arXiv:1501.00249v2 [math.RT] 28 Sep 2015

NORMALITY OF ORTHOGONAL AND SYMPLECTIC NILPOTENT ORBIT CLOSURES IN POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC

HUSILENG XIAO AND BIN SHU

Abstract. In this note we investigate the normality of closures of orthogonal and symplectic nilpotent orbits in positive characteristic. We prove that the closure of such a nilpotent orbit is normal provided that neither type d nor type e minimal irreducible degeneration occurs in the closure, and conversely if the closure is normal, then any type e minimal irreducible degeneration does not occur in it. Here, the minimal irreducible degenerations of a nilpotent orbit are introduced by W. Hesselink in [7] (or see [11] from which we take Table 1 for the complete list of all minimal irreducible degenerations). Our result is a weak version in positive characteristic of [11, Theorem 16.2(ii)], one of the main results of [11] over complex numbers.

1. Preliminaries

1.1. Let G be a reductive algebraic group over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ of positive characteristic, and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. A nilpotent orbit of G is an orbit of a nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}$ under the adjoint action of G. For all classical groups, the nilpotent orbits were parameterized in terms of partitions. The normality of closures of nilpotent orbit of classical group have been studied by several authors. However, there is still an open question to decide the normality of the closures of nilpotent orbits. Our purpose is to investigate such a problem.

1.2. In 1979 and 1980s, Kraft-Procesi in [10] and [11] determined the normality of orbit closures for all complex classical groups by using smooth equivalent arguments (with few exceptions of the very even orbits in the special orthogonal group D_{2l} remaining, which was completed by Sommers in [14]). For other types, A. Broer in [1] finished the work on the normality of nilpotent orbit closures (corresponding to two pairwise orthogonal short root) by vanishing result of cohomology of line bundles of flag variety.

In the case of positive-characteristic fields, J. F. Thomsen in [15] proved that A. Broer's result holds in good characteristic and decided the normality of some nilpotent orbit closures (corresponding to two pairwise orthogonal short roots). Generally, the difficulty of extending Kraft-Procesi method for linear general groups over complex numbers to the case of positive characteristic fields is the failure of

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 17B08, 17L45, 14L35. This research is partially supported by the NSF of China (No. 11271130; 11201293; 111126062) and Shanghai Key Laboratory of PMMP(13dz2260400).

the statement over $\mathbb{C}$ "*Assume the reductive algebraic group G acts regulary on an affine variety V. If $\pi : V \to V_0$ is a quotient map and $W \subset V$ is a G-stable subvariety, then the restriction of π to W is a quotient map onto $\pi(W)$.*" Donkin in [2] overcome this difficulty by means of representation theory. He viewed the coordinate ring $\mathbb{K}[V]$ as a G-module, then considered certain module filtration of $\mathbb{K}[V]$ (called good filtrations). This enables him to prove that all closures of nilpotent orbits of general linear groups in positive character are normal.

1.3. Recently, E. Goldstein in her doctoral thesis [4] investigated the normality of the closures of nilpotent orbits of orthogonal and symplectic groups. There Goldstein exploited Donkin's method to the orthogonal and symplectic groups in positive characteristic. She finally obtained Proposition 5.2 of [4] which is crucial to the present paper (see Theorem 2.1). With aid of Goldstein's theorem, we are able to decide the normality of some nilpotent orbit closures. Let us introduce our main result in the next subsections.

1.4. Throughout the paper, we always assume $\mathbb{K}$ is an algebraically closed filed of characteristic $p > 2$. Let V be finite dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{K}$, G be one of the algebraic groups $\mathrm{O}(V)$ or $\mathrm{Sp}(V)$ which is determined by a nondegenerate form $(\cdot,\cdot)$ with $(u, v) = \varepsilon(v, u)$ where $\varepsilon \in \{1, -1\}$. Call V a quadratic space of type ε (shortly an orthogonal space in case $\varepsilon = 1$, a symplectic space in case $\varepsilon = -1$). Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(V, \mathbb{K})$ or $\mathfrak{sp}(V, \mathbb{K})$ be the Lie algebra of G. Then the nilpotent orbits $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$ under the adjoint action of G in $\mathfrak{g}$ are completely determined by partitions σ of $n = \dim(V)$. The corresponding young diagram is called an ε-diagram. We denote by $|\sigma|$ the size of σ, which is equal to $\sum_{i=1}^{t} ir_i$ for $\sigma = [1^{r_1}2^{r_2}3^{r_3}\dots t^{r_t}]$.

There is a well-known classification result on nilpotent orbits of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(V, \mathbb{K}), \mathfrak{sp}(V, \mathbb{K})$.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\sigma = [1^{r_1}2^{r_2}3^{r_3}\dots t^{r_t}]$. Then the following statement hold.*

(1) *The partition σ is 1-diagram if and only if r_i is even for even i.*
(2) *The partition σ is -1-diagram if and only if r_i is even for odd i.*

Definition 1.2. Let η be an ε-diagram.

(1) An ε-diagram σ is called an ε-degeneration of η if $|\sigma| = |\eta|$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$, which is denoted by $\sigma \leq \eta$. This gives an ordering for ε-diagrams.
(2) An ε-degeneration σ of η is called minimal if $\sigma \neq \eta$ and there is no ε-diagram ν such that $\sigma < \nu < \eta$. Geometrically this means $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$ is open in complement of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$.

Then we have the following observations on ε-degenerations.

