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Abstract. We classify the irreducible representations of smooth, connected affine algebraic groups over a field, by tackling the case of pseudo-reductive groups. We reduce the problem of calculating the dimension for pseudo-split pseudo-reductive groups to the split reductive case and the pseudo-split pseudo-reductive commutative case. Moreover, we give the first results on the latter, including a rather complete description of the rank one case.

1. Introduction

Let $k$ be a field and let $G$ be a smooth connected affine algebraic $k$-group. We will be interested in the irreducible $k$-representations of $G$. Since the only irreducible representation of a unipotent $k$-group is the trivial representation $k$ itself, any normal unipotent subgroup of $G$ must act trivially on any irreducible representation of $G$. In particular, the smooth connected normal unipotent $k$-subgroup $R_u,k(G)$ acts trivially and so we may as well assume $R_u,k(G) = 1$; that is to say that $G$ is a pseudo-reductive group. The main result of this paper is to classify the irreducible representations of $G$ in terms of those of a maximal torus, effectively completing a programme started in the fifties by Chevalley.

Pseudo-reductive groups have been the focus of a high degree of interest in recent years, due for the most part to the monograph [CGP15] which gives a remarkably transparent structure theory. It says that with a small number of exceptions, $G$ is standard: that is, isomorphic to a certain type of systematic modification of Weil restrictions of connected reductive groups; the modification process involves changing a Cartan subgroup—which is typically far from a torus. For simplicity of exposition all our reductive groups are henceforth assumed to be connected.

When $G$ is reductive and split, the representation theory of $G$ over arbitrary fields is rather extensive; the reader is referred to [Jan03] to see this in all its glory, but we mention some highlights. Firstly, there is, due to Chevalley, a parametrisation of the simple representations by dominant weights, with such representations arising as the socles of certain universal induced modules which are defined over $\mathbb{Z}$—the latter have an elegant formula for their characters and dimensions courtesy of Weyl. If the characteristic of $k$ is 0, these induced modules are irreducible, but even when they are not, there are effective methods of calculating the characters of their simple socles in many cases, using the Anderson–Jantzen sum formula, and informed by the so-called alcove geometry induced by the affine Weyl group (in particular the Linkage Principle). These methods have been implemented algorithmically by Frank Lübeck [Lüb01] and thousands of characters (in arbitrary characteristic) are now available. Furthermore, when the characteristic is huge relative to the root system, it is a result of a number of authors that Lusztig’s character formula holds, relating the characters of simple modules to those of the induced modules via Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials; technically, this gives information only about the principal block, but the remaining characters can
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be deduced by use of Jantzen’s translation functors and Steinberg’s tensor product theorem. It should be mentioned that work of G. Williamson [Wil17] tells us that the characteristic must be at least exponential in the rank of simple factors for Lusztig’s formula to hold, so that there remains a conceptual hole in the theory, but one which continues to be closed as time goes on; see [RW18] for the latest developments, including a replacement conjecture.

The representation theory of split reductive groups is all predicated on the commutative case: a split reductive commutative group is simply a product of copies of the multiplicative group of the field and its representations are all well-known to be semisimple, being just sums of one-dimensional weight spaces. Since this is completely false in the context of commutative pseudo-reductive groups—and their classification is thought to be out of reach—it has been expected that their representation theory should be intractable. However, in the case where \( G \) is pseudo-split—that is, it contains a split maximal torus—we are able to classify the simple representations by dominant weights and reduce the case of giving a dimension formula to understanding the commutative pseudo-reductive case together with the reductive case. The general case (see Proposition 5.1) essentially follows from this together with a Galois descent argument.

The possibility for a breakthrough owes itself to the following crucial theorem, [CGP15, Thm. 3.4.6] (or the simpler proof of [CP17, Thm. 5.5.4]):

**Theorem 1.1** (Conrad–Gabber–Prasad). Let \( G \) be a pseudo-split pseudo-reductive \( k \)-group with split maximal torus \( T \). Then \( G \) has a Levi \( k \)-subgroup \( M \) containing \( T \) (and \( M \) is the unique Levi subgroup containing \( T \)).

Recall that \( M \) is a Levi subgroup of \( G \) if \( M \) is reductive and \( G_{\overline{k}} = M_{\overline{k}} \rtimes \mathcal{R}_u(G_{\overline{k}}) \) where \( \mathcal{R}_u(G_{\overline{k}}) \) is the unipotent radical of \( G_{\overline{k}} \). Our main theorem constructs a correspondence between the irreducible \( G \)-modules and the irreducible \( M \)-modules to that of \( M \)-modules and \( C \)-modules where \( C \) is a Cartan subgroup of \( G \).

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( G \) be a pseudo-split pseudo-reductive group with Cartan subgroup \( C \) containing a split maximal torus \( T \). Let \( M \) be the unique Levi subgroup of \( G \) containing \( T \). Then the isomorphism classes of irreducible representations of \( G \) are in 1-1 correspondence with the dominant weights of \( M \). If \( X(T)_+ \) denotes the set of dominant weights for \( T \subseteq M \), then for \( \lambda \in X(T)_+ \) we denote by \( L_G(\lambda) \) the corresponding irreducible representation. On restriction, \( L_G(\lambda) \) is \( M \)-isotypic and semisimple. Furthermore,

\[
\dim L_G(\lambda) = \dim L_M(\lambda) \cdot \dim L_C(\lambda).
\]

For the dimension formula, note that since a Cartan subgroup \( C \) contains a split maximal torus \( T \) which must be its Levi subgroup, the first part of the theorem guarantees a representation \( L_C(\lambda) \) unique up to isomorphism for any weight \( \lambda \in X(T) \).

As mentioned above, a complete description of \( \dim L_M(\lambda) \) is thought to be out of reach, for \( p \) small compared to the root system of \( M \), though at least there are algorithms that in principle compute any given example. For \( \dim L_C(\lambda) \) the situation is arguably even worse since there is nothing known. We can give an answer in the case \( C = R_{k'/k}(G_m) \) for \( k' \) a finite non-zero reduced purely inseparable \( k \)-algebra (Theorem 6.8). Here is the simpler version of this theorem when \( k' \) is a purely inseparable field extension. In order to state the result, we need some notation: let \( k'/k \) be a purely inseparable extension of fields of degree \( q = p^r \) and let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \). Then we let \( k'(\lambda) \) denote the subfield of \( k' \) generated by \( k \) and \( (k')^\lambda \). Note that if \( \lambda \) is coprime to \( p \) and \( k'/k \) is purely inseparable, then the kernel of the group homomorphism \( x \mapsto x^\lambda \) on \( (k')^\ast \) is contained in \( k \). The
fundamental theorem of homomorphisms now implies that any element of \((k')^*\) lies in the product of \(k\) and the image of this map, so in this case \(k'(\lambda) = k'\). More generally, one can see that if we write \(\lambda = p^{r\nu}(\lambda)\mu\) with \(\mu\) coprime to \(p\) then \(k'(\lambda) = k'(p^{r\nu}(\lambda))\).

**Theorem 1.3.** Let \(k'/k\) be a purely inseparable extension of fields of degree \(q = p^r\) and let \(C = R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)\). Then for any \(\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}\) we have

\[
\dim(L_C(\lambda)) = [k'(\lambda) : k].
\]

This is a good moment to point out that for a general pseudo-reductive group, most simple \(G\)-modules are not absolutely irreducible. If \(V\) is an absolutely irreducible \(G\)-module then \(V_k\) is an irreducible \(G_k\)-module and the Lie–Kolchin theorem implies that \(\mathcal{R}_u(G_k)\) must act trivially. If \(G\) is as in the theorem above, we have \(G_k \cong \mathbb{G}_m \times \mathcal{R}_u(G_k)\), so that the simple \(G_k\)-modules are 1-dimensional, where this is true of simple \(G\)-modules if and only if \(k'(\lambda) = k\).

For split reductive \(G'\), as the action of \(G'\) on \(L_{G'}(\lambda)\) factors through the Frobenius map \(F_{\nu}(\lambda)\), we have that \(R_{k'(\lambda)/k}(L_{G'}(\lambda))\) furnishes us with a \(G\)-module with the correct highest weight and the right dimension. Hence, the following consequence of Theorem 1.3 is immediate.

**Corollary 1.4.** If \(G = R_{k'/k}(G')\) for \(G'\) split reductive, then \(L_G(\lambda) = R_{k'(\lambda)/k}(L_{G'}(\lambda))\).

2. Preliminaries

We collect some basic material in this section. Our main references for the theory of algebraic groups are [CGP15] and [Jan03] and our notation will be kept consistent with those monographs. In particular all rings are commutative and unital.

For \(k\) a ring, let \(G\) be an affine algebraic \(k\)-group, that is a functor \(k-\text{Alg} \to \text{Grp}\) which is represented by a finitely presented \(k\)-algebra \(k[G]\), in other words \(G(?) \cong \text{Hom}_{k-\text{Alg}}(k[G], ?)\). Note that we do not insist that algebraic groups be smooth.

