EXPLICIT CALCULATIONS IN AN INFINITESIMAL SINGULAR BLOCK OF $SL_n$
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ABSTRACT. Let $G = SL_n$ be defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 2$. For each $n \geq 2$ there exists, up to Morita equivalence, a certain singular block in the category of $G_1 T$-modules whose restriction to the $G_1$-module category contains precisely $n$-irreducible modules. We will perform a number of explicit calculations in this block, including a complete determination of the Loewy layers of the baby Verma modules and all possible extensions between the irreducible modules. Additionally, we will explicitly compute the Loewy layers of the indecomposable injective modules when $p \gg 0$.

1. Introduction

Determining the Loewy layers of the baby Verma modules in $\text{Rep}(G_1 T)$ is one of the most fundamental problems in the representation theory of algebraic groups. Significant progress towards this was made in the 1990s, when Andersen–Jantzen–Soergel demonstrated that for $p \gg 0$, the Loewy layers of any baby Verma module, whose highest weight is $p$-regular, can be expressed in terms of periodic Kazhdan–Lusztig $Q$-polynomials (see [AnJS]). Recently, Abe–Kaneda in [AbK], building on a 2010 result by Riche ([R]), were able to extend these results to include baby Verma modules of any highest weight. Their methods depend on the validity of the Lusztig-Character-Formula, as well as some additional assumptions in [R]. Unfortunately, by the well-known result appearing in [W], the Lusztig-Character-Formula generally only holds for $p \gg 0$ (relative to the Coxeter number of $G$). It is also important to note that the polynomials involved in the expressions are known to be extremely difficult to compute, so even for $p \gg 0$, it still quite difficult to obtain precise information using these methods.

In this paper, we take a more specialized approach, and focus on a specific (up to equivalence by translation functors) singular block for $G_1 T$, with $G = SL_{n+1}(k)$ and $n \geq 1$. Our main result is Theorem 5.3, which holds for all $p > 2$ and gives a precise formula for the Loewy layers of every baby Verma module in this block. An important consequence of this theorem is a proof of rigidity for the baby Verma modules (see Proposition 5.5). These formulas are independent of $p$, and thus agree with [AbK, Theorem, p. 2], but the techniques involved in the proof differ considerably from loc. cit. In fact, one of the most crucial steps in our argument is Theorem 4.1, which gives a determination of all extensions between the irreducible objects in this block for $p > 2$, and is a significant result in its own right.

Finally in §6, we assume $p \gg 0$. We then obtain an explicit description of the Loewy layers for the indecomposable injective modules by combining our baby Verma calculations with the results from [AbK] and adapting the techniques from [AnK] over to this block (see Theorem 6.3).
To the author’s best knowledge, these results give the first known example of an infinite family (indexed by \( n \geq 1 \)) of non-trivial singular blocks in \( \text{Rep}(G_1 T) \) for \( G = \text{SL}_{n+1}(k) \), in which \([AbK, \text{Theorem, p. 2}]\) holds for all \( p > 2 \). By contrast, recall from \([W]\) that if we consider the corresponding family of principal blocks in \( \text{Rep}(G_1 T) \), and let \( p(n) \) be the minimal prime for each \( n \) such that \([AbK, \text{Theorem, p. 2}]\) holds, then the growth rate of the function \( p(n) \) is actually non-polynomial (see \([F]\) for an explicit upper bound to \( p(n) \)).

As a consequence, we can see that even though the principal block may be poorly behaved in general for smaller \( p \), there may still exist interesting singular blocks which are well-behaved under milder assumptions on the characteristic. Moreover, these blocks may be controlled by a simpler combinatoric than the periodic Kazhdan–Lusztig \( Q \)-polynomials. Evidence in this direction has also been provided in a recent preprint by Nandakumar–Zhao \(([NZ])\), where the authors showed that certain families of singular \( G_1 \)-blocks occur in a categorification of an \( \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \) representation. In fact, their results provided partial motivation for this project.

Another significant source of inspiration for this project were the results and techniques used by N. Xi and M. Towers to obtain information in low-rank cases (see \([X1], [X2], \text{and [T]}\)).
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2. Notation and preliminaries

2.1. Let \( G = \text{SL}_{n+1}(k) \), where \( k \) is an algebraically closed field of characteristic \( p > 2 \) and let \( B \) and \( T \) denote the Borel subgroup of lower triangular matrices and torus respectively. The Frobenius kernel will be denoted by \( G_1 \subseteq G \), and the Frobenius twist of any \( k \)-module \( M \) will be denoted by \( M^{(1)} \). The weight lattice is \( X = \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} / \langle \epsilon_1 + \cdots + \epsilon_{n+1} \rangle \) with fundamental weights \( \varpi_i = \epsilon_1 + \cdots + \epsilon_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). The root system is given by \( \Phi = \{ \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n + 1, i \neq j \} \), the set of positive roots are \( \Phi^+ = \{ \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1 \} \) and with basis \( S = \{ \alpha_i := \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n \} \).

The Weyl group is \( W = \Sigma_{n+1} \) (the set of permutations on \( n + 1 \)-letters), and its action on \( X \) is induced by the natural action on \( \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} \), given by permuting coordinates. The affine Weyl group is given by \( W_p = W \rtimes p\mathbb{Z}\Phi \), where \( \mathbb{Z}\Phi \) acts on \( X \) by translations (and hence \( p\mathbb{Z}\Phi \) acts by translations of elements in \( p\mathbb{Z}\Phi \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\Phi \)). We similarly define the extended affine Weyl group by \( W_p^{\text{ext}} = W \rtimes p\mathbb{Z}X \).
The dot action of $W_p$ (or $W_p^{\text{ext}}$) on $X$ will be denoted by $w \cdot \lambda$ for any $w \in W_p$ (or $W_p^{\text{ext}}$) and $\lambda \in X$. This extends to an action on $X \otimes \mathbb{R}$ and defines a system of facets for $X \otimes \mathbb{R}$, where we let $C \subset X \otimes \mathbb{R}$ denote the bottom alcove (see [J1, II.6.2]).

For any group scheme $H$, let $\text{Rep}(H)$ denote the category of finite-dimensional $H$-modules, and let $\mathcal{K}(H)$ denote its Grothendieck group. For any finite-dimensional $H$-module $M$, let $[M] \in \mathcal{K}(H)$ denotes its class, and for two finite-dimensional $H$-modules $M, N$, take $[M] \leq [N]$ to mean $[M : L] \leq [N : L]$ for every irreducible $H$-module $L$.

The irreducible representations for $G_1$ are indexed by the set of $p$-restricted weights $X_I = \{ \sum a_i \varpi_i \mid 0 \leq a_i < p \}$, and will be denoted by $L(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in X_I$. The irreducible representations for $G_1T$ will be denoted by $\hat{L}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in X$, where we recall that if $\lambda = \mu + p\nu$ for $\mu \in X_I$ and $\nu \in X$, then

\begin{equation}
\hat{L}(\lambda) \cong L(\mu) \otimes p\nu.
\end{equation}

For any $\lambda \in X$, we define the baby Verma and dual baby Verma modules respectively by

\[
\tilde{Z}(\lambda) = \text{coind}_{B_1T}^{G_1T} \lambda, \quad \tilde{Z}'(\lambda) = \text{ind}_{B_1T}^{G_1T} \lambda
\]

(see [J1, II.9] for an overview). We also let $\hat{Q}(\lambda)$ denote the injective hull (or projective cover) of $\hat{L}(\lambda)$ (see [J1, II.11]). We can similarly define the $G_1$-modules

\[
Z(\lambda) = \text{coind}_{B_1}^{G_1} \lambda, \quad Z'(\lambda) = \text{ind}_{B_1}^{G_1} \lambda, \quad Q(\lambda)
\]

for any $\lambda \in X_I$.

2.2. Let $H$ be a group scheme. For any finite-dimensional $H$-module $M$, let $\text{rad} M$ denote the radical of $M$ (i.e. the intersection of all maximal submodules of $M$). Now for $i \geq 0$, we define $\text{rad}^i M$ by

\[
\text{rad}^0 M = M, \quad \text{rad}^i M = \text{rad}(\text{rad}^{i-1} M) \quad \text{for } i \geq 1.
\]

Also,

\[
\overline{\text{rad}}_i M = \text{rad}^i M / \text{rad}^{i+1} M
\]

will denote the $i^{th}$-radical layer of $M$. Similarly, we let $\text{soc} M$ denote the socle of $M$ (i.e. the sum of all simple submodules of $M$), and let $\text{soc}^i M$ for $i \geq 0$ be given by

\[
\text{soc}^0 M = 0, \quad \text{soc}^i M = \pi^{-1}(\text{soc}(M/\text{soc}^{i-1} M)) \quad \text{with } \pi : M \twoheadrightarrow M/\text{soc}^{i-1} M, \text{ for } i \geq 1.
\]

It is also helpful to introduce the notation

\[
\text{cap}^i M = M / \text{rad}^i M,
\]

for $i \geq 0$. Observe that $\text{cap}^1 M = \overline{\text{rad}}_0 M$, this is often called the head of $M$.

The following identity is easy to verify, and will be useful later on. Suppose $N \subseteq M$ is any submodule, then for all $i \geq 0$,

\begin{equation}
\text{soc}^i N = \text{soc}^i M \cap N, \quad \text{rad}^i M \cap N = \frac{\text{rad}^i M + N}{N}.
\end{equation}
The Loewy length of \( M \) is defined to be the smallest integer \( r \geq 0 \) such that 
\[ \text{rad}^r(M) = 0 \] (or equivalently \( \text{soc}^r M = M \)); we will denote this by \( \ell \ell(M) \) (see [J1, II.D.1]). For all \( 0 \leq i \leq \ell \ell(M) \),
\[ [M] \leq [\text{soc}^i M] + [\text{cap}^{\ell \ell(M)-i} M] \in \mathcal{K}(H), \]
where \( M \) is said to be \textit{rigid} whenever equality holds for all \( i \) (see [AnK, (4)] or [J1, D.9]).

We remark that if \( M \) is a \( G_1T \)-module, then
\[ \text{rad}^i(M|_{G_1}) \cong (\text{rad}^i M)|_{G_1}, \quad \text{soc}^i(M|_{G_1}) \cong (\text{soc}^i M)|_{G_1} \]
So in particular, \( \ell \ell(M) = \ell \ell(M|_{G_1}) \).

