

# THE TAYLOR–WILES METHOD FOR REDUCTIVE GROUPS

DMITRI WHITMORE

**ABSTRACT.** We construct a local deformation problem for residual Galois representations  $\bar{\rho}$  valued in an arbitrary reductive group  $\hat{G}$  which we use to develop a variant of the Taylor–Wiles method. Our generalization allows Taylor–Wiles places for which the image of Frobenius is semisimple, a weakening of the regular semisimple constraint imposed previously in the literature. We introduce the notion of  $\hat{G}$ -adequate subgroup, our corresponding ‘big image’ condition. When  $\hat{G}$  is a simply connected simple group of type C or of exceptional type and  $\hat{G} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n$  is a faithful irreducible representation of minimal dimension, we show that a subgroup is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate if it is  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducible and the residue characteristic is sufficiently large.

We apply our ideas to the case  $\hat{G} = \mathrm{GSp}_4$  and prove a modularity lifting theorem for abelian surfaces over a totally real field  $F$  which holds under weaker hypotheses than in the work of Boxer–Calegari–Gee–Pilloni. We deduce some modularity results for elliptic curves over quadratic extensions of  $F$ .

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction . . . . .	2
1.1. Main ideas and theorems . . . . .	2
1.2. Structure of the paper . . . . .	5
1.3. Acknowledgements . . . . .	6
2. Setup for a local deformation problem . . . . .	6
2.1. Lifting the Lie algebra . . . . .	7
2.2. Lifting $M_{\bar{g}}$ . . . . .	9
2.3. Functoriality properties of $M_g$ . . . . .	13
2.4. A construction of $M_g$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ . . . . .	14
3. Deformation theory . . . . .	15
3.1. Deformation theory of representations . . . . .	16
3.2. Taylor–Wiles places . . . . .	18
3.3. Dual groups and the $\Delta_Q$ -action . . . . .	24
3.4. Presentations of framed deformation rings in the number fields case . . . . .	26
4. $\hat{G}$ -adequate subgroups . . . . .	28
4.1. $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducible implies $\hat{G}$ -adequate . . . . .	29
4.2. $\hat{G}$ -adequate implies $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducible . . . . .	31
4.3. $\mathrm{Sp}_4$ -adequate subgroups of $\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . . . . .	36
5. Local computations . . . . .	37
5.1. A Satake isomorphism . . . . .	37
5.2. An abelian subalgebra of the $\mathfrak{p}_1$ -Hecke algebra . . . . .	43
5.3. Parahoric invariants . . . . .	46
5.4. Jacquet module computations . . . . .	49
5.5. Computations in the case $G = \mathrm{GSp}_4$ . . . . .	50
6. Local-global compatibility . . . . .	52

7. Modularity of abelian surfaces . . . . .	55
7.1. Setup and notation . . . . .	55
7.2. Preparation for the Taylor–Wiles method . . . . .	58
7.3. Patching . . . . .	63
7.4. Modularity results for abelian surfaces . . . . .	65
8. Inductions from $\mathrm{GL}_2$ and modularity of elliptic curves . . . . .	67
8.1. Modularity lifting for elliptic curves . . . . .	67
8.2. Projectively dihedral representations . . . . .	72
8.3. Modularity when $p = 5$ . . . . .	77
Appendix A. . . . .	80
References . . . . .	81

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Main ideas and theorems.** In this paper we introduce a new setup which provides a generalization of the Taylor–Wiles method for an arbitrary reductive group. We show how our constructions may be applied to the context of proving modularity results for abelian surfaces over totally real fields, extending the work of [BCGP21].

Let  $\hat{G}$  be a reductive group over  $\mathbb{Z}$  and let  $p$  a prime number not dividing the order of the Weyl group of  $\hat{G}$ . Let  $F$  be a number field with absolute Galois group  $G_F$  and fix a continuous representation  $\bar{\rho} : G_F \rightarrow \hat{G}(\mathbb{F}_p)$  which is absolutely  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible (see Definition 4.1). The main idea is to consider finite places  $v$  of  $\mathcal{O}_F$  for which

- $\bar{\rho}$  is unramified at  $v$
- the residue field  $k(v)$  satisfies  $\#k(v) \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$
- the image of the Frobenius element  $\bar{g} = \bar{\rho}(\mathrm{Frob}_v)$  is semisimple and its centralizer  $M_{\bar{g}} = Z_{\hat{G}_{\mathbb{F}_p}}(\bar{g})$  is connected.

We call such a place  $v$  a Taylor–Wiles place. This is a generalization of previous notions for which  $\bar{g}$  was always taken to be regular semisimple.

The main difficulty arising from our above notion is that the Taylor–Wiles method requires us to consider deformations of  $\bar{\rho}$  for which the inertia subgroup  $I_v$  has image in a torus. While this is automatic in the regular semisimple case, we prove the following theorem to provide us with a ‘canonical’ torus.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $A$  be a complete Noetherian local  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -algebra of residue field  $\mathbb{F}_p$  and let  $g \in \hat{G}(A)$  be a lift of  $\bar{g}$ . Then there is a canonical lift of  $M_{\bar{g}}$  to a closed connected reductive subgroup scheme  $M_g$  of  $\hat{G}_A$ .*

A more precise statement is given in Theorem 2.14. Let  $g$  be the image of a Frobenius lift at  $v$  under a lift  $\rho : G_F \rightarrow \hat{G}(A)$  of  $\bar{\rho}$ . We then define a local deformation problem by admitting all lifts  $\rho$  for which  $I_v$  is valued in the torus given by the connected center of  $M_g$ .

In order to control the arising universal deformation rings, one requires the existence sets of Taylor–Wiles places for which a certain Galois cohomology group (the dual Selmer group) is forced to vanish. Consequently, one typically imposes ‘big image’ hypotheses on the representation  $\bar{\rho}$  (e.g. the  $\hat{G}$ -abundant image condition of [BHK19] or vast representations of [BCGP21]) to guarantee the existence of such sets of Taylor–Wiles places. In Proposition 3.19 we show that the dual Selmer group can be killed off under much

weaker assumptions on  $\bar{\rho}$  if one allows our notion of Taylor–Wiles prime. This motivates the following definition, which is our milder ‘big image’ condition.

**Definition 1.2.** *We say  $H \leq \hat{G}(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *The following groups vanish*
  - (a)  $H^0(H, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{0,\vee})$
  - (b)  $H^1(H, \mathbb{F}_p)$
  - (c)  $H^1(H, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{0,\vee})$
- (2) *For every non-zero simple  $\mathbb{F}_p[H]$ -submodule  $W \leq \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{0,\vee}$  there exists a semisimple element  $h \in H$  whose centralizer  $Z_{\hat{G}_{\mathbb{F}_p}}(h)$  is a connected subgroup of  $\hat{G}$  such that for some  $w \in W$  and  $z \in \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^h)$  we have  $w(z) \neq 0$ .*

Here  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0$  denotes the Lie algebra of the derived group of  $\hat{G}$  (over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ ) equipped with the adjoint action of  $\hat{G}(\mathbb{F}_p)$ ,  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{0,\vee}$  denotes the dual module and  $\mathfrak{z}$  denotes the center of a Lie algebra.

Our notion of Taylor–Wiles and  $\hat{G}$ -adequate subgroup are by analogy with [Tho12]. There unramified places  $v$  are considered for which the  $\bar{\rho}(\text{Frob}_v)$  acts as  $\bar{\psi} \oplus \bar{s}$ , where  $\bar{\psi}$  is an eigenspace which is acted on semisimply. A local deformation problem is then defined by taking lifts of the form  $\psi \oplus s$ , where the action on  $\psi$  is through a scalar. This itself was a generalization of [CHT08], where  $\bar{\psi}$  was required to be 1-dimensional. Thus our generalization of allowing  $\bar{\rho}(\text{Frob}_v)$  to be any semisimple element, rather than regular semisimple, is analogous to allowing repeated eigenvalues in the case of  $\text{GL}_n$ .

An ‘irreducibility implies adequacy’ result has already been established in the case of  $\hat{G} = \text{GL}_n$  when  $p \geq 2(n+1)$  in [GH11]. We use this to deduce an analogous theorem for absolutely irreducible subgroups of some simple linear algebraic groups.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\hat{G}$  be one of the following simple linear algebraic groups over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ :*

- *the special orthogonal group  $\text{SO}_n$  for  $n \geq 3$*
- *the symplectic group  $\text{Sp}_n$  for  $n \geq 2$  even*
- *the simply connected exceptional groups  $G_2, F_4, E_6, E_7, E_8$ .*

*Let  $\hat{G} \hookrightarrow \text{GL}_n$  be a faithful irreducible representation of minimal dimension. If  $p \geq 2(n+1)$  and  $\Gamma \subset \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p})$  is  $\text{GL}_n$ -irreducible, then*

- (1) *(a)  $H^0(\Gamma, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\vee) = 0$*   
*(b)  $H^1(\Gamma, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\vee) = 0$*   
*(c)  $H^1(\Gamma, \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}) = 0$*
- (2)  *$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\text{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}})^\gamma) = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ .*

*Here  $\Gamma^{\text{ss}}$  denotes the set of semisimple elements of  $\Gamma$ . In particular, if  $\hat{G}$  is not special orthogonal then  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate.*

We give a converse to Theorem 1.3 when  $\hat{G}$  is either  $\text{Sp}_{2n}$ ,  $\text{SO}_n$  or  $G_2$  in Corollaries 4.11 and 4.14.

Our methods are then applied with the goal of proving modularity results in the case  $\hat{G} = \text{GSp}_4$ . We are able to prove modularity theorems in which the assumption of [BCGP21] that  $\bar{\rho}$  is ‘vast’ is replaced by the assumption that  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable (see Definition 3.20); this holds when  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)})$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -adequate. This offers a significant upgrade, since condition 2 in Definition 1.2 always holds for irreducible subgroups of  $\text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . In contrast, the corresponding condition with ‘semisimple’ replaced by ‘regular simple’ fails for approximately half of the conjugacy classes of irreducible subgroups of

$\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$  (for some small choices of  $p$ ). Many of our preparatory lemmas (such as the study of various Hecke algebras) are proven for an arbitrary reductive group and are therefore applicable in other settings. Here are the modularity lifting theorems we prove.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which  $p \geq 3$  splits completely. Suppose that  $\rho : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}_4(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$  is a continuous representation satisfying:*

- (1)  $\nu \circ \rho = \varepsilon^{-1}$
- (2)  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\hat{G}$ -reasonable and tidy in the senses of Definition 3.20 and Definition 7.1
- (3) For every  $v|p$ ,  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}}$  is  $p$ -distinguished weight 2 ordinary in the sense of Definition 7.2
- (4) There exists an automorphic representation  $\pi$  of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$ , ordinary in the sense of [BCGP21, Definition 2.4.25], such that  $\overline{\rho_{\pi,p}} \cong \bar{\rho}$ , where  $\rho_{\pi,p}$  is as in Corollary 7.9.
- (5) For every finite place  $v$  of  $F$ , the representations  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}}$  and  $\rho_{\pi,p}|_{G_{F_v}}$  are pure.

Then  $\rho$  is modular and for every finite place  $v$  of  $F$  we have full local-global compatibility.

Here  $\nu : \mathrm{GSp}_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m$  is the similitude character and  $\varepsilon$  is the  $p$ -adic cyclotomic character. A more precise statement of Theorem 1.4 is given in Theorem 7.12

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which  $p \geq 3$  splits completely. Let  $A/F$  be an abelian surface such that*

- (1)  $A$  has good ordinary reduction at every  $v|p$
- (2) for each  $v|p$ , the unit root crystalline eigenvalues are distinct modulo  $p$
- (3)  $A$  admits a polarization of degree prime to  $p$ .

Suppose that the residual Galois representation  $\overline{\rho_{A,p}}$  is such that

- (4)  $\overline{\rho_{A,p}}$  is  $\hat{G}$ -reasonable and tidy
- (5)  $\overline{\rho_{A,p}}$  is ordinarily modular: there exists  $\pi$  an automorphic representation of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  for which
  - (a)  $\pi$  has parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$
  - (b) for every  $v|p$ ,  $\pi_v$  is unramified and ordinary
  - (c)  $\overline{\rho_{A,p}} \cong \overline{\rho_{\pi,p}}$
  - (d) for every finite place  $v$  of  $F$ ,  $\rho_{\pi,p}$  is pure.

Then  $A$  is modular.

Here the Galois representation  $\rho_{A,p}$  is given by the  $p$ -adic cohomology group  $H^1(A_{\overline{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$ . Now let  $K/F$  be an arbitrary quadratic extension. We apply Theorem 1.4 to  $p$ -adic Galois representations of abelian surfaces arising as the restriction of scalars of an elliptic curve over  $K$  and deduce a modularity for lifting theorem for elliptic curves  $E/K$ .

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which  $p \geq 3$  splits completely and let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension in which  $p$  is unramified with Galois group  $\{1, \sigma\}$ . Let  $E/K$  is an elliptic curve and let  $\bar{\varrho} = \overline{\varrho_{E,p}}$  be the attached mod  $p$  Galois representation of determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ . Suppose that the following conditions hold:*

- (1)  $E$  has ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every place  $w|p$
- (2)  $\bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  is absolutely irreducible
- (3)  $\bar{\varrho}$  is ordinarily modular
- (4) if  $p = 3$  or  $p = 5$  then order of the subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p) \times \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  generated by the image of  $\bar{\varrho} \oplus \bar{\varrho}^\sigma$  together with the matrices  $\mathrm{diag}(I, -I)$ ,  $\mathrm{diag}(-I, I)$  is not equal to 64.

Then  $E$  is modular.

Theorem 1.6 often applies even when the image  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  is small, such as when it is projectively dihedral. In some such cases we are able to establish ordinary modularity of  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}}$  via automorphic induction of a character and hence deduce modularity of  $E$  (see, for example, Corollary 8.9 when  $p \geq 7$ ). Here is a precise statement we prove when  $p = 5$ .

**Corollary 1.7.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which 5 splits completely and let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension in which 5 is unramified. There exists representations  $\overline{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_5)$  which are CM-compositum induced from a character  $\overline{\psi} : G_L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_5^\times$  (see Definition 8.7), where  $L/K$  is a quadratic extension, and  $\overline{\psi}$  satisfies  $(\overline{\psi}^2)^\tau|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}} \neq \overline{\psi}^2|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$  for  $\tau \in G_F \setminus G_K$ . Fix such a representation  $\overline{\varrho}$  and suppose that  $E/K$  is an elliptic curve for which  $\overline{\varrho_{E,5}} \cong \overline{\varrho}$  and that  $E$  has ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every  $w|5$ . Then  $E$  is modular. Moreover, the subset of  $X_{\overline{\varrho}}(K)$  given by such elliptic curves which in addition do not have complex multiplication nor have  $j$ -invariant contained in a proper subfield of  $K$  is of positive density (in the sense of Definition 8.15).*

**1.2. Structure of the paper.** In Section 2, we prove in Theorem 2.14 a precise version of Theorem 1.1 and show that our ‘canonical’ torus lift given by the connected center of  $M_{\mathfrak{g}}$  satisfies many of the desired functoriality properties. We also give an alternate construction in the case of lifting to the ring of integers of a finite extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ , which is used in Section 6.

Then in Section 3 we define our Taylor–Wiles local deformation problem by requiring that the inertia subgroup  $I_v$  has image in the torus constructed in Section 2. We then study the Galois cohomological interpretation of our local deformation problem and give a definition of  $\hat{G}$ -adequate subgroups, which is our weakened ‘big image’ condition.

In Section 4 we compare our notion of  $\hat{G}$ -adequate subgroups to absolute irreducibility. From the corresponding result for  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ , we show an ‘irreducibility implies adequacy’ type result for some simple groups. We use computer algebra software `magma` to study the case of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4$  in small characteristic for our applications in Sections 7 and 8, and give a comparison between  $\mathrm{Sp}_4$ -adequacy and a ‘big image’ condition seen previously in the literature using the tables given in Appendix A.

Let  $G$  be the reductive group dual to  $\hat{G}$  and let  $v$  be a Taylor–Wiles place. In Section 5, we explore the representation theory of  $G(F_v)$  in relation to our constructions of Section 3. We explain how our semisimple image of Frobenius gives rise to certain compact open groups  $\mathfrak{p}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $G(F_v)$ , summarized by Construction 5.12. We prove Theorem 5.1, a generalization of the Satake isomorphism, which we use to define certain abelian subalgebras of the Hecke algebras arising from our compact open subgroups. These abelian subalgebras have maximal ideals corresponding to  $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ , and we study the localizations of modules of our Hecke algebras at these maximal ideals. The results obtained are in full generality, but with the precise statements suited for our applications in the  $\hat{G} = \mathrm{GSp}_4$  case. To conclude the section, we restrict to the  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$  case, where there is the local Langlands correspondence of [GT11] available. We show in Proposition 5.18 and Proposition 5.19 that if our localized spaces of invariants of irreducible admissible representations of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v)$  are non-zero, then their image under the local Langlands map is a semisimple Weil–Deligne representation.

The main goal of Section 6 is to prove Proposition 6.3. In rough terms, this states that if we have a sufficiently strong local-global compatibility assumption between an automorphic representation  $\pi$  and an associated Galois representation at the Taylor–Wiles places then the Galois representation will satisfy our deformation condition. Moreover, we show

the necessary compatibility between the action of inertia and the action of certain Hecke operators holds. Our proof uses the alternate construction of  $M_{\bar{g}}$  of Section 2.4 to understand the passage to Frobenius-semisimplification of Weil–Deligne representations in the context of our deformation problem.

In Section 7, we apply the theory developed in the earlier sections to the case of  $\hat{G} = \mathrm{GSp}_4$  in order to extend the partial results on modularity of abelian surfaces over a totally real field  $F$  given in [BCGP21]. Using the methods of [BCGP21] as a framework, we explain a setup compatible with our generalized notion of Taylor–Wiles primes. The majority of the work is done in Section 7.2. Here we prove analogues of many of the results of [BCGP21, 7] necessary for the Taylor–Wiles patching argument. In particular, we explain the moduli interpretation of working with level structures given by the compact open subgroups of Section 5 at Taylor–Wiles primes. We use the main result of Section 6 to prove the existence of a Galois representation valued in a certain Hecke algebra satisfying our deformation condition. The patching construction then goes through from our work in Sections 3 and 5. In Section 7.4 we deduce our modularity lifting theorems which are analogous to those of [BCGP21] but hold under our weaker hypotheses on the images of the residual Galois representations.

Finally, in Section 8 we study representations of  $G_F$  induced from  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ -valued representations of the absolute Galois group of quadratic extensions  $K/F$ . From the main modularity lifting theorem of Section 7.4 we deduce modularity lifting theorems for elliptic curves over  $K$ . We define the notion of CM-compositum induced representations (Definition 8.7), which are certain projectively dihedral residual Galois representations. We give a construction of these representation for every  $p \geq 5$  and prove modularity theorems for some elliptic curves with CM-compositum induced mod  $p$  Galois representation.

**1.3. Acknowledgements.** The author is exceptionally grateful to his PhD supervisor Jack Thorne for the inspiration of the topic of this paper, numerous insightful conversations and for his helpful comments on drafts of this paper.

## 2. SETUP FOR A LOCAL DEFORMATION PROBLEM

Let  $\hat{G}$  be a reductive group defined over  $\mathbb{Z}$  (that is, a smooth affine group scheme  $\hat{G} \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{Z}$  such that every geometric fibre  $\hat{G}_{\bar{s}}$  is a connected reductive group). Let  $p$  be a prime number, which we will later assume is pretty good for  $\hat{G}$  (see Definition 2.6). Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be the ring of integers of a finite extension of  $E/\mathbb{Q}_p$  with residue field  $k$ , a finite field of characteristic  $p$ . Denote by  $\mathrm{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  the category whose objects are complete Noetherian local  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebras together with a fixed isomorphism from the residue field to  $k$ , so that we may freely identify them without confusion.

Motivated by wanting to impose constraints on representations valued in  $\hat{G}(A)$  for  $A \in \mathrm{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$ , we will consider the following setup. Fix  $A \in \mathrm{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  with maximal ideal  $m_A$  and let  $\bar{g} \in \hat{G}(k)$  be a semisimple element whose centralizer  $M_{\bar{g}} = Z_{\hat{G}_k}(\bar{g})$  is connected. Denote by  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  the Lie algebra of  $\hat{G}_k$ , and consider the adjoint action of  $\bar{g}$ , a Lie algebra automorphism  $\mathrm{Ad}(\bar{g}) : \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$ . Let  $\overline{L}_0 = \{v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k : \mathrm{Ad}(\bar{g})(v) = v\}$  denote the eigenvalue-1 subspace. Let  $\overline{L}_1$  denote the  $\mathrm{Ad}(\bar{g})$ -invariant complement in  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$ , which will be the direct sum of all other eigenspaces over an algebraic closure. Thus we have an  $\mathrm{Ad}(\bar{g})$ -invariant decomposition  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k = \overline{L}_0 \oplus \overline{L}_1$ . The centralizer  $M_{\bar{g}}$  is a reductive group over  $k$ , being the connected centralizer of a semisimple group element, and we have the equality of Lie algebras  $\mathrm{Lie} M_{\bar{g}} = \overline{L}_0$  by [Bor91, 9.1].

Now let  $g \in \hat{G}(A)$  be a fixed choice of lift of  $\bar{g}$  under the natural map  $\hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k)$ . Our main goal of this section is to show Theorem 2.14, which states that the Lie algebra  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  admits a unique  $\text{Ad}(g)$ -invariant lift  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A = L_0 \oplus L_1$  of the decomposition  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k = \overline{L_0} \oplus \overline{L_1}$  and that there exists a unique closed reductive subgroup  $M_g \subset \hat{G}_A$  defined over  $A$  with the properties that the base change  $(M_g)_k$  is naturally identified with  $M_{\bar{g}}$ ,  $\text{Lie } M_g = L_0$  and that  $g \in M_g(A)$ .

Throughout this section we will allow ourselves to replace  $k$  (and  $\mathcal{O}$ ) by some finite extension, so long as the choice of extension depends only on  $\bar{g}$ .

### 2.1. Lifting the Lie algebra.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $f : A^n \rightarrow A^n$  be an  $A$ -linear map inducing  $\bar{f} : k^n \rightarrow k^n$ . Suppose we have a factorisation of the characteristic polynomial of  $\bar{f}$  as  $\det(X - \bar{f}) = \bar{p}(X)\bar{q}(X)$  with  $\bar{p}(X)$  coprime to  $\bar{q}(X)$ . Then letting  $\bar{N} = \ker(\bar{p}(\bar{f}))$ , there exists a unique  $f$ -invariant direct summand lift  $N$  of  $\bar{N}$  to  $A^n$ . Moreover if  $M$  is an  $f$ -invariant direct summand of  $A^n$  with  $\bar{M} \subset \bar{N}$  then  $M \subset N$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\det(X - \bar{f})$  is monic and  $A$  is a Henselian local ring (as  $A$  is a complete Noetherian local ring) it follows by Hensel's lemma that there exists a factorisation  $f(X) = p(X)q(X)$  with  $p(X) \bmod m_A = \bar{p}(X)$  and  $q(X) \bmod m_A = \bar{q}(X)$ . Moreover, since  $\bar{p}(X)$  and  $\bar{q}(X)$  are coprime, we claim we can find power series  $r[X], s[X] \in A[[X]]$  with  $p(X)r(X) + q(X)s(X) = 1$ . Indeed, by coprimality of  $\bar{p}(X)$  and  $\bar{q}(X)$  we can find  $\bar{r}[X], \bar{s}[X] \in k[X]$  such that  $\bar{p}(X)\bar{r}(X) + \bar{q}(X)\bar{s}(X) = 1$ . Then taking arbitrary lifts  $\tilde{r}[X], \tilde{s}[X] \in A[X]$  of  $\bar{r}(X), \bar{s}(X)$  respectively, we have that  $p(X)\tilde{r}(X) + q(X)\tilde{s}(X) = 1 + h(X)$  for some polynomial  $h(X)$  whose coefficients all lie in  $m_A$ . Multiplying both  $\tilde{r}(X)$  and  $\tilde{s}(X)$  by  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i h(X)^i$  yields the desired  $r(X)$  and  $s(X)$ .

Now we have  $p(f)r(f) + q(f)s(f) = \text{id}_{A^n}$  so letting  $e_1 = p(f)r(f)$  and  $e_2 = q(f)s(f)$  we have  $e_1e_2 = e_2e_1 = r(f)s(f)p(f)q(f) = 0$  by Cayley-Hamilton. Since  $e_1 + e_2 = \text{id}_{A^n}$  we have  $e_1^2 = e_1^2 + e_1e_2 = e_1$  and  $e_2^2 = e_2$ . Setting  $N = e_2(A^n)$ , we see that  $N$  is an  $f$ -invariant direct summand, since  $f$  commutes with  $e_2$  and  $A^n = N \oplus e_1(A^n)$ . Note  $\overline{e_2(A^n)} = \overline{e_2(k^n)} = \bar{N}$ , so we have constructed a lift.

For uniqueness we show that if  $N'$  is any  $f$ -invariant direct summand lift with  $\bar{N}' \subset \bar{N}$  then  $N' \subset N$  with equality if and only if  $\bar{N}' = \bar{N}$ . We have that  $N'$  is a free submodule (since projective modules over a local ring are free). Since  $N'$  is  $f$ -invariant, we can consider the decomposition  $N' = e_1(N') \oplus e_2(N')$ . Then  $\bar{N}' = \overline{e_1(N')} \oplus \overline{e_2(N')}$ . We supposed that  $\bar{N}' \subset \bar{N}$ , and we know  $\overline{e_1(N')} = 0$  and  $\overline{e_2(N')} = \bar{N}$ . Thus  $e_1(N')$  is a finite free  $A$ -module which is zero on reduction modulo  $m_A$ , so it is equal to 0. Hence  $N' = e_2(N') \subset e_2(A^n) = N$ . Finally, if  $\bar{N}' = \bar{N}$  then we have that  $N'$  is a free  $A$ -submodule direct summand of  $N$  of equal rank (as their reductions modulo  $m_A$  have equal dimension), and we therefore have equality.  $\square$

Applying Lemma 2.1 to the adjoint action of  $g$  on  $A^n$ , we see that  $\overline{L_0}$  admits a unique  $\text{Ad}(g)$ -invariant direct summand lift to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ , and we write this decomposition as  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A = L_0 \oplus L_1$ . We can also use Lemma 2.1 to prove a generalisation which will be of use later.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $f_1, \dots, f_m : A^n \rightarrow A^n$  be a commuting family of  $A$ -linear maps such that each  $f_i$  has all of its eigenvalues lying in  $k$ . For each vector  $\lambda \in k^m$  let*

$$\overline{V}_\lambda = \{v \in k^n : (f_i - \lambda_i)^n(v) = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

*Then reduction modulo  $m_A$  puts the following sets in bijection:*

- (i) *The set of  $k$ -subspaces of  $k^n$  of the form  $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in S} \overline{V}_\lambda$  for some  $S \subset k^m$*

- (ii) *The set of  $A$ -submodule direct summands of  $A^n$  invariant under each  $f_i$  whose reduction modulo  $m_A$  is of the type defined in (i).*

*Proof.* Let  $e_{i,\lambda_i}$  denote the  $f_i$ -invariant projection from  $A^n$  onto the unique  $f_i$ -invariant lift of the generalised  $\lambda_i$ -eigenspace for the action of  $f_i$  on  $k^n$ , as in Lemma 2.1. Then  $e_{i,\lambda_i}$  is a polynomial in  $f_i$ , and hence commutes with any other such  $e_{j,\lambda_j}$ . We show firstly that  $\overline{V_\lambda}$  admits a lift to a direct summand of  $A^n$  which is invariant under every  $f_i$ , and that this lift is unique.

We have that  $\overline{V_\lambda} = \cap_{i=1}^m \overline{e_{i,\lambda_i}(k^n)}$ . We claim that  $V_\lambda = \cap_{i=1}^m e_{i,\lambda_i}(A^n)$  is such a lift. To see this, let  $e = \prod_{i=1}^m e_{i,\lambda_i}$  and observe that  $V'_\lambda = e(A^n)$  is equal to  $V_\lambda$ . Clearly we have  $V'_\lambda \subset V_\lambda$ , as the projection operators all commute. Now let  $v \in V_\lambda$ . Note that since each  $e_{i,\lambda_i}$  is a projection operator, we have  $v = e_{1,\lambda_1}(v)$ ,  $v = e_{2,\lambda_2}(v) = e_{2,\lambda_2}(e_{1,\lambda_1}(v))$ , and so on. Thus we have  $v = \prod_{i=1}^m e_{i,\lambda_i}(v) \in V'_\lambda$ , establishing the claim. We deduce that  $e(A^n)$  is a lift of  $\overline{V_\lambda} = \bar{e}(k^n)$ . Moreover, this lift is a direct summand of  $A^n$ . Indeed, the operator  $\tilde{e} = \sum_{\mu \in k^n \setminus \{\lambda\}} \prod_{i=1}^m e_{i,\mu_i}$  satisfies  $\tilde{e}e = 0$ ,  $\tilde{e}^2 = \tilde{e}$  and  $\tilde{e} + e = \text{id}_{A^n}$ . Thus  $\tilde{e}(A^n)$  provides a direct sum complement to  $e(A^n)$ . This lift is invariant under each  $f_i$ , as each  $f_i$  commutes with  $e$  and so  $f_i(e(A^n)) = e(f_i(A^n)) \subset e(A^n)$ .

To see uniqueness, observe that if  $N$  is a direct summand lift of  $\overline{V_\lambda}$  that is invariant under each  $f_i$  then  $N \subset e_{i,\lambda_i}(A^n)$  for every  $i$  by Lemma 2.1. It follows that  $N \subset V_\lambda$  is a direct summand free  $A$ -submodule of the same rank (as their reductions modulo  $m_A$  are equal), and hence are equal.

By taking direct sums of such  $V_\lambda$  we have established the existence of  $f_i$ -invariant direct summand lifts. To show uniqueness, suppose that  $N \subset A^n$  is a direct summand  $f_i$ -invariant lift of  $\oplus_{\lambda \in S} \overline{V_\lambda}$ . Then  $N$  is free over  $A$  and we can therefore write  $N = \oplus_{\lambda \in S} V'_\lambda$ , with each  $V'_\lambda$  a direct summand  $f_i$ -invariant lift of  $\overline{V_\lambda}$ . Since  $N$  itself is a direct summand of  $A^n$ , it follows by the uniqueness of  $V_\lambda$  shown already that  $V'_\lambda = V_\lambda$  and we are done.  $\square$

The following lemma provides another perspective on the lifts of Lemma 2.1 in terms of topological nilpotents.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $f : A^n \rightarrow A^n$  be an  $A$ -linear map inducing  $\bar{f} : k^n \rightarrow k^n$ . The  $\bar{f}$ -invariant decomposition  $k^n = \overline{V_0} \oplus \overline{V_1}$ , where  $\overline{V_0} = \ker \bar{f}^n$  admits a unique  $f$ -invariant lift  $A^n = V_0 \oplus V_1$ . Then*

$$V_0 = \{v \in A^n \mid f^m(v) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty\},$$

where convergence is with respect to the  $m_A$ -adic topology.

*Proof.* The existence and uniqueness of the decomposition follows from Lemma 2.1. Let

$$V'_0 = \{v \in A^n \mid f^m(v) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty\}.$$

If  $v \in V_0$  then  $\bar{f}^n(v \bmod m_A) = 0$ , so  $f^n(v) \in m_A A^n \cap V_0 = m_A V_0$ , since  $V_0$  is a direct summand of  $A^n$ . Thus  $f^n(V_0) \subset m_A V_0$  and so  $f^{nu}(V_0) \subset (m_A)^u V_0$  for every  $u \geq 1$ . It follows that  $V_0 \subset V'_0$ .

Now suppose  $v \in V'_0$ , and write  $v = x + y$  with  $x \in V_0$  and  $y \in V_1$ . Then  $y \in V_1 \cap V'_0$ . On the one hand,  $f$  acts invertibly on  $y$ , since  $\bar{f}$  has trivial kernel on  $\overline{V_1}$ . On the other hand,  $f^m(y) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , so  $y \in (m_A)^m \cdot A^n$  for every  $m$ . We conclude that  $y = 0$  and  $V_0 = V'_0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.**  *$L_0$  is a Lie subalgebra of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ .*



*Proof.* We need only check that  $L_0$  is closed under the Lie bracket of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . We will firstly consider the case that  $A$  is Artinian, so  $(m_A)^u = 0$  for some  $u \geq 1$ . Let  $f : \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  denote the endomorphism  $\text{Ad}(g) - \text{id}$  and define the increasing sequence of  $A$ -submodules  $L_0^{(m)} = \{v \in L_0 \mid f^m(v) = 0\}$ . Since  $L_0$  is the  $f$ -invariant lift of  $\ker \bar{f}$ , we have by Lemma 2.3 that  $L_0 = \{v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A \mid f^m(v) = 0 \text{ for some } m \geq 0\} = \bigcup_{m \geq 0} L_0^{(m)}$ . Let  $x \in L_0^{(n)}$  and  $x' \in L_0^{(m)}$ . We show that  $[x, x'] \in L_0^{(n+m)}$  by induction on  $n + m$ . Notice that in the case  $n = 0$  we have  $x = 0$  and so the result is clear. We need only show the inductive step then, where we may take both  $n, m \neq 0$ . Then write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(g)(x) &= x + y \\ \text{Ad}(g)(x') &= x' + y' \end{aligned}$$

where  $f^{n-1}(y) = f^{n-1}(f(x)) = 0$  and  $f^{m-1}(y') = 0$ . Thus  $y \in L_0^{(n-1)}$  and  $y' \in L_0^{(m-1)}$ . We show  $f([x, x']) \in L_0^{(n+m-1)}$  to deduce then that  $[x, x'] \in L_0^{(n+m)}$ , completing the argument. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f([x, x']) &= \text{Ad}(g)([x, x']) - [x, x'] \\ &= [\text{Ad}(g)(x), \text{Ad}(g)(x')] - [x, x'] \\ &= [x + y, x' + y'] - [x, x'] \\ &= [y, x'] + [x, y'] + [y, y'] \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $\text{Ad}(g)$  is a Lie algebra homomorphism on  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . By induction hypothesis, the three terms all lie in  $L_0^{(n+m-1)}$  and we are done in the Artinian case.

Suppose now that  $A$  is not necessarily Artinian. Let  $x, x' \in L_0$  and let  $u \geq 1$ . We wish to show that  $f^m([x, x']) \in (m_A)^u \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  for all  $m$  sufficiently large. We know that there exists  $M \geq 1$  such that for all  $m \geq M$  we have  $f^m(x), f^m(x') \in (m_A)^u \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . From the argument above applied to  $A/(m_A)^u$ , we see that  $f^{2m}([x, x']) \in (m_A)^u \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . So indeed we have for every  $m \geq 2M$  that  $f^m([x, x']) \in (m_A)^u \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  and we are done.  $\square$

**2.2. Lifting  $M_{\bar{g}}$ .** We will frequently wish to take the Lie algebra of a base-changed group scheme, and so we record the following lemma which will be of repeated use.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $G \rightarrow S$  be a smooth group scheme over a base scheme  $S$  with identity section  $e : S \rightarrow G$ . Let  $f : S' \rightarrow S$  be a morphism of schemes and let  $G' = G \times_S S'$  be the base change. Let  $e' : G' \rightarrow S'$  be the base-change of  $e$ . Then we have an isomorphism*

$$f^* e^* \Omega_{G/S}^1 \cong (e')^* \Omega_{G'/S'}^1$$

and, in particular, an isomorphism of Lie algebras

$$(\text{Lie } G)_{S'} \cong \text{Lie } G'.$$

*Proof.* Letting  $g : G' \rightarrow G$  be the natural map, there is an isomorphism  $g^* \Omega_{G/S}^1 \cong \Omega_{G'/S'}^1$  ([Sta22, Tag 01V0]). Pulling back by  $e'$  we have

$$(e')^* \Omega_{G'/S'}^1 \cong (e')^* g^* \Omega_{G/S}^1 \cong f^* e^* \Omega_{G/S}^1$$

by functoriality of pullback. Since pullback of locally free sheaves commutes with taking duals, we deduce the stated isomorphism of Lie algebras.  $\square$

We will require later that taking centers of certain reductive groups will commute with formation of the Lie algebras. For such statements to hold we need to make assumptions on the characteristic of  $k$ . An example where such an equality does not hold is for  $\text{SL}_2$

in characteristic 2: the Lie algebra has 1-dimensional center spanned by the identity while  $\mathrm{SL}_2$  has 0-dimensional center. We introduce the notion of pretty good characteristic, as in [Her13, Definition 2.11].

**Definition 2.6.** *Let  $l$  be a prime number and  $G$  a reductive group over a field  $F$ . Denote the root datum of  $G$  (with respect to some maximal torus over an algebraic closure of  $F$ ) by  $(X^*, \Phi, X_*, \Phi^\vee)$ . We say  $l$  is a prime of pretty good characteristic for  $G$  if for any subset  $\Phi' \subset \Phi$  the abelian groups  $X^*/\mathbb{Z}\Phi'$  and  $X_*/\mathbb{Z}(\Phi')^\vee$  are  $l$ -torsion free.*

For a given group  $G$ , we are only considering the  $l$ -torsion of finitely many finitely generated abelian groups and hence only finitely many primes  $l$  are not of pretty good characteristic for  $G$ . In our setting we have that if  $l$  is a prime of pretty good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$  then it is also of pretty good characteristic for  $M_{\bar{g}}$ , since the roots of  $M_{\bar{g}}$  are a subset of the roots of  $\hat{G}$  (and the character and cocharacter groups are equal). From now on then we assume that  $p = \mathrm{char} k$  is a pretty good prime for  $\hat{G}_k$ .

One use of Definition 2.6 to us comes from [Her13, Theorem 3.3] and [Her13, Lemma 3.1]. Together these imply that if  $\mathrm{char} F = l$  is a prime of pretty good characteristic for  $G$ , then  $Z_G(G)$  is smooth and in particular the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie} G$  is separable inside itself, in the sense that

$$(2.1) \quad \dim Z_G(\mathfrak{g}) = \dim \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

From this discussion we deduce the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $\bar{H} = Z(M_{\bar{g}})$ . Then there is an equality of Lie algebras  $\mathrm{Lie} \bar{H} = \mathfrak{z}(\overline{L_0})$ .*

*Proof.* By [Con14, Proposition 3.3.8] we always have  $\bar{H} = Z_{M_{\bar{g}}}(\overline{L_0})$ , the kernel of the adjoint representation, and hence equality of their Lie algebras. The containment  $\mathrm{Lie} \bar{H} \subset \mathfrak{z}(\overline{L_0})$  is clear from differentiating the adjoint action of  $\bar{H}$  on  $\overline{L_0}$ . Thus they are equal, as by equality 2.1 they are  $k$ -vector spaces of the same dimension.  $\square$

*Remark 2.8.* In our applications in later sections, we will take  $p$  to be a prime of order coprime to the Weyl group of  $\hat{G}$ . This will, in particular, imply that  $p$  is a prime of pretty good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$  since  $p$  will be a very good prime for  $\hat{G}$  by [BHKT19, Lemma 3.9] and hence a pretty good prime by [Her13, Lemma 2.12].

The next step in the construction of  $M_g$  is to find an appropriate multiplicative type subgroup, which will be the center of  $M_g$ . The key will be to find a suitable lift of a maximal torus of  $\hat{G}_k$ . We recall some definitions and results from [DG70] which will aid us in this goal.

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a Lie algebra of dimension  $n$  over a field  $F$ . For any  $F$ -algebra  $R$  and for any  $a \in \mathfrak{g}_R = \mathfrak{g} \otimes_F R$  we can consider the endomorphism of  $\mathfrak{g}_R$  given by  $\mathrm{ad}(a)$ . We may write its characteristic polynomial as  $P_{\mathfrak{g}}(a, t) = t^n + c_{n-1}(a)t^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0(a)$ . The nilpotent rank is the maximal  $r$  such that  $c_r(a) \neq 0$  for some  $a$ . Let  $r$  denote the nilpotent rank of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

**Definition 2.9.** *With notation as above, we say that  $a \in \mathfrak{g}$  is ad-regular if  $c_r(a) \neq 0$ .*

*Remark 2.10.* The terminology ‘ad-regular’ is not standard, but we use it to avoid conflict with the other notion of regular (which is that the centralizer has dimension as small as possible).

If  $a \in \mathfrak{g}$  is any element we let  $\mathrm{Nil}(a, \mathfrak{g}) = \bigcup_{u \geq 0} \ker(\mathrm{ad}(a)^u : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g})$ , a Lie subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . If  $a \in \mathfrak{g}$  is ad-regular then  $\mathrm{rank}_k(\mathrm{Nil}(a, \mathfrak{g})) = r$  and we call  $\mathrm{Nil}(a, \mathfrak{g})$  a Cartan

subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . More generally [DG70, XIV Définition 2.4], if  $S = \text{Spec } R$  is any affine scheme and  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a Lie algebra over  $S$  we say a Lie subalgebra  $\mathfrak{d} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  is a Cartan subalgebra if  $\mathfrak{d}$  is locally a direct summand of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and for every  $s \in S$  we have that  $\mathfrak{d}(s) \subset \mathfrak{g}(s)$  is a Cartan subalgebra in the sense described above. Here  $\mathfrak{g}(s) = \mathfrak{g} \otimes_R k(s)$  is the fibre over  $k(s)$ .

**Proposition 2.11.** *Suppose that  $a \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  is such that  $\bar{a}$  is ad-regular in  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$ . Let  $\mathfrak{d}$  denote the direct summand  $\text{ad}(a)$ -invariant lift of  $\text{Nil}(\bar{a}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)$  to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . Then  $\mathfrak{d}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S = \text{Spec } A$ . Since  $\hat{G}$  admits a maximal torus of rank  $r \geq 0$ ,  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  satisfies condition  $(C_0)$  of [DG70, XIV Proposition 2.9] stating that the nilpotent rank of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(s)$  is a locally constant function of  $s$  on  $S$ . Then by [DG70, Corollaire 2.10], the set  $U$  of  $s \in S$  for which  $a(s)$  is ad-regular in  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(s)$  is an open subset of  $S$ . Thus since  $U$  contains the closed point of  $S$  corresponding to  $m_A$ , we have that  $U = S$ .

Let  $f = \text{ad}(a) : \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ , and recall that the unique  $f$ -invariant lift of  $\ker(\bar{f}^{\dim(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)}) = \text{Nil}(\bar{a}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)$  is given by

$$(2.2) \quad \mathfrak{d} = \{a \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A : \text{ad}(a)^m(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty\}$$

by Lemma 2.3. We claim that  $\mathfrak{d}$  is a Lie subalgebra. Note that  $f$  is an  $A$ -linear derivation, in the sense that  $f([y, z]) = [f(y), z] + [y, f(z)]$  for every  $y, z \in L_0$ . So suppose  $y, z \in \mathfrak{d}$ , and let  $u \geq 1$ . There exists  $M \geq 1$  such that  $f^m(y), f^m(z) \in (m_A)^u \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  for every  $m \geq M$ . Now suppose  $m \geq 2M$ . Then since  $f$  is a derivation,

$$f^m([y, z]) = \sum_{i=0}^m \binom{m}{i} [f^i(y), f^{m-i}(z)]$$

and each term in the sum lies in  $(m_A)^u \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . Hence  $[y, z] \in \mathfrak{d}$ .

Observe that there are inclusions  $\mathfrak{d}(s) \supset \text{Nil}(a(s), \hat{\mathfrak{g}}(s))$  for every  $s \in S$ . Indeed, let  $\eta$  denote the  $f$ -invariant direct sum complement to  $\mathfrak{d}$  in  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . Then  $f$  acts invertibly on  $\eta$ . Hence writing  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(s) = \mathfrak{d}(s) \oplus \eta(s)$ , we see that  $\text{ad}(a(s))$  acts invertibly on  $\eta(s)$ , which shows the containment. This inclusion is an equality, since both are  $k(s)$ -vector spaces of dimension  $r$ , as  $a(s)$  is ad-regular and  $r$  is the nilpotent rank of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(s)$ . We have therefore shown that  $\mathfrak{d}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ .  $\square$

Let  $S$  be a scheme and  $G$  a group-scheme over  $S$ . We say [DG70, IX Définition 1.3]  $G$  is a torus if  $G$  is locally isomorphic in the fpqc topology to a group of the form  $\mathbb{G}_m^r$  for some  $r \geq 0$ . We say [DG70, XII Définition 1.3] a subgroup-scheme  $T$  of  $G$  is a maximal torus if  $T$  is a torus whose geometric fibres are maximal tori in the geometric fibres of  $G$ , in the classical sense. By [DG70, X Corollaire 3.3(ii)], reduction modulo  $m_A$  induces an equivalence of categories between the categories of finite type and multiplicative type group schemes over  $A$  and those over  $k$ . So if we have a torus over  $A$  such that its reduction modulo  $m_A$  is split, then our torus over  $A$  must also be split.

Now suppose that  $G$  is a smooth group scheme over  $S$ . We say ([BC20, 4.1.1]) that  $G$  is root-smooth if for every geometric point  $\bar{s}$  of  $S$  and maximal torus  $T$  of  $G_{\bar{s}}$ , every root  $T \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m, \bar{s}}$  is a smooth morphism. Equivalently, a root  $\alpha$  is smooth if  $X^*(T)/\mathbb{Z}\alpha$  is char  $k(\bar{s})$ -torsion free. It therefore follows from Definition 2.6 that  $\hat{G}$  is root-smooth over  $A$ . The following proposition is contained in [BC20, Proposition 4.1.3] and allows us to pass between Cartan subalgebras and maximal tori in our setting.

**Proposition 2.12.** *Let  $G$  be root-smooth reductive group over a scheme  $S$ . The Cartan subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{g}$  are precisely the Lie algebras of the maximal  $S$ -tori of  $G$ .*

**Corollary 2.13.** *Suppose  $x \in L_0$  is any choice of lift of an ad-regular element of  $\overline{L_0}$ . Then there exists a Lie subalgebra  $\mathfrak{t}$  of  $L_0$  containing  $x$  and a maximal torus  $T$  of  $\hat{G}_A$  with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{t}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{t}$  denote the unique  $\text{ad}(x)$ -invariant lift of  $\text{Nil}(\bar{x}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)$  to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . Then  $\mathfrak{t}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  by Proposition 2.11 and we can find a maximal torus  $T$  with  $\text{Lie } T = \mathfrak{t}$  by Proposition 2.12. Hence we just need to show that  $\mathfrak{t} \subset L_0$ . Since  $L_0$  is a Lie algebra, the adjoint action of  $x$  on  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  restricts to an  $A$ -linear endomorphism of  $L_0$ . We can therefore lift  $\bar{\mathfrak{t}}$  to an  $\text{ad}(x)$ -invariant direct summand of  $L_0$ . Since  $L_0$  is itself a direct summand of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ , by uniqueness in Lemma 2.1 this lift must equal  $\mathfrak{t}$  and we are done.  $\square$

By extending  $k$  if necessary, we will assume from now on that  $M_{\bar{g}}$  contains a split maximal torus  $\bar{T}$  whose Lie algebra  $\bar{\mathfrak{t}}$  contains an ad-regular element  $\bar{x}$  of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$ . Let  $x$  be an arbitrary lift of  $\bar{x}$  to  $L_0$  and let  $T$  be the maximal torus arising from Corollary 2.13. Necessarily  $T$  is split, since we assumed  $\bar{T}$  is split. Now recall that  $\bar{H} = Z(M_{\bar{g}})$  is the scheme-theoretic centre of  $M_{\bar{g}}$ , a subgroup of  $\bar{T}$  of multiplicative type. We claim that there exists a unique subgroup  $H \subset T$  lifting  $\bar{H}$ . Indeed, by [DG70, VIII Corollaire 1.6] we deduce an antiequivalence of categories between finite  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules and split multiplicative groups of finite type on any connected scheme, and that this is compatible with base change to a connected scheme. So  $\bar{H}$  corresponds to a quotient of the finite free module defining  $\bar{T}$ , and thus under the antiequivalence correspond to subgroup of  $T$  lifting  $\bar{H}$ .

We are now ready to define  $M_g$  and show the desired properties.

**Theorem 2.14.** *Let  $\bar{g} \in \hat{G}(k)$  be semisimple with connected centralizer  $M_{\bar{g}}$ , whose Lie algebra is denoted by  $\overline{L_0}$ . Let  $A \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  and let  $g \in \hat{G}(A)$  be a lift of  $\bar{g}$ . There exists a unique connected reductive closed subgroup-scheme  $M_g$  of  $\hat{G}_A$  with the following properties:*

- (i)  $(M_g)_k$  is naturally identified with  $M_{\bar{g}}$
- (ii)  $\text{Lie } M_g = L_0$
- (iii)  $g \in M_g(A)$ .

Here we recall that  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A = L_0 \oplus L_1$  is the unique  $\text{Ad}(g)$ -invariant lift of the  $\text{Ad}(\bar{g})$ -invariant decomposition  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k = \overline{L_0} \oplus \overline{L_1}$ .

*Proof.* Set  $M_g = Z_{\hat{G}_A}(H)$  to be the scheme-theoretic centralizer of  $H$ . The group scheme  $M_g$  is reductive and smooth over  $A$  by the discussion preceding [Con14, Remark 3.1.5]. We show (i) firstly. By definition of scheme-theoretic centralizer, we have that  $(M_g)_k = Z_{\hat{G}_k}(H_k)$ . Recalling that  $\bar{H} = H_k$  is the centre of  $M_{\bar{g}}$ , (i) would follow if we have  $Z_{\hat{G}_k}(Z(M_{\bar{g}})) = M_{\bar{g}}$ . Certainly we have  $M_{\bar{g}} \subset Z_{\hat{G}_k}(\bar{H})$ . For the other containment we note that  $\bar{g} \in Z(M_{\bar{g}})(R)$  for every  $k$ -algebra  $R$ , and hence if  $h \in Z_{\hat{G}_k}(Z(M_{\bar{g}}))(R)$  then  $h\bar{g}h^{-1} = \bar{g}$  (so  $h$  is in the centralizer of  $\bar{g}$  giving the other containment).

Next we note that  $\text{Lie } M_g$  is a lift of  $\overline{L_0}$ . Indeed, we have that taking Lie algebras is compatible with base-change, so  $(\text{Lie } M_g)_k = \text{Lie}(M_g)_k = \text{Lie } M_{\bar{g}} = \overline{L_0}$  by (i). We have that  $\text{Lie } M_g = \text{Lie } Z_{\hat{G}_A}(H) = (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A)^H$  by [Con14, Lemma 2.2.4] and that  $\text{Lie } M_g$  is a direct summand of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ . Indeed, the action of the split multiplicative group  $H$  on the finite free  $A$ -module  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  induces a grading given by the character group of  $H$  (see [CGP15, A.8.8]). Then  $(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A)^H$  corresponds to the grading given by the trivial character, hence is a direct summand.

So now we have direct summand submodules  $L_0$  and  $\text{Lie } M_g$  of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ , both containing  $\mathfrak{t}$ , with reductions modulo  $m_A$  both equal to  $\overline{L_0}$ . Since  $\bar{T}$  is a split maximal torus in

$\hat{G}_k, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  admits a root space decomposition  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k = \bar{\mathfrak{t}} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha} \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha}$ . These  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha}$  come in pairs, and are distinct subspaces for different pairs (even when  $\text{char } k = 2$ ). We also have that  $\overline{L_0} = \text{Lie } M_{\bar{g}}$  admits such a decomposition, hence necessarily corresponding to a subset of pairs of roots. Applying Lemma 2.2 to the adjoint action of a basis of  $\mathfrak{t}$  on  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$ , we see that  $L_0$  must equal  $\text{Lie } M_g$ .

We now show (iii). Note firstly that  $g$  normalizes  $H = Z(M_g)$ . This follows on noting that  $Z(M_g)$  is the kernel of the adjoint representation of  $T$  on its Lie algebra (see [Con14, Proposition 3.3.8]) and that  $\text{Ad}(g) : L_0 \rightarrow L_0$  is an automorphism of Lie algebras. Since  $\bar{g} \in \bar{H}(k)$ , the morphism of split multiplicative type groups  $\text{Ad}(\bar{g}) : \bar{H} \rightarrow \bar{H}$  is trivial. Thus  $\text{Ad}(g)|_H$  is an automorphism which is trivial mod  $m_A$ . By [DG70, 1.6, VIII], this implies that the conjugation action of  $g$  on  $H$  is trivial. By definition, we have  $M_g(A) = \{z \in \hat{G}_A(A) : \text{Ad}(z)|_H = \text{id}_H\}$ , so we have indeed shown  $g \in M_g(A)$ .

Uniqueness of such a subgroup  $M_g$  satisfying (ii) follows from [DG70, XIV Proposition 3.12] since  $\mathfrak{t} \subset L_0$  is Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_A$ .  $\square$

**2.3. Functoriality properties of  $M_g$ .** Having constructed  $M_g$ , we now show some properties which will be useful in defining our deformation condition. The following lemma is straightforward from the construction of  $M_g$ .

**Lemma 2.15.** *The center of  $M_g, Z(M_g)$ , lifts  $Z(M_{\bar{g}})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T \leq \hat{G}_A$  be the maximal torus constructed previously and let  $H \subset T$  be the unique closed subgroup scheme lifting  $Z(M_{\bar{g}})$ . We saw in the proof of Theorem 2.14 that  $M_g = Z_{\hat{G}_A}(H)$ , so necessarily  $H \subset Z(M_g)$ . Since  $M_g$  lifts  $M_{\bar{g}}$  we also have  $Z(M_g)_k \subset Z(M_{\bar{g}}) = \bar{H}$ , so  $Z(M_g)$  must lift  $\bar{H}$ .  $\square$

We now show that the construction of  $M_g$  is compatible with changing  $g$  by an element  $h \in \ker(\hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k))$ , in the following senses.

**Lemma 2.16.** *Let  $h \in \ker(\hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k))$ . Then*

- (i)  $M_{hgh^{-1}} = \text{Ad}(h)(M_g)$ ;
- (ii) if additionally  $h \in M_g(A)$  then  $M_{gh} = M_g$ .

*Proof.* We prove (i) firstly. We show that the Lie algebras of  $M_{hgh^{-1}}$  and  $\text{Ad}(h)(M_g)$  coincide:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Lie } M_{hgh^{-1}} &= \{v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A : (\text{Ad}(hgh^{-1}) - 1)^u v \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty\} \\ &= \{v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A : (\text{Ad}(h) \text{Ad}(g) \text{Ad}(h)^{-1} - 1)^u v \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty\} \\ &= \{v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A : \text{Ad}(h)(\text{Ad}(g) - 1)^u \text{Ad}(h)^{-1} v \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty\} \\ &= \text{Ad}(h)\{v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A : (\text{Ad}(g) - 1)^u v \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty\} \\ &= \text{Ad}(h)(\text{Lie } M_g) \\ &= \text{Lie } \text{Ad}(h)(M_g). \end{aligned}$$

Equality of  $M_{hgh^{-1}}$  and  $\text{Ad}(h)(M_g)$  then follows from this equality of Lie algebras, just as in the proof of uniqueness in Theorem 2.14.

Now suppose in addition that  $h \in M_g(A)$ . We have a semisimple element  $\bar{g} \in M_g(k)$  with connected centralizer and a lift  $gh \in M_g(A)$ . Thus we can apply Theorem 2.14 to the reductive group  $M_g$  to define a connected, reductive, closed subgroup-scheme  $N$  of  $M_g$  with the properties

- $N$  lifts  $Z_{M_{\bar{g}}}(\bar{g}) = M_{\bar{g}}$

- $\text{Lie } N = \{v \in \text{Lie } M_g : (\text{Ad}(gh) - 1)^u v \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } u \rightarrow \infty\}$ .

It follows that  $N = M_g$ , and therefore  $\text{Lie } M_g = \text{Lie } N \subset \text{Lie } M_{gh}$ . Thus we have equality of Lie algebras and hence equality of  $M_g$  and  $M_{gh}$  just as above.  $\square$

As an application, we obtain the following corollary which will be of use in identifying Selmer groups corresponding to our deformation condition in Section 3.

**Corollary 2.17.** *Suppose  $A = k[\epsilon]$  and identify  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k = \ker(\hat{G}(k[\epsilon]) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k)) \subset \hat{G}(k[\epsilon])$ . Then  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \cap M_{\bar{g}}(k[\epsilon]) = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \cap M_g(k[\epsilon])$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \cap Z(M_{\bar{g}}(k[\epsilon])) = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \cap Z(M_g)(k[\epsilon])$ .*

*Proof.* Observe firstly that for  $h \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  we have  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \cap M_g(k[\epsilon]) = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \cap M_{hgh^{-1}}(k[\epsilon])$ , since conjugation by  $h$  acts trivially on  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$ . Since conjugation will also send centers to centers, we may freely replace  $g$  by its conjugate under an element of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$ . Now suppose we are in the situation that  $g = \bar{g}\delta$  where  $\delta \in M_{\bar{g}}(k[\epsilon])$ . Then since  $g$  is a lift of  $\bar{g}$ , we have  $\delta \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  and so by Lemma 2.16 (ii) we have  $M_{\bar{g}\delta} = M_{\bar{g}}$ . Thus equality of their centers also holds.

Thus we just need to find some  $h \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  such that  $\bar{g}^{-1}hgh^{-1} \in M_{\bar{g}}(k[\epsilon])$ . Writing  $g = \bar{g}\gamma$  for  $\gamma \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  we require, switching now to additive notation, that

$$\text{Ad}(\bar{g}^{-1})(h) + \gamma - h \in \overline{L_0}.$$

Letting  $\overline{L_1}$  be the  $\text{Ad}(\bar{g})$ -invariant complement to  $\overline{L_0}$ , we know that  $\text{Ad}(\bar{g}) - \text{id}$  restricts to a vector space automorphism of this subspace. Thus we may write

$$\text{Ad}(\bar{g})(\gamma) \equiv (\text{Ad}(\bar{g}) - \text{id})(h) \pmod{\overline{L_0}}$$

for some  $h \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$ . Taking  $\text{Ad}(\bar{g})^{-1}$  of this equality, we are done.  $\square$

We now show compatibility under changing the coefficient ring  $A$ .

**Lemma 2.18.** *Let  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism in  $\text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$ . Let  $g' \in \hat{G}(B)$  denote the image of  $g$  under the map  $\hat{G}(\varphi) : \hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(B)$ . Then under the natural identification of  $(\hat{G}_A)_B$  with  $\hat{G}_B$ , we have  $(M_g)_B = M_{g'}$  and  $Z(M_g)_B = Z(M_{g'})$ . In particular, we have the equality  $Z(M_g)(B) = Z(M_{g'})(B)$ .*

*Proof.* We may identify  $\text{Lie}(M_g)_B$  with  $\text{Lie } M_g \otimes_A B$  by compatibility of Lie algebras under base-change. This isomorphism is also compatible with the action of  $\text{Ad}(g)$  in the sense that  $\text{Ad}(g')(v \otimes b) = \text{Ad}(g)(v) \otimes b$  for any  $v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_A$  and  $b \in B$ . Hence we have a containment of Lie algebras  $\text{Lie}(M_g)_B \subset \text{Lie } M_{g'}$ . Indeed, if  $v \in \text{Lie } M_g$  and  $b \in B$  then  $(\text{Ad}(g') - 1)^u(v \otimes b) = (\text{Ad}(g) - 1)^u(v) \otimes b \rightarrow 0$  as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ . The Lie algebras are both free and direct summand  $B$ -submodules of equal ranks (as their reductions  $\pmod{m_B}$  coincide) and hence are equal. We have by functoriality of base-change that  $(M_g)_B$  reduces to  $M_{\bar{g}}$  modulo  $m_B$  and that  $g' \in M_{g'}(B) = (M_g)_B(B)$ , as  $g \in M_g(A)$ . So by uniqueness in Theorem 2.14, they are equal. By definition of scheme-theoretic centre, we have that  $Z((M_g)_B) = Z(M_{g'})_B$ , and hence the lemma follows.  $\square$

**2.4. A construction of  $M_g$  over  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ .** For the remainder of this section suppose that  $A = \mathcal{O}$ . We give a description of  $(M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$  and its center which depend only on the knowledge of the semisimple part of  $g$  in its Jordan decomposition.

**Lemma 2.19.** *Let  $g = g_{ss}g_u$  be the multiplicative Jordan decomposition of  $g$  in  $\hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . Let  $T$  be any maximal torus of  $Z_{\hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})}(g_{ss})$  and let*

$$N_{g_{ss}} = \langle T, U_{\alpha} | \alpha \in \Phi(\hat{G}, T), \alpha(g_{ss}) \equiv 1 \pmod{m_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}^{\circ}} \rangle.$$

Then  $N_{g_{ss}} = (M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $L \leq \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$  be given by the sum of generalized eigenspaces for the action of  $\text{Ad}(g_{ss})$  on  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$  with eigenvalues congruent to  $1 \pmod{m_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}}$ . We firstly show that  $L$  coincides with  $(\text{Lie } M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ . The generalized eigenspaces for the actions of  $\text{Ad}(g)$  and  $\text{Ad}(g_{ss})$  on  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$  coincide. It then follows because  $\text{Lie } M_g = L_0$  is given by the sum of topological nilpotents for the action of  $\text{Ad}(g) - 1$ , while its  $\text{Ad}(g)$ -invariant complement is given by the sum of topological nilpotents for the action of  $\text{Ad}(g) - \lambda$  for all eigenvalues  $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}^\times$  with  $\lambda \not\equiv 1 \pmod{m_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}}$ .

We next claim that

$$\text{Lie } N_{g_{ss}} = \langle \text{Lie } T \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi(\hat{G}, T), \alpha(g_{ss}) \equiv 1 \pmod{m_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}}} \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_\alpha \rangle$$

coincides with  $L$ . Since the action of  $\text{Ad}(g_{ss})$  on  $\text{Lie } \hat{G}$  is the identity on  $\text{Lie } T$  and given by  $\alpha(g_{ss})$  on a root space  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_\alpha$ , they must coincide as  $L$  is a Lie algebra. Thus  $N_g = (M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ , as their Lie algebras coincide (and contain a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ ).  $\square$

We deduce the following corollary, which we use in Section 6.

**Corollary 2.20.** *If  $g_1, g_2 \in \hat{G}(\mathcal{O})$  are lifts of  $\bar{g}$  and there exists  $h \in \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  for which  $\text{Ad}(h)(g_{1,ss}) = g_{2,ss}$  then  $\text{Ad}(h)((M_{g_1})_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}) = (M_{g_2})_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$  and  $\text{Ad}(h)(Z(M_{g_1})_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}^\circ) = Z(M_{g_2})_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}^\circ$ .*

### 3. DEFORMATION THEORY

Continue with notation as in the start of Section 2. We make a further assumption on  $p = \text{char } k$  by taking  $p$  to be a very good prime for  $\hat{G}$ . Let  $F$  be a global field, so  $F$  is either a number field or the function field of a smooth, projective, geometrically connected curve  $X$  over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (whose characteristic we suppose is prime to  $p$ ). Fix a separable closure  $\bar{F}$  of  $F$  and denote the absolute Galois group by  $G_F$ . If  $S$  is a finite set of finite places of  $F$ , let  $F_S$  denote the maximal extension of  $F$  unramified outside of  $S$  with Galois group  $G_{F,S} = \text{Gal}(F_S/F)$ . We let  $S_p$  denote the (possibly empty) set of places dividing  $p$ .

Let  $\bar{\rho} : G_F \rightarrow \hat{G}(k)$  be an absolutely  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible representation, continuous with respect to the usual profinite topology on  $G_F$  and discrete topology on  $\hat{G}(k)$ , and unramified outside of fixed finite set  $S$  of finite places of  $F$  (so that we can, and will, view  $\bar{\rho}$  as a representation of  $G_{F,S}$ ). Recall that absolutely  $\hat{G}$ -irreducibility means that the image of  $G_F$  is not contained inside (the  $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ -points of) any proper parabolic subgroup of  $\hat{G}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}}$ . By [Ric88, Theorem 16.4], this implies that  $Z_{\hat{G}}(\bar{\rho}(G_F))$  is finite modulo  $Z(\hat{G})$ , and hence that the invariants of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  under the adjoint action of  $G_F$  via  $\bar{\rho}$  are exactly  $\mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)$ . We let  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0$  denote the Lie algebra of  $\hat{G}_k^{\text{der}}$ , viewed as a  $G_F$ -module via the adjoint action under  $\bar{\rho}$ . Since we are in very good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$ , we in fact have a decomposition  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0 \oplus \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)$  as  $G_F$ -modules. By extending  $k$  if necessary, we assume throughout this section that for every semisimple element  $\bar{g}$  in the image of  $\bar{\rho}$  there exists a split maximal torus  $T$  defined over  $k$  such that  $\bar{g} \in T(k)$  and that  $\text{Lie } T$  contains an ad-regular element, in the sense of Definition 2.9.

If  $v$  is a place of  $F$ , let  $F_v$  denote the completion of  $F$  with residue field  $k(v)$  of finite cardinality  $q_v$  and fix embeddings  $\bar{F} \rightarrow \bar{F}_v$  defining inertia and decomposition subgroups  $I_v \subset G_{F_v} \subset G_F$ . We will let  $\bar{\rho}_v = \bar{\rho}|_{G_{F_v}}$ . If, for each  $v \in S$ , we are given  $\Lambda_v \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$

then we will let  $\Lambda = \hat{\otimes}_{v \in S, \mathcal{O}} \Lambda_v$  be the completed tensor product and let  $\text{CNL}_\Lambda$  be the category of complete Noetherian local  $\Lambda$ -algebras with residue field  $k$ . Let  $C_{\hat{G}}$  denote the cocenter of  $\hat{G}$ , the quotient of  $\hat{G}$  by its derived group, and let  $\nu : \hat{G} \rightarrow C_{\hat{G}}$  be this quotient map. Fix a continuous character  $\psi : G_{F,S} \rightarrow C_{\hat{G}}(\mathcal{O})$  such that  $\nu \circ \bar{\rho} = (\psi \bmod \lambda)$ , which may be thought of by analogy with fixing the determinant when  $\hat{G} = \text{GL}_n$ .

**3.1. Deformation theory of representations.** Firstly, let us recall some of the theory of deformation problems, as in [CSS13].

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a profinite group,  $\bar{\rho} : \Gamma \rightarrow \hat{G}(k)$  be a continuous representation and  $\Lambda \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$ .*

- *Let  $(\theta : \Lambda \rightarrow A) \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$ . A lift  $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \hat{G}(A)$  is a continuous homomorphism satisfying  $\rho \bmod m_A = \bar{\rho}$ . Such a lift  $\rho$  is said to have similitude character  $\psi$  if  $\nu \circ \rho = \theta \circ \psi$ . This defines the functor of lifts (also called framed deformations)  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^\square : \text{CNL}_\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  sending  $A \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$  to the set of lifts of similitude character  $\psi$ .*
- *If  $A \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$ , a deformation is a strict equivalence class of lifts of similitude character  $\psi$ , where two lifts in  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^\square(A)$  are said to be strictly equivalent if they are conjugate by an element of  $\ker(\hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k))$ . This defines a functor  $D_{\bar{\rho}} : \text{CNL}_\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  assigning  $A \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$  to the set of deformations valued in  $A$ . Note that if any representative of a deformation class has similitude character  $\psi$ , then all of representatives do.*

We say a functor  $D : \text{CNL}_\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is representable if there exists  $R \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$  and a natural equivalence between  $D$  and the functor  $h_R = \text{Hom}_{\text{CNL}_\Lambda}(R, -)$ . If  $\mathcal{D}, D : \text{CNL}_\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  are two functors with  $\mathcal{D} \subset D$  a subfunctor, we say  $\mathcal{D}$  is relatively representable to  $D$  if the following condition holds: for every pair of morphisms  $A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B$  in  $\text{CNL}_\Lambda$  the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}(A \times_C B) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}(A) \times_{\mathcal{D}(C)} \mathcal{D}(B) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ D(A \times_C B) & \longrightarrow & D(A) \times_{D(C)} D(B) \end{array}$$

is cartesian. By Grothendieck's theorem on representability [Gro60, Proposition 3.1], we see that if  $D$  itself is representable, then  $\mathcal{D}$  is representable if and only if  $\mathcal{D}$  is relatively representable to  $D$ . If  $D$  is represented by  $R$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  is relatively representable then  $\mathcal{D}$  will be represented by a quotient of  $R$ .

We will use notation similar to [BCGP21, Section 7.1] in defining local and global deformation problems.

**Definition 3.2** (Local Deformation Problem). *Let  $v \in S$ . Let  $D_v^\square : \text{CNL}_{\Lambda_v} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  denote the functor of liftings for  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{F_v}} : G_{F_v} \rightarrow \hat{G}(k)$ . A local deformation problem for  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{F_v}}$  is a subfunctor  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square$  of  $D_v^\square$  which is relatively representable and is closed under strict equivalence.*

Since  $G_{F_v}$  satisfies Mazur's  $\Phi_p$ -condition (see [Maz89, 1.1]), the functor of lifts  $D_v^\square$  is representable (see [Bal12, Theorem 1.2.2]) by some  $R_v^\square \in \text{CNL}_{\Lambda_v}$ . Hence any local deformation problem will be representable by a quotient of  $R_v^\square$ . If  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square$  is any local deformation problem, we will let  $\mathcal{D}_v$  denote the functor of strict equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square$ . In particular,  $D_v$  will denote the functor of all deformations of  $\bar{\rho}_v$ .



**Definition 3.3** (Global Deformation Problem). *A global deformation problem is a tuple*

$$\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v^\square\}_{v \in S})$$

where for  $v \in S$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square$  is a local deformation problem. For  $A \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$ , a lift  $\rho : G_{F,S} \rightarrow \hat{G}(A)$  is of type  $\mathcal{S}$  if  $\nu \circ \rho$  equals the image of  $\psi$  and  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}} \in \mathcal{D}_v(A)$  (where we view  $A \in \text{CNL}_{\Lambda_v}$  via the natural map  $\Lambda_v \rightarrow \Lambda$ ). We let  $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$  denote the functor sending  $A \in \text{CNL}_{\Lambda_v}$  to the set of strict equivalence classes of  $A$ -valued lifts of type  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Definition 3.4** ( $T$ -framed deformations). *Let  $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v\}_{v \in S})$  be a global deformation problem and let  $T \subset S$ . If  $T \subset S$  and  $A \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$ , a  $T$ -framed lift of type  $\mathcal{S}$  is a tuple  $(\rho, \{\gamma_v\}_{v \in T})$  where  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}(A)$  and  $\gamma_v \in \ker(\hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k))$  for every  $v \in T$ . Two  $T$ -framed lifts  $(\rho, \{\gamma_v\}_{v \in T})$  and  $(\rho', \{\gamma'_v\}_{v \in T})$  are said to be strictly equivalent if there exists  $\alpha \in \ker(\hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k))$  such that  $\rho' = \alpha\rho\alpha^{-1}$  and  $\gamma'_v = \alpha\gamma_v$  for every  $v \in T$ . A strict equivalence class of  $T$ -framed lifts is called a  $T$ -framed deformation and the functor sending  $A$  to the set of  $T$ -framed deformations is denoted  $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}^T$ .*

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v^\square\}_{v \in S})$  be a global deformation problem. The functor  $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$  is representable by an object  $R_\mathcal{S}$  of  $\text{CNL}_\Lambda$ . If  $T \subset S$  then the functor  $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$  is representable by an object  $R_\mathcal{S}^T$  of  $\text{CNL}_\Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* This can be proved in the same way as the proof of [Pat15, Proposition 9.2], since  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{\bar{\rho}(G_{F,S})} = \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)$ .  $\square$

Now suppose  $v \in S \setminus S_p$  is a place and  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square : \text{CNL}_{\Lambda_v} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a local deformation problem. As explained in [NSW13, 7.2.6], local Tate duality gives a perfect pairing

$$H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \times H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) \rightarrow H^2(G_{F_v}, \mu),$$

where  $\mu = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n$  and

- if  $F$  is a number field then  $H^2(G_{F_v}, \mu) \cong \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ ,
- if  $F$  has positive characteristic  $l$ , then  $H^2(G_{F_v}, \mu) \cong \bigcup_{l^n} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}$ .

We will define the Selmer conditions for  $\mathcal{D}_v$ , which will be subspaces  $\mathcal{L}_v \subset H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_v^\perp \subset H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))$  dual to each other under the local Tate pairing.

**Definition 3.6.** *Take  $v$  and  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square$  as above and let  $\mathcal{D}_v$  be the arising functor of deformations. Let  $\mathcal{D}_v(k[\epsilon])$  be the tangent space of the functor  $\mathcal{D}_v$ . The Selmer condition,  $\mathcal{L}_v$ , is the subspace given by the image of  $\mathcal{D}_v(k[\epsilon])$  in  $H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)$  under the isomorphism  $\mathcal{D}_v(k[\epsilon]) \cong H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)$ . The dual Selmer condition,  $\mathcal{L}_v^\perp \subset H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))$ , is the annihilator of  $\mathcal{L}_v$  under the Tate pairing.*

Note that any local deformation problem defines a subspace of  $H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)$  rather than just  $H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)$ , since we have fixed the similitude character  $\psi$  (and hence the arising cocycles will have trivial image under projection to  $\text{Lie } C_{\hat{G}}$ ). We can now define the Selmer groups arising from a global deformation problem.

**Definition 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v^\square\}_{v \in S})$  be a global deformation problem and let  $T \subset S$  with  $S_p \subset T$ . For  $v \in S \setminus T$  let  $\mathcal{L}_v$  and  $\mathcal{L}_v^\perp$  be the subspaces arising from*

Definition 3.6 applied to  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square$ . The Selmer groups for  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $T$  are given by

$$H_{\mathcal{S},T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) = \ker \left( H^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \rightarrow \prod_{v \in S \setminus T} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)}{\mathcal{L}_v} \times \prod_{v \in T} H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \right)$$

$$H_{\mathcal{S}^\perp, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) = \ker \left( H^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) \rightarrow \prod_{v \in S \setminus T} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))}{\mathcal{L}_v^\perp} \right).$$

**3.2. Taylor–Wiles places.** We begin this section by giving a modified definition of what it means to be a Taylor–Wiles place.

**Definition 3.8** (Taylor–Wiles place). *We say a finite place  $v \notin S$  of  $F$  is a Taylor–Wiles place if  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ ,  $\bar{g}_v := \bar{\rho}(\phi_v) \in \hat{G}(k)$  is semisimple and the centralizer  $M_{\bar{g}_v} := Z_{\hat{G}_k}(\bar{g}_v)$  is a connected subgroup of  $\hat{G}_k$  for any choice of lift of (geometric) Frobenius element  $\phi_v \in G_{F_v}$ . Such a place is said to be of level  $n \geq 1$  if  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p^n}$ .*

In [Tho12, Definition 4.1], there is no insistence of Taylor–Wiles places having image of Frobenius with a multiplicity one eigenvalue, as was the case for previous work in the  $\hat{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n$  case. As explained in the introduction, Definition 3.8 is an attempt to make an analogous generalization for a general reductive group  $\hat{G}$ , by allowing  $v$  for which  $\bar{g}_v$  is only semisimple rather than regular-semisimple. It is therefore necessary for us impose a deformation condition at such Taylor–Wiles places  $v$  to ensure that the image of inertia subgroup at  $v$  is still valued in a torus, as is automatic in the regular-semisimple case.

If  $v$  is a Taylor–Wiles place, let  $\phi_v \in G_{F_v}$  be a fixed choice of lift of the Frobenius element at  $v$ . Let  $\bar{g}_v$  and  $M_{\bar{g}_v}$  be as in Definition 3.8; these are independent of the choice of  $\phi_v$  since  $\bar{\rho}$  is unramified at  $v$ .

**Definition 3.9** (Taylor–Wiles datum). *A Taylor–Wiles datum is a pair*

$$(Q, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q})$$

where  $Q$  is a set of Taylor–Wiles places and, for each  $v \in Q$ ,  $\hat{T}_v \subset \hat{G}_k$  is a split maximal torus defined over  $k$  containing  $Z(M_{\bar{g}_v})^\circ$  and  $\hat{B}_v$  is a Borel subgroup of  $\hat{G}_k$  containing  $\hat{T}_v$ .

Fixing a maximal torus and Borel subgroup can be seen as analogous to fixing an ordering on the eigenvalues of  $g_v$ . Now let  $(Q, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q})$  be a Taylor–Wiles datum. We will set  $\Lambda_v = \mathcal{O}$  for  $v \in Q$  and define a local deformation problem  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \mathrm{TW}}$  for  $v \in Q$ .

**Definition 3.10.** *Let  $v \in Q$  be a Taylor–Wiles place. Define a subfunctor  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \mathrm{TW}} \subset \mathcal{D}_v^\square$  given by the subfunctor of lifts  $\rho_v : G_{F_v} \rightarrow \hat{G}(A)$  for which  $\rho_v(I_v) \subset Z(M_{g_v})(A)$ . Here  $g_v = \rho_v(\phi_v)$  and  $M_{g_v}$  is the subgroup constructed in Theorem 2.14.*

**Remark 3.11.** We make the following three remarks on Definition 3.10.

- (1) Definition 3.10 is independent of the choice of lift of Frobenius,  $\phi_v$ , by Lemma 2.16.
- (2) For  $\rho_v \in \mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \mathrm{TW}}(A)$  the representation has image in  $M_{g_v}(A)$  since  $G_{F_v}$  is topologically generated by  $\phi_v$  and inertia.
- (3) It is equivalent to ask for  $\rho_v(I_v) \subset Z(M_{g_v})^\circ(A)$  in Definition 3.10, since  $\rho_v|_{I_v}$  will factor through its  $p$ -power quotient and  $\pi_0(Z(M_{g_v}))$  will have order prime to  $p$ , as we are in very good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$ .

We need to show this functor  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}$  is relatively representable to the functor of all liftings.

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $v$  be a Taylor–Wiles place and  $\rho : G_{F_v} \rightarrow \hat{G}(A)$  be a lift of  $\bar{\rho}_v$  in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(A)$ . Then*

- (1) *if  $\phi : A \rightarrow B$  is a morphism in  $\text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $\rho' : G_{F_v} \rightarrow \hat{G}(B)$  denotes the composition of  $\rho$  with the induced map  $\hat{G}(\phi) : \hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(B)$  then  $\rho'$  lies in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(B)$*
- (2) *if  $A \rightarrow C$  and  $B \rightarrow C$  are two morphisms in  $\text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $\rho_B \in \mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(B)$  with  $\rho$  and  $\rho_B$  inducing the same lift to  $C$ , then the arising representation to  $\hat{G}(A \times_C B) \cong \hat{G}(A) \times_{\hat{G}(C)} \hat{G}(B)$  lies in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(A \times_C B)$ .*

*Proof.* For 1, Lemma 2.18 immediately shows that  $\rho'(I_v) \subset Z(M_{\rho'(\phi_v)})$  and hence  $\rho'$  lies in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(B)$ . Let  $D$  denote the fibre product  $A \times_C B$ . For 2 it will suffice to show that under the isomorphism  $\hat{G}(D) \cong \hat{G}(A) \times_{\hat{G}(C)} \hat{G}(B)$  we have  $Z(M_{g_D})(D)$  is mapped to  $Z(M_{g_A})(A) \times_{Z(M_{g_C})(C)} Z(M_{g_B})(B)$ , where  $g_R$  denotes the image of  $\phi_v$  for the aforementioned representations with values in  $\hat{G}(R)$ . By Lemma 2.18 again we have  $Z(M_{g_D})(A) = Z(M_{g_A})(A)$ , and similarly for  $B, C$ . So denoting  $Y = Z(M_{g_D})$  we need  $Y(D) = Y(A) \times_{Y(C)} Y(B)$ , which indeed holds.  $\square$

From this we deduce  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}$  is relatively representable to  $D_v$  and hence the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.13.** *The functor  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}$  defines a local deformation problem, represented by an algebra  $R_v^{\text{TW}} \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$ .*

Now let  $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v\}_{v \in S})$  be a global deformation problem. We can form the augmented global deformation problem

$$\mathcal{S}_Q = (\bar{\rho}, S \cup Q, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S \cup Q}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v\}_{v \in S \cup Q}),$$

where for every  $v \in Q$  we take  $\mathcal{D}_v = \mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}$  (and  $\Lambda_v = \mathcal{O}$ , as before). Hence for any  $T \subset S$ , the functors  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_Q}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T$  are representable by respective objects  $R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}, R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T \in \text{CNL}_{\Lambda}$  by Proposition 3.5.

Having now shown our deformation problem is representable, we can explore the Selmer conditions  $\mathcal{L}_v$  and  $\mathcal{L}_v^{\perp}$  arising from our local deformation problem  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}$  at  $v \in Q$ . From this we can find conditions for existence of sets of Taylor–Wiles places with generating sets for the universal deformation rings of our augmented deformation problems as small as possible, by controlling the arising dual Selmer groups.

For  $v \in Q$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_v$  is given by those classes in  $H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)$  whose restriction to inertia lies in  $\text{Lie } Z(M_{\bar{g}_v})$ . Indeed, we have by Corollary 2.17 that the condition of a deformation to  $k[\epsilon]$  defining a cocycle whose restriction to inertia lies in  $\text{Lie } Z(M_{\bar{g}_v})$  is equivalent to a representative lift  $\rho$  having image of inertia in  $Z(M_{\bar{g}_v})(k[\epsilon])$ .

If  $M$  is any  $G_{F_v}$ -module write  $H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M) = \ker(\text{res} : H^1(G_{F_v}, M) \rightarrow H^1(I_v, M))$ . Let  $N_v$  denote the  $G_{F_v}$ -submodule  $\text{Lie } Z(M_{\bar{g}_v}) \cap \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0$ , equal to  $\mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^{\bar{g}_v})$  by Lemma 2.7. Then we may write

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{L}_v = H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) + H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v).$$

Indeed, if  $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_v$  then we can choose a lift  $\gamma$  of  $\text{res}(\xi)$  in  $H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v)$  (as  $N_v$  is a trivial  $G_{F_v}$ -module and so identifying  $H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v)$  with continuous group homomorphisms from the abelianisation of  $G_{F_v}$ , we have that the abelianisation of  $I_v$  appears by local

class field theory as a non-canonical factor of  $(G_{F_v})^{\text{ab}}$ , and so any homomorphism can be extended). Then  $\xi = (\xi - \gamma) + \gamma$  shows  $\xi \in H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) + H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v)$ .

We will further simplify this to a direct sum of terms whose dimensions can be computed. Consider the following decomposition of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  into  $G_{F_v}$ -submodules:

$$(3.2) \quad \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0 = N_v \oplus M_v \oplus L_{1,v}$$

where  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k = L_{0,v} \oplus L_{1,v}$  is the  $\text{Ad}(\bar{g}_v)$ -invariant decomposition of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0$  into its eigenvalue 1 subspace and complement, and  $M_v$  is any choice of vector space complement to  $N_v \subset L_{0,v}$  (necessarily a  $G_{F_v}$ -module, since  $L_{0,v}$  is a trivial  $G_{F_v}$ -module). Note then that since  $Z(\hat{G}_k) \subset M_{\bar{g}_v}$  we have  $\text{Lie } M_{\bar{g}_v} / \text{Lie } Z(\hat{G}_k) \cong L_{0,v}$ . We now claim that  $H^1(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v}) = 0$ . Indeed, by the Euler characteristic formula [Mil06, Lemma 2.9] we have  $h^1(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v}) = h^0(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v}) + h^2(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v})$ . We have in turn by Tate duality that  $h^2(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v}) = h^0(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v}^\vee(1))$ . Both  $L_{1,v}$  and its Tate dual have trivial  $\phi_v$ -invariants (as the residual  $p$ -adic cyclotomic character is trivial on  $G_{F_v}$ , since  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ ) and so indeed  $h^1(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v}) = 0$ . So we can rewrite

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_v = H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v) \oplus H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M_v).$$

Now let  $z = \dim Z(\hat{G}_k)$ ,  $l_v = \dim_k(L_{0,v}) = \dim M_{\bar{g}_v} - z$  and  $n_v = \dim_k(N_v) = \dim Z(M_{\bar{g}_v}) - z$ . We will compute  $\dim_k(\mathcal{L}_v)$ . We will firstly show that  $h^1(G_{F_v}, k) = 2$  and  $h_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, k) = 1$ . The former follows by the local Euler characteristic formula and Tate duality:

$$\begin{aligned} h^1(G_{F_v}, k) &= h^0(G_{F_v}, k) + h^2(G_{F_v}, k) \\ &= 1 + h^0(G_{F_v}, k^\vee(1)) = 2 \end{aligned}$$

since the residual  $p$ -adic cyclotomic character is trivial. The latter is exactly  $\dim_k(\text{Hom}(G_{F_v}/I_v, k))$ , which equals 1 since any such homomorphism is determined by the image of Frobenius, of which all may occur. Since  $\mathcal{L}_v = H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v) \oplus H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M_v)$  for trivial  $G_{F_v}$ -modules  $N_v$  and  $M_v$  of respective dimensions  $n_v$  and  $l_v - n_v$ , it follows that

$$(3.4) \quad \dim_k \mathcal{L}_v = l_v + n_v.$$

We will now consider the dual Selmer conditions  $\mathcal{L}_v^\perp$ , given by annihilators of  $\mathcal{L}_v$  under the Tate pairing. If  $M$  is any  $G_{F_v}$ -module then the annihilator of  $H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M)$  in  $H^1(G_{F_v}, M^\vee(1))$  under this pairing is given by the subspace  $H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M^\vee(1))$ . We therefore see from equations 3.2 and 3.3 that

$$\mathcal{L}_v^\perp = H^1(G_{F_v}, M_v^\vee(1) \oplus L_{1,v}^\vee(1)) \cap (H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M_v^\vee(1)) \oplus H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v^\vee(1) \oplus L_{1,v}^\vee(1))).$$

Since we already saw that  $H^1(G_{F_v}, L_{1,v}^\vee(1)) = 0$ , we conclude that

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_v^\perp = H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M_v^\vee(1)).$$

Having explicitly computed the dual Selmer condition for a Taylor–Wiles deformation, we obtain a better understanding of the arising dual Selmer groups.

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let  $S = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v\}_{v \in S})$  a global deformation problem and  $T \subset S$  with  $S_p \subset T$ . Let  $Q$  be any set of Taylor–Wiles places and let  $S_Q$  denote the augmented global deformation problem. Then*

$$H_{S_Q, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) \cong \ker \left( H^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) \rightarrow \prod_{v \in Q} H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, N_v^\vee(1)) \times \prod_{v \in S \setminus T} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))}{\mathcal{L}_v^\perp} \right).$$

*Proof.* Recall by Definition 3.7 that

$$H_{S_{\hat{Q}}, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) = \ker \left( H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \rightarrow \prod_{v \in Q \cup S \setminus T} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))}{\mathcal{L}_v^\perp} \right),$$

where for  $v \in Q$  we saw that  $\mathcal{L}_v^\perp = H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, M_v^\vee(1)) \leq H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$ . We therefore see that any class  $[\psi] \in H_{S_{\hat{Q}}, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$  has  $\text{res}_{G_{F_v}}[\psi] \in H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$ .

We will firstly show that any class  $[\psi] \in H_{S_{\hat{Q}}, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$  lies in the subgroup  $H^1(G_{F, S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \leq H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$ . Let  $Q = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$  and for  $0 \leq t \leq r$  let  $Q_t = \{v_1, \dots, v_t\}$ . We show that if  $[\psi] \in H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q_t}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$  for some  $t \geq 1$  then in fact  $[\psi] \in H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q_{t-1}}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$ . To simplify notation, let  $v$  denote  $v_t$ . Inflation–restriction gives an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q_{t-1}}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q_t}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(I_{v, t}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)),$$

where  $I_{v, t}$  is an inertia subgroup at a place of  $F_{S \cup Q_{t-1}}$  above  $v$  in  $F_{S \cup Q_t}$ . Since  $I_{v, t}$  may be identified as a quotient of  $I_v$  (noting that, as  $F_{S \cup Q_{t-1}}/F$  is unramified at  $v$ , we see that  $I_{v, t}$  is equal to the inertia subgroup at  $v$  in  $F_{S \cup Q_t}$ ), we have an inclusion  $H^1(I_{v, t}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \hookrightarrow H^1(I_v, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$ . Under this inclusion,  $\text{res}_{I_{v, t}}[\psi]$  has image 0, since this coincides with  $\text{res}_{I_v}[\psi] = 0$  and we saw that  $[\psi]$  defines an unramified class at  $v$ . Thus  $[\psi]$  naturally lies in  $H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q_{t-1}}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$  completing the induction.

We next claim that if  $v \in Q$ , then

$$\frac{H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))}{H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \cap \mathcal{L}_v^\perp} \cong H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, N_v^\vee(1)).$$

The result would then follow, since we already saw that any class in  $H_{S_{\hat{Q}}, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$  is unramified at  $v$ . The claim follows immediately on writing  $H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) = H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v^\vee(1)) \oplus H^1(G_{F_v}, M_v^\vee(1))$ , where we have recalled that  $H^1(G_{F_v}, L_v^\vee(1)) = 0$ .  $\square$

We now consider conditions under which we can show existence of sets of Taylor–Wiles places of level  $N$  with vanishing dual Selmer group. Our first notion is a modification of the definition of an abundant subgroup [BKHT19, Definition 5.18] to allow for our images of Frobenius elements to be only semisimple elements of  $\hat{G}(k)$ .

**Definition 3.15.** We say  $H \leq \hat{G}(k)$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate if the following conditions hold:

- (1) The following groups vanish
  - (a)  $H^0(H, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee})$
  - (b)  $H^1(H, k)$
  - (c)  $H^1(H, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee})$
- (2) For every non-zero simple  $k[H]$ -submodule  $W \leq \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}$  there exists a semisimple element  $h \in H$  whose centralizer  $Z_{\hat{G}_k}(h)$  is a connected subgroup of  $\hat{G}_k$  such that for some  $w \in W$  and  $z \in \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^h)$  we have  $w(z) \neq 0$ .

*Remark 3.16.* It may be possible to remove the condition that the centralizer  $Z_{\hat{G}_k}(h)$  is connected in Definition 3.15, and still construct a local deformation problem which would work equally well. However, since it makes no difference for our application to symplectic groups in Section 7 (as the centralizer of a semisimple element in a simply connected group is connected), we have not yet tried to do this.

Note that in the case of  $h \in H$  being regular semisimple we recover the original definition of  $\hat{G}$ -abundant (when  $\hat{G}$  is semisimple): the centralizer of  $h$  is a maximal torus and  $\mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^h) = (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^h$ , so taking  $z \in (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^h$  and  $w \in W$  with  $w(z) \neq 0$  shows the restriction of  $w$  to  $W^h$  is non-zero.

The following lemma has an identical proof to that of [BCGP21, Lemma 7.5.9].

**Lemma 3.17.** *Let  $n \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $H^0(\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}), \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}) = 0$ . Let  $L$  be the fixed field of the module  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}$ . Suppose that one of the following conditions holds*

- (1)  $\zeta_p \notin L$
- (2)  $H^1(\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}), \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}) = 0$ .

Then  $H^1(\text{Gal}(L(\zeta_{p^n})/F), \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) = 0$ .

Let us now recall a form of the Chebotarev density theorem, which we will use to relate the existence of desired semisimple elements to a Frobenius element at some place of  $F$ .

**Theorem 3.18** (Chebotarev density theorem). *Let  $T$  be a finite set of places of  $F$ . Then the set of Frobenius elements of the form  $\{\text{Frob}_w\}$  for  $w$  a place of the maximal extension of  $F$  unramified outside  $T$  not dividing  $T$  is a dense subset of  $G_{F,T}$ .*

We are now ready to prove the standard result on the existence of sets of Taylor–Wiles places with vanishing dual Selmer group under suitable conditions on the image of  $\bar{\rho}$ .

**Proposition 3.19.** *Let  $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v\}_{v \in S})$  a global deformation problem and  $T \subset S$  with  $S_p \subset T$ . Let  $n \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}) \subset \hat{G}(k)$  satisfies condition 2 of Definition 3.15, and if  $\zeta_p$  is in the fixed field of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}$  then suppose further that  $H^1(\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}), \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}) = 0$ . Let  $q \geq h^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))$ . Then there exists a set  $Q$  of Taylor–Wiles places of level  $n$  such that*

- $H_{S_{Q^\perp}, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) = 0$
- $\#Q = q$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.14, it will suffice to find for each non-zero class  $[\psi] \in H^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))$  infinitely many Taylor–Wiles places  $v$  of level  $n$  with  $[\psi]$  having non-zero image in  $H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, N_v^\vee(1))$ . Indeed, suppose that  $t < q$  and that we have inductively found Taylor–Wiles places  $Q_t = \{v_1, \dots, v_t\}$  of level  $n$  for which  $h_{S_{Q_t}^\perp, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) \leq q - t$ . If there still exists  $0 \neq [\psi] \in H_{S_{Q_t}^\perp, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))$  then we can find a Taylor–Wiles place  $v_{t+1} \notin Q_t$  of level  $n$  for which  $[\psi]$  has non-zero image in  $H_{\text{ur}}^1(G_{F_v}, N_{v_{t+1}}^\vee(1))$ . It then follows that  $h_{S_{Q_{t+1}}^\perp, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) \leq q - t - 1$ . So inductively we can always find some  $t \leq q$  and  $Q_t$  for which  $h_{S_{Q_t}^\perp, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) = 0$ , and then we are done on extending  $Q_t$  by any other  $q - t$  choices of Taylor–Wiles places of level  $n$ .

So let  $[\psi] \in H^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))$  be a non-zero class and suppose that we can always find  $\sigma \in G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}$  such that  $\bar{\rho}(\sigma)$  is semisimple with connected centralizer and  $\psi(\sigma)(N) \neq 0$ , where  $N = \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^\sigma)$ . We claim that by the Chebotarev density theorem we can find infinitely many places  $v \notin S$  with  $\bar{\rho}(\sigma) = \bar{\rho}(\text{Frob}_v)$ ,  $\psi(\sigma) = \psi(\text{Frob}_v)$  and  $\text{Frob}_v \in G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}$ . Such a  $v$  would be a Taylor–Wiles place of level  $n$  with  $[\psi]$  having non-zero image in  $H^1(G_{F_v}, N_v^\vee(1))$ . Indeed, consider the non-empty open subset  $U$  of  $G_{F,S}$  given by the intersection of  $\bar{\rho}^{-1}\{\bar{\rho}(\sigma)\}$ ,  $\text{Gal}(F_S/F(\zeta_{p^n}))$  and  $\psi^{-1}\{\psi(\sigma)\}$ . The Frobenius elements are dense in  $G_{F,S}$  by Chebotarev, so there exists (infinitely many) Frobenius elements  $\text{Frob}_v$  satisfying  $\bar{\rho}(\text{Frob}_v) = \bar{\rho}(\sigma)$ ,  $\psi(\text{Frob}_v) = \psi(\sigma)$  and  $\text{Frob}_v \in G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}$ .

We now show the existence of such a  $\sigma$ . Let  $F_n = F(\zeta_{p^n})$  and let  $H = \bar{\rho}(G_{F_n})$ . Let  $L$  be the fixed field of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)$  and let  $L_n = L(\zeta_{p^n})$ . We will show that the restriction of  $\psi$  to  $G_{L_n,S}$  is a non-zero homomorphism which we denote  $f : G_{L_n,S} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)$ . This would follow immediately from injectivity of the restriction map

$$H^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1)) \rightarrow H^1(G_{L_n,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))^{G_F}.$$

By inflation-restriction, the kernel of this map is given by

$$H^1(\text{Gal}(L(\zeta_{p^n})/F), \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}(1))$$

which therefore vanishes by Lemma 3.17.

Thus  $f(G_{L_n})$  is non-zero and moreover is a  $G_{F_n,S}$ -module, as for  $\sigma \in G_{L_n}$  and  $\tau \in G_{F_n,S}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\tau\sigma\tau^{-1}) &= \psi(\tau) + \tau\psi(\sigma\tau^{-1}) \\ &= \psi(\tau) + \tau(\psi(\sigma) + \sigma\psi(\tau^{-1})) \\ &= \psi(\tau) + \tau\psi(\sigma) + \tau\psi(\tau^{-1}) \\ &= \psi(\text{id}) + \tau\psi(\sigma) \\ &= \tau\psi(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can take a non-zero simple  $H$ -submodule  $W \leq f(G_{L_n,S})$ . Now use that  $H$  satisfies condition 2 of Definition 3.15 to find a  $\sigma_0 \in H$  with  $\bar{\rho}(\sigma_0)$  semisimple whose centralizer is connected, and such that there exists a  $w \in W$  and  $z \in \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^{\sigma_0})$  with  $w(z) \neq 0$ . We may write  $w = \psi(\sigma)$  for some  $\sigma \in G_{L_n,S}$ . We claim that there exists  $\tau \in G_{L_n}$  with  $\psi(\tau\sigma_0)(\mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{\sigma_0})) \neq 0$ . If  $\psi(\sigma_0)(z) \neq 0$  then we're done. Otherwise  $\psi(\tau\sigma_0) = \psi(\tau) + \psi(\sigma_0)$ . So choose  $\tau$  to be such that  $\psi(\tau) = w$  and let  $\sigma = \tau\sigma_0$ . Then  $\psi(\sigma)(z) = \psi(\tau)(z) = w(z) \neq 0$ , and  $\mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^{\sigma}) = \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^{\sigma_0})$ , so we're done.  $\square$

The hypotheses of Proposition 3.19 motivates the following definition, which is a weakening of the notion of vast Galois representations of [BCGP21, Definition 7.5.6].

**Definition 3.20.** *A Galois representation*

$$\bar{\rho} : G_F \rightarrow \hat{G}(k)$$

is said to be  $\hat{G}$ -reasonable if the following conditions hold for all sufficiently large  $n$

- (1)  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}) \subset \hat{G}(k)$  satisfies conditions 1a and 2 of Definition 3.15
- (2) if  $\zeta_p$  is in the fixed field of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}$  then  $H^1(\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})}), \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0,\vee}) = 0$ .

Note that while Definition 3.15 is a condition on a subgroup, Definition 3.20 is a condition on a representation  $\bar{\rho}$ . We can relate these notions as follows

**Lemma 3.21.** *Suppose that  $H^1(\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)}), k) = 0$ . Then for every  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)}) = \bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})})$ . In particular, if  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)})$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate then  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\hat{G}$ -reasonable.*

*Proof.* We have that  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_{p^n})})$  is a normal subgroup of  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)})$  of  $p$ -power index. If they weren't equal, there would therefore exist a non-trivial homomorphism  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ , which would contradict the hypothesis that  $H^1(\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)}), k) = 0$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Dual groups and the  $\Delta_Q$ -action.** To begin this section, we will recall some properties of (pinned) root data over a general scheme from [DG70] and the relationship to reductive group schemes. Let  $S$  be a scheme and  $T$  a torus over  $S$ . We recall the notion of a root datum in  $T$  over  $S$  from [DG70, Exp XXII Définition 1.9]. This consists of

- a finite subgroup scheme  $\mathcal{R} \subset \text{Hom}_{S\text{-gp}}(T, \mathbb{G}_{m,S})$
- a finite subgroup scheme  $\mathcal{R}^\vee \subset \text{Hom}_{S\text{-gp}}(\mathbb{G}_{m,S}, T)$
- an isomorphism  $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^\vee$  denoted  $\alpha \mapsto \alpha^\vee$

such that for every  $S' \rightarrow S$

- for every  $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(S')$  we have  $\alpha \circ \alpha^\vee = 2$
- for every  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{R}(S')$  we have

$$\alpha - (\beta^\vee, \alpha)\beta \in \mathcal{R}(S') \quad \alpha^\vee - (\alpha^\vee, \beta)\beta^\vee \in \mathcal{R}^\vee(S').$$

The root datum is called reduced if whenever  $S' \rightarrow S$  is non-empty and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(S')$  we have  $2\alpha \notin \mathcal{R}(S')$ . Suppose now that the  $T$  torus is split, so that we can identify the characters and cocharacters of  $T$  with finite free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. Then  $\mathcal{R}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{R}^\vee$ ) can be identified with a finite subset  $\Phi \subset X^*(T)$  (resp.  $\Phi^\vee \subset X_*(T)$ ). A set of simple roots  $\Delta \subset \Phi$  is a subset such that each  $\alpha \in \Phi$  can be written uniquely as a linear combination of elements of  $\Delta$  with integral coefficients all of the same sign. A pinned root datum over  $S$  is then the data of a root datum together with a system of simple roots ([DG70, Exp XXIII 1.5]). We can denote such a pinned root datum by a tuple

$$R = (X^*(T), \Phi, \Delta, X_*(T), \Phi^\vee, \Delta^\vee),$$

where  $\Delta^\vee = \{\alpha^\vee : \alpha \in \Delta\}$ . We can then form the dual root datum

$$R^\vee = (X_*(T), \Phi^\vee, \Delta^\vee, X^*(T), \Phi, \Delta)$$

given by interchanging the roles of  $X^*(T)$  and  $X_*(T)$ .

Suppose now that  $G$  is a reductive group scheme over  $S$  together with a split maximal torus  $T$ . A pinning of  $G$  with respect to  $T$ , as in [DG70, Exp XXIII Définition 1.1] is the data of a root basis  $\Delta$  of the arising set of roots together with sections  $X_\alpha \in \Gamma(S, \mathfrak{g}_\alpha)^\times$  for every  $\alpha \in \Delta$ . The functor assigning a pinned reductive group  $G$  over  $S$  to its pinned root datum  $R(G)$  defines an equivalence of categories to the category of pinned reduced root data over  $S$ , as stated in [DG70, Exp XXV Théorème 1.1]. The data of the sections  $X_\alpha$  is to ensure faithfulness of this functor and does not change the arising pinned root datum. If  $B \subset G$  is a Borel subgroup containing  $T$ , then  $B$  determines a unique choice of root basis  $\Delta$  by insisting  $\Delta \subset \Phi^+$ , the positive roots with respect to  $B$ . Hence the choice of  $B$  determines a pinned root datum. We note that if we have an isomorphism of pinned root data then it is unique, by [DG70, Exp XXIII Corollaire 5.5]. Given a reduced pinned root datum then, we can view this as a reduced pinned root datum over  $\mathbb{Z}$  and hence this determines (up to isomorphism) a reductive group scheme over  $\mathbb{Z}$  together with a split maximal torus and Borel subgroup containing it.

Now let  $\hat{T} \subset \hat{B} \subset \hat{G}$  be a choice of split maximal torus and Borel subgroup of  $\hat{G}$ , determining a pinned root datum  $R(\hat{G})$  and dual root datum  $R(\hat{G})^\vee$ . Let  $G$  be a reductive group scheme defined over either  $\mathcal{O}_F$  in the case that  $F$  is a number field, or  $\mathbb{F}_q$  in the function field case, together with a split maximal torus  $T$  and Borel subgroup  $B$  with root datum  $R(G)$  and suppose there exists an isomorphism  $R(G) \cong R(\hat{G})^\vee$ . We see that for every such choice of split maximal torus  $\hat{T}$  and Borel subgroup  $\hat{B}$  containing  $\hat{T}$  we get unique isomorphisms  $X^*(\hat{T}) \cong X_*(T)$  and  $X_*(\hat{T}) \cong X^*(T)$ . We will now suppose that we have fixed such a  $\hat{T}$  and  $\hat{B}$  and let  $\iota$  denote this isomorphism of pinned root data.



Suppose that  $\hat{P}$  is a standard parabolic subgroup of  $\hat{G}$  (so  $\hat{B} \subset \hat{P}$ ) and  $\hat{L}$  is a standard Levi factor of  $\hat{P}$  (so  $\hat{T} \subset \hat{L}$ ). Then the isomorphism of root data determines dual subgroups  $P$  and  $L$  of  $G$ , which are a standard parabolic and standard Levi subgroup respectively. We will explain this now, following the explanation of [Sch05, 2.3]. Let  $\hat{\Delta}$  be the set of simple roots of  $\hat{G}$ , and  $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{P}} \subset \hat{\Delta}$  be the set of simple roots corresponding to  $\hat{P}$  under the bijection between subsets of simple roots and standard parabolic subgroups. We can then form the parabolic subgroup of  $P \subset G$  dual to  $\hat{P}$  by defining  $P$  to be the standard parabolic subgroup of  $G$  corresponding to the subset of simple roots given by the image of  $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{P}}^\vee$  under  $\iota$ . The dual Levi subgroup  $L$  can then be taken to be the unique Levi factor containing the maximal torus  $T$ . There will then be an isomorphism of pinned root data between that of  $L$  and  $\hat{L}$  induced by  $\iota$ , where the pinned root datum of  $L$  (resp  $\hat{L}$ ) is defined via the maximal torus  $T$  (resp.  $\hat{T}$ ) and Borel subgroup  $B \cap L$  (resp.  $\hat{B} \cap \hat{L}$ ).

There is also a duality induced between  $Z(\hat{G})^\circ$  and  $C_G$ . Recall here that the cocenter  $C_G = G/G^{\text{der}}$  is the quotient of  $G$  by its derived group. We may view  $X_*(Z(\hat{G})^\circ)$  as a submodule of  $X_*(\hat{T})$  and  $X^*(C_G)$  as a submodule of  $X^*(T)$ ; we claim that these submodules are identified via  $\iota$ . This is immediate from the characterizations of these submodules as the annihilators of the roots of  $\hat{G}$  (resp. coroots of  $G$ ). This description of the coroots of the connected center follows from viewing  $Z(\hat{G}) = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \hat{\Delta}} \ker(\alpha)$ , a consequence of  $Z(\hat{G})$  being the kernel of the adjoint representation of  $\hat{G}$ . This characterization of the cocenter, on the other hand, follows from the start of the proof of [Con14, 5.3.1].

Suppose now that  $(Q, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q})$  is a Taylor–Wiles datum and let  $v \in Q$ . The data of the split maximal torus  $\hat{T}_v$  and Borel subgroup  $\hat{B}_v$  thus determines unique isomorphisms  $X^*(T) \cong X_*(\hat{T}_v)$  and  $X_*(T) \cong X^*(\hat{T}_v)$  which we will denote by  $\iota_v$  in both cases. Let  $\bar{g}_v = \bar{\rho}(\phi_v)$  and recall that the centralizer of  $\bar{g}_v$  in  $\hat{G}_k$  is a connected reductive closed subgroup  $M_{\bar{g}_v}$  of  $\hat{G}_k$  containing the torus  $\hat{T}_v$ . It is not, in general, a Levi subgroup of  $\hat{G}_k$  (consider, for example, a semisimple element of  $\text{Sp}_4(k)$  of order 2 with  $\text{char } k \neq 2$ : its centralizer will be isomorphic to  $\text{SL}_2 \times \text{SL}_2$ , which is not the centralizer of any torus). However, we can use the connected center of  $M_{\bar{g}_v}$  to construct a Levi subgroup  $\hat{L}_v$  of  $\hat{G}_k$ .

**Definition 3.22** ( $\hat{L}_v$  and  $L_v$ ). *Let  $\hat{L}_v = Z_{\hat{G}_k}(Z(M_{\bar{g}_v})^\circ)$  denote the centralizer of the identity component of the center of  $M_{\bar{g}_v}$ . This is a standard Levi subgroup of  $\hat{G}_k$ . Let  $L_v$  denote the dual Levi subgroup of  $G$  arising from  $\iota_v$ .*

Note that  $\hat{L}_v$  will always contain  $M_{\bar{g}_v}$  and their connected centers will coincide. As above,  $\iota_v$  allows us to identify  $X_*(Z(M_{\bar{g}})^\circ) \subset X_*(\hat{T}_v)$  with  $X^*(C_{L_v}) \subset X^*(T)$ .

Suppose now that  $\rho_v \in \mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(A)$  for some  $A \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  and let  $g = \rho(\phi_v)$ . Then since  $\rho_v$  lifts the unramified representation  $\bar{\rho}_v$ , we have by definition of  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}$  that  $\rho|_{I_v}$  is valued in  $\ker(Z(M_g)(A) \rightarrow Z(M_g)(k))$ , where  $M_g$  is as in Theorem 2.14. This group is pro- $p$  and abelian, so  $\rho|_{I_v}$  factors through the maximal  $p$ -power quotient of  $k(v)^\times$ , viewing  $k(v)^\times$  as a quotient of  $I_v$ . We thus obtain a map in  $\text{Hom}(k(v)^\times, Z(M_g)^\circ(A))$ . Given  $\alpha \in X_*(C_{L_v})$  we have  $\iota_v(\alpha) \in X^*(Z(M_{\bar{g}})^\circ)$  which lifts to a unique homomorphism of  $A$ -tori,  $Z(M_g)^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m, A}$ . We can thus define a bijection

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}(k(v)^\times, Z(M_g)^\circ(A)) &\rightarrow \text{Hom}(X_*(C_{L_v}) \otimes k(v)^\times, A^\times) \\ \varphi &\mapsto (\alpha \otimes x \mapsto \iota_v(\alpha)(\varphi(x))) \end{aligned}$$

which can be thought as an instance of tensor-hom adjunction. Thus we obtain a map  $C_{L_v}(k(v)) \rightarrow A^\times$ , and it can be checked that this map factors through the maximal  $p$ -power quotient of  $C_{L_v}(k(v))$ . Since  $\psi|_{I_v}$  is trivial, this map is also trivial on the image of  $Z(G)(k(v))$  in  $C_{L_v}(k(v))$ , as  $\iota_v$  induces an isomorphism  $X_*(Z(G)^\circ) \cong X^*(C_{\hat{G}})$ . Note that since  $p$  is a prime of very good characteristic, the images of  $Z(G)^\circ(k(v))$  and  $Z(G)(k(v))$  in the maximal  $p$ -power order quotient of  $C_{L_v}(k(v))$  coincide.

We thus define  $\Delta_v$  to be the maximal quotient of  $C_{L_v}(k(v))$  which is of  $p$ -power order and for which the image of  $Z(G)(k(v))$  is trivial. From this discussion, we see that  $\rho$  induces a group homomorphism  $\Delta_v \rightarrow A^\times$ , and it is clear that this construction is functorial in  $A$ . The assignment of a representation to the  $\Delta_v$ -action is also constant on strict equivalence classes. Indeed, if  $\gamma \in \ker(\hat{G}(A) \rightarrow \hat{G}(k))$ , set  $g' = \text{Ad}(\gamma)(g)$ . Then  $\text{Ad}(\gamma)(Z(M_g)) = Z(M_{g'})$  by Lemma 2.16 and hence  $\gamma$  will define an isomorphism  $X^*(Z(M_g)) \rightarrow X^*(Z(M_{g'}))$  which is the identity on reduction modulo  $m_A$ .

Associated to the Taylor–Wiles datum  $(Q, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q})$ , we can now set  $\Delta_Q = \prod_{v \in Q} \Delta_v$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v^\square\}_{v \in S})$  is any global deformation problem,  $T \subset S$  is any subset, and consider  $\mathcal{S}_Q$ , the augmented deformation problem. If  $\rho$  defines a class in  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T(A)$  then we obtain a map  $\Delta_v \rightarrow A^\times$  for every  $v \in Q$ , and hence a map  $\Delta_Q \rightarrow A^\times$ . In particular, we obtain a map  $\Delta_Q \rightarrow (R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T)^\times$ . If we let  $\mathfrak{a}_Q$  denote the ideal of  $(R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T)^\times$  generated by the images of  $\delta - 1$  for  $\delta \in \Delta_Q$ , we have an isomorphism  $R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T/\mathfrak{a}_Q \rightarrow R_S^T$ . This is clear from noting that, for  $v \in Q$ , a lift in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(A)$  is unramified if and only if the map  $\Delta_v \rightarrow A^\times$  is trivial.

### 3.4. Presentations of framed deformation rings in the number fields case.

In this section let  $F$  be a number field and suppose that  $p > 2$ . Let  $T \subset S$  with  $S_p \subset T$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{\rho}, S, \{\Lambda_v\}_{v \in S}, \psi, \{\mathcal{D}_v^\square\}_{v \in S})$  is a global deformation problem such that for every  $v \in S \setminus T$  we have  $\mathcal{D}_v^\square = D_v^\square$  and  $\Lambda_v = \mathcal{O}$ . Then for  $v \in S \setminus T$  we have  $\mathcal{L}_v = H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)$ . Set  $R^{T, \text{loc}} = \hat{\otimes}_{v \in T} R_v^\square$ . This has the structure of a  $\Lambda = \otimes_{v \in T} \Lambda_v$ -algebra. Now let  $(Q, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q})$  be a Taylor–Wiles datum (with  $Q$  possibly empty) and consider the augmented deformation problem  $\mathcal{S}_Q$ . For  $v \in T$  there is a natural transformation of functors  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_v^\square$  on  $\text{CNL}_{\Lambda_v}$  given by  $(\rho, \{\gamma_v\}_{v \in T}) \mapsto \gamma_v^{-1} \rho|_{G_{F_v} \gamma_v}$ . Thus for each  $v \in T$  we have a morphism  $R_v^\square \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T$  in  $\text{CNL}_{\Lambda_v}$ . Tensoring, we obtain a map  $R^{T, \text{loc}} \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T$  in  $\text{CNL}_\Lambda$ . The Selmer groups in this case become

$$H_{\mathcal{S}_Q, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) = \ker \left( H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \rightarrow \left( \prod_{v \in Q} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)}{\mathcal{L}_v} \times \prod_{v \in T} H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \right) \right)$$

$$H_{\mathcal{S}_Q, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) = \ker \left( H^1(G_{F, S \cup Q}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \rightarrow \prod_{v \in S \setminus T} H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) \times \prod_{v \in Q} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))}{\mathcal{L}_v^1} \right).$$

**Proposition 3.23.** *With the above setup, there exists a surjective morphism  $R^{T, \text{loc}}[[X_1, \dots, X_g]] \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{S}_Q}^T$  in  $\text{CNL}_\Lambda$  with*

$$g = h_{\mathcal{S}_Q, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) - h^0(G_{F, S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) - \sum_{v| \infty} h^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \\ + \sum_{v \in S \setminus T} h^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) + z(\#T - 1) + \sum_{v \in Q} n_v.$$

Here  $z = \dim Z(\hat{G}_k)$  and for  $v \in Q$  we have  $n_v = \dim Z(M_{\bar{\rho}(\phi_v)}) - z$ .

*Proof.* Note firstly that if  $A \rightarrow B$  is a morphism in  $\text{CNL}_\Lambda$  then taking  $g = \dim_k m_B/(m_A, m_B^2)$  we can find a surjection  $A[[X_1, \dots, X_g]] \rightarrow B$  by sending the  $X_i$  to lifts of a  $k$ -basis of  $m_B/(m_A, m_B^2)$ . Viewed in terms of relative tangent spaces we have an exact sequence of  $k$ -vector spaces

$$m_A/(m_\Lambda, m_A^2) \rightarrow m_B/(m_\Lambda, m_B^2) \rightarrow m_B/(m_A, m_B^2) \rightarrow 0$$

so it is equivalent to compute the dimension of

$$\ker \left[ (m_B/(m_\Lambda, m_B^2))^* \rightarrow (m_A/(m_\Lambda, m_A^2))^* \right],$$

the map on relative cotangent spaces. For  $R \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$  we can identify  $(m_R/(m_\Lambda, m_R^2))^* \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{CNL}_\Lambda}(R, k[\epsilon])$ . Hence taking  $A = R^{T, \text{loc}}$  and  $B = R_{S_Q}^T$  now, we can understand these maps explicitly in terms of  $k[\epsilon]$ -points of the functors they represent. By definition, the map will send a strict equivalence class to a tuple  $(\rho, \{\gamma_v\}_{v \in T}) \mapsto (\gamma_v^{-1} \rho|_{G_{F_v}})_{v \in T}$ . Before continuing further, we introduce the following notation:

$$Z_Q^1 = \ker \left( Z^1(G_{F_{S \cup Q}}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \rightarrow \prod_{v \in Q} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)}{\mathcal{L}_v} \right)$$

$$H_Q^1 = \ker \left( H^1(G_{F_{S \cup Q}}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \rightarrow \prod_{v \in Q} \frac{H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)}{\mathcal{L}_v} \right).$$

Since we are working with  $k[\epsilon]$ -points, we can view the assignment above in terms of cocycles as a map

$$\alpha_2 : \left( Z_Q^1 \times \prod_{v \in T} \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \right) / \sim \rightarrow \prod_{v \in T} Z^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)$$

$$(\psi, (\gamma_v)_{v \in T}) \mapsto (\psi|_{G_{F_v}} - \delta(\gamma_v))$$

where  $\delta$  is the usual coboundary map and the equivalence relation  $\sim$  is given by  $(\psi, (\gamma_v)_{v \in T}) \sim (\psi', (\gamma'_v)_{v \in T})$  if there exists  $\alpha \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  such that  $\psi' = \psi + \delta(\alpha)$  and  $\gamma'_v = \gamma_v + \alpha$  for every  $v \in T$  (see Definition 3.4).

Now consider the following commutative diagram, whose rows are short exact sequences.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0 \times \prod_{v \in T} \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k & \xrightarrow{\delta \times \text{id}} & Z_Q^1 \times \prod_{v \in T} \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k & \xrightarrow{\alpha_3} & H_Q^1 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \alpha_1 & & \downarrow \alpha_2 & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \prod_{v \in T} \frac{Z^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)}{H^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \prod_{v \in T} Z^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{v \in T} H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Here the map  $\alpha_1$  is defined by  $(\gamma, \{\gamma_v\}_{v \in T}) \mapsto (\gamma + \gamma_v)_{v \in T}$ . The map  $\alpha_3$  sends  $(\psi, \{\gamma_v\}_{v \in T}) \mapsto [\psi]$ , forgetting the data of the  $\{\gamma_v\}_{v \in T}$ . The final row is then just the product over  $v \in T$  of the exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{Z^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)}{H^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)} \rightarrow Z^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \rightarrow H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \rightarrow 0,$$

where we have used the isomorphism  $\frac{Z^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)}{H^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)} \cong \frac{Z^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)}{H^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k)}$ . Since  $\alpha_1$  is surjective, it follows by the snake lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \sum_{v \in T} h^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k) + \dim_k(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) - h^0(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) + h_{S_Q, T}^1 - \dim \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k \\ &= \sum_{v \in T} h^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k) - h^0(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k) + h_{S_Q, T}^1, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the decomposition of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  as a direct sum of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0$  and a trivial submodule again and that the equivalence relation  $\sim$  defines a quotient by a subspace of dimension  $\dim_k \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k$  since  $T \neq \emptyset$ .

We have by [DDT95, Theorem 2.19] that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{S_Q, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) &= h_{S_Q^\perp, T}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) + h^0(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) - h^0(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) - \sum_{v|\infty} h^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) \\ &\quad - \sum_{v \in T} h^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) + \sum_{v \in S \setminus T} (h^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0 - h^0(F_v, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)) + \sum_{v \in Q} n_v, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $H^1(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k) = 0$  if  $v|\infty$  by the assumption that  $\text{char } k > 2$ . The result then follows on applying the local Euler characteristic formula together with Tate duality at those places  $v \in S \setminus T$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.24.** *Continue with the same setup as above, but with  $T = S$ . Let  $n \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\hat{G}$ -reasonable. Let  $q \geq h^1(G_{F,S}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1))$ . Then there exists a set  $Q$  of Taylor–Wiles places of level  $n$  such that*

- $H_{S_Q^\perp, S}^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}(1)) = 0$
- $\#Q = q$
- *There exists a surjection  $R^{S, \text{loc}}[[X_1, \dots, X_g]] \rightarrow R_{S_Q, S}$  with  $g = \sum_{v \in Q} n_v - \sum_{v|\infty} h^0(G_{F_v}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0) + z(\#S - 1)$ .*

Here  $z = \dim Z(\hat{G}_k)$  and  $n_v = \dim Z(M_{\bar{\rho}(\phi_v)}) - z$ , for  $v \in Q$ .

*Proof.* Taking  $n$  sufficiently large as necessary, this is immediate from Proposition 3.19 together with Proposition 3.23.  $\square$

#### 4. $\hat{G}$ -ADEQUATE SUBGROUPS

In this section let  $p$  be a prime number and let  $\hat{G}$  be a connected reductive group over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ . We assume throughout this section that  $p$  is a prime of very good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$ . We fix a finite subgroup  $\Gamma \leq \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  (so  $\Gamma$  is defined over a finite extension  $k$  of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ ). We aim to relate the notions of  $\hat{G}$ -irreducibility and  $\hat{G}$ -adequacy of  $\Gamma$ . We recall these firstly.

**Definition 4.1.** *We say  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible if for every proper parabolic subgroup  $P$  of  $\hat{G}$ , we have  $\Gamma \not\subset P(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ .*

Note that this coincides with the usual definition of irreducibility in the case  $\hat{G} = \text{GL}_n$ . Now let  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0$  be the Lie algebra of  $\hat{G}^{\text{der}}$ , a finite dimensional  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ -vector space, and  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{0, \vee}$  its linear dual. Both are  $\Gamma$ -modules, via the adjoint action of  $\hat{G}$  on its Lie algebra.

**Definition 3.15.** *We say  $H \leq \hat{G}(k)$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *The following groups vanish*
  - (a)  $H^0(H, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee})$

- (b)  $H^1(H, k)$   
(c)  $H^1(H, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee})$
- (2) For every non-zero simple  $k[H]$ -submodule  $W \leq \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^{0, \vee}$  there exists a semisimple element  $h \in H$  whose centralizer  $Z_{\hat{G}_k}(h)$  is a connected subgroup of  $\hat{G}_k$  such that for some  $w \in W$  and  $z \in \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_k^0)^h)$  we have  $w(z) \neq 0$ .

Here  $(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^h = \{v \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0 \mid \text{Ad}(h)(v) = v\}$  is the Lie algebra centralizer of  $h$ , a Lie subalgebra of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ , and  $\mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^h)$  its center. It suffices to check these conditions when we replace each instance of  $k$  with  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$  in Definition 3.15, and we will do so throughout this section.

Let  $\Gamma^{\text{ss}}$  denote the set of semisimple elements of  $\Gamma$ ; since we are working over a finite field these are exactly the elements of order prime to  $p$ . Let  $\Gamma^c$  denote the subset of  $\Gamma^{\text{ss}}$  given by those  $\gamma \in \Gamma^{\text{ss}}$  for which the centralizer of  $\gamma$  in  $\hat{G}$  is a connected subgroup. An equivalent characterisation of condition 2 in Definition 3.15 is as follows:

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^c} \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma) = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0.$$

Indeed, letting  $U \leq (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\vee$  be the annihilator of  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^c} \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma)$ , this is non-zero if and only if there exists a non-zero simple  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$ -submodule  $W \leq (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\vee$  such that for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma^c$ , every  $w \in W$  and  $z \in \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma)$  we have  $w(z) = 0$ .

We record the following observation relating the center of the centralizer of a semisimple element  $\gamma$  to the centralizer of  $\gamma$  in the Weyl group of  $\hat{G}$  with respect a choice of maximal torus containing  $\gamma$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $T \subset \hat{G}$  be a maximal torus with Weyl group  $W = N_{\hat{G}}(T)/T$  and let  $\gamma \in \hat{T}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  with connected centralizer in  $\hat{G}$ . Then the subgroups  $Z(Z_{\hat{G}}(\gamma))$  and  $T^{\text{Stab}_W(\gamma)}$ , the fixed points of  $T$  under the conjugation action of  $\text{Stab}_W(\gamma)$ , coincide on taking identity components. Hence we have an equality of Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma) = (\text{Lie } T \cap \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^{\text{Stab}_W(\gamma)}$ .*

*Proof.* The centralizer  $Z_{\hat{G}}(\gamma)$  is reductive with maximal torus  $T$  and Weyl group  $\text{Stab}_W(\gamma)$ . It follows from [29] that the center of  $Z_{\hat{G}}(\gamma)$  is a finite index subgroup of  $T^{\text{Stab}_W(\gamma)}$ , and these subgroups therefore coincide on identity components. Since we are in very good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$  we deduce the statement on Lie algebras.  $\square$

**4.1.  $\text{GL}_n$ -irreducible implies  $\hat{G}$ -adequate.** We firstly try to answer the question of when does irreducibility imply adequacy. In the case  $\hat{G} = \text{GL}_n$  these notions are already known to be equivalent in sufficiently large characteristic:

**Theorem 4.3.** *Suppose that  $p \geq 2(n+1)$ . Then  $\Gamma \leq \text{GL}_n(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is  $\text{GL}_n$ -adequate if and only if  $\Gamma$  is absolutely irreducible.*

*Proof.* This is immediate from combining [GH11, Lemma 1, Theorem 9] on noting that each semisimple element  $\gamma$  of  $\text{GL}_n(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  has connected centralizer and that  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)$  is exactly the span of the projections to the eigenspaces of  $\gamma$ .  $\square$

In the rest of this section, let  $\hat{G}$  be one of the following simple linear algebraic groups over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ :

- the special orthogonal group  $\text{SO}_n$  for  $n \geq 3$
- the symplectic group  $\text{Sp}_{2n}$  for  $n \geq 1$
- the simply connected exceptional groups  $G_2, F_4, E_6, E_7, E_8$ .

We will use Theorem 4.3 to prove an analogous theorem for  $\hat{G}$ , viewing  $\hat{G}$  as a subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ . We firstly prove some lemmas which will allow us to verify that a finite subgroup of  $\hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate by working in  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\hat{G}$  be as above. View  $\hat{G} \subset \mathrm{GL}_n$  via an irreducible faithful representation of  $\hat{G}$  of minimal dimension. If  $p$  is a prime of very good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$  then the Lie algebra  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \leq \mathfrak{gl}_n$  admits a  $\hat{G}$ -module complement.*

*Proof.* In the proof of [Hum11, Theorem 3.9], it is shown that for some embedding  $\hat{G} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n$  there is a  $\hat{G}$ -module complement to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  inside  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$ . For the cases of the classical simple groups, these embeddings are of minimal dimension. However, the cases of the exceptional groups are instead handled by considering the inclusion  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$  given by the adjoint representation. There it is shown that  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  admits a  $\hat{G}$ -module complement by showing that the trace form  $(X, Y) \mapsto \mathrm{tr}(XY)$  on  $\mathfrak{gl}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$  is invertible on restriction to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  in primes of very good characteristic by computing the determinant of the restriction. We perform a similar computation with respect to the faithful irreducible representation of minimal dimension, computing the restriction of the trace form  $B$  on  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$  to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ .

Note that  $\hat{G}$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Z}$  by means of a Chevalley basis for the Lie algebra. Let  $V$  be a highest weight module giving rise to such a faithful irreducible representation. Then  $V$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and there exists a finite set  $S$  of primes such that this representation is defined over the localization  $\mathbb{Z}_S$ . The set  $S$  can be taken to consist of those primes appearing in the denominators of the images of the Chevalley basis in  $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ . This minimal set  $S$  together with the determinant of the Killing form is computed in magma and displayed below in Table 4.1. In the case  $\hat{G} = E_8$ , the smallest dimension faithful irreducible representation is given by the 248-dimensional adjoint representation and is computed in the proof of [Hum11, Theorem 3.9]. We are done on observing that the prime numbers not appearing in  $S \cup \{p : v_p(\det(B|_{\hat{\mathfrak{g}}})) > 0\}$  are exactly the primes of very good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$ .

TABLE 1. Determinant of the trace form on restriction to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$

$\hat{G}$	$n$	$\det(B _{\hat{\mathfrak{g}}})$	$S$
$G_2$	7	$2^{14} \cdot 3^7$	$\emptyset$
$F_4$	26	$2^{78} \cdot 3^{52}$	$\emptyset$
$E_6$	27	$2^{78} \cdot 3^{77}$	$\{3\}$
$E_7$	56	$-2^{265} \cdot 3^{133}$	$\{2\}$
$E_8$	248	$2^{496} \cdot 3^{248} \cdot 5^{248}$	$\emptyset$

□

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\hat{G}$  be an arbitrary closed reductive smooth subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n$  over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$  and suppose that there exists a decomposition  $\mathfrak{gl}_n = \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  as  $\hat{G}$ -modules. Let  $\pi : \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  be the projection onto the first factor. Then for any set  $S$  of semisimple elements of  $\hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  we have*

$$\pi\left(\sum_{\gamma \in S} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)\right) \subset \sum_{\gamma \in S} \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma).$$

*Proof.* Observe that it suffices to show the inclusion

$$(4.2) \quad \pi(\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)) \subset \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma)$$

for any  $\gamma \in \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  semisimple. Now suppose that  $x + y \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)$  with  $x \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  and  $y \in \mathfrak{m}$ . We just need to show that  $\pi(x + y) = x \in \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma)$ . If  $w \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma$ , then  $w \in \mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma$  and hence

$$0 = [x + y, w] = [x, w] + [y, w].$$

Differentiating the action of  $\hat{G}$  on  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$ , we see that  $[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}] \subset \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  and  $[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{m}] = [\mathfrak{m}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}] \subset \mathfrak{m}$ . Therefore  $[x, w] \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  and  $[y, w] \in \mathfrak{m}$ , so since these subspaces are disjoint both terms in the above sum must equal zero. We deduce that  $x \in \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $\hat{G}$  be as in the start of Section 4.1 and let  $\hat{G} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n$  be a faithful irreducible representation of minimal dimension. If  $p \geq 2(n + 1)$  and  $\Gamma \subset \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducible, then*

- (1) (a)  $H^0(\Gamma, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\vee) = 0$
- (b)  $H^1(\Gamma, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\vee) = 0$
- (c)  $H^1(\Gamma, \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p) = 0$
- (2)  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}})^\gamma) = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ .

*In particular, if  $\hat{G}$  is not special orthogonal then  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.3 we know that  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -adequate, hence

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma) = \mathfrak{gl}_n.$$

By Lemma 4.4 we may write  $\mathfrak{gl}_n = \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  as  $\Gamma$ -modules and we let  $\pi$  denote the  $\hat{G}$ -equivariant projection  $\mathfrak{gl}_n \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ . Then by Lemma 4.5 it follows that

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \pi\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)\right) \subset \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma)$$

and the spanning condition therefore holds on all semisimple elements of  $\Gamma$ . If  $\hat{G}$  is not special orthogonal then  $\Gamma^c = \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}$ , which follows as the centralizers of the semisimple elements of  $\hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  are always connected since  $\hat{G}$  is then simply connected. Thus in that case, the spanning condition in the definition of  $\hat{G}$ -adequacy holds.

We now check the cohomological conditions of Definition 3.15 using the  $\hat{G}$ -module decomposition of  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$  once again. For  $0 \leq i \leq 1$  we have

$$0 = H^i(\Gamma, \mathfrak{gl}_n) = H^i(\Gamma, \mathfrak{gl}_n^\vee) = H^i(\Gamma, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\vee) \oplus H^i(\Gamma, \mathfrak{m}^\vee)$$

and  $H^1(\Gamma, \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p) = 0$  by  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -adequacy of  $\Gamma$ .  $\square$

**4.2.  $\hat{G}$ -adequate implies  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducible.** In some cases, a converse to Theorem 4.6 holds. In all of the results in this section, we will show a converse only by considering the spanning condition and ignore the cohomological conditions of  $\hat{G}$ -adequacy. We firstly show that  $\hat{G}$ -adequacy implies  $\hat{G}$ -irreducibility in general.

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $\hat{G}$  be an arbitrary reductive group over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ . If  $\Gamma$  is not  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible then*

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma) \neq \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0.$$

*Thus if  $\Gamma \subset \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate then  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible.*

*Proof.* If  $\Gamma$  is not  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible, there must exist a proper parabolic subgroup  $P \leq \hat{G}$  with  $\Gamma \leq P(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ . Now let  $\gamma \in \Gamma^{\text{ss}}$ . We claim that  $\mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma) \leq \text{Lie } P$  and it would therefore follow that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\text{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma) \leq \text{Lie } P \cap \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0 \subsetneq \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0.$$

Since  $\gamma$  is semisimple we can find a maximal torus  $T$  of  $P$  for which  $\gamma \in T(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ , as is true in any connected linear algebraic group. It follows that  $\mathfrak{z}((\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^0)^\gamma) \subset \text{Lie } T$  by Lemma 4.2, from which deduce the claim.  $\square$

4.2.1. *The case of classical simple groups.* We firstly suppose that  $p > 2$  and  $\hat{G}$  is either  $\text{SO}_n$  or  $\text{Sp}_n$ , defined as a subgroup of  $\text{GL}_n$  by a choice of non-degenerate symmetric or alternating bilinear form  $J$  on a vector space  $V = \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^n$  (so  $n$  is necessarily even in the case of  $\text{Sp}_n$ ). Thus we have an irreducible faithful representation  $\hat{G} \rightarrow \text{GL}_n = \text{GL}(V)$ . We assume that  $n \geq 3$  if  $\hat{G} = \text{SO}_n$ . We say a subspace  $U \leq V$  is isotropic if  $J|_{U \times U} = 0$ .

An explicit realisation of  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  as a subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$  is given by

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \{A \in \mathfrak{gl}_n : A^T J + J A = 0\}.$$

It follows that a  $\hat{G}$ -invariant complement to  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  inside  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$  is given by

$$\mathfrak{m} = \{A \in \mathfrak{gl}_n : A^T J - J A = 0\},$$

since we assumed  $p > 2$ . We let  $\pi : \mathfrak{gl} = \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  denote the arising  $\hat{G}$ -equivariant projection. It is easy to verify that  $[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{m}] \subset \mathfrak{m}$  and  $[\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}] \subset \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ . The following lemma makes the computation of projections of centers of centralizers more straightforward.

**Lemma 4.8.** *For  $\gamma \in \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  semisimple we have*

$$\pi(\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)) = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma) \cap \hat{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

*Proof.* We only show that  $\pi(\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)) \subset \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma) \cap \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  since the reverse containment is clear. Suppose that  $x + y \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)$  with  $x \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  and  $y \in \mathfrak{m}$ . We just need to show that whenever  $z \in \mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma \oplus \mathfrak{m}^\gamma$  we have  $[x, z] = 0$ . Suppose that  $z \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma$  firstly. Then

$$0 = [x + y, z] = [x, z] + [y, z]$$

with  $[x, z] \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  and  $[y, z] \in \mathfrak{m}$ . It follows that  $[x, z] = 0$ . Similarly if  $z \in \mathfrak{m}^\gamma$  we have  $[x, z] \in \mathfrak{m}$  and  $[y, z] \in \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  summing to 0, so both must equal 0.  $\square$

The following lemma shows that the inclusion 4.2 is an equality in most cases and thereby allows us to compute centers of centralizers by working inside  $\mathfrak{gl}_n$ .

**Lemma 4.9.** *Suppose that  $\gamma \in \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is semisimple. Then the inclusion*

$$\pi(\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)) \subset \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma).$$

*is an equality if and only if either*

- (1)  $\hat{G} = \text{Sp}_n$ , or
- (2)  $\hat{G} = \text{SO}_n$  and the multiplicities of 1 and  $-1$  as eigenvalues of  $\gamma \in \text{GL}_n(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  are both not equal to 2.

*Proof.* For  $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$ , let  $m_\alpha$  denote the multiplicity of  $\alpha$  as an eigenvalue of  $\gamma$ . The bilinear form  $J$  is non-degenerate on restriction to the sum of eigenspaces  $V_\alpha + V_{\alpha^{-1}}$ . Since the centralizer of  $\gamma$  inside  $\text{GL}_n$  is equal to  $\prod_\alpha \text{GL}(V_\alpha)$ , we can assume without loss of generality that the only eigenvalues of  $\gamma$  are  $\alpha^{\pm 1}$ .



Suppose firstly that  $\alpha \neq \alpha^{-1}$ . Then  $V = V_\alpha \oplus V_{\alpha^{-1}}$  and the center of the centralizer of  $\gamma$  inside  $\mathrm{GL}_n$  is given by diagonal matrices on the two factors. We must also have that  $V_\alpha$  and  $V_{-\alpha}$  are isotropic subspaces and thus the intersection of  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)$  with  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  is given by matrices of the form  $\lambda \mathrm{id}_{V_\alpha} \oplus (-\lambda) \mathrm{id}_{V_{\alpha^{-1}}}$ . The centralizer of  $\gamma$  in  $\hat{G}$  is given by a copy of  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ , whose center also has dimension 1. So since the inclusion  $\pi(\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)) \subset \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma)$  always holds, we must have an equality.

Now suppose that  $\alpha = \pm 1$ , so that  $\alpha$  is the only eigenvalue of  $\gamma$ . Then the center of the  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -centralizer of  $\gamma$  is exactly the scalar matrices. The scalar matrices in  $\hat{G}$  are a subset of  $\{\pm \mathrm{id}\}$  and therefore  $\pi(\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_n^\gamma)) = 0$ . On the other hand, the centralizer of  $\gamma$  in  $\hat{G}$  is clearly  $\hat{G}$  itself. The center of  $\hat{G}$  is then finite, unless  $\hat{G} = \mathrm{SO}_2$  equals its own center. Hence equality holds exactly when  $\hat{G} \neq \mathrm{SO}_2$ , as desired.  $\square$

In order to handle the case when  $J$  is symmetric and  $\gamma$  has  $\pm 1$  as an eigenvalue of multiplicity 2 we will use the following result on semisimplicity of  $V$ . Recall that the parabolic subgroups of  $\hat{G}$  are exactly the stabilizers of flags of isotropic subspaces of  $V$ . Thus a finite subgroup  $\Gamma \leq \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible if and only if there does not exist a non-zero isotropic  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$ -submodule  $U$  of  $V$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $\Gamma \subset \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  be a finite group. Then either  $V$  is a direct sum of simple  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$ -submodules  $V = \bigoplus_i U_i$ , with  $J|_{U_i \times U_i}$  non-degenerate for every  $i$ , or  $\Gamma$  is not  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible.*

*Proof.* Let  $U \leq V$  be a simple submodule. If  $J|_{U \times U}$  is non-degenerate then the annihilator of  $U$  with respect to  $J$  provides a  $\Gamma$ -invariant complement and we are done by induction on  $\dim V$ . Suppose instead that  $J|_{U \times U}$  is degenerate. Since  $U$  is irreducible, Schur's lemma implies that  $J$  induces the zero map  $U \rightarrow U^\vee$ . Thus  $U$  is a non-zero isotropic  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$ -submodule and  $\Gamma$  is not  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible.  $\square$

We are now ready to show the converse to Theorem 4.6 in this setting.

**Corollary 4.11.** *Let  $p \geq 3$ , let  $\hat{G}$  be either  $\mathrm{SO}_n$  with  $n \geq 3$  or  $\mathrm{Sp}_n$  with  $n \geq 2$  even. Let  $\Gamma \subset \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  be a finite subgroup. If  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma) = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  then  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducible. In particular, if  $\hat{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_n$  then  $\hat{G}$ -adequacy of  $\Gamma$  implies  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducibility of  $\Gamma$ , and the converse holds if  $p \geq 2(n+1)$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.6, we just need to show that if  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -reducible then

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma) \neq \hat{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible, else we are done by Proposition 4.7. Thus by Lemma 4.10 we may write  $V = U \oplus W$ , where  $U, W \leq V$  are proper,  $\Gamma$ -invariant subspaces such that  $J$  has non-degenerate restriction to both  $U$  and  $W$ . Let  $P$  be the proper parabolic subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n$  defined by the stabilizer of  $U$ . Since the inclusion  $\hat{G} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n$  is an irreducible representation,  $\hat{G}$  is not a subgroup of  $P$ , and hence  $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$  is not a subalgebra of  $\mathrm{Lie} P = \mathfrak{p}$ . On the other hand, we claim that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\gamma) \leq \mathfrak{p},$$

in which case  $\Gamma$  cannot be  $\hat{G}$ -adequate.

Let  $\gamma \in \Gamma^{\text{ss}}$  and consider the eigenspace decomposition of  $V = \bigoplus_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}$  with respect to the action of  $\gamma$ . As in the proof of Lemma 4.9,

$$\mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{\gamma}) \subset \bigoplus_{\alpha} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_{V_{\alpha}}) \subset \mathfrak{gl}_U \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_W$$

except in the case that  $\hat{G} = \text{SO}_n$  and  $\alpha = \pm 1$  occurs with multiplicity 2. Let us therefore assume we are in this case. We can suppose that  $V_{\alpha}$  has 1-dimensional intersection with both  $U$  and  $W$  as otherwise  $\mathfrak{gl}_{V_{\alpha}} \subset \mathfrak{p}$  similarly to above. Let  $u$  (resp.  $w$ ) span  $V_{\alpha} \cap U$  (resp.  $V_{\alpha} \cap W$ ). The restriction of  $J$  to  $V_{\alpha}$  has diagonal entries which are zero with respect to the basis  $\{u, w\}$  of  $V_{\alpha}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{\gamma}) \cap \mathfrak{gl}_{V_{\alpha}}$  is spanned by the matrix  $\text{diag}(1, -1)$  in this basis. Thus we always have  $\mathfrak{z}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{\gamma}) \subset \mathfrak{gl}_U \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_W \subset \mathfrak{p}$  and we are done.  $\square$

For completeness, we include the following proposition which relates  $\text{GL}_n$ -irreducibility (and hence  $\hat{G}$ -adequacy by Corollary 4.11) to properties more intrinsic to  $\hat{G}$ .

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $\hat{G}$  be either  $\text{SO}_n$  or  $\text{Sp}_n$ , let  $\Gamma \subset \hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  be a finite subgroup and let  $p \geq 3$ . Let  $\hat{H} = \text{O}_n$  and suppose that  $n \geq 3$  if  $\hat{G} = \text{SO}_n$ , and let  $\hat{H} = \hat{G}$  if  $\hat{G} = \text{Sp}_n$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible and  $Z_{\hat{H}}(\Gamma) = Z(\hat{H}) \cong \mu_2$
- (2)  $\Gamma$  is an irreducible subgroup of  $\text{GL}_n(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that 1 does not hold. If  $\Gamma$  is not  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible then it must be contained inside the  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ -points of a proper parabolic subgroup  $P$ , which stabilizes some non-zero isotropic subspace of  $V$ . Thus  $V$  is not irreducible as a  $\Gamma$ -module. Otherwise, if  $Z_{\hat{H}}(\Gamma) \neq Z(\hat{H})$  then  $Z_{\text{GL}_n}(\Gamma) \neq Z(\text{GL}_n)$  since  $Z(\text{GL}_n) \cap \hat{H} = Z(\hat{H})$ . By Schur's lemma,  $\Gamma$  is therefore not  $\text{GL}_n$ -irreducible.

Now suppose that  $\Gamma \subset \text{GL}_n(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is reducible. We may suppose that  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -irreducible; we then have to show that  $Z_{\hat{H}}(\Gamma) = \mu_2$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is  $(\text{GL}_n)$ -reducible, by Lemma 4.10 we may therefore write  $V = X \oplus Y$  where  $X, Y$  are non-zero  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\text{III}]$ -modules such that the restrictions of  $J$  to both  $X$  and  $Y$  are non-degenerate. Consider the automorphisms of  $V$  given by all choices of  $\pm \text{id}$  on each summand. Such maps will commute with the action of  $\Gamma$  and preserve  $J$  and thus define elements of  $\hat{H}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ . We have shown  $Z_{\hat{H}}(\Gamma)(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  has order at least 4 and hence  $Z_{\hat{H}}(\Gamma)$  cannot equal  $\mu_2$ .  $\square$

4.2.2. *The case  $\hat{G} = G_2$ .* Now let  $p \geq 5$  and  $\hat{G} = G_2$ . We will view  $G_2$  as the automorphisms of the split octonion algebra  $\mathbb{O}$  and use notation similar to that of [GG06, 4]. Fix a 3-dimensional  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ -vector space  $W$  with basis  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$  and cross product  $e_i \times e_{i+1} = e_{i+2}$  where indices are taken modulo 3. Let  $\{e_1^*, e_2^*, e_3^*\} \subset W^*$  be the dual basis and similarly define a cross product by  $e_i^* \times e_{i+1}^* = e_{i+2}^*$ . An explicit model for  $\mathbb{O}$  is given by Zorn's vector matrix algebra. Let  $\mathbb{O}$  be the set of matrices of the form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & v \\ v^* & b \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $a, b \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ ,  $v \in W$  and  $v^* \in W^*$ . Multiplication in  $\mathbb{O}$  is defined by matrix multiplication, where the product of a pair of vectors both in  $W$  or both in  $W^*$  is given by the cross product and the product of a vector in  $W$  with a vector in  $W^*$  is given by evaluation. The trace of  $A \in \mathbb{O}$  as above is given by  $a+b$  and let  $V \subset \mathbb{O}$  denote the 7-dimensional subspace where the trace vanishes. Fix an ordered basis of  $V$  given by  $(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_0, e_1^*, e_2^*, e_3^*)$ , where  $e_0 = \text{diag}(1, -1)$ . The group  $G_2$  preserves  $V$  and our choice of basis defines an embedding  $G_2 \hookrightarrow \text{GL}_7$  (which is a faithful representation of  $G_2$  of minimal dimension).

The norm of  $A \in \mathbb{O}$  is given by  $\det A = ab - \langle v, v^* \rangle$ . This gives rise to a non-degenerate,  $G_2$ -invariant symmetric bilinear form on  $V$  through which we can view  $G_2$  as a subgroup of  $\mathrm{SO}_7$ . The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{so}_7$  decomposes as a  $G_2$ -module into the 14-dimensional adjoint representation together with a copy of the 7-dimensional standard representation  $V$ . Our aim is to use Corollary 4.11 (or rather, its proof) to deduce a corresponding statement for  $G_2$  by working inside the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{so}_7$ .

**Lemma 4.13.** *For every semisimple element  $\gamma \in G_2(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  we have the equality*

$$\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_2^\gamma) = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{so}_7^\gamma) \cap \mathfrak{g}_2.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathfrak{so}_7 = \mathfrak{g}_2 \oplus V$  as  $G_2$ -modules, we have  $\mathfrak{so}_7^\gamma = \mathfrak{g}_2^\gamma \oplus V^\gamma$ . Thus it suffices to show that if  $z \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_2^\gamma)$  and  $v \in V^\gamma$  then  $[z, v] = 0$ . By differentiating, it suffices to show that for every  $g \in Z(Z_{G_2}(\gamma))(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  and  $v \in V^\gamma$  we have  $g \cdot v = v$ . Now recall that the image of a maximal torus  $T$  of  $G_2$  in  $\mathrm{GL}_7$  is, in our basis, given by matrices of the form  $\mathrm{diag}(\alpha, \beta, \alpha^{-1}\beta^{-1}, 1, \alpha^{-1}, \beta^{-1}, \alpha\beta)$ . By conjugating, it suffices to consider the case that  $\gamma \in T(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ , in which case  $Z(Z_{G_2}(\gamma)) \subset T$  (just as in Lemma 4.2).

Consider the possibilities for the multiplicity  $m_1 = \dim V^\gamma$ :  $m_1$  must be odd, and cannot equal 5 (as if  $m_1 \geq 5$  then automatically  $m_1 = 7$ ). If  $m_1 = 1$  then  $e_0$  is the corresponding eigenvector of  $\gamma$  and  $e_0$  an eigenvector for every element of  $T(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  with eigenvalue 1. If  $m_1 = 3$  then by conjugating  $\gamma$  we may suppose that  $e_2$  and  $e_2^*$  both lie in  $V^\gamma$ . Now consider the matrix

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & 1 & & \\ & & & -1 & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & & \\ 1 & & & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

which defines an element of  $N_{G_2}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  lying in  $Z_{G_2}(\gamma)(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ . Any matrix in  $T$  which commutes with  $g$  must act trivially on  $e_2$ . Thus  $Z(Z_{G_2}(\gamma))$  must act trivially on  $V^\gamma$ . Finally, when  $m_1 = 7$  we have that  $\mathfrak{g}_2^\gamma = \mathfrak{g}_2$  and  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_2^\gamma) = 0$  so there is nothing more to show.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.14.** *Let  $\hat{G} = G_2$  viewed as a subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_7$  by the standard representation and let  $\Gamma \subset G_2(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  be a finite subgroup. If  $p \geq 5$  and  $\Gamma$  is  $G_2$ -adequate then  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_7$ -irreducible. In particular, if  $p \geq 17$ , then  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_7$ -irreducible if and only if  $\Gamma$  is  $G_2$ -adequate.*

*Proof.* Once again, by Theorem 4.6 we just need to show that if  $p \geq 5$  and  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_7$ -reducible then  $\Gamma$  is not  $G_2$ -adequate. The proof of Corollary 4.11 showed that there exists a proper parabolic subgroup  $P$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_7$  such that  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{so}_7^\gamma) \subset \mathrm{Lie} P$  (note that this holds in the case when  $\Gamma$  is not  $\mathrm{SO}_7$ -irreducible by taking  $P$  to be the stabilizer of a non-zero isotropic  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$ -submodule of  $V$ ). By Lemma 4.13 we deduce that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_2^\gamma) = \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{so}_7^\gamma) \right) \cap \mathfrak{g}_2.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{g}_2$  is not contained in  $\mathrm{Lie} P$  (as  $G_2 \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_7$  is an irreducible representation) we deduce that  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{ss}}} \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_2^\gamma) \neq \mathfrak{g}_2$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 4.15.* It seems unlikely that a similar argument to the one presented above would be possible for the other exceptional simple groups. For example, consider  $F_4$  as a subgroup of  $\mathrm{SO}_{26}$  via the standard faithful irreducible representation of  $F_4$ . Then there are many examples of conjugacy classes  $\gamma \in F_4(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  for which  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{f}_4^\gamma) \neq \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{so}_{26}^\gamma) \cap \mathfrak{f}_4$ . There is therefore no reason to believe that a converse to Theorem 4.6 would hold for the remaining exceptional simple groups.

**4.3.  $\mathrm{Sp}_4$ -adequate subgroups of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$ .** For our applications in Section 7, we now focus on the case  $\hat{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$  and study the extent to which Theorem 4.6 fails when  $p$  is small. The following lemma provides an answer. It is the result of computations carried out via the computer algebra software `magma` when  $p \in \{3, 5, 7\}$  and otherwise follows from Theorem 4.6. We use Lemma 4.9 to verify the spanning condition by working inside  $\mathfrak{gl}_4$ , where  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{gl}_4^\gamma)$  is given by the span of powers of  $\gamma$ .

**Lemma 4.16.** *Let  $p > 2$  be prime. Suppose  $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . If  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_4$ -absolutely irreducible then  $\Gamma$  is  $\hat{G}$ -adequate, unless  $\Gamma$  is one of the finitely many groups listed in Table 3 in the appendix. Here  $\cdot$  refers to a non-split extension,  $\mathrm{wr}$  the wreath product and  $:$  a semidirect product. In all cases, the spanning condition of  $\hat{G}$ -adequacy holds and  $H^0(\Gamma, \mathfrak{sp}_4)$  vanishes.*

We now give an example in the setting of subgroups of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{F}_3)$  of how our spanning condition compares to the similar but more restrictive conditions seen previously in the literature. Let  $\Gamma' \leq \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{F}_3)$  be such that  $\Gamma = \Gamma' \cap \mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_3)$  is absolutely  $\mathrm{GL}_4$ -irreducible. Suppose that the similitude character  $\nu$  defines a surjection  $\Gamma' \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_3^\times$ , so that  $\Gamma$  is an index 2 subgroup of  $\Gamma'$ . In Table 4 of the Appendix, we record some properties of the conjugacy classes of such  $\Gamma'$ . The column headings (A) and (B) refer to whether the following conditions on  $H$  hold:

- (A) For every simple  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$ -submodule  $W \leq \mathfrak{sp}_4^\vee$  there exists a semisimple element  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that for some  $w \in W$  and  $z \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{sp}_4^\gamma)$  we have  $w(z) \neq 0$ .
- (B) For every simple  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p[\Gamma]$ -submodule  $W \leq \mathfrak{sp}_4^\vee$  there exists a regular semisimple element  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that  $W^\gamma \neq 0$ .

Condition (B) in some form is seen in both the definition of enormous subgroup of [BCGP21, Definition 7.5.3 (E3)] and  $\hat{G}$ -abundant subgroup of [BHKT19, Definition 5.18(ii)]. Condition (A), equivalent to our spanning condition, appears in Definition 3.15 and is implied by condition (B) (since  $\mathfrak{sp}_4 \cong \mathfrak{sp}_4^\vee$  as  $\Gamma$ -modules). The column ‘Adequate’ refers to whether  $H$  is  $\mathrm{Sp}_4$ -adequate, in the sense of Definition 3.15.

The remaining columns are included for applications to modularity of abelian surfaces. The column heading ‘Tidy’ indicates whether  $G$  is a tidy subgroup in the sense of Definition 7.1. The column ‘Induced’ refer to whether the underlying 4-dimensional module for  $G$  is no longer absolutely irreducible on restriction to some index 2 subgroup of  $G$ , and ‘Split-induced’ refers to whether this reducibility may take place over  $\mathbb{F}_p$  (so it is split induced).

As already noted in Lemma 4.16, condition (A) holds in every case, while condition (B) holds for only 12 of the possible 25 choices of  $\Gamma'$ . A similar computation shows that when  $p = 5$  (resp.  $p = 7$ ) condition (A) always holds while condition (B) holds for 36/69 (resp. 41/86) possible images. The importance of these conditions on simple submodules is that to prove an analogue of Proposition 3.19 in which the Frobenius image at a Taylor–Wiles place is required to be regular semisimple, it would be very difficult to weaken condition (B) on some image of the representation. Moreover, the failure of the cohomological

vanishing conditions in small characteristic do not automatically eliminate representations with image  $\Gamma'$ , as we saw with the definition of  $\hat{G}$ -reasonable representations (Definition 3.20).

## 5. LOCAL COMPUTATIONS

In this section, we will carry out computations with Hecke algebras of reductive groups over a local field with respect to various compact open subgroups. We will firstly prove a version of the Satake isomorphism at a slightly deeper level in Theorem 5.1 and compose it with the maps of [BK98] to define certain abelian subalgebras of Hecke algebras. We will then use the Bernstein presentation of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra to prove a variation of a standard result about modules over this algebra in Section 5.3. We will also define various data attached to a semisimple element of the dual group in Construction 5.12. Finally, we will use Jacquet modules to deduce properties of parabolically induced representations and relate these to the local Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$  in Propositions 5.18 and 5.19.

**5.1. A Satake isomorphism.** Throughout this section, we will let  $F_v$  be a local field with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$ , uniformizer  $\varpi_v$  and residue field  $k(v)$  of order  $q_v$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be as in Section 2, the ring of integers of a finite extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  with residue field  $k$  of characteristic  $p$ . We will assume that  $q_v$  is coprime to  $p$  and suppose that  $\mathcal{O}$  contains a fixed squareroot  $q_v^{\frac{1}{2}}$  of  $q_v$ . Let  $|\cdot|_v$  denote the absolute value on  $F_v$ ; its squareroot has image in  $q_v^{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}}$ , which we will view as a subgroup of either  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\times$  or  $\mathcal{O}^\times$ .

For now, let  $G$  be a reductive group defined over  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$  with a split maximal torus  $T$  and Borel subgroup  $B$  containing  $T$  with unipotent radical  $N$ . We will often abuse notation and write  $G$  for  $G(F_v)$  (and similarly for other groups) when it is clear from context. We will consider various Hecke algebras  $\mathcal{H}(H, U)$  for closed algebraic subgroups  $H \leq G$  and compact open subgroups  $U \leq H$ ; these are the algebras of compactly supported, locally constant,  $U$ -biinvariant functions  $H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  which form an  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra under convolution.

Let  $G^{\mathrm{der}}$  be the derived subgroup of  $G$ , defined over  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$  and compatible with base change by [Con14, Theorem 5.3.1]. Let  $C_G = G/G^{\mathrm{der}}$  be the cocenter of  $G$ , a torus which we will assume is split. Fix a quotient  $\Delta$  of the finite abelian group  $C_G(k(v))$  of order coprime to  $|W_G|$ . We may then consider the composition  $\theta$  of the natural maps

$$G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \rightarrow G(k(v)) \rightarrow C_G(k(v)) \rightarrow \Delta$$

and define  $K_1 = \ker \theta$ , a finite index subgroup of  $K = G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ . We may realise  $C_G$  as the quotient of the maximal torus  $T$  by a split subtorus  $T'$ , as described in Section 3.3. It follows that  $T(k(v))$  surjects onto  $C_G(k(v))$ , and thus we may take coset representatives for  $K_1$  which lie inside  $T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ .

The Satake isomorphism [Car79, Theorem 4.1] is an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} S : \mathcal{H}(G(F_v), K) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(T(F_v), T(F_v) \cap K)^{W_G} \\ f &\mapsto (t \mapsto \delta_B(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_N f(tn) dn). \end{aligned}$$

We will show that the same formula gives an isomorphism

$$S_1 : \mathcal{H}(G(F_v), K_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(T(F_v), T(F_v) \cap K_1)^{W_G}.$$

Here  $\delta_B : T(F_v) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\times$  is the homomorphism given by  $\delta_B(t) = |\det(\mathrm{Ad}(t)|_{\mathrm{Lie} N})|_v$ , where  $\mathfrak{n}$  is the Lie algebra of  $N$  acted on by the adjoint action of  $t \in T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ .

Let  $\Phi^+$  denote the positive roots of  $G$  with respect to the choice of Borel subgroup  $B$  and  $\Lambda^+ = \{\lambda \in X_*(T) : \langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Phi^+\}$ . Let  $\rho \in X_*(T) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$  be the half-sum of all positive coroots of  $G$ . Then for  $\mu \in X_*(T)$  we have  $\delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v))^{1/2} = q_v^{-\langle \mu, \rho \rangle}$ , so that  $(\delta_B)^{1/2}$  is valued in  $q_v^{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}}$ . Fix for each  $\delta \in \Delta$  a preimage  $\dot{\delta} \in T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ . The well-known variation of the Cartan decomposition  $G(F_v) = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} K\lambda(\varpi_v)K$  yields a further decomposition

$$G(F_v) = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+, \delta \in \Delta} K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}K_1.$$

Indeed,  $K_1 \triangleleft K$  is a normal subgroup with coset representatives given by  $\{\dot{\delta}\}_{\delta \in \Delta}$ , and these coset representatives all commute with  $\lambda(\varpi_v) \in T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ . Thus we have a basis of  $\mathcal{H}(G(F_v), K_1)$  given by the characteristic functions  $\phi_{(\lambda, \delta)} = [K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}K_1]$  for  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$  and  $\delta \in \Delta$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *The Satake map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 : \mathcal{H}(G(F_v), K_1) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(T(F_v), T(F_v) \cap K_1)^{W_G} \\ f &\mapsto (t \mapsto \delta_B(t)^{1/2} \int_N f(tn)dn) \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebras.

*Proof.* We will follow the approach of the usual Satake isomorphism presented in [Car79, Theorem 4.1]. We will normalise all Haar measures on subgroups  $\Gamma \leq G(F_v)$  to give  $\Gamma \cap K_1$  measure 1 and write  $T_1 = T(F_v) \cap K_1$ . The groups  $G, N, T, K$  and  $K_1$  are all unimodular. For the group  $B$  we may define a left Haar measure by the formula

$$(5.1) \quad \int_B f(b)d_l b = \int_T \int_N f(tn)dt dn$$

with the required normalisation. The map  $\mathcal{S}_1$  has image in  $\mathcal{H}(T, T \cap K_1)$ , as  $f$  is biinvariant under  $K_1$  and due to the fact that  $\mathcal{S}_1 f(t) = \delta_B(t)^{-1/2} \int_N f(nt)dn$  by [Car79, IV (19)].

We firstly show the map defines a homomorphism. To do this, we may write  $\mathcal{S}_1$  as the composition of restricting functions to  $\mathcal{H}(B, B \cap K_1)$  and then applying the same integral formula. The proof that the second map is a homomorphism is exactly as in the usual case, since it is largely independent of choice of compact open subgroup. So we show restriction  $\mathcal{H}(G, K_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(B, B \cap K_1)$  is a homomorphism. If  $f \in \mathcal{H}(G, K_1)$  we have by [Car79, IV (4)] that

$$\int_G f(u)du = \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \int_K \int_B f(bk)dk d_l b,$$

recalling we have normalised the Haar measures with respect to intersections with  $K_1$ . Decomposing  $K$  into  $K_1$ -cosets then we have

$$\int_G f(u)du = \sum_{\delta \in \Delta} \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \int_{K_1} \int_B f(b\dot{\delta}k)dk d_l b.$$

The modular function for  $B$  is given by  $\Delta_B(tn) = \delta_B(t)^{-1}$  for  $t \in T$  and  $n \in N$  by [Car79, Equation (11)]. So right translation by  $\dot{\delta} \in T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$  has no effect since  $\delta_B(\dot{\delta}) = 1$ . It follows that

$$(5.2) \quad \int_G f(u)du = \int_{K_1} \int_B f(bk)dk d_l b.$$

If  $g \in \mathcal{H}(G, K_1)$  and  $x \in B$  then

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star g)(x) &= \int_G f(u)g(u^{-1}x)du \\ &= \int_{K_1} \int_B f(bk)g((bk)^{-1}x)dkdb \\ &= \int_B f(b)g(b^{-1}x)db \text{ by } K_1 \text{ biinvariance,} \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the convolution of the restrictions of  $f$  and  $g$  to  $\mathcal{H}(B, B \cap K_1)$  evaluated on  $x$ .

Next we show that the image of  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is contained inside  $\mathcal{H}(T(F_v), T(F_v) \cap K_1)^{W_G}$ . Since  $G$  is defined over  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$ , the Weyl group is also defined over  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$ . Since our coset representatives for  $\Delta$  lie in  $T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$  we can take representatives of the Weyl group to lie in  $N_G(T)(F_v) \cap K_1$  by taking any representatives in  $G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$  and multiplying through by suitable  $\delta$ . It then would suffice to show that  $\mathcal{S}_1 f(xtx^{-1}) = \mathcal{S}_1 f(t)$  for every  $x \in N_G(T)(F_v) \cap K_1$ . This can then be proved in exactly the same way as [Car79] by firstly showing that this holds for  $t \in T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$  regular.

Finally, we show that we do indeed have a bijection. We recall that the functions  $\phi_{(\lambda, \delta)} = [K_1 \lambda(\varpi_v) \delta K_1]$  for  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$  and  $\delta \in \Delta$  form a basis for  $\mathcal{H}(G, K_1)$ . Letting  $\Phi_{(\lambda, \delta)} = [T_1 \lambda(\varpi_v) \delta T_1]$ , we have a basis of  $\mathcal{H}(T, T_1)$  given by  $\{\Phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}\}_{(\lambda, \delta) \in X_*(T) \times \Delta}$ . Summing up  $\Phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}$  over  $\lambda$  in a Weyl orbit gives a basis  $\Phi'_{(\lambda, \delta)}$  for  $\mathcal{H}(T, T_1)^{W_G}$ , which may be parameterized by  $(\lambda, \delta) \in \Lambda^+ \times \Delta$ . Recall there is a partial ordering on  $\Lambda^+$  given by  $\lambda \geq \mu$  if and only if  $\lambda - \mu$  is a sum of positive coroots.

We may write  $\mathcal{S}_1 \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)} = \sum_{(\mu, \epsilon) \in \Lambda^+ \times \Delta} c(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) \Phi'_{(\mu, \epsilon)}$ . We will show that the coefficients  $c(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon)$  satisfy the following:

- (1)  $c(\lambda, \lambda, \delta, \epsilon) = 0$  for  $\epsilon \neq \delta$
- (2)  $c(\lambda, \lambda, \delta, \delta) \in \mathcal{O}^\times$
- (3) If  $c(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) \neq 0$  then  $\lambda \geq \mu$ .

Together these give imply the map is an isomorphism. Indeed, if  $0 \neq \sum \alpha_{(\lambda, \delta)} \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)} \in \mathcal{H}(G, K_1)$  then let  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$  and  $\delta \in \Delta$  be such that  $\alpha_{(\lambda, \delta)} \neq 0$  and for every  $\mu > \lambda$  and  $\epsilon \in \Delta$  we have  $\alpha_{(\mu, \epsilon)} = 0$ . Then the coefficient of  $\Phi'_{(\lambda, \delta)}$  in the image under  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is non-zero and this shows injectivity. For surjectivity, induction on  $\lambda$  shows that  $\Phi'_{(\lambda, \delta)}$  is in the image of  $\mathcal{S}_1$ .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} c(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) &= \mathcal{S}_1 \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(\mu(\varpi_v)\epsilon) \\ (5.3) \quad &= \delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_N \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(n\mu(\varpi_v)\epsilon)dn \\ (5.4) \quad &= q_v^{(\mu, \rho)} \mu_N(N\mu(\varpi_v)\epsilon \cap K_1 \lambda(\varpi_v) \delta K_1) \\ &= q_v^{(\mu, \rho)} \mu_G(N\mu(\varpi_v)\epsilon K_1 \cap K_1 \lambda(\varpi_v) \delta K_1) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu_N$  and  $\mu_G$  denote the respective Haar measures on  $N$  and  $G$ , and with the final equality following from the bijection

$$(Ns \cap K_1 t K_1) / (N \cap K_1) \leftrightarrow (Ns K_1 \cap K_1 t K_1) / K_1$$

for any  $s, t \in T$ . For 1 we need to show that for  $\epsilon \neq \delta$  that

$$N\lambda(\varpi_v)\epsilon K_1 \cap K_1 \lambda(\varpi_v)\delta K_1 = \emptyset.$$

Suppose then that there exists  $x, y \in K_1$  and  $n \in N$  with  $x\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}y = n\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}$ ; we will show  $\delta = \epsilon$ . Then since  $N$  is a normal subgroup of  $B$  we may write

$$\dot{\epsilon}y\dot{\delta}^{-1} = \lambda(\varpi_v)^{-1}x^{-1}\lambda(\varpi_v)n'$$

for some  $n' \in N$ . Applying the quotient map  $\pi : G \rightarrow C_G$  to the above equality, we obtain

$$\pi(\dot{\epsilon})\pi(y)\pi(\dot{\delta}^{-1}) = \pi(x)^{-1},$$

where we have used that  $\pi(N(F_v)) = \{1\}$ . Both sides have image contained in  $C_G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ , and passing to the images under the map  $C_G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \rightarrow \Delta$ , we are left with  $\epsilon\delta^{-1} = 1$ .

Now we show 2. Since  $\dot{\delta}K_1 = K_1\dot{\delta}$  we have that

$$c(\lambda, \lambda, \delta, \delta) = q_v^{(\lambda, \rho)} \mu_G(N\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1 \cap K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1).$$

Certainly the inclusion  $N\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1 \cap K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1 \supset \lambda(\varpi_v)K_1$  holds, so

$$\mu_G(N\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1 \cap K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1) \geq 1.$$

We have by [BT72, 4.4.4(ii)] that  $N\lambda(\varpi_v)K \cap K\lambda(\varpi_v)K = \lambda(\varpi_v)K$ , so

$$N\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1 \cap K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)K_1 \subset \bigsqcup_{\epsilon \in \Delta} \lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}K_1 = \lambda(\varpi_v)K.$$

If  $\lambda(\varpi_v)^{-1}x\lambda(\varpi_v)y \in \dot{\epsilon}K_1$  for  $x, y \in K_1$  and  $\epsilon \in \Delta$ , then applying  $\pi$  and taking images in  $\Delta$  we see that  $\epsilon = 1$ . Thus  $c(\lambda, \lambda, \delta, \delta) = q_v^{(\lambda, \rho)} \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ .

Finally, to show 3 we can reduce to the case of  $K_1 = K$  since if

$$N\mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}K_1 \cap K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}K_1 \neq \emptyset$$

then  $N\mu(\varpi_v)K \cap K\lambda(\varpi_v)K \neq \emptyset$ . It is shown in [BT72, (4.4.4)(i)] that if this latter intersection is non-empty then  $\lambda \geq \mu$ .  $\square$

From the proof of the isomorphism, we see that the Satake map is compatible with passage to a quotient  $\tilde{\Delta}$  of  $\Delta$  (inducing a compact open subgroup  $\tilde{K}_1$ ), in the following sense.

**Lemma 5.2.** *The following diagram of  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebras commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)} & \mathcal{H}(G, K_1) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}_1} & \mathcal{H}(T, T \cap K_1)^{W_G} & \Phi'_{(\lambda, \delta)} \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \phi_{(\lambda, \tilde{\delta})} & \mathcal{H}(G, \tilde{K}_1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1} & \mathcal{H}(T, T \cap \tilde{K}_1)^{W_G} & \Phi'_{(\lambda, \tilde{\delta})} \end{array}$$

where  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$  and  $\tilde{\delta}$  denotes the image in  $\tilde{\Delta}$  of  $\delta \in \Delta$ .

*Proof.* We may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1(\phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}) &= \sum_{(\mu, \epsilon) \in \Lambda^+ \times \Delta} c_{(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon)} \Phi'_{(\mu, \epsilon)} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(\phi_{(\lambda, \tilde{\delta})}) &= \sum_{(\mu, \tilde{\epsilon}) \in \Lambda^+ \times \tilde{\Delta}} \tilde{c}_{(\lambda, \mu, \tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\epsilon})} \Phi'_{(\mu, \tilde{\epsilon})}, \end{aligned}$$

as in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Letting  $\theta : \Delta \rightarrow \tilde{\Delta}$  be the quotient map, we must show that the coefficients satisfy the following relation

$$\sum_{(\delta, \epsilon) \in \theta^{-1}(\tilde{\delta}) \times \theta^{-1}(\tilde{\epsilon})} c_{(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon)} = \tilde{c}_{(\lambda, \mu, \tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\epsilon})}.$$



We saw in equality 5.4 that these coefficients are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_{(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon)} &= q_v^{\langle \mu, \rho \rangle} \mu_N(N\mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon} \cap K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}K_1) \\ &= q_v^{\langle \mu, \rho \rangle} \mu_N(N\mu(\varpi_v) \cap K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}\dot{\epsilon}^{-1}K_1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu_N(K_1 \cap N) = 1$ . We can write

$$\tilde{K}_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}\dot{\epsilon}^{-1}\tilde{K}_1 = \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \ker(\theta)} K_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}\dot{\epsilon}^{-1}\eta K_1.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{(\delta, \epsilon) \in \theta^{-1}(\tilde{\delta}) \times \theta^{-1}(\tilde{\epsilon})} c_{(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon)} = \frac{\#\Delta}{\#\tilde{\Delta}} q_v^{\langle \mu, \rho \rangle} \mu_N(\tilde{K}_1\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}\dot{\epsilon}^{-1}\tilde{K}_1).$$

This in turn equals  $\tilde{c}_{(\lambda, \mu, \tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\epsilon})}$ , as this factor of  $\#\Delta/\#\tilde{\Delta}$  is exactly the ratio between the respective Haar measures on  $N$  for which either  $K_1 \cap N$  or  $\tilde{K}_1 \cap N$  have measure 1.

Finally, all the maps in the diagram are maps of commutative  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebras, since the horizontal maps are algebra isomorphisms and the map  $\mathcal{H}(T, T \cap K_1)^{W_G} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(T, T \cap \tilde{K}_1)^{W_G}$  is clearly an algebra homomorphism.  $\square$

We will now offer a different perspective on the map  $\mathcal{S}_1$ , following arguments similar to those of [HKP10]. Our goal will be to show that  $\mathcal{S}_1$  will respect formation of  $K_1$ -invariants of parabolic inductions of characters of  $T$ . For the rest of this section only, we will take all Hecke algebras to have  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ -coefficients.

Firstly we will introduce some more notation. Let  $\mathfrak{t}_1 = K_1 \cap T(F_v) = \ker(T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \rightarrow \Delta)$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1} = \mathcal{H}(G, K_1)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}[T/\mathfrak{t}_1]$ . If  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^\times$  is a smooth character we will let  $i_B^G(\chi)$  denote the normalized parabolic induction, given by those smooth functions  $\phi : G(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  satisfying  $\phi(bg) = \delta_B(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\chi(b)\phi(g)$  for every  $b \in B$  and  $g \in G$ .

Let  $M_1 = C_c(\mathfrak{t}_1 N \backslash G / K_1)$  denote the space of compactly supported  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ -valued functions on  $G(F_v)$ , left-invariant under  $\mathfrak{t}_1 N(F_v)$  and right-invariant under  $K_1$ . Then  $M_1$  naturally has the structure of a right  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1}$ -module via the convolution giving  $K_1$  measure 1. The Iwasawa decomposition  $G = BK$  implies that

$$(5.5) \quad G = BK_1 = TNK_1$$

and the elements  $m^{(\lambda, \delta)} := 1_{\mathfrak{t}_1 N \lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta}K_1}$  for  $\lambda \in X_*(T)$  and  $\delta \in \Delta$  form a  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ -vector space basis for  $M_1$ . There is also a left  $\mathcal{A}_1$ -module structure on  $M_1$ , defined by

$$\lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta} \cdot m^{(\mu, \epsilon)} = \delta_B(\lambda(\varpi_v))^{\frac{1}{2}} m^{(\mu + \lambda, \delta\epsilon)}.$$

These actions are compatible, and from the above basis we see that  $M_1$  is a free module over  $\mathcal{A}_1$  of rank 1. This induces a homomorphism  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1$  sending  $h \mapsto h^\vee$ , where

$$(5.6) \quad m \star h = h^\vee \cdot m.$$

**Lemma 5.3.** *The map  $h \mapsto h^\vee$  is given by  $\mathcal{S}_1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$  and  $\delta \in \Delta$ . Let  $h = \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}$  and write

$$h^\vee = \sum_{(\mu, \epsilon) \in X_*(T) \times \Delta} d(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) \Phi_{(\mu, \epsilon)}.$$

We will show that the coefficients  $d(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon)$  are exactly given as in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Consider applying the equality 5.6 to  $m = m^{(1,1)}$  and evaluating these functions at  $\mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}$ . We obtain

$$(5.7) \quad \int_G 1_{\mathfrak{t}_1 N K_1}(g) \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(g^{-1} \mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}) dg \\ = \sum_{(\nu, \gamma) \in X_*(T) \times \Delta} d(\lambda, \nu, \delta, \gamma) \delta_B(\nu(\varpi_v))^{\frac{1}{2}} m^{(\nu, \gamma)}(\mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}).$$

By 5.2 and 5.1, the left hand side of 5.7 becomes

$$\int_{K_1} \int_T \int_N 1_{\mathfrak{t}_1 N K_1}(tnk) \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}((tnk)^{-1} \mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}) dk dt dn \\ = \int_N \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(n^{-1} \mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}) dn = \int_N \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(n \mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}) dn,$$

since  $\phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}$  is bi-invariant under  $K_1 \supset \mathfrak{t}_1$  and  $N$  is unimodular. The right hand side of 5.7 equals  $d(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) \delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . We therefore see that

$$d(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) = \delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_N \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(n \mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}) dn,$$

which is exactly formula 5.3 (which is still valid for computing the coefficient of  $\Phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}$ , even when  $\mu \notin \Lambda^+$ ).  $\square$

We will now describe involutions of the algebras  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , and show that these are compatible with  $\mathcal{S}_1$ . This will allow us to convert between left and right  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1}$ -modules. Let  $\iota_{K_1}$  be the involution on  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1}$  defined by  $\iota_{K_1}(f)(x) = f(x^{-1})$  for every  $x \in G(F_v)$  and  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{K_1}$ . A special case of this will be the involution  $\iota_{\mathcal{A}_1}$  of  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , given by  $\iota_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\Phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}) = \Phi_{(-\lambda, \delta^{-1})}$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *The involutions  $\iota_{K_1}$  and  $\iota_{\mathcal{A}_1}$  are compatible with the Satake map  $\mathcal{S}_1$ , in the sense that*

$$\mathcal{S}_1 \circ \iota_{K_1} = \iota_{\mathcal{A}_1} \circ \mathcal{S}_1.$$

*Proof.* We will prove this directly from the coefficient formulas 5.3 and 5.4. We just need to show that

$$c(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) = c(-\lambda, -\mu, \delta^{-1}, \epsilon^{-1})$$

for every  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$  and  $\delta, \epsilon \in \Delta$ . By [Car79, IV (19)] and our coefficient formulas, we can write

$$c(\lambda, \mu, \delta, \epsilon) = \delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_N \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(n \mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon}) dn \\ = \delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v))^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_N \phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}(\mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon} n) dn \\ = \delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v))^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu_N(\mu(\varpi_v)\dot{\epsilon} N \cap K_1 \lambda(\varpi_v)\dot{\delta} K_1) \\ = \delta_B(\mu(\varpi_v)^{-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu_N(N \mu(\varpi_v)^{-1} \dot{\epsilon}^{-1} \cap K_1 \lambda(\varpi_v)^{-1} \dot{\delta}^{-1} K_1),$$

where we have used unimodularity of  $N$  in the final line. Since these formulas do not depend on the choice of representatives of  $\Delta$  in  $T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ , the final line is exactly  $c(-\lambda, -\mu, \delta^{-1}, \epsilon^{-1})$  and we are done.  $\square$

*Remark 5.5.* A proof of Lemma 5.4 similar to that of [HKP10, 4.4] should also be possible by creating a  $\mathcal{A}_1$ -valued,  $G$ -invariant perfect  $\mathcal{A}_1$ -sesquilinear pairing on a module  $M \supset M_1$  and applying the relation 5.6.

Now let  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^\times$  be a smooth character. There is an isomorphism of right  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1}$ -modules

$$(5.8) \quad \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p} \otimes_{\chi, \mathcal{A}_1} M_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} i_B^G(\chi^{-1})^{K_1},$$

where the action of  $\mathcal{H}_{K_1}$  on the  $K_1$ -invariants of the parabolically induced representation is by first applying  $\iota_{K_1}$  followed by the usual left-action. We can now prove the desired compatibility between our Satake isomorphism and such parabolic inductions.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^\times$  be a smooth character and  $\pi = i_B^G \chi$ . The space of  $K_1$ -invariants,  $\pi^{K_1}$ , is at most one-dimensional, and if  $\pi^{K_1} \neq 0$  then  $\chi|_{\mathfrak{t}_1}$  is trivial and for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{K_1}$  and  $v \in \pi^{K_1}$  we have*

$$fv = \chi(\mathcal{S}_1 f)v.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $0 \neq \varphi \in \pi^{K_1}$ . Then writing  $G = TNK_1$  as in 5.5, we see that  $\varphi(tnk) = \delta_B(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi(t) \varphi(1)$ . Since  $\varphi$  is determined by  $\varphi(1)$ , we see that  $\dim \pi^{K_1} = 1$  and  $\varphi(1) = \varphi(t) = \chi(t) \varphi(1)$  if  $t \in T(F_v) \cap K_1 = \mathfrak{t}_1$ .

Now let  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{K_1}$  and let  $m \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p} \otimes_{\chi^{-1}, \mathcal{A}_1} M_1$ . If we can show that  $m \star \iota_{K_1}(f) = \chi(\mathcal{S}_1(f))m$  then we would be done using the isomorphism 5.8. By equation 5.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m \star \iota_{K_1}(f) &= \mathcal{S}_1(\iota_{K_1}(f))m \\ &= \iota_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\mathcal{S}_1(f))m && \text{by Lemma 5.4} \\ &= \chi^{-1}(\iota_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\mathcal{S}_1(f)))m \\ &= \chi(\mathcal{S}_1(f))m, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $\chi^{-1} \circ \iota_{\mathcal{A}_1} = \chi$  as maps  $\mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ , which can be checked on basis elements  $\Phi_{(\lambda, \delta)}$  for  $\mathcal{A}_1$ . □

**5.2. An abelian subalgebra of the  $\mathfrak{p}_1$ -Hecke algebra.** Now consider the following setup. Let  $G$  be a reductive group over  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$ , with  $T \subset B \subset G$  a split maximal torus contained in a Borel subgroup of  $G$  and continue with the notation of writing  $H$  for  $H(F_v)$  when  $H \leq G$  is a closed algebraic subgroup. Let  $P = LN$  be a standard parabolic subgroup of  $G$ , with unipotent radical  $N$ , and  $L$  a Levi factor containing  $T$ . Let  $W_G$  (resp.  $W_L$ ) denote the Weyl group of  $G$  (resp.  $L$ ). Let  $\delta_P : P(F_v) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$  be the modulus character for  $P$ , defined by  $\delta_P(p) = |\det(\text{Ad}(p)|_{\text{Lie } N})|_v$ . Let  $(X^*(T), \Phi, X_*(T), \Phi^\vee)$  denote the root datum of  $G$  with respect to this choice of maximal torus and let  $\Phi^+$  denote the positive roots with respect to the Borel subgroup  $B$ . We assume that  $p$  is coprime to the order of  $W_G$  (and hence of  $W_L$ ).

Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be the parahoric subgroup given by the preimage of  $P(k(v))$  in  $G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ . We will apply the Satake map of Section 5.1 to the reductive group  $L$ , defined over  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$ . Let  $C_L = L/L^{\text{der}}$  be the cocenter of  $L$  and let  $\Delta$  be a quotient of  $C_L(k(v))$  of order coprime to the order of  $W_G$ . Define the further compact open subgroup  $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}$  given by the kernel of the composition

$$\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow P(k(v)) \rightarrow L(k(v)) \rightarrow \Delta.$$

Thus we have an isomorphism  $\mathcal{S}_1^{-1} : \mathcal{H}(T, T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)^{W_L} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(L, L \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)$  by Theorem 5.1. We will show the existence of an injective algebra homomorphism  $\mathcal{T}_1 : \mathcal{H}(L, L \cap \mathfrak{p}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ , so that the composition will allow us to view  $\mathcal{H}(T, T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)^{W_L}$  as an abelian subalgebra of  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ .

To do this, we will use the notion of strongly  $(P, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -positive elements as in [BK98, 6.16]. We say  $z \in L$  is positive if  $z(N \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)z^{-1} \subset N \cap \mathfrak{p}_1$  and  $z^{-1}(\bar{N} \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)z \subset \bar{N} \cap \mathfrak{p}_1$ , where  $\bar{N}$  denotes the unipotent radical of the opposite parabolic subgroup to  $P$ . We say further that  $\zeta \in Z(L)$  is strongly positive if  $\zeta$  is positive and for all pairs of compact open subgroups  $H_1, H_2 \leq N$  and  $K_1, K_2 \leq \bar{N}$  there exists  $n, m \geq 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta^n H_1 \zeta^{-n} &\leq H_2 \\ \zeta^{-m} K_1 \zeta^m &\leq K_2. \end{aligned}$$

Write  $L^+$  for the set of positive elements of  $L$ . Our homomorphism will come from [BK98, Theorem 7.2] provided we can find a strongly  $(P, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -positive element  $\zeta \in Z(L)$  whose characteristic function  $[\mathfrak{p}_1 \zeta \mathfrak{p}_1]$  is invertible in  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ .

**Proposition 5.7.** *The map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_1 : \mathcal{H}(L^+, \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap L^+) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1) \\ [(\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap L^+)z(\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap L^+)] &\mapsto \delta_P(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} [\mathfrak{p}_1 z \mathfrak{p}_1] \end{aligned}$$

is an injective algebra homomorphism. Let  $\lambda \in X_*(T)$  take values in  $Z(L)$  and be such that  $\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle > 0$  for every  $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_L$ . Then  $\lambda(\varpi_v)$  is a strongly  $(P, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -positive element and  $[\mathfrak{p}_1 \lambda(\varpi_v) \mathfrak{p}_1]$  is invertible in  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ . The map  $\mathcal{T}_1$  extends to an injective algebra homomorphism

$$\mathcal{T}_1 : \mathcal{H}(L, \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap L) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1).$$

*Proof.* The map on the Hecke algebra with positive support is a twist of the injective algebra homomorphism stated in [BK98, 6.12]. The proof of [BK98, Lemma 6.14] shows that  $\lambda(\varpi_v)$  is strongly  $(P, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -positive for  $\lambda$  as in the statement of the proposition. By [CGP15, 2.2.9, 2.18], we can find such a  $\lambda \in X_*(T)$ .

Next we show that  $[\mathfrak{p}_1 \lambda(\varpi_v) \mathfrak{p}_1]$  is invertible. Letting  $\mathrm{Iw}^{(1)}$  be the pro- $p$ -Iwahori subgroup (given by the preimage of  $U(k(v))$  in  $G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ , where  $U$  is the unipotent radical of the Borel subgroup  $B$ ) and  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)} = \mathcal{H}(G, \mathrm{Iw}^{(1)})$ , we have by [Vig05, Corollary 1] that  $[\mathrm{Iw}^{(1)} \lambda(\varpi_v) \mathrm{Iw}^{(1)}]$  is invertible in  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ . Let  $W^{(1)} = W_G \rtimes (T(F_v)/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \times T(k(v)))$ , which we will view as a quotient of  $N_G(T)(F_v)$ . We will extend the usual length function on  $(W_G \rtimes T(F_v)/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}))$  to  $l : W^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying  $l(\alpha w \beta) = l(w)$  for any  $w \in W^{(1)}$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in T(k(v))$ , as in [Vig05, Proposition 1]. If  $w \in W^{(1)}$ , choose a representative  $n \in N_G(T)(F_v)$  and let  $T_w = [\mathrm{Iw}^{(1)} w \mathrm{Iw}^{(1)}]$ . The Iwahori-Matsumoto presentation of  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$  [Vig05, Theorem 1] states that  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$  has  $\{T_w\}_{w \in W^{(1)}}$  as a basis with multiplication defined by the braid relations

$$T_w T_{w'} = T_{ww'} \text{ whenever } w, w' \in W^{(1)} \text{ satisfy } l(ww') = l(w) + l(w')$$

and certain quadratic relations. By definition of  $l$  and the same proof of [Lus89, Lemma 2.2], it can be seen that for every  $w \in W_L$  and  $\alpha \in T(k(v))$  the basis elements  $T_{w\alpha}$  and  $T_{\lambda(\varpi_v)}$  commute.

Let  $\Gamma = \ker(\pi : L(k(v)) \rightarrow \Delta)$ . If we choose representatives  $\dot{w}$  lying in  $L^{\text{der}}(k(v)) \subset \Gamma$  for  $w \in W_L$ , we claim there is a decomposition of the group

$$\Gamma \cdot N(k(v)) = \bigsqcup_{w \in W_L, \alpha \in T(k(v)) \cap \Gamma} U(k(v)) \dot{w} \alpha U(k(v)).$$

Firstly, observe that the right hand side is actually a disjoint union. Indeed, suppose that  $u \dot{w} \alpha v = \dot{x} \beta$  with  $u, v \in U(k(v))$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in T(k(v))$  and  $w, x \in W_L$ . Then by the Bruhat decomposition for  $G$  we have that  $w = x$ . Writing the equality as  $(\dot{w} \alpha)(\dot{w} \alpha)^{-1} u (\dot{w} \alpha) v = \dot{w} \beta$ , we deduce that  $y^{-1} u y v = \alpha^{-1} \beta$  for some  $y$ . It follows that  $y^{-1} u y \in B(k(v))$ , so must lie in  $U(k(v))$ , as it is unipotent. Therefore  $\alpha^{-1} \beta \in T(k(v)) \cap U(k(v))$ , so  $\alpha = \beta$  as required.

Suppose that  $m \in \Gamma$  and  $n \in N(k(v))$ . By the Bruhat decomposition for  $L(k(v))$ , we may write  $m = x \dot{w} y$  where  $x, y \in (B \cap L)(k(v))$  and  $w \in W_L$ . Then since  $B = TU$ , we may write  $x = s x'$  and  $y = t y'$  with  $x', y' \in L(k(v))$  unipotent and  $s, t \in T(k(v))$ . It follows that we can write  $m = z \dot{w} \alpha y'$  with  $z \in L(k(v))$  unipotent and  $\alpha \in T(k(v))$ . Applying  $\pi$  to both sides, we see that  $1 = \pi(m) = \pi(z t' \dot{w} y') = \pi(t')$ . We deduce that  $t' \in \Gamma \cap T(k(v))$  and since  $N \subset U$  we have  $mn \in U(k(v)) \dot{w} \alpha U(k(v))$ .

To show the other containment, we just need to show  $U(k(v)) \subset \Gamma N(k(v))$ , so let  $u \in U(k(v))$ . Since  $u \in P(k(v)) = L(k(v))N(k(v))$ , we can write  $u = l n$  with  $l \in L(k(v))$  and note that  $l$  is necessarily unipotent. Therefore  $\pi(l) = 1$  and  $l \in \Gamma$ , as required.

We see that

$$\mathfrak{p}_1 = \bigsqcup_{w \in W_L, \alpha \in \Gamma \cap T(k(v))} \text{Iw}^{(1)} \dot{w} \dot{\alpha} \text{Iw}^{(1)},$$

where for each  $\alpha \in \Gamma \cap T(k(v))$ ,  $\dot{\alpha}$  is a choice of lift of  $\alpha$  to  $T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ . Therefore the indicator function  $[\mathfrak{p}_1]$  in  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$  commutes with  $[\text{Iw}^{(1)} \lambda(\varpi_v) \text{Iw}^{(1)}]$ , and they have product  $[\mathfrak{p}_1 \lambda(\varpi_v) \mathfrak{p}_1]$ . Taking the product of the inverse in  $[\text{Iw}^{(1)} \lambda(\varpi_v) \text{Iw}^{(1)}]$  in  $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$  with  $[\mathfrak{p}_1]$  then yields the desired inverse in  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ .

To conclude the proof then, we apply [BK98, Theorem 7.2] with our invertible element to see that  $\mathcal{T}_1$  does indeed extend to an algebra homomorphism on  $\mathcal{H}(L, \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap L)$ .  $\square$

We have constructed our desired abelian subalgebra.

**Corollary 5.8.** *The composition*

$$\mathcal{T}_1 \circ \mathcal{S}_1^{-1} : \mathcal{H}(T, T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)^{W_L} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$$

*is an injective  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra homomorphism.*

Now suppose that  $\Delta$  has  $p$ -power order (note that  $p$  is coprime to  $\#W_G$  by assumption). Consider the Hecke algebras of the torus  $T$  at levels  $T \cap \mathfrak{p}$  and  $T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1$ : these are just group algebras of suitable quotients of  $T$ , and we have a natural map of  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebras

$$\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})]$$

which also restricts to a map of  $W_L$ -invariants. The maps induce bijections on maximal ideals. Indeed, we can find a section of the above map which gives a presentation  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)] \cong \mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})][\Delta]$  using the Teichmüller map. It suffices to show there is a bijection modulo  $\lambda$ ; but then the presentation reduces to one of the form  $k[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})][y_1, \dots, y_r]/(y_i^{p^{a_i}})$ , where  $y_i + 1$  are generators of  $\Delta$  and  $a_i \geq 1$ , since  $k$  is characteristic  $p$ . The bijection follows, as the residual map is given by quotienting of nilpotents.

Now suppose  $N$  is any  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -module which is finite free over  $\mathcal{O}$ . Then  $N$  receives the structure of a module over  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  via the composition  $\mathcal{T}_1 \circ \mathcal{S}_1^{-1} : \mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ . Similarly, the invariants  $N^{\mathfrak{p}} = N^{\Delta}$  (viewing  $\Delta = \mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{p}_1$ ) receive the structure of a module over  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})]^{W_L}$ . We can relate the module to the algebra at level  $\mathfrak{p}$  in the following way.

**Proposition 5.9.** *Let  $\mathfrak{n}_1$  be any maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  and  $\mathfrak{n}_0$  the corresponding maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})]^{W_L}$ . The localisations  $N_{\mathfrak{n}_1}$  and  $(N^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  are submodules of  $N$  and  $N^{\mathfrak{p}}$  respectively, and under this identification we have the equality  $(N_{\mathfrak{n}_1})^{\Delta} = (N^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$ .*

*Proof.* The proposition is clear provided we know that the two actions of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  (viewing either as a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p}_1)$  or passing to  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})]^{W_L}$  and viewing as a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ ) on  $N^{\mathfrak{p}}$  coincide. By Lemma 5.2 it suffices to show the actions of the  $\phi_{(\lambda, \delta)} \in \mathcal{H}(L, L \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)$  and  $\phi_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}(L, L \cap \mathfrak{p})$  agree. We know the maps  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_1$  on positive elements, and the respective maps extend uniquely, so it suffices to show that for  $z = \lambda(\varpi_v)\delta \in L^+$  we have a bijection  $\mathfrak{p}_1 z \mathfrak{p}_1 / \mathfrak{p}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{p} z \mathfrak{p} / \mathfrak{p}$ . Decomposing  $\mathfrak{p}_1 z \mathfrak{p}_1 = \bigsqcup_i z_i \mathfrak{p}_1$ , it is easy to see that  $\mathfrak{p} z \mathfrak{p} = \bigsqcup_i z_i \mathfrak{p}$ , as  $z$  commutes with the representatives  $\delta$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_1 \triangleleft \mathfrak{p}$ . □

**5.3. Parahoric invariants.** Continue with notation as in the previous subsection. Assume for the rest of Section 5 that  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{b} = \{g \in G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) : g \pmod{(\varpi_v)} \in B(k(v))\}$  denote the Iwahori-subgroup of  $G(F_v)$  and let  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{b})$  denote the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of compactly supported,  $\mathcal{O}$ -valued functions on the double coset space  $\mathfrak{b} \backslash G(F_v) / \mathfrak{b}$ . We will make use of the Bernstein presentation of  $\mathcal{H}$ . This presents  $\mathcal{H}$  as a twisted tensor product of  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{O}[X_*(T)]$  and  $\mathcal{O}[\mathfrak{b} \backslash \mathfrak{g} / \mathfrak{b}]$ . We refer the reader to [HKP10] for more details, but note that the inclusion  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  arises from sending  $\lambda \mapsto q_v^{-\langle \rho, \lambda \rangle} [\mathfrak{b} \lambda(\varpi_v) \mathfrak{b}]$ , where  $\lambda$  is a dominant cocharacter and  $\rho$  is the usual half sum of positive roots. Since  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , the Bernstein presentation of  $\mathcal{H}$  allows us to identify the reduction of  $\mathcal{H}$  modulo  $(\lambda)$  as  $\overline{\mathcal{H}} = k[X_*(T) \rtimes W_G]$  (see for example [BHKT19, Lemma 7.5]).

Continue to let  $P \supset B$  be a standard parabolic subgroup of  $G$  with standard Levi factor  $L \supset T$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} = \{g \in G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) : g \pmod{\lambda} \in P(k(v))\}$  be the parahoric subgroup associated to the parabolic subgroup  $P$  (and similarly  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to  $G$ ). For each  $w \in W_G$  we will fix a coset representative  $\dot{w} \in G(F_v)$ . For  $U \subset G(F_v)$  a compact open subset biinvariant under  $\mathfrak{b}$ , let  $[U] \in \mathcal{H}$  denote the indicator function on  $U$ . The Bruhat decompositions for  $L(k(v))$  and  $G(k(v))$  imply the following equalities in  $\mathcal{H}$ :

$$[\mathfrak{p}] = \sum_{w \in W_L} [\mathfrak{b} \dot{w} \mathfrak{b}]$$

$$[\mathfrak{g}] = \sum_{w \in W_G} [\mathfrak{b} \dot{w} \mathfrak{b}].$$

The choice of parabolic subgroup  $P$  determines an injective algebra homomorphism  $\mathcal{T}_P : \mathcal{H}(L, \mathfrak{p} \cap L) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ , as in Proposition 5.7 applied to the case where  $\Delta$  is trivial (so  $\mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{p}$ ). Thus  $\mathcal{T}_B$  allows us to view  $\mathcal{A}$  as a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{H}$ , and this map is easily seen to agree with the inclusion of  $\mathcal{A}$  via the Bernstein presentation. Consider the further subalgebra  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{O}[X_*(T)]^{W_L} \leq \mathcal{A}$ . If we let  $\mathcal{S}_P$  denote the isomorphism in Proposition 5.1 applied to the case where the reductive group is the Levi subgroup  $M$  and the group  $\Delta$  is trivial, the composition  $\mathcal{T}_P \circ \mathcal{S}_P^{-1} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p})$  is an injective algebra homomorphism.

If  $N$  is any left  $\mathcal{H}$ -module  $N$  then  $[\mathfrak{p}]N$  is a left  $\mathcal{H}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ -module. The map  $\mathcal{T}_P \circ \mathcal{S}_P^{-1}$  allows us to further view  $[\mathfrak{p}]N$  as a  $\mathcal{B}$ -module. This action coincides with the restriction of the above action of  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  by [Tho22, Proposition 3.4].

Suppose  $\mathfrak{n}$  is a maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{A}$  with residue field  $k$ . Intersection of  $\mathfrak{n}$  with  $\mathcal{B}$  defines a maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{B}$ , with maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{n}$  and  $\mathfrak{n}'$  having the same image if and only if they lie in the same orbit under the action of  $W_L$ . This map is also surjective, and hence maximal ideals of  $\mathcal{B}$  are in bijection with  $W_L$ -orbits of maximal ideals of  $\mathcal{A}$ . This bijection continues to hold on taking both of these rings modulo  $(\lambda)$ .

**Proposition 5.10.** *Let  $N$  be a left  $\mathcal{H}$ -module, which is either a finite free  $\mathcal{O}$ -module or a finite dimensional  $k$ -vector space. Let  $\mathfrak{n}_0$  be a maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{B}$  and suppose that the centralizer of some (equivalently, any) maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{A}$  above  $\mathfrak{n}_0$  in  $W_G$  is contained in  $W_L$ . Let  $\mathfrak{q}$  denote the unique maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}[X_*(T)]^{W_G}$  lying below  $\mathfrak{n}_0$ . Then multiplication by  $[\mathfrak{g}]$  defines an isomorphism  $[\mathfrak{g}] : ([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0} \rightarrow ([\mathfrak{g}]N)_{\mathfrak{q}}$ .*

*Proof.* In the case where  $N$  is a finite free  $\mathcal{O}$ -module, the claims will hold true if and only if they hold true for  $N/\lambda N$ . Hence we will take  $N$  to be a finite dimensional  $k$ -vector space from now on.

As observed,  $\overline{\mathcal{H}} = k[X_*(T) \rtimes W_G]$  is just the group algebra of a semi-direct product. We may decompose  $N = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{m}} N_{\mathfrak{m}}$  as a module over  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} = k[X_*(T)]$ , since the localisations are given by the generalized eigenspaces for the action of  $k[X_*(T)]$  on  $N$ . If  $\mathfrak{n}$  is a maximal ideal of  $\overline{\mathcal{B}} = k[X_*(T)]^{W_L}$ , let  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{n}}$  denote the set of maximal ideals of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  above  $\mathfrak{n}$ . We claim firstly that  $([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}} = [\mathfrak{p}](\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{n}}} N_{\mathfrak{m}})$ . Indeed, if  $n \in N$  is in the generalized eigenspace for the character of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  defining  $\mathfrak{m}$ , we have that  $(\sum_{w \in W_L} w)n$  is in the generalized eigenspace for the restriction of this character to  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ ; the other containment is similar.

Now let  $M = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{n}_0}} N_{\mathfrak{m}}$  and  $\pi : N = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{m}} N_{\mathfrak{m}} \rightarrow M$  denote the natural projection. We next claim that the composition  $\pi \circ [\mathfrak{g}] : ([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0} \rightarrow M$  has image in  $([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  and is given by multiplication by  $\#W_L \in k^\times$ . To see this, let  $n \in ([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  and suppose firstly that  $w \in W_G \setminus W_L$ . The only maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  for which the image of  $wn$  in the localisation  $N_{\mathfrak{m}}$  could be non-zero are such that  $w^{-1}\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$ . We cannot have both  $\mathfrak{m}$  and  $w\mathfrak{m}$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$ , since this would contradict that the centralizer of  $\mathfrak{m}$  is contained in  $W_L$  and therefore the composition  $\pi \circ w$  is zero. If  $w \in W_L$ , then  $wn = n$  for any  $n \in ([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$ , and the claim then follows.

Lastly, we show that  $\pi|_{([\mathfrak{g}]N)_{\mathfrak{q}}}$  is an injection with image contained in  $([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$ . We will then be done, since  $\frac{1}{\#W_L}\pi$  will provide the inverse to  $[\mathfrak{g}]$  on  $([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  (and the image of  $([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  under  $[\mathfrak{g}]$  is supported only at maximal ideals in  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  as a module over  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , and hence only at the maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{q}$  as an  $\mathcal{O}[X_*(T)]^{W_G}$ -module. Let us suppose that  $0 \neq n \in ([\mathfrak{g}]N)_{\mathfrak{q}}$ . Then since  $n = \frac{1}{\#W_L}[\mathfrak{p}]n \in [\mathfrak{p}]N$  there must exist a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{n}$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{B}} = k[X_*(T)]^{W_L}$  for which the image of  $n$  in  $([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}}$  is non-zero. The maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{n}$  and  $\mathfrak{n}_0$  must be conjugate, so there exists a  $w \in W_G$  such that  $wn$  has non-zero image in  $([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0} \subset M$ . Since  $wn = n$ , we have shown that  $\pi|_{([\mathfrak{g}]N)_{\mathfrak{q}}}$  is indeed injective. Multiplication by  $w \in W_L$  commutes with  $\pi$ , so  $\pi(([\mathfrak{g}]N)_{\mathfrak{q}}) \subset [\mathfrak{p}]N \cap M = ([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  and we are done.  $\square$

*Remark 5.11.* While the statement of Proposition 5.10 is really about a module over the parahoric Hecke algebra, the proof used the Bernstein presentation of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra. It would be of interest to know whether similar presentations exist of the parahoric Hecke algebras, at least in the case when  $q_v = 1$ .

Now let  $\hat{G}$  be a reductive group over  $k$  and suppose that  $\hat{T}$  is a split maximal torus contained in a Borel subgroup  $\hat{B}$  of  $\hat{G}$ . Suppose that the arising pinned root datum is dual to that of  $G$ , and let  $\iota$  denote the induced isomorphisms  $X_*(T) \cong X^*(\hat{T})$  and  $X^*(T) \cong X_*(\hat{T})$  (just as in Section 3.3). If we take some  $\bar{g} \in \hat{T}(k)$ , the isomorphism  $\iota$  will allow us to define various objects, firstly via the same construction of a Levi subgroup of  $G$  in Definition 3.22.

*Construction 5.12.* Let  $\bar{g} \in \hat{T}(k)$ . Then we can form the following:

- (1)  $M_{\bar{g}} = Z_{\hat{G}_k}(\bar{g})$ , the scheme-theoretic centralizer of  $\bar{g}$ .
- (2) A subtorus  $\hat{S}$  of  $\hat{T}$ . This will be given by the connected center of  $M_{\bar{g}}$ ,  $\hat{S} = Z(M_{\bar{g}})^\circ$ .
- (3) A standard Levi subgroup  $\hat{L}$  of  $\hat{G}$  with connected center  $\hat{S}$ . The scheme-theoretic centralizer of  $\hat{S}$ ,  $\hat{L} = Z_{\hat{G}_k}(\hat{S})$ , will be a Levi subgroup of  $\hat{G}$  containing  $M_{\bar{g}}$  and let  $\hat{P}$  denote the standard parabolic subgroup of  $\hat{G}$  admitting  $\hat{L}$  as a Levi factor.
- (4) A standard parabolic subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  with unipotent radical  $N$  and standard Levi subgroup  $L$ . These will be the dual standard parabolic subgroup and Levi subgroup to  $\hat{P}$  and  $\hat{L}$  via  $\iota$ , as in Section 3.3.
- (5) A parahoric subgroup  $\mathfrak{p} \leq G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ . This will be given by those  $g \in G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$  for which  $g \bmod \varpi_v \in P(k(v))$ .
- (6) A finite  $p$ -group  $\Delta$ . This will denote the maximal  $p$ -power quotient of  $C_L(k(v))$  such that the image of  $Z(G)(k(v))$  is trivial. Here  $C_L = L/L^{\text{der}}$  is the cocenter of  $L$ .
- (7) A compact open subgroup  $\mathfrak{p}_1 \leq \mathfrak{p}$ , normal in  $\mathfrak{p}$ , with quotient  $\Delta$ . This will be given by the kernel of the composition

$$\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow P(k(v)) \rightarrow L(k(v)) \rightarrow C_L(k(v)) \rightarrow \Delta.$$

Associated to the element  $\bar{g} \in \hat{T}(k)$ , we obtain a character

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\chi} : X_*(T) &\rightarrow k^\times \\ \alpha &\mapsto \iota(\alpha)(\bar{g}) \end{aligned}$$

and the same formula defines a bijection  $\hat{T}(k) \cong \text{Hom}(X_*(T), k^\times)$ . The next lemma will place restrictions on the centralizer of  $\bar{\chi}$  under action of the Weyl group  $W_G$ , which will help us verify the hypotheses of Proposition 5.10 in cases of interest.

**Lemma 5.13.** *The following inclusions hold:*

- (1)  $\text{Stab}_{W_{\hat{G}}}(\bar{g}) \leq W_{\hat{L}}$
- (2)  $\text{Stab}_{W_G} \bar{\chi} \leq W_L$

with equalities if  $M_{\bar{g}}$  is a Levi subgroup.

*Proof.* We have by [Car85, Theorem 3.5.3] that the connected centralizer  $M_{\bar{g}}^\circ$  is generated by the maximal torus  $\hat{T}$  and root groups  $U_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in (\Phi^\vee)^+$  for which  $\alpha(\bar{g}) = 1$ , while the centralizer  $Z_{\hat{G}}(\bar{g})$  is generated by  $Z_{\hat{G}}(\bar{g})^\circ$  together with those Weyl elements of  $W_{\hat{G}}$  which centralize  $\bar{g}$ . Since  $\hat{L}$  always contains  $M_{\bar{g}}$ , 1 therefore holds. If  $M_{\bar{g}} = \hat{L}$  is a Levi subgroup, then  $M_{\bar{g}}^\circ = M_{\bar{g}}$  and those elements of  $W_{\hat{G}}$  centralizing  $\bar{g}$  lie in  $M_{\bar{g}}(\bar{k})$ , showing the reverse containment.

By [Bor91, 14.8] we may view  $W_G$  and  $W_{\hat{G}}$  as subgroups of  $\text{Aut}(X^*(T)) \cong \text{Aut}(X_*(\hat{T}))$  generated by reflections corresponding to simple roots of  $G$  (or simple coroots of  $\hat{G}$ ). Therefore,  $\iota$  induces an isomorphism between  $W_G$  and  $W_{\hat{G}}$ . This isomorphism restricts to an isomorphism between  $W_L$  and  $W_{\hat{L}}$ , and also between  $\text{Stab}_{W_G}(\bar{\chi})$  and  $\text{Stab}_{W_{\hat{G}}}(\bar{g})$ . Thus 2 follows immediately from 1.  $\square$



We can extend the map  $\bar{\chi}$  to a map  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow k$ , defining a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ . From Lemma 5.13 and Proposition 5.10 we deduce the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.14.** *Let  $N$  be a left  $\mathcal{H}$ -module, which is either a finite free  $\mathcal{O}$ -module or a finite dimensional  $k$ -vector space. Let  $\bar{g} \in \hat{T}(k)$  and form  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $L$  as in Construction 5.12. Let  $\mathfrak{n}_0$  be the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{O}[X_*(T)]^{W_L}$  corresponding to  $\bar{g}$  and let  $\mathfrak{q}$  denote the unique maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}[X_*(T)]^{W_G}$  lying below  $\mathfrak{n}_0$ . Then multiplication by  $[\mathfrak{g}]$  defines an isomorphism  $[\mathfrak{g}] : ([\mathfrak{p}]N)_{\mathfrak{n}_0} \rightarrow ([\mathfrak{g}]N)_{\mathfrak{q}}$ .*

**5.4. Jacquet module computations.** Continue with the setup of Section 5.3. This required fixing some  $\bar{g} \in \hat{T}(k)$ , and it allowed us to define the data of Construction 5.12. We saw already that the maximal ideals of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  and  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})]^{W_L}$  are naturally in bijection. We will let  $\mathfrak{n}_1$  (respectively  $\mathfrak{n}_0$ ) denote the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  (respectively  $\mathcal{O}[T/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]^{W_L}$ ) corresponding to  $\bar{\chi}$ .

If  $\sigma$  is an admissible representation of  $L$ , we will let  $i_P^G \sigma$  denote the usual normalised induction of  $\sigma$ , so that left translation by  $p \in P(F_v)$  acts via  $\delta_P(p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(p)$ . If  $\rho$  is a representation of  $G$  then let  $r_N(\rho)$  denote the normalised Jacquet module of  $\rho$ , viewed as a representation of  $L$ . It will be of use to compute Jacquet modules of parabolically induced representations. A formula for this is given by [BZ77, 2.12] and we will combine this with [BZ77, 2.11(a)] to understand the indexing of the stated filtration. The following lemma will help us understand invariants of smooth representations of  $G(F_v)$  in terms of the invariants of the Jacquet module.

**Lemma 5.15.** *Let  $\pi$  be a smooth representation of  $G$ . The quotient map gives isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{\mathfrak{p}} &\xrightarrow{\sim} r_N(\pi)^{(\mathfrak{p} \cap L)} \\ \pi^{\mathfrak{p}_1} &\xrightarrow{\sim} r_N(\pi)^{(\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap L)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We saw already in the proof of Proposition 5.7 that there exists a strongly  $(P, \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -positive element of  $L$ . The proof then goes through exactly as in the proof of [Tho22, Proposition 3.2 (4)].  $\square$

**Lemma 5.16.** *Let  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p^\times$  be a smooth character of  $T$  and  $\pi = i_B^G \chi$ . The space of localized invariants  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1}$  is at most one-dimensional. If  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} \neq 0$  then  $\chi$  is valued in  $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$ , there exists  $w \in W_G$  such that the action of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  on  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1}$  is through  $w\chi$ , and this  $w\chi$  lifts  $\bar{\chi}$ .*

*Proof.* By [BZ77, 2.12 and 2.11(a)], we can write the semisimplification of the Jacquet module  $r_N(\pi)$  as

$$\bigoplus_{w \in W_L \setminus W_G} i_{B \cap L}^L w\chi.$$

Since taking invariants under a compact open subgroup is an exact functor, it suffices to compute the dimension of these localised invariants in the semisimplification of  $r_N(\pi)$ . By Lemma 5.15 then we just need to compute

$$(i_{B \cap L}^L w\chi)^{(\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap L)}$$

for  $w \in W_G$ . Viewed as a module over  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$ , this is exactly  $(w\chi)^{(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)}$  by Proposition 5.6. Now suppose that  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} \neq 0$ . We claim there must be some  $w\chi$  valued in  $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$  and lifting  $\bar{\chi}$ .

If  $((w\chi)^{(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} \neq 0$  but  $w\chi$  is not integral then there exists  $t \in T(F_v)$  with  $\alpha = w\chi(t) \equiv 0 \pmod{m_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p}}$ . The element  $\alpha$  is integral over  $\mathcal{O}$  and hence satisfies  $\alpha^n + c_{n-1}\alpha^{n-1} + \dots + c_0 = 0$  for some  $c_i \in \mathcal{O}$ . We can take these  $c_i \in \lambda\mathcal{O}$ , as the coefficients in the minimal polynomial are sums and products of the Galois conjugates of  $\alpha$ , which will all have positive  $p$ -adic valuation. Then  $t^n + c_{n-1}t^{n-1} + \dots + c_0 \equiv t^n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{n}_1}$ , so the localisation  $((w\chi)^{(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} = 0$ .

We must then have that  $w\chi$  lifts  $\bar{\chi}$ . Indeed, let  $t \in T(F_v)$  with  $\alpha = w\chi(t) \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$  and minimal polynomial over  $\mathcal{O}$  given by  $f(X) \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ . We must have  $f(t) - f(\alpha) \in \mathfrak{n}_1$ , in order for the localisation to be non-zero. Thus  $f(t) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{n}_1}$ . Let  $\bar{\beta} \in k^\times$  denote the image of  $t$  under  $\bar{\chi}$  and let  $\bar{f}(X)$  be the reduction of  $f(X)$  modulo  $(\lambda)$ . We must have  $\bar{f}(\bar{\beta}) = 0$ . Writing  $\bar{f}(X) = \bar{g}(X)\bar{h}(X)$ , where  $\bar{g}(X) = (X - \bar{\beta})^s$  and  $\bar{g}(X), \bar{h}(X) \in k[X]$  are coprime, if  $\bar{h}(X)$  was non-zero we could lift this factorization to a non-trivial factorisation of  $f(X)$  in  $\mathcal{O}[X]$  by Hensel's lemma. So we must have that  $\bar{f}(X) = (X - \bar{\beta})^n$  and  $\alpha$  lifts  $\bar{\beta}$  proving the claim.

Note that there is at most one such coset  $W_L w$  across  $W_L \backslash W_G$  by Lemma 5.13. Moreover, we can find a choice of  $w$  for which  $w\chi$  actually lifts  $\bar{\chi}$ , viewing both as characters of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]$ , by going up.  $\square$

In the same way, we can prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.17.** *Let  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p^\times$  be a smooth character of  $T$  and  $\pi = i_B^G \chi$ . The space of localized invariants  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  is at most one-dimensional. If  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0} \neq 0$  then  $\chi$  is valued in  $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$ , there exists  $w \in W_G$  such that the action of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p})]^{W_L}$  on  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  is through  $w\chi$ , and this  $w\chi$  lifts  $\bar{\chi}$ .*

**5.5. Computations in the case  $G = \mathrm{GSp}_4$ .** We will continue with notation as in the previous section, temporarily suspending our assumption that  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , and now restricting to the case where  $G = \mathrm{GSp}_4$  and  $F_v$  is characteristic zero. There is an isomorphism  $\hat{G} \cong \mathrm{GSp}_4$ ; in everything that follows we will identify  $\hat{G}$  with  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$  via the isomorphism of root data given by [RS07, (2.13)]. A local Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$  has been established in [GT11, Main Theorem], and we will work with  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  coefficients by fixing an isomorphism  $\iota : \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  compatible with our choice of  $q_v^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . As in [BCGP21, 2.3], we will let  $\mathrm{rec}_{\mathrm{GSp}_4, p}$  denote the local Langlands map sending an equivalence class of a smooth irreducible  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ -valued representation of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v)$  to a Weil–Deligne representation of  $W_{F_v}$  valued in  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$ .

Suppose once again that  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  now. The goal of this section is to show that if  $\pi$  is an irreducible admissible representation of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v)$  for which a certain space of localized invariants are non-zero, then  $\mathrm{rec}_{\mathrm{GSp}_4, p}(\pi) = (V_\pi, N_\pi)$  is unramified. We will make this explicit via the description given in [RS07, Table A.7], where we will need to check that  $N_\pi = 0$ . This description matches up, as stated directly after [GT10, Proposition 13.1]. The following propositions are similar in statement and allow us to conclude  $N_\pi = 0$  in cases where the localised  $\mathfrak{p}$  or  $\mathfrak{p}_1$  invariants are non-zero.

**Proposition 5.18.** *Let  $\pi$  be an admissible irreducible  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p[G(F_v)]$ -module. Suppose that  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0} \neq 0$ . Then  $\pi$  is a subquotient of a parabolically induced representation  $i_B^G \chi$  for some unramified smooth character  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$ . The characters through which  $\mathcal{O}[T/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]^{W_L}$  act on  $\pi^{\mathfrak{p}}$  are  $W_G$ -conjugates of  $\chi$  and there exists  $w \in W_G$  such that  $w\chi$  lifts  $\bar{\chi}$ . The localized invariants  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0}$  are 1-dimensional and the action of  $\mathcal{O}[T/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]^{W_L}$  is through  $w\chi$ . Finally, if  $\mathrm{rec}_{\mathrm{GSp}_4, p}(\pi) = (V_\pi, N_\pi)$  is the Weil–Deligne*

representation associated to  $\pi$  under the local Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$  then  $N_\pi = 0$  and there is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{O}[T/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]^{W_G}$ -modules  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{n}_0} \rightarrow \pi^{\mathfrak{q}}$ .

**Proposition 5.19.** *Let  $\pi$  be an admissible irreducible  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}[G(F_v)]$ -module. Suppose that  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}^1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} \neq 0$ . Then  $\pi$  is a subquotient of a parabolically induced representation  $i_B^G \chi$  for some tamely ramified smooth character  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}^\times$ . The characters through which  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  act on  $\pi^{\mathfrak{p}^1}$  are  $W_G$ -conjugates of  $\chi$  and there exists  $w \in W_G$  such that  $w\chi$  lifts  $\bar{\chi}$ . The localized invariants  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}^1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1}$  are 1-dimensional and the action of  $\mathcal{O}[T/(T \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  is through  $w\chi$ . Finally, if  $\mathrm{rec}_{\mathrm{GT}, p}(\pi) = (V_\pi, N_\pi)$  is the Weil–Deligne representation associated to  $\pi$  under the local Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$  then  $N_\pi = 0$ .*

We will prove Proposition 5.19 firstly, since the proofs are mostly very similar and the nature of the computations are slightly more intricate in this case.

*Proof of Proposition 5.19.* The first three points are a standard consequence of Frobenius reciprocity together with Lemma 5.16; it follows from [BHKT19, Lemma 7.4(i)], for example. To show the final point, it is enough by the previous discussion about the map  $L$  to work case by case using the descriptions given in [RS07, A.5 Table A.7]. The cases will be determined by  $M_{\bar{g}}$  up to conjugacy. In all but one case,  $M_{\bar{g}}$  will be a Levi subgroup and  $\bar{\chi}$  will have centralizer in  $W_G$  equal to  $W_L$  by Lemma 5.13. In such cases we will look for characters  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}^\times$  for which the centralizer of  $\chi \bmod m_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}$  in  $W_G$  is conjugate to  $W_L$ , since some Weyl conjugate of  $\chi$  will lift  $\bar{\chi}$ . To conclude, we will show that those irreducible subquotients  $\pi$  of  $i_B^G \chi$  for which  $N_\pi \neq 0$  satisfy  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}^1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} = 0$ .

- (1) Suppose firstly that  $\bar{g}$  is regular semisimple; this is the only case for which  $L = T$  is a maximal torus and  $W_L$  is trivial. The stabilizer in  $W_G$  of the reduction modulo  $(\lambda)$  of some  $w\chi$  must be trivial. Hence by the discussion of [Sch05, 1.1] the only possibility is that  $\pi$  is an irreducible principal series representation (occurring in group I in [RS07, A.5 Table A.7]). So  $N_\pi = 0$  immediately follows.
- (2) Next suppose that the stabilizer  $M_{\bar{g}}$  of  $\bar{g}$  in  $\hat{G}$  is conjugate to a Levi subgroup of the Klingen parabolic subgroup. Then  $L \cong \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_1$  is in fact conjugate to a Levi subgroup of the Siegel parabolic subgroup of  $G$  ([RS07, Proof of Lemma 2.3.1]). We know that  $W_L$  is the stabilizer of  $\bar{\chi}$  and so the only possibilities are groups I or II of [RS07, A.5 Table A.7]). Thus we just need to eliminate the possibility that  $\pi$  is conjugate to a representation of the form  $\varphi \mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \rtimes \sigma$  for some smooth characters  $\varphi, \sigma$ .

Without loss of generality, we will take  $\pi = \varphi \mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \rtimes \sigma$  to be an induced representation from the Siegel parabolic, where  $\mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \rtimes \sigma$  is defined on the Levi factor  $M$ , a  $W_G$ -conjugate of  $L$ . We must then take  $\bar{\chi}$  to be a reduction of the character of  $T$  given by  $w\chi$ , where  $\chi := \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi \otimes \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varphi \otimes \sigma$ ,  $\nu$  is the absolute value on  $F_v$  (notation as in [Sch05]) and  $w \in W_G$ . We will show that  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}^1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} = 0$  to obtain a contradiction. We will compute Jacquet modules and take  $(L \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -invariants again. By [BZ77, 2.12 and 2.11(a)] and Lemma 5.15, we can write  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}^1})$ , up to semisimplification as

$$\bigoplus_{x \in W_L \backslash W_G / W_M, x(M) \neq L} (i_{B \cap L}^L x s \chi)^{(L \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)}.$$

Here  $s \in W_M$  is the non-identity element, occurring since the Jacquet module of the Steinberg representation is given by the  $s$  twist of the original character

for which the Steinberg representation is a submodule of the parabolic induction. Moreover, those  $x$  for which  $x(M) = L$  yield the  $(L \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)$ -invariants of a Steinberg representation, which vanish and therefore do not contribute to the sum.

On restricting to  $T$ , those characters possibly occurring in  $(i_{B \cap L}^L x s \chi)^{(L \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)}$  are of the form  $y x s \chi$  for  $y \in W_L$ . To show  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{n_1} = 0$ , it would suffice to show that if  $w \chi = y x s \chi$  then  $x(M) = L = w(M)$ . We may suppose then that  $w^{-1} y x s = 1$  since  $\chi$  has trivial stabilizer. We have  $w^{-1} W_L w = W_M$ , so since  $w^{-1} y w \in W_M$  and  $s \in W_M$ , it follows that  $w^{-1} x = (w^{-1} y w)^{-1} s^{-1} \in W_M$  and hence  $w(M) = x(M)$ .

- (3) Suppose that  $M_{\bar{g}}$  is conjugate to a Levi subgroup of the Siegel parabolic subgroup. Then  $L$  is conjugate to a Levi subgroup of the Klingen parabolic, isomorphic to  $\mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GSp}_2 \cong \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ . The stabilizer of  $\bar{\chi}$  is  $W_L$  and the only possibility we need to consider is that  $\pi$  is conjugate to a representation  $\varphi \rtimes \sigma \mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{GSp}_2}$ .  $\bar{\chi}$  must be a lift of a  $W_G$ -conjugate of  $\chi = \varphi \otimes \nu \otimes \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma$ . The remaining analysis to show  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{n_1} = 0$  is then similar to the previous case.
- (4) The remaining possibilities are those for which  $L = G$  (though we do not necessarily have  $M_{\bar{g}} = \hat{G}$ ). In this case  $\Delta$  is trivial and  $\mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{g}$ . It follows that  $N_\pi = 0$  from inspection of [RS07, A.10 Table A.15 and A.5 Table A.7].

□

*Proof of Proposition 5.18.* The majority of the proof is very similar to the proof of Proposition 5.19. We will thus only show the existence of an isomorphism  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{n_0} \rightarrow \pi^{\mathfrak{g}}$  using the explicit possible descriptions of  $\pi$ , in contrast to the proof of Proposition 5.10. As expected, we may observe from [RS07, A.10 Table A.15] that those  $\pi$  for which  $N_\pi = 0$  are exactly those for which  $\pi^{\mathfrak{g}} \neq 0$  and that in this case  $\pi^{\mathfrak{g}}$  is 1-dimensional. Since  $(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})_{n_0}$  is also 1-dimensional, with the actions of  $\mathcal{O}[T/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]^{W_G}$  given on both by the  $W_G$ -orbit of  $\chi$ , we see they are isomorphic as  $\mathcal{O}[T/T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]^{W_G}$ -modules.

□

## 6. LOCAL-GLOBAL COMPATIBILITY

We begin this section by proving some lemmas about when torus-valued representations are conjugate in the Weyl group of an ambient reductive group. We use these in proving Proposition 6.3, which implies that if we have a sufficiently strong local-global compatibility result then we can deduce a statement necessary for the Taylor–Wiles method applied to our generalized notion of Taylor–Wiles places (as in Section 3.2).

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $H$  be a (possibly disconnected) reductive group over an algebraically closed field  $K$  and let  $T$  be a maximal torus in  $H^\circ$ . Then any tuples  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  and  $(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  in  $T^n(K)$  are conjugate via the diagonal action of  $H(K)$  if and only if they are conjugate in  $N_H(T)(K)$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $n$ , so suppose that  $n > 0$  and that we can find  $w \in N_H(T)$  with  $\mathrm{Ad}(w)(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}) = (t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})$ . Thus by firstly conjugating by  $w$ , we may assume that  $s_i = t_i$  for every  $i < n$ . Then we know that  $s = s_n$  and  $t = t_n$  are conjugate by an element of  $H(K)$  which centralizes  $s_i$  for every  $i < n$ . Let  $Z = Z_H(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1})$  be the centralizer of  $s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}$ . Then  $Z$  is a (possibly disconnected) reductive group over  $K$  containing  $T$  as a maximal torus. Thus by replacing  $H$  by  $Z$ , we just need to prove the lemma in the case where  $n = 1$ .

We may write  $H(K) = H^\circ(K) \cdot N_H(T)(K)$ , since  $g \in H(K)$  will conjugate  $T$  into some other maximal torus in  $H^\circ$ , and these two maximal tori will be conjugate by some

element of  $H^\circ(K)$ . By writing an element of  $H(K)$  which conjugates  $s$  into  $t$  as a product of an element of  $H^\circ(K)$  and of  $N_H(T)(K)$ , we may without loss of generality take  $s$  and  $t$  to be conjugate by an element of  $H^\circ(K)$ . It is then well-known (see e.g. [Car85, Proposition 3.7.1]) that  $s$  and  $t$  must then be conjugate by an element of  $N_{H^\circ}(T)$ .  $\square$

The next lemma uses V. Lafforgue’s notion of pseudocharacters. A description of them and some properties can be found in [BHKT19, Section 4]; in particular we will use the construction of a representation from a pseudocharacter.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a group. Let  $H$  be a reductive group over an algebraically closed field  $K$  and let  $\iota : T \rightarrow H$  be the inclusion of a maximal torus of  $H$ , defining a Weyl group  $W = W(H, T)$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $\chi_i : \Gamma \rightarrow T(K)$  be characters and  $\rho_i = \iota \circ \chi_i : \Gamma \rightarrow H(K)$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The characters  $\chi_i$  are conjugate by an element of  $W$*
- (2) *The representations  $\rho_i$  are conjugate via an element of  $H(K)$*
- (3) *The  $H$ -pseudocharacters  $\text{tr } \rho_i$  are equal.*

*Proof.* That 1 implies 2 is clear, and 2 implies 3 is also clear from the definition of  $\text{tr } \rho_i$ . To prove that 3 implies 1, we shall use the construction of representations from pseudocharacters given in [BHKT19, Theorem 4.5]. As in the proof, we can choose  $n \geq 1$  and  $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) \in \Gamma^n$  such that the centralizer in  $H$  of the Zariski closure of the subgroup of  $H(K)$  generated by  $\rho_1(\delta_1), \dots, \rho_1(\delta_n)$  has minimal dimension, and among those tuples for which this dimension is minimised we choose one for which the component group of this centralizer has minimal order.

Now let  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , and consider  $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n, \gamma) \in \Gamma^{n+1}$  defining a point of  $(H^{n+1}/H)(K)$  via  $\text{tr } \rho_i$ . The construction then shows that  $\rho_i(\gamma)$  is given by the final entry of the unique tuple in  $H^{n+1}(K)$  whose  $H$ -orbit is closed, whose image in  $(H^{n+1}/H)(K)$  is the point defined above and whose first  $n$  entries are given by  $(\rho_i(\delta_1), \dots, \rho_i(\delta_n))$  (note condition (i) in [BHKT19, Theorem 4.5] is automatically satisfied for any choice of tuple of elements of  $\Gamma$ ). If we can show that the tuples  $(\rho_i(\delta_1), \dots, \rho_i(\delta_n))$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  are conjugate by some element of  $W$  then by uniqueness of the above tuples,  $\rho_i(\gamma)$  will be conjugate by the same element of  $W$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . Since we are assuming  $\text{tr } \rho_1 = \text{tr } \rho_2$ , the tuples  $(\rho_i(\delta_1), \dots, \rho_i(\delta_n))$  are conjugate by some element of  $H(K)$ . By Lemma 6.1 they are therefore conjugate by some element of  $W$  and we are done.  $\square$

Now let  $F$  be a global field and fix  $\bar{\rho} : G_F \rightarrow \hat{G}(k)$  as in Section 3. We will also fix a lift  $\rho : G_F \rightarrow \hat{G}(\mathcal{O})$  (which we will assume is unramified outside a finite set of places of  $F$ ) and let the composition  $\hat{G}(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow C_{\hat{G}}(\mathcal{O})$  determine the choice of similitude character. Let  $v$  be a Taylor–Wiles place, as in Definition 3.8. Let  $\phi_v \in G_{F_v}$  be a choice of Frobenius element and let  $\varpi_v = \text{Art}_{F_v}(\phi_v) \in F_v^\times$  be the corresponding uniformizer. Then set  $g = \rho(\phi_v)$  and  $\bar{g} = \bar{\rho}(\phi_v)$ . In Section 2, we saw the construction of a subgroup  $M_{\bar{g}}$  of  $\hat{G}_k$  defined over  $k$ , together with a lift  $M_g$  defined over  $\mathcal{O}$ . Fix a split maximal torus  $\hat{T}$  of  $\hat{G}_k$  containing  $Z(M_{\bar{g}})^\circ$  and a Borel subgroup  $\hat{B}$  containing  $\hat{T}$ . We also fix a lift of  $\hat{T}$  defined over  $\mathcal{O}$  and containing  $Z(M_g)^\circ$ , which we also denote by  $\hat{T}$ .

Let  $G$  be the split reductive group dual to  $\hat{G}$ , defined over  $\mathcal{O}_F$ , as described in Section 3.3, and let  $T \subset B$  be a split maximal torus and Borel subgroup of  $G$ . By Construction 5.12, the data of  $\bar{g}$  and our maximal torus and Borel subgroup of  $\hat{G}_k$  determine unique isomorphisms  $X_*(\hat{T}) \cong X^*(T)$  and  $X^*(\hat{T}) \cong X_*(T)$  both denoted by  $\iota$ , dual Levi subgroups  $L \subset G$  and  $\hat{L} \subset \hat{G}_k$ , and compact open subgroups  $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_1 \subset G(F_v)$ . We also

have a  $p$ -group  $\Delta_v = \mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{p}_1$ , the maximal  $p$ -power quotient of  $C_L(k(v))$  for which the image of  $Z(G)(k(v))$  is trivial. We saw already in Section 3.3 that the subtorus  $Z(M_{\bar{g}})^\circ \subset \hat{T}$  is dual to the quotient torus of  $T$  given by the cocenter of the Levi subgroup,  $C_L$ , in the sense that  $X_*(Z(M_{\bar{g}})^\circ) \subset X_*(\hat{T})$  is identified with  $X^*(C_L) \subset X^*(T)$  via  $\iota$ .

Let  $\bar{\chi} : T(F_v) \rightarrow k^\times$  be the unramified character whose dual  $\bar{\chi}^\vee : F_v^\times \rightarrow \hat{T}(k)$  satisfies  $\bar{\chi}^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1} = \bar{\rho}|_{W_{F_v}}$  on including  $\hat{T}$  into  $\hat{G}_k$ . The character  $\bar{\chi}$  determines a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{n}_1$  of the subalgebra  $\mathcal{O}[T(F_v)/(T(F_v) \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  of the Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{H}(G(F_v), \mathfrak{p}_1)$ .

Now suppose that  $\pi_v$  is a smooth admissible irreducible representation of  $G(F_v)$  which satisfies  $((\pi_v)^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1} \neq 0$ . By Lemma 5.16, we know that  $\pi_v$  is a subquotient of a parabolic induction by some character  $\chi : T(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^\times$ , which we may take to be a lift of  $\bar{\chi}$  and that the action of  $\mathcal{O}[T(F_v)/(T(F_v) \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)]^{W_L}$  on  $((\pi_v)^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1}$  is through  $\chi$ . Via  $\iota$  we obtain a dual character  $\chi^\vee : F_v^\times \rightarrow \hat{T}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  which in fact has image in  $\hat{T}(\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p})$  and lifts  $\bar{\rho}|_{W_{F_v}} \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}$ .

We note here that  $\chi^\vee(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times) \subset Z(M_g)^\circ(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . Indeed, it suffices to show that if  $\alpha \in X^*(\hat{T})$  and  $x \in \mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times$  with  $\alpha|_{Z(M_g)^\circ}$  trivial then  $\alpha(\chi^\vee(x)) = 1$ . Equivalently, we need to show that  $\chi(\iota(\alpha)(x)) = 1$ . We must have  $\iota(\alpha)(x) \in \mathfrak{p}_1$ , since  $\iota(\alpha)(x)$  will have trivial image in  $C_L(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ , and hence also trivial image in  $C_L(k(v))$ . To conclude, recall that  $\chi$  is trivial on restriction to  $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap T(F_v)$ .

Recall the local deformation problem  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}$  of Definition 3.10. The following proposition will allow us to deduce that  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}}$  defines a lift in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(\mathcal{O})$  and an explicit description of the arising map  $\Delta_v \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$  in terms of the action of the Hecke algebra on  $\pi_v$  whenever we have sufficiently strong local-global compatibility result.

**Proposition 6.3.** *Suppose  $\text{WD}(\rho|_{G_{F_v}})^{\text{F-ss}} \cong ((\chi \otimes \varphi)^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}, 0)$  as Weil–Deligne representations over  $\hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ , where  $\varphi : G(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^\times$  is some character which factors through  $C_G(F_v)$  and is trivial on restriction to  $G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ . Then  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}}$  defines a lift in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(\mathcal{O})$  and the induced map  $\Delta_v \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$  coincides with the scalar action of  $\Delta_v$  on  $((\pi_v)^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1}$  arising from viewing  $\Delta_v = T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})/(T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)$  as Hecke operators.*

*Proof.* Note firstly that since  $\varphi$  factors through  $C_G(F_v)/C_G(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ , the only effect it has on the Weil–Deligne representations is to multiply through by an unramified representation valued in  $Z(\hat{G})(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . Therefore it has no effect on whether  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(\mathcal{O})$  (aside from changing the similitude character potentially), nor on any arising  $\Delta_v$ -actions. Hence the claims of the proposition hold true if and only if they hold true when  $\varphi = 1$ , so we will assume from now on that  $\varphi = 1$ .

Since  $\text{WD}(\rho|_{G_{F_v}})^{\text{F-ss}}$  is semisimple, it follows that  $\text{WD}(\rho|_{G_{F_v}})^{\text{F-ss}} = (r, 0)$  with  $r(\phi_v) = g_{ss}$ , where  $g = g_{ss}g_u$  is the Jordan decomposition of  $g$  into its semisimple and unipotent parts, but  $\rho|_{I_v} = r|_{I_v}$ . We claim that  $\rho(I_v) \subset Z(M_g)^\circ(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . Since  $\chi^\vee(\varpi_v) \in \hat{T}(\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p})$  lifts  $\bar{g}$ , we can form  $(M_{\chi^\vee(\varpi_v)})_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}$  as in Section 2. Then the equality

$$Z(M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}} = Z(M_{\chi^\vee(\varpi_v)})_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}$$

follows from Lemma 2.15 and rigidity of tori, since both are closed subgroup schemes of  $\hat{T}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}}$  lifting  $Z(M_{\bar{g}})_{\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}}$ . Since

$$\chi^\vee(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times) \subset Z(M_g)^\circ(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}) = Z(M_{\chi^\vee(\varpi_v)})^\circ(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$$

and  $r \cong \chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}$ , the claim follows by Corollary 2.20.

Since  $g \in M_g(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  (by Theorem 2.14), functoriality of the Jordan decomposition implies that  $g_{ss} \in M_g(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . Hence by the above claim  $r(W_{F_v}) \subset M_g(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . We can choose some  $h \in M_g(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  such that  $\text{Ad}(h)(r)$  has image in  $\hat{T}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ , since  $g_{ss}$  lies inside (the  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ -points of) a maximal torus of  $(M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$  and all maximal tori in a connected reductive group over an algebraically closed field are conjugate (and all contain  $(Z(M_g)^\circ)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ ). Now, we know that  $\text{Ad}(h)(r)$  and  $\chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}$  are  $\hat{G}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ -conjugate and both are valued in  $\hat{T}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . Therefore Lemma 6.2 implies that they are in fact conjugate by some element  $w \in W(\hat{G}, \hat{T})$ , whose class may be represented by an element  $n \in N_{\hat{G}}(\hat{T})(\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p})$ . Our goal will be to show that  $n \in M_g(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ .

Observe that the  $(M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ -pseudocharacters of  $r$  and  $\rho|_{W_{F_v}}$  coincide. This is a consequence of [Ric88, Theorem 5.2], as given  $x = (g^{a_i} z_i)_i$  with  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $z_i \in Z(M_g)^\circ(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we may take  $y = ((g_{ss})^{a_i} z_i)_i$  to be the ‘Levi’ part of the Levi decomposition of  $x$ . These both have the same image in  $(M_g^n // M_g)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  since the closed orbit defined by conjugation on  $y$  is the unique closed orbit in the closure of the orbit of  $x$  (see [BHKT19, Proposition 3.7(ii)]).

Let  $\Theta_1$  denote the  $(M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ -pseudocharacter attached to  $r$  and let  $\Theta_2$  be the  $(M_g)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}}$ -pseudocharacter given by  $\text{tr}(\chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1})$ . Both  $\Theta_1$  and  $\Theta_2$  are defined over  $\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  (since both are given by traces of representations valued in  $M_g(\overline{\mathbb{Z}_p})$ ) and are lifts of  $\bar{\Theta} = \text{tr}(\bar{\rho})$ , an  $M_g$ -pseudocharacter over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ . The representations  $\bar{\rho}$  and the mod  $p$  reduction of  $\text{Ad}(h)(r)$  have image contained in  $\hat{T}(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p})$  and by Lemma 6.2 they are conjugate by some element  $\bar{x} \in N_{(M_{\bar{g}})_{\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}}}(\hat{T}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}})$ . We also know that these representations are conjugate by the image  $\bar{n}$  of  $n$  in  $N_{\hat{G}}(\hat{T})(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p})$ , since  $\bar{\rho}$  is the mod  $p$  reduction of  $\chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}$ . The elements  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{n}$  of  $W(\hat{G}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}}, \hat{T}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}})$  can differ only up to an element centralizing the image of  $\bar{\rho}$ . Thus their difference must lie in  $M_{\bar{g}}(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p})$ , as it centralizes  $\bar{g}$ . We see that  $\bar{n} \in N_{M_{\bar{g}}}(\hat{T}_k)(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p})$ , and hence also  $n \in N_{M_g}(\hat{T})(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ , as desired.

Thus  $r$  and  $\chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}$  are conjugate in  $M_g(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  with images of  $I_v$  both contained inside  $Z(M_g)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ . It follows that that  $\rho$  and  $\chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}$  have equal restrictions to  $I_v$ , since we saw that  $\rho|_{I_v} = r|_{I_v}$ . We are now done, since the action of  $T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})/(T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \cap \mathfrak{p}_1)$  on  $((\pi_v)^{\mathfrak{p}_1})_{\mathfrak{n}_1}$  is via  $\chi$  and this will exactly coincide with the  $\Delta_v$ -action arising from  $\chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}$  constructed in Section 3.3.  $\square$

## 7. MODULARITY OF ABELIAN SURFACES

In this section we will apply the constructions of the earlier sections to showing the modularity of some abelian surfaces over totally real fields, extending the results of [BCGP21]; for this we will need analogues of many of the results of [BCGP21, Section 7]. Since many of the arguments will work in exactly the same way, we will focus only on explaining the modifications arising from working with our more general notion of Taylor–Wiles place.

**7.1. Setup and notation.** In this section we continue with the setup of Section 3 but let  $F$  be a totally real number field and take  $G = \text{GSp}_4$ , defined over  $\mathcal{O}_F$ . We will fix an isomorphism  $\iota : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ , through which we will determine a squareroot in  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  of every prime number and assume that these are all contained in our coefficient ring  $\mathcal{O}$  (which we may since we need only adjoin finitely many elements). Let  $T \leq \text{GSp}_4$  be usual diagonal split maximal torus and  $B \leq \text{GSp}_4$  the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices. We can identify  $\hat{G}$  with  $\text{GSp}_4$  just as in Section 5.5, and take  $\hat{G}$  to be defined over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . We let

$p \geq 3$  be the residue characteristic of  $\mathcal{O}$  and assume that  $p$  that splits completely in  $F$ . Note that  $p$  is coprime to the order of  $W_G$  and hence of very good characteristic for  $\hat{G}$ . We let  $S_p$  denote the set of places of  $F$  which divide  $p$ .

Let  $\bar{\rho} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}_4(k)$  be a continuous representation. We recall the following definitions from [BCGP21] which will be of repeated use.

**Definition 7.1.** *A representation  $\bar{\rho} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}_4(k)$  is said to be tidy if there exists  $g \in \bar{\rho}(G_F)$  such that  $\nu(g) \neq 1$  and for every pair of eigenvalues  $\bar{\alpha} \neq \bar{\beta}$  of  $g$  we have  $\bar{\alpha}/\bar{\beta} \neq \nu(g)$ .*

**Definition 7.2.** *Let  $A$  be either  $\mathcal{O}$  or  $k$ , and let  $v \in S_p$ . A representation  $\rho_v : G_{F_v} \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}_4(A)$  is said to be  $p$ -distinguished weight 2 ordinary if for each place  $v \in S_p$  we have an isomorphism*

$$\rho_v \cong \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{\alpha_v} & 0 & * & * \\ & \chi_{\beta_v} & * & * \\ & & \chi_{\beta_v}^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1} & 0 \\ & & & \chi_{\alpha_v}^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $\alpha_v \not\equiv \beta_v \pmod{m_A}$ . Here for  $\lambda \in A^\times$ ,  $\chi_\lambda : G_{F_v} \rightarrow A^\times$  is the unramified character satisfying  $\chi_\lambda(\phi_v) = \lambda$  for any choice of Frobenius lift  $\phi_v$ .

We will suppose that  $\bar{\rho}$  satisfies all of the hypotheses of [BCGP21, 7.8.1] except replacing vastness by the assumption that  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$ -reasonable. We record explicitly what this means.

The representation  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$ -reasonable, in the sense of Definition 3.20, and tidy, in the sense of Definition 7.1. For each  $v \in S_p$ ,  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{F_v}}$  is  $p$ -distinguished weight 2 ordinary, in the sense of Definition 7.2 (and fix an ordering  $(\bar{\alpha}_v, \bar{\beta}_v)$  on the eigenvalues of  $\bar{\rho}(\mathrm{Frob}_v)$ ). We suppose that there exists a finite set of finite places  $R$  of  $F$ , disjoint from  $S_p$ , such that for each  $v \in R$ ,  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  and, if  $p = 3$ , then  $q_v \equiv 1 \pmod{9}$ . We suppose that  $\bar{\rho}$  is unramified outside of  $S_p \cup R$ . For  $v$  a finite place of  $F$  let  $Iw_v$  be the Iwahori subgroup of  $G(F_v) = \mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v)$  defined with respect to the Borel subgroup  $B$ . Consider  $\pi$  an ordinary cuspidal automorphic representation of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$  such that for  $v \in R \cup S_p$  that  $\pi_v^{Iw_v} \neq 0$  and for  $v \notin R \cup S_p$  that  $\pi_v^{\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})} \neq 0$ . There exists an associated continuous semi-simple Galois representation  $\rho_{\pi,p} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_4(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$  (see [Mok14, Theorem 4.6]), and we assume that there exists such a  $\pi$  as above for which  $\overline{\rho_{\pi,p}} \cong \bar{\rho}$ . Extending  $k$  if necessary, we also assume throughout that  $k$  is large enough for the results of Section 3 to apply to  $\bar{\rho}$ .

We will consider the global deformation problem described in [BCGP21, 7.7]. For this we fix, for each  $v \in R$ , a pair of characters  $\chi_v = (\chi_{v,1}, \chi_{v,2})$  where  $\chi_{v,i} : \mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$  are trivial modulo  $\lambda$ . Let  $\chi = (\chi_v)_{v \in R}$ , and let  $\chi$  also denote the character  $\prod_{v \in R} Iw_v \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$  arising from viewing each (necessarily  $p$ -power order)  $\chi_v$  as a character on  $T(k_v)$  (via the first two diagonal entries) and inflating. We take the similitude character  $\psi$  of our lifts of  $\bar{\rho}$  as in Section 3 to be given by  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ , the inverse of the cyclotomic character (and assume that  $\bar{\rho}$  has its similitude character given by the reduction of  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ ). We let  $I \subset S_p$  and write  $I^c = S_p \setminus I$ . We can find, by tidiness of  $\bar{\rho}(G_F)$  and the Chebotarev density theorem, an unramified place  $v_0$  such that  $q_{v_0} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ ,  $\mathrm{char} k(v_0) > 5$  and such that no pair of eigenvalues of  $\bar{\rho}(\mathrm{Frob}_{v_0})$  are in the ratio  $q_{v_0}$ . Set  $S = S_p \cup R \cup \{v_0\}$ .

For  $v \in I$ , we let  $\Lambda_v = \mathcal{O}[[\mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times(p)]]$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times(p) = 1 + p\mathcal{O}_{F_v}$ . For  $v \in I^c$ , set  $\Lambda_v = \mathcal{O}[[\mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times(p)^2]]$ . For  $v \in S_p$  fix a choice  $\varsigma_v$  of either  $\bar{\alpha}_v$  or  $\bar{\beta}_v$ , and let  $\bar{\varsigma} = (\bar{\varsigma}_v)_{v \in S_p}$ .



We have  $p$ -adic local deformation problems  $\mathcal{D}_v^P$  for  $v \in I$  and  $\mathcal{D}_v^{B, \bar{s}_v}$  for  $v \in I^c$  described in [BCGP21, 7.3].

For  $v \in R$ , we let  $\Lambda_v = \mathcal{O}$  and consider the Ihara avoidance local deformation problem  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\chi_v}$  of [BCGP21, 7.4.5], given roughly by lifts for which the eigenvalues under the image of inertia are given according to  $\chi_v$ . At the place  $v_0$  we will let  $\Lambda_v = \mathcal{O}$  and consider the unrestricted local deformation problem  $D_{v_0}^\square$ . The global deformation problem  $\mathcal{S}_\chi^{I, \bar{s}}$  is then defined by these local deformation problems at the places of  $S$ .

Now fix a Taylor–Wiles datum  $(Q, \{\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v\}_{v \in Q})$  as in Definition 3.9. We will consider the augmented global deformation problem  $\mathcal{S}_{\chi, Q}^{I, \bar{s}}$  arising from our Taylor–Wiles datum, as in Section 3.2. Denote the arising deformation functor by  $\mathcal{D}_{\chi, Q}^{I, \bar{s}}$ , represented by  $R_{\chi, Q}^{I, \bar{s}} \in \text{CNL}_\Lambda$ .

If  $v \in Q$ , then  $\bar{g}_v := \bar{\rho}(\text{Frob}_v)$  is a semisimple element of  $\hat{G}(k) = \text{GSp}_4(k)$  and defines a connected reductive subgroup  $M_{\bar{g}_v} = Z_{\hat{G}_k}(\bar{g}_v)$  of  $(\text{GSp}_4)_k$ . The data of the maximal torus  $\hat{T}_v$  of  $M_{\bar{g}_v}$  and Borel subgroup  $\hat{B}_v$  of  $(\text{GSp}_4)_k$  containing  $\hat{T}_v$  yields dual Levi subgroups  $L_v$  of  $G = \text{GSp}_4$  and compact open subgroups  $\mathfrak{p}_{1, v} \leq \mathfrak{p}_v$  of  $\text{GSp}_4(F_v)$  as in Construction 5.12. We also obtain maximal ideals  $\tilde{m}_v$  of  $\mathcal{O}[T(F_v)/(T(F_v) \cap \mathfrak{p}_{1, v})]^{W_{L_v}}$ , which are the ideals denoted  $\mathfrak{n}_1$  of Section 5.15. For  $v \in R \cup \{v_0\}$ , let  $\text{Iw}_{1, v}$  denote maximal the pro- $v$  subgroup of  $\text{Iw}_v$ , which will be given by the preimage of  $U(k(v))$  in  $\text{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ , where  $U$  is the unipotent radical of  $B$ . For  $v \in R$ , we will let  $L_v = T$ .

*Remark 7.3.* The notation  $\text{Iw}_{1, v}$  is inconsistent with the notation  $\mathfrak{p}_{1, v}$  for places  $v \in Q$  (but the same as in [BCGP21]). The quotient  $\text{Iw}_v / \text{Iw}_{1, v}$  can be identified with  $T(k(v))$ . On the other hand, if  $P_v = B$  for  $v \in Q$  then the quotient  $\mathfrak{p}_v / \mathfrak{p}_{1, v}$  would be the maximal  $p$ -power quotient of  $T(k(v))/Z(G)(k(v))$ .

Let  $\mathbb{A}_F^{\infty, p}$  denote the ring of finite adèles of  $F$  away from places dividing  $p$ . We will define compact open subgroups of  $\text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F^{\infty, p})$  in a similar manner to [BCGP21, Definition 7.8.2]. We warn the reader that our definitions will not coincide with these exactly, even in the case where  $Q$  consists of places with  $\bar{\rho}(\phi_v)$  regular semisimple for the reasons of Remark 7.3. The definition of  $K^p = \prod_v K_v$  is the same; we let:

- $K_v = \text{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ , if  $v \notin S$
- $K_v = \text{Iw}_{1, v}$ , if  $v \in R \cup \{v_0\}$ .

Define compact open subgroups  $K_{\text{Iw}}^p(Q), K_0^p(Q), K_1^p(Q) \leq K^p$  and  $K_0^p(Q, R)$  as follows:

- $K_{\text{Iw}}^p(Q)_v = K_0^p(Q)_v = K_1^p(Q)_v = K_0^p(Q, R)_v = K_v^p$ , if  $v \notin Q \cup R$
- $K_{\text{Iw}}^p(Q)_v = \text{Iw}_v$ ,  $K_0^p(Q)_v = K_0^p(Q, R)_v = \mathfrak{p}_v$  and  $K_1^p(Q)_v = \mathfrak{p}_{1, v}$ , if  $v \in Q$
- $K_{\text{Iw}}^p(Q)_v = K_0^p(Q)_v = K_1^p(Q)_v = \text{Iw}_{1, v}$  and  $K_0^p(Q, R)_v = \text{Iw}_v$ , if  $v \in R$ .

Lastly let  $K_1^p(Q, R) = K_1^p(Q)$ . The extra compact open subgroup  $K_{\text{Iw}}^p(Q)$  will be helpful for carrying out computations using the well-understood structure of the Iwahori–Hecke algebra at places  $v \in Q$ . It follows from the existence of  $v_0$  and [BCGP21, Lemma 7.8.3] that these compact open subgroups are neat.

For  $I \subset S_p$  we will let  $K^p(I) = \prod_{v \in I} \text{Kli}_v \prod_{v \in I^c} \text{Iw}_v$ , where  $\text{Kli}_v$  is the parahoric subgroup of  $G(F_v)$  associated to the Klingen parabolic subgroup of  $G$ , the latter given by block upper triangular matrices corresponding to the partition  $4 = 1 + 2 + 1$ . These will determine our level structure at  $v \in S_p$ .

We will now define analogous objects to those constructed in the discussion following on from [BCGP21, Lemma 7.8.3]. Firstly, let

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{T}} &= \bigotimes_{v \notin S} \mathcal{O}[\mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v) // \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})] \\ \tilde{\mathbb{T}}^Q &= \bigotimes_{v \notin S \cup Q} \mathcal{O}[\mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v) // \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]\end{aligned}$$

be the natural rings of Hecke operators for these levels at finite places away from  $S$  (respectively  $S \cup Q$ ). For  $v \notin S$ , define the following elements of  $\mathbb{T}$

- $T_{v,0} = [\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \mathrm{diag}(\varpi_v, \varpi_v, \varpi_v, \varpi_v) \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]$
- $T_{v,1} = [\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \mathrm{diag}(\varpi_v, \varpi_v, 1, 1) \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]$
- $T_{v,2} = [\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \mathrm{diag}(\varpi_v^2, \varpi_v, \varpi_v, 1) \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]$ ,

where we are viewing  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v), \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}))$  as a subalgebra of  $\mathbb{T}$ . Then let

$$q_v(X) = X^4 - T_{v,1}X^3 + (q_v T_{v,2} + (q_v^3 + q_v)T_{v,0})X^2 - q_v^3 T_{v,0}T_{v,1}X + q_v^6 T_{v,0}^2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}[X].$$

We let  $\tilde{m}^{an} \subset \tilde{\mathbb{T}}$  denote the maximal ideal corresponding to  $\bar{\rho}$  in the same way as in this discussion, and similarly for  $\tilde{m}^{an,Q} \subset \tilde{\mathbb{T}}^Q$ . We will also let  $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^I$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^{I,Q}$  be defined in the same way by adjoining Hecke operators dependent on  $I$  at places  $v \in S_p$ , and form the maximal ideals  $\tilde{m}^{I,\varsigma}$  and  $\tilde{m}^{I,\varsigma,Q}$  of these respective rings in the same way, corresponding to eigenvalues determined by  $\bar{\rho}$  and the choice of  $\varsigma$ .

We define a  $\Lambda_I[\Delta_Q]$ -module

$$M^{\chi,I,\varsigma,Q} = \mathrm{RHom}_{\Lambda_I}^0(M_{K_1^p(Q)}^{\bullet,I}, \Lambda_I)_{\tilde{m}^{I,\varsigma,Q}, \tilde{m}_Q, \chi, |\cdot|^2}$$

and a  $\Lambda_I$ -module

$$M^{\chi,I,\varsigma} = \mathrm{RHom}_{\Lambda_I}^0(M_{K_p}^{\bullet,I}, \Lambda_I)_{\tilde{m}^{I,\varsigma}, \chi, |\cdot|^2}.$$

Here

- The complexes  $M_{K_1^p(Q)}^{\bullet,I}$  and  $M_{K_p}^{\bullet,I}$  are as defined in [BCGP21, Theorem 4.6.1] at the prime-to- $p$  levels  $K_1^p(Q)$  and  $K_p$  respectively
- The localizations at  $\tilde{m}^{I,\varsigma,Q}$  and  $\tilde{m}^{I,\varsigma}$  are as above
- $\tilde{m}_Q$  is the maximal ideal of the Hecke algebra at places  $v \in Q$

$$\bigotimes_{\mathcal{O}, v \in Q} \mathcal{O}[T(F_v)/(T(F_v) \cap \mathfrak{p}_{1,v})]^{W_{L_v}}$$

defined by the maximal ideals  $\tilde{m}_v$  of the tensorands

- $\chi$  denotes taking  $\chi$ -coinvariants for the action of  $\prod_{v \in R} T(k(v))$
- $|\cdot|^2$  denotes fixing the central character, by taking coinvariants under the Hecke operators  $[\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \mathrm{diag}(\varpi_v, \varpi_v, \varpi_v, \varpi_v) \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})] - q_v^{-2}$  for  $v \notin S$ .

Finally in this section, we will let  $\mathbb{T}^{\chi,I,\varsigma,Q}$  denote the  $\Lambda_I$ -subalgebra of  $\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda_I}(M^{\chi,I,\varsigma,Q})$  generated by the image of  $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^{I,Q}$ . Similarly, let  $\mathbb{T}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  denote the  $\Lambda_I$ -subalgebra of  $\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda_I}(M^{\chi,I,\varsigma})$  generated by the image of  $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^I$ .

**7.2. Preparation for the Taylor–Wiles method.** In this section fix  $I \subset S_p$  and let  $K_p = K_p(I)$  be the level structure at  $v \in S_p$ . Let  $X_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R), \Sigma}$ ,  $X_{K_p K_1^p(Q,R), \Sigma}$  denote the compactified Shimura varieties at the respective levels  $K_p K_0^p(Q, R)$  and  $K_p K_1^p(Q, R)$  with respect to a compatible choice  $\Sigma$  of polyhedral cone decompositions (as in [BCGP21, Theorem 3.5.1]). For  $v \in Q \cup R$ , we have a parabolic subgroup  $P_v$  defining a parahoric subgroup  $\mathfrak{p}_v \leq \mathrm{GSp}_4(F_v)$  (these are given by the standard Borel subgroup  $B$  and Iwahori subgroup respectively in the case  $v \in R$ ). This parabolic subgroup  $P_v$  may be viewed as

the subgroup of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$  which preserves a filtration  $0 = V_{v,0} \leq \dots \leq V_{v,n_v}$  of isotropic subspaces of  $V$  for some  $0 \leq n_v \leq 2$ . Thus from the definition of the moduli problem described in [BCGP21, 3.3], we obtain over the interior  $Y_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R)}$  a filtration of  $k(v)$ -group schemes of  $A[v]$ , which we will denote  $H_{v,0} \leq \dots \leq H_{v,n_v}$ . To show the natural map between the compactified Shimura varieties at the respective levels is finite étale we shall be interested in extending the top exterior powers of the graded pieces of these filtrations.

**Proposition 7.4.** *For  $v \in Q \cup R$ , the group schemes  $J_{v,m+1} := \det(H_{v,m+1}/H_{v,m})$  defined over  $Y_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R)}$  for  $0 \leq m < n_v$  may be extended to rank 1 finite étale  $k(v)$ -group schemes over  $X_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R),\Sigma}$ . Let  $J_{v,0}$  denote the constant  $k(v)$ -group scheme of rank 1 defined over  $X_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R),\Sigma}$ . Let  $\Xi_Q = \ker(\prod_{v \in Q} C_{L_v}(k(v)) \rightarrow \Delta_Q)$ . The map  $X_{K_p K_1^p(Q,R),\Sigma} \rightarrow X_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R),\Sigma}$  is then finite étale with group  $\Delta_Q \times \prod_{v \in R} T(k(v))$  and we can identify  $X_{K_p K_1^p(Q,R),\Sigma}$  as the torsor of  $\Xi_Q$ -orbits of trivialisations of the extended group schemes  $J_{v,m}$  for each  $v \in Q \cup R$  and  $0 \leq m \leq n_v$ .*

*Proof.* We shall follow an argument along the lines of the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.8.10]. We firstly explain how the second part of the Proposition follows from the first. We claim that the torsor of  $\Xi_Q$ -orbits of trivialisations of the extended group schemes  $J_{v,m}$  over  $Y_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R)}$  is isomorphic to  $Y_{K_p K_1^p(Q,R)}$ . If  $\{V_{v,i}\}_{0 \leq i \leq n_v}$  is the filtration of  $V$  corresponding to the parabolic subgroup  $P_v$  then the Levi subgroup  $L_v$  is isomorphic to an extension of  $\mathbb{G}_m$  (corresponding to the similitude factor) by  $\mathrm{GL}_{r_1} \times \dots \times \mathrm{GL}_{r_{n_v}} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2r_0}$  where  $r_i = \dim V_{v,i} - \dim V_{v,i-1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n_v$  and  $r_0 = 2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n_v} r_i$ . It then follows that the map  $P_v \rightarrow C_{L_v} \cong \mathbb{G}_m^{\{0,1,\dots,n_v\}}$  is given by the similitude character onto the 0-index copy of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ , and taking determinants of the various  $\mathrm{GL}_{r_i}$  factors onto the copy of  $\mathbb{G}_m$  indexed by  $i$ . Then giving a  $\ker(P_v(k(v)) \rightarrow C_{L_v}(k(v)))$ -orbit of isomorphisms  $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_F} k(v) \rightarrow A[v]$  of  $\Pi_1(Y_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R)}, \bar{s})$ -modules is equivalent to giving a  $P_v(k(v))$ -orbit, together with isomorphism between  $J_{v,m}$  and the trivial  $\Pi_1(Y_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R)}, \bar{s})$ -module  $k(v)$  for every  $0 \leq m \leq n_v$ . Similarly, giving a  $\ker(P_v(k(v)) \rightarrow \Delta_Q)$ -orbit of such isomorphisms is equivalent to giving a  $P_v(k(v))$  orbit, together with a  $\Xi_Q$ -orbit of isomorphisms  $J_{v,m} \rightarrow k(v)$ , where  $\Xi_Q$  acts on the isomorphism indexed by  $m$  via the map  $C_L(k(v))$  to  $k(v)^\times$  onto the factor indexed by  $m$ . As in the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.8.10] the torsor of  $\Xi_Q$ -orbits of trivializations and  $X_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R),\Sigma}$  are both normal, finite flat over  $X_{K_p K_0^p(Q,R),\Sigma}$  and generically equal, so they are isomorphic.

We thus have to show we can extend each  $J_{v,m}$ . Just as in the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.8.10] we may reduce to the following situation: we have an open immersion of schemes  $S \subset T$  together with an abelian scheme  $A$  defined over  $S$ , and a semi-abelian scheme  $B$  of constant toric rank defined over  $T$  such that  $A$  is the quotient of  $B$  by a finite free  $\mathcal{O}_F$ -module on restricting to  $S$ , as in Mumford's construction. In that proof we saw that  $B[v]$  is already defined as a finite étale group scheme over the whole of  $T$ , and that  $A[v]/B[v]$  is a constant group scheme on  $S$ . For  $m > 0$  write  $J_{v,m} = \det(D/C)$ , where  $C \leq D \leq A[v]$  are étale subgroup schemes defined on  $S$ . Then we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{D \cap B[v]}{C \cap B[v]} \rightarrow \frac{D}{C} \rightarrow \frac{D + B[v]}{C + B[v]} \rightarrow 0,$$

from which it follows on taking determinants that

$$\det \frac{D}{C} \cong \det \left( \frac{D \cap B[v]}{C \cap B[v]} \right) \otimes \det \left( \frac{D + B[v]}{C + B[v]} \right).$$

The first tensorand is an exterior power of a subquotient of  $B[v]$  defined over  $T$ , and therefore extends to  $T$ . The second tensorand is an exterior power of a subquotient of  $A[v]/B[v]$ , which is a constant group scheme on  $S$  and thus extends to  $T$ , so we are done.  $\square$

The following is the direct analogue of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.8.11].

**Proposition 7.5.** *If  $I = \emptyset$  then  $M^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  is a finite free  $\Lambda_I[\Delta_Q]$ -module. If  $\#I = 1$  then  $M^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  is a balanced  $\Lambda_I[\Delta_Q]$ -module, in the sense of [BCGP21, Definition 2.10.1].*

*Proof.* Having shown Proposition 7.4, the proof is now identical to the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.8.11].  $\square$

The final result we need about the module  $M^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  for the Taylor–Wiles method to go through is the analogue of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.9.8].

**Proposition 7.6.** *The map  $M^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q} \rightarrow M^{\chi, I, \varsigma}$  arising from the inclusion  $K_1^p(Q) \subset K^p$  induces an isomorphism  $(M^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})_{\Delta_Q} \rightarrow M^{\chi, I, \varsigma}$ .*

*Proof.* We again follow the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.9.8]. Recall that the natural map

$$\bigotimes_{\mathcal{O}, v \in Q} \mathcal{O}[T(F_v)/(T(F_v) \cap \mathfrak{p}_{1,v})]^{W_{L_v}} \rightarrow \bigotimes_{\mathcal{O}, v \in Q} \mathcal{O}[T(F_v)/(T(F_v) \cap \mathfrak{p}_v)]^{W_{L_v}}$$

induces a bijection on maximal ideals, since  $\Delta_Q$  is of  $p$ -power order. Let  $\tilde{m}_{0,Q}$  be the maximal ideal corresponding to  $\tilde{m}_Q$  under this bijection. We can then form

$$M_{K_0^p(Q)}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q} = \mathrm{RHom}_{\Lambda_I}^0(M_{K_0^p(Q)}^{\bullet, I}, \Lambda_I)_{\tilde{m}^{I, \varsigma, Q}, \tilde{m}_{0,Q}, \chi, |\cdot|^2}.$$

From Proposition 7.4, we deduce in the same way as the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.9.8] that we have an isomorphism

$$(M^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})_{\Delta_Q} \cong M_{K_0^p(Q)}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}.$$

Then to show that there is an isomorphism

$$M_{K_0^p(Q)}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q} \cong M^{\chi, I, \varsigma}$$

it suffices to prove by [BCGP21, Lemma 7.9.7] that the composition

$$H^i(M_{K_0^p(Q)}^{\bullet, I} \otimes k)_{\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{an}, Q}, \tilde{m}_{0,Q}} \rightarrow H^i(M_{K_0^p(Q)}^{\bullet, I} \otimes k)_{\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{an}, Q}} \rightarrow H^i(M_{K^p}^{\bullet, I} \otimes k)_{\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{an}, Q}} \rightarrow H^i(M_{K^p}^{\bullet, I} \otimes k)_{\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{an}}}$$

is an isomorphism for every  $i$ . The action of the Hecke algebra on the various complexes is described in [BCGP21, 3.9]. If we have compact open subgroups  $K' \leq K$  which differ only at places  $v \in Q$ , then we have the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{K_1 K'} 1_{K' 1 K} &= [K : K'] \\ 1_{K' 1 K} 1_{K 1 K'} &= [K], \end{aligned}$$

where  $[K]$  is the Hecke operator arising from the indicator function on  $K$ , a  $K'$ -biinvariant function. Let  $N_i = H^i(M_{K_{\mathrm{Iw}}^p(Q)}^{\bullet, I} \otimes k)_{\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{an}, Q}}$ , viewed as a module over the product of Iwahori–Hecke algebras at places  $v \in Q$ . Since  $p > 2$  it follows that the indices  $[K^p : K_{\mathrm{Iw}}^p(Q)]$  and  $[K_0^p : K_{\mathrm{Iw}}^p(Q)]$  are units in  $k$ . Thus via the above equalities of Hecke operators we can identify  $H^i(M_{K^p}^{\bullet, I} \otimes k)_{\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{an}, Q}}$  (resp.  $H^i(M_{K_0^p}^{\bullet, I} \otimes k)_{\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{an}, Q}}$ ) with the image of  $N_i$  under the Hecke operator  $[K^p]$  (resp.  $[K_0^p]$ ). This identification is also compatible with the localizations at the various maximal ideals of the abelian subalgebras

of the parahoric and unramified Hecke algebras at places  $v \in Q$ . We are done on applying Corollary 5.14 since the above composition becomes identified with the isomorphism

$$([K_0^p(Q)]N_i)_{\tilde{m}^{\text{an}}, Q, \tilde{m}_0, Q} \xrightarrow{\sim} ([K^p(Q)]N_i)_{\tilde{m}^{\text{an}}}$$

given by the corollary, noting that  $\tilde{m}^{\text{an}}$  is defined at places  $v \in Q$  by the maximal ideal of the unramified Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{O}[X_*(T)]^{W_G}$  corresponding to the  $W_G$ -orbit of  $\bar{g}_v$ .  $\square$

We now state a theorem on the existence of Galois representations associated to a classical weight cuspidal automorphic representation  $\pi$ . Local-global compatibility will then imply these Galois representations define a class in the image of our deformation functor and that the  $\Delta_Q$ -action is the expected one arising from the local factors of  $\pi$ .

**Theorem 7.7.** *Suppose  $\pi$  is a cuspidal automorphic representation of  $\text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of classical weight  $\kappa = (k_v, l_v)$  with  $k_v \geq l_v > 2$  and  $k_v \equiv l_v \pmod{2}$  for all  $v | \infty$  with central character  $|\cdot|^2$ . Suppose moreover that  $(\pi_f^{K_1^p(Q)K_p(\emptyset)} \otimes \bar{E})_{\tilde{m}^{I, \varsigma, Q}, \tilde{m}_Q}^{\chi, |\cdot|^2} \neq 0$ . Then there exists an associated continuous irreducible Galois representation  $\rho_{\pi, p} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GSp}_4(\bar{E})$  which satisfies, for each finite place  $v \nmid p$ ,*

$$\text{WD}(\rho_{\pi, p}|_{G_{F_v}})^{\text{F-ss}} \cong \text{rec}_{\text{GT}, p}(\pi_v \otimes |\nu|^{-3/2}).$$

We may conjugate  $\rho_{\pi, p}$  to a representation  $\rho : G_F \rightarrow \text{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{E_\pi})$  where  $E_\pi/E$  is some finite extension with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}$  and residue field  $k_\pi$  such that  $\rho$  lifts  $\bar{\rho} \otimes_k k_\pi$ .

Then for each  $v \in Q$  and any such conjugate  $\rho$ , we have  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{v, \mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}}^{\text{TW}}(\mathcal{O}_{E_\pi})$ . The composition  $\Delta_v \rightarrow (R_{v, \mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}}^{\text{TW}})^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}^\times$  coincides with the scalar action of  $\Delta_v$  on the space  $(\pi_f^{K_1^p(Q)K_p(\emptyset)} \otimes \bar{E})_{\tilde{m}^{I, \varsigma, Q}, \tilde{m}_Q}^{\chi, |\cdot|^2}$ .

Recall here that  $\text{rec}_{\text{GT}, p}$  is the local Langlands correspondence described in Section 5.5.

*Proof of Theorem 7.7.* The existence of  $\rho_{\pi, p}$  is stated in [BCGP21, Theorem 2.7.2] and to show the desired properties from this we will firstly explain why  $\rho_{\pi, p}$  is conjugate to a lift of  $\bar{\rho}$ . Continuity of  $\rho_{\pi, p}$  implies that it is conjugate to a representation valued in the ring of integers of some such extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ . As in the proof of [BCGP21, Theorem 7.9.4], it follows that the reduction of  $\rho$  on a dense subset of  $G_F$  (given by Frobenius elements at places outside  $S_p \cup Q \cup R \cup \{v_0\}$ ) has characteristic polynomial coinciding with that of  $\bar{\rho}$ , and so the two residual representations are conjugate in  $\text{GSp}_4(k_\pi)$ . Thus we may take such a conjugate  $\rho$ , lifting  $\bar{\rho} \otimes_k k_\pi$ . By absolute irreducibility of  $\bar{\rho}$ ,  $\rho$  itself must also be absolutely irreducible and hence the stated local-global compatibility holds by [BCGP21, Theorem 2.7.2] again.

Now let  $v \in Q$  be a Taylor–Wiles place. We know that  $\pi_v$  satisfies  $((\pi_v)^{\mathfrak{p}^{1, v}})_{\tilde{m}_v} \neq 0$ . By Proposition 5.19, we know that  $\text{rec}_{\text{GT}, p}(\pi_v)$  is a semisimple Weil–Deligne representation with  $\text{rec}_{\text{GT}, p}(\pi_v) = (\chi^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}, 0)$  for some character  $\chi : G(F_v) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^\times$ , with  $\pi_v$  an irreducible subquotient of the parabolic induction  $i_B^G \chi$ . Note then that  $\text{rec}_{\text{GT}, p}(\pi_v \otimes |\nu|^{-3/2})$  equals  $((\chi \otimes |\nu|^{-3/2})^\vee \circ \text{Art}_{F_v}^{-1}, 0)$  by [BCGP21, Proposition 2.4.6]. Hence we are done on applying Proposition 6.3.  $\square$

**Theorem 7.8.** *There exists a continuous Galois representation  $\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})$  defining a class in  $\mathcal{D}_{\chi, Q}^{I, \varsigma}(\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})$  and such that the composition  $\Delta_Q \rightarrow (R_{\chi, Q}^{I, \varsigma})^\times \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})^\times$  defines the same action of  $\Delta_Q$  on  $M^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  as the action arising from viewing  $\Delta_Q$  as a set of Hecke operators at places in  $Q$ . Moreover, we have*

- (1) If  $v \notin S_p \cup R \cup \{v_0\} \cup Q$ , then  $\det(X - \rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}(\text{Frob}_v)) = Q_v(X)$ .  
(2) If  $v \in I$ , then

$$\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}|_{G_{F_v}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{\tilde{\alpha}_v} \theta_v & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & \lambda_{\tilde{\beta}_v} \theta_v & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_{\tilde{\beta}_v}^{-1} \theta_v^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_{\tilde{\alpha}_v}^{-1} \theta_v^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

- (3) If  $v \in I^c$ , then

$$\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}|_{G_{F_v}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{U_{v,1}} \theta_{v,1} & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & \lambda_{U_{v,2}/U_{v,1}} \theta_{v,2} & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_{U_{v,2}/U_{v,1}}^{-1} \theta_{v,2}^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_{U_{v,1}}^{-1} \theta_{v,1}^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Proof.* We will follow the proof of [BCGP21, Theorem 7.9.4] and suppose that  $I = \emptyset$  firstly. Consider the set  $W$  of cuspidal automorphic representations  $\pi$  of classical weight  $\kappa = (k_v, l_v)$  with  $k_v \geq l_v \geq 4$  and  $k_v \equiv l_v \equiv 2$  or  $p+1 \pmod{2(p-1)}$  such that  $e(\emptyset)(\pi_f^{K_1^p(Q)K_p(\emptyset)} \otimes \bar{E})_{\tilde{m}^{\emptyset, \varsigma, Q, \tilde{m}_Q}}^{\chi, |\cdot|^2} \neq 0$ . Here  $\pi_f$  is the finite part of  $\pi$  and  $e(\emptyset)$  is the ordinary projector of [BCGP21, 2.4]. For each such  $\pi \in W$ , we have an associated Galois representation  $\rho_{\pi, p} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{E_\pi})$ , with  $\rho_{\pi, p}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}$  as in Theorem 7.7. We have an inclusion

$$(7.1) \quad M^{\chi, \emptyset, \varsigma, Q} \subset \prod_{\kappa} \bigoplus_{\pi \in W, \text{wt}(\pi) = \kappa} (e(\emptyset)(\pi_f^{K_1^p(Q)K_p(\emptyset)} \otimes \bar{E})_{\tilde{m}^{\emptyset, \varsigma, Q, \tilde{m}_Q}}^{\chi, |\cdot|^2})^*$$

respecting the actions of the Hecke operators  $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  at places away from  $Q$  and

$$\bigotimes_{\mathcal{O}, v \in Q} \mathcal{O}[T(F_v)/(T(F_v) \cap \mathfrak{p}_{1,v})]^{W_{L_v}}.$$

The above inclusion allows us to view  $\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  as a subalgebra of

$$A = \{(a, (a_\pi)) \in k \times \prod_{\pi \in W} \mathcal{O}_{E_\pi} : a_\pi \pmod{m_{E_\pi}} = a\}$$

given by the scalar action of a Hecke operator on the space of localised invariants of  $\pi$ .

The same construction of the proof of [BCGP21, Theorem 7.9.4] yields a lift  $\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})$  when  $I = \emptyset$ , and the desired properties away from places  $v \in Q$  can be proved in the same way. We can assume from the construction of  $\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  that the composition of  $\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  with the maps  $\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q} \rightarrow A \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}$  will yield a representation conjugate in  $\ker(\text{GSp}_4(\mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}) \rightarrow \text{GSp}_4(k_\pi))$  to  $\rho_{\pi, p}$ . This composition will be valued in the ring of integers of a totally ramified extension of  $\mathcal{O}$  and will satisfy the consequences of Theorem 7.7. We may write  $\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  as an inverse limit of Artinian quotients  $\mathbb{T}_n = \mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}/I_n$  where each  $\mathbb{T}_n$  can be written as a finite fibre product over  $k$  of quotients of some such rings  $\mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}$ . Then the image of  $\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  in  $\text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{T}_n)$  will lie in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(\mathbb{T}_n)$  by Lemma 3.12, and hence  $\rho^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q}$  itself will lie in  $\mathcal{D}_v^{\square, \text{TW}}(\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})$ .

For each  $\pi \in W$ , the composition  $\Delta_v \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{E_\pi}^\times$  will also coincide with the action of  $\Delta_v$  on  $e(\emptyset)(\pi_f^{K_1^p(Q)K_p(\emptyset)} \otimes \bar{E})_{\tilde{m}^{\emptyset, \varsigma, Q, \tilde{m}_Q}}^{\chi, |\cdot|^2}$  by Theorem 7.7. The inclusion 7.1 implies that the map  $\Delta_v \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^{\chi, I, \varsigma, Q})^\times$  defines an action on  $M^{\chi, \emptyset, \varsigma, Q}$  coinciding with the one arising from viewing  $\Delta_v \subset \mathcal{O}[T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})/(T(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \cap \mathfrak{p}_{1,v})]^{W_{L_v}}$ .

We are now done in the case where  $I = \emptyset$ . The case  $I \neq \emptyset$  can now be proved by induction on  $\#I$  via the same argument of [BCGP21, Theorem 7.9.4].  $\square$

To finish this section, we will state the analogue of [BCGP21, Corollary 7.9.6], which we will use in proving our modularity results.

**Corollary 7.9.** *Suppose that  $\pi$  is cuspidal automorphic representation of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of parallel weight 2, and that  $\pi$  is ordinary in the sense of [BCGP21, Definition 2.4.25]. There exists a continuous semisimple Galois representation  $\rho_{\pi,p} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_4(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$  satisfying*

(1) *If  $v \nmid p$  is such that  $\pi_v$  is unramified, then  $\rho_{\pi,p}|_{G_{F_v}}$  is unramified and*

$$\det(X - \rho_{\pi,p}(\mathrm{Frob}_v)) = Q_v(X).$$

*Suppose moreover that  $\overline{\rho_{\pi,p}}$  is  $\hat{G}$ -reasonable and that for each  $v|p$ , the ordinary Hecke parameters  $\alpha_v$  and  $\beta_v$  satisfy  $\overline{\alpha_v} \neq \overline{\beta_v}$ . Then  $\rho_{\pi,p}$  can be conjugated into  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$  and satisfies*

(2)  $\nu \circ \rho_{\pi,p} = \varepsilon^{-1}$

(3) *For each  $v \nmid p$ , we have*

$$\mathrm{WD}(\rho_{\pi,p}|_{G_{F_v}})^{ss} \cong \mathrm{rec}_{\mathrm{GT},p}(\pi_v \otimes |\nu|^{-3/2})^{ss}$$

(4) *For each  $v|p$ , we have*

$$\rho_{\pi,p}|_{G_{F_v}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{\alpha_v} \theta_v & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & \lambda_{\beta_v} \theta_v & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_{\beta_v}^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_{\alpha_v}^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 7.8 and [Mok14] in the same way as in the proof of [BCGP21, Corollary 7.9.6].  $\square$

**7.3. Patching.** We are now ready to carry out a patching argument analogous to [BCGP21, 7.11]. Most of the notation and constructions will be similar, so we will firstly highlight the main difference arising from our more general notion of Taylor–Wiles places of Section 3.2 in the following lemma. Let  $q = h^1(G_{F,S}, \mathfrak{sp}_4^\vee(1))$ .

**Lemma 7.10.** *There exists  $0 \leq t \leq 2q$  such that for every  $N \geq 1$  there exists a Taylor–Wiles datum*

$$(Q_N, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q_N})$$

*of level  $N$  with  $Q_N$  as in Corollary 3.24,  $\#Q_N = q$  and such that  $\Delta_{Q_N}$  has  $t$  cyclic factors as an abelian group.*

*Proof.* We can, for each  $N \geq 1$ , fix a Taylor–Wiles datum  $(Q_N, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q_N})$  of level  $N$  with  $Q_N$  as in Corollary 3.24 and  $\#Q_N = q$ . These  $(Q_N)_{N \geq 1}$  may induce  $p$ -groups  $\Delta_{Q_N}$  for which the number of cyclic factors may differ with  $N$ . The number of such cyclic factors is bounded by  $2q$  (since each  $\Delta_v$  is the maximal  $p$ -power quotient of  $S(k(v))$ , where  $S$  is a torus of rank at most 2), so by the pigeonhole principle we can find an infinite sequence  $(N_i)_{i \geq 1}$  for which our  $\Delta_{Q_{N_i}}$  all have an equal number  $0 \leq t \leq 2q$  of cyclic factors. Since a Taylor–Wiles datum of level  $N$  is also a Taylor–Wiles datum of level  $N'$  for  $N' \leq N$ , we can use our subsequence to obtain Taylor–Wiles data as in the statement of the lemma.  $\square$

Fix for  $N \geq 1$  Taylor–Wiles data

$$(Q_N, \{(\hat{T}_v, \hat{B}_v)\}_{v \in Q_N})$$

as in Lemma 7.10, and when  $N = 0$  we will take  $Q_0 = \emptyset$ . Let  $g = t - 4[F : Q] + \#S - 1$ , with  $t$  as in Lemma 7.10 for our choice of Taylor–Wiles data. Note that this coincides with

the  $g$  of Corollary 3.24. Indeed we have that  $z = \dim Z(\mathrm{GSp}_4) = 1$ ,  $n_v$  is the number of cyclic factors in  $\Delta_v$  and for each  $v|\infty$  we have  $h^0(G_{F_v}, \mathfrak{sp}_4) = 4$ , which follows from a straightforward computation using that  $\bar{\rho}$  is odd in the sense of [BCGP21, Definition 7.6.2], as the similitude character is the inverse cyclotomic character. Set  $\Delta_\infty = \mathbb{Z}_p^t$  and, for each  $N \geq 1$ , let  $\Delta_N = \Delta_{Q_N}$  and fix a surjection  $\Delta_\infty \twoheadrightarrow \Delta_N$ . Set  $\Delta_0$  to be the trivial group equipped with the unique map from  $\Delta_\infty$ .

With this notation in place, the rest of the setup will be almost identical to that of [BCGP21, 7.11], but we shall include it for clarity. We fix  $I \subset S_p$  with  $\#I \leq 1$  and let  $\Lambda = \Lambda_I$ . By enlarging  $E$  if required, we suppose that  $E$  contains a primitive  $p$ th root of unity, and that if  $p = 3$  then  $E$  contains a primitive 9th root of unity. Then let  $\mathcal{T} = \Lambda[(\prod_{v \in S} \widehat{\mathrm{GSp}}_4) / \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m]$ , a power series ring in  $11\#S - 1$  variables over  $\Lambda$ . Set  $S_\infty = \mathcal{T}[[\Delta_\infty]]$  and let  $\mathfrak{a} = \ker(S_\infty \rightarrow \Lambda)$  be the augmentation ideal. Fix, for each  $v \in R$ , a pair of non-trivial characters  $\chi_v = (\chi_{v,1}, \chi_{v,2})$  as in Section 7.1 with  $\chi_{v,1} \neq \chi_{v,2}^{\pm 1}$ . In what follows, write  $\chi$  for these choice of characters and 1 for the trivial characters.

Let  $N \geq 0$ . We will write  $S_N = \mathcal{T}[\Delta_N]$ . Recall the augmented global deformation problems of Section 7.1. Let  $R_N^{1,I,\varsigma} = R_{1,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}$  and  $R_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma} = R_{\chi,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}$ . Let  $R^{1,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}} = R_{S_{1,\varsigma}^{I,\varsigma}}^{S,\mathrm{loc}}$  and  $R^{\chi,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}} = R_{S_{\chi,\varsigma}^{I,\varsigma}}^{S,\mathrm{loc}}$  be the completed tensor product of deformation rings described in Section 3.4.

There are still canonical isomorphisms

$$(7.2) \quad R^{1,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}}/(\lambda) \cong R^{\chi,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}}/(\lambda)$$

and, for every  $N \geq 0$ ,

$$(7.3) \quad R_N^{1,I,\varsigma}/(\lambda) \cong R_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma}/(\lambda).$$

For  $N \geq 1$ , we saw in Section 3.3 that our Taylor-Wiles datum give both  $R_N^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $R_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  the structure of a  $\Lambda[\Delta_N]$ -algebra, and it is easy to see that there are isomorphisms

$$(7.4) \quad R_N^{1,I,\varsigma} \otimes_{\Lambda[\Delta_N]} \Lambda \cong R_0^{1,I,\varsigma}$$

$$(7.5) \quad R_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma} \otimes_{\Lambda[\Delta_N]} \Lambda \cong R_0^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$$

compatible with the isomorphisms 7.3.

For each  $N \geq 0$ , fix representatives  $\rho_N^{1,I,\varsigma}$  of  $\mathcal{D}_{S_{1,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}}$  and  $\rho_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  of  $\mathcal{D}_{S_{\chi,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}}$  which are compatible with 7.3 and also compatible with the isomorphisms 7.4 and 7.5. As explained in [BCGP21, Lemma 7.1.6], the natural map of functors  $\mathcal{D}_{S_{1,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}}^S \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{S_{1,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}}$  has the structure of a torsor with group  $\mathcal{T}$ , and our choice of representatives determine an isomorphism  $R_{S_{1,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}}^{S,\mathrm{loc}} \cong R_N^{1,I,\varsigma} \hat{\otimes}_\Lambda \mathcal{T}$  (and similarly, an isomorphism  $R_{S_{\chi,Q_N}^{I,\varsigma}}^{S,\mathrm{loc}} \cong R_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma} \hat{\otimes}_\Lambda \mathcal{T}$ ).

Therefore, we obtain an  $R^{1,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}}$ -algebra structure on  $R_N^{1,I,\varsigma} \hat{\otimes}_\Lambda \mathcal{T}$  and a  $R^{\chi,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}}$ -algebra structure on  $R_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma} \hat{\otimes}_\Lambda \mathcal{T}$ , and these are again compatible with 7.2 and 7.3. Now let  $R_\infty^{1,I,\varsigma}$  denote the ring of formal power series in  $g$  variables over  $R^{1,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}}$  and similarly for  $R_\infty^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  over  $R^{\chi,I,\varsigma,\mathrm{loc}}$ ; we then have

$$(7.6) \quad R_\infty^{1,I,\varsigma}/(\lambda) \cong R_\infty^{\chi,I,\varsigma}/(\lambda)$$

via 7.2. As in Corollary 3.24, we can find local  $\Lambda$ -algebra surjections  $R_\infty^{1,I,\varsigma} \twoheadrightarrow R_N^{1,I,\varsigma} \hat{\otimes}_\Lambda \mathcal{T}$  and  $R_\infty^{\chi,I,\varsigma} \twoheadrightarrow R_N^{\chi,I,\varsigma} \hat{\otimes}_\Lambda \mathcal{T}$ , which we may again assume are compatible modulo  $(\lambda)$  in the sense of 7.6 and 7.3, and with the isomorphisms 7.4 and 7.5.



We will apply the patching criterion of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.10.1] together with Theorem 7.8, Proposition 7.5 and Proposition 7.6. Before we summarize the main consequences of this in a proposition, we will introduce the following notation. If  $R \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  we will let  $R'$  denote the maximal  $\mathcal{O}$ -flat quotient of  $R$ .

**Proposition 7.11.** *There exists the following data:*

- Maps  $S_{\infty} \rightarrow R_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $S_{\infty} \rightarrow R_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  of  $\Lambda_1$ -algebras
- Finite  $S_{\infty}$ -modules  $M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$
- Isomorphisms

$$(7.7) \quad M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}/\mathfrak{a} \cong M^{1,I,\varsigma}$$

$$(7.8) \quad M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}/\mathfrak{a} \cong M^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$$

- Maps  $R_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma} \rightarrow \text{End}_{S_{\infty}}(M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma})$  and  $R_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma} \rightarrow \text{End}_{S_{\infty}}(M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma})$  of  $S_{\infty}$ -algebras which respect the respective actions of  $R_0^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $R_0^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  on  $M^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $M^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$
- Isomorphisms  $M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}/\lambda M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma} \cong M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}/\lambda M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  respecting 7.6 and  $M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}/\lambda M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma} \cong M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}/\lambda M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  respecting 7.3, which are also compatible with 7.7 and 7.8.

The modules  $M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  satisfy the following properties:

- (1) If  $\#I = 0$  then  $M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  are free  $S_{\infty}$ -modules
- (2) If  $\#I = 1$  then  $M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}$  and  $M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$  are balanced  $S_{\infty}$ -modules, in the sense of [BCGP21, Definition 2.10.1]
- (3)  $M_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}$  (resp.  $M_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$ ) is a maximal Cohen–Macaulay module over  $R_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma}$  (resp.  $R_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma}$ ).

*Proof.* The existence of the stated data satisfying properties 1 and 2 follows in the same way as in [BCGP21, 7.11] with our above setup in place. In order to satisfy the patching criteria of [BCGP21, 7.10.1], we are appealing to Theorem 7.8, Proposition 7.5 and Proposition 7.6, which are the direct analogues of the corresponding statements of [BCGP21].

It remains to show 3, which is the statement corresponding to [BCGP21, Proposition 7.11.2]. The same proof would go through, provided we have the analogue of [BCGP21, Equation 7.11.1]:

$$(7.9) \quad \dim(R_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma})' = \dim(R_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma})' = \dim S_{\infty} - \#I.$$

The same argument still shows that  $S_{\infty}$  is formally smooth over  $\Lambda_1$  of relative dimension  $t + 11\#S - 1$ , while  $(R_{\infty}^{1,I,\varsigma})'$  and  $(R_{\infty}^{\chi,I,\varsigma})'$  are both equidimensional of relative dimension  $g + 10\#S + 4[F : Q] - \#I$  over  $\Lambda_1$ . Since  $g = t - 4[F : Q] + \#S - 1$ , the equalities in 7.9 hold and we are done.  $\square$

**7.4. Modularity results for abelian surfaces.** We can now use the patched modules of Proposition 7.11 to prove modularity lifting theorems, by exactly the same methods of [BCGP21]. From the work of the previous sections, this amounts to replacing the vastness assumptions on  $\bar{\rho}$  by our assumption that  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable. The following is the analogue of [BCGP21, Theorem 8.4.1], and is a more precise version of Theorem 1.4 stated in the introduction.

**Theorem 7.12.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which  $p \geq 3$  splits completely. Suppose that  $\rho : G_F \rightarrow \text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  is a continuous Galois representation satisfying:*

- (1)  $\nu \circ \rho = \varepsilon^{-1}$
- (2)  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable and tidy in the senses of Definition 3.20 and Definition 7.1
- (3) For every  $v|p$ ,  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}}$  is  $p$ -distinguished weight 2 ordinary in the sense of Definition 7.2

- (4) *There exists an automorphic representation  $\pi$  of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$ , ordinary in the sense of [BCGP21, Definition 2.4.25], such that  $\overline{\rho_{\pi,p}} \cong \bar{\rho}$ , where  $\rho_{\pi,p}$  is as in Corollary 7.9.*
- (5) *For every finite place  $v$  of  $F$ , the representations  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}}$  and  $\rho_{\pi,p}|_{G_{F_v}}$  are pure.*

*Then  $\rho$  is modular, in the sense that there exists an ordinary automorphic representation  $\pi'$  of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$  satisfying  $\rho_{\pi',p} \cong \rho$ . For every finite place  $v$  of  $F$  we have full local-global compatibility, in the sense that*

$$WD(\rho|_{G_{F_v}})^{\mathrm{F-ss}} \cong \mathrm{rec}_{\mathrm{GT},p}(\pi'_v \otimes |\nu|^{-3/2}).$$

*Proof.* The theorem now follows from Proposition 7.11 and Corollary 7.9 by the same arguments used to prove [BCGP21, Theorem 8.4.1]. More precisely, one could use the two results mentioned to firstly prove analogues of [BCGP21, Theorem 7.13.6, Theorem 8.2.1, Corollary 8.2.2, Lemma 8.3.2] in which vastness of  $\bar{\rho}$  is replaced by the assumption that  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$ -reasonable, from which the theorem would follow by the same proof word for word.  $\square$

We can now apply Theorem 7.12 to deduce a modularity lifting theorem for abelian surfaces. We recall as in [BCGP21, Definition 9.1.8] that a Galois representation  $\rho : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}_4(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$  is said to be modular if there exists a cuspidal automorphic representation  $\pi$  of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$  such that  $\overline{\rho_{\pi,p}} \cong \bar{\rho}$ . We then say an abelian surface  $A/F$  is modular if the associated Galois representation  $\rho_{A,l}$  (given by the  $l$ -adic cohomology group  $H^1(A_{\bar{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{Q}_l})$ ) is modular for some prime number  $l$ . The following modularity lifting theorem is the analogue of [BCGP21, Proposition 10.1.1] with the identical proof via Theorem 7.12.

**Theorem 7.13.** *Let  $A/F$  be an abelian surface such that*

- (1)  *$A$  has good ordinary reduction at every  $v|p$*
- (2) *for each  $v|p$ , the unit root crystalline eigenvalues  $\alpha_v, \beta_v$  are distinct modulo  $p$*
- (3)  *$A$  admits a polarization of degree prime to  $p$ .*

*Suppose that the residual Galois representation  $\overline{\rho_{A,p}}$  is such that*

- (4)  *$\overline{\rho_{A,p}}$  is  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$ -reasonable and tidy*
- (5)  *$\overline{\rho_{A,p}}$  is ordinarily modular: there exists  $\pi$  an automorphic representation of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  for which*
  - (a)  *$\pi$  has parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$*
  - (b) *for every  $v|p$ ,  $\pi_v$  is ordinary*
  - (c)  *$\overline{\rho_{A,p}} \cong \overline{\rho_{\pi,p}}$*
  - (d) *for every finite place  $v$  of  $F$ ,  $\rho_{\pi,p}$  is pure.*

*Then  $A$  is modular.*

The assumption that  $\bar{\rho}$  is tidy is still enforced in the above modularity lifting theorems. However, due to the other assumptions on  $\bar{\rho}$ , only a small number of possible images  $\Gamma' = \bar{\rho}(G_F)$  are ruled out in practice. The assumptions that  $p$  is unramified in  $F$  and that the similitude character is given by  $\varepsilon^{-1}$  imply that the image  $\Gamma'$  must surject onto  $\mathbb{F}_p^\times$  via the similitude character. The intersection  $\Gamma = \bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)})$  of  $\Gamma'$  with  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(k)$  must also be absolutely  $\mathrm{GL}_4$ -irreducible for  $\bar{\rho}$  to be  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$ -reasonable. When  $k = \mathbb{F}_3$ , 22 of the 25 such possible images  $\Gamma'$  are tidy, as can be seen from Table 4. A similar story holds for  $k = \mathbb{F}_5$  and  $k = \mathbb{F}_7$  with 65/69 and 86/86 respective possible images being tidy.

Now suppose that  $K/F$  is a quadratic extension by a totally real field. One source of modular mod  $p$  Galois representations comes from inductions of representations  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow$

$\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$  for some small  $q$ . While we study these inductions more closely in Section 8, we have included the following variation of [BCGP21, Proposition 10.1.3] in this section for convenience. In combination with Theorem 7.13 it yields more explicit criteria on the mod  $p$  Galois representation of an abelian surface  $A/F$  under which we can establish modularity of  $A$ .

**Proposition 7.14.** *Let  $q \in \{5, 7, 9\}$ . Suppose that  $K/F$  is a quadratic extension by a totally real field in which  $p$  is unramified and  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$  is a continuous representation of determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$  which is semistable ordinary of weight 0, in the sense of Definition 8.4. Let  $\bar{\rho} = \mathrm{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F} \bar{\varrho} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{F}_q)$  be the induced representation with similitude character  $\varepsilon^{-1}$  as in the start of Section 8.1. Then*

- (1)  $\bar{\rho}$  is ordinarily modular, in the sense that there exists an automorphic representation  $\pi$  of  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  such that
  - (a)  $\pi$  has parallel weight 2 and central character  $|\cdot|^2$
  - (b) for every  $v|p$ ,  $\pi_v$  is ordinary
  - (c)  $\bar{\rho} \cong \overline{\rho_{\pi,p}}$
  - (d) for every finite place  $v$  of  $F$ ,  $\rho_{\pi,p}$  is pure.
- (2) If for every place  $v \in S_p$  which splits into places  $w, w'$  of  $K$  we have

$$\bar{\varrho}|_{G_{K_w}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \chi_w & * \\ 0 & \chi_w^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $\chi_w$  unramified and not equal to its  $\mathrm{Gal}(K/F)$ -conjugate then  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $p$ -distinguished weight 2 ordinary.

- (3) Suppose that  $\bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  and  $\bar{\rho}(G_{F(\zeta_p)})$  are both absolutely  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ -irreducible. If  $p = 3$  suppose that  $\bar{\varrho}$  is valued in  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . If  $p = 3$  or  $p = 5$  suppose that  $\bar{\rho}(G_F)$  is not isomorphic to the group  $C_2.C_2 \wr C_4$  of order 128 (group ID 128,77). Then  $\bar{\rho}$  is tidy and  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$ -reasonable.

*Proof.* As in the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 10.1.3], it follows from [BLGG13, Theorem A] that modularity of  $\bar{\varrho}$  implies that  $\bar{\varrho}$  is the mod  $p$  Galois representation attached to an ordinary Hilbert modular form, and that  $\bar{\rho}$  is therefore ordinarily modular by automorphic induction. Modularity of  $\bar{\varrho}$  then follows by the known cases of Serre’s conjecture stated in [AKT21, Theorem 1.1]. The second part can be proved in the same way as Proposition 8.5. For the third part, tidiness follows from Lemma 8.1 and  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\mathrm{GSp}_4$ -reasonable by the same computation as in the proof of Proposition 8.3. □

## 8. INDUCTIONS FROM $\mathrm{GL}_2$ AND MODULARITY OF ELLIPTIC CURVES

**8.1. Modularity lifting for elliptic curves.** Suppose for now that  $K/F$  is an arbitrary quadratic extension of number fields and that  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is a continuous representation with  $\det \bar{\varrho} = \varepsilon^{-1}$ . The induced representation

$$\bar{\rho} = \mathrm{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F} \bar{\varrho} : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_4(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$$

may be viewed as taking values in  $\mathrm{GSp}_4(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  with similitude character  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ . We recall how this is done in [BCGP21, 2.2]. Let  $V$  denote the underlying representation of  $\bar{\varrho}$  and let  $\sigma \in G_F \setminus G_K$ . Writing  $\bar{\rho} = V \oplus \sigma V$  and choosing an arbitrary symplectic form  $\wedge$  on  $V$ , we can extend this form to  $V \oplus \sigma V$  by taking  $V$  and  $\sigma V$  to be orthogonal and by setting  $\sigma v_1 \wedge \sigma v_2 = \varepsilon^{-1}(\sigma) v_1 \wedge v_2$ . As noted in [BCGP21, 2.2], this is compatible with formation of restriction of scalars of an elliptic curve  $E/K$  in the sense that if  $A = \mathrm{Res}_{K/F} E$  has

associated mod  $p$  Galois representation  $\overline{\rho_{A,p}}$  then this is exactly the induction of the mod  $p$  Galois representation  $\overline{\rho_{E,p}}$  of determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$  given by the dual of  $E[p]$ .

We make some observations about  $G$ , the image of the induced representation  $\bar{\rho}$ . Certainly  $G \subset \Delta \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ , where

$$\Delta = \{(A, B) \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p) \times \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p) \mid \det A = \det B\} \subset \mathrm{GSp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$$

and  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  permutes the two factors of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . The similitude character of  $(A, B) \in \Delta$  is easily seen to be equal to  $\det A = \det B$ . We then have the following lemma about tidiness of induced representations.

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension of number fields with  $p \geq 3$  unramified in  $K$ . Suppose that  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is a continuous representation with  $\det \bar{\varrho} = \varepsilon^{-1}$  such that  $\bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  is absolutely irreducible and that the induced representation  $\bar{\rho} = \mathrm{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F} \bar{\varrho}$  is absolutely irreducible. If  $p = 3$  or  $p = 5$  suppose that  $\bar{\rho}(G_F)$  is not isomorphic to the group  $C_2.C_2 \wr C_4$  of order 128 (group ID 128,77). Then  $\bar{\rho}$  is tidy.*

*Proof.* Let  $G = \bar{\rho}(G_F)$  and  $\Gamma = \bar{\varrho}(G_K)$ . By Definition 7.1,  $G$  is tidy if there exists  $g \in G$  such that  $\nu(g) \neq 1$  and for every pair of distinct eigenvalues  $\alpha \neq \beta$  of  $g$  we have  $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \neq \nu(g)$ . A computation in magma gives the result when  $p \leq 7$ , so suppose throughout the rest of this proof that  $p > 7$ . Consider  $G \cap \Delta = \bar{\rho}(G_K)$ , isomorphic to a subgroup of  $\Gamma \times \Gamma$  (since  $\bar{\varrho}^\sigma(G_K) \cong \Gamma$ , where  $\mathrm{Gal}(K/F) = \{1, \sigma\}$ ). Goursat's lemma states that subgroups of  $\Gamma \times \Gamma$  with surjective projections onto the two factors of  $\Gamma$  are parameterised by triples

$$(H_1 \triangleleft \Gamma, H_2 \triangleleft \Gamma, \varphi : \Gamma/H_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma/H_2)$$

with the corresponding subgroup given by

$$\{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \Gamma \times \Gamma : \varphi(\gamma_1 H_1) = \gamma_2 H_2\}.$$

We show tidiness of  $G$  by giving a lower bound on the number of elements of  $G$  of the form  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ , where each  $\gamma_i$  is a scalar matrix.

We firstly bound the order of the center of  $\Gamma$  by an argument similar to [DT94, Lemma 3]. We have a surjection

$$\det : (\Gamma/Z(\Gamma))^{\mathrm{ab}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^\times / \det(Z(\Gamma)).$$

By the classification of subgroups of  $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ , the abelianization of  $\Gamma/Z(\Gamma)$  must be either trivial,  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  or  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$  in order for  $\Gamma$  to act absolutely irreducibly. Thus  $\det Z(\Gamma)$  must be index 2 inside  $\mathbb{F}_p^\times$ . Therefore, if  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  we must have  $Z(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{F}_p^\times$  and otherwise we only have that  $\#Z(\Gamma) \geq \frac{p-1}{2}$ .

Now suppose that  $H \triangleleft \Gamma$  is a normal subgroup. We consider the possibilities for the index of the image of  $Z(\Gamma)$  inside of  $Z(\Gamma/H)$ . The short exact sequence of groups

$$(8.1) \quad 1 \rightarrow Z(\Gamma)H/H \rightarrow \Gamma/H \rightarrow \Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H) \rightarrow 1$$

implies that  $[Z(\Gamma/H) : Z(\Gamma)H/H] \mid \#\Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H)$ . Thus we need to compute the possibilities for the center of a quotient of an irreducible subgroup of  $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . If  $\Gamma$  is projectively dihedral then any quotient will either be  $D_{2n}$  (where  $n \geq 1$ ) or trivial. Hence in that case  $Z(\Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H))$  is isomorphic to a subgroup of  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$ . Otherwise,  $Z(\Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H))$  must be trivial unless  $\Gamma/Z(\Gamma)$  is isomorphic to either  $A_4$  or  $S_4$ . In the case of  $A_4$ ,  $Z(\Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H))$  must have order 1 or 3. In the case of  $S_4$ ,  $Z(\Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H))$  must have order 1 or 2.

Now suppose that  $G \cap \Delta$  is defined (on fixing an isomorphism  $\Gamma \cong \bar{\varrho}^\sigma(G_K)$ ) by subgroups  $H_1, H_2 \triangleleft \Gamma$  and  $\varphi : \Gamma/H_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma/H_2$ . Then  $\varphi$  restricts to an isomorphism  $Z(\Gamma/H_1) \xrightarrow{\sim} Z(\Gamma/H_2)$ . Let  $Z \leq Z(\Gamma)$  be the preimage of

$$Z(\Gamma)H_1/H_1 \cap \varphi^{-1}(Z(\Gamma)H_2/H_2).$$

For every  $A \in Z$  there exists  $B \in Z(\Gamma)$  with  $\text{diag}(A, B) \in G$  and from the above paragraph,  $m := |Z(\Gamma) : Z| \leq 4$ . In the case where  $Z(\Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H)) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$  we claim that  $m \leq 2$ . Indeed, suppose not and note firstly that  $\Gamma/(Z(\Gamma)H)$  must be abelian in order for its center to be order 4. Then since  $m = 4$  the short exact sequence 8.1 shows that  $\Gamma/H$  is also an abelian group given by an extension of  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$  by  $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$  for some  $k \geq 1$ . In that case,  $\Gamma/H$  is isomorphic to either  $\mathbb{Z}/(2k\mathbb{Z}) \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  or  $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$ . Then  $Z(\Gamma)H/H$  is a cyclic subgroup of index 4, and any two such cyclic subgroups of index 4 cannot generate all of  $\Gamma/H$ . It follows that  $Z \leq Z(\Gamma)$  must be index at most 2. Writing  $A = \text{diag}(\zeta, \zeta)$  we must have  $B = A^{\pm 1}$  in order for the equality  $\det A = \det B$  to hold. We then see that  $G$  is tidy if the order of  $Z$  does not divide 4.

Putting together our above observations, we see that  $Z$  is a subgroup of  $Z(\Gamma)$  of index at most 3. If  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$  then we need  $p - 1$  to not be divisible by 6 to guarantee that  $\#Z$  does not divide 4; this holds since  $p > 7$ . If  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  then  $Z(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{F}_p^\times$  and  $Z$  is a subgroup of  $\mathbb{F}_p^\times$  of index at most 3. We therefore need to rule out when  $(p - 1)|8$  or  $(p - 1)|12$ . Since  $p > 5$ , the only case left to consider then is when  $p = 13$  and  $\Gamma/Z(\Gamma) \cong A_4$ . Another computation in magma shows that all such subgroups are necessarily tidy.  $\square$

Now continue, as in Section 7.4, to fix  $p \geq 3$  a prime which splits completely in a totally real field  $F$ , and fix a quadratic extension  $K/F$  in which  $p$  is unramified. Continue to let  $S_p$  denote the set of places of  $F$  dividing  $p$ . We recall the idea of twisting  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  by a quadratic character in order to ensure that the induction  $\bar{\rho}$  has sufficiently large image (as in [BCGP21, 7.5.24]), which is the content of the following propositions.

**Proposition 8.2.** *Let  $L/K$  be an arbitrary finite extension and  $\Sigma \subset \{v \in S_p | v \text{ splits in } K\}$ . There exists a finite extension  $H/K$  with the following properties.*

- (1)  $H/F$  is Galois with group  $\text{Gal}(H/F) \cong D_8$ , the dihedral group of order 8
- (2)  $\text{Gal}(H/K) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$
- (3)  $H$  is the Galois closure over  $F$  of a quadratic extension  $M/K$
- (4) For each  $v|p$ ,  $H/F$  is unramified at  $v$
- (5) For each  $v|p$ ,  $\text{Frob}_v \in \text{Gal}(H/F)$  is central if and only if  $v \in \Sigma$
- (6)  $H/K$  is disjoint from  $L$ .

*Proof.* We follow the proof of [BCGP21, Proposition 7.5.25], with the above statement being a modification only in properties 5 and 6. In that proof an intermediate extension  $F(\sqrt{\beta})$  is introduced, where  $\beta = x^2 - \alpha y^2 \notin (F^*)^2$  for some  $x, y \in F$  and  $K = F(\sqrt{\alpha})$ . The field  $M$  is then taken to be  $K(\sqrt{x + y\sqrt{\alpha}})$ .

We deviate from this proof by choosing  $\beta$  so that, for  $v \in S_p$ ,  $\beta \pmod{v}$  is a quadratic residue if and only if  $v \in \Sigma$ . We then see that  $v \in \Sigma$  will split in the compositum  $F(\sqrt{\beta}) \cdot K$ , which we saw is the fixed field of the center of  $\text{Gal}(H/F)$ . Thus  $\text{Frob}_v$  is necessarily central if  $v \in \Sigma$  and the remaining parts of the proposition follow in almost the same way by appropriate choice of  $x$  and  $y$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 8.3.** *Let  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  be a continuous representation with determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ . Let  $L/K$  be such that  $\ker(\bar{\varrho}) \cap \ker(\bar{\varrho}^\sigma) = G_L$ , where  $\text{Gal}(K/F) = \{1, \sigma\}$ . Let  $\Sigma \subset \{v \in S_p | v \text{ splits in } K\}$ . Form the extension  $H/K$  as in Proposition 8.2, disjoint from*

$L/K$ . Let  $\delta_{M/K}$  be the character of  $G_K$  associated to the arising quadratic extension  $M/K$  and let  $\bar{\rho} = \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F}(\bar{\varrho} \otimes \delta_{M/K})$ . Suppose that  $\bar{\varrho}(G_K) \cap \text{SL}_2(G_K) = \bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  is absolutely irreducible. Then  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable.

*Proof.* Let  $\Gamma = \bar{\varrho}(G_K)$  and let  $G = \bar{\rho}(G_F)$ . We show absolute  $\text{GL}_4$ -irreducibility of  $G \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . Since  $\Gamma \cap \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is absolutely irreducible, it suffices to note that  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{K(\zeta_p)}}$  is not isomorphic to its conjugate under an element of  $\sigma \in G_{F(\zeta_p)} \setminus G_{K(\zeta_p)}$ . This follows, as such a  $\sigma$  necessarily acts non-trivially on the character  $\delta_{M(\zeta_p)/K(\zeta_p)}$ .

We see by Lemma 4.16 that  $G$  is automatically  $\text{GSp}_4$ -adequate if  $p > 5$ , and therefore  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable by Lemma 3.21. Hence suppose that  $p = 3$  or  $p = 5$  and consider those subgroups  $G_{\text{bad}} \subset \text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$  for which

- (1)  $G_{\text{bad}} \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is absolutely  $\text{GL}_4$ -irreducible
- (2)  $G_{\text{bad}}$  surjects onto  $\mathbb{F}_p^\times$  via the similitude character
- (3) there exists an index 2 subgroup  $G'_{\text{bad}} \leq G_{\text{bad}}$  such that  $G'_{\text{bad}} \subset \text{GL}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is reducible over  $\mathbb{F}_p$
- (4) at least one of the following hold
  - (a)  $H^1(G_{\text{bad}} \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p), \mathbb{F}_p) \neq 0$
  - (b)  $H^1(G_{\text{bad}} \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p), \mathfrak{sp}_4) \neq 0$ .

Any other possible image will be  $\text{GSp}_4$ -adequate and hence our  $\bar{\rho}$  will still be  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable.

As computed in `magma`, the only failure of vanishing of the above cohomology groups when  $p = 3$  is the existence of such subgroups  $G_{\text{bad}}$  for which  $H^1(G_{\text{bad}} \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p), \mathbb{F}_p) \neq 0$  (as in all cases  $H^1(G_{\text{bad}} \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p), \mathfrak{sp}_4) = 0$ ). By [BCGP21, Lemma 7.5.5], to show that  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable in these cases, it suffices to check that for every normal subgroup  $H_{\text{bad}} \subset G_{\text{bad}} \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$  of index 3 or index 9 we have  $H^1(H_{\text{bad}}, \mathfrak{sp}_4) = 0$  and  $H_{\text{bad}}$  is absolutely  $\text{GL}_4$ -irreducible. A further computation shows that this is always the case.

When  $p = 5$ , the failure occurs from subgroups for which  $H^1(G_{\text{bad}} \cap \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p), \mathfrak{sp}_4) \neq 0$ , with the other cohomology group vanishing. A further computation then shows that the image in  $\text{PGSp}_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$  of every such subgroup  $G_{\text{bad}}$  does not admit a surjective quotient onto  $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ . It follows, just as in [BCGP21, Lemma 7.5.19], that  $\zeta_p$  cannot lie in the fixed field of the adjoint action on  $\mathfrak{sp}_4$  and that  $\bar{\rho}$  is therefore  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable.  $\square$

**Definition 8.4.** Suppose that  $A \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $\varrho : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(A)$  is a continuous representation. We say that  $\varrho$  is semistable ordinary of weight 0 if for every place  $w|p$  of  $K$  there is an isomorphism

$$(8.2) \quad \varrho|_{G_{K_w}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \chi_w & * \\ 0 & \chi_w^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for some unramified character  $\chi_w : G_{K_w} \rightarrow A^\times$ .

**Proposition 8.5.** Suppose that we are in the setup of Proposition 8.3. Let  $A \in \text{CNL}_{\mathcal{O}}$  and let  $\varrho : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(A)$  be a lift of  $\bar{\varrho}$  which is semistable ordinary of weight 0. For  $w|p$ , let  $\chi_w : G_{K_w} \rightarrow A^\times$  denote the character defining the eigenvalue of the image of Frobenius, as in (8.2) and let  $\overline{\chi_w} : G_{K_w} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}^\times$  be the reduction of  $\chi_w$  modulo the maximal ideal of  $A$ . Set

$$\Sigma = \{v \in S_p | v = ww' \text{ and } \overline{\chi_w} \neq (\overline{\chi_{w'}})^\sigma\},$$

where  $\sigma \in G_F \setminus G_K$ . Then the induced representation

$$\rho = \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F}(\varrho \otimes \delta_{M/K})$$

is  $p$ -distinguished weight 2 ordinary, in the sense of Definition 7.2.

*Proof.* Suppose  $v \in S_p$  is inert in  $K$  firstly and let  $w$  be the unique place of  $K$  above  $v$ . Then  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}} = \text{Ind}_{G_{K_w}}^{G_{F_v}} (\varrho \otimes \delta_{M/K})|_{G_{K_w}}$ . This has the desired form, with the unramified characters defining the diagonal entries being given by the two choices of extensions of  $\chi_w$  to  $G_{F_v}$  (which differ by a sign on  $\text{Frob}_v \in G_{F_v}$ ).

Now suppose that  $v \in S_p$  splits as  $v = ww'$  in  $K$ , so that there are isomorphisms  $F_v \cong K_w$  and  $F_v \cong K_{w'}$  interchanged via  $\sigma$ . Then  $\rho|_{G_{F_v}} = \varrho|_{G_{K_w}} \oplus (\varrho^\sigma)|_{G_{K_w}}$ . This has the required form, provided that the mod  $p$  reduction of these summands,  $\bar{\varrho}|_{G_{K_w}}$  and  $(\bar{\varrho}^\sigma)|_{G_{K_w}}$ , are not isomorphic. Thus it suffices to show that the characters  $\overline{\chi_w} \otimes \delta_{M/K}|_{G_{K_w}}$  and  $(\overline{\chi_{w'}} \otimes \delta_{M/K}|_{G_{K_{w'}}})^\sigma$  are not equal. By choice of  $\Sigma$ , the following are equivalent

- (1)  $v \in \Sigma$
- (2)  $\delta_{M/K}|_{G_{K_w}} = (\delta_{M/K}|_{G_{K_{w'}}})^\sigma$
- (3)  $\overline{\chi_w} \neq (\overline{\chi_{w'}})^\sigma$

and we are therefore done.  $\square$

Now let  $E/K$  be an elliptic curve. The curve  $E$  is said to be modular if there exists a cuspidal automorphic representation  $\pi$  of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_K)$  of weight 0 (see [BCGP21, 2.6]) and trivial central character such that  $\varrho_{E,p} \cong \varrho_{\pi,p}$ . Here  $\varrho_{E,p}$  is the Galois representation given by the  $p$ -adic cohomology group  $H^1(E_{\overline{K}}, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$  and the Galois representation  $\varrho_{\pi,p}$  attached to  $\pi$  is as in [BCGP21, Theorem 2.7.3]. Similarly, we say an irreducible representation  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is modular if there exists such a  $\pi$  as above with  $\bar{\varrho} \cong \overline{\varrho_{\pi,p}}$ . We also say  $\bar{\varrho}$  is ordinarily modular if we can take such a  $\pi$  as above which is also semistable weight 0 ordinary, in the sense that there exists, for every place  $w|p$  of  $K$ , a non-zero eigenvector in  $\pi_w^{\text{Iw}_w}$  whose eigenvalues under the Hecke operators

$$U_w^1 = [\text{Iw}_w \text{diag}(\varpi_w, 1) \text{Iw}_w]$$

$$U_w^2 = [\text{Iw}_w \text{diag}(\varpi_w, \varpi_w) \text{Iw}_w]$$

lie in  $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$  (under our fixed isomorphism  $\iota : \mathbb{C} \cong \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ ). Here  $\varpi_w$  is a uniformizer of  $K_w$  and  $\text{Iw}_w$  is the standard Iwahori subgroup of  $\text{GL}_2(K_w)$  given by those matrices in  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{K_w})$  whose reduction modulo  $\varpi_w$  is upper triangular.

We now apply Theorem 7.12 to the mod  $p$  Galois representation attached to  $\text{Res}_{K/F} E$  together with our above results to deduce a modularity lifting theorem for  $E$  under mild conditions on the image of  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}}$ . This is an attempt at a generalization of [BCGP21, Theorem 10.1.4].

**Theorem 8.6.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which  $p \geq 3$  splits completely and let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension in which  $p$  is unramified with Galois group  $\{1, \sigma\}$ . Let  $E/K$  be an elliptic curve and let  $\bar{\varrho} = \overline{\varrho_{E,p}}$  be the attached mod  $p$  Galois representation of determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ . Suppose that the following conditions hold:*

- (1)  $E$  has ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every place  $w|p$
- (2)  $\bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  is absolutely irreducible
- (3)  $\bar{\varrho}$  is ordinarily modular
- (4) if  $p = 3$  or  $p = 5$  then order of the subgroup of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p) \times \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  generated by the image of  $\bar{\varrho} \oplus \bar{\varrho}^\sigma$  together with the matrices  $\text{diag}(I, -I)$ ,  $\text{diag}(-I, I)$  is not equal to 64.

Then  $E$  is modular.

*Proof.* Since  $E$  has ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every place  $w|p$ , the representation  $\varrho_{E,p}$  is semistable ordinary of weight 0. Thus we may form the induction  $\bar{\rho} = \text{Ind}_{G_K}^{G_F}(\bar{\varrho} \otimes \delta_{M/K})$  by taking  $\Sigma$  as in Proposition 8.5 and then taking  $M/K$  as in Proposition 8.3 for this choice of  $\Sigma$  and  $\bar{\varrho}$ . This is the mod  $p$  reduction of the Galois representation attached to the abelian surface  $A = \text{Res}_{K/F} E'$ , where  $E'/K$  is the quadratic twist of  $E$  corresponding to  $\delta_{M/K}$ . Modularity of  $\rho = \rho_{A,p}$  then implies modularity of  $E'$ , just as in the proof of [BCGP21, Theorem 9.3.4], and hence modularity of  $E$ . So we just have to show that  $\rho$  satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 7.12 to deduce modularity of  $E$ .

We see from Proposition 8.3 that  $\bar{\rho}$  is  $\text{GSp}_4$ -reasonable. By Lemma 8.1, we see that  $\bar{\rho}$  is tidy, except possibly if  $p \leq 5$  and  $\#\bar{\rho}(G_F) = 128$ . The image of  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_K}$  is exactly the subgroup of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p) \times \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  generated by the image of  $\bar{\varrho} \oplus \bar{\varrho}^\sigma$  and the matrices  $\text{diag}(I, -I)$ ,  $\text{diag}(-I, I)$ , since the extensions of  $K$  given by the Galois closure of  $M/F$  and the fixed field of  $\ker(\bar{\varrho} \oplus \bar{\varrho}^\sigma)$  are linearly disjoint by Proposition 8.2. Since  $\bar{\rho}(G_K)$  is an index 2 subgroup of  $\bar{\rho}(G_F)$ , it follows from our hypotheses that  $\bar{\rho}(G_F)$  does not have order 128 and  $\bar{\rho}$  is therefore tidy.

As in the proof of [BCGP21, Theorem 10.1.4] we can find, by automorphic induction and our assumption that  $\bar{\varrho}$  is ordinarily modular, a parallel weight 2 automorphic representation  $\pi$  of  $\text{GSp}_4(\mathbb{A}_F)$  of central character  $|\cdot|^2$  which is ordinary at all  $v|p$  such that  $\overline{\rho_{\pi,p}} \cong \bar{\rho}$  and with  $\rho_{\pi,p}$  pure. By Proposition 8.5, we see that  $\rho$  is  $p$ -distinguished weight 2 ordinary. Purity of  $\rho$  follows from [BCGP21, Proposition 2.8.1]. Thus all of the hypotheses of Theorem 7.12 hold for  $\rho$  and we are done.  $\square$

**8.2. Projectively dihedral representations.** One case amenable to establishing modularity of  $\bar{\varrho}$  directly is when the projective image of  $\bar{\varrho}$  is dihedral, in which case we can find a quadratic extension  $L/K$  and a character  $\bar{\psi} : G_L \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}^\times$  such that  $\bar{\varrho} \cong \text{Ind}_{G_L}^{G_K} \bar{\psi}$ . We wish to control the Hodge–Tate weights of a lift  $\psi : G_L \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}_p}^\times$  and use automorphic induction to deduce that  $\bar{\varrho}$  is ordinarily modular. This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 8.7.** *Let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension of number fields in which  $p \geq 3$  is unramified. We say a continuous Galois representation  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p})$  is CM-compositum induced if  $\bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  is absolutely irreducible with  $\det \bar{\varrho} = \varepsilon^{-1}$  and there exists*

- (1) *an imaginary CM quadratic extension  $F'/F$ , disjoint from  $K/F$*
- (2) *a continuous character  $\bar{\psi} : G_L \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}^\times$ , where  $L = F' \cdot K$  is the compositum*

*such that*

- (3) *each place  $w|p$  of  $K$  splits in  $L$*
- (4) *for every place  $z|p$  of  $L$  there exists an unramified character  $\overline{\chi}_z : G_{L_z} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}^\times$  with  $\{\bar{\psi}|_{G_{L_z}}, \bar{\psi}^\sigma|_{G_{L_z}}\} = \{\overline{\chi}_z, \overline{\chi}_z^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1}\}$ , where  $\text{Gal}(L/K) = \{1, \sigma\}$*
- (5)  *$\bar{\varrho} \cong \text{Ind}_{G_L}^{G_K} \bar{\psi}$ .*

Note that if such an extension  $F'/F$  in Definition 8.7 exists then it is unique. There are then two choices of  $\bar{\psi}$ , which are conjugate under  $\sigma$  and whose product is the inverse cyclotomic character. We also observe that if  $k$  is a finite field and  $\bar{\varrho}$  is CM-compositum induced and conjugate to a representation valued in  $\text{GL}_2(k)$ , then  $\bar{\psi}$  is also valued in  $k^\times$ . Indeed, letting  $q = \#k$  we must have  $\{\bar{\psi}, \bar{\psi}^\sigma\} = \{\bar{\psi}^q, (\bar{\psi}^\sigma)^q\}$  by considering  $\bar{\varrho}|_{G_L}$  and the action of Frobenius. On the other hand we must also have that  $\bar{\psi}^\sigma \neq \bar{\psi}^q$  due to condition 4. In particular, there can never exist a CM-compositum induced representation valued in  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_3)$ , since  $\bar{\psi}$  would have image of order at most 2 and thus  $\bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_p)})$  would have



order at most 4 (noting that  $D_8 \subset \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_3)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{F}_3$ ). In what follows, if  $\bar{\varrho}$  is CM-compositum induced then we shall use notation as in Definition 8.7.