2.1. \(G\)-modules. Let \(M\) be a \(k\)-module (possibly infinite-dimensional). Then we may define a group functor \(M_k : k-\text{Alg} \to \text{Grp}\) so that \(M_k(A) = M \otimes_k A\) inherits a group structure from the additive group on \(A\). Note that, even when \(k\) is a field, \(M_k\) is only an algebraic group when \(M\) is finite-dimensional. Recall that an action of \(G\) on a \(k\)-functor \(X\) is a morphism (i.e. a natural transformation) \(\phi : G \times X \to X\) such that \(\phi(A) : G(A) \times X(A) \to X(A)\) is an action of the group \(G(A)\) on \(X(A)\) for each \(k\)-algebra \(A\). In case \(G\) acts on \(M_k\) such that the action of \(G(A)\) on \(M_k(A)\) is \(A\)-linear for each \(k\)-algebra \(A\), we say \(M\) is a representation for \(G\), or more frequently in this paper, a \(G\)-module. Equivalently, one may use the Hopf algebra structure on \(k[G]\) to define a \(G\)-module \(M\) to be a comodule for \(k[G]\). These definitions permit the possibility of working with infinite-dimensional modules, though if \(V\) is a finite-dimensional \(G\)-module then it corresponds to a homomorphism \(G \to \text{GL}(V)\) of algebraic groups. Of course, if \(k \to k'\) is a homomorphism of rings and \(M\) is a \(G\)-module then \(M_{k'} := M \otimes k'\) acquires an action of the base change \(G_{k'}\) of \(G\) making it into a \(G_{k'}\)-module.

**Remark 2.1.** If \(G\) is smooth and \(k\) is an algebraically closed field then one may more straightforwardly define a \(G\)-module to be a vector space \(M\) over \(k\) on which \(G(k)\) acts rationally through \(k\)-linear maps. Here to act rationally means that if \(g \in G(k)\) and \((v_i)_{i \in I}\) is a basis for \(M\) then \(g.v_i = \sum_{j \in J} f_{ji}(g)v_i\) for \(f_{ji} \in k[G]\) with cofinitely many of the \(f_{ij}\) being zero.
The collection of $G$-modules forms a category $G$-Mod, with morphisms being $G$-equivariant $k$-linear maps. If $M$ and $M'$ are $G$-modules, the full collection of such morphisms is written $\text{Hom}_G(M, M')$. An important fact [Jan03, I.2.10(7)] is that the $\text{Hom}_G$ bifunctor commutes with base change across flat extensions, i.e.

$$\text{Hom}_G(V, W) \otimes k' \cong \text{Hom}_{G_{k'}}(V \otimes k', W \otimes k').$$

If $G$ is flat, then it is an immediate consequence of the definitions that all $G$-modules are locally finite, that is to say that for any $m \in M(k)$ there is a unique minimal finitely generated submodule $G$-submodule $kGm$ of $M$ containing $m$. It follows that all simple $G$-modules over a field are finite-dimensional. Furthermore, the category of $G$-modules is abelian.

One may consult [Jan03, §I.2] for more details.

2.2. **Representations of $G_m$.** The $\mathbb{Z}$-defined group scheme $G_m$ is the functor $\text{Rng} \to \text{Grp}$ which returns the group of units $R^\times$ of any ring $R$. (It is represented by the algebra $\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$.) Let $k$ be a ring and let $W$ be a non-zero $(G_m)_k$-module. If there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a \cdot w = a^\lambda w$ for any $k$-algebra $A$, $w \in W(A)$ and $a \in (G_m)_k(A) = A^\times$, then we say $W$ is a weight module (of weight $\lambda$). More typically $k$ will be a field and so $W(k)$ will be a vector space over $k$, in which case we refer to it as a weight space (of weight $\lambda$). By [Jan03, I.2.14(4)], any $(G_m)_k$-module $V$ is semisimple, breaking into a sum of 1-dimensional irreducible weight spaces; the resulting weights are referred to as the weights of $V$. If $\lambda$ is a weight of $V$ then $V_\lambda$ is the sum of all submodules of $V$ which are weight modules of weight $\lambda$. When $k$ is a field, then an irreducible representation is a 1-dimensional weight space. We denote by $k_\lambda$ a 1-dimensional weight space of weight $\lambda$. We will usually abuse notation by identifying the character group $X(G_m)$ with $\mathbb{Z}$.

In many cases it will be simpler to consider $G_m$ as a $k$-group over some ring $k$ (which will usually be a field), in which case we will just write $G_m$ in place of $(G_m)_k$.

2.3. **Representations of unipotent groups.** In this section let $k$ be a field. Recall that a $k$-group $U$ is unipotent if it is isomorphic to a closed subgroup of the group $U_n$ of strictly upper triangular $n \times n$ matrices over $k$ for some $n$. In the case that $k$ is a field of characteristic $p$ and $U$ is a smooth $k$-group, for $U$ to be unipotent, it suffices for there to be some $e$ such that the $p^e$-map on $U$ factors through the identity. In order to apply the Lie–Kolchin theorem to a solvable group $G$, one needs $G$ to be split (which happens in the case $k$ is algebraically closed), but when $G$ is a unipotent $k$-group one can show, cf. [DG70, IV.§2.2.5]:

**Proposition 2.2.** Let $U$ be any unipotent $k$-group. Then the only simple $U$-module is the 1-dimensional trivial module, $k$.

2.4. **Induction.** We construct simple modules by induction. The archetypal use of induction for reductive algebraic groups is of simple modules for a maximal torus, lifted to a Borel subgroup $B$ and induced to $G$. Such modules are then finite-dimensional since $G/B$ is a projective variety. The reader is warned that the induced modules we consider are generally infinite-dimensional.

The essential definition is this: Let $k$ be a unital ring and $M$ be an $H$-module for $H$ a closed flat subgroup scheme of the flat $k$-group scheme $G$ and let $M_a$ be the underlying $k$-group functor of $M$. Then from [Jan03, I.3.3] we have

$$\text{Ind}_H^G(M) = \{ f \in \text{Mor}(G, M_a) \mid f(gh) = h^{-1}f(g) \text{ for all } g \in G(A), h \in H(A) \text{ and all } k\text{-algebras } A \},$$
is a $G$-module via $(g_1 \cdot f)(g) = f(g_1^{-1}g)$. Of course, if $H = 1$ is the trivial subgroup of $G$ we have $\text{Ind}_H^G(k) = k[G]$ is the co-ordinate algebra of $G$, considered as a left $G$-module.

A key feature of induction is Frobenius reciprocity. For a $G$-module $N$ and $H$-module $M$, we have

$$\text{Hom}_G(N, \text{Ind}_H^G(M)) \cong \text{Hom}_H(\text{Res}_H^G(N), M),$$

where $\text{Res}_H^G(N) = N|_H$ is the obvious $H$-module obtained by restriction.

If $G$ is unipotent and $k$ is a field then, then Prop. 2.2 implies that $k$ is the only simple module, and taking $H = 1$, the above equation gives

$$k \cong \text{Hom}_H(k, k) \cong \text{Hom}_G(k, \text{Ind}_1^G(k)) = \text{Hom}_G(k, k[G]).$$

Thus $k[G]$ has a unique simple module in its socle (and is therefore indecomposable).

This argument can be run in reverse, so that if one shows an induced module has a simple socle then it will follow that there is exactly one simple $G$-module up to isomorphism which has an $H$-homomorphism to the $H$-module being induced.

Another fact we need is that induction commutes with base change, [Jan03, I.3.5(3)]. Let $k'$ be a flat $k$-algebra. Then we have for each $H$-module $M$ a canonical isomorphism

$$\text{Ind}_H^G(M) \otimes k' \cong \text{Ind}_{H'}^G(M \otimes k').$$

Lastly, we recall the tensor identity, [Jan03, I.3.6]. Let $N$ be a $G$-module that is flat over $k$. For any closed flat subgroup scheme $H$ of $G$ and any $H$-module $M$ there is a canonical isomorphism of $G$-modules

$$\text{Ind}_H^G(M \otimes \text{Res}_H^G(N)) \cong \text{Ind}_H^G(M) \otimes N.$$

2.5. Weil restriction. Since the notion of Weil restriction is at the heart of the structure theory of pseudo-reductive groups, we recall some of the important features from [CGP15, §A.5]. If $B \to B'$ is a finite flat map of Noetherian rings, and $X'$ a quasi-projective $B'$-scheme, one may define the Weil restriction $X := R_{B'/B}(X')$. Then $X$ is a $B$-scheme of finite type satisfying the universal property

$$X(A) = X'(B' \otimes_B A),$$

for $A$ any $B$-algebra.

