ON THE COHOMOLOGY OF LINE BUNDLES OVER CERTAIN FLAG SCHEMES
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ABSTRACT. Let $G$ be the group scheme $SL_{d+1}$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ and let $Q$ be the parabolic subgroup scheme corresponding to the simple roots $\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_{d-1}$. Then $G/Q$ is the $\mathbb{Z}$-scheme of partial flags $\{ D_1 \subset H_d \subset V \}$. We will calculate the cohomology modules of line bundles over this flag scheme. We will prove that the only non-trivial ones are isomorphic to the kernel or the cokernel of certain matrices with multinomial coefficients.

INTRODUCTION

Fix an integer $d \geq 2$. Let $S = \mathbb{Z}[X_0, \cdots, X_d]$ be the ring of polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}$ in the variables $X_0, \cdots, X_d$ and for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S_m$ be its graded component of degree $m$. Let $A = \mathbb{Z}[Y_0, \cdots, Y_d]$ be the ring of polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}$ in another set of variables $Y_0, \cdots, Y_d$ and denote by $\Delta$ the $A$-module of \textit{“inverse”} polynomials:

\begin{align}
\Delta = \mathbb{Z}[Y_0, \cdots, Y_d]/ \left( \sum_{i=0}^{d} \mathbb{Z}[Y_0, \cdots, Y_d][Y_0, \cdots, Y_d] \right).
\end{align}

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Delta_n$ denote the graded component of $\Delta$ of degree $-n$. We can easily see that as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, $\Delta_n$ is isomorphic to

\begin{align}
\left( \mathbb{Z}[Y_0^{-1}, \cdots, Y_d^{-1}] \right)^{\text{deg} - n}.
\end{align}

Consider the $\mathbb{Z}$-linear map

\begin{align}
\phi = \phi_{m,n} : S_{m-1} \otimes \Delta_{n+d+1} \to S_m \otimes \Delta_{n+d}
\end{align}

given by the multiplication by the element $f = X_0 \otimes Y_0 + \cdots + X_d \otimes Y_d$. The goal (partially achieved) is to study the cokernel of $\phi$. Furthermore, there is a natural action of the group scheme $G = SL_{d+1}$ on the representation $V$ with basis $X_0, \cdots, X_d$ and on the dual representation $V^*$ with dual basis $Y_0, \cdots, Y_d$, and the element $f$ is $G$-invariant, hence $\text{coker}(\phi)$ and $\text{ker}(\phi)$ are $G$-modules. As will be explained below, these are the cohomology groups (the only non zero ones) of a certain line bundle $L = L(m, -n - d)$ on the $\mathbb{Z}$-scheme of partial flags $D_1 \subset H_d \subset V$.

1. Notations

Let $G$ be the group scheme $SL_{d+1}$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ with $d \geq 2$. Let $T$ and $B$ be the subgroup schemes of diagonal matrices and of \textit{lower} triangular matrices respectively. Let $W$ be the Weyl group of $(G, T)$ and $X(T)$ the character group of $T$. For $i \in \{ 0, 1, \cdots, d \}$, we define $\epsilon_i \in X(T)$ as the character that sends $\text{diag}(a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_d)$ to $a_i$ and we set $\alpha_i = \epsilon_{i+1} - \epsilon_i$. Then $\{ \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_d \}$ is the set of simple roots. We denote by $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_d$ the corresponding fundamental weights and by $R^+$ the set of positive roots. Let $X(T)^+ \subset X(T)$ be the set of dominant weights and let $\rho \in X(T)$ be the half sum of positive roots. The dot action of the Weyl group is defined by $w \cdot \lambda = w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$, for all $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in X(T)$. Let $C = \{ \lambda \in X(T) \mid \lambda + \rho \in X(T)^+ \}$. 
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2. DESCRIPTION OF THE COHOMOLOGY GROUPS $H^d(G/P, \mu)$

Let $V$ be the natural representation of $G$ and $V^*$ the dual representation. Let $\{X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_d\}$ be the canonical basis of $V$ and let $\{Y_0, Y_1, \ldots, Y_d\}$ be the dual basis of $V^*$. Let $P_d$ and $P_1$ be the stabilizers of the point $[X_d] \in \mathbb{P}(V)$ and of the point $[Y_0] \in \mathbb{P}(V^*)$ respectively. Let $Q = P_d \cap P_1$. Then $P_d$ (resp. $P_1$, resp. $Q$) is the parabolic subgroup scheme containing $B$ and corresponding to the simple roots $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_{d-1}$ (resp. $\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \ldots, \alpha_d$, resp. $\alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_{d-1}$). Therefore, denoting by $S(V)$ resp. $S(V^*)$ the symmetric algebra of $V$ resp. $V^*$ one has

$$G/P_d \cong \mathbb{P}(V) = \text{Proj}(S(V)) = \text{Proj}(k[Y_0, Y_1, \ldots, Y_d])$$

$$G/P_1 \cong \mathbb{P}(V^*) = \text{Proj}(S(V^*)) = \text{Proj}(k[X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_d]).$$

We have for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ (cf. [Jan03] II.4.3)

$$\mathcal{L}_{G/P_1}(r\omega_1) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V^*)}(r),$$

hence

$$H^0(G/P_1, r\omega_1) \cong S_r$$

if $r \geq 0$, where $S_r = \langle X_0^{a_0}X_1^{a_1}\cdots X_d^{a_d} | a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_d = r \rangle$ as in the introduction.

On the other hand, for $P_d$, we have for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\mathcal{L}_{G/P_d}(r\omega_d) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}(r).$$

Hence if $r \geq 0$ we have (cf. [Ke93] Cor 9.1.2):

$$H^d(G/P_d, -r\omega_d) \cong \Delta_r$$

where $\Delta_r = \langle Y_0^{1-b_0}Y_1^{1-b_1}\cdots Y_d^{1-b_d} | b_i \in \mathbb{N}, b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d + d + 1 = r \rangle$ as in [2].

We set $\xi = ([Y_0], [X_d]) \in \mathbb{P}(V^*) \times \mathbb{P}(V)$. Then

$$Q = \text{Stab}(\xi)$$

and $G/Q \cong G\xi = \mathcal{V}(X_0Y_0 + X_1Y_1 + \cdots + X_dY_d)$

where $\mathcal{V}(\psi)$ is the closed subscheme defined by a bi-homogeneous polynomial $\psi$. This means that $G/Q$ is the flag scheme $\{D_1 \subset H_d \subset V\}$, which is a hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(V^*) \times \mathbb{P}(V)$.

Denote $\mathbb{P}(V^*) \times \mathbb{P}(V)$ by $Z$. Then $\mathcal{O}_Z \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V^*)} \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}$ by Künneth formula. The ideal sheaf defining the subvariety $G/Q = \mathcal{V}(f)$ is $\mathcal{L}(-1, -1)$. More precisely, we have an exact sequence of sheaves

$$0 \to \mathcal{L}(-1, -1) \to \mathcal{O}_Z \to \mathcal{O}_{G/Q} \to 0,$$

i.e.

$$0 \to \mathcal{L}_{G/P_1}(-1) \boxtimes \mathcal{L}_{G/P_d}(-1) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V^*)} \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)} \to \mathcal{O}_{G/Q} \to 0,$$

where $f$ means the multiplication by the element $f = X_0 \otimes Y_0 + \cdots + X_d \otimes Y_d$. 

If $N$ is a $B$-module, we set $H^i(N) = H^i(G/B, \mathcal{L}(N))$ where $\mathcal{L}(N)$ is the $G$-equivariant vector bundle on the flag scheme $G/B$ induced by $N$ (cf. [Jan03] I.5.8). In particular, if $\mu \in X(T)$, then $\mu$ can be viewed as a one-dimensional $B$-module, and we set $H^i(\mu) = H^i(G/B, \mathcal{L}(\mu))$.

We fix $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and take $\mu = m\omega_1 - (n + d)\omega_d$. Our goal is to calculate the cohomology groups $H^i(\mu)$ of the line bundle $\mathcal{L}(\mu)$. The only non zero ones are $H^{d-1}(\mu) \cong \ker(\phi_{m,n})$ and $H^d(\mu) \cong \operatorname{coker}(\phi_{m,n})$ and we will show that $H^d(\mu)$ is isomorphic to the cokernel of a certain matrix of multinomial coefficients of size much smaller than the rank of the $\mathbb{Z}$-modules $S_m \otimes \Delta_{n+d+1}$ and $S_m \otimes \Delta_{n+d}$. 


