

On the mod p cohomology for GL_2

Yitong Wang

September 21, 2022

Abstract

Let p be a prime number and F a totally real number field unramified at places above p . Let $\bar{\tau} : \text{Gal}(\bar{F}/F) \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ be a modular Galois representation which satisfies the Taylor-Wiles hypothesis and some technical genericity assumptions. For v a fixed place of F above p , we prove that many of the admissible smooth representations of $\text{GL}_2(F_v)$ over $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ associated to $\bar{\tau}$ in the corresponding Hecke-eigenspaces of the mod p cohomology have Gelfand–Kirillov dimension $[F_v : \mathbb{Q}_p]$. This builds on and extends the work of [BHH⁺] and [HW22], giving a unified proof in all cases ($\bar{\tau}$ either semisimple or not at v).

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	The main results	2
1.2	Organization of the article	7
1.3	Notation	7
1.4	Acknowledgement	8
2	Preliminaries	8
2.1	Group theoretic preliminaries	8
2.2	Tame inertial types	11
2.3	Extension graph	13
3	Kisin modules	15
3.1	Kisin modules with tame descent data	15
3.2	Gauge bases	18
3.3	Étale φ -modules	20
4	Galois deformation rings	21
4.1	Setup	21
4.2	Single type Galois deformation rings	25
4.3	Multi-type Galois deformation rings	27

5	Gelfand-Kirillov dimension and representations of GL_2	39
6	Global applications	41
6.1	Patching functors	41
6.2	Freeness for projective envelopes	43
6.3	Global results	46

1 Introduction

Let p be a prime number. The mod p Langlands correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is completely known by the work of [Bre03], [Col10], etc. However, the situation becomes much more complicated when we consider $\mathrm{GL}_2(L)$ for L a nontrivial finite extension of \mathbb{Q}_p . For example, there are many more irreducible admissible smooth representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(L)$ over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ and we don't have a classification of these representations ([BP12]).

Motivated by the local-global compatibility results of Emerton ([Eme11]), we study the representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(L)$ that come from geometry and hope that these representations can realize a mod p Langlands correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_2(L)$.

1.1 The main results

We begin with the global setup.

Let F be a totally real number field which is unramified at places above p . Let D be a quaternion algebra with center F which is split at places above p and at exactly one infinite place. Let \mathbb{F} be a sufficiently large finite extension of \mathbb{F}_p , which is considered as the coefficient field.

For each compact open subgroup V of $(D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^\infty)^\times$, we denote by X_V the associated smooth projective Shimura curve over F . Let v be a fixed place of F above p . Let F_v be the completion of F at v and $f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [F_v : \mathbb{Q}_p]$. We define an admissible smooth representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ over \mathbb{F} of the form

$$\pi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ V_v}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{F}/F)}(\overline{\tau}, H_{\text{ét}}^1(X_{V^v V_v} \times_F \overline{F}, \mathbb{F})), \tag{1}$$

where V^v is a fixed compact open subgroup of $(D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^{\infty, v})^\times$, the inductive limit runs over compact open subgroups V_v of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$, and $\overline{\tau} : \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{F}/F) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ is a continuous absolutely irreducible representation such that $\pi \neq 0$.

One of the aims of the mod p Langlands program is to understand these representations. In the case $F = \mathbb{Q}$ and $D = \mathrm{M}_2(\mathbb{Q})$, the representations π of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ are well-understood by [Eme11] and they realize a local mod p Langlands correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. However as soon as $F_v \neq \mathbb{Q}_p$, the representations π of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ are far from being known, though there have been several results on various invariant subspaces attached to these representations π ([EGS15], [Le19], etc.). In this work, we go one step further and show that under some genericity assumptions the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of π equals to f .

To state the main theorem, we recall the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension (see [BHH⁺, Introduction]). Let $K_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 + pM_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v}) \subseteq \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ and Z_1 be the center of K_1 . Let $\mathbb{F}[[K_1/Z_1]]$ be the Iwasawa algebra of K_1/Z_1 . We define the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of π to be

$$\dim_{\text{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 3f - \min \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{F}[[K_1/Z_1]]}^i(\pi^\vee, \mathbb{F}[[K_1/Z_1]]) \neq 0\},$$

where $\pi^\vee \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}(\pi, \mathbb{F})$ is the algebraic dual of π .

Let I_{F_v} be the inertia subgroup of F_v . Let k' be the quadratic extension of the residue field of F_v and fix an embedding $k' \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$. Let $\omega_{f'}$ be the corresponding Serre's fundamental character of level f' for $f' \in \{f, 2f\}$. We make the following assumptions on $\bar{\tau}$ (see §6.1):

- (i) $\bar{\tau}|_{G_F(\sqrt{1})}$ is absolutely irreducible;
- (ii) for $w \nmid p$ such that either D or $\bar{\tau}$ ramifies, the framed deformation ring $R_{\bar{\tau}_w}$ of $\bar{\tau}_w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\tau}|_{\text{Gal}(\bar{F}_w/F_w)}$ over the Witt vectors $W(\mathbb{F})$ is formally smooth;
- (iii) for $w \mid p$, $\bar{\tau}|_{I_{F_w}}$ is generic in the sense of [BP12];
- (iv) $\bar{\tau}|_{I_{F_v}}$ is of one of the following forms up to twist:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} & \begin{pmatrix} \omega_f^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & & * \\ & 0 & 1 \\ & & & \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } 12 \leq r_i \leq p-15, \\ \text{(b)} & \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{2f}^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & & & 0 \\ & 0 & & \omega_{2f}^{p^f \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} \\ & & & & \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } 13 \leq r_0 \leq p-14 \text{ and } 12 \leq r_i \leq p-15 \text{ for } \\ & i > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1 (Corollary 6.3.1 (iv)). *Keep all the above assumptions on $F, D, \bar{\tau}$. Let $V^v = \prod_{w \neq v} V_w$ with $V_w = \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ if neither D nor $\bar{\tau}$ ramifies at w , and $V_w \subseteq 1 + pM_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ is normal in $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ if $w \mid p$ and $w \neq v$. Then for π as in (1) we have $\dim_{\text{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi) = f$.*

Theorem 1.1 is proved by [BHH⁺, Thm. 1.1] when $\bar{\tau}$ is semisimple at v and is proved by [HW22, Thm. 1.1] in the ‘‘minimal’’ case (i.e. $\pi = \pi_v^D(\bar{\tau})$, see [HW22, Introduction]) when $\bar{\tau}$ is non-semisimple at v . So the new case of Theorem 1.1 is that we allow arbitrary π when $\bar{\tau}$ is non-semisimple at v . We adapt the method of [BHH⁺] to the non-semisimple case. This provides a uniform proof of Theorem 1.1.

Now we briefly review the arguments of [BHH⁺] and indicate what need to be changed in the non-semisimple case. We follow closely [BHH⁺, Introduction] to which we refer the reader for more details.

First, by dévissage, we can replace π by

$$\pi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varinjlim_{V_v} \text{Hom}_{\prod_{\substack{w \mid p \\ w \neq v}} \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})} \left(\bigotimes_{\substack{w \mid p \\ w \neq v}} \sigma_w, \text{Hom}_{G_F}(\bar{\tau}, H_{\text{ét}}^1(X_{V^v V_v} \times_F \bar{F}, \mathbb{F})) \right), \quad (2)$$

where, for $w \mid p$ and $w \neq v$, σ_w is any Serre weight in the set $W(\bar{\tau}_w^\vee)$ of [BDJ10, §3] and $V_w \subseteq 1 + pM_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ is normal in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$, and where V_{w_1} is sufficiently small at a nice place w_1 where nothing ramifies. It follows from the arguments of Gee and Newton in [GN20, Appendix A] that we have $\dim_{\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi) \geq f$. It is therefore enough to prove the upper bound $\dim_{\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi) \leq f$ for π as in (2).

Let $I \subset K$ be the subgroup of upper triangular matrices modulo p and $I_1 \subset I$ be the subgroup of upper unipotent matrices modulo p . We denote by $D_1(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ the finite dimensional representation of I over \mathbb{F} defined in [BP12, §13]. We denote by \mathfrak{m}_{K_1} the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{F}[[K_1/Z_1]]$. In order to get the above upper bound on $\dim_{\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi)$, we need to apply the following representation-theoretic theorem to π as in (2).

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 5.3). *Let π be an admissible smooth representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ over \mathbb{F} with a central character. Assume that:*

- (i) *we have $\mathrm{JH}(\mathrm{soc}_K(\pi)) = W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ up to multiplicity,*
- (ii) *for each $\sigma \in W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$, we have $[\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2]|_K : \sigma] = [\mathrm{soc}_K \pi : \sigma]$,*
- (iii) *we have $\mathrm{JH}(\pi^{I_1}) = \mathrm{JH}(D_1(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee))$ up to multiplicity (as I -representations).*

Then $\dim_{\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi) \leq f$. Here “JH” means the set of Jordan-Hölder factors.

In the semisimple case, Theorem 1.2 is exactly [BHH⁺, Thm. 6.4.7]. In the non-semisimple case, Theorem 1.2 is also known in the “minimal” case (combining [HW22, Prop. 4.20] and [BHH⁺, Prop. 6.4.6]). We combine the arguments of [BHH⁺] and results of [HW22] to treat the general case.

Now we need to show that the representations π of (2) satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.2. The conditions (i) and (iii) are already familiar (see e.g. [EGS15],[Le19]) and are not difficult to prove. We will focus on the condition (ii) of Theorem 1.2, which is the hardest one. We need to prove that for each $\sigma \in W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_K(\sigma, \pi) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_K(\mathrm{Proj}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \sigma, \pi), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathrm{Proj}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \sigma$ is the projective envelope of σ in the category of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ -modules and $\tilde{\Gamma} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbb{F}[[K/Z_1]]/\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2$.

We use the patching functor defined by Emerton-Gee-Savitt ([EGS15]) building on the work of Taylor-Wiles and of Kisin. It is an exact functor M_∞ from continuous representations of K over finite type $W(\mathbb{F})$ -modules to finite type R_∞ -modules with additional properties, where R_∞ is the patched deformation ring (see [EGS15] and §6.1 for a precise statement). This functor enables us to transfer statements from the GL_2 -side to the Galois-side, where it turns out they can be proven.

Using the patching functor, proving (3) is equivalent to proving that for each $\sigma \in W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ we have

$$M_\infty(\mathrm{Proj}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \sigma)/\mathfrak{m}_\infty \xrightarrow{\sim} M_\infty(\sigma)/\mathfrak{m}_\infty \quad (4)$$

as \mathbb{F} -vector spaces, where \mathfrak{m}_∞ is the maximal ideal of R_∞ .

Define $\Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{GL}_2(k)$, where k is the residue field of F_v . For σ a Serre weight, we let $P_\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Proj}_\Gamma \sigma$ be the projective envelope of σ in the category of $\mathbb{F}[\Gamma]$ -modules and \tilde{P}_σ be the projective $\mathcal{O}[\Gamma]$ -module lifting P_σ .

We fix $\sigma_v \in W(\bar{r}_v^\vee)$. To prove (4) for σ_v , we lift the $\tilde{\Gamma}$ -module $\text{Proj}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \sigma_v$ over \mathbb{F} to characteristic zero following [BHH⁺, §7.3] as follows (see §6.2 for more details): We define $L_{-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{P}_{\sigma_v}$ and $R_{2,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{Sym}^2 W(\mathbb{F})^2 \otimes \det^{-1})^{(j)} \otimes_{W(\mathbb{F})} \tilde{P}_{\sigma_v}$ for each $j = 0, \dots, f-1$, where “(j)” means that the matrices of K act via the j -th embedding $\sigma_0 \circ \varphi^j : \mathcal{O}_{F_v} \hookrightarrow W(\mathbb{F})$. For each j there is an isomorphism

$$R_{2,j}/pR_{2,j} \cong P_{\sigma_v} \oplus P_{\sigma_{v_j^+}} \oplus P_{\sigma_{v_j^-}}$$

for some Serre weights $\sigma_{v_j^+}$ and $\sigma_{v_j^-}$, which induces an inclusion

$$\iota_j : P_{\sigma_v} \hookrightarrow R_{2,j}/pR_{2,j}.$$

Then we define a K -lattice $R'_{2,j}$ in $R_{2,j}[1/p]$ by

$$R'_{2,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{\sigma_v} \times_{R_{2,j}/p} R_{2,j} = \{x \in R_{2,j} : (x \bmod pR_{2,j}) \in \iota_j(R_{\sigma_v})\}.$$

We also define a K -lattice L_j in $L_{-1}[1/p] \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j'=0}^j R_{2,j'}[1/p] \right)$ by

$$L_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (x, (x_{j'})_{0 \leq j' \leq j}) \in L_{-1} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j'=0}^j R_{2,j'} \right) : \begin{aligned} &(x_{j'} \bmod pR_{2,j'}) = (x \bmod pL_{-1}) \\ &\text{via } \iota_{j'} : L_{-1}/pL_{-1} \hookrightarrow R_{2,j'}/pR_{2,j'} \quad \forall 0 \leq j' \leq j \end{aligned} \right\},$$

which is equivalent to defining

$$L_j = L_{j-1} \times_{P_{\sigma_v}} R'_{2,j} \tag{5}$$

for each $0 \leq j \leq f-1$. We define $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_{f-1}$. Then we have $R/pR \cong \text{Proj}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \sigma_v$.

Now the equality (4) for σ_v is a consequence of the following statements: there exists an integer $r \geq 1$ such that

- (i) $M_\infty(\sigma_v)$ is free of rank r over $\text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(\sigma_v))$;
- (ii) $M_\infty(\tilde{P}_{\sigma_v})$ is free of rank r over $\text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(\tilde{P}_{\sigma_v}))$;
- (iii) $M_\infty(R'_{2,j})$ is free of rank r over $\text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(R'_{2,j}))$;
- (iv) $M_\infty(R)$ is free of rank r over $\text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(R))$.

Statement (i) is proved in [BHH⁺, Prop. 8.2.3] in the semisimple case building on [EGS15, §10] and can be easily generalized to the non-semisimple case (see Proposition 6.2.1). Statement (ii) is proved in the case $r = 1$ by [Le19, Thm. 4.9]. We generalize the arguments of *loc.cit.* to arbitrary r (see Proposition 6.2.3). Statement (iii) is proved in [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.3.4] in the semisimple case using the standard dévissage techniques as in [EGS15, §10] and [Le19, Lemma 4.5], and can be easily generalized to the general case (see Proposition 6.2.4 (i)).

Finally we turn to the statement (iv), which is the most subtle and the most technical part of the proof. One can use (5) and the results (ii), (iii) to prove (iv) by induction. For simplicity we only talk about the first step of the induction. By exactness of the functor M_∞ , we have the equality

$$M_\infty(L_0) = M_\infty(\tilde{P}_{\sigma_v}) \times_{M_\infty(P_{\sigma_v})} M_\infty(R'_{2,0}). \quad (6)$$

We already know the freeness of each factor on the right-hand side of (6) by (ii) and (iii). To show that $M_\infty(L_0)$ is free of rank r over $\text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(L_0))$, it suffices to show that

$$\text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(P_{\sigma_v})) = \text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(\tilde{P}_{\sigma_v})) + \text{Ann}_{R_\infty}(M_\infty(R'_{2,0})). \quad (7)$$

Each term of (7) has an interpretation as a certain deformation space of Galois representations. Let $R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee}$ be the universal framed deformation ring of $\bar{\tau}_v^\vee$. Let τ be a tame inertial type. Let $R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee}^{(1,0),\tau}$, resp. $R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee}^{(2,-1)_0,\tau}$, be the maximal reduced, \mathcal{O} -flat quotient of $R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee}$ that parametrizes potentially crystalline lifts of $\bar{\tau}_v^\vee$ of inertial type τ and parallel Hodge–Tate weights $(1,0)$, resp. Hodge–Tate weights $(2,-1)$ in the embedding $\sigma_0 : F_v \hookrightarrow W(\mathbb{F})[1/p]$ and $(1,0)$ elsewhere. Let $\mathfrak{p}_\tau^{(1,0)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \ker(R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee} \rightarrow R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee}^{(1,0),\tau})$ and $\mathfrak{p}_\tau^{(2,-1)_0} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \ker(R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee} \rightarrow R_{\bar{\tau}_v^\vee}^{(2,-1)_0,\tau})$. By some detour (see [BHH⁺, Introduction] for more details), to prove (7), we are reduced to the proof of the following subtle (non-)congruence properties.

Theorem 1.3 (Proposition 4.3.3). *We have*

$$p \in \cap_\tau \mathfrak{p}_\tau^{(1,0)} + \mathfrak{p}_{\tau_0}^{(2,-1)_0},$$

where τ runs over the tame inertial types such that σ is a Jordan–Hölder factor in the mod p semisimplification of $\sigma(\tau)$ (here $\sigma(\tau)$ is the irreducible smooth representation of K associated by Henniart to τ in the appendix to [BM02]), and τ_0 is any tame inertial type such that the set of irreducible constituents of the mod p semisimplification of $\sigma(\tau_0)$ contains the set $W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ (which exists).

When $\bar{\tau}_v$ is semisimple, Theorem 1.3 is proved in [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.3] by an explicit computation of potentially crystalline deformation rings using the machinery of Kisin modules developed in [LLHLM18] and [LLHL19] (see §3). We generalize the computation of potentially crystalline deformation rings to the non-semisimple case. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

As a byproduct of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we can determine the structure of the $\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2$ -torsion part of the representation π in (2), the semisimple case being proved in [BHH⁺, Thm. 1.9].

Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 6.3.1 (ii)). *Let π be as in (2) and $r \geq 1$ as above. We have*

$$\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2] \cong (\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee))^{\oplus r},$$

where $\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ is certain finite-dimensional $\tilde{\Gamma}$ -representation over \mathbb{F} defined in §5. In particular, each irreducible constituent of $\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2]$ has multiplicity r .

Finally we mention one application of the main result: the existence of many admissible unitary Banach representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ lifting π (for π as in (2)). There exists an R_∞ -module \mathbb{M}_∞ with an R_∞ -linear action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ defined in [CEG⁺16, §2.8] such that $\mathbb{M}_\infty/\mathfrak{m}_\infty \cong \pi^\vee$. We have the following theorem, which is known in the semisimple case by [BHH⁺, Thm. 1.3], and is known in the non-semisimple “minimal” case by [HW22, Thm. 1.5].

Theorem 1.5 (Corollary 6.3.1 (iii)). *Let $x : R_\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{O}'$ be any homomorphism of local $W(\mathbb{F})$ -algebras, where \mathcal{O}' is the ring of integers of a finite extension E' of E , and set*

$$V(x) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}'}^{\mathrm{cont}}(\mathbb{M}_\infty \otimes_{R_\infty, x} \mathcal{O}', E').$$

*Then $V(x)$ is a **nonzero** admissible unitary Banach representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ over E' with a $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ -invariant unit ball (given by $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}'}^{\mathrm{cont}}(\mathbb{M}_\infty \otimes_{R_\infty, x} \mathcal{O}', \mathcal{O}')$) lifting $\pi \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$, where \mathbb{F}' is the residue field of \mathcal{O}' .*

1.2 Organization of the article

In §2, we recall the preliminary notions and results on algebraic groups, tame inertial types and extension graphs. In §3, we recall the machinery of Kisin modules. In §4, we use the machinery of Kisin modules to compute explicitly the potentially crystalline deformation rings and prove Theorem 1.3. In §5, we recall the notion of Gelfand-Kirillov dimension and prove Theorem 1.2. In §6 we combine all the previous results and prove Theorem 1.1.

1.3 Notation

If F is any field, we denote by $G_F \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{F}/F)$ the absolute Galois group of F , where \overline{F} is a separable closure of F . If F is a local field, let I_F be the inertia subgroup of G_F and $W_F \subset G_F$ be the Weil group. We normalize Artin’s reciprocity map $\mathrm{Art}_F : F^\times \xrightarrow{\sim} W_F^{\mathrm{ab}}$ so that uniformizers are sent to geometric Frobenius elements, which are elements of G_F that induce the geometric Frobenius map on the residue field of F . If F is a number field and v is a place of F , then we write F_v for the completion of F with respect to the place v , and if v is a finite place we write \mathcal{O}_{F_v} for the ring of integers of F_v , Frob_v for an arbitrary geometric Frobenius element at v and k_v for the residue field of \mathcal{O}_{F_v} . We also denote by \mathbb{A}_F^\times the set of finite adèles of F . If F is a perfect field in characteristic p , we denote $W(F)$ the ring of Witt vectors of F .

We fix an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ of \mathbb{Q} . All number fields are considered as subfields of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. For each prime number ℓ , we fix an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}$ of \mathbb{Q}_ℓ as well as an embedding $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}$. All finite extensions of \mathbb{Q}_ℓ are considered as subfields of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}$.

Let p be a fixed prime number. We write $\varepsilon : G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$ for the cyclotomic character, ω its mod p reduction and $\tilde{\omega}$ the Teichmüller lift of ω .

We let E be a finite extension of \mathbb{Q}_p with ring of integers \mathcal{O} , uniformizer ϖ and residue field \mathbb{F} . We always assume that E is large enough.

