i (as the dual of ω_i) makes sense over the Igusa tower and defines

$$\theta_i : H^0(\mathfrak{I}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{I}}) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathfrak{I}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{I}}).$$

Choose any polynomial

$$P \in \mathbb{Z}_p[T_i : i = 1, \dots, d_g]$$

and, setting $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d_g})$, consider the differential operator

$$\theta_P := P(\theta) : H^0(\mathfrak{I}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{I}}) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathfrak{I}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{I}}).$$

According to Lemma 5.4, we have

$$\theta_P(f)(q) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{s}_{g, \mathbb{Z}}^{\text{even}}} a_f(\beta) P'(\beta) q^\beta$$

where $P'(T_1, \dots, T_g, T_{g+1}, \dots) = P(2^{-1}T_1, \dots, 2^{-1}T_g, T_{g+1}, \dots)$ and $f(q)$ is as in (4.3). In particular, choosing any sequence $\{s_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $s_n \rightarrow +\infty$ in the archimedean topology but converging to zero p -adically and considering the product of the p -adic topologies on the coefficients of the q -expansions, we see that the rule

$$e^{[P]}(f(q)) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\theta_P^{s_n}(f)(q)) = \sum_{\beta: p \nmid P'(\beta)} a_f(\beta) q^\beta$$

defines a q -expansion which does not depend on the choice of the sequence $\{s_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Indeed, it follows from the q -expansion principle that we can define an idempotent

$$e^{[P]} : H^0(\mathfrak{I}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{I}}) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathfrak{I}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{I}}) \text{ via } e^{[P]}(f(q)) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \theta_P^{s_n}(f)$$

whose description in terms of q -expansion is as above: $e^{[P]}(f)(q) = e^{[P]}(f(q))$. We set $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})^{[P]} := e^{[P]}H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$ and, more generally, if ρ is a representation of $\mathbf{GL}_g \times \mathbf{G}_m$,

$$H^0(X_0, \mathcal{W}_\rho)^{[P]} := e^{[P]}H^0(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho =: e^{[P]}(R_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho.$$

(where we use the canonical trivialization (5.1)). As a consequence of the formula $e^{[P]}(f)(q) = e^{[P]}(f(q))$, we deduce the following fact.

Lemma 5.5. *If $X_0 \in \{\mathfrak{I}, X_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty\}$, the operator θ_P restricts to an invertible operator on $H^0(X_0, \mathcal{W}_\rho)^{[P]}$.*

We assume, until the end of §5.1, that $X_0 \in \{\mathfrak{I}, X_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty\}$. The Gauss-Manin connection ∇ allows us to define

$$\eta_i := \nabla(\theta_i)(\delta_i) \in H^0(X_0, \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, g$$

and, indeed, in this way the trivialization $\alpha_0 : \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^g \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{X_0}$ can be extended to a trivialization $\alpha_{\text{dR}, 0} : \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^\times$ (and, indeed, in the \mathbf{Q}° -torsor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \text{dR}}^\times \subset \mathcal{T}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^\times$ of Remark 3.2, see the proof of Lemma 5.7 below).

Remark 5.6. *Another equivalent definition η'_i of η_i making evident that the basis $\{\delta_i, \eta'_j\}_{i,j=1}^g$ yields an isomorphism $\alpha_{\text{dR}, 0} : \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}, \text{dR}}^\times$, not relying on the proof of Lemma 5.7 (hence, on Fonseca's calculation [9, Theorem 6.4], as explained below), is obtained as follows. According to [9, Proposition 1.9 (2)], to give an ordered symplectic-Hodge basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1$ is the same thing as to give an ordered basis of ω_{dR, X_0} and a maximal isotropic $\mathcal{O}_{X_0}^{2g}$ -subspace $\bar{\omega}_{\text{dR}, X_0} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1$ such that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1 = \omega_{\text{dR}, X_0} \oplus \bar{\omega}_{\text{dR}, X_0}$: every ordered basis $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^g$ of ω_{dR, X_0} uniquely extend to an ordered symplectic-Hodge basis $\{w_i, \bar{w}_i\}_{i=1}^g$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1$ with the property that \bar{w}_i is the dual of w_i and $\{\bar{w}_i\}_{i=1}^g \subset \bar{\omega}_{\text{dR}, X_0}$. Thanks to the unit root splitting (5.11) recalled before Lemma 5.11 below, we can take $\bar{\omega}_{\text{dR}, X_0} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^{1, \varphi=1}$: indeed, it is isotropic because the symplectic pairing $\langle -, - \rangle$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1$ satisfies the equality $\langle \varphi(x), \varphi(y) \rangle = p \langle x, y \rangle$ (as it follows from the fact that it arises by*

duality from the symplectic pairing of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}}^{1,\vee}$ obtained by evaluation at the first Chern class $c_{1,\text{dR}}(\mathcal{L}) \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}}^{2,\varphi=p}$ of the relatively ample line bundle \mathcal{L} giving rise to the polarization); hence, it is maximal isotropic in view of the unit root splitting. It then follows that we can uniquely extend $\{\delta_i\}_{i=1}^g$ to an ordered symplectic-Hodge basis $\{\delta_i, \eta'_j\}_{i,j=1}^g$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dR},X_0}^1$ with the property that η'_i is the dual of δ_i and $\{\eta'_i\}_{i=1}^g \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=1}$. From this point of view, the fact that $\{\delta_i, \eta_j\}_{i,j=1}^g$ is another symplectic-Hodge basis extending $\{\delta_i\}_{i=1}^g$ such that η_i is the dual of δ_i (by Fonseca's calculation) and $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^g \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=1}$ (as proved in Lemma 5.11 below) implies that $\{\eta'_j\} = \{\eta_j\}$.

For every $\rho \in \text{Rep}_{fl\text{-}alg}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$, consider the ∇_ρ -operator

$$\nabla_\rho : H^0(X_0, \mathcal{E}_\rho) \longrightarrow H^0(X_0, \mathcal{E}_\rho \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^1).$$

The choice of the trivialization $\alpha_{\text{dR},0}$ induces

$$(5.3) \quad \vartheta_{\alpha_{\text{dR},0}} : \mathcal{E}_\rho(X_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_X(X_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho = R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho.$$

By definition of $\nabla_\rho(\theta_i)$ and the fact that θ_i is the dual of ω_i , we see that $f \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v \in R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho$ is sent to

$$\nabla_\rho(f \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_g} \nabla_\rho(\theta_i)(f \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v) \omega_i = \sum_{i=1}^{d_g} (\theta_i(f) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v + X(\theta_i, \alpha_0)(f \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v)) \otimes_{R_0} \omega_i.$$

Consider the elements

$$\partial_{ij} \in \mathfrak{u}^- \simeq \text{Sym}^2(\text{Std}_g)^\vee$$

corresponding to $e_i^t e_j^t$ under the isomorphism of Lemma 2.16: hence, in \mathfrak{u}^- the matrix ∂_{ij} is characterized by the fact that its lower left g -by- g entry is the symmetric matrix whose upper triangular part has all zero except a 1 in (i, j) -entry. As usual, set $\partial_i := \partial_{ii}$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$ and $\partial_i := \partial_{kl}$ for $i > g$, where (k, l) corresponds to i under our fixed bijection.

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose that $X_0 \in \{X_\infty, \mathfrak{X}_\infty\}$. For every*

$$\partial \in \mathfrak{u}^- \simeq \text{Sym}^2(\text{Std}_g)^\vee (1) \xrightarrow{(3.6)} \text{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{O}_{X_0})$$

with image $\theta_\partial \in \text{Der}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{O}_{X_0})$, we have $X(\theta_\partial, \alpha_\infty) = 1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \partial$ on $R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho$ and, furthermore, $X(\theta_i, \alpha_\infty) = 1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \partial_i$.