Lemma 1.3. *Let $\sigma = (\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots)$ and $\eta = (\eta_1 \geq \eta_2 \geq \cdots)$ be two ε-diagrams and $|\sigma| = |\eta|$. Then the following statements hold.*

(1) *The inclusion $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma} \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ happens if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^{j} \sigma_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{j} \eta_i$ for all j.*
(2) *Assume that $\sigma \leq \eta$ be an ε-degeneration with the first r rows and the first s columns of both σ and η coinciding respectively. Denote by σ', η' the new diagrams obtained by erasing these r rows and s columns from σ and η*

respectively, and put $\varepsilon' = (-1)^s$. *Then* $\sigma' < \eta'$ *is an* ε'*-degeneration and* $codim_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}}\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma} = codim_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\eta'}}}\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\sigma'}$.

Proof. For (1), one can be refereed to [9]. For (2), it can be proved by the same arguments as the complex number case given in [4]. □

In the setup of the above lemma (2), we say that the ε-degeneration $\sigma \leq \eta$ is obtained from the ε'-degeneration $\sigma' < \eta'$ by adding rows and columns. An ε-degeneration $\sigma \leq \eta$ is called *irreducible* if there is no pair $\sigma' \leq \eta'$ with $|\sigma'| = |\eta'| < |\sigma| = |\eta|$ such that (σ', η') is obtained from (σ, η) by procedure of Lemma 1.3(2). In [7], all minimal irreducible degenerations are classified (see Table 1).

1.5. **The main result of the present paper.**

Theorem 1.4. *Let* V *be a vector space over an algebraically closed field* $\mathbb{K}$ *of* $char(\mathbb{K}) \neq 2$, $G = O(V)$ *(resp.* $Sp(V)$*) be the orthogonal (resp. symplectic) group corresponding to the defining non-degenerate bilinear form* $(\cdot, \cdot)$ *of type* $\varepsilon = 1$ *(resp.* $\varepsilon = -1$*). Then the following statements hold.*

1. *For any nilpotent orbit* $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$, *its closure* $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ *is normal if* η *has neither degeneration of type* d *nor degeneration of type* e.
2. *Conversely, for a given nilpotent orbit* $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$, *if its closure* $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ *is normal then* η *does not contain any degeneration of type* e.

Here, the types d *and* e *are listed as in Table 1.*

The main text of the paper will be devoted to the proof of the above theorem. In the concluding subsection, some examples are presented for demonstrating the main theorem. Our approach is based on Theorem 2.1 by Goldstein (cf. [4]) along with some crucial observations on the separability and the decomposability arising from quadratic spaces under action of reductive groups (see Lemma 2.8 and Claim 3.7), which make Kraft-Procesi's arguments on smoothly equivalent singularities over complex numbers in [11] revivified in our case.

For the special orthogonal and exceptional groups, we will give the investigation on the normality of their nilpotent orbit closures elsewhere.

2. On smooth property of two canonical maps

2.1. Let us first recall the main result Proposition 5.2 in [4] which is actually a modular version of [11, Theorem 9.2(ii)], one of the main results of [11] over complex numbers. This result will be important to the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 2.1. *(Goldstein* [4]*,proposition 5.2) Let* $\mathcal{O}$ *be a nilpotent orbit of the symplectic or orthogonal group. Then* $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ *is normal if and only if it is normal at all points contained in the orbits* $\mathcal{O}_i \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ *of codimension 2.*

We then have some consequences.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that the pair* (η, σ) *is of type* a, b, c *as in Table 1. Then* $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ *is normal . In particular ,*$\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ *is normal at* $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$

TABLE 1. Classification of minimal irreducible degenerations

type	a	b	c	d
Lie algebra	$\mathfrak{sp}_2$	$\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$	$\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$	$\mathfrak{sp}_{4n+2}$
ε	-1	-1	1	-1
η	(2)	$(2n)$	$(2n+1)$	$(2n+1, 2n+1)$
σ	$(1,1)$	$(2n-2, 2)$	$(2n-1, 1, 1)$	$(2n, 2n, 2)$
$\operatorname{codim}_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}}\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$	2	2	2	2

e	f	g	h
$\mathfrak{so}_{4n}$	$\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$	$\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$	$\mathfrak{so}_{2n}$
1	1	-1	1
$(2n, 2n)$	$(2, 2, 1^{2n-3})$	$(2, 1^{2n-2})$	$(2, 2, 1^{2n-4})$
$(2n-1, 2n-1, 1, 1)$	(1^{2n+1})	1^{2n}	1^{2n}
2	$(4n-2)$	$(2n)$	$(4n-2)$

Proof. It is well known that $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}} = \mathcal{N}$, the nilpotent cone of the corresponding Lie agebra, which is normal (cf. [9, Corollary 8.5]). □

Lemma 2.3. *The closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ is not normal at $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$ in the case of type e in Table 1.*

Proof. The closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ is reducible, which is a non-trivial union of two closures of equal-dimentional $\mathrm{SO}(V)$-orbits. So it is not normal. Note that $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$ is of codimension 2 in $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$. By Theorem 2.1, $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ is not normal at $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$. □

Remark 2.4. (1) For the above Lemma, we make another account, as a direct consequence of the following general fact.

Let X be a reducible affine variety which is the union $Y \cup Z$ of distinct irreducible components Y and Z. Then for all $x \in Y \cap Z$, X is not normal at x. This comes from a fact that for the local ring $A = O_{X,x}$, irreducible components of $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ are in 1-1 correspondence with irreducible components of X containing x (see [12, Proposition 2.4.12]).

(2) The closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ is normal at $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$ in the case of type f, g, h, which comes from the fact that it is the closure of the orbit of a highest weight vector in the adjoint representation (cf. [9, Proposition 8.13] and the remark following it). We are only concerned with those codimension 2 orbits inside. So we will not use this fact in this paper .