We let K be an unramified extension of \mathbb{Q}_p of degree f with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K and residue field k . We fix an embedding $\sigma_0 : k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$ and we let $\sigma_j \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sigma_0 \circ \varphi^j$, where $\varphi : x \mapsto x^p$ is the

arithmetic Frobenius on k . We still use σ_j to denote the corresponding embedding $K \hookrightarrow E$. We have an identification of $\mathcal{J} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Hom}(k, \mathbb{F})$ with $\text{Hom}(K, E)$ and with $\{0, \dots, f-1\}$ given by $\sigma_j \leftrightarrow j$. We also identify \mathcal{J} with the quotient $\mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z}$ in the evident way so that the addition and subtraction in \mathcal{J} are modulo f .

If G is a group and V is a representation of G on a finite-dimensional E -vector space we denote by \overline{V} the semisimplification of a G -stable \mathcal{O} -lattice in V . If V is a representation of G on a finite-dimensional vector space, we let $\text{JH}(V)$ denote the set of Jordan–Hölder factors of V . If σ is an irreducible representation of G , we let $[V : \sigma]$ be the multiplicity of σ in the semisimplification of V .

For each commutative ring A and $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in A^n$, we write $\text{Diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for the diagonal matrix in $M_n(A)$ whose i -th diagonal entry is x_i . If $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $x \in A$, then we write x^μ for the diagonal matrix $\text{Diag}(x^{\mu_1}, \dots, x^{\mu_n}) \in M_n(A)$. If $M \in \text{GL}_n(A)$ and $N \in M_n(A)$ we define $\text{Ad}(M)(N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} MNM^{-1}$. If $s \in S_n$ is a permutation, we let \dot{s} denote the associated permutation matrix, which we also denote by s when there is no possible confusion. We let $\text{sgn}(s) \in \{\pm 1\}$ be the signature of s .

If $h : A \rightarrow B$ is a ring homomorphism and M is an A -module, we define the B -module $h^*(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \otimes_A B$.

1.4 Acknowledgement

The author is extremely grateful to his advisor Christophe Breuil for suggesting this problem and to his advisors Christophe Breuil and Ariane Mézard for helpful discussions. The author also thanks Stefano Morra for answering many questions on computing Galois deformation rings.

The author thanks the École Normale Supérieure and the Université Paris-Saclay for their support.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we give the preliminary notions and results that we will use. We follow closely [BHH⁺, §2].

2.1 Group theoretic preliminaries

In this subsection we review some notions related to algebraic groups that we will use.

We consider the algebraic group GL_n defined over \mathbb{Z} . Let $T \subseteq \text{GL}_n$ be the diagonal maximal torus and $Z \subseteq \text{GL}_n$ be the center. We write R (resp. R^\vee) for the set of roots (resp. coroots) of (GL_n, T) and W for its Weyl group with longest element \mathbf{w} . Let $R^+ \subseteq R$ be the subset of positive roots with respect to the upper triangular Borel. We identify the set of characters $X^*(T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m)$ with \mathbb{Z}^n in the standard way.

Example 2.1.1. If $n = 2$, then $W = S_2$, \mathfrak{w} is the nontrivial element of S_2 and $R^+ = \{\alpha\}$, where $\alpha \in X^*(T)$ corresponds to $(1, -1) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

If A is any commutative ring, we denote $\mathrm{GL}_{n/A} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{GL}_n \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{Spec} A$.

Let \underline{G} be the algebraic group $(\mathrm{Res}_{\mathcal{O}_K/\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathrm{GL}_{n/\mathcal{O}_K}) \times_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{O}$ with diagonal maximal torus \underline{T} and center \underline{Z} . We write \underline{R} (resp. \underline{R}^\vee) for the set of roots (resp. coroots) of $(\underline{G}, \underline{T})$, \underline{W} for its Weyl group and $\underline{R}^+ \subseteq \underline{R}$ for the subset of positive roots with respect to the upper triangular Borel. There is a natural isomorphism $\underline{G} \cong \prod_{\mathcal{J}} \mathrm{GL}_{n/\mathcal{O}}$ induced by the ring homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{O} \cong \mathcal{O}^{\mathcal{J}}$ defined by $x \otimes y \mapsto (\sigma_j(x)y)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$. One has similar isomorphisms for \underline{T} , \underline{Z} , \underline{R} , \underline{R}^\vee , \underline{W} , \underline{R}^+ and the character group $X^*(\underline{T})$. There is an action of \underline{W} on $X^*(\underline{T})$ which is compatible with this isomorphism.

Under the identification of $X^*(\underline{T}) \cong \bigoplus_{\mathcal{J}} X^*(T)$ with $(\mathbb{Z}^n)^f$ as above, for each $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$ we can write $\mu = (\mu_j)_{0 \leq j \leq f-1}$ with $\mu_j = (\mu_{j,1}, \dots, \mu_{j,n}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Moreover, if $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ we write $(\underline{a}_1, \dots, \underline{a}_n)$ to denote the element of $X^*(\underline{T})$ whose corresponding tuple equals (a_1, \dots, a_n) at each place $j \in \mathcal{J}$. For $j \in \mathcal{J}$ we let $\eta_j \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^f$ be $(n-1, \dots, 1, 0)$ in the j -th coordinate and 0 otherwise. We let $\eta \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \eta_j = (\underline{n-1}, \dots, \underline{1}, \underline{0})$. There is an automorphism π on $X^*(\underline{T})$ defined by $\pi(\mu)_j = \mu_{j-1}$.

Example 2.1.2. If $n = 2$, let $\alpha_j \in X^*(\underline{T})$ be $(1, -1)$ in the j -th coordinate and 0 otherwise. Then we have $\underline{R}^+ = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathcal{J}\}$.

Let $\Lambda_R \subseteq X^*(\underline{T})$ be the root lattice of \underline{G} . Let $X_+^*(\underline{T}) \subseteq X^*(\underline{T})$ be the set of **dominant weights**, i.e. the set of weights $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ satisfying $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \underline{R}^+$. Let $X_1(\underline{T}) \subseteq X_+^*(\underline{T})$ be the subset of **p -restricted weights**, i.e. the set of weights $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ satisfying $0 \leq \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \leq p-1$ for all simple roots $\alpha \in \underline{R}^+$. Let $X_{\mathrm{reg}}(\underline{T}) \subseteq X_1(\underline{T})$ be the subset of weights $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ satisfying $0 \leq \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle < p-1$ for all simple roots $\alpha \in \underline{R}^+$. Finally, let $X^0(\underline{T}) \subseteq X_{\mathrm{reg}}(\underline{T})$ be the subset of weights $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ satisfying $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$ for all simple roots $\alpha \in \underline{R}^+$.

The lowest alcove is defined as

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}_0 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} : 0 < \langle \lambda + \eta, \alpha^\vee \rangle < p \ \forall \alpha \in \underline{R}^+\}.$$

Given $N \geq 0$ and $\mu \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}_0$ we say that μ is **N -deep** in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_0$ if $N < \langle \mu + \eta, \alpha^\vee \rangle < p - N$ for all $\alpha \in \underline{R}^+$. Thus the existence of an N -deep weight in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_0$ implies $p \geq 2N + 2$.

Example 2.1.3. When $n = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_R &= \{\lambda \in (\mathbb{Z}^2)^f : \lambda_{j,1} + \lambda_{j,2} = 0 \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J}\}, \\ X_+^*(\underline{T}) &= \{\lambda \in (\mathbb{Z}^2)^f : \lambda_{j,1} \geq \lambda_{j,2} \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J}\}, \\ X_1(\underline{T}) &= \{\lambda \in (\mathbb{Z}^2)^f : 0 \leq \lambda_{j,1} - \lambda_{j,2} \leq p-1 \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J}\}, \\ X_{\mathrm{reg}}(\underline{T}) &= \{\lambda \in (\mathbb{Z}^2)^f : 0 \leq \lambda_{j,1} - \lambda_{j,2} < p-1 \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J}\}, \\ X^0(\underline{T}) &= \{\lambda \in (\mathbb{Z}^2)^f : \lambda_{j,1} = \lambda_{j,2} \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J}\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{C}_0 = \{ \lambda \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^f : -1 < \lambda_{j,1} - \lambda_{j,2} < p - 1 \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J} \},$$

and $\lambda \in \underline{C}_0$ is N -deep if and only if $N \leq \lambda_{j,1} - \lambda_{j,2} \leq p - 2 - N$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$.

Given $w \in \underline{W}$, we write w_j to denote its j -th component via the identification $\underline{W} \cong \prod_{\mathcal{J}} W$. There is an automorphism π on \underline{W} defined by $\pi(w)_j = w_{j-1}$.

Let $\underline{W}_a \cong \Lambda_R \rtimes \underline{W}$ (resp. $\widetilde{W} \cong X^*(\underline{T}) \rtimes \underline{W}$) be the affine Weyl group (resp. extended affine Weyl group) of \underline{G} . We denote by t_λ the image of $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ in \widetilde{W} . Hence an element of \widetilde{W} can be written as $(w, \lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} wt_\lambda$ with $w \in \underline{W}$ and $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$, and the multiplication of \widetilde{W} is given by

$$(w_1, \lambda_1) \cdot (w_2, \lambda_2) = (w_1 w_2, w_2^{-1}(\lambda_1) + \lambda_2).$$

We identify \widetilde{W} with $(\mathbb{Z}^n \rtimes S_n)^f$ (the action of S_n on \mathbb{Z}^n is given by $(s(a))_i = a_{s^{-1}(i)}$).

We have the p -dot action of \widetilde{W} on $X^*(\underline{T})$ defined as follows: if $\tilde{w} = wt_\nu \in \widetilde{W}$ and $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$ then we define

$$\tilde{w} \cdot \mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w(\mu + \eta + p\nu) - \eta. \quad (8)$$

We let Ω be the stabilizer of the lowest alcove \underline{C}_0 in \widetilde{W} , then one easily checks that $\widetilde{W} = \underline{W}_a \rtimes \Omega$. Concretely, when $n = 2$, Ω is the subgroup of \widetilde{W} generated by $X^0(\underline{T})$ and $\{1, \mathbf{wt}_{(-1,0)}\}^f$.

The choice of the lowest alcove \underline{C}_0 endows \underline{W}_a with a Bruhat order by viewing \underline{W}_a as a Coxeter group generated by the walls of the alcove \underline{C}_0 (see [Jan03, II.6.3]). We denote this order by \leq . It induces a partial order \leq on \widetilde{W} by defining $\tilde{w}_a \omega \leq \tilde{w}'_a \omega'$ in $\underline{W}_a \rtimes \Omega = \widetilde{W}$ if and only if $\tilde{w}_a \leq \tilde{w}'_a$ in \underline{W}_a and $\omega = \omega'$ in Ω . We denote by \widetilde{W}^\vee the group \widetilde{W} , endowed with the Bruhat order induced by the choice of the antidominant base alcove, i.e.

$$\underline{C}_0^\vee \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \lambda \in X^*(\underline{T}) \otimes \mathbb{R} : -p < \langle \lambda + \eta, \alpha^\vee \rangle < 0 \ \forall \alpha \in \underline{R}^+ \}.$$

There is an anti-isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}^\vee &\xrightarrow{\sim} \widetilde{W} \\ \tilde{w} &\mapsto \tilde{w}^* \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

defined by $((st_\mu)^*)_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t_{\mu_{f-1-j}} s_{f-1-j}^{-1}$ such that $\tilde{w}_1 \leq \tilde{w}_2$ in \widetilde{W}^\vee if and only if $\tilde{w}_2^* \leq \tilde{w}_1^*$ in \widetilde{W} ([LLHL19, Lemma 2.1.3]).

Given $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$, we define

$$\text{Adm}^\vee(t_\lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}^\vee : \tilde{w} \leq t_{w(\lambda)} \text{ for some } w \in \underline{W} \right\} \quad (10)$$

to be the λ -admissible set with respect to the Bruhat order defined above on \widetilde{W}^\vee .

Example 2.1.4. Let $n = 2$. We have

$$\text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)}) = \left\{ \tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}^\vee : \tilde{w}_j \in \{t_{(2,1)}, \mathbf{wt}_{(2,1)}, t_{(1,2)}\} \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J} \right\},$$

$$\text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(3,0)}) = \left\{ \tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}^\vee : \tilde{w}_j \in \{t_{(3,0)}, \mathbf{wt}_{(3,0)}, t_{(2,1)}, \mathbf{wt}_{(2,1)}, t_{(1,2)}, \mathbf{wt}_{(1,2)}, t_{(0,3)}\} \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J} \right\}.$$

We will only use the Bruhat order induced by the choice of the antidominant base alcove. From now on, we use \widetilde{W} to mean \widetilde{W}^\vee for simplicity.

Finally we remark that we can consider \widetilde{W} as a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}((v)))^f$ by the injective homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W} &\hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}((v)))^f \\ st_\mu &\mapsto (\dot{s}_j v^{\mu_j})_j. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

2.2 Tame inertial types

In this subsection we review the combinatorial description of tame inertial types.

An **inertial type** of K is a representation $\tau : I_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$ with open kernel that can be extended to G_K . An inertial type is said **tame** if it factors through the tame inertial quotient.

When $n = 2$, by a result of Henniart (see the appendix to [BM02]), given an inertial type $\tau : I_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p})$, we can associate to it a smooth irreducible $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation $\sigma(\tau)$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$, normalized as in [BM02, §2.1.1], and we may realize τ and $\sigma(\tau)$ as representations over E if E is large enough.

Now we fix a pair $(s, \mu) \in \underline{W} \times X^*(\underline{T})$. We recall how to associate to it a tame inertial type.

We write $s = (s_0, \dots, s_{f-1})$ with $s_j \in S_n$ and $\mu = (\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{f-1})$ with $\mu_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Let $s_\tau \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} s_0 s_{f-1} s_{f-2} \cdots s_1 \in S_n$. Let $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the order of s_τ in S_n . Let K' be the unramified extension of K of degree r and let k' be its residue field. Fix an embedding $\sigma'_0 : k' \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$ extending σ_0 and let $\sigma'_{j'} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sigma_0 \circ \varphi^{j'}$. Let $f' \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} r f$. We have an identification of $\mathcal{J}' \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Hom}(k', \mathbb{F})$ with $\mathrm{Hom}(K', E)$ and with $\{0, \dots, f' - 1\}$ given by $\sigma'_{j'} \leftrightarrow j'$. We also identify it with the quotient $\mathbb{Z}/f'\mathbb{Z}$ in the evident way so that the addition and subtraction in \mathcal{J}' are modulo f' . Under this identification, the restriction of an embedding $k' \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$ to k corresponds to the natural projection $\mathbb{Z}/f'\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z}$. If $j' \in \mathcal{J}'$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$ is the image of j' under this projection, we set $s_{j'} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} s_j$, $\mu_{j'} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mu_j$ and $\eta_{j'} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \eta_j$.

We define the tame fundamental character $\omega_{f'} : I_K \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\times$ as the composition

$$I_K = I_{K'} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Art}_{K'}^{-1}} \mathcal{O}_{K'}^\times \rightarrow k'^\times \xrightarrow{\sigma'_0} \mathbb{F}^\times.$$

We also let $\widetilde{\omega}_{f'} : I_K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$ denote the Teichmüller lift of $\omega_{f'}$.

We define $\alpha'_{(s, \mu)} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^{f'}$ by

$$\alpha'_{(s, \mu), j'} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} s_1^{-1} s_2^{-1} \cdots s_{j'}^{-1} (\mu_{j'} + \eta_{j'}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad 0 \leq j' \leq f' - 1.$$

In particular, we have $\alpha'_{(s,\mu),j+kf} = s_\tau^{-k} \alpha'_{(s,\mu),j}$ for $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ and $0 \leq k \leq r-1$. We also define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}^{(0)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} \alpha'_{(s,\mu),i} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ \mathbf{a}'_{(s,\mu)}{}^{(j')} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i'=0}^{f'-1} \alpha'_{(s,\mu),-j'+i'} p^{i'} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad 0 \leq j' \leq f'-1. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have $\mathbf{a}'_{(s,\mu),i}{}^{(0)} = \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} \mathbf{a}_{s_\tau^k(i)}^{(0)} p^{fk}$.

The following combinatorial description of tame inertial types comes from [LLHL19, Def. 2.2.1], which is based on [Her09, (6.15)].

Definition 2.2.1. *Let $(s, \mu) \in \underline{W} \times X^*(\underline{T})$. We define*

$$\tau(s, \mu + \eta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \tilde{\omega}_{f'}^{\mathbf{a}'_{(s,\mu),i}{}^{(0)}} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \tilde{\omega}_{f'}^{\sum_{k=0}^{r-1} \mathbf{a}_{s_\tau^k(i)}^{(0)} p^{fk}} : I_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathcal{O}^\times). \quad (12)$$

This is a tame inertial type (i.e. can be extended to G_K), and we write $\bar{\tau}(s, \mu + \eta)$ for its reduction modulo ϖ . The following two definitions come from [LLHL19, Def. 2.2.5].

Definition 2.2.2. *Let τ be a tame inertial type and $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*

- (i) *We say that τ is **N -generic** if there is an isomorphism $\tau \cong \tau(s, \lambda + \eta)$ for some $s \in \underline{W}$ and some $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ which is N -deep in alcove \underline{C}_0 .*
- (ii) *A **lowest alcove presentation** of τ is a pair $(s, \mu) \in \underline{W} \times \underline{C}_0$ such that $\tau \cong \tau(s, \mu + \eta)$ (which by definition exists exactly when τ is 0-generic).*

Definition 2.2.3. *Let $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ be a Galois representation and let $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let $\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}|_{I_K}$ denote the restriction to I_K of the semisimplification of $\bar{\rho}$. We say that $\bar{\rho}$ is **N -generic** if $\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}|_{I_K} \cong \bar{\tau}(s, \mu)$ for some $s \in \underline{W}$ and $\mu - \eta \in X^*(\underline{T})$ which is N -deep in alcove \underline{C}_0 .*

Then we introduce the **orientation** $s'_{\text{or}} \in (S_n)^{f'}$ of $\alpha'_{(s,\mu)}$ as in [LLHL19, Remark 3.2.3], which is defined by

$$s'_{\text{or},j'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_1^{-1} s_2^{-1} \cdots s_{f'-1-j'}^{-1}, \quad 0 \leq j' \leq f'-1. \quad (13)$$

In particular, we have $s'_{\text{or},j+kf} = s_\tau^k s'_{\text{or},j}$ for $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ and $0 \leq k \leq r-1$.

By definition, we have $(s'_{\text{or},j'})^{-1} \left(\alpha'_{(s,\mu),f'-1-j'} \right) = \mu_{f'-1-j'} + \eta_{f'-1-j'}$. Since the p -adic expansion of $\mathbf{a}'_{(s,\mu)}{}^{(j')}$ has leading term $\alpha'_{(s,\mu),f'-1-j'} p^{f'-1}$, if $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$ is 0-deep in alcove \underline{C}_0 , then the element $(s'_{\text{or},j'})^{-1} \left(\mathbf{a}'_{(s,\mu)}{}^{(j')} \right) \in X^*(T) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ is dominant for each $0 \leq j' \leq f'-1$.

We will use the orientation in §3.

Example 2.2.4. Let $n = 2$. Let $s = (s_0, 1, \dots, 1) \in \underline{W}$ with $s_0 \in S_2$ and $\mu = (\mu_j)_j \in X^*(\underline{T})$ with $\mu_j = (r_j + m_j, m_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'_{(s,\mu),j} &= (r_j + 1 + m_j, m_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad 0 \leq j \leq f-1, \\ \mathbf{a}^{(0)} &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j + 1 + m_j) p^j, \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} m_j p^j \right) \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following two cases.

(i) If $s_0 = 1$, then $s_\tau = 1$, $f' = f$, $s'_{\text{or}} = (1, \dots, 1)$, and we have

$$\tau(s, \mu + \eta) \cong \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\omega}_f^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \tilde{\omega}_f^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} m_j p^j}.$$

(ii) If $s_0 = \mathfrak{w}$, then $s_\tau = \mathfrak{w}$, $f' = 2f$, $s'_{\text{or}} = (1, \dots, 1, \mathfrak{w}, \dots, \mathfrak{w})$, and we have

$$\tau(s, \mu + \eta) \cong \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\omega}_{2f}^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\omega}_{2f}^{p^f \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} \end{pmatrix} \otimes \tilde{\omega}_f^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} m_j p^j}.$$

In both cases, $\tau(s, \mu + \eta)$ is N -generic if $N \leq r_j \leq p - 2 - N$ for all j .

2.3 Extension graph

In this subsection we review the description of the extension graph for GL_2 . Then we use it to describe certain sets of Serre weights.

Recall that a **Serre weight** of $\text{GL}_n(k)$ is an isomorphism class of an (absolutely) irreducible representation of $\text{GL}_n(k)$ over \mathbb{F} . By [GHS18, Lemma 9.2.4], for each $\lambda \in X_1(\underline{T})$ we can associate to it a Serre weight $F(\lambda)$ of $\text{GL}_n(k)$, which induces a bijection

$$F : X_1(\underline{T}) / (p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \{\text{Serre weights of } \text{GL}_n(k)\} \quad (14)$$

(see §2.1 for π). We say that a Serre weight σ is **regular** if $\sigma \cong F(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \in X_{\text{reg}}(\underline{T})$, cf. [Her09, Def. 6.1].

