CONNECTEDNESS OF AFFINE DELIGNE-LUSZTIG VARIETIES FOR UNRAMIFIED GROUPS
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ABSTRACT. For unramified reductive groups, we determine the connected components of affine Deligne-Lusztig varieties in the partial affine flag varieties. As consequences, all the He-Rapoport axioms and the “almost product structure” of Newton strata are verified for the Kisin-Pappas integral models of Shimura varieties of Hodge type with parahoric level structure in the unramified group case.

INTRODUCTION

0.1. Let $F$ be a non-Archimedean local field with valuation ring $\mathcal{O}_F$ and residue field $\mathbb{F}_q$, where $q$ is a power of some prime $p$. Denote by $\bar{F}$ the completion of a maximal unramified extension of $F$. Let $G$ be a connected reductive group defined over $F$, and let $\sigma$ be the Frobenius automorphism of $G(\bar{F})$. Fix an element $b \in G(\bar{F})$, a geometric cocharacter $\lambda$ of $G$, and a $\sigma$-stable parahoric subgroup $K \subseteq G(\bar{F})$. The attached affine Deligne-Lusztig variety is defined by

$$X(\lambda, b)_K = X^{G}(\lambda, b)_K = \{ g \in G(\bar{F})/K; g^{-1}b\sigma(g) \in K \Adm(\lambda)K \},$$

where $\Adm(\lambda)$ is the admissible set associated to the geometric conjugacy class of $\lambda$. If $F$ is of equal characteristic, $X(\lambda, b)_K$ is a locally closed and locally finite-type subvariety of the partial affine flag variety $G(\bar{F})/K$. If $F$ is of mixed characteristic, $X(\lambda, b)_K$ is a perfect subscheme of the Witt vector partial affine flag variety, in the sense of Zhu [36] and Bhatt-Scholze [1].

The variety $X(\lambda, b)_K$, first introduced by Rapoport [31], encodes important arithmetic information of Shimura varieties. Let $(G, X)$ be a Shimura datum with $G = G_{\mathcal{O}_p}$ and $\lambda$ the inverse of the Hodge cocharacter. Suppose there is a good integral model for the corresponding Shimura variety with parahoric level structure. Langlands [26], and latter refined by Langlands-Rapoport [27] and Rapoport [31], conjectured a precise description of $\mathbb{F}_p$-points of the integral model in terms of the varieties $X(\lambda, b)_K$. In the case of PEL Shimura varieties, $X(\lambda, b)_K$ is also the set of $\mathbb{F}_p$-points of a moduli space of $p$-divisible groups defined by Rapoport-Zink [32].

0.2. The main purpose of this paper is to study the set $\pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K)$ of connected components of $X(\lambda, b)_K$. Notice that $X(\lambda, b)_K$ only depends on $\lambda$ and the $\sigma$-conjugacy class $[b]$ of $b$. Thanks to He [11], $X(\lambda, b)_K$ is non-empty if and only if $[b]$ belongs to the set of “neutral acceptable” $\sigma$-conjugacy classes of $G(\bar{F})$ with respect to $\lambda$.

Let $\pi_1(G)\Gamma_0$ be the set of coinvariants of the fundamental group $\pi_1(G)$ under the Galois group $\Gamma_0 = \Gal(\bar{F}/F)$. There is a natural map $\eta_C : G(\bar{F})/K \to \pi_1(G)\Gamma_0$. To compute $\pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K)$ we can assume that $G$ is adjoint and hence simple by the following Cartesian diagram (see [18, Corollary 4.4])

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi_0(X^{G}(\lambda, b)_K) & \longrightarrow & \pi_0(X^{G,\text{ad}}(\lambda_{\text{ad}}, b_{\text{ad}})_{\text{K,ad}}) \\
\eta_C \downarrow & & \eta_{\text{ad}} \downarrow \\
\pi_1(G)\Gamma_0 & \longrightarrow & \pi_1(G)\Gamma_0 \end{array}$$

The map $\eta_C$ gives a natural obstruction to the connectedness of $X(\lambda, b)_K$. Another more technical obstruction is given by the following Hodge-Newton decomposition theorem.

Theorem 0.1 [6, Theorem 4.17]). Suppose $G$ is adjoint and simple. If the pair $(\lambda, b)$ is Hodge-Newton decomposable (with respect to some proper Levi subgroup $M$) in the sense of [6, §2.5.5], then $X(\lambda, b)_K$ is a disjoint union of open and closed subsets, which are isomorphic to affine Deligne-Lusztig varieties attached to $M$.
By Theorem 0.1 and induction on the dimension of $G$, it suffices to consider the Hodge-Newton indecomposable case. This means that either $\lambda$ is a central cocharacter or the pair $(\lambda, b)$ Hodge-Newton irreducible, see [35, Lemma 5.3]. In the former case,

$$X(\lambda, b)_K \cong \mathbb{J}_b/(K \cap \mathbb{J}_b)$$

is a discrete subset with $\mathbb{J}_b$ the $\sigma$-centralizer of $b$. In the latter case, we have the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 0.1.** Assume $G$ is adjoint and simple. If $(\lambda, b)$ is Hodge-Newton irreducible, then the map $\eta_G$ induces a bijection

$$\pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K) \cong \pi_1(G)^{\eta}_\sigma,$$

where $\pi_1(G)^{\eta}_\sigma$ is the set of $\sigma$-fixed point of $\pi_1(G)_\Gamma_0$.

If $G$ is unramified (that is, $G$ extends to a reductive group over $\mathcal{O}_p$) and $K$ is hyperspecial, Conjecture 0.1 is established by Viehmann [34], Chen-Kisin-Viehmann [2], and the author [29]. If $b$ is basic, it is proved by He-Zhou [18]. If $G$ is split or $G = \text{Res}_{E/F}\text{GL}_n$ with $E/F$ a finite unramified field extension, it is proved by L. Chen and the author in [3] and [4].

The main result of this paper is the following.

**Theorem 0.2.** Conjecture 0.1 is true if $G$ is unramified.

In particular, Theorem 0.2 completes the computation of connected components of affine Deligne-Lusztig varieties for unramified groups.

0.3. We discuss some applications. Assume $p \neq 2$. Let $(G, X)$ be a Shimura datum of Hodge type with parahoric level structure such that $p \nmid |\pi_1(G_{\text{der}})|$, $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ is tamely ramified, and the parahoric subgroup $K$ at $p$ is a connected parahoric. Let $\mathcal{Y}_K = \mathcal{Y}(G, X)$ be the Kisin-Pappas integral model of the corresponding Shimura variety constructed in [23]. Let $F = \mathbb{Q}_p$, $G = G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, and $\lambda$ be the inverse of the Hodge cocharacter.

0.3.1. A major motivation to study $\pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K)$ comes from the Langlands-Rapoport conjecture mentioned in §0.1. In the hyperspecial level structure case, the conjecture is proved by Kottwitz [25] for PEL Shimura varieties of types $A$ and $C$, and by Kisin [21] for his integral models [20] of Shimura varieties of abelian type. Using the Kisin-Pappas integral models [23] for Hodge type Shimura varieties with parahoric level structure $K$, Zhou [35] proved that each mod $p$ isogeny class has the predicted form if $G$ is residually split. Recently, van Hoften [12] extends Zhou’s result to the case that $G$ is unramified, by reducing the conjecture to Kisin’s result in the hyperspecial case.

The key ingredient in the proofs of Kisin and Zhou is to construct certain lifting map from $X(\lambda, b)_K$ to an isogeny class of $\mathcal{Y}_K(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$, which uses in a crucial way descriptions of $\pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K)$ in [2] and [18] respectively. Combining [35, Proposition 6.5] with Theorem 0.2, we deduce that such a lifting map always exists if $G$ is unramified.

**Proposition 0.3.** If $G$ is unramified, then the Rapoport-Zink uniformisation map admits a unique lift on $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$-points

$$X(\lambda, b)_K \to \mathcal{Y}_K(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p),$$

which respects canonical crystalline Tate tensors on both sides.

**Remark 0.4.** In the unramified group case, using Proposition 0.3 one is expected to adapt Zhou’s proof [35] to show that each isogeny class in $\mathcal{Y}_K(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ has the form predicted by the Langlands-Rapoport conjecture.

If $G$ is unramified and $K$ is hyperspecial, Proposition 0.3 is proved by Kisin [21]. If $b$ is basic or $G$ is residually split, it is proved by Zhou [35]. If $G$ is quasi-split and $K$ is absolutely special, it is proved by Zhou in [12, Theorem A.4.3].
0.3.2. In [17], He and Rapoport formulated five axioms on Shimura varieties with parahoric level structure, which provide a group-theoretic way to study certain characteristic subsets (such as Newton strata, Ekedahl-Oort strata, Kottwitz-Rapoport strata, and so on) in the mod $p$ reductions of Shimura varieties. Based on this axiomatic approach, Zhou [35] proved that all the expected Newton strata are non-empty (see [22] using a different approach). We refer to [17], [16], [6], [35] and [33] for more applications of these axioms. Combining [35, Theorem 8.1] with Proposition 0.3 we have

**Corollary 0.5.** All the He-Rapoport axioms hold if $G$ is unramified.

These axioms are verified by He-Rapoport [17] in the Siegel case, and by He-Zhou [18] for certain PEL Shimura varieties (unramified of types $A$ and $C$ and odd ramified unitary groups). In [35], Zhou verified all the axioms except the surjectivity of [17, Axiom 4 (c)] in the general case, and all of them in the case that $G$ is residually split.

0.3.3. In [28], Mantovan established a formula expressing the $l$-adic cohomology of proper PEL Shimura varieties in terms of the $l$-adic cohomology with compact supports of the Igusa varieties and of the Rapoport-Zink spaces for any prime $l \neq p$. This formula encodes nicely the local-global compatibility of the Langlands correspondence. A key part of its proof is to show that the products of reduced fibers of Igusa varieties and Rapoport-Zink spaces form nice “pro-étale covers up to perfection” for the Newton strata, of PEL Shimura varieties with hyperspecial level structure. This is referred as the “almost product structure” of Newton strata. In [14], Hamacher-Kim extended Mantovan’s results to the case of Kisin-Pappas integral models under some mild assumptions. Combining [14, Theorem 2] and Proposition 0.3 we have

**Corollary 0.6.** The “almost product structure” of Newton strata holds if $G$ is unramified.

0.4. We outline the strategy of the proof. First we show the $\sigma$-centralizer $J_b$ acts transitively on $\pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K)$. Then we show the stabilizer of each connected component is the normal subgroup $J_b \cap \ker(\eta_C)$. Combining these two results one deduces that $\pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K) \cong J_b/(J_b \cap \ker(\eta_C)) \cong \pi_1(G)^\sigma$ as desired.

The stabilizers can be determined by adapting the computations in [30]. The crucial part is to show the transitivity of the $J_b$ action. Our starting point is the following natural surjection (see Theorem 2.1)

$$\sqcup_{\bar{\omega} \in S_{\lambda, b}^-} J_{b, \bar{\omega}} \twoheadrightarrow \pi_0(X(\lambda, b)_K),$$

where $S_{\lambda, b}^-$ is the set of semi-standard elements (see §1.4) contained in $\operatorname{Adm}(\lambda)$ and $[b]$, and $J_{b, \bar{\omega}} = \{ g \in G(\bar{F}); g^{-1}b(g) = \bar{\omega} \}$ on which $J_b$ acts transitively. So it remains to connect all the subsets $J_{b, \bar{\omega}}K/K$ in $X(\lambda, b)_K$. To this end we consider the following decomposition

$$S_{\lambda, b} = \sqcup_{x \in S_{\lambda, b}^+} S_{\lambda, b, x},$$

where $S_{\lambda, b}^+$ consists of standard elements in $S_{\lambda, b}$, and $S_{\lambda, b, x}$ consists of elements in $S_{\lambda, b}$ that are $\sigma$-conjugate to $x \in S_{\lambda, b}^+$ under the Weyl group of $G$. Note that $S_{\lambda, b}^+$ can be naturally identified with a subset of cocharacters dominated by $\lambda$. So we can adapt the connecting algorithm in [30] to connect $J_{b, \bar{\omega}}K/K$ for $x \in S_{\lambda, b}^+$ with each other. In contrast, the structure of $S_{\lambda, b, x}$ is much more mysterious, which makes it an essential difficulty to connect $J_{b, \bar{\omega}}K/K$ for $\bar{\omega} \in S_{\lambda, b, x}$ with each other. To overcome it, we show that each set $S_{\lambda, b, x}$ contains a unique (distinguished) element $x_{\text{dist}}$ which is of minimal length in its Weyl group coset, and then connect $J_{b, \bar{\omega}}K/K$ with $J_{b, \bar{\omega}_{\text{dist}}}K/K$ for all $\bar{\omega} \in S_{\lambda, b, x}$. This new connecting algorithm is motivated from the partial conjugation method by He in [9] and [10].

0.5. The paper is organized as follows. In §1 we recall some basic notions and introduce the semi-standard elements. In §2 we outline the proof of the main result. In §3 we introduce the set $P_{\tilde{\omega}}$ which will play an essential role in our new connecting algorithm. In §4, we introduce the new connecting algorithm and use it to connect $J_{b, \bar{\omega}}K/K$ for $\bar{\omega} \in S_{\lambda, b, x}$ with each other. In §5 we connect $J_{b, x}K/K$ for $x \in S_{\lambda, b}^+$ with each other. In §6, §7 and §8 we compute the stabilizer in $J_{b}$ of each connected component of $X(\lambda, b)_K$. 
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1. Preliminaries

In the body of the paper we assume that $G$ is unramified, simple, and adjoint. Without loss of generality, we assume further that $F = F_{\nu}(t))$. Then $\bar{F} = k[[t]]$ and residue field $k = \mathbb{F}_q$.

1.1. Let $T \subseteq B$ be a maximal torus and a Borel subgroup defined over $\mathcal{O}_F$. Let $\mathcal{R} = (Y, \Phi^\vee, X, \Phi, S_0)$ be the root datum associated to the triple $(T \subseteq B \subseteq F)$, where $X$ and $Y$ are the character and cocharacter groups of $T$ respectively equipped with a perfect pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : Y \times X \to \mathbb{Z}$; $\Phi = \Phi_G \subseteq X$ (resp. $\Phi^\vee \subseteq Y$) is the set of roots (resp. coroots); $S_0$ is the set of simple roots appearing in $B$. For $\alpha \in \Phi$, we denote by $s_\alpha$ the reflection which sends $\mu \in Y$ to $\mu - \langle \mu, \alpha \rangle \alpha^\vee$, where $\alpha^\vee \in \Phi^\vee$ denotes the coroot of $\alpha$. Via the bijection $\alpha \mapsto s_\alpha$, we also denote by $S_0$ the set of simple reflections.

Let $W_0 = N_T(\bar{F})/T(\bar{F})$ be the Weyl group of $G$, where $N_T$ is the normalizer of $T$ in $G$. The Iwahori-Weyl group of $G$ is given by

$$\tilde{W}_G = \tilde{W} = N_T(\bar{F})/T(\mathcal{O}_F) = Y \times W_0 = \{t^\mu w; \mu \in Y, w \in W_0\}.$$  

We can view $\tilde{W}$ as a subgroup of affine transformations of $V := Y \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$, where the action of $\tilde{w} = t^\mu w$ is given by $v \mapsto \mu + w(v)$. Let $\Phi^+ = \Phi \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}S_0$ be the set of positive roots and let $\alpha = \{v \in Y_{\mathbb{R}}; 0 < \langle \alpha, v \rangle < 1, \alpha \in \Phi^+ \}$ be the base alcove.

Let $\Phi = \Phi_G = \Phi \times \mathbb{Z}$ be the set of (real) affine roots. Let $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha + k \in \tilde{\Phi}$. Then $\tilde{\alpha}$ is an affine root in $B$. For $\tilde{\alpha}(v) = -\langle \alpha, v \rangle + k$. The induced action of $\tilde{w}$ on $\tilde{\Phi}$ is given by $\tilde{w}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \tilde{w}(\tilde{\alpha}^{-1}(v))$. Let $s_{\tilde{\alpha}} = t^{\langle \alpha, v \rangle} s_\alpha \in \tilde{W}$ be the corresponding affine reflection. Then $\{s_{\tilde{\alpha}}; \tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\Phi} \}$ generates the affine Weyl group

$$W^a = W_G^a = \mathbb{Z}\Phi^\vee \rtimes W_0 = \{t^\mu w; \mu \in \mathbb{Z}\Phi^\vee, w \in W_0\}.$$  

Moreover, we have $\tilde{W} = W^a \rtimes \Omega$, where $\Omega = \Omega_G = \{\omega \in \tilde{W}; \omega(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}\}$. Set $\Phi^+_G = \{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\Phi}; \tilde{\alpha}(\mathbf{a}) > 0\}$ and $\Phi^- = -\Phi^+$. Then $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi}^+ \cup \tilde{\Phi}^-$. Note that $\Phi^+ \subseteq \tilde{\Phi}^+$. Let $\ell : \tilde{W} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a length function given by $\ell(\tilde{w}) = |\tilde{\Phi}^- \cap \tilde{w}(\tilde{\Phi}^+)|$. Let $S^a = \{s_{\tilde{\alpha}}; \tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\Phi}, \ell(s_{\tilde{\alpha}}) = 1\}$ be the set of simple affine reflections. Notice that $(W^a, S^a)$ is a Coxeter system, and let $\mathfrak{B} \leq \Omega$ be the associated Bruhat order on $\tilde{W} = W^a \rtimes \mathfrak{B}$.

For $\tilde{\alpha} = (\alpha, k) \in \tilde{\Phi}$, let $U_{\tilde{\alpha}} : \mathcal{G}_a \to LG$ be the corresponding affine root subgroup, where $LG$ denotes the loop group associated to $G$. More precisely, $U_{\tilde{\alpha}}(z) = u_{\alpha}(zt^k)$ for $z \in k$, where $u_{\alpha} : \mathcal{G}_a \to G$ is the root subgroup of $\alpha$. We set

$$I = I_G = T(\mathcal{O}_F) \prod_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\Phi}^+} U_{\tilde{\alpha}}(k) = T(\mathcal{O}_F) \prod_{\mu \in \Phi^+} u_{\alpha}(t\mathcal{O}_F) \prod_{\beta \in \Phi^+} u_{-\beta}(\mathcal{O}_F),$$  

which is called an Iwahori subgroup of $G(\bar{F})$.

1.2. Let $v \in V = Y \otimes \mathbb{R}$. We say $v$ is dominant if $\langle \nu, \alpha \rangle \geq 0$ for each $\alpha \in \Phi^+$, and denote by $\tilde{v}$ the unique dominant $W_0$-conjugate of $v$. Let $Y^+$ and $V^+$ be the set of dominant vectors in $Y$ and $V$ respectively. For $v, v' \in V$ we write $v' \leq v$ if $v - v' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\Phi^+)^\vee$.

Let $\sigma$ be the Frobenius automorphism of $G(\bar{F})$. We also denote by $\sigma$ the induced automorphism on the root datum $\mathcal{R}$. Then $\sigma$ acts on $V$ as a linear transformation of finite order which preserves $\Phi$. For $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W}$ there exists a nonzero integer $m$ such that $(\tilde{w}^m)^m = t^\xi$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define $\nu_{\tilde{w}} = \xi / m \in V$, which does not depend on the choice of $m$.

Let $b \in G(L)$. We denote by $[b] = [b]_{G} = \{g^{-1} b \sigma(g); g \in G(L)\}$ the $\sigma$-conjugate class of $b$. By [24], the $\sigma$-conjugacy class $[b]$ is determined by two invariants: the Kottwitz point $\kappa_G(b) \in \pi_1(G)_\sigma$ and the Newton point $\nu_G(b) \in (V^+)^\vee$. Here $\kappa_G : G(\bar{F}) \to \pi_1(G)_\sigma = \pi_1(G)/\langle \sigma - 1 \rangle \pi_1(G)$ is the natural projection. To define $\nu_G(b)$, we note that there exists $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W}$ such that $\tilde{w} \in [b]$. Then $\nu_G(b) = \nu_{\tilde{w}}$, which does not depend on the choice of $\tilde{w}$. For $b' \in G(\bar{F})$ we set

$$\mathcal{J}_{b, b'} = \mathcal{J}_{b, b'}^G = \{g \in G(\bar{F}); g^{-1} \sigma(g) = b'\},$$
and put $J_b = J_{b', b}$ if $b = b'$.

For $\lambda \in Y^+$ and $b \in G(\hat{F})$ we define
\[ X(\lambda, b) = X^G(\lambda, b) = \{ g \in G(\hat{F})/I; g^{-1}b\sigma(g) \in I\text{Adm}(\lambda)I \}, \]
where $\text{Adm}(\lambda)$ is the $\lambda$-admissible set defined by
\[ \text{Adm}(\lambda) = \{ x \in \hat{W}; x \leq \nu^c(\lambda) \text{ for some } w \in W_0 \}. \]
Note that $\mathbb{J}_b$ acts on $X(\lambda, b)$ by left multiplication. By [11], $X(\lambda, b) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\kappa_G(t^\lambda) = \kappa_G(b)$ and $\nu_G(b) \leq \lambda^c$, where $t^\lambda := \lambda(t)$ and $\lambda^c$ is the $\sigma$-average of $\lambda$. We say the pair $(\lambda, b)$ is Hodge-Newton irreducible if $X(\lambda, b) \neq \emptyset$ and $\lambda^c - \nu_G(b) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}(\Phi^+)^\sigma$.

1.3. Let $M \supseteq T$ be a (semi-standard) Levi subgroup of $G$. Then $B \cap M$ is a Borel subgroup of $M$. By replacing the triple $(T, B, G)$ with $(T, B \cap M, M)$, we can define, as in previous subsections, $\Phi^+_M, \hat{W}_M, S'_M, \Omega_M, \hat{\Phi}^+_M, I_M, K_M$ and so on.

For $v \in V$ we set $\Phi_v = \{ \alpha \in \Phi; \alpha(v) = 0 \}$ and let $M_v \subseteq G$ be the Levi subgroup generated by $T$ and the root subgroups $u_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Phi_v$. We let $\hat{W}_v = \hat{W}_M, \Phi_v = \hat{\Phi}_M$, and so on. If $v$ is dominant, let $J_v = \{ s \in S_0; s(v) = v \}$.

Let $J \subseteq S_0$. Then there exists some $v' \in V^+$ such that $J_{v'} = J$, and we put $\Phi_J = \Phi_{M_{v'}}$, $\hat{W}_J = \hat{W}_{M_{v'}}, \hat{W}_J' = \hat{W}_{M_{v'}}, \Omega_J = \Omega_{M_{v'}}$, and so on. We say $\mu \in Y$ is $J$-dominant (resp. $J$-minuscule) if $\langle (\alpha, \mu) \rangle \geq 0$ (resp. $\langle (\alpha, \mu) \rangle \in \{ 0, \pm 1 \}$) for $\alpha \in \Phi_J^+$. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{S}^0$. Let $W_K \subseteq \hat{W}^0$ be the parabolic subgroup generated by $K$. Set $K\hat{W} = \{ \tilde{w} \in \hat{W}; \tilde{w} < s \tilde{w} \text{ for } s \in K \}$ and $\hat{W}^K = (K\hat{W})^{-1}$. For $\tilde{w} \in K\hat{W}$ we define $I(K, \tilde{w}) = \max\{ K' \subseteq K; \tilde{w}s(K')\tilde{w}^{-1} = K' \}$.

Let $\tilde{w}, \tilde{w}' \in \hat{W}$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}^0$. Write $\tilde{w} \rightarrow s \tilde{w}'$ if $\tilde{w}' = s\tilde{w}\sigma(s)$ and $\ell(\tilde{w}') \leq \ell(\tilde{w})$. For $K \subseteq \mathbb{S}^0$ we write $\tilde{w} \rightarrow_K \tilde{w}'$ if there is a sequence $\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0 \rightarrow s_0 \tilde{w}_1 \rightarrow s_1 \tilde{w}_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow s_i \tilde{w}_i = \tilde{w}'$ with $s_i \in K$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$.

**Lemma 1.1.** Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{S}^0$ and $\tilde{w} \in K\hat{W}$. Then we have
1. if $\tilde{w} < s \tilde{w}$ with $s \in \mathbb{S}^0$, then either $\tilde{w}s \in K\hat{W}$ or $\tilde{w}s = s'\tilde{w}$ for some $s' \in K$;
2. $\tilde{w}$ is the unique element of its $W_K$-$\sigma$-conjugacy class which lies in $K\hat{W}$.

**Theorem 1.2.** [9, §3] Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{S}^0$ and $\tilde{w} \in K\hat{W}$. Then there exist $x \in K\hat{W}$ and $u \in I(x, K)$ such that $\tilde{w} \rightarrow_K x u x$. Moreover, such $x$ is uniquely determined by the $W_K$-$\sigma$-conjugacy class of $\tilde{w}$.

1.4. We say $\tilde{w} \in \hat{W}$ is semi-standard if $\tilde{w}\sigma(\tilde{w}) = \tilde{w}$, that is, $\tilde{w}\sigma M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}} = M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}$. We say $\tilde{w}$ is standard if it is semi-standard and $\nu_{\tilde{w}}$ is dominant. Let $S$ and $S^+$ denote the set of semi-standard elements and standard elements respectively.

By abuse of notation, we will freely identify an element of $\hat{W}$ with its lift in $N_{\hat{G}}(O_{\hat{F}})$, according to the context.

**Lemma 1.3.** Let $\tilde{w} \in S$. Then we have
1. $z\tilde{w}\sigma(z)^{-1} \in S$ if $z \in \hat{W}$ such that $z(\tilde{w}) \subseteq \tilde{w}^+$;
2. there exists a unique pair $(\tilde{w}', z') \in S^+ \times W_0^{J_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}}$ such that $\tilde{w} = z'\tilde{w}\sigma(z')^{-1}$;
3. $z\tilde{w}\sigma(s)^{-1} \in S$ if $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and either $\tilde{w} < s \tilde{w}$ or $\tilde{w}s < \tilde{w}$;
4. $J_{\tilde{w}}$ is generated by $I \cap J_{\tilde{w}}$ and $\hat{W} \cap J_{\tilde{w}}$.

**Proof.** By assumption we have $z(\tilde{w}) = \tilde{w}$. So (1) follows by definition.

Let $z' \in W_0^{J_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}}$ such that $z'(\tilde{w}) = \nu_{\tilde{w}}$. Let $\tilde{w}' = z'^{-1}\tilde{w}\sigma(z')$. Note that $z'(\tilde{w}) = \tilde{w}$. So $\tilde{w}' \in S^+$ by (1). Suppose there exists another pair $(\tilde{w}', z'') \in S^+ \times W_0^{J_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}}$ satisfies (2). Then $\nu_{\tilde{w}'} = \nu_{\tilde{w}''} = \nu_{\tilde{w}}$ and $z'^{-1}z'' \in W_0^{J_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}}$. Thus $z' = z'' \in W_0^{J_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}}$ and hence $\tilde{w}' = \tilde{w}''$.

To prove (3) it suffices to show $s(\tilde{w}) \subseteq \tilde{w}^+$. Otherwise, the simple affine root of $s$ lies in $\tilde{w}$. Hence $s\tilde{w}, \tilde{w}\sigma(s) > \tilde{w}$ (since $s\tilde{w}(\tilde{w}^+) = \tilde{w}^+$), contradicting our assumption.

Note that $J_{\tilde{w}} \subseteq M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}$. Thus (4) follows from that $\tilde{w}\sigma M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}} = M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}, \tilde{w}\sigma \hat{W} M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}} = \hat{W} M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}},$ and

$$I_{M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}} \hat{W} M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}} M_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}.$$

$\square$
2. Proof of Theorem 0.2

We fix \( \lambda \in Y^+ \) and \( b \in G(\check{F}) \) such that \( X(\lambda, b) \neq \emptyset \). Let \( J = J_{\nu_G(\theta)} \subseteq S_0 \). Moreover, we may and do assume that \( b \in M_J(\check{F}) \) and \( \nu_{M_J}(b) = \nu_G(b) \). In particular, \( J_b = J_b^{M_J} \).

For \( x \in \pi_1(M_J) \cong Y/\mathbb{Z}\Phi_1^J \) we set \( \tilde{w}_x = t^{ux}w_x \in \Omega_{M_J} \) with \( \mu_x \in Y \) and \( w_x \in W_J \) such that \( \eta_{M_J} w_x = x \). Here \( \eta_{M_J} : M_J(\check{F}) \rightarrow \pi_1(M_J) \) denotes the natural projection. Define

\[
S^+_{\lambda,b} = \{ x \in \pi_1(M_J); \kappa_{M_J}(x) = \kappa_{M_J}(b), \mu_x \preceq \lambda \}, \\
S_{\lambda,b,x} = \{ z\tilde{w}_x\sigma(z)^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda); x \in S^+_{\lambda,b}, z \in W_J \}.
\]

Let \( S_{\lambda,b} \) be the set of semi-standard elements in \( \text{Adm}(\lambda) \) which are \( \sigma \)-conjugate to \( b \). Then we have \( S_{\lambda,b} = \sqcup z \in S^+_{\lambda,b} S_{\lambda,b,z} \) by Lemma 1.3.

Theorem 2.1 ([18]). Each connected component of \( X(\lambda, b) \) intersects \( \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}}I/I \) for some \( \tilde{w} \in S_{\lambda,b} \).

Proof. By [18, Theorem 4.1], each connected component of \( X(\lambda, b) \) intersects \( \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \) for some \( \sigma \)-straight element \( \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \) which is \( \sigma \)-conjugate to \( b \). Then the statement follows from the proof of [29, Theorem 1.3], which shows that \( \sigma \)-straight elements are semi-standard. \( \square \)

For \( g, g' \in G(\check{F}) \) we write \( gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g'I \) if they are in the same connected component of \( X(\lambda, b) \). For \( \tilde{w}, \tilde{w}' \in S_{\lambda,b} \), we write \( \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \sim_{\lambda,b} \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}'} \) if their natural images in \( \pi_0(X(\lambda, b)) \) coincide.

Proposition 2.2. For \( x \in S^+_{\lambda,b} \) and \( \tilde{w}, \tilde{w}' \in S_{\lambda,b,x} \) we have \( \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \sim_{\lambda,b} \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}'} \).

In the following four propositions, we retain the assumptions in Theorem 0.2. Their proofs will occupy the remaining sections.

Proposition 2.3. For \( x, x' \in S^+_{\lambda,b} \) we have \( \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}_x} \sim_{\lambda,b} \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}_{x'}} \). As a consequence, the natural projection \( \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \rightarrow \pi_0(X(\lambda, b)) \) is surjective for \( \tilde{w} \in S_{\lambda,b} \).

Proposition 2.4. The natural action of \( \ker(\eta_{M_J}) \cap \mathbb{J}_b \) on \( \pi_0(X(\lambda, b)) \) is trivial.

Proposition 2.5. The natural action of

\[
(\ker(\eta_G) \cap \mathbb{J}_b)/(\ker(\eta_{M_J}) \cap \mathbb{J}_b) \cong (\mathbb{Z}\Phi_1^J/\mathbb{Z}\Phi_1^J)^{\sigma}
\]
on \( \pi_0(X(\lambda, b)) \) is trivial.

Proof of Theorem 0.2. By [11, Theorem 1.1], it suffices to consider the Iwahori case \( K = I \). Combining Proposition 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 we have \( \pi_0(X(\lambda, b)) \cong \mathbb{J}_b/(\mathbb{J}_b \cap \ker(\eta_G)) \). As \( b \) is basic in \( M_J \) and \( \mathbb{J}_b = \mathbb{J}_b^{M_J} \), it follows that \( \mathbb{J}_b \) is generated by \( I_{M_J} \cap \mathbb{J}_b \) and \( W_{M_J} \cap \mathbb{J}_b \). So we have \( \mathbb{J}_b/(\ker(\eta_G) \cap \mathbb{J}_b) = (\Omega_J \cap \mathbb{J}_b)/(\Omega_J \cap \ker(\eta_G) \cap \mathbb{J}_b) = \Omega_J^\sigma/(\Omega_J^\sigma \cap \ker(\eta_G)) \cong \pi_1(G)^{\sigma} \) as desired. \( \square \)

3. The set \( \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}} \)

In the rest of the paper, we assume that \( G \) is adjoint, simple, and its root system \( \Phi \) has \( d \) irreducible factors.

3.1. Let \( \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \). For \( \alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{\nu_G} \) we set \( \alpha^i = (\tilde{w}\sigma)^i(\alpha) \in \check{\Phi} \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \), and

\[
m_{\alpha,\tilde{w}} = \min\{ i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}; \alpha^{-i} \in \check{\Phi} \setminus \Phi \},
\]

which is well defined since \( \{ \alpha, \nu_G \} \neq 0 \).

We say \( \alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{\nu_G} \) is \( \tilde{w} \)-permissible if \( \tilde{w}\sigma(s_\alpha) \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \) and \( \alpha^{-m_{\alpha,\tilde{w}}} \in \check{\Phi}^+ \). Let \( \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}} \) denote the set of \( \tilde{w} \)-permissible roots.

Let \( R \subseteq S_0 \) be a \( \sigma \)-orbit of \( S_0 \). We say \( \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \) is left (resp. right) \( R \)-distinct if \( s\tilde{w} \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda) \) (resp. \( \tilde{w}s \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda) \)) for \( s \in R \). Let \( w_R \) denote the longest root of \( W_R \).

Lemma 3.1. Let \( R \) be a \( \sigma \)-orbit of \( S_0 \), and let \( \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \) be left \( R \)-distinct. Then \( w_R \tilde{w}w_R \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \) is right \( R \)-distinct. Moreover, \( \mathcal{P}_{w_R \tilde{w}w_R} \neq \emptyset \) if \( \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}} \neq \emptyset \).
Proof. To show the first statement, we can assume \( d = 1 \), and hence \( R \) is either commutative or is of type \( A_2 \). Then the first statement follows from Lemma A.4.

Now we show the “Moreover” part. Let \( \alpha \in P_\tilde{w} \) and let

\[
n_\alpha = \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}; \alpha^{-i} \notin \Phi_R^+\} \leq m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}}.
\]

We show \( w_R(\alpha^{-n_\alpha}) \in P_{w_R \tilde{w} R}, \) and it suffices to check that \( \alpha^{-n_\alpha} \in \Phi^+ \) and

\[
w_R \tilde{w} R \sigma(s_{w_R(\alpha^{-n_\alpha})}) = w_R \tilde{w} R \sigma(s_{\alpha^{-n_\alpha}}) w_R \in \text{Adm}(\lambda).
\]

(a) If \( n_\alpha = 0 \), then \( \alpha^{-n_\alpha} = \alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_R, \) and (a) follows from Corollary A.6. Otherwise, \( \alpha^{-n_\alpha + 1} \in \Phi_R^+ \), which implies that \( \alpha^{-n_\alpha} = (\tilde{w} \sigma)^{-1}(\alpha^{-n_\alpha + 1}) \in \Phi^- \) as \( \tilde{w} \) is left \( R \)-distinct. Hence \( \alpha^{-n_\alpha} \in \Phi^+ \) since \( n_\alpha \leq m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}} \) and \( \alpha^{-m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}}} \in \Phi^+ \). Moreover,

\[
w_R \tilde{w} R \sigma(w_R(\alpha^{-n_\alpha})) = w_R(\alpha^{-n_\alpha + 1}) \in \Phi_R^-,
\]

which means \( w_R \tilde{w} R \sigma(s_{w_R(\alpha^{-n_\alpha})}) \leq w_R \tilde{w} R w_R \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \), and (a) follows.

3.2. Fix \( \eta \in Y \). Let \( A = \max\{|(\alpha, \eta)|; \alpha \in \Phi\} \). Choose \( M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2} \) such that \( M |(\alpha, \eta)| > 2A \) for any \( \alpha \in \Phi \) with \( (\alpha, \eta) \neq 0 \). Let \( \tilde{w} \in t^N W_0 \subseteq W_0 t^N W_0 \), where \( \mu \) is some \( W_0 \)-conjugate of \( \eta \). Motivated from the \( \Phi \)-function in [10], we define

\[
\nu^\lambda_\tilde{w} = \frac{N-1}{i=0} p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^i(\mu) \frac{M^i}{M^i},
\]

where \( N \) is the order of \( p(\tilde{w} \sigma) \), and \( p : \tilde{W} \times \langle \sigma \rangle \to W_0 \times \langle \sigma \rangle \) is the natural projection.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \( \alpha \in \Phi \) and \( 0 \leq n \leq N-1 \) such that \( (\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^n(\mu)) \neq 0 \) and \( (\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^1(\mu)) = 0 \) for \( 0 \leq i < n \). Then \( (\alpha, \nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}) \) is not \( \tilde{w} \)-distinct.

**Proof.** Note that \( \mu, \eta \) are conjugate by \( W_0 \). By the choice of \( M \geq 2 \) we have

\[
\frac{|(\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^n(\mu))|}{M^n} > \frac{2A}{M^{n+1}} > \frac{A}{M^{n+1}} \sum_{i=n+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{M^{i-n-1}} \geq \frac{1}{M^1} \sum_{i=n+1}^{N-1} \frac{|(\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^1(\mu))|}{M^i}.
\]

So the statement follows.

**Corollary 3.3.** We have the following:

1. \( (\alpha, \nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}) = 0 \) if and only if \( (\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^1(\mu)) = 0 \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \);
2. \( \nu^\lambda_\tilde{w} \) is dominant for \( \Phi^\pm_\tilde{w} \) if \( \tilde{w} \in S \);
3. \( \nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}(z) = z(\nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}) \) for \( z \in W_0 \);
4. \( \tilde{w} \sigma(\Phi^+_{\tilde{w}}) = \tilde{w} \sigma(\nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}) \) if \( \tilde{w} \in S \);
5. If \( \alpha \in P_{\tilde{w}}, \) then \( (\alpha, \nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}) < 0 \) for \( 0 \leq m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}} \leq i < 0 \), and the roots \( \alpha^i \in \Phi \) for \( 1 - m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}} < i \leq 0 \) are linearly independent. Here \( \alpha^i = (\tilde{w} \sigma)^i(\alpha) \).

**Proof.** The statement (1) follows from Lemma 3.2 and the definition of \( \nu^\lambda_\tilde{w} \).

Suppose there exists \( \alpha \in \Phi^+_{\tilde{w}} \) such that \( (\alpha, \nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}) < 0 \). By Lemma 3.2, there exists \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) such that \( (\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^n(\mu)) < 0 \) and \( (\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^1(\mu)) = 0 \) for \( 0 \leq i < n-1 \). In particular, we have \( (\tilde{w} \sigma)^{-1}(\alpha) = p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^{-1}(\alpha) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( (\tilde{w} \sigma)^{n-1}(\alpha) = \Phi \setminus \Phi \), contradicting that \( \tilde{w} \in S \). So (2) follows.

The statement (3) follows by definition.

By (1) we have \( \Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}} = \sigma(\Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_\tilde{w}}) \subseteq \Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_{\tilde{w}}} \). As \( \tilde{w} \in S \), we have \( \tilde{w} \sigma(\Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_{\tilde{w}}}) = \Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_{\tilde{w}}} \). So (4) follows from that \( \Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_{\tilde{w}}} = \Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_{\tilde{w}}} \cap \Phi^+_{\nu^\lambda_{\tilde{w}}} \).

Let \( \alpha \in P_{\tilde{w}} \) and let \( m = m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}} \). By definition, \( (\alpha^{1-m}, \mu) < 0 \), \( \alpha^{-i} = p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^{-1}(\alpha) \) and \( (\alpha^{1-i}, \mu) = (\alpha, p(\tilde{w} \sigma)^{-1}(\mu)) = 0 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq m-1 \). Thus it follows from Lemma 3.2 that \( (\alpha, \nu^\lambda_{\tilde{w}}) < 0 \) for \( 1 - m \leq i \leq 0 \). Suppose \( \sum_{i=0}^{1-m} c_i \alpha^i = 0 \), where the coefficients \( c_i \in \mathbb{R} \) are not all zero. Let \( i_0 = \min\{1 - m \leq i \leq 0; c_i \neq 0\} \). Then

\[
0 = (\tilde{w} \sigma)^{1-m-i_0} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{1-m} c_i \alpha^i, \mu \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{i_0} c_i (\alpha^{1-m-i_0+i}, \mu) = c_{i_0} (\alpha^{1-m}, \mu) \neq 0,
\]

which is a contradiction. So (5) follows.
Lemma 3.4. Let \( \tilde{w} \in S \) and let \( z_0 \in W_0 \) be the unique minimal element such that \( z_0(\nu_{\tilde{w}}) \) is dominant. Then \( z_0 \tilde{w} \in \bar{S}_0 \). In particular, \( \tilde{w} \in \bar{S}_0 \) if \( \nu_{\tilde{w}} \) is dominant.

Proof. Let \( \tilde{w} = z_0 \tilde{w} (z_0^{-1})^\mu \) with \( \mu = z_0(\mu) \). By the choice of \( z_0 \), we have \( \nu_{\tilde{w}} = z_0(\nu_{\tilde{w}}) \) is dominant and \( z_0(\Phi_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}^+) = \Phi_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}^+ \). By Lemma 3.2, \( \mu \) is dominant since \( \nu_{\tilde{w}} = z_0(\nu_{\tilde{w}}) \) is dominant.

Let \( \gamma \in \Phi^+ \). We need to show that \( \tilde{w} \gamma < s_\gamma \tilde{w} \). If \( \langle \gamma, \nu_{\tilde{w}} \rangle > 0 \), then either \( \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle > 0 \), or \( \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle = 0 \) and \( p(\tilde{w} \gamma)^{-1}(\gamma) > 0 \). Hence, \( \langle \gamma, \nu_{\tilde{w}} \rangle = 0 \) by Corollary 3.3, which means \( \tilde{w} \gamma < s_\gamma \tilde{w} \) as desired. Suppose \( \langle \gamma, \nu_{\tilde{w}} \rangle = 0 \), that is, \( \gamma \in \Phi_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}^+ \). Then by Corollary 3.3 (4) we have

\[
(\tilde{w} \gamma)^{-1}(\gamma) = z_0(\tilde{w} \gamma)^{-1}(\Phi_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}^+) = z_0(\tilde{w} \gamma)^{-1}(\Phi_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}^-) = \Phi_{\nu_{\tilde{w}}}^-.
\]

So we also have \( \tilde{w} \gamma < s_\gamma \tilde{w} \) as desired. \( \square \)

Proposition 3.5. Let \( K \subseteq S_0 \) and \( \tilde{w} \in S_{\lambda, b} \). Then there exists a unique semi-standard element \( \tilde{w} \in K \bar{W} \) which is \( \sigma \)-conjugate to \( \tilde{w} \) by \( W_K \). If, moreover, \( K = S_0 \) and \( (\lambda, b) \) is Hodge-Newton irreducible, then \( \tilde{w} \) is not left \( R \)-distinct for any \( \sigma \)-orbit \( R \) of \( S_0 \).

Proof. By Theorem 1.2, there exist unique \( \tilde{w} \in K \bar{W} \) and some \( u \in I(K, \tilde{w}) \) such that \( \tilde{w} \sigma \rightarrow_K u \tilde{w} \). So \( \Phi_{I(K, \tilde{w})} \subseteq \Phi_{\tilde{w}} \) and \( \ell(\tilde{w}) = \ell(u) + \ell(\tilde{w}) \). As \( \tilde{w} \in S \), we have \( u \tilde{w} \) by Lemma 1.3 (2). \( u \tilde{w} \leq u^{-1}u \tilde{w} = \tilde{w} \), which means \( u = 1 \), and the first statement follows. The second one is proved in [3, Lemma 6.11]. \( \square \)

3.3. Let \( \tilde{w}, \tilde{w}' \in \bar{W} \) and \( s \in S^\circ \). Write \( \tilde{w} \rightarrow_s \tilde{w} \) if \( \tilde{w}' = s \tilde{w} \sigma(s) \) and \( s \tilde{w} < \tilde{w} \) (which implies that \( \ell(\tilde{w}') \leq \ell(\tilde{w}) \)). For \( K \subseteq S^\circ \) we write \( \tilde{w} \rightarrow_K \tilde{w} \) if there is a sequence \( \tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0 \rightarrow_s \tilde{w}_1 \rightarrow_s \tilde{w}_2 \rightarrow_s \cdots \rightarrow_s \tilde{w}_n + 1 = \tilde{w} \) with \( s_i \in K \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n \).

Lemma 3.6. Let \( K \subseteq S_0 \) and \( \tilde{w} \in S \). There is no infinite sequence

\[
\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0 \rightarrow_s \tilde{w}_1 \rightarrow_s \cdots,
\]

where \( s_i \in K \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). As a consequence, we have \( \tilde{w} \rightarrow_K \tilde{w}' \) for some \( \tilde{w}' \in K \bar{W} \).

Proof. We argue by induction on \( |K| \). If \( K = \emptyset \), the statement is trivial. Assume \( |K| > 1 \). Suppose there exists such an infinite sequence. By Lemma 1.3 we have \( \tilde{w}_i \in S \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). Moreover, by Lemma 1.1 (1) we can assume that (a) \( \ell(\tilde{w}_0) = \ell(\tilde{w}_1) = \cdots \), and (b) there exists \( y \in K \bar{W} \) such that \( \tilde{w}_i \in W_K y \) and \( y \sigma(s_i) y^{-1} \in K \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). If each element of \( K \) appears infinitely many times in the sequence \( s_0, s_1, \ldots \), then by (b) we have \( K = I(K, y) \subseteq W_{S^\circ} \), see §1.3. So \( \tilde{w}_i = y \in K \bar{W} \) since \( \tilde{w}_i \in S \), which is impossible. Otherwise, there exists a proper subset \( K' \subseteq K \) such that \( s_i \in K' \) for \( i > 0 \), which contradicts the induction hypothesis. The proof is finished. \( \square \)

Let \( R \) be a \( \sigma \)-orbit of \( S_0 \). For \( \tilde{w}, \tilde{w}' \in \bar{W} \) we write \( \tilde{w} \rightarrow_R \tilde{w}' \) if \( \tilde{w}, \tilde{w}' \in S \) are \( W_R \sigma \)-conjugate and \( \tilde{w}' \in R \bar{W} \). Write \( \tilde{w} \rightarrow \tilde{w}' \) if there is a sequence \( \tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0 \rightarrow_{R_0} \tilde{w}_1 \rightarrow_{R_1} \cdots \rightarrow_{R_n} \tilde{w}_{n+1} = \tilde{w}' \).

Proposition 3.7 ([3, Proposition 6.16]). Let \( \tilde{w} \in S \). Then \( \tilde{w} \rightarrow \tilde{w}' \), where \( \tilde{w}' \in \bar{S}_0 \bar{W} \) is the unique element in the \( W_0 \sigma \)-conjugacy class of \( \tilde{w} \).

Proof. Assume otherwise. Then by Lemma 3.6 there is an infinite sequence

\[
\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0 \rightarrow_{R_0} \tilde{w}_1 \rightarrow_{R_1} \cdots,
\]

where \( \tilde{w}_{i+1} \in R_i \bar{W} \) and \( R_i \) is some \( \sigma \)-orbit of \( S_0 \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). This contradicts Lemma 3.6. So the statement follows. \( \square \)

Lemma 3.8. Let \( R \) be a \( \sigma \)-orbit of \( S_0 \). Let \( \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \cap S \). If \( \tilde{w} \not\in R \bar{W} \) and \( \tilde{w} \) is not right \( R \)-distinct. Then \( P_{\tilde{w}} \neq \emptyset \).

Proof. By assumption, there exists \( s \in R \) and \( 0 \leq k \leq |R| - 1 \) such that \( \sigma^{-k}(s) \tilde{w} < \tilde{w} \), \( \tilde{w} \sigma(s) \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \), and

\[
k = \min \{0 \leq i \leq |R| - 1; \sigma^{-i}(s') \tilde{w} < \tilde{w}, \tilde{w} \sigma(s') \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \text{ for some } s' \in R \}.
\]
Let $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ be the simple root of $s$. We claim that

$$\sigma^{-1} = \sigma^{-1}(a) \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq k, \text{ and hence } m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}} \geq k + 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (a)

Let $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$. By the choice of $k$ we have $\tilde{w} < \sigma^{-1}(s)\tilde{w}$ and $\tilde{w}\sigma^{-1}(i) \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)$, which means $\sigma^{-1}(a) = \tilde{w}\sigma^{-1}(a)$ by Lemma A.2. So (a) is proved.

By (a) we have $\alpha^{\perp} \in \Phi^+$. So $\alpha^{\perp} = (\tilde{w}\sigma^{-1}(a)) \in \Phi^+$ and $\sigma^{-1}(s)\tilde{w} < \tilde{w}$. As $\tilde{w} \in S$, it follows that $\alpha^{\perp} \notin \Phi_{\tilde{w}}$ and hence $\alpha^{\perp} \notin \Phi_{\tilde{w}, i}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $\alpha \notin \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}}$, we have $m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}} \in \Phi^\perp \Phi$ by definition, which means $\alpha^{\perp} \notin \Phi^\perp \Phi$. Let $\beta = -\alpha^{\perp} \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{\tilde{w}}$. Then $\beta^{-m_{\alpha, \tilde{w}}} = -\alpha^{\perp} \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi$, and $\tilde{w}\sigma(\beta) < \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ since $\tilde{w}\sigma(\beta) = -\alpha^{\perp} \in \Phi^-$. So $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}}$ as desired. \hfill $\Box$

**Corollary 3.9.** Assume $(\lambda, b)$ is Hodge-Newton irreducible. For $\tilde{w} \in S_{\lambda, b}$ we have either $\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{S}_{\lambda, b}$ or $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}} \neq \emptyset$.

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.7, there exists a sequence $\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0 \Rightarrow R_0 \tilde{w}_1 \Rightarrow R_1 \cdots \Rightarrow R_{n-1} \tilde{w}_n = \tilde{w}'$, where $\tilde{w}_0, \ldots, \tilde{w}_{n+1}$ are distinct semi-standard elements, $R_0, \ldots, R_n$ are $\sigma$-orbits of $S_0$, and $\tilde{w}^r \in \mathbb{S}_{\lambda, b}$ as desired. Assume $n \geq 1$. If $\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0$ is not right $R_0$-distinct, then $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}} \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.8. Otherwise, by Lemma A.4, $w_0w_0w_0 \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ is left $R_0$-distinct. So $w_0w_0w_0 \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}}$ by Lemma 3.5. By induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}} \neq \emptyset$, which implies $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{w}} \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.1. \hfill $\Box$

### 4. Proof of Proposition 2.2

Recall that $d$ is the number of connected components of $S_0$.

For $g \in G(\tilde{F})$, $\gamma \in \tilde{F}$, $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W}$, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we define

$$g_{\gamma, \tilde{w}, m} : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow G(\tilde{F})/I, \ z \mapsto g(\tilde{w}\sigma)^{-m}U_{\gamma}(z) \cdots (\tilde{w}\sigma)^{-1}U_{\gamma}(z)U_{\gamma}(z)I.$$

**Hypothesis 4.1.** Recall that $\mathbb{F}_q$ is the residue field of $F$. Assume that $q^d > 2$ (resp. $q^d > 3$) if some/any connected component of $S_0$ is non-simply-laced except of type $G_2$ (resp. is of type $G_2$).

Note that if Hypothesis 4.1 is not true, then $d = 1$ and some/any connected component of $S_0$ is non-simply-laced, which implies that $G$ is residually split, and hence split (as $G$ is unramified).

**Lemma 4.1.** Suppose Hypothesis 4.1 is true. Let $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W}$, $\gamma \in \tilde{F}$, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that the roots $\gamma^i := (\tilde{w}\sigma)^i(\gamma) \in \Phi$ for $1-m \leq i \leq 0$ are linearly independent. Let $g = g_{\gamma, \tilde{w}, m}$. Then there exist integers $1 \leq m \leq r < \cdots < r_0 \leq 0$ such that

$$g(\gamma) = s_{r_1} \cdots s_{r_0} I, \text{ and } s_{r_1} \cdots s_{r_k} (\gamma^{i_k}) \in \Phi^+ \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq r.$$  

Moreover, if there exists $v \in V$ such that $\langle \gamma^i, v \rangle < 0$ for $1-m \leq i \leq 0$, then $v \in (s_{r_1} \cdots s_{r_0})^{-1}(v)$, where the equality holds if and only if $r < 0$, that is, $\gamma^i \in \Phi^-$ for $1-m \leq i \leq 0$.

**Proof.** First notice that

$$(\tilde{w}\sigma)^iU_{\gamma}(z) = U_{\gamma}(c_i z^i) \text{ with } c_i \in \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{F}}^\times \text{ for } 1-m \leq i \leq 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (a)

We argue by induction on $m$. If $m = 0$, the statement is trivial. Assume $m \geq 1$. If $\gamma \in \Phi^-$, then $g(\gamma) = s_{1, \gamma, -1, \tilde{w}, m-1}(\gamma)$, and hence by induction hypothesis. Otherwise, we have

$$g(\gamma) = (\tilde{w}\sigma)^{-m}U_{\gamma}(z) \cdots (\tilde{w}\sigma)^{-1}U_{\gamma}(z)U_{\gamma}(z^{-1})s_{i} I \text{ for } z \neq 0.$$  

As the roots $\gamma^i$ for $1-m \leq i \leq 0$ are linearly independent, it follows by (a) and induction on $m$ that

$$(\tilde{w}\sigma)^{-m}U_{\gamma}(z) \cdots (\tilde{w}\sigma)^{-1}U_{\gamma}(z)U_{\gamma}(z^{-1}) = \prod_{\beta} U_{\beta}(c_{\beta, \gamma} z^{n_{\beta, \gamma}}),$$  

where $a_{\beta} = (a_{ij})_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^m$ such that $a_0 \geq 1$ and $a_0 = 0$ unless $i \in i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d}$, $\beta = -a_0 \gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_i \gamma^{-1} \in \Phi$, $c_{\beta, \gamma} \in \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{F}}$, and $n_{\beta, \gamma} = -a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_i q^{-i}$. Moreover, we have $a_{jd}/a_0 \leq 1$ (resp.
Let $x \in S^+_{\lambda,b}$. Let $J_{x,0}$ be union of connected components of $J$ on which $\sigma^i(\mu_x)$ is central for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $J_{x,1} = J \setminus J_{x,0}$. Let $H_x \subseteq M_f(F)$ be the subgroup generated by $M_{J_{x,0}, W_{J_{x,0}}}$, and $W_{J_{x,1}}$, see §1.3. Note that $J_{x,1}$ commutes with $J_{x,0}$, and $w_x \in W_{J_{x,1}}$.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let $x \in S^+_{\lambda,b}$ and $w \in S_{\lambda,b,x}$ and $z \in W_\delta'$ such that $w = z \varpi_x \sigma(z)^{-1}$. Let $y \in \tilde{W}$ (resp. $y \in W_\delta$) such that $y \varpi_x \sigma(y)^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. Let $y' \in W_\delta'$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ such that $yz \in z' \omega^{-1} W_\delta'$. Then $w' := z' \omega^{-1} w_x \sigma(\omega) \sigma(z')^{-1} \in S_{\lambda,b}$. Moreover, there exists $h \in \ker(\eta_{M_f}) \cap J_{\omega,x}$ (resp. $h \in H_x \cap J_{\omega,x}$) such that $gg^{-1}I \sim_{\lambda,b} gzhz'^{-1}I$ for $g \in J_{b,\omega}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume $y \in W_\delta$ and hence $\omega = 1$. Write $yz = z'u$ for some $u \in W_f$. By [3, Lemma 1.3] we have

$$w' = z' \varpi_x \sigma(z')^{-1} - \delta w_x \sigma(z')^{-1} = y \varpi_x \sigma(y)^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$$

where $\delta = w_x \sigma(\omega)^{-1} w_x^{-1} \in W_{J_{x,1}} W_{J_{x,0}}$. So $w' \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ is semi-standard by Lemma 1.3. The "Moreover" part follows from [4, Lemma 6.13]. □

**Lemma 4.3.** Assume $(\lambda, b)$ is Hodge-Newton irreducible and $G$ is not split. Let $x \in S^+_{\lambda,b}$ and $w \in S_{\lambda,b,x}$. If $w \notin \mathfrak{g}_0 W_\delta$, then there exist $h \in H_x \cap J_{\omega,x}$ and $w' \in S_{\lambda,b,x}$ such that $\nu_{\omega'} < \nu_{w'}$ and $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} gzhz'^{-1}I$ for $g \in J_{b,\omega}$. Here $z, z' \in W_\delta'$ such that $w = z \varpi_x \sigma(z)$ and $w' = z' \varpi_x \sigma(z')$.

Proof. By Corollary 3.9, there exists $a \in \mathcal{P}_{\omega}$. Set $\alpha = (\varpi_x)\sigma(\alpha)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $g = g_{g,a,\nu_0, m_{a,\nu}}$ for $g \in J_{b,\omega}$. Since $\nu_{m_{a,\nu}} \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \Phi$ and $\alpha \in \Phi$ for $1 - m_{a,\nu} \leq i \leq 0$, we have

$$g^{-1}h \alpha \Phi \subseteq w \varpi_x \sigma(\alpha)^{-1} \subseteq \text{Adm}(\lambda) \subseteq \text{Adm}(\lambda) \subseteq \text{Adm}(\lambda)$$

As $G$ is not split, then Hypothesis 4.1 is true. Moreover, by Lemma 3.3 (5), the conditions in Lemma 4.1 are satisfied (for $(\gamma, m, v) = (\alpha, m_{a,\nu}, \nu_{w'})$). Thus, by Lemma 4.1 we have $gI = g(0) \sim_{\lambda,b} g(\infty) = gg^{-1}I$ for some $y \in W_\delta$ such that $y \nu_{w'} > \nu_{w'}$. Then $w' := y \varpi_x \sigma(y)^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ and $\nu_{\omega'} < \nu_{w'} \nu_{w'} = \nu_{w'}$. Let $h \in H_x$, $w' \in S_{\lambda,b,x}$, and $z' \in W_\delta'$ be as in Lemma 4.2 such that $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} gg^{-1}I \sim_{\lambda,b} gzhz'^{-1}I$. By construction, $w'$ and $w''$ are $\sigma$-conjugate by $W_{\nu_\omega'} = z' \omega^{-1} z'^{-1}$, and hence $\nu_{\omega'}$ and $\nu_{w'}$ are conjugate by $W_{\nu_\omega'}$. By Corollary 3.3 (2), $\nu_{w'}$ is dominant for $\Phi_{\nu_{w'}}$, which means $\nu_{\omega'} < \nu_{w'} \leq \nu_{w'}$ as desired.

**Corollary 4.4.** Assume $(\lambda, b)$ is Hodge-Newton irreducible. Let $x \in S^+_{\lambda,b}$ and $w', w'' \in S_{\lambda,b,x}$ with $w'$ the unique element in $\mathfrak{g}_0 W_\delta$. Then there exists $h \in H_x \cap J_{\omega,x}$ such that $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} gzhz'^{-1}I$ for $g \in J_{b,\omega}$, where $z, z' \in W_\delta'$ such that $w = z \varpi_x \sigma(z)$ and $w' = z' \varpi_x \sigma(z')$.

Proof. Note that the statement follows from Theorem 0.2, which is proved in [3] when $G$ is split. So we assume that $G$ is not split. If $w \notin \mathfrak{g}_0 W_\delta$, by Lemma 4.3, there exist $h \in H_x \cap J_{\omega,x}$ and $w' \in S_{\lambda,b,x}$ such that $\nu_{w'} < \nu_{w'}$, and $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} gzhz'^{-1}I$ for $g \in J_{b,\omega}$, where $z' \in W_\delta'$ such that $w' = z' \varpi_x \sigma(z')^{-1}$. Repeating this process, we may assume either $w' \in \mathfrak{g}_0 W$ or $\nu_{w'}$ is dominant. In either case, we have $w' \in \mathfrak{g}_0 W$ by Lemma 3.4. So the statement follows. □
Proposition 4.5. Let $x \in S_{\lambda,b}^g$ and $\tilde{w} \in S_{\lambda,b,x}$. Then there exists $h \in H_x \cap S_{\lambda,b}$ such that $\tilde{w} = z\sigma^{-1}(z')$ and $\sigma^{-1}(z') = \lambda$ or, equivalently, $gh^{-1} - \lambda,b g^{-1}$ for $g \in S_{\lambda,b,z}$, where $z \in W_0'$ such that $\tilde{w} = z\sigma^{-1}(z')$. In particular, $\tilde{S}_{\lambda,b} \sim \lambda,b \tilde{S}_{\lambda,b}$. 

Proof. Let $z' \in W_0'$ such that $z'\sigma^{-1}(z') \in \tilde{S}_0$ (see Lemma 1.3 and Proposition 3.5). By Corollary 4.4, there exist $h_1, h_2 \in H_x \cap \tilde{S}_{\lambda,b}$ such that $g \sim \lambda,b gh_1^{-1} - \lambda,b g^{-1}$ for $g \in \tilde{S}_{\lambda,b}$. Then we have

$$ghz^{-1} = gh^{-1} = gh_1\sigma^{-1}(z') = gh_1z^{-1} = gh_1z^{-1}I \sim \lambda,b gI,$$

where $h = h_1h_2^{-1} \in H_x \cap S_{\lambda,b}$ and $\gamma = gh_1^{-1}g^{-1} \in \tilde{S}_{\lambda,b}$. \hfill \Box

5. Proof of Proposition 2.3

5.1. Let $K \subseteq S_0$. Let $\tilde{w} = t^w w \in \Omega_K$ with $\mu \in Y$ and $w \in W_K$. Let $\gamma \in \Phi^+ \backslash \Phi_K$ such that $\gamma^\vee$ is $K$-dominant and $K$-minuscule. Set $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma + 1 \in \tilde{\Phi}^+$. Suppose $\mu, \mu - \gamma^\vee, \mu + w\sigma^r(\gamma^\vee), \mu - \gamma^\vee + w\sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) \leq \lambda$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Lemma 5.1. Let $K$, $\tilde{w} = t^w w$, $\gamma$, $\tilde{\gamma}$, and $r$ be as in \S 5.1. Then we have

1. $\mu - \gamma^\vee, \mu + w(\sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)), \mu - \gamma^\vee + w\sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) \in K$-minuscule;
2. $\tilde{w}, s_{\tilde{\gamma}}\tilde{w}, \tilde{w}, gI, s_{\tilde{\gamma}}\tilde{w}I, s_{\tilde{\gamma}}\tilde{w}I \in \tilde{\text{Adm}}(\lambda)$;
3. $\tilde{w}^r s_{\tilde{\gamma}} \in \tilde{\text{Adm}}(\lambda)$ if $\gamma \neq \sigma^r(\gamma)$ and $\langle w\sigma^r(\gamma), \mu, \gamma, \mu \rangle \leq 1$;

Proof. Note that (1) and (2) are proved in [2, Lemma 4.4.6] and [4, Lemma 1.5] respectively. To show (3) we claim that

there is a $W_K$-conjugate $\eta$ of $\mu$ such that $\eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)$ is $K$-minuscule. (a)

Indeed, let $\gamma$ be a $W_K$-conjugate of $\mu$ such that $\eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)$ is minimal under the partial order $\leq$. If $\eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)$ is not $K$-minuscule, then there exists $\alpha \in \Phi_K$ such that $\langle \alpha, \eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) \rangle \geq 2$. As $\eta$ is $K$-minuscule, and $\gamma^\vee, \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)$ are $K$-dominant and $K$-minuscule, we deduce that $\langle \alpha, \eta \rangle = 1$. Let $\eta' = s_{\alpha}(\eta) = \eta - \alpha^\vee$. Then we have

$$\eta' - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) = \eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) - \alpha^\vee < \eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee),$$

which contradicts the choice of $\eta$. So (a) is proved.

By (1) and (a), $\mu - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee), \mu - \gamma^\vee + w\sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)$ are conjugate by $W_K$. In particular, $\eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) \leq \lambda$. Then (3) follows from that

$$s_{\tilde{\gamma}}\tilde{w} s_{\sigma^r(\gamma)}(\tilde{\gamma}) \leq s_{\tilde{\gamma}}\tilde{w} s_{\sigma^r(\gamma)}(\tilde{\gamma}) = s_{\tilde{\gamma}}\tilde{w} - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) \leq \tilde{\mu} - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee) \leq \tilde{\mu},$$

where the first $\leq$ follows from [3, Lemma 1.3], and the second $\leq$ follows from that

$$(\gamma, \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)) \leq 0 \text{ since } \gamma \neq \sigma^r(\gamma);$$

$$(\gamma, \eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)) \leq \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle - 2 \leq -1;$$

$$(\sigma^r(\gamma), \eta - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^\vee)) \geq \langle w\sigma^r(\gamma), \mu \rangle + 2 \geq 1.$$

The proof is finished. \hfill \Box

For $K \subseteq S_0$ we say $\gamma^\vee$ with $\gamma \in \Phi^+ \backslash \Phi_K$ is strongly $K$-minuscule if $\gamma^\vee$ is $K$-minuscule, and moreover, $\gamma$ is a long root if (1) some/any connected component of $S_0$ is of type $G_2$, and (2) $K$ is the set of short simple roots.

Lemma 5.2. Let $K$, $\tilde{w} = t^w w$, $\gamma$, $\tilde{\gamma}$, and $r$ be as in \S 5.1. Assume furthermore that $\gamma^\vee$ is strongly $K$-minuscule. Then $U_{-\gamma} \tilde{w} U_{-\gamma} \subseteq I\tilde{\text{Adm}}(\lambda) I$ unless

$$\langle \gamma, \mu \rangle = \langle w\sigma^r(\gamma), \mu \rangle = 1 \text{ and } \langle \gamma, w\sigma^r(\gamma) \rangle = -1,$$

in which case we have

$$\tilde{w} \neq w', U_{-\gamma} \tilde{w} U_{-\gamma} \subseteq I\tilde{\text{Adm}}(\lambda) I, \text{ and } \mu \pm (\gamma + w\sigma^r(\gamma))^\vee \leq \lambda.$$
Proof. First we claim that

$$
\Psi := \Phi \cap (Z\gamma + Z\nu^*(\gamma)) \text{ is of type } A_2, \text{ or } A_1 \times A_1, \text{ or } A_1.
$$

(a)

Otherwise, then $\Psi$ is of type $B_2$ or $G_2$. In particular, $\gamma = \sigma^r(\gamma)$ (since $\sigma^d(\gamma) = 1$, $\gamma \neq w\sigma^r(\gamma) = w(\gamma)$, and hence $K \neq 0$. If $\Psi$ is of $B_2$, then $\gamma \neq w(\gamma) \in \Phi$ and $(\gamma, w(\gamma)^{(\gamma)}) = 0$ since $\gamma, w(\gamma)$ are of the same length. Thus $\gamma - w(\gamma) \in \Phi_K$ and $(\gamma - w(\gamma), \gamma)^{\gamma} = 2$, contradicting that $\gamma^{\gamma}$ is $K$-minuscule. So $\Psi$ is of type $G_2$. As $\gamma^{\gamma}$ is strongly $K$-minuscule, $\gamma \neq w\sigma^r(\gamma)$ are short roots and $K$ consists of long simple roots, which contradicts that $\gamma^{\gamma}$ is $K$-minuscule. So (a) is proved.

Then we claim that

$$
U_{-\gamma} w U_{-\sigma(\gamma)} I \subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda) I
$$

if one of the following holds:

(b) either $(\gamma, \mu) \geq 2$ or $(\gamma, \mu) = 1$ and $(\gamma, w\sigma(\gamma^{\gamma})) \geq 0$;

(b1) either $(\sigma^r(\gamma), \mu) \leq 2$ or $(\sigma^r(\gamma), \mu) = -1$ and $(\gamma, w\sigma(\gamma^{\gamma})) \geq 0$.

(b2)

By symmetry we assume (b1) occurs. Then $U_{-\gamma} w U_{-\sigma(\gamma)} I \subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda) I$ by (a). Thus

$$
U_{-\gamma} w U_{-\sigma(\gamma)} I \subseteq \bar{w} U_{-\sigma(\gamma)} I \subseteq I \{\bar{w}, \bar{w} s_{\sigma^{\gamma}(\gamma)}\} \subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda) I,
$$

where the last inclusion follows from Lemma 5.1 (2). So (b) is proved.

Suppose $U_{-\gamma} w U_{-\sigma(\gamma)} \not\subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda) I$. Then $-\langle \sigma^r(\gamma), \mu \rangle, \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle \leq 1$ by (b), and $\bar{w}^{-1}(\gamma) \neq \sigma^r(\gamma)$. Assume $(\gamma, \mu) \neq 0$. Then $U_{-\gamma} w U_{-\sigma(\gamma)} I \subseteq I \{\bar{w}, \bar{w} s_{\sigma^{\gamma}(\gamma)}\} \subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda) I,$

which contradicts our assumption. So $(\gamma, \mu) = 1$, and $(\gamma, w\sigma(\gamma^{\gamma}), \mu) = -1$ by symmetry. Moreover, we have $(\gamma, w\sigma(\gamma^{\gamma})) = -1$ by (b) and (a).

Write $w' = \mu^i \mu^j \in \Omega_K$ with $\mu^i \in Y$ and $\mu^j \in W_K$. Then $\mu^i, \mu - \gamma^\vee + w\sigma(\gamma^{\gamma})$ (resp. $\mu^i - \sigma(\gamma^{\gamma}), \mu - \gamma^\vee$, resp. $\mu^i + w(\gamma^{\gamma}), \mu + w(\gamma^{\gamma})$) are conjugate by $W_K$ by Lemma 5.1 (1). Since $(\gamma, \mu) = -\langle \sigma^r(\gamma), \mu \rangle = -\langle \gamma, w\sigma(\gamma^{\gamma}) \rangle = -1$, it follows that $\mu - \gamma^\vee + w\sigma(\gamma^{\gamma})$ and $\mu - (\gamma^\vee + w(\gamma^{\gamma}))$ are conjugate by $W_0$. Hence $\mu - (\gamma^\vee + w(\gamma^{\gamma})) \leq \lambda$. As $w_K(\gamma)$ (with $w_K$ the longest element of $W_K$) is $K$-anti-dominant, we have

$$
\langle w(\gamma), \mu \rangle = \langle w_K(\gamma), \mu \rangle \leq -1, \text{ and } U_{-\sigma(\gamma)} \bar{w} U_{-\gamma} \subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda) I \text{ by (b2)}.
$$

5.2. Let $x, x' \in S_{\lambda, b}^{+, s} \subseteq \pi_1(M_J)$. Write $x \xrightarrow{(\gamma, r)} x'$ for some $\gamma \in \Phi \setminus \Phi_J$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ if $x' - x = \sigma^r(\gamma)^{\gamma} - \gamma$ and $\mu_x - \gamma^\vee, \mu_x + \sigma(\gamma^{\gamma}) \leq \lambda$, see §2. Moreover, write $x \xrightarrow{(\gamma, r)} x'$ if $x \xrightarrow{(\gamma, \delta)} x'$, and for each $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ we have

$$
\text{either } x \xrightarrow{(\gamma, i)} x - \gamma^\vee + \sigma^r(\gamma^{\gamma}) \xrightarrow{(\sigma^r(\gamma)^{r-i})} x',
$$

nor

$$
x \xrightarrow{(\sigma^r(\gamma)^{r-i})} x - \sigma^r(\gamma^{\gamma}) + \sigma^r(\gamma^{\gamma}) \xrightarrow{(\gamma, i)} x'.
$$

Notice that $x \xrightarrow{(\gamma, r)} x'$ is equivalent to $x' \xrightarrow{(-\gamma, r)} x$.

Lemma 5.3 ([2, Remark 4.5.2]). Let $x \neq x' \in S_{\lambda, b}^{+, s}$ such that $x \xrightarrow{(\gamma, r)} x'$ for some $\gamma \in \Phi \setminus \Phi_J$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Then $\omega_x \sigma^i(\delta) = \sigma^i(\delta)$ for any $W_0$-conjugate $\delta$ of $\gamma$ and $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ with $i, r - i \notin d\mathbb{Z}$.

For $\gamma \in \Phi$ we denote by $\mathcal{O}_\gamma$, the $\sigma$-orbit of $\gamma$.

Proposition 5.4 ([30, Lemma 6.7]). Let $x \neq x' \in S_{\lambda, b}^{+, s}$. Then there exist distinct elements $x = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m = x' \in S_{\lambda, b}^{+, s}$ such that

$$
x_0 \xrightarrow{(\gamma_1, r_1)} x_1 \xrightarrow{(\gamma_2, r_2)} \cdots \xrightarrow{(\gamma_m, r_m)} x_m,
$$

where for each $1 \leq i \leq m$ we have (1) $\gamma_i \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$ with $\gamma_i$ $J$-dominant and $J$-minuscule; (2) $1 \leq r_i \leq d - 1$ if $|\mathcal{O}_{\gamma_i}| = d$; (3) $1 \leq r_i \leq d$ if $|\mathcal{O}_{\gamma_i}| = 2d$; and (4) $1 \leq r_i \leq 2d - 1$ if $|\mathcal{O}_{\gamma_i}| \leq 3d$. 

Proof of Proposition 2.3. The case that $\sigma$ has order $3d$ is handled in §8.2. We consider the case that $\sigma$ has order $\leq 2d$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $x' = x_1, \gamma = \gamma_1$ with $|O_\gamma| = 2d$, and $1 \leq r = r_1 \leq d$. Moreover, we can assume

$$U_{-\gamma}w_\gamma U_{-\sigma'(\gamma)} \subseteq I_{\text{Adm}}(\lambda)I.$$

Indeed, if $1 \leq r \leq d - 1$, (a) follows from Lemma 5.1 (2). If $r = d$, by Lemma 5.2 we can switch the pairs $(x, \gamma)$ and $(x', \sigma^d(\gamma))$ (if necessary) so that (a) still hold.

Now we can assume further that $x = (\gamma, x')$. Let $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma + 1 \in \Phi^+$, and let $g = g_{0,-\sigma^{-1}(\tilde{\gamma})}w_{x,r}$ for $g \in \mathbb{J}_b, \mathbb{\tilde{w}}_x$ (see §4). By Lemma 5.3, $(\tilde{w}\sigma)^i(\gamma) = \sigma^i(\gamma)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$. Then by (a) we have $g^{-1}\tilde{w}\sigma(g) \subseteq U_{-\gamma}w_\gamma U_{-\sigma'(\gamma)} \subseteq I_{\text{Adm}}(\lambda)I$, which means that $gI = g(0) \sim_{\lambda,b} g(\infty) = gsI$, where $s = s_{\tilde{\gamma}} \cdots s_{\sigma^{-1}(\gamma)}$. By Lemma 5.1 (4), $s = \omega z^{-1}$, where $z \in W_0^+$ and $\omega = \gamma^v + \cdots + \sigma^{-1}(\gamma^v) \in \Omega_J \cong \pi_1(M_J)$. By Proposition 4.5, there is $h' \in \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}_x}$ such that $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega z^{-1} I \sim_{\lambda,b} gh' I$. So we have $\mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}_x} \sim_{\lambda,b} \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}_x}$, as desired.

6. Proof of Proposition 2.4

Retain the assumptions and notations in previous sections. For $K \subseteq S_0$ we denote by $\text{pr}_K : \Phi^+ \to (\Phi^+)^J$ the orthogonal projection.

Lemma 6.1. Let $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda,b}^+$ and let $\mathcal{O}$ be a $\sigma$-orbit of $J$-anti-dominant roots in $\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$. Then we have (1) $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}} \langle \alpha, \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \rangle > 0$, and (2) $\langle w_J(\beta), \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{O}$. Here $w_J$ denotes the longest element of $W_J$.

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$. By definition, $\langle \gamma, \nu_G(b) \rangle = \langle \gamma, \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \rangle > 0$. So (1) follows as

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}} \langle \alpha, \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \rangle = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}} \langle \alpha, \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \rangle^\circ = |\mathcal{O}| \langle \gamma, \nu_G(b) \rangle > 0.$$

By (1), there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $\langle \beta, \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \rangle > 0$. As $w_J(\beta)$ is $J$-dominant and $\mu_x - \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(\Phi^+)^J$, we have

$$\langle w_J(\beta), \mu_x \rangle \geq \langle w_J(\beta), \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \rangle = \langle \beta, \text{pr}_J(\mu_x) \rangle > 0.$$

So (2) follows. \hfill \Box

Lemma 6.2 ([4, Lemma 1.6]). Let $K \subseteq S_0$ and $\tilde{w} = t^\mu w \in \Omega_K$ with $\mu \in Y$ and $w \in W_K$. Let $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ be $K$-anti-dominant. Then (1) $\tilde{w} \alpha_n \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ if $\mu + \alpha^v \leq \lambda$; (2) $s_\alpha \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ if $\mu - \alpha^v \leq \lambda$; (3) $z \tilde{w}^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ if $\alpha \in \Pi_K$.

6.1. Define $J_1 = \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda,b}^+} J_{x,1}$ and $J_0 = J \setminus J_1$. Define $H_{J'} = M_{J'}(\hat{F}) \cap \ker(\eta_{M_{J'}})$ for $J' \subseteq J$.

Theorem 6.3 ([18, Theorem 6.3]). Let $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda,b}^+$. Then $H_{J_{x,1}} \cap \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}_x}$ fixes each connected component of $X^{M_{J_{x,1}}}(\mu_x, \tilde{w}_x)$.

Lemma 6.4. We have that $H_{J_1} \cap \mathbb{J}_b$ fixes each connected component of $X(\lambda, b)$.

Proof. Let $C$ be a connected component of $X(\lambda, b)$. Let $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda,b}^+$. By Proposition 2.3, there exists $g \in \mathbb{J}_{b,\tilde{w}_x} \subseteq M_J(\hat{F})$ such that $gI \in C$. Moreover, $gI$ also lies in the image of the embedding $X^{M_{J_{x,1}}}(\mu_x, \tilde{w}_x) \to X(\lambda, b), hI_{M_{J_{x,1}}} \mapsto ghI$.

Thus $\text{g}(H_{J_{x,1}} \cap \mathbb{J}_{\tilde{w}_x})g^{-1} = H_{J_{x,1}} \cap \mathbb{J}_b$ fixes $C$ by Theorem 6.3. So the statement follows by noticing that $H_{J_1} \cap \mathbb{J}_b$ is generated by $H_{J_{x,1}} \cap \mathbb{J}_b$ for $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda,b}^+$. \hfill \Box

6.2. Let $K \subseteq J_0$ be the union of some $\sigma$-orbit of connected components of $J_0$.

Lemma 6.5. If $\mu_x + \alpha^v \leq \lambda$ for some $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda,b}^+$ and $\alpha \in K$, then $H_K \cap \mathbb{J}_b$ fixes each connected component of $X(\lambda, b)$.
Proof. As $\mu_x$ is central on $\Phi_K$, we can assume $\alpha$ is $K$-dominant and hence $\sigma^\delta(\alpha) = \alpha$. Let $C$ be a connected component of $X(\lambda, b)$. Then $gI = C$ for some $g \in \mathbb{J}_b$. So the stabilizer of $C$ in $\mathbb{J}_b$ equals $gQg^{-1}$, where $Q \subseteq \mathbb{J}_{\omega_x}$. By Lemma 1.3 (4) it remains to show $W_K \cap \mathbb{J}_{\omega_x} \subseteq Q$. Let $g = g_{g, \alpha, \omega_x, d}$ and $g' = g_{g, -\alpha, -1, \omega_x, d}$ (see §4). By Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 5.1,
\[ g^{-1}b\sigma(g) \subseteq U_{\alpha, \omega_x} \subseteq \text{IAdm}(\lambda)I, \quad \text{and} \quad g'^{-1}b\sigma(g') \subseteq \omega_xU_{-\alpha, -1} \subseteq \text{IAdm}(\lambda)I, \]
which means
\[ g\omega_x = g(\infty) \sim_{\lambda, b} g(0) = g'(0) \sim_{\lambda, b} g'(\infty) = g\omega_x', \]
where $s = s_{\alpha} \cdots \sigma_{\alpha-1}(\alpha), s' = s_{\alpha+1} \cdots \sigma_{\alpha-1}(\alpha + 1) \in \mathbb{J}_{\omega_x}$. So we have $s, s' \in Q$, which means $W_K \cap \mathbb{J}_{\omega_x} \subseteq Q$ since $\alpha \in \Phi_K^+$ is $K$-dominant.

The following technical lemma is proved in §6.3

Lemma 6.6. If $\mu_x + \delta^\nu \not\leq \lambda$ for any $x'' \in S_{\lambda, b}^+$ and $\delta \in K$, then there exist $x \in S_{\lambda, b}^+$ and $\beta \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$ with $\beta^\nu$ $J$-anti-dominant and $J$-minuscule such that
(1) $\mu_x + \beta^\nu \leq \lambda$, and $\beta^\nu$ is non-central on $K$;
(2) $\tilde{w}_x\sigma^\nu(\beta) = \sigma^\nu(\beta)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus n\mathbb{Z}$;
(3) $\langle \sigma^\nu(\beta), \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$;
(4) if $\sigma^\nu$ does not act trivially on $\Psi_\beta \cap J_0$, then $\Psi = \Phi$, $\Psi_\beta$ is of type $E_6$, $\Psi_\beta \cap J_0 = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_6\}$, $\Psi_\beta \cap J_1 = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}$, $\beta = \alpha_3, \mu_x|_{\varphi_\beta} = \omega_x^\nu - \omega_x^\nu$, and $\mu_x|_{\varphi_\beta} = 0$.

Here, $n \in \{0, 2, 3, 4\}$ denotes the minimal integer such that $\beta, \sigma^\nu(\beta)$ are in the same connected component $\Psi_\beta$ of $\Phi := \Phi \cap (J \cup O)$, whose simple roots $\alpha_i$ and fundamental coweights $\omega_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 6$ are labeled as in [19].

Lemma 6.7. Retain the situation of Lemma 6.6. Let $\alpha \in \Phi_K^+$ such that $\langle \alpha, \beta^\nu \rangle = -1$. If $\alpha = \sigma^\nu(\alpha)$, then $U_{\beta, \omega_x}U_{\sigma^\nu(\beta), \omega_x}U_{\alpha} \subseteq \text{IAdm}(\lambda)I$.

Proof. Note that $\mu_x + \sigma(\beta)^\nu = \mu_x + \beta^\nu + \alpha^\nu \leq \lambda$, $s_{\alpha}, s_{\beta}, s_{\alpha, \beta} \in W_J^1$, and $\tilde{w}_x \in \Omega_J$. By Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.2, $s_{\beta} \tilde{w}_x, s_{\alpha, \beta} \tilde{w}_x \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$.

As $\tilde{w}_x^\nu(\beta) \in \tilde{\Phi}^+ \setminus \Phi$, we have
\[ U_{\beta, \omega_x}U_{\sigma^\nu(\beta), \omega_x}U_{\alpha} \subseteq \text{IAdm}(\lambda)I, \]
and it remains to show $s_{\alpha} s_{\beta} \tilde{w}_x s_{\alpha, \beta} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. As $\tilde{w}_x^\nu(\beta) \in \tilde{\Phi}^+ \setminus \Phi$, $\tilde{w}_x(\alpha) = \alpha$, and $s_{\alpha} s_{\beta}(\alpha) \in \tilde{\Phi}^+$. We have $s_{\beta} \tilde{w}_x s_{\alpha, \beta} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ and
\[ s_{\alpha} s_{\beta} \tilde{w}_x s_{\alpha, \beta} \leq s_{\alpha} s_{\beta} \tilde{w}_x \leq s_{\alpha} s_{\beta} s_{\alpha, \beta} \tilde{w}_x = s_{\alpha, \beta} \tilde{w}_x \in \text{Adm}(\lambda). \]

The proof is finished.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Let $K$ be the union of some $\sigma$-orbit of connected components of $J_0$. By Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.5, it remains to show $H_K \cap \mathbb{J}_b$ acts trivially on $\tau_{\sigma}(X(\lambda, b))$. Let $x, \beta$ and $n$ be as in Lemma 6.6. Let $g \in \mathbb{J}_b$, and $I_{\mathbb{J}_b} \cap Q = Q \cap \mathbb{J}_b$, be as in the proof of Lemma 6.5. It suffices to show $W_K^2 \cap \mathbb{J}_{\omega_x} \subseteq Q$.

Case (1): $\sigma^\nu$ acts trivially on $\Psi_\beta \cap J_0$. Let $\alpha \in \Phi_K^+$ be a highest root such that $\langle \alpha, \beta^\nu \rangle = -1$. Then it suffices to show $s, s' \in Q$, where $s = s_{\alpha} \cdots \sigma_{\alpha-1}(\alpha), s' = s_{\alpha+1} \cdots \sigma_{\alpha-1}(\alpha + 1) \in \mathbb{J}_{\omega_x}$.

Let $r = s_{\beta} \cdots \sigma_{\alpha-1}(s_{\beta})$. We claim that
\[ gI \sim_{\lambda, b} grI \sim_{\lambda, b} grsI \sim_{\lambda, b} gsI, \]
and hence $s \in Q$ (a)

To show the first relation $\sim_{\lambda, b}$ in (a) we define $g = g_{g, \sigma_{\alpha-1}(\alpha), \omega_x, n}$. By Lemma 6.6 (2) and Lemma 6.7 we have
\[ g^{-1}b\sigma(g) \subseteq U_{\beta, \omega_x}U_{\sigma^\nu(\beta), \omega_x} \subseteq \text{IAdm}(\lambda)I, \]
which means $gI = g(0) \sim_{\lambda, b} g(\infty) = grI$ as desired. The last relation $\sim_{\lambda, b}$ in (a) follows the same way by replacing $g$ with $gs, s_{\beta}$ respectively.

To show the second relation $\sim_{\lambda, b}$ in (b) we define $g' = g_{g, \sigma_{\alpha-1}(\alpha), \omega_x, n}$. Notice that $r^{-1} \tilde{w}_x \sigma(r) = s_{\beta} \tilde{w}_x s_{\alpha, \beta}$. Then by Lemma 6.7 we have
\[ g^{-1}b\sigma(g') \subseteq U_{\alpha, \omega_x}U_{\beta, \omega_x}U_{\sigma^\nu, \omega_x} \subseteq \text{IAdm}(\lambda)I, \]
which means $grI = g'(0) \sim_{\lambda, b} g'(\infty) = grsI$. So (a) is proved.
By Lemma 6.4, Lemma 6.5, and (a) we have $(W_{1}^0 W_{1}^0) \cap J_{\bar{w}_{s}} \subseteq Q$, and hence

$$H_x \cap J_{\bar{w}_{s}} \subseteq Q.$$  

(b)

Let $x' = x + \beta^\gamma - \sigma^n(\beta^\gamma) \in \pi_1(M_{f})$. If $\beta \neq \sigma^n(\beta)$, then $\beta, \sigma^n(\beta)$ are neighbors of $\Psi_{\beta} \cap K$ on which $\sigma^n$ acts trivially, which means they are in distinct connected components of $\Psi_{\beta} \setminus K$. Thus

$$\langle w(\beta), \sigma^n(\beta^\gamma) \rangle = 0 \text{ for any } w \in W_{1}^0 \text{ if } \beta \neq \sigma^n(\beta^\gamma).$$  

(c)

By Lemma 6.6 (1) & (3) and (c) we have $x' \in S_{x,\bar{w}}^+$. Moreover, $\mu_x + \beta^\gamma - w_x(\beta^\gamma), \mu_x'$ are conjugate by $W_{f}$ as they are conjugate by $W_{1}$ and $\mu_x'$ is central on $J_{0}$. Let $\gamma_1 = w_{J_{1}}(\beta)$ and $\gamma_2 = w_{J_{1}}(s_{0}(\beta))$ which are $J_{1}$-dominant. By Lemma 5.1 (1) and that $\sigma^n$ acts trivially on $\Psi_{\beta} \cap J_{0}$,

$$\mu_x, \mu_x - \sigma^n(\gamma_1^\gamma), \mu_x + w_x(\gamma_1^\gamma), \mu_x - \sigma^n(\gamma_2^\gamma) \leq \lambda$$

are conjugate to

$$\mu_x' - \gamma_1^\gamma + w_x(\sigma^n(\gamma_1^\gamma)), \mu_x' - \gamma_1^\gamma, \mu_x' + w_x(\sigma^n(\gamma_1^\gamma)), \mu_x' \leq \lambda$$

under $W_{1}^0$, respectively.

Let $\tau = \beta^\gamma + \cdots + \sigma^n(-1)(\beta^\gamma) \in \pi_1(M_{f}) \cong \Omega_{f}$. Then $\bar{w}_{x} = \tau^{-1} \bar{w}_{x} \sigma(\tau)$ and hence $g\tau^{-1} \in J_{b,\bar{w}_{x}}$. Define $g_{i} = g_{\tau^{-1},-\sigma^{n}(\gamma_{i}^{\gamma})}$. As $J_{0} \neq \emptyset$, $\gamma_1^\gamma$ is strongly $J_{1}$-minuscule. Then it follows from Lemma 6.6 (2), Lemma 5.2 and (c) that

$$g_{i}^{-1} b \sigma(g_{i}) \subseteq U_{-\gamma_{i},-1} \bar{w}_{x} U_{-\sigma(\gamma_{i})^{\gamma}} \subseteq I \operatorname{Adm}(\lambda) I,$$

which means $g\tau^{-1} I = g_{i}(0) \sim_{\lambda, b} g_{i}(\infty) = g^{-1}s_{I} I$, where $s_{i} = s_{\gamma_{i},-1} \cdots s_{\gamma_{i},-1}$. As $\gamma_1^\gamma$ is $J_{1}$-minuscule and $J_{1}$-dominant, we have $s_{i} = \tau_{i} y_{i}^{-1}$, where $\tau_{i} \in J_{1}$ and $y_{i} \in W_{0}$. Notice that $g\tau^{-1}\gamma_{i} \in J_{b,\bar{w}_{x}}, \tau = \tau_{i}$, and $g\tau^{-1} = s's \in J_{b,\bar{w}_{x}}$. By Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.5, there exist $h_{i} \in H_x \cap J_{\bar{w}_{s}}$ such that

$$g\tau^{-1}s_{I} I = g\tau^{-1}\tau_{i} y_{i}^{-1} I \sim_{\lambda, b} g\tau^{-1}\tau_{i} h_{i} I.$$  

In particular, by (b) we have $gI \sim_{\lambda, b} gh_{i} I \sim_{\lambda, b} g\tau^{-1} t_{2} h_{2} I$, that is, $g\tau^{-1} t_{2} h_{2} \in Q$. It follows from (b) and (a) that $g\tau^{-1} t_{2} = s's \in Q$ and $s' \in Q$ as desired.

Case(2): $\sigma^n$ acts nontrivially on $\Psi_{\beta} \cap J_{0}$. By Lemma 6.6 (4), $\Psi = \Phi$ and $\mu_x|_{\Psi} = 0$. So we can assume that $n = d = 1$, $\sigma$ is of order 2, and $\Phi$ is of type $E_6$. Then $w_{x} = s_{\alpha_{1}}s_{\alpha_{2}}$, and it suffices to show $s, s' \in Q$, where $s = s_{\alpha_{1}}s_{\alpha_{2}}$ and $s' = s_{\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{3}}s_{\alpha_{4}+\alpha_{1}+1}$ are all the simple affine reflections of $W_{f}^0 \cap J_{\bar{w}_{s}}$.

Let $b_0 = \alpha_{2} + \alpha_{4} + \alpha_{5} + \alpha_{6}, \theta_{1} = \alpha_{2} + \alpha_{4} + \alpha_{5}, \eta_1 = (w_{x}\sigma)^{(-1)}(\theta_{1})$ and $\theta_{1}' = \eta_1 + \theta_{1}$. Define $g_{i} = g_{\eta_{1},-1,\bar{w}_{x},2}$ for $g \in J_{b,\bar{w}_{x}}$. As $\mu + \alpha_{1}^{\gamma}, \mu + \alpha_{1}^{\gamma} \leq \lambda$, we have $x_{s,\sigma(\theta_{1})} \in \operatorname{Adm}(\lambda)$ by Lemma 5.1. Then

$$g_{i}^{-1} b \sigma(g_{i}) \subseteq U_{-\theta_{1},-1} \bar{w}_{x} U_{-\sigma(\theta_{1})^{\gamma}} \subseteq I \bar{w}_{x} U_{-\sigma(\theta_{1})^{\gamma}} \subseteq I \operatorname{Adm}(\lambda) I,$$

which means

$$g_{s,\sigma(\theta_{1})} s_{n_{1}} = g_{0}(\infty) \sim_{\lambda, b} g_{0}(0) = gI = g_{i}(0) \sim_{\lambda, b} g_{i}(\infty) = g_{s,\sigma(\theta_{1})} s_{n_{1}}.$$  

As $g_{i}^{-1}$ is $J$-dominant and $J$-minuscule, $g_{s,\sigma(\theta_{1})} s_{n_{1}} = \omega y_{1}^{-1}$, where $\omega = g(y_{1}) \in J_{f} \cap J_{\bar{w}_{s}}$ and $y_{0} \in W_{0}$. Then $s_{\theta_{1}} s_{n_{1}} = s_{\theta_{1}} s_{\sigma(\theta_{1})} = s_{\omega y_{1}^{-1}}$ for some $y_{1} \in W_{0}$. By Proposition 4.2 & 4.5, there exist $h_{0}, h_{1} \in H_x \cap J_{\bar{w}_{s}}$ such that $g_{\omega h_{0}} I \sim_{\lambda, b} gI \sim_{\lambda, b} g_{\omega h_{1}} I$, that is, $\omega h_{0}, \omega h_{1} \in Q$, and hence

$$s_{\omega h_{0}^{-1}} \omega^{-1} \in Q, \omega \omega_{s,\omega}^{-1} = s', \text{ by (d) we have}$$

$$s_{\omega h_{0}^{-1}} \omega^{-1} \in Q \cap \{I(s, ss')\}, \text{ which means } s \in Q. \text{ Hence } H_x \cap J_{\bar{w}_{s}} \subseteq Q, \omega \in Q \text{ and } s' = \omega \omega_{s,\omega}^{-1} \in Q \text{ as desired.} \quad \square$$

Corollary 6.8. Let $x \in S_{x,\bar{w}}^{+}, g \in J_{b,\bar{w}_{s}}$, and $y \in \bar{W}$ such that $gI \sim_{\lambda, b} gy^{-1}I$. Then we have $gI \sim_{\lambda, b} g\omega z^{-1} \sim_{\lambda, b} g\omega I$, where $z \in W_{f}^0$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{f}$ such that $y \in z' \omega^{-1} W_{f}^0$. 

Proof. By Proposition 4.2, there exists \( h \in \ker(\eta_{M,J}) \cap J_{\tilde{u}_b} \) such that \( g y^{-1} I \sim_{\lambda, b} g w z'^{-1} I \sim_{\lambda, b} g w z^{-1} I \), where the last relation \( \sim_{\lambda, b} \) follows from Proposition 2.4. Let \( x' \in S^+_{\lambda, b} \) such that \( \tilde{w}_b = \omega^{-1} \tilde{w}_a \sigma(\omega) \). Applying Proposition 4.5 and Proposition 2.4, there exists \( h' \in H_{J'} \cap J_{\tilde{u}_a} \) such that \( g w z'^{-1} I \sim_{\lambda, b} g w h' I \sim_{\lambda, b} g w I \), where the last relation \( \sim_{\lambda, b} \) again follows from Proposition 2.4. This concludes the proof. \( \square \)

6.3. To prove Lemma 6.6, we start with a general lemma on root systems.

**Lemma 6.9.** Let \( \mu \in Y \), \( \lambda \in Y^+ \) and \( \alpha \in \Phi^+ \) such that \( \mu \leq \lambda \), \( \mu + \alpha \leq \lambda \), and \( \mu + \alpha \not\preceq \lambda \). Then there exists \( \beta \in \Phi^+ \) such that \( \langle \beta, \mu + \alpha \rangle \leq -2 \), and either \( \mu + \beta \leq \lambda \) or \( \mu + \alpha + \beta \leq \lambda \).

**Proof.** We argue by induction on \( \mu + \alpha \) via the partial order \( \preceq \). If \( \mu + \alpha \in Y^+ \), then \( \mu + \alpha \leq \lambda \), contradicting our assumption. So there exists \( \beta \in S_0 \) such that \( \langle \beta, \mu + \alpha \rangle \leq -1 \) and hence \( \mu + \alpha + \beta \leq \lambda \) (by [5, Proposition 2.2]). If \( \langle \beta, \mu + \alpha \rangle \leq -2 \), the statement follows. Assume \( \langle \beta, \mu + \alpha \rangle = -1 \). Then \( \mu + \alpha < s_\beta(\mu + \alpha) \not\preceq \lambda \). If \( \beta = \alpha \), then \( \langle \alpha, \mu \rangle = -3 \) and \( \mu + \alpha \leq \lambda \), a contradiction. So \( \beta \neq \alpha \) and \( s_\beta(\alpha) \in \Phi^+ \). By induction hypothesis for the pair \( s_\beta(\mu), s_\beta(\alpha) \), there exists \( \gamma \in \Phi^+ \) such that

\[
\langle \gamma, s_\beta(\mu + \alpha) \rangle = \langle s_\beta(\gamma), \mu + \alpha \rangle \leq -2,
\]

(whence \( \beta \neq \gamma \) and \( s_\beta(\gamma) \in \Phi^+ \)), and either \( s_\beta(\mu) + \gamma \preceq \lambda \) or \( s_\beta(\mu + \alpha) + \gamma \preceq \lambda \). If the former case occurs, we have \( \mu + s_\beta(\gamma) \preceq \lambda \), and the statement follows. Otherwise, \( \langle s_\beta(\gamma), \mu \rangle \geq 0 \) and the latter case occurs. In particular, \( \langle s_\beta(\gamma), \alpha \rangle \leq -2 \), and hence means \( \gamma \) is a long root.

So we have

\[
\mu + \alpha + s_\beta(\gamma) \preceq \mu + \alpha + s_\beta(\alpha) \preceq \mu + \alpha + \gamma + \beta = s_\beta(\mu + \alpha) + \gamma \preceq \lambda,
\]

and the statement also follows. \( \square \)

**Proof of Lemma 6.6.** By [30, Lemma 3.3], there exists \( x \in S^+_{\lambda, b} \) such that \( \mu_x \) is weakly dominant, that is, \( \langle \delta, \mu_x \rangle \geq -1 \) for \( \delta \in \Phi^+ \). As \( (\lambda, b) \) is Hodge-Newton irreducible, there exists \( \alpha \in K \) such that \( \mu_x + \alpha \preceq \lambda \). We show that

\[
(\text{a1}) \text{ there exists } \xi \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \text{ such that } \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle \leq -1, \mu + \xi \preceq \lambda; \quad (\text{a})
\]

\[
(\text{a2}) \text{ if, moreover, } \Phi \text{ is simply-laced, then } \langle \xi, \mu_x \rangle = -1 \text{ and } \beta \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J.
\]

By assumption, \( \mu_x + \xi \preceq \lambda \). By Lemma 6.9, there exists \( \zeta \in \Phi^+ \) such that \( \langle \zeta, \mu_x + \xi \rangle \leq -2 \), and either \( \mu_x + \zeta \preceq \lambda \) or \( \mu_x + \zeta \preceq \lambda \). As \( \mu_x \) is weakly dominant, we have either (i) \( \langle \zeta, \mu_x \rangle = -1 \) or (ii) \( \langle \zeta, \mu_x \rangle = -2 \) and \( \langle \zeta, \mu_x \rangle = 0 \) or (iii) \( \langle \zeta, \mu_x \rangle = -3 \). Take \( \xi = \zeta \) if (i) occurs. Assume (ii) or (iii) occurs. Then \( \Phi \) is non-simply-laced and \( \langle \alpha, \zeta \rangle = -1 \).

If \( \mu_x + \zeta \preceq \lambda \), take \( \xi = \zeta \). Otherwise, \( \mu_x + \zeta \preceq \lambda \) is not weakly dominant (by [5, Proposition 2.2]). So there exists \( \gamma \in \Phi^+ \) such that \( \langle \gamma, \mu_x + \zeta \rangle \leq -2 \), which means \( \langle \gamma, \xi \rangle = -2 \) since \( \mu_x \) is weakly dominant and \( \zeta \) is a long root. Then \( \gamma \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \) and \( \mu_x + \gamma \preceq \lambda \). Note that \( \alpha \) is a short root and \( \langle \alpha, \mu_x \rangle = 0 \). If \( \langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle = -1 \), we take \( \xi = \gamma \). If \( \langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle = 0 \), then (ii) occurs (since (ii) occurs, then \( \gamma = -3 \alpha - 2 \zeta \), contradicting that \( \langle \gamma, \mu_x \rangle = -1 \)), which means \( \mu_x + \gamma \preceq \lambda \). So we take \( \xi = s_\alpha(\zeta) \). If \( \langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle = 1 \), we take \( \xi = s_\alpha(\gamma) \). It remains to show \( \xi \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \). Otherwise, \( \xi \in \Phi_K \) since \( \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle \neq 0 \), contradicting our assumption that \( \mu_x + \xi \preceq \lambda \). So (a) is proved.

Let \( \beta \) be the \( J \)-anti-dominant conjugate of \( \xi \) under \( W_J \). By (a) we have

\[
(\text{b}) \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = -1 \text{ if } \Phi \text{ is simply-laced; (c) } \mu_x + \beta \preceq \lambda; \quad (\text{d}) \beta \text{ is non-central on } K_0,
\]

where \( K_0 \leq \Psi_\beta \) is the connected component of \( K \) containing \( \alpha \). We show that

\[
\beta \text{ is } K \text{-minuscule. \ (e)}
\]

Otherwise, \( \langle \theta, \beta \rangle \preceq -2 \) for some \( \theta \in \Phi_K^+ \). Then \( \mu_x + \beta + \theta \preceq \lambda \). If \( \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle \geq 0 \), then \( \langle \beta, \mu_x + \beta + \theta \rangle \geq 1 \) and \( \mu_x + \theta \preceq \lambda \), contradicting our assumption. Otherwise, \( \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = -1 \) and \( \langle s_\beta(\theta), \mu_x \rangle = -\langle \theta, \beta \rangle \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle \leq -2 \), contradicting that \( \mu_x \) is weakly dominant. So (e) follows.

Applying [30, Lemma 6.6] we can assume furthermore that \( \beta \) is \( J \)-anti-dominant and \( J \)-minuscule. Hence (1) is proved.
If \((w_x \sigma^i(\beta), \mu_x) \geq 1\) for some \(i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus n\mathbb{Z}\), then \(\mu_1 := \mu_x + \beta^\vee - w_x \sigma^i(\beta)^\vee \preceq \lambda\), which means \(x_1 := x + \beta^\vee - \sigma^i(\beta)^\vee \in S_{\lambda,b}^+\). By (e), \(\mu_1\) is non-central on \(K_0\). As \(\mu_x, \mu_1\) are conjugate by \(W_J\) (see Lemma 5.1), \(\mu_x\) is also non-central on \(K_0\), contradicting that \(K_0 \subseteq J_0\). So \((w_x \sigma^i(\beta), \mu_x) \leq 0\) for \(i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus n\mathbb{Z}\). If \((\sigma^i(\beta), \mu_x) \leq -1\) for some \(i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus n\mathbb{Z}\), by Lemma 6.1 there exists \(j \in n\mathbb{Z}\) such that \((w_x \sigma^j(\beta), \mu_x) \geq 1\). Then \(\mu_2 := \mu_x - w_x \sigma^j(\beta)^\vee + \sigma^j(\beta)^\vee \preceq \lambda\) and hence \(x_2 := x - \sigma^j(\beta)^\vee + \sigma^j(\beta)^\vee \in S_{\lambda,b}^+,\) which is also impossible since \(\mu_2\) is non-central on \(\sigma^j(K_0)\). So \((\sigma^j(\beta), \mu_x) = (w_x \sigma^j(\beta), \mu_x) = 0\) for \(i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus n\mathbb{Z}\) and (2) is proved.

If \(\sigma^{2n}(\beta) \neq \beta\), then \(\Phi = \Psi\) and \(\Psi_\beta\) is of type \(D_4\), whose simple roots are \(\beta, \sigma^n(\beta), \sigma^{2n}(\beta), \alpha\) with \(\sigma^n(\alpha) = \alpha\). Moreover, \(J = J_0 = O_\alpha\). (By (2), we have \(\mu_x |_{\Psi \setminus \Psi_\beta} = 0\). Hence \(\sum_{i=0}^n (\sigma^i(\beta), \mu_x) \geq 1\) by Lemma 6.1. If \((\sigma^i(\beta), \mu_x) \geq 1\), then (3) follows. If \((\sigma^i(\beta), \mu_x) \leq -1\), it follows by replacing \(\beta\) with \(\sigma^n(\beta)\). If \((\sigma^i(\beta), \mu_x) = 0\), it follows by replacing \(x\) with \(x - \sigma^2n(\beta)^\vee + \sigma^n(\beta)^\vee \in S_{\lambda,b}^+\).

Now we assume \(\sigma^{2n}(\beta) = \beta\). By (2) and Lemma 6.1,
\[
\langle \beta + \sigma^n(\beta), pr_J(\mu_x) \rangle = \langle \beta + \sigma^n(\beta), pr_J(\mu_x) \rangle > 0.
\]
(\(f\)) So (3) follows if \(\beta = \sigma^n(\beta)\). Assume \(\beta \neq \sigma^n(\beta)\). Then \(\Phi\) is simply-laced, and hence \(\langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = -1\) by (b). Moreover, \(O_\beta \cup J\) is a set of simple roots of \(\Psi\) by [2, Proposition 4.2.11]. As \(\beta\) is a neighbor of \(K_0\) in \(\Psi_\beta\) and \((\beta, \mu_x) = -1\), one checks (on the type of \(\Psi_\beta\)) that \(\langle \beta, pr_J(\mu_x) \rangle < 0\).

By (f) we have \((w_x \sigma^n(\beta), \mu_x) \geq 1\) and (3) follows.

Assume \(\sigma^n\) does not act trivially on \(\Psi_\beta \setminus J_0\). Then \(\Phi\) is simply-laced and \((\beta, \mu_x) = -1\). We may assume \(\sigma^n\) does not fix each point of \(K_0\). Let \(\alpha \in K_0\) such that \(\langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = -1\). If \(\sigma^n(\beta) = \beta\), then one checks directly (on the type of \(\Psi_\beta\) and using the assumption on \(K_0\)) that \(\langle \beta, pr_J(\mu_x) \rangle < 0\), which contradicts (f). So \(\beta \neq \sigma^n(\beta) \in \Psi_\beta\). Let \(x_3 = x + \beta^\vee - \sigma^n(\beta)^\vee \in \pi_1(M_J)\). If \(\beta, \sigma^n(\beta)\) are in distinct connected components of \(O_\beta \cup J \setminus \{\alpha, \sigma^n(\alpha)\} \supseteq O_\beta \cup J_1\), then \(x_3 \in S_{\lambda,b}^+\) by (2) that \((w_x \sigma^n(\beta), \mu_x) \geq 1\). As \((\alpha, \mu_{x_3}) = 0\), we deduce that \(\alpha = \sigma^n(\alpha)\) is the common neighbor of \(\beta, \sigma^n(\beta)\) in \(\Psi_\beta\), which implies that \(\sigma^n\) fixes each point of \(K_0\), contradicting our assumption. So \(\beta, \sigma^n(\beta)\) are connected in \(O_\beta \cup J \setminus \{\alpha, \sigma^n(\alpha)\}\). Then \(\alpha \neq \sigma^n(\alpha)\), and it follows from (f) that either \((w_x \sigma^n(\beta), \mu_x) \geq 2\) or the case in (4) occurs. The former case does not occur since \(x_3 \in S_{\lambda,b}^+\) but \(\mu_{x_3}\) is non-central on \(K_0\). So (4) follows.

7. Proof of Proposition 2.5

In this section, we assume that \((\lambda, b)\) is Hodge-Newton irreducible. Let \(O\) be a \(\sigma\)-orbit of \(\Phi^+\). We set
\[
\omega_O = \sum_{\sigma \in O} \alpha^\vee \in \pi_1(M_J)^\sigma = \Omega_J^\sigma \subseteq \Omega_J \cap \mathbb{J}_b.
\]
Let \(\Psi = \Phi \cap \mathbb{Z}(O \cup J)\). We say \(O\) is of type I (resp. type II, resp. type III) if \(|O| = n\) (resp. \(2n\), resp. \(3n\)). Here \(n \in \{d, 2d, 3d\}\) is the minimal positive integer such that \(\alpha, \sigma^n(\alpha)\) are in the same connected component of \(\Psi\) for some/any \(\alpha \in O\). If \(O\) is of type II or III, then \(n = d\), \(\Phi\) is simply-laced, and \(O \cap J\) is a set of simple roots for \(\Psi\). In this case, for \(\alpha \in O\) we denote by \(\nu_\alpha \in \Phi^+\) the sum of simple roots in the closed geodesic of \(O \cup J\) connecting \(\alpha\) and \(\sigma^n(\alpha)\), see [2, §4.7].

7.1. Let \(x \in S_{\lambda,b}^+\). Define
\[
C_{\lambda,b,x} = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J; \mu_x + \alpha^\vee \preceq \lambda, \alpha^\vee \text{ is } J\text{-anti-dominant and strongly } J\text{-minuscule}\}.
\]
let \(O\) be a \(\sigma\)-orbit of some root in \(C_{\lambda,b,x}\).

Lemma 7.1. Assume \(x \mapsto x\) with \(x' = x - \gamma^\vee - \sigma^i(\gamma)^\vee \in S_{\lambda,b}^+\) for some \(\gamma \in O\) and \(1 \leq r \leq n\). Let \(\omega = \gamma^\vee + \cdots + \sigma^{r-1}(\gamma)^\vee \in \pi_1(M_J) \cong \Omega_J\). Then
\[
g1 \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega l \quad \text{for } g \in \mathbb{J}_b \tilde{\omega}.
\]
if Lemma 5.2 (*) fails. In particular, the statement follows if (1) \(\langle \gamma, w_x \sigma^i(\gamma)^\vee \rangle = 0\); or (2) \(x = x\); or (3) \(\mu_x + \gamma^\vee \not\preceq \lambda\) when \(O\) is of type II.

Proof. Let \(\tilde{\theta} = w_x \sigma^{r-1}(\gamma) + 1 \in \Phi^+\). By [30, Lemma 6.5] we can assume that
\[
x \mapsto x', \quad \text{and hence } (\tilde{\omega}_x \sigma^i(\tilde{\theta}) = \sigma^i(\tilde{\theta})) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq r \leq i \leq 0.
\]
Define $g = g_{g,-\delta,\omega_r,r}$ for $g \in J_b,\omega_r$. By (a) and Lemma 5.2 we have
\[ g^{-1}b\sigma(g) \subseteq U_{-\sigma^{1-r}(\delta)}\omega_rU_{-\sigma(\delta)} \subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda)I, \]
which means
\[ gI = g(0) \sim_{\lambda,b} g(\infty) = gs_{\delta}^{1} \cdots s_{-1}(\delta)I = g\omega^{-1}I \]
for some $z \in W_0^l$ and $\omega = \gamma^r + \cdots + \sigma^{r-1}(\gamma) \in \pi_1(M_J) \cong \Omega_J$. By Corollary 6.8, we have $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega z^{-1}I \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega I$ as desired. \hfill $\Box$

Let $A_{\lambda,b}$ be the group of elements $\omega \in \pi_1(M_J)^{\sigma} \cong \Omega_J^r$ which fixes some/any connected component of $X(\lambda,b)$.

**Lemma 7.2.** Suppose $\mathcal{O}$ is of type I. Then there exist $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$, $1 \leq r \leq n$, and $x' \in S_{\lambda,b}^+$ such that $x \sim^{(r)} x'$. In particular, $\omega_\mathcal{O} \in A_{\lambda,b}$.

**Proof.** Assume otherwise. By the choice of $\mathcal{O}$, we have $\mu + \alpha^r \leq \lambda$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$. If \(\langle w_J, \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = 1\) for some $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$, then
\[ x^{(\sigma(\alpha)_n^n-r)} x^{(\sigma(\alpha)_n^n-r)} x, \]
where $x' = x - \sigma^r(\alpha^r) + \alpha^r \in S_{\lambda,b}^+$.

Otherwise, \(\langle w_J, \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \leq 0\) for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, which means $\langle w_J(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$ by Lemma 6.1. So $x^{(\alpha_n^n-r)} x$ and the first statement follows. As $\mathcal{O}$ is of type I, the second statement follows from Lemma 7.1 and (2). \hfill $\Box$

**Lemma 7.3.** Suppose $\mathcal{O}$ is of type II. Assume $\mu_{x'} + \theta_{\beta}^r \not\leq \lambda$ for any $x'' \in S_{\lambda,b}^+$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{O}$. If there exist $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$, $n + 1 \leq r \leq 2n - 1$, and $x' \in S_{\lambda,b}^+$ such that $x \sim^{(r)} x'$, then

1. $\langle \sigma^r(\gamma), \mu_x \rangle = 0$, $w_J \sigma^r(\gamma) = \sigma^r(\gamma)$ for $1 \leq i \neq r - n \leq r - 1$;
2. $w_J \sigma^{-n}(\gamma) = \sigma^{-n}(\gamma)$ and $w_J \sigma^{-n}(\gamma, \mu_x) = 1$;
3. $\langle w_J(\sigma, -\sigma^r(\gamma), \mu_x) \rangle \geq 1$.

As a consequence, $\omega_\mathcal{O} \in A_{\lambda,b}$.

**Proof.** Write $x' = x + \sigma^r(\gamma) - \sigma^{-n}(\gamma)$). Then (1), (2) and (3) follow from [30, Lemma 8.2] by using $\sigma^{-1}$ instead of $\sigma$. Let $\tilde{\theta} = w_J \sigma^{-n}(\gamma) + 1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_x = \tilde{\omega}_x + 1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. By (1) and (2) we have $\langle \tilde{\omega}_x, \sigma^r(\tilde{\theta}) \rangle = \sigma^r(\tilde{\theta}) = w_J \sigma^{r-n}(\gamma) + 1$ for $1 - n \leq i \leq 0$, and
\[ \langle \tilde{\omega}_x, \sigma^r(\tilde{\theta}) \rangle = \sigma^{i+n-n} w_J \sigma^{r-n}(\gamma) = \sigma^{i+n-1} w_J \sigma^{r-n}(\gamma) \]
for $1 - n \leq i \leq -n$. Define $g = g_{g, -\tilde{\delta}, \omega_r, r}$ for $g \in J_b,\tilde{\omega}_r$. Then we have
\[ g^{-1}b\sigma(g) \subseteq IU_{-\omega_r(\tilde{\delta})}\tilde{\omega}_xU_{-\omega_r(\tilde{\delta})}I \subseteq I \tilde{\omega}_xU_{-\omega_r(\tilde{\delta})}I \subseteq I \text{Adm}(\lambda)I, \]
where the second inclusion follows from (1) and (3) that $\langle w_J(\theta_x), \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$. Thus
\[ gI = g(0) \sim_{\lambda,b} g(\infty) = gs_{\tilde{\omega}_x}^{1} \cdots s_{-1}(\tilde{\omega}_x, \sigma^{-1}(\tilde{\delta}) s_{\tilde{\omega}_x}^{1} gI = g\omega^{-1}I, \]
where $y \in W_0$ and $\omega = \gamma^r + \cdots + \sigma^{r-1}(\gamma) \in \pi_1(M_J) \cong \Omega_J$. By Corollary 6.8 we have $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega I$ for some $1 \leq r \leq 2n - 1$, and hence $g\omega I \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega I = g\omega I$ by Lemma 7.1, where $\omega' = \sigma^r(\gamma) + \cdots + \sigma^{2n-1}(\gamma) \in \pi_1(M_J) = \Omega_J$. So $\omega_\mathcal{O} \in A_{\lambda,b}$ as desired. \hfill $\Box$

**Lemma 7.4.** Suppose $\mathcal{O}$ is of type II. Assume $\mu_{x'} + \theta_{\beta}^r \not\leq \lambda$ for any $x'' \in S_{\lambda,b}^+$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{O}$. If there do not exist $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$, $1 \leq r \leq 2n - 1$, and $x' \in S_{\lambda,b}^+$ such that $x \sim^{(r)} x'$. Then there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$ such that

1. $\langle \sigma^i(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = 0$, $w_J \sigma^i(\alpha) = \sigma^i(\alpha)$ for $1 \neq i \neq n \leq 2n - 1$;
2. $w_J \sigma^i(\alpha, \mu_x) = \theta_x$ and $\langle w_J(\sigma^i(\alpha), \mu_x) \rangle = 1$;
3. $\langle w_J(\theta_x), \mu_x + \alpha^r \rangle \geq 1$;
4. $\langle w_J(\theta_x), \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$.

As a consequence, $\omega_\mathcal{O} \in A_{\lambda,b}$. 

Proof. The statements (1), (2) and (3) follow from [30, Lemma 8.3 & Lemma 8.4]. Note that $\theta_\alpha$ is $J$-anti-dominant. So (4) follows from (1) and Lemma 6.1. By (3) and (4) we have
\[
\langle w_x(\theta_\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \geq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle w_x(\theta_\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \geq 2 \text{ or } \langle w_x(\theta_\alpha), \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 0.
\]
Let $g \in J_{\alpha, w_x}$ and $\tilde{\theta} = w_x \sigma^{-1}(\alpha) + 1 \in \tilde{\Phi}^+$, and $\tilde{\theta} = w_x \sigma^{-1}(\theta_\alpha) + 1 \in \tilde{\Phi}^+$. By (1) and (2) we have $\langle \tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}(\tilde{\theta}) = \sigma 1^{-n}(\tilde{\theta}) = w_x(\theta_\alpha)$ and
\[
\langle \tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}(\tilde{\theta}) = \sigma 1^{-n}w_x \sigma^{-1}(\alpha) = \sigma 1^{-n}w_x \sigma^{-1}(\theta_\alpha - \alpha).
\]
Define $g : \mathbb{P}^1 \to G(\tilde{F})/I$ by
\[
g(z) = gU_{-\tilde{g}}(z) \cdots (\tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}U_{-\tilde{g}}(z) U_{-\tilde{g}}(cz^{1+q^{-n}}) \cdots (\tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}U_{-\tilde{g}}(z)),
\]
where $c \in O^\times_F$ (as $\Phi$ is simply-laced) such that
\[
\langle \tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}U_{-\tilde{g}}(z)U_{-\tilde{g}}(z)U_{-\tilde{g}}(cz^{1+q^{-n}}) = U_{-\tilde{g}}(z)|\tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}U_{-\tilde{g}}(z).
\]
Then by (1) we compute that $g^{-1}b \sigma(g) = U_{-w_x}(\tilde{e}_x)U_{-w_x}(\tilde{e}_x)I \subseteq Iw_x U_{-w_x}(\tilde{e}_x)I \subseteq IA_{\Phi}(\lambda)I$, where the first inclusion follows by (a) that $\tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}U_{-w_x}(\tilde{e}_x), U_{-w_x}(\tilde{e}_x)] \subseteq I$. Thus
\[
ge(I) = g(0) \sim_{\lambda, b} g(\infty) = g(s_{\tilde{g}} \tilde{g}^\vee) \cdots \sigma 1^{-n}(s_{\tilde{g}} \tilde{g}^\vee)I = g \omega_\sigma g I,
\]
where $\theta' = (\tilde{w}_x \sigma 1^{-n}(\tilde{\theta}) \in \Phi$ and $y \in W_0$. So $gI \sim_{\lambda, b} g \omega_\sigma I$ and $\omega_\sigma \in A_{\lambda, b}$ as desired. □

7.2. Now we have the following result.

Proposition 7.5. Let $O$ be the $\sigma$-orbit of some element in $\cup_{x \in S^+_{\lambda, b}} C_{\lambda, b, x}$. Then $\omega_\sigma \in A_{\lambda, b}$.

Proof. If $O$ is of type III, the statement is proved in §8.2. If $O$ is of type I, the statement follows from Lemma 7.2. If $\mu_{\sigma, \theta} + \theta_\beta \leq \lambda$ for some $\mu^\vee \in S^+_{\lambda, b}$ and $\beta \in O$, then we also have $\omega_\sigma = \omega_{\sigma, \beta} \in A_{\lambda, b}$ since $O_{\sigma, \beta}$ is of type I. If $O$ is of type II, the statement follows from Lemma 7.1 (3), Lemma 7.3 and Lemma 7.4. □

Proof of Proposition 2.5. First note that $(\mathbb{Z} \Phi^\vee / \mathbb{Z} \Phi^\vee)^\sigma$ is panned by $\omega_\sigma$, where $\Phi$ ranges over $\sigma$-orbits of $S_0$. Let $J \subseteq S_0 \subseteq S_0$ be such that $\omega_\sigma \in A_{\lambda, b}$ for each $\sigma$-orbit of $S_0$. It suffices to show $S_0 = S_0$. Assume otherwise. By (a) and (b) in the proof of [30, Proposition 4.3], $\Phi$ is simply-laced, and there exist $\alpha = \sigma 1^n(\alpha) \in S_0 \setminus S_0$, $\theta = \sigma 1^n(\theta) \in \Phi^+$ such that $\theta^\vee \alpha^\vee \in Z \Phi^\vee$ and either (b1) $\theta \in \cup_\alpha S^+_{\lambda, b}$ or (b2) $x (\theta, n) \to x'$ and $x (\theta, n) \to x'$ for some $x \in S^+_{\lambda, b}$ and $\beta \in \Phi_{S_0}$ such that $x' = x - \beta^\vee + 1^n(\beta^\vee) \in S^+_{\lambda, b}$ and $\theta + \beta \in \Phi^+$. Let $O$ and $O'$ be the $\sigma$-orbits of $\alpha$ and $\theta$ respectively. Then $|O| = |O'| = n$ and $\omega_\sigma - \omega_{\alpha, \beta} \in (\mathbb{Z} \Phi^\vee / \mathbb{Z} \Phi^\vee)^\sigma \subseteq A_{\lambda, b}$. If (b1) occurs, then $\omega_\sigma \in A_{\lambda, b}$ by Proposition 7.5. Hence $\omega_\sigma \in A_{\lambda, b}$ and $\alpha \in S_0$, which is a contradiction. Suppose (b2) occurs. Let $\omega = \beta^\vee + \cdots 1^n(\beta^\vee) \in \pi_1(M_\beta) \cong \Omega_J$. We claim that
\[
g \omega I \sim \lambda, b \ g I \sim \lambda, b \ g \omega_\sigma I \quad \text{for } g \in J_{\alpha, \tilde{w}_x}.
\]
Given (*) we have $g \omega I \sim \lambda, b \ g \omega_\sigma I$, and hence $\omega_{\sigma, \beta} \in A_{\lambda, b}$, which is again a contradiction. Thus $S_0 = S_0$ as desired.

To show (*) we can assume $\beta \in \Phi^+$ by switching $x$ and $x'$. If $O_{\beta}$ is of type I, (a) follows from Lemma 7.2. If $O_{\beta}$ is of type III, (a) follow from Lemma 8.1. If $O_{\beta}$ is of type II, by Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 7.1, we have
\[
either gI \sim \lambda, b \ g \omega I \text{ or } g \omega \sim \lambda, b \ g \omega_\sigma I \text{ for } g \in J_{\alpha, \tilde{w}_x},
\]
where $\omega' = \sigma 1^n(\beta^\vee) + \cdots 1^n(\beta^\vee) \in \pi_1(M_\beta) \cong \Omega_J$. As $gI \sim \lambda, b \ g \omega_\sigma I$ by Proposition 7.5, we always have $gI \sim \lambda, b \ g \omega I$, and similarly, $gI \sim \lambda, b \ g \omega_\sigma I$. So (*) is proved. □

8. The case that $\sigma$ has order $3d$

We assume that $\sigma$ has order $3d$. Then some/any connected component of $S_0$ is of type $D_4$.
8.1. Let $\alpha, \beta \in S_0$ such that $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = -1$ and $\beta = \sigma^d(\beta)$. Then the subset \{\(\alpha, \sigma^d(\alpha), \sigma^{2d}(\alpha), \beta\) is a connected component of \(S_0\). Assume $J = O_\beta$.

Let $x, x' \in S^+_b$ such that $x \rightarrow (\alpha, r) x'$ for some $J$-anti-dominant root $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$ and $1 \leq r \leq 3d - 1$. Let $\omega = \gamma^r + \cdots + \sigma^r(\gamma)^{r} \in \pi_1(M_J) \cong \Omega_f$.

**Lemma 8.1.** If $r \leq d$, then $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega y^{-1}I$ for $g \in \mathbb{J}_b, \mathbb{w}_x$ and some $y \in W^0$.

**Proof.** As in the proof of Lemma 7.1, we can assume $x \rightarrow (\alpha, r)$, and it suffices to show

$$U_{-(\alpha + \beta) - 1} \bar{\omega}_x U_{-\sigma^r(\alpha + \beta) - 1} \subseteq I\text{Adm}(\lambda)I.$$

Assume otherwise. Then $r = d$, and by Lemma 5.2 (*) we have

$$\langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = \langle \alpha, \beta, \mu_x \rangle = -w_x \sigma^d(\alpha + \beta), \mu_x \rangle = 1, \text{ and } \mu_x + \delta \geq \lambda,$$

where $\delta = \alpha + \beta + \sigma^d(\alpha)$. As $\delta$ central for $J = O_\beta$, by Lemma 5.1 (2) we have

$$U_{-(\alpha + \beta) - 1} \bar{\omega}_x U_{-\sigma^r(\alpha + \beta) - 1} \subseteq I(U_{-(\beta + 1)} \bar{\omega}_x I \subseteq I\{s_{\delta + 1} \bar{\omega}_x, \bar{\omega}_x \} I \subseteq I\text{Adm}(\lambda)I,$$

and the statement follows. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 8.2.** Suppose $2d \leq r \leq 3d - 1$ and the following conditions hold:

1. $\langle \alpha, \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$
2. If $r = 2d$, then $\langle \sigma^d(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = 0$.
3. If $2d + 1 \leq r \leq 3d - 1$, then $\langle \sigma^r(\beta), \mu_x \rangle = 1, \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = 0, \text{ and } \langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = 0$ for $i \in \{r - d, r - 2d, d, 2d\}$;
4. $\bar{\omega}_x \sigma^i(\alpha) = \sigma^i(\alpha)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ with $i \notin \{r - d, r - 2d, d, 2d\}$.

Moreover, $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega y^{-1}I$ for $g \in \mathbb{J}_b, \mathbb{w}_x$ and some $y \in W^0$.

**Proof.** Let $\tilde{\theta} = \sigma^{-1}(\alpha + \beta) + 1 \in \Phi^+$. Define $g = g_{\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\omega}_x, \rho}$ for $g \in \mathbb{J}_b, \mathbb{w}_x$.

Case(1): $r = 2d$. By (2) and (4) we have

$$g^{-1}\sigma(g) \subseteq \begin{cases} I(U_{-(\alpha + \beta + \sigma^d(\alpha) - 1} \tilde{\omega}_x U_{-\sigma^r(\alpha + \beta) - 1} I, & \text{if } \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = 1; \\
I(U_{-(\alpha + \beta + \sigma^d(\alpha) - 1} \tilde{\omega}_x U_{-\sigma^r(\alpha + \beta) - 1} I, & \text{if } \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = 0; \\
\end{cases}$$

By (1) and (2), $\langle \alpha + \beta, \mu_x \rangle = \langle \alpha + \beta + \sigma^d(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \geq \langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle + 1$, which means

$$g^{-1}\sigma(g) \subseteq \tilde{\omega}_x U_{-\sigma^r(\alpha + \beta) - 1} I \subseteq I\text{Adm}(\lambda)I.$$

So $g = g(0) \sim_{\lambda,b} g(\infty) = gsI$, where $s = \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} s_{\sigma^i(\alpha + \beta + \sigma^d(\alpha) + 1)} \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} s_{\sigma^i(\alpha)}$ if $\langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = 1$, and $s = \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} s_{\sigma^i(\alpha + \beta + 1)}$ if $\langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = 0$.

Case(2): $2d + 1 \leq r \leq 3d - 1$. Let $\tilde{\theta} = \alpha + \sigma^d(\alpha) + \sigma^{2d}(\alpha) + 2\beta$. By (3) and (4),

$$g^{-1}\sigma(g) \subseteq I(U_{-\sigma^{r-1}} \tilde{\omega}_x U_{-\sigma^r(\alpha + \beta) - 1} I \subseteq I\tilde{\omega}_x U_{-\sigma^r(\alpha + \beta) - 1} I \subseteq I\text{Adm}(\lambda)I,$$

which means $gI = g(0) \sim_{\lambda,b} g(\infty) = gsI$, where

$$s = \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \sigma^i(\alpha + \beta) \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \sigma^i(\alpha + \beta + \sigma^d(\alpha) + 1) \prod_{i=r}^{d-1} \sigma^i(\alpha + \beta + \sigma^d(\alpha) + 1) \sigma^i(\alpha + \beta).$$

The proof is finished. \hfill \Box

The following two lemmas follow from the same construction in Lemma 8.2.

**Lemma 8.3.** Assume $d + 1 \leq r \leq 2d - 1$ and the following conditions hold:

1. $\langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \sigma^r(\beta), \mu_x \rangle \in [0, 1]$;
2. $\langle \sigma^d(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = \langle \sigma^{r-d}(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = 0$, and $\langle \alpha, \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$;
3. $\bar{\omega}_x \sigma^i(\alpha) = \sigma^i(\alpha)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ with $i \notin \{r - d, r - 2d, d, 2d\}$.

Then we have $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega y^{-1}I$ for $g \in \mathbb{J}_b, \mathbb{w}_x$ and some $y \in W^0$.

**Lemma 8.4** ([30, Lemma 6.6]). Suppose $\langle \beta, \mu_x \rangle = 1, \langle \sigma^d(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = \langle \sigma^{d}(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = 0$, $\langle \alpha, \mu_x \rangle \geq -1$, and $\bar{\omega}_x \sigma^i(\alpha) = \alpha$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$. Then $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} g\omega \alpha y^{-1}I$ for $g \in \mathbb{J}_b, \mathbb{w}_x$ and some $y \in W^0$.

Here $\omega_{\alpha} = \alpha^\vee + \cdots \sigma^{2d-1}(\alpha^\vee) \in \pi_1(M_J) \cong \Omega_f$. 
Lemma 8.5. Let $x_1, x_2 \in S^+_{\lambda,b}$, $\delta = \alpha + \beta + \sigma^{2d}(\alpha)$ and $1 \leq k \leq 3d - 1$ such that $x_1 \xrightarrow{(\delta,k)} x_2$. Then we have $gI \sim_{\lambda,b} gw^{-1}I$ for $g \in J_{b,\widehat{w}_1}$ and some $y \in W_0$. Here $\omega_{\mathcal{O}_a} = \delta^V + \cdots + \sigma^{k-1}(\delta^V) \in \pi_1(M_J) \cong \Omega_j$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 7.2 by noticing that $\mathcal{O}_a$ is of type I. \hfill \Box

Lemma 8.6. Assume $d + 1 \leq r \leq 2d - 1$ and the following conditions hold:

1. $\langle \beta, \mu_{x} \rangle = 1$ and $\langle \sigma^{r}(\beta), \mu_{x} \rangle = 0$;
2. $\langle \sigma^{r}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle = -1$, $\langle \sigma^{r-d}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle = 0$, $\langle \alpha, \mu_{x} \rangle \leq 0$, and $\langle \sigma^{r}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle \leq -1$;
3. $\widetilde{w}_b \sigma^{i}(\alpha) = \sigma^{i}(\alpha)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ with $i \notin \{r - d, d\}$.

Then we have $J_{b,\widehat{w}_x} \sim_{\lambda,b} J_{b,\widehat{w}_y}$.

Proof. Let $\delta = \alpha + \beta + \sigma^{2d}(\alpha)$. Assume $\mu_{x} - \delta^V \leq \lambda$. By (2) we have

$x \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x'' \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x''' \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} \ldots$.

So $J_{b,\widehat{w}_x} \sim_{\lambda,b} J_{b,\widehat{w}_v}$ by Lemma 8.5. It suffices to show $J_{b,\widehat{w}_x} \sim_{\lambda,b} J_{b,\widehat{w}_y}$. If $\langle \sigma^{r}(\sigma), \mu_{x''} \rangle \leq -1$, then

$x'' \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x'' - \sigma^{r}(\sigma) \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x'' - \sigma^{r}(\sigma)$,

and the statement follows from Lemma 8.1 that $J_{b,\widehat{w}_v} \sim_{\lambda,b} J_{b,\widehat{w}_y}$. Otherwise, by (2) we have $\langle \sigma^{r}(\sigma), \mu_{x''} \rangle = -1$, that is, $\langle \sigma^{r}(\sigma), \mu_{x''} \rangle = 0$. the statement follows from Lemma 8.3 that $J_{b,\widehat{w}_v} \sim_{\lambda,b} J_{b,\widehat{w}_y}$. Let $l = \min\{r + 1 \leq i \leq 2d - 1; \langle \sigma^{i}(\sigma), \mu_{x} \rangle \neq 0\}$. If $\langle \sigma^{l}(\sigma), \mu_{x} \rangle \geq 1$, then

$x'' \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x'' - \sigma^{r}(\sigma) \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x'' - \sigma^{r}(\sigma)$,

and the statement also follows from Lemma 8.1 & 8.3.

Now we assume $\mu_{x} - \delta^V \geq \lambda$, which means (as $\mu_{x} - \alpha^V - \beta^V = \mu_{x} - \alpha^V \leq \lambda$) that

$\langle \sigma^{2d}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle \leq -1$.

If $\langle \sigma^{r+d}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle \geq 1$, then we have

$x \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x - \sigma^{r+d}(\alpha) \xrightarrow{(\delta,r)} x - \sigma^{r+d}(\alpha)$,

and the statement follows from Lemma 8.5 and Lemma 8.1. So we assume

$\langle \sigma^{r+d}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle \leq 0$.

By (a), (b), (1), and (2), we have

$\sum_{i \in \{r - d, r, r + d, 0, d, 2d\}} \langle \sigma^{i}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle = 0$.

By Lemma 6.1, there exists $r + 1 \leq k \leq 3d - 1$ with $k \notin \{2d, r + d\}$ such that

$k = \min\{r + 1 \leq i \leq 3d - 1; \langle \sigma^{i}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle \geq 1\}$.

(c)

Suppose $\langle \sigma^{j}(\alpha), \mu_{x} \rangle \leq -1$ for some $r + 1 \leq j \leq 3d - 1$ with $j \notin \{2d, k + d, k - d, r + d\}$. Let

$z = x - \sigma^{k_1}(\delta)^V + \sigma^{k_1}(\delta)^V$, $z' = x' - \sigma^{k_1}(\delta)^V + \sigma^{k_1}(\delta)^V \in S^+_{\lambda,b}$,

where $k_1 = k + d$ if $k > 2d$ and $k_1 = k$ otherwise, and $j_1$ is defined in the same way. By Lemma 8.5, we have $J_{b,\widehat{w}_x} \sim_{\lambda,b} J_{b,\widehat{w}_v}$ and $J_{b,\widehat{w}_y} \sim_{\lambda,b} J_{b,\widehat{w}_v}$. Moreover, there exist $z_1, z_2 \in S^+_{\lambda,b}$ such that

$z \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_1 \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_2 \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_2.$

$z \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_1 \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_2 \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_2,$

If $r + 1 \leq k \leq 3d - 1$;

$z \xrightarrow{(a,k,d)} z_1 \xrightarrow{(a,k,d)} z_2 \xrightarrow{(a,k,d)} z_2,$

If $r + 1 \leq k \leq 2d - 1$;

$z \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_1 \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_2 \xrightarrow{(a,k,2d)} z_2,$

If $2d + 1 \leq k \leq r + d - 1$. 


By Lemma 8.1, $\tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \sim \lambda, b \tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}}$, and the statement follows. So we can assume $$(\sigma^i(\alpha), \mu_x) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k - 1 \text{ with } i \notin \{r - d, r, r + d, 2d\}. \quad (d)$$ As $\langle \sigma^{r - d}(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = -1$, we have $y := x' + \sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma - \sigma^k(\alpha)\gamma \in S^+_\lambda, b$.

Case (1): $r + 1 \leq k \leq 2d - 1$. Then
$$x \xrightarrow{\sigma^k(\alpha)\gamma} x' + \sigma^r(\alpha)\gamma - \sigma^k(\alpha)\gamma \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} x'. $$

By Lemma 8.1, it suffices to show $\tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \sim \lambda, b \tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}}$. If $\langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \leq -2$, then $\langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_y \rangle \leq -1$, it follows from that
$$y \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} x' + \sigma^r(\alpha)\gamma - \sigma^k(\alpha)\gamma \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} x'. $$

Otherwise, we have $\langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = -1$ by (2), that is, $\langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_y \rangle = 0$. Then the statement follows from Lemma 8.3.

Case (2): $2d + 1 \leq k \leq 3d - 1$. Then we have
$$x \xrightarrow{\sigma^{k + d}(\alpha)\gamma} x' + \sigma^r(\alpha)\gamma - \sigma^k(\alpha)\gamma \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} x', $$

Again, it suffices to show $\tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \sim \lambda, b \tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}}$. If $k \leq r + d - 1$, it follows similarly as in Case (1). Otherwise, it follows from that
$$y \xrightarrow{\sigma^{k - d}(\alpha)\gamma} y' + \sigma^r(\alpha)\gamma - \sigma^k(\alpha)\gamma \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} x', $$

where the first arrow follows from (b) that $\langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle = \langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_y \rangle = 1 \leq -1$. 

8.2. Now we finish the proofs for the case that $\sigma$ has order $3d$.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Let $x, x' \in S^+_{\lambda, b}$. To show $\tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}} \sim \lambda, b \tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}}$, by Proposition 5.4 we can assume $x \xrightarrow{\gamma, r} x'$ for some $1 \leq r \leq 2d - 1$ and $\gamma \in \Phi \setminus \Phi_J$ such that $\gamma^r$ is $J$-anti-dominant and $J$-minuscule. If $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ is of type I, the statement follows from Lemma 7.1. Otherwise, we can assume $J = O_{\beta}$ and $\gamma = \alpha$ as in §8.1. If $r \leq d$, the statement follows from Lemma 8.1. Otherwise, by the proof of [30, Proposition 6.8], either Lemma 8.3 or Lemma 8.6 applies. So the statement also follows.

Proof of Proposition 7.5. As $\mathcal{O}$ is of type III, we can assume $\mathcal{O} = O_{\alpha}$ and $J = O_{\beta}$, where $\alpha, \beta$ are as in §8.1. Moreover, we can assume that $\mu_{x'} + \theta_r \not\in \lambda$ for any $x' \in S^+_{\lambda, b}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$. If there do not exist $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}$, $1 \leq r \leq 3d - 1$, and $x' \in S^+_{\lambda, b}$ such that $x \xrightarrow{\gamma, r} x'$, the statement follows from [30, Lemma 8.6], Lemma 8.2 and Corollary 6.8. Assume otherwise. By Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 8.2, we may assume $x \xrightarrow{\alpha, r} x'$ for some $x' \in S^+_{\lambda, b}$ and $d + 1 \leq r \leq 2d - 1$. By the proof of [30, Proposition 6.8], either Lemma 8.3 or Lemma 8.6 occurs. So we retain the case of Lemma 8.6.

If $\langle \sigma^{r + d}(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \leq 0$, then $\langle \sigma^r(\theta_a), \mu_x \rangle \leq -1$, which contradicts our assumption. So we have $\langle \sigma^{r + d}(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \geq 1$, and hence
$$x \xrightarrow{\sigma^{d + r}(\alpha)\gamma} y := x - \sigma^{r + d}(\alpha)\gamma + \sigma^d(\alpha)\gamma \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} x. $$

Then it suffices to show that
$$g_2 I \sim_{\lambda, b} g_2 \omega_1 I \text{ for } g_2 \in \tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}}; \quad (a)$$
g_1 I \sim_{\lambda, b} g_1 \omega_1 I \text{ for } g_1 \in \tilde{J}_{b,\tilde{w}}, \quad (b)$$
where $\omega_1 = \sigma^{r + d}(\alpha)\gamma + \cdots + \sigma^{4d}(\alpha)\gamma, \omega_2 = \sigma^d(\alpha)\gamma + \cdots + \sigma^{r + d}(\alpha)\gamma \in \pi_1(M_J)$.

First we show (a). Note that $\langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_y \rangle = \langle \sigma^r(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \leq -1$. We have
$$y \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} y' + \sigma^r(\alpha)\gamma - \sigma^d(\alpha)\gamma \xrightarrow{\sigma^{r - d}(\alpha)\gamma} x, $$

and (a) follows from Lemma 8.1.
Now we show (b). If \((\alpha, \mu_x) \leq -1\), the statement follows from that
\[
x \xrightarrow{(\sigma^{r+d}(\alpha), 2d-r)} x - \sigma^{r+d}(\alpha) + \alpha^{(a,d)} \rightarrow y.
\]
So we can assume \((\alpha, \mu_x) = 0\). If \((\sigma^i(\alpha), \mu_x) = 0\) for \(r + d + 1 \leq i \leq 3d - 1\), it follows from Lemma 8.3. Otherwise, let \(k = \max\{r + d + 1 \leq i \leq 3d - 1; \langle \sigma^i(\alpha), \mu_x \rangle \neq 0\}\). If \((\sigma^k(\alpha), \mu_x) = -1\), then \((\sigma^{k-d}(\alpha), \mu_x) \geq 1\) since \((\sigma^k(\alpha), \mu_x) \geq 0\), which means \(x \xrightarrow{(\sigma^{k-d}(\alpha), 2d)} x_1 := x + \sigma^k(\alpha)^\vee - \sigma^{k-d}(\alpha)^\vee\) and \(y \xrightarrow{(\sigma^{k-d}(\alpha), 2d)} y_1 := y + \sigma^k(\alpha)^\vee - \sigma^{k-d}(\alpha)^\vee\). By Lemma 7.2, we have
\[
g_1 \sim_{\lambda, b} g_1\omega' I\text{ for } g_1 \in \mathbb{1}_{b, \tilde{w}_x},\ g_2 \sim_{\lambda, b} g_2\omega' I\text{ for } g_2 \in \mathbb{1}_{b, \tilde{w}_y},
\]
where \(\omega' = \sigma^{k-d}(\delta^\vee) + \cdots + \sigma^{k+d}(\delta^\vee) \in \Omega_f\). So we can replace the pair \((x, y)\) with \((x_1, y_1)\) so that \((\sigma^k(\alpha), \mu_x) \geq 1\). Then
\[
x \xrightarrow{(\sigma^k(\alpha), 2d-k)} x - \sigma^k(\alpha)^\vee + \sigma^{d}(\alpha)^\vee \xrightarrow{(\sigma^{r+d}(\alpha), k-r-d)} y,
\]
and (b) follows from Lemma 8.3 and Lemma 8.1. \(\Box\)

**Appendix A.** Distinct elements in \(\text{Adm}(\lambda)\)

In this Appendix, we study the distinct elements introduced in [4].

A.1. First we recall the following lemmas.

**Lemma A.1.** Let \(s, s' \in S^a\) and \(\tilde{w} \in \hat{W}\) such that \(\ell(\tilde{w}s) = \ell(\tilde{w}s') = \ell(\tilde{w})\). Then \(\tilde{w} = ss's'\).

**Lemma A.2** ([4, Lemma 1.8 & 1.9], [7, Lemma 4.5]). Let \(s \in S^a\) and \(\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) with \(\lambda \in Y\) such that \(\tilde{w} < ss's'\). Then we have
\[
\begin{align*}
(1) &\quad \tilde{w}s \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \text{ if } \tilde{w}s < ss's; \\
(2) &\quad \tilde{w}s = ss's \text{ if } \tilde{w}s \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda); \\
(3) &\quad ss's \in \text{Adm}(\lambda) \text{ if } \ell(ss's) = \ell(\tilde{w}).
\end{align*}
\]

**Lemma A.3.** Let \(\tilde{w} \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) and \(s \in S^a\) such that \(\tilde{w}s > \tilde{w}\). Then \(ss' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\).

**Proof.** Assume \(ss' \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\), then \(\tilde{w}s < ss's\) and hence \(\ell(ss's) = \ell(\tilde{w})\). By Lemma A.2 (3), we have \(\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\), contradicting the assumption that \(\tilde{w} \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\). \(\Box\)

A.2. Fix \(\lambda \in Y^+\). Let \(R \subseteq S_0\) and \(\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\). We say \(\tilde{w}\) is left \(R\)-distinct (resp. right \(R\)-distinct) if \(ss' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) (resp. \(\tilde{w}s \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\)) for all \(s \in R\). Let \(w_R\) denote the longest element of \(W_R\).

For a reflection \(s \in W_0\) we denote by \(\alpha_s \in \Phi^+\) the corresponding simple root.

**Lemma A.4.** Let \(R = \{s, s'\} \subseteq S_0\). Let \(\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) be right \(R\)-distinct. Let \(u, u' \in W_R\) with \(\ell(u') \leq \ell(u)\). Then \(u'wuw^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) if and only if \(u = u'\). As a consequence, \(w_R \tilde{w} w_R \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) is left \(R\)-distinct.

**Proof.** First we notice that \(\tilde{w} \in \hat{W}^R\), see §1.1. Without loss of generality, we can assume \(s \neq s'\) and \(ss's = s's's'\).

First we show the “only if” part. By symmetry it suffices to consider the following cases.

Suppose \(ss's \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\). Then \(ss's < ss's\) and \(ss's \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) (see Lemma A.3). By Lemma A.2 we have \(ss's(\alpha_s) = \alpha_s\), that is, \(\tilde{w}(\alpha_s + \alpha_{s'}) = -\alpha_s\). This is impossible since \(\tilde{w} \in W_R^R\).

Suppose \(ss's' \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\). Then \(ss's' < ss's\) (as \(ss's' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\)), that is, \(ss's'(\alpha_s) = \alpha_{s'}\). Since \(\tilde{w}(\alpha_s) \in \Phi^+\) (as \(\tilde{w} \in W_R^R\)), we have \(\tilde{w}(\alpha_s) = \alpha_s\). This means \(ss's = ss's' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\), a contradiction. Notice that \(ss's' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) by Lemma A.3.

Suppose \(ss'ss' \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)\). Then \(ss'ss' < ss'ss'\). If \(ss'ss' < ss'ss'\), then \(ss'ss' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) by Lemma A.3. Otherwise, by Lemma A.1 we have \(ss's = ss's' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\) and hence \(ss'ss' = ss'ss' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\). So we always have \(ss'ss' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)\). By Lemma A.2 we have \(ss'ss' = ss's\), that is, \(\tilde{w}(\alpha_s) = -(\alpha_s + \alpha_{s'})\), which is impossible as \(\tilde{w} \in \hat{W}^R\).
Suppose $ss^i wss's \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. Then $ss^i wss's < s^i wss's$. Since $ss^i wss' \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)$, by Lemma A.2 we have $ss^i wss's(\alpha_s) = \alpha_s$, that is, $\bar{w}(\alpha_s) = \alpha_s + \alpha_s'$. This means $ss^i wss's = s^i wss's \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$, a contradiction.

Now we show the “if” part, that is, $u_1 w^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ for $u \in W_R$. We argue by induction on the length $u$. If $u = 1$, the statement is true. Let $u = su_1 > u_1$ with $u_1 \in W_R$ and $s \in R$. We assume $u_1 w^{-1} u_1^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ by induction hypothesis. It remains to show that $u w^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. Otherwise, we have $(u w^{-1}) = u_1 w^{-1} + 2$ and $u w^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ by Lemma A.2 (1) \& (3), which contradicts the “only if” part. \hfill $\square$

**Lemma A.5.** Let $\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ and $s \in S_0$ such that $s\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ and $s\tilde{w} \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. Let $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \{\alpha_s\}$ such that $\tilde{w} s_\alpha \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. Then $s\tilde{w} s_\alpha s \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$

**Proof.** Suppose $s\tilde{w} s_\alpha s \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)$, then $s\tilde{w} s_\alpha \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ by Lemma A.2. As $s\tilde{w} \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)$, we have $s\tilde{w}(\alpha) \in \Phi^+$. On the other hand, as $\alpha(\alpha) \in \Phi^+$, $s\tilde{w} s_\alpha \notin \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ and $s\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$, we have $s\tilde{w}(\alpha) \in \Phi^+$. \hfill $\square$

**Corollary A.6.** Let $R = \{s, s'\} \subseteq S_0$. Let $\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ be left $R$-distinct. Let $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_R$ such that $\tilde{w} s_\alpha \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. Then $u w\tilde{w} s_\alpha u^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ for $u \in W_R$.

**Proof.** We argue by induction on $\ell(u)$. If $u = 1$, the statement follows by assumption. Supposing it is true for $u_1$, that is, $u_1 w^{-1} u_1^{-1} (s\tilde{w}(\alpha)) = u_1 \tilde{w} s_\alpha u_1^{-1} \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$, we show it is also true for $u = su_1 > u_1$ with $s \in R$. By Lemma A.4 we have $u_1 w^{-1} u_1^{-1} s w \tilde{w} u_1^{-1} s \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ and $s\tilde{w} u_1^{-1} s \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$. Moreover, we have $u_1(\alpha) \neq \alpha_s$ since $\alpha(\alpha) \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_R$. Thus $\tilde{w} s_\alpha u^{-1} = u_1 \tilde{w} u_1^{-1} s \tilde{w}(\alpha) s \in \text{Adm}(\lambda)$ by Lemma A.5. \hfill $\square$
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