Hence for all $m,n \in \mathbb{N}$, by tensoring (12) with $L_{G/P_1}(m\omega_1) \boxtimes L_{G/P_d}(-(n+d)\omega_d)$, we obtain an exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{G/P_1}(m-1) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{G/P_d}(-n-d-1) \overset{f}{\to} \mathcal{O}_{G/P_1}(m) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{G/P_d}(-n-d) \to L_{G/Q}(\mu) \to 0.$$  

(10)

By taking cohomology, we obtain $H^i(G/Q,\mu) = 0$ if $i \neq d-1, d$ and an exact sequence of $G$-modules:

$$0 \to H^{d-1}(G/Q,\mu) \to S_{m-1} \otimes \Delta_{n+d+1} \overset{f}{\to} S_m \otimes \Delta_{n+d} \to H^d(G/Q,\mu) \to 0.$$  

(11)

Since $H^0(Q/B,\mu) \cong \mu$ and $H^1(Q/B,\mu) = 0$ if $i > 0$, we have

$$H^i(\mu) \cong H^i(G/Q,\mu)$$

for all $i$. So (11) gives that $H^{d-1}(\mu) = \ker(f)$ and $H^d(\mu) = \text{coker}(f)$.

Let $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_d$ be the simple reflections, then since $\mu = (m,0,\cdots,0,-n-d)$, we have $\sigma_d\mu = (m,0,\cdots,0,-n-d+1,n+d-2)$, then $\sigma_3\sigma_4 \cdots \sigma_d\mu = (m,-n-2,n+1,0,\cdots,0)$ and $\sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_d\mu = (m-n-1,n,0,\cdots,0)$. Hence $\mu \in \sigma_d \cdots \sigma_2 \cdot C$ if $m \geq n$ and $\mu \in \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_1 \cdot C$ if $n > m$. In particular, $\mu$ is regular unless $m = n$, and if $m = n$, $\mu$ is located on a unique wall.

For a field $k$ and any $i$, set $H^i_k(\mu) = H^i(G_k/B_k,\mu)$, where $G_k$ and $B_k$ are the $k$-group schemes obtained by base change. Then we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to H^i(\mu) \otimes k \to H^i_k(\mu) \to \text{Tor}^Z(k,H^{i+1}(\mu)) \to 0$$

(12)

by the universal coefficient theorem (cf. [Jan03] I.4.18). Since $H^{d-1}(\mu)$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module by (11), it is completely determined by $H^{d-1}(\mu) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. On the other hand, since the extension $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is flat, we have $H^{d-1}(\mu) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \cong H^{d-1}_Q(\mu)$ by (12), and the latter can be calculated by the Borel-Weil-Bott theorem (cf. [Jan03] II.5.5). More precisely, we have $H^{d-1}_Q(\mu) = 0$ if $n > m$, and $\text{ch} H^{d-1}_Q(\mu) = \chi(m-n-1,n,0,\cdots,0)$ if $m \geq n$, where $\chi M$ is the character of $M$ (cf. [Jan03] I.2.11 (6)), and $\chi(\mu)$ is the Euler characteristic of $\mu$ viewed as a $B$-module (cf. [Jan03] II.5.7), which can be calculated by the Weyl’s character formula (cf. [Jan03] II.5.10). So the most interesting group is $H^d(\mu) \cong \text{coker}(f)$, which can have torsion. We have an exact sequence of $\mathbb{Z}$-modules

$$0 \to H^d(\mu)_{\text{tors}} \to H^d(\mu) \to H^d(\mu)_{\text{free}} \to 0.$$  

(13)

Since $H^{d+1}(\mu) = 0$, for any field $k$, we have $H^i_k(\mu) \cong H^i(\mu) \otimes k$ by (12). Tensoring (13) by $k$ and using the fact that $H^d(\mu)_{\text{free}}$ is torsion free, we thus get

$$0 \to H^d(\mu)_{\text{tors}} \otimes k \to H^i_k(\mu) \to H^d(\mu)_{\text{free}} \otimes k \to 0.$$  

(14)

First, take $k = \mathbb{Q}$, this gives an isomorphism $H^d(\mu)_{\text{free}} \otimes \mathbb{Q} \cong H^d_Q(\mu)$, which can be calculated by the Borel-Weil-Bott theorem and the Weyl’s character formula, so $H^d(\mu)_{\text{free}}$ is already known. On the other hand, we have

$$0 \to H^{d-1}(\mu) \otimes k \to H^{d-1}_k(\mu) \to \text{Tor}^Z(k,H^d(\mu)_{\text{tors}}) \to 0.$$  

(15)

Hence $H^d(\mu)_{\text{tors}}$ determines both $H^{d-1}_k(\mu)$ and $H^d_k(\mu)$ for any field $k$. Therefore, it suffices to calculate $\text{coker}(f) \cong H^d(\mu)$ (especially its torsion part) to achieve our goal.

We set $E = S_{m-1} \otimes \Delta_{n+d+1}$ and $F = S_m \otimes \Delta_{n+d}$. The highest weight of $E$ and $F$ is $(m+n-1)\omega_1$.

We know that $X_0, X_1, \cdots, X_d$ are of weights $\omega_1, \omega_1-\alpha_1, \cdots, \omega_1-\alpha_1-\alpha_2-\cdots-\alpha_d = -\omega_d$ and $Y_i$ is of opposite weight to $X_i$. Since $f$ preserves the weight spaces, we can restrict $f$ to the $\nu$-weight space for each dominant weight $\nu$, and we get a linear map $f_\nu : E_\nu \to F_\nu$, where $E_\nu$ and $F_\nu$ are the $\nu$-weight spaces of $E$ and $F$ respectively. Hence it suffices to calculate the cokernel of $f_\nu$ for each dominant weight $\nu \leq (m+n-1)\omega_1$, where $\leq$ is the usual partial order on $X(T)$. 
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For each such $\nu$, there exists $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\nu = (m + n - 1)\omega_1 - s_1\alpha_1 - s_2\alpha_2 - \cdots - s_d\alpha_d
$$

$$
= (m + n - 1 - 2s_1 + s_2)\omega_1 + (s_1 - 2s_2 + s_3)\omega_2 + (s_2 - 2s_3 + s_4)\omega_3
$$

$$
+ \cdots + (s_{d-2} - 2s_{d-1} + s_d)\omega_{d-1} + (s_{d-1} - 2s_d)\omega_d
$$

with $m + n - 1 - 2s_1 + s_2 \geq 0$ and $s_{i-1} - 2s_i + s_{i+1} \geq 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq d - 1$ and $s_{d-1} - 2s_d \geq 0$.

Hence the $\nu$-weight space consists of monomials $X_0^{a_0} \cdots X_d^{a_d} Y_0^{n_1-1-b_0} \cdots Y_d^{n_d-1-b_d}$ such that

$$(a_0 + b_0, a_1 + b_1, \ldots, a_d + b_d) = (m + n - 1 - s_1, s_1 - 2s_2, \ldots, s_{d-1} - s_d, s_d).$$

Therefore, if we fix $\nu$, a monomial in the $\nu$-weight space is determined by $b = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_d)$. In the following, the letter $b$ without subscript means a tuple of non-negative integers.

3. THE CASE $n \leq m$

3.1. If $s_1 \leq n - 1$, then a monomial $(b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_d)$ in $E_{\nu}$ satisfies $b_0 \geq 1$ since $b_1 + \cdots + b_d \leq s_1 < n$ and $b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n$. Let

$$
A = \{b = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \quad 1 \leq b_0 \leq m + n - 1 - s_1, \quad b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\}.
$$

Then we take as a basis for $E_{\nu}$ the set $\{v_b \mid b \in A\}$ where $v_b$ is the monomial determined by $b$. Since $m + n - 1 - s_1 \geq 2n - 1 - s_1 \geq n$, we have

$$
A = \{b = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \quad 1 \leq b_0 \leq n, \quad b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\}.
$$

For $0 \leq i \leq d$, we set $e_i = (0, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$ where 1 is at the $i$-th position, then we take as a basis for $F_{\nu}$ the set $\{w_b \mid b \in A\}$ where $w_b$ is the monomial determined by $b - e_0$. We set $w_b = 0$ whenever $b \notin A$. With these notations, we have for all $u \in A$

$$
\begin{align*}
\ell(v_b) &= w_u + w_{u + e_0 - e_1} + \cdots + w_{u + e_0 - e_d},
\end{align*}
$$

We equip the set $A \subset \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$ with the reverse lexicographic order. Then $u + e_0 - e_i < u$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, thus the matrix of $\ell$ with respect to the bases $v_b$ and $w_b$ is lower triangular, and its entries on the diagonal are all 1. Hence the cokernel $H^d(\mu)_{\nu}$ of $f_{\nu}$ is zero if $s_1 < n$.

This proves that every weight of $H^d(\mu)$ is $\leq (m + n - 1)\omega_1 - n\alpha_1$.

