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ABSTRACT. We prove a “twist-compatibility” result for $p$-adic families of cohomology classes associated to symmetric spaces. This shows that a single family of classes (lying in a finitely-generated Iwasawa module) interpolates classical cohomology classes of many different weights, including twists by Grössencharacters of possibly non-trivial infinity-type. This subsumes and generalises a number of prior results relating to Euler systems and $p$-adic $L$-functions, and we conclude with some novel applications to Euler systems for $\text{GSp}_4$, $\text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_2$, and $\text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2$.

1. Introduction

This article is a sequel to the article [Loe19] of the first author. In the previous article, we constructed norm-compatible families of cohomology classes for Shimura varieties and other symmetric spaces, associated to pairs of reductive groups satisfying an “open orbit” condition. This very general construction subsumes a number of well-known results in Iwasawa theory, including the norm-compatibility of modular symbols and Heegner points for $\text{GL}_2$.

In this paper, we consider varying the algebraic weight defining the coefficient system for our cohomology. Our main result, Theorem 5.2.2, shows that the norm-compatible families constructed in [Loe19] interpolate classical cohomology classes of many different weights (including twists by Grössencharacters of possibly non-trivial infinity-type). Several specific instances of this result are already known – see Remark 5.2.5 below – and form an important ingredient in the proofs of “explicit reciprocity laws” for Euler systems and $p$-adic $L$-functions. The general theorem proved here subsumes all of these earlier results, and we conclude with several new applications of this theory to Euler systems for $\text{GSp}_4$, $\text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_2$, and $\text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2$.

2. Control theorems for ordinary cohomology

2.1. Setup. Let $p$ be a prime. We consider the following situation:

- $G$ is a connected reductive group over $\mathbb{Q}$, satisfying Milne’s axiom (SV5)\(^1\) (i.e. its centre contains no torus which is $\mathbb{R}$-split but not $\mathbb{Q}$-split).
- $G$ is a Chevalley group (reductive group scheme) over $\mathbb{Z}_p$, whose base extension to $\mathbb{Q}_p$ coincides with that of $G$.
- $Q$ is a parabolic subgroup of $G$, and $\bar{Q}$ a choice of opposite parabolic; thus $L = Q \cap \bar{Q}$ is a Levi subgroup of $Q$, and the “big cell” $\mathbb{N} \times L \times N$ is an open subscheme of $G$ over $\mathbb{Z}_p$, where $N$ is the unipotent radical of $Q$ (and similarly $\mathbb{N}$).
- $S$ denotes the torus $L/L^\der$, and $X^*(S)$ its character lattice. We let $X^*_+(S)$ be the cone of dominant weights (relative to $Q$).
- $A$ is the maximal $\mathbb{Q}_p$-split torus in the centre of $L$.

We choose a torus $S^0 \subset S$, and let $L^0$ and $Q^0$ be its preimages in $L$ and $Q$ respectively (so $Q^0 = L^0 \ltimes N$). We write $\mathcal{G}$ for the profinite abelian group $L(\mathbb{Z}_p)/L^0(\mathbb{Z}_p) \subseteq (S/S^0)(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

2.2. Algebraic representations. Let us fix a finite extension $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$, with ring of integers $\mathcal{O}$, such that the maximal torus $T$ splits over $K$. We can and do assume that $K$ is unramified (since $G$ has a smooth integral model). For $\lambda \in X^*_+(S)$, there is a unique isomorphism class of irreducible representations $(\rho_\lambda, V_\lambda)$ of $G/K$ of highest weight $\lambda$ (with respect to any choice of Borel contained in $Q$). A representative

\(^1\)The assumption (SV5) can be relaxed, but at the cost of slightly more complicated statements, allowing one to treat the important case of $\mathcal{G} = \text{Res}_{F/\mathbb{Q}} \text{GL}_2$ for $F$ a totally real field. We leave the details to the interested reader.
of this isomorphism class can be constructed using the Borel–Weil–Bott theorem, as the space of all polynomials
\[ \{ f \in K[G] : f(\tau g) = \lambda(\ell) f(g) \quad \forall \tau \in \mathbb{N}, \ell \in L, g \in G \}, \]
with \( G \) acting by right-translation. In particular, the highest weight space of \( V_\lambda \) has a unique basis vector \( f_\lambda^{\max} \) whose restriction to the big Bruhat cell \( \overline{NLN} \) is given by \( \tau \mapsto \lambda(\ell) \). This is also the highest relative weight space of \( V_\lambda \), i.e. the highest-weight eigenspace for the action of \( A \).

2.3. Integral lattices.

**Definition 2.3.1.** An admissible lattice in \( V_\lambda \) is an \( \mathcal{O} \)-lattice \( \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{V}_\lambda \) which is invariant under \( G_\mathcal{O} \) (i.e. \( G(R) \) preserves \( \mathcal{L} \otimes R \) for every \( \mathcal{O} \)-algebra \( R \)), and whose intersection with the highest-weight subspace is \( \mathcal{O} \cdot f_\lambda^{\max} \).

We recall the following standard facts, which can be found in [Lin92] for example:

(a) There are only finitely many admissible lattices in \( V_\lambda \).

(b) Every admissible lattice is the direct sum of its intersections with the weight spaces of \( V_\lambda^G \).

(c) There are unique maximal and minimal admissible lattices \( \mathcal{L}^{\max} \) and \( \mathcal{L}^{\min} \) such that every admissible \( \mathcal{L} \) satisfies \( \mathcal{L}^{\max} \supseteq \mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{L}^{\min} \).

(d) If we realise \( \mathcal{V}_\lambda \) via the Borel–Weil construction as above, then the maximal admissible lattice \( \mathcal{L}^{\max} \) is given by the intersection of \( \mathcal{V}_\lambda \) with the coordinate ring of \( G_\mathcal{O} \).

(e) The dual of an admissible lattice in \( \mathcal{V}_\lambda \) is an admissible lattice in \( (V_\lambda)^\vee \). In particular, the dual of the maximal lattice is the minimal lattice and vice versa.

We shall henceforth always write \( V_\lambda, \mathcal{O} \) for the maximal admissible lattice, realised via the Borel–Weil construction as above, and \( V^{\min}_\lambda, \mathcal{O} \) for the minimal lattice.

**Remark 2.3.2.** Note that if \( G = \text{GL}_2 \) and \( \mathcal{V}_\lambda = \text{Sym}^n(K^2) \) is the \( n \)-th symmetric power of the standard representation, then \( \text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{O}^2) \) is the maximal lattice, and the module \( \text{TSym}^n(\mathbb{O}^2) \) of symmetric tensors (which features prominently in [KLZ17]) is the minimal lattice.

**Definition 2.3.3.** Let \( \Sigma^+ \) denote the monoid of cocharacters \( \eta \in X_*(A) \) which are dominant with respect to \( Q \), so that \( \langle \eta, \phi \rangle \geq 0 \) for every relative root \( \phi \). We let \( \Sigma^{++} \subset \Sigma^+ \) be the ideal of elements that are strictly dominant, so \( \langle \eta, \phi \rangle > 0 \) for all \( \phi \).