Proof. The claim is reduced to verification that $\nabla \eta_i = 0$, $\nabla(\theta_{ij})(\delta_i) = \eta_j$, $\nabla(\theta_{ij})(\delta_j) = \eta_i$ and $\nabla(\theta_{ij})(\delta_k) = 0$ for every $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ with $k \notin \{i, j\}$, where $\theta_{ij} : R_0 \rightarrow R_0$ is defined by the rule $\theta_{ii}(q^\beta) = \frac{1}{2}\beta_{ii}q^\beta$ and $\theta_{kl}(q^\beta) = \beta_{kl}q^\beta$ if $k \neq l$ (so that $\theta_i = \theta_{ii}$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$ and $\theta_i := \theta_{kl}$ for $i > g$ where (k, l) corresponds to i)⁸. For principally polarized abelian schemes, this is the content of [9, Theorem 6.4], taking into account [9, Proposition 5.17 and Remark 5.18], which also proves the fact that setting $\eta_i := \nabla(\theta_i)(\delta_i)$ extends the trivialization $\mathcal{O}_{X_0}^g \xrightarrow{\sim} \omega_{X_0}$ to $\alpha_{\text{dR},0} : \mathcal{O}_{X_0}^{2g} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR},X_0}^1$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H},\text{dR}}^{\circ \times}$, as claimed above. Let us explain how these claims extend to the more general PEL setting. As explained in [9, §11.4], these results follow from their complex analytic counterparts, namely [9, Theorem 11.2] and [9, Proposition 11.7] and the same reduction holds in the PEL setting. Suppose we are considering abelian schemes with polarization of type $d = (d_1, \dots, d_g)$ and let Δ be the diagonal matrix with diagonal given by the vector d . Then in [9, Example 9.8, Example 10.4 and Proposition 10.5] we have simply to replace the lattice $\mathbb{Z} + \tau\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{C}^g$ with the lattice $\mathbb{Z} + \tau\mathbb{Z}^g \subset \mathbb{C}^g$, the Hermitian metric is again given by the matrix $\text{Im}(\tau)^{-1}$ and a d -integral symplectic basis of $R^1 p_{g*}(\mathbb{Z})$ is given by the sections $\gamma_i(\tau) := d_i e_i$ (rather than $\gamma_i(\tau) := e_i$) and $\delta_i(\tau) := \tau e_i$, where we define a d -integral symplectic basis $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_g, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_g\}$ by the condition that $\langle \gamma_i, \gamma_j \rangle = \langle \delta_i, \delta_j \rangle$ and $\langle \gamma_i, \delta_j \rangle = \Delta_{ij}$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ (see [3, Ch. VI, proof of Théorème 1.3 and Ch. VII, §1]; here $\delta_i(\tau)$ has nothing to do with the differentials δ_i considered above). Then all the results of loc.cit. hold unchanged: the only point that involves a priori a modification is the calculation of $\int_{\gamma_i} \eta_k^{ij}$ in the proof of [9, Proposition 11.3], which is however again zero. (Let us also remark that, since we assume that d is inverted, the notion of symplectic basis in de Rham cohomology holds unchanged as in [9, Definition 2.5] and they Zariski locally exist by [9, Lemma 1.5 and Proposition 1.9]). Furthermore, one can also deduce the result directly from the principally polarized case as follows. Suppose that $\varphi_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a polarization with kernel $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ étale locally

⁸Indeed, we remark that the relations $\nabla(\theta_{ij})(\delta_i) = \eta_j$, $\nabla(\theta_{ij})(\delta_j) = \eta_i$ and $\nabla(\theta_{ij})(\delta_k) = 0$ for every $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ with $k \notin \{i, j\}$ also follows from Lemma 5.4, in view of the definition of the Kodaira-Spencer morphism recalled in §3.

isomorphic to H_d^2 with $H_d = \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{d_1\mathbb{Z}} \times \dots \times \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{d_g\mathbb{Z}}$ and non-degenerate symplectic pairing $e_{\mathcal{L}}$ (see [3, Ch. VI, §4.4] for its definition from the complex point of view). Then one can consider the functor classifying triples $(A, \varphi_{\mathcal{L}}, H)$ where $(A, \varphi_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a polarized abelian scheme of type d and H is a totally isotropic subgroup of $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ étale locally isomorphic to H_d (cfr. Remark 3.1). This functor is the source of the following two morphisms. The former maps $(A, \varphi_{\mathcal{L}}, H)$ to $(A, \varphi_{\mathcal{L}})$ and the second maps it to the principally polarized abelian scheme $(A/H, \overline{\varphi}_{\mathcal{L}})$, where $\overline{\varphi}_{\mathcal{L}}$ denotes the induced polarization. As these two morphisms are finite étale, the result in the general PEL setting follows from the principally polarized case. \square

For every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, write $I_p \subset \{1, \dots, n\}^p$ for the set of multi-indexes $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p)$ such that $i_1 < \dots < i_p$ (we understand that $I_0 := \{\phi\}$). For every $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$, we write $\{\mathbf{i}\}$ for the set $\{i_1, \dots, i_p\}$ (we understand that $\{\phi\} = \phi$). With these notations, we define

$$\omega_{\mathbf{i}} := \omega_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{i_p} \in \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p(X_0).$$

Then (5.3) yields

$$(5.4) \quad H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{E}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p\right) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho \otimes_{R_{\infty}} \omega_{\mathbf{i}}.$$

Lemma 5.8. *If $X_0 = X_{\infty}$ and*

$$\omega = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} f_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_{R_{\infty}} \omega_{\mathbf{i}} \text{ and } \nabla_{\rho}^p(\omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in I_{p+1}} \nabla_{\rho}^p(\omega)_{\mathbf{j}} \otimes_{R_{\infty}} \omega_{\mathbf{j}},$$

writing $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{p+1})$ we have

$$\nabla_{\rho}^p(\omega)_{\mathbf{j}} = \sum_{k=1}^{p+1} (-1)^{k+1} \left(\theta_{j_k} \left(f_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_k}, \dots, j_{p+1})} \right) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_k}, \dots, j_{p+1})} + f_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_k}, \dots, j_{p+1})} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \partial_{j_k} v_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_k}, \dots, j_{p+1})} \right).$$

Proof. Since $d^1(\omega_i) = 0$ (see Remark 5.3), the result can be deduce from the above formula for ∇_{ρ} and Lemma 5.7. Indeed, an efficient way to implement the Leibnitz rule is to identify the de Rham complex with an appropriate Koszul complex, as explained after Proposition 5.22 below. \square

Regarding $\rho \otimes \wedge^p \text{Sym}_g^2$ as a \mathbf{Q} -module, the trivialization (5.3) yields

$$(5.5) \quad H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{E}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p\right) \xrightarrow{\sim} R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \wedge^p \text{Sym}_g^2 \simeq \bigoplus_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho \otimes_{R_{\infty}} \omega_{\mathbf{i}},$$

where, taking into account (5.2), the above isomorphism (5.5) \simeq (5.4) is given by the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism $\mathcal{W}_{\text{Sym}_g^2(-1)} \simeq \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^1$ inducing $\mathcal{W}_{\wedge^p \text{Sym}_g^2} \simeq \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p$. Using (5.5), we can define $H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{E}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p\right)^{[P]}$ by means of the following isomorphism

$$H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{E}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p\right)^{[P]} \xrightarrow{\sim} e^{[P]}(R_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \wedge^p \text{Sym}_g^2 = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} e^{[P]}(R_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho \otimes_{R_{\infty}} \omega_{\mathbf{i}}.$$

Corollary 5.9. *We have that $H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{E}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p\right)^{[P]}$ is a subcomplex.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Lemma 5.8 and the fact that θ_P operates on $e^{[P]}(R_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho = H^0(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho})^{[P]}$. \square

