

# On the rank of the multivariable $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -modules associated to mod $p$ representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$

Yitong Wang\*

## Abstract

Let  $p$  be a prime number,  $K$  a finite unramified extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  a finite extension of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ . For  $\pi$  an admissible smooth representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  satisfying certain multiplicity-one properties, we compute the rank of the associated étale  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module  $D_A(\pi)$  defined in [BHH<sup>+</sup>b], extending the results of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>c].

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Combinatorics of Serre weights</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The principal series</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>On certain <math>H</math>-eigenvectors in <math>D_0(\bar{\rho})</math></b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>The relations between <math>H</math>-eigenvectors</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Projective systems in <math>\pi</math></b>	<b>23</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>The finiteness condition</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>An explicit basis of <math>\mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)</math></b>	<b>33</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>On the subrepresentations of <math>\pi</math></b>	<b>36</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Some vanishing results</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>The degree function</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>The actions of <math>\varphi</math> and <math>\mathcal{O}_K^\times</math> on <math>\mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)</math></b>	<b>51</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Some relations between constants</b>	<b>56</b>

---

\*E-mail address: yitongw.wang@utoronto.ca

# 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 Breuil, Colmez, Emerton, etc. In particular, Colmez ([Col10]) constructed a functor from the category of admissible finite length mod  $p$  representations of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  to the category of finite-dimensional continuous mod  $p$  representations of  $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ , using Fontaine's category of  $(\varphi, \Gamma)$ -modules ([Fon90]) as an intermediate step. This gives a functorial way to realize the mod  $p$  Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ .

However, the situation becomes much more complicated when we consider  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  for  $K$  a nontrivial finite extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ . For example, there are many more supersingular representations of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  ([BP12]) and we don't have a classification of these representations. Moreover, they are not of finite presentation ([Sch15], [Wu21]), and it is impossible so far to write down explicitly one of these representations.

Another important feature of the mod  $p$  Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  is that it satisfies the local-global compatibility ([Eme11]), in the sense that it can be realized in the  $H^1$  of towers of modular curves. Motivated by this, we are particularly interested in the mod  $p$  representations  $\pi$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  coming from the cohomology of towers of Shimura curves, see for example [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, (1)]. We hope that these representations play a role in the mod  $p$  Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ .

There have been many results on the representation-theoretic properties of  $\pi$  as above. For example, when  $K$  is unramified over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ , we can explicitly describe the finite-dimensional invariant subspace  $\pi^{K_1}$  of  $\pi$  where  $K_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} 1 + p\mathrm{M}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$  ([Le19]), and we know that  $\pi$  has Gelfand–Kirillov dimension  $[K : \mathbb{Q}_p]$  ([BHH<sup>+</sup>23], [HW22], [Wan23]). However, the complete understanding of  $\pi$  still seems a long way off.

In [BHH<sup>+</sup>b], Breuil–Herzig–Hu–Morra–Schraen constructed an exact functor  $D_A$  from a nice subcategory of the category of admissible smooth mod  $p$  representations of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  (which contains  $\pi$ ) to the category of multivariable  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -modules. This functor generalizes Colmez's functor. Then the key question is to determine the structure of  $D_A(\pi)$  for  $\pi$  as above. In this article, we answer this question further, extending the results of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>c]. The results of this article can be used to deduce important properties of  $\pi$ .