Example 2.3.1. When $n = 2$, let $\lambda = (\lambda_j)_j \in X_1(\underline{T})$ with $\lambda_j = (\lambda_{j,1}, \lambda_{j,2}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we have

$$F(\lambda) = \bigotimes_{j=0}^{f-1} ((\text{Sym}^{\lambda_{j,1}-\lambda_{j,2}} k^2 \otimes_k \det^{\lambda_{j,2}}) \otimes_{k, \sigma_j} \mathbb{F}).$$

Moreover, $F(\lambda)$ is regular if and only if λ is 0-deep in alcove \underline{C}_0 if and only if $0 \leq \lambda_{j,1} - \lambda_{j,2} \leq p - 2$.

In the remaining of this section we let $n = 2$. We consider the algebraic group $G' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{Res}_{k/\mathbb{F}_p} \text{SL}_{2/k}) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}$. Let \underline{T}_1 be its maximal torus consisting of diagonal matrices of determinant 1. The corresponding root lattice is identified with Λ_R . Its weight lattice is denoted by Λ_W and we have $\Lambda_W \cong X^*(\underline{T})/X^0(\underline{T})$, which is identified with \mathbb{Z}^f by the isomorphism $[(a_j, b_j)_j] \mapsto (a_j - b_j)_j$.

Fix $\omega \in X^*(\underline{T})$. Since $\widetilde{W} = \underline{W}_a \rtimes \Omega$, there is a unique element $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega \cap t_{-\pi^{-1}(\omega)} \underline{W}_a$ in \widetilde{W} (see §2.1 for t). We also define $w_\omega \in \underline{W}$ to be the image of $\tilde{\omega}$ in \underline{W} under the projection $\widetilde{W} \rightarrow \underline{W}$.

Now we fix $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$. Following [LLHLM20, §2.1], we define the **extension graph** associated to μ by

$$\Lambda_W^\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\omega \in \Lambda_W : 0 \leq \langle \bar{\mu} + \omega, \alpha^\vee \rangle < p - 1, \forall \alpha \in \underline{R}^+\},$$

where $\bar{\mu}$ is the image of μ in Λ_W . We define a map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{t}'_\mu : X^*(\underline{T}) &\rightarrow X^*(\underline{T})/(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T}) \\ \omega &\mapsto \tilde{\omega} \cdot (\mu + \omega), \end{aligned}$$

where “ \cdot ” is the p -dot action defined in (8). This map factors through $X^*(\underline{T})/X^0(\underline{T}) = \Lambda_W$, and restricts to a map

$$\mathfrak{t}_\mu : \Lambda_W^\mu \rightarrow X_{\text{reg}}(\underline{T})/(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T}).$$

Remark 2.3.2. *If we compose \mathfrak{t}_μ with the bijection (14)*

$$F : X_1^*(\underline{T})/(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \{\text{Serre weights of } \text{GL}_2(k)\},$$

then the resulting map $\omega \mapsto F(\mathfrak{t}_\mu(\omega))$ gives a bijection between Λ_W^μ and the set of regular Serre weights of $\text{GL}_2(k)$ with central character $\mu|_{\mathbb{Z}}$ (see [LLHLM20, Prop. 2.1.4]).

Example 2.3.3. *In terms of the identification $\Lambda_W \cong \mathbb{Z}^f$ the map \mathfrak{t}_μ can be described as follows: We may assume that μ has the form $(r_j, 0)_j \in X^*(\underline{T})$, because for arbitrary $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$ one can use the formula $\mathfrak{t}'_{\mu+\nu}(\omega) - \mathfrak{t}'_\mu(\omega) = \tilde{\omega} \cdot (\mu + \nu) - \tilde{\omega} \cdot \mu = w_\omega(\nu) = \nu$ (for $\nu \in X^0(\underline{T})$) to reduce to the computation for this form. Write $\omega = (\omega_j)_j = (2n_j + \delta_j)_j \in \Lambda_W^\mu$ with $n_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\delta_j \in \{0, 1\}$, then a representative of $\mathfrak{t}_\mu(\omega)$ in $X_{\text{reg}}(\underline{T})$ is then given by*

$$(\mathfrak{t}_\mu(\omega))_j = \begin{cases} (r_j + n_j + \delta_j, -n_j) & \text{if } \delta_{j+1} = 0, \\ (-n_j - 1, r_j + n_j + \delta_j - p + 1) & \text{if } \delta_{j+1} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Moreover, by Example 2.3.1 and (15) one can compute that

$$F(\mathfrak{t}_\mu(\omega)) = \left(\bigotimes_{j=0}^{f-1} \left(\text{Sym}^{r'_j} k^2 \otimes_{k, \sigma_j} \mathbb{F} \right) \right) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \det^{e(\omega)},$$

where

$$r'_j = \begin{cases} r_j + \omega_j & \text{if } 2 \mid \omega_{j+1}, \\ p - 2 - r_j - \omega_j & \text{if } 2 \nmid \omega_{j+1}, \end{cases}$$

$$e(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\delta_0(p^f - 1) + \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j - r'_j)p^j \right).$$

Now we recall the “change of origin” formula for the map t_μ .

Lemma 2.3.4 ([LMS20], Prop. 2.5). *Let $\mu \in X^*(\underline{T})$, $\omega \in \Lambda_W^\mu$ and $\lambda \in X^*(\underline{T})$ be such that $\mathfrak{t}_\mu(\omega) \equiv \lambda \pmod{(p - \pi)X^0(\underline{T})}$. Then $\mathfrak{t}_\lambda(\omega') = \mathfrak{t}_\mu(w_\omega^{-1}(\omega') + \omega)$ for all $\omega' \in \Lambda_W^\lambda$. Equivalently $\mathfrak{t}_\mu(\omega') = \mathfrak{t}_\lambda(w_\omega(\omega' - \omega))$.*

Remark 2.3.5. *Keep the assumptions of Lemma 2.3.4. If we write $\omega = (a_0, \dots, a_{f-1})$ and $\omega' = (b_0, \dots, b_{f-1})$ with $a_j, b_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, then we have*

$$\mathfrak{t}_\lambda(b_0, \dots, b_{f-1}) = \mathfrak{t}_\mu \left(\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (a_j + (-1)^{a_{j+1}} b_j) \bar{\eta}_j \right),$$

$$\mathfrak{t}_\mu(b_0, \dots, b_{f-1}) = \mathfrak{t}_\lambda \left(\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} ((-1)^{a_{j+1}} (b_j - a_j)) \bar{\eta}_j \right).$$

3 Kisin modules

In this section we review the machinery of Kisin modules that are used to compute the Galois deformation rings. We follow closely [LLHLM18],[LLHL19],[LLHLM20],[LLHLM] as well as [BHH⁺, §3].

3.1 Kisin modules with tame descent data

In this subsection we review the notion of Kisin modules with descent data and some related objects.

Throughout this section we fix a 1-generic tame inertial type $\tau : I_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathcal{O})$ of K and a lowest alcove presentation (s, μ) for τ (hence μ is 0-deep in alcove \underline{C}_0 by [LLHL19, Prop. 2.2.15]).

We keep the notation of §2.2, for example, $s_\tau = s_0 s_{f-1} s_{f-2} \cdots s_1 \in S_n$, r is the order of s_τ , K' is the unramified extension of K of degree r with residue field k' and $f' = fr$. We also define $e' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p^{f'} - 1$.

Fix an e' -th root $\pi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-p)^{1/e'} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of $-p$. Let $L' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K'(\pi')$ and $E(u') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (u')^{e'} + p = v + p$ be the minimal polynomial of π' over K' , where we define $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (u')^{e'}$. Let $\Delta' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Gal}(L'/K') \subseteq$

$\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(L'/K)$. We define a group homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\pi'} : \Delta' &\rightarrow W(k')^\times \\ g &\mapsto \frac{g(\pi')}{\pi'}. \end{aligned}$$

It is independent of the choice of π' and satisfies $\sigma'_0 \circ \omega_{\pi'} = \tilde{\omega}_{f'}$.

Let R be a p -adically complete Noetherian local \mathcal{O} -algebra with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_R . We define

$$\mathfrak{S}_{L',R} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} W(k')[[u']] \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R = (W(k') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R) [[u']].$$

The ring $\mathfrak{S}_{L',R}$ has a Δ -action defined as follows: For each $g \in \Delta'$, $g(u') = (\omega_{\pi'}(g) \otimes 1)u'$ and g acts trivially on $W(k') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$. Let $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(L'/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ be the lift of the arithmetic Frobenius on $W(k')$ which fixes π' . Then $\sigma^f \in \Delta$ maps to a generator of $\Delta/\Delta' \cong \text{Gal}(K'/K)$ and we define its action on $\mathfrak{S}_{L',R}$ by letting it act trivially on R and u' and act as the f -th power of the arithmetic Frobenius on $W(k')$. In particular,

$$(\mathfrak{S}_{L',R})^{\Delta=1} = (W(k) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R) [[v]].$$

There is also a Frobenius endomorphism $\varphi : \mathfrak{S}_{L',R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{L',R}$, which is $W(k')$ -semilinear, R -linear, and $\varphi(u') = (u')^p$. The Frobenius endomorphism and the Δ -action commute with each other. For each $\mathfrak{S}_{L',R}$ -module \mathfrak{M} we define the $R[[u']]$ -module $\mathfrak{M}^{(j')} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{M} \otimes_{W(k') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R, \sigma_{-j'}} R$, then we have a decomposition $\mathfrak{M} \cong \bigoplus_{j' \in \mathcal{J}'} \mathfrak{M}^{(j')}$.

Definition 3.1.1 ([LLHLM18], Def. 2.4). *Let $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and τ, R as above. A **Kisin module** over R with height in $[0, h]$ and type τ is a triple $(\mathfrak{M}, \phi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \{\widehat{g}\}_{g \in \Delta})$, such that*

- (i) \mathfrak{M} is a finitely generated projective module over $\mathfrak{S}_{L',R}$;
- (ii) the Frobenius map $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}} : \varphi^*(\mathfrak{M}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is an injective $\mathfrak{S}_{L',R}$ -linear map whose cokernel is killed by $E(u')^h$;
- (iii) for each $g \in \Delta$, $\widehat{g} : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is a g -semilinear map satisfying
 - (a) the induced map $\widehat{g}^* : g^*(\mathfrak{M}) \xrightarrow{\widehat{g} \otimes \text{id}} \mathfrak{M}$ is a $\mathfrak{S}_{L',R}$ -linear isomorphism for all $g \in \Delta$;
 - (b) $\widehat{g} \circ \widehat{h} = \widehat{gh}$ for all $g, h \in \Delta$;
 - (c) $\widehat{g} \circ \phi_{\mathfrak{M}} = \phi_{\mathfrak{M}} \circ \varphi^*(\widehat{g})$ on $\varphi^*(\mathfrak{M})$ for all $g \in \Delta$;
- (iv) for each $0 \leq j' \leq f' - 1$,

$$\mathfrak{M}^{(j')}/u'\mathfrak{M}^{(j')} \cong \tau^\vee \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} R \tag{16}$$

as Δ' -representations over R , where $\tau^\vee \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(\tau, \mathcal{O})$ is the algebraic dual of τ .

Morphisms of Kisin modules over R with height in $[0, h]$ and type τ are defined in the natural way and we denote by $Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ the category of Kisin modules over R with height in $[0, h]$ and type τ . We often omit the additional data and just write $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$.

We define $\tau' : I_{K'} = I_K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathcal{O})$. It is a tame inertial type on K' . We define the category $Y^{[0,h],\tau'}(R)$ of Kisin modules over R with height in $[0, h]$ and type τ' by replacing Δ by Δ' in Definition 3.1.1.

Recall that $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L'/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is the lift of the arithmetic Frobenius on $W(k')$ which fixes π' . Let $(\tau')^{p^f}$ denote the composition of τ' (which factors through Δ') and the automorphism $g \mapsto g^{p^f}$ on Δ' . For each $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau'}(R)$, we define its Frobenius twist $(\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}) \in Y^{[0,h],(\tau')^{p^f}}(R)$ as follows: $(\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathfrak{M} \otimes_{W(k'),\sigma^f} W(k')$, the Frobenius map is

$$\phi_{(\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M})} : \varphi^* \left((\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}) \right) \xrightarrow{\sim} (\sigma^f)^* \left(\varphi^*(\mathfrak{M}) \right) \xrightarrow{(\sigma^f)^*(\phi_{\mathfrak{M}})} (\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}),$$

and the Δ' -action is

$$\widehat{g^{p^f}}_{(\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M})}^* : (\widehat{g^{p^f}})^* \left((\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}) \right) \xrightarrow{\sim} (\sigma^f)^* \left(\widehat{g^*}(\mathfrak{M}) \right) \xrightarrow{(\sigma^f)^*(\widehat{g^*})} (\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}),$$

using that $g \mapsto g^{p^f}$ is an automorphism on Δ' . By definition, a Kisin module $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau'}(R)$ lies in $Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ if and only if its Δ' -action extends to a Δ -action. By [LLHLM18, Prop. 6.6], this is equivalent to the datum of an isomorphism $\iota_{\mathfrak{M}} : (\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}) \cong \mathfrak{M}$, such that the r -fold composite of

$$\mathfrak{M} \xrightarrow{m \mapsto m \otimes 1} (\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}) \xrightarrow[\cong]{\iota_{\mathfrak{M}}} \mathfrak{M}$$

is the identity on \mathfrak{M} . Note that the first map identifies $\mathfrak{M}^{(j')}$ with $((\sigma^f)^*(\mathfrak{M}))^{(j'+f)}$.

Definition 3.1.2 ([LLHLM20], Def. 3.1.6). *Let $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$. An **eigenbasis** of \mathfrak{M} is a collection $\beta = (\beta^{(j')})_{j' \in \mathcal{J}'}$, where $\beta^{(j')} = (f_1^{(j')}, \dots, f_n^{(j')})$ is an $R[[u]]$ -basis of $\mathfrak{M}^{(j')}$ such that Δ' acts on $f_i^{(j')}$ as χ_i^{-1} , where $\chi_i \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \tilde{\omega}_{f'}^{\mathbf{a}'_{(s,\mu),i}}$ (see (12) for the notation), and satisfies $\iota_{\mathfrak{M}}((\sigma^f)^*(\beta^{(j')})) = \beta^{(j'+f)}$ for each $j' \in \mathcal{J}'$.*

Since R is assumed to be local, by (16) and the fact that Δ' has order prime to p , eigenbases always exist.

Let $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$. Under the decomposition $\mathfrak{M} \cong \bigoplus_{j' \in \mathcal{J}'} \mathfrak{M}^{(j')}$, the Frobenius map $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}$ decomposes into $R[[u]]$ -linear maps $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}^{(j')} : \varphi^*(\mathfrak{M}^{(j')}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{(j'+1)}$.

The following definition combines [LLHLM18, Def. 2.11] and [LLHLM18, Prop. 2.13].

Definition 3.1.3. *Let $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ with eigenbasis β . For each $j' \in \mathcal{J}'$, the matrix $C_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j')} \in \mathrm{M}_n(R[[u]])$ of $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}$ with respect to β is defined by the formula*

$$\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}^{(j')} \left(\varphi^*(\beta^{(j')}) \right) = \beta^{(j'+1)} C_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j')},$$

and the matrix $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j')} \in \mathrm{M}_n(R[[v]])$ is defined by the formula

$$A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j')} = \mathrm{Ad} \left((\dot{s}'_{\mathrm{or},j'+1})^{-1} (u')^{-\mathbf{a}'_{(s,\mu)^{(j'+1)}}} \right) (C_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j')}).$$

By the paragraph after [LLHLM, Remark 5.1.7] the matrix $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j')}$ is upper triangular modulo v and only depends on $j' \bmod f$.

To end this subsection, we introduce the Kisin modules with more strict height conditions. These conditions are related to the Hodge–Tate weights of Galois representations. The following definition comes from [CL18, §5] (see also [LLHLM18, Prop. 4.18] for a special case).

Definition 3.1.4. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_{j,1}, \dots, \lambda_{j,n})_j \in X_+^*(\underline{T})$ be a dominant weight such that $\lambda_{j,i} \in \{0, \dots, h\}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq f-1$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. We define a subcategory $Y^{\leq \lambda, \tau}(R)$ of $Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ whose objects consist of Kisin modules $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ such that all i by i minors of $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)}$ with respect to a fixed eigenbasis β of \mathfrak{M} are divisible by $(v+p)^{\sum_{k=1}^i \lambda_{j,n+1-k}}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\det(A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)}) \in R[[v]]^\times (v+p)^{\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_{j,k}}$. In this case we say that \mathfrak{M} has **height** $\leq \lambda$. This definition does not depend on the choice of the eigenbasis for \mathfrak{M} .*

For simplicity, we also write $Y^{\leq (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \tau}(R)$ to denote $Y^{\leq (\underline{\lambda}_1, \dots, \underline{\lambda}_n), \tau}(R)$ for $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ (see §2.1 for the notation).

3.2 Gauge bases

In this subsection we review the notion of gauge bases introduced in [LLHLM18] and \tilde{w} -gauge bases introduced in [LLHLM]. They have the property that the corresponding matrices $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)}$ of the Frobenius maps defined in Definition 3.1.3 have standard forms.

Definition 3.2.1 ([LLHLM18], Def. 2.22). *Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F})$ and $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_j)_j \in \widetilde{W}$. Write $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F})$ for the Iwahori subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$ consisting of matrices which are upper triangular modulo v . We say that $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ has **shape** \tilde{w} if for any choice of eigenbasis $\overline{\beta}$ the equality*

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F}) A_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \overline{\beta}}^{(j)} \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F}) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F}) \tilde{w}_j \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{F})$$

holds in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}((v)))$ for each $0 \leq j \leq f-1$, where we regard \tilde{w}_j as an element of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}((v)))$ by (11). This notion is independent of $\overline{\beta}$. We also say that the matrix $A_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \overline{\beta}}^{(j)}$ has shape \tilde{w}_j .

The following proposition is a restatement of [CL18, Prop. 5.4].

Proposition 3.2.2. *Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F})$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_{j,1}, \dots, \lambda_{j,n})_j \in X_+^*(\underline{T})$ be a dominant weight such that $\lambda_{j,i} \in \{0, \dots, h\}$ for all j, i . Then $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ has shape $\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}$ for some $\tilde{w} \in \mathrm{Adm}^\vee(t_\lambda)$ (see (10) for the notation), if and only if $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{\leq \lambda, \tau}(\mathbb{F})$.*

The property of having a fixed shape is not an open condition, as we will see in Example 3.2.6. Instead, we will use the notion of \tilde{w} -gauge following [LLHLM]. For simplicity of notation, the following definition is slightly different from [LLHLM, Def. 5.2.6].

Definition 3.2.3. Let $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ and $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_j)_j \in \widetilde{W}$. Write $\tilde{w}_j = s_j t_{\nu_j}$ with $s_j \in W$ and $\nu_j \in X^*(T)$. We say that \mathfrak{M} has \tilde{w} -**gauge** if it has an eigenbasis β such that

- (i) $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)}(v+p)^{-\nu_j} \dot{s}_j^{-1} \in \mathrm{GL}_n \left(R \left[\frac{1}{v+p} \right] \right)$ is lower triangular modulo $\frac{1}{v+p}$;
- (ii) $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)}(v+p)^{-\nu_j} \in \mathrm{GL}_n \left(R \left[\frac{1}{v+p} \right] \right)$ is upper triangular modulo $\frac{v}{v+p}$

for each $0 \leq j \leq f-1$. Such a β is called a \tilde{w} -**gauge basis**. We also say that the matrix $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)}$ has \tilde{w}_j -**gauge**.

Remark 3.2.4. If $A \in M_n(R[[v]])$ has \tilde{z} -gauge, where $\tilde{z} = st_\nu$ with $s \in W$ and $\nu \in X^*(T)$, then its (i,j) -entry A_{ij} has the form

$$v^{\delta_{i>j}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\nu_j - \delta_{i>j} - \delta_{i<s(j)}} c_{ij,k} (v+p)^k \right)$$

with $c_{ij,k} \in R$ and $c_{s(j)j, \nu_j - \delta_{s(j)>j}} \in R^\times$, and it satisfies $\det(A) \in R^\times (v+p)^3$. Here if P is a statement, then we define

$$\delta_P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P \text{ is true,} \\ 0 & \text{if } P \text{ is not true.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.2.5. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F})$. If $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ has shape \tilde{w} , then it has \tilde{w} -gauge ([LLHLM, Remark 5.2.5]). In general, $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ has a unique shape, but it could have \tilde{w} -gauge for many choices of \tilde{w} .

Example 3.2.6. Let $n = 2$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, and $a \in \mathbb{F}$. We list the gauges and shapes of some matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}((v)))$ that will be considered in §4.

Figure 1: Gauges and shapes of some matrices

Matrix	One choice of gauge	Shape
$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha v^2 & 0 \\ \alpha v^2 & \beta v \end{pmatrix}$	$t_{(2,1)}$ -gauge	$t_{(2,1)}$
$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta v \\ \alpha v^2 & \alpha v \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathfrak{w}t_{(2,1)}$ -gauge	$\mathfrak{w}t_{(2,1)}$ if $a = 0$ $t_{(2,1)}$ if $a \neq 0$
$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha v & 0 \\ 0 & \beta v^2 \end{pmatrix}$	$t_{(1,2)}$ -gauge	$t_{(1,2)}$

Everything follows directly from the definitions, except the fact that the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta v \\ \alpha v^2 & \alpha v \end{pmatrix}$ has shape $t_{(2,1)}$ for $a \neq 0$. To check this, we may assume that $\alpha = \beta = 1$, then it follows from the equality

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & v \\ v^2 & \alpha v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -a^{-1} & a^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v^2 & 0 \\ 0 & v \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ v & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

The following Proposition comes from [LLHLM, Prop. 5.2.7] which is a generalization of [LLHLM18, Thm. 4.1] and [LLHLM18, Thm. 4.16].