5.2. Acyclicity of p -depleted de Rham complexes. Consider the following diagram that we are going to describe⁹:

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \longrightarrow & \omega_{\text{dR}, X_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega_{\text{dR}, X_0}(1) & \longrightarrow & \omega_{\text{dR}, X_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^1(1) & \longrightarrow & \omega_{\text{dR}, X_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \text{Lie}_{\text{dR}, X_0}^t(1) & \longrightarrow 0 \\ & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & \omega_{\text{dR}, X_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega_{\text{dR}, X_0}(1) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J}'' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{X_0} & \longrightarrow 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & \text{Sym}^2(\omega_{\text{dR}, X_0})(1) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J}' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{X_0} & \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

⁹As explained in the first footnote of §3 and clarified in the proof of Lemma 5.12 below, the twists introduced in (5.6) and the ones previously considered in §3 are inserted in order to make everything Frobenius equivariant when restricting to X_0 . Also, the proof of Lemma 5.12 below shows that one has to impose the equality $\mathcal{E}_{\rho(-1)} = \mathcal{E}_{\rho}(1)$ if $\rho(-1) := \rho \otimes \nu^{-1}$ for the symplectic multiplier ν , where the Frobenius of $\mathcal{E}_{\rho}(1)$ is obtained multiplying the Frobenius of \mathcal{E}_{ρ} by p^{-1} .

The first row is obtained applying $\omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}(1) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} -$ to the exact sequence which gives the Hodge filtration of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^1$. Then, we identify $\omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0} \simeq \mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{t,\vee}(-1)$ using the symplectic pairing (cfr. §3), consider the canonical evaluation pairing $\mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^t \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{t,\vee} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_0}$ and pull-back the first row via the resulting \mathcal{O}_{X_0} -dual morphism $\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \rightarrow \omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \mathrm{Lie}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^t(1)$ to get the second row. Finally, we push-out the second row via the canonical morphism $\omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0} \rightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^2(\omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0})$ in order to get the third row. By construction the diagram is commutative with exact rows. The following result follows from Proposition 2.17 and the discussion preceding it (see (2.36)).

Lemma 5.10. *Taking the dual exact sequence of the third row of the above diagram yields the exact sequence*

$$(5.7) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{J} \longrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{J}}{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \longrightarrow 0$$

associated to \mathcal{E} . to (2.38).

Applying \mathcal{E} . to (2.21) and recalling that \mathcal{E} . restricts to \mathcal{W} . on $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbf{M})$ via (2.4), we see that there is an isomorphism

$$(5.8) \quad \mathcal{W}_\rho \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathrm{Sym}^r(\mathcal{J}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{V}_\rho^{\leq r}$$

functorial in $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$. We will now assume that a section $p_0 : \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^1 \rightarrow \omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}$ of the inclusion $\omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^1$ has been fixed. By construction it induces a splitting of all the rows appearing in (5.6) and then, thanks to Lemma 5.10, we get a splitting

$$(5.9) \quad \mathcal{J} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \oplus \mathrm{Sym}^2(\omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0})^\vee(1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \oplus \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{Sym}_g^{2,\vee}(-1)}$$

of the exact sequence (5.7). It will be convenient to set $\rho_i := \rho \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathrm{Sym}_g^{2,\vee})(-i)$, so that (5.8) together with (5.9) yields the decompositions functorial in $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}_f(\mathbf{M})$

$$(5.10) \quad \mathcal{V}_\rho \simeq \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \text{ and } \mathcal{V}_\rho \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p \simeq \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p \simeq \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i \otimes \wedge^p(\mathrm{Sym}_g^2(-1))},$$

where the second identifications are induced by the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{Sym}_g^2(-1)} \simeq \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^1$ inducing $\mathcal{W}_{\wedge^p(\mathrm{Sym}_g^2(-1))} \simeq \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p$.

In particular, thanks to [14, Theorem 4.1] and [15, Lemma 4.2.1], we can consider the unit root splitting

$$(5.11) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^1 = \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=p} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=1}, \text{ where } \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=p} = \omega_{\mathrm{dR},X_0},$$

φ is the σ -linear morphism induced by the morphism of X^{ord} onto itself sending G to the quotient by the connected part of $G[p]$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=p^r}$ is the submodule where the σ -linear Frobenius φ acts with slope r . Indeed, as proved in Lemma 5.11 below (see also [15, Lemma 4.2.1]), one has that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=p^r}$ is spanned as an \mathcal{O}_{X_0} -module by a \mathbb{Z}_p -module free of rank g on which $\varphi = p^r$.

Lemma 5.11. *We have that $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^g \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^{1,\varphi=1}$ and, indeed, $\varphi(\delta_i) = p\delta_i$ and $\varphi(\eta_i) = \eta_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$.*

Proof. The fact that $\varphi(\delta_i) = p\delta_i$ follows from (4.2) and, then, the relation $\varphi(\eta_i) = \eta_i$ will follow if we can check that

$$\varphi \circ \nabla(\theta_i) = p^{-1} \cdot \nabla(\theta_i) \circ \varphi.$$

By definition, we have $\nabla(\theta_i) := (1 \otimes \tilde{\theta}_i) \circ \nabla$, where $\tilde{\theta}_i : \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_0}$ denotes the \mathcal{O}_{X_0} -linear morphism associated to the derivation $\theta_i : \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_0}$. But according to Lemma 5.4 (where $\tilde{\theta}_i$ is abusively denoted again θ_i), we have that $\tilde{\theta}_i(\omega_j) = \delta_{ij}$, where ω_i satisfies $\varphi(\omega_i) = p\omega_i$ (because it is a multiple of $\frac{dq_i}{q_i}$ by an element of \mathbb{k} and φ operates on q -expansion by sending q^β to $q^{p\beta}$, see [8, pag. 247, pa262 and Ch. VII, 4.2 Theorem and 4.4 Proposition]). One deduces from this fact that $1 \otimes \tilde{\theta}_i \circ (\varphi \otimes \varphi) = p \cdot \varphi \circ (1 \otimes \tilde{\theta}_i)$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{dR},X_0}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^1$. Because by functoriality of the Gauss-Manin connection, φ satisfies the relation $(\varphi \otimes \varphi) \circ \nabla = \nabla \circ \varphi$, the claimed relation follows. \square

Lemma 5.12. *If $p_0 = p^{\mathrm{ord}}$ is the unit root splitting, then under the trivializations $\mathcal{V}_\rho \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathrm{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \rho_i$ given by (5.3), the first decomposition in (5.10) corresponds to $\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} (2.20)$.*

Proof. Because the first decomposition in (5.10) (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} (2.20)$) is induced by (5.8) (resp. (2.21)) and the splitting (5.9) (resp. the splitting given by the graduation on $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\text{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}$), suffices to check that the splitting (5.9) equals $\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}}$ – applied to the splitting given by the graduation on $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\text{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}$. By definition of $\alpha_{\text{dR},0}$, the ordered symplectic-Hodge basis provided by the standard basis $\{e_i, f_j\}_{i,j=1}^g$ is sent via $\alpha_{\text{dR},0}$ to $\{\delta_i, \eta_j\}_{i,j=1}^g$ (see the discussion before Remark 5.6). Hence, it follows from Lemma 5.11 that the Frobenious φ on the left hand side of

$$\vartheta_{\alpha_{\text{dR},0}} = \alpha_{\text{dR},0}^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_{\text{dR},X_0}^1 \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} V$$

is given on the right hand side of this identification by the Frobenious element

$$m_0 := \begin{pmatrix} p \cdot 1_g & 0_g \\ 0_g & 1_g \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{M}$$