2.2. **The canonical maps π and ρ.** Let V and U be two quadratic spaces of type ε and $-\varepsilon$ respectively with $\dim V := n \geq \dim U := m$, and $G(U)$ and $G(V)$ the orthogonal or sympletic groups defined by the given quadratic forms on U and V respectively, depending on the values of ε and of $-\varepsilon$. Denote by $\mathfrak{g}(U)$and $\mathfrak{g}(V)$ the Lie algebras of $G(U)$ and of $G(V)$ respectively. Denote by $L(V, U)$ the linear space $\mathbb{K}$-spanned by all linear maps between V and U. For a given $X \in L(V, U)$, define X^* to be the adjoint map of X, this is to say, the unique element in $L(U, V)$ satisfying $(Xv, u) = (v, X^*u)$ for all $v \in V, u \in U$. We consider the following

canonical maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L(V,U) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathfrak{g}(U) \\ \rho \big\downarrow & & \\ \mathfrak{g}(V) & & \end{array}$$

where $\pi(X) = X \circ X^*$, $\rho(X) = X^* \circ X$. Define a natural action of the group $G(U) \times G(V)$ on $L(V,U)$ via $(g,h)X = gXh^{-1}$. Then First theorem of classical invariant theory says π and ρ are $G(U)$- and $G(V)$-equivariant quotient maps, in positive character case see ([4, Theorem 2.7]).

Let $L'(V,U) := \{Y \in L(V,U) \mid Y \text{ is surjective}\}$, simply written as L'. We immediately have the following lemma by the same arguments as in the proof of [11, Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 2.5. *(*[4, Lemma 2.9]*) For any $Y \in L'$ the stabilizer of Y in $G(U)$ is trivial and $\rho^{-1}(\rho(Y))$ is an orbit under $G(U)$.*

2.3. Now for a given quadratic space V, take a nilpotent element $D \in \mathfrak{g}(V)$ with conjugacy class $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$. Consider the new form on V given by $|v,u| := (u, Dv)$. Clearly it is of type $-\varepsilon$ and its kernel is exactly $\mathrm{Ker}D$. Set $U = \mathrm{Im}D$, and take $X : V \to U$ which is defined by the canonical decomposition $D = I \circ X : V \to U \hookrightarrow V$, where $I : U \hookrightarrow V$ is the inclusion map. Then we can canonically define a non-degenerate form on U of type $-\varepsilon$. Note that $X^* = I$. We have $D = I \circ X = X^* \circ X \in \mathfrak{g}(V)$. Then $D' := X \circ X^*$ is also a nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}(U)$ with conjugacy class $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\eta'}$, where the corresponding young diagram η' of D' is obtained from the young diagram of η by erasing the first column (see [10, §2.2 and §2.3] and [11, §4.1]). Set $N_{\varepsilon,\eta} := \pi^{-1}(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\eta'}})$. Note that $N_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ is stable under $G(U) \times G(V)$. We then have the following observation by the same arguments as in the proof of [11, Lemma 4.3].

Lemma 2.6. *(*[4, Lemma 2.8]*) The following statements hold.*

1. $\rho(N_{\varepsilon,\eta}) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$
2. $\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta})$ *is a single orbit under* $G(U) \times G(V)$ *contained in* $N_{\varepsilon,\eta} \cap L'$
3. $\pi(\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta})) = \mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\eta'}$
4. *The above three statements are still valid to other degenerations of η by erasing the first column.*

2.4. Keep the setup in §2.2. We have the following proposition which is somewhat a weaker version in positive characteristic of [11, Proposition 11.1]. This proposition will play a role similar to [11, Proposition 11.1] and the followed remark in the complex number case.

Proposition 2.7. *Maintain the notations as above. And recall $n = \dim V \geq \dim U = m$. Then the following statements hold.*

1. *The map π is smooth in L', and $\pi(L') = \{D \in \mathfrak{g}(U) \mid Rank(D) \geq 2m - n\}$.*
2. *$\rho(L') = \{D \in \mathfrak{g}(V) \mid Rank(D) = m\}$ and $\rho|_{L'} : L' \to \rho(L')$ is a smooth morphism, admitting the fibers isomorphic to $G(U)$*

Proof. The description here on the images of π and ρ is the same thing as what has been done in the case of characteristic 0 given in [11, Proposotion 11.1]. So we only need prove the remaining assertions.

(1) In the proof of [11, Proposotion 11.1(1)], the authors calculate explicitly the tangent map $(\mathsf{d}\pi)_X$ of π at any $X \in L'(V,U)$, showing that $(\mathsf{d}\pi)_X$ is surjective. Their arguments are still valid for the algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ (note that $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K}) > 2$). This is to say, in our case we still have that the tangent map $(\mathsf{d}\pi)_X$ is surjective for all $X \in L'(V,U)$. By [6, Proposition 10.4] π is smooth at all points in $L'(U,V)$. We complete the proof of (1).

(2) First notice that $L' = L'(V,U)$ is one orbit under $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ by right multiplication and so is $\rho(L')$ under action $D \mapsto (g^{-1})^* \circ D \circ g^{-1}$. And ρ is a $\mathrm{GL}(V)$-equivariant morphism. Fix $X \in L'$ and let q and q' be two orbit mappings associated with X as below

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{GL}(V) & \xrightarrow{\quad q \quad} & \mathrm{GL}(V).X \\ {\scriptstyle q'}\big\downarrow & & \\ \mathrm{GL}(V).\rho(X) & & \end{array}$$

We first prove $L' \simeq \mathrm{GL}(V)/H$, $\rho(L') \simeq \mathrm{GL}(V)/H'$. Here H (*resp.* H') is the centralizer of $X \in L'$ (*resp.* $\rho(X) \in \mathfrak{g}(U)$). So by [8, 12.4] we only need to prove that both q and q' are separable. For this, by [8, 5.5] we only need to prove that q and q' are smooth. In fact, L' is an open subset of the vector space $L(V,U)$ and $\mathcal{T}_X(L') = L(V,U)$. Then we have $\mathrm{Im}((\mathsf{d}q)_{\mathrm{Id}}) = X \cdot \mathfrak{gl}(V)$. Here the dot action "$\cdot$" is right multiplication (composition), and "Id" stands for the identity element. On the other side, the surjective property of X implies that $X \cdot \mathfrak{gl}(V) = L(V,U)$. Hence $(\mathsf{d}q)_{\mathrm{Id}}$ is surjective. Note that q is an orbit map, thereby $\mathrm{GL}(V)$-equivariant. By [6, Proposition 10.4], q is smooth.

