

Analogues of Morozov Theorem in characteristic $p > 0$

Marion Jeannin

December 28, 2021

Abstract

Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let G be a reductive k -group. In this article we prove an analogue of Morozov Theorem when p is separably good for G and the group satisfies some extra assumptions. The latter characterises, in characteristic 0, the Lie algebras of parabolic subgroups of G by means of their nilradical. If now k is any field of characteristic $p \geq 0$, let X be a smooth projective geometrically connected k -curve. Let us assume that G is a reductive k -group which is the twisted form of a constant X -group. The existence of the aforementioned analogue has been in particular useful to extend, to the positive characteristic framework, the construction of the canonical parabolic subgroup of G proposed by M. Atiyah and R. Bott when k is of characteristic 0 (see [1]).

1 Introduction

Let k be a field and G be a reductive k -group. In this article we adopt the convention of [15, XIX], in particular a reductive k -group is connected (see Définition 2.7 *ibid.*). We denote by $\mathfrak{g} := \text{Lie}(G)$ the corresponding Lie algebra.

More generally, if $H \subseteq G$ is a subgroup we denote:

- by $\mathfrak{h} := \text{Lie}(H)$ the Lie algebra of H ,
- by H_{red} the reduced part of H ,
- by H^0 the connected component of the identity of H .

If \mathfrak{l} is a Lie algebra, we denote by $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{l})$ the solvable radical of \mathfrak{l} , namely its maximal solvable ideal. Let \mathfrak{u} be a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} that only consists in p -nilpotent elements.

One can associate to \mathfrak{u} a tower of p -nil subspaces in \mathfrak{g} (see [9, XVIII, §10, Corollaire 2]):

- set $\mathfrak{u}_0 := \mathfrak{u}$ and let $\mathfrak{q}_1 := N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_0)$,
- the subspace \mathfrak{u}_1 is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{q}_1)$ be the normaliser of \mathfrak{u}_0 ,
- the Lie algebra \mathfrak{q}_2 is the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_1)$,
- and so on: let \mathfrak{u}_i be the set of all p -nilpotent elements of the radical of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_{i-1})$ and $\mathfrak{q}_{i+1} := N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_i)$.

This tower stabilises for dimensional reasons. We denote by \mathfrak{q}_{∞} the limit object of the tower of normalisers, and by \mathfrak{u}_{∞} the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_{\infty}))$. So in particular we have that $\mathfrak{q}_{\infty} = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_{\infty})$.

In characteristic 0, the p -nilpotency of the elements of \mathfrak{u}_i is replaced by the classical condition of ad-nilpotency. The limit object \mathfrak{q}_{∞} can then be shown to be a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , namely \mathfrak{q}_{∞} is the Lie algebra of a parabolic subgroup of G . This result is attributed to V. Morozov and can be found for instance in [9, VIII, §10 Corollaire 2].

A similar construction is possible at the group level, this time by considering the tower of smooth connected normalisers of a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subset G$. Namely, at each iteration one needs to consider the smooth connected part of the normaliser rather than the whole normaliser. Once again the tower stabilises. Let us denote by k^s the separable closure of k . Assume that for any field k the unipotent subgroup U is k^s -embeddable into the unipotent radical of a parabolic k -subgroup of G . This condition is for instance always satisfied when the field k is perfect. A theorem of B. Weisfeiler (see [49]) and Borel–Tits (see [5, Corollaire 3.2]) then states that the limit smooth connected normaliser is a parabolic subgroup of G , denoted by $P_G(U)$ (its Lie algebra is denoted by $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U)$).

Finally, the Hilbert–Mumford–Kempf–Rousseau theory (see [27] and [33, 2.3]) allows to associate to any p -nil Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} an optimal parabolic subgroup (thus an optimal parabolic subalgebra), denoted by $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$), where $\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}$ is an optimal cocharacter for \mathfrak{u} . See section 4 for more details on the construction and the definition of the objects involved here.

In this article we aim to determine under which conditions on p and G the following statement holds true:

Statement 1.1 (Analogue of Morozov Theorem in characteristic $p > 0$). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a reductive k -group. Let $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie subalgebra. Assume that \mathfrak{u} is the set of p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. Then, under some assumptions on p and G (that are detailed in the remaining part of this introduction and that in particular exclude SL_p factors in the simply connected cover of G):*

1. *the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} ,*
2. *this parabolic subalgebra satisfies the following equalities $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U)$ where $U \subset G$ is a unipotent smooth connected subgroup such that $\text{Lie}(U) = \mathfrak{u}$ (hypotheses on p will in particular allow the existence of such a subgroup).*

Moreover, in characteristic 0 a well known corollary of Morozov Theorem states that any proper maximal subalgebra of the Lie algebra of a reductive group is either reductive or parabolic (see [9, VIII, §10, Corollaire 1]). If now k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ one may also wonder whether such an analogue of this corollary still hold true, namely:

Statement 1.2. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a reductive k -group. Let $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be proper restricted p -Lie subalgebra. Then \mathfrak{q} is either parabolic or p -reductive.*

Note that A. Premet proved this Statement to hold true when G is simple and the characteristic is very good for G by making use of a case-by-case analysis (see [39]). We will provide a uniform proof of this statement under more restrictive hypotheses on the characteristic.

Before going any further let us briefly remind the reader of the context. In characteristic $p > 0$, some Lie algebras come endowed with an additional p -power map $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, $x \mapsto x^{[p]}$ such that:

1. for any $\lambda \in k$ and any $x \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have $(\lambda x)^{[p]} = \lambda^p x^{[p]}$,
2. for any $x \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have $\text{ad}(x^{[p]}) = (\text{ad}(x))^p$,
3. for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathfrak{g}$ we have

$$(x_1 + x_2)^{[p]} = x_1^{[p]} + x_2^{[p]} - W(x_1, x_2),$$

where we denote by

$$W(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{0 < r < p} \frac{1}{r} \sum_u \text{ad } x_{u(1)} \text{ad } x_{u(2)} \cdots \text{ad } x_{u(p-1)}(x_1)$$

for u going through all the maps $[1, p-1] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that take r times the value 0.

Given a restricted p -Lie algebra, restricted p -subalgebras, respectively p -ideals, are subalgebras, respectively ideals that are stable under the p -power map. For more details we refer the reader to [13, II, §7, n°3] and [47, chapter 2]. Let us only briefly remind here a few specificities and definitions. Let \mathfrak{g} be a restricted p -Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} over k . An element $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ is p -nil if there is an integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^{[p]^m} = 0$. A restricted p -nil algebra is p -nil if all its elements are p -nilpotent, when \mathfrak{g} is of finite dimension any restricted p -subalgebra which is p -nilpotent is also p -nil. Moreover, let $h(G)$ be the Coxeter number of G . The values for any type of G are listed in Table 1. When $p > h(G)$ G. McNinch shows in [34] that any nilpotent element $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ is of p -nilpotency order equal to 1, that is $x^{[p]} = 0$. When \mathfrak{g} is a restricted p -subalgebra, we denote:

- by $\text{Nil}(\mathfrak{g})$ its nilradical, that is its maximal nilpotent ideal,
- by $\text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{g})$ its p -radical, namely its maximal p -nilpotent ideal,
- by $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ its center,

- by $\mathrm{rad}_u(\mathfrak{g})$ the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of G if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ is the Lie algebra of a smooth connected algebraic group.

These objects should definitely be compared, recall in particular the following properties (see [48, Lemma 2.1] and [26, Lemmas 2.6 and 2.13] together with [26, Remarks 2.7]).

Lemma 1.3. *Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$,*

1. *let G be a connected reductive k -group and assume that p is separably good for G (see [38, Definition 2.2] or 2.1 for a precise definition, in practice, this amounts to avoid very small characteristics and some factors of A_{p-1} -type in characteristic p). Then the equalities $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathrm{rad}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathrm{Nil}(\mathfrak{g})$ hold true;*
2. *let H be a smooth connected k -group and assume that p is separably good for the quotient $H/\mathrm{Rad}_U(H)$, then the p -radical of \mathfrak{h} is both the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of H and the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\mathrm{rad}(\mathfrak{h})$.*

Statement 1.2 involves p -reductive Lie-algebras. This notion, specific to the characteristic p framework underlines a very specific behaviour of Lie algebras in this context. More precisely, when k is of characteristic 0, a reductive Lie algebra is the Lie algebra of a reductive group or equivalently a Lie algebra that has a trivial nilradical. In characteristic $p > 0$ these two properties are no longer equivalent, which justify to define the notion of p -reductivity:

Definition 1.4. A restricted p -algebra \mathfrak{h} is p -reductive if its p -radical is trivial.

Remark 1.5. Let us note that if k is a perfect field and G is a reductive k -group such that p is separably good for G , the Lie algebra of G is p -reductive. According to Lemma 1.3 the p -radical of \mathfrak{g} is indeed the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of G , thus is trivial.

Assume that $p > \mathrm{h}(G)$ and that G admits a representation which is:

1. almost faithful, meaning that its kernel is of multiplicative type,
2. of low height. More precisely, let V be such a representation. Let us denote by $\mathrm{ht}_G(V) := \max\{\sum_{\alpha > 0} \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle\}$ the Dynkin height of the representation, where λ is a weight for the action of T on V . Then V is of low height if $p > \mathrm{ht}_G(V)$.

In [2, Proposition 4.7], V. Balaji, P. Deligne and A. J. Parameswaran show a result for which the first point of the theorem above is an immediate corollary. We start by showing that the second assumption is superfluous. When G is simple and simply connected this amounts to widen the range of admissible characteristics, without any additional assumptions on G . In particular we have some gains for types F_4 , E_6 , E_7 and E_8 (see [2, p.14]).

When G satisfies the standard hypotheses (see [23, 2.9], the definition is reminded in section 2.1), A. Premet and D. I. Stewart provide a proof of the first point of the analogue of Morozov Theorem as stated above by means of a case-by-case study that relies on the classification of semisimple groups (see [40, Corollary 1.4]). Note that these hypotheses in particular imply the semisimplicity of \mathfrak{g} . That explains why the authors consider the nilradical rather than the p -radical of the Lie algebra in their statements. Let us note that when \mathfrak{g} is semisimple these objects coincide, see for example Remark 2.9 in section 2.5 below.

Our assumptions on G and p (we explicit below) approach, in the most refined version of the analogue statement of Morozov Theorem the level of generalities of [40]. Proofs proposed here are uniform and allow to characterise the parabolic subgroup obtained here by means of Geometric Invariant Theory.

The article is organised as follows: after a quick reminder of some prerequisites in the first section, we will study high characteristics in section 3. When p is big enough, obtaining an analogue of Morozov theorem as stated above makes no difficulties but allows to better understand issues that are specific to the characteristic $p > 0$ framework. More precisely

1. in characteristic $p > 0$, the existence of an integration of any restricted p -nil Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is not always satisfied. Namely, given a restricted p -nil Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ one can not always associate to U a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subset G$ such that $\mathrm{Lie}(U) = \mathfrak{u}$. Note that this is well known to be always possible in characteristic 0 thanks to the existence of the exponential. Moreover, when such an integration exists, nothing ensures a priori that it will be compatible with the adjoint representation. This last condition would ensure the equality of the normalisers $N_G(U)$ and $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$. These two issues have been studied in a previous article (see [26]). They underline the existence of a huge gap between:

- the characteristic $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ for which an integration (given by the truncated exponential) always exists, even if it does not satisfy all the properties of the integration process in characteristic 0. In particular this integration is no longer compatible with the Adjoint representation;
 - the characteristics $p \leq \mathfrak{h}(G)$ that are separably good for G . In this last framework only a punctual integration can be expected to be satisfied a priori. Nevertheless when \mathfrak{u} is such as in the Analogue of Morozov Theorem, it is integrable into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup (as shown in [26, Lemma 5.1], see also [26, Lemma 3.5] for the equality of normalisers);
2. when $p > 0$, given a subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ the normaliser $N_G(\mathfrak{h})$ is no longer smooth in general. In characteristic 0 this smoothness condition for normalisers is automatically satisfied. This is a consequence of a theorem of P. Cartier (see for example [13, II, §6, n°1.1]). Counter-examples to this property in characteristic $p > 0$ can be found in [20, lemma 11].

We thus treat separately (even if there are some similarities) the case of the characteristics $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ (that is explained in section 5) and the one of separably good characteristics for G (which is studied in section 6).

Let us stress out that the smoothness of normalisers of subsets of \mathfrak{g} for the action of G is a crucial issue in this article. This is explained in section 4 in which we show the following result:

Theorem 1.6. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let G be a reductive k -group and $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -Lie subalgebra such that \mathfrak{u} is the set of p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. Assume that p is not of torsion for G . Let also $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ be the optimal parabolic subgroup of \mathfrak{u} defined by the Hilbert–Mumford–Kempf–Rousseau method (see [27, Theorem 3.4] for the existence of such a subgroup). The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. the algebra $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is the Lie algebra of the parabolic subgroup $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$;
2. the connected component $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ is smooth;
3. this connected component satisfies the equality $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0 = P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$.

A theorem of P. Deligne (see [12, Théorème 2.7]) stated when $G = \text{GL}(V)$ under some assumptions on V and generalised in the article of V. Balaji, P. Deligne and A. J. Parameswaran to any reductive group G when $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ (see [2, Theorem 2.5]) allows to measure the lack of smoothness of infinitesimally saturated subgroups (see Definition 1.7 below). In particular, when $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ a direct application of this theorem leads to the conclusion that if $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a restricted p -nil p -Lie subalgebra, then $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ differs from $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ only by a subgroup of multiplicative type. This comes from the fact that the normaliser of any such \mathfrak{u} in G is infinitesimally saturated. As a reminder, the following notion of infinitesimal saturation generalises that of saturation introduced in [43, §4]. It has first been introduced by P. Deligne (see [12, Définition 1.5]). Let us recall that, when $p \nmid \mathfrak{h}(G)$ the exponential map is well defined.

Definition 1.7. A subgroup $H \subseteq G$ is infinitesimally saturated if for any p -nilpotent element $x \in \mathfrak{h} := \text{Lie}(H)$ the t -power map factors through H . In other words the situation is the following:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{G}_a & \xrightarrow{\exp_x(\cdot)} & G, \\ \exists \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ & & H. \end{array}$$

We show in section 5.1.1 that the infinitesimal saturation of the normaliser of a p -nil Lie subalgebra is immediate when the adjoint representation is of low height and that this still holds true under the assumption $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ (which is slightly less restrictive). This is a crucial key to prove, in section 5, that analogues of Morozov theorem hold true when $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$, namely we show:

Theorem 1.8 (Analogue of Morozov Theorem when $p > h(G)$). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a reductive k -group such that $p > h(G)$ (where $h(G)$ is the Coxeter number of G , see section 2.1). Let $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . Let us assume that \mathfrak{u} is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of the radical of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$, then:*

1. *the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} ,*
2. *this parabolic subalgebra satisfies the equalities $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U)$ where $U \subset G$ is a unipotent smooth connected subgroup such that $\text{Lie}(U) = \mathfrak{u}$ (when $p > h(G)$ such a subgroup exists according to [2, section 6], see also [26, Proposition 3.1]).*

This theorem can be rephrased in terms of p -radicals:

Corollary 1.9. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G a reductive k -group such that $p > h(G)$. Let $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} such that $\mathfrak{u} = \text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. Then $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is the Lie subalgebra of the parabolic subgroup obtained in Theorem 1.8.*

Let us remark that Theorem 1.8 above is a particular case of the following corollary (for which the tower of normalisers stabilises directly).

Corollary 1.10. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.8, let $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -nil subalgebra, then:*

1. *the tower of normalisers \mathfrak{u} converges to a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} denoted by $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_{\infty})$,*
2. *this limit object satisfies $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_{\infty}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}_{\infty}}) = \text{Lie}(N_G(V_{\infty}))$ where the subgroup $N_G(V_{\infty})$ is the limit object of the tower of smooth normalisers associated to $\text{Rad}_U(N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0)$.*

Section 6 is dedicated to prove the existence of analogues of Morozov Theorem in separably good characteristics. Recall that when $p > h(G)$ the existence of an integration is ensured by the exponential map, unfortunately this morphism is no longer defined when p is smaller than $h(G)$. Nevertheless, a punctual integration is still possible when p is separably good for G , thanks to the existence of Springer isomorphisms $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$. As a reminder, a Springer isomorphism is a G -equivariant isomorphism of reduced varieties, where $\mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g})$ stands for the reduced nilpotent k -scheme of \mathfrak{g} and $\mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ is the reduced unipotent k -scheme of G . Such an isomorphism always exists under our assumptions as explained in [26, section 3.1]. The notion of infinitesimal saturation is thus replaced in this context by that of ϕ -infinitesimal saturation (see [26, Definition 4.1]), for $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ a Springer isomorphism. This allows us to define:

Definition 1.11. Let $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ be a Springer isomorphism for G . A subgroup $G' \subseteq G$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated if for any p -nilpotent element $x \in \mathfrak{g}'$ the t -power map:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_x : \mathbb{G}_a &\rightarrow G, \\ t &\mapsto \phi(tx), \end{aligned}$$

factorises through G' . In other words the situation is the following:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{G}_a & \xrightarrow{\phi_x} & G, \\ \exists \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ G' & & \end{array}$$

This notion leads to a natural extension of P. Deligne Theorem for infinitesimally saturated subgroups (see [26, Theorem 1.1]) and allows to settle, on the same way as before, the lack of smoothness of normalisers. Unfortunately it is not possible to adapt the reasoning provided in characteristic $p > h(G)$ to show that $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated. This is what justifies the additional assumption in the statement of Theorem 1.12 below:

Theorem 1.12 (Analogue of Morozov Theorem when p is separably good). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a reductive k -group. Assume p to be separably good for G . Let $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ be a Springer isomorphism for G . If $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie subalgebra such that \mathfrak{u} is the set of p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$ and if $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated then:*

1. the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} ,
2. this parabolic subalgebra satisfies the equalities $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(J_{\mathfrak{u}}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ where $J_{\mathfrak{u}} \subset G$ is a unipotent smooth connected subgroup such that $\text{Lie}(J_{\mathfrak{u}}) = \mathfrak{u}$ (such a subgroup exists according to [26, Lemma 5.1]).