We deduce that (5.11) is induced by the decomposition of V as an $\langle m_0 \rangle$ -module. It also follows from Remark 5.6 that the symplectic pairing (3.1) is equivariant (with the convention that the twist by -1 means that the Frobenious is multiplied by p): it then follows that all the arrows appearing in (5.6) are φ -equivariant. On the other hand, because $m_0 \in \mathbf{Q}$, we also know that all the arrows appearing in (2.36) are m_0 -equivariant. Because $\vartheta_{\alpha_{\text{dR},0}}$ identifies (5.6) with $\mathcal{O}_{X_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} (2.36)$ (in view of Lemma 5.10, with the conventions that $\mathcal{E}_{\rho(-1)} = \mathcal{E}_{\rho}(1)$ if $\rho(-1) := \rho \otimes \nu^{-1}$ for the symplectic multiplier ν), we deduce that (5.9) is also induced by the decomposition of $\mathbf{J} := \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(1)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}$ as an $\langle m_0 \rangle$ -module. But this decomposition coincides with the splitting given by the graduation on $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\text{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}$, as it follows from Lemma 2.14 (2), which gives $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\text{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}^{m_0=p^{-1}} = \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\text{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=1}$ and $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\text{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{\leq 1}^{m_0=1} = \text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\text{GSp}_{2g}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}]_{=0}$. \square

We assume, until the end of §5.1, that $X_0 \in \{\mathfrak{J}, X_{\infty}, \mathfrak{X}_{\infty}\}$ and that $p_0 = p^{\text{ord}}$ is the unit root splitting. The trivialization (5.3) yields

$$H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right) \xrightarrow{\sim} R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_i \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \wedge^p \text{Sym}_g^2 \simeq \bigoplus_{i \in I_p} R_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_i \otimes_{R_{\infty}} \omega_i,$$

where, taking into account (5.2), again the above isomorphism is given by the Kodaira-Spencer isomorphism $\mathcal{W}_{\text{Sym}_g^2(-1)} \simeq \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{K}}^1$ inducing $\mathcal{W}_{\wedge^p \text{Sym}_g^2} \simeq \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{K}}^p$. Thanks to Lemma 5.12 we deduce that, if we define $H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}\right)^{[P]}$ by means of the isomorphism

$$(5.12) \quad H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}\right)^{[P]} \xrightarrow{\sim} e^{[P]}(R_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_i \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \wedge^p \text{Sym}_g^2 \simeq \bigoplus_{i \in I_p} e^{[P]}(R_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_i \otimes_{R_{\infty}} \omega_i,$$

then (5.10) (and the fact that the p -depletion $(-)^{[P]}$ is can be defined by evaluating the sections at X_{∞}) yields

$$H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right)^{[P]} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right)^{[P]}.$$

We have

$$\nabla^p : H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right) \longrightarrow H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^{p+1}\right) \text{ for } p \in \{0, \dots, d_g - 1\}.$$

Thanks to Griffiths' transversality condition (see Lemma 3.10) and the identification $\text{gr}_i(\mathcal{V}_{\rho}) \simeq \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i}$, it induces

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i^p : H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right) &\simeq H^0\left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{V}_{\rho}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right) \\ \xrightarrow{\text{gr}_i(\nabla^p)} H^0\left(X_0, \text{gr}_{i+1}(\mathcal{V}_{\rho}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^{p+1}\right) &\simeq H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{i+1}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^{p+1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.13. *Suppose that*

$$F \in H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right)^{[P]} \xrightarrow{(5.10)} H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{K}}^p\right)^{[P]}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^p(F) &= \Theta^p(F) + \Delta_i^p(F) \in H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1}\right)^{[P]} \oplus H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{i+1}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1}\right)^{[P]} \\ &\stackrel{(5.10)}{\hookrightarrow} H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_\rho \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1}\right)^{[P]},\end{aligned}$$

where $\Theta^p(F) \in H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1}\right)^{[P]}$ and $\Delta_i^p(F) \in H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{i+1}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p+1}\right)^{[P]}$ admits the following description. If

$$F = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} F_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_{R_0} \omega_{\mathbf{i}} \text{ and } \Psi(F) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in I_{p+1}} \Psi(F)_{\mathbf{j}} \otimes_{R_0} \omega_{\mathbf{j}}$$

for $\Psi \in \{\Theta^p, \Delta_i^p\}$, writing $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{p+1})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta^p(F)_{\mathbf{j}}(q) &= \sum_{k=1}^{p+1} (-1)^{k+1} \theta_{j_k} \left(F_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j}_k, \dots, j_{p+1})} \right) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j}_k, \dots, j_{p+1})} \text{ and} \\ \Delta_i^p(F)_{\mathbf{j}}(q) &= \sum_{k=1}^{p+1} (-1)^{k+1} F_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j}_k, \dots, j_{p+1})} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \partial_{j_k} v_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j}_k, \dots, j_{p+1})}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Taking into account Lemma 5.12, Lemma 2.14 (3) tells us that θ_i raises the total Y -degree by one for $i = 1, \dots, d_g$. Hence Lemma 5.8 with $(\rho$ taken to be $\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{Q}^-}^{\mathbf{G}}(\rho)[\mathbf{Y}])$ gives the claim. \square

The following lemma tells us that the theta operators defined in Lemma 5.13 give rise to complexes.

Lemma 5.14. *If $p \in \{1, \dots, d_g\}$, then $\Theta^p(\Theta^{p-1}(F)) = 0$ for every $F \in H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1}\right)^{[P]}$: hence $H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}\right)^{[P]}$ is a complex. Indeed, as a complex, we have*

$$\left(H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}\right)^{[P]}, \Theta^\cdot \right) \simeq \left(\rho_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} H^0\left(X_0, \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}\right)^{[P]}, 1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} d^\cdot \right)$$

Proof. Indeed, a comparison between the explicit formulas for $\nabla^p(F)$ and $\Theta^p(F)$ appearing in Lemma 5.8 (with ρ of loc.cit. taken to be the trivial representation) and, respectively, Lemma 5.13 (with ρ our given representation) shows that the graded module $\rho_i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} H^0\left(X_0, \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}\right)^{[P]}$ with its degree one morphism $1_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} d^\cdot$ is identified with $H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}\right)^{[P]}$ with its degree one morphism Θ^\cdot . The claimed isomorphism follows and, with it, the fact that $H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}\right)^{[P]}$ is a complex. \square

We are now going to show certain acyclicity properties of $H^0\left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}\right)^{[P]}$ under the assumption that $P(0) = 0$. It then follows that we can write

$$P = \sum_{k=1}^{d_g} T_k P_k^*$$

for suitable polynomials $P_k^* \in \mathbb{Z}_p[T_i : i = 1, \dots, d_g]$. Using (5.12), we define

$$\Theta_{p-1}^{-1} : H^0\left(X_\infty, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p\right) \longrightarrow H^0\left(X_\infty, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1}\right)$$

as follows. For every $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$, we write $\{\mathbf{i}\}$ for the set $\{i_1, \dots, i_p\}$ (we understand that $\{\phi\} = \phi$). If $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we set $k \wedge \mathbf{i} = \phi$ in case $k \in \{\mathbf{i}\}$ and, otherwise, we write $k \wedge \mathbf{i}$ for the unique element of I_{p+1} such that $\{k \wedge \mathbf{i}\} = \{k\} \cup \{\mathbf{i}\}$. Define $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}(k) := \#\{i \in \{\mathbf{i}\} : i < k\}$. If

$$\omega = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} f_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_{R_0} \omega_{\mathbf{i}} \text{ and } \Theta_{p-1}^{-1}(\omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in I_{p-1}} \Theta_{p-1}^{-1}(\omega)_{\mathbf{j}} \otimes_{R_0} \omega_{\mathbf{j}},$$

then we have, by definition,

$$(5.13) \quad \Theta_{p-1}^{-1}(\omega)_{\mathbf{j}} = \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} - \{\mathbf{j}\}} (-1)^{\varepsilon_{k \wedge \mathbf{j}}(k)} P_k^*(\theta) (\theta_P^{-1}(f_{k \wedge \mathbf{j}})) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} v_{\mathbf{i}}.$$

Proposition 5.15. *Suppose that $P(0) = 0$. If $p \in \{1, \dots, d_g\}$ and*

$$f \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]} \hookrightarrow H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$$

is such that, $\Theta^p(f) = 0$ (we understand this condition as an empty condition when $p = d_g$), then $f = \Theta^{p-1}(\Theta_{p-1}^{-1}(f))$. In particular, $H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$ is acyclic in degree $p \in \{1, \dots, d_g\}$.