**Lemma 2.3.4.** If \( \eta \in \Sigma^+ \), then the endomorphism \( \rho^{(\eta, \lambda)}(\eta(p)^{-1}) \) of \( V_\lambda \) acts on every weight space as a non-negative power of \( p \), and hence restricts to an endomorphism of \( \mathcal{L} \) for any admissible lattice \( \mathcal{L} \). If \( \eta \in \Sigma^{++} \) then this endomorphism acts as a strictly positive power of \( p \) on every weight space except the highest one.

**Proof.** This is an easy explicit check. \( \square \)

2.4. Cohomology of symmetric spaces. Let us fix a prime-to-\( p \) level group \( K^p \) (which we shall suppose to be neat). We define \( H^*(U, \mathcal{O}) \), for \( U \subset G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \) open compact, to mean one of the following:

- Betti cohomology of the locally symmetric space \( Y_G(K^p U) \), viewed as a real manifold, with coefficients in \( \mathcal{O} \);
- étale cohomology of the Shimura variety of that level, viewed as an algebraic variety over \( \overline{Q} \), and supposing \( \mathcal{G} \) to be equipped with a choice of Shimura datum;
- étale cohomology of the canonical integral model of the Shimura variety over \( O_E[1/S] \), where \( E \) is the reflex field, and \( S \) is a sufficiently large finite set of primes containing all of those dividing \( p \). Here we suppose the Shimura datum to be of Hodge type. In this case, we may also allow arbitrary cyclotomic twists of the coefficients.

One can also consider cohomology with compact support (in any of the above settings). More generally, since we may regard an algebraic representation of \( G \) as a cochain sheaf (for any of the above cohomology theories), we can make sense of \( H^*(U, V_\lambda, \mathcal{O}) \) for any \( U \subset G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \).

When considering étale cohomology of canonical models, we shall suppose that either \( p > 2 \) or \( E \) has no real places. Then in all the above cases the cohomology groups \( H^i(U, -) \) are finitely-generated over \( \mathcal{O} \), and zero for \( i \) exceeding some bound independent of \( U \).
2.5. Hecke actions. For general $\lambda$, the integral étale cohomology groups $H^*(-, V_{\lambda,O})$ are Cartesian cohomology functors for $G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ in the sense of [Loe19]. However, if the coefficients are non-trivial they are Typically not cohomology functors for the whole of $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ since this group does not act on the lattice $V_{λ,O}$. We shall work around this by renormalising our Hecke operators using Lemma 2.3.4:

**Definition 2.5.1.** Suppose $U \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Then, for any $λ \in X^*_+ (S)$ and $η \in Σ^+$, we can define a normalised Hecke operator acting on $H^* (U, V_{λ,O})$ by

$$T^*_η = p^h[U\eta(p^{-1})U], \quad h = (λ, η).$$

**Remark 2.5.2.** In the special cases of this theory we have previously worked out, the scalar factor $p^h$ appearing above is hidden from view, since we had always chosen $η$ and $λ$ such that $⟨η, λ⟩ = 0$. ⊳

**Definition 2.5.3.** We say an open compact $U \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ has an Iwahori decomposition (with respect to $Q$) if we have $U = N_U L_U N_U$, where $N_U = U \cap N(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ etc, and $N_U$ and $N_U$ are the products of their intersections with the relative root spaces for $A$.

The prototypical examples are the parahoric subgroups $J = \{ g \in G(\mathbb{Z}_p) : g \mod p \in Q(\mathbb{F}_p) \}$ and its opposite $J$.

**Proposition 2.5.4.** If $U$ has an Iwahori decomposition, then the operators $T^*_η$ for varying $η$ define an action of $Σ^+$ on $H^* (U, V_{λ,O})$; and if we choose an $η_0$ which is strictly dominant, then the anti-ordinary idempotent

$$e^*_Q = \lim_{k \to ∞} (T^*_η)^k$$

is independent of the choice of $η_0$, and cuts out the maximal direct summand on which the operators $T^*_η$ are all invertible.

**Proposition 2.5.5.** For any $U$ with an Iwahori decomposition, the natural map

$$e^*_Q H^* (U, V_{λ,O}^{\min}) \to e^*_Q H^* (U, V_{λ,O})$$

induced by the inclusion $V_{λ,O}^{\min} \hookrightarrow V_{λ,O}$, is an isomorphism.

**Proof.** Both $V_{λ,O}^{\min}$ and $V_{λ,O}$ are direct sums of their weight spaces for $A$. The inclusion map is an isomorphism on the highest relative weight space (by definition). On each lower weight space, $p^{λ(η_0)} ρ(η_0(p)^{-1})$ acts as a positive power of $p$, so some power of this map will annihilate the quotient of the weight spaces in the two lattices. Thus, if $r \gg 0$ (depending on $λ$), the operator $(T^*_η)^r$ annihilates the cohomology of the quotient. □

2.6. Anti-ordinary cohomology and Rockwood’s control results.

**Definition 2.6.1.** For $i \geq 0$ we set

$$H^i_{Iw}(Q^0, V_{λ,O}) = \lim_{U} \{ H^i(U, V_{λ,O}) \},$$

where $U$ varies over open compact subgroups of $G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ containing $Q^0(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, and the inverse limit is taken relative to the pushforward maps.

One checks that the levels $U$ having an Iwahori decomposition are cofinal in the above inverse system, and the operators $\{ T^*_η : τ \in Σ^+ \}$ are compatible with the pushforward maps and hence act on the inverse limit.

The following result, proved in [Roc21], is a generalisation to arbitrary reductive groups of results due to Ohta [Oht99, Olt00] for Betti or étale cohomology of modular curves:

**Theorem 2.6.2** (Ohta, Rockwood).

(i) The modules $e^*_Q H^i_{Iw}(Q^0, V_{λ,O})$ are finitely-generated over $O[[Θ]]$, and vanish for $i \gg 0$.

(ii) Tensor product with the highest weight vector $f^{Iw}_λ$ defines a “moment map”

$$\text{mom}^λ : H^i_{Iw}(Q^0, O) \to H^i_{Iw}(Q^0, V_{λ,O})$$

whose kernel and cokernel are annihilated by $e^*_Q$. This map commutes with the operators $T^*_η$, and commutes with the action of $Θ$ up to a twist by $λ$. 


(iii) For any subgroup $U$ such that $G(Z_p) \supseteq U \supseteq Q^0(Z_p)$ and $U$ admits an Iwahori decomposition, there is a convergent spectral sequence (supported in the second quadrant $i \leq 0, j \geq 0$):

$$E^{ij}_2 = \text{Tor}^{Q[[\mathfrak{O}]]}_{i-j}(e'_Q H^j_{\text{tw}}(Q^0, \mathfrak{O}), \mathfrak{O}) \Rightarrow e'_Q H^{i+j}(U, V, \lambda, \mathfrak{O}),$$

where $\mathfrak{O}_U$ is the image of $U \cap Q(Z_p)$ in $\mathfrak{O}$. In particular, $e'_Q H^{*}(U, V, \lambda, \mathfrak{O})$ depends only on $U \cap Q(Z_p)$.