Let us stress out that $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ must be ϕ -infinitesimally saturated for Theorem 1.12 to hold true as any parabolic subgroup is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated according to [26, lemma 4.2]. This result admits the following reformulation by means of the p -radical of the involved normaliser:

Corollary 1.13. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a reductive k -group. Assume that p is separably good for G . Let $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -Lie subalgebra such that $\mathfrak{u} = \text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. Let us also assume that $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq G$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated. Then $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is the Lie subalgebra obtained in Theorem 1.12.*

Let us finally remark that Theorem 1.12 is a particular case of the following corollary, for which the tower of normalisers stabilises immediately:

Corollary 1.14. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.12, let \mathfrak{u} be a restricted p -nil p -subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . Then:*

1. the tower of normalisers of \mathfrak{u} converges to a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} ,
2. this limit object satisfies $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_{\infty}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}_{\infty}}) = \text{Lie}(N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}_{\infty}}))$ where the subgroup $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}_{\infty}})$ is the limit object of the tower of smooth normalisers associated to $\text{Rad}_U(N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0)$.

Analogues of Morozov Theorem in characteristic $p > 0$ admit the following corollary (which is introduced here as an analogue of Theorem 1.8 stated in characteristic $p > h(G)$, to avoid the additional assumption of ϕ -infinitesimal saturation):

Corollary 1.15 (of Theorem 1.8). *Let k be an algebraically closed field and G be a reductive. Assume k to be of characteristic $p > h(G)$ and \mathfrak{g} to be endowed with a symmetric G -equivariant non-degenerate bilinear form κ . Let $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie subalgebra such that \mathfrak{p}^{\perp} is a nilpotent subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . Then:*

1. the subalgebra \mathfrak{p} is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} ,
2. it is the parabolic subalgebra obtained in Theorem 1.8, namely one has:

$$\mathfrak{p} = \text{Lie}(P_G(\exp(\mathfrak{p}^{\perp}))) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}^{\perp}}).$$

This result allows us to show, in the relative case and under some additional assumptions on the base, that some Lie algebras are parabolic. This is explained in the last section of this article (see section 7). We provide there an example of a practical application of Theorem 1.8 (the latter is useful here under the Corollary 1.15 form). More precisely: let k be a field and C be a projective smooth and geometrically connected k -curve. Let also G be a reductive C -group which is the twisted form of a constant reductive C -group G_0 (namely G_0 is obtained from a reductive k -group by base change). In other words there is a G_0 -torsor E for which $G = {}^E G_0$. When k is of characteristic 0, M. Atiyah and R. Bott consider the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} (seen as a vector bundle over C):

$$0 \subsetneq E_{-r} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq E_{-1} \subsetneq E_0 \subsetneq E_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq E_t = \mathfrak{g},$$

where the indices are chosen in such a way that the term E_0 is the one for which the semistable quotient is of slope 0. The authors show in [1, §10] that E_0 is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} and they call “canonical parabolic subgroup of G ” the subgroup from which it derives. If now k is any field and G is a reductive C -group, K. A. Behrend extends in [3] the notion of canonical parabolic subgroup when k is any field. Its definition does no longer involves the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of \mathfrak{g} . In [36, Proposition 3.4], V. B. Mehta and S. Subramanian show that the definition given by M. Atiyah and R. Bott (in characteristic 0) still makes sense in the aforementioned framework when k is of characteristic $p > \max(2 \dim(G), 4(h(G) - 1))$ ¹. See also [37, Theorem 2.6] for a refinement of the statement, that only requires $p > 2 \dim(G)$. Their proof relies on techniques coming from representation theory. Theorem 1.8 allows to provide a new proof of this equality when $p > 2 \dim(G) - 2$ that mimics the one already known

¹The original result is stated with the height of G which is equal to the Coxeter number of G minus 1.

in characteristic 0 (the latter can be found in [1]). Let us finally mention that A. Langer shows that the definitions of canonical parabolic subgroup are the same when the G_0 -torsor E admits a strong Harder–Narasimhan filtration (see [30, Definition 3.1 and Proposition 3.3]). In section 7 we make use of Corollary 1.15 to show:

Proposition 1.16. *If k is of characteristic 0 or $p > 2 \dim G - 2$ and if G is endowed with a symmetric G -equivariant non-degenerate bilinear form then:*

1. *the subbundle $E_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of a parabolic subgroup $Q \subseteq G$ and E_{-1} is the Lie algebra of its unipotent radical (denoted by $\mathfrak{rad}_u(Q)$),*
2. *this parabolic subalgebra satisfies the equalities $E_0 = \mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ and $E_{-1} = \mathfrak{rad}_u(P_G^{\text{can}})$, where P_G^{can} is the canonical parabolic subgroup of G and $\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ is its Lie algebra. Let K be the function field of C and \bar{K} its algebraic closure. Over the geometric generic fiber we have that $(E_0)_{\bar{K}} = \mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}(\lambda_{(E_{-1})_{\bar{K}}})$,*
3. *the subbundles E_i are p -nil p -ideal of $E_0 = \mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ for any $-r \leq i < 0$.*

A substantially part of this article comes from the author’s Ph.D. manuscript (see [25]).

2 Prerequisites

2.1 Context

In this section and unless otherwise stated, we denote by k a field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G is a reductive k -group. Let $T \subset G$ be a maximal torus, let us denote by $W = W(G, T)$ the Weyl group and $\Phi = \Phi(G, T)$ the associated root system. Let then Φ^+ be a positive root system and $\Delta := \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ be the corresponding root basis that defines the corresponding Borel subgroup $T \subset B \subset G$.

Assume for the moment that Φ is irreducible. Let $\alpha := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \alpha_i$ be its highest root. The Coxeter number of G , denoted by $h(G)$, is the height of α plus 1, whence the equality $h(G) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i + 1$.

For any root $\beta \in \Phi$, denote by β^\vee the corresponding coroot. Let $\alpha^\vee := \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \alpha_i^\vee$ be the coroot associated with the highest root. The characteristic p of k is:

- *of torsion* for Φ if there exists $i \in [1, \dots, n]$ such that p divides b_i ;
- *bad* for Φ if there exists an integer $i \in [1, \dots, n]$ such that p divides a_i ;
- *good* for Φ if its not bad for Φ ;
- *really good* for Φ if it is good and if p does not divide $n + 1$ when Φ is of type A_n .

For a more detailed discussion on torsion integers for G see for example [46], good characteristics are for instance studied in [44, §0.3].

The values of torsion, good and very good integers are listed in the table below, the rank of the algebraic k -group G is also mentioned, it is equal to the dimension of a maximal torus of G , which is the same for any maximal torus of G (see [15, XIX 1.5]) and is denoted by $\text{rg}(G)$.

Type of G	Torsion integers	Good characteristics	Very good characteristics	$\text{rg}(G)$	$h(G)$
A_n	1	any	$p \nmid n + 1$	n	n
B_n , where $n \geq 2$	2	> 2	> 2	n	$2n$
C_n , where $n \geq 2$	1	> 2	> 2	n	$2n$
D_n , where $n \geq 3$	2	> 3	> 3	n	$2(n - 1)$
E_6	3	> 3	> 3	6	12
E_7	4	> 3	> 3	7	18
E_8	6	> 5	> 5	8	30
F_4	3	> 3	> 3	4	12
G_2	2	> 3	> 3	2	6

Table 1: Assumptions on the characteristic for a simple group.

Let us note that when the characteristic is very good for G the Lie algebra of G is endowed with a non-degenerate Killing form (see for example [45, I, 5.3], [10, 1.16], and [23, 2.9]).

When ϕ is no longer irreducible and G is any reductive group, the Coxeter number of G is the highest Coxeter number of the irreducible components of ϕ . The characteristic p of k is:

- *of torsion* if p is of torsion for one irreducible component of Φ or if p divides the order of the fundamental group of G ;
- *bad* for G if it is bad for one irreducible component of Φ ;
- *good*, respectively *very good*, for G if it is good, respectively very good, for each irreducible component of $\Phi = \Phi(G, T)$.

Table 1 allows to check that if the characteristic is very good for G then it is not of torsion for G . Moreover, when $p > h(G)$ then p is very good for G .

Finally, let us recall that a reductive k -group G satisfies *the standard hypotheses* (see [23, 2.9]) if:

- (H1) the derived group of G is simply connected,
- (H2) the characteristic of k is good for G ,
- (H3) there exists a symmetric non-degenerate G -equivariant bilinear form over \mathfrak{g} .

Let us recall that according to [41, I, §8, Corollary], if \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a symmetric non degenerate G -equivariant bilinear form, the Lie algebra is semisimple (i.e. its solvable radical is trivial, see [47, 1.7, Definition]). Let us remark that according to what precedes when G is simple and simply connected and p is very good for G , this latter satisfies the standard hypotheses. Let us finally note that J. C. Jantzen provides:

- in [23, 2.9] some explicit characterisation for Lie algebras of reductive groups that satisfy the standard hypotheses,
- in [24, B.6] some criteria for adjoint reductive groups to satisfy these.

When k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic p and G is a semisimple k -group, if p is not of torsion for G the following corollary can be deduced from [31, Theorem 2.2 and Remark a)] :

Corollary 2.1 (of [31, theorem 2], see [26, Remark 2.2]). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a reductive k -group. Assume that p is not of torsion for G . Let $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -nil p -subalgebra. Then \mathfrak{u} is a subalgebra of the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of a Borel subgroup $B \subseteq G$.*

Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let G be a reductive k -group. When G is semisimple the characteristic of k is separably good for G if:

1. the integer p is separably good for G ,
2. the morphism $G^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow G$, where G^{sc} is the simply connected cover of G , is separable.

When G is a reductive group, the integer p is separably good if it is separably good for the derived group $[G, G]$ (see [38, Definition 2.2]). As underlined in the paragraph that follows Definition 2.2 in [38], if p is really good for G then it is separably good. This last condition is nevertheless less restrictive when G is of type A , which is the only type for which good, separably good, and very good integers do not coincide.

2.2 Rank and faithful representations

In this section the field k is assumed to be algebraically closed.

Lemma 2.2. *Let d be the dimension of a minimal faithful representation of G . Then the inequality $d > \text{rg}(G)$ is satisfied.*

Proof. Let $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_n$ be a minimal faithful representation of G . The representation ρ is also a faithful representation of a maximal torus $T \subseteq G$. If we denote by n the dimension of T then necessary one has $d \geq n =: \text{rg}(G)$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *The inequality $2h(G) - 2 \leq 2^{2d}$ holds true for any reductive k -group G .*

Proof. When G is simple the values of $h(G)$ and $\text{rg}(G)$ are listed in Table 1 and one can check that the inequalities $2h(G) - 2 < 2^{2\text{rg}(G)} < 2^{2d}$ are indeed satisfied (according to Lemma 2.2).

Let us denote by G_i the simple groups defined by the irreducible components of Φ . The restriction of a faithful representation of G to G_i is still a faithful representation for G_i . Let us denote by d_i the dimension of a minimal faithful representation of G_i , by what precedes one has $d \geq d_i \geq h(G_i)$ for any G_i . As there exists an integer i for which $h(G) = h(G_i)$ the inequalities $2h(G) - 2 \leq 2^{2\sum_{i=1}^m d_i} \leq 2^{2d}$ then hold true, whence the expected result. \square

2.3 Parabolic subalgebras

A parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of a parabolic subgroup $P \subseteq G$. This is equivalent to requiring the existence of a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi'} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, where the subset $\Phi' \subseteq \Phi$ is a parabolic subset of Φ (see [15, XXVI, Proposition 1.4]). Note that this description allows us to naturally define the Coxeter number of a parabolic subgroup of G : it is the height plus one of the highest root of the associated parabolic subset. In particular $h(G) = h(B)$ for any Borel subgroup $B \subset G$. When k is of characteristic 0 these conditions are satisfied if and only if \mathfrak{p} contains the Lie algebra of a Borel subgroup of G . When k is a field of characteristic $p > 0$ such a characterisation does no longer hold true: a parabolic subalgebra always contains a Borel subalgebra (because a parabolic subgroup always contains a Borel subgroup), but there are some pathological characteristics for which one can find Lie subalgebras of \mathfrak{g} that contain a Borel subalgebra but do not derive from a parabolic subgroup of G .

Proposition 2.4. *If k is of characteristic $p \neq 2, 3$, a subalgebra $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is parabolic if and only if it contains a Borel subalgebra.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie subalgebra that contains a Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b} . One needs to show that \mathfrak{p} is of the form $\mathfrak{t} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi'} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ with \mathfrak{t} and Φ' as in the preamble of this section. As \mathfrak{p} contains a Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b} , it contains the Lie algebra of a maximal torus \mathfrak{t} . This Cartan subalgebra acts on \mathfrak{p} via the Lie bracket. The roots of \mathfrak{t} define a family of endomorphisms of \mathfrak{t} that are diagonalisable and that commute with each other. They are therefore simultaneously diagonalisable and \mathfrak{p} decomposes as a sum of weight spaces for this action. Namely one has that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi'} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. It remains to show that:

- the subset $\Phi' \subseteq \Phi$ contains a positive root system. This is immediate as by assumption \mathfrak{p} contains the Lie algebra of a Borel subgroup,
- the subset $\Phi' \subseteq \Phi$ is of type (R) (see [15, XXII, Définition 5.4.2]). According to [15, XXII, Théorème 5.4.7] one needs to remark that Φ' is closed. In other words, for any roots $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi'$ such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$ one needs to show that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi'$. This last condition is satisfied as soon as $p \neq 2, 3$ according to [15, XXIII, Corollaire 6.6].

\square

Remark 2.5. When G is of type A_1 , one only needs to require $p \neq 2$ in the above Proposition.

Examples 2.6. We provide here examples of Lie subalgebras that contain a Borel subalgebra and do not derive from a parabolic subgroup of G .

1. When $G = \text{PGL}_3$ and k is of characteristic 3, let us consider the Lie subalgebra

$$\mathfrak{p} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & f \\ 0 & td & g \end{pmatrix} \mid d, t \in k^\times \right\} \subseteq \mathfrak{pgl}_3(k).$$

It contains the Borel subalgebra of upper triangular matrices with trace 0. Notwithstanding this, the Lie algebra \mathfrak{p} cannot be written as the Lie algebra of a parabolic subgroup $P \subseteq \text{PGL}_3$ (as this can be checked when k is of characteristic 0 as no parabolic subgroup admits \mathfrak{p} as a Lie algebra).

2. We still assume that $G = \text{PGL}_3$ and k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p = 3$. We consider the example of [31]: we set $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $Y =$

$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Let $\mathfrak{u} := \langle X, Y \rangle \subsetneq \mathfrak{pgl}_3$ be the subalgebra generated by X and Y . It is an

ad-nilpotent subalgebra of \mathfrak{pgl}_3 . Its normaliser is given by $N_{\mathfrak{pgl}_3}(\mathfrak{u}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ d & e & b \\ g & -d & i \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ that contains a Borel subalgebra, namely the Lie algebra of the Borel subgroup obtained by conjugating the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices by $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. However \mathfrak{p} does not derive from a parabolic subgroup of G (for the same reasons as the one mentioned previously).

2.4 Lie algebras and normalisers

The formalism used in this section is developed in [13, II, §4]. We especially refer the reader to [13, II, §4, 3.7] for notations. Let A be a ring and G be an affine A -group functor. As a reminder:

1. if R is an A -algebra, we denote by $R[t]$ the algebra of polynomials in t and by ϵ the image of t via the projection $R[t] \rightarrow R[t]/(t^2) =: R[\epsilon]$. We associate to G a functor in Lie algebras denoted by $\mathfrak{Lie}(G)$ and which is the kernel of the following exact sequence:

$$1 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Lie}(G)(R) \longrightarrow G(R[\epsilon]) \xrightarrow[p]{} G(R) \longrightarrow 1.$$

$\overset{i}{\curvearrowright}$

For any $y \in \mathfrak{Lie}(G)(R)$ we denote by $e^{\epsilon y}$ the image of y in $G(R[\epsilon])$. In what follows the notation $\mathfrak{Lie}(G)(R)$ refers both to the kernel of p and to its image in $G(R[\epsilon])$. The Lie-algebra of G is given by the k -algebra $\mathfrak{Lie}(G)(A)$ and is denoted by $\text{Lie}(G) := \mathfrak{g}$. According to [13, II, §4, n°4.8, Proposition] when G is smooth or when A is a field and G is locally of finite presentation over A , the equality

$$\text{Lie}(G) \otimes_A R = \mathfrak{Lie}(G)(A) \otimes_A R = \mathfrak{Lie}(G)(R) = \text{Lie}(G_R)$$

holds true for any A -algebra R (these are sufficient conditions). When the aforementioned equality is satisfied the A -functor $\mathfrak{Lie}(G)$ is representable by $W(\mathfrak{g})$, where for any A -module M and any A -algebra R we set $W(M)(R) := M \otimes_A R$;

2. the A -group functor G acts on $\mathfrak{Lie}(G)$ as follows: for any A -algebra R the induced morphism is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}_R : G_R &\rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{Lie}(G))(R), \\ g &\mapsto \text{Ad}_R(g) : \mathfrak{Lie}(G)(R) \rightarrow \mathfrak{Lie}(G)(R) : x \mapsto i(g)xi(g)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

When G is smooth (in particular when $\mathfrak{Lie}(G)$ is representable) the G -action on $\mathfrak{Lie}(G)$ defines a linear representation $G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathfrak{g})$ (see [13, II, §4, n°4.8, Proposition]).