Proof. This will be proved after Proposition 5.22 below. \square

Theorem 5.16. *Suppose that $P(0) = 0$. For $p \in \{1, \dots, d_g\}$, suppose that $f = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} f_i$ with*

$$f_i \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]} \hookrightarrow H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$$

is such that $\nabla^p(f) = 0$. Define

$$F_0 := \Theta_{p-1}^{-1}(f_0) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]}.$$

Then $\Delta_0^{p-1}(F_0) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$ and, having defined inductively

$$F_k \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_k} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]} \text{ such that } \Delta_k^{p-1}(F_k) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{k+1}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$$

for every $k = 0, \dots, i-1$ with $i \geq 1$, setting

$$F_i := \Theta_{p-1}^{-1} \left(f_i - \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1}(F_{i-1}) \right) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]}$$

we have $\Delta_i^{p-1}(F_i) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{i+1}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$. Furthermore, assuming that there is $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Delta_r^{p-1}(F_r) = 0$ and $f_i = 0$ for every $i \geq r+1$, we have $F_i = 0$ for every $i \geq r+1$ and we can define

$$F := \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} F_i \in \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_i} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]} \stackrel{(5.10)}{\simeq} H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_{\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]}.$$

Then

$$\nabla^{p-1}(F) = f.$$

Proof. The fact that $\Delta_0^{p-1}(F_0) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$ and then $\Delta_i^{p-1}(F_i) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{i+1}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$

for every $i \geq 1$ follows from the inductive definition and the fact that $F_{i-1} \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{W}_{\rho_0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]}$ in view of Lemma 5.13. In particular, the family $\{F_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is defined.

We now claim, by induction on $i \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$(5.14) \quad \Theta^p \left(f_i - \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1}(F_{i-1}) \right) = 0,$$

where we set $F_{-1} = 0$. The fact that $\nabla^p(f) = 0$ implies, thanks to Lemma 5.13, that its i -component

$$(5.15) \quad \Theta^p(f_i) + \Delta_{i-1}^p(f_{i-1}) = 0$$

for every $i \geq 0$, where we set $f_{-1} = 0$. This proves (5.14) when $i = 0$ and, assuming (5.14) for $i-1$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta^p \left(f_i - \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1}(F_{i-1}) \right) &= \Theta^p(f_i) - \Theta^p \left(\Delta_{i-1}^{p-1}(F_{i-1}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(A)}{=} \Theta^p(f_i) + \Theta^p(\Theta^{p-1}(F_i)) + \Delta_{i-1}^p(\Theta^{p-1}(F_{i-1})) + \Delta_{i-1}^p \left(\Delta_{i-2}^{p-1}(F_{i-2}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(B)}{=} \Theta^p(f_i) + \Theta^p(\Theta^{p-1}(F_i)) + \Delta_{i-1}^p \left(f_{i-1} - \Delta_{i-2}^{p-1}(F_{i-2}) \right) + \Delta_{i-1}^p \left(\Delta_{i-2}^{p-1}(F_{i-2}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(C)}{=} \Theta^p(\Theta^{p-1}(F_i)) - \Delta_{i-1}^p \left(\Delta_{i-2}^{p-1}(F_{i-2}) \right) + \Delta_{i-1}^p \left(\Delta_{i-2}^{p-1}(F_{i-2}) \right) \\ &= \Theta^p(\Theta^{p-1}(F_i)), \end{aligned}$$

where we are going to explain the identities. The equality (A) follows from the relation $\nabla^p \circ \nabla^{p-1} = 0$, in view of the decomposition provided by Lemma 5.13, (B) follows the definition $F_{i-1} = \Theta_{p-1}^{-1} \left(f_{i-1} - \Delta_{i-2}^{p-1} (F_{i-2}) \right)$ and the fact that we can apply Proposition 5.15 to $f_{i-1} - \Delta_{i-2}^{p-1} (F_{i-2})$ thanks to the induction and (C) = (5.15). Thanks to Lemma 5.14 we deduce the claimed (5.14).

Suppose now that $\Delta_r^{p-1} (F_r) = 0$ and $f_i = 0$ for every $i \geq r+1$. Then $F_{r+1} := \Theta_{p-1}^{-1} (f_{r+1} - \Delta_r^{p-1} (F_r)) = 0$ and the inductive definition of F_i shows that $F_i = 0$ for every $i \geq r+1$, so that F is defined. According to Lemma 5.13, the inductive definition of F_i and Proposition 5.15 (which applies to $f_i - \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1} (F_{i-1})$, thanks to (5.14)):

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^{p-1} (F) &= \sum_{i=0}^r \Theta^{p-1} (F_i) + \Delta_i^{p-1} (F_i) = \Theta^{p-1} (F_0) + \sum_{i=1}^r \left(\Theta^{p-1} (F_i) + \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1} (F_{i-1}) \right) + \Delta_r^{p-1} (F_r) \\ &= \Theta^{p-1} (\Theta_{p-1}^{-1} (f_0)) + \sum_{i=1}^r \left(\Theta^{p-1} \left(\Theta_{p-1}^{-1} \left(f_i - \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1} (F_{i-1}) \right) \right) + \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1} (F_{i-1}) \right) + \Delta_r^{p-1} (F_r) \\ &= f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^r \left(f_i - \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1} (F_{i-1}) + \Delta_{i-1}^{p-1} (F_{i-1}) \right) + \Delta_r^{p-1} (F_r) = f, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equalities we have used the fact that $\Delta_r^{p-1} (F_r) = 0$ and $f_i = 0$ for every $i \geq r+1$. \square

Suppose now that $\lambda \in X_{\mathbf{G},+}$ and recall the inclusion of filtered complexes

$$\mathrm{dR}(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{dR}(\mathcal{V}_\lambda).$$

Suppose that \mathcal{C} is an exact category and let $\mathrm{Fil}(\mathcal{C})$ be the associated filtered category (we will consider increasing filtrations). By a splitting of an object $M \in \mathrm{Fil}(\mathcal{C})$ we mean an isomorphism $s_M : M \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{gr}(M)$ in \mathcal{C} such that, writing σ_M for the inverse, then $\mathrm{Fil}_i(M) = \sigma_M \left(\bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{gr}^{i-j}(M) \right)$.