Proposition 3.2.7. *Let μ be $(h+1)$ -deep in \underline{C}_0 , $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ and $\tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{M}/\varpi\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R/\varpi R)$ has \tilde{w} -gauge, then \mathfrak{M} has \tilde{w} -gauge. Moreover its \tilde{w} -gauge basis β is unique up to scaling by the group*

$$\left\{ (t_{j'})_{j' \in \mathcal{J}'} \in T^{\mathcal{J}'}(R) \mid t_{j'} = t_{k'} \text{ for } j' \equiv k' \pmod{f} \right\} \cong \underline{T}(R).$$

3.3 Étale φ -modules

In this subsection we review the relation between Kisin modules and Galois representations.

We fix a compatible system $(p_n)_n$ of p -power roots of $(-p)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ and define $K_\infty \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K(p_n)$.

Let $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},L'}$) be the p -adic completion of $W(k)[[v]][1/v]$ (resp. $W(k)[[u']][1/u']$). It has a Frobenius endomorphism φ extending the arithmetic Frobenius on $W(k)$ (resp. $W(k')$) and such that $\varphi(v) = v^p$ (resp. $\varphi(u') = (u')^p$). Let R be a complete Noetherian local \mathcal{O} -algebra. The completed tensor product (see [Dee01, Def. 1.2.1]) $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},L'} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$) is naturally equipped with a Frobenius endomorphism φ . Moreover, the ring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},L'} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ is naturally equipped with a Δ -action such that $(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},L'} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R)^{\Delta=1} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$.

The following definition comes from [Fon90], generalized by [Dee01] for a version with coefficients.

Definition 3.3.1. *An étale φ -module over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ is a pair $(\mathcal{M}, \phi_{\mathcal{M}})$, such that*

- (i) \mathcal{M} is a finitely generated projective $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ -module;
- (ii) $\phi_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is φ -semilinear and the image of $\phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ generates \mathcal{M} as an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ -module.

Morphisms of étale φ -modules over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ are defined in the natural way and we denote by $\Phi \text{Mod}^{\text{ét}}(R)$ the category of étale φ -modules over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$. We often omit $\phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ and just write $\mathcal{M} \in \Phi \text{Mod}^{\text{ét}}(R)$.

Similar to Kisin modules, an étale φ -module \mathcal{M} decomposes as $\mathcal{M} \cong \bigoplus_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{M}^{(j)}$, where each $\mathcal{M}^{(j)}$ is a finite free module over the p -adic completion $(R[[v]][1/v])^\wedge$ of the ring $R[[v]][1/v]$. The Frobenius map $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}$ decomposes into R -linear maps $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}^{(j)} : \mathcal{M}^{(j)} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{(j+1)}$ which are semilinear with respect to $v \mapsto v^p$.

There is a natural inclusion $\mathfrak{S}_{L',R} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},L'} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ and we define a functor

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_\tau : Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R) &\rightarrow \Phi \text{Mod}^{\text{ét}}(R) \\ \mathfrak{M} &\mapsto \left(\mathfrak{M} \otimes_{\mathfrak{S}_{L',R}} (\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},L'} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R) \right)^{\Delta=1}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Note that it doesn't use the lowest alcove presentation of τ .

Proposition 3.3.2 ([LLHLM20], Prop. 3.2.1). *Let $\mathfrak{M} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R)$ and β an eigenbasis of \mathfrak{M} . Let $\mathcal{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon_\tau(\mathfrak{M})$. Then there exists an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E},K} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} R$ -basis \mathfrak{f} of \mathcal{M} such that the matrix of $\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)}$ with respect to \mathfrak{f} is given by*

$$A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)} s_j^* v^{\mu_j^* + \eta_j^*} \in \text{GL}_n \left((R[[v]][1/v])^\wedge \right),$$

where “ $*$ ” is defined in (9) and $A_{\mathfrak{M},\beta}^{(j)}$ is viewed as an element of $\text{GL}_n \left((R[[v]][1/v])^\wedge \right)$ under the natural inclusion $R[[v]] \hookrightarrow (R[[v]][1/v])^\wedge$.

Let $\text{Rep}_{G_{K_\infty}}(R)$ denote the category of finite free R -modules with continuous R -linear representations of G_{K_∞} . By a result of Fontaine ([Fon90]), generalized by [Dee01] for a version with coefficients, there is an exact anti-equivalence of categories

$$\mathbb{V}_K^* : \Phi \text{Mod}^{\text{ét}}(R) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Rep}_{G_{K_\infty}}(R). \quad (18)$$

Composing it with ε_τ , we get a functor

$$T_{dd}^* : Y^{[0,h],\tau}(R) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_\tau} \Phi \text{Mod}^{\text{ét}}(R) \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathbb{V}_K^*} \text{Rep}_{G_{K_\infty}}(R). \quad (19)$$

Proposition 3.3.3 ([LLHL19], Prop. 3.2.18). *Assume that τ is $(h+1)$ -generic. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}, \overline{\mathfrak{M}'} \in Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F})$. If $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}'})$ as G_{K_∞} -representations over \mathbb{F} , then $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \cong \overline{\mathfrak{M}'}$ in $Y^{[0,h],\tau}(\mathbb{F})$.*

4 Galois deformation rings

In this section we compute some potentially crystalline Galois deformation rings explicitly. The semisimple case is already known by [BHH⁺, §4]. We combine the method of [BHH⁺, §4] and [Le19, §3] to deal with the non-semisimple case.

4.1 Setup

In this subsection we determine the tame inertial types that we will use.

Throughout this section we fix a 2-dimensional Galois representation $\overline{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ such that $\overline{\rho}^{\text{ss}}|_{I_K} \cong \overline{\tau}(s, \mu)$, where

- (i) $s_j \neq 1$ (hence $s_j = \mathfrak{w}$) if and only if $j = 0$ and $\overline{\rho}$ is irreducible;
- (ii) $\mu - \eta$ is N -deep in \underline{C}_0 with $N \geq 12$.

We need N to be large in order to deal with the error term coming from the monodromy condition (see (32) below).

Twisting $\bar{\rho}$ by a power of ω_f if necessary, we furthermore assume that $\mu_j = (r_j + 2, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $N < r_j + 1 < p - N$ for all j so that (see Example 2.2.4)

$$\bar{\rho}|_{I_K} \cong \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \left(\omega_f^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & * \\ 0 & 1 \right) \otimes \omega & \text{if } \bar{\rho} \text{ is reducible,} \\ \left(\omega_{2f}^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{2f}^{p^f \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} \right) \otimes \omega & \text{if } \bar{\rho} \text{ is irreducible.} \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Now we associate to $\bar{\rho}$ a tuple of f elements $(a_0, \dots, a_{f-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^f$ and describe the set $W(\bar{\rho})$ of Serre weights of $\bar{\rho}$ in terms of these elements. By (18) there exists an étale φ -module $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ over $k((v)) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}$ such that $\mathbb{V}_K^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}) \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K^\infty}}$. Recall from §3.3 that we have a decomposition $\overline{\mathcal{M}} \cong \bigoplus_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)}$ with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)} = \mathbb{F}((v))e_1^{(j)} \oplus \mathbb{F}((v))e_2^{(j)}$. We separate the following two cases.

- (i) If $\bar{\rho}$ is reducible, by [Le19, Prop. 3.1] we can take the Frobenius maps $\phi_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}^{(j)} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{(j+1)}$ to have the form

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}^{(j)}(e_1^{(j)}) = \alpha_{f-1-j} v^{r_{f-1-j}+2} (e_1^{(j+1)} + a_j e_2^{(j+1)}) \\ \phi_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}^{(j)}(e_2^{(j)}) = \beta_{f-1-j} v e_2^{(j+1)} \end{cases}$$

for some $\alpha_j, \beta_j \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ and $a_j \in \mathbb{F}$. In other words, the matrices of the Frobenius maps $\phi_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}^{(j)}$ in the basis $\{(e_1^{(j)}, e_2^{(j)})_j\}$ are given by

$$\text{Mat}(\phi_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}^{(f-1-j)}) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j v^{r_j+2} & 0 \\ \alpha_j a_{f-1-j} v^{r_j+2} & \beta_j v \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Notice that whether a_j equals 0 or not is unchanged when we rescale the basis. From now on, we fix a choice of α_j, β_j and a_j . In particular, this gives a tuple $(a_0, \dots, a_{f-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^f$.

- (ii) If $\bar{\rho}$ is irreducible, by [Le19, Prop. 3.1] we can take the Frobenius maps $\phi_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}^{(j)} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{(j)} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{(j+1)}$ to have the form

$$\text{Mat}(\phi_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}^{(f-1-j)}) = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j v^{r_j+2} & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_j v \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } j \neq 0, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta_j v \\ \alpha_j v^{r_j+2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } j = 0 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

for some $\alpha_j, \beta_j \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. In this case we define $a_j = 0$ for all j .

In particular, we see that $\bar{\rho}$ is semisimple if and only if $(a_0, \dots, a_{f-1}) = (0, \dots, 0)$.

Recall that for $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ a Galois representation, we have a set $W(\bar{\rho})$ of Serre weights of $\bar{\rho}$ defined in [BDJ10, §3] which only depends on $\bar{\rho}|_{I_K}$. In both cases, by [Le19, Prop. 3.2] it can be described by

$$W(\bar{\rho}) = \{F(\mathfrak{t}_{\mu-\eta}(b_0, \dots, b_{f-1})) : b_j \in \{0, \mathrm{sgn}(s_j)\} \text{ if } a_{f-1-j} = 0 \text{ and } b_j = 0 \text{ if } a_{f-1-j} \neq 0\}. \quad (23)$$

See §2.3 for the notation.

Then we introduce the following 3^f tame inertial types that are needed in the computation of Galois deformation rings. Given an arbitrary

$$\tilde{w} \in \mathrm{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)}) = \{t_{(2,1)}, \mathfrak{w}t_{(2,1)}, t_{(1,2)}\}^f$$

(see Example 2.1.4), we write $\tilde{w}^* = t_\nu w$ for some unique $(w, \nu) \in \underline{W} \times X^*(\underline{T})$ (see (9) for “*”). Then we define the tame inertial type

$$\tau_{\tilde{w}} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \tau(sw^{-1}, \mu - sw^{-1}(\nu)) \quad (24)$$

with lowest alcove presentation $(s(\tau), \mu(\tau)) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} (sw^{-1}, \mu - sw^{-1}(\nu) - \eta)$. In particular, $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$ is $(N-1)$ -generic.

Explicitly, $s(\tau)_j = w_j^{-1}$ except when $j = 0$ and $\bar{\rho}$ is irreducible, in which case we have $s(\tau)_0 = \mathfrak{w}w_0^{-1}$. Also we have

$$\mu(\tau)_j + \eta_j = \begin{cases} (r_j, 0) & \text{if } (t_{\nu_j} w_j, s_j) \in \{(t_{(2,1)}, 1), (t_{(2,1)} \mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}), (t_{(1,2)}, \mathfrak{w})\}, \\ (r_j + 1, -1) & \text{if } (t_{\nu_j} w_j, s_j) \in \{(t_{(2,1)}, \mathfrak{w}), (t_{(2,1)} \mathfrak{w}, 1), (t_{(1,2)}, 1)\}. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

The following lemma tells us whether a tame inertial type contains a given Serre weight of $\bar{\rho}$.

Lemma 4.1.1. *There is a unique injection $\theta : W(\bar{\rho}) \hookrightarrow \{t_{(2,1)}, t_{(1,2)}\}^f$ such that for $\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})$ and $\tilde{w} \in \mathrm{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)})$ we have*

$$\sigma \in \mathrm{JH} \left(\overline{\sigma(\tau_{\tilde{w}})} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} (N_{k/\mathbb{F}_p} \circ \det) \right) \iff (\tilde{w}_j \neq \theta(\sigma)_j \ \forall j). \quad (26)$$

Proof. The proof is almost the same as [BHH⁺, Lemma 4.1.2] except that we replace all the bijections by injections, since a non-semisimple $\bar{\rho}$ has less Serre weights than a semisimple one. \square

Remark 4.1.2. *By the proof of [BHH⁺, Lemma 4.1.2], the map θ of Lemma 4.1.1 is defined in the following way: If $\sigma = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\mu-\eta}(b_0, \dots, b_{f-1}))$ as in (23), then we define*

$$\theta(\sigma)_{f-1-j} = \begin{cases} t_{(1,2)} & \text{if } b_j = 0, \\ t_{(2,1)} & \text{if } b_j \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, still by the proof of [BHH⁺, Lemma 4.1.2], the 2^f tame inertial types $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$ appearing in (26) are all the tame inertial types that contain a given Serre weight σ of $\bar{\rho}$.

Let σ be a Serre weight of $\bar{\rho}$. We define the set of tame inertial types that contain σ :

$$X(\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)}) : \sigma \in \text{JH} \left(\overline{\sigma(\tau_{\tilde{w}})} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} (N_{k/\mathbb{F}_p} \circ \det) \right) \right\}. \quad (27)$$

By Lemma 4.1.1 we have

$$X(\sigma) = \{ \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)}) : \tilde{w}_j \neq \theta(\sigma)_j \ \forall j \}.$$

We also define the set of tame inertial types that contain at least one Serre weight of $\bar{\rho}$:

$$X(\bar{\rho}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)}) : \text{JH} \left(\overline{\sigma(\tau)} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} (N_{k/\mathbb{F}_p} \circ \det) \right) \cap W(\bar{\rho}) \neq \emptyset \right\} = \bigcup_{\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})} X(\sigma).$$

We describe this set explicitly. Let $(a_j)_j$ be the chosen elements of \mathbb{F} associated to $\bar{\rho}$. If $a_{f-1-j} = 0$, then b_j can be either 0 or $\text{sgn}(s_j)$ by (23), and \tilde{w}_{f-1-j} can be any one of the elements of $\text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)}) = \{t_{(2,1)}, \mathfrak{w}t_{(2,1)}, t_{(1,2)}\}$ by Lemma 4.1.1 and Remark 4.1.2. If $a_{f-1-j} \neq 0$, then b_j has to be 0 by (23), and $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} \in \{t_{(2,1)}, \mathfrak{w}t_{(2,1)}\}$ by Lemma 4.1.1 and Remark 4.1.2. To conclude, we have

$$X(\bar{\rho}) = \{ \tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)}) : \tilde{w}_{f-1-j} \neq t_{(1,2)} \text{ if } a_{f-1-j} \neq 0 \}. \quad (28)$$

These are all the tame inertial types that we need.

Lemma 4.1.3. *Let $\tilde{w} \in X(\bar{\rho})$. Up to isomorphism there exists a unique Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{\leq(2,1), \tau_{\tilde{w}}}(\mathbb{F}) \subseteq Y^{\leq(3,0), \tau_{\tilde{w}}}(\mathbb{F})$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong \bar{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$ (see (19) for T_{dd}^*).*

Proof. We concentrate on the case that $\bar{\rho}$ is reducible. The irreducible case is similar and can also be treated as in [BHH⁺, Lemma 4.1.1]. Define a Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ over \mathbb{F} of type $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$ by imposing the matrices of the partial Frobenius maps to be $A^{(f-1-j)} = \text{Mat}(\phi_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}}^{(f-1-j)})v^{-(\mu(\tau)_j + \eta_j)}s(\tau)_j$, where $\text{Mat}(\phi_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}}^{(f-1-j)}) \in M_2(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$ is the matrix in (21), and $s(\tau)$, $\mu(\tau)$ are computed in (25). Explicitly, we have the three cases:

(i) If $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}$, then $s(\tau)_j = 1$ and $\mu(\tau)_j + \eta_j = (r_j, 0)$. We have

$$A^{(f-1-j)} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j v^{r_j+2} & 0 \\ \alpha_j a_{f-1-j} v^{r_j+2} & \beta_j v \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v^{-r_j} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j v^2 & 0 \\ \alpha_j a_{f-1-j} v^2 & \beta_j v \end{pmatrix}.$$

It has shape $t_{(2,1)}$ by Example 3.2.6.

(ii) If $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = \mathfrak{w}t_{(2,1)}$, then $s(\tau)_j = \mathfrak{w}$ and $\mu(\tau)_j + \eta_j = (r_j + 1, -1)$. We have

$$A^{(f-1-j)} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j v^{r_j+2} & 0 \\ \alpha_j a_{f-1-j} v^{r_j+2} & \beta_j v \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v^{-(r_j+1)} & 0 \\ 0 & v \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_j v \\ \beta_j v^2 & \alpha_j a_{f-1-j} v \end{pmatrix}.$$

It has shape $\mathfrak{w}t_{(2,1)}$ if $a_{f-1-j} = 0$, and shape $t_{(2,1)}$ if $a_{f-1-j} \neq 0$ by Example 3.2.6.

(iii) If $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}$, then $s(\tau)_j = 1$ and $\mu(\tau)_j + \eta_j = (r_j + 1, -1)$. In this case, we must have $a_{f-1-j} = 0$ by (28), hence

$$A^{(f-1-j)} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j v^{r_j+2} & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_j v \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v^{-(r_j+1)} & 0 \\ 0 & v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j v & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_j v^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It has shape $t_{(1,2)}$ by Example 3.2.6.

In all cases, we see that the matrix $A^{(f-1-j)}$ belongs to $M_2(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$ and has shape contained in $\text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)})$ for all j , hence $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{\leq(2,1),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}(\mathbb{F}) \subseteq Y^{\leq(3,0),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}(\mathbb{F})$ by Proposition 3.2.2. Moreover, we remark that $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ has \tilde{w} -gauge by Example 3.2.6.

Now by Proposition 3.3.2, the matrices of the Frobenius maps of the associated étale φ -module $\varepsilon_{\tau_{\tilde{w}}}(\overline{\mathfrak{M}})$ (see (17)) with respect to some basis \mathfrak{f} is given by

$$\text{Mat}_{\mathfrak{f}}(\phi^{(f-1-j)}) = A^{(f-1-j)} s(\tau)_j^{-1} v^{\mu(\tau)_j + \eta_j}. \quad (29)$$

This is the same matrix as in (21), hence $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong \overline{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$.

The uniqueness of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ follows from Proposition 3.3.3, since $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ has height in $[0, 2]$, $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$ is $(N-1)$ -generic and $N-1 \geq 3$. \square

Remark 4.1.4. For general $\tilde{w} \in \text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)})$, there could be some j , such that $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}$ and $a_{f-1-j} \neq 0$ (this can happen only when $\overline{\rho}$ is non-semisimple). In this case, the above construction gives a matrix $A^{(f-1-j)}$ of shape $\mathfrak{wt}_{(1,2)}$ which belongs to $\text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(3,0)}) - \text{Adm}^\vee(t_{(2,1)})$ (see Example 2.1.4), so there is still a Kisin module $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{\leq(3,0),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}(\mathbb{F})$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong \overline{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$, which is unique up to isomorphism using Proposition 3.3.3 and $N-1 \geq 4$.

4.2 Single type Galois deformation rings

In this subsection we combine all the above preliminaries and compute the single type deformation rings following [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1] (which deals with the semisimple case).

Let $\overline{\rho}$ and $(a_0, \dots, a_{f-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^f$ an f -tuple be as in §4.1. Fix $\tilde{w} \in X(\overline{\rho})$ (see (28)) and let $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$ be as in (24). We compute the Galois deformation ring of $\overline{\rho}$ for a single type $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$ and Hodge–Tate weights $\leq (3, 0)$ (meaning Hodge–Tate weights $(3, 0)$ or $(2, 1)$ at each embedding).

Let $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \in Y^{\leq(2,1),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}(\mathbb{F})$ such that $T_{dd}^*(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) \cong \overline{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$ (see Lemma 4.1.3). By the proof of Lemma 4.1.3, the associated matrix $\overline{A}^{(j)}$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ with respect to some eigenbasis $\overline{\beta}$ is of the form:

$$\overline{A}^{(f-1-j)} = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{e_{11}^{*(j)}} v^2 & 0 \\ \overline{d_{21}^{(j)}} v^2 & \overline{d_{22}^{*(j)}} v \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } \tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \overline{d_{12}^{*(j)}} v \\ \overline{d_{21}^{*(j)}} v^2 & \overline{d_{22}^{(j)}} v \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } \tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = \mathfrak{wt}_{(2,1)}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \overline{d_{11}^{*(j)}} v & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{e_{22}^{*(j)}} v^2 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } \tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Here we use the notation of Tables 1-3. Each element with “*” (e.g. $\overline{e_{11}^{*(j)}}$) belongs to \mathbb{F}^\times . The element $\overline{d_{21}^{(j)}}$ (resp. $\overline{d_{22}^{(j)}}$) equals 0 if $a_{f-1-j} = 0$, and belongs to \mathbb{F}^\times if $a_{f-1-j} \neq 0$.