**Proof.** If $H^*$ denotes Betti cohomology, this is the main result of [Roc21]. (Rockwood works with the minimal admissible lattice rather than the maximal one, but this makes no difference, because of Proposition 2.5.5. Rockwood also assumes $S^0 = \{1\}$, but the proofs extend without difficulty.) The case of étale cohomology follows from this; one may define all the spaces and maps for a finite truncation of the coefficients using general functoriality properties of étale cohomology, and then the remaining assertions – that the inverse limits are finitely-generated, and that the moment map in (ii) is an isomorphism on the ordinary part – can be checked using the comparison between Betti and étale cohomology. \qed

Note that combining parts (ii) and (iii) of the theorem, we obtain a more general spectral sequence

$$\text{Tor}^{Q[[\mathfrak{O}]]}_{i-j}(e'_Q H^j_{\text{tw}}(Q^0, \mathfrak{O}), \mathfrak{O}[\{-\lambda\}]) \Rightarrow e'_Q H^{i+j}(U, V, \lambda, \mathfrak{O}),$$

where $\mathfrak{O}[\{-\lambda\}]$ denotes $\mathfrak{O}$ regarded as a $\mathfrak{O}$-module via the inverse of $\lambda: S(Z_p) \to \mathfrak{O}^\times$.

**Definition 2.6.3.** We denote by

$$\text{mom}^\lambda_U : e'_Q H^j_{\text{tw}}(Q^0, \mathfrak{O}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{O}[\{-\lambda\}]} \mathfrak{O}[\{-\lambda\}] \to e'_Q H^j(U, V, \lambda, \mathfrak{O})$$

the edge map of the spectral sequence (2.1), induced by $\text{mom}^\lambda$ and projection to level $U$.

3. Branching laws for algebraic representations

We recall the setup considered in [Loe19], where we consider pushforward of “Eisenstein-type” cohomology classes from a group $H$ to a larger group $G$. We shall fix an embedding $H \hookrightarrow G$ of reductive groups over $Q$, extending to an embedding $H \hookrightarrow G$ of reductive group schemes over $Z_p$.

3.1. Flag varieties. We fix choices of subgroups $Q, S$ etc as in §2.1, both for $G$ and for $H$; and we distinguish between them using subscripts, so $Q_G$ and $Q_H$ are parabolics in $G$ and $H$ respectively. Note that we do not assume any direct compatibility between these (e.g. we do not suppose that $Q_H = Q_G \cap H$ etc). We are interested in the action of $H$, and its subgroup $Q^0_H$, on the flag variety $\mathcal{F} = G/\overline{Q}_G$. We assume that there exists $u \in \mathcal{F}(Z_p)$ such that

(A) the $Q^0_H$-orbit of $u$ is Zariski-open in $\mathcal{F}$.

(B) the image of $\overline{Q}_G \cap u^{-1} Q^0_H u$ under the projection $\overline{Q}_G \twoheadrightarrow L_G \twoheadrightarrow S_G$ is contained in the subtorus $S^0_G$.

**Remark 3.1.1.** Note that the validity of (B) is independent of the choice of representative $u$ in (A), since $\overline{Q}_G \cap u^{-1} Q^0_H u$ is well-defined up to conjugation (and $S_G$ is commutative). \hfill \Box

3.2. Highest-weight representations.

**Proposition 3.2.1.** For any $\lambda \in X^*_G(S_G/S^0_G)$, we have $\dim(V^G_{\lambda}) Q^0_H \leq 1$. If this dimension is $1$, then $(V^G_{\lambda}) Q^0_H$ is spanned by the unique polynomial $\text{br}_\lambda \in K[\mathfrak{G}]$ (a “branching polynomial”) such that $\text{br}_\lambda(\overline{u}^{-1} q') = \lambda(\overline{u})$ for $\overline{u} \in \overline{Q}_G$ and $q' \in Q^0_H$.

**Proof.** Suppose $f \in (V^G_{\lambda}) Q^0_H$. Then the restriction of $f$ to the subvariety $\overline{Q}_G u^{-1} Q^0_H$ of $G$ is uniquely determined by $f(u^{-1})$. Since $\overline{Q}_G u^{-1} Q^0_H$ is open (and $G$ is connected), this implies that $f$ itself is uniquely determined, as an element of $K[\mathfrak{G}]$, by $f(u^{-1})$. In particular, if $f$ is non-zero, then we can scale it so that $f(u^{-1}) = 1$. \hfill \Box

**Remark 3.2.2.** Conversely, if $S^0_G$ is exactly the image of $\overline{Q}_G \cap u^{-1} Q^0_H u$ in $S_G$, then any weight $\lambda \in X^*_G(S_G)$ such that $(V^G_{\lambda}) Q^0_H \neq 0$ must lie in $X^*_G(S_G/S^0_G)$. However, it is convenient not to require $S^0_G$ to have this minimality property. \hfill \Box

**Definition 3.2.3.** We shall say that a weight $\lambda \in X^*_G(S_G/S^0_G)$ is $Q^0_H$-admissible if $(V^G_{\lambda}) Q^0_H \neq 0$. 


If this holds, then $Q_H/Q^0_H$ must act on $(V^G_X)^{Q_H}$ via a weight $\mu \in X^*(S_H/S^0_H)$, and this weight must be dominant (since it is the highest weight of the $H$-representation spanned by $(V^G_X)^{Q_H}$, which is finite-dimensional). We denote this weight by $\mu(\lambda)$, or just $\mu$ if $\lambda$ is clear from context.

**Remark 3.2.4.** The natural map
\[
\frac{Q_H \cap uQ_Gu^{-1}}{Q^0_H \cap uQ_Gu^{-1}} \to Q_H/Q^0_H
\]
is injective, and for dimension reasons, it must in fact be an isomorphism. The left-hand side maps naturally to $S_G/S^0_G$; so we can characterise $\mu(\lambda)$ as the pullback of $\lambda$ to this quotient.

**Proposition 3.2.5.** If $\lambda$ is $Q^0_H$-admissible, then there exists a unique homomorphism
\[
V^H_\mu \to (V^G_X)|^H,
\]
where $\mu \in X^*(L_H/L^0_H)$ is the character by which $Q_H$ acts on $(V^G_X)^{Q_H}$. This is characterised by mapping the highest-weight vector $f^\mu_{hw}$ of $V^H_\mu$ to $br_\lambda$.