Lemma 5.17. *The isomorphisms (5.10) are splittings and they yield, by restriction, the splittings*

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p \simeq \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathrm{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p \text{ for } p = 1, \dots, d_g.$$

Proof. Because (2.20) is a splitting, the fact that the isomorphisms (5.10) are splittings follows from Lemma 5.12. Let us write $\rho_{\lambda,i}$ for ρ_i appearing in (5.10) in order to emphasize the dependence on the choice of λ . Let us consider the left exact sequence obtained from the truncated integral (dual) BGG complex of Theorem 2.9 applying the functor \mathcal{E}_- (which is exact, cfr. Remark 3.11): it follows from Remark 3.9 that we get the following diagram with exact rows, the former in $\mathrm{Fil}(\mathcal{C})$ with \mathcal{C} the category of \mathcal{O}_{X_0} -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \longrightarrow & \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} \mathcal{V}_{w \cdot \lambda} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p & \\ & & & \parallel & & \parallel & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathrm{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{\lambda,i}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\mathbf{M}}: l(w)=1} \left(\bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{W}_{\rho_{w \cdot \lambda, i}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}} \Omega_{X_0/\mathbb{k}}^p \right) & \end{array}$$

Indeed, the square is commutative because the identifications (5.10) are induced by (2.20) for λ and each $w \cdot \lambda$ and the proof of Lemma 5.12 shows that these decompositions (2.20) are obtained by simply regarding the representations as $\langle m_0 \rangle$ -modules and noticing that they admit a decomposition into isotypic components. It follows that we can complete the diagram (5.16) with an arrow making the resulting diagram commutative and, hence, giving the claim. \square

Define the $[P]$ -depleted subcomplex $H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right)^{[P]}$ of $H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right)$ by taking the intersection with the subcomplex $H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right)^{[P]}$ of $H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right)$. We can now prove the following result.

Corollary 5.18. *Suppose that $P(0) = 0$. For $p \in \{1, \dots, d_g\}$ and every $f \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$ such that $\nabla^p(f) = 0$, define F_i inductively as in Proposition 5.15. Then*

$$F_i \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathrm{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]} \hookrightarrow H^0 \left(X_0, \mathrm{gr}_i(\mathcal{V}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]}$$

for every i , there is $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Delta_r^{p-1}(F_r) = 0$ and $f_i = 0$ for every $i \geq r+1$ and, with the notations of Proposition 5.15,

$$F \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]} \hookrightarrow H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{V}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]}$$

is such that $\nabla^{p-1}(F) = f$. In particular, the complex $H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right)^{[P]}$ is acyclic in degree $p \in \{1, \dots, d_g\}$.

Proof. Suppose that we can show that $F_i \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)$ for every i . Because \mathcal{L}_λ has finite rank and the filtration $\text{Fil}_i(\mathcal{V}_\lambda) = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{gr}_{i-j}(\mathcal{V}_\lambda)$ of \mathcal{V}_λ strictly increases the rank, we have

$$H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_{r+1}(\mathcal{V}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right) \cap H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}} \right) = 0$$

and thus $\Delta_r^{p-1}(F_r) = 0$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$: taking r large enough we may even assume that $f_i = 0$ for every $i \geq r+1$, where we write

$$(5.17) \quad f = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} f_i \text{ in } H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty} H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)$$

(as guaranteed by Lemma 5.17). Then we have $F \in H^0 \left(X_0, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)$ because $F_i \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)$.

It remains to explain why we have $F_i \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)$. But indeed, we first note that it follows from (5.13) that $\Theta_{p-1}^{-1}(g) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)^{[P]}$ if $g \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)^{[P]}$ since we have $v_i \in L_\lambda$ in the right hand side of (5.13). Because $L_\lambda \subset V_\lambda$ is a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{Q})$ -submodule, we also see from the expression of $\Delta_i^{p-1}(G)(q)$ appearing in Lemma 5.13 that we have $\Delta_i^{p-1}(G) \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_{i+1}(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^p \right)$ if $G \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)$. Taking into account (5.17), the inductive definition of F_i now proves that $F_i \in H^0 \left(X_0, \text{gr}_i(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_{X/\mathbb{k}}^{p-1} \right)$, as wanted. \square

5.2.1. Proof of Proposition 5.15. Suppose that M is an R -module over a (commutative and unitary) ring R and that $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \in \text{End}_R(M)^n$ is an ordered family of R -linear maps. Then, we define a graded R -module $K^\bullet(\varphi) = K^\bullet(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ concentrated in degree $[0, n]$ equipped with a degree 1 morphism as follows. For every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, write $I_p \subset \{1, \dots, n\}^p$ for the set of multi-indexes $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p)$ such that $i_1 < \dots < i_p$ (we understand that $I_0 := \{\emptyset\}$). For every $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$, we write $\{\mathbf{i}\}$ for the set $\{i_1, \dots, i_p\}$ (we understand that $\{\emptyset\} = \emptyset$). If $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we set $k \wedge \mathbf{i} = \phi$ in case $k \in \{\mathbf{i}\}$ and, otherwise, we write $k \wedge \mathbf{i}$ for the unique element of I_{p+1} such that $\{k \wedge \mathbf{i}\} = \{k\} \cup \{\mathbf{i}\}$. Define $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}(k) := \#\{i \in \{\mathbf{i}\} : i < k\}$.

- We set $K^p(\varphi) := M \otimes_R \wedge_R^p(R^n) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} M$. If $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$, we write $e_{\mathbf{i}} := e_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i_p}$ where $e_i \in R^n$ denotes the i -canonical vector: if $m \in M$, then $m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}}$ corresponds to the family whose components are all zero except the \mathbf{i} -component, which equals m . We also adopt the convention that $e_\emptyset = 0$ (cfr. the displayed equality below).
- We let $d^p = d_\varphi^p : K^p(\varphi) \rightarrow K^{p+1}(\varphi)$ be the direct sum of the R -linear morphisms

$$(5.18) \quad d^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{k=1}^n \varphi_k(m) \otimes_R e_k \wedge e_{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}(k)} \varphi_k(m) \otimes_R e_{k \wedge \mathbf{i}}.$$

Let us make the following useful remarks.

- (i) If $\mathbf{j} \in I_{p+1}$, then we see that the \mathbf{j} -component $d^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{j}}$ of $d^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})$ (for $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$ as above) is zero except in case $\{\mathbf{i}\} \subset \{\mathbf{j}\}$. Furthermore, in this case, if $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{p+1})$, then we have $\mathbf{i} = (j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_k}, \dots, j_{p+1})$ for a unique $j_k \in \{\mathbf{j}\}$ and $d^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{j}} = (-1)^{k+1} \varphi_{j_k}(m) \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{j}}$ (note that $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}(j_k) = k-1$). We deduce that, if

$$m = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} m_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}} \in K^p(\varphi) \text{ and } d^p(m) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in I_{p+1}} d^p(m)_{\mathbf{j}} \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{j}},$$

¹⁰We hope this notation will not create confusion with the set theoretic notation according to which $\{\phi\} \neq \phi$. We want $\{k\} \cup \{\mathbf{i}\}$ to be $\{k\}$ when $\mathbf{i} = \phi$ in the following definition.

then

$$(5.19) \quad d^p(m)_{\mathbf{j}} = \sum_{k=1}^{p+1} (-1)^{k+1} \varphi_{j_k} \left(m_{(j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_k}, \dots, j_{p+1})} \right) \text{ if } \mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{p+1}).$$

- (ii) The degree one morphism d^\cdot makes the graded R -module $K^\cdot(\varphi)$ a complex if and only if $d^0 \circ d^1 = 0$ if and only if $\varphi_i \varphi_j = \varphi_j \varphi_i$ for every $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$: this can be deduced from (5.18). In this case, we say that $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ is a commuting family and that $K^\cdot(\varphi)$ is the dual Koszul complex associated to it.

We now define a degree -1 morphism on $K^\cdot(\varphi)$ as follows. For every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, every $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$ and every $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we set $\mathbf{i}_k = \phi$ if $k \notin \{\mathbf{i}\}$ and, otherwise, we write \mathbf{i}_k for the unique element of I_{p-1} such that $\{\mathbf{i}_k\} = \{\mathbf{i}\} - \{k\}$.

- We let $\partial^p = \partial_\varphi^p : K^p(\varphi) \rightarrow K^{p-1}(\varphi)$ be the direct sum of the R -linear morphisms

$$(5.20) \quad \partial^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}(k)} \varphi_k(m) \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}_k}.$$

Let us make the following useful remarks.