To state the main result, we begin with the construction of the functor  $D_A$ . We let  $K$  be a finite unramified extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  of degree  $f \geq 1$  with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}_K$  and residue field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (hence  $q = p^f$ ). Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a large enough finite extension of  $\mathbb{F}_p$  and fix an embedding  $\sigma_0 : \mathbb{F}_q \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$ . We let  $N_0 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathcal{O}_K \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ . Then we have  $\mathbb{F}[N_0] = \mathbb{F}[Y_0, \dots, Y_{f-1}]$  with  $Y_j \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times} \sigma_0(a)^{-pj} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & [a] \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}[N_0]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ , where  $[a] \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$  is the Teichmüller lift of  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ . We let  $A$  be the completion of  $\mathbb{F}[N_0][1/(Y_0 \cdots Y_{f-1})]$  with respect to the  $(Y_0, \dots, Y_{f-1})$ -adic topology on  $\mathbb{F}[N_0]$ . There is an  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear action of  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $\mathbb{F}[N_0]$  given by multiplication on  $N_0 \cong \mathcal{O}_K$ , and an  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear Frobenius  $\varphi$  on  $\mathbb{F}[N_0]$  given by multiplication by  $p$  on  $N_0 \cong \mathcal{O}_K$ . They extend canonically by continuity to commuting continuous  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $A$ . Then an étale  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module over  $A$  is by definition a finite free  $A$ -module endowed with a semi-linear Frobenius  $\varphi$  and a commuting continuous semi-linear action of  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  such that the image of  $\varphi$  generates everything.

For  $\pi$  an admissible smooth representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  with central character, we let  $\pi^\vee$  be its  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear dual, which is a finitely generated  $\mathbb{F}[I_1]$ -module and is endowed with the  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}$ -adic topology, where  $I_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 1+p\mathcal{O}_K & \mathcal{O}_K \\ p\mathcal{O}_K & 1+p\mathcal{O}_K \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}$  is the maximal ideal of  $\mathbb{F}[I_1]$ . We define  $D_A(\pi)$  to be the completion of  $A \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[N_0]} \pi^\vee$  with respect to the tensor product

topology. The  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action on  $\pi^\vee$  given by  $f \mapsto f \circ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  (for  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ) extends by continuity to  $D_A(\pi)$ , and the  $\psi$ -action on  $\pi^\vee$  given by  $f \mapsto f \circ \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  induces a continuous  $A$ -linear map

$$\beta : D_A(\pi) \rightarrow A \otimes_{\varphi, A} D_A(\pi). \quad (1)$$

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the abelian category of admissible smooth representations  $\pi$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  with central characters such that  $\mathrm{gr}(D_A(\pi))$  is a finitely generated  $\mathrm{gr}(A)$ -module. Then for  $\pi$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $D_A(\pi)$  is a finite free  $A$ -module (see [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Cor. 3.1.2.9] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Remark. 2.6.2]). If moreover  $\beta$  is an isomorphism, then its inverse  $\beta^{-1} = \mathrm{id} \otimes \varphi$  makes  $D_A(\pi)$  an étale  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module.

Let  $\bar{\rho} : \mathrm{GL}_2(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$  be a continuous representation of the following form up to twist:

$$\bar{\rho}|_{I_K} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \omega_f^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (r_j+1)p^j} & * \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } 2f+1 \leq r_j \leq p-3-2f \ \forall 0 \leq j \leq f-1, \quad (2)$$

where  $\omega_f : I_K \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\times$  is the fundamental character of level  $f$  (associated to  $\sigma_0$ ). If  $f = 1$ , we assume moreover that  $r_0 \geq 4$ . In particular, we have  $p \geq 4f + 4$ .

Let  $\pi$  be a smooth representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  which satisfies

- (i)  $\pi^{K_1} \cong D_0(\bar{\rho})$  as  $K^\times \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representations, where  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  is the representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$  defined in [BP12, §13] and is viewed as a representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$  by inflation, and  $K^\times$  acts on  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  by the character  $\det(\bar{\rho})\omega^{-1}$ , where  $\omega$  is the mod  $p$  cyclotomic character;
- (ii) for any character  $\chi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\times$  appearing in  $\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}] = \pi^{I_1}$ , we have  $[\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^3] : \chi] = 1$ , where  $\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^3]$  is the set of elements of  $\pi$  annihilated by  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^3$ , and  $[\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^3] : \chi]$  is the multiplicity of  $\chi$  in the semisimplification of  $\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^3]$  as  $I$ -representations.