**Proof.** This follows from Frobenius reciprocity: $V^H_\mu$ is isomorphic to the co-induced module $\text{Coind}^H_{Q_H}(\mu)$ (which is left adjoint to restriction of representations, while the usual induction is right adjoint). □

**Proposition 3.2.6.** If $\lambda$ is a $Q^0_H$-admissible weight, then $br_\lambda \in V^G_{\lambda,\mathcal{O}}$.

**Proof.** Since $G/\mathcal{O}$ is smooth over $\mathcal{O}$, it is a normal scheme, so it suffices to check that $br_\lambda$ is regular away from a subvariety of codimension $\geq 2$ (Hartogs’ lemma). By definition, it is regular in characteristic 0, and also on an open dense subvariety of $G/\mathcal{O}$, where $k = \mathcal{O}/p\mathcal{O}$; so we are done. □

**Corollary 3.2.7.** The branching map of Proposition 3.2.5 restricts to a map of $\mathcal{O}$-modules
\[
V^H_{\mu,\mathcal{O}} \to V^G_{\mu,\mathcal{O}}.
\]

**Remark 3.2.8.** Compare [LSZ17, Proposition 4.3.5]. (We do not know whether the minimal lattice maps to the minimal lattice, nor whether the maximal one maps to the maximal one.) □

3.3. **Projection to the highest-weight subspace.** If $\lambda$ is an $Q^0_H$-admissible weight, we thus have two canonical vectors in $V^G_{\lambda,\mathcal{O}}$: namely, the highest-weight vector $f^\lambda_{hw}$, and the $Q^0_H$-invariant vector $br_\lambda$. We also have a canonical linear functional $\psi_\lambda$ on $V_\lambda$, given by evaluation at $id_G$, which factors through projection from $V_\lambda$ to its highest-weight space (i.e. it is a lowest-weight vector of weight $-\lambda$ for the contragredient representation $(V^G_X)^\vee$).

**Proposition 3.3.1.** We have $\psi_\lambda(f^\lambda_{rw}) = \psi_\lambda(u^{-1} \cdot br_\lambda)$.

**Proof.** Both sides are, by definition, equal to 1. □

**Corollary 3.3.2.** Let $\eta \in \Sigma^+$. If $\lambda$ is $Q^0_H$-admissible, then for any $r \geq 1$ we have
\[
p^r \rho_\lambda(\eta(p)^{-r}) \cdot (f^\lambda_{rw} - u^{-1} \cdot br_\lambda) \in p^r V_\lambda,\mathcal{O}.
\]

**Proof.** Since $V_\lambda,\mathcal{O}$ is stable under the action of $G$, it is certainly stable under the action of $G_m/\mathbb{Z}_p$ defined by $\eta$, and hence is equal to the direct sum of its eigenspaces for the powers of $\eta$. So to prove that $p^r \rho_\lambda(\tau^{-1})$ maps $V_\lambda,\mathcal{O}$ to itself, it suffices to show that the eigenvalues of $\rho_\lambda(\tau^{-1})$ on $V_\lambda$ are in $p^{-r}\mathbb{Z}_p$. Clearly, these eigenvalues are given by $p^{-r}\eta(\mu)$ where $\mu$ varies over the weights $V_\lambda$. However, since $\lambda$ is the highest weight of $V_\lambda$, and $\eta$ is dominant, all such weights satisfy $\langle \eta, \mu \rangle \leq \langle \eta, \lambda \rangle = h$.

To prove the second statement, it suffices to take $r = 1$. By Proposition 3.3.1, $f^\lambda_{rw} - u^{-1} \cdot br_\lambda$ has zero projection to the highest relative weight space. So it is a sum of vectors lying in relative weight spaces of strictly smaller weights, and hence $p^r \rho_\lambda(\tau^{-1})$ acts on these with eigenvalues in $p\mathbb{Z}_p$. □

4. **Norm-compatible families**

4.1. **Subgroups.** Let us choose $\eta \in \Sigma^+$ (which will remain fixed throughout the construction), and set $\sigma = \eta(p)$. For $r \geq 0$, let us write
\[
N_r = \tau^r N_G(\mathbb{Z}_p)^{\tau^{-r}}, \quad \overline{N_r} = \tau^{-r} N_G(\mathbb{Z}_p)^{\tau^r}.
\]
Note that $N_r$ and $\overline{N_r}$ are contained (usually strictly) in the kernel of reduction modulo $p^r$. We set $L_r = \{ \ell \in L_G(\mathbb{Z}_p) : \ell \text{ mod } p^r \in L^0_G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \}$. Then the “norm-compatibility machine” of [Loc19] uses the open compact subgroups $U_r$ and $V_r$ of $G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ defined for $r \geq 1$ by
\[
U_r = \overline{N_0} L_r N_r, \quad V_r = \overline{N_r} L_r N_0.
\]
Note that $(U_r)_{r \geq 1}$ is a decreasing sequence of open neighbourhoods of $\overline{Q}_G^0(Z_p)$, and $(V_r)_{r \geq 1}$ similarly of $Q_G^0(Z_p)$.

4.2. **Hecke actions.** For $r \geq 1$, the groups $U_r$ and $V_r$ have Iwahori decompositions, so we have an integrally normalised Hecke operator $T_q'$ on cohomology at these levels, defined in weight $\lambda$ using the normalisation factor $p^k$ where $k = \langle \eta, \lambda \rangle$. Similarly, we obtain an integrally normalised pushforward map

$$[r^*]_* : H^i(U_r, \mathcal{V}_\lambda, \mathcal{O}) \rightarrow H^i(V_r, \mathcal{V}_\lambda, \mathcal{O}),$$

whose effect on the coefficient sheaves is given by $p^k \rho_\lambda(r^{-i})$. Note that this map commutes with the actions of $T_q'$.

4.3. **Pushforward from $H$.**

**Definition 4.3.1.** Let $c$ be the integer

$$\dim_\mathbb{R}(Y_G) - \dim_\mathbb{R}(Y_H) - \text{rk}_\mathbb{R} \left( \frac{Z_H}{Z_G} \right) \geq 0,$$

where $\text{rk}_\mathbb{R}$ denotes the split rank over $\mathbb{R}$. (Note that this is simply $2(\dim_\mathbb{C}(Y_G) - \dim_\mathbb{C} Y_H)$, if $H$ and $G$ admit compatible Shimura data.)

For any open compacts $U_G \subseteq G(Z_p)$ and $U_H \subset H(Z_p)$ with $U_H \subset H \cap U_G$, and any $H$-admissible weight $\lambda$, the maps of Corollary 3.2.7 give us morphisms

$$i_*^{[\lambda]} : H^i(U_H, \mathcal{V}^{H, \text{min}}_{\mu, \mathcal{O}}) \rightarrow H^{i+c}(U_G, \mathcal{V}^{G}_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}).$$

(As usual, we work with some fixed tame levels $K^p_G$ and $K^p_H$ away from $p$; we shall suppose $K^p_H = K^p_G \cap H(A^p_F)$.)

**Remark 4.3.2.** In the Shimura-variety setting, $c = 2d$ is always even, and the pushforward map for étale cohomology takes the form

$$H^i_{\text{ét}}(U_H, \mathcal{V}^{H, \text{min}}_{\mu, \mathcal{O}}(j)) \rightarrow H^{i+2d}_{\text{ét}}(U, \mathcal{V}^{G}_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}(j+d))$$

for any $i,j$, where $(j)$ denotes a cyclotomic twist.

Now let $\lambda$ be a $Q^0_H$-admissible weight, and $\mu$ the corresponding weight for $H$. We suppose we are given a compatible family of classes (for some given $i \geq 0$),

$$z^0_H \in H^i_{\text{ét}}(Q^0_H, \mathcal{V}^{H, \text{min}}_{\mu, \mathcal{O}}).$$

**Remark 4.3.3.** We remind the reader that the special case when $Q^0_H = H$, $\mu = 0$, and $z^0_H$ is the identity class in $H^0(H(Z_p), \mathcal{O})$ is permitted (and not at all trivial).