As mentioned in the introduction, the determination of the Loewy structure for various \( \hat{Z}(\lambda) \), \( \hat{Z}'(\lambda) \) and \( \hat{Q}(\lambda) \) is a significant source of problems in representation theory. For instance, computing \( \text{rad}^i \hat{Q}(\lambda) \) for some \( \lambda \in X \), is equivalent to computing \( \text{Ext}_{G_1T}^i(\hat{L}(\lambda), \hat{L}(\mu)) \) for all \( \mu \in X \) (see Corollary 4.2).

2.3. Let \( \tau : G \to G \) be the anti-automorphism which preserves \( T \) and interchanges \( B \) and \( B^+ \) (see [J1, Corollary II.1.16]). It is well-known that \( \tau \) commutes with the Frobenius map, and hence preserves \( G_1 \) and \( G_1T \). If \( H \leq G \) is any subgroup scheme preserved by \( \tau \), and \( M \) is any \( H \)-module, then the twist \( \tau M \) is called the \( \tau \)-\textit{dual} of \( M \). It is easy to show that
\[ (\tau(\text{cap}^i M) \cong \text{soc}^i (\tau M), \quad \tau(\text{rad}^i M) \cong \text{soc}^{i+1}(\tau M) \]
for \( i \geq 0 \). This implies \( \ell \ell(\tau M) = \ell \ell(M) \) for any \( H \)-module \( M \).

If \( H = G_1T \), then by [J1, II.9.3(5), II.9.6(13), II.11.5(5)],
\[ \tau(\hat{Z}(\lambda)) \cong \hat{Z}'(\lambda), \quad \tau(\hat{L}(\lambda)) \cong \hat{L}(\lambda), \quad \tau(\hat{Q}(\lambda)) \cong \hat{Q}(\lambda), \]
for any \( \lambda \in X \), and in particular,
\[ \text{soc}^{i+1} \hat{Z}'(\lambda) \cong \text{rad}^i \hat{Z}(\lambda), \quad \text{soc}^{i+1} \hat{Q}(\lambda) \cong \text{rad}^i \hat{Q}(\lambda) \]
for \( i \geq 0 \) (similar statements hold for \( H = G_1 \)).

2.4. For any \( \lambda \in X \), let \( \hat{C}(\nu) \) denote the block whose simple objects are given by
\( \hat{L}(w \cdot \lambda) \) for \( w \in W_p \) (cf. [J1, II.9.22]). Let \( \overline{C} \) denote the closure of the bottom alcove \( C \), and recall from [J1, II.6.2(5)] that \( \overline{C} \cap X \) is a fundamental domain for the dot action of \( W_p \) on \( X \). Thus, since \( \hat{C}(\lambda) = \hat{C}(w \cdot \lambda) \) for any \( w \in W_p \), it follows that \( \overline{C} \cap X \) forms an indexing set for the blocks of \( \text{Rep}(G_1T) \). For any facet \( F \subset \overline{C} \), and any \( \lambda, \mu \in F \cap X \), the \( G_1T \)-translation functors \( T^\lambda_\mu \) (and \( T^\mu_\lambda \)) are mutually inverse and induce an equivalence \( \hat{C}(\lambda) \cong \hat{C}(\mu) \) (see [J1, II.9.4]).

For any \( \lambda \in X_1 \), we similarly let \( \hat{C}(\lambda) \) denote the block of \( \text{Rep}(G_1) \) whose simple objects are given by \( L(\mu) \) for \( \mu \in (\text{W}_p^{\text{ext}} \cdot \lambda) \cap X_1 \) (see [J1, II.9.22(1)]). We also let \( \hat{C}(\lambda) \) denote the subcategory of \( \text{Rep}(G_1T) \) generated by blocks of the form \( \hat{C}(\lambda') \) where \( \lambda' \in (\text{W}_p^{\text{ext}} \cdot \lambda) \cap \overline{C} \). By (2.1), the \( L(\mu) \otimes \nu \) for \( \mu \in (\text{W}_p^{\text{ext}} \cdot \lambda) \cap X_1 \) and \( \nu \in X \) (or equivalently, the \( \hat{L}(w \cdot \lambda) \) for \( w \in \text{W}_p^{\text{ext}} \)) form the set of isomorphism classes of simple objects for \( \hat{C}(\mu) \). We will refer to \( \hat{C}(\mu) \) as the \textit{lift} of \( \hat{C}(\mu) \) to \( \text{Rep}(G_1T) \).
2.5. We will now introduce a certain set of “very singular” blocks for \( G_1 T \). First, for any \( 1 \leq a \leq p - 1 \), let
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_0 &= (a - 1)\varpi_1 + (p - 1)\varpi_2 + \cdots + (p - 1)\varpi_n, \\
\lambda_n &= (p - 1)\varpi_1 + (p - 1)\varpi_2 + \cdots + (p - 1)\varpi_{n-1} + (p - a - 1)\varpi_n, \\
\lambda_i &= (p - a - 1)\varpi_i + (a - 1)\varpi_{i+1} + \sum_{j \neq i+1} (p - 1)\varpi_j \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n - 1.
\end{align*}
\]
We have,
\[
W_p^{\text{ext}} \cdot (\lambda_0 \cap X_1) = \{ \lambda_0, \ldots, \lambda_n \},
\]
and thus \( C(\lambda_0) \) is the block of \( \text{Rep}(G_1) \) where \( \text{L}(\lambda_0), \ldots, \text{L}(\lambda_n) \) gives the complete set of isomorphism classes of irreducibles. The \( G_1 T \)-blocks occurring in the lift \( \hat{C}(\lambda_0) \) are all of the form \( \hat{C}(\lambda_i + p\nu) \), with \( \nu \in X \) and \( \lambda_i + p\nu \in C \cap X \).

Remark 2.1. For any fixed \( i \) and \( \nu \in X \), the weights \( \lambda_i + p\nu \) defined above are all contained in the same facet for any choice of \( a \). Thus, if \( \lambda_i' + p\nu \) is the weight obtained by setting \( a = 1 \), we can see by [J1, II.9.22(2), II.9.22(4)], that for any \( w \in W_p \)
\[
T_{\lambda_i' + p\nu} (w \cdot (\lambda_i' + p\nu)) \cong \hat{L}(w \cdot (\lambda_i + p\nu)), \quad T_{\lambda_i' + p\nu} (\hat{Z}(w \cdot (\lambda_i' + p\nu)) \cong \hat{Z}(w \cdot (\lambda_i + p\nu)).
\]
This induces an equivalence
\[
\hat{C}(\lambda_i + p\nu) \cong \hat{C}(\lambda_i' + p\nu)
\]
via \( T_{\lambda_i' + p\nu} (-) \) and \( T_{\lambda_i' + p\nu} (-) \). So, without loss of generality, we may always assume \( a = 1 \).

Remark 2.2. If we fix \( a = 1 \), as in the preceding remark, then another description of the \( \lambda_0, \ldots, \lambda_n \) can be obtained by using \( \epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{n+1} \)-coordinates. For \( i = 0, \ldots, n \), let
\[
(2.9) \quad \mu_i = \epsilon_{i+1} - \delta = \epsilon_{i+1} - \rho \in \mathbb{Z}^n / \langle \epsilon_1 + \cdots + \epsilon_{n+1} \rangle,
\]
where \( \delta = n\epsilon_1 + (n - 1)\epsilon_2 + \cdots + \epsilon_n \) and satisfies \( \overline{\delta} = \rho \). It is easy to see that \( \lambda_i \) is the unique representative of \( \mu_i + p\overline{X} \) in \( X_1 \). More precisely, if we observe
\[
\overline{\varpi}_i = \epsilon_1 + \cdots + \epsilon_i
\]
for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), then
\[
(2.10) \quad \lambda_i = \epsilon_{i+1} + p\delta - p\epsilon_1 - \cdots - p\epsilon_{i+1} = \mu_i + p\rho - p\overline{\varpi}_i \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq n - 1
\]
\[
\lambda_n = \epsilon_{n+1} + p\delta - p\epsilon_1 - \cdots - p\epsilon_{n+1} = \mu_n + p\rho.
\]

2.6. Generalization to \((SL_{n+1}(k) \times G_n^\circ)/Z\). All of the results here can be easily generalized to groups of the form \( G = (SL_{n+1}(k) \times G_n^\circ)/Z \) for \( r \geq 0 \), where \( Z \) is a central subgroup (i.e. arbitrary reductive groups of type \( A_n \) with simply-connected derived subgroup). For instance, suppose \( G \) is the Levi factor \( L_I \subset SL_{n+r+1}(k) \), where
\[
I = \{ \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \ldots, \epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n+1} \} \subseteq S.
\]
We can then let \( C_I(\lambda_0) \) denote the block of \( (L_I)_I \) whose simple objects are given by \( L_I(\lambda_0), \ldots, L_I(\lambda_n) \) (notice that if \( r \geq 1 \), then the weights \( \overline{\epsilon}_1, \ldots, \overline{\epsilon}_{n+1} \) are all linearly independent).
3. Initial results and techniques

3.1. In this section, we will always assume that the \( \lambda_i \) are chosen with \( a = 1 \) (see Remark 2.1). We will establish a remarkable property of \( C(\lambda_0) \), which enables us to solve a number of multiplicity problems.

**Proposition 3.1.** For \( i = 0, \ldots, n, \)
\[ V(\lambda_i)|_{G_i} \cong L(\lambda_i) \]
where \( V(\lambda) \) denotes the Weyl module of highest weight \( \lambda \in X \).