In particular, (i) and (ii) are satisfied for those  $\pi$  coming from the cohomology of towers of Shimura curves in a ‘‘multiplicity-one’’ situation ([BHH<sup>+</sup>23], [HW22], [Wan23]). Our main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.1** (§8). *Suppose that  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\pi$  are as above. Then  $\pi$  is in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\beta$  in (1) is an isomorphism and*

$$\mathrm{rank}_A D_A(\pi) = 2^f.$$

By [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Remark 3.3.2.6(ii)] we know that  $\pi$  is in  $\mathcal{C}$ . By [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Thm. 3.3.2.1] and localization we know that  $\mathrm{rank}_A D_A(\pi) \leq 2^f$ . Theorem 1.1 is proved by [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Thm. 3.1.3] when  $\bar{\rho}$  is semisimple. We generalize the method of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c] to the non-semisimple case, which is seriously more delicate.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is by an explicit construction of an  $A$ -basis of the dual étale  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module  $\mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$  in the following steps.

**Step 1.** We construct  $2^f$  projective systems  $(x_{J,k})_{k \geq 0}$  of elements of  $\pi$  indexed by the subsets  $J \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, f-1\}$  (see Theorem 6.3). To do this, we first define suitable elements  $x_{J,k} \in \pi^{K_1} \cong D_0(\bar{\rho})$  for  $k \leq f$ . Since  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  is explicit, we can then study the precise relations among these elements, which enable us to define  $x_{J,k} \in \pi$  for all  $k$  inductively. This is the content of §§4-6 and Appendix A.

**Step 2.** We prove that  $x_{J,k} \in \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{kf+1}]$  for all  $J \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, f-1\}$  and  $k \geq 0$  (see Proposition 8.1, whose proof makes use of condition (ii) and is given in Appendix B), from which we deduce that each projective system  $x_J$  can be regarded as an element of  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$ .

**Step 3.** There is a canonical  $A$ -linear injection (see [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, (87)])

$$\mu_* : \mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F}).$$

We prove that each  $x_J \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$  satisfies a crucial finiteness condition (see Theorem 7.5), which guarantees that it lies in the image of  $\mu_*$ . Once we prove that  $x_J \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$  for all  $J$ , it is not difficult to conclude that they form an  $A$ -basis of  $\mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ .

Finally, we prove the following generalization of Theorem 1.1. This result is crucially needed to prove that  $\pi$  is of finite length (in the non-semisimple case) in [BHH<sup>+</sup>a].

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 9.2). *Suppose that  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\pi$  are as above. Then for  $\pi_1$  a subrepresentation of  $\pi$ , we have*

$$\mathrm{rank}_A D_A(\pi_1) = \left| \mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1}) \cap W(\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}) \right|,$$

where  $\mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$  is the set of Jordan–Hölder factors of  $\pi_1^{K_1}$  as a  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation,  $\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}$  is the semisimplification of  $\bar{\rho}$ , and  $W(\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}})$  is the set of Serre weights of  $\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}$  defined in [BDJ10, §3].

## Organization of the article

In §§2-3, we review the notion of the extension graph and recall some results of [BP12, §2] that are needed in the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. In §§4-7 and Appendix A, we explicitly construct some projective systems of elements of  $\pi$  and study their basic properties. In particular, we prove the crucial finiteness condition in §7. In §8 and Appendix B, we use these projective systems to construct an explicit basis of  $D_A(\pi)$  and finish the proof of Theorem 1.1. In §9, we finish the proof of Theorem 1.2. In Appendix C, we compute the actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $D_A(\pi)$ . Finally, in Appendix D, we list some equalities among the various constants defined throughout this article.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Christophe Breuil for suggesting this problem, and thank Christophe Breuil and Ariane Mézard for helpful discussions and a careful reading of the earlier drafts of this paper.

This work was supported by the Ecole Doctorale de Mathématiques Hadamard (EDMH).