With the above notations, given:

1. a closed subgroup $H \subseteq G$, the normaliser of H in G is the closed subscheme of G defined for any k -algebra A by

$$N_G(H)(A) := \{g \in G(A) \mid \text{Ad}(g)(H(R)) = H(R) \text{ for any } A\text{-algebra } R.\}$$

2. a subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$,

- (i) the normaliser of \mathfrak{h} in G is the closed subscheme of G defined for any k -algebra A by

$$N_G(\mathfrak{h})(A) := \{g \in G(A) \mid \text{Ad}(g)(\mathfrak{h}(A)) = \mathfrak{h}(A) \text{ for any } A\text{-algebra } R.\}$$

- (ii) the normaliser of \mathfrak{h} in \mathfrak{g} is the closed subscheme of \mathfrak{g} defined for any k -algebra A by

$$N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{h})(A) := \{g \in \mathfrak{g}(A) \mid \text{ad}(g)(\mathfrak{h}(R)) = \mathfrak{h}(R) \text{ for any } A\text{-algebra } R\}$$

The following result is a quick reminder of useful facts for the proofs that follow:

Lemma 2.7. *Let G be a reductive k -group. Then:*

1. *let d be the dimension of a minimal faithful representation for G . If $p > 2^{2d}$ then all normalisers of subspaces of \mathfrak{g} are smooth (see [20, Theorem A]);*
2. *let $H \subseteq G$ be a closed subgroup then:*
 - (i) *the inclusion $N_G(H) \subseteq N_G(\mathfrak{Lie}(H))$ is satisfied. In particular if H is smooth this leads to the inclusion $N_G(H)(R) \subseteq N_G(\mathfrak{h}_R)$ for any A -algebra R (see [26, Lemma 6.3]);*
 - (ii) *if moreover $H \subseteq G$ is smooth, then:*
 - *in general only the inclusion $\text{Lie}(N_G(H)) \subseteq N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{h})$ holds true,*
 - *if $H(k)$ is Zariski-dense in H then*

$$\text{Lie}(N_G(H)) = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \text{Ad}(h)(x) - x \in \mathfrak{h} \ \forall h \in H(k)\}.$$

(see [26, Lemma 6.4]).

2.5 Radicals of a restricted p -Lie algebra

Lemma 2.8. *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be an algebraic k -group. Assume:*

1. *that $p \geq 3$ or if $p = 2$ that k is algebraically closed and G has a root system for which all the irreducible components are of A_n type (which is the only characteristic 2 option that can occur in this article)*
2. *that G is an extension of a k -group of multiplicative type S by a smooth connected algebraic k -group H such that $\iota(\text{Rad}_U(H))$ is a normal subgroup of G :*

$$1 \longrightarrow H \xrightarrow{\iota} G \xrightarrow{\pi} S \longrightarrow 1.$$

Then the p -radical of \mathfrak{g} identifies with the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$. Namely one has $\text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{g}) = \{x \in \text{rad}(\mathfrak{g}) \mid x \text{ is } p\text{-nilpotent}\} = \text{Lie}(\iota(\text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{h}))$.

Proof. One inclusion is clear: the p -radical of \mathfrak{g} is a p -nil p -ideal of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$. Thus $\text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{g})$ is contained in the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ (see the second point of [26][Lemma 2.5]).

The derived sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{h} \xrightarrow{\text{Lie}(\iota)} \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\text{Lie}(\pi)} \mathfrak{s} \longrightarrow 0,$$

is still exact as H is smooth and the morphism $G \rightarrow S$ is surjective (see [13, II, §5, n°Proposition 5.3]). This is moreover an exact sequence of p -morphisms of restricted p -Lie algebras (see [13, II, §7 n°2.1 and n°3.4] for the compatibility with the p -structure).

Let x be a p -nilpotent element of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$. The image $\text{Lie}(\pi)(x)$ is a p -nilpotent element of \mathfrak{s} which is toral because it is the Lie algebra of a group of multiplicative type. The p -power map is therefore injective over \mathfrak{s} . This implies the vanishing of $\text{Lie}(\pi)(x) = 0$. The exactness of the derived sequence ensures that x belongs to the image of $\text{Lie}(\iota)$, let us say $x = \text{Lie}(\iota)(z)$,

for an element $z \in \mathfrak{h}$. As ι is a p -morphism of restricted p -Lie algebras and as by assumption x is p -nilpotent, there exists an integer m such that

$$0 = x^{[p^m]} = \iota(z)^{[p^m]} = \iota(z^{[p^m]}).$$

This implies that $z^{[p^m]} = 0$, so that z is p -nilpotent because ι is injective. The element x thus belongs to the set of p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \text{Im}(\text{Lie}(\iota))$ which is:

- a solvable ideal of $\text{Im}(\text{Lie}(\iota))$,
- contained in $\text{rad}(\text{Im}(\text{Lie}(\iota))(\mathfrak{h})) \cong \text{rad}(\mathfrak{h})$.

In other words, any p -nilpotent element of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the image of a p -nilpotent element of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{h}) = \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(H)$ according to [26, lemma 2.13] (and [26, Remark 2.10] for the characteristic 2 case).

By assumption, the image of $\mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(H) = \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{h})$ is an ideal of \mathfrak{g} . It is a p -nil p -ideal of \mathfrak{g} because $\text{Lie}(\iota)$ is a p -morphism of restricted p -Lie algebras. In other words the inclusion $\text{Lie}(\iota)(\mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(H)) \subseteq \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{g})$ holds true.

To summarise, we have shown the following inclusions

$$\{x \in \text{rad}(\mathfrak{g}) \mid x \text{ is } p\text{-nilpotent}\} \subseteq \text{Lie}(\iota)(\mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(H)) \subseteq \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{g}),$$

whence the desired equality. \square

Remark 2.9. If G is a reductive k -group such that \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a symmetric non degenerate G -equivariant bilinear form, then \mathfrak{g} is semisimple according to [41, I, §8, Corollary]: its radical (thus its center) is trivial. In other words, in this case the adjoint representation $\text{ad} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$ is faithful. Therefore under this assumption any ad-nilpotent element is p -nilpotent. In particular the equality of p -ideals $\text{Nil}(\mathfrak{h}) = \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{h})$ holds true for any restricted p -Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$.

Lemma 2.10. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let G be a reductive k -group such that \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a symmetric non-degenerate G -equivariant bilinear form κ , and let $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a Borel subalgebra. Then the equality $\text{Nil}(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{b}^\perp$ holds true.*

Proof. The inclusion $\text{Nil}(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq \mathfrak{b}^\perp$ is clear according to [8, §4, n°4, Proposition 6].

Let Φ^+ be a positive root system associated to B . Let us thus show the converse inclusion. According to [26, Remark 2.14] the p -radical of \mathfrak{b} is the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of B (Table 1 allows to check that requiring the existence of κ leads to avoid the pathological cases).

According to the third point of [26, Lemma 2.5] this p -radical is the nilradical of \mathfrak{b} if and only if $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{b}} \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$. Let us show that this is indeed the case: we assumed that \mathfrak{g} was endowed with a symmetric non-degenerate G -equivariant bilinear form κ . According to [41, I, §8, Corollary] the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is therefore semisimple. Its center is in particular trivial according to [47, Corollary 5.6]). Then, by making use of the inclusions $Z_G^0 \subseteq Z_B \subseteq Z_G$ (see for instance [6, Corollary 11.11]), one obtains by derivation that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is trivial. This is so because $\text{Lie}(Z_B) = \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ according to [26, Remark 6.2].

To summarise, we have shown that $\text{Nil}(\mathfrak{b}) = \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{b}) = \text{Lie}(\text{Rad}_U(B)) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} \mathfrak{g}^\alpha$, where:

- the first equality comes from [26, Lemma 2.5] iii),
- the second equality comes from [26, Remark 2.14].

Moreover, as \mathfrak{g}^α is orthogonal to \mathfrak{g}^μ as soon as $\mu \neq -\alpha$, one necessarily has $\mathfrak{b}^\perp \subseteq \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{b})$, whence the desired equality. \square

3 First steps

Unsurprisingly under some assumptions that allow to reproduce the characteristic 0 framework, an analogue of Morozov Theorem can be easily shown to hold true in characteristic $p > 0$. Especially the characteristic p has to be quite big. This results are already instructive as they underline obstructions one has to face when considering the positive characteristic setting.

3.1 When all the normalisers are smooth

When k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 or $p > 0$ really high, Theorem 1.8 is an immediate application of Veisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem (see [5, corollaire 3.2]). More precisely:

Proposition 3.1. *Let k be an algebraically closed field and G be a reductive k -group. We denote by d the dimension of a minimal faithful representation of G . Assume that k is of characteristic 0 or $p > 2^{2d}$. Finally, let $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -nil p -subalgebra such that \mathfrak{u} is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. Then $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a parabolic Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .*

Remark 3.2. When $G = \text{GL}_n$ the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 amount to require $p > 2^{2n}$.

Proof. Under the assumptions of the proposition, the normaliser $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ of $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ for the adjoint action is smooth. This is

- clear in characteristic 0,
- ensured by [20, Theorem A] when $p > 2^{2d}$.

Moreover assumptions of the proposition warrant the existence of an exponential map, allowing:

- to integrate the nil Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{u} into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subseteq G$ such that $\text{Lie}(U) = \mathfrak{u}$,
- to make sure that this integration is compatible with the adjoint representation, implying in particular that the normalisers $N_G(U)$ and $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ are the same (according to [20, Lemma 4.3]).

This is detailed:

- for instance in [13, II, §6, Corollary 3.4] when k is of characteristic 0,
- in [2, §6] and [26, Proposition 3.1] when $p > 2^{2d}$, for the existence of an integration for \mathfrak{u} (because if $p > 2^{2d}$ then $p > 2\text{h}(G) - 2 \geq \text{h}(G)$ according to Lemma 2.3), and in [42, Lecture 4, Theorem 5] and [2, §4.6] for the compatibility between the truncated exponential map and the adjoint representation (once again one can apply these results because $p > 2\text{h}(G) - 2$). For this last point see also Remark 5.2.2 below.

Let V be the unipotent radical of $N_G(U)^0$. Note that it is well defined because $N_G(U) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})$, the latter being smooth because of the assumptions we made on the characteristic. The inclusion $U \subseteq V$ is clear because U is a unipotent, smooth, connected normal subgroup of $N_G(U)$. So one has the following inclusions of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{v}$. Moreover according to Lemma 2.7 the equalities of Lie algebras $\text{Lie}(N_G(U)) = \text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})) = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ are satisfied. As one has $V := \text{Rad}_U(N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0)$, the subalgebra $\mathfrak{v} := \text{Lie}(V)$ is a p -nil p -ideal of \mathfrak{g} (see [26, Lemma 2.12]). By assumption \mathfrak{u} is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$, whence the inclusion $\mathfrak{v} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}$. So we have shown that $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{v}$. Moreover, as U and V are smooth connected subgroups of G , this last equality of Lie algebras allows to conclude that $U = V$ (see [13, II, §5, 5.5]). To summarise, the unipotent smooth and connected subgroup $U = V$ is the unipotent radical of the connected component of its smooth normaliser. According to Veisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem ([49] and [5, corollary 3.2]), the latter is thus a parabolic subgroup of G and $\text{Lie}(N_G(U)) = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is therefore a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . \square

Remark 3.3. When $\text{h}(G) < p \leq 2^{2d}$, even if an exponential map still exists and allows us to integrate the restricted p -nil p -subalgebra \mathfrak{u} into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subset G$, none of the steps arising in the previous proof is immediate. More precisely, the compatibility between the exponential map and the adjoint representation does no longer hold true (see for example [20, Lemma 4.3], this is a consequence of [43, 4.1.7]), neither does the smoothness of normalisers (see [20, Lemma 11]).

3.2 Conditional statements when the Killing form is non-degenerate

A careful reading of the proof of V. Morozov Theorem provided in [9, VIII, §10 Corollaire 2] leads to obtain the following conditional statement:

Theorem 3.4. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let G be a reductive k -group. Assume that $p > \text{h}(G)$ and that \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a symmetric non degenerate G -equivariant bilinear form κ . Let \mathfrak{u} be a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} such that:*

1. the Lie algebra \mathfrak{u} is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$
2. the orthogonal of \mathfrak{u} for the form κ is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .

Then $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .

The following lemma will be useful in the proof of Theorem 3.4:

Lemma 3.5. *Let \mathfrak{h} and \mathfrak{u} be two restricted p -Lie subalgebras of \mathfrak{g} such that:*

- the subalgebra \mathfrak{u} is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{h})$,
- the Killing form over \mathfrak{g} , denoted by κ , is non degenerate,
- the subalgebra \mathfrak{h} is the normaliser of \mathfrak{u} in \mathfrak{g} , namely we have $\mathfrak{h} = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$,
- the orthogonal of \mathfrak{u} for κ is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} ,

then \mathfrak{u} is the orthogonal of \mathfrak{h} for the Killing form over \mathfrak{g} .

Proof. Let \mathfrak{q} be the orthogonal of \mathfrak{u} for the Killing form over \mathfrak{g} . Let us show that $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{h}$. The vanishing condition $\kappa([x, q_1], q_2) = \kappa(x, [q_1, q_2]) = 0$, is satisfied for any pair $(q_1, q_2) \in \mathfrak{q}$ and any $x \in \mathfrak{u}$. Therefore the Lie bracket $[x, q_1]$ lies in \mathfrak{q}^\perp , where \mathfrak{q}^\perp is the orthogonal of \mathfrak{q} for κ . Hence we have obtained that:

- for any $q_1 \in \mathfrak{q}$ the Lie bracket $[x, q_1]$ belongs to \mathfrak{u} ,
- the Lie algebra \mathfrak{q} normalises \mathfrak{u} .

In other words we have shown that $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{h}$.

Moreover and by assumption, the Lie algebra \mathfrak{u} is an ideal of \mathfrak{h} that only consists in p -nilpotent elements (this is in particular a nilpotent ideal). It is therefore contained in the nilradical of \mathfrak{h} , and it is thus orthogonal to \mathfrak{h} for the Killing form over \mathfrak{h} (according to [8, §4, n°4, Proposition 6]). In other words we have shown that $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{u}^\perp$, hence the equality $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{q}$. \square

Proof of theorem 3.4. As $p > \text{h}(G)$, the restricted p -nil p -subalgebra \mathfrak{u} is integrable into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subset G$ (see [2, 6] but also [26, Proposition 3.1]). Let $N_0 := N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$ be the smooth connected part of the normaliser of U in G , set $V_1 := \text{Rad}_U(N_0)$ and let us consider the tower of smooth connected normalisers of U in G . This tower converges to a limit object N_∞ which is the smooth connected part of the normaliser of its unipotent radical V_∞ (for dimensional reasons). According to [5, Théorème 3.2] the smooth connected normaliser N_∞ is a parabolic subgroup of G , denoted by $P_G(U)$. There are two possibilities:

1. either $P_G(U) = G$, in this case $V_\infty = \{0\}$ is trivial, so is $U = \{0\}$ thus the vanishing of $\text{Lie}(U) = \mathfrak{u}$ and the result follows,
2. or $P_G(U)$ is a proper parabolic subgroup of G . It thus contains a Borel subgroup $B \subseteq G$. As k is algebraically closed, thus perfect, the unipotent smooth connected subgroup V_∞ is k -embeddable into the unipotent radical of a Borel subgroup $B \subseteq G$ (see [5, Corollary 3.7]). Moreover as the Lie algebras involved here are of finite dimension we have the following inclusions:

$$\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{v}_\infty \subseteq \text{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(B) \subseteq \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq (\mathfrak{b})^\perp$$

where the last inclusion is ensured by [8, §4 n°4, Lemma]. As by assumption \mathfrak{g} is endowed by κ , which is non degenerate, one can deduce that:

$$(\mathfrak{b}^\perp)^\perp = \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{b})^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{v}_\infty^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{u}^\perp = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}),$$

where the last equality is ensured by Lemma 3.5 and Remark 2.9. By assumption $p > \text{h}(G)$, in other words $p \neq 2$ when G is of type A_1 and $p > 3$ otherwise (see Table 1). In this case the parabolic subalgebras of \mathfrak{g} are exactly those that contain the Lie algebra of a Borel subgroup (see Section 2.3). The Lie algebra $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ satisfies this condition according to what precedes because $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U) \subseteq N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a parabolic Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , thus it contains a Borel subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . So $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is indeed a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . \square

4 Hilbert–Mumford–Kempf–Rousseau method and the optimal parabolic subgroup

In what follows and unless otherwise stated, the field k is algebraically closed of characteristic $p > 0$ and G is a reductive k -group. We assume that p is not of torsion for G (let us denote that this condition is in particular always satisfied when $p > h(G)$ (see section 2.1)). In what follows and by convention, a k -variety is a separated k -scheme of finite type, in particular a variety is not assumed to be reduced a priori. If Y is a k -variety we denote by \bar{Y} its reduced closure.

4.1 Construction

Set $X := \mathfrak{g}^{\oplus d}$ and let $\text{Ad}(G)^\Delta$ be the diagonal adjoint action of G over X . Let $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -nil p -subalgebra of dimension $d > 0$ and let $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ be a basis of \mathfrak{u} . As explained in this section, the Hilbert–Mumford–Kempf–Rousseau method (see [27]) allows us to obtain a parabolic subgroup

- which is of the form $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$, where $\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a cocharacter of G which is not unique, optimal for \mathfrak{u} in a certain sense,
- such that \mathfrak{u} is a Lie subalgebra of the Lie algebra of $\text{Rad}_U(P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}))$.