**Proposition 8.8.** *Suppose that  $F$  is a totally real field and  $K/F$  is a quadratic extension in which  $p \geq 3$  is unramified. Suppose that  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  is CM-compositum induced. Then*

(1) *for every place  $w|p$  of  $K$  there is an isomorphism*

$$\bar{\varrho}|_{G_{K_w}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\chi}_w & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\chi}_w^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

*for some unramified character  $\overline{\chi}_w : G_{K_w} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$*

(2)  *$\bar{\varrho}$  is ordinarily modular.*

*Proof.* If  $w|p$  is a place of  $K$  then by Definition 8.7  $w$  splits in  $L$  into places  $z, z'$  and we can find an unramified character  $\overline{\chi}_z : G_{L_z} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$  such that  $\bar{\psi}|_{G_{L_z}} = \overline{\chi}_z$  and  $\bar{\psi}|_{G_{L_{z'}}} = (\overline{\chi}_z^{-1})^{\sigma \varepsilon^{-1}}$ . It follows that  $\bar{\varrho}$  is of the required form for the first part of the proposition. Next observe that  $z$  and  $z'$  lie above distinct places of  $F'$  (as if  $v$ , the place of  $F$  below  $w$ , splits completely in  $L$  then the action of  $\mathrm{Gal}(L/F)$  is transitive on the places of  $L$  above  $v$ , but  $\{z, z'\}$  would be an orbit if these places both lie over the same places of  $K$  and  $F'$ ). We claim that we can find an algebraic  $p$ -adic character  $\varphi : G_L \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$  such that  $\bar{\varphi}$  differs from  $\bar{\psi}$  by a character which is unramified at the places dividing  $p$ . Indeed, suppose that for every  $\tau : F' \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  we have  $k_\tau \in \{0, 1\}$  satisfying  $k_\tau + k_{\tau \circ c} = 1$  with  $c \in \mathrm{Gal}(F'/F)$  complex conjugation. Then we can find a character of  $G_{F'}$  with Hodge–Tate weights  $\{k_\tau\}_\tau$  since  $F'/F$  is a quadratic extension of a totally real field by an imaginary CM field (by [Pat19, Corollary 2.3.16], for example). Composing such a character with the inclusion  $G_L \rightarrow G_{F'}$  yields the desired  $\varphi$  by our above observation about the places of  $L$  dividing  $p$  in relation to those of  $F'$  and  $K$ .

Now let  $\theta : \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p^\times$  be the Teichmüller map and let  $\psi = \varphi \cdot \theta(\bar{\psi}/\bar{\varphi})$ , an algebraic lift of  $\bar{\psi}$ . Let  $\psi^\vee : \mathbb{A}_L^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$  denote the algebraic Hecke character corresponding to  $\psi$ . Then the automorphic induction of  $\psi^\vee \otimes |\cdot|^{1/2}$  to  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_K)$  is a weight 0 cuspidal automorphic representation  $\pi$  with trivial central character for which the attached Galois representation  $\varrho_{\pi, p}$  lifts  $\bar{\varrho}$ . Moreover, for  $w|p$  a place of  $K$ ,  $\pi_w$  can be identified with  $(\psi_z^\vee \otimes |\cdot|^{1/2}) \boxplus (\psi_{z'}^\vee \otimes |\cdot|^{1/2})$  and we shall distinguish  $z$  from  $z'$  by supposing that  $\psi|_{I_{L_z}}$  is trivial. Since  $\psi^\vee$  is unramified at places dividing  $p$  by construction,  $\pi_w$  is Iwahori-spherical and there exists an eigenvector whose eigenvalues  $u_w^i$  under the operators  $U_w^i$  have  $p$ -adic valuation given by

$$\begin{aligned} v_p(u_w^1) &= v_p(\iota(\psi_z^\vee \otimes |\cdot|^{1/2})(\varpi_w)) - \sum_{\tau: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \iota\tau=w} 1/2 \\ v_p(u_w^2) &= v_p(\iota(\psi_{z'}^\vee \otimes |\cdot|^{1/2})(\varpi_w)) - \left( \sum_{\tau: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \iota\tau=w} -1/2 \right) + v_p(u_w^1) \end{aligned}$$

by (the proof of) [CT14, Lemma 2.5]. Here  $\iota : \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  was our fixed choice of isomorphism and we have identified embeddings  $K \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  with places of  $K$  dividing  $p$ .

We compute  $v_p(\iota\psi_{z'}^\vee(\varpi_{z'}))$ ; the computation for  $z$  is similar. Choose  $\alpha \in L^\times$  whose valuation is non-zero only at the place  $z'$  and equal to some  $m > 0$ . Raising  $\alpha$  to a sufficiently large power, we can suppose that  $\psi_v^\vee(\alpha) = 1$  for every finite place  $v \neq z'$  and  $\psi_{z'}^\vee(\alpha) = \psi_{z'}^\vee(\varpi_{z'}^m)$ . Then  $v_p(\iota\psi_v^\vee(\alpha)) = -v_p(\iota\psi_\infty^\vee(\alpha))$  since  $\psi^\vee$  is trivial on  $L^\times$ . We

have  $\psi_\infty^\vee(\alpha) = \prod_{\tau: L \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} \tau(\alpha)^{n_\tau}$  where  $n_\tau = -1$  for every  $\tau : L \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  inducing the place  $z'$  via  $\iota$ , since we supposed that  $\psi^\vee|_{I_{L_{z'}}} = \varepsilon^{-1}$ . We see that

$$v_p(\iota\psi_\infty^\vee(\alpha)) = \sum_{\tau: L \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}} m \cdot (-1)$$

where the sum is over complex embeddings  $\tau$  of  $L$  whose composition with  $\iota$  induces the place  $z'$  (as  $v_p(\iota(\tau(\alpha))) = 0$  for any  $\tau$  not inducing the place  $z'$  by choice of  $\alpha$ ). We deduce that

$$v_p(\iota(\psi_{z'}^\vee \otimes |\cdot|^{1/2})(\varpi_w)) = -f_w + f_w/2$$

and similarly that

$$v_p(\iota(\psi_z^\vee \otimes |\cdot|^{1/2})(\varpi_w)) = 0 + f_w/2,$$

where  $f_w = |K_w : \mathbb{Q}_p|$ . Thus  $v_p(u_w^1) = v_p(u_w^2) = 0$ , which shows the second point and concludes the proof.  $\square$

We deduce a modularity theorem for some elliptic curves over  $K$  with CM-compositum induced Galois representation.

**Corollary 8.9.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which  $p \geq 7$  splits completely and let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension in which  $p$  is unramified. Suppose that  $E/K$  is an elliptic curve which has ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every place  $w|p$  and that  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}}$  is CM-compositum induced in the sense of Definition 8.7. Then  $E$  is modular.*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Theorem 8.6 and Proposition 8.8.  $\square$

In order to apply Theorem 7.12 we required the elliptic curve  $E/K$  to have ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at the places dividing  $p$ . We show that this automatically holds in some cases when  $\overline{\rho_{E,p}}$  is CM-compositum induced.

**Lemma 8.10.** *Let  $p \geq 5$  be a prime number with  $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and let  $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$  be a finite unramified extension. Suppose that  $E/K$  is an elliptic curve such that there is an isomorphism*

$$\overline{\varrho_{E,p}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\chi} & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\chi}^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , where  $\overline{\chi} : G_K \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$  is an unramified character. Then

- (1) if  $p \geq 11$  then either  $E$  has multiplicative reduction or ordinary good reduction
- (2) if  $p = 5$  then either  $E$  has multiplicative reduction, or the degree of a minimal totally ramified extension over which  $E$  acquires good reduction is either 1 or 4 and  $E$  acquires ordinary good reduction over this extension.

*Proof.* Let  $v$  be the valuation on  $K$  and suppose firstly that  $v(j(E)) < 0$ , so that  $E$  has potentially multiplicative reduction. Then  $E$  is the quadratic twist of an elliptic curve  $A/K$  with split multiplicative reduction by a quadratic character  $\delta : G_K \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ . The mod  $p$  Galois representation of  $A$  is, on the one hand, the twist of  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}}$  by  $\delta$  and thus can be written as a direct sum of the characters  $\overline{\chi}\delta$  and  $\overline{\chi}^{-1}\delta\varepsilon^{-1}$ . On the other hand, since  $A$  has split multiplicative reduction we have an isomorphism

$$\overline{\varrho_{A,p}}|_{I_K} \cong \begin{pmatrix} 1 & * \\ 0 & \varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $\varepsilon : I_K \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^\times$  has order  $p-1 \geq 4$ , we must have that  $\delta$  is unramified and that  $E$  has multiplicative reduction over  $K$ .

Now suppose that  $E$  does not have (potentially) multiplicative reduction. The elliptic curve  $E$  acquires good reduction on base change to a totally ramified extension  $L/K$  of degree  $e \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 6\}$ , with  $E$  having bad reduction on base change to any proper subfield of  $L$  containing  $K$ . We can take  $L = K(\varpi^{1/e})$ , where  $\varpi$  is any choice of uniformizer for  $K$ . We firstly show that  $E_L$  has ordinary good reduction. Suppose not, so that  $E_L$  has supersingular reduction. The same argument as in the proof of [LR13, Theorem 3.1 2] then shows that either the image of inertia under the dual representation  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}^\vee}(I_L)$  contains an element of order  $p$ , or is the given by matrices of the form

$$(8.3) \quad \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & \eta b \\ b & a \end{pmatrix}^e \mid (a, b) \in \mathbb{F}_p^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\} \right\}$$

with respect to some basis for  $E[p]$  and where  $\eta \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times$  is a non-quadratic residue. By hypothesis,  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}}(I_L)$  does not contain any element of order  $p$  and the only diagonal matrix it contains is the identity. On the other hand, the group of matrices 8.3 contains a subgroup of diagonal matrices of order  $p - 1$  (since  $(p^2 - 1)/e \geq p - 1$ , as  $p \geq 5$  and  $e \leq 6$ ) which gives a contradiction.

Next we show that  $e \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ . Again we suppose not, so that  $e \in \{3, 6\}$ . This can only happen when  $E$  has a Weierstrass equation of the form  $E : y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$  with  $3v(A) > 2v(B)$ . In that case, a Weierstrass equation for the reduction of  $E$  modulo  $\varpi^{1/e}$  is given by  $\tilde{E}_L : y^2 = x^3 + B$  for some  $B \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$ . This defines a supersingular elliptic curve by [Sil09, V.4.1(a)] since the coefficient of  $x^{(p-1)/2}$  in  $(x^3 + B)^{p-1}$  is zero, as  $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . We have therefore reached a contradiction since  $\tilde{E}_L$  was already shown to be ordinary.

Now suppose that  $e \in \{2, 4\}$ . Let  $K' = K(\varpi^{2/e})$ , so that  $L/K'$  is a ramified quadratic extension. Then  $E_{K'}$  is the quadratic twist of an elliptic curve  $A/K'$  with good reduction. It follows that

$$\overline{\varrho_{A,p}}|_{I_{K'}} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \delta & 0 \\ 0 & \delta\varepsilon^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $\delta : I_{K'} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  is the quadratic character arising from  $L/K'$ . Firstly suppose that  $A$  has supersingular reduction. Again, the same argument as in [LR13, Theorem 3.1 2] shows that  $\overline{\varrho_{A,p}^\vee}(I_{K'})$  either contains an element of order  $p$  or is of the form 8.3 where the exponent is  $e_{K'/\mathbb{Q}_p} \in \{1, 2\}$ . In either case, this gives an immediate contradiction.

We are left with the case that  $A$  has ordinary reduction. The only possibility is that  $\delta = \varepsilon^{-1}$  as characters of  $I_{K'}$ , so we must have  $p = 5$  and  $e = 4$  since  $\#\varepsilon(I_{K'}) = 2(p - 1)/e$ . We deduce the desired statement when  $p = 5$ . When  $p \geq 11$ , we see that  $e = 1$  so that  $E/K$  has good reduction and  $\tilde{E}$  was already shown to be ordinary.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.11.** *Let  $p \geq 5$  with  $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which  $p$  splits completely and let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension in which  $p$  is unramified. Suppose that  $E/K$  is an elliptic curve such that  $\overline{\varrho_{E,p}}$  is CM-compositum induced. If  $p = 5$  and  $E$  has potentially good reduction suppose further that  $E$  has good reduction over  $K$ . Then  $E$  has either ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every place  $w|p$ .*

*Proof.* This is immediate from Lemma 8.10 and Proposition 8.8.  $\square$

We can also satisfy the constraints on  $\bar{\varrho}$  arising from tidiness considerations when  $p = 5$  by imposing a condition on  $\bar{\psi}$ .

**Lemma 8.12.** *Suppose that  $p = 5$ ,  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_5)$  is CM-compositum induced and let  $\tau \in G_F \setminus G_K$ . If  $(\bar{\psi}^2)^\tau|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}} \neq \bar{\psi}^2|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}}$  then  $\bar{\rho} = \mathrm{Ind}_{G_F}^{G_K}(\bar{\varrho} \otimes \delta)$  is tidy whenever  $\delta : G_K \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  is chosen such that  $\bar{\rho}$  is absolutely irreducible.*

*Proof.* We claim that it suffices to show the order of the image of  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{K(\zeta_5)}} = \bar{\varrho}|_{G_{K(\zeta_5)}} \oplus \bar{\varrho}^\tau|_{G_{K(\zeta_5)}}$  is at least 32. Indeed, then  $\bar{\rho}(G_F)$  would be order at least  $32 \cdot 2 \cdot 4 = 256$ , since  $\bar{\rho}$  is absolutely irreducible and the similitude character surjects onto  $\mathbb{F}_5^\times$ . It follows from Lemma 8.1 that  $\bar{\rho}$  is then tidy. Since  $\bar{\varrho}(G_{K(\zeta_5)})$  is necessarily of order 8, it suffices to show that the extensions of  $L(\zeta_p)$  cut out by  $\bar{\varrho}|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}}$  and  $\bar{\varrho}^\tau|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}}$  are linearly disjoint. Since  $\bar{\psi}^\sigma|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}} = \bar{\psi}^{-1}|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}}$ , we just need to show that the extensions of  $L(\zeta_5)$  cut out by  $\bar{\psi}|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}}$  and  $\bar{\psi}^\tau|_{G_{L(\zeta_5)}}$  are linearly disjoint. If they were not linearly disjoint, then certainly the squares of both characters would cut out the same quadratic extension of  $L(\zeta_5)$ , contradicting our hypothesis.  $\square$

*Example 8.13.* Continue to fix  $F$  a totally real field in which  $p \geq 5$  splits completely and  $K/F$  a quadratic extension in which  $p$  is unramified. We give a construction of some CM-compositum induced representations  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ .

Let  $F'/F$  be the compositum of  $F$  with an imaginary quadratic field  $N$  which is disjoint from  $K$  and in which  $p$  splits completely. Set  $L = K \cdot F'$  and  $\mathrm{Gal}(L/K) = \{1, \sigma\}$ . We wish to construct characters  $\bar{\psi} : G_L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^\times$  as in Definition 8.7. We can find  $\bar{\psi}$  such that for every place  $z|p$  of  $L$  we have  $\{\bar{\psi}|_{G_{L_z}}, \bar{\psi}^\sigma|_{G_{L_z}}\} = \{1, \varepsilon^{-1}\}$  and  $\bar{\psi}\bar{\psi}^\sigma = \varepsilon^{-1}$  by taking the restriction of the mod  $p$  reduction of a  $p$ -adic algebraic character on  $G_{F'}$ . We just need  $\bar{\psi}|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}} \neq \bar{\psi}^\sigma|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$  for  $\bar{\varrho} = \mathrm{Ind}_{G_L}^{G_K}(\bar{\psi})$  to be CM-compositum induced, so suppose this is not the case.

Suppose that  $\bar{\chi} : G_L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^\times$  is unramified at every place dividing  $p$  and satisfies  $\bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}^\sigma = 1$ . Setting  $\bar{\varphi} = \bar{\psi}\bar{\chi}$ ,  $\bar{\varrho} = \mathrm{Ind}_{G_L}^{G_K}(\bar{\varphi})$  will be CM-compositum induced provided that  $\bar{\varphi}|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}} \neq \bar{\varphi}^\sigma|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$ . If  $\bar{\chi}$  (and hence  $\bar{\chi}|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$ ) has image of order at least 3 then  $\bar{\varphi}|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$  will not be equal to its conjugate, since otherwise  $1 = \bar{\varphi}(\bar{\varphi})^\sigma|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}} = \bar{\chi}(\bar{\chi})^\sigma|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}} = \bar{\chi}^2|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$ .

We can obtain such a  $\bar{\chi}$  by considering a dihedral extension  $M/K$  which contains  $L$ . If  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , then similarly to Proposition 8.2 we can find an extension  $M/L$  for which

- (1)  $M/K$  is Galois with  $\mathrm{Gal}(M/K) \cong D_8$  and  $\mathrm{Gal}(M/L) \cong \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$
- (2)  $p$  is unramified in  $M$ .

When  $p = 5$ , we can choose  $\bar{\chi}$  such that the induction of a suitable twist of  $\bar{\varrho}$  will be tidy by Lemma 8.12. Explicitly, write  $L = K(\sqrt{\beta})$ . Then for  $x, y, \alpha \in K$  with  $y \neq 0$  and  $\alpha \notin (L^*)^2$  consider  $\gamma = x + y\sqrt{\alpha}$  satisfying  $x^2 - \alpha y^2 = \beta$ . Then  $M = L(\sqrt{\gamma})/K$  is Galois with group  $D_8$ . For tidiness of  $\bar{\rho}$  we need  $(\bar{\varphi}^2)^\tau|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}} \neq \bar{\varphi}^2|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$  where  $\tau \in G_F \setminus G_K$ . The extension of  $L(\zeta_p)$  cut out by  $\bar{\varphi}^2|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$  is given by adjoining the square roots of  $\alpha$ . If  $L(\zeta_p, \sqrt{\delta})$  is the extension of  $L(\zeta_p)$  cut out by  $\bar{\chi}^2|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$ , where  $\delta$  can be taken to lie inside  $L^\times$ , then we just require that  $(\alpha\delta)^\tau(\alpha\delta)^{-1} \notin (L(\zeta_p)^\times)^2$ . It is then straightforward to choose such an  $\alpha$  which is also a  $w$ -adic unit for every place  $w|p$  of  $K$ .

If  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , choose an odd prime  $l|(p-1)$ . Then by [Bar09, Theorem 3.3] (applied with  $k_2$  greater than the number of rational primes which ramify in  $F$ ) we can find a Galois extension  $N'/\mathbb{Q}$  containing our imaginary quadratic field  $N$  such that

- (3)  $\text{Gal}(N'/\mathbb{Q}) = D_{2l}$  and  $\text{Gal}(N'/N) \cong \mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z}$
- (4)  $p$  is unramified in  $N'$
- (5) there exists a rational prime  $r$  which is unramified in  $K$  and whose ramification index in  $N'$  divisible by  $l$ .

Taking  $M = N' \cdot K$ , we have  $\text{Gal}(M/K) \cong D_{2l}$  with  $\text{Gal}(M/L) \cong \mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z}$  and  $p$  is unramified in  $M$ . Then in either of the above cases let  $\bar{\chi}$  be the character corresponding to  $\text{Gal}(M/L)$ .

**8.3. Modularity when  $p = 5$ .** For now, suppose again that  $K$  is an arbitrary number field and that  $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is a continuous representation of determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ . Let  $V$  denote the underlying  $\mathbb{F}_p$ -vector space of  $\bar{\rho}$  and fix an isomorphism  $\iota_0 : \bigwedge^2 \bar{\rho} \cong \mu_p^\vee$ . Let  $Y_{\bar{\rho}}$  denote the uncompactified moduli space of pairs  $(E, \iota)$  where  $E$  is an elliptic curve and  $\iota : V \xrightarrow{\sim} E[p]^\vee$  satisfies  $\bigwedge^2 \iota = \iota_0$  via the isomorphism  $\bigwedge^2 E[p]^\vee \cong \mu_p^\vee$  coming from the Weil pairing.

Now suppose that  $p = 5$ . The compactified curve  $X_{\bar{\rho}}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{P}^1$  over  $K$  (by the same argument as in [SBT97, Lemma 1.1]). We use this to give a notion of a positive density of a subset of  $X_{\bar{\rho}}(K)$ . For  $v$  a place of  $K$  lying above a place  $w$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$  define the valuation  $\|\cdot\|_v$  to equal  $|\cdot|_v^{|K_v:\mathbb{Q}_w|}$ , where  $|\cdot|_v$  extends the usual absolute value on  $\mathbb{Q}$  defined by  $w$ . Then the absolute height of  $[x_0 : \dots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}^n(K)$  is given by

$$H([x_0 : \dots : x_n]) = \prod_v \max(\|x_0\|_v, \dots, \|x_n\|_v)^{1/|K:\mathbb{Q}|},$$

where the product is over all places of  $K$ . We have the following lemma on the asymptotic behaviour of the number of points of bounded height.

**Lemma 8.14.** *Let  $K$  be a number field of degree  $d$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and let  $\Sigma$  be a finite set of finite places of  $K$ . Consider the subset  $S = \{(\alpha : 1) \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \mid v_w(\alpha) = 0 \text{ for all } w \in \Sigma\}$  of  $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ , where  $v_w$  denotes the valuation corresponding to the place  $w$ . Then there exists a constant  $C_\Sigma > 0$  such that*

$$\#\{P \in S \mid H(P) \leq X\} = C_\Sigma X^{2d} + \begin{cases} O(X^d \log X) & \text{if } d = 1 \\ O(X^{2d-1}) & \text{if } d > 1. \end{cases}$$

where  $H$  is the absolute height on  $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ . An explicit value for  $C_\Sigma$  is given by

$$C_\Sigma = \frac{hR}{w\zeta_K(2)} \gamma_{K,2} \prod_{w \in \Sigma} \frac{(N(\mathfrak{p}_w) - 1)^2}{N(\mathfrak{p}_w)^2 - 1}$$

where

- $h$  is the class number of  $K$
- $R$  is the regulator of  $K$
- $w$  is the number of roots of unity in  $K$
- $\zeta_K$  is the Dedekind zeta function of  $K$
- $\gamma_{K,2} = \frac{(2^{r_1}(2\pi)^{r_2})^2 2^r}{|D_K|}$  where
  - $r_1$  is the number of real embeddings and  $r_2$  is the number of pairs of complex embeddings of  $K$
  - $r = r_1 + r_2 - 1$
  - $D_K$  is the discriminant of  $K$
- $N(\mathfrak{p}_w)$  is the norm of the prime ideal corresponding to  $w$ .

*Proof.* The case where  $\Sigma = \emptyset$  is stated in [Lan13, Chapter 3, Theorem 5.3]. We show how the lemma follows by the same proof of this case, which was due to Schanuel. If  $P = (x_0 : x_1) \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$  with  $x_0, x_1 \in K$  then we let  $\mathfrak{a}_P$  denote the fractional ideal of  $K$  generated by  $x_0, x_1$ . In what follows we say two points in  $K^2$  are equivalent if they differ by an element of  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ . It suffices to show that the same asymptotic, on dividing through by a factor of  $h$ , holds when restricting only to  $P \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$  for which  $\mathfrak{a}_P$  lies in a fixed class in the ideal class group of  $K$ . This is the same as fixing an ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  (which we may assume is prime to the prime ideals defined by the places in  $\Sigma$ ) and counting  $(x_0, x_1) \in \mathfrak{a}^2$  up to equivalence for which  $\mathfrak{a}_P = \mathfrak{a}$ ,  $v_w(x_0) = v_w(x_1) = 0$  and  $H(x_0 : x_1) \leq X$ . Now suppose we have an asymptotic formula with the same order of leading term and same error term for counting pairs  $(x_0, x_1) \in \mathfrak{a}^2$  up to equivalence for which  $v_w(x_0) = v_w(x_1) = 0$  and  $H(x_0 : x_1) \leq X$ . Then by Möbius inversion (see [Lan13, p73] for the  $\Sigma = \emptyset$  case; in our case we can restrict to sums over integral ideals coprime to  $\mathfrak{p}_w$  for  $w \in \Sigma$ ) the same asymptotic will hold for the sum of interest above, but we gain a factor of  $\zeta_K(2)^{-1} \prod_{w \in \Sigma} (1 - N\mathfrak{p}_w^{-2})^{-1}$ .

For  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $w \in \Sigma$  and  $X > 0$ , let

$$A_{i,w,X} = \{(x_0, x_1) \in \mathfrak{a}^2 \mid x_i \in \mathfrak{p}_w, H(x_0 : x_1) \leq X\},$$

viewed as a subset of the set of such pairs whose height is bounded by  $X$  but without any conditions at places in  $\Sigma$ . For  $T \subset \{0, 1\} \times \Sigma$ , the asymptotic behaviour of  $\# \bigcap_{(i,w) \in T} A_{i,w,X}$  can be computed in exactly the same way as the  $T = \emptyset$  computation as in [Sch79, p442], since the size of this intersection is also given by counting the number of lattice points in a homogeneously expanding domain. The formula [Sch79, Thm 2] and the  $T = \emptyset$  computation then gives that

$$\# \bigcap_{(i,w) \in T} A_{i,w,X} = \left( \prod_{(i,w) \in T} N(\mathfrak{p}_w)^{-1} \right) \frac{R\gamma_{K,2}}{w} X^{2d} + \begin{cases} O(X^d \log X) & \text{if } d = 1 \\ O(X^{2d-1}) & \text{if } d > 1. \end{cases}$$

A straightforward application of the inclusion-exclusion principle then yields the result.  $\square$

We state one more fact about  $H$  that will be of repeated use. If  $f : \mathbb{P}_K^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^1$  is an isomorphism over  $K$  then there exists  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  depending only on  $f$  such that for every  $P \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$  we have the inequalities

$$(8.4) \quad C_1 H(P) \leq H(f(P)) \leq C_2 H(P).$$

**Definition 8.15.** Let  $K$  be a number field and let  $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_5)$  be a continuous representation of determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$ . We say a subset  $S \subset X_{\bar{\rho}}(K)$  has positive density if there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for every  $X$  sufficiently large

$$\frac{\#\{P \in S : H(P) \leq X\}}{\#\{P \in X_{\bar{\rho}}(K) : H(P) \leq X\}} \geq C$$

where  $H$  is a height function on  $X_{\bar{\rho}}$  arising from some (equivalently, any by Lemma 8.14 and 8.4) isomorphism  $X_{\bar{\rho}} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$  over  $K$  via the absolute height on  $\mathbb{P}^1$ .

The following lemma provides us with a subset of positive density on this modular curve, which we use to deduce a positive density of modular elliptic curves under certain hypotheses.

**Lemma 8.16.** *Let  $K$  be a number field such that each place  $w|5$  is unramified and every such residue field  $k(w)$  is an extension of  $\mathbb{F}_5$  of degree at most 2. Let  $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_5)$  be a representation of determinant  $\varepsilon^{-1}$  such that for each  $w|5$ ,  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_w}}$  is isomorphic to a direct sum of characters over  $\mathbb{F}_5$ .*

- (1) *There exists non-empty  $p$ -adic open subsets  $\Omega_w \subset X_{\bar{\rho}}(K_w)$  for each place  $w|5$  such that if  $P \in \Omega_w$  then  $E_P$  is an elliptic curve with ordinary good reduction or potentially multiplicative reduction.*
- (2) *Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite set of finite places of  $K$  and let  $\Omega_w \subset X_{\bar{\rho}}(K_w)$  be a non-empty  $p$ -adic open subset for each  $w \in \Sigma$ . Then*

$$\Omega = \{P \in X_{\bar{\rho}}(K) \mid P \in \Omega_w \text{ for every } w \in \Sigma\}$$

*has positive density in the sense of Definition 8.15.*

*Proof.* Let  $w|5$  and write  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_w}} \cong \psi_w \oplus \psi_w^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1}$  with  $\psi_w$  an unramified character of  $G_{K_w}$ , which we can therefore view as a character of  $G_{k(w)}$ . We can find an ordinary elliptic curve  $\tilde{E}$  over  $k(w)$  such that  $\tilde{E}[5](\overline{k(w)})$  is isomorphic, as a  $G_{k(w)}$ -module, to  $\mathbb{F}_5[\psi_w^{-1}]$ . Indeed,  $\psi_w$  has order dividing 4 and there are only 4 possibilities for  $\psi_w$ ; examples are listed in Table 2 below. Here when  $|k(w) : \mathbb{F}_5| = 2$ ,  $\alpha \in k(w) \setminus \mathbb{F}_5$  satisfies  $\alpha^2 + 4\alpha + 2 = 0$ .

TABLE 2. Some ordinary elliptic curves over finite fields of characteristic 5 with specified 5-torsion

$ k(w) : \mathbb{F}_5 $	$\#\psi_w(G_{k(w)})$	$\tilde{E}$
1	1	$y^2 = x^3 + 3x$
1	2	$y^2 = x^3 + 2x$
1	4	$y^2 = x^3 \pm x$
2	1	$y^2 = x^3 + 3x$
2	2	$y^2 = x^3 + x$
2	4	$y^2 = x^3 + \alpha x$
		$y^2 = x^3 + \alpha^3 x$

Now consider the Serre–Tate canonical lifting of  $\tilde{E}$  to an elliptic curve  $\mathcal{E}$  defined over  $\mathcal{O}_{K_w}$ . This has the property that the  $p$ -divisible group of  $\mathcal{E}$  splits as a direct sum of a connected group scheme and an étale group scheme. Letting  $E = \mathcal{E}_{K_w}$ , it therefore follows that the action of  $G_{K_w}$  on  $E[5]^\vee$  is given by a direct sum of characters which must be  $\psi_w$  and  $\psi_w^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1}$ . Thus  $E$  is an elliptic curve over  $K_w$  with ordinary good reduction that defines a point of  $X_{\bar{\rho}}(K_w)$ .

Consider the modular curve  $Y_{\bar{\rho}, \bar{\rho}_E, 7}$  parameterising triples  $(A, \iota, \iota_7)$  where  $A$  is an elliptic curve,  $\iota$  is a symplectic isomorphism between  $A[5]^\vee$  and  $\bar{\rho}$ , and  $\iota_7$  is a symplectic isomorphism between  $A[7]^\vee$  and  $E[7]^\vee$  compatible with the action of Galois. The natural map  $Y_{\bar{\rho}, \bar{\rho}_E, 7} \rightarrow (Y_{\bar{\rho}})_{K_w}$  is étale (since after base change by a separable extension the map defines a  $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_7)$ -torsor). Hence there is an open neighbourhood in the 5-adic topology of the point of  $Y_{\bar{\rho}, \bar{\rho}_E, 7}(K_w)$  defined by  $E$  which is mapped isomorphically onto an open subset  $\Omega_w \subset Y_{\bar{\rho}}(K_w)$  under the map  $Y_{\bar{\rho}, \bar{\rho}_E, 7}(K_w) \rightarrow Y_{\bar{\rho}}(K_w)$ . Let  $P \in \Omega_w$  define an elliptic curve  $A_P$  and suppose that  $A_P$  potentially multiplicative reduction. Then  $A_P$  must in fact have multiplicative reduction over  $K$ , as the quadratic twist of  $A_P$  by a ramified

character cannot have the mod 5 Galois representation of an elliptic curve with split multiplicative reduction. Now suppose instead that  $A_P$  has potentially good reduction. Then since  $A_P[7]$  is unramified as a  $G_{K_w}$ -module, it follows by a variation of the Néron–Ogg–Shafarevich criterion that  $A_P$  has good reduction and the reduction  $\tilde{A}_P$  is ordinary by Lemma 8.10. This shows the first part of the lemma.

For the second part, choose an isomorphism  $f : X_{\bar{\varrho}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{P}^1$  over  $K$  such that  $P \in X_{\bar{\varrho}}(K)$  lies inside each  $\Omega_w$  whenever  $f(P) = (x : 1)$  has  $v_w(x) = 0$  for every  $w \in \Sigma$ . It then follows from Lemma 8.14 that  $\Omega$  has positive density.  $\square$

**Corollary 8.17.** *Let  $F$  be a totally real field in which 5 splits completely and let  $K/F$  be a quadratic extension in which 5 is unramified. There exists representations  $\bar{\varrho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_5)$  which are CM-compositum induced from a character  $\bar{\psi} : G_L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_5^\times$  (see Definition 8.7), where  $L/K$  is a quadratic extension, and  $\bar{\psi}$  satisfies  $(\bar{\psi}^2)^\tau|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}} \neq \bar{\psi}^2|_{G_{L(\zeta_p)}}$  for  $\tau \in G_F \setminus G_K$ . Fix such a representation  $\bar{\varrho}$  and suppose that  $E/K$  is an elliptic curve for which  $\overline{\varrho}_{E,5} \cong \bar{\varrho}$  and that  $E$  has ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every  $w|5$ . Then  $E$  is modular. Moreover, the subset of  $X_{\bar{\varrho}}(K)$  given by such elliptic curves which in addition do not have complex multiplication nor have  $j$ -invariant contained in a proper subfield of  $K$  is of positive density (in the sense of Definition 8.15).*

*Proof.* Such representations  $\bar{\varrho}$  were constructed in Example 8.13. A point  $P \in Y_{\bar{\varrho}}(K)$  for which  $E_P$  has ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction at every  $w|5$  is modular by (the proofs of) Theorem 8.6, Lemma 8.12 and Proposition 8.8.

We now turn our attention to the positive density statement. Note that only finitely many points  $P \in Y_{\bar{\varrho}}(K)$  correspond to a CM elliptic curve  $E_P$ . Indeed, there are only finitely many possible values of  $j(E_P) \in K$  and if  $Q \in Y_{\bar{\varrho}}(K)$  satisfies  $j(E_P) = j(E_Q)$  then  $E_Q$  is a twist of  $E_P$  which must be equal to  $E_P$  since  $\overline{\varrho}_{E_P,5} \cong \overline{\varrho}_{E_Q,5}$ . Thus we can ignore the existence of CM elliptic curves in showing the density statement.

Now let  $l \neq 5$  be a prime number that splits completely in  $K$ . For each place  $v$  of  $K$  above  $l$  we can find non-empty  $l$ -adic open subsets  $\Omega_v \subset X_{\bar{\varrho}}(K_v)$  whose images under the  $j$ -invariant,  $j(\Omega_v) \subset \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_l)$ , are pairwise disjoint. We can therefore find a positive density subset  $\Omega \subset X_{\bar{\varrho}}(K)$  such that each point  $P \in \Omega$  defines an elliptic curve with ordinary good reduction or multiplicative reduction and whose image in  $X_{\bar{\varrho}}(K_v)$  lies in  $\Omega_v$  for each  $v|l$  by Lemma 8.16 (which we may apply by Proposition 8.8). We are done, since the elliptic curves corresponding to points of  $\Omega$  cannot have  $j$ -invariant contained in a proper subfield of  $K$  and were already shown to be modular. (One can also show further that the set of elliptic curves arising from points of  $X_{\bar{\varrho}}(K)$  whose  $j$ -invariant is contained inside a proper subfield of  $K$  is of density zero, but we have not done so since it makes no difference for the purpose of this corollary.)  $\square$

## APPENDIX A.

In this appendix we record the output of computations carried out in the computer algebra software magma, as explained in Section 4.3.



TABLE 3. Conjugacy classes of absolutely  $GL_4$ -irreducible subgroups  $\Gamma \leq Sp_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$  which are not  $Sp_4$ -adequate

$p$	$\#\Gamma$	Label	$h^1(\Gamma, \mathfrak{sp}_4)$	$h^1(\Gamma, \mathbb{F}_p)$	ID
3	96	$D_4.A_4$	0	1	96,202
3	96	$SL(2, 3).C_2^2$	1	0	96,191
3	240	$C_2.S_5$	1	0	240,89
3	384	$Q_8^2.C_6$	0	1	384,618
3	1440	$C_2.A_6.C_2$	1	0	1440,4591
3	1152	$C_2^2.A_4 \text{ wr } C_2$	0	1	
5	160	$(C_4.C_2^3) : C_5$	0	1	160, 199
5	480	$D_4.A_5$	1	0	480,957
5	480	$(C_2 \times SL(2, 5)) : C_2$	1	0	480,953
5	720	$S_3 \times SL(2, 5)$	1	0	720,417
5	28800	$C_2^2.A_5^2.C_2$	1	0	

TABLE 4. Conjugacy classes of subgroups  $\Gamma' \leq GSp_4(\mathbb{F}_3)$  with  $\nu(\Gamma') \neq 1$  for which  $\Gamma = \Gamma' \cap Sp_4(\mathbb{F}_3)$  is absolutely  $GL_4$ -irreducible

$\#\Gamma'$	$\#\Gamma$	(A)	(B)	$h^1(\Gamma, \mathfrak{sp}_4)$	$h^1(\Gamma, \mathbb{F}_3)$	Adequate	Tidy	Induced	Split-induced
64	32	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
64	32	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
64	32	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
64	32	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
80	40	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
128	64	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
128	64	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
128	64	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
128	64	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
192	96	TRUE	FALSE	1	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
192	96	TRUE	FALSE	0	1	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
192	96	TRUE	FALSE	1	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
192	96	TRUE	FALSE	0	1	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
192	96	TRUE	FALSE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
256	128	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
384	192	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
480	240	TRUE	TRUE	1	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
480	240	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
640	320	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
768	384	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
768	384	TRUE	TRUE	0	1	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2304	1152	TRUE	TRUE	0	1	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2880	1440	TRUE	TRUE	1	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
3840	1920	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
103680	51840	TRUE	TRUE	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE

REFERENCES

[AKT21] Patrick B. Allen, Chandrashekar B. Khare, and Jack A. Thorne. Modularity of  $PGL_2(F_p)$ -representations over totally real fields. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(33), 2021.

- [Bal12] S. Balaji. G-valued Potentially Semi-stable Deformation Rings. University of Chicago, Division of the Physical Sciences, Department of Mathematics, 2012.
- [Bar09] Alex Bartel. Large Selmer groups over number fields. Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, 148(1):73–86, Jul 2009.
- [BC20] Alexis Bouthier and Kestutis Cesnavicius. Torsors on loop groups and the Hitchin fibration. Annales Scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure, 2020.
- [BCGP21] George Boxer, Frank Calegari, Toby Gee, and Vincent Pilloni. Abelian surfaces over totally real fields are potentially modular. Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS, pages 1–349, 2021.
- [BHKT19] Gebhard Böckle, Michael Harris, Chandrashekhara Khare, and Jack A. Thorne.  $\hat{G}$ -local systems on smooth projective curves are potentially automorphic. Acta Mathematica, Volume 223 (2019)(1):1–111, 2019.
- [BK98] CJ Bushnell and PC Kutzko. Smooth representations of reductive  $p$ -adic groups: structure theory via types. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 77(3):582–634, 1998.
- [BLGG13] Thomas Barnet-Lamb, Toby Gee, and David Geraghty. Congruences between Hilbert modular forms: Constructing ordinary lifts, II. Mathematical Research Letters, 20:67–72, 2013.
- [Bor91] A. Borel. Linear Algebraic Groups. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 1991.
- [BT72] François Bruhat and Jacques Tits. Groupes réductifs sur un corps local : I. Données radicielles valuées. Publications Mathématiques de l'IHÉS, 41:5–251, 1972.
- [BZ77] I. N. Bernstein and Andrei Zelevinsky. Induced representations of reductive  $p$ -adic groups. i. Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure, Ser. 4, 10(4):441–472, 1977.
- [Car79] P. Cartier. Representations of  $p$ -adic groups: a survey. In Automorphic forms, representations and  $L$ -functions (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Oregon State Univ., Corvallis, Ore., 1977), Part 1, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., XXXIII, pages 111–155. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1979.
- [Car85] R.W. Carter. Finite Groups of Lie Type: Conjugacy Classes and Complex Characters. Pure and Applied Mathematics Series. John Wiley & Sons, 1985.
- [CGP15] B. Conrad, O. Gabber, and G. Prasad. Pseudo-reductive Groups. New Mathematical Monographs. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [CHT08] Laurent Clozel, Michael Harris, and Richard Taylor. Automorphy for some  $l$ -adic lifts of automorphic mod  $l$  Galois representations. Publications Mathématiques de l'IHÉS, 108:1–181, 2008.
- [Con14] Brian Conrad. Reductive group schemes. Autour des schémas en groupes, 1:93–444, 2014.
- [CSS13] Gary Cornell, Joseph H Silverman, and Glenn Stevens. Modular forms and Fermat's last theorem. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [CT14] Laurent Clozel and Jack A Thorne. Level-raising and symmetric power functoriality, I. Compositio Mathematica, 150(5):729–748, 2014.
- [DDT95] Henri Darmon, Fred Diamond, and Richard Taylor. Fermat's last theorem. Current developments in mathematics, 1995(1):1–154, 1995.
- [DG70] M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck. Schemas en Groupes. Seminaire de Geometrie Algebrique du Bois Marie 1962/64 (SGA 3). Springer-Verlag,

- 1970.
- [DT94] Fred Diamond and Richard Taylor. Lifting modular  $\text{mod } \ell$  representations. Duke Mathematical Journal, 74(2):253 – 269, 1994.
- [GG06] Wee Gan and Nadya Gurevich. Nontempered A-packets of  $G_2$ : Liftings from  $SL_2$ . American Journal of Mathematics, 128:1105–1185, 10 2006.
- [GH11] Robert Guralnick, Florian Herzig, Richard Taylor, and Jack Thorne. Adequate subgroups. J. Inst. Math. Jussieu, 11, 07 2011.
- [Gro60] Alexander Grothendieck. Technique de descente et théorèmes d’existence en géométrie algébriques. II. Le théorème d’existence en théorie formelle des modules. In Séminaire Bourbaki : années 1958/59 - 1959/60, exposés 169-204, number 5 in Séminaire Bourbaki. Société mathématique de France, 1960. talk:195.
- [GT10] Wee Gan and Shuichiro Takeda. Theta correspondences for  $GSp(4)$ . Representation Theory of the American Mathematical Society, 15, 06 2010.
- [GT11] Wee Teck Gan and Shuichiro Takeda. The local Langlands conjecture for  $GSp(4)$ . Annals of Mathematics, 173(3):1841–1882, 2011.
- [Her13] Sebastian Herpel. On the smoothness of centralizers in reductive groups. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 365(7):3753–3774, 2013.
- [HKP10] Thomas Haines, Robert Kottwitz, and Amritanshu Prasad. Iwahori-Hecke Algebras. Journal of the Ramanujan Mathematical Society, 25, No 2:113–145, 2010.
- [29] Marty (<https://mathoverflow.net/users/3545/marty>). Fixed points of the weyl group action on a maximal torus and the center of a reductive group. Math-Overflow, 2018. URL:<https://mathoverflow.net/q/307885> (version: 2018-08-09).
- [Hum11] J.E. Humphreys. Conjugacy Classes in Semisimple Algebraic Groups. Conjugacy Classes in Semisimple Algebraic Groups. American Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [Lan13] Serge Lang. Fundamentals of Diophantine geometry. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [LR13] Álvaro Lozano-Robledo. On the field of definition of  $p$ -torsion points on elliptic curves over the rationals. Mathematische Annalen, 357(1):279–305, 2013.
- [Lus89] George Lusztig. Affine Hecke Algebras and Their Graded Version. Journal of the American Mathematical Society, 2(3):599–635, 1989.
- [Maz89] Barry Mazur. Deforming Galois representations. In Galois Groups over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , pages 385–437. Springer, 1989.
- [Mil06] James S Milne. Arithmetic duality theorems. Citeseer, 2006.
- [Mok14] Chung Pang Mok. Galois representations attached to automorphic forms on  $GL_2$  over CM fields. Compositio Mathematica, 150(4):523–567, 2014.
- [NSW13] Jürgen Neukirch, Alexander Schmidt, and Kay Wingberg. Cohomology of number fields, volume 323. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Pat15] Stefan Patrikis. Deformations of Galois representations and exceptional monodromy. Inventiones mathematicae, 205(2):269–336, Nov 2015.
- [Pat19] Stefan Patrikis. Variations on a theorem of Tate, volume 258. American Mathematical Society, 2019.
- [Ric88] R. W. Richardson. Conjugacy classes of  $n$ -tuples in Lie algebras and algebraic groups. Duke Mathematical Journal, 57:1–35, 1988.

- [RS07] B. Roberts and R. Schmidt. Local Newforms for  $\mathrm{GSp}(4)$ . Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [SBT97] Nicholas I Shepherd-Barron and Richard Taylor. Mod 2 and mod 5 icosahedral representations. Journal of the American Mathematical Society, pages 283–298, 1997.
- [Sch79] Stephen Hoel Schanuel. Heights in number fields. Bulletin de la Société mathématique de France, 107:433–449, 1979.
- [Sch05] Ralf Schmidt. Iwahori-spherical representations of  $\mathrm{GSp}(4)$  and Siegel modular forms of degree 2 with square-free level. Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan, 57(1):259 – 293, 2005.
- [Sil09] Joseph H Silverman. The arithmetic of elliptic curves, volume 106. Springer, 2009.
- [Sta22] The Stacks project authors. The stacks project. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2022.
- [Tho12] Jack A. Thorne. On the automorphy of  $l$ -adic Galois representations with small residual image with an appendix by Robert Guralnick, Florian Herzig, Richard Taylor and Jack Thorne. Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu, 11(4):855–920, 2012.
- [Tho22] Jack A. Thorne. On the vanishing of adjoint Bloch–Kato Selmer groups of irreducible automorphic Galois representations (preprint). 2022.
- [Vig05] Marie-France Vignéras. Pro- $p$ -Iwahori Hecke ring and supersingular  $\bar{F}_p$ -representations. Mathematische Annalen, 331:523–556, 03 2005.