3.2. If $s_1 \geq n$, set $s_1 = n + k$ with $k \geq 0$. We introduce

$$
A = \{b = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \quad 1 \leq b_0 \leq m - 1 - k, \quad b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\},
$$

$$
C = \{b = (0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \quad b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\},
$$

$$
D = \{b = (m - k - 1, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = k + n - m, \quad b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\}.
$$

We take the set $\{v_b \mid b \in A \cup C\}$ as the basis of $E_{\nu}$ where $v_b$ is the monomial determined by $b = (b_0, \ldots, b_d)$. We take the set $\{w_b \mid b \in A\} \cup \{w_b \mid b \in D\}$ as the basis of $F_{\nu}$ where $w_b$ is the monomial determined by $b - e_0$ and $w_b$ is the monomial determined by $b$.

**Convention 1.** Let $b \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$. If $b \notin A \cup C$, we set $v_b = 0$. If $b \notin A$, we set $w_b = 0$. If $b \notin D$, we set $u_b = 0$.

With these notations, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
f(v_b) &= w_u + w_{u + e_0 - e_1} + w_{u + e_0 - e_2} + \cdots + w_{u + e_0 - e_d} \quad \text{if} \quad b_0 \leq m - 2 - k,
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
f(v_b) &= w_u + u_{u - e_1} + u_{u - e_2} + \cdots + u_{u - e_d} \quad \text{if} \quad b_0 = m - k - 1.
\end{align*}
$$
Now we make a change of basis of $E_b$ by defining $v'_b$ for all $b \in A \cup C$ by:

- if $b_0 = m - k - 1$, we set $v'_b = v_b$;
- if $b_0 = m - k - 2$, we set

$$v'_b = v_b - v_{b+e_0-e_1} - v_{b+e_0-e_2} - \cdots - v_{b+e_0-e_d}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

Let $j \geq 1$. If we have already defined $v'_b$ for all $b$ such that $j \leq b_0 \leq m - k - 2$, we set

$$v'_b = v_b - v'_{b+e_0-e_1} - v'_{b+e_0-e_2} - \cdots - v'_{b+e_0-e_d} \text{ if } b_0 = j - 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

Hence $v'_b$ is defined for all $b \in A \cup C$.

Therefore, if $b_0 = m - k - 1$, we have:

$$f(v'_b) = w_b + u_{b-e_1} + u_{b-e_2} + \cdots + u_{b-e_d}$$

$$= w_b + \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{array} \right) u_{b-e_1} + \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{array} \right) u_{b-e_2} + \cdots + \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0, \ldots, 0, 1 \end{array} \right) u_{b-e_d}$$

$$= w_b + \sum_{b' \in D} \frac{1}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d} u_{b'}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

**Lemma 1.** For all $b \in A \cup C$, we have

$$f(v'_b) = w_b - (-1)^{m-k-b_0} \sum_{b' \in D} \frac{m-k-b_0}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d} u_{b'}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

**Remark 1.** Since $b_0 + \cdots + b_d = n$ if $b \in A \cup C$, we have $b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_d = n - b_0$. On the other hand, if $b' \in D$, then $b'_1 + b'_2 + \cdots + b'_d = n - 1 - b'_0 = n - 1 - (m - 1 - k) = k + n - m$, hence $b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d = m - k - b_0$.

**Proof.** We use descending induction on $b_0$. Clearly, (20) is true if $b_0 = m - k - 1$. If (20) holds for all $b \in A \cup C$ such that $1 \leq j \leq b_0 \leq m - k - 1$, then for all $b \in A \cup C$ such that $b_0 = j - 1$, one has:

$$f(v'_b) = f(v_b) - f(v'_{b+e_0-e_1}) - \cdots - f(v'_{b+e_0-e_d})$$

$$= w_b + u_{b+e_0-e_1} + u_{b+e_0-e_2} + \cdots + u_{b+e_0-e_d}$$

$$- w_{b+e_0-e_1} + (-1)^{m-k-b_0-1} \sum_{b' \in D} \frac{m-k-b_0}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d} u_{b'}$$

$$- w_{b+e_0-e_2} + (-1)^{m-k-b_0-1} \sum_{b' \in D} \frac{m-k-b_0}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d} u_{b'}$$

$$- \cdots$$

$$- w_{b+e_0-e_d} + (-1)^{m-k-b_0-1} \sum_{b' \in D} \frac{m-k-b_0}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d} u_{b'}$$

$$= w_b - (-1)^{m-k-b_0} \sum_{b' \in D} \frac{m-k-b_0}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d} u_{b'}.$$

This proves the lemma. \hfill \square
Therefore, by writing \( f(v'_b) \) in row, the matrix of \( f \) with respect to the bases \( v'_b \) and \( w_b, u_b \) is of the form

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
A & D \\
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & * \\
0 & 1 & \cdots & \vdots & * \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & * \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where the rows of \( M \) are indexed by \( C \), its columns by \( D \), and the entry corresponding to \( b \in C \) and \( b' \in D \) is \((-1)^{m-k+1}(b_1-v'_1, b_2-v'_2, \ldots, b_d-v'_d)\). (One has \( m-k-b_0 = m-k \) since \( b_0 = 0 \) for \( b \in C \).

We thus obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** Let \( m \geq n \geq 0 \)

1. Every weight of \( H^d(m, 0, \cdots, 0, -n-d) \) is \( (m-n-1, n, 0, \cdots, 0) \).
2. For \((k, s_2, \cdots, s_d)\) such that

\[
\nu = (m-n-1, n, 0, \cdots, 0) - k\alpha_1 - s_2\alpha_2 - \cdots - s_d\alpha_d
\]

is dominant, the \( \nu \)-weight space of \( H^d(m, 0, \cdots, 0, -n-d) \) is isomorphic as an abelian group to the cokernel of the matrix

\[
(\begin{pmatrix}
m - k \\
b_1 - v'_1, b_2 - v'_2, \ldots, b_d - v'_d \\
\end{pmatrix})_{b \in C, b' \in D}
\]

where by setting \( s_1 = n + k \), we have

\[
C = \{b = (0, b_1, \cdots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \\
b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d-1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\},
\]

\[
D = \{b = (m-k-1, b_1, \cdots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = k + n - m, \\
b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d-1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\}.
\]

In this case, we also know that \( H^d(\mu) \) is a torsion abelian group, since \( H^d(\mu)_{\text{free}} \otimes \mathbb{Q} \cong H^d_Q(\mu) = 0 \) by the Borel-Weil-Bott theorem.

4. The Case \( n > m \)

1. If \( s_1 \leq m - 1 < n - 1 \), then a monomial \((b_0, b_1, \cdots, b_d)\) in \( E_\nu \) satisfies \( b_0 \geq 1 \) since \( b_1 + \cdots + b_d \leq s_1 < n \) and \( b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n \). Set

\[
A = \{b = (b_0, b_1, \cdots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \\
b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d-1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\}.
\]

Then we take as a basis for \( E_\nu \) the set \( \{v_b \mid b \in A\} \), where \( v_b \) is the monomial determined by \( b \). Since \( m+n-1-s_1 > n-1 \), we have

\[
A = \{b = (b_0, b_1, \cdots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \\
b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d-1, \quad b_d \leq s_d\}.
\]

For \( 0 \leq i \leq d \), set \( e_i = (0, 0, \cdots, 1, \cdots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \) where 1 is at the \( i \)-th position. Then we take as a basis for \( F_\nu \) the set \( \{w_b \mid b \in A\} \), where \( w_b \) is the monomial determined by \( b - e_0 \). We set \( w_b = 0 \) whenever \( b \notin A \). With these notations, we have for all \( u \in A \):

\[
f(v_u) = w_u + w_{u+e_0-e_1} + \cdots + w_{u+e_0-e_d}.
\]
We equip the set $A \subset \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$ with the reverse lexicographic order. Then $u + e_0 - e_i < u$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, and hence the matrix of $f$ with respect to basis $v_b$ and $w_b$ is lower triangular, and its entries on the diagonal are all 1. Hence the cokernel $H^d(\mu)$ of $f_\nu$ is zero if $s_1 < m$.

This proves that every weight of $H^d(\mu)$ is $\leq (m + n - 1)\omega_1 - m\alpha_1$.

42. If $s_1 \geq m$, set $s_1 = m + k$ with $k \geq 0$. Let

$$A = \{b = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \ 1 \leq b_0 \leq n - 1 - k, \ b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \text{ if } 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \ b_d \leq s_d\},$$

$$C = \{b = (0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \ b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \text{ if } 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \ b_d \leq s_d\},$$

$$D = \{b = (n - k - 1, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = k, \ b_i \leq s_i - s_{i+1} \text{ if } 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \ b_d \leq s_d\}.$$

We take the set $\{v_b \mid b \in A \cup C\}$ as the basis of $E_\nu$ where $v_b$ is the monomial determined by $b = (b_0, \ldots, b_d)$. We take the set $\{w_b \mid b \in A\} \cup \{w_b \mid b \in D\}$ as the basis of $F_\nu$ where $w_b$ is the monomial determined by $b - e_0$ and $u_b$ is the monomial determined by $b$.