Set $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X$ and $S := \left(\overline{\text{Ad}(G)^\Delta x} \setminus \text{Ad}(G)^\Delta x \right)_{\text{red}} \subseteq X$.

Lemma 4.1. *The subvariety $S \subseteq X$ is closed, it is $\text{Ad}(G)^\Delta$ -invariant and not empty. Moreover the vector x does not belong to S .*

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Only the assumption on the emptiness of S is not clear. To prove it one only needs to check that $0 \in S$: according to Corollary 2.1, there exists a Borel subgroup $B \subseteq G$ such that \mathfrak{u} is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(B)$. Let $T \subseteq B \subseteq G$ be a maximal torus. Any dominant regular cocharacter λ of G with respect to T satisfies the equality $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot z = 0$ for any $z \in \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(B)^{\oplus d}$. In particular we have that

$$0 \in \left(\overline{\text{Ad}(G)^\Delta x} \setminus \text{Ad}(G)^\Delta x \right)_{\text{red}} \subseteq X.$$

□

Let us denote by $|X, x| := \left\{ \lambda \in X_*(G) \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \text{Ad}^\Delta(\lambda(t))x \text{ exists} \right\}$ the attractor of X (see [16, 1.4]). For any $\lambda \in |X, x|$ let $x_0^\lambda := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \text{Ad}^\Delta(\lambda(t))x \in S$ (or simply $x_0 := x_0^\lambda$ when there is no ambiguity on the chosen cocharacter λ). Finally let us set

$$\alpha_{S,x}(\lambda) := \begin{cases} \text{vanishing order of } t \mapsto \text{Ad}^\Delta(\lambda(t))x - x_0 : \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow X \text{ if } x_0 \in S, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us note that in particular $\alpha_{S,x} : X_*(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ has strictly positive values if and only if $x_0^\lambda \in S$.

As a reminder any cocharacter $\lambda : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow k$ defines a parabolic subgroup $P_G(\lambda)$ such that for any k -algebra A one has $P_G(\lambda)(A) := \{g \in G(A) \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot g \text{ exists}\}$. Its unipotent radical $U_G(\lambda)$ satisfies $U_G(\lambda)(A) := \{g \in P_G(\lambda)(A) \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot g = 1\}$ for any k -algebra A . The following theorem has been established by G. R. Kempf in the more general case where we consider:

- a finite dimensional linear representation (ρ, V) of G ,
- a closed $\rho(G)^\Delta$ -invariant subvariety $S \subset V^{\oplus d}$.

It allows to associate to \mathfrak{u} optimal cocharacters and the subgroup they define.

Theorem 4.2 (Kempf, [27, Theorem 3.4]). *The function $\lambda \mapsto \alpha_{S,x}(\lambda) / \|\lambda\|$ admits a maximum $B > 0$ on $|X, x|$. Set:*

$$\Delta_{S,x} = \{\lambda \in |X, x| \mid \alpha_{S,x}(\lambda) = B \cdot \|\lambda\| \text{ and } \lambda \text{ is indivisible}\}.$$

Such a cocharacter $\lambda \in \Delta_{S,x}$ is said to be optimal. Under these conditions:

1. *the set $\Delta_{S,x}$ is non-empty,*

2. there exists a parabolic subgroup $P_{S,x} \subseteq G$, denoted by $P_G(\lambda_u)$ in what follows, and such that $P_G(\lambda_u) = P_G(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \Delta_{S,x}$. The parabolic subgroup $P_G(\lambda_u)$ is the optimal parabolic subgroup of \mathfrak{u} ,
3. the set $\Delta_{S,x}$ is a principal homogeneous space under $\text{Rad}_U(P_G(\lambda_u))(k)$,
4. any maximal torus of $P_G(\lambda_u)$ contains a unique cocharacter that belongs to $\Delta_{S,x}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let \mathfrak{u} and $P_G(\lambda_u)$ be as in Theorem 4.2 above. Let us denote by $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of $P_G(\lambda_u)$. Then the following inclusion $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ holds true.*

Proof. According to [11, I, Proposition 2.1.8] the Lie algebra of $P_G(\lambda_u)$ writes $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u) \oplus \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ where:

- the factor $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u) := \mathfrak{g}_0$ is the Lie algebra of the centraliser of the torus $\lambda(\mathbb{G}_m)$ (which is denoted by $C_G(\lambda)$),
- and $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u) := \bigoplus_{n>0} \mathfrak{g}_n$, with $\mathfrak{g}_n := \{v \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \lambda(t) \cdot v = t^n v\}$.

The choice of λ_u is such that $\alpha_{S,x}(\lambda_u)$ is strictly positive. In particular the weights are all strictly positive for x , so for any vector of the basis of \mathfrak{u} , hence for \mathfrak{u} . This allows us to obtain the inclusion $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$. \square

Remark 4.4. If $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a nilpotent Lie algebra of dimension 1, the results of [23] ensure the existence of a parabolic subgroup $P_G(\lambda_u) \subseteq G$ such that $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ with no restriction on the characteristic of k (as in this case the $\text{Ad}(G)$ -orbite of x is never closed (according to [23, §2.10])). Let us remark that in the general case (without restriction on the dimension), the additional assumption on p comes from the fact that one needs to embed \mathfrak{u} into the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of a Borel subgroup to ensure that the $\text{Ad}(G)$ -orbit of x is not closed (see the proof of Lemma 4.1).

4.2 Obstruction

In what follows we assume that the restricted p -nil p -Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$.

4.2.1 Preliminary remarks

The whole point here is to obtain the inclusion $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$, as explained by the following lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *Let us assume that the inclusion $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ holds true. Then under our assumptions on \mathfrak{u} this normaliser is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .*

Proof. In Lemma 4.3 we have shown the inclusion $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$. Assume this inclusion to be strict. In this case \mathfrak{u} is a proper ideal of $\mathfrak{u}' := N_{\mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)}(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ (see for example [21, Chapter 1, §3 exercice 7]).

The intersection $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u) \cap N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{u}'$ is a restricted p -algebra because it derives from an algebraic group (namely $N_{U_G(\lambda_u)}(\mathfrak{u})$, see Lemma 2.7). This is a p -ideal of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ (because $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ by assumption). It is p -nil according to [26, Remark 2.14] because $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ is the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of $P_G(\lambda_u)$. In particular \mathfrak{u}' is a nilpotent (thus solvable) ideal of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$, so it is contained in $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. As \mathfrak{u} is the set of p -nilpotent elements of this radical, one necessarily has $\mathfrak{u}' \subseteq \mathfrak{u}$, thus the equality $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u) \cap N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$. This contradicts the strictness of the inclusion $\mathfrak{u} \subsetneq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$. In other words the equality $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_u)$ is satisfied. \square

Remark 4.6. The inclusion required in Lemma 4.5 is immediate in some cases, for example when $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is smooth. One only needs to apply [33, Corollary 9, (2)] to $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ to conclude.

Remark 4.7. When the subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is generated by a p -nilpotent element x , and with no additional assumption, the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is necessarily the Lie algebra of a parabolic subgroup of G . Indeed, under this assumption and according to G. R. Kempf [35, Proposition 18 (1)] there exists an optimal cocharacter λ of \mathfrak{u} associated to x . This means that:

1. the element x is of weight 2 for the conjugation by λ ,

2. the image of \mathbb{G}_m by λ is contained in the derived group of a Levi subgroup $L \subseteq G$ for which $x \in \text{Lie}(L)$ is distinguished (namely any torus contained in $C_G(x)$ is contained in the center of G).

The λ -conjugation on \mathfrak{g} induces a grading on $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_i \mathfrak{g}_i$. For such a grading the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is contained in \mathfrak{g}_0 . Indeed let $n := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} n_i \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(x)$, thus the bracket $[n, x]$ lies in \mathfrak{g}_2 . In particular, the bracket $[n_i, x]$ is necessarily trivial for any $i < 0$ because the bracket $[\mathfrak{g}_i, \mathfrak{g}_j]$ belongs to \mathfrak{g}_{i+j} . In other words $n_i \in C_{\mathfrak{g}}(x)$ for any $i < 0$, where $C_{\mathfrak{g}}(x)$ is the centraliser of x in \mathfrak{g} . But as G satisfies the standard hypotheses, the equalities

$$C_{\mathfrak{g}}(x) = \mathfrak{p}_G(\lambda) = \text{Lie}(P_G(\lambda)) = \text{Lie}(C_G(x))$$

hold true (see [23, 5.9, Remark]). Therefore $n_i = 0$ vanishes for any $i < 0$ and the inclusion $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(x) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_G(\lambda)$ is satisfied.

4.2.2 Characterisation, proof of Theorem 1.6

The first point of Remark 4.6 above is actually an equivalence, this is the point of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let us denote by $U_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) := \text{Rad}_U(P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}))$.

1. \implies 3. There are two possibilities:

- either $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) = G$, then the p -nil Lie algebra \mathfrak{u} is trivial because so is $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ (as a reminder this last inclusion is provided by Lemma 4.3);
- or $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ is a proper parabolic subgroup of G . In this case we have that:

$$\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) = \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})) = \text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})) \subset \text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$$

where:

- the first inclusion is given by Lemma 4.3,
- the first equality is provided by [26, Remark 2.14],
- the second equality comes from the hypothesis $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$,
- and the last inclusion is provided by [26, Lemma 2.5].

The inclusion $\text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})) \subseteq \mathfrak{u}$ is satisfied a priori because \mathfrak{u} is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$ (as a reminder the p -radical of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a p -nil p -ideal). To summarise $\mathfrak{u} = \text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$ and the equality $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ is satisfied. Moreover one has

$$N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0 = N_G(\mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}))^0 \supseteq N_G(U_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}))^0 = P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})^0 = P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$$

where

- the inclusion is given by Lemma 2.7,
- the first equality is ensured by assumption,
- and the last equality is provided by [15, XXII, Corollaire 5.8.5].

In other words $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) \hookrightarrow N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ is a monomorphism that induces an isomorphism at the Lie algebras level and whose source is a smooth k -group (the smoothness is ensured by [15, XXVI, Définition 1.1] because $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ is a parabolic subgroup). By [13, II, §5, 5.5] this monomorphism is therefore an open immersion. As $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ is a closed subgroup of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$, the equality $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ holds true and this latter group is smooth over k .

3. \implies 2. This is clear because a parabolic subgroup is smooth by definition (see [15, XXVI, Définition 1.1]).

2. \implies 1. According to Lemma 4.5 one only needs to obtain the inclusion $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$. This is provided by [33, Corollary 9, (2)] because $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ is smooth by assumption. Let us detail the reasoning, the notations are those of section 4.

The idea is to show that $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ normalises $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ because then $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0 \subseteq N_G(P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})) = P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$, (the equality is immediate because $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ is its own normaliser, see [15, XXII, corollaire 5.8.5]). This leads to the desired inclusion.

The smoothness of the normaliser $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ is crucial: it allows us to restrict our proof to a reasoning on k -points by Zariski-density of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0(k)$ in $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ (because k is

algebraically closed, see [17, Corollaire 10.4.8]). Thus one only needs to show that $\text{Ad}(h)P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) = P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ for any $h \in N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0(k)$. According to [27, Corollary 3.5] the subgroup $\text{Ad}(h)P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ and the optimal parabolic subgroup defined by an optimal cocharacter of $\Delta_{S, \text{Ad}(h)x}$ are the same. In other word the equality $\text{Ad}(h)P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}) = P_{S, \text{Ad}(h)x}$ is satisfied. Moreover, the sets $\Delta_{S,x}$ and $\Delta_{S, \text{Ad}(h)x}$ are equal according to [33, Corollary 7] because for any $h \in N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0(k)$:

- (i) the sets $|X, x|$ and $|X, \text{Ad}(h)(x)|$ are the same,
- (ii) one has $\alpha_{S,x}(\lambda) = \alpha_{S, \text{Ad}(h)x}(\lambda)$.

This leads to the equality $P_{S, \text{Ad}(h)x} = P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ for any $h \in N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0(k)$, whence the inclusion $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0 \subseteq P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$. □

Remark 4.8. When k is of characteristic $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ we introduce in section 5.1.1 the notion of infinitesimal saturation defined by P. Deligne and show, by making use of Lemma 5.1, that the subgroup $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq G$ is infinitesimally saturated. This ensures that Lemma 2.8 holds true in the context we are interested in (see [13, Theorem 2.5]) allows us to show the equality $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}}))$ more easily (as one only needs to apply the aforementioned lemma).

5 Analogue of Morozov Theorem in characteristic $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$

In this section k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G is a reductive k -group. We propose here to prove Theorem 1.8 and Corollaries 1.10 and 1.9 that are respectively analogue and corollaries of Morozov Theorem in characteristic $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$.

Let $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -nil p -Lie subalgebra. See [26, Section 2.2] for the terminology and the fundamental properties of the objects involved in this section. Under the assumption $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ a theorem of J-P. Serre in [42, Part II, Lecture 2, Theorem 3], and detailed by V. Balaji, P. Deligne and A. J. Parameswaran in [2, section 6] provides the existence of an integration for any restricted p -nil p -Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} (see also [26, Proposition 3.1]). Nevertheless, and as already mentioned in the introduction, such an integration is a priori no longer compatible with the adjoint representation. In particular, if we denote by $U \subset G$ the unipotent smooth connected subgroup that integrates \mathfrak{u} , there is no good reasons for the equality $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) = N_G(U)$ to hold true a priori. Moreover, as mentioned in the introduction, the normalisers involved here are a priori no longer smooth. The notion of infinitesimal saturation developed here allows to settle this issue.

5.1 Measuring the lack of smoothness of normalisers

5.1.1 Infinitesimal saturation

The following lemmas are crucial in the proof of Theorem 1.8. Let us note that they are clear as soon as $p > 2\mathfrak{h}(G) - 2$, as detailed in Section 5.2.2.

Lemma 5.1. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a reductive k -group such that $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$. Let $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -nil subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . The normaliser of \mathfrak{u} in G is infinitesimally saturated.*

Proof. Let $x \in \text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})) = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ be a p -nilpotent element (note that the equality is provided by Lemma 2.7). One needs to show that the t -power map factors through $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$. One has:

1. if $x \in \mathfrak{u}$, as U integrates \mathfrak{u} , the inclusions $\exp(tx) \in U \subseteq N_G(U) \subseteq N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ are satisfied (see for example [26, lemma 6.4]),
2. if $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) \setminus \mathfrak{u}$, let $\mathfrak{u}_x := \mathfrak{u} \oplus kx$ be the restricted p -Lie algebra generated by \mathfrak{u} and x . This is a Lie subalgebra because $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$. It remains to show that it is p -nil. This means that we have to check that any element of the form $u + x$, with $u \in \mathfrak{u}$ are p -nilpotent. As $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ this amounts to verify that $(u + x)^{[p]} = 1$. By assumption $\mathfrak{u} \oplus kx \subseteq \mathfrak{u}$ and Jacobson formulae provide the desired result. According to [26, Proposition 3.1] there exist unipotent smooth connected subgroups of G , denoted respectively by U and U_x such that $\text{Lie}(U_x) = \mathfrak{u}_x$, respectively $\text{Lie}(U) = \mathfrak{u}$. Note that

these constructions are independent from the Borel subalgebra in whose we embed \mathfrak{u} and \mathfrak{u}_x . In particular, it is not necessary to choose the same Borel subalgebra for both \mathfrak{u} and \mathfrak{u}_x .

By construction we have that $U \subseteq U_x$. These groups are smooth, so the following equalities $\dim \mathfrak{u}_x = \dim U_x$ and $\dim \mathfrak{u} = \dim U$ hold true. As $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_x$ is of codimension 1, the unipotent smooth connected subgroup U is of codimension 1 in the unipotent smooth connected subgroup U_x . According to [13, IV, §4 Corollaire 3.15] this is a normal subgroup of U_x (this quotient is isomorphic to \mathbb{G}_a). Thus $U_x \subseteq N_G(U) \subseteq N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ where the last inclusion comes from Lemma 2.7, so $\exp(tx) \in N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ and $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ are infinitesimally saturated. □

The proof of Lemma 5.1 allows us to show the following result:

Lemma 5.2. *Under the previous assumptions, let us denote by $U := \exp_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{u})$ where $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a Borel subalgebra such that $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(B)$. Then $N_G(U)$ is infinitesimally saturated.*

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We have to show that for any p -nilpotent element $x \in \text{Lie}(N_G(U)) \subset N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$, the t -power map factors through $N_G(U)$. The equality is ensured by [26, Lemma 6.4]. According to the proof of Lemma 5.1, the image of x by the t -power map is an element of $N_G(U)$, hence the latter is infinitesimally saturated. □

Remark 5.3. We just have shown in Lemma 5.1 that the normaliser $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ of any p -nil subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is infinitesimally saturated. In particular the normaliser of Theorem 1.8 is infinitesimally saturated. This condition is necessary for the statement to be true because any parabolic subgroup of G is infinitesimally saturated (see [26, Lemma 4.2]).