## Notation

Let  $p$  be a prime number. We fix an algebraic closure  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ . Let  $K \subseteq \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  be the unramified extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  of degree  $f \geq 1$  with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}_K$  and residue field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (hence  $q = p^f$ ). We denote by  $G_K \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p/K)$  the absolute Galois group of  $K$  and  $I_K \subseteq G_K$  the inertia subgroup. Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a large enough finite extension of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ . Fix an embedding  $\sigma_0 : \mathbb{F}_q \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$  and let  $\sigma_j \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sigma_0 \circ \varphi^j$  for  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , where  $\varphi : x \mapsto x^p$  is the arithmetic Frobenius on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We identify  $\mathcal{J} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathbb{F})$  with  $\{0, 1, \dots, f-1\}$ , which is also identified with  $\mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z}$  so that the addition and subtraction in  $\mathcal{J}$  are modulo  $f$ . For  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ , we denote by  $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_q$  its reduction modulo  $p$ . For  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , we also view it as an element of  $\mathbb{F}$  via  $\sigma_0$ .

For  $F$  a perfect ring of characteristic  $p$ , we denote by  $W(F)$  the ring of Witt vectors of  $F$ . For  $x \in F$ , we denote by  $[x] \in W(F)$  its Teichmüller lift.

Let  $I \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}_K^\times & \mathcal{O}_K \\ p\mathcal{O}_K & \mathcal{O}_K^\times \end{pmatrix}$  be the Iwahori subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ ,  $I_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 1+p\mathcal{O}_K & \mathcal{O}_K \\ p\mathcal{O}_K & 1+p\mathcal{O}_K \end{pmatrix}$  be the pro- $p$  Iwahori subgroup,  $K_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} 1 + p\mathrm{M}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$  be the first congruence subgroup,  $N_0 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathcal{O}_K \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $H \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} [\mathbb{F}_q^\times] & 0 \\ 0 & [\mathbb{F}_q^\times] \end{pmatrix}$ .

For  $P$  a statement, we let  $\delta_P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$  if  $P$  is true and  $\delta_P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$  otherwise.

Throughout this article, we let  $\bar{\rho} : G_K \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$  be as in (2) and  $\pi$  be an admissible smooth representation of  $\text{GL}_2(K)$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  satisfying the conditions (i),(ii) before Theorem 1.1.

## 2 Combinatorics of Serre weights

In this section, we review the notion of the extension graph following [BHH<sup>+</sup>23].

We write  $\underline{i}$  for an element  $(i_0, \dots, i_{f-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . For  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we write  $\underline{a} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a, \dots, a) \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . For each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we define  $e_j \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  to be 1 in the  $j$ -th coordinate, and 0 otherwise. For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we define  $\underline{e}^J \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by  $e_j^J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta_{j \in J}$ . We say that  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{i}'$  if  $i_j \leq i'_j$  for all  $j$ . We write

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(\underline{T}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f} : \underline{0} \leq \underline{\lambda}_1 - \underline{\lambda}_2 \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1} \right\}; \\ X_{\text{reg}}(\underline{T}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f} : \underline{0} \leq \underline{\lambda}_1 - \underline{\lambda}_2 \leq \underline{p} - \underline{2} \right\}; \\ X^0(\underline{T}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f} : \underline{\lambda}_1 = \underline{\lambda}_2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the left shift  $\delta : \mathbb{Z}^f \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^f$  by  $\delta(\underline{i})_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} i_{j+1}$  and define  $\pi : \mathbb{Z}^{2f} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{2f}$  by  $\pi(\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\delta(\underline{\lambda}_1), \delta(\underline{\lambda}_2))$ .

A **Serre weight** of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$  is an isomorphism class of an absolutely irreducible representation of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$  over  $\mathbb{F}$ . For  $\lambda = (\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \in X_1(\underline{T})$ , we define

$$F(\lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigotimes_{j=0}^{f-1} \left( \left( \text{Sym}^{\lambda_{1,j} - \lambda_{2,j}} \mathbb{F}_q^2 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} \det^{\lambda_{2,j}} \right) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q, \sigma_j} \mathbb{F} \right).$$

We also denote it by  $(\underline{\lambda}_1 - \underline{\lambda}_2) \otimes \det^{\underline{\lambda}_2}$ . This induces a bijection

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

We say that a Serre weight  $\sigma$  is **regular** if  $\sigma \cong F(\lambda)$  with  $\lambda \in X_{\text{reg}}(\underline{T})$ .