**Definition 4.3.4.** We let $z^{[\lambda]}_{G,r} \in H^{i+c}(U_r, \mathcal{V}^{G}_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}})$ be the following class: it is the image of $z^0_H$ under the composite map

$$H^i_{\text{ét}}\left(Q^0_H, \mathcal{V}^{H, \text{min}}_{\mu, \mathcal{O}} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}^*} H^i_{\text{ét}}\left(Q^0_H \cap uU_r u^{-1}, \mathcal{V}^{H, \text{min}}_{\mu, \mathcal{O}} \right) \xrightarrow{i_*^{[\lambda]}} H^{i+c}(uU_r u^{-1}, \mathcal{V}^{G}_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}) \xrightarrow{[\mu]} H^{i+c}(U_r, \mathcal{V}^{G}_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}).$$

We set

$$\xi^{[\lambda]}_{G,r} = [r^*]_* (z^{[\lambda]}_{G,r}) \in H^{i+c}(V_r, \mathcal{V}^{G}_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}).$$

(Here $\text{pr}^*$ is the natural pullback map, and $[r^*]_*$ the integrally normalised pushforward as above.)

The main theorem of [Loe19] is the following:

**Theorem 4.3.5.** If $\text{pr}_{V_r+1, V_r, *}$ denotes pushforward along the map $Y_G(V_{r+1}) \rightarrow Y_G(V_r)$, then we have

$$\text{pr}_{V_r+1, V_r, *} \left( \xi^{[\lambda]}_{G,r+1} \right) = T_q' \cdot \xi^{[\lambda]}_{G,r},$$

for all $r \geq 1$. 

6
Definition 4.3.6. We define
\[ \xi_{G, \infty}^{[\lambda]} \coloneqq \left( (T_{\eta}')^{-r} e'_{Q_{G}} \xi_{G, r}^{[\lambda]} \right)_{r \geq 1} \in e'_{Q_{G}} H_{1w}^{(i+c)}(V_{\infty}, Y_{\lambda, G}^{G}) , \]
and we let
\[ \xi_{G, r}^{[\lambda]} : H_{1w}^{i} \left( Q_{H}^{0}, V_{\mu, G}^{H, \min} \right) \to e'_{Q_{G}} H_{1w}^{(i+c)} \left( Q_{G}^{0}, V_{\lambda, G}^{G} \right) \]
to be the map sending \( z_{H}^{[\lambda]} \) to \( \xi_{G, \infty}^{[\lambda]} \).

Note that \( \lambda \) (and hence \( \mu \)) are fixed in the above construction. The goal of this paper is to compare the classes \( \xi_{G, \infty}^{[\lambda]} \) for different values of \( \lambda \).

5. Moment maps

5.1. Definitions. Let \( r \geq 1 \), and let \( \lambda \in X_{+}^{*}(S_{G}/S_{G}^{0}) \). (For the moment we do not assume \( \lambda \) is \( H \)-admissible.)

Since \( f_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{hw}} \) is a highest-weight vector, and its weight is trivial on \( L_{G}^{0} \), the mod \( p^{r} \) reduction of this vector is invariant under the group \( Q_{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^{r}) \), which is the image of \( V_{r} \) in \( G(\mathbb{Z}/p^{r}) \). Thus the reduction of \( f_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{hw}} \) defines a class
\[ f_{\lambda, r}^{\mathrm{hw}} \in H^{0}(V_{r}, V_{\lambda, r}) , \]
and these have the property
\[ f_{\lambda, r+1}^{\mathrm{hw}} \mod p^{r} = \text{pr}^{\mathrm{hw}}_{Y_{r+1}, V_{r}} \left( f_{\lambda, r}^{\mathrm{hw}} \right) \in H^{0}(V_{r+1}, V_{\lambda, r}) . \]

Definition 5.1.1. The moment map of weight \( \lambda \) and level \( r \) is the map
\[ \text{mom}^{G}_{r} : H_{1w}^{i} \left( Q_{G}^{0}, O \right) \to H_{1w}^{i} \left( Q_{G}^{0}, V_{\lambda, G}^{G} \right) \]
defined as follows: if \( \underline{\lambda} = (x_{s})_{s \geq 1} \in \lim_{\leftarrow s} H^{c}(V_{s}, O) \), then \( \text{mom}^{G}_{r}(\underline{\lambda}) \) is given by
\[ \left( (x_{s} \mod p^{s}) \cup f_{\lambda, s}^{\mathrm{hw}} \right) \in \lim_{\leftarrow s} H^{c}(V_{s}, V_{\lambda, s}) \cong H_{1w}^{i} \left( Q_{G}^{0}, V_{\lambda, G}^{G} \right) . \]
which is well-defined by (5.1).

By construction this map is compatible with the action of the Hecke operator \( T_{\eta}' \), and hence with the ordinary projector \( e_{O} \). (It is not compatible with the action of the abelian group \( S_{G}(\mathbb{Z}_{p}) \).) Moreover, we can make the same definitions with the lattice \( V_{\lambda, G}^{0} \) replaced with \( V_{\lambda, G}^{\min} \) (and the moment maps for the two lattices are compatible).

5.2. Twist-compatibility. We now bring the group \( H \) back into the picture. Suppose \( \lambda \in X_{+}^{*}(S_{G}) \) is \( Q_{H} \)-admissible, and \( \mu = \mu(\lambda) \) as above. We consider the following diagram of maps:
\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
H_{1w}^{i} \left( Q_{H}^{0}, O \right) & \xrightarrow{\text{mom}^{H}_{r}} & e_{Q_{G}} H_{1w}^{(i+c)} \left( Q_{G}^{0}, O \right) \\
\downarrow \text{mom}^{G}_{r} & & \downarrow \text{mom}^{G}_{r} \\
H_{1w}^{i} \left( Q_{H}^{0}, V_{\mu, G}^{H, \min} \right) & \xrightarrow{\xi_{G, r}^{[\lambda]}} & e_{Q_{G}} H_{1w}^{(i+c)} \left( Q_{G}^{0}, V_{\lambda, G}^{G} \right) .
\end{array} \]

The following is the key technical result of the present paper:

Theorem 5.2.1. The above diagram is commutative.