Let $R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\leq(3,0),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$ denote the maximal reduced, \mathcal{O} -flat quotient of the universal framed deformation ring $R_{\overline{\rho}}^\square$ that parametrizes potentially crystalline lifts of $\overline{\rho}$ of Hodge–Tate weights $\leq (3, 0)$ in each embedding and tame inertial type $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$ (its existence follows from [Kis08]). For each dominant character $\lambda \in X_+^*(\underline{T})$, let $R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\lambda,\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$ denote the maximal reduced, \mathcal{O} -flat quotient of $R_{\overline{\rho}}^\square$ that parametrizes potentially crystalline lifts of $\overline{\rho}$ of Hodge–Tate weights λ_j in the j -th embedding for all j and tame inertial type $\tau_{\tilde{w}}$.

The following result is a generalization of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1] (where $\overline{\rho}$ was assumed to be semisimple).

Theorem 4.2.1. *Let $\tilde{w} \in X(\overline{\rho})$. We have an isomorphism*

$$R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\leq(3,0),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}[[X_1, \dots, X_{2f}]] \cong \left(R^{\tau_{\tilde{w}}} / \sum_j I^{(j)} \right) [[Y_1, \dots, Y_4]], \quad (31)$$

where $R^{\tau_{\tilde{w}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\bigotimes}_{\mathcal{O}, 0 \leq j \leq f-1} R^{(j)}$, and where the rings $R^{(j)}$ and the ideals $I^{(j)}$ of $R^{\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$ are found in Tables 1-3. The irreducible components of $\text{Spec } R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\leq(3,0),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$ are given by $\text{Spec } R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\lambda,\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$, where $\lambda = (\lambda_j) \in \{(3, 0), (2, 1)\}^f$.

More precisely, via the isomorphism (31), for any choice of $\lambda = (\lambda_j) \in \{(3, 0), (2, 1)\}^f$ the kernel of the natural surjection $R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\leq(3,0),\tau_{\tilde{w}}}[[X_1, \dots, X_{2f}]] \rightarrow R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\lambda,\tau_{\tilde{w}}}[[X_1, \dots, X_{2f}]]$ is generated by the prime ideal $\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} \mathfrak{p}^{(j),\lambda_{f-1-j}}$ of $R^{\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$, where the ideals $\mathfrak{p}^{(j),\lambda_{f-1-j}}$ of $R^{\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$ are found in Tables 1-3.

Moreover, the special fiber of each $\text{Spec } R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\lambda,\tau_{\tilde{w}}}$ is reduced.

Proof. We follow the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1] and use without comment the notation of *loc.cit.*

By (30) and Example 3.2.6 the eigenbasis $\overline{\beta}$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a \tilde{w} -gauge basis in the sense of Definition 3.2.3. We modify the definition of $D_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}},\overline{\beta}}^{\leq(3,0),\tau}(R)$ appearing in the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1] by requiring β to be a \tilde{w} -gauge basis instead of a gauge basis. Then by Remark 3.2.4, for any lift $(\mathfrak{M}, \beta, j) \in D_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}},\overline{\beta}}^{\leq(3,0),\tau}(R)$ the corresponding matrices $A^{(f-1-j)}$ are given in row 1 of Tables 1-3, where the entries $c_{11}^{(j)}, c_{12}^{(j)}, \dots$ are in R satisfying $A^{(f-1-j)} \bmod \mathfrak{m}_R$ equals $\overline{A}^{(f-1-j)}$. Here we remark that the matrix $A^{(f-1-j)}$ in row 1 of Table 2 has $\mathfrak{wt}_{(2,1)}$ -gauge but has shape $t_{(2,1)}$ if $a_{f-1-j} \neq 0$.

Row 2 of Tables 1-3 are obtained from row 1 by applying Proposition 3.3.2.

Let $R^{(j)}$ be the power series ring in row 3 of Tables 1-3. Its variables c_{11}, \dots come from the coefficients of the matrices $A^{(f-1-j)}$ in row 1 of Tables 1-3. The condition that \mathfrak{M} has height $\leq (3, 0)$ (see Definition 3.1.4), or equivalently the determinant condition appearing in Remark 3.2.4, is given by

$$\det A^{(f-1-j)} \in R^\times (v + p)^3.$$

This gives the ideal $I^{(j), \leq (3,0)}$ in row 4 of Tables 1-3. Then the argument of [LLHLM18, Thm. 4.17] shows that the deformation problem $D_{\overline{\mathfrak{m}}, \overline{\beta}}^{\leq (3,0), \tau}$ is represented by the maximal reduced \mathcal{O} -flat quotient of $\widehat{\bigotimes}_{\mathcal{O}, 0 \leq j \leq f-1} R^{(j)} / I^{(j), \leq (3,0)}$.

As in the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1], the monodromy condition given by [BHH⁺, Prop. 3.1.9] is equivalent to

$$\left(\frac{d}{dv} \right)^t \Big|_{v=-p} \left\{ \left[v \frac{d}{dv} A^{(f-1-j)} - A^{(f-1-j)} \begin{pmatrix} a^{(j)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] (v+p)^3 (A^{(f-1-j)})^{-1} \right\} + O(p^{N-3-t}) = 0 \quad (32)$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$, $0 \leq j \leq f-1$. Here $a^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ is as in the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1] and $O(p^{N-3-t})$ is certain unspecified element of $p^{N-3-t} M_2(R)$. Then the entries of the matrices given by the left-hand side of (32) give the ideal $I^{(j), \nabla}$ of $R^{\tau \tilde{w}}$ which are given in row 5 of Tables 1-3. We remark that row 5 of Table 3 is not computed directly, but is computed using the fact that the matrix $A^{(f-1-j)}$ of Table 3 can be conjugated to that of Table 1 by the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ v & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

We have a similar diagram as (5.9) of [LLHLM18]. The vertical map labelled “f.s.” in *loc.cit.* now corresponds to forgetting the \tilde{w} -gauge basis on the Kisin modules, and is still formally smooth by Proposition 3.2.7 which is a generalization of [LLHLM18, Thm. 4.1] and [LLHLM18, Thm. 4.16]. Let $R_{\overline{\mathfrak{m}}, \overline{\beta}}^{\leq (3,0), \tau, \nabla}$ be the maximal reduced and \mathcal{O} -flat quotient of $R_{\overline{\mathfrak{m}}, \overline{\beta}}^{\leq (3,0), \tau} / \sum_j (I^{(j), \leq (3,0)} + I^{(j), \nabla})$. Then the argument of [LLHLM18, Thm. 5.12] and [LLHLM18, Cor. 5.13] goes through and gives an isomorphism

$$R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\leq (3,0), \tau} [[X_1, \dots, X_{2f}]] \cong R_{\overline{\mathfrak{m}}, \overline{\beta}}^{\leq (3,0), \tau, \nabla} [[Y_1, \dots, Y_4]].$$

The rest of the proof and the computations are completely analogous to those of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1] (see Remark 4.2.2 below). Here we notice that the equation (25) in [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.2.1] is guaranteed by our assumption on \tilde{w} . Finally, the proof of the last statement is completely analogous to that of [BHH⁺, Cor. 4.2.6]. \square

Remark 4.2.2. *The Tables 1-Table 3 are very similar to those of [BHH⁺, §4]. The main difference is that here the element d_{21} (resp. d_{22}) of Table 1 (resp. Table 2) is a unit in $R^{(j)}$ if and only if $a_{f-1-j} \neq 0$.*

4.3 Multi-type Galois deformation rings

In this subsection we compute the multi-type deformation rings following [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.1] (which deals with the semisimple case).

Let $\overline{\rho}$ and $(a_0, \dots, a_{f-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^f$ be as in §4.1. For $\sigma \in W(\overline{\rho})$, let $R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\leq (3,0), \sigma}$ denote the maximal reduced, \mathcal{O} -flat quotient of $R_{\overline{\rho}}^{\square}$ that parametrizes potentially crystalline lifts of $\overline{\rho}$ of Hodge–Tate weights $\leq (3, 0)$ in each embedding and tame inertial type τ with $\tau \in X(\sigma)$, where $X(\sigma)$

is as in (27). By Lemma 4.1.1 and Remark 4.1.2, we see that $\text{Spec } R_{\bar{p}}^{\leq(3,0),\sigma}$ is the flat closure of $\bigcup_{\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)} \text{Spec } R_{\bar{p}}^{\leq(3,0),\tau\tilde{w}}[1/p]$ inside $\text{Spec } R_{\bar{p}}^{\square}$. Also, we denote $\tilde{w}_{\sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \theta(\sigma) \in \{t_{(2,1)}, t_{(1,2)}\}^f$, where θ is defined in Lemma 4.1.1.

We define a bijection $i : \text{Adm}^{\vee}(t_{(\underline{2},\underline{1})}) \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}^f$ by letting $i(\tilde{w})$ be the f -tuple given by

$$i(\tilde{w})_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \tilde{w}_j = t_{(2,1)} \\ 2 & \text{if } \tilde{w}_j = \mathbf{w}t_{(2,1)} \\ 3 & \text{if } \tilde{w}_j = t_{(1,2)}. \end{cases}$$

They will be the indices of ideals.

The following result is a generalization of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.1] (where \bar{p} was assumed to be semisimple).

Theorem 4.3.1. *We have an isomorphism*

$$R_{\bar{p}}^{\leq(3,0),\sigma}[[X_1, \dots, X_{2f}]] \cong \left(S / \bigcap_{\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)} \sum_j I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} \right) [[Y_1, \dots, Y_4]], \quad (33)$$

where $S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\bigotimes}_{0 \leq j \leq f-1} S^{(j)}$, and where the ring $S^{(j)}$ and the ideals $I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)}$ of S are as in Table 4 if $(\tilde{w}_{\sigma})_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}$, whereas the ring $S^{(j)}$ and the ideals $I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)}$ of S are as in Table 5 if $(\tilde{w}_{\sigma})_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}$. The irreducible components of $\text{Spec } R_{\bar{p}}^{\leq(3,0),\sigma}$ are given by $\text{Spec } R_{\bar{p}}^{\lambda,\tau\tilde{w}}$, where $\lambda = (\lambda_j) \in \{(3,0), (2,1)\}^f$ and $\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)$.

More precisely, via the isomorphism (33), for any choice of $\lambda = (\lambda_j) \in \{(3,0), (2,1)\}^f$ and $\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)$ the kernel of the natural surjection $R_{\bar{p}}^{\leq(3,0),\sigma}[[X_1, \dots, X_{2f}]] \twoheadrightarrow R_{\bar{p}}^{\lambda,\tau\tilde{w}}[[X_1, \dots, X_{2f}]]$ is generated by the prime ideal $\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} \mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),\lambda_{f-1-j}}$ of S , where the ideals $\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),\lambda_{f-1-j}}$ of S are found in Tables 4 and 5.

Proof. We follow the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.1] and use without comment the notation of *loc.cit.* The main difference in the non-semisimple case is that we need to modify the definition of the map ψ of *loc.cit.* and to prove the Claim 1 of *loc.cit.* in this case.

Recall from (21) and (22) that there exist $\delta_{12}^{(j)}, \delta_{21}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}^{\times}$ and $\delta_{22}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}$, such that

$$\text{Mat}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(f-1-j)}) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)} v & 0 \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)} v & \delta_{21}^{(j)} v \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} v^{\mu'_j}$$

where $\mu'_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu_j - (1,1) = (r_j + 1, 0)$. Note that $\delta_{22}^{(j)} = 0$ if and only if $a_{f-1-j} = 0$. In particular, if \bar{p} is reducible nonsplit, there exists at least one $j \in \mathcal{J}$, such that $\delta_{22}^{(j)} \neq 0$. In this case we fix one such j and denote it j_0 . Let $[\delta_{12}^{(j)}], [\delta_{21}^{(j)}] \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}$ and $[\delta_{22}^{(j)}] \in \mathcal{O}$ be the Teichmuller lifts of $\delta_{12}^{(j)}, \delta_{21}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}^{\times}$ and $\delta_{22}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}$.

Let $\overline{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S / \bigcap_{\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)} \sum_j I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)}$. We consider the étale φ -module \mathcal{M} over $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon, \overline{S}}$ given by

$$\text{Mat}(\phi_{\mathcal{M}}^{(f-1-j)}) = \begin{pmatrix} (v+p)([\delta_{12}^{(j)}] + x_{12}^{*(j)}) + c_{12}^{(j)} + \frac{b_{12}^{(j)}}{v} & \frac{1}{v}((v+p)d_{11}^{(j)} + c_{11}^{(j)}) \\ (v+p)([\delta_{22}^{(j)}] + x_{22}^{(j)}) + c_{22}^{(j)} & (v+p)([\delta_{21}^{(j)}] + x_{21}^{*(j)}) + c_{21}^{(j)} + \frac{b_{21}^{(j)}}{v} \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} v^{\mu'_j}$$

in a suitable basis, where $b_{21}^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ if $(\tilde{w}_\sigma)_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}$ and $b_{12}^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ if $(\tilde{w}_\sigma)_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}$. In particular, we see that $\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\overline{S}} \mathbb{F} \cong \overline{\mathcal{M}}$.

Fix an \mathbb{F} -basis $\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}$ of $\mathbb{V}_K^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}) \cong \overline{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}$. We demand moreover that $\gamma_{\mathbb{F},1}, \gamma_{\mathbb{F},2}$ span G_{K_∞} -stable lines in case $\overline{\rho}$ is reducible split. Fix an \overline{S} -basis γ of $\mathbb{V}_K^*(\mathcal{M})$ lifting $\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}$. Denote $\overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{S}[[Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4]]$. Then the G_{K_∞} -representation $\mathbb{V}_K^*(\mathcal{M} \widehat{\otimes}_{\overline{S}} \overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]) \cong \mathbb{V}_K^*(\mathcal{M}) \widehat{\otimes}_{\overline{S}} \overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]$ over $\overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]$ together with the basis $\left(1 + \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 & Y_2 \\ Y_3 & Y_4 \end{pmatrix}\right) (\gamma \otimes 1)$ give rise to a homomorphism $\psi_0 : R_{\overline{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}}^\square \rightarrow \overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]$.

We extend ψ_0 to a homomorphism $\psi : R_{\overline{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}}^\square [[\underline{X}', \underline{X}'']] \rightarrow \overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]$ as follows:

$$\psi(X'_j) = \begin{cases} x_{12}^{*(j)} & \text{if } 0 \leq j < f-1 \text{ or } \overline{\rho} \text{ is irreducible;} \\ Y_1 & \text{if } j = f-1 \text{ and } \overline{\rho} \text{ is reducible split;} \\ x_{22}^{(j_0)} & \text{if } j = f-1 \text{ and } \overline{\rho} \text{ is reducible nonsplit;} \end{cases}$$

$$\psi(X''_j) = \begin{cases} x_{21}^{*(j)} & \text{if } 0 \leq j < f-1; \\ Y_4 & \text{if } j = f-1. \end{cases}$$

Claim. The map $\psi : R_{\overline{\rho}|_{G_{K_\infty}}}^\square [[\underline{X}', \underline{X}'']] \rightarrow \overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]$ is surjective.

Now we prove the Claim following the proof of Claim 1 in [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.1] (which treats the semisimple case).

We check that ψ is injective on reduced tangent vectors, i.e. on $\mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)$ -points: Let $t_0 : \overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]] \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)$ be the zero vector, where the first map maps all the variables of \overline{S} and the variables Y_i to 0. Fix one continuous homomorphism $t : \overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)$ such that $t \circ \psi = t_0 \circ \psi$. The goal is to prove that $t = t_0$.

Abusing notation, we write $t(b_{ik}^{(j)}) = \varepsilon b_{ik}^{(j)}$ for some $b_{ik}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}$ on the right, and similarly $t(c_{ik}^{(j)}) = \varepsilon c_{ik}^{(j)}$, $t(d_{ik}^{(j)}) = \varepsilon d_{ik}^{(j)}$, $t(x_{ik}^{*(j)}) = \varepsilon x_{ik}^{(j)}$ if $(i, k) = (2, 1)$ or $(1, 2)$, $t(x_{22}^{(j)}) = \varepsilon x_{22}^{(j)}$, and $t(Y_i) = \varepsilon y_i$. Since $t \circ \psi = t_0 \circ \psi$, evaluating on the variables \underline{X}' and \underline{X}'' we deduce that

$$x_{12}^{(j)} = x_{21}^{(j)} = 0 \text{ for } 0 \leq j < f-1, \quad y_4 = 0, \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{cases} x_{12}^{(f-1)} = 0 & \text{if } \overline{\rho} \text{ is irreducible;} \\ y_1 = 0 & \text{if } \overline{\rho} \text{ is split reducible;} \\ x_{22}^{(j_0)} = 0 & \text{if } \overline{\rho} \text{ is nonsplit reducible.} \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Moreover, by the definition of ψ_0 and using $t \circ \psi = t_0 \circ \psi$, there is an isomorphism

$$\lambda : \mathcal{M}_{\overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]} \widehat{\otimes}_{\overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]], t} \mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_{\overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]]} \widehat{\otimes}_{\overline{S}[[\underline{Y}]], t_0} \mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2) \quad (35)$$

of étale φ -modules over $\mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)$ which induces the identity of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ modulo ε and such that $\mathbb{V}_K^*(\lambda)$ sends the basis $\left(1 + \varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} y_1 & y_2 \\ y_3 & y_4 \end{pmatrix}\right) (\gamma \otimes 1)$ to $\gamma \otimes 1$ on the corresponding G_{K_∞} -representations over $\mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)$. In particular, the isomorphism λ is realized by the change of basis (i.e. φ -conjugation) by a matrix of the form

$$1 + \varepsilon M_{f-1-j} \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{F}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)}),$$

for some $M_{f-1-j} \in \mathrm{M}_2(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{F}}) = \mathrm{M}_2(\mathbb{F}((v)))$. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \varepsilon M_{j-1}) & \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)} & 0 \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)} & \delta_{21}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} v^{\mu'_j} (1 - \varepsilon \varphi(M_j)) \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)} + \varepsilon(x_{12}^{(j)} + c_{12}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{12}^{(j)}v^{-2}) & \varepsilon(d_{11}^{(j)}v^{-1} + c_{11}^{(j)}v^{-2}) \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)} + \varepsilon(x_{22}^{(j)} + c_{22}^{(j)}v^{-1}) & \delta_{21}^{(j)} + \varepsilon(x_{21}^{(j)} + c_{21}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{21}^{(j)}v^{-2}) \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} v^{\mu'_j}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where we have divided by v , and j is considered in $\mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z}$ as usual.

First we show that the matrix $M_j \in \mathrm{M}_2(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$ for each j . Let $k_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ be minimal such that $v^{k_j} M_j \in \mathrm{M}_2(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$. The equation (36) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \varepsilon \varphi(M_j) & = v^{-\mu'_j} s_j \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)} & 0 \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)} & \delta_{21}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} (1 - \varepsilon M_{j-1}) \\ & \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)} + \varepsilon(x_{12}^{(j)} + c_{12}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{12}^{(j)}v^{-2}) & \varepsilon(d_{11}^{(j)}v^{-1} + c_{11}^{(j)}v^{-2}) \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)} + \varepsilon(x_{22}^{(j)} + c_{22}^{(j)}v^{-1}) & \delta_{21}^{(j)} + \varepsilon(x_{21}^{(j)} + c_{21}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{21}^{(j)}v^{-2}) \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} v^{\mu'_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mu'_j = (r_j + 1, 0)$, hence multiplying the right-hand side by $v^{r_j+1} \cdot v^{k_j-1} \cdot v^2$ makes it v -integral. Considering the left-hand side, it follows that $pk_j \leq k_{j-1} + r_j + 3 < k_{j-1} + p - 1$ by genericity. This implies $p(\max_j k_j) < (\max_j k_j) + p - 1$, so $\max_j k_j < 1$, meaning $M_j \in \mathrm{M}_2(\mathbb{F}[[v]])$ for all j .

Comparing the coefficients of ε in (36) and multiplying on the right by $v^{-\mu'_j} s_j$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} M_{j-1} & \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)} & 0 \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)} & \delta_{21}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)} & 0 \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)} & \delta_{21}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} v^{\mu'_j} \varphi(M_j) v^{-\mu'_j} s_j \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} x_{12}^{(j)} + c_{12}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{12}^{(j)}v^{-2} & d_{11}^{(j)}v^{-1} + c_{11}^{(j)}v^{-2} \\ x_{22}^{(j)} + c_{22}^{(j)}v^{-1} & x_{21}^{(j)} + c_{21}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{21}^{(j)}v^{-2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

From now on we assume that $\bar{\rho}$ is reducible, the case for $\bar{\rho}$ irreducible is similar and is contained in the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.1]. In particular, we have $s_j = 1$ for all j . If we

write $M_j = \begin{pmatrix} m_{11}^{(j)} & m_{12}^{(j)} \\ m_{21}^{(j)} & m_{22}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix}$ with $m_{ik}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}[[v]]$ and expand equation (37), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} m_{11}^{(j-1)}\delta_{12}^{(j)} + m_{12}^{(j-1)}\delta_{22}^{(j)} & m_{12}^{(j-1)}\delta_{21}^{(j)} \\ m_{21}^{(j-1)}\delta_{12}^{(j)} + m_{22}^{(j-1)}\delta_{22}^{(j)} & m_{22}^{(j-1)}\delta_{21}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix} \\ & - \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)}\varphi(m_{11}^{(j)}) & \delta_{12}^{(j)}v^{r_j+1}\varphi(m_{12}^{(j)}) \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)}\varphi(m_{11}^{(j)}) + \delta_{21}^{(j)}v^{-(r_j+1)}\varphi(m_{21}^{(j)}) & \delta_{22}^{(j)}v^{r_j+1}\varphi(m_{12}^{(j)}) + \delta_{21}^{(j)}\varphi(m_{22}^{(j)}) \end{pmatrix} \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} x_{12}^{(j)} + c_{12}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{12}^{(j)}v^{-2} & d_{11}^{(j)}v^{-1} + c_{11}^{(j)}v^{-2} \\ x_{22}^{(j)} + c_{22}^{(j)}v^{-1} & x_{21}^{(j)} + c_{21}^{(j)}v^{-1} + b_{21}^{(j)}v^{-2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Compare the (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2)-entries. Since M is v -integral, we deduce that $c_{12}^{(j)} = b_{12}^{(j)} = 0$, $d_{11}^{(j)} = c_{11}^{(j)} = 0$, and $c_{21}^{(j)} = b_{21}^{(j)} = 0$ for all j .