**Convention 2.** Let $b \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$. If $b \notin A \cup C$, we set $w_b = 0$. If $b \notin A$, we set $w_b = 0$. If $b \notin D$, we set $u_b = 0$.

With these notations, we have

$$f(v_b) = w_b + w_{b+e_0-e_1} + w_{b+e_0-e_2} + \cdots + w_{b+e_0-e_d} \quad \text{if} \quad b_0 \leq n - k - 2$$

$$f(v_b) = w_b + w_{b-e_1} + w_{b-e_2} + \cdots + w_{b-e_d} \quad \text{if} \quad b_0 = n - k - 1. \quad (22)$$

Now we make a change of basis of $E_\nu$ by defining $v'_b$ for all $b \in A \cup C$ by:

- if $b_0 = n - k - 1$, we set $v'_b = v_b$;
- if $b_0 = n - k - 2$, we set

$$v'_b = v_b - v'_{b+e_0-e_1} - v'_{b+e_0-e_2} - \cdots - v'_{b+e_0-e_d}. \quad (23)$$

Let $j \geq 1$. If we have already defined $v'_b$ for all $b$ such that $j \leq b_0 \leq n - k - 2$, we set

$$v'_b = v_b - v'_{b+e_0-e_1} - v'_{b+e_0-e_2} - \cdots - v'_{b+e_0-e_d} \quad \text{if} \quad b_0 = j - 1. \quad (24)$$

Hence $v'_b$ is defined for all $b \in A \cup C$.

Therefore, if $b_0 = n - k - 1$, we have:

$$f(v'_b) = w_b + w_{b-e_1} + w_{b-e_2} + \cdots + w_{b-e_d}$$

$$= w_b + \binom{1}{1, 0, \ldots, 0}w_{b-e_1} + \binom{1}{0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0}w_{b-e_2} + \cdots + \binom{1}{0, \ldots, 0, 1}w_{b-e_d}$$

$$= w_b + \sum_{b' \in D} \binom{1}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d}u_{b'}. \quad (25)$$

**Lemma 2.** For all $b \in A \cup C$, we have

$$f(v'_b) = w_b - (-1)^{n-k-b_0} \sum_{b' \in D} \binom{n-k-b_0}{b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d}u_{b'}. \quad (26)$$

**Remark 2.** Since $b_0 + \cdots + b_d = n$ if $b \in A \cup C$, we have $b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_d = n - b_0$. On the other hand, if $b' \in D$, then $b'_1 + b'_2 + \cdots + b'_d = n - 1 - b'_0 = n - 1 - (n - 1 - k) = k$, hence $b_1 - b'_1 + b_2 - b'_2 + \cdots + b_d - b'_d = n - k - b_0$. 

Proof. We use descending induction on $b_0$. Clearly, (26) is true if $b_0 = n - k - 1$. If (26) holds for all $b \in A \cup C$ such that $1 \leq j \leq b_0 \leq n - k - 1$, then for all $b \in A \cup C$ such that $b_0 = j - 1$, one has:

$$f(v'_b) = f(v_b) - f(v'_{b+e_0-e_1}) - \cdots - f(v'_{b+e_0-e_d})$$

$$= w_b + w_{b+e_0-e_1} + w_{b+e_0-e_2} + \cdots + w_{b+e_0-e_d}$$

$$- w_{b+e_0-e_1} + (-1)^{n-k-b_0-1} \sum_{\nu \in D} \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k-b_0-1 \\ b_1 - 1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right) u_{\nu'}$$

$$- w_{b+e_0-e_2} + (-1)^{n-k-b_0-1} \sum_{\nu \in D} \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k-b_0-1 \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2 - 1, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right) u_{\nu'}$$

$$- \cdots$$

$$- w_{b+e_0-e_d} + (-1)^{n-k-b_0-1} \sum_{\nu \in D} \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k-b_0-1 \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - 1 - b'_d \end{array} \right) u_{\nu'}$$

$$= w_b - (-1)^{n-k-b_0} \sum_{\nu \in D} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k-b_0-1 \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_i - 1 - b'_i, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right) u_{\nu'}$$

$$= w_b - (-1)^{n-k-b_0} \sum_{\nu \in D} \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k-b_0 \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right) u_{\nu'}.$$  

This proves the lemma. 

Therefore, the matrix of $f$ with respect to the bases $v'_b$ and $w_b$, $u_b$ is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix}
A & D \\
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & * \\
0 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots & * \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & * \\
\end{pmatrix}$$

where the rows of $M$ are indexed by $C$, its columns by $D$, and the entry corresponding to $b \in C$ and $b' \in D$ is $(-1)^{n-k+1}(b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d).$ (One has $n-k-b_0 = n-k$ since $b_0 = 0$ for $b \in C$).

We thus obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.** Let $n > m \geq 0$.

1. Every weight of $H^d(m, 0, \ldots, 0, -n - d)$ is $\leq (n-m-1, m, 0, \ldots, 0)$.
2. For $(k, s_2, \ldots, s_d)$ such that

$$\nu = (n-m-1, m, 0, \ldots, 0) - k\alpha_1 - s_2\alpha_2 - \cdots - s_d\alpha_d$$

is dominant, the $\nu$-weight space of $H^d(m, 0, \ldots, 0, -n - d)$ is isomorphic as an abelian group to the cokernel of the matrix

$$(27) \begin{pmatrix} n-k \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{pmatrix}_{b \in C}$$
where by setting \( s_1 = m + k \), we have
\[
C = \{ b = (0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \\
b_i \leq s_i - s_i+1 \text{ if } 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \quad b_d \leq s_d \},
\]
\[
D = \{ b = (n - k - 1, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = k, \quad b_i \leq s_i - s_i+1 \}
\]
if \( 1 \leq i \leq d - 1, \quad b_d \leq s_d \}.

5. On the wall

We now suppose that \( m = n \). Then we have proved that every dominant weight of \( H^d(\mu) \)
is of the form \( \nu = (2n-1)\omega_1 - s_1\alpha_1 - s_2\alpha_2 - \cdots - s_d\alpha_d \) with \( s_1 \geq n \) and \( s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \cdots \geq s_d \).

Set \( h_i = s_i - s_i+1 \) for \( 1 \leq d - 1 \) and \( h_d = s_d \), then the fact that \( \nu \) is dominant implies that \( h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \cdots \geq h_d \geq 0 \). Set \( k = s_1 - n \geq 0 \). Then as a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module, the weight space \( H^d(\mu) \) is isomorphic to the cokernel of the matrix \( M \) whose rows are indexed by
\[
C = \{ b = (0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = n, \quad b_i \leq h_i \}
\]
and whose columns are indexed by
\[
D = \{ b = (n - k - 1, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = k, \quad b_i \leq h_i \}
\]
and the entry corresponding to \( b \in C \) and \( b' \in D \) is \( (b_i - b'_i, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d) \).

This is a square matrix. In fact, there exists a bijection \( \Phi : C \to D \) defined by \( \Phi(0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) = (n-k-1, h_1-b_1, h_2-b_2, \ldots, h_d-b_d) \) since \( h_1 + h_2 + \cdots + h_d = s_1 + n - k \).

The determinant of this matrix has been calculated by Proctor \([\text{Pro90}] \) Cor.1. More precisely, set \( h = (h_1, \ldots, h_d) \) and for all \( \ell \geq 0 \), let
\[
C(d, h, \ell) = \{ (b_1, \ldots, b_d) \mid b_1 + \cdots + b_d = \ell, \quad b_i \leq h_i \}.
\]
For each \( \ell \), set \( \delta_\ell = |C(d, h, \ell) - |C(d, h, \ell - 1)| \) (we use the convention that \( C(d, h, -1) = \varnothing \)) and \( S_\ell = |C(d, h, 0)| + |C(d, h, 1)| + \cdots + |C(d, h, \ell)| \). Fix some ordering of the elements of \( C(d, h, k) \).

Since there is a bijection \( C(d, h, k) \) to \( C(d, h, n) \) via \( (b_1, \ldots, b_d) \mapsto (h_1 - b_1, \ldots, h_d - b_d) \), we can order the elements of \( C(d, h, n) \) with the same ordering.

With these notations, one has the following

**Proposition 3** (Proctor). If \( d \geq 1 \) and \( h_1, \ldots, h_d \geq 1 \), then
\[
\det \left( \begin{array}{c} n - k \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right)_{b \in C(d, h, n), b' \in C(d, h, k)} = (-1)^{S_\ell} \prod_{b' \in C(d, h, k)} b'_1 b'_2 \cdots b'_d \prod_{\ell=0}^{k} ((\ell + 1)(\ell + 2) \cdots (\ell + n - k))^{\delta_{k-\ell}},
\]
where \( k' \) is the largest odd integer \( \leq k \).