For  $\lambda = (\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f}$ , we define the character  $\chi_\lambda : I \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\times$  by  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ pc & d \end{pmatrix} \mapsto (\bar{a})^{\underline{\lambda}_1} (\bar{d})^{\underline{\lambda}_2}$ , where  $a, d \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$  and  $b, c \in \mathcal{O}_K$ . Here, for  $x \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  we write  $x^{\underline{i}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} i_j p^j}$ . In particular, if  $\lambda \in X_1(\underline{T})$ , then  $\chi_\lambda$  is the  $I$ -character acting on  $F(\lambda)^{I_1}$ . We still denote  $\chi_\lambda$  for its restriction to  $H$ . For each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we define  $\alpha_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (e_j, -e_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f}$ , and for each  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  we define  $\alpha^{\underline{i}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} i_j \alpha_j \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f}$ . We also denote  $\alpha_j$  and  $\alpha^{\underline{i}}$  the corresponding characters  $\chi_{\alpha_j}$  and  $\chi_{\alpha^{\underline{i}}}$  when there is no possible confusion. Concretely, we have  $\alpha^{\underline{i}} \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ pc & d \end{pmatrix} \right) = (\bar{a}\bar{d}^{-1})^{\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} i_j p^j}$ .

For  $\mu = (\underline{\mu}_1, \underline{\mu}_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f}$ , we define the extension graph associated to  $\mu$  by

$$\Lambda_W^\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \underline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^f : 0 \leq \underline{\mu}_1 - \underline{\mu}_2 + \underline{b} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{2} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

As in [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, p.16], there is a map

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

such that the map  $\underline{b} \mapsto F(\mathfrak{t}_\mu(\underline{b}))$  gives a bijection between  $\Lambda_W^\mu$  and the set of regular Serre weights of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$  with central character  $\chi_\mu|_Z$ , where  $Z \cong \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  is the center of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$ .

We let  $\mu_{\underline{r}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\underline{r}, \underline{0}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2f}$  with  $\underline{r} = (r_0, \dots, r_{f-1})$  and  $r_j$  as in (2). For  $\underline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $-\underline{r} \leq \underline{b} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{2} - \underline{r}$ , we denote  $\sigma_{\underline{b}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\mathfrak{t}_{\mu_{\underline{r}}}(\underline{b}))$ . For  $\bar{p}$  as in (2), we let  $J_{\bar{p}} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  be as in [Bre14, (17)]. Then by [Bre14, Prop. A.3] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, (14)] we have

$$W(\bar{p}) = \left\{ \sigma_{\underline{b}} : \begin{array}{ll} b_j = 0 & \text{if } j \notin J_{\bar{p}} \\ b_j \in \{0, 1\} & \text{if } j \in J_{\bar{p}} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

In particular,  $\bar{p}$  is semisimple if and only if  $J_{\bar{p}} = \mathcal{J}$ . For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we define  $\sigma_J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{\underline{a}^J}$  with

$$a_j^J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \notin J \\ 1 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \notin J \text{ or } j \in J, j+1 \in J, j \in J_{\bar{p}} \\ -1 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J, j \notin J_{\bar{p}}. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

In particular, for  $J \subseteq J_{\bar{p}}$  we have  $\sigma_J = \sigma_{\underline{e}^J}$ . Then as a special case of [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, (14)], we have  $\sigma_J = (\underline{s}^J) \otimes \det^{t^J}$  with

$$s_j^J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} r_j & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \notin J \\ r_j + 1 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \notin J \\ p - 2 - r_j & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \in J \\ p - 1 - r_j & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J, j \notin J_{\bar{p}} \\ p - 3 - r_j & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J, j \in J_{\bar{p}}; \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$t_j^J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \notin J \\ -1 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \notin J \\ r_j + 1 & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \in J \text{ or } j \in J, j+1 \in J, j \in J_{\bar{p}} \\ r_j & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J, j \notin J_{\bar{p}}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