Next we prove q' is smooth. As $\rho(L')$ is an orbit of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$, by the same arguments as in the last paragraph it suffices for us to prove $(\mathsf{d}q')_{\mathrm{Id}}$ is surjective at the identity element. We have $(\mathsf{d}q')_{\mathrm{Id}}(Z) = -Z^*D - DZ$ with $D = \rho(X) \in \rho(L')$. We will further show that $\dim \mathrm{Im}((\mathsf{d}q')_{\mathrm{Id}}) = \dim L' - \dim G(U) = \dim \rho(L')$ in the forthcoming Lemma 2.8 (the second equality is due to the fact that $\rho^{-1}(D)$ is isomorphic to $G(U)$). Thus, $\mathsf{d}q'$ is surjective at Id, thereby surjective at all points in $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. So q' is smooth. Thus we have $L' \simeq \mathrm{GL}(V)/H$ and $\rho(L') \simeq \mathrm{GL}(V)/H'$. Note that under the above identification, $q' = \rho|_{L'} \circ q$. Hence $\rho|_{L'}$ is smooth. Therefore the proof is completed modulo Lemma 2.8. □

Lemma 2.8. *Keep the notations and assumptions in the above proposition. Then* $\dim Im(\mathsf{d}q')_{Id} = \dim(L') - \dim(G(U)) = \dim(\rho(L'))$.

Proof. We only need to prove the lemma in the case of $\mathfrak{g}(V) = \mathfrak{sp}(V)$, and omit the arguments for the case of $\mathfrak{g}(V) = \mathfrak{o}(V) = \mathfrak{so}(V)$ because the latter is the same. So we assume $\dim(V) = 2l \geq 4$ (it is trivial when $\dim(V) = 2$), and further take $\{e_1, \cdots, e_l, e_{1+l}, \cdots, e_{2l}\}$, a basis of V compatible with the quadratic form $(\cdot,\cdot)$.

This is to say $(e_i, e_j) = \mathrm{sgn}(i-j)\delta_{l,|i-j|}$. Then by a direct computation we have

$$E^*_{i,j} = \begin{cases} E_{j+l,i+l}, & \text{for } i,j \le l; \\ E_{j-l,i-l} & \text{for } l < i,j \le 2l; \\ E_{j-l,i+l} & \text{for } i \le l < j; \\ E_{j+l,i-l} & \text{for } j \le l < i. \end{cases}$$

Now we view $(\mathsf{d}q')_{\mathrm{Id}}$ (composing with $\mathfrak{g}(V) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(V)$) as an element of $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{gl}(V))$. We proceed the arguments by different cases.

(1) Suppose m is even, say $2k$. By description of $\rho(L')$ which is an orbit in the above proposition, we may take D to be a diagonal matrix of rank m as below

$$D = \mathrm{diag}\{1, \dots 1, 0, \dots, 0, -1, \cdots -1, 0, \dots, 0\},$$

where k-times 1 and k-times -1 foremost and continuously occur in the first l-block and the last l-block respectively. It is elementary to check that subspace $V(i,j) := \mathbb{K}\text{-span}\{E_{i,j}, E^*_{i,j}\}$ are stable under the map $(\mathsf{d}q')_{\mathrm{Id}}(Z) = -Z^*D - DZ$. And

$$\mathfrak{gl}(V) = \bigoplus_{i,j \le l} V(i,j) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \le l, l < j, j-l \le i} V(i,j) \oplus \bigoplus_{j \le l, l < i, i-l \ge j} V(i,j).$$

We find by explicit calculation that the dimension of image of restriction of $(\mathsf{d}q')_{\mathrm{Id}}$ in each $V(i,j)$ are independent of $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K})$ (under assumption $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K}) > 2$). Note that the statement of Lemma holds in the case of complex numbers. So the lemma follows in this case.

(2) Suppose m is odd, say $2k+1$. By the same reason as before we may take D to be a matrix of rank m as below

$$D = \mathrm{diag}\{1, \dots 1, 0, \dots, 0, -1, \cdots -1, 0, \dots, 0\} + E_{1,l+1},$$

where for the diagonal matrix, k-times 1 and k-times -1 foremost and continuously occur in the first l-block and the last l-block respectively. We construct $V(i,j)$ (it is enough to do for some pairs of (i,j)) as below

$$V(i,j) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{K}\text{-span}\{E_{i,j}, E^*_{i,j}\}, \text{ for } (i,j) \ne (1,k), (l+1,k), (k,1)(k,l+1), \forall k \le 2l; \\ \mathbb{K}\text{-span}\{E_{i,j}, E_{j-l,1}, E_{1,j}, E_{j-l,l+1}\}, \text{ for } i = l+1, l+1 < j < 2l; \\ \mathbb{K}\text{-span}\{E_{l+1,j}, E_{1,j}, E_{l+j,l+1}, E_{l+j,1}\}, \text{ for } i = l+1, , 1 < j < l; \\ \mathbb{K}\text{-span}\{E_{1,1}, E_{1,l+1}, E_{l+1,1}, E_{l+1,l+1}\}, \text{ for } (i,j) = (1,1). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that those subspaces of $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ are stable under $(\mathsf{d}q')_{\mathrm{Id}}$ and $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ can be written as a direct sum of some of those $V(i,j)$'s. By the same argument above we can prove our lemma in this case. So we complete the proof of lemma. □