Proof. From the definition of the moment maps, it suffices to prove the following claim: suppose we define \( z_{H}^{[\mu]} = \text{mom}^{H}_{r}(z_{H}^{[\lambda]} \mod p^{r}) \) and apply the constructions above in weight 0 and in weight \( \lambda \). Then for each \( r \geq 1 \) we have the following equality of elements of \( H^{c}(V_{r}, V_{\lambda, r}) \):
\[ \xi_{G, r}^{[\lambda]} \mod p^{r} = (\xi_{G, r}^{[\lambda]} \mod p^{r}) \cup f_{\lambda, r}^{\mathrm{hw}} . \]
Recall that \( V_{r} = \tau^{-r} U_{r}, \tau^{r} \). We thus have an isomorphism \( \tau^{*} : Y_{G}(U_{r}) \to Y_{G}(V_{r}) \), and our (integrally normalised) pushforward map \( H^{c}(Y_{G}(U_{r}), V_{\lambda, r}) \to H^{c}(Y_{G}(V_{r}), V_{\lambda, r}) \) can be written more explicitly as the composite
\[ H^{c}(Y_{G}(U_{r}), V_{\lambda, r}) \to H^{c}(Y_{G}(U_{r}), (\tau_{r})^{*} V_{\lambda, r}) \to H^{c}(Y_{G}(V_{r}), V_{\lambda, r}) , \]
where the first map is given by the morphism of sheaves \( V_{\lambda, r} \to (\tau_{r})^{*} V_{\lambda, r} \) corresponding to the endomorphism \( A = p^{h^{\mu}} r_{\lambda}(\tau^{-r}) \) of \( V_{\lambda, r} \).
Since $V_{\lambda, G}$ is an admissible lattice, it is the direct sum of its intersections with the weight spaces of $V_{\lambda}$ for the action of $S$. On the highest-weight space, $A$ acts as the identity, and on all other weight spaces, it acts as multiplication by $p^n$ for some $n \geq 1$. Hence, modulo $p^n$, the map $A$ factors through projection to the highest weight space.

Since $A$ acts trivially on the highest-weight space, we have $A(f^{\text{hw}}_{\lambda, r}) = (\tau^r)^*(f^{\text{hw}}_{\lambda, r})$. So it suffices to prove that

$$z_{G, r}^{[\lambda]} \mod p^n = \left( (z_{G, r}^{[0]} \mod p^n) \cup f^{\text{hw}}_{\lambda, r} \right) \pmod{\ker A},$$

as elements of $H^{i+c}(U_r, V_{\lambda, r})$. Via adjunction between pushforward and pullback, we are reduced to showing that the classes $u^{-1} f^{\text{hw}}_{\lambda, r}$ and $f^{\text{hw}}_{\lambda, r}$, viewed as vectors in $V_{\lambda, r}$ invariant under $u^{-1} H_u \cap U_r$, agree modulo $\ker(A)$; and this is precisely the statement of Corollary 3.3.2.

Applying the maps in the diagram to the class $z_{H, r}^{[0]}$, and defining $z_{H}^{[\mu]}$ using the moment maps as above, we have proved the following:

**Theorem 5.2.2.** Let $\xi_{G, \infty} := z_{G, \infty}^{[0]} \in c_{Q_G} H^{(i+c)} (Q^0_G, \mathcal{O})$. Then, for all $Q^0_H$-admissible $\lambda$ and all $r \geq 1$, we have

$$\text{mom}^{[\lambda]}_{G, V_r} (\xi_{G, \infty}) = (T^r_{\eta})^{-r} c_{Q_G} \cdot z_{G, r}^{[\lambda]}.$$

(We shall give a formula in the next section for the moments of $\xi_{G, \infty}$ at parahoric level, which may be more convenient in applications than the level groups $V_r$ used above.)

**Remark 5.2.3.** Thus the single Iwasawa-comology class $\xi_{G, \infty}$ “knows” the classes $z_{G, r}^{[\lambda]}$, or at least their projections to the ordinary part) for all $r$ and all $\lambda$. As $\xi_{G, \infty}$ lies in the module $c_{Q_G} H^{(i+c)} (Q^0_G, \mathcal{O})$, which is finitely-generated over $\mathcal{O}[\mathbb{G}]$ by Theorem 2.6.2, this forces very strong compatibilities between the $z_{G, r}^{[\lambda]}$, for varying $\lambda$, which is the crucial input needed to prove explicit reciprocity laws.

**Corollary 5.2.4.** Suppose that our cohomology is étale cohomology, and for all $r \geq 1$ and all $Q^0_H$-admissible $\lambda$, the class $z_{H, r}^{[\mu(\lambda)]}$ is the image of a motivic cohomology class. Then $\text{mom}^{[\lambda]}_{G, V_r} (\xi_{G, \infty})$ is in the image of motivic cohomology for all $\lambda$, where we set $\xi_{G, \infty} = z_{G, \infty}^{[0]}$.

Note that the “motivicity” assumption on the classes $z_{H, r}^{[\lambda]}$ is automatic if $Q^0_H = H$ (which implies $\mu(\lambda) = 0$ for all $\lambda$) and $z_{H, r}^{[0]}$ is the identity class in $H^{0}$; this is the “algebraic cycle” setting. Crucially for many applications, the $GL_2$ Eisenstein classes also satisfy this motivicity condition, by the main result of [Kin15].

**Remark 5.2.5.** Special cases of this computation appear in many of our previous works, such as:

- Theorem 6.3.4 of [KLZ17] is the case $G = GL_2 \times GL_2$, $H = GL_2$, with $Q_H$ and $Q_G$ taken to be Borel subgroups.
- The case $G = \text{Res}_{F/Q} GL_2$ and $H = GL_2$, with $F$ a quadratic field, is considered in [LLZ18, Theorem 8.2.3] (for $F$ real quadratic, using étale cohomology) and [LW18, Proposition 5.6] (for $F$ imaginary quadratic, using Betti cohomology). Again, we take $Q_H$ and $Q_G$ here to be Borel subgroups.
- Theorem 9.6.4 of [LSZ17] is an analogous result for $G = \text{Sp}_4$ and $H = GL_2 \times GL_2$, taking $Q_G$ to be the Siegel parabolic subgroup. In this case we did not assume $L_G/L^0_G$ to be commutative.
- Theorem 11.2.1 of [LSZ21] is the case $G = GU(2, 1)$, $H = GL_2 \times GL_1 \text{Res}_{E/Q} GL_1$, for $E$ an imaginary quadratic field.

In some of these works there are various correction terms appearing (such as the factor $(-2)^{-q}$ which appears in several places in [LSZ17]) which are, in effect, a consequence of using the “wrong” normalisations for the branching maps. In the present work, we have avoided these correction terms, by normalising the branching maps for algebraic representations using the same element $u$ used to define the pushforward maps $z_{G, r}^{[0]}$.

We briefly mention some related works by other authors in the literature. A result roughly equivalent to the above theorem in the case of Gross–Kudla–Schoen diagonal cycles (associated to $G = (GL_2)^\lambda$, $H = GL_2$ embedded diagonally) has recently been proved in [DR18] and independently in [BSV19]. The methods of these works (in particular the former) appear to be closely related to the present work. The case of $G = GL_2$ and $H$ a non-split torus (the “Heegner point” setting) has also been explored, initially by Castella [Cas13] using very different methods based on $p$-adic L-functions, and in a more general setting by Disegni [Dis19] using methods rather closer to those of this paper.
6. Interpolating properties

6.1 Parahoric-level classes. It will be convenient to work with a slightly different family of subgroups. Let \( J_G = \{ g \in G(\mathbb{Z}_p) : g \mod p \in Q_G \} \), and similarly \( J_C \). On the other hand, let \( J_H^0 = \{ h : h \mod p \in Q_H^0 \} \). Then the quotient \( J_H^0 \backslash G(\mathbb{Z}_p)/J_G \) is identified with the \( Q_H^0(\mathbb{F}_p) \)-orbits on \( F(\mathbb{F}_p) \), and the double coset of \( u \) represents the unique open orbit. Thus we have a pushforward map

\[
u_* \circ \iota_* : H^i(J_H^0, V^{H,\min}_\mu, \mathcal{O}) \to H^{i+c}(J_G, V^G_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}),
\]

and this map is independent of the choice of \( u \) in its orbit (except via the normalisation of the branching map).

**Proposition 6.1.1.** The map \( B : H^s(J_G, V_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}) \to H^s(J_G, V_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}) \) given by pullback to level \( J_G \cap J_G \) composed with the trace map, commutes with the action of the operators \( T_\eta \), and induces an isomorphism on the ordinary part for these operators.

**Proof.** Let \( A \) be the map \( H^s(J_G, V_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}) \to H^s(J_G, V_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}) \), given by the double coset \([J_G \eta(p)^{-1} J_G]\) (normalised as in Definition 2.5.1). Then one checks that the composite of \( A \) and \( B \), either way around, is \( T_\eta \); and the result follows.

For \( \lambda \) an \( H \)-admissible weight, and \( \mu \) the corresponding weight of \( H \), we have a class

\[\xi^{[\lambda]}_{J_G} = B^{-1}(u_* \circ \iota_*) (z^{[\mu]}_{J_H}) \in H^{i+c}(J_G, V_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}),\]

where \( z^{[\mu]}_{J_H} \) is the image of \( z^{[\mu]} \) at level \( J_H^0 \), pulled back to \( J_H^0 \cap u J_G u^{-1} \).

**Proposition 6.1.2.** For each \( Q_H^0 \)-admissible \( \lambda \), we have

\[\xi^{[\lambda]}_{J_G} = \text{mom}^{[\lambda]}_{J_G} (\xi_{G, \infty}).\]

**Proof.** This follows by an argument using Cartesian diagrams which is very similar to the proof of the norm-compatibility relations; we leave the details to the reader.

There is an analogous map \( B^* : H^*(J_G, V^*_\lambda, \mathcal{O}) \to H^*(J_G, \bar{V}_{\lambda, \mathcal{O}}) \) defined by interchanging the roles of \( Q_G \) and \( Q_G \), and one checks that \( B^* \) is the transpose of \( B \) with respect to Poincaré duality. This commutes with the “dominant” Hecke operator \( T_\eta \) defined by the double coset of \( \eta(p) \) (the transpose of \( T_\eta \)). So, if we are given some \( v \in H^*(J_G, V^*_\lambda, \mathcal{O}) \), which is an ordinary eigenvector for \( T_\eta \), in the cohomological degree complementary to \( i + c \), we can define \( \bar{v} = (B^*)^{-1}(v) \), which is a \( T \)-eigenvector at level \( J_G \); and we compute that

\[\left( \xi^{[\lambda]}_{J_G}, \bar{v} \right)_{J_G} = \left( (u_* \circ \iota_*) (z^{[\mu]}_{J_H}), \bar{v} \right)_{J_G} = \left( z^{[\mu]}_{J_H}, \iota^* u^*(\bar{v}) \right)_{J_H^0 \cap u J_G u^{-1}}.\]

**Remark 6.1.3.** It is natural to expect that the latter expression – an “open-orbit cohomological period” at parahoric level – should be related to cohomological periods at prime-to-\( p \) level, via an appropriate Euler factor. For examples of statements of this kind for specific groups \( G \) and \( H \), see e.g. [KLZ17, Theorem 5.7.6] for \( GL_2 \subset GL_2 \times GL_2 \), and the results for \( GSp_4 \) proved in [Loc21] and recalled in the next section. It would be interesting to attempt to find a general recipe for this Euler factor; at least in the special case when \( Q_H^0 = H \) and \( Q_G \) is a Borel, this may be possible using the results of Sakellaridis, in particular [Sak13, Theorem 1.3.1].

7. Applications to \( GSp_4 \)

We now consider applications of the above theory to Euler systems for \( GSp_4 \).

7.1 A variant of the setting of [LSZ17]. Let \( 0 \leq q \leq a, 0 \leq r \leq b \) be integers; and let \( G = GSp_4 \). We choose a set of primes \( S \ni p \), and auxiliary data \( \Xi_S, \phi_S, \lambda, c_1, c_2 \), as in §8.4.6 of [LSZ17]; these will remain fixed throughout the following discussion. For simplicity, we also assume that the function \( \phi_S \) has the form \( \phi_{1,S} \otimes \phi_{2,S} \) where each \( \phi_{1,S} \) vanishes at \( (0,0) \) and transforms under \( \mathbb{Z}_p^\times \) by (the adelic character attached to) \( \chi_\lambda^{-1} \), where \( \chi_\lambda \) is a Dirichlet character unramified outside \( S \). This allows us to define classes

\[c_1, c_2 \in H^2_{\text{ét}} \left( G(\mathbb{Z}_p), \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Z}_p}^a(3-q) \right),\]

which are given by the same construction as loc.cit. (with \( M = 1 \)) but taking the test data at \( p \) to be the spherical test data.
We now consider the group 
\[ \epsilon_{B_G}^* H^4_{\text{ét}, \text{Iw}} \left( N_G(Z_p), Z_p(3) \right), \]
where \( B_G \) is the upper-triangular Borel and \( N_G \) its unipotent radical. This is a finitely-generated module over the Iwasawa algebra of \( T_G(Z_p) \), and we can identify this group with \( (Z_p^\times)^3 \) in such a way that the character \((a, b, q)\) corresponds to the highest weight of \( \mathcal{G}^{a,b}(-q) \). Thus the fibre of the Iwasawa cohomology at \((a, b, q)\) maps canonically (via the edge map of Equation (2.1)) to the ordinary part of the cohomology of \( \mathcal{G}^{a,b}(3-q) \) at Iwahori level.

Given an automorphic representation \( \Pi \) of \( G \) as in \( \S 10 \) of \textit{op.cit.}, of weight \((a, b)\), good ordinary at \( p \), we can identify the \( \Pi^\ast \)-eigenspace in the ordinary cohomology at Iwahori level with the \( \Pi^\ast \)-eigenspace at prime-to-\( p \) level, via a suitable Hecke operator (compare Note 17.1.6 of [LZ20a] for Siegel-parahorich level).

We label the Hecke parameters of \( \Pi \) as \((\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)\) in increasing order of valuation, so \( v_p(\alpha) = 0 \) and \( v_p(\beta) = a + 1 \).