We let  $\chi_J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_{\lambda_J}$  with  $\lambda_J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\underline{s}^J + \underline{t}^J, \underline{t}^J)$ . Then  $\chi_J$  is the  $I$ -character acting on  $\sigma_J^{I_1}$ . For each  $I$ -character  $\chi$ , we denote by  $\chi^s$  its conjugation by the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define  $J + k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j + k : j \in J\}$ . Then we define the **semisimple part** of  $J$ , the **non-semisimple part** of  $J$  and the **shifting index** of  $J$  to be respectively

$$J^{\text{ss}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} J \cap J_{\bar{p}}, \quad J^{\text{nss}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} J \setminus J_{\bar{p}} = J \setminus J^{\text{ss}}, \quad J^{\text{sh}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} J \cap (J - 1) \cap J_{\bar{p}} \subseteq J^{\text{ss}}. \quad (8)$$

In particular, if  $\bar{p}$  is semisimple, then  $J^{\text{ss}} = J$  and  $J^{\text{nss}} = \emptyset$  for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . By (2), we have from (6) and (8)

$$2(f - \delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}) + 1 \leq 2(f - \delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}) + 1 + \delta_{f=1} \leq s_j^J \leq p - 2 - 2(f + \delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}) \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (9)$$

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $-(2(f - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}) + \underline{1}) \leq \underline{b} \leq 2(f + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}})$ . Then we have  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(\underline{b})) = \sigma_{\underline{a}}$  with  $a_j = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}}(b_j + \delta_{j \in J}) + 2\delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . In particular,*

- (i) *we have  $\sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}} = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $b_j = \delta_{j \in J^{\text{nss}}}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ ;*
- (ii) *we have  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $b_j = \delta_{j \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ ;*
- (iii) *for each  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we have  $\sigma_{J'} = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $b_j = \delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j \in J'}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J \Delta J'}}$  if  $j \notin J_{\bar{p}}$ , and  $b_j = (\delta_{j \in J} - \delta_{j \notin J'})(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}}$  if  $j \in J_{\bar{p}}$ .*

Here we recall that  $J \Delta J' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (J \setminus J') \sqcup (J' \setminus J)$ .

*Proof.* The assumption on  $\underline{b}$  implies that  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_j}(\underline{b}))$  is well-defined. By (5) and a case-by-case examination we have

$$a_j^J = \delta_{j \in J}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}} + 2\delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}} \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Then by [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 2.4.4] applied to  $\mu = \mu_{\underline{r}}$  and  $\omega = \underline{b}$ , we deduce that

$$a_j = a_j^J + (-1)^{a_{j+1}^J} b_j = (\delta_{j \in J}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}} + 2\delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}) + (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}} b_j = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}} (b_j + \delta_{j \in J}) + 2\delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}.$$

The assertions (i),(ii),(iii) then follow easily whose proofs are left as an exercise.  $\square$

### 3 The principal series

In this section, we recall some results of [BP12, §2].

For  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we define

$$Y_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times} a^{-pj} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & [a] \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}[[N_0]].$$

Then we have  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]] = \mathbb{F}[[Y_0, \dots, Y_{f-1}]]$ . For  $\underline{i} = (i_0, \dots, i_{f-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ , we set  $\|\underline{i}\| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} i_j$  and write  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{i}}$  for  $\prod_{j=0}^{f-1} Y_j^{i_j}$ . We recall the following results of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.2.1].