A key fact is that Weil restriction is right adjoint to base change along $\text{Spec}(B) \to \text{Spec}(B')$. That is to say that there is a bijection

$$\text{Hom}_B(Y, R_{B'/B}(X')) \cong \text{Hom}_{B'}(Y_{B'}, X'),$$

which is natural in $X'$ and the $B$-scheme $Y$. Two situations are particularly important. If $X' = Z_{B'}$ for a $B$-scheme $B'$ then taking $Y = Z$ in (6), one has the identity map on the right-hand side, giving a canonical map $Z \to R_{B'/B}(X')$; [CGP15, A.5.7] implies that this map is a closed immersion provided $\text{Spec}(B') \to \text{Spec}(B)$ is surjective (which will be true if $B$ is a field and $B'$ is non-zero, since then $\text{Spec}(B)$ is a single point). Conversely, if we take $Y = R_{B'/B}(X')$ the identity map on the left-hand side corresponds to a canonical map $q : R_{B'/B}(X')_{B'} \to X'$; [CGP15, A.5.10] implies this map is is surjective on all $A$-points for $A$ a $B$-algebra provided $B$ is a field and $B'$ is a finite local $B$-algebra with a purely inseparable residue field over $B$.

In case $X' = G'$ is a $B'$-group, we find $G := X$ is a $B$-group. When $B = k$ is a field, and $B' = k'$ is a nonzero finite reduced $k$-algebra, then $G'$ is pseudo-reductive whenever $G$ is reductive. If $G'$ is
defined over $k$ and we choose a $k$-descent $H$ of $G'$, then the remarks above show that $H$ embeds as a canonical subgroup in $G$; since any split reductive group is defined over $\mathbb{Z}$ we deduce:

(7) If $G'$ is a split reductive $\mathbb{Z}$-group then $G'_k$ embeds as a canonical subgroup of $R_{k'/k}(G'_{k'})$.

3. Existence and uniqueness

Let $k$ be an imperfect field of characteristic $p$ and let $G$ be a pseudo-split, pseudo-reductive $k$-group. Then by [CGP15, Thm. 3.4.6], $G$ has a Levi subgroup $M$, containing a split torus $T$. A choice of Borel subgroup $B \supseteq T$ in $M$ containing negative root groups defines a partial ordering on weights together with a set of dominant weights $X(T)_+$. Since everything is flat over $k$, we may apply all the results of the previous section. Moreover, by [Jan03, II.2.4], each simple module for $M$ has a unique highest weight $\lambda \in X(T)_+$, and any such is isomorphic to $L_M(\lambda) := \text{Soc}_M(\text{Ind}_B^M(\lambda))$.

Having fixed this notation, we prove essentially the same is true for $G$. Define $Q_G(\lambda) := \text{Ind}_M^G(\lambda)$ and let $k'$ be the minimal field of definition of the unipotent radical of $G$, so that $G_{k'} \cong M_{k'} \rtimes \mathcal{R}_{u,k'}(G_{k'})$. Now, as $G_{k'} \cong M_{k'} \rtimes \mathcal{R}_{u,k'}(G_{k'})$, the $k'$-module $L_{M_{k'}}(\lambda)$ inherits a $G_{k'}$-structure by allowing $\mathcal{R}_{u,k'}(G_{k'})$ to act trivially on $L_{M_{k'}}(\lambda)$; conversely $\mathcal{R}_{u,k'}(G_{k'})$ acts trivially on any simple $G_{k'}$-module, so this structure is unique. Write $L_{G_{k'}}(\lambda)$ for this module.

**Lemma 3.1.** The module $Q_G(\lambda)$ is $M$-isotypic; that is, all $M$-composition factors are isomorphic to $L_M(\lambda)$. Furthermore $Q_G(\lambda)$ is $M$-semisimple.

**Proof.** We have $Q_G(\lambda)_{k'} \cong \text{Ind}_{M_{k'}}^G(\lambda)$ by (4). Then by the tensor identity (5), we have $Q_G(\lambda)_{k'} \cong \text{Ind}_{M_{k'}}(\lambda) \otimes L_{G_{k'}}(\lambda)$. By [Jan03, I.3.8(4)], $M_{k'}$ acts trivially on $\text{Ind}_{M_{k'}}(\lambda)$. Hence $Q_G(\lambda)_{k'}$ is a semisimple $M_{k'}$-module whose composition factors are all isomorphic to $L_{M_{k'}}(\lambda)$. However if $L_M(\mu)$ is a composition factor of $Q_G(\lambda)$ then $L_M(\mu)_{k'} \cong L_{M_{k'}}(\mu)$ by [Jan03, II.2.9], so $\mu = \lambda$, showing that $Q_M(\lambda)$ is $M$-isotypic. Finally, there are no self-extensions of simple $M$-modules—[Jan03, II.12.1]—so $Q_M(\lambda)$ must be $M$-semisimple also. \qed

**Theorem 3.2.** Any simple module for $G$ is $M$-isotypic and semisimple. If $\lambda \in X(T)_+$ is the unique highest weight, then any simple modules of the same highest weight are isomorphic to $L_G(\lambda)$, the simple socle of $Q_G(\lambda)$.

**Proof.** Let $\lambda \in X(T)_+$. Define $L_G(\lambda) := \text{Soc}_G(Q_G(\lambda)) = \text{Soc}_G(\text{Ind}_M^G(\lambda)))$. Then $L_G(\lambda)$ is non-zero if and only if there is a module $V$ such that $\text{Hom}_G(V, Q_G(\lambda)) \neq 0$, which is true if and only if $0 \neq \text{Hom}_G(V, Q_G(\lambda)_{k'} \cong \text{Hom}_{G_{k'}}(V_{k'}, Q_G(\lambda)_{k'})$, using (1).

By Frobenius reciprocity and (4) we have $\text{Hom}_{G_{k'}}(L_G(\lambda)_{k'}, Q_G(\lambda)_{k'}) \cong \text{Hom}_{M_{k'}}(L_M(\lambda), L_M(\lambda)) \cong k'$ and in particular $Q_G(\lambda)$ is non-zero. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{R}_{u,k'}(G_{k'})$ acts trivially on any simple $G_{k'}$-module, the only simple $G_{k'}$-modules are isomorphic to $L_{G_{k'}}(\mu)$ for some $\mu$. In particular $\text{dim}_{k'} \text{Hom}_{G_{k'}}(L_G(\lambda), Q_G(\lambda)_{k'}) = \delta_{\lambda\mu}$, so $Q_G(\lambda)_{k'}$—thus also $Q_G(\lambda)$—is indecomposable, with simple socle. Thus $\text{Soc}_G(Q_G(\lambda)) = L_G(\lambda)$ as required.

Finally take any simple $G$-module $V$. This is finite-dimensional by local finiteness and so $\text{Res}_M^G(V)$ has a simple $M$-quotient isomorphic to $L_M(\lambda)$, say, with $\lambda \in X(T)_+$. By Frobenius reciprocity, we get a homomorphism $V \to Q_G(\lambda)$, giving an isomorphism $V \cong L_G(\lambda)$. The $M$-isotypicity and semisimplicity of $L_G(\lambda)$ follows from that of $Q_G(\lambda)$, guaranteed by Lemma 3.1. \qed
Remark 3.3. In fact the proof of the theorem shows that for any affine algebraic group $G$ over a field $k$ (not necessarily connected or smooth), if $G$ admits a Levi subgroup $M$ then its isomorphism classes of irreducible representations are in one-to-one correspondence with those of $M$.

4. Dimension formula

Keep the notation of the previous section. Let $C = Z_G(T)^σ$ be a Cartan $k$-subgroup of $G$. Then by Theorem 3.2, there is a unique simple $C$-module for any $λ ∈ X(T)$. (Note that $C$ is commutative so all weights are dominant for $C$.) Here we prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. Let $λ ∈ X(T)_+$. Then

$$\dim L_G(λ) = \dim L_M(λ) \cdot \dim L_C(λ).$$

Following [CGP15, §2.1], as $G$ is pseudo-split, we may take $λ$ a regular cocharacter with $C = Z_G(λ)$. We may define $B := P_G(λ)$ as the subgroup whose $A$-points for any $k$-algebra $A$ is the collection

$$P_G(λ)(A) := \{g ∈ G(A) \mid \lim_{t→0} λ(t)g(λ)^{-1}t exists\}.$$ 

Then $B$ is a minimal pseudo-parabolic subgroup or pseudo-Borel subgroup, and we may assume that it corresponds to the negative roots. Define also $B^+ := P_G(λ^{-1})$, the corresponding opposite pseudo-Borel. We have the decompositions $B := C × U$ and $B^+ := C × U^+$ where $U := U_G(λ)$ with

$$U_G(λ)(A) := \{g ∈ G(A) \mid \lim_{t→0} λ(t)g(λ)^{-1}t = 1\},$$

and $U^+ := U_G(λ^{-1})$; indeed $U = ℘_{u, k}(B)$ and $U^+ = ℘_{u, k}(B^+)$. Furthermore, $B ⊂ B^+ = C$, by inspection.

The commutativity of $C$ implies that any weight space for $T ⊂ C$ is stable under $C$. From Theorem 3.2 we therefore must have a submodule isomorphic to $L_C(λ)$ in the $C$-module $L_G(λ)_λ$. Thus the $λ$-weight space of $L_G(λ)$ is dimension at least $L_C(λ)$. Since the dimension of $L_M(λ)_λ$ is 1 and $L_G(λ)$ is $M$-isotypic, we need only exhibit a $G$-module whose highest weight is $λ$ and whose $λ$-weight space is dimension $L_C(λ)$. For this we follow the programme of [Jan03, §II.2].