**Proof.** We will use Jantzen’s criterion for the simplicity of Weyl modules (cf. [J1, II.8.21] or [J2]). Set \( \nu_i = \lambda_i + \rho \) for \( i = 0, \ldots, n \). Let us first consider the \( i = 0 \) case, then \( \langle \nu_0, \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 \rangle = 1 \), and for \( 2 \leq k \leq n \), \( \langle \nu_0, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{k+1} \rangle = p \). Thus, for any \( 2 \leq j \leq n+1 \),
\[ \langle \nu_0, \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_j \rangle = 1 + (j - 2)p, \]
so, following the notation in [J1, II.8.21], set \( a = 1, b = j - 2 \) and \( s = 0 \). The criterion is satisfied by setting \( \beta_0 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 \) and \( \beta_r = \epsilon_r - \epsilon_{r+1} \) for \( r = 2, \ldots, j - 1 \). Similarly, if \( 2 \leq k \leq j \leq n+1 \), then
\[ \langle \nu_0, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle = (j - k)\rho, \]
and if we write \( j - k = ap^{s-1} + bp^s \) for some \( s \geq 1 \) and \( 0 < a < p \), then \( \langle \nu_0, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle = ap^{s} + bp^{s+1} \). We can then set \( \beta_0 = \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{ap^{s-1}+k} \) and \( \beta_r = \epsilon_r - \epsilon_{r+1} \) for
\[ r = ap^{s-1} + k, \ldots, j - k - 1. \]

Now suppose \( i = n \), then for \( 1 \leq k \leq n-1 \),
\[ \langle \nu_n, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{k+1} \rangle = p, \]
and \( \langle \nu_n, \epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n+1} \rangle = p - 1 \). For any \( 1 \leq k \leq n \),
\[ \langle \nu_n, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{n+1} \rangle = (p - 1) + (n - k)p, \]
so \( a = p - 1, b = n - k \) and \( s = 0 \). The criterion is satisfied by setting \( \beta_0 = \epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n+1} \) and \( \beta_r = \epsilon_r - \epsilon_{r+1} \) for \( r = k, \ldots, n - 1 \). If \( 1 \leq k \leq j \leq n \), then
\[ \langle \nu_n, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle = (j - k)p, \]
and if we write \( j - k = ap^{s-1} + bp^s \) for some \( s \geq 1 \) and \( 0 < a < p \), then \( \langle \nu_n, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle = ap^{s} + bp^{s+1} \). We can then set \( \beta_0 = \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{ap^{s-1}+k} \) and \( \beta_r = \epsilon_r - \epsilon_{r+1} \) for
\[ r = ap^{s-1} + k, \ldots, j - k - 1. \]

As we will now see, the \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \) case is essentially a combination of the two previous cases. For \( 1 \leq k \leq i - 1 \) and \( i+2 \leq k \leq n + 1 \),
\[ \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{k+1} \rangle = p, \]
\[ \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1} \rangle = p - 1 \] and \( \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_{i+2} \rangle = 1 \) (obviously some of these cases are empty if \( i = 1 \) or \( i = n - 1 \)). If either \( 1 \leq k < j \leq i \) or \( i+2 \leq k < j \leq n + 1 \), then
\[ \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle = (j - k)p \]
with \( j - k = ap^{s-1} + bp^s \) and \( 0 < a < p \), then \( \beta_0 = \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{ap^{s-1}+k} \) and \( \beta_r = \epsilon_r - \epsilon_{r+1} \) for \( r = ap^{s-1} + k, \ldots, j - k - 1 \). Also, if \( 1 \leq k < i + 2 \leq j \)
\[ \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle = (j - k - 1)p, \]
with \( j - k - 1 = ap^{s-1} + bp^s \) and \( 0 < a < p \), \( \beta_0 = \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{ap^{s-1}+k+1} \) and \( \beta_r = \epsilon_r - \epsilon_{r+1} \) for \( r = ap^{s-1} + k + 1, \ldots, j - k - 1 \).
Finally the $\langle \nu_i, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_i \rangle$ with $1 \leq k \leq i - 1$, and the $\langle \nu_i, \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \rangle$ with $i < j \leq n + 1$ cases are handled identically to the $\langle \nu_n, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{n+1} \rangle$ and $\langle \nu_0, \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_j \rangle$ cases respectively.

**Corollary 3.2.** The dimensions and characters of the irreducible modules in $\mathcal{C}(\lambda_0)$ are given by Weyl’s dimension and character formula respectively.

We will now let $\mathcal{U} := \text{Dist}(G_1) \cong U^{[p]}(g)$ and $\mathcal{U} = \text{Dist}(G_1T)$ be two subalgebras of $\text{Dist}(G)$, where $U^{[p]}(g)$ is the restricted universal enveloping algebra for $G$. Following [J1, II.1.11], let $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Phi}$ and $\{H_i\}_{i=1, \ldots, n}$ denote the Chevalley basis for $\mathfrak{g}Z$.

Now by [J1, II.1.12], $\mathcal{U} \leq \text{Dist}(G)$ is the subalgebra generated by $X_\alpha$ and $H_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Similarly, $\mathcal{U} \leq \text{Dist}(G)$ is the subalgebra generated by $X_\alpha$ and $(H_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $m \geq 1$, where

$$\left( \frac{H_i}{m} \right) = \frac{H_i(H_i - 1) \cdots (H_i - m + 1)}{m!}.$$ 

For any $\lambda = a_1 \varpi_1 + \cdots + a_n \varpi_n \in X$, let $I_\lambda \trianglelefteq \mathcal{U}$ be the left-ideal generated by $H_i - a_i \cdot 1$ and $X_\alpha$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then

$$Z(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{U}/I_\lambda.$$ 

Likewise, let $\mathcal{I}_\lambda \trianglelefteq \mathcal{U}$ be the left-ideal generated by $[\left( \frac{H_i}{m} \right) - \left( \frac{a_i}{m} \right)] \cdot 1$ and $X_\alpha$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $m \geq 1$, then

$$Z(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{I}_\lambda.$$ 

In particular, $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)$ is a cyclic module generated by $\mathcal{T}$, where $\text{wt}(\mathcal{T}) = \lambda$. By [J1, II.9.2], the elements

$$\Pi_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} X_{-\alpha}^{n(\alpha)} \cdot \mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Z}(\lambda)$$

form a basis of weight vectors, with

$$\text{wt} \left( \Pi_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} X_{-\alpha}^{n(\alpha)} \cdot \mathcal{T} \right) = \lambda - \left( \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} n(\alpha) \alpha \right).$$

**3.2. Parabolic coinduction.** Let $P^+_I \subseteq G$ be a (positive) parabolic with Levi decomposition $P^+_I = L_I \rtimes U_I$ for $I \subseteq S$. At times we may omit $I$ from the notation, and simply write $P^+$ and $L$ for the parabolic and Levi subgroups. For any $\lambda \in X$, let $\mathcal{L}_I(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_I(\lambda)$ denote the corresponding irreducible and indecomposable injective $L_I$-modules. Also, set

$$\mathcal{Z}_I(\lambda) = \text{coind}_{P^+_I \cap L_I}^{L_I T} \mathcal{L}_I(\lambda), \quad \mathcal{Z}_I^j(\lambda) = \text{ind}_{P^+_I \cap L_I}^{L_I T} \mathcal{L}_I(\lambda).$$

We note that these modules can be regarded as $P^+_I T$-modules by inflation and, in particular, that

$$\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) = \text{coind}_{P^+_I T}^{G_1 T} \mathcal{Z}_I(\lambda),$$

by transitivity of coinduction. We also introduce a new class of $G_1 T$-modules, which may be regarded as a parabolic analogue to the baby Verma modules,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{M}_I(\lambda) = \text{coind}_{P^+_I T}^{G_1 T} \mathcal{L}_I(\lambda).$$

It will be useful to denote

$$D_I := \text{Dist}((U_I)_1) \cong U^{[p]}(u_I).$$
where \( \text{Dist}((U_I)_1) \) (respectively \( U[I^p](u_I) \)) is the distribution algebra for \((U_I)_1\) (respectively the restricted enveloping algebra for \(u_I\)). Following the notation in \([J1, II.1]\), a weight basis for \(D_I\) consists of elements of the form

\[
\Pi_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_I} X^{n(\alpha)}
\]

where \(0 \leq n(\alpha) < p\) and \(X_\alpha \in g_Z\) is a root vector. In particular, the lowest weight of \(D_I\) is given by

\[
\mu_I := \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_I} -(p-1)\alpha.
\]

The arguments in \([J1, II.9.2]\) also provide a \(T\)-module isomorphism

\[
(3.2) \quad \text{coind}_{P^+_I T}^{G_I^T} M \cong D_I \otimes M,
\]

for any \(P^+_I T\)-module \(M\).

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \(\lambda \in X\).

1. \(\widehat{M}_I(\lambda)\) is a quotient of \(\widehat{Z}(\lambda)\).
2. The lowest weight of \(\widehat{M}_I(\lambda)\) is given by \(\mu_I + w_I(\lambda)\), where \(w_I \in W\) is the long element for \(W_I \subseteq W\).

**Proof.** (1) follows from exactness of coinduction and (2) follows immediately from (3.2). \qed

**3.3.** For the remainder of this section, we will fix \(I = \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \ldots, \epsilon_{n-1} - \epsilon_n\} \subseteq S\), and \(J = \{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3, \ldots, \epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n+1}\} \subseteq S\) (e.g. the first and last \((n-1)\)-simple roots respectively). We have that

\[
\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_I = \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_{n+1}, \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_{n+1}, \ldots, \epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n+1}\}
\]

which implies \(\dim_k D_I = p^n\), and that the lowest weight of \(D_I\) is

\[
(3.3) \quad \mu_I = -(p-1)(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_{n+1} + \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_{n+1} + \cdots + \epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n+1})
\]

\[
= -(p-1)(n+1)\varpi_n.
\]

The long element \(w_I \in W_I\) is the permutation given by

\[
w_I : i \mapsto \begin{cases} n+1-i & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ n+1 & \text{for } i = n+1. \end{cases}
\]

Similarly, \(w_0 \in W\) is the permutation given by \(w_0 : i \mapsto n + 2 - i\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, n+1\).

Analogously, the lowest weight of \(D_J\) is

\[
\mu_J = -(p-1)(n+1)\varpi_1
\]

and \(w_J \in W_J\) is given by

\[
w_J : i \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = 1, \\ n+3-i & \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq n+1. \end{cases}
\]

Our goal is to explicitly describe the modules \(\widehat{M}_I(\lambda_i)\) and \(\widehat{M}_J(\lambda_i)\). We begin with the following dimension formula.