Lemma 2.9. *For any locally closed $G(U)$-stable subset $W \subseteq L'$ the image $\rho(W)$ is also locally closed and $\rho|_W : W \to \rho(W)$ is smooth. Here by the term "locally closed" it means either in the Zariski topology or in the étale topology.*

In the case of complex numbers and the étale topology, the above lemma is a direct consequence of the fact that $\rho|_{L'}$ is local trivial fibration in the étale topology

(see remark after [10, Proposition 11.1]). In the case of positive-characteristic fields, we give another proof with aid of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a continuous, surjective and open map of topology spaces. Assume that $W \subseteq X$ is locally closed, and the subset W and its closure $\overline{W}$ are full, then $f(W)$ is also locally closed. (Call a subset $W \subseteq X$ full provided that $W = f^{-1}(f(W))$.)*

Proof. Since f is open and $\overline{W}$ (*resp.* $\overline{W} - W$) is closed and full, so $f(\overline{W})$ (*resp.* $f(\overline{W} - W)$) is closed. This implies $f(W) = f(\overline{W}) - f(\overline{W} - W)$ is open in its closure $\overline{f(W)} = f(\overline{W})$. □

Proof. (of Lemma 2.9) Since smoothness is preserved under base changes(cf. [6, Proposition 10.1 in Ch.III], or [5, (4.9-4.10)]), the second statement follows from Proposition 2.7(2) and the first statement. So it is enough to prove the first statement.

Keep in mind the notations appearing in the proof of Proposition 2.7, where we have $L' \simeq \mathrm{GL}(V)/H$ and $\rho(L') \simeq \mathrm{GL}(V)/H'$. Under the identification we have $q' = \rho|_{L'} \circ q$. Note that q' is open map by [8, 12.1(2)], hence $\rho|_{L'}$ is also open map . Since W is $G(U)$-stable, so is its closure $\overline{W}$ in L'. Hence both W and $\overline{W}$ are full by Lemma 2.5. Combining with Lemma 2.10, we complete the proof. □

3. smoothly equivalent singularities

3.1. Maintain the notations as previously. Let us first recall some general theory.

Definition 3.1. Let X, Y be two varieties, and $x \in X$, $y \in Y$. We call singularity of X at x *smoothly equivalent* to singularity of Y at y if there exist a pair of (Z, z) with Z a variety containing a point z and two morphisms φ, ψ:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & X \\ {\scriptstyle\psi}\downarrow & & \\ Y & & \end{array}$$

with $\varphi(z) = x, \psi(z) = y$ and φ, ψ are smooth at z. This defines an equivalent relation between pointed varieties and denote the equivalence class of (X, x) by $\mathrm{Sing}(X, x)$.

In this paper, for a subset $X' \subset X$ such that $\mathrm{Sing}(X, x') = \mathrm{Sing}(X, y')$ holds for all $x', y' \in X'$,the notation $\mathrm{Sing}(X, X')$ is short-hand for $\mathrm{Sing}(X, x')$ where x' is any point in X'.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume Sing(X, x) = Sing(Y, y). Then X is normal at x if and only if Y is normal at y.*

Proof. Let $\varphi : Z \to X$ be a smooth map. For a point $z \in Z$, write $\varphi(z) = x$. By [13, 3.24(b) in Ch.1] there are affine neighbourhood V of z and U of x and an étale map $g : V \to V'$ (where $V' = \mathbb{K}^n_U$ is the affine n-space over U) such that restriction of φ to U is $\varphi|_U = p \circ g$, where $p : V' \to U$ is the natural projection.

Since an étale map preserves normality, we have V is normal at z if and only if V' is normal at $g(z)$ by [13, 3.17(b) in Ch.1]. We also have V' is normal at $g(z)$ if and only if U is normal at x by the fact that a commutative ring A is normal if and only if the polynomial ring $A[T]$ is normal. □

3.2. In spirit of the arguments in [11] for the complex classical groups, we will manage to make the propositions there of "induction by canceling rows" and of "induction by canceling columns" revived in our case.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that the ε-degeneration $\sigma \leq \eta$ is obtained from the ε'-degeneration $\sigma' < \eta'$ by adding rows and columns. Then*

$$Sing(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}, \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}) = Sing(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\eta'}}, \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\sigma'}).$$

For this, we will make some necessary preparation. Theorem 3.3 will directly follow from the forthcoming Propositions 3.4 and 3.9.

Proposition 3.4. *(Induction by canceling rows) Assume that the ε-degeneration $\sigma \leq \eta$ is obtained from the ε-degeneration $\sigma' < \eta'$ by adding rows, then*

$$Sing(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}, \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}) = Sing(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\eta'}}, \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\sigma'}).$$

This proposition corresponds to [11, Proposition 13.4]. The proof of [11, Proposition 13.4] is dependent on [11, Proposition 13.1]. However, the arguments for the latter can not carry out in positive characteristic because it seems impossible to find H'-stable decomposition used there for arbitrary reductive group. Fortunately, we observe that some desirable decompositions still exist for the groups we are concerned with (we will write out it explicitly, see Lemma 3.6). Let us first recall the notion of cross sections (see [11, 12.4]).