For a $G$-module $V$, the fact that $U$ and $U^+$ are unipotent implies that $Soc_U(V)$ and $Soc_{U^+}(V)$ are non-zero modules for $U$ with trivial composition factors. Thus $V^U$ and $V^{U^+}$ (the subspaces of $U$- and $U^+$-fixed vectors) are both non-zero.

As $C$ normalises $U$ (resp. $U^+$), $V^U$ (resp. $V^{U^+}$) is a $B$-submodule (resp. $B^+$-submodule) of $V$ on which $U$ (resp. $U^+$) acts trivially. A simple $B$-submodule $W$ of $V^U$ (resp. $B^+$-submodule of $V^{U^+}$), restricts to a simple $C$-module $W|C ≅ L_C(λ)$ (resp. $W|C ≅ L_C(λ')$) guaranteed by Theorem 3.2; we denote the isomorphism class of $W$ by $L_B(λ)$ (resp. $L_{B^+}(λ')$). We have thus:

there are $λ, λ' ∈ X(T)$ with $Hom_B(L_B(λ), V) \neq 0 \neq Hom_{B^+}(L_B(λ'), V)$.

If $V$ is finite-dimensional (for example if $V$ is simple), then we may apply the above to $V^*$ and dualise to get

there are $λ, λ' ∈ X(T)$ with $Hom_B(V, L_B(λ)) \neq 0 \neq Hom_{B^+}(V, L_{B^+}(λ'))$.

Now, using Frobenius reciprocity (2), we get
Lemma 4.2. If \( \dim V < \infty \), then there are \( \lambda, \lambda' \in X(T) \) with

\[
\text{Hom}_G(V, \text{Ind}^G_B(L_B(\lambda))) \neq 0 \neq \text{Hom}_G(V, \text{Ind}^G_B(L_B^+(\lambda')))\]

Denote the module \( \text{Ind}^G_B(L_B(\lambda)) \) by \( H^0(\lambda) \).

From [CGP15, Prop. 2.1.8(3)] we have:

(8) \( U^+B \) and \( UB^+ \) are dense in \( G \).

With this in hand, we can prove:

Proposition 4.3. Let \( \lambda \in X(T) \) with \( H^0(\lambda) \neq 0 \).

(a) We have \( \dim H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} = \dim L_B(\lambda) \) and \( H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} = H^0(\lambda)_\lambda \).

(b) Each weight \( \mu \) of \( H^0(\lambda) \) satisfies \( w_0(\lambda) \leq \mu \leq \lambda \), where \( w_0 \) denotes the longest element in the Weyl group \( W \).

Proof. Recall that

\[
H^0(\lambda) = \{ f \in \text{Mor}(G, L_C(\lambda)) \mid f(gb) = b^{-1}f(g) \text{ for all } g \in G(A), b \in B(A) \text{ and all } A \}.
\]

The action of \( G \) is given by left translation. Since \( U^+ \) acts trivially on \( H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \) and \( U \subseteq B \), given \( f \in H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \) we have

\[
f(u_1cu_2) = c^{-1}f(1)
\]

for all \( u_1 \in U^+(A), c \in C(A), u_2 \in U(A) \), and all \( A \). Thus \( f(1) \) determines the restriction of \( f \) to \( U^+B \), and hence in fact determines \( f \) itself as \( U^+B \) is dense in \( G \) by (8). Now \( f(1) \in L_B(\lambda) \), so \( \dim H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \leq \dim L_B(\lambda) \). Moreover, the evaluation map \( \epsilon : H^0(\lambda) \to L_B(\lambda) \) given by \( f \mapsto f(1) \) is a homomorphism of \( B \)-modules which is injective on \( H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \). This implies

\[
H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \subseteq H^0(\lambda)_\lambda.
\]

If \( \mu \) is a maximal weight of \( H^0(\lambda) \) then \( H^0(\lambda)_\mu \subseteq H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \subseteq H^0(\lambda)_\lambda \), but this allows us to conclude both that \( H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} = H^0(\lambda)_\lambda \) and that \( \mu \leq \lambda \) for any weight \( \mu \) of \( H^0(\lambda) \).

Now, restricting to the Levi subgroup \( M \) of \( G \), we see that if \( \mu \) is a weight, then so is \( w_0(\mu) \) by [Jan03, II.1.19(1)], hence \( w_0(\mu) \leq \lambda \) and \( w_0(\lambda) \leq \mu \).

We have thus found a module \( H^0(\lambda) \) of high weight \( \lambda \) whose \( \lambda \)-weight space is of dimension \( \dim L_C(\lambda) = \dim L_B(\lambda) \) as required. In fact, one also sees:

Corollary 4.4. If \( H^0(\lambda) \neq 0 \) then \( \text{Soc}_G(H^0(\lambda)) \) is simple.

Proof. If \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) are two simple submodules of \( H^0(\lambda) \) then \( L_1 \oplus L_2 \subseteq H^0(\lambda) \) hence \( L_1^{U^+} \oplus L_2^{U^+} \subseteq H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \) and \( \dim H^0(\lambda)^{U^+} \geq 2 \cdot \dim L_T(\lambda) \), contradicting Prop. 4.3(a).

In other words, \( \text{Soc}_G(H^0(\lambda)) \cong L_G(\lambda) \).

This gives another immediate proof of Theorem 4.1:

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let \( V \) be any simple module. Then it is finite-dimensional and so admits a surjection onto a simple \( B \)-module \( L_B(\lambda) \). But now Frobenius reciprocity together with Corollary 4.4 implies an isomorphism with \( \text{Soc}(H^0(\lambda)) = L_G(\lambda) \).\qed
5. General pseudo-reductive groups

Once we have the classification of irreducible representations for pseudo-split pseudo-reductive groups in hand, we can classify the irreducible representations for any pseudo-reductive group. The key idea is to extend scalars to a separable extension of \( k \) in order to split a maximal torus, and then to use Galois descent arguments to apply the classification of irreducibles for pseudo-split groups. The ideas are similar to those in [Tit71].

We first need some notation. Given a pseudo-reductive \( k \)-group \( G \) with maximal torus \( T \), there exists a finite Galois extension \( k_1 \) of \( k \) such that the group \( G_{k_1} \) is pseudo-split pseudo-reductive with split maximal torus \( T_{k_1} \). Let \( \Gamma \) denote the Galois group of \( k_1/k \).

By choosing a Levi subgroup \( M \) of \( G_{k_1} \) containing \( T_{k_1} \) we can identify a set of dominant weights \( X(T_{k_1})_+ \) in the weight lattice. The Galois group \( \Gamma \) acts naturally on the weight lattice for \( T_{k_1} \). We denote this action by \( (\gamma, \lambda) \mapsto \gamma^* \lambda \), so

\[
\gamma^* \lambda(z) = \gamma(\lambda(\gamma^{-1}(z)))
\]

for \( z \in T_{k_1}(A) \), and any \( k_1 \)-algebra \( A \). Note that this action will not preserve the set of dominant weights, but since it does respect the pairing between characters and cocharacters, for any \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) there will be a unique element \( w \) of the Weyl group such that \( w^*(X(T_{k_1})_+) = X(T_k)_+ \). Thus there is an induced action of \( \Gamma \) on the dominant weights; this action we denote by

\[
(\gamma, \lambda) \mapsto \gamma(\lambda).
\]

Now we can prove

**Proposition 5.1.** Keeping the notation above, there is a one-one correspondence between \( \Gamma \)-orbits in \( X(T_{k_1})_+ \) and isomorphism classes of irreducible representations of \( G \).

Moreover, if \( V \) is an irreducible representation of \( G \) corresponding to the \( \Gamma \)-orbit \( \{ \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r \} \), then \( V_{k_1} \) decomposes as a direct sum of the irreducible \( G_{k_1} \)-modules \( L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda_i) \), each of which appears with the same multiplicity.

**Proof.** Given an irreducible representation \( V \) for \( G \), we get a representation \( \overline{V} := V_{k_1} = V \otimes_k k_1 \) for \( G_{k_1} \). Given a dominant weight \( \lambda \in X(T_{k_1})_+ \), let \( \overline{V}_\lambda \) denote the \( G_{k_1} \)-submodule of \( \overline{V} \) generated by the irreducible \( G_{k_1} \)-submodules of high weight \( \lambda \). It is clear from the definition of the \( \Gamma \)-action on dominant weights given above that if \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) and \( L \simeq L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda) \) is a \( G_{k_1} \)-submodule of \( \overline{V} \), then \( \gamma^*(L) \simeq L_{G_{k_1}}(\gamma^*(\lambda)) \), where on the left \( \gamma \) acts via the canonical action on \( \overline{V} \). Thus the \( G_{k_1} \)-submodule \( \overline{V} \) generated by all \( \overline{V}_{\gamma(\lambda)} \) is \( \Gamma \)-stable and this means that it has a \( k \)-form; that is, \( \overline{V} = Y_{k_1} \) for some \( G \)-submodule \( Y \) of \( X \). Since \( X \) is irreducible, \( Y = X \) and hence \( \overline{V} = \overline{V} \). But now standard arguments show that \( \overline{V} \) is the direct sum of the nonzero \( \overline{V}_\lambda \), and each of these in turn is the direct sum of a number of copies of the corresponding irreducible \( L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda) \) (so, in particular, \( \overline{V} \) is semisimple). Further, \( \Gamma \) must act transitively on the \( \overline{V}_\lambda \), so the dominant weights appearing form a single \( \Gamma \)-orbit and each simple module \( L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda) \) appears with the same multiplicity.