- (iii) If $\mathbf{j} \in I_{p-1}$, then we see that the \mathbf{j} -component $\partial^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{j}}$ of $\partial^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})$ (for $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$ as above) is zero except in case $\{\mathbf{j}\} \subset \{\mathbf{i}\}$. Furthermore, in this case, if $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{p-1})$, then we have $\mathbf{i} = k \wedge \mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, k, \dots, j_{p-1})$ for a unique $k \in \{\mathbf{i}\}$ and $\partial^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{j}} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}(k)} \varphi_k(m) \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{j}}$. We deduce that, if

$$m = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} m_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}} \in K^p(\varphi) \text{ and } \partial^p(m) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in I_{p-1}} \partial^p(m)_{\mathbf{j}} \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{j}},$$

then

$$(5.21) \quad \partial^p(m)_{\mathbf{j}} = \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} - \{\mathbf{j}\}} (-1)^{\varepsilon_{k \wedge \mathbf{j}}(k)} \varphi_k(m_{k \wedge \mathbf{j}}) \text{ if } \mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{p-1}).$$

- (iv) The degree minus one morphism ∂^\cdot makes the graded R -module $K^\cdot(\varphi)$ a complex if and only if $\partial^1 \circ \partial^2 = 0$ if and only if $\varphi_i \varphi_j = \varphi_j \varphi_i$ for every $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$: this can be deduced from (5.21). In this case, we say that $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ is a commuting family and that $K^\cdot(\varphi)$ is the Koszul complex associated to it.

Let us now fix two ordered families

$$\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n), \psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) \subset \text{End}_R(M)^n$$

and define two degree 0 morphisms on $K^\cdot(M, n) := K^\cdot(\varphi) = K^\cdot(\psi)$ (the equality of the underlying graded R -modules) as follows.

- We let $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^p : K^p(M, n) \rightarrow K^p(M, n)$ be the direct sum of the R -linear morphisms

$$(5.22) \quad \Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} - \{\mathbf{i}\}} \psi_k(\varphi_k(m)) \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}} + \sum_{i \in \{\mathbf{i}\}} \varphi_i(\psi_i(m)) \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}}$$

and define $\Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p : K^p(M, n) \rightarrow K^p(M, n)$ as the direct sum of the R -linear morphisms

$$(5.23) \quad \Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} - \{\mathbf{i}\}, l \in \{\mathbf{i}\}} (-1)^{\varepsilon_{k \wedge \mathbf{j}}(k) + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{j}}(l)} [\psi_k, \varphi_l](m) \otimes_R e_{(l \wedge \mathbf{i})_k}.$$

Let us make the following remark.

- (v) If $\mathbf{j} \in I_p$, then we see that the \mathbf{j} -component $\Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{j}}$ of $\Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})$ (for $\mathbf{i} \in I_p$ as above) is zero except in case $\{\mathbf{i}\}, \{\mathbf{j}\} \subset \{\mathbf{k}\}$ for some $\mathbf{k} \in I_{p+1}$ (taking \mathbf{k} of the form $l \wedge \mathbf{i}$ in the expression (5.23)). Furthermore, in this case, if $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_p)$, then $\mathbf{k} = k \wedge \mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{h_k-1}, k, j_{h_k}, \dots, j_p)$ for a unique $k \in \{\mathbf{k}\} - \{\mathbf{j}\}$ (with h_k defined by the equality $\varepsilon_{k \wedge \mathbf{j}}(k) = h_k - 1$) and $\mathbf{i} = (j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_l}, \dots, j_{h_k-1}, k, \dots, j_p)$ if $l < h_k$ or $\mathbf{i} = (j_1, \dots, j_{h_k-1}, k, \dots, \widehat{j_l}, \dots, j_p)$ if $l \geq h_k$ for a unique $j_k \in \{\mathbf{j}\}$. In any case, we have $\mathbf{i} = k \wedge (j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_l}, \dots, j_p)$ and $\Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p(m \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{j}} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_{k \wedge \mathbf{j}}(k) + l + 1} [\psi_k, \varphi_{j_l}](m) \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{j}}$ (note that $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{j}}(j_l) = l - 1$). We deduce that, if

$$m = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_p} m_{\mathbf{i}} \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{i}} \in K^p(M, n) \text{ and } \partial^p(m) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in I_p} \Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p(m)_{\mathbf{j}} \otimes_R e_{\mathbf{j}},$$

then

$$(5.24) \quad \Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p(m)_j = \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} - \{j\}} \left(\sum_{l=1}^p (-1)^{\varepsilon_{k \wedge j}(k) + l + 1} [\psi_k, \varphi_{j_l}] \left(m_{k \wedge (j_1, \dots, \widehat{j_l}, \dots, j_p)} \right) \right).$$

A somewhat tedious calculation based on (5.19), (5.21) and (5.24) proves the following useful formula.

Lemma 5.19. *Suppose that φ and ψ are as above. Then we have, for every $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the following equality:*

$$\partial_\psi^{p+1} d_\varphi^p + d_\varphi^{p-1} \partial_\psi^p = \Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^p + \Delta_{[\psi, \varphi]}^p.$$

Corollary 5.20. *Suppose that $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, that $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n\} \subset \text{End}_R(M)$ is a commuting family, that $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^p$ is invertible and that one between $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p+1}$ or $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p-1}$ is invertible. Then, $H^p(K^\bullet(M, n), d_\varphi) = H^p(K^\bullet(M, n), \partial_\varphi) = 0$ and a section*

$$s^p : K^p(M, n) \longrightarrow K^{p-1}(M, n) \quad (\text{resp. } s^p : K^p(M, n) \longrightarrow K^{p+1}(M, n))$$

of d_φ^{p-1} (resp. ∂_ψ^{p+1}) is obtained as follows. If $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p+1}$ (resp. $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p-1}$) is invertible, set $s^p := \partial_\psi^p \Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p-1}$ (resp. $s^p := d_\varphi^p \Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p+1}$) and, if $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p-1}$ (resp. $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p+1}$) is invertible, set $s^p := \Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p-1, -1} \partial_\psi^p$ (resp. $s^p := \Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p+1, -1} d_\varphi^p$).

Remark 5.21. *If $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p+1}$ and $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^{p-1}$ are both invertible, then the two sections of Corollary 5.20 are the same.*

Suppose now that A is an R -algebra, that Ω is a free A -module of finite rank n and that $d : A \rightarrow \Omega$ and $\nabla : M \rightarrow \Omega \otimes_A M$ are a morphism of R -modules. Fix an A -basis $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$ of Ω and let $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\} \subset \text{Hom}_A(\Omega, A)$ be the dual basis. Then we define $d_i := \delta_i \circ \nabla \in \text{End}_R(M)$ and $\nabla_i := (\delta_i \otimes_A 1_M) \circ \nabla \in \text{End}_R(M)$.

Proposition 5.22. *There is a unique sequence of morphisms of R -modules $d^p : \wedge_A^p \Omega \rightarrow \wedge_A^{p+1} \Omega$ such that $d^0 = d$ and*

$$d^{p+q}(\omega_p \wedge \omega_q) = d^p(\omega_p) \wedge \omega_q + (-1)^p \omega_p \wedge d^q(\omega_q)$$

for every $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p + q \geq 1$, every $\omega_p \in \wedge_A^p \Omega$ and every $\omega_q \in \wedge_A^q \Omega$ and there is a unique sequence of morphisms of R -modules $\nabla^p : \wedge_A^p \Omega \otimes_A M \rightarrow \wedge_A^{p+1} \Omega \otimes_A M$ such that $\nabla^0 = \nabla$ and

$$\nabla^p(\omega \otimes m) = d^p(\omega) \otimes m + (-1)^p \omega \wedge \nabla(m)$$

for every $m \in M$ and $\omega \in \wedge_A^p \Omega$. The isomorphism $A^n \xrightarrow{\sim} \Omega$ induced by the A -basis $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$ yields an isomorphism of graded R -modules $K^\bullet(\nabla_1, \dots, \nabla_n) \xrightarrow{\sim} \wedge_A^\bullet \Omega \otimes_A M$ such that the degree one morphism d on $K^\bullet(\nabla_1, \dots, \nabla_n)$ corresponds to $\{\nabla^p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$: then $\wedge_A^\bullet \Omega \otimes_A M$ is a complex if and only if $\nabla^1 \circ \nabla^0 = 0$ if and only if $\{\nabla_1, \dots, \nabla_n\}$ is a commuting family.