Definition 3.5. Let X be a variety with a regular action of an algebraic group G. A *cross section* at a point $x \in X$ is defined to be a locally closed subvariety $S \subseteq X$ such that $x \in S$ and the map $G \times S \longrightarrow X, (g, s) \mapsto g \cdot s$, is smooth at the point (e, x). Of course we have $\mathrm{Sing}(S, x) = \mathrm{Sing}(X, x)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.4: (Here we just replace the notations D, D', E, E', F in the proof of [11, Proposition 13.4] by x, x', y, y', z respectively) Let V be a quadratic space of type ε of dimension $|\eta|$, and $x \in \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta} \subset \mathfrak{g}(V)$. By assumption the diagrams η and σ are decomposed into $\eta = \nu + \eta'$, $\sigma = \nu + \sigma'$ respectively where ν is a common row of (σ, η) and (σ, η) is obtained from (σ', η') by adding the diagram ν. Under the decomposition $V = W \oplus V'$, write $x = (z, x') \in \mathfrak{g}(W) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(V')$, $y = (z, y') \in \mathfrak{g}(W) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(V')$ where $y \in \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$; $x' \in \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta'} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}(V')$, $y' \in \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma'} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}(V')$ and $z \in \mathfrak{g}(W)$. Now let us consider the following reductive groups $G := \mathrm{GL}(V)$, $G' := \mathrm{GL}(W) \times \mathrm{GL}(V')$, $H := G(V)$, $H' = G(W) \times G(V')$. Set $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$, $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathrm{Lie}(G')$, $\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{Lie}(H)$ and $\mathfrak{h}' = \mathrm{Lie}(H)$. The assumptions of [11, Proposition 13.1] hold in this context, namely

(1) $\mathrm{codim}_{\overline{G'x}} G'y = \mathrm{codim}_{\overline{Gx}} Gy$.
(2) $\overline{G'x} \cap \mathfrak{h}' = \overline{H'x}$.
(3) $\overline{Gx}$ is normal at y.

The above (1) is due to the property of nilpotent orbits in the type A. As to (3), it follows from the main result of [2]. By the same arguments as in the proof of [11, Proposition 13.4], we only need to prove that the statement of [11, Proposition 13.1] is still valid to our situation. This is to say, we only need to prove that $\mathrm{Sing}(\overline{Hx}, y) = \mathrm{Sing}(\overline{H'x}, y)$, which will result from Lemma 3.6 presented below. The proof is completed modulo the forthcoming lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Maintain the notations as in the above proof. Then* $Sing(\overline{Hx}, y) = Sing(\overline{H'x}, y)$.

Proof. Firstly let us make the following claim.

Claim 3.7. There is an H'-stable decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$ as below

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h}' \oplus M' \oplus M_0 \oplus D$$

where $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{h}' \oplus M'$, $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}' \oplus M_0$.

We certify the claim. Suppose that $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the defining quadratic form of G, i.e. $G := \{g \in \mathrm{GL}(V) \mid (gv, gu) = (u, v)\}$. For a given $f \in \mathrm{End}(V)$, define f^* via $(fu, v) = (u, f^*v)$. Then we have $H = \{g \in \mathrm{GL}(V) \mid g^{-1} = g^*\}$, and $\mathfrak{h} = \{x \in \mathfrak{gl}(V) \mid -x = x^*\}$. We further have $\mathrm{End}(V) = \mathfrak{g} \bigoplus M$, where $M = \{x \in \mathrm{End}(V) \mid x = x^*\}$. Set $M' = \{x \in g' \mid x = x^*\}$ and $M_0 = \{x \in \mathfrak{h} \mid x(v) \in W \text{ for all } v \in V'; x(w) \in V' \text{ for all } w \in W\}$, $D = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid x(v) \in W \text{ for all } v \in V'; x(w) \in V' \text{ for all } w \in W; x = x^*\}$. It is easy to verified that those spaces are H'-stable and

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h}' \oplus M' \oplus M_0 \oplus D.$$

So the claim follows.

Secondly, by the same argument as in the proof of [10, Proposition 13.1], we can complete the proof of the lemma. For the readers' convenience, we give the detailed arguments.

Now we have vector space decomposition

$$\mathfrak{h}' = [\mathfrak{h}', y] \oplus N_0', \quad M' = [M', y] \oplus \overline{N'}$$

and

$$M_0 = [M_0, y] \oplus \overline{N_0}, \quad D = [D, y] \oplus \overline{D}.$$

Set $N := N_0' \oplus \overline{N'} \oplus \overline{N_0} \oplus \overline{D}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g} &= [\mathfrak{g}, y] \oplus N \\
\mathfrak{g}' &= [\mathfrak{g}', y] \oplus N', \text{where } N' := N \bigcap \mathfrak{g}', \\
\mathfrak{h} &= [\mathfrak{h}, y] \oplus N_0, \text{where } N_0 := N \bigcap \mathfrak{h}, \\
\mathfrak{h}' &= [\mathfrak{h}', y] \oplus N_0', \text{where } N_0' := N \cap \mathfrak{h}'. \qquad (3.1)
\end{aligned}$$

So we can define

$$\begin{aligned}
S &:= (N + y) \cap \overline{Gx}, \\
S' &= (N' + y) \cap \overline{G'x}, \\
S_0 &= (N_0 + y) \cap \overline{Hx},
\end{aligned}$$

$$S_0' = (N_0' + y) \cap \overline{H'x}.$$

From the forthcoming Lemma 3.8 it follows that those S, S', S_0, S_0' are cross sections of $\overline{Gx}, \overline{G'x}, \overline{Hx}, \overline{H'x}$ at y respectively under the adjoin action of the corresponding groups. So we have $\mathrm{Sing}(\overline{H'x}, y) = \mathrm{Sing}(S_0', y)$, $\mathrm{Sing}(\overline{Hx}, y) = \mathrm{Sing}(S_0, y)$. Hence it is enough to prove $\mathrm{Sing}(S_0', y) = \mathrm{Sing}(S_0, y)$. By the same arguments as in [11, Proposition 13.4], we have $S_0' = S' \cap \mathfrak{h}$. From Property (1) listed in the proof of Proposition 3.4 and the forthcoming Lemma 3.8, we have $\dim_y S = \dim_y S'$. From Property (3) appearing as previously, S is normal in y. So there exists an open neighborhood F of y in S such that $F \subset S'$ and F open in S'. From the known fact

$$S \cap \mathfrak{h} \supseteq S_0 \supseteq S_0' = S' \cap \mathfrak{h},$$

we have that $F \cap \mathfrak{h}$ is a common open neighborhood of y in S_0 and S_0'. Thus we have $\mathrm{Sing}(S_0', y) = \mathrm{Sing}(S_0, y)$. So the proof is completed, modulo the following Lemma 3.8. □