Now suppose \( V \) and \( V' \) are two irreducible \( G \)-modules labelled via the construction in the previous paragraph by the same \( \Gamma \)-orbit in \( X(T_{k_1})_+ \). Let \( d \) (respectively, \( d' \)) be the multiplicity of each \( L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda) \) in \( V_{k_1} \) (respectively, \( V'_{k_1} \)). We may assume that \( d \leq d' \). But then, since \( V_{k_1} \) and \( V'_{k_1} \) are semisimple, we have a nonzero \( G_{k_1} \)-module homomorphism \( V_{k_1} \to V'_{k_1} \), and Equation (1) implies that we have a nonzero \( G \)-module homomorphism \( V \to V' \), so \( V \) and \( V' \) are isomorphic.
Finally, suppose $\lambda \in X(T_{k_1})_\pm$. Let $\rho : G_{k_1} \to \text{GL}(L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda))$ denote the corresponding representation of $G_{k_1}$. Then, since there is a canonical copy of $G$ inside $R_{k_1/k}(G_{k_1})$, the Weil restriction

$$R_{k_1/k}(\rho) : R_{k_1/k}(G_{k_1}) \to R_{k_1/k}(\text{GL}(L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda)))$$

provides a $G$-module $Y$. Further, the universal property of Weil restriction (see Section 2.5) implies that $Y_{k_1}$ has $L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda)$ as a $G_{k_1}$-module quotient. The intersection of the $\Gamma$-conjugates of the kernel of this quotient map is the largest $\Gamma$-stable $G_{k_1}$-submodule of the kernel, and the quotient by this intersection is a $\Gamma$-stable $G_{k_1}$-module containing a copy of $L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda)$ (and hence copies of all the $L_{G_{k_1}}(\gamma(\lambda))$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma$). Call this module $\nabla$. Then $\nabla$ has a $k$-form $V$, and $V$ must be an irreducible $G$-module by the construction of $\nabla$. The $\Gamma$-orbit attached to $V$ is the $\Gamma$-orbit of $\lambda$. □

Note that this also furnishes a dimension formula of sorts: if the common multiplicity appearing above is $d$, then the dimension of $V$ is $r \cdot d \cdot \dim(L_{G_{k_1}}(\lambda))$. Further, the number $r$ is the index in $\Gamma$ of the stabilizer of $\lambda$ inside $\Gamma$.

6. ON REPRESENTATIONS OF COMMUTATIVE PSEUDO-REDUCTIVE GROUPS

Recall our assumption that $k$ is imperfect of characteristic $p$. In this section, we (amongst other things) calculate $\dim L_C(\lambda)$ whenever $C$ is the Weil restriction $R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$ for $k'$ a non-zero finite reduced $k$-algebra whose factor fields are all purely inseparable over $k$. This assumption guarantees that $C$ is pseudo-split, so that, by Theorem 3.2 the isomorphism classes of simple $C$-modules are in 1–1 correspondence with the weights of a maximal torus of $C$.

To start with we may make some general remarks.

6.1. Blocks of commutative pseudo-split pseudo-reductive groups. Let $C$ be a commutative pseudo-split pseudo-reductive group with maximal split torus $T$. If $V$ is any non-zero $C$-module, and $\lambda$ is any $T$-weight of $C$ on $V$ then $V_\lambda$ is a $C$-submodule, using the commutativity of $C$. By Theorem 3.2, $V_\lambda$ is isotypic, with composition factors all isomorphic to $L_C(\lambda)$. Indeed the projection $pr_\lambda$ of $V$ to $V_\lambda$ is a $C$-module map which splits. In particular $\text{Ext}^1_C(L_C(\lambda), L_C(\mu)) \neq 0$ only if $\lambda = \mu$, so it follows that the blocks of $C$ are in bijection with $X(T)$.

Remark 6.1. Any commutative (connected) reductive group $G$ is linearly reductive, hence all $\text{Ext}^n_G(V, W)$ vanish for all $G$-modules $V, W$ and integers $n > 0$. This in contrast to the pseudo-reductive case: for example if $G = R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$ for $k'/k$ an inseparable field extension then $G$ acts on the unipotent group $G/\mathbb{G}_m$, hence on $k[G/\mathbb{G}_m]$. By (3), $k[G/\mathbb{G}_m]$ is indecomposable, and infinite dimensional. In particular $\text{Ext}^1_G(k, k) \neq 0$.

6.2. The case $R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$ for $k'$ a field. For the time being, we let $k'$ be a purely inseparable field extension of $k$. We recall that the exponent of such an extension is the minimal $e$ such that $k^{p^e} \subseteq k$. Set $C = R_{k'/k}(C')$, where $C' = \mathbb{G}_m$. Following (7) we denote by $T$ the canonical copy of $\mathbb{G}_m$ inside $C$. Of course, $T$ is a Levi subgroup of $C$.

6.2.1. The standard module. We identify $C'$ with $\text{GL}_1$, acting faithfully on the 1-dimensional vector group $S' \cong \mathbb{G}_a$. Applying the Weil restriction function $R_{k'/k}$ we have that $C$ acts faithfully on the $[k' : k]$-dimensional vector group $S = R_{k'/k}(S')$. Let $k'$ have basis $\{1 = \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_q\}$ as a $k$-vector space. This choice allows us to identify $C$ with a $k$-subgroup of $\text{GL}_{[k' : k]}$, where the matrix
of \( g \in C(A) \cong \mathbb{G}_m(k' \otimes_k A) \) on \( S(A) \) is calculated by acting on \( S'(k' \otimes_k A) \) and taking coordinates relative to the given \( k \)-basis.

Since \( C'(k') = (k')^\times \) has two orbits on the vector space \( S'(k') = k' \) (one trivial and one non-trivial) we see that \( C(k) \) has also two orbits on \( S(k) = S'(k') \). Thus we conclude that \( S \) is an irreducible module for \( C \) and refer to it as the standard (or natural) module for \( C \). It is easy to see that the canonical subgroup \( T \) of \( G \) acts on \( C \) as scalars; more precisely, if \( a \in T(A) = A^\times \) for a \( k \)-algebra \( A \), then \( a \cdot s = as \) for all \( s \in S(A) \). In other words, \( \text{Res}_C^G S = (k_1)^{\oplus[k':k]} \), the direct sum of \([k':k] \) copies of the weight space \( k_1 \) with weight 1. Of course, in light of Theorem 3.2 we must have

\[(9) \quad S \cong L_C(1),\]

and so \( \dim L_C(1) = \dim S = [k':k] \).

Following [Jan03, I.2.15] we may twist any representation of any algebraic group \( G \) by precomposing with an endomorphism \( \sigma \) of \( G \). If \( V \) is a \( G \)-module then we denote the resulting representation by \( \sigma V \). This gives rise to a functor \( G\text{-Mod} \to G\text{-Mod} \) by \( V \mapsto \sigma^*(V) = \sigma V \). By precomposing the representation of \( C' \) on \( S' \) by the function \( \sigma'_\lambda : C' \to C' \) via \( c \mapsto c^\lambda \), we get a representation \( (\sigma'_\lambda)^*(S') \) on which \( C' \) acts with weight \( \lambda \), indeed \( (\sigma'_\lambda)^*(S') \cong k_\lambda \). Taking the Weil restriction of this representation then gives the representation \( \sigma^\lambda(S) \) where \( \sigma^\lambda : C \to C \) via \( c \mapsto c^\lambda \) also.

If \( p \nmid \lambda \) it is quite easy to see that \( (\sigma_\lambda)^*(S) \) is irreducible, giving us the dimension in this case, but we will show something stronger, namely that \( \sigma'_\lambda \) is an equivalence of categories, in fact, that \( \sigma'_\lambda \) has an inverse \( \tau \). In order to do this, we will want to understand the coordinate algebra \( k[C] \) a little better. We prove more than we need and give a complete description.