Proof. The isomorphism $A^n \xrightarrow{\sim} \Omega$ induced by the A -basis $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$ identifies

$$K^p(\nabla_1, \dots, \nabla_n) = M \otimes_A \wedge_A^p(A^n) \xrightarrow{\sim} M \otimes_A \wedge_A^p \Omega \simeq \wedge_A^p \Omega \otimes_A M$$

and one checks that the degree one differential obtained by transport from $K^\bullet(\nabla_1, \dots, \nabla_n)$ satisfies the required existence property (taking $M = A$ in order to get $\{d^p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$). The uniqueness is clear and, by construction, we have $K^\bullet(\nabla_1, \dots, \nabla_n) \xrightarrow{\sim} \wedge_A^\bullet \Omega \otimes_A M$ with d corresponding to $\{\nabla^p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$. Remark (ii) yields the last assertion. \square

In the setting before the above proposition, suppose that $d(a_1 a_2) = d(a_1) a_2 + a_1 d(a_2)$ and $\nabla(am) = d(a) \otimes m + a \nabla(m)$ for every $a_1, a_2, a \in A$ and every $m \in M$: then the operators d_i 's and ∇_i 's satisfy

$$\nabla_i(am) = d_i(a)m + a \nabla_i(m) \quad \text{for every } a \in A \text{ and } m \in M.$$

In particular, take $(A, R) = (R_0, K)$ and let Ω be the A -module of Kähler differentials $\Omega_{X_0/K}^1$. If $M = H^0(X_0, \mathcal{E}_\rho)$, then formula (5.19) translates into the formula claimed in Lemma 5.8. In order to get Proposition 5.15, we first remark that, thanks to Lemma 5.14, we deduce the result from the analogous result for $H^0(X_0, \Omega_{X/K}^{\bullet})^{[P]}$. In general, if $M' \subset M$ is an R -submodule such that $\varphi_i(M') \subset M'$ for every i and $\varphi_{|M'} := (\varphi_{1|M'}, \dots, \varphi_{n|M'})$, then $(K^\bullet(\varphi_{|M'}), d_{\varphi_{|M'}})$ is a subcomplex of $(K^\bullet(\varphi), d_\varphi)$ and similarly for ∂_ψ

and $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}$: applying this remark to $H^0(X_0, \Omega_{X/K}^1)^{[P]} \subset H^0(X_0, \Omega_{X/K}^1)$ and $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) := (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d_g})$ we see, thanks to (5.12), that the isomorphism of Proposition 5.22 restricts to an isomorphism $K^\cdot(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d_g}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(X_0, \Omega_{X/K}^1)^{[P]}$ (where we do not write the restrictions). If $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) := (P_1^*(\theta), \dots, P_{d_g}^*(\theta))$, then we have, by definition, the equality $\Delta_{\psi, \varphi}^p = \theta_P$, which is invertible on $H^0(X_0, \Omega_{X/K}^p)^{[P]}$ thanks to Lemma 5.5. The claim follows from Corollary 5.20, noticing that $s^p = \Theta_{p-1}^{-1}$ in our setting.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. N. Andrianov, *Quadratic forms and Hecke operators*. Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [2] B. Conrad, *Reductive group schemes*, Panoramas Synthèses **42–43** (2014), 93–439.
- [3] O. Debarre, *Tores et variétés abéliennes complexes*, EDP Sciences, 2002.
- [4] M. Demazure. *Exposé I: Structures algébriques. Cohomologie des groupes*. In: Schémas en groupes, Tome 1: Propriétés Générales des Schémas en Groupes, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 151, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1970, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1962/64 (SGA 3), dirigé par M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck avec la collaboration de M. Artin, J. E. Bertin, P. Gabriel, M. Raynaud and J.-P. Serre.
- [5] M. Demazure, *Exposé II: Fibres tangentes. Algèbres de Lie*. In: Schémas en groupes, Tome 1: Propriétés Générales des Schémas en Groupes, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 151, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1970, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1962/64 (SGA 3), dirigé par M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck avec la collaboration de M. Artin, J. E. Bertin, P. Gabriel, M. Raynaud and J.-P. Serre.
- [6] J. Dixmier, *Enveloping algebras*, Grad. Stud. Math., American Mathematical Society Vol. 11, 1977.
- [7] M. Emerton, *Jacquet modules of locally analytic representations of p -adic reductive groups. II. The relation to parabolic induction*, to appear in J. Inst. Math. Jussieu, available at <https://www.math.uchicago.edu/~emerton/preprints.html>
- [8] G. Faltings and C.-L. Chai, *Degeneration of abelian varieties*, Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [9] T. J. Fonseca, *Higher Ramanujan equations and periods of abelian varieties*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society 281, 2023.
- [10] H. Hida, *p -adic automorphic forms on Shimura varieties*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, 2004.
- [11] J. E. Humphreys, *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in the BGG category \mathcal{O}* , American Mathematical Society Vol. 94, 2008.
- [12] J.-C. Jantzen, *Representations of algebraic groups*, American Mathematical Society Vol. 107, 2nd edition, 2007.
- [13] O. T. R. Jones, *An analogue of the BGG resolution for locally analytic principal series*, J. Number Theory 131 (2011), 1616–1640.
- [14] N. M. Katz, “*Travaux de Dwork*”, in Séminaire Bourbaki (1971/1972), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 317, Springer, 1973, 167–200.
- [15] N. M. Katz, “*Serre-Tate local moduli*”, in Surfaces algébriques séminaire, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 868, Springer, 1978, 138–202.
- [16] K.-W. Lan, *Arithmetic compactification of p -type Shimura varieties*, revised version. PhD Thesis, revised March 14, 2021.
- [17] G. Laumon, *Fonctions zêtas des variétés de Siegel de dimension trois*, Astérisque 302, 1–66 (2005).
- [18] Z. Liu, *Nearly overconvergent Siegel modular forms*, Ann. Inst. Fourier 69 no 6 (2019), 2439–2506.
- [19] J. S. Milne, *Algebraic groups. The theory of groups schemes of finite type over a field*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics 170, 2017.
- [20] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty and F. Kirwan, *Geometric invariant theory*, Third enlarged edition, Springer (1994).
- [21] P. Polo and J. Tilouine, *Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand complexes and cohomology of nilpotent groups over $\mathbf{Z}_{(p)}$ for representations with p -small weights*, Astérisque 280 (2002), 97–135.
- [22] J.-P. Serre, *Groupes de Grothendieck des schémas en groupes réductifs déployés*, Pub. Math. IHES 34 (1968), 37–52.
- [23] B. Stroh, *Compactification de variétés de Siegel aux places de mauvaise réduction*, Bull. de la Soc. Math. de France 138 (2010), 259–315.
- [24] J. Tilouine, *Formes compagnons et complexe BGG dual pour GSp_4* , Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble 62 (2012), 1383–1436.
- [25] E. Urban, *Eigenvarieties for reductive groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) 174 (2011) no. 3, 1685–1784.

MARCO ADAMO SEVESO: MILANO, ITALY
Email address: seveso.marco@gmail.com