Compare the (2, 1)-entries. Since the first term of the left-hand side is v -integral and the right-hand side times v is integral, we deduce that $v^{-r_j}\varphi(m_{21}^{(j)})$ is v -integral (recall that $\delta_{21}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$). Since $r_j \geq 1$, we get $v \mid m_{21}^{(j)}$ in $\mathbb{F}[[v]]$. Since $p - (r_j + 1) \geq 0$ by genericity, it follows that the left-hand side of the (2, 1)-entry of (38) is v -integral, hence $c_{22}^{(j)} = 0$ for all j .

Compare the (1, 2)-entries again. Now we have the equality $m_{12}^{(j-1)}\delta_{21}^{(j)} = \delta_{12}^{(j)}v^{r_j+1}\varphi(m_{12}^{(j)})$ for all j . Comparing the order of v and using $\delta_{21}^{(j)}, \delta_{21}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ for all j , we easily deduce that $m_{12}^{(j)} = 0$ for all j .

Now the equation (38) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{12}^{(j)}(m_{11}^{(j-1)} - \varphi(m_{11}^{(j)})) & 0 \\ \delta_{12}^{(j)}m_{21}^{(j-1)} + \delta_{22}^{(j)}(m_{22}^{(j-1)} - \varphi(m_{11}^{(j)})) - \delta_{21}^{(j)}v^{-(r_j+1)}\varphi(m_{21}^{(j)}) & \delta_{21}^{(j)}(m_{22}^{(j-1)} - \varphi(m_{22}^{(j)})) \end{pmatrix} \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} x_{12}^{(j)} & 0 \\ x_{22}^{(j)} & x_{21}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Specializing the equation (39) at $v = 0$ and using that $v \mid m_{21}^{(j)}$ in $\mathbb{F}[[v]]$ and $p - (r_j + 1) \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{cases} \delta_{12}^{(j)}(m_{11}^{(j-1)} - m_{11}^{(j)})|_{v=0} = x_{12}^{(j)}, \\ \delta_{22}^{(j)}(m_{22}^{(j-1)} - m_{11}^{(j)})|_{v=0} = x_{22}^{(j)}, \\ \delta_{21}^{(j)}(m_{22}^{(j-1)} - m_{22}^{(j)})|_{v=0} = x_{21}^{(j)}. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

By (34), $x_{12}^{(j)} = 0$ for $0 \leq j < f - 1$, hence $m_{11}^{(j)}|_{v=0}$ does not depend on j and we denote it m_{11} . By (40) again, it follows that $x_{12}^{(f-1)} = 0$. Similarly, $x_{21}^{(j)} = 0$ for $0 \leq j < f - 1$ by (34), hence $m_{22}^{(j)}|_{v=0}$ does not depend on j and we denote it m_{22} . As previously, it follows that $x_{21}^{(f-1)} = 0$.

If $\bar{\rho}$ is reducible split, then $\delta_{22}^{(j)} = 0$ for all j , hence by the second equation of (40), we get $x_{22}^{(j)} = 0$ for all j .

If $\bar{\rho}$ is reducible non-split, we know by (34) that $x_{22}^{(j_0)} = 0$, hence by the second equation of (40), we get $m_{11} = m_{22}$ since $\delta_{22}^{(j_0)} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ by our choice of j_0 . Then by the second equation of (40) again, we get $x_{22}^{(j)} = 0$ for all j .

As a result, the right-hand side of (37) vanishes and we conclude that $(M_{f-1-j})_j \in \text{End}_{\varphi\text{-mod}}(\overline{\mathcal{M}})$. Denote this endomorphism by ξ . Since the isomorphism (35) satisfies

$$(1 + \varepsilon \mathbb{V}_K^*(\xi)) \left[\left(1 + \varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} y_1 & y_2 \\ y_3 & y_4 \end{pmatrix} \right) (\gamma \otimes 1) \right] = \gamma \otimes 1,$$

it follows that $\mathbb{V}_K^*(\xi) = - \begin{pmatrix} y_1 & y_2 \\ y_3 & y_4 \end{pmatrix}$ with respect to the basis $\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}$. Moreover, we have

$$\text{End}_{\varphi\text{-mod}}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}) \cong \text{End}_{G_{K_\infty}}(\bar{\rho}|_{K_\infty}) \cong \text{End}_{G_K}(\bar{\rho})$$

by [BHH⁺, Lemma 3.2.8].

If $\bar{\rho}$ is non-split reducible, then $\text{End}_{\varphi\text{-mod}}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}) = \mathbb{F}$. As $y_4 = 0$ we conclude from the formula for $\mathbb{V}_K^*(\xi)$ that $y_i = 0$ for all i .

If $\bar{\rho}$ is split reducible, then $\text{End}_{\varphi\text{-mod}}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}) \cong \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}$. By our condition that $\gamma_{\mathbb{F},1}, \gamma_{\mathbb{F},2}$ each span G_{K_∞} -stable lines, we conclude that $y_2 = y_3 = 0$. Using (34) we also have $y_1 = y_4 = 0$.

We have shown that $t = t_0$, completing the proof of the Claim.

The rest of the proof and the computations are completely analogous to that of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.1] (see Remark 4.3.2 below) using Theorem 4.2.1. As in the proof of Claim 2 of *loc.cit.*, one can identify the étale φ -modules between the tables via the change of variables given by the following.

Figure 2: Change of variables between the tables

Table 1	e_{11}^*	d_{11}	c_{11}	d_{21}	c_{12}	c_{21}	d_{22}^*	c_{22}
Table 4	d_{12}^*	$c_{12} - pd_{12}^*$	$b_{12} - pc_{12}$	d_{22}	d_{11}	c_{22}	d_{21}^*	c_{21}
Table 3	d_{11}^*	c_{11}	d_{12}	c_{12}	c_{21}	e_{22}^*	d_{22}	c_{22}
Table 5	d_{12}^*	c_{12}	d_{11}	c_{11}	d_{22}	d_{21}^*	$c_{21} - pd_{21}^*$	$b_{21} - pc_{21}$

□

Remark 4.3.2. *The Tables 4 and 5 are very similar to those of [BHH⁺, §4]. The main difference is that here the element d_{22} of Table 4 is a unit in $R^{(j)}$ if and only if $a_{f-1-j} \neq 0$.*

The following result is a generalization of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.3] (where $\bar{\rho}$ was assumed to be semisimple).

Proposition 4.3.3. *Keep the assumption of Theorem 4.3.1. Fix $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ and $\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)$ such that $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 2$.*

If $(\tilde{w}_\sigma)_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}$, then we have $p \in \mathfrak{q}_1^{(j),(2,1)} \cap \mathfrak{q}_2^{(j),(2,1)} + \mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(3,0)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{q}_1^{(j),(2,1)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (b_{12} - pc_{12}, c_{11}, c_{12} - pd_{12}^*, c_{21}, c_{22}, d_{11}), \\ \mathfrak{q}_2^{(j),(2,1)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(b_{12}, c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22}, \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we omit the superscripts (j) for readability and we consider these as ideals of S .

If $(\tilde{w}_\sigma)_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}$, then we have $p \in \mathfrak{q}_2^{(j),(2,1)} \cap \mathfrak{q}_3^{(j),(2,1)} + \mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(3,0)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{q}_2^{(j),(2,1)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(b_{21}, c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22}, \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right), \\ \mathfrak{q}_3^{(j),(2,1)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (b_{21} - pc_{21}, c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21} - pd_{21}^*, c_{22}, d_{22}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is purely computational and is completely analogous to that of [BHH⁺, Prop. 4.3.3] (see Remark 4.3.2). \square

Table 1: $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}$ i.e. $\overline{A}^{(f-1-j)} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{e_{11}^*} v^2 & 0 \\ \overline{d_{21}} v^2 & \overline{d_{22}^*} v \end{pmatrix}$.

$A^{(f-1-j)}$	$\begin{pmatrix} (v+p)^2 e_{11}^* + (v+p)d_{11} + c_{11} & c_{12} \\ v((v+p)d_{21} + c_{21}) & (v+p)d_{22}^* + c_{22} \end{pmatrix}$
φ -module at the ($f-1-j$)-th embedding	$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{v}((v+p)^2 e_{11}^* + (v+p)d_{11} + c_{11}) & c_{12} \\ (v+p)d_{21} + c_{21} & (v+p)d_{22}^* + c_{22} \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} v^{r_j+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$R^{(j)}$	$\mathcal{O}[[c_{11}, d_{11}, x_{11}^*, c_{12}, c_{21}, x_{21}, c_{22}, x_{22}^*]]$
$I^{(j), \leq (3,0)}$	$c_{11}c_{22} + pc_{12}c_{21},$ $d_{11}c_{22} - c_{12}c_{21} + c_{11}d_{22}^* + pc_{12}d_{21},$ $e_{11}^*c_{22} + d_{11}d_{22}^* - c_{12}d_{21}$
$I^{(j), \nabla}$	$(a_1 - 1)d_{11}c_{22} + a_1c_{11}d_{22}^* + p(d_{11}d_{22}^* + 2e_{11}^*c_{22}) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $c_{22}(a_1c_{11} + pd_{11}) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $c_{12}((a_1 - 1)d_{11} + 2pe_{11}^*) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $c_{12}(a_1c_{11} + pd_{11}) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $(a_1 - 1)c_{21}c_{22} - p((a_1 - 3)d_{21}c_{22} + (a_1 + 1)c_{21}d_{22}^*) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $p((a_1 - 1)c_{21}c_{22} + p(d_{21}c_{22} - c_{21}d_{22}^*)) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $(a_1 - 1)c_{12}c_{21} + c_{11}d_{22}^* - p((a_1 - 3)c_{12}d_{21} + d_{11}d_{22}^*) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $p((a_1 - 1)c_{12}c_{21} + c_{11}d_{22}^* + pc_{12}d_{21}) + O(p^{N-3})$
$I^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I^{(j), \nabla} + I^{(j), \leq (3,0)})^{p\text{-sat}}$	$d_{11} + (a_1 - 2)\frac{c_{12}d_{21}}{d_{22}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{22} - (a_1 - 1)\frac{c_{12}d_{21}}{e_{11}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{21} + \frac{(a_1 - 1)(a_1 - 2)c_{12}(d_{21})^2}{a_1 e_{11}^* d_{22}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{11} - \frac{c_{12}d_{21}}{d_{22}^*} \left(\frac{(a_1 - 1)^2(a_1 - 2)c_{12}d_{21}}{a_1 e_{11}^* d_{22}^*} - p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $(c_{12} + O(p^{N-8})) \left((a_1 - 1)(a_1 - 2)\frac{c_{12}d_{21}}{e_{11}^* d_{22}^*} - 2p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}^{(j), (2,1)}$	$I^{(j)} + (c_{12} + O(p^{N-8}))$
$\mathfrak{p}^{(j), (3,0)}$	$I^{(j)} + \left((a_1 - 1)(a_1 - 2)\frac{c_{12}d_{21}}{e_{11}^* d_{22}^*} - 2p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$

Here $a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ and $a_1 \equiv -\langle s_j^{-1}(\mu_j) - (2, 1), \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \equiv -\text{sgn}(s_j)(r_j + 1) + 1 \pmod{p}$. For readability we write a_1, c_{ik} , etc. instead of $a_1^{(j)}, c_{ik}^{(j)}$, etc. Also note that $x_{11}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_{11}^* - \overline{[e_{11}^*]}$, $x_{22}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{22}^* - \overline{[d_{22}^*]}$ and $x_{21} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{21} - \overline{[d_{21}]}$.

Table 2: $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = \mathfrak{wt}_{(2,1)}$ i.e. $\overline{A}^{(f-1-j)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \overline{d_{12}^*}v \\ \overline{d_{21}^*}v^2 & \overline{d_{22}^*}v \end{pmatrix}$.

$A^{(f-1-j)}$	$\begin{pmatrix} (v+p)d_{11} + c_{11} & (v+p)d_{12}^* + c_{12} \\ v((v+p)d_{21}^* + c_{21}) & (v+p)d_{22} + c_{22} \end{pmatrix}$
φ -module at the ($f-1-j$)-th embedding	$\begin{pmatrix} (v+p)d_{12}^* + c_{12} & \frac{1}{v}((v+p)d_{11} + c_{11}) \\ (v+p)d_{22} + c_{22} & (v+p)d_{21}^* + c_{21} \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} v^{r_j+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$R^{(j)}$	$\mathcal{O}[[c_{11}, d_{11}, c_{12}, x_{12}^*, c_{21}, x_{21}^*, c_{22}, x_{22}]]$
$I^{(j), \leq (3,0)}$	$d_{11}d_{22} - (c_{12}d_{21}^* + d_{12}^*c_{21}) + pd_{12}^*d_{21}^*,$ $c_{12}c_{21} - d_{11}c_{22} - c_{11}d_{22} - p(c_{12}d_{21}^* + d_{12}^*c_{21}),$ $c_{11}c_{22} + pc_{12}c_{21}$
$I^{(j), \nabla}$	$(a_2 - 1)d_{11}c_{22} + a_2c_{11}d_{22} + p(d_{11}d_{22} - 2d_{12}^*c_{21} + pd_{12}^*d_{21}^*) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $a_2c_{11}c_{22} + p(d_{11}c_{22} + pd_{12}^*c_{21}) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $(a_2 + 1)c_{11}d_{12}^* + (a_2 - 1)d_{11}c_{12} + O(p^{N-4}),$ $a_2c_{11}c_{12} + p(d_{11}c_{12} - c_{11}d_{12}^*) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $(a_2 - 1)c_{21}c_{22} - p((a_2 - 3)d_{21}^*c_{22} + (a_2 + 1)c_{21}d_{22}) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $p((a_2 - 1)c_{21}c_{22} + p(d_{21}^*c_{22} - c_{21}d_{22})) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $(a_2 - 1)c_{12}c_{21} + c_{11}d_{22} - p((a_2 - 3)c_{12}d_{21}^* + (a_2 - 1)d_{12}^*c_{21}$ $\quad + d_{11}d_{22} + pd_{12}^*d_{21}^*) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $p((a_2 - 1)c_{12}c_{21} + c_{11}d_{22} + pc_{12}d_{21}^*) + O(p^{N-3})$
$I^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I^{(j), \nabla} + I^{(j), \leq (3,0)})^{p\text{-sat}}$	$c_{21} + (a_2 - 1)d_{21}^* \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{12} - a_2d_{12}^* \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{11} + \frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{a_2 + 1} d_{11} \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{22} - \frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{a_2 - 2} d_{22} \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $\left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right) \left(\frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2 - 2)(a_2 + 1)} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}^{(j), (2,1)}$	$I^{(j)} + \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}^{(j), (3,0)}$	$I^{(j)} + \left(\frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2 - 2)(a_2 + 1)} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$

Here $a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ and $a_2 \equiv -\langle \mathfrak{w}s_j^{-1}(\mu_j) - (2, 1), \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \equiv \text{sgn}(s_j)(r_j + 1) + 1 \pmod{p}$. For readability we write a_2, c_{ik} , etc. instead of $a_2^{(j)}, c_{ik}^{(j)}$, etc. Also note that $x_{12}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{12}^* - \overline{[d_{12}^*]}$, $x_{21}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{21}^* - \overline{[d_{21}^*]}$ and $x_{22} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{22} - \overline{[d_{22}]}$.

Table 3: $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}$, i.e. $\overline{A}^{(f-1-j)} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{d_{11}^*}v & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{e_{22}^*}v^2 \end{pmatrix}$.

$A^{(f-1-j)}$	$\begin{pmatrix} (v+p)d_{11}^* + c_{11} & (v+p)d_{12} + c_{12} \\ vc_{21} & (v+p)^2e_{22}^* + (v+p)d_{22} + c_{22} \end{pmatrix}$
φ -module at the $(f-1-j)$ -th embedding	$\begin{pmatrix} (v+p)d_{11}^* + c_{11} & \frac{1}{v}((v+p)d_{12} + c_{12}) \\ vc_{21} & \frac{1}{v}((v+p)^2e_{22}^* + (v+p)d_{22} + c_{22}) \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} v^{r_j+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$R^{(j)}$	$\mathcal{O}[[c_{11}, x_{11}^*, c_{12}, d_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22}, d_{22}, x_{22}^*]]$
$I^{(j), \leq (3,0)}$	$c_{11}c_{22} + pc_{12}c_{21},$ $c_{11}d_{22} - c_{12}c_{21} + d_{11}^*c_{22} + pd_{12}c_{21},$ $c_{11}e_{22}^* + d_{11}^*d_{22} - d_{12}c_{21}$
$I^{(j), \nabla}$	$a_3c_{11}d_{22} + (a_3 - 1)d_{11}^*c_{22} - p(d_{11}^*d_{22} + 2c_{11}e_{22}^*) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $c_{11}((a_3 - 1)c_{22} - pd_{22}) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $c_{21}(a_3d_{22} - 2pe_{22}^*) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $c_{21}((a_3 - 1)c_{22} - pd_{22}) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $a_3c_{11}c_{12} - p((a_3 + 2)c_{11}d_{12} + (a_3 - 2)d_{11}^*c_{12}) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $p(a_3c_{11}c_{12} - p(c_{11}d_{12} - d_{11}^*c_{12})) + O(p^{N-3}),$ $a_3c_{12}c_{21} - d_{11}^*c_{22} - p((a_3 + 2)d_{12}c_{21} - d_{11}^*d_{22}) + O(p^{N-4}),$ $p(a_3c_{12}c_{21} - d_{11}^*c_{22} - pd_{12}c_{21}) + O(p^{N-3})$
$I^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I^{(j), \nabla} + I^{(j), \leq (3,0)})^{p\text{-sat}}$	$d_{22} - (a_3 + 1)\frac{d_{12}c_{21}}{d_{11}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{11} + a_3\frac{d_{12}c_{21}}{e_{22}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{12} - \frac{a_3(a_3 + 1)}{a_3 - 1}\frac{(d_{12})^2c_{21}}{d_{11}^*e_{22}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{22} - \frac{d_{12}c_{21}}{d_{11}^*}\left(\frac{(a_3)^2(a_3 + 1)}{a_3 - 1}\frac{d_{12}c_{21}}{d_{11}^*e_{22}^*} - p\right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $(c_{21} + O(p^{N-8}))\left(a_3(a_3 + 1)\frac{d_{12}c_{21}}{d_{11}^*e_{22}^*} - 2p + O(p^{N-8})\right)$
$\mathfrak{p}^{(j), (2,1)}$	$I^{(j)} + (c_{21} + O(p^{N-8}))$
$\mathfrak{p}^{(j), (3,0)}$	$I^{(j)} + \left(a_3(a_3 + 1)\frac{d_{12}c_{21}}{d_{11}^*e_{22}^*} - 2p + O(p^{N-8})\right)$

Here $a_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ and $a_3 \equiv -\langle s_j^{-1}(\mu_j) - (1, 2), \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \equiv -\text{sgn}(s_j)(r_j + 1) - 1 \pmod{p}$. For readability we write a_3, c_{ik} , etc. instead of $a_3^{(j)}, c_{ik}^{(j)}$, etc. Also, $x_{11}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{11}^* - \overline{[d_{11}^*]}$ and $x_{22}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_{22}^* - \overline{[e_{22}^*]}$. Note that we necessarily have $a_{f-1-j} = 0$ in this case.

Table 4: **Multi-type:** $(\tilde{w}_\sigma)_{f-1-j} = t_{(1,2)}$, so $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}$ and $\mathfrak{wt}_{(2,1)}$.