**Proof.** Basically, this is just \([\text{Pro90}] \) Cor.1. The only thing we need to verify is that \( k < \frac{1}{2}(n + k) \) (corresponding to the hypothesis \( k < \frac{1}{2}n \) in the article of Proctor). But since \( \nu = (2n-1)\omega_1 - s_1\alpha_1 - s_2\alpha_2 - \cdots - s_d\alpha_d \) is dominant, we have \( 0 \leq 2n - 1 - 2s_1 + s_2 = 2n - 1 - s_1 - h_1 \). Since \( h_1 \geq 1 \), one has \( 0 \leq 2n - 1 - s_1 - 1 = n - 2 - k \), hence \( k \leq n - 2 \), which implies \( k < \frac{1}{2}(n + k) \). \( \square \)

In fact, the hypothesis \( h_1, \ldots, h_d \geq 1 \) in the proposition is not necessary. In our setting, we have \( h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \cdots \geq h_d \geq 0 \). Let \( d_0 \) be the largest integer such that \( h_{d_0} \geq 1 \), then we have \( h_1 \geq \cdots \geq h_{d_0} \geq 1 \) and \( h_{d_0+1} = \cdots = h_d = 0 \). Set \( \overline{h} = (h_1, \ldots, h_{d_0}) \), then
\[
C(d, h, \ell) = C(d_0, \overline{h}, \ell) \times \{ (0, \ldots, 0) \} \text{ for all } \ell \text{ (intuitively, the set } C(d, h, \ell) \text{ is just the set}
\]
\[
\text{for } d - d_0 \text{ times}
\]
\( C(d_0, \overline{f}, \ell) \), with some extra zeros added to each element on the tail). Using Proposition 3 for \( d_0 \) and \( \overline{f} \), we get

\[
\det \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right) \right)_{b \in C(d,h,n)} = \det \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{array} \right) \right)_{b \in C(d,h,n)}
\]

\[
= \det \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} n-k \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right) \right)_{b \in C(d,h,n)}
\]

\[
= (-1)^S \prod_{b' \in C(d(h,n), \overline{f})} b'_1! b'_2! \cdots b'_d! \prod_{\ell=0}^{k} ((\ell + 1)(\ell + 2) \cdots (\ell + n - k))^{\delta_{k-\ell}}
\]

Therefore, we can get rid of the hypothesis \( b_1, \ldots, b_d \geq 1 \). Moreover, by the definitions, we have \( (b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in C(d, h) \) if and only if \( (0, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in C \) and \( (b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in C(d, h, k) \) if and only if \( (n - k - 1, b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in D \). Hence the matrix \( C \) is the same as the one in (28). On the other hand, since \( H^d(n,0,\ldots,0,-n-d) \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module of finite type, all maximal weights are dominant. But a dominant weight is \( \leq (-1,0,\ldots,0) \) if and only if it is \( \leq (0, n - 2, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \), we thus obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.** Let \( n \geq 0 \).

1. Every weight of \( H^d(n,0,\ldots,0,-n-d) \) is \( \leq (0, n - 2, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \).
2. For \( (k,s_2,\cdots,s_d) \) such that

\[
\nu = (-1,n,0,\ldots,0) - k\alpha_1 - s_2\alpha_2 - \cdots - s_d\alpha_d
\]

is dominant, the \( \nu \)-weight space of \( H^d(n,0,\ldots,0,-n-d) \) is isomorphic as an abelian group to the cokernel of a matrix with integer coefficients whose determinant has absolute value

\[
\prod_{b' \in C(d,h,n)} b'_1! b'_2! \cdots b'_d! \prod_{\ell=0}^{k} ((\ell + 1)(\ell + 2) \cdots (\ell + n - k))^{\delta_{k-\ell}}
\]

where \( h = (h_1, \ldots, h_d) = (n + k - s_2, s_2 - s_3, \ldots, s_{d-1} - s_d, s_d) \).

**Corollary 2.** Let \( p \) be a prime number such that \( p > n \). Then \( H^d(n,0,\ldots,0,-n-d) \) is without \( p \)-torsion.

**Proof.** If \( n < p \), then for all \( b = (b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in C(d,h,k) \cup C(d,h,n) \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \), we have \( b_i \leq n < p \). For all \( 0 \leq \ell \leq k \), we have \( \ell + n - k \leq n < p \). Hence the determinant \( C \) is non-zero modulo \( p \), and its cokernel has no \( p \)-torsion.

**Corollary 3.** Let \( K \) be an arbitrary field of characteristic \( p > 0 \).

1. Then the dominant weights of \( H^d_K(p,0,\ldots,0,-p-d) \) are exactly those \( \leq \lambda_0 = (0, p - 2, 1, 0, \cdots, 0) \), each of multiplicity 1.
Therefore, for every part of (29) involves a factor $h$.

Let us adopt the notations in Corollary 1. In case (i), the weight $p$ has one-dimensional weight spaces, then either $\mu$ is a fundamental weight, we conclude that indeed (29) involves a factor $p$. In the right part of (29), every factor is $n < p$ except for the term with $\ell = k$, and one has $\delta_0 = 1$. Hence the $p$-adic valuation of (29) is exactly 1, which implies that the weight $\nu$ is of multiplicity 1 in $H^d_K(\mu)$.

On the other hand, by Sup83, the set of weights of the simple module $L_K(\lambda_0)$ consists of all dominant weights $\leq \lambda_0$. Since $L_K(\lambda_0)$ is a simple factor of $H^d_K(p,0,\cdots,0,-p-d)$ whose weights are all of multiplicity 1 with $\lambda_0$ as the highest weight, we conclude that $H^d_K(p,0,\cdots,0,-p-d)$ $\cong L_K(\lambda_0)$.

Remark 3. The corollary above shows that $L_K(\lambda_0)$ has one-dimensional weight spaces. Note that Seitz has shown (Sei87, Prop. 6.1) that if a simple $SL_{d+1}(K)$-module $L_K(\mu)$ has one-dimensional weight spaces, then either $\mu$ is a fundamental weight $\omega_1$ or a multiple of $\omega_2$, or $\mu = a\omega_1 + (p-1-a)\omega_2$ for some $i \in \{1,\ldots,d-1\}$ and $a \in \{0,\ldots,p-1\}$, and our result shows that indeed $L_K((p-2)\omega_2 + \omega_2)$ has one-dimensional weight spaces.

Corollary 4. Let $K$ be an arbitrary field of characteristic $p > 0$. Then the dominant weights of $L_K(p-2,1,0,\cdots,0)$ are exactly those $\leq (p-2,1,0,\cdots,0)$, each of multiplicity 1.

Proof. Consider the Levi factor $G' \cong GL_d$ corresponding to the parabolic $P_1$, and let $L_K'(\lambda_0)$ be the simple $G'$-module with highest weight $\lambda_0$. By Land83 II 2.11 b), we know that $L_K'(\lambda_0)$ is a sub $T$-module of $L_K(\lambda_0)$, hence each weight is of multiplicity 1 by Corollary 3. By replacing $d$ with $d+1$, we deduce that all weights of the simple module $L_K(p-2,1,0,\cdots,0)$ are of multiplicity 1. On the other hand, by Sup83, it contains all dominant weights $\leq (p-2,1,0,\cdots,0)$, which concludes the proof.

Corollary 5. Let $K$ be a field of characteristic $p > 0$ and $\mu_\ell = (n,0,\cdots,0,-n-d)$. Suppose that $n = p + r$ with either (i) $0 \leq r \leq p-2$ or (ii) $r = p-1$ and $d \geq 3$.

Let $\lambda_r = r\omega_1 + (p-r-2)\omega_2 + (r+1)\omega_3 = (-1,n,0,\ldots,0) - (r+1)\omega_2$ in case (i) and $\lambda_r = (-1,n,0,\ldots,0) - p\omega_2 - \alpha_3$ in case (ii).

Then $H^d_K(\mu_\ell)$ contains the weight $\lambda_r$, with multiplicity 1.

Proof. Let us adopt the notations in Corollary 1. In case (i), the weight $\lambda_r$ corresponds to $(k,s_2,\cdots,s_d) = (0,r+1,0,\cdots,0)$.

In case (ii), it corresponds to $(k,s_2,\cdots,s_d) = (0,r+1,1,\cdots,0)$.

In both cases, we have $h_2 = n + k - s_2 = p + r - 1 = p - 1$ and $h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \cdots \geq h_d$. Therefore, for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $b = (b_1,\ldots,b_d) \in C(d,h,\ell)$, we have $b_i \leq p-1$ for all $i$. This implies that in both cases, neither the numerator nor the denominator on the left part of (29) involves a factor $p$. Moreover, since in both cases, we have $k = 0$ and $\delta_0 = 1$,

\footnote{The author is grateful to one of the referees for this proof of assertion (2) and pointing out the work of Seitz mentioned in the following remark.}

\footnote{The author thanks one of the referees for suggesting this result.}
the right part of (29) equals to $n!$, whose $p$-adic valuation is 1. Hence the $p$-adic valuation of (29) is exactly 1, which implies that $H^d_{K}(\mu_n)$ contains the weight $\lambda_r$ with multiplicity 1.

\[ \square \]

Remark 4. (1) In a companion paper [LP19] with P. Polo, we extend Corollary 2 to the case $p > n$ and $m$ arbitrary and we improve on Corollary 3 and Corollary 5 by showing that $H^d_{K}(\mu_{p + r}, 0, \ldots, 0, -p - r - d)$ is the simple module $L(\lambda_0)$.