Lemma 3.8. *Maintain the notations and assumptions as above. Then S, S', S_0, S_0' are cross sections of $\overline{Gx}, \overline{G'x}, \overline{Hx}, \overline{H'x}$ at y respectively under the adjoint action of corresponding groups. Furthermore, $codim_{\overline{Gx}} Gy = dim_y S$, $codim_{\overline{Gx'}} Gy' = dim_{y'} S'$, $codim_{\overline{Hx}} Hy = dim_y S_0$ and $codim_{\overline{H'x}} H'y = dim_y S_0'$*

Proof. We only need to prove the claim in the case of S_0' at y. The remaining things are the same. In fact we already have $\mathfrak{h}' = [\mathfrak{h}', y] \oplus N_0'$ with $N_0' := N \cap \mathfrak{h}'$. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ad}^{-1}(\overline{H'x}) = H' \times S_0' & \xrightarrow{j'} & H' \times \{N_0' + y\} \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Ad}'} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Ad}} \\ \overline{H'x} & \xrightarrow[j]{} & \mathfrak{h}' \end{array}$$

where Ad, Ad′ are adjoint actions, and j' and j are the inclusion maps. It is easy to know by a direct calculation that the image of the tangent map of Ad at (e, y) is $[\mathfrak{h}', y] \oplus N_0'$ which is equal to $\mathfrak{h}'$. So Ad is smooth at (e, y). Since the base change preserves smoothness , Ad′ is smooth at (e, y). So the first part of the lemma follows.

As $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K}) = p > 2$ is good for $G(V')$ and $G(W)$, it is also good for $H' = G(V') \times G(W)$. So we have $\mathcal{T}_y(H'y) = [\mathfrak{h}', y]$, thereby $\dim(H'y) = \dim([\mathfrak{h}', y])$. Combining with the fact that $\mathcal{T}_y(H'y) \bigoplus \mathcal{T}_y(y + N_0') = [\mathfrak{h}', y] \oplus N_0' = \mathfrak{h}'$, we have that N_0' and $H'y$ intersect only at y in a neighborhood $\widehat{O}$ of y in $H'y$, thereby so do S' and $H'y$. In this neighborhood, $(\mathrm{Ad}')^{-1}(\widehat{O}) = \widehat{H'} \times y$ where $\widehat{H'}$ is an open subset of H' such that $\widehat{H'} = \tau^{-1}(\widehat{O})$ with τ being an orbit map of y under the adjoint action of H'. The second part of the lemma follows from the following base

change

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{H'} \times y & \xrightarrow{j} & H' \times S'_0 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Ad}''} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Ad}'} \\ \widehat{O} & \xrightarrow[j]{} & \overline{H'x}, \end{array}$$

and the fact that base change of smooth morphism preserves the relative dimension ([6, Proposition 10.1 in Ch.III]). □

The foregoing lemma is a modular version of the arguments [11, 12.4]. It is still valid in our situation, essentially due to the separable action of groups (see [3, 17.11.1] for general arguments). This is one of the reasons why we requires $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K}) = p$ is good.

3.3. We are in the position to present the canceling-columns proposition.

Proposition 3.9. *(Induction by canceling columns) Assume that ε-degeneration $\sigma \leq \eta$ arises from the ε'-degeneration $\sigma' \leq \eta'$ by adding columns. Then*

$$Sing(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}, \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}) = Sing(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\eta'}}, \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\sigma'}).$$

We will prove the above proposition by the same arguments as in the proof of [11, Proposition 13.5]. For this, we need to check some details in the case of positive-characteristic fields.

Proof. It is enough to treat the case when the ε-degeneration $\sigma \leq \eta$ arises from the ε'-degeneration $\sigma' \leq \eta'$ by adding a single column. Let V be a quadratic space of type ε and of dimension $|\eta|$, U be a quadratic space of type ε' and of dimension $|\eta'|$. By Lemma 2.6, we consider the following restrictions of map π and ρ on the locally closed set

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N_{\varepsilon,\eta} := \pi^{-1}(\overline{\mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\eta'}}) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \overline{\mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\eta'}} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} & & \\ \overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}. & & \end{array}$$

Here $\pi|_{N_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ (*resp.* $\rho|_{N_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$) is simply written as π (*resp.* ρ). We claim that there exists $x \in N_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ such that $\pi(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\sigma'}$, $\rho(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\sigma}$ and that x, π, ρ satisfy the assumption of Definition 3.1. The arguments will proceed by steps.

(1) We assert that the map π is smooth on the open subset

$$N'_{\varepsilon,\eta} := N_{\varepsilon,\eta} \cap L'$$

of $N_{\varepsilon,\eta}$. Indeed, $\pi(N'_{\varepsilon,\eta})$ is open subset of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\eta'}}$ (note that $\pi(N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}) = \pi(L') \cap \overline{\mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\eta'}}$ and $\pi(L')$ is open subset of $\mathfrak{g}(U)$ by Proposition 2.7(1)) and $\pi^{-1}(\pi(N'_{\varepsilon,\eta})) \cap L' =$

$N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}$. Now we have base changes as below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N'_{\varepsilon,\eta} & \xrightarrow{j} & L' \\ \pi\downarrow & & \downarrow\pi \\ \pi(N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}) & \xrightarrow[j]{} & \pi(L') \end{array}$$

where j's are inclusions of locally closed subvarieties. As a base change preserves smoothness (cf. [6, Proposition 10.1 in Ch.III]) or [5, (4.9-4.10)]), we have π is smooth on $N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ by Proposition 2.7.