Multi-type φ -module at the $(f-1-j)$ -embedding	$\begin{pmatrix} (v+p)d_{12}^* + c_{12} + \frac{b_{12}}{v} & \frac{1}{v}((v+p)d_{11} + c_{11}) \\ (v+p)d_{22} + c_{22} & (v+p)d_{21}^* + c_{21} \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} v^{r_j+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$S^{(j)}$	$\mathcal{O}[[c_{11}, d_{11}, b_{12}, c_{12}, x_{12}^*, c_{21}, x_{21}^*, c_{22}, x_{22}]]$
$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 1$	$c_{11} + pd_{11},$ $c_{12} - pd_{12}^* + (a_1 - 2) \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{21}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{21} - (a_1 - 1) \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{22} + \frac{(a_1 - 1)(a_1 - 2)}{a_1} \frac{d_{11}(d_{22})^2}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + O(p^{N-8}),$ $b_{12} - pc_{12} - \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{21}^*} \left(\frac{(a_1 - 1)^2(a_1 - 2)}{a_1} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} - p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $(d_{11} + O(p^{N-8})) \left((a_1 - 1)(a_1 - 2) \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} - 2p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 2$	$b_{12},$ $c_{21} + (a_2 - 1)d_{21}^* \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{12} - a_2d_{12}^* \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{11} + \frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{a_2 + 1} d_{11} \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $c_{22} - \frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{a_2 - 2} d_{22} \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}),$ $\left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right) \left(\frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2 - 2)(a_2 + 1)} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(2,1)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 1$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + (d_{11} + O(p^{N-8}))$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(3,0)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 1$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + \left(\frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2 - 2)(a_2 + 1)} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(2,1)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 2$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(3,0)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 2$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + \left(\frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2 - 2)(a_2 + 1)} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$

For readability we write a_i, c_{ik} , etc. instead of $a_i^{(j)}, c_{ik}^{(j)}$, etc. Also note that $x_{12}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{12}^* - [d_{12}^*]$, $x_{21}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{21}^* - [d_{21}^*]$ and $x_{22} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{22} - [d_{22}]$. Note that the constants a_1 and a_2 and the $O(p^{N-8})$ tails coming from Tables 1-2 (by the change of variables in Figure 2) depend on the whole f -tuple $\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)$.

Table 5: **Multi-type:** $(\tilde{w}_\sigma)_{f-1-j} = t_{(2,1)}$, so $\tilde{w}_{f-1-j} = \mathfrak{m}t_{(2,1)}$ and $t_{(1,2)}$.

Multi-type φ -module at the $(f-1-j)$ -embedding	$\begin{pmatrix} (v+p)d_{12}^* + c_{12} & \frac{1}{v}((v+p)d_{11} + c_{11}) \\ (v+p)d_{22} + c_{22} & (v+p)d_{21}^* + c_{21} + \frac{b_{21}}{v} \end{pmatrix} s_j^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} v^{r_j+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$S^{(j)}$	$\mathcal{O}[[c_{11}, d_{11}, c_{12}, x_{12}^*, b_{21}, c_{21}, x_{21}^*, c_{22}, x_{22}]]$
$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 2$	$\begin{aligned} & b_{21}, \\ & c_{21} + (a_2 - 1)d_{21}^* \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & c_{12} - a_2d_{12}^* \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & c_{11} + \frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{a_2 + 1}d_{11} \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & c_{22} - \frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{a_2 - 2}d_{22} \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p \right) + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right) \left(\frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2 - 2)(a_2 + 1)} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right) \end{aligned}$
$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 3$	$\begin{aligned} & c_{22} + pd_{22}, \\ & c_{21} - pd_{21}^* - (a_3 + 1) \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*} + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & c_{12} + a_3 \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{21}^*} + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & c_{11} - \frac{a_3(a_3 + 1)}{a_3 - 1} \frac{(d_{11})^2 d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & b_{21} - pc_{21} - \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*} \left(\frac{(a_3)^2(a_3 + 1)}{a_3 - 1} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} - p \right) + O(p^{N-8}), \\ & (d_{22} + O(p^{N-8})) \left(a_3(a_3 + 1) \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} - 2p + O(p^{N-8}) \right) \end{aligned}$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(2,1)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 2$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + \left(\frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(3,0)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 2$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + \left(\frac{a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2 - 2)(a_2 + 1)} \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} + p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(2,1)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 3$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + (d_{22} + O(p^{N-8}))$
$\mathfrak{p}_{\tilde{w}}^{(j),(3,0)}$, $i(\tilde{w})_{f-1-j} = 3$	$I_{\tilde{w}}^{(j)} + \left(a_3(a_3 + 1) \frac{d_{11}d_{22}}{d_{12}^*d_{21}^*} - 2p + O(p^{N-8}) \right)$

For readability we write a_i, c_{ik} , etc. instead of $a_i^{(j)}, c_{ik}^{(j)}$, etc. Also, $x_{12}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{12}^* - \overline{[d_{12}^*]}$, $x_{21}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{21}^* - \overline{[d_{21}^]}$ and $x_{22} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_{22}$. Note that we necessarily have $a_{f-1-j} = 0$ in this case. Also note that the constants a_2 and a_3 and the $O(p^{N-8})$ tails coming from Tables 2-3 (by the change of variables in Figure 2) depend on the whole f -tuple $\tilde{w} \in X(\sigma)$.

5 Gelfand-Kirillov dimension and representations of GL_2

In this section we recall a criterion which gives an upper bound for the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of certain admissible smooth representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ over \mathbb{F} . This criterion is given in [BHH⁺, §6] and is used in the semisimple case. It works in the non-semisimple case as well by the result of [HW22, §4].

We introduce some notation. Let $I \subset \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ be the subgroup of upper triangular matrices modulo p . Let $I_1 \subset I$ be its maximal pro- p subgroup, which is the subgroup of upper unipotent matrices modulo p . Let $K_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} 1 + pM_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \subset \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ be the first congruence subgroup. Let Z be the center of $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ and let $Z_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} Z \cap K_1$. Let \mathfrak{m}_{K_1} denote the unique maximal ideal of the Iwasawa algebra $\mathbb{F}[[K_1/Z_1]]$. The ideal of $\mathbb{F}[[\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)/Z_1]]$ generated by \mathfrak{m}_{K_1} under the natural inclusion $\mathbb{F}[[K_1/Z_1]] \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}[[\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)/Z_1]]$ is also denoted by \mathfrak{m}_{K_1} when there is no possible confusion. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma &\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{GL}_2(k), \\ \tilde{\Gamma} &\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbb{F}[[\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)/Z_1]]/\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ be as in §4.1 (see (20)). Recall that [HW22, §4.1] constructs a finite dimensional representation $\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho})$ of (the non-commutative ring) $\tilde{\Gamma}$ over \mathbb{F} (generalizing the constructions of [BP12, §13]) characterized by the following properties:

- (i) $\mathrm{soc}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho}) = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})} \sigma$,
- (ii) for each $\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})$, we have $[\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho}) : \sigma] = 1$,
- (iii) $\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho})$ is maximal with respect to properties (i) and (ii).

We have a decomposition of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ -representations

$$\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho}) = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})} \tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho}),$$

where each $\tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho})$ satisfies $\mathrm{soc}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho}) = \sigma$. We have $\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho})^{K_1} \cong D_0(\bar{\rho})$, which is the representation of Γ over \mathbb{F} defined in [BP12, §13]. We also define the I -representation

$$D_1(\bar{\rho}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} D_0(\bar{\rho})^{I_1} = \tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho})^{I_1}.$$

The following proposition comes from [HW22, Thm. 4.6].

Proposition 5.1. *The representation $\tilde{D}_0(\bar{\rho})$ of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ over \mathbb{F} is multiplicity-free.*

One can describe explicitly the structure of each $\tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho})$, where $\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})$. We use the notation of §2.3. Let $\lambda \in X_1(\underline{T})$ be such that $\sigma \cong F(\lambda)$. By (23) and Lemma 2.3.4 there exist a subset $J_{\bar{\rho},\sigma} \subseteq \{0, \dots, f-1\}$ and elements $\varepsilon_j \in \{\pm 1\}$ for each $j \in J_{\bar{\rho},\sigma}$, such that

$$W(\bar{\rho}) = \{F(t_\lambda(b_0, \dots, b_{f-1})) : b_j \in \{0, \varepsilon_j\} \text{ if } j \in J_{\bar{\rho},\sigma} \text{ and } b_j = 0 \text{ if } j \notin J_{\bar{\rho},\sigma}\}. \quad (41)$$

Then by [HW22, Lemma 4.8] and [HW22, Cor. 2.35], the multiplicity-free representation $\tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho})$ has Jordan–Hölder factors

$$\text{JH}(\tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho})) = \left\{ \sigma_{\underline{a}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(t_\lambda(a_0, \dots, a_{f-1})) : a_j \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{sgn}(a_j) \neq \varepsilon_j \text{ for } j \in J_{\bar{\rho},\sigma}, \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} \left\lfloor \frac{a_j}{2} \right\rfloor \leq 1 \right\} \quad (42)$$

and its submodule structure is determined as follows: the unique subrepresentation of $\tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho})$ with cosocle $\sigma_{\underline{a}}$ has constituents $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$ for all \underline{b} such that each b_j is between 0 and a_j . Here for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $[x]$ the largest integer which is smaller than or equal to x .

The following proposition comes from [BHH⁺, Cor. 6.3.13.(i)] where the assumption that $\bar{\rho}$ is semisimple is not used in the proof of *loc.cit.*

Proposition 5.2. *Fix $m_\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for each $\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})$. There exists a unique (up to isomorphism) finite dimensional representation V of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ over \mathbb{F} such that*

- (i) $\text{soc}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} V = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})} \sigma^{m_\sigma}$,
- (ii) for each $\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})$, we have $[V : \sigma] = m_\sigma$,
- (iii) V is maximal with respect to properties (i) and (ii).

Proof. We use the same argument as in the proof of [BHH⁺, Cor. 6.3.13(i)]. In particular, we can take V to be $\bigoplus_{\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})} \tilde{D}_{0,\sigma}(\bar{\rho})^{m_\sigma}$. □

Now we give a generalization of [BHH⁺, Thm. 6.4.7] where $\bar{\rho}$ was assumed to be semisimple. This gives an upper bound for the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension $\dim_{\text{GL}_2(K)}(\pi)$ of some admissible smooth representations π of $\text{GL}_2(K)$ over \mathbb{F} . We refer to [BHH⁺, §5] for the notion of Gelfand-Kirillov dimension.

Theorem 5.3. *Let π be an admissible smooth representation of $\text{GL}_2(K)$ over \mathbb{F} with a central character. Assume that:*

- (i) we have $\text{JH}(\text{soc}_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\pi)) = W(\bar{\rho})$ up to multiplicity,
- (ii) for each $\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})$, we have $[\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2]_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)} : \sigma] = [\text{soc}_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)} \pi : \sigma]$,
- (iii) we have $\text{JH}(\pi^{I_1}) = \text{JH}(D_1(\bar{\rho}))$ up to multiplicity (as I -representations).

Then $\dim_{\text{GL}_2(K)}(\pi) \leq f$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of [BHH⁺, Thm. 6.4.7]. For $\bar{\rho}$ not necessarily semisimple, the condition (a) of [BHH⁺, §6.4] is guaranteed by Proposition 5.2. The condition (b) of *loc.cit.* is guaranteed by Proposition 5.1 and (42). Finally the condition (c) of *loc.cit.* is a consequence of [BHH⁺, Lemma 6.4.3]. □

6 Global applications

In this section we use the machinery of patching functors introduced by [EGS15] to prove the main global results: Theorem 6.3.1. We follow closely [BHH⁺, §8] which deals with the semisimple case.

6.1 Patching functors

In this subsection we recall the global setting following [BHH⁺, §8.1], to which we refer the reader for more references and details.

We assume $p > 5$ and E unramified, so that $\mathcal{O} = W(\mathbb{F})$.

We fix F a totally real number field in which p is unramified. We denote by S_p the set of places of F above p . We refer to §1.3 for the notation \mathcal{O}_F , F_w , \mathcal{O}_{F_w} , Frob_w and \mathbb{A}_F^∞ . We fix a place $v \in S_p$.

We fix D a quaternion algebra with center F which is split at places above p and at exactly one infinite place (called the **indefinite** case) or at no infinite places (called the **definite** case). In the indefinite case we assume that $(D, F) \neq (\text{GL}_2, \mathbb{Q})$ since our main theorem is already known in this case. We denote by S_D the set of finite places where D ramifies. We fix a maximal order \mathcal{O}_D of D and isomorphisms $(\mathcal{O}_D)_w \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{M}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ for $w \notin S_D$, where $(\mathcal{O}_D)_w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{O}_D \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_F} \mathcal{O}_{F_w}$.

We fix $\bar{r} : G_F \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ a continuous representation and set $\bar{r}_w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{r}|_{G_{F_w}}$. Let $S_{\bar{r}}$ be the set of finite places where \bar{r} ramifies. We assume that

- (i) $\bar{r}|_{G_{F(\sqrt[p]{\mathbb{T}})}}$ is absolutely irreducible;
- (ii) for each $w \in (S_D \cup S_{\bar{r}}) \setminus S_p$, the universal framed deformation ring $R_{\bar{r}_w}$ of \bar{r}_w over $W(\mathbb{F})$ is formally smooth over $W(\mathbb{F})$;
- (iii) for each $w \in S_p$, \bar{r}_w is generic in the sense of [BP12, Def. 11.7]. In particular we have $S_p \subseteq S_{\bar{r}}$;
- (iv) \bar{r}_v (equivalently \bar{r}_v^\vee) is one of the following forms up to twist:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(a)} \quad \bar{r}_v|_{I_{F_v}} &\cong \begin{pmatrix} \omega_f^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & * \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } 12 \leq r_i \leq p-15, \\
 \text{(b)} \quad \bar{r}_v|_{I_{F_v}} &\cong \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{2f}^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{2f}^{p^f \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } 13 \leq r_0 \leq p-14 \text{ and } 12 \leq r_i \leq \\
 & p-15 \text{ for } i > 0, \text{ where } f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [F_v : \mathbb{Q}_p];
 \end{aligned}$$

Assume first that we are in the indefinite case, for each compact open subgroup $V \leq (D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^\infty)^\times$ let X_V be the associated smooth projective algebraic Shimura curve over F (see e.g. [BD14, §3.1] and the references therein). We assume moreover that

(v) there exists V such that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G_F}(\bar{\tau}, H_{\text{ét}}^1(X_V \times_F \bar{F}, \mathbb{F})) \neq 0. \quad (43)$$

We let $\psi : G_F \rightarrow W(\mathbb{F})^\times$ be the Teichmüller lift of $\omega \det \bar{\tau}$ and set $\psi_w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi|_{G_{F_w}}$.

Exactly as in [BHH⁺, §8.1], we fix a finite place w_1 , a finite set of places S , a compact open subgroup $U = \prod_w U_w \subseteq \prod_w (\mathcal{O}_D)_w^\times \subseteq (D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^\infty)^\times$ which in particular satisfies $U_w \cong \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ for each $w \in S_p$, a tame inertial type τ_w such that $\mathrm{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau_w)^\vee}) = \mathrm{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau_w^\vee)})$ contains exactly one Serre weight in $W(\bar{\tau}_w^\vee)$ for each $w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}$, and a $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ -invariant lattice $\sigma^0(\tau_w^\vee)$ in $\sigma(\tau_w^\vee) = \sigma(\tau_w)^\vee$ for each $w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}$.

Then as in [EGS15, §6] we can define a patching functor M_∞ from the category of continuous representations σ_v of $U_v \cong \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ on finite type $W(\mathbb{F})$ -modules with central character $\psi|_{I_{F_v}}^{-1} \circ \mathrm{Art}_{F_v}|_{\mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times}$ to the category of finite type R_∞ -modules, where

$$R_\infty \cong R_{\bar{\tau}_v}^{\psi_v}[[X_1, \dots, X_g]]$$

for some integer g . Here $R_{\bar{\tau}_v}^{\psi_v}$ is the framed deformation ring of $\bar{\tau}_v$ with fixed determinant $\varepsilon^{-1}\psi_v$.

We denote by \mathfrak{m}_∞ the maximal ideal of R_∞ and for $w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}$ let σ_w be the unique Serre weight in $W(\bar{\tau}_w^\vee)$ that appears in $\mathrm{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau_w^\vee)})$. We have

$$M_\infty(\sigma_v)/\mathfrak{m}_\infty \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{U_v/V_v} \left(\sigma_v, \mathrm{Hom}_{U^v/V^v} \left(\bigotimes_{w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}} \sigma_w, \mathrm{Hom}_{G_F}(\bar{\tau}, H_{\text{ét}}^1(X_V \times_F \bar{F}, \mathbb{F})) \right) \right)^\vee \quad (44)$$

for any $V = \prod V_w \subseteq (D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^\infty)^\times$ such that $V_w = U_w$ if $w \notin S_p$ and $V_w \subseteq 1 + p\mathrm{M}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ normal in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ if $w \in S_p$, and for any representation σ_v of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ over $W(\mathbb{F})$ on which V_v acts trivially. Moreover, we have $M_\infty(\sigma_v) \neq 0$ if and only if $\mathrm{JH}(\overline{\sigma_v}) \cap W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee) \neq \emptyset$.

The definite case is analogous to the indefinite one. In this case, the space

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G_F}(\bar{\tau}, H_{\text{ét}}^1(X_V \times_F \bar{F}, \mathbb{F}))$$

in (43) is replaced by $S(V, \mathbb{F})[\mathfrak{m}]$, where

$$S(V, \mathbb{F}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f : D^\times \setminus (D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^\infty)^\times / V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\}$$

and \mathfrak{m} is generated by $T_w - S_w \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{\tau}(\mathrm{Frob}_w))$, $\mathrm{Norm}(w) - S_w \det(\bar{\tau}(\mathrm{Frob}_w))$ for $w \notin S \cup \{w_1\}$ such that $V_w = (\mathcal{O}_D)_w^\times$, with T_w, S_w acting on $S(V, \mathbb{F})$ (via right translation on functions) respectively by $V \begin{pmatrix} \varpi_w & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} V$, $V \begin{pmatrix} \varpi_w & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi_w \end{pmatrix} V$, where ϖ_w is any uniformizer in F_w . Then, (44) is replaced by

$$M_\infty(\sigma_v)/\mathfrak{m}_\infty \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{U_v/V_v} \left(\sigma_v, \mathrm{Hom}_{U^v/V^v} \left(\bigotimes_{w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}} \sigma_w, S(V, \mathbb{F})[\mathfrak{m}] \right) \right)^\vee. \quad (45)$$

6.2 Freeness for projective envelopes

In this subsection we prove the freeness of some patched modules following [BHH⁺, §8.2, §8.3] (which deals with the semisimple case). The main result is Proposition 6.2.4.

We keep the notation of §5 with $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F_v$ and let k_v be the residue field of F_v . In particular we have $\Gamma = \text{GL}_2(k_v)$ and $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathbb{F}[[\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})/Z_1]]/\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2$. For σ a Serre weight, we let $P_\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Proj}_\Gamma \sigma$ be the projective envelope of σ in the category of $\mathbb{F}[\Gamma]$ -modules, \tilde{P}_σ be the projective $\mathcal{O}[\Gamma]$ -module lifting P_σ and $\text{Proj}_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \sigma$ be the projective envelope of σ in the category of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ -modules.

Let M_∞ be the patching functor defined in §6.1. If A is a ring and M is an A -module, we define the **scheme-theoretic support** of M to be the quotient $A/\text{Ann}_A(M)$. For each τ a tame inertial type and $\lambda = (a_j, b_j)_j \in X^*(\underline{T})$ with $a_j > b_j$ for each j , we define

$$R_\infty^{\lambda, \tau} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\bar{\tau}_v}} R_{\bar{\tau}_v}^{\lambda, \tau},$$

where $R_{\bar{\tau}_v}^{\lambda, \tau}$ parametrizes potentially crystalline lifts of $\bar{\tau}_v^\vee$ of Hodge–Tate weights (a_j, b_j) in the j -th embedding $\sigma_j : F_v \hookrightarrow E$ and inertial type τ . When $a_j = a$ and $b_j = b$ for all j we write $R_\infty^{(a, b), \tau}$.

The following proposition is a generalization of [BHH⁺, Prop. 8.2.3] (where $\bar{\tau}_v$ was assumed to be semisimple).

Proposition 6.2.1. *There exists an integer $r \geq 1$ such that*

- (i) *for all $\sigma_v \in W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ the module $M_\infty(\sigma_v)$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support, which is formally smooth over \mathbb{F} .*
- (ii) *for all tame inertial type τ such that $\text{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau)}) \cap W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee) \neq \emptyset$ and all $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ -invariant $W(\mathbb{F})$ -lattices $\sigma^0(\tau)$ in $\sigma(\tau)$ with irreducible cosocle, the module $M_\infty(\sigma^0(\tau))$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support $R_\infty^{(1, 0), \tau}$, which is a domain.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the one of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.2.3]. In the case $|\mathcal{J}| = 2$ (see the fourth paragraph of the proof of *loc.cit.*), we used the “connectedness” of $W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ by non-split extensions to deduce that $M_\infty(\sigma)$ has the same rank over its scheme-theoretic support for $\sigma \in W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$. In general the Serre weights in $W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ can still be “connected” by non-split extensions by (23) and [BHH⁺, Lemma 2.4.6]. \square

Lemma 6.2.2. *Let A be a ring which is p -torsion free and M be an A -module which can be generated by d elements for some $d \geq 1$. If $M[\frac{1}{p}]$ is free of rank d over $A[\frac{1}{p}]$, then M is free of rank d over A .*

Proof. We have a surjective map of A -modules $f : A^{\oplus d} \twoheadrightarrow M$. By [Mat89, Thm. 2.4], f is an isomorphism after inverting p . Hence f is also injective since A is p -torsion free. \square

The following proposition is a generalization of [BHH⁺, Prop. 8.2.6] (where \bar{r}_v was assumed to be semisimple).