**Lemma 3.4.** (1) For \(i = 0, \ldots, n-1\),

\[
\dim_k M_I(\lambda_i) = \dim_k L(\lambda_i) + \dim_k L(\lambda_{i+1}).
\]
(2) For \( i = 1, \ldots, n \),
\[
\dim_k M_f(\lambda_i) = \dim_k L(\lambda_i) + \dim_k L(\lambda_{i-1}).
\]

Proof. It will be enough to prove (1), since (2) will follow from exactly the same arguments. For notational simplicity, set \( \nu_i = \lambda_i + \rho \) for \( i = 0, \ldots, n \). By Proposition 3.1, we can apply the Weyl dimension formula, which gives
\[
\dim_k L(\lambda_i) = \frac{\prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n+1} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j)}{\prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n+1} (\rho \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j)},
\]
where
\[
\prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n+1} (\rho \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) = n!(n - 1)! \cdots 2!.
\]

Also, by Lemma 3.3,
\[
\dim_k M_f(\lambda_i) = \frac{p^n \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j)}{(n - 1)! \cdots 2!}.
\]

Thus, the equation in the statement of the lemma is equivalent to
\[
(3.4) \quad \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n+1} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) + \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n+1} (\nu_{i+1} \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) = \frac{n! p^n \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j)}{(n - 1)! \cdots 2!}
\]
for \( i = 0, \ldots, n - 1 \). Notice that the quantities
\[
(\nu_i, \epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_n) = (n - 1 - i)p + 1, \quad (\nu_{i+1}, \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_{i+2}) = (i + 1)p - 1
\]
are unique to the first and second terms appearing in (3.4) respectively. This motivates us to introduce the notation
\[
\Gamma = \{(k, j) \mid 1 \leq k < j \leq n + 1\}.
\]

Claim 3.5. For \( i = 0, \ldots, n - 1 \),
\[
\prod_{\Gamma \setminus \{(i+1, n+1)\}} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) = \prod_{\Gamma \setminus \{(1, i+2)\}} (\nu_{i+1} \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j).
\]

Suppose for now that this claim holds, then by the observation immediately preceding the claim,
\[
\prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n+1} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) + \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n+1} (\nu_{i+1} \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) = np \prod_{\Gamma \setminus \{(i+1, n+1)\}} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j).
\]
Now combining this with the following identity:
\[
\prod_{\Gamma \setminus \{(i+1, n+1)\}} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, k \neq i+1} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_{i+1}) \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j)
\]
\[
= (n - 1)! p^{n-1} \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} (\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j),
\]
verifies (3.4).

The remainder of the proof will be devoted to proving the claim. Now it can be checked that
\[
X = \{(k, j) \in \Gamma \mid j = i + 1, i + 2, \text{ or } k = i + 1, i + 2\},
\]
is the subset of \( \Gamma \) consisting of all \((k, j)\) satisfying
\[
(\nu_i \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j) \neq (\nu_{i+1} \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j),
\]
and that \( |X| = 2n - 1 \). In particular, the sets \( X \setminus \{(i + 1, n + 1)\} \) and \( X \setminus \{(1, i + 2)\} \) have precisely \( 2n - 2 \) elements. We get immediately that
\[
\prod_{\Gamma \setminus X} \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle = \prod_{\Gamma \setminus X} \langle \nu_{i+1}, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle,
\]
and we only have to check the \((2n - 2)\)-fold products
\[
\prod_{X \setminus \{(i+1,n+1)\}} \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{X \setminus \{(1,i+2)\}} \langle \nu_{i+1}, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle.
\]
If \( i = 0 \),
\[
\prod_{X \setminus \{(1,n+1)\}} \langle \nu_0, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle
= \left( \frac{(p)(2p)\cdots((n-1)p)}{(p+1)(2p+1)\cdots((n-2)p+1)} \right)
= \prod_{X \setminus \{(1,2)\}} \langle \nu_1, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle,
\]
and for \( i = n - 1 \),
\[
\prod_{X \setminus \{(n-1,n+1)\}} \langle \nu_{n-1}, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle
= \left( \frac{(n-1)p-1}{((n-1)p)(n-2)p\cdots(p-1)} \right)
\times \left( \frac{(n-1)p}{((n-1)p)(n-2)p\cdots(p)} \right)
\prod_{X \setminus \{(1,n+1)\}} \langle \nu_n, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle.
\]
Finally, suppose that \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 2 \), then
\[
\prod_{X \setminus \{(i+1,n+1)\}} \langle \nu_i, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle
= \left( \frac{(ip-1)(i-1)p-1\cdots(p-1)}{(ip)(i-1)p\cdots(p)} \right)
\times \left( \frac{(p+1)(2p+1)\cdots((n-2-i)p+1)}{(p)(2p)\cdots((n-1-i)p+1)} \right)
\prod_{X \setminus \{(1,i+2)\}} \langle \nu_{i+1}, \epsilon_k - \epsilon_j \rangle.
\]
\[\square\]

Recall that for any \( \lambda \in X \), with \( \lambda = \mu + \nu \) for \( \mu \in X_{\text{1}} \) and \( \nu \in X \), the lowest weight of \( \hat{L}(\lambda) \) is given by
\[w_0(\mu) + p\nu,
\]
which is unique to each \( \lambda \).

**Lemma 3.6.** (1) For each \( i = 0, \ldots, n - 1 \), \( \hat{L}(\lambda_{i+1} - p\varpi_n) \subset \hat{M}_I(\lambda_i) \).
(2) For each \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), \( \hat{L}(\lambda_{i-1} - p\varpi_1) \subset \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i) \).

Proof. The proofs for (1) and (2) are identical, so we will only prove (1). It will be sufficient to show that the lowest weights of \( \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i) \) and \( \hat{L}(\lambda_{i+1} - p\varpi_n) \) coincide. By Lemma 3.3 and (3.3), the lowest weight of \( \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i) \) is

\[
-(p-1)(n+1)\varpi_n + \nu_J(\lambda_i).
\]

Likewise, the lowest weight of \( \hat{L}(\lambda_{i+1} - p\varpi_n) \) is

\[
w_0(\lambda_{i+1}) - p\varpi_n.
\]

Hence, the result will follow if we can prove that

\[
-(p-1)(n+1)\varpi_n + \nu_J(\lambda_i) - w_0(\lambda_{i+1}) = -p\varpi_n.
\]

To verify this identity, let us first define

\[
\rho_I := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^+} \alpha \in \frac{1}{2} X,
\]

then

\[
\rho = \rho_I + \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_{n+1} + \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_{n+1} + \cdots + \epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n+1})
\]

\[
= \rho_I + \frac{(n+1)}{2}\varpi_n.
\]

Thus, \( w_0(\rho) = -\rho_I - \frac{(n+1)}{2}\varpi_n \) and \( \nu_J(\rho) = -\rho_I + \frac{(n+1)}{2}\varpi_n \). We also observe that for \( i = 1, \ldots, n-1 \), \( \nu_J(\varpi_i) = \varpi_n - \varpi_{n-1-i} \) and, by recalling the \( \mu_i \) from (2.9), for \( i = 0, \ldots, n-1 \)

\[
w_I(\mu_i) = \varpi_{n-i} + \rho_I - \frac{(n+1)}{2}\varpi_n,
\]

\[
w_0(\mu_{i+1}) = \varpi_{n-i} + \rho_I + \frac{(n+1)}{2}\varpi_n.
\]

Finally, (3.5) follows by applying (2.10) and plugging in the preceding identities. \( \square \)

The following proposition completely determines the structure of the \( \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \) and \( \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \).

**Proposition 3.7.** Let \( \nu \in X \).

1. For \( i = 0, \ldots, n-1 \), \( \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \) is an indecomposable length 2 module with \( \text{rad}_0 \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \cong \hat{L}(\lambda_i + p\nu) \) and \( \text{rad}_1 \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \cong \hat{L}(\lambda_{i+1} + p\nu - p\varpi_n) \). Also,

\[
\hat{M}_J(\lambda_n) \cong \hat{Z}(\lambda_n + p\nu).
\]

2. For \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), \( \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \) is an indecomposable length 2 module with \( \text{rad}_0 \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \cong \hat{L}(\lambda_i + p\nu) \) and \( \text{rad}_1 \hat{M}_J(\lambda_i + p\nu) \cong \hat{L}(\lambda_{i-1} + p\nu - p\varpi_1) \). Also,

\[
\hat{M}_J(\lambda_0 + p\nu) \cong \hat{Z}(\lambda_0 + p\nu).
\]

Restricting to \( G_1 \) gives similar descriptions for \( M_J(\lambda_i) \) and \( M_J(\lambda_i) \).
Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume $\nu = 0$. Also, it will enough to prove (1), since (2) will follow from an identical argument. The description of $\hat{M}_I(\lambda_i)$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$ follows immediately from Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6. In the $\lambda_n$ case, since $\langle \lambda_n + \rho, \alpha^v \rangle = p$ for all $\alpha \in I$, then
\[ \hat{L}(\lambda_n) \cong \hat{Z}(\lambda_n) \]
and hence
\[ \hat{M}_I(\lambda_n) \cong \coind^{G_1; T}_{(P^*_I); T} \coind^{(P^*_I); T}_{B^*_I; T} \lambda_n \cong \hat{Z}(\lambda_n). \]
\[ \square \]

3.4. The parabolic coinduction techniques developed in the previous subsections will allow us to inductively compute the composition multiplicities of the baby Verma modules and, by reciprocity, the composition multiplicities of the indecomposable injective modules in $C(\lambda_0)$.

**Proposition 3.8.** For $0 \leq i, j \leq n$,
\[ [Z(\lambda_i) : L(\lambda_j)] = \binom{n}{j}. \]

Proof. We shall perform in induction on $n$, where $G = SL_{n+1}(\mathbb{k})$. For the base case, when $n = 1$, we have
\[ \lambda_0 = 0, \quad \lambda_1 = p - 2. \]

In this case, $C(\lambda_0)$ is actually the regular block and the claim can be verified through explicit computation (e.g. [J1, II.9.10]). Now suppose $n \geq 2$ and that the formula holds for $SL_{r+1}(k)$ for $r \leq n - 1$. Notice that $L_1 \cong (SL_n \times \text{G}_m)/\mathbb{Z}$. Internally, we can set $G = [L_I, L_I]$ with $G \cong SL_n$. Similarly, set $B' = B^+ \cap G' \subset B^+ \cap L_I$ and $T' = T \cap G'$, where $B'$ is the (upper) Borel subgroup of $G'$ and $T'$ is the torus of $G'$.