5.1.2 Exponential map and normalisers

Let G be a reductive group over an algebraic closed field k of characteristic $p > h(G)$. When $U \subseteq G$ is a reductive subgroup only the inclusion $N_G(U)_{\text{red}} \subseteq N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}$ is a priori satisfied (see for instance [26, Lemma 6.4 et Remark 6.7]). When $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a restricted p -nil p -subalgebra, let $U = \exp_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{u})$, where $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a Borel subalgebra such that $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(B)$. Under our assumptions on p the normalisers are equal. We start by showing the equality of the reduced parts, the preliminary remark is useful for what follows:

Remark 5.4. The exponential map built in [2, section 6] and used in [26, Proposition 3.1] allows us to define for any p -nilpotent element of \mathfrak{g} the t -power map:

$$\begin{aligned} \exp_x(\cdot) : \mathbb{G}_a &\rightarrow G \\ t &\mapsto \exp(tx), \end{aligned}$$

that itself induces a morphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\mathfrak{u}} : W(\mathfrak{u}) \times \mathbb{G}_a &\rightarrow G \\ (x, t) &\mapsto \exp(tx) =: \exp_x(t). \end{aligned}$$

The unipotent smooth connected subgroup obtained in [26, Proposition 3.1] is actually the subgroup $\tilde{U} \subseteq G$ generated by the image of the morphism ψ for the fppf-topology (see [14, VIB Proposition 7.1 and Remarque 7.6.1]). Indeed this subgroup is:

- unipotent, according to [13, IV, §2, n°2, Proposition 2.5] as it can be embedded into the unipotent radical of the Borel subgroup of G ,
- connected, according to [14, VIB Corollaire 7.2.1] because $\mathfrak{u} \cong W(\mathfrak{u})$ is geometrically reduced and geometrically connected;
- and reduced, thus smooth, because it is the image of a smooth, thus reduced, group.

The inclusion $\tilde{U} \subseteq U$ is clear and once again the equality of the considered groups follows from the equality of their Lie algebras: let B be a Borel subgroup of G such that $U \subseteq \text{Rad}_U(B)$. As the exponential map $\exp_{\mathfrak{b}}$ induces the identity on the tangent spaces, the equality $\text{Lie}(\tilde{U}) = \mathfrak{u}$ is necessarily satisfied. According to [2, II, §5, 5.5] the k -groups U and \tilde{U} are then equal because U and \tilde{U} are smooth and connected.

Lemma 5.5. *With the previous notations one has $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}} = N_G(U)_{\text{red}}$.*

Proof. As the equality $\text{Lie}(U) = \mathfrak{u}$ holds true only the inclusion $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}} \subseteq N_G(U)_{\text{red}}$ has to be checked.

By Zariski density as k is algebraically closed, we only need to do the reasoning on k -points (according to [17, Corollaire 10.4.8] because the schemes we consider are locally of finite type): let $g \in N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}(k)$, and let $h \in U(k)$. As $U := \exp_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{u})$ there exists an element $x \in \mathfrak{u}(k)$ such that $h = \exp_{\mathfrak{b}}(x) = \exp(x)$ (where the last equality comes from the preamble of [26, Section 3.1] and Remark 5.4 because $x \in \mathfrak{u}(k)$ is a closed point). We still make use of the aforementioned remark to obtain that $\text{Ad}(g)(h) = \text{Ad}(g)(\exp(x)) = \exp(\text{Ad}(g)(x)) \in U(k)$ because $g \in N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}(k)$ (where the last inclusion is obtained by making use of the G -equivariance of \exp). \square

The fppf-formalism of Remark 5.4 allows us to obtain the equality at the group level:

Lemma 5.6. *The subgroup $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ normalises U . In particular the equality $N_G(U) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ holds true.*

Proof. Let R be a k -algebra. For any $g \in N_G(\mathfrak{u})(R)$ and $h \in U(R)$, there exists a fppf-covering $S \rightarrow R$ such that $h_S = \psi(x_1, s_1) \times \cdots \times \psi(x_n, s_n)$ where $x_i \in \mathfrak{u}_R \otimes_R S$ et $s_i \in S$. By making use of the G -equivariance of \exp_{x_i} for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we then have

$$(\text{Ad}(g)h)_S = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Ad}(g_S)\psi(x_i, s_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \psi(\text{Ad}(g_S)x_i, s_i) \in U(S) \cap G(R) = U(R),$$

because U is generated by ψ as an fppf-sheaf. Therefore $\text{Ad}(g)h \in U(R)$, in other words we have obtained the inclusion of normalisers $N_G(\mathfrak{u})(R) \subseteq N_G(U)(R)$ for any k -algebra R . Yoneda's Lemma then allows us to conclude that $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq N_G(U)$. As the Lie algebra \mathfrak{u} derives from a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subseteq G$ according to [26, Proposition 3.1], the inclusion $N_G(U) \subseteq N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is still satisfied (see for instance Lemma 2.7), hence the equality of normalisers. \square

5.2 Proof of theorem 1.8 and corollaries 1.9, 1.10 and 1.15

5.2.1 Proof of theorem 1.8

Proof of theorem 1.8. As $p > \text{h}(G)$ the restricted p -nil p -subalgebra \mathfrak{u} can be integrated into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subset G$ according to [26, Proposition 3.1]. In particular one has $U \subseteq N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$. Let us denote by V the unipotent radical of $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$. The inclusion $U \subseteq V$ is necessarily verified. At the Lie algebras level this leads to the inclusion $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{v}$.

By Weisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem the first point of Theorem 1.8 is obtained if one can show that the equality $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{v}$ holds true. Note that as U and V are smooth connected subgroups of G this allows us to conclude that $U = V$ according to [13, II, §5, 5.5].

Set $W := \text{Rad}_U(N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0)$. According to [26, lemma 2.12] the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{w} := \text{Lie}(W)$ is a p -nil p -ideal of $\text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0) \subseteq \text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u}))$. The subgroup $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ being infinitesimally saturated, [2, Theorem 2.5] ensures that W is a normal subgroup of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$. Hence \mathfrak{w} is a p -nil p -ideal of $\text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})) = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$. It is therefore contained in the p -radical of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$, which is itself contained in the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$ according to [26, Lemma 2.5] ii). The latter is nothing but \mathfrak{u} by assumption, whence the conclusion.

To summarise, we have obtained the following inclusions: $\mathfrak{w} \subseteq \mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{v}$.

According to Lemma 5.5 the reduced normalisers $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}$ and $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}$ are the same, so are respectively their connected components and their unipotent radicals. In other words, the groups V and W are equal, whence the equality of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{w} = \mathfrak{v} = \mathfrak{u}$. The groups $U \subseteq V$ are smooth and connected, therefore the equality of their Lie algebra lifts to an equality of groups, namely we have shown that $U = V$ (see [13, II, §5, 5.5]).

In other words U is equal to $\text{Rad}_U((N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0))$. Its smooth connected normaliser is therefore a parabolic subgroup of G according to [5, Corollaire 3.2]. We denote it by $P_G(U) := N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$.

As the normaliser $N_G(U)$ is infinitesimally saturated, the subgroup $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$ is normal in $N_G(U)$ according to [2, Theorem 2.5]. In other words the inclusion $N_G(U) \subseteq N_G(N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0)$ holds true. This leads to the equality $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0 = N_G(U)$ because $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$ is its own

normaliser (according to [15, XXII, Corollaire 5.8.5]), whence $N_G(U)$ is a parabolic subgroup of G .

The equality we just obtained in particular implies that $N_G(U) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is a parabolic subgroup of G . The same reasoning as above thus allows us to conclude that $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is a proper parabolic subgroup of G . Note that this reasoning can be done because $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is infinitesimally saturated (see Lemma 5.1). Therefore the equalities:

$$N_G(\mathfrak{u}) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0 = N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0 = N_G(U) = P_G(U),$$

are satisfied and $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})) = \text{Lie}(P_G(U))$ is indeed a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} (namely it is the Lie algebra of the parabolic subgroup of G obtained by applying the Borel–Tits theorem to U).

Moreover, as Theorem 1.6 holds true because the normaliser $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0 = N_G(U)$ is smooth, the normaliser $N_G(U)$ is actually the optimal parabolic subgroup $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ obtained by Kempf–Rousseau theory (see section 4). \square

Remark 5.7. Lemma 5.6, together with the fppf-formalism it introduces, allow to drastically simplify the proof of Theorem 1.8 by ensuring the equality of the whole normalisers $N_G(U)$ and $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ (and not only the equality of their smooth part). Lemma [26, 2.13] then allows us to conclude. The notations are the same as the one in the above proof. The properties satisfied by U (which is unipotent smooth and connected) implied the inclusion $U \subseteq V := \text{Rad}_U(N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0)$ that leads to an inclusion of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{v}$. By assumption \mathfrak{u} is the set of p -nilpotent elements of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$. Now, as $\mathfrak{v} \subset N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is p -nil (according to [26, Lemma 2.12]) the inclusion $\mathfrak{v} \subseteq \mathfrak{u}$ is trivially satisfied. This leads to the desired equality: $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{v}$. We deduce from the latter (and as in the proof), that $N_G(U)$ is a parabolic subgroup of G . As we already know that $N_G(U) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ there is no need of any additional argument to show that $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is parabolic.

5.2.2 Remarks on the characteristic 0 or p high enough

Let G be a simple and simply connected k -group. When $p = 0$ or $p > 2 \text{h}(G) - 2$, the adjoint representation is compatible with the exponential map. In other words, any \mathfrak{g} -nilpotent element $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ satisfies the equality $\text{Ad}(\exp(tX)) \cdot y = \exp(t \text{ad}(X)) \cdot y$ for any $y \in \mathfrak{g}$. In characteristic $p > 0$, the assumption on p is required because the p -structure of \mathfrak{g} in particular leads to the following identity for any x and $y \in \mathfrak{g}$ (see [13, II, §7, 3.3]):

$$(x + y)^{[p]} = x^{[p]} + y^{[p]} - W(x, y).$$

This implies that the equality $\exp(x)\exp(y) = \exp(x + y)$ is no longer satisfied in general, when x and y are any p -nilpotent elements of \mathfrak{g} (see [43, Remarque 4.1.7]). Requiring $p > 2 \text{h}(G) - 2$ allows to settle this issue because under this assumption the adjoint representation Ad is of low height. The proof of [20, Lemma 4.3] details the reasoning when G is of type A_{n+1} , this easily extends to the other types: let x be a p -nilpotent element of \mathfrak{g} , denote by l the left multiplication by tx and by r the right multiplication by $-tx$. Then

$$\text{Ad}(\exp(tx)) = \exp(l)\exp(r) = \exp\left(l + r - \sum_{n=1}^{p-1} c_n l^{[n]} r^{[p-n]}\right),$$

where the $c_n \in k$ are non trivial coefficients, whence the vanishing

$$\begin{aligned} W_p(l, r) &= \sum_{n=1}^{p-1} c_n l^{[n]} r^{[p-n]} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\text{h}(G)-1} c_n l^{[n]} r^{[p-n]} + \sum_{n=\text{h}(G)}^{p-1} c_n l^{[n]} r^{[p-n]} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

as in each sum one of the factor is raised to a power greater than $\text{h}(G)$, thus vanishes, because when $p > \text{h}(G)$, any nilpotent element $y \in \mathfrak{g}$ is killed by the $[p]$ -power, namely $y^{[p]} = 0$ (see [34, 4.4]). Such a compatibility drastically simplifies the proof of Lemmas 5.1 et 5.2. Let us explain why in more details.

Let \mathfrak{u} be a nilpotent subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . According to [26, Proposition 3.1] this subalgebra can be integrated into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup of G , denoted by $U := \exp_{\mathfrak{u}}(\mathfrak{u})$,

where $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a Borel subalgebra such that $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(B)$. A priori only the inclusion $\text{Lie}(N_G(U)) \subseteq N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ holds true (according to Lemma 2.7) but the compatibility between the adjoint representation and the exponential map ensures that these normalisers are actually equal:

Lemma 5.8. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G be a simple and simply connected k -group such that $p > 2h(G) - 2$. Let also \mathfrak{u} be a p -nil subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . Then the equality $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \text{Lie}(N_G(U))$ holds true.*

Proof. One needs to show that any $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ actually belongs to $\text{Lie}(N_G(U))$. According to Lemma 2.7, this amounts to show that $\text{Ad}(u)x - x \in \mathfrak{u}$ for any $u \in U(k)$. Let us thus consider $u \in U(k)$. As $U = \exp_{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathfrak{u})$ integrates \mathfrak{u} , for the same reasons as in the proof of Lemma 5.5, there exists an element $y \in \mathfrak{u}$ such that $u = \exp(y)$. Therefore we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(u)x - x &= \text{Ad}(\exp(y))(x) - x \\ &= \exp(\text{ad}(y))(x) - x, \text{ because Ad and exp are compatible,} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq n < p} \frac{\text{ad}^n(y)}{n!}(x) - x \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq n < p} \frac{\text{ad}^n(y)}{n!}(x) \in \mathfrak{u} \end{aligned}$$

because $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ by assumption. When Ad and exp are compatible (so in particular when $p > 2h(G) - 2$) the equality $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \text{Lie}(N_G(U))$ is thus satisfied. \square

When $p > 2h(G) - 2$ Lemmas 5.2 and 5.1 are thus the same, their proof is immediate in this context:

Proof of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 when $p > 2h(G) - 2$. According to what precedes, and by making use of Lemma 2.7, one can show that the equalities $\text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})) = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \text{Lie}(N_G(U))$ are satisfied. One needs to show here that given any p -nilpotent element $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$, the t -power map $t \mapsto \exp(tx)$ factors through $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$. Let $y \in \mathfrak{u}$ and $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ be a p -nilpotent element. As the adjoint representation is compatible with the exponential map, it is so with the t -power map. This leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(\exp(tx))(y) &= \exp(\text{ad}(tx))(y) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq n < p} \frac{\text{ad}(tx)^n}{n!}(y) \in \mathfrak{u} \end{aligned}$$

because $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ by assumption. \square

Remark 5.9. When G is any reductive k -group, the following assumptions allow, in a certain framework, to weaken the condition on p without losing the compatibility between a representation of G and the exponential map.

Let us denote by $\text{ht}_G(\mathfrak{g}) := \max\{\sum_{\alpha > 0} \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle\}$ the Dynkin height of the adjoint representation. The restriction on p amounts to require the adjoint representation to be of low height. This means that $p > \text{ht}_G(\mathfrak{g})$ as $\text{ht}_G(\mathfrak{g}) = 2 \times \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\omega}_i = 2h(G) - 2$, where $\bar{\omega}_i$ are the fundamental weights for the T -action (see [42, Lecture 4, example of Theorem 8]).

More generally, one can weaken the restrictions on p by considering an almost faithful representation ρ (i.e. a representation whose kernel is of multiplicative type) and whose Dynkin height is minimal. In this case, the exponential map and the representation ρ are compatible (see [2, 4.5 et 4.6]) and the previous reasoning can be extended to this context. Let us note that the adjoint representation is always almost faithful when G is a reductive k -group because its kernel is nothing but the center of G , which is of multiplicative type. When G is simple and simply connected, if G is not of type F_4 , E_6 , E_7 or E_8 , a low height almost faithful representation always exists when $p > h(G)$ (see the remark that follows Theorem 4.7 in [2]).

Remark 5.10. The lack of compatibility between the exponential map and the adjoint representation has been studied in [29, Chapter 4]. In paragraph 4.2, the author defines an operator, denoted by had , compatible with the truncated exponential.

Definition 5.11. A subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is had-weakly saturated if and only if $\text{had}(x)(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \mathfrak{u}$ for any p -nilpotent element $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$.

In practice when $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$, a restricted p -nil p -subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is had-weakly saturated if and only if its normaliser $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is infinitesimally saturated. One inclusion is clear: assume \mathfrak{u} to be had-weakly saturated and let $y \in \mathfrak{u}$. For any p -nilpotent element $x \in N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ and for any $t \in R$ (where R is a k -algebra) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(\exp(tx))(y) &= \exp(t \text{had}(x))(y) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{(t \text{had}(x))^i}{i!} \right) (y) \in \mathfrak{u}, \end{aligned}$$

as any coefficient $\text{had}^i(x)(y) \in \mathfrak{u}$. Moreover, if $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is infinitesimally saturated let x be a p -nilpotent element of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$. For any $y \in \mathfrak{u}$ and $t \in \mathbb{G}_a$ we have:

$$\text{Ad}(\exp(tx))(y) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{(t \text{had}(x))^i}{i!} \right) (y) \in \mathfrak{u},$$

because $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is infinitesimally saturated. In particular $\text{had}(x)(y) \in \mathfrak{u}$ thus \mathfrak{u} is weakly had-saturated. Let us remark that in particular Lemma 5.1 allows us to conclude that if $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ any restricted p -nil p -subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} is had-saturated.

5.2.3 Proof of corollaries 1.9 and 1.10

Corollary 1.9 follows from Theorem 1.8 thanks to the following result:

Corollary 5.12 (of [26, Lemma 2.13]). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let G be a reductive k -group. Assume that $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$. Let $H \subseteq G$ be an infinitesimally saturated group. Then the following equalities hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{h}) &= \{x \in \text{rad}(\mathfrak{h}) \mid x \text{ is } p\text{-nilpotent}\} \\ &= \{x \in \text{rad}_p(\text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}})) \mid x \text{ is } p\text{-nilpotent}\} = \text{rad}_p(\text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}})) = \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(H_{\text{red}}^0). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us note that the assumptions of Lemma 2.8 are satisfied here as:

1. the unipotent radical of H_{red}^0 is normal in H and the quotient H/H_{red}^0 is a group of multiplicative type according to [2, Theorem 2.5], because H is infinitesimally saturated,
2. the characteristic is always as requested in the statement of the lemma because we assume the characteristic p to be greater than $\mathfrak{h}(G)$. This can be checked with Table 1.

By making use of the identity $\text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}}^0) = \text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}})$, we obtain the desired equalities. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.9. The normaliser of \mathfrak{u} is infinitesimally saturated according to Lemma 5.1 because $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$. Corollary 5.12 thus ensures that \mathfrak{u} is a subalgebra of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ given by the set of all p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. Theorem 1.8 thus holds true and allows to conclude. \square

Remark 5.13. To show Corollary 1.9 one needs to combine Theorem 1.8 with Proposition 5.12. This in particular underlines that, when k is of characteristic $p > 0$, the p -radical of a Lie algebra that derives from a reductive k -group is really the good analogue of the nilradical of a semisimple Lie algebra in characteristic 0. Nevertheless, a much simpler proof is possible, by making use of the exponential map as defined in [26, Proposition 3.1]: by definition the p -radical of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is a p -nil p -ideal. According to [26, Proposition 3.1] the ideal

\mathfrak{u} can be integrated into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $U \subseteq G$. By construction U is normal in $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$ and this normal subgroup is thus necessarily contained into the unipotent radical of $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$, denoted by V . The inclusion being preserved by derivation, this leads to the following inclusion of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{v}$. According to Lemma 5.2 the group $N_G(U)$ is infinitesimally saturated. The subgroups V and $N_G(U)_{\text{red}}^0$ are therefore normal in $N_G(U)$ (see [2, Theorem 2.5]). Thus \mathfrak{v} is an ideal of $\text{Lie}(N_G(U))$. As the normalisers $N_G(U)$ and $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ are equal according to Lemma 5.6, we actually have shown that $\text{Lie}(N_G(U)) = \text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})) = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ (where the last equality is ensured by Lemma 2.7). The Lie algebra of V is therefore a p -nil p -ideal of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ (according to [26, Lemma 2.12]). It is thus necessarily contained in $\text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$ which is the Lie algebra \mathfrak{u} itself by assumption. In other words we have shown the equality $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{v}$, whence the equality of the smooth connected groups U and V (by making use of [13, II, §5, 5.5]). As in the proof of Theorem 1.8, Veisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem (see [5, corollaire 3.2]) allows us to conclude.

The proof of Corollary 1.10 is now immediate:

Proof of Corollary 1.10. By noetherianity of \mathfrak{g} there exists an integer i for which the sequences $(\mathfrak{u}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathfrak{q}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the statement stabilise. Let us denote by \mathfrak{u}_∞ , respectively \mathfrak{q}_∞ , the limit objects.

According to Corollary 5.12, as $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_\infty)$ is infinitesimally saturated (see Lemma 5.1) the Lie algebra \mathfrak{u}_∞ is the p -radical of its normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}_\infty)$. According to Corollary 1.10 this normaliser is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . The aforementioned Corollary ensures that:

- this algebra derives from the subgroup $P(U_\infty)$ obtained by applying Veisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem (see [5, corollaire 3.2]) to the group U_∞ that integrates \mathfrak{u}_∞ ,
- this parabolic subalgebra is also the Lie algebra of the optimal parabolic subgroup of \mathfrak{u} denoted by $P_G(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}_\infty})$.

□

Corollary 1.10 allows us to show Corollary 5.14 below.

Corollary 5.14 (of Theorem 1.8). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let G be a reductive k -group. Assume that $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$. Let $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a maximal proper restricted p -Lie subalgebra. Then \mathfrak{q} is either p -reductive or parabolic.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{u} := \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{q})$, there are two possibilities:

1. either $\mathfrak{u} = \{0\}$ and so \mathfrak{q} is p -reductive;
2. or $\mathfrak{u} \neq \{0\}$. In this case let us note that the inclusion $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is satisfied and that \mathfrak{q} is maximal by assumption. There are again two possibilities:
 - (i) either $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{g}$ which is impossible because \mathfrak{g} is p -reductive so has no non trivial p -nil p -ideal,
 - (ii) or $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{q}$. In this case, as $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$, Corollary 1.10 allows us to conclude that $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ is the Lie algebra of a parabolic subgroup of G .

□

5.2.4 Proof of Corollary 1.15

Corollary 1.15 allows to bridge together Theorem 1.8 and Section 7. We assume here that \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a symmetric non-degenerate G -equivariant bilinear form, denoted by κ . Under this assumption, and according to [41, I, §8, Corollary], the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is semisimple.

Proof. Let us first show that $\mathfrak{p} = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp)$: let $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{p}^\perp$. For any $z \in \mathfrak{p}$, the following vanishing condition $\kappa([x, y], z) = \kappa(y, [z, x]) = 0$ is satisfied. In other words $[x, y] \in \mathfrak{p}^\perp$ and \mathfrak{p} is a subalgebra of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp)$. Now, remark that \mathfrak{p}^\perp is contained in $\text{Nil}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp))$ as \mathfrak{p}^\perp is a nilpotent ideal of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp)$. It is thus orthogonal to $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp)$ according to [8, §4, n°3, proposition 4d]. In other words the inclusion $\mathfrak{p}^\perp \subseteq (N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp))^\perp$ holds true because κ is non degenerate. This leads to obtain the inclusion $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ thus the equality $\mathfrak{p} = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp)$.

According to 1.9, as \mathfrak{p}^\perp is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} by assumption, one only needs to show that $\mathfrak{p}^\perp = \text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}^\perp))$ to conclude. This is clear according to Remark 2.9 and what precedes as by assumption \mathfrak{g} is semisimple and we just have shown that $\mathfrak{p}^\perp = \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{p})$. □

6 Analogue of Morozov Theorem in separably good characteristics

In this section k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G is a reductive k -group. We aim to show here that Morozov Theorem admits an analogue when p is separably good for G and under an extra assumption on normalisers which is explained below. This condition is by far less restrictive than the one required in Theorem 1.8. More precisely, in this section, we prove Theorem 1.12 and corollaries 1.14 and 1.13.

As mentioned in the introduction of this article, when p is separably good for G , not all restricted p -nil p -subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ can be integrated into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup of G . Moreover, even if this integration exists, nothing ensures that it would be compatible with the adjoint representation. The results stated in this section therefore require to impose an additional condition on the normaliser of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ to settle these issues.

The proofs of the aforementioned results reproduce and adapt arguments developed in section 5 (in which we assumed $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$). Obtaining such statements required the existence of a unipotent smooth connected subgroup of G which integrates \mathfrak{u} . This condition does not always hold true as illustrated in [26, Section 3.3]. However, assuming p to be separably good for G ensures the existence of a Springer isomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ and allows us to lift nilpotent elements of \mathfrak{g} to unipotent elements of G . This is detailed, for instance, in [26, Section 3.1]. This punctual integration induces for any p -nilpotent element $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ a morphism, called t -power map:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_x : \mathbb{G}_a &\rightarrow G, \\ t &\mapsto \phi(tx). \end{aligned}$$

This, combined with the fppf-formalism developed in [14, VIB, Proposition 7.1], leads to associate to any restricted p -nil p -subalgebra $\mathfrak{v} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $J_{\mathfrak{v}}$. This group can be huge in general, but when the subalgebra \mathfrak{v} is as in Statement 1.1 I have showed in [26, Lemma 5.1] that the subgroup $J_{\mathfrak{v}}$ actually integrates \mathfrak{v} .

As mentioned in the introduction, the lack of smoothness of normalisers is another issue specific to the characteristic $p > 0$ framework. Under the assumption $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$, we have shown that any normaliser of any restricted p -nil p -Lie subalgebra is infinitesimally saturated (see Lemma 5.1). This allowed us to make use of [2, Theorem 2.5] to settle the lack of smoothness of normalisers. To show this property was satisfied we made use of a structure theorem for unipotent groups. This was possible in this context because any restricted p -nil p -subalgebra $\mathfrak{v} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ was integrable into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $V \subset G$. As explained in introduction, the notion of infinitesimal saturation naturally extends in separably good characteristics to that of ϕ -infinitesimal saturation, where $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ is a Springer isomorphism for G . This allows us to obtain a variation of a result of P. Deligne (see [26, Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 4.12]). However the difficulty raised in this paragraph is only partially settled here as we are missing the existence of an integration of any restricted p -nil p -Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} when $p < \mathfrak{h}(G)$. This prevents us from using the aforementioned structural argument useful in the proof of Lemma 5.1 and justifies the additional assumption in the statement of Theorem 1.12 (with respect to the statement in characteristic $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$).

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1.12

Let us remind the reader of the notations of Theorem 1.12: in what follows k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G is a reductive k -group. The characteristic p is assumed to be separably good for G . Let $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -subalgebra such that \mathfrak{u} is the set of p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$.

Proof of Theorem 1.12. The proof is the same as the one of the analogue of Morozov Theorem in characteristic $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ (see Theorem 1.8). According to [26, Lemma 5.1] the restricted p -nil p -Lie algebra \mathfrak{u} integrates into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $J_{\mathfrak{u}} \subset G$, and we aim to show that $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) = P_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})$. Let us note that this directly implies the smoothness of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ because a parabolic subgroup is smooth (see [15, XXVI, Définition 1.1]). According to section 4, and in particular the equivalent conditions 2. and 3. of Theorem 1.6, what precedes is equivalent to require the equality $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{u}})$ to hold true.

As by assumption the subgroup $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated and satisfies hypotheses of [26, Theorem 1.1], the connected component of its reduced part $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is normal in $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$. In particular if $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is a parabolic subgroup of G then one has $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) = N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ because a parabolic subgroup is its own normaliser (see [15, XXII, Corollaire 5.8.5]). This is thus enough to show that $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is a parabolic subgroup of G .

According to [26, Lemma 3.5] the normalisers $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ and $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})$ are equal, so are the connected components of their reduced parts. Hence one only needs to show that $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})_{\text{red}}^0$ is a reduced parabolic subgroup of G . When $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$, we made use of Veisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem ([5, Corollaire 3.2]) to show the equality $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})_{\text{red}}^0 = P_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})$. Let $V := \text{Rad}_U(N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})_{\text{red}}^0)$, one then needs to show that $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})_{\text{red}}^0 = N_G(V)_{\text{red}}^0$.

The subgroup $J_{\mathfrak{u}}$ is actually contained in the unipotent radical of $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})_{\text{red}}^0$ because it is a unipotent smooth connected normal subgroup of $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})_{\text{red}}^0$ according to the preamble of [26, Section 3.2]. Thus $J_{\mathfrak{u}} \subseteq V$ whence the inclusion of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{j}_{\mathfrak{u}} \subseteq \mathfrak{v}$.

Finally, let us note that the unipotent subgroup V is normal in $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ according to [26, Theorem 1.1] because by assumption $N_G(\mathfrak{u}) = N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated. The Lie algebra of V is therefore a p -nil p -ideal of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ according to [26, Lemma 2.12]. The situation is hence the following $\mathfrak{v} \subseteq \text{rad}_p(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})) \subseteq \mathfrak{u} = \text{Lie}(\mathfrak{j}_{\mathfrak{u}})$ where we make use of [26, Lemma 2.5] because \mathfrak{u} is the set of p -nilpotent elements of $\text{rad}(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}))$. Let us note that the last equality is ensured by [26, Lemma 5.1] which ensures that the subgroup $J_{\mathfrak{u}}$ integrates \mathfrak{u} . As a conclusion we have shown that $\mathfrak{v} = \mathfrak{j}_{\mathfrak{u}}$. The subgroups V and $J_{\mathfrak{u}}$ are smooth, connected and their Lie algebras are equal, so they are according to [13, II, §5, 5.5]. Thus the subgroup V is the unipotent radical of its smooth and connected normaliser. The latter is hence the parabolic subgroup $P_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}}) \subseteq G$ obtained by applying Veisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem [5, Corollaire 3.2]). \square

Remarks 6.1. The proof of Theorem 1.12 allows to state the two following remarks:

1. the assumption of ϕ -infinitesimal saturation a priori ensures that the smooth connected part of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ contains a torus. Let us stress out that this is a necessary condition for the statement to hold true. Indeed, let $H \subseteq N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ be a maximal connected subgroup of multiplicative type and assume that $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ does not contain any torus. Then, the intersection $H \cap N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is non trivial and $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is unipotent. The unipotency of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ can indeed be deduced from the maximality of H that ensures that $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ has no factors of type μ_p . To conclude we use that k is algebraically closed. So we have the equality $J_{\mathfrak{u}} = N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ in the proof of Theorem 1.12, in other words $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$ is both parabolic and unipotent, which is absurd.
2. Moreover, the infinitesimal version of [2, Theorem 2.5] obtained in [26, Proposition 4.14] already allowed us to show an infinitesimal version of Theorem 1.12, stated below.

Proposition 6.2. *Let k be an algebraically closed field and G be a reductive k -group. Assume that p is separably good for G and let $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ be a Springer isomorphism for G . Let $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted p -subalgebra and assume that:*

1. *the subalgebra \mathfrak{u} is the set of all p -nilpotent elements of the normaliser of \mathfrak{g} ;*
2. *the normaliser $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated.*

Then the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a parabolic Lie subalgebra.

Proof. The restricted p -nil p -subalgebra $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ of the statement integrates into a unipotent smooth connected subgroup $J_{\mathfrak{u}} \subset G$. According to [26, Lemma 3.5] the normalisers $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$ and $N_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}})$ are equal. Let V be the unipotent radical of $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$. The subgroup $J_{\mathfrak{u}}$ is unipotent smooth connected and normal in $N_G(\mathfrak{u})$, thus in $N_G(\mathfrak{u})_{\text{red}}^0$. It is moreover contained in the unipotent radical of the latter. In other words the inclusion $J_{\mathfrak{u}} \subseteq V$ is satisfied and one only needs to get the reverse inclusion. Once again, and as the groups involved here are smooth and connected, this can be checked on their Lie algebras (see [13, II, §5, n°5.5]). According to [26, Lemma 2.12] the Lie algebra \mathfrak{v} is a restricted p -nil p -subalgebra of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$. As $N_G(\mathfrak{u})^0$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated the Lie algebra \mathfrak{v} is an ideal of $\text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{u})) = N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ according to the second point of [26, Proposition 4.14]. In other words \mathfrak{v} is a p -nil p -ideal of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ thus is contained in \mathfrak{u} (which is nothing but the set of all p -nilpotent elements of the radical of $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{u})$ according to [26, Lemma 2.5]). Hence $J_{\mathfrak{u}} = V$ is the unipotent radical of its smooth connected normaliser. According to [5, Corollaire 3.2] this normaliser is the parabolic subgroup $P_G(J_{\mathfrak{u}}) \subseteq G$. Moreover, recall that \mathfrak{u} is the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of a parabolic subgroup. It is therefore the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of

the optimal parabolic subgroup associated to it (and obtained in section 4 via the Hilbert–Mumford–Kempf–Rousseau method). In other words we have shown that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda_{\mathbf{u}}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{u}})$, whence the infinitesimal version of Theorem 1.12. \square

Remark 6.3. When G is of type (RA) , [26, Proposition 4.14] is even enough to show the “strong” version of Morozov Theorem 1.12. We detail the reasoning here. Let us also emphasize that, in practice, this assumption together with the additional assumption of separably good characteristic amounts to avoid factors of type A_{pm-1} in the decomposition of G .

In order to simplify the notations we set $P := P_G(J_{\mathbf{u}})$ so $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{u}}) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$. Assume G to be of type (RA) . Then any of its parabolic subgroups $Q \subseteq G$ is such that $Q = N_G(\mathfrak{q})^0$ (according to [15, XXII, Proposition 5.3.4]). In other words the situation is the following:

$$\mathfrak{p} \trianglelefteq N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{u}) \subseteq N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{p}) = \text{Lie}(N_G(\mathfrak{p})^0),$$

by virtue of the first point of [26, Proposition 4.14]. This leads to the following inequalities:

$$\dim(\mathfrak{p}) = \dim(P) \leq \dim(N_G(\mathbf{u})) \leq \dim(N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \dim(N_G(\mathfrak{p})^0) = \dim(P)$$

and allows us to conclude that $P_G(J_{\mathbf{u}}) = N_G(\mathbf{u})_{\text{red}}^0 = N_G(\mathbf{u})$. The equality $N_G(\mathbf{u}) = P_G(\lambda_{\mathbf{u}})$ follows, as explained in the above proof.

6.2 Proofs of corollaries 1.13 and 1.14

The preceding paragraphs aimed to adapt techniques and notions developed when $p > \mathfrak{h}(G)$ to separably good characteristics. This work being done, proofs of corollaries 1.13 and 1.14 will be the same as those of corollaries 1.9 and 1.10. In particular corollary 1.13 follows from Theorem 1.12 thanks to the following result:

Corollary 6.4 (of [26, Lemma 2.14]). *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let G be a reductive k -group. Assume that p is separably good for G and let $\phi : \mathcal{N}_{\text{red}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\text{red}}(G)$ be a Springer isomorphism for G . Let $H \subseteq G$ be a ϕ -infinitesimally saturated group. Then the following equalities hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rad}_p(\mathfrak{h}) &= \{x \in \text{rad}(\mathfrak{h}) \mid x \text{ is } p\text{-nilpotent}\} \\ &= \{x \in \text{rad}_p(\text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}})) \mid x \text{ is } p\text{-nilpotent}\} = \text{rad}_p(\text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}})) = \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathbf{u}}(H_{\text{red}}^0). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us note that assumptions of Lemma 2.8 are satisfied here, indeed:

1. the unipotent radical of H_{red}^0 is normal in H and the quotient H/H_{red}^0 is a group of multiplicative type according to [26, Theorem 1.1] because H is infinitesimally saturated,
2. the characteristic is always as requested in the statement of Lemma 2.8 as p is assumed to be separably good for G . This can be checked with Table 1.

By making use of the identity $\text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}}^0) = \text{Lie}(H_{\text{red}})$, we obtain the desired equalities. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.13. Note that the main point here was to obtain Corollary 6.4 above. The proof of the corollary is now exactly the same as the proof of Corollary 1.9. \square

The proof of Corollary 1.14 is now immediate:

Proof of Corollary 1.14. Let us consider the towers of the statement and denote by \mathbf{u}_{∞} , respectively \mathfrak{q}_{∞} , the limit objects. As by assumption the normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{u}_{\infty})$ is ϕ -infinitesimally saturated, the proof of Corollary 1.13 allows us to identify the Lie algebra \mathbf{u}_{∞} with the p -radical of its normaliser $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{u}_{\infty})$. According to Corollary 1.14 this normaliser is a parabolic Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . The same statement ensures that:

- it derives from a subgroup $P(U_{\infty})$ obtained by applying Veisfeiler–Borel–Tits Theorem (see [5, Corollaire 3.2]) to the group U_{∞} that integrates \mathbf{u}_{∞} ,
- it is also the Lie algebra of the parabolic subgroup optimal for \mathbf{u} , denoted by $P_G(\lambda_{\mathbf{u}_{\infty}})$.

\square

Remark 6.5. In Section 5 we obtained a classical corollary of the analogue of Morozov Theorem when $p > h(G)$ (see Corollary 5.14). When p is separably good for G obtaining such a result is no longer that easy: the main issue here is that the integration of a restricted p -nil Lie algebra does no longer always exist. This prevents us from obtaining that the normalisers in G of p -nil subalgebras are ϕ -infinitesimally saturated. Nevertheless, one could expect that the maximality condition on \mathfrak{q} would force the involved normalisers to be ϕ -infinitesimally saturated.

7 An application: characterisation of the canonical parabolic subgroup of a reductive group

7.1 Canonical parabolic subgroup

In what follows we use the language of [15], in particular the theory we refer to is the one of reductive groups over an arbitrary basis. Let us remind the reader of some conventions: a group scheme G over a basis S is reductive if it is affine and smooth over S , with connected and reductive fibres (see [15, XIX, Définition 2.7]). A definition of Borel subgroups in this framework can be found in [15, XXII Exemples 5.2.3.a)], see also [15, XXVI Définition 1.1] for a definition of parabolic subgroups. A reference for the study of the scheme of automorphisms of a group scheme is [15, XXIV].

Let k be a field and C be a smooth geometrically connected projective k -curve. In [3], K. A. Behrend defines the notion of the canonical parabolic subgroup of a reductive C -group G which is the twisted form of a constant C -group G_0 (see [3, Definition 5.6]). The author shows that such a group has a unique canonical parabolic subgroup, denoted by P_G^{can} : it is the maximal element (for the inclusion) of the set of parabolic subgroups of G whose degree is the degree of instability of G (see Theorem 7.3 and Definition 4.4 *ibid.*). As a reminder (see Definition 4.1 and Note 4.2 *ibid.*), the degree of a smooth connected C -group is the degree of its Lie algebra seen as a C -vector bundle. The degree of a reductive group is thus always equal to 0. The parabolic subgroup defined by the author generalises that of G as defined by M. Atiyah and R. Bott in [1, §10] when k is of characteristic 0.

Let us set $U_G^{\text{can}} := \text{Rad}_U(P_G^{\text{can}})$. As mentioned in the introduction, when $p > 2 \dim(G) - 2$ and under the above assumptions on G , Theorem 1.8 allows to provide a new proof that the definition of M. Atiyah and R. Bott still make sense in characteristic $p > 0$. In this framework, the parabolic subgroups obtained respectively by K. A. Behrend in [3, Theorem 7.3] (and that are always defined), and by M. Atiyah and R. Bott in [1, §10] (that is defined only for $p = 0$ or $p > 2 \dim(G) - 2$), coincide. This is the point of this section.

Let V be a vector bundle over a curve C . As a reminder,

- the slope of V , denoted by $\mu(V)$, is the quotient $\deg(V)/\text{rank}(V)$ where $\deg(V)$ and $\text{rank}(V)$ are respectively the degree and the rank of the vector bundle V . Let us in particular underline that V is of positive (respectively negative) slope if and only if V has positive (respectively negative) degree;
- any vector bundle over a curve admits a Harder–Narasimhan filtration (see [18, 1.3.9]), that is a filtration by vector subbundles such that the successive quotient are semistable with strictly decreasing slope.

Let us denote by $\mu_{\min}(V)$ (respectively $\mu_{\max}(V)$) the minimum (respectively the maximum) of slopes of the successive quotients that occur in this filtration.

In order to avoid heavy notations, we denote:

- by $P := P_G^{\text{can}}$ the canonical parabolic subgroup of G ,
- by I the type of P ,
- and by P_0 the parabolic subgroup of G_0 from which P is a twisted form.

The couple $({}^E G_0, {}^{E_{P_0}} P_0)$ naturally identifies with (G, P) , where E is the $\text{Aut}(G_0, P_0)_k$ -torsor $\text{Isom}((G_0, P_0), (G, P))$, and E_{P_0} is its restriction to P_0 (see [15, Exposé XXIV], in particular Corollary 2.2). This restriction of structure is said to be canonical (see [3, §8] as well as the preamble and Lemma 4 of [19]). The associated $P_0/\text{Rad}_U(P_0)$ -torsor is thus semi-stable. this means that the reductive group $P/\text{Rad}_U(P)$ it defines is semistable. As a reminder a reductive k -group H is semistable if any parabolic subgroup $Q \subseteq H$ is of negative or 0 degree, see [3, Definition 4.4]).

Let us go back to our notations. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} := {}^E\mathfrak{g}_0$ is a vector bundle over C . It thus admits a Harder–Narasimhan filtration:

$$0 \subsetneq E_{-r} \subsetneq E_{-r+1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq E_{-1} \subsetneq E_0 \subsetneq E_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq E_l = \mathfrak{g},$$

where the indices are chosen in such a way that:

- the slopes $\mu(E_i/E_{i-1})$ are non positive for $0 \leq i \leq l$,
- and the slopes $\mu(E_{-i}/E_{-i-1})$ are positive for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$.

The following lemma allows a first comparison between $\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ and E_0 . Its proof requires to compare the semi-stability of a H_0 -torsor and that of the vector bundle it induces (for H_0 a constant C -group). This is the point of [22, Theorem 3.1] when H_0 is semisimple. The general case of a reductive group when the connected component of the center of H_0 acts by homothetic is detailed in [4, Proposition 6.9].

Lemma 7.1. *When $p > 2h(G) - 2$ the Lie algebra of the canonical parabolic subgroup as defined by K. A. Behrend satisfies the inclusion $\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}} \subseteq E_0$.*

Proof. As previously mentioned, the $P_0/\text{Rad}_U(P_0)$ -torsor induced by P_0 is semistable because P is the canonical parabolic subgroup of $G = {}^E G_0$. Let us remark that one has $h(G_0) = h(G)$ and $h(P_0) = h(P)$. This comes from the definition of the Coxeter number (see subsections 2.1 and 2.3). Let us moreover note that [4, Proposition 6.9] holds true, because when $p > 2h(G) - 2$ the Adjoint representation $\text{Ad} : P_0/\text{Rad}_U(P_0) \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{rad}_\mathfrak{u}(P_0))$ is of low height (see Remark 5.9). Therefore the induced vector bundle $\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}/\mathfrak{rad}_\mathfrak{u}(P_G^{\text{can}})$ is semistable. It is thus of degree 0 (because the quotient $P/\text{Rad}_U(P)$ is reductive), so $\mu_{\min}(\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}) = 0$. As by construction $\mu_{\max}(\mathfrak{g}/E_0) = \mu(E_1/E_0) < \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) \leq 0$, the only possible morphism between $\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ and \mathfrak{g}/E_0 is the trivial morphism. In other words the inclusion $\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}} \subseteq E_0$ holds true. \square

The main point of this section is to determine some conditions under which the equality $E_0 = \mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ is satisfied. A first criterion is obtained by making additional assumptions on the slopes of the successive quotients of the Harder–Narasimhan filtrations of both $\mathfrak{rad}_\mathfrak{u}(P_G^{\text{can}})$ and $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$:

Proposition 7.2. *When $p > 2h(G) - 2$, if:*

1. *the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of $\mathfrak{u}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ admits successive quotients whose slopes are strictly positive,*
2. *the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ admits successive quotients of strictly negative slopes,*

then E_0 is the Lie algebra of P_G^{can} while E_{-1} is that of U_G^{can} .

Proof. In order to avoid heavy notations, we set $U := \text{Rad}_U(P_G^{\text{can}})$ and $\mathfrak{u} := \mathfrak{u}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$.

By assumption one has $\mu_{\min}(\mathfrak{u}) > 0$ and the equality $\mu_{\max}(\mathfrak{g}/E_{-1}) = \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) \leq 0$ holds true. Thus the only possible morphism between \mathfrak{u} and \mathfrak{g}/E_{-1} is the trivial one. Therefore we have shown the inclusion $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq E_{-1}$.

By assumption $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$ admits a filtration by semistable quotients of strictly negative slope. As P is the canonical parabolic subgroup of G , for the same reasons as the one involved in proof of Lemma 7.1, the quotient $\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{u}$ is semistable and of slope 0, hence the equality $\mu_{\max}(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{u}) = \mu(\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{u}) = 0$. As by construction $\mu_{\min}(E_{-1}) = \mu(E_{-1}/E_{-2}) > \mu(E_{-1}/E_0) > 0$, the only possible morphism between E_{-1} and $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{u}$ is trivial, whence the equality $\mathfrak{u} = E_{-1}$. To summarise, the situation is as follows $E_{-2} \subsetneq E_{-1} = \mathfrak{u} \subsetneq \mathfrak{p} \subset E_0 \subsetneq E_1$ and it remains to show that $\mathfrak{p} = E_0$.

By assumption the slopes of the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$ are strictly negative, so $\mu_{\max}(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}) < 0$. As one has $\mathfrak{u} = E_{-1}$ the quotient $\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{u}$ is a subbundle of E_0/E_{-1} , which is semistable. In other words the inequality $\mu(\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{u}) < \mu(E_0/E_{-1})$ is satisfied. The quotient $\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{u}$ is of slope 0 because it is of degree 0. As the slope $\mu(E_0/E_{-1})$ is not positive by construction, the following vanishing condition is actually satisfied $\mu_{\min}(E_0) = \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) = 0$. The only possible morphism between E_0 and $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$ is therefore the trivial morphism, so we have shown that $E_0 = \mathfrak{p}$. \square

When \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a non degenerate symmetric G -equivariant bilinear form κ the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of \mathfrak{g} has a very specific shape, namely:

Lemma 7.3. *Under the above assumptions the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of \mathfrak{g} is such that $l = r + 1$ and $E_{-i} \cong E_{i-1}^\perp$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$.*

Proof. If κ is non degenerate then $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g}^\vee$ and the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of \mathfrak{g}^\vee is given by:

$$0 \subsetneq (E^\vee)_{-r} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq (E^\vee)_{-1} \subsetneq (E^\vee)_0 \subsetneq (E^\vee)_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq (E^\vee)_l = \mathfrak{g}^\vee,$$

where $(E^\vee)_{-i} = (\mathfrak{g}/E_{i+l-r-1})^\vee$ if $0 \leq i \leq r$ and $(E^\vee)_i = (\mathfrak{g}/E_{-i+l-r+1})^\vee$ if $0 \leq i \leq l$. Indeed:

- the bundle $(E^\vee)_{-r} = (\mathfrak{g}/E_{l-1})^\vee$ is semistable, because \mathfrak{g}/E_{l-1} is (this is the first quotient of the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of \mathfrak{g}),
- the quotient $(E^\vee)_{-i}/(E^\vee)_{-i-1}$ is isomorphic to $(E_{i+l-r}/E_{i+l-r-1})^\vee$ (by application of Snake Lemma), therefore $(E^\vee)_{-i}/(E^\vee)_{-i-1}$ is semistable for all $0 \leq i \leq r$. The same reasoning holds for any $0 \leq i \leq l$ as one can show on the same way that $(E^\vee)_i/(E^\vee)_{i-1}$ is isomorphic to $(E_{-i+l-r+1}/E_{i+l-r})^\vee$,
- the preceding isomorphisms ensure the desired strictness of the inequalities for slopes.

The equalities $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g}^\vee$ and $E_{-i} \cong (E^\vee)_{-i} = (E/E_{i-1})^\vee \cong E_{i-1}^\perp$ then follow from the uniqueness of the Harder–Narasimhan filtration. \square

Remark 7.4. Lemma 7.3 allows us to remark that under the conditions of Proposition 1.16, the slopes of the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}} = \mathfrak{g}/E_0$ are strictly negative and those of the Harder–Narasimhan $\text{de } \mathfrak{u}_\mathfrak{g}^{\text{can}}$ are strictly positive. In other words, the assumptions required at Proposition 1.16 imply those of Proposition 7.2.

As mentioned in the introduction, when k is of characteristic 0, the equality $E_0 = P$ is proven in [1, §10]. Given a constant reductive group G_0 over a k -curve C , Atiyah–Bott definition was actually the definition of the canonical parabolic subgroup of a G_0 torsor G before K. A. Behrend’s work (so such an object was at first only defined in characteristic 0). In characteristic $p > 0$, the equality $E_0 = P$ is given:

- by V. B. Mehta in [37, Theorem 2.6] when $p > 2 \dim(G)$ (see also the paper of V. B. Mehta et S. Subramanian [36, Proposition 3.4] when $p > \max(2 \dim G, 4(\text{h}(G) - 1))$),
- and by A. Langer in [30, Proposition 3.3] when E admits a strong Harder–Narasimhan filtration (see [30, Definition 3.1]). This last condition is in particular satisfied when $p > 3$ and the minimal slope of the tangent bundle of X is strictly positive (see [30, Corollary 6.4] and [36, Theorem 4.1]).

Theorem 1.8 allows us to show the equality of Proposition 7.2 and provides a new proof for it when $p > 2 \dim(G) - 2$ by mimicking the one already known in characteristic 0.

Remark 7.5. Some of the results stated in the article of V. Balaji, P. Deligne and A. J. Parameswaran [2] already allow to show Proposition 7.2 when G admits an almost faithful representation of low height and $p > \text{h}(G)$. This amounts to require $p > 2 \text{h}(G) - 2$ if G is simple and allows to show [36, Proposition 3.4] without the additional assumption $p > 4(\text{h}(G) - 1)$ (this assumption allowed the authors to make use of a result of J-P. Serre coming from representation theory to reduce the proof to the case $G := \text{GL}_n$).

7.2 Proof of Proposition 1.16

Let us remind the reader of the notations of this section: in what follows and unless otherwise stated k is a field and C is a projective, smooth and geometrically connected k -curve. We denote by K its function field whose algebraic closure is denoted by \bar{K} . Let G be a reductive C -group which is the twisted form of a constant C -group G_0 and assume that \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a non degenerate Killing form. Let us moreover denote:

- by P the canonical parabolic subgroup of G (as defined by K. A. Behrend in [3, Theorem 7.3]),
- by P_0 the parabolic subgroup of G from which P is a twisted form,
- by E the $\text{Aut}(G_0, P_0)_C$ -torsor $\text{Isom}((G_0, P_0), (G, P))$ and by E_{P_0} its restriction to P_0 .

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = {}^E\mathfrak{g}_0$ seen as a vector bundle over C admits a Harder–Narasimhan filtration:

$$0 \subsetneq E_{-r} \subsetneq E_{-r+1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq E_{-1} \subsetneq E_0 \subsetneq E_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq E_l = \mathfrak{g},$$

where the indices are chosen such that $\mu(E_i/E_{i-1}) \leq 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq l$ and $\mu(E_{-i}/E_{-i-1}) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$. According to Lemma 7.3, any factor of the filtration satisfies $E_{-i} \cong E_{i-1}^\perp$ because \mathfrak{g} is endowed with a non degenerate Killing form.

The proof of Proposition 1.16 requires to show that:

1. the factor E_0 is a Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} and the factor E_{-1} is a nilpotent ideal of E_0 .
Let us note that a priori one would have to show that E_{-1} is actually p -nil, but the assumption of the existence of a non degenerate bilinear form on \mathfrak{g} guarantees the equivalence between p -nilpotency and ad-nilpotency (see Remark 2.9);
2. the factor E_0 derives from a parabolic subgroup of G .

To prove the first point we make use of results that ensure a compatibility between the tensor product and the semi-stability of its factors. We then need Corollary 1.15 to prove the second point, as this result allows us to show, on the generic geometric fibre, that $(E_0)_{\bar{K}}$ is a parabolic subalgebra.

7.2.1 Semi-stability of tensor products

The point of this paragraph is to show:

1. that E_0 is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} ,
2. that E_{-1} is a nilpotent ideal of E_0 ,
3. the third point of Proposition 1.16.

We start by showing the following lemma:

Lemma 7.6. *When $p > 2 \dim G - 2$, for any couple of indices $-r \leq i, j \leq l$ in the above Harder–Narasimhan filtration of \mathfrak{g} the slope identity $\mu_{\min}(E_i \otimes E_j) = \mu_{\min}(E_i) + \mu_{\min}(E_j)$ is satisfied.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the following results:

1. if k is of characteristic 0, the tensor product of semistable C -vector bundles V_1 and V_2 is still semistable and of slope $\mu(V_1) + \mu(V_2)$ (see [1, Lemma 10.1] see also [32, Theorem 6]), the result extends to k non algebraically closed),
2. if k is a field of characteristic $p > 0$, let V_1 and V_2 be two semistable C -vector bundles and assume that $p + 2 > \text{rank}(V_1) + \text{rank}(V_2)$. Then the vector bundle $V_1 \otimes V_2$ is still semistable of slope $\mu(V_1) + \mu(V_2)$ (see [22, Remark 3.4], and [32, Theorem 8]).

□

This lemma allows us to show that E_0 is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . Let us consider the Lie bracket:

$$\phi : E_0 \otimes E_0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}/E_0,$$

where we made use of the isomorphism $(\mathfrak{g}^\vee)^\vee \cong \mathfrak{g}$ because κ is non degenerate.

As $E_{-1} \cong E_0^\perp = (\mathfrak{g}/E_0)^\vee$ (according to Lemma 7.3) the degree of E_{-1} satisfies

$$\deg(E_{-1}) = -(\deg(\mathfrak{g}) - \deg(E_0)) = \deg(E_0),$$

where the last equality is induced by the fact that $\deg(\mathfrak{g}) = 0$. So one actually has obtained the vanishing condition $\mu_{\min}(E_0) = \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) = 0$.