**Theorem 7.1.1.** There exists a class 
\[ c_{1,c_3} z_{\text{ét}} \in H^4_{\text{ét}, \text{Iw}} \left( N_G(Z_p), Z_p(3) \right) \otimes Z_p[[Z_p^\times]] \]
such that for all \( a, b, q, r \) as above, and any cuspidal automorphic representation \( \Pi \) of weight \((a, b)\) ordinary at \( p \), the image of \( c_{1,c_3} z_{\text{ét}} \) under evaluation at \((a, b, q, r)\) and projection into \( H^4(Q, W^\Pi_{17}(-q)) \) is \( (-2)^{-q} \mathcal{E} \cdot \mathcal{E} \cdot \Pi_{\Pi} \left( c_{1,c_3} \mathcal{E}^{a,b.q,r} \right) \), where \( \mathcal{E} \) is the Euler factor 
\[ \left( 1 - \frac{q^2}{\alpha} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\beta}{p+q} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma}{p+q} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\delta}{p+q} \right) \times \left( 1 - \frac{p^{\alpha+1+r} \chi_2(p)}{\alpha} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{p^{\beta+1+r} \chi_2(p)}{\beta} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{p^{\gamma+1+r} \chi_2(p)}{\gamma} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{p^{\delta+1+r} \chi_2(p)}{\delta} \right). \]

**Remark 7.1.2.** This refines a result in [LZ20a, §17] in which \((a, q)\) were varying and \((b, r)\) were fixed (but only Siegel-ordinarity was assumed, rather than full Borel-ordinarity as here).

\( \square \)

**Proof.** We consider the groups \( \tilde{G} = \text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_1 \), and \( \tilde{H} = (\text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2) \times \text{GL}_1 \). There is an obvious embedding \( \tilde{H} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G} \), extending the embedding \( H \hookrightarrow G \) used in [LSZ17]. We can also view \( \tilde{H} \) as a double cover of \( \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2 \) via \((h_1, h_2, z) \mapsto (h_1, zh_2)\). All of these maps are compatible with the standard Shimura data, if we take the Shimura cocharacter to project trivially into the \( \Pi \)-factors of \( \tilde{G} \) and \( \tilde{H} \). The cohomology group \( H^4_{\text{ét}, \text{Iw}} \left( N_G(Z_p), Z_p(3) \right) \otimes Z_p[[Z_p^\times]] \) then has a natural interpretation as étale cohomology for \( \tilde{G} \) with level \( N_G(Z_p) \).

We apply the machinery of [Loe19] and the present paper to the groups \( \tilde{G} \) and \( \tilde{H} \), taking the input class \( z_{\text{ét}} \) to be the pullback of the Eisenstein–Iwasawa class for \( \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2 \); the associated mirabolic subgroup \( Q^0_{\tilde{H}} \) is then given by the preimage of the usual mirabolic of \( \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2 \), namely 
\[ \{(\mathbf{0} \mathbf{1}), (xy, y^{-1}) : x, y \in G_m\} \]
This group has an open orbit on the Borel flag variety of \( \tilde{G} \), with trivial stabiliser. We can now obtain a family of classes in the Iwahori level tower for \( \tilde{G} \). Comparing these with their analogues at prime-to-\( p \) level is done via an Euler-factor computation, for which we refer to [Loe21]. \( \square \)

### 7.2. The setting of [HJS20]

We now let \( \tilde{G} = \text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_1 \times \text{GL}_2 \). As in \textit{op.cit.} we can construct classes 
\[ \epsilon_{z_{\text{ét}}}^{[a,b,c,q]} \in H^5_{\text{ét}, \text{Iw}} \left( G(Z_p), W_{Z_p}^{a,b,c,q}(3-q) \right) \]
where \( W^{a,b,c} \) is a certain representation of \( G \) for \( a, b, c \geq 0 \), and \( \max(a, c) \leq q \leq \min(a + b, a + c) \). As in the previous section, we are fixing some arbitrary test data away from \( p \), including the smoothing parameter \( e > 1 \); and we are taking the test data at \( p \) to be the spherical data. We have also relabelled the parameters slightly, so \( q = a + r \) in the notation of \textit{op.cit.}.

**Theorem 7.2.1.** There exists a class \( \epsilon z_{\text{ét}} \in e_{B_G}^* H^5_{\text{ét}, \text{Iw}} \left( N_G(Z_p), Z_p(3) \right) \) whose specialisation at an automorphic representation \( \Pi \times \Sigma \) of weight \((a, b, c)\), good ordinary at \( p \), is given by \( \mathcal{E} \cdot \Pi_{\Pi \times \Sigma} \left( \epsilon_{z_{\text{ét}}}^{[a,b,c,q]} \right) \), where \( \mathcal{E} \) is the Euler factor 
\[ \prod \left\{ \left( 1 - \lambda \frac{p^{\lambda+q}}{\alpha} \right) : \lambda = ab, \gamma a, \beta b, \delta a, \delta b \right\} \cdot \Pi \left\{ \left( 1 - \lambda \frac{p^{\lambda+q}}{\alpha} \right) : \lambda = aa, ab, \beta a \right\} \]
Here \( a \) and \( b \) are the Hecke parameters of \( \Sigma \) (with \( v_p(a) = 0, v_p(b) = c + 1 \)).

**Proof.** We apply the machinery of the previous sections with \( H = \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2 \) embedded in the usual way, and an Eisenstein class on the first factor of \( H \) alone. As before, we obtain a family of classes at Iwahori level; and these are related to their analogues at prime-to-\( p \) level via an Euler-factor computation, which is again carried out in \[\text{Loe21}\].

This result is an important ingredient in the proof of new cases of the Bloch–Kato conjecture for \( \text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_2 \) in \[\text{LZ21}\].

### 7.3. The setting of \[\text{LZ20b}\]

Finally, we consider the triple product of cusp forms, as in \[\text{LZ20b}\]. This requires some care owing to the necessity of choosing a self-dual twist (compare \S 3.3 of op.cit.).

Let \( \mathcal{G} = \text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_1 \), and let \( H = \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2 \) embedded via

\[
(h_1, h_2) \mapsto (h_1 \boxplus h_2, h_1, h_2, \det h_1^{-1}).
\]

In this setting, we let \( Q^0_H = H \), and \( Q_G \) the upper-triangular Borel of \( G \). Then one computes that \( H \cap u Q_G \text{GL}_2 \text{GL}_2 \) is a copy of \( G_m \), embedded as \( z \mapsto (z, z, z, z^{-2}) \). We take \( S^0_G \) to be the subgroup

\[
\left\{ \left( \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & * & * & * \\ * & 1 & * & * \\ * & * & 1 & * \\ * & * & * & 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right) : z \in G_m \right\}.
\]

With these choices, the group \( \mathcal{G} \) is once more isomorphic to \((\mathbb{Z}/p^m)^4\); and a \( p \)-adic modular form for \( \mathcal{G} \), of level \( Q^0_G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \), is identified with a triple of \( p \)-adic modular forms for the groups \( \text{GSp}_4, \text{GL}_2 \) and \( \text{GL}_2 \) such that the product of their weight-characters is a square, together with a choice of square root of this character. Applying the machinery of the previous sections, combined with yet another zeta-integral computation from \[\text{Loe21}\], gives Theorem 8.2.5 of \[\text{LZ20b}\], showing that diagonal-cycle cohomology classes for \( \text{GSp}_4 \times \text{GL}_2 \times \text{GL}_2 \) vary in \( p \)-adic families.
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