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ , we have*

- (i)  $Y_j^p \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} Y_{j+1}$ ;
- (ii)  $\begin{pmatrix} [\mu_1] & 0 \\ 0 & [\mu_2] \end{pmatrix} Y_j = (\mu_1 \mu_2^{-1})^{p^j} Y_j \begin{pmatrix} [\mu_1] & 0 \\ 0 & [\mu_2] \end{pmatrix}$ . *In particular, if  $V$  is a representation of  $I$  and  $v \in V^{H=\chi}$ , then for  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{0}$  we have  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{i}} v \in V^{H=\chi \alpha^{\underline{i}}}$ .*

Let  $\lambda = (\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \in X_1(\underline{T})$  such that  $\underline{1} \leq \underline{\lambda}_1 - \underline{\lambda}_2 \leq \underline{p} - \underline{2}$ . Let  $f_0, \dots, f_{q-1}, \phi$  be the elements of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_\lambda^s)$  defined as in [BP12, §2]. For  $0 \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$  we let  $i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} i_j p^j$ . Then by definition and [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.2.5(ii)] we have

$$(-1)^{f-1} \left[ \prod_{j=0}^{f-1} i_j! \right] \underline{Y}^{\underline{p}-\underline{1}-\underline{i}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \phi = \begin{cases} f_i & \text{if } 0 \leq i \leq q-2 \\ f_{q-1} - f_0 & \text{if } i = q-1. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The following lemma is a restatement of some results of [BP12, §2].

**Lemma 3.2.** (i) *The  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_\lambda^s)$  is multiplicity-free with constituents  $\{F(\mathfrak{t}_\lambda(-\underline{b})) : \underline{0} \leq \underline{b} \leq \underline{1}\}$ . Moreover, the constituent  $F(\mathfrak{t}_\lambda(-\underline{b}))$  corresponds to the subset  $\{j : b_{j+1} = 1\}$  in the parametrization of [BP12, §2].*

(ii) *The elements  $\{\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \phi : \underline{0} \leq \underline{k} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}, \phi\}$  form a basis of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_\lambda^s)$ . Moreover,  $\phi$  has  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_\lambda^s$  and  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \phi$  has  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_\lambda \alpha^{-\underline{k}} = \chi_\lambda^s \alpha^{\underline{p}-\underline{k}}$ .*

(iii) *Let  $\tau$  be the constituent of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_\lambda^s)$  corresponding to  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  as in (i) and denote by  $Q(\chi_\lambda^s, J)$  the unique quotient of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_\lambda^s)$  with socle  $\tau$  (see [BP12, Thm. 2.4(iv)]).*

(a) *If  $J = \emptyset$ , then the following  $H$ -eigenvectors*

$$\left\{ \underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \phi : \underline{p} - \underline{1} - (\underline{\lambda}_1 - \underline{\lambda}_2) < \underline{k} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}, \underline{Y}^{\underline{p}-\underline{1}-(\underline{\lambda}_1-\underline{\lambda}_2)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \phi + x\phi \right\}$$

*with  $x = (-1)^{\|\underline{\lambda}_1\|+(f-1)} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{f-1} (\lambda_{1,j} - \lambda_{2,j})! \right)^{-1} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$  form a basis of  $\tau$  inside  $Q(\chi_\lambda^s, \emptyset) = \text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_\lambda^s)$ .*

(b) If  $J \neq \emptyset$ , then the following  $H$ -eigenvectors

$$\left\{ \underline{Y}^k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \phi : \begin{array}{ll} 0 \leq k_j \leq p-2 - (\lambda_{1,j} - \lambda_{2,j}) + \delta_{j-1 \in J} & \text{if } j \in J \\ p-1 - (\lambda_{1,j} - \lambda_{2,j}) + \delta_{j-1 \in J} \leq k_j \leq p-1 & \text{if } j \notin J \end{array} \right\}$$

map to a basis of  $\tau$  inside  $Q(\chi_\lambda^s, J)$ .

*Proof.* The first statement of (i) is [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 6.2.1(i)], and the second statement of (i) follows from the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 6.2.1(i)]. (ii) and (iii) are restatements of [BP12, Lemma 2.5] and [BP12, Lemma 2.7] using (10).  $\square$