By the remark following [J1, Proposition I.8.20],
\[ Z_I(\lambda)_{|G'_1} \cong \coind^{G'_1}_{B'_1}(\lambda|_{T'}) \]
and by [J1, II.2.10(2)]
\[ L_I(\lambda)_{|G'_1} \cong L(\lambda|_{T'}). \]

For $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$, set $\lambda'_i = \lambda_i|_{T'}$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to $G'$ yields
\[ [Z_I(\lambda_i)_{|G'_1} : L_I(\lambda_j)_{|G'_1}] = [\coind^{G'_1}_{B'_1}(\lambda'_i) : L(\lambda'_j)] = \binom{n-1}{j} \]
for $0 \leq i, j \leq n - 1$. The modules $L_I(\lambda_0), \ldots, L_I(\lambda_{n-1})$ form the set of all irreducibles of the block $C_I(\lambda_0)$ of $\text{Rep}((L_I)_{11})$ (see §2.6). Now since $Z_I(\lambda_i)$ is an object of $C_I(\lambda_0)$ and for each $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$, $L_I(\lambda_i)$ is the only irreducible of $C_I(\lambda_0)$ which satisfies $L_I(\lambda_i)_{|G'_1} \cong L(\lambda'_i)$, then we must also have
\[ [Z_I(\lambda_i) : L_I(\lambda_j)] = \binom{n-1}{j}. \]

If we take any Jordan-Holder filtration of $Z_I(\lambda_i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and apply the exact functor $\coind^{G'_1}_{B'_1}(-)$, we will get a filtration whose layers are of the form
M_I(\lambda_j) for 0 \leq j \leq n - 1. Thus,
\[ [Z(\lambda_i) : M_I(\lambda_j)] = [Z_I(\lambda_i) : L_I(\lambda_j)] = \binom{n-1}{j}, \]
where \([Z(\lambda_i) : M_I(\lambda_j)]\) denotes the filtration multiplicity.

By Proposition 3.7, each \(M_I(\lambda_j)\) contributes a single \(L(\lambda_j)\) and \(L(\lambda_{j+1})\). Thus,
\[ [Z(\lambda_i) : L(\lambda_j)] = \binom{n-1}{j} + \binom{n-1}{j-1} \]
coming from the \(\binom{n-1}{j}\) copies of \(M_I(\lambda_j)\) and the \(\binom{n-1}{j-1}\) copies of \(M_I(\lambda_{j-1})\). The proposition now follows from the well-known identity
\[ \binom{n}{j} = \binom{n-1}{j} + \binom{n-1}{j-1}. \]
Thus, we have verified the formula for \(Z(\lambda_i)\) when \(0 \leq i \leq n - 1\). The \(Z(\lambda_n)\) case can be handled by replacing with \(I\) with \(J\). \(\square\)

**Remark 3.9.** An alternative argument for this would be to simply apply Theorem 5.3, whose proof, as we will later see, is independent of this proposition.

3.5. If we let \([Q(\lambda) : Z(\mu)]\), denote the multiplicity of \(Z(\mu)\) in any filtration as in [J1, Proposition II.11.4], then
\[ (3.7) \quad [Q(\lambda) : Z(\mu)] = [Z(\mu) : L(\lambda)]. \]
Combining this with Proposition 3.8, gives the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.10.** For \(0 \leq i, j \leq n\),
\[ [Q(\lambda_i) : L(\lambda_j)] = (n+1) \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{j}. \]

*Proof.* By reciprocity,
\[ [Q(\lambda_i) : L(\lambda_j)] = \sum_{k=0}^{n} [Q(\lambda_i) : Z(\lambda_k)][Z(\lambda_k)L(\lambda_j)] \]
\[ = \sum_{k=0}^{n} [Z(\lambda_k) : L(\lambda_i)][Z(\lambda_k)L(\lambda_j)] \]
\[ = (n+1) \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{j}, \]
where the last equality follows from Proposition 3.8. \(\square\)

4. **Extensions between irreducibles**

4.1. In this section, we will again assume that the \(\lambda_i\) are chosen with \(a = 1\) (see Remark 2.1). The goal will be to prove the following theorem.
The lemma then follows by combining this observation, with Theorem G which is obtained by applying \( \text{Hom}_{\leq 0} \) for 0.

Some additional notation.

Determining the top two radical layers of the \( T \).

**Proof.** We also set \( F_{i} = F_{i}(\varpi) = F_{i}(\varpi)_{J} \) for 0.

Similarly, for 1 \( i \leq n \), set

\[
F_{j} = F_{j}(\varpi) = F_{j}(\varpi)_{J},
\]

We also set \( F_{j} = F_{j}(\varpi) / F_{j+1}(\varpi) \) and \( F_{j} = F_{j}(\varpi) / F_{j+1}(\varpi) \).

The exactness of coinduction implies

\[
F_{j}(\varpi) = \frac{\text{coind}_{G_{j_{i}}}^{G_{j_{j}}}(\varpi)}{\text{coind}_{G_{j_{i}}}^{G_{j_{j}}}(\varpi)} \cong \text{coind}_{G_{j_{i}}}^{G_{j_{j}}}(\varpi),
\]

with a similar statement for \( P_{j} \).
Lemma 4.3. Let $G = SL_{n+1}(k)$ with $n \geq 1$, then

$$\overline{\text{rad}_1 Z(\lambda_i)} = \begin{cases} L(\lambda_1)^{\oplus n} & \text{if } i = 0, \\ L(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \oplus L(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-i} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ L(\lambda_{n-1})^{\oplus n} & \text{if } i = n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The case for $n = 1$ follows from [J1, II.9.10] and the $n = 2$ case follows from [X1, Theorems 2.4-2.5].

Now suppose $n > 2$ and that the statement of the lemma holds for $SL_{r+1}(k)$ whenever $1 \leq r < n$. By the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.8, we can assume the statement also holds for the Levi factor $L_I$ with $Z_I(\lambda_i)$ and $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ (respectively $L_J$ with $Z_J(\lambda_i)$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$).

More precisely, the inductive hypothesis gives

$$\overline{\text{rad}_1 Z_I(\lambda_i)} = \begin{cases} L_I(\lambda_0)^{\oplus n-1} & \text{if } i = 0, \\ L_I(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \oplus L_I(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-1-i} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-2, \\ L_I(\lambda_{n-1})^{\oplus n-1} & \text{if } i = n-1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\overline{\text{rad}_1 Z_J(\lambda_i)} = \begin{cases} L_J(\lambda_1)^{\oplus n-1} & \text{if } i = 1, \\ L_J(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i-1} \oplus L_J(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-i} & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ L_J(\lambda_{n-1})^{\oplus n-1} & \text{if } i = n. \end{cases}$$

By coinducing, we get

$$\overline{F^0_I(\lambda_i)} = \text{coind}^{G_i}_{(M^*_I)^1} (\overline{\text{rad}_0 Z_I(\lambda_i)}) = M_I(\lambda_i),$$

and

$$\overline{F^l_I(\lambda_i)} = \text{coind}^{G_i}_{(M^*_I)^1} (\overline{\text{rad}_1 Z_I(\lambda_i)}) = \begin{cases} M_I(\lambda_0)^{\oplus n-1} & \text{if } i = 0, \\ M_I(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \oplus M_I(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-1-i} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-2, \\ M_I(\lambda_{n-1})^{\oplus n-1} & \text{if } i = n-1, \end{cases}$$

where we note that the formulas for $\overline{F^0_I}$ and $\overline{F^l_I}$ are similar.

Let us focus on $I$ for now. By Proposition 3.7,

$$\overline{\text{rad}_0 F^0_I(\lambda_i)} = L(\lambda_i), \quad \overline{\text{rad}_1 F^0_I(\lambda_i)} = L(\lambda_{i+1})$$

and

$$\overline{\text{rad}_0 F^l_I(\lambda_i)} = \begin{cases} L(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \oplus L(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-1-i} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-2, \\ L(\lambda_{n-1})^{\oplus n-1} & \text{if } i = n-1. \end{cases}$$

We quickly observe

$$\overline{\text{rad}_1 F^0_I(\lambda_i)} = L(\lambda_{i+1}) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{rad}_1 Z(\lambda_i)},$$

since $M_I(\lambda_i)$ is a length 2 quotient of $Z(\lambda_i)$. Also,

$$\overline{\text{rad}_1 Z(\lambda_i)} \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{rad}_1 F^l_I(\lambda_i) \oplus \overline{\text{rad}_0 F^l_I(\lambda_i)}}$$

$$\cong L(\lambda_{i+1}) \oplus L(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \oplus L(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-1-i}$$

since every other factor of $Z(\lambda_i)$ either occurs in $\overline{\text{rad}_1 F^l_I(\lambda_i)}$ (or in $\overline{\text{rad}_0 F^l_I(\lambda_i)}$ for $j \geq 2$ and $k = 0, 1$), and is strictly below $\overline{\text{rad}_0 F^l_I(\lambda_i)}$. In fact, this tells us that
\[ \text{rad}_1 Z(\lambda_i) \] must occur as the head of a subquotient, \( M \), of \( Z(\lambda_i) \) which fits into a short exact sequence of the form
\[ 0 \to L(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \oplus L(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-1-i} \to M \to L(\lambda_{i+1}) \to 0. \]
In other words, \( M \) is given by an element of
\[ \text{Ext}_{G_1}^1 (L(\lambda_{i+1}), L(\lambda_{i+1}))^{\oplus n-1-i} \oplus \text{Ext}_{G_1}^1 (L(\lambda_{i+1}), L(\lambda_{i-1}))^{\oplus i} \]
\[ \cong \text{Ext}_{G_1}^1 (L(\lambda_{i+1}), L(\lambda_{i-1}))^{\oplus i}, \]
where the isomorphism follows from [An, Theorem 4.5]). This specifically implies that \( L(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-1-i} \) also occurs in the head of \( M \) (i.e., \( M \) fits into
\[ 0 \to L(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \to M \to L(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-i} \to 0, \]
which provides a map
\[ L(\lambda_{i+1})^{\oplus n-i} \to \text{rad}_1 Z(\lambda_i), \]
and so, in particular, we are done if \( i = 0 \).
For \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), it can be verified that replacing \( I \) with \( J \), and repeating the same arguments, also gives an inclusion
\[ L(\lambda_{i-1})^{\oplus i} \to \text{rad}_1 Z(\lambda_i), \]
which immediately handles the \( i = n \) case as well. Finally, for \( 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \), the lemma follows by combining (4.4) and (4.5).
\[ \square \]

Combining Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 4.3, we can also compute the first radical layer of \( \hat{Z}(\lambda_i) \).

**Lemma 4.4.** Let \( G = SL_{n+1}(k) \) with \( n \geq 1 \), then
\[ \text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}(\lambda_0) = \]
\[ \hat{L}(\lambda_1 - p\varpi_n) \oplus \hat{L}(\lambda_1 - p\varpi_{n-2} + p\varpi_n) \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{L}(\lambda_1 - p\varpi_1 + p\varpi_2), \]
\[ \text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}(\lambda_n) = \]
\[ \hat{L}(\lambda_{n-1} - p\varpi_1) \oplus \hat{L}(\lambda_{n-1} - p\varpi_2 + p\varpi_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{L}(\lambda_{n-1} - p\varpi_n + p\varpi_{n-1}), \]
and for \( i = 1, \ldots, n-1 \),
\[ \text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}(\lambda_i) = \left( \bigoplus_{k=1}^i \hat{L}(\lambda_{i-1} - p\varpi_k + p\varpi_{k-1}) \right) \]
\[ \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{k=1}^{n-i} \hat{L}(\lambda_{i+1} - p\varpi_{n+1-2k} + p\varpi_{n+2-k}) \right), \]
where we set \( \varpi_0 := 0 \) and \( \varpi_{n+1} := 0 \) for notational simplicity.

**Proof.** The case for \( n = 1 \) follows from [J1, II.9.10], and the \( n = 2 \) case is given in [X1, Theorems 2.4-2.5]. Suppose now that \( n > 2 \), and that the statement holds for \( SL_{r+1}(k) \) with \( 2 \leq r < n \). The inductive hypothesis can be applied to \( L_I \) and \( L_J \) as in the proof of Proposition 3.8. More precisely, for \( L_I \) and \( i = 0, \ldots, n-1 \), [J1, Lemma II.9.2(3)] implies that every composition factor of \( \hat{Z}_I(\lambda_i) \) is of the form \( \lambda_i - \gamma \) for various \( \gamma \in Z(I) \).

If we set \( G' = [L_I, L_I] \cong SL_n \) and \( T' = T \cap G' \), we get
\[ \hat{Z}_I(\lambda_i)|_{G'_1 T'} \cong \hat{Z}(\lambda_i|_{T'}), \quad \hat{L}(\lambda_i - \gamma)|_{G'_1 T'} \cong \hat{L}(\lambda_i|_{T'} - \gamma|_{T'}), \]
with $[\hat{Z}_I(\lambda_i) : \hat{L}(\lambda_i - \gamma)] = [\hat{Z}(\lambda_i|_{T'}) : \hat{L}(\lambda_i|_{T'} - \gamma|_{T'})]$. Furthermore,

$$
\gamma|_{T'} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1})|_{T'} \iff \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1})
$$

(4.6)

So the inductive hypothesis is applied to $L_I$ by first expressing the irreducibles occurring in the inductive hypothesis for $SL_n(k)$ as $\hat{L}(\lambda_i|_{T'} - \gamma|_{T'})$ for various uniquely determined $\gamma$, and then employing (4.6) to obtain the corresponding formulas for $\text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}_I(\lambda_i)$. The case for $L_J$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n$ is similar.

Thus, the inductive hypothesis gives

$$
\text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}_I(\lambda_0) = \hat{L}_I(\lambda_1 - p\varpi_{n-1} + p\varpi_n) \oplus \hat{L}_I(\lambda_1 - p\varpi_{n-2} + p\varpi_{n-1}) \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{L}_I(\lambda_1 - p\varpi + p\varpi_2).
$$

So the formula for $\text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}(\lambda_0)$ follows from Proposition 3.7 and the proof of Lemma 4.3. For $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$, the hypothesis also gives

$$
\text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}_I(\lambda_i) = \left( \bigoplus_{k=1}^{i} \hat{L}_I(\lambda_{i-1} - p\varpi_k + p\varpi_{k-1}) \right) \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{k=1}^{n-1-i} \hat{L}_I(\lambda_{i+1} - p\varpi_{n+1-k} + p\varpi_{n+2-k}) \right),
$$

and again the formula for $\text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}(\lambda_i)$ is obtained by applying Proposition 3.7, and proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Finally, the formula for $\text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}(\lambda_n)$ is verified by first applying the inductive hypothesis to $L_J$, which gives

$$
\text{rad}_1 \hat{Z}_J(\lambda_n) = \hat{L}_J(\lambda_{n-1} - p\varpi_2 + p\varpi_1) \oplus \hat{L}_J(\lambda_{n-1} - p\varpi_3 + p\varpi_2) \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{L}_J(\lambda_{n-1} - p\varpi + p\varpi_{n-1}),
$$

and then proceeding as above.

\[\square\]

4.3. Ext\(^1\)-vanishing. We will first prove the vanishing portion of Theorem 4.1. The following simple observation will be useful.

Lemma 4.5. If $E \in \text{Ext}_G^1(\hat{L}(\lambda), \hat{L}(\mu - p\nu))$ for $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in X$ is non-trivial and $\lambda \nleq \mu - p\nu$, then $E$ is a quotient of $\hat{Z}(\lambda)$.

Proof. By definition, $E$ is an indecomposable length 2 module with head $\hat{L}(\lambda)$ and socle $\hat{L}(\mu - p\nu)$. In particular, $E$ is a cyclic module for $\hat{U}$, generated by a weight vector $v_\lambda$. Now every weight $\gamma$ occurring in $\hat{L}(\mu - p\nu)$ satisfies $\gamma \leq \mu - p\nu$, and hence, $\lambda \nleq \gamma$. And since every weight $\gamma \neq \lambda$ occurring in $\hat{L}(\lambda)$ satisfies $\gamma < \lambda$, we can see that $\lambda + \alpha_i \nleq \gamma$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and every nonzero weight $\gamma$ of $E$. This implies that $X_{\alpha_i} \cdot v_\lambda = 0$ for all $i$, and hence the surjective map

$$
\hat{U} \twoheadrightarrow E
X \mapsto X \cdot v_\lambda
$$

factors through the ideal $\hat{I}_\lambda$, and thus $E$ is a quotient of $\hat{Z}(\lambda) \cong \hat{U}/\hat{I}_\lambda$. \[\square\]
If we let \( \lambda, \mu \in \mathbf{X}_1 \) be arbitrary, and set \( M = \text{Ext}^1_{G_1}(L(\lambda), L(\mu)) \), then

\[
M_{\nu \nu} = (M \otimes (-\nu \nu))^T \cong \text{Ext}^1_{G_1,T}(\hat{L}(\lambda), \hat{L}(\mu - \nu \nu))
\]

for any \( \nu \in \mathbf{X} \). In other words, the weight spaces for the \( G/G_1 \)-module \( M \) are given by the \( \text{Ext}^1_{G_1,T} \)-modules.

**Lemma 4.6.** If \( M = \text{Ext}^1_{G_1}(L(\lambda_i), L(\lambda_j)) \) is nonzero for \( |i - j| \geq 2 \), then there exists \( \nu \in \mathbf{X}^+ \) such that \( \nu \nu \leq \lambda_j - \lambda_i \).

**Proof.** The \( G/G_1 \)-module \( M \) is nonzero if and only if \( M_{\nu \nu} \neq 0 \) for some \( \nu \in \mathbf{X}^+ \). By Lemma 4.3, we know that there exist no \( E \in M \) which can occur as a quotient of \( Z(\lambda_i) \). Likewise, there are no \( E \in M_{\nu \nu} = \text{Ext}^1_{G_1,T}(\hat{L}(\lambda_i), \hat{L}(\lambda_j - \nu \nu)) \) occurring as a quotient of \( Z(\lambda_i) \). Thus, by Lemma 4.5, we must have

\[
\lambda_i \leq \lambda_j - \nu \nu
\]

if \( M_{\nu \nu} \neq 0 \).

Our vanishing result will now follow if we can show that whenever \( |i - j| \geq 2 \), there exist no nonzero \( \nu \in \mathbf{X}^+ \) which satisfy

\[
\nu \nu \leq \lambda_j - \lambda_i.
\]

**Lemma 4.7.** If \( 0 \leq i, j \leq n \) are such that \( |i - j| \neq 1 \), then

\[
\text{Ext}^1_{G_1}(L(\lambda_i), L(\lambda_j)) = 0.
\]

**Proof.** From the preceding remarks, it will be enough to show that there exist no dominant weights \( \nu \) such that

\[
\nu \nu \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_j,
\]

whenever \( |i - j| \geq 2 \). From (2.8), we can see

\[
(4.8) \quad \lambda_i - \lambda_j = \begin{cases} 
\epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_{j+1} + p(-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1}) & \text{if } 0 \leq i, j \leq n - 1, \\
\epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_{n+1} - p\varpi_{i+1} & \text{if } 0 \leq i \leq n - 1 \text{ and } j = n, \\
\epsilon_{n+1} - \epsilon_{j+1} + p\varpi_{j+1} & \text{if } i = n \text{ and } 0 \leq j \leq n - 1.
\end{cases}
\]

First suppose that \( i > j \) (and \( i - j \geq 2 \)), then we can see that

\[
\lambda_i - \lambda_j < \begin{cases} 
p(-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1}) & \text{if } i < n, \\
p\varpi_{j+1} & \text{if } i = n.
\end{cases}
\]

The \( i = n \) case is now obvious, since \( \varpi_{j+1} \) is minuscule, and thus \( \nu \nu \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_j \) would imply

\[
\nu \nu < p\varpi_{j+1} \iff \nu < \varpi_{j+1},
\]

which is impossible for \( \nu \in \mathbf{X}^+ \). On the other hand, for \( j < i < n \),

\[
\lambda_i - \lambda_j < p(-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1}) < p\varpi_{n+1-(i-j)},
\]

where the rightmost inequality comes from the fact that \( \varpi_{n+1-(i-j)} = w(-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j}) \), with (in cycle notation)

\[
w = (i + 2, j + 2)(i + 3, j + 3) \cdots (n + 1, j + (n+1-i)) \in W.
\]

To obtain the formula for \( w \), observe that we can write

\[
-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1} = \epsilon_{i+2} + \cdots + \epsilon_{n+1}
\]

and \( \varpi_{j+1} = \epsilon_{i+1} + \cdots + \epsilon_{j+1} \), so that

\[
-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1} = \epsilon_{i+2} + \cdots + \epsilon_{j+1} + \epsilon_{i+2} + \cdots + \epsilon_{n+1}.
\]
which gives us the formula for $w$. Now just as above, we can see that $p\nu \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_j$ then forces $\nu < \varpi_{n+1-(i-j)}$, which is impossible for $\nu \in X^+$ since $\varpi_{n+1-(i-j)}$ is minuscule.

Suppose now that $i < j$ (and $j - i \geq 2$). When $j = n$, we can see that $\lambda_i - \lambda_n \not\in pX$ so if $p\nu < \lambda_i - \lambda_n$ then

$$(\lambda_i - \lambda_n) - p\nu = (\epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_{n+1}) + (-p\varpi_{i+1} - p\nu) = (\epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_{n+1}) + p\gamma,$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}\Phi^+$ (since writing $p\gamma = \sum_{k=1}^n pc_k \gamma_k$ gives

$$(\epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_{n+1}) + p\gamma = \sum_{k=1}^i pc_k \alpha_k + \sum_{k=i+1}^n (pc_k + 1) \alpha_k$$

and $c_k < 0 \implies pc_k + 1 < 0$). Hence,

$$p\nu \leq -p\varpi_{i+1} < w_0(-p\varpi_{i+1}) = p\varpi_{n-i} \implies \nu < \varpi_{n-i},$$

which is impossible for $\nu \in X^+$. For $i < j < n$, the same reasoning shows that if $p\nu \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_j$, then $p\nu \leq \rho(-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1})$. If we set

$$w = (1,j)(2,j-1)\cdots(i+1,j-i) \in W,$$

then $w(-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1}) = \varpi_{j-1-i}$, hence

$$p\nu \leq \rho(-\varpi_{i+1} + \varpi_{j+1}) < p\varpi_{j-1-i} \implies \nu < \varpi_{j-1-i},$$

which again is impossible for $\nu \in X^+$. $\square$

4.4. We now have enough information to complete our $\text{Ext}^1$-calculation. However, before we get to the proof of Theorem 4.1, it will be helpful to recall [An, Lemma 5.1]. For any $\lambda \in X^+$, set

$$\lambda^0 = 2(p-1)\rho + w_0(\lambda).$$

The aforementioned lemma states that if $M = \text{Ext}^1_{G_1}(L(\lambda), L(\mu))^{-(1)}$ for $\lambda, \mu \in X_1$, and $M_{\nu} \neq 0$ for some $\nu \in X$, then

$$(4.9) \quad p\nu \leq \mu^0 - \lambda.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. By Lemma 4.7, we only have to determine

$$\text{Ext}^1_{G_1}(L(\lambda_i), L(\lambda_j))^{(-1)},$$

when $|i - j| = 1$. Let us begin with

$$M = \text{Ext}^1_{G_1}(L(\lambda_i+1), L(\lambda_i))^{(-1)}.$$ 

By Lemma 4.4, we can see that $\dim_k M_{\varpi_1} = 1$, thus (4.9) and Lemma 4.5 imply

$$p\varpi_1 \leq \lambda^0 - \lambda_{i+1}, \quad p\varpi_1 \not\leq \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}.$$ 

Now since $\varpi_1$ is minimal in $\varpi_1 + \mathbb{Z}\Phi \cap X^+$, then any other $\nu \in X^+$ satisfying $M_{\nu} \neq 0$, must also satisfy $\varpi_1 < \nu$. But this implies that $p\nu \not\leq \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}$ which contradicts Lemma 4.4. Thus, $\dim_k M_{\varpi_1} = 1$ and $M_{\nu} = 0$ for any other $\nu \in X^+$ imply that $V$ is the only composition factor of $M$ and $[M : V] = 1$, therefore $M \cong V$.

Similarly, if we set

$$N = \text{Ext}^1_{G_1}(L(\lambda_i), L(\lambda_{i+1}))^{(-1)},$$

then by the same reasoning as above, we get $N \cong V^*$. 

5. The Loewy Structure of $\hat{Z}(\lambda_i + p\nu)$ and $\hat{Z}^\prime(\lambda_i + p\nu)$

5.1. In this section we will use the parabolic coinduction technique and the $\text{Ext}^1$-vanishing results to determine the Loewy structure of $\hat{Z}(\lambda_i + p\nu)$ and $\hat{Z}^\prime(\lambda_i + p\nu)$. Our calculations will also determine the Loewy lengths and establish the rigidity of these modules. We will use all of the notation introduced in 4.2.

5.2. It will be helpful to first consider the easier problem involving $Z(\lambda_i)$ and $Z^\prime(\lambda_i)$. The following lemma is an application of Theorem 4.1.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let $n \geq 2$, then for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $j \geq 0$,

$$[L(\lambda_i)] \leq [\text{rad}_j Z(\lambda_i)] \in \mathcal{K}(G_1) \implies k \equiv i + j \mod 2.$$  

Moreover, for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$,

$$[\text{rad}_j Z(\lambda_i)] = [\text{rad}_0 F^j_I(\lambda_i)] \oplus [\text{rad}_1 F^{j-1}_I(\lambda_i)],$$

and for $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$[\text{rad}_j Z(\lambda_i)] = [\text{rad}_0 F^j_I(\lambda_i)] \oplus [\text{rad}_1 F^{j-1}_I(\lambda_i)],$$

where we recall the notation from 4.2 and set $F^{-1}_I(\lambda_i) = 0$ and $F^{-1}_I(\lambda_i) = 0$.

**Proof.** As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we will proceed by induction on $n \geq 2$. The base case again follows from the explicit formulas given in [X1, Theorems 2.4-2.5]. Suppose $n > 2$ and assume the statement of the lemma holds for all $SL_{r+1}(k)$ with $2 \leq r < n$. The argument in the proof of Proposition 3.8 implies that the statement also holds for the Levi factor $L_I$ with $Z_I(\lambda_i)$ and $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ (respectively $L_J$ with $Z_J(\lambda_i)$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$).

For simplicity, let us begin by fixing $i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. The inductive hypothesis implies

$$[\text{rad}_j Z_I(\lambda_i)] = \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} L_I(\lambda_k)^{\oplus m^j_{ik}},$$

where $m^j_{ik} \neq 0$ implies $k \equiv i + j \mod 2$. Thus,

$$F^j Z_I(\lambda_i) = \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} M_I(\lambda_k)^{\oplus m^j_{ik}}.$$  

By Proposition 3.7,

$$[\text{rad}_0 F^j_I(\lambda_i)] = \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} L(\lambda_k)^{\oplus m^j_{ik}}, \quad [\text{rad}_1 F^j_I(\lambda_i)] = \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} L(\lambda_{k+1})^{\oplus m^j_{ik}}.$$  

From the inductive hypothesis, we can see that (5.1) will hold on the factors of $\text{rad}^j Z(\lambda_i)$, provided we verify (5.2). To accomplish this, we will proceed by induction on $j \geq 0$. The base case, $j = 0$, is obvious since $[\text{rad}_0 Z(\lambda_i)] = L(\lambda_i)$. Now assume $j > 0$ and that (5.2) holds for $0 \leq l < j$. Essentially the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.3 then shows that $\text{rad}_j Z(\lambda_i)$ is the head of a module $M$ which fits into a short exact sequence of the form

$$0 \to [\text{rad}_0 F^j_I(\lambda_i)] \to M \to [\text{rad}_1 F^{j-1}_I(\lambda_i)] \to 0.$$  

However, by the inductive hypothesis and (5.4), we can see that every factor $L(\lambda_k)$ of $M$ occurring with non-zero multiplicity must satisfy $k \equiv i + j \mod 2$. In particular,
if \( L(\lambda_s) \) and \( L(\lambda_t) \) are two non-zero factors of \( M \), then \(|s-t| \neq 1\). Thus, Theorem 4.1 implies the preceding short exact sequence is split, and hence (5.2) holds for all \( j \geq 0 \).

So we have verified (5.1) and (5.2) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n-1 \) and \( j \geq 0 \). On the other hand, if we replace \( I \) with \( J \) and fix any \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), then the same argument as above also verifies (5.1) and (5.3) for all \( j \geq 0 \).

Before we get to the main results of this section, it will be helpful to recall a simple combinatorial identity. Namely, for any \( 0 \leq j \leq n \),

\[
\binom{n}{j} = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq i} \binom{i}{k} \binom{n-i}{j-k}
\]

(5.5)

can be obtained from Pascal’s triangle. We assume, of course, that \( \binom{n}{j} = 0 \) unless \( 0 \leq j \leq n \).

**Proposition 5.2.** Let \( n \geq 1 \), then for \( 0 \leq i \leq n \) and \( j \geq 0 \),

\[
\text{rad}_j Z(\lambda_i) = \text{soc}_j Z'(\lambda_i) = \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq i} L(\lambda_{i+j-2k}) \oplus \binom{i}{(n-i)}.
\]

(5.6)

In particular, \( \ell(\lambda_i) = \ell(Z(\lambda_i)) = n + 1 \) and \( \text{rad}_j Z(\lambda_i) \) has precisely \( \binom{n}{j} \) factors.

**Proof.** By (2.7), we are reduced to determining the radical layers of \( Z(\lambda_i) \). We obtain (5.6) by induction on \( n \geq 1 \). The base case, \( n = 1 \), is trivial. Assume by induction that the formula holds for \( SL_{r+1}(k) \) with \( 1 \leq r < n \). Apply this to \( L_1 \)

and fix \( i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\} \). Then by Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 3.7,

\[
\text{rad}_j Z(\lambda_i) = \text{rad}_0 \bigoplus \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq i} L(\lambda_{i+j-2k}) \oplus \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq i} L(\lambda_{i+j-2k}) \oplus \binom{i}{(n-i)}.
\]

Similarly, we can verify (5.6) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) by applying the inductive hypothesis to \( L_j \).

\[ \square \]

**5.3. Loewy structure as a \( G_1T \)-module.** Using the same methods as above, we can determine the radical layers of \( \tilde{Z}(\lambda_i + \nu) \) (or equivalently the socle layers of \( \tilde{Z}'(\lambda_i + \nu) \) by (2.7)) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n \). For any \( i \leq j \), set \([i, j] = \{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}\).

and for any subset \( X \subseteq \{1, n+1\} \), we define \( \epsilon_X = \sum_{k \in X} \epsilon_k \),
where $\epsilon_0 = 0$. Now, the $\lambda_0$ and $\lambda_n$ formulas are easily obtained by using Lemma 5.1, and repeatedly applying Proposition 3.7. In particular, if we take any $\nu \in X$, then

$$\text{rad}_j \hat{Z}(\lambda_0 + \nu) = \bigoplus_{\{X \subseteq [2, n+1], |X| = j\}} \hat{L}(\lambda_j + \nu + p\overline{X}),$$

(5.7)

$$\text{rad}_j \hat{Z}(\lambda_n + \nu) = \bigoplus_{\{X \subseteq [1, n], |X| = j\}} \hat{L}(\lambda_{n-j} + \nu + p\overline{X}).$$

(5.8)

To handle the $0 < i < n$ case, we introduce the subsets $I_i = \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \ldots, \epsilon_{i-\epsilon_{i+1}}\}$. We then apply (5.8) to $\hat{Z}_{I_i}(\lambda_i)$ and get

$$\text{rad}_k \hat{Z}_{I_i}(\lambda_i) = \bigoplus_{\{X \subseteq [1, i], |X| = k\}} \hat{L}_{I_i}(\lambda_{i-k} - p\overline{X}),$$

with $0 \leq k \leq i$ (it is zero otherwise). The radical layers for $\hat{Z}(\lambda_i)$ are computed by repeatedly applying Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 3.7 to each radical layer of $\hat{Z}_{I_i}(\lambda_i)$ for $i < r \leq n$. In particular, applying this procedure to each $\hat{L}_{I_i}(\lambda_{i-k} - p\overline{X})$ produces an object “$M_{i-k,X}$”, whose non-zero radical layers are given by

$$\text{rad}_s M_{i-k,X} = \bigoplus_{\{Y \subseteq [i+2, n+1], |Y| = s\}} \hat{L}(\lambda_{i-k+s} - p\overline{X} + p\overline{Y}),$$

with $0 \leq s \leq n - i$. The radical layers of $\hat{Z}(\lambda_i)$ are actually built out of various “$k$-shifted” copies of $\text{rad}_s M_{i-k,X}$, where we have

$$\text{rad}_s M_{i-k,X} \subseteq \text{rad}_{s+k} \hat{Z}(\lambda_i).$$

All-together, we get

$$\text{rad}_j \hat{Z}(\lambda_i) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^i \bigoplus_{\{X \subseteq [1, i], |X| = k\}} \text{rad}_{j-k} M_{i-k,X}.$$

So, we have established the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.3.** Let $n \geq 1$, then for $0 \leq i \leq n$, $\nu \in X$ and any $j \geq 0$,$$
\text{rad}_j \hat{Z}(\lambda_i + \nu) = \text{soc}_{j+1} \hat{Z}'(\lambda_i + \nu)
= \bigoplus_{k=0}^i \bigoplus_{\{(X,Y) | |X|=k, |Y|=j-k, X \subseteq [1, i], Y \subseteq [i+2, n+1]\}} \hat{L}(\lambda_{i+j-2k} + \nu - p\overline{X} + p\overline{Y}).$$

**Remark 5.4.** Compare with [AbK, Theorem, p. 2].

5.4. The arguments used in §4.2, §5.2 and §5.3, can also be adapted to compute $\text{soc}_j \hat{Z}(\lambda_i)$ for $j \geq 1$ (or equivalently $\text{rad}_j \hat{Z}'(\lambda_i)$ for $j \geq 0$). This yields the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.5.** Let $n \geq 1$, then for $0 \leq i \leq n$, $\nu \in X$ and any $j \geq 1$,$$
\text{soc}_j \hat{Z}(\lambda_i + \nu) \cong \text{rad}_{n+1-j} \hat{Z}(\lambda_i + \nu), \quad \text{soc}_j \hat{Z}'(\lambda_i + \nu) \cong \text{rad}_{n+1-j} \hat{Z}'(\lambda_i + \nu),$$
or equivalently, $\hat{Z}(\lambda_i + \nu)$ and $\hat{Z}'(\lambda_i + \nu)$ are rigid.
6. The Loewy Structure of $\hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu)$

6.1. We will now show that the results for $\hat{Z}(\lambda_i + p\nu)$ from the preceding sections, enable us to adapt the arguments from [AnK] to our setting and obtain information about the Loewy structure of $\hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu)$. From now on, we will assume that $p > 0$ is large enough so that the following conjecture holds.

**Conjecture 6.1.** Let $n \geq 1$, then for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\nu \in X$, $\ell(\hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu)) = 2n+1$.  

**Remark 6.2.** This conjecture is known to hold for $p \gg 0$ by [AbK, Theorem, p. 10].

The remainder of the section will be devoted to proving the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.3.** Suppose Conjecture 6.1 holds. Let $n \geq 1$, then for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\nu \in X$, $\hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu)$ is rigid and for any $j \geq 0$

$$
\text{(6.1) } \text{rad}_j \hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu) = \sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k=0}^{j} \text{rad}_k \hat{Z}(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda_i + p\nu) \text{rad}_{j-k} \hat{Z}(\mu) \in K(G_1 T).
$$

**Remark 6.4.** Obviously, $\text{rad}_j \hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu) = 0$ unless $\mu = \lambda_i + p\eta$ for some $0 \leq t \leq n$ and $\eta \in X$. So the preceding theorem, combined with Theorem 5.3, completely determines the Loewy structure of the $\hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu)$.

6.2. For the remainder of the section, we will fix $I, J \subset S$ as in §3.3. Let us first observe that from the identities in §2.3, it can be shown that (6.1) holds for all $j \geq 0$ if and only if

$$
\text{(6.2) } \text{soc}_j \hat{Q}(\lambda_i + p\nu) = \sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k=1}^{j} \text{soc}_k \hat{Z'}(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda_i + p\nu), [\text{soc}^{j+1-k} \hat{Z'}(\mu)]
$$

for all $j \geq 1$ (compare with [AnK, Theorem 7.1(ii)]).

It turns out that the preceding identity is always “partially” true by the following lemma (adapted from [AnK, Proposition 3.7]).

**Lemma 6.5.** For any $\lambda \in X$ and $j \geq 1$,

$$
[\text{soc}_j \hat{Q}(\lambda)] \leq \sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k=1}^{j} [\text{soc}_k \hat{Z'}(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda)] [\text{soc}^{j+1-k} \hat{Z'}(\mu)].
$$

**Proof.** We first note that the Lemmas occurring in [AnK, 3.5 and 3.6], can be adapted to our setting. This is because their proofs essentially consist of the same types of arguments occurring in the proof of [J1, Proposition II.11.2], as well as certain general results on socle filtrations of modules, and on the basic properties of $\hat{Z}'(\lambda)$ (e.g. the highest weight structure). In particular, there is no dependence on the $p$-regularity of $\lambda \in X$, or even on $p > 0$. The proof of our result follows by applying the more general versions of these lemmas to imitate the proof of [AnK, Proposition 3.7].

Next, we observe that results from §6 imply the following analogue to [AnK, Lemma 7.1].
Lemma 6.6. Let $n \geq 1$, then for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\nu \in X$,
\[
\sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k=1}^{j} \left[ \text{soc}_k \hat{Z}'(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda + \nu) \right] \left[ \text{soc}^{j+1-k} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right] = \\
\sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k=1}^{j} \left[ \text{soc}_k \hat{Z}'(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda + \nu) \right] \left[ \text{cap}^{j+k-n-1} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right],
\]
for all $j \geq 1$.

Proof of Theorem 6.3. To verify (6.2) (which is equivalent to (6.1)), we will proceed as in the proof of [AnK, Theorem 7.2]. Namely, observe that
\[
\tau \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu) \equiv \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu),
\]
implies
\[
[\text{soc}^j \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)] = [\text{cap}^j \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)] \in K(G_1T),
\]
for all $j \geq 1$. Applying Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6, and Proposition 5.5, we get
\[
[\text{soc}^j \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)] + [\text{cap}^{2n+1-j} \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)]
= [\text{soc}^j \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)] + [\text{soc}^{2n+1-j} \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)]
\leq \sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k} \left[ \text{soc}_k \hat{Z}'(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda + \nu) \right] \left[ \text{soc}^{j+1-k} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right] + \left[ \text{soc}^{2n+1-j-k} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right]
= \sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k} \left[ \text{soc}_k \hat{Z}'(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda + \nu) \right]
\times \left[ \text{soc}^{j+1-k} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right] + \left[ \text{soc}^{2n+1-j-k} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right]
= \left[ \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu) \right] \quad \text{(by [J1, Proposition II.11.4]).}
\]
Combining this with Conjecture 6.1 and (2.3), then gives
\[
\hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu) = [\text{soc}^j \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)] + [\text{cap}^{2n+1-j} \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)],
\]
and hence the rigidity result follows. We are also forced to have both
\[
[\text{soc}^j \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)] = \sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k} \left[ \text{soc}_k \hat{Z}'(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda + \nu) \right] \left[ \text{soc}^{j+1-k} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right],
\]
\[
[\text{soc}^{2n+1-j} \hat{Q}(\lambda + \nu)] = \sum_{\mu \in X} \sum_{k} \left[ \text{soc}_k \hat{Z}'(\mu) : \hat{L}(\lambda + \nu) \right] \left[ \text{soc}^{2n+1-j-k} \hat{Z}'(\mu) \right],
\]
by Lemma 6.5. Therefore, (6.2) must also hold.

\[\square\]
explicit calculations in an infinitesimal singular block of $SL_n$, 25


Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, U.S.A.
E-mail address: whardesty@lsu.edu