6.2.2. Description of \( k[\text{R}_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)] \). Recall our choice of \( k \)-basis \( \{1 = \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots , \alpha_q \} \) of \( k' \). The coordinate algebra of \( C' \) is \( k'[C'] = k'[t, t^{-1}] \). To find the coordinate algebra of \( C = \text{R}_{k'/k}(C') \), we should rewrite the generators \( t \) and \( t^{-1} \) in terms of our chosen \( k \)-basis of \( k' \). So we introduce new functions \( \hat{\alpha}_i \) on \( C \) and write \( t = \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i \hat{\alpha}_i \). Equivalently, when we identify \( C \) with a subgroup of \( \text{GL}_{[k':k]} \) via its (left) action on \( S \), the \( \hat{\alpha}_i \) can be identified with the matrix coordinate functions from the first column, i.e., for \( g \in C(A) \), \( \hat{\alpha}_i(g) \) gives the coefficient of \( \alpha_i \) in \( g \cdot 1 \). If \( e \) is the exponent of the extension \( k'/k \) then the \( p^e \)-power map takes \( (k')^\times \) into \( k^\times \). Hence it takes \( C \) into its canonical copy of \( \mathbb{G}_m \), which we have denoted \( T \). We thus get a 1-dimensional representation \( \hat{d} \) of \( C \), i.e., an element of the character group \( X(C) \). The function \( \hat{d} \) is a polynomial of degree \( p^e \) in the functions \( \hat{\alpha}_i \). Given any \( k \)-algebra \( A \) and any \( g \in C(A) \), \( g^{p^e} \) is represented by a scalar matrix with diagonal entries all equal to \( \hat{d}(g) \in A^\times \). Let \( \det \) denote the element of \( k[C] \) given by taking determinants of matrices—then we see that for any \( g \in C(A) \) we have

\[
\det(g^{p^e}) = (\hat{d}(g))^q,
\]

so \( (\det)^{p^e} = \hat{d}^q \). We conclude that the function \( \det \) is a power of the function \( \hat{d} \) in \( k[C] \). Now we can write \( t^{-1} = p^{e-1}/p^e \) in terms of the \( \hat{\alpha}_i \) and the function \( \hat{d}^{-1} \). Evidently \( \hat{\alpha}_i \) and \( \hat{d}^{-1} \) are elements of \( k[C] \).

Proposition 6.2. The natural map

\[ F : k[\hat{\alpha}_i, \hat{d}^{-1}]_{1 \leq i \leq q} \to k[C], \]

is an isomorphism.
As a $C$-module, the action of $T$ induces a grading on the generators so that $\hat{\alpha}_i$ is in degree 1 and $\hat{d}$ is in degree $p^e$.

To see that $F$ is an isomorphism it suffices to see that it is an isomorphism after extension to $\bar{k}$. We have $C_k \cong \mathbb{G}_m \times U$, where $U$ is the unipotent radical of $C_k$ and the quotient $\mathbb{G}_m$ of $C_k$ corresponds to the subalgebra $\bar{k}[\hat{\alpha}_1, \hat{\alpha}_1^{-1}]$ of $\bar{k}[C]$. Since $U$ is a connected unipotent algebraic group we have $\bar{k}[U] \cong \bar{k}[\beta_2, \ldots, \beta_q]$, for some indeterminates $\beta_i$ in the image of the comorphism $\bar{k}[C_k] \to \bar{k}[U]$. We can find appropriate choices for the $\beta_i$ from the following, which uses the natural embedding of $C$ in $\mathbb{A}_q$:

**Lemma 6.3.** Let $A$ be a $\bar{k}$-algebra and $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_q) \in C_k(A) \subseteq \mathbb{A}_q(A)$. Then $a \in U(A)$ if and only if $a_1 = 1 - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq q} a_i \alpha_i$.

**Proof.** It is an elementary calculation using the multiplication inherited from $(k')^\times$ as a $k$-group to see that the given condition on $a$ defines a subgroup all of whose elements are unipotent. Since it is evidently $(q - 1)$-dimensional, the claim follows. $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 6.2.** Consider the short exact sequence $1 \to U \xrightarrow{i} C_k \xrightarrow{q} \mathbb{G}_m \to 1$, where $q$ is the canonical map described in §2.5. At the level of $k$-algebras, this corresponds to

$$0 \to I_{\mathbb{G}_m} \cdot \bar{k}[C_k] \xrightarrow{q'} \bar{k}[C_k] \xrightarrow{i'} \bar{k}[U] \to 0,$$

where $I_{\mathbb{G}_m}$ is the image in $\bar{k}[C_k]$ of the augmentation ideal in $\bar{k}[\mathbb{G}_m]$. The lemma implies that $\bar{k}[U]$ is the quotient of $\bar{k}[C_k]$ by the ideal generated by $\hat{\alpha}_1 - 1 + \sum_{2 \leq i \leq q} \alpha_i \hat{\alpha}_i = \hat{d}^{1/q} - 1$; thus $I_{\mathbb{G}_m} \cdot \bar{k}[C_k] = (\hat{d}^{1/q} - 1)\bar{k}[C_k]$, and $\bar{k}[\mathbb{G}_m] = \bar{k}[\hat{d}^{1/q}, \hat{d}^{-1/q}]$. Since the values of the $\hat{\alpha}_i$ on a point of $C_k$ determine it completely, and $U$ is isomorphic to affine $(q - 1)$-space, we may choose $\beta_i = i^*(\hat{\alpha}_i)$ for $2 \leq i \leq q$. Now, $R := \bar{k}[\hat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_q, \hat{d}^{-1}] = \bar{k}[\hat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_q, \hat{d}^{-1/q}]$: the inclusion $\subseteq$ is obvious, and for the other direction, note $\hat{d}^{1/q} \in R$. But as $C_k$ is a semidirect product, we have

$$\bar{k}[C_k] \cong \bar{k}[\mathbb{G}_m] \otimes \bar{k}[\mathbb{A}_q] \cong \bar{k}[\hat{d}^{1/q}, \hat{d}^{-1/q}] \otimes \bar{k}[\hat{\alpha}_2, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_q] = \bar{k}[\hat{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \hat{\alpha}_q, \hat{d}^{-1/q}] = R.$$

It remains to prove the second part. We define a grading by setting $\deg(f) = j$ if $z \cdot f = z^{-j} f$ for any $z \in T(k) = k^\times$. By definition $\hat{\alpha}_i(g)$ is the coefficient of $\alpha_i$ in $g \cdot 1$, so that $z \cdot \hat{\alpha}_i(g) = \hat{\alpha}_i(z^{-1} g)$ gives the coefficient of $\alpha_i$ in $z^{-1} g \cdot 1$. But this is clearly just $z^{-1} \hat{\alpha}_i(g)$, and so $\hat{\alpha}_i$ is in degree 1. Now if $f = gh$ is a product of functions in $k[C]$, then $f(z^{-1} g) = g(z^{-1} h(z^{-1} g))$ so that a monomial in $j$ of the $\hat{\alpha}_i$’s is in degree $j$. Lastly, $\hat{d}$ is by definition a function for which $z \cdot \hat{d} = z^{-p^e \hat{d}}$ so that $\hat{d}$ is in degree $p^e$.

**Remark 6.4.** In [Fri10, §1] a general method for computing the coordinate rings of Weil restrictions is given. Applied to non-trivial separable field extensions this generally gives a much more complicated presentation than the one we have shown above. For example, if one takes $C' = \mathbb{G}_m$, $k = \mathbb{R}$ and $k' = \mathbb{C}$, then $k'[C'] = k'[x, y]/(xy - 1)$ and $k[R_{k'/k}(C')] = k[x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2]/(x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_2 - 1, x_2 y_1 + y_2 x_1)$.

For the benefit of the reader, we give some concrete examples to illustrate the constructions above.
Example 6.5. (i) Suppose $p = 3$ and $k'/k$ is a purely inseparable extension of fields of degree 3. Write $k' = k[s]$ so that $k'$ has $k$-basis $1, s, s^2$. Then the matrix representation of $G$ gives matrices of the form:
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
a & cs^3 & bs^3 \\
b & a & cs^3 \\
c & b & a 
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

One can check that the cubing map sends such a matrix to a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $a^3 + b^3 s^3 + c^3 s^6$. Thus, if the functions $\hat{\alpha}_1, \hat{\alpha}_2, \hat{\alpha}_3$ are the coordinate functions for the first column, the function $\hat{d} = \hat{\alpha}_1^3 + s^3 \hat{\alpha}_2^3 + s^6 \hat{\alpha}_3^3$. One can also check that in this case we get the same function by taking determinants of these matrices. Now $k'[G'] = k'[t, t^{-1}]$ and we can write $t = \hat{\alpha}_1 + s\hat{\alpha}_2 + s^2\hat{\alpha}_3$. Then we calculate:
\[
t^{-1} = \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}_1 + s\hat{\alpha}_2 + s^2\hat{\alpha}_3} = \frac{\hat{\alpha}_1 + s\hat{\alpha}_2 + s^2\hat{\alpha}_3}{\hat{d}},
\]
which is a polynomial function of the $\hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\hat{d}^{-1}$.

(ii) Suppose $p = 2$ and $k'/k$ is a purely inseparable extension of degree 4 such that $k' = k[s, u]$ with $s^2, u^2 \in k \setminus k^2$. Then $k'$ has $k$-basis $1, s, u, su$ and the extension has exponent $e = 1$. This time our matrices have the form:
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
a & bs^2 & cu^2 & ds^2 u^2 \\
b & a & du^2 & cu^2 \\
c & ds^2 & a & bs^2 \\
d & c & b & a 
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

One checks that the function $\hat{d} = \hat{\alpha}_1^2 + s^2 \hat{\alpha}_2^2 + u^2 \hat{\alpha}_3^2 + s^2 u^2 \hat{\alpha}_4^2$. The function coming from the determinant is $\hat{d}^2$.

6.2.3. Irreducible modules $L(\lambda)$ with $p \nmid \lambda$. We can now define an inverse to $\sigma^*_\lambda$ when $p \nmid \lambda$. Let $\hat{d}$ be the 1-dimensional representation from Section 6.2.2. Recall that $\hat{d}$ arises from the $p^r$-power map for $e$ the exponent of $k'/k$, and we have $(p^r, \lambda) = 1$. This means that we may take $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ to be an inverse to $\lambda$ in their projections to $\mathbb{Z}/(p^r)$, i.e., we can choose $\mu$ so that $\lambda \mu = 1 + rp^e$ for some $r$. Then set $\tau$ to be the composition of $\sigma^*_\mu$ with the tensor product functor $\otimes \hat{d}^{-r}$. Thus
\[
\tau(V) = \sigma^*_\lambda(V) \otimes \hat{d}^{-r}.
\]

**Proposition 6.6.** The functors $\tau$ and $\sigma := \sigma^*_\lambda$ are mutually inverse.

**Proof.** To see this, simply note that the map $C \to C; x \mapsto x^{\lambda \mu} x^{-rp^e}$ is the identity on $C$. Since $C$ acts on $(\tau \circ \sigma)(V)$ as $x^{\lambda \mu} x^{-rp^e}$ acts on $V$ (considering $x^{-rp^e}$ as an element of $k$), it follows that $\tau \circ \sigma$ and $\sigma \circ \tau$ are both the identity functor on $C\text{-Mod}$ as required.

\[\square\]

We conclude from above that $\tau$ and $\sigma$ are equivalences of categories, i.e. Morita equivalences. Since the latter sends representations of weight 1 to representations of weight $\lambda$, of the same dimension, we deduce that for $p \nmid \lambda$,
\[
\sigma^*_\lambda(L_C(1)) \cong L_C(\lambda)
\]
\[
\dim L_C(\lambda) = [k' : k]
\]
6.2.4. Irreducible modules \( L(\lambda) \) with \( p \mid \lambda \). Let \( \tilde{k} \) be the field generated by \( k \) and the \( p \)-th powers in \( k' \) (this is the field \( k'/(p) \) in the notation introduced before the statement of Theorem 1.3). Then \( \tilde{k} \) is in fact the \( k \)-span of the \( p \)-th powers in \( k' \). We see \( \tilde{C} := R_{k/k}(C') \) naturally as a subgroup of \( C \) because \( \tilde{k} \subseteq k' \). We also have a quotient \( C_1 \) of \( C \) which we can realise as a subgroup of \( \tilde{C} \). Let \( F : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m \) denote the geometric Frobenius map (with isomorphism \( t \mapsto t^p \)). Then since \( k'^p \subseteq k \) we can see that \( R_{k'/k}(F) : C \rightarrow \tilde{C} \). Let \( C_1 \) be the image of this map; in general \( C_1 \) is a \( k \)-subgroup of \( \tilde{C} \), but may not be all of \( \tilde{C} \).

We have a \( k \)-basis \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_q \) of \( k' \), so \( \alpha_1^p, \ldots, \alpha_q^p \) span \( \tilde{k} \) over \( k \). It follows that \( kC_1(k) = k\tilde{C}(k) \). Since also the \( k \)-points of each of \( C_1 \) and \( C \) are dense in those groups, we deduce

\[
\text{(12) a \( \tilde{C} \)-module } V \text{ is irreducible if and only if it is irreducible on restriction to } C_1.
\]

(Both groups of course are defined over \( k \), hence \( V \) is in particular a \( k \)-module by definition.)

We now prove the counterparts to the last section.

**Proposition 6.7.** Let \( \lambda \in X(T) \). We have \( L_C(p\lambda) \cong (R_{k'/k}(F))^*(L_{\tilde{C}}(\lambda)) \). Furthermore,

\[
\dim L_C(\lambda) = |k'/(\lambda) : k|.
\]

**Proof.** Since \( L_{\tilde{C}}(\lambda) \) is irreducible, (12) implies that \( R_{k'/k}(F)^*(L_{\tilde{C}}(\lambda)) \) is irreducible for \( C \). Since \( F^*(k\lambda) \cong k_{p\lambda} \) as \( T \)-modules, the first statement follows.

For the second, we proceed by induction on \( |k' : k| \). If \( p \nmid \lambda \) then we are done by (11), otherwise, let \( \lambda = p\lambda' \). Then by induction, \( \dim L_{\tilde{C}}(\lambda') = |k(\lambda') : k| = |k'(\lambda') : k| = |k'(\lambda) : k| \), and we are done by the first part.

\[ \square \]

6.3. The case \( R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \) for \( k' \) a non-zero finite reduced \( k \)-algebra. With the results of the previous section in hand, we can now give a dimension formula in the case where \( C = R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \) for \( k' \) a non-zero finite reduced \( k \)-algebra. This is precisely the case where \( C = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \), and the \( k_i \) are the factor fields of \( k' \). Since \( C \) is pseudo-split, we must have that the \( k_i \) are all purely inseparable extensions of \( k \) and so \( k' \) is a purely inseparable \( k \)-algebra. By [CGP15, A.7.8] the minimal field of definition of the unipotent radical of each factor \( R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \) is \( k_i \) itself. Since each \( k_i \) is a finite field extension it embeds into the algebraic closure \( \bar{k} \) and the unique minimal field of definition \( K' \) for \( \mathcal{A}(G'_{k_i}) \) is the subfield of \( \bar{k} \) generated by the \( k_i \).

Let \( T \) be the canonical Levi subgroup \( \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{G}_m \) inside \( C \). By Theorem 3.2 there is up to isomorphism a unique simple \( C \)-module \( L_C(\lambda) \) of weight \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \in X(T) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \). The following theorem calculates its dimension:

**Theorem 6.8.** We have \( \dim L_C(\lambda) = [K : k] \), where \( K \) is the subfield of \( K' \) generated by \( k \) together with \( k_i(\lambda_i) \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \).

**Proof.** We must exhibit an irreducible module of weight \( \lambda \) and the correct dimension. For each \( i \) write \( \lambda_i = p^{e_i} \mu_i \) where \( p \nmid \mu_i \) and put \( \tilde{k_i} = k_i(p^{e_i}) \). Since \( k_i/k \) is purely inseparable we must have \( \tilde{k_i} = k_i(\lambda_i) \) and hence \( K \) is generated by the \( \tilde{k_i} \). From §6.2.4 recall there is a map \( R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \rightarrow R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \). Precomposing a module \( M \) of weight \( \nu \) for \( R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \) with \( R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \) gives a module \( R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)^*(M) \) of weight \( p^{e_i} \nu \) for \( R_{k_i/k}(\mathbb{G}_m) \).
Now by definition of $K$, we have each $\tilde{k}_i$ a subfield of $K$ and hence we get an embedding $\iota_i : R_{k_i/k}(G_m) \hookrightarrow R_{K/k}(G_m)$ for each $i$. We also get a map $R_{K/k}(\mu) : \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} R_{K/k}(G_m) \rightarrow R_{K/k}(G_m)$ corresponding to the weight $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$.

Now form the composite map

$$\mathcal{X} : G \cong \prod_i R_{k_i/k}(G_m) \xrightarrow{\prod_i R_{k_i/k}(F^\infty)} \prod_i R_{\tilde{k}_i/k}(G_m) \xrightarrow{\prod_i \iota_i} \prod_i R_{K/k}(G_m) \xrightarrow{R_{K/k}(\mu)} R_{K/k}(G_m).$$

Then if $S$ is the natural module for $R_{K/k}(G_m)(k)$ one sees easily that $\mathcal{X}^*(S)$ is a module for $C$ of weight $\lambda$. We must see that $\mathcal{X}^*(S)$ is irreducible; in other words, $\mathcal{X}^*(S) \cong L_C(\lambda)$.

But as $S$ is irreducible for $R_{K/k}(G_m)(k)$ we need only see that $\mathcal{X}$ induces a surjection of group algebras $k(C(k)) \twoheadrightarrow k(R_{K/k}(G_m))(k) = K$. This follows essentially from the definition of $K$: we have $k\mathcal{X}(C)(k)$ contains $\tilde{k}_i = kR_{\tilde{k}_i}(G_m)(k) = k\tilde{k}_i$ for each $i$ and so $k\mathcal{X}(C)(k) = K$ as required. □

6.4. Towards a general dimension formula. Let $C$ be an arbitrary commutative pseudo-split pseudo-reductive group with maximal split torus $T$.

If $k'$ is the minimal field of definition of the unipotent radical of $C$ then we may form $\mathcal{C} := R_{k'/k}(C_{k'}) \cong R_{k'/k}(T_0 \ltimes \mathbb{A}_{u,k'}(C_{k'})) = R_{k'/k}(T_{k'}) \rtimes U$, where $U = R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{A}_{u,k'}(C_{k'}))$ is a unipotent normal subgroup of $\mathcal{C}$. By the usual properties of Weil restriction, $C$ embeds as a canonical $k$-subgroup of $\mathcal{C}$. Since $U$ acts trivially on any simple $\mathcal{C}$-module, in view of Theorem 3.2 we have natural correspondences

$$\text{simple }C\text{-modules} \longleftrightarrow \text{simple }\mathcal{C}\text{-modules} \longleftrightarrow \text{simple }R_{k'/k}(T_{k'})\text{-modules} \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{X}(T),$$

and thus we lose nothing by assuming that $C$ is a subgroup of $D := R_{k'/k}(T_{k'})$. Now, we know the dimensions of the simple $D$-modules, by the work of the previous sections. The obvious question presents: is the restriction $L_D(\lambda)|C$ always irreducible? A positive answer would solve our problem since we know the dimension $L_D(\lambda)$. Unfortunately, this will not hold in general.

Example 6.9. Let $k' = k(t, u)$, $[k' : k] = p^3$ for $t^2, u^p \in k$. Let $k_1 = k(t^p, u)$ and $k_2 = k(t)$. Then $C := R_{k_1/k}(G_m) \times R_{k_2/k}(G_m)$ is pseudo-reductive and the minimal field of definition of its unipotent radical is $k' = k_1k_2$, and we have $C \subseteq D := R_{k'/k}(T')$ where $T' \cong G_m \times G_m$ is the canonical maximal torus of $C$ after base change to $k'$. Suppose $V$ is a simple module of weight $(1,0)$ for $T' \subseteq C$ inside $C$. That is, the first $G_m$ factor acts via $a \cdot v = av$ for $a \in G_m(A)$ and $v \in V(A)$, and the second factor acts trivially. Then the second $G_m$ factor is in the kernel of the representation. Since $R_{k_2/k}(G_m)/G_m$ is unipotent and $V$ is simple, it also acts trivially, so only the first factor acts non-trivially. However $\dim L_{R_{k_1/k}(G_m)}(1) = 4$, while $\dim L_D(1,0) = 8$, hence $L_D(1,0)$ restricted to $C$ is reducible.

Of course, one may deal with Weil restrictions of the type in the example via Theorem 6.8. However, there are countless commutative pseudo-reductive groups which are not Weil restrictions—indeed any sensible classification looks to be beyond reach at present; see [Tot13] for a flavour of the difficulty.

Question 6.10. Choose a nonzero finite reduced $k$-algebra $A$ of minimal dimension such that we can find a copy $C \subseteq D := R_{A/k}(G_m)$. Is $L_D(\lambda)$ always irreducible on restriction to $C$?
If the answer to the question is “yes”, then in principle this provides a dimension formula for $L_C(\lambda)$ in all cases, using Theorem 6.8.

We will finish the paper with a partial result towards answering the question, which takes care of the rank one case completely. First a technical lemma:

**Lemma 6.11.** Suppose $k'/k$ is a finite extension and let $G = R_{k'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$. Let $W$ be a proper non-trivial $k$-subspace of $k'$, and let $S = \text{Stab}_G(W)$. Then there exists an intermediate field $k \subseteq E \subseteq k'$ such that $S \subseteq R_{E/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$.

**Proof.** First recall that for the subspace $W$ we have the corresponding (additive) group functor $W_a$ given by $W_a(A) := W \otimes_k A$ (see Section 2.1). Then $S$ is an algebraic subgroup scheme of $G$ and for every $k$-algebra $A$ we have, by [Jan03, I.2.12]

$$S(A) = \{g \in G(A) \mid g W_a(A) \subseteq W_a(A)\}.$$ 

Now, since all multiplication here is commutative, given any nonzero $w \in W = W_a(k)$ we can see that $S$ also stabilizes the $k$-subspace $w^{-1}W$ of $k'$. Hence, we may assume that $1 \in W$.

Now let $E$ denote the intersection of all $k$-subspaces of $k'$ containing 1 and stabilized by $S$ (i.e., the intersection of all $k$-subspaces $X$ such that $1 \in X$ and $S(A)(X \otimes_k A) \subseteq X \otimes_k A$ for all $k$-algebras $A$). We show that $E$ is an intermediate field and that $S \subseteq E_a$. Given this, $S$ is then contained in the corresponding multiplicative unit group, which is precisely $R_{E/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$.

To see that $E$ is a field we just need to show $E \setminus \{0\}$ is a group under multiplication. So let $x \in E \setminus \{0\}$. Appealing to the commutativity of multiplication again, we see that the $k$-subspace $x^{-1}E$ is $S$-stable and contains $x^{-1}x = 1$, so we must have $x^{-1}E = E$, as required. Since $W$ is proper, $E$ is properly contained in $k'$. The final step is to note that since $1 \in E$ and $E$ is $S$-stable, we have $S(A) \subseteq E_a(A)$ for all $k$-algebras $A$. Hence $S \subseteq E_a$. □

**Proposition 6.12.** With the notation of the question, let $C$ have rank 1. Then the answer is ‘yes’.

**Proof.** We first wish to show we can assume that $A$ has one factor field (and therefore $D$ is of rank 1). For this, assume $A = k_1 \times \cdots \times k_d$. Suppose the field of definition of $R_u(C_{\bar{k}})$ is $k'$. Then as the compositum $\bar{k} := k_1 \cdots k_d$ of the factor fields of $A$ is the minimal field of definition for $R_u(D_{\bar{k}})$, we must have $k' \subseteq \bar{k}$. As $\dim_k A \geq \dim_k \bar{k} \geq \dim_k k'$, then by minimality, $A = k'$, as required.

Now pick a weight $\lambda = p^e \mu$. Then the irreducible $L_D(\lambda)$ identifies with the field $k'(\lambda) = k(p^e)$ inside $k'$, and this contains a copy of the irreducible $L_C(\lambda)$, which is some subfield $E$ by Lemma 6.11. The image of $C$ under the representation is contained in $R_{E/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$. Let $E' \subseteq k'$ be the set of $x$ such that $x^{p^e} \in E$ (the preimage of $E$ under Frobenius).

Then $E'$ is a subfield of $k'$ containing $k$ because $E$ is a subfield of $k'$ and $k \subseteq E'$ obviously. Also, $C$ is contained in $R_{E'/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$, so actually $E' = k'$ by minimality of $k'$. But then $E$ must be $k'(\lambda)$ by definition of $k'(\lambda)$.

**Remark 6.13.** It seems likely that the hypotheses of the question force the rank of $C$ and $D$ to be equal. The proof above shows that this is true if the rank of $C$ is 1.

Using Lemma 6.11, we can also give a partial answer in the case the rank is bigger than 1. First, let $k_1, \ldots, k_d$ be the $d$ factor fields of $A$ and recall that the proof of Theorem 6.8 shows that as a $k$-vector space, $L_D(\lambda) = K$, where $K$ is the field extension of $k$ generated by $k$ together with the $k_i(\Lambda_i)$. Furthermore, $D$ acts through the action of $R_{K/k}(\mathbb{G}_m)$.
Corollary 6.14. Keeping notation from above, $E := L_C(\lambda)$ is a subfield of $K = L_D(\lambda)$ and $C$ acts on $E$ through the action of $R_{E/k}(G_m)$.

Proof. Since $C$ acts on $K$ with the correct weight, $K$ contains at least one copy of $L_C(\lambda)$. Lemma 6.11 shows that we may assume that this copy is a subfield $E$ and $C$ acts through $R_{E/k}(G_m)$. \qed

We remark that Brion [Bri18, Prop. 3.1] has proved a similar result to this in a slightly different context, and using a different approach. In order to fully answer our question, it would suffice to pull back the stabiliser $R_{E/k}(G_m)$ provided by the previous lemma through the map $\mathcal{X}$ in (13), and use the minimality assumption on $A$ to conclude that $E = K$ in all cases. However, as previously remarked, in the absence of any further concrete restrictions on the group $C$ in question, it seems hard to get a handle on this part of the problem at present. The following example gives some indication of the subtlety of the problem.

Example 6.15. Let $k' = k(s,t)$ be a purely inseparable extension of degree $p^2$ and exponent 1. Then for the subfields $k_1 = k(s)$, $k_2 = k(t)$ consider the homomorphism $C := R_{k(s)/k}(G_m) \times R_{k(t)/k}(G_m) \to D := R_{k'/k}(G_m)$ with the images of $k(s), k(t)$ identified as the relevant subfields in $k(s,t)$. In the natural module $L_D(1) \cong k'$ consider the stabiliser $\text{Stab}_C(k(st))$ of the subfield $k(st)$ in $C$. One sees easily that at the level of $k$-points, this amounts to $p$-cosets of $k^\times \times k^\times$ by the elements $(s^i, t^i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq p - 1$. In particular we see there is no $C' \subset C$ of smaller dimension which contains $\text{Stab}_C(k(st))$. Of course being disconnected, $\text{Stab}_C(k(st))$ is not pseudo-reductive by convention, and indeed the identity component $k^\times \times k^\times$ of $\text{Stab}_C(k(st))$ is a subgroup of proper dimension.
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