(2) By Corollary 3, every weight of $H^d_{K}(\mu_p)$ has multiplicity 1. This is no longer true for $H^d_{K}(\mu_{p + r})$ if $r \geq 1$. For example, set $d = 3$, $p = 3$ and $r = 1$. Then $H^3_{K}(\mu_{p + r}) = H^3_{K}(4, 0, -7)$ has three dominant weights: $(1, 0, 2), (1, 1, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 1)$. The first two are both of multiplicity 1, but the last one appears with multiplicity 3.

In general, the number $\delta_{k-\ell}$ in (29) is not easy to calculate. But if we suppose that $h_1 \geq k$, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 4. If $h_1 \geq k$, then for all $\ell \in \{0, \ldots, k\}$, we have

\[ \delta_{k-\ell} = |\{(b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in C(d, h, k) \mid b_1 = \ell\}|. \]

Therefore, we have

\[ \det \left( \begin{array}{cccc} n-k \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right)_{b \in C} = (-1)^{\sum_{i \in I} b_i - \sum_{i \in J} b_i} \prod_{b' \in D} \frac{\prod_{b \in C} (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_d)}{\prod_{b' \in C} (b'_1, b'_2, \ldots, b'_d)}. \]

Moreover, if $d = 2$ or $3$, we are always in this case.

Proof. Let $\ell \in \{0, \ldots, k\}$. Set

\[ I = C(d, h, k - \ell) = \{(b_1, \ldots, b_d) \mid \sum b_i = k - \ell, \ b_i \leq h_i\} \]

\[ J = C(d, h, k - \ell - 1) = \{(b_1, \ldots, b_d) \mid \sum b_i = k - \ell - 1, \ b_i \leq h_i\}. \]

Then by definition, we have $\delta_{k-\ell} = |I| - |J|$. Since $h_1 \geq k$, we have

\[ I = \{(b_1, \ldots, b_d) \mid \sum b_i = k - \ell, \ b_i \leq h_i \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq d, \ b_1 \leq k\} \]

\[ J = \{(b_1, \ldots, b_d) \mid \sum b_i = k - \ell - 1, \ b_i \leq h_i \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq d, \ b_1 \leq k\}. \]

Define $I' = \{b \in I \mid b_1 \geq 1\} \subset I$. We can construct a bijection between $I'$ and $J$. More precisely, define

\[ \phi : I' \to B, \quad (b_1, \ldots, b_d) \mapsto (b_1 - 1, b_2, \ldots, b_n). \]

This is clearly a well-defined injection. On the other hand, for all $(b_1, \ldots, b_d) \in J$, we have $b_1 \leq k - \ell - 1 \leq k - 1 \leq h_1$, thus $(b_1 + 1, b_2, \ldots, b_d) \in I'$ and $\phi(b_1 + 1, b_2, \ldots, b_d) = (b_1, \ldots, b_d)$. Hence $\phi$ is a bijection.

Now we have

\[ \delta_{k-\ell} = |I| - |J| = |I \setminus I'| = |\{(b \in I \mid b_1 = 0\}| = |\{(0, b_2, \ldots, b_d) \mid b_2 + \cdots + b_d = k - \ell, \ b_i \leq h_i\}| = |\{(\ell, b_2, \ldots, b_d) \mid \ell + b_2 + \cdots + b_d = k, \ b_i \leq h_i\}| = |\{b \in C(d, h, k) \mid b_1 = \ell\}|, \]

where the last equality is due to the fact that $\ell \leq k \leq h_1$. This proves (30).

With this expression of $\delta_{k-\ell}$, we have

\[ \det \left( \begin{array}{cccc} n-k \\ b_1 - b'_1, b_2 - b'_2, \ldots, b_d - b'_d \end{array} \right)_{b \in C} = \prod_{b' \in D} \frac{\prod_{b \in C} (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_d)}{\prod_{b' \in C} (b'_1, b'_2, \ldots, b'_d)}. \]
Corollary 6. Let $m \geq n > 0$.

(1) Every weight of $H^2(m,-n-2)$ is $\leq (m-n-1,n)$. 

Assume that $d = 2$, i.e. $G = SL_3$. Let $\alpha, \beta$ be the simple roots, and $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$. 

Corollary 6. Let $m \geq n > 0$.

(1) Every weight of $H^2(m,-n-2)$ is $\leq (m-n-1,n)$. 

Remark 5. In fact, if $h_i \geq k$ for an $i \in \{1, \cdots, d\}$ (which implies $h_1 \geq k$), then we have

$$
\det \begin{pmatrix} n-k \\ b_1-b_1', b_2-b_2', \ldots, b_d-b_d' \end{pmatrix} = (-1)^{s_{\nu'}} \frac{\prod_{b' \in D} (b_{1,b_2',\ldots,b_d'})}{\prod_{b' \in E} (b_{1,b_2',\ldots,b_d'})}.
$$

The proof is similar to the case $i = 1$. 

6. The case $G = SL_3$ 

6.1. The sets $C$ and $D$ are a lot simpler. In this case, the multinomial coefficients are replaced by binomial coefficients, and we have the following corollaries.

Corollary 6. Let $m \geq n > 0$.

(1) Every weight of $H^2(m,-n-2)$ is $\leq (m-n-1,n)$. 

Remark 5. In fact, if $h_i \geq k$ for an $i \in \{1, \cdots, d\}$ (which implies $h_1 \geq k$), then we have

$$
\det \begin{pmatrix} n-k \\ b_1-b_1', b_2-b_2', \ldots, b_d-b_d' \end{pmatrix} = (-1)^{s_{\nu'}} \frac{\prod_{b' \in D} (b_{1,b_2',\ldots,b_d'})}{\prod_{b' \in E} (b_{1,b_2',\ldots,b_d'})}.
$$

The proof is similar to the case $i = 1$. 

6. The case $G = SL_3$ 

6.1. The sets $C$ and $D$ are a lot simpler. In this case, the multinomial coefficients are replaced by binomial coefficients, and we have the following corollaries.
(2) For \((t, k)\) such that \(\nu_{t,k} = (m-n-1, n) - k\alpha - t\beta\) is dominant, the \(\nu_{t,k}\)-weight space of \(H^2(m, -n - 2)\) is isomorphic as an abelian group to the cokernel of the matrix
\[
D_{m,n,t,k} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{m-k}{t-k} & \frac{m-k}{t-k-1} & \ldots & \frac{m-k}{t-2k+m-n} \\
\frac{m-k}{t-k+1} & \frac{m-k}{t-k} & \ldots & \frac{m-k}{t-2k+m-n+1} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{m-k}{t} & \frac{m-k}{t-1} & \ldots & \frac{m-k}{t-k+m-n}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
if \(m - n \leq k \leq t\), and is zero otherwise.

Corollary 7. Let \(n > m \geq 0\)

(1) Every weight of \(H^2(m, -n - 2)\) is \(\leq (n - m - 1, m)\).

(2) For \((t, k)\) such that \(\nu_{t,k} = (n - m - 1, m) - k\alpha - t\beta\) is dominant, the \(\nu_{t,k}\)-weight space of \(H^2(m, -n - 2)\) is isomorphic as an abelian group to the cokernel of the matrix
\[
D_{m,n,t,k} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{n-k}{t-k+n-m} & \frac{n-k}{t-k+n-m-1} & \ldots & \frac{n-k}{t-2k+n-m} \\
\frac{n-k}{t-k+n-m+1} & \frac{n-k}{t-k+n-m} & \ldots & \frac{n-k}{t-2k+n-m+1} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{n-k}{t} & \frac{n-k}{t-1} & \ldots & \frac{n-k}{t-k}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
if \(k \geq n - m\), and is isomorphic to \(\mathbb{Z}^{\min(t,k) - \max(0,t-m)+1}\) otherwise.