(2) $N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ is locally closed $G(U)$-stable subset of L', by lemma 2.9 we have $\rho|_{N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ is smooth. In another words, ρ is smooth on $N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}$.

(3) By Lemma 2.6(4), there exists $x \in N'_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ such that $\pi(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{-\varepsilon,\sigma'}$ and $\rho(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$.

Summing up, we complete the proof. □

4. Proof of the main result

4.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Owing to Theorem 2.1, we only need to consider all $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$ of codimention 2 in $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$, which is of course a minimal degeneration. By canceling "rows" and "columns" we obtain a minimal irreducible ε'-degeneration $\sigma' \leq \eta'$ (see [11, §3.4]), which is among types a, b, c, e in Table 1. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, the normality of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\sigma'}$ at $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon',\eta'}}$ is known. From Theorem 3.3 and lemma 3.2 we can clearly determine as the theorem says, the normality of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ at $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$. The proof is completed.

Remark 4.1. (1) The reason why we exclude type d is that we are not able to prove Proposition 10.2 of [11] in positive characteristic. The important tool in [11] is Grauert-Riemenschneider vanishing theorem which does not hold ever in positive characteristic. Thus we are not able to obtain the modular version of Proposition 15.4 of [11].

(2) By the arguments in the above proof, one easily has the following observation. If the normality of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\eta}}$ at $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,\sigma}$ is in type e is known, then we can determine normality of all nilpotent orbits of the orthogonal and symplectic groups. The issue of this question in type e is under investigation.

(3) In comparison with J. Thomsen's results on the normality of nilpotent orbit closures in positive characteristic (cf. [15]), our results are more extensively applicable. This is easily seen by some plain examples listed in §4.2 (1) and (2) below.

4.2. **Examples.** In the concluding subsection with the same notations and assumptions as in the main theorem, we illustrate our main result by some examples.

(1) Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_{11}$ and $\eta = [7, 2, 2]$). Then the nilpotent variety $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{1,\eta}}$ is not normal because it has codimension 2 degeneration $\mathcal{O}_{1,\sigma}$ with $\sigma = [7, 1, 1, 1, 1]$. By erasing first row, the pair (η, σ) corresponds to the minimal irreducible degeneration $([2, 2], [1, 1, 1, 1])$ (by erasing first row) of type e in Table 1.

(2) Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_8$ and $\eta = [6, 1, 1]$. Then the nilpotent variety $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{-1,\eta}}$ is normal. $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{-1,\eta}}$ has only one codimension 2 degeneration $\mathcal{O}_{-,\sigma}$ with $\sigma = [4, 2, 2]$ and by erasing first column the pair (η, σ)corresponds to minimal irreducible degeneration([5], [3,1,1]) of type c in Table 1.

(3) Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_{14}$ and $\eta = [4, 4, 3, 3]$. In this case, we are not able to judge if the nilpotent variety $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{-1,\eta}}$ is normal. It has a codimension 2 degeneration of $\mathcal{O}_{-1,\sigma}$ with $\sigma = [4, 4, 2, 2, 2]$. This case corresponds to the minimal degeneration of type d in Table 1.

Acknowledgements

We thank Hao Chang and Miaofen Chen for their helpful discussions. We express our deep thanks to the referee whose suggestions improve our paper. Especially, the referee pointed out some general fact for Lemma 2.3 (see Remark 2.4(1)) and provided us with a more strict proof of Lemma 3.2.

References

[1] A. Broer, *Line bundles on the cotangent bundle of the flag variety*, Invent. Math. 113 (1991), 1-20.
[2] S. Donkin, *The normality of closures of conjugacy classes of matrices*, Invent. Math. 101 (1990), 717-736.
[3] A. Grothendiek and J. Dieudonné, *Elements de géometrie algébrique* O-IV, Publ. Math. de I'I.H.E.S. 11, 20, 24, 32, Paris (1961-67).
[4] E. Goldstein, *Nilpotent Orbits in the symplectic and orthogonal Groups*, Doctoral Theisis, Tufts University, 2011.
[5] U. Görtz and T. Wedhorn, *Algebraic geometry I*, Vieweg+Teubner Verlag, Heidelberg, 2010.
[6] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977. (GTM 52)
[7] W. Hesselink, *Singularities in the nilpotent scheme of a calssical group*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 222 (1976), 1-32.
[8] J. E. Humphreys, *Linear algebraic groups*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975. (GTM 21)
[9] J. C. Jantzen, *Nilpotent orbits in representation theory*, Lie theory, 1-211, Progr. Math., 228, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2004.
[10] H. Kraft and C. Procesi, *Closures of conjugacy classes of matrices are normal*, Invent. Math. 53 (1979), 227-247.
[11] H. Kraft and C. Procesi, *On the geometry of conjugacy classes in classical groups*, Comment. Math. Helv. 57 (1982), 539-602.
[12] Q. Liu, *Algebraic Geometry and Arithmetic Curves*, Oxford Grad Texts in Math,Oxford University Press 2002.
[13] J. S. Milne, *Étale cohomology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J., 1980. (Princiton mathmatical series)
[14] E. Sommers, *Normality of very even nilpotent varieties in D_{2l}*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 37 (2005), 351-360.
[15] J. Thomsen, *Normality of certain nilpotent varieties in positive characteristic*, J. Algebra 227 (2000), no. 2, 595-613

Department of Mathematics, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200241, China.

E-mail address: hsl1523@163.com

Department of Mathematics, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200241, China.

E-mail address: bshu@math.ecnu.edu.cn