Moreover, according to Lemma 7.6,

$$\mu_{\min}(E_0 \otimes E_0) = \mu_{\min}(E_0) + \mu_{\min}(E_0) = 0,$$

and $\mu_{\max}(\mathfrak{g}/E_0) = \mu(E_1/E_0) < \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) = 0$. This implies that the morphism ϕ is necessarily trivial: the vector bundle E_0 is thus a Lie algebra bundle.

This kind of reasoning also allow to show that E_{-1} is a nilpotent ideal of \mathfrak{g} . For any $0 \leq j \leq r$ let us consider the bracket:

$$\phi : E_{-1} \otimes E_{-j} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}/E_{-j-1},$$

with the convention that $E_{-r-1} = 0$. As by assumption $p > 2 \dim G - 2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\min}(E_{-1} \otimes E_{-j}) &= \mu_{\min}(E_{-1}) + \mu_{\min}(E_{-j}) \\ &= \mu(E_{-1}/E_{-2}) + \mu(E_{-j}/E_{-j-1}) \\ &> \mu(E_{-j}/E_{-j-1}) = \mu_{\max}(E_0/E_{-j-1}), \end{aligned}$$

because $\mu(E_{-1}/E_{-2}) > \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) = 0$. Indeed, the morphism ϕ is necessarily trivial, thus $[E_{-1}, E_{-j}] \subset E_{-j-1}$ for any $0 \leq j$, and E_{-1} is a nilpotent ideal of E_0 .

In order to show the third point of Proposition 1.16 we once again consider the following Lie bracket for any $0 \leq i \leq r$:

$$E_{-i} \otimes E_0 \rightarrow E_0/E_{-i},$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\min}(E_0 \otimes E_{-i}) &= \mu_{\min}(E_0) + \mu_{\min}(E_{-i}) \\ &= \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) + \mu(E_{-i}/E_{-i-1}) \\ &> \mu_{\max}(E_0/E_{-i}) = \mu(E_{-i+1}/E_{-i}), \end{aligned}$$

as $\mu(E_0/E_{-1}) = 0$ and $\mu(E_{-i}/E_{-i-1}) > \mu(E_{-i+1}/E_{-i})$ by assumption. The morphism ϕ is therefore necessarily trivial and E_{-i} is an ideal of E_0 , nilpotent because so is E_{-1} .

Remark 7.7. The key point of the preceding proof is the equality

$$\mu_{\min}(E_0 \otimes E_0) = \mu_{\min}(E_0) + \mu_{\min}(E_0) = 0,$$

which is satisfied when $p > 2 \operatorname{rank} E_0 - 2$. This condition, and more generally the condition of compatibility between the stability of vector bundles and their tensor products is ensured in the articles of V. B. Mehta and S. Subramanian [36], and V. B. Mehta [37] by the assumption $p > 2 \dim(G)$.

7.2.2 Consequences of corollary 1.15

Corollary 1.15 allows us to show that E_0 is a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , this is the second part of the first point of Proposition 1.16. It moreover provides a characterisation of such on the geometric fibres in terms of the instability parabolic subgroup of E_{-1} . This is the point of the second point of the aforementioned Proposition.

As G is a reductive group, the Lie bracket on $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{K}}$ comes from the Lie bracket on \mathfrak{g} . As a reminder and according to Lemma 7.3, the ideal E_{-1} is the orthogonal of E_0 for the Killing form on \mathfrak{g} . Thus we have:

$$(E_{-1})_{\bar{K}} := E_{-1} \times_C \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{K}) = (E_0^\perp)_{\bar{K}} = (E_0)_{\bar{K}}^\perp$$

and E_{-1} is a nil ideal of $(E_0)_{\bar{K}}$. According to Corollary 1.15, the subalgebra $(E_0)_{\bar{K}} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{K}}$ is thus a parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{K}}$. It derives from a parabolic subgroup \tilde{Q} of $G_{\bar{K}}$. According to [15, XXII, Corollaire 5.3.4] we have that $\tilde{Q} = N_{G_{\bar{K}}}((E_0)_{\bar{K}})^0$ because $G_{\bar{K}}$ is of type (RA) (as $p > 2 \dim(G) - 2 \geq 2h - 2$ the morphism $G \rightarrow G^{\text{Ad}}$ is separable). This in particular implies the smoothness of the involved normaliser.

Let us show that this parabolic subgroup is actually defined over K . As E_0 is defined over C , thus over K , we can consider the normaliser $N_{G_K}((E_0)_K)$ (which is representable according to [13, II, §1 n°3 Théorème 3.6 b)). The equality $N_{G_{\bar{K}}}((E_0)_{\bar{K}})^0 = N_{G_K}((E_0)_K)^0 \times_K \bar{K}$ holds true according to [13, II, §1 n°3]. As $N_{G_{\bar{K}}}((E_0)_{\bar{K}})^0$ is in particular smooth, the situation is compatible with base change so we have that:

$$(E_0)_K \times_K \bar{K} = (E_0)_{\bar{K}} = \operatorname{Lie}(\tilde{Q}) = \operatorname{Lie}(N_{G_{\bar{K}}}((E_0)_{\bar{K}})^0) = \operatorname{Lie}(N_{G_K}((E_0)_K)^0) \times_K \bar{K}.$$

In other words $(E_0)_K$ is the Lie algebra of a smooth subgroup of G_K with parabolic geometric fibre, thus of a parabolic subgroup (by definition, see [15, XXVI, Définition 1.1]).

The latter extends on a unique way to a parabolic subgroup $Q \subseteq G$ over C (because the scheme of parabolic subgroups of G is projective, see [15, exposé XXVI, corollaire 3.5]). It remains to show that $\operatorname{Lie}(Q) = E_0$. As a reminder two \mathcal{O}_C -submodules of $\mathfrak{g} = E_l = E_{r-1}$ that are locally direct factors are equals if they are geometrically the same. This allows us to conclude because one has the following generic identity:

$$\operatorname{Grass}_S(n, E_0)(C) = \operatorname{Grass}_S(n, E_0)(K) = \{\text{subvector bundles of rank } n \text{ of } E_0 \times_C K\},$$

which is ensured by the projectivity of the S -scheme $\text{Grass}_S(n, E_0)$ obtained for example in [28, Definition 1.7.1 et Remarks 1.7.5]. Let us remark that $\text{Grass}_S(n, E_0)$ is well defined as E_0 is a locally direct factor, so is any factor of the above Harder–Narasimhan filtration.

By assumption (see also [7, Planches]) the characteristic of k satisfies $p > 2 \dim(G) > 2(\mathfrak{h}(G) - 1)$. According to Lemma 7.1 one thus has $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq E_0 = \mathfrak{q}$ and $E_{-1} = \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(Q)$, that allows us to obtain the inclusions $E_{-1} \subseteq \mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(P) \subseteq \mathfrak{p} \subseteq E_0$. The quotient E_0/E_{-1} is semi-stable hence $\mu(\mathfrak{p}/E_{-1}) < \mu(E_0/E_{-1}) = \mu(\mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{rad}_{\mathfrak{u}}(Q)) = 0$ and thus $\deg(\mathfrak{p}) \leq \deg(E_{-1}) = \deg(\mathfrak{q})$. The parabolic subgroup P is the canonical parabolic subgroup of G , therefore it is maximal among the parabolic subgroups of G of maximal degree (see [3, Theorem 7.3]), hence the equality $P = Q$. This leads to the equality of Lie algebras $E_0 = \mathfrak{p}$ and $E_{-1} = \mathfrak{u}$ and ends the proof of the first point. Finally, according to Corollary 1.15, the equality $Q_{\bar{K}} = \tilde{Q} = P_{G_{\bar{K}}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}_{\bar{K}}^\perp})$ holds on the generic geometric fibre. This settles the proof of the second point of Proposition 1.16.

Remark 7.8. If G is split over X , let $T \subseteq G$ be a maximal torus of G and denote by $T_{\bar{K}} \subset G_{\bar{K}} \subset \tilde{Q}$ the maximal subtorus obtained by base change. According to [15, XXV, corollaire 1.3] there exists a triple $(T_{\mathbb{Z}}, Q_{\mathbb{Z}}, G_{\mathbb{Z}})$ that provides a triple $(T_{\bar{K}}, Q_{\bar{K}} = \tilde{Q}, G_{\bar{K}})$ after base change. For any group of multiplicative type H let us denote by $X^*(H)$ the group of cocharacters of H .

Let $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \lambda_{\mathfrak{p}_{\bar{K}}^\perp} \cap X^*(T_{\mathbb{Z}})$ be an indivisible cocharacter of the intersection. It defines a parabolic subgroup $P_{G_{\mathbb{Z}}}(\beta)$ such that $Q = P_G(\beta)$ et $(P_G(\beta))_{\bar{K}} = P_{G_{\bar{K}}}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}_{\bar{K}}^\perp})$. If G is not split, the same reasoning is still valid locally, as G is a twisted form of a constant group (thus G can be pinned).

Acknowledgements The author would like to thank Philippe Gille for his precious help, his availability, his patience and all the fruitful conversations they had, Benoît Dejoncheere for his careful proofreading and advice, the reviewers of her PhD manuscript, Anne-Marie Aubert and Vikraman Balaji, for their useful remarks and corrections. Any critical remark must be exclusively addressed to the author of this paper.

References

- [1] M. F. Atiyah and R. Bott. The Yang-Mills equations over Riemann surfaces. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 308(1505):523–615, 1983.
- [2] V. Balaji, P. Deligne, and A. J. Parameswaran. On complete reducibility in characteristic p . *Épjournal de Géométrie Algébrique*, Volume 1, 2017.
- [3] Kai A. Behrend. Semi-stability of reductive group schemes over curves. *Mathematische Annalen*, 301(2):281–306, 1995.
- [4] Indranil Biswas and Yogish I. Holla. Harder-Narasimhan reduction of a principal bundle. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 174:201–223, 2004.
- [5] A. Borel and J. Tits. Éléments unipotents et sous-groupes paraboliques de groupes réductifs. i. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 12:95–104, 1971.
- [6] Armand Borel. *Linear algebraic groups*, volume 126 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [7] N. Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXXIV. Groupes et algèbres de Lie. Chapitre IV: Groupes de Coxeter et systèmes de Tits. Chapitre V: Groupes engendrés par des réflexions. Chapitre VI: systèmes de racines*. Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1337. Hermann, Paris, 1968.
- [8] N. Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXVI. Groupes et algèbres de Lie. Chapitre I: Algèbres de Lie*. Seconde édition. Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1285. Hermann, Paris, 1971.
- [9] N. Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXXVIII: Groupes et algèbres de Lie. Chapitre VII: Sous-algèbres de Cartan, éléments réguliers. Chapitre VIII: Algèbres de Lie semi-simples déployées*. Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1364. Hermann, Paris, 1975.
- [10] Roger W. Carter. *Finite groups of Lie type*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1985. Conjugacy classes and complex characters, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

- [11] Brian Conrad, Ofer Gabber, and Gopal Prasad. *Pseudo-reductive groups*, volume 26 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2015.
- [12] Pierre Deligne. Semi-simplicit  de produits tensoriels en caract ristique p . *Invent. Math.*, 197(3):587–611, 2014.
- [13] M. Demazure and P. Gabriel. *Groupes alg briques. Tome I: G om trie alg brique, g n ralit s, groupes commutatifs*. Masson & Cie,  diteur, Paris; North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1970. Avec un appendice it Corps de classes local par Michiel Hazewinkel.
- [14] M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck. *Sch mas en groupes (SGA 3). Tome I. Propri t s g n rales des sch mas en groupes*, volume 7 of *Documents Math matiques (Paris) [Mathematical Documents (Paris)]*. Soci t  Math matique de France, Paris, 2011. S minaire de G om trie Alg brique du Bois Marie 1962–64, avec la collaboration de M. Artin, J.-E. Bertin, P. Gabriel, M. Raynaud and J-P. Serre,  dition recompos e et annot e de l’ dition originale de 1970,  diteurs P. Gille et P. Polo.
- [15] M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck. *Sch mas en groupes (SGA 3). Tome III. Structure des sch mas en groupes r ductifs*, volume 8 of *Documents Math matiques (Paris) [Mathematical Documents (Paris)]*. Soci t  Math matique de France, Paris, 2011. S minaire de G om trie Alg brique du Bois Marie 1962–64, avec la collaboration de M. Artin, J.-E. Bertin, P. Gabriel, M. Raynaud and J-P. Serre,  dition recompos e et annot e de l’ dition originale de 1970,  diteurs P. Gille et P. Polo.
- [16] V. Drinfeld and D. Gaitsgory. On a theorem of Braden. *Transform. Groups*, 19(2):313–358, 2014.
- [17] A. Grothendieck.  l ments de g om trie alg brique. IV.  tude locale des sch mas et des morphismes de sch mas. III. *Inst. Hautes  tudes Sci. Publ. Math.*, (28):255, 1966.
- [18] G. Harder and M.S. Narasimhan. On the cohomology groups of moduli spaces of vector bundles on curves. *Mathematische Annalen*, 212:215–248, 1974.
- [19] Jochen Heinloth. Bounds for Behrend’s conjecture on the canonical reduction. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (14):Art. ID rnn045, 17, 2008.
- [20] S. Herpel and D. I. Stewart. On the smoothness of normalisers, the subalgebra structure of modular lie algebras, and the cohomology of small representations. *Doc. Math., J. DMV*, 21:1–37, 2016.
- [21] James E. Humphreys. *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, volume 9 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1978. Second printing, revised.
- [22] S. Ilangovan, V. B. Mehta, and A. J. Parameswaran. Semistability and semisimplicity in representations of low height in positive characteristic. In *A tribute to C. S. Seshadri (Chennai, 2002)*, Trends Math., pages 271–282. Birkh user, Basel, 2003.
- [23] J. C. Jantzen. *Nilpotent Orbits in Representation Theory*, pages 1–211. Birkh user Boston, Boston, MA, 2004.
- [24] Jens Carsten Jantzen. Representations of Lie algebras in positive characteristic. In *Representation theory of algebraic groups and quantum groups*, volume 40 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 175–218. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2004.
- [25] Marion Jeannin. *Sur les sous-groupes paraboliques associ s   un groupe r ductif*. Theses, Universit  de Lyon (COMUE), September 2020.
- [26] Marion Jeannin. Integration questions in separably good characteristics, 2021.
- [27] George R. Kempf. Instability in invariant theory. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 108(2):299–316, 1978.
- [28] J nos Koll r. *Rational curves on algebraic varieties*, volume 32 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [29] Darci L. Kracht. *Applications of the Artin-Hasse exponential series and its generalizations to finite algebra groups*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2011. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Kent State University.

- [30] Adrian Langer. Semistable principal G -bundles in positive characteristic. *Duke Math. J.*, 128(3):511–540, 2005.
- [31] P. Levy, G. McNinch, and D. M. Testerman. Nilpotent subalgebras of semisimple lie algebras. 347, 05 2009.
- [32] Marco Maculan. Tensor product and semi-stability: four variations on a theme. *Eur. Math. Soc. Newsl.*, (108):8–15, 2018.
- [33] George McNinch. Completely reducible Lie subalgebras. *Transform. Groups*, 12(1):127–135, 2007.
- [34] George J. McNinch. Abelian unipotent subgroups of reductive groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 167(2-3):269–300, 2002.
- [35] George J. McNinch. Nilpotent orbits over ground fields of good characteristic. *Math. Ann.*, 329(1):49–85, 2004.
- [36] V. B. Mehta and S. Subramanian. On the Harder-Narasimhan filtration of principal bundles. In *Algebra, arithmetic and geometry, Part I, II (Mumbai, 2000)*, volume 16 of *Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Stud. Math.*, pages 405–415. Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Bombay, 2002.
- [37] Vikram Bhagvandas Mehta. Representations of algebraic groups and principal bundles on algebraic varieties. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002)*, pages 629–635. Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.
- [38] Julia Pevtsova and Jim Stark. Varieties of elementary subalgebras of maximal dimension for modular Lie algebras. In *Geometric and topological aspects of the representation theory of finite groups*, volume 242 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 339–375. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [39] Alexander Premet. A modular analogue of Morozov’s theorem on maximal subalgebras of simple Lie algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 311:833–884, 2017.
- [40] Alexander Premet and David I. Stewart. Classification of the maximal subalgebras of exceptional Lie algebras over fields of good characteristic. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 32(4):965–1008, 2019.
- [41] G. B. Seligman. *Modular Lie algebras*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 40. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1967.
- [42] J.-P. Serre. 1998 moursund lectures at the university of oregon. *ArXiv Mathematics e-prints*, may 2003.
- [43] Jean-Pierre Serre. Sur la semi-simplicit  des produits tensoriels de repr sentations de groupes. *Invent. Math.*, 116(1-3):513–530, 1994.
- [44] T. A. Springer. The unipotent variety of a semi-simple group. In *Algebraic Geometry (Internat. Colloq., Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Bombay, 1968)*, pages 373–391. Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1969.
- [45] T. A. Springer and R. Steinberg. Conjugacy classes. In *Seminar on Algebraic Groups and Related Finite Groups (The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J., 1968/69)*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 131, pages 167–266. Springer, Berlin, 1970.
- [46] Robert Steinberg. Torsion in reductive groups. *Advances in Math.*, 15:63–92, 1975.
- [47] Helmut Strade and Rolf Farnsteiner. *Modular Lie algebras and their representations*, volume 116 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1988.
- [48] Adrian Vasiu. Normal, unipotent subgroup schemes of reductive groups. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 341(2):79–84, 2005.
- [49] B. Ju. Veisfeiler. A class of unipotent sub-groups of semi-simple algebraic groups. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 21(2 (128)):222–223, 1966.