Remark 6. If \(\mu = (m, -n - 2)\) is on the wall, i.e. \(m = n\), then the matrix \(D_{m,n,t,k} = D_{n,t,k}\) is square. More precisely, we have
\[
D_{n,t,k} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{n-k}{t-k} & \frac{n-k}{t-k-1} & \ldots & \frac{n-k}{t-2k} \\
\frac{n-k}{t-k+1} & \frac{n-k}{t-k} & \ldots & \frac{n-k}{t-2k+1} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{n-k}{t} & \frac{n-k}{t-1} & \ldots & \frac{n-k}{t-k}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

While we can still apply the result of [Pro90] Cor.1, this determinant has also been calculated in [Kra97] (2.17), which gives:
\[
d_{n,t,k} = \det(D_{n,t,k}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} \prod_{j=1}^{t-k} \prod_{l=1}^{n-t} i + j + l - 1 = \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} \left( \frac{n-k+i-1}{t-k} \right)_{t-k+1} = \prod_{i=0}^{k} \binom{n}{t-i}.
\]

2. In the following, we fix an arbitrary field \(k\) of characteristic \(p > 0\) and we use \(G, B\), etc., to denote the corresponding group scheme over \(k\) obtained by base change \(\mathbb{Z} \to k\). Now we have \(H^2(m, -n - 2) \cong H^1(-m - 2, n)^*\) and we can apply the results in [Jan03] II.5.15.

For \(\lambda\) dominant, denote by \(L(\lambda)\) (resp. \(V(\lambda)\)) the simple \(G\)-module (resp. Weyl module) of highest weight \(\lambda\). If \(\lambda\) is not dominant, we use the convention that \(L(\lambda) = V(\lambda) = 0\). Then we have the following proposition.

In [Lin97] Thm.1, the author has proved that if \(n = ap^d + r\) with \(1 \leq a \leq p - 1, d \geq 1\) and \(0 \leq r < p^d\), there exists an exact sequence
\[
0 \to L(0,a)^{(d)} \otimes H^2(r, -r - 2) \to H^2(n, -n - 2) \to Q(n, -n - 2) \to 0
\]
where \( Q(n, -n - 2) \) is a certain quotient of \( V(n, -n - 2) \). If \( r < p \), we have \( H^2(r, -r - 2) = 0 \) according to Corollary 2, and hence \( H^2(n, -n - 2) = Q(n, -n - 2) \). We will determine \( Q(n, -n - 2) \) in this case.

**Proposition 5.** If \( n = ap^d + r \) with \( a \in \{1, 2, \cdots, p-1\} \) and \( r \in \{0, 1, \cdots, p-1\} \), then we have an exact sequence of \( G \)-modules

\[
0 \to L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d + r) \to V(r, n - 2r - 2) \to H^2(n, -n - 2) \to 0.
\]

**Remark 7.** If \( n = p^d - 1 \), then \( H^2(n, -n - 2) \cong H^1(-n - 2, n) \) by Jan03 II.5.15 a) and \( V(r, n - 2r - 2) = V(p - 1, (p - 3)p + p - 1) \cong L(p - 1, (p - 3)p + p - 1) \) by Jan03 II 3.19 and Steinberg’s tensor identity. Hence the proposition is true in this case and we may assume that \( n \neq p^2 - 1 \) in the proof.

If \( a = 1 \), then we have \( H^2(n, -n - 2) \cong V(r, p^d - r - 2) = V(r, n - 2r - 2) \) by Lin19 Thm.2. On the other hand, we have \( L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d + r) = L(p^d - 1, r - p^d) = 0 \) by our convention. Hence we can also suppose that \( a \geq 2 \) in the proof.

**Proof.** By Serre duality, we have \( H^2(n, -n - 2) \cong H^1(-n - 2, n)^\ast \). According to Jan03 II.5.15, the socle of \( H^1(-n - 2, n) \) is simple and isomorphic to \( L(n - 2r - 2, r) \). Since \( r < p, (n - 2r - 2, r) \) is also the highest weight of \( H^1(-n - 2, n) \) by the same proposition. Hence by duality, \( H^2(n, -n - 2) \) is generated by its highest weight \( (r, n - 2r - 2) \). We thus have an exact sequence of \( G \)-modules

\[
0 \to K \to V(r, n - 2r - 2) \to H^2(n, -n - 2) \to 0.
\]

It suffices to prove that \( K \cong L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d + r) \)

1) First suppose that \( r = 0 \). In this case, \( n = ap^d \) and the Weyl module \( V(0, ap^d - 2) \) has no multiplicity. The submodule structure of \( V(0, ap^d - 2) \) has been determined by Doty (Dot85).

As in Corollary 6, set

\[
\nu_{\nu,k} = (2n - 1)\omega_1 - (n + k)\alpha - t\beta = (t - 2k - 1, n + k - 2k).
\]

We want to prove that

\[
K \cong L_0 = L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d) = L(p^d - 1, n - 2p^d) = L(\nu_{p^d,0}).
\]

Using the same notation as in Remark 6 we have

\[
det(D_{n,p^d,0}) = \begin{pmatrix} n \\ p^d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} ap^d \\ p^d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.
\]

Hence the matrix reduced modulo \( p \) is invertible and hence its cokernel is zero. This means that \( H^2(n, -n - 2) \) does not contain the weight \( \nu_{p^d,0} \), thus the \( \nu_{p^d,0} \)-weight space is contained in \( K \).

To prove that \( K = L_0 \), we will use the results in Dot85. Doty considers the module \( H^0(m, 0) \), while we consider its dual \( V(0, m) \), for

\[
m = ap^d - 2 = (p - 2) + \sum_{u=1}^{d-1} (p-1)p^u + (a-1)p^d.
\]

As in Dot85 2.3], for \( u = 0, \ldots, d \), denote by \( c_u(m) \) the \( u \)-th digit of the \( p \)-adic expansion of \( m \); we thus have \( c_0(m) = p - 2 \), \( c_u(m) = p - 1 \) for \( u = 1, \ldots, d - 1 \), \( c_d(m) = a - 1 \) and \( c_u(m) = 0 \) for \( u > d \).

As in Dot85, Prop. 2.4, denote by \( E(m) \) the set of all \( d \)-tuples \((a_1, \ldots, a_d)\) of integers in \( \{0, 1, 2\} \) satisfying

\[
0 \leq c_u(m) + a_{u+1}p - a_u \leq 3(p-1)
\]
for all $u = 0, \cdots, d$ (here we use the convention that $a_0 = a_{d+1} = 0$).

**Lemma 3.** We have $E(m) = \{0, 1\}^d$.

*Proof.* We prove by induction on $u_0 \in \{1, \cdots, d\}$ that (39) holds for $u = 0, \cdots, u_0 - 1$ if and only if $0 \leq a_u \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq u \leq u_0$. For $u = 0$ in (39), we get

\[(40) \quad 0 \leq c_0(m) + a_1p = p - 2 + a_1p \leq 3(p - 1).\]

This inequality holds if and only if $0 \leq a_1 \leq 1$.

Suppose that for some $1 \leq u_0 \leq d - 1$, we have proved that (39) holds for $u = 0, \cdots, u_0 - 1$ if and only if $0 \leq a_u \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq u \leq u_0$. Now by taking $u = u_0$, (39) gives

\[(41) \quad 0 \leq c_{u_0}(m) + a_{u_0+1}p - a_{u_0} = p - 1 + a_{u_0+1}p - a_{u_0} \leq 3(p - 1).\]

Assuming $0 \leq a_{u_0} \leq 1$, (41) holds if and only if $0 \leq a_{u_0+1} \leq 1$. Hence by induction, (39) holds for $u = 0, \cdots, d - 1$ if and only if $0 \leq a_u \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq u \leq d$. At last, for $u = d$, (39) becomes

\[0 \leq c_d(m) - a_d = a - 1 - a_d \leq 3(p - 1)\]

which is automatically satisfied if $0 \leq a_d \leq 1$ since $2 \leq a \leq p - 1$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \hfill $\square$

Since $V(0, m)$ is the dual of $H^0(m, 0)$, it contains a simple module $L(x, y)^* = L(y, x)$ if and only if $L(x, y)$ is a quotient of $H^0(m, 0)$. By [Dot85] Thm.2.3, the submodule lattice of $H^0(m, 0)$ is equivalent with the lattice of $E(m)$ equipped with the partial order $(a_1, \cdots, a_d) \leq (a'_1, \cdots, a'_d)$ if and only if $a_i \leq a'_i$ for all $i$. As in [Dot85] 2.4, for $a = (a_1, \cdots, a_d) \in E(m)$ and $u \in \{0, \cdots, d\}$, let $N_u(a)$ (resp. $R_u(a)$) be the quotient (resp. the remainder) of the Euclidean division of $c_u(m) + a_{u+1}p - a_u$ by $p - 1$. (And one takes $a_0 = 0 = a_{d+1}$). Then the simple factor of $H^0(m, 0)$ corresponding to $a \in E(m)$ is $L(b_1 - b_2, b_2 - b_3)$, where $b_j$ is determined by the following rule (cf. [Dot85] top of the page 379):

\[(42) \quad c_u(b_j) = \begin{cases} p - 1, & \text{if } j \leq N_u(a), \\ R_u(a), & \text{if } j = N_u(a) + 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } j > N_u(a) + 1. \end{cases}\]

Taking this into account, we know that $V(0, ap^d - 2)$ contains a unique simple submodule $L(\nu)^*$, which corresponds to the maximal element $e = (1, \cdots, 1)$ of $E(m)$. Suppose $\nu = (b_1 - b_2, b_2 - b_3)$. We will calculate $b_1, b_2, b_3$ using (42). In this case, for $u = 0, \cdots, d$, $N_u(e)$ (resp. $R_u(e)$) is the quotient (resp. the remainder) of the Euclidean division of $c_u(m) + e_{u+1}p - e_u$ by $p - 1$, where $e_0 = e_{d+1} = 0$ and $e_1 = e_2 = \cdots = e_d = 1$. We thus have:

\[c_0(m) + e_1p - e_0 = p - 2 + p - 0 = 2p - 2, \quad \text{thus } N_0(e) = 2 \text{ and } R_0(e) = 0.\]

Then for $u = 1, \cdots, d - 1$, we have:

\[c_u(m) + e_{u+1}p - e_u = p - 1 + p - 1 = 2p - 2, \quad \text{thus } N_u(e) = 2 \text{ and } R_u(e) = 0.\]

Finally, for $u = d$ we have $c_d(m) + e_{d+1}p - e_d = a - 1 + 0 - 1 = a - 2$ and hence $N_d(e) = 0$ and $R_d(e) = a - 2$. Therefore, the coefficients $c_u(b_j)$ of the $p$-adic expansion of $b_j$ are given for $j = 1$ by:

\[c_u(b_1) = \begin{cases} p - 1, & \text{if } j = 1 \leq N_u(e) \text{ i.e. if } u = 0, 1, \cdots, d - 1 \\ R_d(e) = a - 2, & \text{for } u = d \text{ since } j = 1 = N_d(e) + 1. \end{cases}\]
Then, for \( j = 2 \) the coefficients \( c_u(b_2) \) are given by
\[
c_u(b_2) = \begin{cases} 
p - 1 & \text{if } j = 2 \leq N_u(e) \text{ i.e. if } u = 0, 1, \ldots, d - 1 \\
0 & \text{for } u = d \text{ since } j = 2 > N_d(e) + 1.
\end{cases}
\]

Finally, for \( j = 3 \) the coefficients \( c_u(b_3) \) are given by
\[
c_u(b_3) = \begin{cases} 
R_u(e) = 0 & \text{if } j = 3 = N_u(e) + 1 \text{ i.e. if } u = 0, 1, \ldots, d - 1 \\
0 & \text{for } u = d \text{ car } j = 3 > N_d(e) + 1.
\end{cases}
\]

We thus obtain the triplet \( (p^d - 1 + (a - 2)p^d, p^d - 1, 0) \) and then the dominant weight
\[\nu = (a - 2)p^d\omega_1 + (p^d - 1)\omega_2\]
and hence \( V(0, ap^d - 2) \) contains as unique simple submodule the simple module considered earlier:
\[L_0 = L(\nu)^* = L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d) = L(p^d - 1, n - 2p^d) = L(\nu_{p^d, 0}).\]

Since we have proved that the weight \( \nu_{p^d, 0} \) is contained in \( K \), we have \( L_0 \subset K \). It remains to prove that \( K \subset L_0 \).

Still according to [DotS5], Theorem 2.3 and §2.4, the socle of \( V(0, m)/L_0 \) is the direct sum of the simple modules \( L(e^i)^* \), for \( i = 1, \ldots, d \), where each \( e^i \) means the \( d \)-tuple:
\[(1, \ldots, 1, 0, 1, \ldots, 1)\]
with the unique 0 at the \( i \)-th position. We need to determine the highest weight of \( L(e^i) \), still with the help of (42). This time we have,
\[N_{i-1}(e^i) = 0, \quad R_{i-1}(e^i) = p - 2, \quad N_i(e^i) = 2, \quad R_i(e^i) = 1,
\] if \( i \leq d - 1 \), and
\[N_{d-1}(e^d) = 0, \quad R_{d-1}(e^d) = p - 2, \quad N_d(e^d) = 0, \quad R_d(e^d) = a - 1.
\]
Thus the highest weight \( \lambda_i \) of \( L(e^i)^* \) is \( \nu_{t_i, k_i} \) with \( (t_i, k_i) = (p^d + p^{i-1}, p^i) \) for \( i = 1, \cdots, d - 1 \) and \( \lambda_d = \nu_{t_d, k_d} \) with \( (t_d, k_d) = (p^{d-1}, 0) \).

If \( 1 \leq i \leq d - 1 \), with the notation of Remark 6, we have
\[d_{n,t_i,k_i} = \frac{\prod_{l=0}^{k_i} \binom{n}{t_i-l}}{\prod_{l=0}^{k_i} \binom{n}{l}}.
\]
\[v_p(d_{n,t_i,k_i}) = (j + 1)d - \sum_{l=0}^{k_i} v_p(t_i - l) - jd + \sum_{l=1}^{k_i} v_p d \]
\[= d - v(t_i) - v(t_i - k_i) = d - v(t_i) - (i - 1) \]
\[\geq d - (d - i) - (i - 1) = 1,
\]
where the last inequality results from the \( p \)-adic expansion of \( k_i = p^i \) and \( t_i - k_i = p^d - p^i \). This means that \( p \) divides \( d_{n,t_i,k_i} \) and the cokernel of \( D_{n,t_i,k_i} \) is non-trivial. Hence \( H^2(n, -n - 2) \) contains the weight \( \lambda_i \) and \( L(\lambda_i) \) does not exist in \( K \).

For \( i = d \), where \( (t_d, k_d) = (p^{d-1}, 0) \), we have \( d_{n,t_d,k_d} = \binom{n}{t_d} = \binom{a^{p^d-1}}{p^{d-1}} \), and \( v_p(d_{n,t_d,k_d}) = 1 \). Hence \( L(\lambda_d) \) does not exist in \( K \) either. This proves that \( K = L_0 \), i.e. there is an exact sequence of \( G \)-modules:
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d) \longrightarrow V(0, ap^d - 2) \longrightarrow H^2(ap^d, -ap^d - 2) \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}
\]

2) Suppose now that \( 1 \leq r \leq p - 1 \).
Set \( \lambda = (0, ap^d - 2) \) and \( \mu = (r, ap^d - r - 2) \). Then the facet containing \( \lambda \) is defined by
\[
F = \{ \nu \in X(T) \mid 0 < \langle \nu + \rho, \alpha' \rangle < \langle \nu + \rho, \beta' \rangle < \langle \nu + \rho, \gamma' \rangle = ap^d \}
\]
and \( \mu \) belongs to the closure \( \overline{F} \) (in fact it belongs to \( F \) if \( r \neq p - 1 \)).

Let \( T^\mu \) be the translation functor from \( \lambda \) to \( \mu \), which is exact (cf. [Jan03] II.7.6). Then we have \( T^\mu \nu(V(\lambda)) = V(\mu) \) by [Jan03] II.7.11. Apply \( T^\mu \) to the exact sequence, one obtains:
\[
\text{(44)} \quad 0 \longrightarrow T^\mu L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d) \longrightarrow V(\mu) \longrightarrow T^\mu H^2(ap^d, -ap^d - 2) \longrightarrow 0.
\]

Define the elements \( w_1, w_2 \in W_p \) by
\[
w_1 \cdot \nu = \nu - \langle \nu + \rho, \beta' \rangle - (a - 1)p^d)\beta
\]
and
\[
w_2 \cdot \nu = s_\beta \cdot (\nu - \langle \nu + \rho, \beta' \rangle - (a - 1)p^d)\beta = \nu - ap^d \beta.
\]

Then \( (p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d) = w_1 \cdot \lambda \) belongs to the facet.
\[
F' = \{ \nu \in X(T) \mid \langle \nu + \rho, \alpha' \rangle = p^d, (a - 2)p^d < \langle \nu + \rho, \beta' \rangle < (a - 2)p^d + p, \langle (a - 1)p^d < \langle \nu + \rho, \gamma' \rangle < (a - 1)p^d + p \}.
\]

Hence \( w_1 \cdot \mu = (p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d + r) \) belongs to the upper closure of \( F' \) (see [Jan03] II.6.2(3) for the definition of the upper closure \( \overline{F'} \) of \( F' \)). Therefore, by [Jan03] II.7.15, we have
\[
T^\mu L(p^d - 1, (a - 2)p^d) = T^\mu L(w_1 \cdot \lambda) \cong L(w_1 \cdot \mu) = L(p^d - 2, (a - 2)p^d + r).
\]

Similarly, \( w_2 \cdot \lambda = (ap^d, -ap^d - 2) \), hence by [Jan03] II.7.11, we have
\[
T^\mu H^2(ap^d, -ap^d - 2) = T^\mu H^2(w_2 \cdot \lambda) \cong H^2(w_2 \cdot \mu) = H^2(ap^d + r, -ap^d - r - 2).
\]

Therefore, the exact sequence (44) becomes (37). This proves Proposition 5. 

\[\square\]
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