Proposition 6.2.3. *Let r be the integer as in Proposition 6.2.1. If $\sigma_v \in W(\bar{r}_v^\vee)$, then $M_\infty(\tilde{P}_{\sigma_v})$ is free of rank r over $R_\infty/\cap_\tau \mathfrak{p}_\tau$, where τ runs over all tame inertial types such that $\sigma_v \in \text{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau)})$ and \mathfrak{p}_τ is the prime ideal $\text{Ker}(R_\infty \twoheadrightarrow R_\infty^{(1,0),\tau})$ of R_∞ .*

Proof. The strategy of the proof is very close to the one of [Le19, Thm. 4.9] which treats the case $r = 1$. We freely use the notation from *loc.cit.*

First we show that $M_\infty(R_\mu/\text{Fil}_\otimes^2 R_\mu)$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support (see [Le19, Lemma 4.3]), where R_μ is the same as P_{σ_v} and $\text{Fil}_\otimes^2 R_\mu$ is a certain submodule of R_μ defined in [LMS20, §3]. The argument of [Le19, Lemma 4.3] gives a tame inertial type τ and a $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ -invariant $W(\mathbb{F})$ -lattice $\sigma^0(\tau)$ in $\sigma(\tau)$ such that

$$M_\infty(R_\mu/\text{Fil}_\otimes^2 R_\mu) \cong M_\infty(\bar{\sigma}^0(\tau)/\text{rad}^2 \bar{\sigma}^0(\tau)),$$

where $\bar{\sigma}^0(\tau)$ is the reduction modulo p of $\sigma^0(\tau)$ and $\text{rad}^2 \bar{\sigma}^0(\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{rad}(\text{rad} \bar{\sigma}^0(\tau))$ is the radical of the radical of $\bar{\sigma}^0(\tau)$ as an $\mathbb{F}[\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})]$ -module. By the notation of the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 8.2.3] based on [EGS15, §10.1], the representation $\bar{\sigma}^0(\tau)/\text{rad}^2 \bar{\sigma}^0(\tau)$ has the form $\bar{\sigma}^{\mathcal{J}_0}$ for some capped interval $\mathcal{J}_0 \subseteq \{0, \dots, f-1\}$. Hence $M_\infty(\bar{\sigma}^0(\tau)/\text{rad}^2 \bar{\sigma}^0(\tau))$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support by the proof of [BHH⁺, Prop. 8.2.3].

Next we show that if $I \subseteq S$ is such that $|I \cap \{\pm\omega^{(i)}\}| + |S_\bar{\rho}^\sigma \cap \{\pm\omega^{(i)}\}| = 1$ for each $0 \leq i \leq f-1$, then $M_\infty(\tilde{R}_{\mu,I})$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support, which is $R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\bar{\rho}}} R_{\bar{\rho}}^{T_{\sigma,I}}$ (see [Le19, Prop. 4.6, Prop. 4.7]). Here $S = \{\pm\omega^{(i)}\}_{0 \leq i \leq f-1}$ whose subsets parametrize the Serre weights that appear in R_μ , $\bar{\rho}$ is the same as \bar{r}_v^\vee , $S_\bar{\rho}^\sigma$ is a subset of S satisfying $W(\bar{\rho}) = \{\sigma_J | J \subset S_\bar{\rho}^\sigma\}$, \tilde{R}_μ is the same as \tilde{P}_{σ_v} , $\tilde{R}_{\mu,I}$ is a certain quotient of \tilde{R}_μ , $T_{\sigma,I}$ is the set of tame inertial types that appear as subquotients in the Γ -representation $\tilde{R}_{\mu,I}[1/p]$ over E and $R_{\bar{\rho}}^{T_{\sigma,I}}$ is the maximal reduced \mathcal{O} -flat quotient of $R_{\bar{\rho}}$ parametrizing potentially crystalline framed deformations of $\bar{\rho}$ of Hodge–Tate weights $(1, 0)$ at each embedding and inertial type in $T_{\sigma,I}$. In fact, the argument of [Le19, Prop. 4.6] shows that $M_\infty(\tilde{R}_{\mu,I})$ is minimally generated by r elements, and the argument of [Le19, Prop. 4.7] shows that $M_\infty(\tilde{R}_{\mu,I})$ has scheme-theoretic support $R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\bar{\rho}}} R_{\bar{\rho}}^{T_{\sigma,I}}$ which is p -torsion free. Moreover, by exactness of M_∞ we have

$$M_\infty(\tilde{R}_{\mu,I})[1/p] \cong \bigoplus_{\tau \in T_{\sigma,I}} M_\infty(\sigma^0(\tau))[1/p]$$

for any choices of $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ -stable $W(\mathbb{F})$ -lattices $\sigma^0(\tau) \subset \sigma(\tau)$. In particular, we can take $\sigma^0(\tau)$ to have irreducible cosocle (see [EGS15, Lemma 4.1.1]). By Proposition 6.2.1 and the fact that the supports of $M_\infty(\sigma^0(\tau))[1/p]$ are pairwise disjoint for $\tau \in T_{\sigma,I}$, it follows that $M_\infty(\tilde{R}_{\mu,I})[1/p]$ is free of rank r over $(R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\bar{\rho}}} R_{\bar{\rho}}^{T_{\sigma,I}})[1/p]$. We deduce from Lemma 6.2.2 that $M_\infty(\tilde{R}_{\mu,I})$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support, which is $R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\bar{\rho}}} R_{\bar{\rho}}^{T_{\sigma,I}}$.

Then we show that if $I \subseteq S$ is such that $|I \cap \{\pm\omega^{(i)}\}| + |S_\bar{\rho}^\sigma \cap \{\pm\omega^{(i)}\}| \leq 1$ for each $0 \leq i \leq f-1$, then $M_\infty(\tilde{R}_{\mu,I})$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support, which is

$R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\overline{p}}} R_{\overline{p}}^{T^{\sigma, I}}$ (see [Le19, Thm. 4.9]). The proof is completely analogous to that of [Le19, Thm. 4.9].

In particular if we take $I = \emptyset$ so that we have $\tilde{R}_{\mu, \emptyset} = \tilde{R}_\mu = \tilde{P}_{\sigma_v}$, we get that $M_\infty(\tilde{P}_{\sigma_v})$ is free of rank r over its scheme-theoretic support, which is $R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\overline{p}}} R_{\overline{p}}^{T^{\sigma, \emptyset}}$. Moreover, by Chinese remainder theorem we have

$$(R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\overline{p}}} R_{\overline{p}}^{T^{\sigma, \emptyset}})[1/p] \cong \bigoplus_{\tau} (R_\infty/\mathfrak{p}_\tau)[1/p] \cong (R_\infty/\bigcap_{\tau} \mathfrak{p}_\tau)[1/p],$$

where τ runs over all tame inertial types such that $\sigma_v \in \text{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau)})$. Since both $R_\infty/\mathfrak{p}_\tau$ and $R_\infty^{(1,0), \tau}$ are p -torsion free \mathcal{O} -algebras, we deduce that

$$R_\infty \otimes_{R_{\overline{p}}} R_{\overline{p}}^{T^{\sigma, \emptyset}} \cong R_\infty/\bigcap_{\tau} \mathfrak{p}_\tau.$$

Finally, each \mathfrak{p}_τ is a prime ideal because $R_\infty/\mathfrak{p}_\tau = R_\infty^{(1,0), \tau}$ is a domain by [EGS15, Thm. 7.2.1]. \square

Now we recall from [BHH⁺, §7.3] the construction of a $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ -representation R over $W(\mathbb{F})$ such that $R/pR \cong \text{Proj}_{\overline{p}} \sigma_v$.

We define $L_{-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{P}_{\sigma_v}$ and $R_{2,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{Sym}^2 W(\mathbb{F})^2 \otimes \det^{-1})^{(j)} \otimes_{W(\mathbb{F})} \tilde{P}_{\sigma_v}$ for each $j = 0, \dots, f-1$, where “ (j) ” means that the matrices of $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ act via the j -th embedding $\sigma_j : \mathcal{O}_{F_v} \hookrightarrow W(\mathbb{F})$. For each j there is an isomorphism (see [BHH⁺, (55)])

$$R_{2,j}/pR_{2,j} \cong P_{\sigma_v} \oplus P_{\sigma_{v_j^+}} \oplus P_{\sigma_{v_j^-}} \quad (46)$$

for some Serre weights $\sigma_{v_j^+}$ and $\sigma_{v_j^-}$. The isomorphism (46) induces an inclusion

$$\iota_j : P_{\sigma_v} \hookrightarrow R_{2,j}/pR_{2,j}.$$

As in the paragraph before [BHH⁺, Lem. 8.3.2], we define a $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ -lattice $R'_{2,j}$ in $R_{2,j}[1/p]$ by

$$R'_{2,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{\sigma_v} \times_{R_{2,j}/p} R_{2,j} = \{x \in R_{2,j} : (x \bmod pR_{2,j}) \in \iota_j(R_{\sigma_v})\}.$$

We also define a $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_v})$ -lattice L_j in $L_{-1}[1/p] \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j'=0}^j R_{2,j'}[1/p] \right)$ by

$$L_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (x, (x_{j'})_{0 \leq j' \leq j}) \in L_{-1} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j'=0}^j R_{2,j'} \right) : \begin{aligned} &(x_{j'} \bmod pR_{2,j'}) = (x \bmod pL_{-1}) \\ &\text{via } \iota_{j'} : L_{-1}/pL_{-1} \hookrightarrow R_{2,j'}/pR_{2,j'} \quad \forall 0 \leq j' \leq j \end{aligned} \right\},$$

which is equivalent to defining

$$L_j = L_{j-1} \times_{P_{\sigma_v}} R'_{2,j}$$

for each $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ (see [BHH⁺, (8)]). We define $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_{f-1}$. It satisfies $R/pR \cong \text{Proj}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \sigma_v$ (see [BHH⁺, Cor. 7.3.4]).

Let r be the integer as in Proposition 6.2.1. The following proposition is a generalization of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.3.4], [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.3.9], [BHH⁺, Cor. 8.3.10] and [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.3.11] (where $\bar{\tau}_v$ was assumed to be semisimple).

- Proposition 6.2.4.** (i) *For each $0 \leq j \leq f-1$, the module $M_\infty(R'_{2,j})$ is free of rank r over $R_\infty/\cap_\tau \mathfrak{p}_\tau$, where τ runs over all tame inertial types such that $\sigma_v \in \text{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau)})$ and \mathfrak{p}_τ is the prime ideal $\text{Ker}(R_\infty \twoheadrightarrow R_\infty^{(2,-1)_{j,\tau}})$ of R_∞ , where $(2,-1)_j$ is $(2,-1)$ in the j -th embedding $\sigma_j : F_v \hookrightarrow E$ and $(1,0)$ elsewhere.*
- (ii) *The module $M_\infty(R)$ is free of rank r over $R_\infty/\cap_{\lambda,\tau} \mathfrak{p}_{\lambda,\tau}$, where τ runs over all tame inertial types such that $\sigma_v \in \text{JH}(\overline{\sigma(\tau)})$, $\lambda = (\lambda_j)_{0 \leq j \leq f-1}$ runs over the Hodge–Tate weights such that $\lambda_j \in \{(1,0), (2,-1)\}$ for all j and $\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda,\tau}$ is the prime ideal $\text{ker}(R_\infty \twoheadrightarrow R_\infty^{\lambda,\tau})$ of R_∞ . In particular, we have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} M_\infty(R)/\mathfrak{m}_\infty = r$.*
- (iii) *The surjection*

$$\text{Proj}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \sigma_v \twoheadrightarrow \sigma_v$$

induces an isomorphism of nonzero finite-dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector spaces

$$M_\infty(\text{Proj}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \sigma_v)/\mathfrak{m}_\infty \xrightarrow{\sim} M_\infty(\sigma_v)/\mathfrak{m}_\infty.$$

Proof. The proof of (i) is analogous to the one of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.3.4]. All the arguments concerning the set of Serre weights $W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ go through in the general case because we always have $W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee) \subseteq W((\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)^{\text{ss}})$ (see (23)). We also replace [BHH⁺, Prop. 8.2.6] by Proposition 6.2.3. Finally each \mathfrak{p}_τ is a prime ideal by Theorem 4.2.1.

The proof of (ii) is analogous to the one of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.3.9] using the same comment on $W(\bar{\tau}_v^\vee)$ together with Proposition 6.2.3, Proposition 4.3.3 and (i).

Finally, (iii) is a direct consequence of Proposition 6.2.1, (i) and (ii). \square

6.3 Global results

In this subsection we state and prove the main global results following [BHH⁺, §8.4], (which deals with the semisimple case).

Let $F, D, \bar{\tau}, \psi, S$ and $U = \prod_w U_w \subseteq (D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^\infty)^\times$ be as in §6.1. For each $w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}$, we fix a Serre weight $\sigma_w \in W(\bar{\tau}_w^\vee)$. We consider the following admissible smooth representation π' of $\text{GL}_2(F_v)$ over \mathbb{F} with central character $\bar{\psi}^{-1} = \omega^{-1}(\det \bar{\tau}_v)^{-1}$:

$$\pi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varinjlim_{V_v} \text{Hom}_{U^v/V^v} \left(\otimes_{w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}} \sigma_w, \text{Hom}_{G_F}(\bar{\tau}, H_{\text{ét}}^1(X_{V^v V_v} \times_F \bar{F}, \mathbb{F})) \right) \text{ in the indefinite case,}$$

$$\pi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varinjlim_{V_v} \text{Hom}_{U^v/V^v} \left(\otimes_{w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}} \sigma_w, S(V^v V_v, \mathbb{F})[\mathfrak{m}] \right) \text{ in the definite case,}$$

with $V^v = \prod_{w \neq v} V_w$ as in (44) or (45), i.e. $V_w = U_w$ if $w \notin S_p$ and $V_w \subseteq 1 + pM_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ is normal in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ if $w \in S_p$. Recall that we defined the Gelfand–Kirillov dimension $\dim_{\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi)$ in §5.

The following theorem is a generalization of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.4.1], [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.4.2], [BHH⁺, Cor. 8.4.4] and [BHH⁺, Cor. 8.4.6], where \bar{r}_v was assumed to be semisimple.

Theorem 6.3.1. (i) *We have $\dim_{\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi) = [F_v : \mathbb{Q}_p]$.*

(ii) *There is an integer $r \geq 1$ such that*

$$\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2] \cong (\tilde{D}_0(\bar{r}_v^\vee))^{\oplus r},$$

where $\tilde{D}_0(\bar{r}_v^\vee)$ is defined in §5. In particular, each irreducible constituent of $\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{K_1}^2]$ has multiplicity r .

(iii) *Let $x : R_\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{O}'$ be any homomorphism of local $W(\mathbb{F})$ -algebras, where \mathcal{O}' is the ring of integers of a finite extension E' of E , and set*

$$V(x) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}'}^{\mathrm{cont}}(\mathbb{M}_\infty \otimes_{R_\infty, x} \mathcal{O}', E'),$$

where \mathbb{M}_∞ is the big patched module over R_∞ with an R_∞ -linear action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ defined in [CEG⁺16, §2.8] and also mentioned in the proof of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.4.1]. Then $V(x)$ is a **nonzero** admissible unitary Banach representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ over E' with a $\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)$ -invariant unit ball (given by $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}'}^{\mathrm{cont}}(\mathbb{M}_\infty \otimes_{R_\infty, x} \mathcal{O}', \mathcal{O}')$) lifting $\pi \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$, where \mathbb{F}' is the residue field of \mathcal{O}' .

(iv) *For any compact open subgroup*

$$V^v = \prod_{w \notin S_D \cup S_{\bar{r}}} (\mathcal{O}_D)_w^\times \prod_{w \in (S_D \cup S_{\bar{r}}) \setminus \{v\}} V_w \subseteq \prod_{w \neq v} (\mathcal{O}_D)_w^\times$$

such that $V_w \subseteq 1 + pM_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ is normal in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{F_w})$ for $w \in S_p \setminus \{v\}$ and such that $\pi \neq 0$, where

$$\pi \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \varinjlim_{V_v} \mathrm{Hom}_{G_F}(\bar{r}, H_{\mathrm{ét}}^1(X_{V^v V_v} \times_F \bar{F}, \mathbb{F})) \text{ in the indefinite case,}$$

$$\pi \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \varinjlim_{V_v} S(V^v V_v, \mathbb{F})[\mathfrak{m}] \text{ in the definite case,}$$

we have $\dim_{\mathrm{GL}_2(F_v)}(\pi) = [F_v : \mathbb{Q}_p]$.

Proof. The proof of (i) is analogous to the one of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.4.1]. For the upper bound of the Gelfand–Kirillov dimension, we use Theorem 5.3. The condition (ii) in Theorem 5.3 is guaranteed by Proposition 6.2.4 (iii), and the conditions (i) and (iii) in Theorem 5.3 are satisfied as in the proof of [BHH⁺, Thm. 8.4.1].

The proof of (ii) is completely analogous to the one of [BHH⁺, Thm 8.4.2] using Proposition 6.2.4 (iii) and Proposition 5.1.

The proof of (iii) is completely analogous to the one of [BHH⁺, Cor. 8.4.4] using (i).

Finally, the proof of (iv) is completely analogous to that of [BHH⁺, Cor 8.4.6] using (i). \square

References

- [BD14] Christophe Breuil and Fred Diamond. Formes modulaires de Hilbert modulo p et valeurs d’extensions entre caractères galoisiens. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 47(5):905–974, 2014.
- [BDJ10] Kevin Buzzard, Fred Diamond, and Frazer Jarvis. On Serre’s conjecture for mod ℓ Galois representations over totally real fields. *Duke Math. J.*, 155(1):105–161, 2010.
- [BHH⁺] Christophe Breuil, Florian Herzig, Yongquan Hu, Stefano Morra, and Benjamin Schraen. Gelfand-kirillov dimension and mod p cohomology for GL_2 . *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03127*.
- [BM02] Christophe Breuil and Ariane Mézard. Multiplicités modulaires et représentations de $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}_p)$ et de $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_p/\mathbf{Q}_p)$ en $l = p$. *Duke Math. J.*, 115(2):205–310, 2002. With an appendix by Guy Henniart.
- [BP12] Christophe Breuil and Vytautas Paškūnas. Towards a modulo p Langlands correspondence for GL_2 . *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 216(1016):vi+114, 2012.
- [Bre03] Christophe Breuil. Sur quelques représentations modulaires et p -adiques de $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$. I. *Compositio Math.*, 138(2):165–188, 2003.
- [CEG⁺16] Ana Caraiani, Matthew Emerton, Toby Gee, David Geraghty, Vytautas Paškūnas, and Sug Woo Shin. Patching and the p -adic local Langlands correspondence. *Camb. J. Math.*, 4(2):197–287, 2016.
- [CL18] Ana Caraiani and Brandon Levin. Kisin modules with descent data and parahoric local models. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 51(1):181–213, 2018.
- [Col10] Pierre Colmez. Représentations de $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ et (ϕ, Γ) -modules. *Astérisque*, (330):281–509, 2010.
- [Dee01] Jonathan Dee. Φ - Γ modules for families of Galois representations. *J. Algebra*, 235(2):636–664, 2001.
- [EGS15] Matthew Emerton, Toby Gee, and David Savitt. Lattices in the cohomology of Shimura curves. *Invent. Math.*, 200(1):1–96, 2015.
- [Eme11] Matthew Emerton. Local-global compatibility in the p -adic Langlands programme for GL_2/\mathbf{Q} . *preprint*, 2011.
- [Fon90] Jean-Marc Fontaine. Représentations p -adiques des corps locaux. I. In *The Grothendieck Festschrift, Vol. II*, volume 87 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 249–309. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990.

- [GHS18] Toby Gee, Florian Herzig, and David Savitt. General Serre weight conjectures. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 20(12):2859–2949, 2018.
- [GN20] Toby Gee and James Newton. Patching and the completed homology of locally symmetric spaces. *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu*, pages 1–64, 2020.
- [Her09] Florian Herzig. The weight in a Serre-type conjecture for tame n -dimensional Galois representations. *Duke Math. J.*, 149(1):37–116, 2009.
- [HW22] Yongquan Hu and Haoran Wang. On the mod p cohomology for GL_2 : the non-semisimple case. *Cambridge Journal of Mathematics*, 10(2):261–431, 2022.
- [Jan03] Jens Carsten Jantzen. *Representations of algebraic groups*, volume 107 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2003.
- [Kis08] Mark Kisin. Potentially semi-stable deformation rings. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(2):513–546, 2008.
- [Le19] Daniel Le. Multiplicity one for wildly ramified representations. *Algebra Number Theory*, 13(8):1807–1827, 2019.
- [LLHL19] Daniel Le, Bao V. Le Hung, and Brandon Levin. Weight elimination in Serre-type conjectures. *Duke Math. J.*, 168(13):2433–2506, 2019.
- [LLHLM] Daniel Le, Bao V. Le Hung, Brandon Levin, and Stefano Morra. Local models for galois deformation rings and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.05398*.
- [LLHLM18] Daniel Le, Bao V. Le Hung, Brandon Levin, and Stefano Morra. Potentially crystalline deformation rings and Serre weight conjectures: shapes and shadows. *Invent. Math.*, 212(1):1–107, 2018.
- [LLHLM20] Daniel Le, Bao V. Le Hung, Brandon Levin, and Stefano Morra. Serre weights and Breuil’s lattice conjecture in dimension three. *Forum Math. Pi*, 8:e5, 135, 2020.
- [LMS20] Daniel Le, Stefano Morra, and Benjamin Schraen. Multiplicity one at full congruence level. *J. Institut Math. Jussieu*, pages 1–22, 2020.
- [Mat89] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory*, volume 8 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1989. Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid.