

A p -ADIC SIMPSON CORRESPONDENCE FOR RIGID ANALYTIC VARIETIES

YUPENG WANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish a p -adic Simpson correspondence on the arena of Liu-Zhu for rigid analytic varieties X over \mathbb{C}_p with a liftable good reduction by constructing a new period sheaf on $X_{\text{proét}}$. To do so, we use the theory of cotangent complex after Beilinson and Bhatt. Then we give an integral decompletion theorem and complete the proof by local calculations. Our construction is compatible with the previous works of Faltings and Liu-Zhu.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Notations	4
1.2. Organization	5
Acknowledgments	5
2. Integral Faltings' extension and period sheaves	5
2.1. Integral Faltings' extension	6
2.2. Faltings' extension as obstruction class	11
2.3. Period sheaves	16
3. An integral decompletion theorem	22
3.1. Construction of decompletion functor	23
3.2. Essentially $(a+r)$ -trivial representation is $(a+r)$ -trivial	27
4. Local Simpson correspondence	28
4.1. Calculation in trivial representation case	30
4.2. Calculation in general case	32
5. A p -adic Simpson correspondence	36
5.1. Statement and preliminaries	36
5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.3	43
6. Appendix	46
References	48

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 14F30,14G22.

Key words and phrases. p -adic Simpson correspondence, period sheaf, small generalised representation, small Higgs bundles.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the theory of complex geometry, for a compact Kähler manifold X , in [Sim92] Simpson established a tensor equivalence between the category of semisimple flat vector bundles on X and the category of polystable Higgs bundles with vanishing Chern classes. Nowadays, such a correspondence is known as the non-abelian Hodge theory or the Simpson correspondence. There is a good theory of Simpson correspondence for smooth varieties in characteristic $p > 0$ admitting a lifting modulo p^2 (cf. [OV07]). So we ask for a p -adic analogue of Simpson's correspondence.

The first step is due to Deninger-Werner [DW05]. They gave a partial analogue of classical Narasimhan-Seshadri theory by studying parallel transport for vector bundles for curves. At the same time, Faltings [Fal05] constructed an equivalence between the category of small generalised representations and the category of small Higgs bundles for schemes \mathfrak{X}_0 with toroidal singularities over \mathcal{O}_k , the ring of integers of some p -adic local field k , under a certain deformation assumption. His method was elaborated and generalized by Abbes-Gros-Tsuji [AGT16] and related with the integral p -adic Hodge theory by Morrow-Tsuji [MT20] recently. When X is a rigid analytic space over k , Liu-Zhu [LZ17] related a Higgs bundle on $X_{\hat{k}, \text{ét}}$ to each \mathbb{Q}_p -local system on $X_{\text{ét}}$ and proved that the resulting Higgs field must be nilpotent (cf. [LZ17, Theorem 2.1]). Their work was generalized to the logarithmic case in [DLLZ22]. However, their Higgs functor is not an equivalence, so it is still open to classify Higgs bundles coming from representations. In [Heu20], for smooth rigid spaces X over \hat{k} , Heuer established an equivalence between the category of one-dimensional \hat{k} -representation of the fundamental group $\pi_1(X)$ and the category of pro-finite-étale Higgs bundles. Using his method, Heuer-Mann-Werner [HMW21] constructed a Simpson correspondence for abeloids over \hat{k} .

In this paper, we establish an equivalence between the category of small generalised representations (Definition 5.1) and the category of small Higgs bundles (Definition 5.2) for rigid analytic varieties X with liftable (see Notations) good reductions \mathfrak{X} over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ in the arena of the work of Liu-Zhu. Our construction is global and the main ingredient is a new overconvergent period sheaf \mathcal{OC}^\dagger endowed with a canonical Higgs field Θ on $X_{\text{proét}}$, which can be viewed as a kind of p -adic complete version of the period sheaf \mathcal{OC} due to Hyodo [Hy89]. The main theorem is stated as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 5.3). *Assume $a \geq \frac{1}{p-1}$. Let \mathfrak{X} be a liftable smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ of relative dimension d with the rigid generic fibre X and $\nu : X_{\text{proét}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$ be the natural projection of sites. Then there is an overconvergent period sheaf \mathcal{OC}^\dagger endowed with a canonical Higgs field Θ such that the following assertions are true:*

- (1) For any a -small generalised representation \mathcal{L} of rank l on $X_{\text{proét}}$, let $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} := \text{id}_{\mathcal{L}} \otimes \Theta$ be the induced Higgs field on $\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger$, then $\text{R}\nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger)$ is discrete. Denote $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}) := \nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger)$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})} = \nu_*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})})$ is an a -small Higgs bundle of rank l .
- (2) For any a -small Higgs bundle $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ of rank l on $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$, let $\Theta_{\mathcal{H}} := \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \Theta + \theta_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger}$ be the induced Higgs field on $\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger$ and denote

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) = (\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger)^{\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}=0}.$$

Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ is an a -small generalised representation of rank l .

- (3) The functor $\mathcal{L} \mapsto (\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})})$ induces an equivalence from the category of a -small generalised representations to the category of a -small Higgs bundles, whose quasi-inverse is given by $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$. The equivalence preserves tensor products and dualities and identifies the Higgs complexes

$$\text{HIG}(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) \simeq \text{HIG}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger, \Theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})}).$$

- (4) Let \mathcal{L} be an a -small generalised representation with associated Higgs bundle $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$. Then there is a canonical quasi-isomorphism

$$\text{R}\nu_*(\mathcal{L}) \simeq \text{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}),$$

where $\text{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ is the Higgs complex induced by $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$. In particular, $\text{R}\nu_*(\mathcal{L})$ is a perfect complex of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -modules concentrated in degree $[0, d]$.

- (5) Assume $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ is a smooth morphism between liftable smooth formal schemes over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$ be the fixed A_2 -liftings of \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{Y} , respectively. Assume f lifts to an A_2 -morphism $\widetilde{f} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$, then the equivalence in (3) is compatible with the pull-back along f .

Note that when $\mathcal{L} = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$, we get $(\mathcal{H}(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X)}) = (\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[\frac{1}{p}], 0)$. So our result can be viewed as a generalization of [Sch13b, Proposition 3.23]. Theorem 1.1 (3) also provides a way to compute the pro-étale cohomology for a small generalised representation \mathcal{L} . More precisely, we get a quasi-isomorphism

$$\text{R}\Gamma(X_{\text{proét}}, \mathcal{L}) \simeq \text{R}\Gamma(\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}, \text{HIG}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})})).$$

If moreover, \mathfrak{X} is proper, then we get a finiteness result on pro-étale cohomology of small generalised representations.

Corollary 1.2. *Keep notations as Theorem 1.1 and assume furthermore \mathfrak{X} is proper. Then for any a -small generalised representation \mathcal{L} , $\text{R}\Gamma(X_{\text{proét}}, \mathcal{L})$ is concentrated in degree $[0, 2d]$ and has cohomologies as finite dimensional \mathbb{C}_p -spaces.*

The overconvergent period sheaf $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger$ (with respect to a certain lifting of \mathfrak{X}) has $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}$ as a subsheaf. Indeed, it is a direct limit of certain p -adic completions of $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}$. In particular, when \mathfrak{X} comes from a scheme \mathfrak{X}_0 over \mathcal{O}_k and the generalised representation \mathcal{L} comes from a \mathbb{Z}_p -local system on the rigid generic fibre X_0 of \mathfrak{X}_0 ,

our construction coincides with the work of Liu-Zhu (Remark 5.6). On the other hand, \mathcal{OC}^\dagger is related with an obstruction class $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+)$ solving a certain deformation problem (Remark 2.10 and Proposition 2.14). Since the class $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+)$ is exactly the one used to establish the Simpson correspondence in [Fal05], our construction is compatible with the works of Faltings and Abbes-Gros-Tsuji (Remark 5.5). These answer a question appearing in [LZ17, Remark 2.5]. Another answer was announced in [YZ20] in a different way.

Since we need to take p -adic completions of \mathcal{OC} , we have to find its integral models. Note that \mathcal{OC} is a direct limit of symmetric products of Faltings' extension, which was constructed for varieties by Faltings [Fal88] at first and revisited by Scholze [Sch13a] in the rigid analytic case. So we are reduced to finding an integral version of Faltings' extension. To do so, we use the method of cotangent complex which was established and developed in [Qui70],[Ill71],[Ill72],[GR03] etc., and was systematically used in the p -adic theory by [Sch12],[Bei12], [Bha12] etc.. Finally, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on some explicit local calculations, especially an integral decomposition theorem (Theorem 3.4) for small representations, which can be regarded as a generalization of [DLLZ22, Appendix A].

1.1. Notations. Let k be a complete discrete valuation field of mixed characteristics $(0, p)$ with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_k and perfect residue field κ . We normalise the valuation on k by setting $\nu_p(p) = 1$ and the associated norm is given by $\|\cdot\| = p^{-\nu_p(\cdot)}$. We denote $k_0 = \text{Frac}(\mathbb{W}(\kappa))$ the maximal absolutely unramified subfield of k . Put $\mathcal{D}_k = \mathcal{D}_{k/k_0}$ the relative differential ideal of \mathcal{O}_k over $\mathbb{W}(\kappa)$.

Let \bar{k} be a fixed algebraic closure of k and $\mathbb{C}_p = \widehat{\bar{k}}$ be its p -adic completion. We denote by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$) the ring of integers of \mathbb{C}_p (resp, the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$). In this paper, when we write $p^a A$ for some $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -module A , we always assume $a \in \mathbb{Q}$. An $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -module M is called **almost vanishing** if it is $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -torsion and in this case, we write $M^{\text{al}} = 0$. A morphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -modules is **almost injective** (resp. **almost surjective**) if $\text{Ker}(f)^{\text{al}} = 0$ (resp. $\text{Coker}(f)^{\text{al}} = 0$). A morphism is an **almost isomorphism** if it is both almost injective and almost surjective.

We choose a sequence $\{1, \zeta_p, \dots, \zeta_{p^n}, \dots\}$ such that ζ_{p^n} is a primitive p^n -th root of unity in \bar{k} satisfying $\zeta_{p^{n+1}}^p = \zeta_{p^n}$ for every $n \geq 0$. For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}] \cap (0, 1)$, one can (uniquely) write $\alpha = \frac{t(\alpha)}{p^{n(\alpha)}}$ with $\text{gcd}(t(\alpha), p) = 1$ and $n(\alpha) \geq 1$. Then we define that $\zeta^\alpha := \zeta_{p^{n(\alpha)}}^{t(\alpha)}$ when $\alpha \neq 0$ and that $\zeta^\alpha = 1$ when $\alpha = 0$.

We always fix an element $\rho_k \in \mathbb{C}_p$ with $\nu_p(\rho_k) = \nu_p(\mathcal{D}_k) + \frac{1}{p-1}$. Let $A_{\text{inf},k} = \mathbb{W}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}) \otimes_{\mathbb{W}(\kappa)} \mathcal{O}_k$ be the period ring of Fontaine. Then there is a surjective homomorphism $\theta_k : A_{\text{inf},k} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ whose kernel is a principal ideal by [FF19, Proposition

3.1.9]. We fix a generator ξ_k of $\text{Ker}(\theta_k)$. For instance, when $k = k_0$ is absolutely unramified, then we choose $\rho_k = \zeta_p - 1$ and $\xi_k = \frac{[\epsilon] - 1}{[\epsilon]^{\frac{1}{p}} - 1}$ for $\epsilon = (1, \zeta_p, \zeta_{p^2}, \dots) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}^\times$. Put $A_2 = A_{\text{inf}, k} / \xi_k^2$ and denote Fontaine's p -adic analogue of $2\pi i$ by $t = \log[\epsilon]$.

For a p -adic formal scheme \mathfrak{X} over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, we say it is **smooth** if it is formally smooth and locally of topologically finite type. We say \mathfrak{X} is **liftable** if it admits a lifting $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ to $\text{Spf}(A_2)$. In this paper, we always assume \mathfrak{X} is liftable. Let X be the rigid analytic generic fibre of \mathfrak{X} and denote by $\nu : X_{\text{proét}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$ the natural projection of sites. Let $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ be the completed structure sheaves on $X_{\text{proét}}$ in the sense of [Sch13a, Definition 4.1]. Both of them can be viewed as \mathcal{O}_X -algebras via the projection ν .

Let K be an object in the derived category of complexes of \mathbb{Z}_p -modules. We denote by \hat{K} the derived p -adic completion $\text{R}\varprojlim_n K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}_p/p^n$. In particular, for a morphism $A \rightarrow B$ of \mathbb{Z}_p -algebras, we denote the derived p -adic completion of cotangent complex $L_{B/A}$ by $\hat{L}_{B/A}$. In this paper, for two complexes K_1 and K_2 of (sheaves of) modules, we write $K_1 \simeq K_2$ if they are quasi-isomorphic. For two modules or sheaves M_1 and M_2 , we write $M_1 \cong M_2$ if they are isomorphic.

1.2. Organization. In Section 2, we construct the integral Faltings' extension by using p -complete cotangent complexes and explain how it is related to the deformation theory. At the end of this section we construct the desired overconvergent sheaf. In Section 3, we prove an integral decompletion theorem for small representations. In Section 4, we establish a local version of Simpson correspondence. We first consider the trivial representation and then reduce the general case to this special case. Finally, in Section 5, we state and prove our main theorem. The appendix specifies some notations and includes some elementary facts that were used in previous sections.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The paper consists of main results of the author's Ph.D. Thesis in Peking University. The author expresses his deepest gratitude to his advisor, Ruochuan Liu, for suggesting this topic, for useful advice on this paper, and for his warm encouragement and generous and consistent help during the whole time of the author's Ph.D. study. The author thanks David Hansen, Gal Porat and Mao Sheng for their comments on the earlier draft. The author also thanks anonymous referees for their careful reading, professional comments and valuable suggestions to improve this paper.

2. INTEGRAL FALTINGS' EXTENSION AND PERIOD SHEAVES

We construct the overconvergent period sheaf \mathcal{OC}^\dagger in this section. In order to do so, we have to construct an integral version of Faltings' extension at first.

2.1. Integral Faltings' extension. We first discuss the properties of the cotangent complex. The following Lemmas are well-known, but for the convenience of readers, we include their proofs here.

Lemma 2.1. *Let A be a ring. Suppose that (f_1, \dots, f_n) is a regular sequence in A and generates the ideal $I = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, then $L_{(A/I)/A} \simeq (I/I^2)[1]$.*

Proof. Regard A as a $\mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ -algebra by mapping X_i to f_i for every i . Since f_1, \dots, f_n is a regular sequence in A , for any $i \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathrm{Tor}_i^{\mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]}(\mathbb{Z}, A) = 0.$$

It follows from [Wei, 8.8.4] that

$$L_{(A/I)/A} \simeq L_{\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]}^L A.$$

So we may assume $A = \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ and $I = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$. From homomorphisms $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow A \rightarrow A/I$ of rings, we get an exact triangle

$$L_{A/\mathbb{Z}} \otimes^L A/I \rightarrow L_{(A/I)/\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow L_{(A/I)/A} \rightarrow \cdot$$

The middle term is trivial since $A/I = \mathbb{Z}$ and hence we deduce that

$$L_{(A/I)/A} \simeq (L_{A/\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_A^L \mathbb{Z})[1] \simeq (I/I^2)[1]$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.2. (1) *The map $\mathrm{dlog} : \mu_{p^\infty} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}/\mathcal{O}_k}^1, \zeta_{p^n} \mapsto \frac{d\zeta_{p^n}}{\zeta_{p^n}}$ induces an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{dlog} : \bar{k}/\rho_k^{-1}\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}} \otimes \mathbb{Z}_p(1) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}/\mathcal{O}_k}^1,$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_p(1)$ denotes the Tate twist.

$$(2) L_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}/\mathcal{O}_k} \simeq \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}/\mathcal{O}_k}^1[0].$$

$$(3) \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/\mathcal{O}_k} \simeq \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(1)[1].$$

Proof. (1) This is [Fon82, Théorème 1].

(2) This is [Bei12, Theorem 1.3].

(3) This follows from (1) and (2) after taking derived p -completions on both sides. \square

Corollary 2.3. (1) $\widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_{\mathrm{inf},k}}[-1] \simeq \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(1)[0] \simeq \xi_k A_{\mathrm{inf},k} / \xi_k^2 A_{\mathrm{inf},k}[0]$.

$$(2) \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_2} \simeq \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(1)[1] \oplus \frac{1}{\rho_k^2} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(2)[2].$$

Proof. (1) Considering the morphisms $\mathcal{O}_k \rightarrow A_{\mathrm{inf},k} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ of rings, we have an exact triangle

$$L_{A_{\mathrm{inf},k}/\mathcal{O}_k} \widehat{\otimes}_{A_{\mathrm{inf},k}}^L \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/\mathcal{O}_k} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_{\mathrm{inf},k}} \rightarrow \cdot$$

Since

$$\widehat{L}_{A_{\text{inf},k}/\mathcal{O}_k} \simeq L_{A_{\text{inf}}/W(\kappa)} \widehat{\otimes}_{W(\kappa)}^L \mathcal{O}_k = 0,$$

the first quasi-isomorphism follows from Lemma 2.2 (3). Now, the second quasi-isomorphism is straightforward from Lemma 2.1.

- (2) Considering the morphisms $A_{\text{inf},k} \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ of rings, we have the exact triangle

$$L_{A_2/A_{\text{inf},k}} \widehat{\otimes}_{A_2}^L \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_{\text{inf},k}} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_2} \rightarrow .$$

Combining Lemma 2.1 with (1), the above exact triangle reduces to

$$\xi_k^2 A_{\text{inf},k} / \xi_k^4 A_{\text{inf},k} \otimes_{A_2} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}[1] \rightarrow \xi_k A_{\text{inf},k} / \xi_k^2 A_{\text{inf},k}[1] \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_2} \rightarrow .$$

Now we complete the proof by noting that the first arrow is trivial. \square

We identify $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(1)$ with $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}t$, where t is Fontaine's p -adic analogue of $2\pi i$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 (1) that the sequence $\{\text{dlog}(\zeta_{p^n})\}_{n \geq 0}$ can be identified with the element $t \in \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(1)$. If we regard $A_{\text{inf},k}$ as a subring of B_{dR}^+ and identify $tB_{\text{dR}}^+/t^2B_{\text{dR}}^+$ with $\mathbb{C}_p(1)$, then Corollary 2.3 says that t and $\rho_k \xi_k$ in $\mathbb{C}_p(1)$ differ by a p -adic unit in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}^\times$.

Remark 2.4. *The corollary is still true if one replaces \mathbb{C}_p by any closed subfield $K \subset \mathbb{C}_p$ containing μ_{p^∞} . All results in this paper hold for K instead of \mathbb{C}_p .*

Now we construct the integral Faltings' extension in the local case. We fix some notations as follows:

Let $\mathfrak{X} = \text{Spf}(R^+)$ be a smooth formal scheme over $\text{Spf}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p})$ endowed with an étale morphism

$$\square : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m^d = \text{Spf}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle \underline{T}^{\pm 1} \rangle),$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle \underline{T}^{\pm 1} \rangle = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle T_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_d^{\pm 1} \rangle$. We say \mathfrak{X} is **small** in this case. Let $X = \text{Spa}(R, R^+)$ be the rigid analytic generic fibre of \mathfrak{X} and $X_\infty = \text{Spa}(\widehat{R}_\infty, \widehat{R}_\infty^+)$ be the affinoid perfectoid space associated to the base-change of X along the Galois cover

$$\mathbb{G}_{m,\infty}^d = \text{Spa}(\mathbb{C}_p\langle \underline{T}^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}} \rangle, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle \underline{T}^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}} \rangle) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m^d = \text{Spa}(\mathbb{C}_p\langle \underline{T}^{\pm 1} \rangle, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle \underline{T}^{\pm 1} \rangle).$$

Denote by Γ the Galois group of the cover $X_\infty \rightarrow X$ and let γ_i be in Γ satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad \gamma_i(T_j^{\frac{1}{p^n}}) = \zeta_{p^n}^{\delta_{ij}} T_j^{\frac{1}{p^n}}$$

for any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ and $n \geq 0$. Here, δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker's delta. Then $\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \gamma_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_p \gamma_d$. Let \widetilde{R}^+ be a lifting of R^+ along $A_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. Then the morphisms $\widetilde{R}^+ \rightarrow R^+ \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+$ of rings give an exact triangle of p -complete cotangent complexes

$$(2.2) \quad L_{R^+/\widetilde{R}^+} \widehat{\otimes}_{R^+}^L \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/\widetilde{R}^+} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+} \rightarrow .$$

The first term is easy to handle. Indeed, combining [Wei, 8.8.4] with Corollary 2.3 (2), we deduce that

$$\mathrm{L}_{R^+/\tilde{R}^+} \widehat{\otimes}_{R^+}^L \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \simeq \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1)[1] \oplus \frac{1}{\rho_k^2} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(2)[2].$$

Now we compute the third term of (2.2).

Lemma 2.5. *We have $\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+} \simeq \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1 \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+[1]$, where $\widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1$ denotes the module of formal differentials of R^+ over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$.*

Proof. Since R^+ is étale over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \langle \underline{T}^{\pm 1} \rangle$, thanks to [BMS18, Lemma 3.14], we are reduced to the case $R^+ = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \langle \underline{T}^{\pm 1} \rangle$. For any $n \geq 0$, put $A_n^+ = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} [\underline{T}^{\pm 1/p^n}]$ and denote $A_\infty^+ = \varinjlim_n A_n^+$. Since all rings involved are p -torsion free, we get

$$\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+} \simeq \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{A_\infty^+/A_0^+}.$$

By [Ill71, Chapitre II(1.2.3.4)], we see that

$$\mathrm{L}_{A_\infty^+/A_0^+} = \varinjlim_n \mathrm{L}_{A_n^+/A_0^+}.$$

Since all A_n^+ 's are smooth over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, from the exact triangle

$$\mathrm{L}_{A_0^+/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}} \otimes_{A_0^+}^L A_n^+ \rightarrow \mathrm{L}_{A_n^+/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}_{A_n^+/A_0^+} \rightarrow,$$

we deduce that

$$\mathrm{L}_{A_n^+/A_0^+} \simeq A_n^+ \otimes_{A_0^+} \frac{1}{p^n} \Omega_{A_0^+}^1 / \Omega_{A_0^+}^1[0],$$

where we identify $\Omega_{A_n^+}^1$ with $A_n^+ \otimes_{A_0^+} \frac{1}{p^n} \Omega_{A_0^+}^1$. Therefore, we get

$$\mathrm{L}_{A_\infty^+/A_0^+} \simeq A_\infty^+ \otimes_{A_0^+} \Omega_{A_0^+}^1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} (\mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p)[0].$$

Now the result follows by taking p -completions. \square

Since R^+ admits a lifting \tilde{R}^+ to A_2 , the composition

$$\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+} \simeq \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{A_2(\tilde{R}_\infty^+)/\tilde{R}^+} \widehat{\otimes}_{A_2(\tilde{R}_\infty^+)}^L \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/\tilde{R}^+}$$

defines a section of $\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/\tilde{R}^+} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+}$. Since the exact triangle (2.2) is Γ -equivariant, by taking cohomologies along (2.2), we get the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6. *There exists a Γ -equivariant short exact sequence of \widehat{R}_∞^+ -modules*

$$(2.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1) \rightarrow E^+ \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1 \rightarrow 0,$$

where $E^+ = \mathrm{H}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/\tilde{R}^+})$. Moreover, the above exact sequence admits a (non- Γ -equivariant) section such that $E^+ \cong \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1) \oplus \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1$ as \widehat{R}_∞^+ -modules.

Remark 2.7. *When R^+ is the base-change of some formal smooth \mathcal{O}_k -algebra R_0^+ of topologically finite type along $\mathcal{O}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, then it admits a canonical lifting $\tilde{R}^+ = R_0^+ \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_k} A_2$. After inverting p , the resulting E^+ becomes the usual Faltings' extension and the corresponding sequence (2.3) is even $\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$ -equivariant.*

We describe the Γ -action on E^+ . For any $1 \leq i \leq d$, by the proof of Lemma 2.5, the compatible sequence $\{\mathrm{dlog}(T_i^{\frac{1}{p^n}})\}_{n \geq 0}$ defines an element $x_i \in E^+$, which goes to $\mathrm{dlog}T_i$ via the projection $E^+ \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1$. Since Γ acts on T_i 's via (2.1), we deduce that for any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$,

$$\gamma_i(x_j) = x_j + \delta_{ij}.$$

In summary, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.8. *The \widehat{R}_∞^+ -module E^+ is free of rank $d + 1$ and has a basis $\frac{t}{\rho_k}, x_1, \dots, x_d$ such that*

- (1) *for any $1 \leq i \leq d$, x_i is a lifting of $\mathrm{dlog}(T_i) \in \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1$ and that*
- (2) *for any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $\gamma_i(x_j) = x_j + \delta_{ij}t$.*

Moreover, let $c : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{R^+}(\widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1))$ be the map carrying γ_i to $c(\gamma_i)$, which sends $\mathrm{dlog}(T_j)$ to $\delta_{ij}t$. Then the cocycle determined by c in $H^1(\Gamma, \mathrm{Hom}_{R^+}(\widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1)))$ coincides with the extension class represented by E^+ in $\mathrm{Ext}_\Gamma^1(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1))$ via the canonical isomorphism

$$H^1(\Gamma, \mathrm{Hom}_{R^+}(\widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1))) \cong \mathrm{Ext}_\Gamma^1(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1)).$$

Proof. It remains to prove the ‘‘moreover’’ part. By (1), the extension class of E^+ is represented by the cocycle

$$f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+}(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{R^+}(\widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1))$$

such that $f(\gamma)(\mathrm{dlog}(T_i)) = \gamma(x_i) - x_i$ for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and any i . However, by (2), f is exactly c . We are done. \square

Now we extend the above construction to the global case. Let \mathfrak{X} be a smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ with a fixed lifting $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ to A_2 . Denote by X its rigid analytic generic fibre over \mathbb{C}_p . We regard both $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}$ as sheaves on $X_{\mathrm{pro\acute{e}t}}$ via the projection $\nu : X_{\mathrm{pro\acute{e}t}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_{\acute{e}t}$ (note that \mathfrak{X} and $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ has the same étale site). Considering morphisms of sheaves of rings $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$, we get an exact triangle

$$(2.4) \quad L_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}} \rightarrow L_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \rightarrow .$$

Similar to the local case, the first term becomes

$$L_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \simeq L_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_2} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$$

and the composition

$$\widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}} \simeq \widehat{L}_{A_2(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+)/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}} \widehat{\otimes}_{A_2(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+)}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}}$$

defines a section of $\widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}} \rightarrow L_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}}$.

We claim that

$$(2.5) \quad \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}} \simeq \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}^1[1].$$

Granting this, taking cohomologies along (2.4), we get the following theorem.

Theorem 2.9. *There is an exact sequence of sheaves of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -modules*

$$(2.6) \quad 0 \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1 \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{E}^+ = \mathrm{H}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}})$.

Remark 2.10. *Apply $\mathrm{RHom}(-, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$ to the exact triangle (2.4) and consider the induced long exact sequence*

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_x/\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \xrightarrow{\partial} \mathrm{Ext}^2(\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \rightarrow \cdots$$

and the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_x/\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathrm{Ext}^2(\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ \mathrm{Hom}(\frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_x(1), \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathrm{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)). \end{array}$$

Then the extension class $[\mathcal{E}^+]$ associated to \mathcal{E}^+ is the image of the natural inclusion $\frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_x(1) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$ via the connecting map ∂ . By construction, it is the obstruction class to lift $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ (as a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_x -algebras) to a sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ -algebras in the sense of [Ill71, III Proposition 2.1.2.3]. In particular, \mathcal{E}^+ depends on the choice of \mathfrak{X} . When \mathfrak{X} comes from a smooth formal scheme \mathfrak{X}_0 over \mathcal{O}_k and \mathfrak{X} is the base-change of \mathfrak{X}_0 along $\mathcal{O}_k \rightarrow A_2$, the \mathcal{E}^+ coincides with the usual Faltings' extension after inverting p . So we call \mathcal{E}^+ the **integral Faltings's extension** (with respect to the lifting \mathfrak{X}).

It remains to prove the claim (2.5).

Lemma 2.11. *With notations as above, we have*

$$\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x} \simeq \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1.$$

Proof. Since the problem is local on $X_{\mathrm{pro\acute{e}t}}$, by the proof of [Sch13a, Corollary 4.7], we may assume $\mathfrak{X} = \mathrm{Spf}(R)$ is small and are reduced to showing for any perfectoid affinoid space $U = \mathrm{Spa}(S, S^+) \in X_{\mathrm{pro\acute{e}t}}/X_\infty$,

$$(2.7) \quad \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{S^+/R^+} \simeq S^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1.$$

Since both S^+ and \widehat{R}_∞^+ are perfectoid rings, by [BMS18, Lemma 3.14], we have a quasi-isomorphism

$$\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+} \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{S^+/R^+}.$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.5, we get (2.7) as desired. \square

2.2. Faltings' extension as obstruction class. In this subsection, we shall give another description of the integral Faltings' extension from the perspective of deformation theory. To make notations clear, in this subsection, for a sheaf S of A_2 -algebras, we always identify $\xi_k A_2$ with $\frac{1}{\rho_k} S(1)$. Before moving on, we recall some basic results due to Illusie. Although their statements are given in terms of rings, all results still hold for ring topoi.

Let A be a ring with an ideal $I \triangleleft A$ satisfying $I^2 = 0$. Put $\bar{A} = A/I$ and fix a flat \bar{A} -algebra \bar{B} . A natural question is whether there exists a flat A -algebra B whose reduction modulo I is \bar{B} .

Theorem 2.12 ([Ill71, III Proposition 2.1.2.3]). *There exists an obstruction class $\text{cl} \in \text{Ext}^2(\mathbb{L}_{\bar{B}/\bar{A}}, \bar{B} \otimes_{\bar{A}} I)$ such that \bar{B} lifts to some flat A -algebra B if and only if $\text{cl} = 0$. In this case, the set of isomorphism classes of such deformations forms a torsor under $\text{Ext}^1(\mathbb{L}_{\bar{B}/\bar{A}}, \bar{B} \otimes_{\bar{A}} I)$ and the group of automorphisms of a fixed deformation is $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}_{\bar{B}/\bar{A}}, \bar{B} \otimes_{\bar{A}} I)$.*

If B and C are flat A -algebras with reductions \bar{B} and \bar{C} respectively and if $\bar{f} : \bar{B} \rightarrow \bar{C}$ is a morphism of \bar{A} -algebras, then one can ask whether there exists an deformation $f : B \rightarrow C$ of \bar{f} along $A \rightarrow \bar{A}$.

Theorem 2.13 ([Ill71, III Proposition 2.2.2]). *There is an obstruction class $\text{cl} \in \text{Ext}^1(\mathbb{L}_{\bar{B}/\bar{A}}, \bar{C} \otimes_{\bar{A}} I)$ such that \bar{f} lifts to a morphism $f : B \rightarrow C$ if and only if $\text{cl} = 0$. In this case, the set of all lifts forms a torsor under $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{L}_{\bar{B}/\bar{A}}, \bar{C} \otimes_{\bar{A}} I)$.*

We only focus on the case where $(A, I) = (A_2, (\xi))$. Let \mathfrak{X} be a smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ and denote

$$\text{ob}(\mathfrak{X}) \in \text{Ext}^2(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1))$$

the obstruction class to lift \mathfrak{X} to a flat A_2 -scheme (e.g. [Ill71, III Théorème 2.1.7]). Consider the exact triangle

$$\mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}^L \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/A_2} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}$$

and the induced long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}^L \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)) \\ \xrightarrow{\partial} \text{Ext}^2(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)) \rightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

The $\text{ob}(\mathfrak{X})$ is the image of identity morphism of $\frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)$ under ∂ via the canonical isomorphism

$$\text{Ext}^1(\mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}^L \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)) \cong \text{Hom}(\frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1), \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)).$$

If moreover, \mathfrak{X} is liftable and $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ is such a lifting, then $\text{ob}(\mathfrak{X}) = 0$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ defines a class

$$[\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}] \in \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1))$$

which goes to the identity map of $\frac{1}{\rho_k}\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)$. Indeed, $[\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}]$ is the image of the identity map of $\frac{1}{\rho_k}\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)$ via the morphism

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)).$$

We also consider the similar deformation problem for $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$. Since $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ is locally perfectoid, thanks to [BMS18, Lemma 3.14], $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{c_p}} = 0$ and hence we get a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{c_p}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{c_p}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \simeq \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/A_2}.$$

In particular, we have an isomorphism

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \cong \text{Hom}(\frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1), \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)).$$

Therefore, $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ admits a canonical lifting, which turns out to be $A_2(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+)$ and there is a unique class

$$[X] \in \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$$

corresponding to the identity map of $\frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$.

Regard $[\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}]$ and $[X]$ as classes in $\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$ via the canonical morphisms induced by $\frac{1}{\rho_k}\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/A_2} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/A_2}$, respectively. Then as shown in [Ill71, III Proposition 2.2.4], the difference

$$\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+) := [\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}] - [X]$$

belongs to

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{c_p}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{c_p}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$$

via the injection

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/\mathcal{O}_{c_p}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$$

and $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+)$ is the obstruction answering whether there is an A_2 -morphism from $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}$ to $A_2(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+)$ which lifts the \mathcal{O}_{c_p} -morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ as described in Theorem 2.13.

Recall we have another obstruction class $[\mathcal{E}^+]$ described in Remark 2.10. We claim that it coincides with the class $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+)$ constructed above.

Proposition 2.14. $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+) = [\mathcal{E}^+]$.

Proof. Note that we have a commutative diagram of morphisms of cotangent complexes

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} L_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ & \rightarrow & L_{\mathcal{O}_x/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & L_{\mathcal{O}_x/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \xrightarrow{+1} \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \\ L_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ & \longrightarrow & \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/A_2} & \longrightarrow & \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}} \xrightarrow{+1} \\ & \searrow \simeq & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x} \\ & & \downarrow +1 & & \downarrow +1 \end{array}$$

where the notations “+1” and “-1” denote the shifts of dimensions.

Consider the resulting diagram from applying $\mathrm{RHom}(-, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$ to (2.8). Denote the identity map of $\frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$ by id . By construction, $[\mathcal{E}^+]$ is the image of id via the connecting map induced by the triangle

$$L_{\mathcal{O}_x/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x}.$$

By the commutativity of diagram (2.8), $[\mathcal{E}^+]$ is also the image of $\alpha^*(\mathrm{id})$ via the connecting map ∂ induced by the triangle

$$L_{\mathcal{O}_x/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/A_2} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x}.$$

On the other hand, by the constructions of $[\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}]$ and $[X]$, as elements in

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(L_{\mathcal{O}_x/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)),$$

we have $[\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}] = \alpha^*(\mathrm{id})$ and $[X] = \beta^*(\mathrm{id})$; here, for the second equality, we identify

$$\mathrm{Hom}\left(\frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1), \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)\right) = \mathrm{Ext}^1(\widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{c_p}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{c_p}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$$

with $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{c_p}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$. So we have

$$\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+) = \alpha^*(\mathrm{id}) - \beta^*(\mathrm{id}) \in \mathrm{Ext}^1(L_{\mathcal{O}_x/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)).$$

However, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{L}_{A_2(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+)/\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}} & \xrightarrow{+1} & L_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \widehat{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x} & \xrightarrow{+1} & L_{\mathcal{O}_x/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{x}}}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow L_{\mathcal{O}_x/\mathcal{O}_{c_p}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \end{array}$$

induces a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{O}_x/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{O}_x/A_2} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \\ & \searrow \cong & \downarrow \partial \\ & & \mathrm{Ext}^2(\widehat{\mathrm{L}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/\mathcal{O}_x}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)). \end{array}$$

In particular, as elements in $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{O}_x/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_x}^L \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$, we have

$$\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+) = \partial(\alpha^*(\mathrm{id}) - \beta^*(\mathrm{id})) = \partial(\alpha^*(\mathrm{id})) = [\mathcal{E}^+]$$

as desired. So we are done. \square

Remark 2.15. When \mathfrak{X} is small affine and comes from a formal scheme over \mathcal{O}_k , the obstruction class $\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+)$ was considered as Higgs-Tate extension associated to $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ in [AGT16, I. 4.3].

Example 2.16. Let $R^+ = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle T^{\pm 1} \rangle$ and $\tilde{R}^+ = A_2\langle T^{\pm 1} \rangle$ for simplicity. Consider the A_2 -morphism $\tilde{\psi} : \tilde{R}^+ \rightarrow A_2(\widehat{R}_\infty^+)$, which sends T_i to $[T_i^b]$ for all i , where $T_i^b \in \widehat{R}_\infty^{b+}$ is determined by the compatible sequence $(T_i^{\frac{1}{p^n}})_{n \geq 0}$. Then $\tilde{\psi}$ is a lifting of the inclusion $R^+ \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+$, but is not Γ -equivariant. For any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $\gamma \circ \tilde{\psi}$ is another lifting. By Theorem 2.13, their difference $c(\gamma) := \gamma \circ \tilde{\psi} - \tilde{\psi}$ belongs to $\mathrm{Hom}_{R^+}(\widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1))$. One can check that for any $1 \leq i, j \leq 1$,

$$c(\gamma_i)(\mathrm{dlog}(T_j)) = \frac{(\gamma_i - 1)([T_j^b])}{T_j} = \delta_{ij}([\epsilon] - 1) = \delta_{ij}t,$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $[\epsilon] - 1 - t \in t^2\mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{dR}}^+$. By construction, the cocycle $c : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{R^+}(\widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(1))$ is exactly the class $\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+)$. Comparing this with Proposition 2.8, we deduce that $\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+) = [\mathcal{E}^+]$ in this case.

As an application of Proposition 2.14, we study the behavior of integral Faltings' extension under the pull-back.

Let $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ be a formally smooth morphism of liftable smooth formal schemes. Fix liftings $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$ of \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{Y} , respectively. Denote by \mathcal{E}_X^+ and \mathcal{E}_Y^+ the corresponding integral Faltings' extensions. Then the pull-back of \mathcal{E}_X^+ along the injection

$$f^* \widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$$

defines an extension \mathcal{E}_1^+ of $\widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_y} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \cong f^* \widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ by $\frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$. We denote its extension class by

$$\mathrm{cl}_1 \in \mathrm{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_y} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)).$$

Here, the tensor product $\widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_y} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ should be understood as $f^{-1} \widehat{\Omega}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}}^1 \otimes_{f^{-1} \mathcal{O}_y} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$. The same thing also applies to sheaves like $\mathcal{O}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y^+} \mathcal{E}_Y^+$, $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_Y^+, \rho}^+$, $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{Y, \rho}^+}^+$, $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_{Y, \rho}^+, \rho}^+$, etc..

On the other hand, the tensor product $\mathcal{E}_2^+ = \mathcal{E}_Y^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ induced by applying $-\otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ to

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_Y^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}} \widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{y}^1 \rightarrow 0$$

is also an extension of $\widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{y}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ by $\frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$ and we denote the associated extension class by

$$\text{cl}_2 \in \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{y}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)).$$

Then it is natural to ask whether $\mathcal{E}_1^+ \cong \mathcal{E}_2^+$ (equivalently, $\text{cl}_1 = \text{cl}_2$).

Proposition 2.17. *Keep notations as above. If $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ lifts to an A_2 -morphism $\widetilde{f} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$, then $\text{cl}_1 = \text{cl}_2$.*

We are going to prove this proposition in the rest of this subsection.

By Theorem 2.13, there exists an obstruction class

$$\text{cl}(f) \in \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1))$$

to lift f along the surjection $A_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. Before moving on, let us recall the definition of $\text{cl}(f)$.

Let $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}]$ and $[\widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}]$ be classes similarly defined as before and regard them as elements in $\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1))$ via the obvious morphisms. Then similar to the construction of $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}^+)$, one can check that

$$\text{cl}(f) = [\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}] - [\widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}]$$

via the injection

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}/A_2}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1)).$$

For simplicity, we still denote by $\text{cl}(f)$ its image in

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{y}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$$

via the natural map $\frac{1}{\rho_k} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}(1) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$. Then the following proposition is true.

Proposition 2.18. $\text{cl}(f) = \text{cl}_1 - \text{cl}_2$.

Proof. By the constructions of \mathcal{E}_1^+ and \mathcal{E}_2^+ , we see that cl_1 is the image of $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}_X^+)$ via the morphism

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{X}^1, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{y}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}} \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{X}, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$$

induced by

$$L_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}}^L \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \widehat{L}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}},$$

and that cl_2 is the image of $\text{cl}(\mathcal{E}_Y^+)$ via the morphism

$$\text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{y}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+(1)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\widehat{\Omega}_\mathfrak{y}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{y}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+, \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1))$$

induced by the inclusion $\frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+(1) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_k} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(1)$.

Now by Proposition 2.14, we have

$$\text{cl}_1 - \text{cl}_2 = \text{cl}(\mathcal{E}_X^+) - \text{cl}(\mathcal{E}_Y^+) = ([\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}] - [\widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}]) - ([X] - [Y]).$$

However, the inclusion $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ admits a canonical A_2 -lifting, namely $A_2(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+) \rightarrow A_2(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+)$. So we deduce that $[X] - [Y] = 0$, which completes the proof. \square

Now, Proposition 2.17 is a special case of Proposition 2.18.

Corollary 2.19. *Assume $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ admits a lifting along $A_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, then there is an exact sequence of sheaves of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -modules*

$$(2.9) \quad 0 \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{E}_Y^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_X^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^1 \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^1$ is the module of relative differentials.

Proof. This follows from the Proposition 2.17 combined with the definitions of \mathcal{E}_1^+ and \mathcal{E}_2^+ . \square

2.3. Period sheaves. Now, we define the desired period sheaf $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger$ as mentioned in Introduction. The construction generalizes the previous work of Hyodo [Hy89].

Let $\mathfrak{X} = \text{Spf}(R^+)$ be a small smooth formal scheme and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}} = \text{Spf}(\widetilde{R}^+)$ be a fixed A_2 -lifting. Let E^+ be the integral Faltings' extension introduced in Proposition 2.6. Define $E_{\rho_k}^+ = \rho_k E^+(-1)$. Then it fits into the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \rightarrow E_{\rho_k}^+ \rightarrow \rho_k \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1) \rightarrow 0.$$

For any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, denote by E_ρ^+ the pull-back of $E_{\rho_k}^+$ along the inclusion

$$\rho \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1) \rightarrow \rho_k \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1),$$

then it fits into the following Γ -equivariant exact sequence

$$(2.10) \quad 0 \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \rightarrow E_\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1) \rightarrow 0.$$

By Proposition 2.8, E_ρ^+ admits an \widehat{R}_∞^+ -basis $1, \frac{\rho x_1}{t}, \dots, \frac{\rho x_d}{t}$. Let $E = E_\rho^+[\frac{1}{\rho}]$, which fits into the induced exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \rightarrow E \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then it is independent of the choice of ρ and has E_ρ^+ as a sub- \widehat{R}_∞^+ -module. Moreover, it admits an \widehat{R}_∞^+ -basis

$$1, y_1 = \frac{x_1}{t}, \dots, y_d = \frac{x_d}{t}$$

such that $\gamma_i(y_j) = y_j + \delta_{ij}$ for any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Define $S_\infty = \varinjlim_n \text{Sym}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+}^n E$. Then by similar arguments used in [Hy89, Section I], we have the following result.

Proposition 2.20. *There exists a canonical Higgs field*

$$\Theta : S_\infty \rightarrow S_\infty \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1)$$

on S_∞ such that the induced Higgs complex is a resolution of \widehat{R}_∞ . The Θ is induced by taking alternative sum along the projection $E \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1)$ and if we denote by Y_i the image of y_i in S_∞ , then there is a Γ -equivariant isomorphism

$$\iota : S_\infty \xrightarrow{\cong} \widehat{R}_\infty[Y_1, \dots, Y_d]$$

such that $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$ via this isomorphism, where $\widehat{R}_\infty[Y_1, \dots, Y_d]$ is the polynomial ring on free variables Y_i 's over \widehat{R}_∞ .

Since we have \widehat{R}_∞^+ -lattices E_ρ^+ 's of E , inspired by Proposition 2.20, we make the following definition.

Definition 2.21. *For any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, define*

- (1) $S_{\infty, \rho}^+ = \varinjlim_n \text{Sym}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+}^n E_\rho^+$;
- (2) $\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ = \varprojlim_n S_{\infty, \rho}^+ / p^n$;
- (3) $S_\infty^{\dagger, +} = \varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+$ and $S_\infty^\dagger = S_\infty^{\dagger, +}[\frac{1}{p}]$.

For any $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ satisfying $\nu_p(\rho_1) \geq \nu_p(\rho_2)$, we have $E_{\rho_1}^+ \subset E_{\rho_2}^+ \subset E$. So Proposition 2.20 implies that $S_{\infty, \rho_1}^+ \subset S_{\infty, \rho_2}^+ \subset S_\infty$. Moreover, the restriction of Θ to $S_{\infty, \rho}^+$ (for $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$) induces a Higgs field on $S_{\infty, \rho}^+$, which is identified with $\widehat{R}_\infty^+[\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d]$ via the canonical isomorphism ι . In this case, we still have $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$. Since Θ is continuous, it extends to $\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+$ and thus we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.22. *For any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, there exists a canonical Higgs field*

$$\Theta : \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ \rightarrow \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1)$$

on $\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+$. Moreover, there is a Γ -equivariant isomorphism

$$\iota : \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ \xrightarrow{\cong} \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle$$

such that $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$ via this isomorphism, where $\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle$ is the p -adic completion of $\widehat{R}_\infty^+[\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d]$.

After taking inductive limit among $\{\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \mid \nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)\}$, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 2.23. *There exists a canonical Higgs field*

$$\Theta : S_\infty^{\dagger, +} \rightarrow S_\infty^{\dagger, +} \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1)$$

on $S_\infty^{\dagger, +}$. Moreover, there is a Γ -equivariant isomorphism

$$\iota : S_\infty^{\dagger, +} \xrightarrow{\cong} \varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle$$

such that $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$ via this isomorphism. After inverting p , the induced Higgs complex $\text{HIG}(S_\infty^\dagger, \Theta)$

$$(2.11) \quad S_\infty^\dagger \xrightarrow{\Theta} S_\infty^\dagger \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1) \xrightarrow{\Theta} S_\infty^\dagger \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^2(-2) \rightarrow \dots$$

is a resolution of \widehat{R}_∞ .

Proof. It remains to prove the Higgs complex $\text{HIG}(S_\infty^\dagger, \Theta)$ is a resolution of \widehat{R}_∞ .

For any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, consider the Higgs complexes

$$\text{HIG}(\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+, \Theta) : \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ \xrightarrow{\Theta} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1) \xrightarrow{\Theta} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^2(-2) \rightarrow \dots$$

and

$$\text{HIG}(S_{\infty, \rho}^{\dagger, +}, \Theta) : S_{\infty, \rho}^{\dagger, +} \xrightarrow{\Theta} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+ \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1) \xrightarrow{\Theta} S_{\infty, \rho}^{\dagger, +} \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^2(-2) \rightarrow \dots$$

Then we have

$$\text{HIG}(S_\infty^\dagger, \Theta) = \text{HIG}(S_{\infty, \rho}^{\dagger, +}, \Theta) \left[\frac{1}{p} \right] = \varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \text{HIG}(\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+, \Theta) \left[\frac{1}{p} \right].$$

By Corollary 2.22, $\text{HIG}(\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+, \Theta)$ is computed by the Koszul complex

$$\mathbf{K}(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle; \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_d}) \simeq \mathbf{K}(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1 \rangle; \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_1}) \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+}^L \dots \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+}^L \mathbf{K}(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_d \rangle; \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_d}),$$

via the canonical isomorphism ι . Note that for any j ,

$$\mathbf{H}^i(\mathbf{K}(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_j \rangle; \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_j})) = \begin{cases} \widehat{R}_\infty^+, & i = 0 \\ \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho} \rangle / \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho}, I, + \rangle, & i = 1 \\ 0, & i \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

is derived p -complete by Proposition 6.2, where $\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho} \rangle$ and $\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho}, I, + \rangle$ are defined as in Definition 6.1 for $\Lambda_{j, \rho} = \{\rho^n Y_j^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $I = \{\nu_p(n+1)\}_{n \geq 0}$. We deduce that for any $i \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{H}^i(\mathbf{K}(\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle; \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_d})) = \wedge_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+}^i (\oplus_{j=1}^d \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho} \rangle / \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho}, I, + \rangle).$$

In particular, we get

$$\mathbf{H}^0(\text{HIG}(S_{\infty, \rho}^{\dagger, +}, \Theta)) = \varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \mathbf{H}^0(\text{HIG}(\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+, \Theta)) = \widehat{R}_\infty^+.$$

It remains to show that for any $i \geq 1$,

$$\varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \mathbf{H}^i(\text{HIG}(\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+, \Theta)) \cong \varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \wedge_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+}^i (\oplus_{j=1}^d \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho} \rangle / \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho}, I, + \rangle)$$

is p^∞ -torsion. To do so, it suffices to prove that for any $\nu_p(\rho_1) > \nu_p(\rho_2) > \nu_p(\rho_k)$, there is an $N \geq 0$ such that

$$p^N \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho_1} \rangle \subset \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \Lambda_{j, \rho_2}, I, + \rangle.$$

By Remark 6.3, we only need to find an N such that the following conditions hold:

- (1) for any $i \geq 0$, $N + i\nu_p(\rho_1) - i\nu_p(\rho_2) - \nu_p(i+1) \geq 0$;

$$(2) \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} (N + i\nu_p(\rho_1) - i\nu_p(\rho_2) - \nu_p(i+1)) = +\infty.$$

Since $\nu_p(\rho_1) > \nu_p(\rho_2)$, such an N exists. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.24. (1) *In the proof of Corollary 2.23, we have seen that for any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, the Higgs complex $\mathrm{HIG}(S_{\infty, \rho}^+[\frac{1}{p}], \Theta)$ is not a resolution of \widehat{R}_{∞} .*
 (2) *For any $1 \leq i \leq d$, the p^∞ -torsion of $H^i(\mathrm{HIG}(S_{\infty}^+, \Theta))$ is unbounded.*

Remark 2.25. *Since for any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $\gamma_i(Y_j) = Y_j + \delta_{ij}$, one can check that $\frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} = \log \gamma_i$ on S_{∞}^+ . So the Higgs field is $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \log \gamma_i \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$.*

Remark 2.26. *A similar local construction of S_{∞}^+ also appeared in [AGT16, I.4.7].*

There is a global story by using Theorem 2.9 instead of Proposition 2.6. Put $\mathcal{E}_{\rho_k}^+ = \rho_k \mathcal{E}^+(-1)$ and for any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, denote by \mathcal{E}_{ρ}^+ the pull-back of $\mathcal{E}_{\rho_k}^+$ along the inclusion

$$\rho \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1) \rightarrow \rho_k \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1).$$

Then it fits into the following exact sequence

$$(2.12) \quad 0 \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\rho}^+ \rightarrow \rho \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1) \rightarrow 0.$$

As an analogue of Definition 2.21 in the local case, we define period sheaves as follows:

Definition 2.27. *For any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, define*

- (1) $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho}^+ = \varinjlim_n \mathrm{Sym}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+}^n \mathcal{E}_{\rho}^+$;
- (2) $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho}^+ = \varprojlim_n \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho}^+ / p^n$;
- (3) $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger, +} = \varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho}^+$ and $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} = \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger, +}[\frac{1}{p}]$.

Theorem 2.28. *There is a canonical Higgs field Θ on $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger, +}$ such that the induced Higgs complex $\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}, \Theta)$:*

$$(2.13) \quad \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} \xrightarrow{\Theta} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1) \xrightarrow{\Theta} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^2(-2) \rightarrow \dots$$

is a resolution of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$. Moreover, when $\mathfrak{X} = \mathrm{Spf}(R^+)$ is small affine, there is an isomorphism

$$\iota : \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger, +}_{|X_{\infty}} \rightarrow \varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle_{|X_{\infty}}$$

such that the Higgs field $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$.

Proof. Since the problem is local, we are reduced to Corollary 2.23. \square

Finally, we describe the relative version of above constructions. We assume that $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ is a morphism of liftable smooth formal schemes and lifts to an A_2 -morphism $\widetilde{f} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$. Then by Corollary 2.19, for any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{E}_{\rho, Y}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\rho, X}^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^1(-1) \rightarrow 0.$$

By constructions of period sheaves in Definition 2.27, we get morphisms of sheaves $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{F}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_X$ for $\mathcal{F} \in \{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^+, \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_\rho^+, \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+}\}$. Also, the natural projection $\mathcal{E}_{\rho,X}^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^1(-1)$ induces relative Higgs fields

$$\Theta_{X/Y} : \mathcal{F}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^1(-1)$$

for $\mathcal{F} \in \{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^+, \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_\rho^+, \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+}\}$. Using similar arguments as above, we get the following proposition.

Proposition 2.29. *Assume that $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ is a morphism of liftable smooth formal schemes and lifts to an A_2 -morphism $\tilde{f} : \tilde{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$. The induced relative Higgs complex $\text{HIG}(\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger, \Theta_{X/Y})$:*

$$\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \xrightarrow{\Theta_{X/Y}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^1(-1) \xrightarrow{\Theta_{X/Y}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^2(-2) \rightarrow \dots$$

is a resolution of $\varinjlim_{\rho, \nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} (\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho,Y}^+)[\frac{1}{p}]$ and makes the following diagram

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} f^*\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger & \xrightarrow{f^*\Theta_Y} & f^*\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_y} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{Y}}^1(-1) \rightarrow \dots \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger & \xrightarrow{\Theta_X} & \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1) \rightarrow \dots \\ \downarrow \Theta_{X/Y} & & \downarrow \Theta_{X/Y} \\ \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^1(-1) & \xrightarrow{\Theta_{X/Y}} & \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_x} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}/\mathfrak{Y}}^2(-2) \rightarrow \dots \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \vdots & & \vdots \end{array}$$

commute, where $f^*\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger$ and $f^*\Theta_Y = \text{id} \otimes \Theta_Y$.

Proof. Put $\mathcal{C} := \varinjlim_{\rho, \nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} (\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho,Y}^+)[\frac{1}{p}]$. Since f admits a lifting \tilde{f} , for any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, we have a morphism $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho,Y}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho,X}^+$ and hence morphisms $f^*\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger$. It remains to show the relative Higgs complex $\text{HIG}(\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger, \Theta_{X/Y})$ is a resolution of \mathcal{C} and that the diagram (2.14) commutes. Since the problem is local, we may assume $\mathfrak{Y} = \text{Spf}(S^+)$ and $\mathfrak{X} = \text{Spf}(R^+)$ are both small affine such that the morphism $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ is induced by a morphism $S^+ \rightarrow R^+$ which makes the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \langle T_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_d^{\pm 1} \rangle & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \langle T_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_d^{\pm 1}, T_{d+1}^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_{d+r}^{\pm 1} \rangle \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S^+ & \xrightarrow{\quad} & R^+ \end{array}$$

commute, where d is the dimension of \mathfrak{Y} over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, r is the dimension of \mathfrak{X} over \mathfrak{Y} and both vertical maps are étale. Let \widehat{S}_∞^+ and \widehat{R}_∞^+ be the perfectoid rings corresponding to the base-changes of S^+ and R^+ along morphisms

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle T_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_d^{\pm 1} \rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle T_1^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}}, \dots, T_d^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}} \rangle$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle T_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_d^{\pm 1}, T_{d+1}^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_{d+r}^{\pm 1} \rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}\langle T_1^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}}, \dots, T_d^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}}, T_{d+1}^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}}, \dots, T_{d+r}^{\pm \frac{1}{p^\infty}} \rangle,$$

respectively. Put $Y_\infty = \mathrm{Spa}(\widehat{S}_\infty, \widehat{S}_\infty^+)$ and $X_\infty = \mathrm{Spa}(\widehat{R}_\infty, \widehat{R}_\infty^+)$ with $\widehat{S}_\infty = \widehat{S}_\infty^+[\frac{1}{p}]$ and $\widehat{R}_\infty = \widehat{R}_\infty^+[\frac{1}{p}]$. For any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, since $\mathcal{E}_{\rho, Y}^+$ fits into the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{E}_{\rho, Y}^+ \rightarrow \rho \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{Y}}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(-1) \rightarrow 0,$$

we see that $(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{E}_Y^+)(X_\infty) (\subset \mathcal{E}_{\rho, X}^+(X_\infty))$ coincides with $\widehat{R}_\infty^+ \otimes_{\widehat{S}_\infty^+} \mathcal{E}_{\rho, Y}^+(Y_\infty)$. This implies that

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho, Y}^+)(X_\infty) \cong \widehat{R}_\infty^+[\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d]$$

such that the induced Higgs field is given by $\sum_{i=0}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$. On the other hand, we have

$$\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho, X}^+(X_\infty) \cong \widehat{R}_\infty^+[\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_{d+r}]$$

such that the induced Higgs field is given by $\sum_{i=0}^{d+r} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$. So the morphism $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho, Y}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho, X}^+$ is compatible with Higgs fields for any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. Therefore, for any $\rho \in \rho_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, we have morphisms of sheaves

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_{\rho, Y}^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho, Y}^+ \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y^+} \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho, Y}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho, X}^+$$

which are all compatible with Higgs fields. After taking direct limits and inverting p , we get morphisms

$$f^* \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger$$

of sheaves which are compatible with Higgs fields. In particular, the top two rows of (2.14) form a commutative diagram.

To complete the proof, we have to show that $\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger, \Theta_{X/Y})$ is a resolution of \mathcal{C} . Since we do have a morphism $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger, \Theta_{X/Y})$, we can conclude by checking the exactness locally:

By the ‘‘moreover’’ part of Corollary 2.23, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger(X_\infty) = \left(\varinjlim_{\rho, \nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_{d+r} \rangle \right) \left[\frac{1}{p} \right]$$

with $\Theta_X = \sum_{i=1}^{d+r} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$. A similar argument also shows that $\Theta_{X/Y} = \sum_{i=d+1}^{d+r} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$. So the rest part of (2.14) commutes. Note that $\mathcal{C}(X_\infty) = \left(\varinjlim_{\rho, \nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle \right) \left[\frac{1}{p} \right]$. By a similar argument in the proof of Corollary 2.23, we see that $\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger, \Theta_{X/Y})$ is a resolution of \mathcal{C} as desired. \square

3. AN INTEGRAL DECOMPLETION THEOREM

In this section, we generalize results in [DLLZ22, Appendix A] to an integral case which will be used to simplify local calculations. Let $\mathfrak{X} = \mathrm{Spf}(R^+)$, \widehat{R}_∞^+ and Γ be as in the previous section. Throughout this section, we put $\pi = \zeta_p - 1$, $r = \nu_p(\pi) = \frac{1}{p-1}$ and $c = p^r$. Recall $\nu_p(\rho_k) \geq r$. We begin with some definitions.

- Definition 3.1.** (1) By a **Banach $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -algebra**, we mean a flat $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -algebra A such that $A[\frac{1}{p}]$ is a Banach \mathbb{C}_p -algebra, and that $A = \{a \in A[\frac{1}{p}] \mid \|a\| \leq 1\}$.
- (2) Assume A is a Banach $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -algebra. For an A -module M , we say it is a **Banach A -module** if $M[\frac{1}{p}]$ is a Banach $A[\frac{1}{p}]$ -module, and $M = \{m \in M[\frac{1}{p}] \mid \|m\| \leq 1\}$.

There are some typical examples.

- Example 3.2.** (1) If A is a Banach $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -algebra, then any topologically free A -module endowed with the supreme norm is a Banach A -module.
- (2) The rings R^+ and \widehat{R}_∞^+ are Banach $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -algebras.
- (3) The \widehat{R}_∞^+/R^+ is a Banach R^+ -module.

Now, we make the definition of (a -trivial) Γ -representations.

Definition 3.3. Assume $a > r$ and $A \in \{R^+, \widehat{R}_\infty^+\}$.

- (1) By an **A -representation of Γ of rank l** , we mean a finite free A -module M of rank l endowed with a continuous semi-linear Γ -action.
- (2) Let M be a representation of Γ of rank l over A . We say M is **a -trivial**, if $M/p^a \cong (A/p^a)^l$ as representations of Γ over A/p^a .
- (3) Let M be a representation of Γ of rank l over R^+ . We say M is **essentially $(a+r)$ -trivial** if M is a -trivial and $M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+$ is $(a+r)$ -trivial.

The goal of this section is to prove the following integral decompletion theorem.

Theorem 3.4. Assume $a > r$. Then the functor $M \mapsto M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+$ induces an equivalence from the category of $(a+r)$ -trivial R^+ -representations of Γ to the category of $(a+r)$ -trivial \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representations of Γ . The equivalence preserves tensor products and dualities.

The first difficulty is to construct the quasi-inverse, namely the decompletion functor, of the functor in Theorem 3.4. To do so, we need to generalize the method adapted in [DLLZ22] to the small integral case. However, their method only shows the decompletion functor takes values in the category of essentially $(a+r)$ -trivial representations. So, the second difficulty is to show the resulting representation is actually $(a+r)$ -trivial. The trivialness condition is crucial to overcome both difficulties.

3.1. Construction of decompletion functor. Now we construct the decompletion functor at first. From now on, we use $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M)$ to denote the continuous group cohomology of a p -adically completed R^+ -module endowed with a continuous Γ -action. By virtues of [BMS18, Lemma 7.3], $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M) = \mathrm{R}\varprojlim_k \mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M/p^k)$ can be calculated by Koszul complex $\mathrm{K}(M; \gamma_1 - 1, \dots, \gamma_d - 1)$:

$$M \xrightarrow{(\gamma_1 - 1, \dots, \gamma_d - 1)} M^d \rightarrow \dots$$

Proposition 3.5. *Assume $a > r$. Let M_∞ be an $(a + r)$ -trivial \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representation of Γ . Then there exists a finite free R^+ -submodule $M \subset M_\infty$ such that the following assertions are true:*

- (1) *The M is an essentially $(a + r)$ -trivial R^+ -representation of Γ such that the natural inclusion $M \hookrightarrow M_\infty$ induces an isomorphism $M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \cong M_\infty$ of \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representations of Γ .*
- (2) *The induced morphism $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M) \rightarrow \mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M_\infty)$ identifies the former as a direct summand of the latter, whose complement is concentrated in positive degrees and killed by π .*

Remark 3.6. *The M is unique up to isomorphism and the functor $M_\infty \mapsto M$ turns out to be the quasi-inverse of the functor $M \mapsto M \otimes R_\infty^+$ described in Theorem 3.4.*

Now we prove Proposition 3.5 by using similar arguments in [DLLZ22]. Since we work on the integral level, so we need to control (p -adic) norms carefully. We start with the following result.

Lemma 3.7. *For any cocycle $f \in \mathrm{C}^\bullet(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty/R)$, there exists a cochain $g \in \mathrm{C}^{\bullet-1}(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty/R)$ such that $dg = f$ and $\|g\| \leq c\|f\|$.*

Proof. The result follows from the same argument used in the proof of [DLLZ22, Proposition A.2.2.1], especially the part for checking the condition (3) of [DLLZ22, Definition A.1.6], by using [Sch13a, Lemma 5.5] instead of [DLLZ19, Lemma 6.1.7] there. \square

Since the norm on R (resp. \widehat{R}_∞) is induced by that on R^+ (resp. \widehat{R}_∞^+), there exists a norm-preserving embedding of complexes

$$\mathrm{C}^\bullet(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+) \rightarrow \mathrm{C}^\bullet(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty/R).$$

We shall apply Lemma 3.7 via this embedding.

Lemma 3.8. *For any cocycle $f \in \mathrm{C}^\bullet(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$, there is a cochain $g \in \mathrm{C}^{\bullet-1}(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$ such that $\|g\| \leq \|f\|$ and $dg = \pi f$.*

Proof. Regard $\mathrm{C}^\bullet(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$ as a subcomplex of $\mathrm{C}^\bullet(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty/R)$ as above. Applying Lemma 3.7 to πf , we get a cochain $g \in \mathrm{C}^{\bullet-1}(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty/R)$ such that $\|g\| \leq c\|\pi f\|$ and $dg = \pi f$. But $c\|\pi f\| = \|f\| \leq 1$, so we see $g \in \mathrm{C}^{\bullet-1}(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$ as desired. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let (C^\bullet, d) be a complex of Banach modules over a Banach \mathcal{O}_{C_p} -algebra A . Suppose that for every degree s and every cocycle $f \in C^s$, there exists a $g \in C^{s-1}$ such that $\|g\| \leq \|f\|$ and $dg = \pi f$. Then, for any cochain $f \in C^s$, there exists an $h \in C^{s-1}$ such that $\|h\| \leq \max(\frac{\|f\|}{c}, \|df\|)$ and $\|\pi^2 f - dh\| \leq \frac{\|df\|}{c}$.*

Proof. By assumption, one can choose a $g \in C^s$ such that $dg = \pi df$ and that $\|g\| \leq \|df\|$. Then $(g - \pi f) \in C^s$ is a cocycle. Using assumption again, there is an $h \in C^{s-1}$ satisfying $\|h\| \leq \|g - \pi f\|$ and $dh = \pi(g - \pi f)$. Since $\|\pi^2 f - dh\| \leq \frac{\|g\|}{c} \leq \frac{\|df\|}{c}$ and $\|h\| \leq \max(\|df\|, \frac{\|f\|}{c})$, this h is desired. \square

The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.9.

Lemma 3.10. *For any cochain $f \in C^\bullet(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$, there is a cochain $h \in C^{\bullet-1}(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$ such that $\|h\| \leq \max(\frac{\|f\|}{c}, \|df\|)$ and $\|\pi^2 f - dh\| \leq \frac{\|df\|}{c}$.*

The following lemma can be viewed as an integral version of [DLLZ22, Lemma A.1.12].

Lemma 3.11. *We denote $(R^+, \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$ by (A, M) for simplicity.*

Let $L = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n Ae_i$ be a Banach A -module (with the supreme norm) endowed with a continuous Γ -action. Assume there exists an $R > 1$ such that, for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and each i , $\|(\gamma - 1)(e_i)\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}$. Then the following assertions are true:

- (1) *For any cocycle $f \in C^\bullet(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$, there is a cochain $g \in C^{\bullet-1}(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$ such that $\|g\| \leq \|f\|$ and $dg = \pi f$.*
- (2) *For any cochain $f \in C^\bullet(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$, there exists an $h \in C^\bullet(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$ such that $\|h\| \leq \max(\frac{\|f\|}{c}, \|df\|)$ and $\|\pi^2 f - dh\| \leq \frac{\|df\|}{c}$.*

Proof. We only prove (1) and then (2) follows from Lemma 3.9 directly.

Now, let $f = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes f_i$ be a cocycle with $f_j \in C^s(\Gamma, M)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then $\|f\| \leq 1$. For any $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{s+1} \in \Gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes df_i \right) (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{s+1}) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes df_i \right) (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{s+1}) - df(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{s+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_1)(e_i) \otimes f_i(\gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{s+1}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|\sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes df_i\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{Rc}$. In other words, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have $\|df_j\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{Rc}$. By Lemma 3.10, for every j , there is a $g_j \in C^{s-1}(\Gamma, M)$ such that $\|g_j\| \leq \max(\frac{\|f_j\|}{c}, \|df_j\|) \leq \frac{\|f_j\|}{c}$ and $\|\pi^2 f_j - dg_j\| \leq \frac{\|df_j\|}{c} \leq \frac{\|f\|}{Rc^2}$.

Now, put $g = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes g_i$. Then $\|g\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{c}$. On the other hand, we have

$$\pi^2 f - dg = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes (\pi^2 f_i - dg_i) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes (dg_i - dg) \right).$$

The first term on the right hand side is bounded by $\frac{\|f\|}{Rc^2}$ and the second term is bounded by $\frac{\|g\|}{Rc} \leq \frac{\|f\|}{Rc^2}$. Thus $\|\pi^2 f - dg\|$ is bounded by $\frac{\|f\|}{Rc^2}$. Then $h_1 := \frac{g}{\pi}$ belongs to $C^{s-1}(\Gamma, (L \otimes_A M))$ such that $\|h_1\| \leq \|f\|$ and that $\|\pi f - dh_1\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{Rc}$.

Assume we have already $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_t \in C^{s-1}(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$ satisfying

$$\|h_j\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{R^{j-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\pi f - \sum_{i=1}^j dh_i\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{R^j c}, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq t.$$

Then $f - \pi^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^t dh_i \in C^s(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$ with norm $\|f - \pi^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^t dh_i\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{R^t}$. Replacing f by $f - \pi^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^t dh_i$ and proceeding as above, we get an $h_{t+1} \in C^{s-1}(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$ with norm $\|h_{t+1}\| \leq \|f - \pi^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^t dh_i\| \leq \frac{\|f\|}{R^t}$ such that

$$\|\pi f - \sum_{i=1}^t dh_i - dh_{t+1}\| \leq \frac{\|f - \pi^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^t dh_i\|}{Rc} \leq \frac{\|f\|}{R^{t+1}c}.$$

Then $\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} h_i$ converges to an element $h \in C^{s-1}(\Gamma, L \otimes_A M)$ such that $\pi f = dh$ and that $\|h\| \leq \sup_{j \geq 1} (\|h_j\|) \leq \|f\|$. This implies (1). \square

The following lemma is a generalization of [DLLZ22, Lemma A.1.14] whose proof is similar.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $A \rightarrow B$ be an isometry of Banach \mathcal{O}_{C_p} -algebras. Suppose the natural projection $\text{pr} : B \rightarrow B/A$ admits an isometric section $s : B/A \rightarrow B$ as Banach modules over A . Then, for all $b_1, b_2 \in B$, we have*

$$\|\text{pr}(b_1 b_2)\| \leq \max(\|b_1\| \|\text{pr}(b_2)\|, \|b_2\| \|\text{pr}(b_1)\|)$$

We shall apply this lemma to the inclusion $R^+ \rightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+$.

Lemma 3.13. *We denote the triple $(R^+, \widehat{R}_\infty^+)$ by (A, B) for simplicity. Let f be a cocycle in $C^1(\Gamma, \text{GL}_n(B))$. Suppose there exists an $R > 1$ such that $\|f(\gamma) - 1\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Let \overline{f} be the image of f in $C^1(\Gamma, \text{M}_n(B/A))$ (which is not necessarily a cocycle). If $\|\overline{f}\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc^2}$, then there exists a cocycle $f' \in C^1(\Gamma, \text{GL}_n(A))$ which is equivalent to f such that $\|f'(\gamma) - 1\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.*

Proof. We proceed as in the proof of [DLLZ22, Lemma A.1.15]. It is enough to show that there exists an $h \in \text{M}_n(B)$ with $\|h\| \leq c\|\overline{f}\|$ such that the cocycle

$$g : \gamma \mapsto \gamma(1+h)f(\gamma)(1+h)^{-1}$$

satisfies $\|g(\gamma) - 1\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\|\overline{g}\| \leq \frac{\|\overline{f}\|}{R}$ in $C^1(\Gamma, \text{M}_n(B/A))$.

Granting the claim, by iterating this procession, we can find a sequence h_1, h_2, \dots in $\text{M}_n(B)$ with $\|h_n\| \leq \frac{c\|\overline{f}\|}{R^{n-1}} \leq \frac{1}{cR^n}$ such that

$$\overline{\gamma \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (1+h_i) \right) f(\gamma) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (1+h_i) \right)^{-1}} \leq \frac{\|\overline{f}\|}{R^n}.$$

Set $h = \prod_{i=1}^{+\infty} (1 + h_i) \in \text{GL}_n(B)$. Then we have a cocycle

$$f' : \gamma \mapsto \gamma(h)f(\gamma)h^{-1}$$

taking values in $M_n(A) \cap \text{GL}_n(B)$ such that $\|f'(\gamma) - 1\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Thus $f' \in \text{GL}_n(A)$ and we prove the lemma.

Now, we prove the claim. Since $f \in C^1(\Gamma, \text{GL}_n(B))$ is a cocycle, for all $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$, we have $f(\gamma_1\gamma_2) = \gamma_1(f(\gamma_2))f(\gamma_1)$. Using Lemma 3.12, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (3.1) \quad \|\overline{df}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\| &= \|\overline{\gamma_1 f(\gamma_2) + f(\gamma_1) - f(\gamma_1\gamma_2)}\| \\ &= \|\overline{(\gamma_1 f(\gamma_2) - 1)(f(\gamma_1) - 1) - 1}\| \\ &= \|\overline{(\gamma_1 f(\gamma_2) - 1)(f(\gamma_1) - 1)}\| \leq \frac{\|\overline{f}\|}{Rc}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\overline{f}\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc^2}$, we can apply Lemma 3.10 to $\pi^{-2}\overline{f}$ and get an $\overline{h} \in M_n(B/A)$ such that

$$\|\overline{h}\| \leq \max\left(\frac{\|\pi^{-2}\overline{f}\|}{c}, \|\pi^{-2}\overline{df}\|\right) \leq \max(c\|\overline{f}\|, c^2\|\overline{df}\|) \leq c\|\overline{f}\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}$$

and that

$$(3.2) \quad \|\overline{f} - d\overline{h}\| \leq \frac{\|\pi^{-2}\overline{df}\|}{c} \leq c\|\overline{df}\| \leq \frac{\|\overline{f}\|}{R}.$$

By assumption, we can lift \overline{h} to an $h \in M_n(B)$ such that $\|h\| = \|\overline{h}\| \leq c\|\overline{f}\|$. It follows that for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we have

$$\|\gamma(1+h)f(\gamma)(1+h)^{-1} - f(\gamma)\| \leq \|h\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}$$

and therefore,

$$\|\gamma(1+h)f(\gamma)(1+h)^{-1} - 1\| \leq \frac{1}{Rc}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \|\overline{\gamma(1+h)f(\gamma)(1+h)^{-1} - \gamma(1+h)f(\gamma)(1-h)}\| \leq \|\overline{h}^2\| \leq \frac{c\|\overline{f}\|}{Rc} = \frac{\|\overline{f}\|}{R}.$$

By Lemma 3.12, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|\overline{\gamma(1+h)f(\gamma)(1-h)} - \overline{f(\gamma)} - \gamma(\overline{h}) + \overline{h}\| \\ &= \|\overline{\gamma(h)(f(\gamma) - 1)} - \overline{(f(\gamma) - 1)h} - \overline{\gamma(h)f(\gamma)h}\| \leq \frac{\|\overline{f}\|}{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4), we conclude that

$$\|\overline{\gamma(1+h)f(\gamma)(1+h)^{-1}}\| \leq \frac{\|\overline{f}\|}{R}$$

which proves the claim as desired. \square

Now we are able to prove Proposition 3.5.

Proof. (of Proposition 3.5)

- (1) Since $a > r$, we may choose $s > 1$ such that $\|p^{a+r}\| = \frac{1}{sc^2}$. By assumptions, for a set of basis $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$ of M_∞ , it determines a cocycle $f \in C^1(\Gamma, \mathrm{GL}_n(\widehat{R}_\infty^+))$ satisfying $\|f(\gamma) - 1\| \leq \frac{1}{sc^2}$. In particular, f satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 3.13. Thus there exists a cocycle $f' \in C^1(\Gamma, R^+)$ which is equivalent to f such that

$$\|f'(\gamma) - 1\| \leq \frac{1}{sc}, \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

Then the cocycle f' defines a finite free sub- R^+ -module M of rank n such that

$$M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \cong M_\infty.$$

- (2) By (1), we have $M_\infty \cong M \oplus M \otimes_{R^+} (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$. Applying Lemma 3.11 (1) to $L = M$, we deduce that $H^i(\Gamma, M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+)$ is killed by π for every $i \geq 0$. But $H^0(\Gamma, M_\infty) = M_\infty^\Gamma$ is π -torsion free, so we get

$$H^0(\Gamma, M_\infty) = H^0(\Gamma, M)$$

and complete the proof. \square

Up to now, we have constructed a decompletion functor from the category of $(a+r)$ -trivial \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representations of Γ to the category of essentially $(a+r)$ -trivial R^+ -representations of Γ . Now Theorem 3.4 follows from the next proposition directly.

Proposition 3.14. *Every essentially $(a+r)$ -trivial R^+ -representation of Γ is $(a+r)$ -trivial.*

We leave the proof of this proposition in the next subsection.

3.2. Essentially $(a+r)$ -trivial representation is $(a+r)$ -trivial. Throughout this subsection, we always assume $a > r$. For any R^+ -module N with a continuous Γ -action, we denote $H^i(\Gamma, N)$ by $H^i(N)$ for simplicity.

Now for a fixed essentially $(a+r)$ -trivial R^+ -representation M of Γ of rank n , we define

$$M_\infty = M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+.$$

Then it is $(a+r)$ -trivial and of the form $M_\infty = M \oplus M_{\mathrm{cp}}$ for $M_{\mathrm{cp}} = M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+/R^+$. Since M is a -trivial, by Lemma 3.11, we see that $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M_{\mathrm{cp}})$ is concentrated in positive degrees and is killed by π . As a consequence, for any $h \geq r$, we have

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M_{\mathrm{cp}}/p^h) \simeq \mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M_{\mathrm{cp}})[1].$$

In particular, $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M_{\mathrm{cp}}/p^h)$ is killed by π . So we deduce that

$$\pi H^0(M_\infty/p^h) \cong \pi H^0(M/p^h).$$

Replacing M by $(\widehat{R}_\infty^+)^l$, we get

$$\pi H^0(\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^h)^n \cong \pi H^0(R^+/p^h)^n = (\pi R^+/p^h)^n.$$

Since M_∞ is $(a+r)$ -trivial, choose $h = a+r$ and we get

$$\pi H^0(M/p^{a+r}) \cong \pi H^0(M_\infty/p^{a+r}) \cong \pi H^0(\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^{a+r})^n \cong (\pi R^+/p^{a+r})^n \cong (R^+/p^a)^n.$$

Thus, $\pi H^0(M/p^{a+r})$ is a free R^+/p^a -module of rank n .

Choose $g_1, \dots, g_n \in H^0(M/p^{a+r})$ such that $\pi g_1, \dots, \pi g_n$ is an R^+/p^a -basis of $\pi H^0(M/p^{a+r})$. We claim that the sub- R^+/p^{a+r} -module

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R^+/p^{a+r} \cdot g_i \subset H^0(M/p^{a+r})$$

is free. For any i , let $\tilde{g}_i \in M$ be a lifting of g_i . Assume $x_1, \dots, x_n \in R^+$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \tilde{g}_i \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{a+r}}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \pi \tilde{g}_i \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{a+r}}.$$

By the choice of g_i 's, we deduce that $x_i \in p^a R^+$ for any i . Write $x_i = \pi y_i$ for some $y_i \in R^+$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \pi \tilde{g}_i \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{a+r}}.$$

So $y_i \in p^a R^+$ and hence $x_i \in p^{a+r} R^+$ for all i . This proves the claim.

It remains to prove $\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_n$ is an R^+ -basis of M . Let e_1, \dots, e_n be an R^+ -basis of M . Since M is a -trivial, we get

$$M/p^a = H^0(M/p^a) = \sum_{i=1}^n R^+/p^a e_i.$$

So $\pi e_1, \dots, \pi e_n$ is an R^+/p^{a-r} -basis of $\pi M/p^a$. However, by the choice of \tilde{g}_i 's, $\pi \tilde{g}_1, \dots, \pi \tilde{g}_n$ is also an R^+/p^{a-r} -basis of $\pi M/p^a$. Since $a > r$, we deduce that \tilde{g}_i 's generate M as an R^+ -module. This completes the proof.

4. LOCAL SIMPSON CORRESPONDENCE

In this section, we establish an equivalence between the category of a -small representations of Γ over \widehat{R}_∞^+ and the category of a -small Higgs modules over R^+ . This is a local version of p -adic Simpson correspondence. Throughout this section, put $r = \frac{1}{p-1}$.

Definition 4.1. Assume $a > r$ and $A \in \{R^+, \widehat{R}_\infty^+\}$. We say a representation M of Γ over A is **a -small** if it is $(a + \nu_p(\rho_k))$ -trivial in the sense of Definition 3.3.

Definition 4.2. By a **Higgs module** over R^+ , we mean a finite free R^+ -module H together with an R^+ -linear morphism $\theta : H \rightarrow H \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1)$ such that $\theta \wedge \theta = 0$. A Higgs module (H, θ) is called **a -small**, if θ is divided by $p^{a+\nu_p(\rho_k)}$; that is,

$$\text{Im}(\theta) \subset p^{a+\nu_p(\rho_k)} H \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1).$$

Let $S_\infty^{\dagger,+}$ with the canonical Higgs field Θ be as in Corollary 2.23. For an a -small representation M over \widehat{R}_∞^+ , define

$$(4.1) \quad \Theta_M = \text{id}_M \otimes \Theta : M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+} \rightarrow M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+} \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1).$$

Then it is a Higgs field on $M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+}$ and we denote the induced Higgs complex by $\text{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_H)$. For an a -small Higgs module (H, θ_H) , define

$$(4.2) \quad \Theta_H = \theta_H \otimes \text{id} + \text{id}_H \otimes \Theta : H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+} \rightarrow H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+} \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{\Omega}_{R^+}^1(-1).$$

Then Θ_H is a Higgs field on $H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+}$ and we denote the induced Higgs complex by $\text{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_H)$. The main theorem in this section is the following local version of Simpson correspondence.

Theorem 4.3 (Local Simpson correspondence). *Assume $a > r$.*

- (1) *Let M be an a -small \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representation of Γ of rank l . Let $H(M) := (M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+})^\Gamma$ and $\theta_{H(M)}$ be the restriction of Θ_M to $H(M)$. Then $(H(M), \theta_{H(M)})$ is an a -small Higgs module of rank l .*
- (2) *Let (H, θ_H) be an a -small Higgs module of rank l over R^+ . Put $M(H, \theta_H) = (H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+})^{\Theta_H=0}$. Then $M(H, \theta_H)$ is an a -small \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representation of Γ of rank l .*
- (3) *The functor $M \mapsto (H(M), \theta_{H(M)})$ induces an equivalence from the category of a -small \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representations of Γ to the category of a -small Higgs modules over R^+ , whose quasi-inverse is given by $(H, \theta_H) \mapsto M(H, \theta_H)$. The equivalence preserves tensor products and dualities.*
- (4) *Let M be an a -small \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representation of Γ and (H, θ_H) be the corresponding Higgs module. Then there is a canonical Γ -equivariant isomorphism of Higgs complexes*

$$\text{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_H) \rightarrow \text{HIG}(M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_M).$$

Moreover, there is a canonical quasi-isomorphism

$$\text{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M[\frac{1}{p}]) \simeq \text{HIG}(H[\frac{1}{p}], \theta_H),$$

where $\text{HIG}(H[\frac{1}{p}], \theta_H)$ is the Higgs complex induced by (H, θ_H) .

The following corollary follows from Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 4.3 directly.

Corollary 4.4. *Assume $a > r$. The following categories are equivalent:*

- (1) *The category of a -small representations of Γ over R^+ ;*
- (2) *The category of a -small representations of Γ over \widehat{R}_∞^+ ;*
- (3) *The category of a -small Higgs modules over R^+ .*

In order to prove the theorem, we need to compute $\text{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+})$. By Corollary 2.23, we are reduced to computing $\text{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+ \langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle)$ for

any $\rho \in \widehat{\rho}_k \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. So before we move on, let us fix some notations to simplify the calculation.

For any $n \geq 0$, define

$$F_n(Y) = n! \binom{Y}{n} = Y(Y-1) \cdots (Y-n+1) \in \mathbb{Z}[Y].$$

For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}[\frac{1}{p}] \cap (0, 1)$, define $\epsilon_\alpha = 1 - \zeta^{-\alpha}$. Then $\nu_p(\rho_k) \geq r \geq \nu_p(\epsilon_\alpha)$.

4.1. Calculation in trivial representation case. We are going to compute $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d))$ in this subsection. We assume $d = 1$ first. In this case, $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_p \gamma$ and acts on $\widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y)$ via $\gamma(Y) = Y + 1$. Note that $\{\rho^n F_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a set of topological \widehat{R}_∞^+ -basis of $\widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y)$ and for any $n \geq 0$,

$$\gamma(\rho^n F_n) = \rho^n F_n + n\rho \cdot \rho^{n-1} F_{n-1}.$$

So we get a γ -equivariant decomposition

$$\widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}[\frac{1}{p}] \cap [0, 1)} R^+(\rho Y) \cdot T^\alpha.$$

So it suffices to compute $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, R^+(\rho Y) \cdot T^\alpha)$ for any α . We only need to consider the Koszul complex $\mathrm{K}(R^+(\rho Y) \cdot T^\alpha; \gamma - 1)$:

$$R^+(\rho Y) \cdot T^\alpha \xrightarrow{\gamma - 1} R^+(\rho Y) \cdot T^\alpha.$$

Note that for any α , $\{\rho^n F_n T^\alpha\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a set of topological R^+ -basis of $R^+(\rho Y) T^\alpha$. So we have

$$(4.3) \quad (\gamma - 1)(\rho^n F_n T^\alpha) = \begin{cases} n\rho \cdot \rho^{n-1} F_{n-1}, & \alpha = 0 \\ \zeta^\alpha \epsilon_\alpha T^\alpha (\rho^n F_n + n \frac{\rho}{\epsilon_\alpha} \rho^{n-1} F_{n-1}), & \alpha \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Put $\Lambda_\rho = \{\rho^n F_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $I_\rho = \{\nu_p(\rho(n+1))\}_{n \geq 0}$. Let $R^+(\Lambda_\rho)$ and $R^+(\Lambda_\rho, I_\rho, +)$ be as in Definition 6.1. Then by (4.3), we see that

$$(\gamma - 1)(R^+(\rho Y)) = R^+(\Lambda_\rho, I_\rho, +)$$

and that

$$(\gamma - 1)(R^+(\rho Y) T^\alpha) \sim \left\{ \zeta^\alpha \epsilon_\alpha (\rho^n F_n + n \frac{\rho}{\epsilon_\alpha} \rho^{n-1} F_{n-1}) \right\}_{n \geq 0}$$

in the sense of Definition 6.4. By Proposition 6.5, we get

$$(\gamma - 1)(R^+(\rho Y) T^\alpha) = \epsilon_\alpha (R^+(\rho Y) T^\alpha).$$

In summary, we see that for $\alpha \neq 0$, $\mathrm{H}^1(\mathbb{Z}_p \gamma, R^+(\rho Y) T^\alpha)$ is killed by ϵ_α and that for $\alpha = 0$, $\mathrm{H}^1(\mathbb{Z}_p \gamma, R^+(\rho Y)) = R^+(\rho Y) / R^+(\Lambda_\rho, I_\rho, +)$. So we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Keep notations as above.*

- (1) *The inclusion $R^+(\rho Y) \hookrightarrow \widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y)$ identifies $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, R^+(\rho Y))$ with a direct summand of $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_p \gamma, \widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y))$ whose complement is concentrated in degree 1 and is killed by $\zeta_p - 1$.*

- (2) The $H^0(\Gamma, R^+\langle \rho Y \rangle) = R^+$ is independent of ρ .
- (3) The $H^1(\Gamma, R^+\langle \rho Y \rangle) = R^+\langle \rho Y \rangle / R^+\langle \Lambda_\rho, I_\rho, + \rangle$ is the derived p -adic completion of $\bigoplus_{i \geq 0} R^+ / (i+1)\rho R^+$.

Proof. It remains to compute $H^0(\Gamma, R^+\langle \rho Y \rangle T^\alpha)$.

When $\alpha \neq 0$, assume $\sum_{n \geq 0} a_n \rho^n F_n T^\alpha$ is γ -invariant, then we have

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \zeta^\alpha \epsilon_\alpha (a_n + \frac{\rho}{\epsilon_\alpha} (n+1) a_{n+1}) \rho^n F_n T^\alpha = 0.$$

This implies that for any $n \geq 0$ and any $m \geq 0$,

$$a_n = (-1)^m \prod_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{\rho}{\epsilon_\alpha} (n+j) \right) a_{n+m}.$$

In particular, $\nu_p(a_n) \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_p(n+j)$ for any $m \geq 0$. This forces $a_n = 0$ for any $n \geq 0$.

When $\alpha = 0$, assume $\sum_{n \geq 0} a_n \rho^n F_n$ is γ -invariant, then we have

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} (n+1) \rho a_{n+1} \rho^n F_n = 0,$$

which implies $a_n = 0$ for any $n \geq 1$. So we have $R^+\langle \rho Y \rangle^\Gamma = R^+$. \square

Now we are able to handle the higher dimensional case.

Lemma 4.6. *Identify $\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+$ with $\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+\langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle$.*

- (1) *The inclusion $R^+\langle \rho \underline{Y} \rangle \hookrightarrow \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+$ identifies $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, R^+\langle \rho \underline{Y} \rangle)$ with a direct summand of $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+)$ whose complement is concentrated in degree ≥ 1 and is killed by $\zeta_p - 1$.*
- (2) *For any $i \geq 0$, we have*

$$H^i(\Gamma, R^+\langle \rho \underline{Y} \rangle) = \wedge_{R^+}^i (\bigoplus_{j=1}^d R^+\langle \rho Y_j \rangle / R^+\langle \Lambda_{\rho, j}, I_\rho, + \rangle)$$

$$\text{for } \Lambda_{\rho, j} = \{\rho^n F_n(Y_j)\} \text{ and } I_\rho = \{\nu_p((n+1)\rho)\}_{n \geq 0}.$$

Proof. Note that $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, \widehat{R}_{\infty}^+\langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle)$ is presented by the Koszul complex

$$\mathrm{K}(\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+\langle \rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d \rangle; \gamma_1 - 1, \dots, \gamma_d - 1) \simeq \mathrm{K}(\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+\langle \rho Y_1 \rangle; \gamma_1 - 1) \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+}^L \dots \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+}^L \mathrm{K}(\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+\langle \rho Y_d \rangle; \gamma_d - 1).$$

Since $R^+\langle \rho Y_j \rangle / R^+\langle \Lambda_{\rho, j}, I_\rho, + \rangle$ is already derived p -complete, the lemma follows from Lemma 4.5 directly. \square

Proposition 4.7. (1) $(S_{\infty}^{\dagger, +})^\Gamma = R^+$;

- (2) *For any $i \geq 1$, $H^i(\Gamma, S_{\infty}^{\dagger, +})$ is p^∞ -torsion.*

Proof. We only need to show for any $i \geq 1$,

$$\varinjlim_{\nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_\kappa)} H^i(\Gamma, \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho}^+)$$

is p^∞ -torsion. However, by Lemma 4.6, this follows from a similar argument as in the proof of Corollary 2.23. \square

4.2. Calculation in general case. Now, by virtues of Theorem 3.4, we may assume that M is an a -small representation of Γ over R^+ . Let e_1, \dots, e_l be an R^+ -basis of M and A_j be the matrix of γ_j with respect to the chosen basis for all $1 \leq j \leq d$; that is,

$$\gamma_j(e_1, \dots, e_l) = (e_1, \dots, e_l)A_j.$$

Put $B_j = A_j - I$. It is the matrix of $\gamma_j - 1$ and has p -adic valuation $\nu_p(B_j) \geq a + \nu_p(\rho_k)$ by a -smallness of M . Similar to the trivial representation case, we are reduced to computing $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d))$. Note that we still have a Γ -equivariant decomposition

$$M \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{\underline{\alpha} \in (\mathbb{N}[\frac{1}{p}] \cap [0,1])^d} M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d) \underline{T}^\alpha,$$

where \underline{T}^α denotes $T_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots T_d^{\alpha_d}$ for any $\underline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$.

Assume $\underline{\alpha} \neq 0$ at first. Without loss of generality, we assume $\alpha_d \neq 0$. Note that $\{e_{i,n} := e_i \rho^n F_n(Y_d) \underline{T}^\alpha\}_{1 \leq i \leq l, n \geq 0}$ is a set of topological basis of $M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d) \underline{T}^\alpha$ over $R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_{d-1})$. We have

$$(\gamma_d - 1)(e_{1,n}, \dots, e_{l,n}) = \zeta^{\alpha_d} \epsilon_{\alpha_d}((e_{1,n}, \dots, e_{l,n}) \cdot (\epsilon_{\alpha_d}^{-1} B_d + I) + (e_{1,n-1}, \dots, e_{l,n-1}) \cdot n \frac{\rho}{\epsilon_{\alpha_d}} A_d).$$

Similar to the trivial representation case, using Proposition 6.6, we deduce that

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_p \gamma_d, M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d) \underline{T}^\alpha) \simeq M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d) \underline{T}^\alpha / \epsilon_{\alpha_d}[-1].$$

Using the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Assume $\underline{\alpha} \neq 0$. Then the complex $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d) \underline{T}^\alpha)$ is concentrated in positive degrees and is killed by $\zeta_p - 1$.*

Now, we focus on the $\underline{\alpha} = 0$ case and prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.9. *Keep notations as above. Assume $\nu_p(\rho) < a + \nu_p(\rho_k) - r$. Define*

$$H(M) := (M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d))^\Gamma,$$

then the following assertions are true:

- (1) *The $H(M)$ is a finite free R^+ -module of rank l and is independent of the choice of ρ . More precisely, if we define*

$$(h_1, \dots, h_l) = (e_1, \dots, e_l) \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{(-A_i^{-1} B_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!} F_{n_i}(Y_i),$$

then h_1, \dots, h_l is an R^+ -basis of $H(M)$.

- (2) *The inclusion $H(M) \hookrightarrow M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d)$ induces a Γ -equivariant isomorphism*

$$H(M) \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d) \cong M \otimes_{R^+} R^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d).$$

Proof. We first consider the $d = 1$ case. In this case, $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_p\gamma$ acts on $R^+\langle\rho Y\rangle$ via $\gamma(Y) = Y + 1$. Let e_1, \dots, e_l be a basis of M and A be the matrix of γ associated to the chosen basis. Put $B = A - I$ and then $\nu_p(B) \geq a + \nu_p(\rho_k) > \nu_p(\rho) + r$. Note that $\{\rho^n F_n(Y)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a set of topological basis of $R^+\langle\rho Y\rangle$.

- (1) Assume $x = \sum_{n \geq 0} \underline{e} X_n \rho^n F_n(Y) \in H(M)$, where $X_n \in (R^+)^l$ for any $n \geq 0$ and \underline{e} denotes (e_1, \dots, e_l) . Since $\gamma(x) = x$, we deduce that for any $n \geq 0$,

$$BX_n = -(n+1)\rho AX_{n+1}.$$

In other words, we have

$$X_n = \frac{-A^{-1}B}{n\rho} X_{n-1} = \frac{(-A^{-1}B)^n}{\rho^n n!} X_0.$$

Note that $\nu_p\left(\frac{(-A^{-1}B)^n}{\rho^n n!}\right) \geq (a + \nu_p(\rho_k) - r - \nu_p(\rho))n$. So we get $\frac{(-A^{-1}B)^n}{\rho^n n!} \in M_l(R^+)$ and hence X_n is uniquely determined by X_0 . In particular, we have

$$(4.4) \quad x = \underline{e} \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(-A^{-1}B)^n}{\rho^n n!} \rho^n F_n(Y) X_0 = \underline{e} \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(-A^{-1}B)^n}{n!} F_n(Y) X_0.$$

Conversely, any $x \in M \otimes_{R^+} R^+\langle\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d\rangle$ which is of the form (4.4) for some $X_0 \in (R^+)^l$ is γ -invariant. So we are done.

- (2) From the proof of (1), we see that $\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(-A^{-1}B)^n}{\rho^n n!} \rho^n F_n(Y) \in \mathrm{GL}_l(R^+\langle\rho Y\rangle)$. Thus h_i 's form an $R^+\langle\rho Y\rangle$ -basis of $M \otimes_{R^+} R^+\langle\rho Y\rangle$ as desired.

Now, we handle the case for any $d \geq 1$. By what we have proved and by iterating, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \underline{e}(R^+\langle\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d\rangle)^l \\ &= \underline{e} \sum_{n_d \geq 0} \frac{(-A_d^{-1}B_d)^{n_d}}{n_d!} F_{n_d}(Y_d) (R^+\langle\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d\rangle)^l \\ &= \underline{e} \sum_{n_{d-1}, n_d \geq 0} \frac{(-A_{d-1}^{-1}B_{d-1})^{n_{d-1}}}{n_{d-1}!} F_{n_{d-1}}(Y_{d-1}) \frac{(-A_d^{-1}B_d)^{n_d}}{n_d!} F_{n_d}(Y_d) (R^+\langle\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d\rangle)^l \\ &= \dots \\ &= \underline{e} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{(-A_i^{-1}B_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!} F_{n_i}(Y_i) (R^+\langle\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d\rangle)^l. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\underline{e} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{(-A_i^{-1}B_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!} F_{n_i}(Y_i)$ forms a Γ -invariant basis, the result follows from that $(R^+\langle\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d\rangle)^\Gamma = R^+$. \square

Remark 4.10. Note that if $\nu_p(z) > r$, then $(1+z)^Y = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{z^n}{n!} F_n(Y)$. Therefore, for M and ρ as above, as $\nu_p(A_i^{-1}B_j) \geq a > r$, the operator $\prod_{i=1}^d \gamma_i^{-Y_i}$, whose matrix is given by $\sum_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{(-A_i^{-1}B_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!} F_{n_i}(Y_i)$, is well-defined on $M \otimes_{R^+} R^+\langle\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d\rangle$. Then the above proposition says that we have $H(M) =$

$\prod_{i=1}^d \gamma_i^{-Y_i} M$. Since $\log(1+z)(1+z)^Y = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{z^n}{n!} F'_n(Y)$ when $\nu_p(z) > r$, for any $\underline{e}\vec{m} \in M$ with $\vec{m} \in (R^+)^l$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_j} \left(\prod_{i=1}^d \gamma_i^{-Y_i} \underline{e}\vec{m} \right) &= \underline{e} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_j} \left(\sum_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{(-A_i^{-1} B_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!} F_{n_i}(Y_i) \vec{m} \right) \\ &= \underline{e} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0} \frac{(-A_j^{-1} B_j)^{n_j}}{n_j!} F'_{n_j}(Y_j) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq d, i \neq j} \frac{(-A_i^{-1} B_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!} F_{n_i}(Y_i) \vec{m} \\ &= \underline{e} (-\log(A_j)) \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{(-A_i^{-1} B_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!} F_{n_i}(Y_i) \vec{m} \\ &= -\log \gamma_j \prod_{i=1}^d \gamma_i^{-Y_i} \underline{e}\vec{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.11. *Keep notations as above.*

- (1) Denote by $\theta_{H(M)}$ the restriction of Θ to $H(M)$. Then $(H(M), \theta_{H(M)})$ is an a -small Higgs module. Moreover, $\theta_{H(M)} = \sum_{i=1}^d -\log \gamma_i \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$.
- (2) The inclusion $H(M) \rightarrow M \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}$ induces a Γ -equivariant isomorphism

$$H(M) \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+} \cong M \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}$$

and identifies the corresponding Higgs complexes

$$\text{HIG}(H(M) \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_{H(M)}) \cong \text{HIG}(M \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_M).$$

Proof. (1) Since $\Theta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_i} \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$, the ‘‘moreover’’ part follows from Remark 4.10. Since $\nu_p(B_i) \geq a + \nu_p(\rho_k)$ for all j and $\log \gamma_j = -\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{(-B_j)^n}{n}$, we see the a -smallness of $(H(M), \theta_{H(M)})$ as $\nu_p(\frac{B_i^n}{n}) \geq a + \nu_p(\rho_k)$ for all n .

(2) This follows from Proposition 4.9 (2) and the definition of $\theta_{H(M)}$. \square

We have seen how to achieve an a -small Higgs module from an a -small representation. It remains to construct an a -small representation of Γ from an a -small Higgs module.

Proposition 4.12. *Assume $a > r$. Let (H, θ_H) be an a -small Higgs module of rank l over R^+ . Put $M = (H \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+})^{\Theta_H=0}$.*

- (1) The restricted Γ -action on M makes it an a -small \widehat{R}_{∞}^+ -representation of rank l . Moreover, if $\theta_H = \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i \otimes \frac{d \log T_i}{t}$, then γ_i acts on M via $\exp(-\theta_i)$.
- (2) The inclusion $M \hookrightarrow H \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}$ induces a Γ -equivariant isomorphism

$$M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+} \cong H \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}$$

and identifies the corresponding Higgs complexes

$$\text{HIG}(M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_M) \cong \text{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}, \Theta_H).$$

Proof. (1) The argument is similar to the proof of Proposition 4.9.

Assume $\rho \in \rho_k \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ such that $a + \nu_p(\rho_k) > \nu_p(\rho) + r$. Let e_1, \dots, e_l be an R^+ -basis of H . We claim that $M = (H \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d))^{\Theta_H=0}$.

In fact, if $\vec{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_l)^t \in (\widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d))^l$ such that $m = \sum_{i=1}^l e_i G_i \in M$, then we see that for any $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$\theta_i \vec{G} + \frac{\partial \vec{G}}{\partial Y_i} = 0.$$

This forces $\vec{G} = \prod_{i=1}^d \exp(-\theta_i Y_i) \vec{a}$ for some $\vec{a} \in (\widehat{R}_\infty^+)^l$. Since $\nu_p(\theta_j) \geq a + \nu_p(\rho_k)$, the matrix $\prod_{i=1}^d \exp(-\theta_i Y_i)$ is well-defined in $\mathrm{GL}_l(\widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d))$. This shows that M is finite free of rank l and is independent of the choice of ρ .

Note that $\gamma_i(Y_j) = Y_j + \delta_{ij}$. We see γ_i acts on M via $\exp(-\theta_i)$. Since $\nu_p(\theta_i) \geq a + \nu_p(\rho_k)$, using $\exp(-\theta_i Y_i) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(-\theta_i)^n}{n!} Y_i^n$, we deduce that M is a -small.

(2) The (2) follows from the fact that $\prod_{i=1}^d \exp(-\theta_i Y_i) \in \mathrm{GL}_l(\widehat{R}_\infty^+(\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d))$ and the definition of Γ -action on M . □

Finally, we complete the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Proof. (of Theorem 4.3)

The (1) was given in Corollary 4.11. The (2) was proved in Proposition 4.12. The equivalence part of (3) follows from Corollary 4.11 (2) (as θ_i 's act via $-\log \gamma_i$'s) together with Proposition 4.12 (2) (as γ_i 's act via $\exp(-\theta_i)$'s). An elementary linear algebra shows that the equivalence preserves tensor products and dualities. So we only need to prove the “moreover” part of (4).

Let M be an a -small representation of Γ over \widehat{R}_∞^+ and (H, θ_H) be the corresponding Higgs module over R^+ . By Corollary 2.23, we have quasi-isomorphisms of complexes over \widehat{R}_∞ ,

$$M\left[\frac{1}{p}\right] \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{HIG}(M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^\dagger, \Theta_M) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^\dagger, \Theta_H).$$

Applying $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, \cdot)$, we get a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]) \rightarrow \mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, \mathrm{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^\dagger, \Theta_H)).$$

However, it follows from Proposition 4.7 that

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, S_\infty^\dagger) \simeq R[0].$$

So we get

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, \mathrm{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} S_\infty^\dagger, \Theta_H)) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(H\left[\frac{1}{p}\right], \theta_H).$$

Therefore, we conclude the desired quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, M[\frac{1}{p}]) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(H[\frac{1}{p}], \theta_H).$$

□

Finally, it is worth pointing out that all results in Theorem 4.3 still hold for $\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+$ instead of $S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+}$ except the “moreover” part of (4) for the sake that $\mathrm{HIG}(\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+[\frac{1}{p}], \Theta) \neq \widehat{R}_{\infty}[0]$ and $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\Gamma, \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+[\frac{1}{p}]) \neq R[0]$. For the further use, we give the following proposition.

Proposition 4.13. *Keep notations as in Theorem 4.3.*

- (1) *Let M be an a -small \widehat{R}_{∞}^+ -representation of Γ of rank l . Then $H(M) = (M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+)^{\Gamma}$ and $\theta_{H(M)}$ is the restriction of Θ_M to $H(M)$.*
- (2) *Let (H, θ_H) be an a -small Higgs module of rank l over R^+ . Then $M(H, \theta_H) = (H \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+)^{\Theta_H=0}$.*
- (3) *Let M be an a -small \widehat{R}_{∞}^+ -representation of Γ and (H, θ_H) be the corresponding Higgs module. Then there is a canonical Γ -equivariant isomorphism of Higgs complexes*

$$\mathrm{HIG}(H \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+, \Theta_H) \rightarrow \mathrm{HIG}(M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+, \Theta_M).$$

Proof. By Corollary 2.22, we have a Γ -equivariant decomposition

$$\widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+ = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{\underline{\alpha} \in (\mathbb{N} \cap [0, 1])^d} R^+ \langle \rho_k Y_1, \dots, \rho_k Y_d \rangle \underline{T}^{\underline{\alpha}}.$$

Let N be the a -small R^+ -representation of Γ corresponding to M in the sense of Theorem 3.4. Then $M = N \otimes_{R^+} \widehat{R}_{\infty}^+$.

- (1) Thanks to Lemma 4.8, we have

$$(M \otimes_{\widehat{R}_{\infty}^+} \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+)^{\Gamma} = (N \otimes_{R^+} R^+ \langle \rho_k Y_1, \dots, \rho_k Y_d \rangle)^{\Gamma}.$$

Since $a > r$, it is automatic that $\nu_p(\rho_k) < a + \nu_p(\rho_k) - r$. So (1) is a consequence of Proposition 4.9.

- (2) This follows from the proof of Proposition 4.12 (1) directly (for the sake that $\nu_p(\rho_k) < a + \nu_p(\rho_k) - r$).
- (3) This follows from (1), (2) and Theorem 4.3 (4) via the base-change along $S_{\infty}^{\dagger,+} \rightarrow \widehat{S}_{\infty, \rho_k}^+$.

□

5. A p -ADIC SIMPSON CORRESPONDENCE

5.1. Statement and preliminaries. Now, we want to globalise the local Simpson correspondence established in the last section for a liftable smooth formal scheme \mathfrak{X} . We fix such an \mathfrak{X} together with an A_2 -lifting $\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}$. Then we have the corresponding integral Faltings’ extension \mathcal{E}^+ and overconvergent period sheaf $\mathcal{OC}^{\dagger,+}$. Let X be

the rigid analytic generic fibre of \mathfrak{X} and $\nu : X_{\text{proét}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$ be the projection of sites. Throughout this section, we assume $r = \frac{1}{p-1}$.

Definition 5.1. *Assume $a \geq r$. By an a -small generalised representation of rank l on $X_{\text{proét}}$, we mean a sheaf \mathcal{L} of locally finite free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ -modules of rank l which admits a p -complete sub- $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -module \mathcal{L}^+ such that there is an étale covering $\{\mathfrak{X}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}\}_{i \in I}$ and rationals $b_i > b > a$ such that for any i ,*

$$(\mathcal{L}^+ / p^{b_i + \nu_p(\rho_k)})_{|X_i}^{\text{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ / p^{b_i + \nu_p(\rho_k)})^l)_{|X_i}^{\text{al}}$$

is an isomorphism of $(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ / p^{b_i + \nu_p(\rho_k)})_{|X_i}$ -modules, where $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^{\text{al}}$ is the almost integral structure sheaf and X_i denotes the rigid analytic generic fibre of \mathfrak{X}_i .

Definition 5.2. *Assume $a \geq r$. By an a -small Higgs bundle of rank l on $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$, we mean a sheaf \mathcal{H} of locally finite free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -modules of rank l together with an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -linear operator $\theta_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1)$ satisfying $\theta_{\mathcal{H}} \wedge \theta_{\mathcal{H}} = 0$ such that it admits a $\theta_{\mathcal{H}}$ -preserving $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ -lattice \mathcal{H}^+ (i.e. $\mathcal{H}^+ \subset \mathcal{H}$ is a subsheaf of locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ -modules with $\mathcal{H}^+[\frac{1}{p}] = \mathcal{H}$) satisfying the condition*

$$\theta_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{H}^+) \subset p^{b + \nu_p(\rho_k)} \mathcal{H}^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1)$$

for some $b > a$.

For any a -small generalised representation, define

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{L}} \otimes \Theta : \mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1).$$

Then $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a Higgs field on $\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}$. Denote the induced Higgs complex by $\text{HIG}(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}})$. For any a -small Higgs field $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$, put

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{H}} = \theta_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{id} + \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \Theta : \mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\Omega}_{\mathfrak{X}}^1(-1).$$

Then $\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a Higgs field on $\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}$. Denote the induced Higgs complex by $\text{HIG}(\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}, \Theta_{\mathcal{H}})$. Then our main theorem is the following p -adic Simpson correspondence.

Theorem 5.3 (p -adic Simpson correspondence). *Keep notations as above.*

- (1) *For any a -small generalised representation \mathcal{L} of rank l on $X_{\text{proét}}$, $\text{R}\nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger})$ is discrete. Denote $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}) := \nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger})$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})} = \nu_* \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then $(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})})$ is an a -small Higgs bundle of rank l .*
- (2) *For any a -small Higgs bundle $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ of rank l on $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$, put*

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) = (\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger})^{\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}=0}.$$

Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is an a -small generalised representation of rank l .

This is the presheaf on $X_{\text{proét}}$ sending each affinoid perfectoid space $U = \text{Spa}(R, R^+)$ to the almost $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -module $R^{+\text{al}}$ in the sense of [Sch12, Section 4]. Since $X_{\text{proét}}$ admits a basis of affinoid perfectoid spaces, the proof of [Sch12, Proposition 7.13] shows that $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^{\text{al}}$ is a sheaf.

- (3) The functor $\mathcal{L} \mapsto (\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})})$ induces an equivalence from the category of a -small generalised representations to the category of a -small Higgs bundles, whose quasi-inverse is given by $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$. The equivalence preserves tensor products and dualities and identifies the Higgs complexes

$$\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger, \Theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})}).$$

- (4) Let \mathcal{L} be an a -small generalised representation with associated Higgs bundle $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$. Then there is a canonical quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\nu_*(\mathcal{L}) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}),$$

where $\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ is the Higgs complex induced by $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$. In particular, $\mathrm{R}\nu_*(\mathcal{L})$ is a perfect complex of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -modules concentrated in degree $[0, d]$, where d denotes the dimension of \mathfrak{X} relative to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$.

- (5) Assume $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ is a smooth morphism between liftable smooth formal schemes over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$ be the fixed A_2 -liftings of \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{Y} , respectively. Assume f lifts to an A_2 -morphism $\widetilde{f} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{X}} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{Y}}$, then the equivalence in (3) is compatible with the pull-back along f .

Remark 5.4. Assume \mathcal{L} is a sheaf of locally free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ -modules which becomes a -small after a finite étale base-change $f : \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$. By étale descent, the $\mathrm{R}\nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger)$ is well-defined and discrete. The $\nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger)$ is a Higgs bundle which becomes a -small Higgs bundle via pull-back along f . Conversely, if $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ is a Higgs bundle on \mathfrak{X} which becomes a -small after taking pull-back along a finite étale morphism f , by pro-étale descent for $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ -bundles, $(\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger)^{\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}=0}$ is a well-defined $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ -bundle. Also, it becomes a -small via the pull-back along f . Therefore, one can establish a p -adic Simpson correspondence in this case.

Remark 5.5. Assume \mathfrak{X} comes from a smooth formal scheme \mathfrak{X}_0 over \mathbb{Z}_p and admits an A_2 -lifting $\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}$. Note that Faltings used Breuil-Kisin twist to define Higgs fields [Fal05, Definition 2] while we use Tate twist, so our smallness conditions on Higgs fields differ from his by a multiplication of $(\zeta_p - 1)$. By Proposition 2.14, after choosing a covering $\{\mathfrak{X}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}\}_{i \in I}$, the cocycle $\{\theta_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}$ corresponding to the intergal Faltings' extension is exactly the one used in [Fal05, Section 4]. Note that locally we define Higgs fields by $\theta = -\log \gamma$ (Corollary 4.11) while Faltings defined $\theta = \log \gamma$ ([Fal05, Remark(ii)]). So our construction is compatible with [Fal05] up to a sign on Higgs fields.

Remark 5.6. If \mathfrak{X} comes from a smooth formal scheme \mathfrak{X}_0 over \mathcal{O}_k and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{X}}$ is the base-change of \mathfrak{X}_0 along $\mathcal{O}_k \rightarrow A_2$. Let $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger$ be the associated overconvergent period sheaf. By its construction, there is a natural inclusion $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger$. Now assume \mathbb{L} is a \mathbb{Z}_p -local system on $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{L} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ is the corresponding $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ -bundle on $X_{\text{proét}}$. Since the resulting Higgs field is nilpotent by [LZ17, Theorem 2.1], it can

be seen from the proof of Theorem 5.3 that the morphism

$$\nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \nu_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger)$$

is an isomorphism. So our construction is compatible with the work of [LZ17] in this case.

We do some preparations before proving Theorem 5.3.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $U \in X_{\text{proét}}$ be affinoid perfectoid and \mathcal{M}^+ be a sheaf of p -torsion free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -modules satisfying one of the following conditions:*

- (a) $\mathcal{M}_{|U}^+$ is a sheaf of free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X|U}^+$ -modules.
- (b) \mathcal{M}^+ is p -complete and there is an almost isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{M}_{|U}^+/p^c)^{\text{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X|U}^+/p^c)^r)^{\text{al}}$$

for some $c > 0$.

Then the following assertions are true:

- (1) For any $i \geq 1$ and $a > 0$, $H^i(U, \mathcal{M}^+)^{\text{al}} \cong H^i(U, \mathcal{M}^+/p^a)^{\text{al}} = 0$.
- (2) For any $b > a > 0$, the image of $(\mathcal{M}^+/p^b)(U)$ in (\mathcal{M}^+/p^a) is $\mathcal{M}^+(U)/p^a$.
- (3) Put $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^+ = \varprojlim_n \mathcal{M}^+/p^n$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^+(U) = \varprojlim_n \mathcal{M}^+(U)/p^n$ and for any $i \geq 1$, $H^i(U, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^+)^{\text{al}} = 0$.

Proof. By [Sch13a, Lemma 4.10], both (1) and (2) hold for free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -modules. So we only focus on \mathcal{M}^+ 's satisfying the second condition.

- (1) It is enough to show that for any $i \geq 1$, $H^i(U, \mathcal{M}^+)^{\text{al}} = 0$. Granting this, the rest can be deduced from the long exact sequence induced by

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^+ \xrightarrow{\times p^a} \mathcal{M}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^+/p^a \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $(\mathcal{M}_{|U}^+/p^c)^{\text{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X|U}^+/p^c)^r)^{\text{al}}$, by [Sch13a, Lemma 4.10(v)], we deduce that $H^i(U, \mathcal{M}^+/p^c)^{\text{al}} = 0$ for any $i \geq 1$. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^+/p^c \xrightarrow{p^{(n-1)c}} \mathcal{M}^+/p^{nc} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^+/p^{(n-1)c} \rightarrow 0.$$

By induction on n , we see that for any $i \geq 1$, $H^i(U, \mathcal{M}^+/p^{nc})^{\text{al}} = 0$. Now, the desired result follows from [Sch13a, Lemma 3.18].

- (2) Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^+ & \xrightarrow{p^b} & \mathcal{M}^+ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^+/p^b \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \times p^{b-a} & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^+ & \xrightarrow{p^a} & \mathcal{M}^+ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^+/p^a \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Then by (1), we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^+(U)/p^b & \longrightarrow & (\mathcal{M}^+/p^b)(U) & \xrightarrow{\delta_b} & H^1(U, \mathcal{M}^+) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \times p^{b-a} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^+(U)/p^a & \longrightarrow & (\mathcal{M}^+/p^a)(U) & \xrightarrow{\delta_a} & H^1(U, \mathcal{M}^+) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Since the multiplication by p^{b-a} is zero on $H^1(U, \mathcal{M}^+)$, the image of $(\mathcal{M}^+/p^b)(U)$ in $(\mathcal{M}^+/p^a)(U)$ is contained in the kernel of δ_a . In other words, $(\mathcal{M}^+/p^b)(U)$ takes values in $\mathcal{M}^+(U)/p^a$. Now, the result follows.

- (3) When \mathcal{M}^+ is p -complete, there is nothing to prove. Now, assume \mathcal{M}^+ is a free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -module. The first part follows from (2) and the second part follows from the same argument used in (1). □

Remark 5.8. *In this paper, we say a module (or a sheaf of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -modules) M is p -complete, if $M \cong \mathbf{R} \lim_n M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}^L \mathbb{Z}_p/p^n$. This is different from that $M = \lim_n M/p^n$ in general. However, as mentioned in the paragraph below [BMS19, Lemma 4.6], if M has bounded p^∞ -torsion; that is, $M[p^\infty] = M[p^N]$ for some $N \geq 0$, then saying M is p -complete amounts to saying $M = \lim_n M/p^n$. Indeed, in this case, the pro-systems $\{M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}^L \mathbb{Z}_p/p^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{M/p^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are pro-isomorphic. So we obtain that*

$$\mathbf{R} \lim_n M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}^L \mathbb{Z}_p/p^n \simeq \mathbf{R} \lim_n M/p^n.$$

Lemma 5.9. *Assume $\mathfrak{X} = \mathrm{Spf}(R^+)$ is small. Define $X_\infty, \widehat{R}_\infty^+$ as before. Let \mathcal{L}^+ be a sheaf of p -complete and p -torsion free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -modules such that*

$$(\mathcal{L}^+/p^a)^{\mathrm{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/p^a)^l)^{\mathrm{al}}$$

for some $a > 0$. Put $M = \mathcal{L}^+(X_\infty)$, then

- (1) M is a finite free \widehat{R}_∞^+ -module of rank l .
- (2) For any $0 < b < a$, there is a Γ -equivariant isomorphism $M/p^b \cong (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^b)^l$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.7, we have Γ -equivariant almost isomorphisms

$$(5.1) \quad M/p^a \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathcal{L}^+/p^a)(X_\infty) \approx (\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/p^a)^l(X_\infty) \xleftarrow{\sim} (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a)^l.$$

In particular, we get an almost isomorphism $M/p^a \approx (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a)^l$. Denote e_1, \dots, e_l the standard basis of $(\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a)^l$.

- (1) As mentioned in the paragraph after [Sch13a, Definition 2.2], for any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, one can find \mathcal{O}_{C_p} -morphisms

$$f : M/p^a \rightarrow (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a)^l$$

and

$$g : (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a)^l \rightarrow M/p^a$$

such that $f \circ g = p^\epsilon$ and $g \circ f = p^\epsilon$. In particular, the image of g is $p^\epsilon M/p^a$ and the kernel of g is killed by p^ϵ .

For any i , choose $x_i \in M$ such that

$$x_i \equiv g(e_i) \pmod{p^a M}.$$

Then x_i 's generate

$$p^\epsilon M/p^a \cong M/p^{a-\epsilon}.$$

We claim x_i 's are linear independent over $\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^{a-\epsilon}$. Granting this, we see $M/p^{a-\epsilon}$ is a finite free $\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^{a-\epsilon}$ -module. Since M is p -torsion free and p -complete by Lemma 5.7 (3), by choosing $\epsilon < a$, we deduce that M is finite free of rank l as desired.

So we are reduced to proving the claim. Assume $\lambda_i \in \widehat{R}_\infty^+$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i x_i \in p^a M$, i.e. $g(\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i e_i) \in p^a M$. So $\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i e_i \in \text{Ker}(g)$ and thus is killed by p^ϵ . In other words, $p^\epsilon \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i e_i \in p^a (\widehat{R}_\infty^+)^l$. This forces $\lambda_i \in p^{a-\epsilon} \widehat{R}_\infty^+$ for any i . So we are done.

- (2) By [Sch12, Proposition 4.4], the almost isomorphism $M/p^a \approx (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a)^l$ induces an isomorphism

$$\iota : \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}} (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a)^l \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}} M/p^a.$$

Since (5.1) is Γ -equivariant, so is ι . Since $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$, this amounts to a Γ -equivariant isomorphism

$$h : (\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^a \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \widehat{R}_\infty^+)^l \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} M/p^a \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} M.$$

Now, for any $\epsilon > 0$, choose $x_{i,\epsilon} \in \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} M$ such that for any i ,

$$x_{i,\epsilon} \equiv h(p^\epsilon e_i) \pmod{p^a M}.$$

Note that $x_{i,\epsilon}$ is unique modulo $p^a M$. So for $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$, we have

$$p^{\epsilon-\epsilon'} x_{i,\epsilon'} \equiv x_{i,\epsilon} \pmod{p^a M}.$$

Assume $\epsilon < a$, we see that $p^{\epsilon-\epsilon'}$ divides $x_{i,\epsilon}$ for any ϵ' . By [BMS18, Lemma 8.10], R^+ is a topologically free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -module, then so is \widehat{R}_∞^+ . As we have seen that M is a finite free \widehat{R}_∞^+ -module, it is also topologically free over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. This forces that $x_{i,\epsilon}$ is divided by p^ϵ . So we may assume $x_{i,\epsilon} = p^\epsilon y_{i,\epsilon}$ for some $y_{i,\epsilon} \in M$. By construction, $y_{i,\epsilon}$ is unique modulo $p^{a-\epsilon} M$.

Now define $H_\epsilon : (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^{a-\epsilon})^l \rightarrow M/p^{a-\epsilon}$ by sending e_i to $y_{i,\epsilon}$. By construction of H_ϵ , we see that it is the unique \widehat{R}_∞^+ -morphism from $(\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^{a-\epsilon})^l$ to $M/p^{a-\epsilon}$ whose restriction to $(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} \widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^{a-\epsilon})^l$ coincides with h .

We need to show H_ϵ is an isomorphism. However, since M is also finite free, after interchanging M and $(\widehat{R}_\infty^+)^l$ and proceeding as above, we get a unique $G_\epsilon : M/p^{a-\epsilon} \rightarrow (\widehat{R}_\infty^+/p^{a-\epsilon})^l$, whose restriction to $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p} M/p^{a-\epsilon}$ coincides with h^{-1} . Now, the similar argument shows that $H_\epsilon \circ G_\epsilon = \text{id}$ and $G_\epsilon \circ H_\epsilon = \text{id}$. So H_ϵ is an isomorphism.

Finally, since h is Γ -equivariant, by the uniqueness of H_ϵ , we deduce that H_ϵ is also Γ -equivariant. Since ϵ is arbitrary, we are done. \square

The following corollary is a special case of Proposition 5.9.

Corollary 5.10. *Assume $\mathfrak{X} = \mathrm{Spf}(R^+)$ is small affine. Let \mathcal{L} be an a -small generalised representation with a sub- $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -sheaf \mathcal{L}^+ satisfying $(\mathcal{L}^+ / p^{b+\nu_p(\rho_k)})^{\mathrm{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ / p^{b+\nu_p(\rho_k)})^l)^{\mathrm{al}}$ for some $b > a$. Then $\mathcal{L}^+(X_\infty)$ is a b' -small \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representation of Γ for any $a < b' < b$.*

Lemma 5.11. *Assume $\mathfrak{X} = \mathrm{Spf}(R^+)$ is affine small. Let \mathcal{L}^+ be a sheaf of p -complete and p -torsion free $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -modules such that*

$$(\mathcal{L}^+ / p^c)^{\mathrm{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ / p^c)^l)^{\mathrm{al}}$$

for some $c > 0$. Then for any $\mathcal{P}^+ \in \{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^+, \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_\rho^+, \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+}\}$ and for each $i \geq 0$, the natural map

$$H^i(\Gamma, (\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty)) \rightarrow H^i(X_{\mathrm{pro\acute{e}t}}/\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)$$

is an almost isomorphism. Moreover, when $i = 0$, it is an isomorphism.

Proof. The proof is similar to [Sch13a, Lemma 5.6] and [LZ17, Lemma 2.7]. Denote $X_\infty^{m/X}$ the m -fold fibre product of X_∞ over X . As X_∞ is a Galois cover of X with Galois group Γ , we have $X_\infty^{m/X} \simeq X_\infty \times \Gamma^{m-1}$. Note that $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ / p^c$ comes from the étale sheaf \mathcal{O}_X^+ / p^c on $X_{\acute{e}t}$ and that $(\mathcal{L}^+ / p^c)^{\mathrm{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+ / p^c)^l)^{\mathrm{al}}$. By [Sch13a, Lemma 3.16], for any $i \geq 0$ and $m \geq 1$, we have almost isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{cts}}(\Gamma^{m-1}, H^i(X_\infty, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+ / p^c)) \rightarrow H^i(X_\infty^{m/X}, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+ / p^c).$$

By induction on n , we have almost isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{cts}}(\Gamma^{m-1}, H^i(X_\infty, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+ / p^{nc})) \rightarrow H^i(X_\infty^{m/X}, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+ / p^{nc}),$$

for any $n \geq 1$. By letting n go to $+\infty$, we get almost isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{cts}}(\Gamma^{m-1}, H^i(X_\infty, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)) \rightarrow H^i(X_\infty^{m/X}, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)$$

for $\mathcal{P}^+ \in \{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^{+, \leq r}, \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_\rho^+\}$, where $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^{+, \leq r}$ denotes the sub-sheaf of

$$\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^+ \cong \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+[\rho Y_1, \dots, \rho Y_d]$$

consisting of polynomials of degrees $\leq r$. By the coherence of restricted pro-étale topoi, $H^i(X_\infty^{m/X}, -)$ commutes with direct limits for all i . Since $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^+ = \bigcup_{r \geq 0} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^{+, \leq r}$, we also get desired almost isomorphisms for $\mathcal{P}^+ = \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_\rho^+$. A similar argument also works for $\mathcal{P}^+ = \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+} = \bigcup_{\rho, \nu_p(\rho) > \nu_p(\rho_k)} \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_\rho^+$. Further more, when $i = 0$, since both sides are $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -torsion free, so we get injections in this case.

Now applying Cartan-Leray spectral sequence to the Galois cover $X_\infty \rightarrow X$ and using Lemma 5.7, we conclude that the map

$$H^i(\Gamma_\infty, (\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty)) \rightarrow H^i(X_{\text{proét}}/\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)$$

is an almost isomorphism for every $i \geq 0$.

For $i = 0$, we know $H^0(X_{\text{proét}}/\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)$ is the $(0, 0)$ -term of Cartan-Leray spectral sequence at the E_2 -page, which is the kernel of the map

$$(\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty) \rightarrow (\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty^{2/X}).$$

On the other hand, $H^0(\Gamma, (\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty))$ is the kernel of the map

$$(\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{cts}}(\Gamma, (\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty)).$$

So the result follows from the injectivity of the map

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{cts}}(\Gamma, (\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{P}^+)(X_\infty^{2/X}).$$

□

5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.3. Now we are prepared to prove Theorem 5.3.

- (1) Let \mathcal{L} be an a -small generalised representation of rank l and \mathcal{L}^+ be the sub- $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+$ -sheaf as described in Definition 5.1. Denote $\mathcal{H}^+ := \nu_*(\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+})$. It suffices to show that $R^i\nu_*(\mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+})$ is p^∞ -torsion for any $i \geq 1$ and that \mathcal{H}^+ satisfies conditions in Definition 5.2. Let $b > a$ and $\{\mathfrak{X}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}\}_{i \in I}$ be as in Definition 5.1. Since the problem is local on $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}$, we are reduced to showing that for any $i \in I$, if we write $\mathfrak{X}_i = \text{Spf}(R_i^+)$, then $H^n(X_{\text{proét}}/\mathfrak{X}_i, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+})$ is p^∞ -torsion for any $n \geq 1$ and is a b_i -small Higgs module over R_i^+ for $n = 0$ in the sense of Definition 4.2 for some $b_i > b$. So we only need to deal with the case for \mathfrak{X} small affine.

Now we may assume $\mathfrak{X} = \text{Spf}(R^+)$ is affine small itself and that

$$(\mathcal{L}^+/p^{b'})^{\text{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+)^l/p^{b'})^{\text{al}}$$

for some $b' > b$. Let $X_\infty, \widehat{R}_\infty^+$ and Γ be as before. By Lemma 5.11, the natural morphism

$$H^i(\Gamma, \mathcal{L}^+(X_\infty) \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+}) \rightarrow H^i(X_{\text{proét}}/\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{L}^+ \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+})$$

is an almost isomorphism for $i \geq 1$ and is an isomorphism for $i = 0$. So we are reduced to showing $R\Gamma(\Gamma, \mathcal{L}^+(X_\infty) \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+})$ is discrete after inverting p and $H^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{L}^+(X_\infty) \otimes_{\widehat{R}_\infty^+} S_\infty^{\dagger,+})$ is a b'' -small Higgs module for some $b'' > b$.

However, by Corollary 5.10, $\mathcal{L}^+(X_\infty)$ is a b'' -small \widehat{R}_∞^+ -representation of Γ for some fixed $b'' > b$. So the result follows from Theorem 4.3 (1).

- (2) Let $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ be an a -small Higgs bundle of rank l and \mathcal{H}^+ be the $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ -lattice as described in Definition 5.2. Fix an a' satisfying $a < a' < b$. Denote $\mathcal{L}^+ = (\mathcal{H}^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+})^{\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}=0}$. Then it is a subsheaf of $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger})^{\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}=0}$ and hence p -torsion free. We claim that the inclusion $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+}}_{\rho_k}$ induces a natural isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{H}^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+})^{\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}=0} \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+}}_{\rho_k})^{\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}=0}.$$

Indeed, this is a local problem and therefore follows from Proposition 4.13. As $\mathcal{H}^+ \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+}}_{\rho_k}$ is p -complete, by continuity of $\Theta_{\mathcal{H}}$, so is \mathcal{L}^+ . It remains to prove that \mathcal{L}^+ is locally almost trivial modulo $p^{a'+\nu_p(\rho_k)}$.

Assume $\mathfrak{X} = \mathrm{Spf}(R^+)$ is small affine and let $X_{\infty}, \widehat{R}_{\infty}^+$ and Γ be as before. Shrinking \mathfrak{X} if necessary, we may assume $(\mathcal{H}^+, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ is induced by a b' -small Higgs module over R^+ for some $b' > a'$. Then by Theorem 4.3, $\mathcal{L}^+(X_{\infty})$ is a b' -small \widehat{R}_{∞}^+ -representation of Γ .

Let us go back to the global case. Choose an étale covering $\{\mathfrak{X}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}\}$ of \mathfrak{X} by small affine $\mathfrak{X}_i = \mathrm{Spf}(R_i^+)$'s such that on each \mathfrak{X}_i , $(\mathcal{H}^+, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ is induced by a b_i -small Higgs module over R_i^+ for some $b_i > a'$. Denote by $X_{i,\infty}$ the corresponding “ X_{∞} ” for \mathfrak{X}_i instead of \mathfrak{X} . As above, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^+(X_{i,\infty})/p^{b_i} \cong (\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+(X_{i,\infty})/p^{b_i})^l.$$

Therefore, by the proof of [Sch13a, Lemma 4.10(i)], we get an almost isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{L}^+/p^{b_i})|_{X_i}^{\mathrm{al}} \cong ((\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X^+/p^{b_i})^l)|_{X_i}^{\mathrm{al}}$$

with $b_i > a' > a$ as desired.

- (3) Let \mathcal{L} be an a -small generalised representation. There exists a natural morphism of Higgs complexes

$$\iota : \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}, \Theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})}) \rightarrow \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}})$$

By construction of $(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})})$, it follows from Theorem 4.3 (4) that ι is an isomorphism. Since $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}$ is a resolution of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X$ by Theorem 2.28, we see that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L})}) = \mathcal{L}$. The isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})), \theta_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}))})$$

can be deduced in a similar way. So we get the equivalence as desired.

It remains to show the equivalence preserves products and dualities. But this is a local problem, so we are reduced to Theorem 4.3 (3).

- (4) This follows from the same arguments in the proof of Theorem 4.3 (4). Indeed, combining Theorem 2.28 and the item (3), we have a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger}, \Theta_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

On the other hand, it follows from (1) that there exists a quasi-isomorphism

$$R\nu_*(\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^\dagger, \Theta_{\mathcal{H}})) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

So we get a quasi-isomorphism

$$R\nu_*(\mathcal{L}) \simeq \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$$

as desired.

- (5) Since $f : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ admits an A_2 -lifting \tilde{f} , by Proposition 2.29, we get a morphism $f^*\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger$ which is compatible with Higgs fields.

Assume $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ is an a -small Higgs field on $\mathfrak{Y}_{\text{ét}}$. Denote by $(f^*\mathcal{H}, f^*\theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ its pull-back along f . By (3), we get the following isomorphisms, which are compatible with Higgs fields:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(f^*\mathcal{H}, f^*\theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger &\cong f^*\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \\ &\cong f^*(\mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{Y}}} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger) \otimes_{f^*\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \\ &\cong f^*(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_Y} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger) \otimes_{f^*\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_Y^\dagger} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger \\ &\cong f^*\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_X} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}_X^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

After taking kernels of Higgs fields, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{L}(f^*\mathcal{H}, f^*\theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \cong f^*\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

So the functor $(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ in (2) is compatible with the pull-back along f . But we have shown it is an equivalence, so its quasi-inverse must commute with the pull-back along f . This completes the proof.

Corollary 5.12. *Assume \mathfrak{X} is a liftable proper smooth formal scheme of relative dimension d over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. For any small generalised representation \mathcal{L} , $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\text{proét}}, \mathcal{L})$ is concentrated in degree $[0, 2d]$, whose cohomologies are finite dimensional \mathbb{C}_p -spaces.*

Proof. Since we have assumed \mathfrak{X} is proper smooth, this follows from Theorem 5.3 (4) directly. \square

Remark 5.13. *Except the item (4), all results in Theorem 5.3 are still true by using $\mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathbb{C}}_{\rho_k}^+$ instead of $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{C}^{\dagger,+}$.*

Remark 5.14. *In Corollary 5.12, one can also deduce that $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\text{proét}}, \mathcal{L})$ is concentrated in degree $[0, 2d]$ when \mathfrak{X} is just quasi-compact of relative dimension d over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. Indeed, in this case, we have*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\text{proét}}, \mathcal{L}) \simeq \mathrm{R}\Gamma(\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ét}}, \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})) \simeq \mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{ét}}}),$$

where $\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{ét}}}$ denotes the induced Higgs complex on $X_{\text{ét}}$. On the other hand, by étale descent, the category of étale vector bundles on $X_{\text{ét}}$ is equivalent to the category of analytic vector bundles on X_{an} , where X_{an} denotes the analytic

site of X . So the Higgs complex $\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\acute{e}t}}$ upgrades to an analytic Higgs complex $\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{an}}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})$ such that

$$\mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{an}}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathrm{an}}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\acute{e}t}} = \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\acute{e}t}}.$$

By analytic-étale comparison (cf. [FP, Proposition 8.2.3]), for any coherent $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathrm{an}}}$ -module \mathcal{M} , there is a canonical quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\mathrm{an}}, \mathcal{M}) \simeq \mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\acute{e}t}, \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathrm{an}}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\acute{e}t}}).$$

So by considering corresponding spectral sequences of these complexes, we get a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\mathrm{an}}, \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{an}}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}})) \simeq \mathrm{R}\Gamma(X_{\acute{e}t}, \mathrm{HIG}(\mathcal{H}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\acute{e}t}}).$$

Now, the quasi-compactness of \mathfrak{X} implies that X is a noetherian space. So the result follows from Grothendieck's vanishing theorem (cf. [Gro57, Théorème 3.6.5]) directly. The author thanks anonymous referees for pointing out this.

6. APPENDIX

In Appendix, we prove some elementary facts used in this paper. Throughout this section, we always assume A is a p -complete flat $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$ -algebra.

Definition 6.1. Let $\Lambda = \{\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be an index set and $I = \{i_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha}$ be a set of non-negative real numbers indexed by Λ . Define

- (1) $A[\Lambda] = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} A$;
- (2) $A\langle \Lambda \rangle = \varprojlim_m A[\Lambda]/p^m A[\Lambda]$;
- (3) $A[\Lambda, I] = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} p^{i_{\alpha}} A$;
- (4) $A\langle \Lambda, I \rangle = \varprojlim_m (A[\Lambda, I] + p^m A[\Lambda])/p^m A[\Lambda]$;
- (5) $A\langle \Lambda, I, + \rangle = \varprojlim_m A[\Lambda, I]/p^m A[\Lambda, I]$.

Proposition 6.2. (1) $A\langle \Lambda \rangle/A\langle \Lambda, I \rangle$ is the classical p -completion of $A[\Lambda]/A[\Lambda, I]$.
(2) $A\langle \Lambda \rangle/A\langle \Lambda, I, + \rangle$ is the derived p -completion of $A[\Lambda]/A[\Lambda, I]$.

Proof. Since $A\langle \Lambda, I \rangle$ is the closure of $A\langle \Lambda, I, + \rangle$ in $A\langle \Lambda \rangle$ with respect to the p -adic topology, the item (1) follows from (2) directly. So we are reduced to proving (2).

Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A[\Lambda, I] \longrightarrow A[\Lambda] \longrightarrow A[\Lambda]/A[\Lambda, I] \longrightarrow 0.$$

For any $n \geq 0$, we get an exact triangle

$$A[\Lambda, I] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}^L \mathbb{Z}_p/p^n \rightarrow A[\Lambda] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}^L \mathbb{Z}_p/p^n \rightarrow (A[\Lambda]/A[\Lambda, I]) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}^L \mathbb{Z}_p/p^n \rightarrow .$$

Applying $\mathrm{R}\lim_n$ to this exact triangle and using p -complete flatness of A , we get the following exact triangle

$$A\langle \Lambda, I, + \rangle[0] \rightarrow A\langle \Lambda \rangle[0] \rightarrow K \rightarrow ,$$

where K denotes the derived p -completion of $A[\Lambda]/A[\Lambda, I]$. Now, the item (2) follows from the injectivity of the map $A\langle\Lambda, I, +\rangle \rightarrow A\langle\Lambda\rangle$. \square

Remark 6.3. For any $(\lambda_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \in \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} A$, we write $\lambda_\alpha \xrightarrow{\nu_p} 0$, if for any $M > 0$ the set $\{\alpha \in \Lambda | \nu_p(\lambda_\alpha) \leq M\}$ is finite. Then we have

$$A\langle\Lambda, I\rangle = \{(\lambda_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Lambda} | \nu_p(\frac{\lambda_\alpha}{p^{i_\alpha}}) \geq 0\}$$

and

$$A\langle\Lambda, I, +\rangle = \{(\lambda_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Lambda} | \nu_p(\frac{\lambda_\alpha}{p^{i_\alpha}}) \geq 0, \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{p^{i_\alpha}} \xrightarrow{\nu_p} 0\}.$$

Definition 6.4. Assume M is a (topologically) free A -module. Let Σ_1 and Σ_2 be two subsets of M .

- (1) We write $\Sigma_1 \sim \Sigma_2$, if they (topologically) generate the same sub- A -module of M
- (2) We write $\Sigma_1 \approx \Sigma_2$, if both of them are sets of (topological) basis of M . In this case, we also write $M \approx \Sigma_1$ if no ambiguity appears.

Proposition 6.5. Fix $\epsilon, \omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}_p}$. Let M be a (topologically) free A -module with basis $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$. If $N \subset M$ is a submodule such that

$$N \sim \{\omega(x_i + i\epsilon x_{i-1}) \mid i \geq 0\},$$

where $x_{-1} = 0$, then $N = \omega M$.

Proof. Put $y_i = x_i + i\epsilon x_{i-1}$ for all i . Then we see that

$$(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots) = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) \cdot X$$

with

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 1 & 2\epsilon & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3\epsilon & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

and that

$$(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) = (y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots) \cdot Y$$

with

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\epsilon & 2\epsilon^2 & -6\epsilon^3 & \dots \\ 0 & 1 & -2\epsilon & 6\epsilon^2 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -3\epsilon & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The (i, j) -entry of Y is δ_{ij} if $i \geq j$ and is $(-\epsilon)^{j-i} \frac{(j-1)!}{(i-1)!}$ if $i < j$. Then the proposition follows from the fact $XY = YX = Id$. \square

The following proposition can be proved in the same way.

Proposition 6.6. *Fix $\Theta \in M_l(A)$. Let M be a (topologically) free A -module with basis $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$. Let N be a finite free R -module of rank l with a set of basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}$. For every $1 \leq j \leq l$ and $i \geq 0$, put $f_{j,i} \in N \otimes_A M$ satisfying*

$$(f_{1,i}, \dots, f_{l,i}) = (e_1 \otimes x_i, \dots, e_l \otimes x_i) + i(e_1 \otimes x_{i-1}, \dots, e_l \otimes x_{i-1})\Theta,$$

where $x_{-1} = 0$. Then $N \otimes_A M \approx \{f_{j,i} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l, i \geq 0\}$.

REFERENCES

- [AGT16] A. Abbes, M. Gros, T. Tsuji: The p -adic Simpson Correspondence, *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. 193, 2016.
- [Bei12] A. Beilinson: p -adic periods and derived de Rham cohomology, *JAMS*, Vol. 25, NO. 3, pp. 715-738, July 2012.
- [Bha12] B. Bhatt: p -adic derived de Rham cohomology, arXiv:1204.6560v1, 2012.
- [BMS18] B. Bhatt, M. Morrow, P. Scholze: *Integral p -adic Hodge Theory*, *Publ. math. de l'IHÉS* 128, pp. 219-395, 2018.
- [BMS19] B. Bhatt, M. Morrow, P. Scholze: *Topological Hochschild homology and integral p -adic Hodge theory*, *Publ. math. de l'IHÉS* 129, pp. 199-310, 2019.
- [DLLZ19] H. Diao, K.-W. Lan, R. Liu, X. Zhu: *Logarithmic adic spaces: some foundational results*, arXiv:1912.09836v1, 2019.
- [DLLZ22] H. Diao, K.-W. Lan, R. Liu, X. Zhu: *Logarithmic Riemman-Hilbert correspondences for rigid varieties*, to appear in *JAMS*, 2022.
- [DW05] C. Deninger, A. Werner: *Vector bundles on p -adic curves and parallel transport* *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* 38, pp. 553-597, 2005.
- [Fal88] G. Faltings: *p -adic Hodge Theory*, *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 1, pp. 255-299, 1988.
- [Fal05] G. Faltings: *A p -adic Simpson correspondence*, *Advances in Mathematics*. 198, pp. 847-862, 2005.
- [FF19] L. Fargues, J.-M. Fontaine: *Courbes et fibrés vectoriels en théorie de Hodge p -adique*, *Astérisque* No.406, 2019.
- [Fon82] J.-M. Fontaine: *Forms différentielles et modules de Tate des variétés abéliennes sur les corps locaux*, *Inv. Math.* 65, pp. 379-409, 1982.
- [FP] J. Frensel, M. van der Put: *Rigid analytic geometry and its applications*, *Progress in mathematics* (Boston, Mass.), v. 218, 2004.
- [GR03] O. Gabber, L. Remero: *Almost Ring Theory*, Vol 1800 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin· Heidelberg· New York, 2003.
- [Gro57] A. Grothendieck: *Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique*, *Tohoku Math. J. (2)* 9, 119-221, 1957.
- [Heu20] Ben Heuer: *Line bundles on rigid spaces in the v -topology*, arXiv: 2012.07918v2, 2020.
- [HMW21] Ben Heuer, Lucas Mann, Annette Werner: *The p -adic Corlette-Simpson correspondence for abeloids*, arXiv: 2107.09403v2, 2021.
- [Hy89] O. Hyodo: *On variantion of Hodge-Tate structures*, *Math. Ann.* 284, pp. 7-22, 1989.
- [Ill71] L. Illusie: *Complexe cotangent et déformations I*, Vol 239 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin· Heidelberg· New York, 1971.
- [Ill72] L. Illusie: *Complexe cotangent et déformations II*, Vol 283 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin· Heidelberg· New York, 1972.
- [LZ17] R. Liu, X. Zhu: *Rigidty and a Riemman-Hilbert correspondence for p -adic local systems*, *Inv. Math.* 207, pp. 291-343, 2017.

- [MT20] M. Morrow, T. Tsuji: *Generalized representations as q -connections in integral p -adic Hodge theory*, arXiv: 2010.04059v2, 2020.
- [OV07] A. Ogus, V. Vologodsky: *Nonabelian Hodge theory in characteristic p* , Publ. math. de l'IHÉS 106, pp. 1–138, 2007.
- [Qui70] D. Quillen: On the (co-)homology of commutative rings, in Applications of Categorical Algebra, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math, Vol. XVII, pp. 65-87, Am. Math. Soc., Providence, 1970.
- [Sch12] P. Scholze: *Perfectoid spaces*, Publ. math. de l'IHÉS 116, no. 1, pp. 245-313, 2012.
- [Sch13a] P. Scholze: *p -adic Hodge theory for rigid-analytic varieties*, Forum of Mathematics, Pi, 1, e1, 77 pages, 2013.
- [Sch13b] P. Scholze: *Perfectoid spaces: a survey*, Current developments in mathematics, 2012, Volume 2012, Issue 1, pp. 193-227.
- [Sim92] C.T. Simpson: *Higgs bundles and local systems*, Publ. math. de l'IHÉS 75, pp. 5-95, 1992.
- [Wei] C.A. Weibel: *An introduction to homological algebra*, Camb. Stu. in. Adv. Math., 2004.
- [YZ20] J. Yang, K. Zuo: *A note on p -adic Simpson correspondence*, arXiv:2012.02058v4, 2020.

MORNINGSIDE CENTER OF MATHEMATICS NO.505, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ZHONG-GUANCUN EAST ROAD 55, HAIDIAN, BEIJING, 100190, CHINA.

Email address: wangyupeng@amss.ac.cn