## 4 On certain $H$ -eigenvectors in $D_0(\bar{\rho})$

In this section, we construct some elements in  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$ , which is the (finite-dimensional) representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$  defined in [BP12, §13] and is identified with  $\pi^{K_1}$  from now on (see condition (i) above Theorem 1.1). The main result is Proposition 4.2. They will be the first step in constructing elements of  $D_A(\pi)$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** (i) *The  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  is multiplicity-free with constituents*

$$\mathrm{JH}(D_0(\bar{\rho})) = \left\{ \sigma_{\underline{b}} : \begin{array}{ll} b_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\} & \text{if } j \notin J_{\bar{\rho}} \\ b_j \in \{-1, 0, 1, 2\} & \text{if } j \in J_{\bar{\rho}} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Moreover, there is a decomposition of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representations  $D_0(\bar{\rho}) = \bigoplus_{J \subseteq J_{\bar{\rho}}} D_{0, \sigma_J}(\bar{\rho})$  such that for each  $J \subseteq J_{\bar{\rho}}$ ,  $D_{0, \sigma_J}(\bar{\rho})$  has socle  $\sigma_J = \sigma_{\underline{e}^J}$  and has constituents

$$\mathrm{JH}(D_{0, \sigma_J}(\bar{\rho})) = \left\{ \sigma_{\underline{b}} : \begin{array}{ll} b_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\} & \text{if } j \notin J_{\bar{\rho}} \\ b_j \in \{-1, 0\} & \text{if } j \in J_{\bar{\rho}} \setminus J \\ b_j \in \{1, 2\} & \text{if } j \in J \end{array} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

- (ii) *The  $I$ -representation  $D_0(\bar{\rho})^{I_1}$  is a direct sum of distinct  $I$ -characters. For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\chi_J$  occurs as a direct summand.*
- (iii) *For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , the character  $\chi_J$  appears in the component  $D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\mathrm{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$ , and the character  $\chi_J^s$  appears in the component  $D_{0, \sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$ .*

*Proof.* (i). For  $J \subseteq J_{\bar{\rho}}$  and  $\tau$  an arbitrary Serre weight, we let  $\ell(\sigma_J, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$  be as in [BP12, §12] and  $\ell(\bar{\rho}, \tau) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \min_{J \subseteq J_{\bar{\rho}}} \ell(\sigma_J, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Then by [BP12, Cor. 4.11] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 2.4.4],  $\ell(\sigma_J, \tau) < \infty$  if and only if  $\tau = \sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with  $-\underline{1} \leq \underline{b} - \underline{e}^J \leq \underline{1}$ , in which case we have  $\ell(\sigma_J, \tau) = |\{j : b_j \neq \delta_{j \in J}\}|$ . In particular,  $\ell(\bar{\rho}, \tau) < \infty$  if and only if  $\tau = \sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with  $-\underline{1} \leq \underline{b} - \underline{e}^J \leq \underline{1} + \underline{e}^{J_{\bar{\rho}}}$ , in which case we have  $\ell(\bar{\rho}, \tau) = \ell(\sigma_{J(\tau)}, \tau)$  with  $J(\tau) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{j \in J_{\bar{\rho}} : b_j \geq 1\}$ , and  $\tau$  is a constituent of  $D_{0, \sigma_{J(\tau)}}(\bar{\rho})$  by Proposition [BP12, Prop. 13.4]. Hence for each  $J \subseteq J_{\bar{\rho}}$ ,  $D_{0, \sigma_J}(\bar{\rho})$  has constituents  $\tau$  as above such that  $J(\tau) = J$ , which agrees with (11). The other assertions then follow from [BP12, Prop. 13.4] and [BP12, Cor. 13.5].

(ii). By [BP12, Lemma 14.1], the  $I$ -representation  $D_0(\bar{\rho})^{I_1}$  is a direct sum of distinct  $I$ -characters. By the proof of [BP12, Cor. 13.6], it suffices to find  $I$ -characters  $\chi$  such that  $\sigma_{\underline{0}} \in \mathrm{JH}(\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)} \chi^s)$ . Then we conclude using [Bre14, Prop. 4.2] and (6).

(iii). The first assertion is clear since  $\sigma_J$  lies in the component  $D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\mathrm{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$  by (11). To prove the second assertion, we follow the notation of [BP12, §15]. In particular, we let  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^-, \mathcal{S}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  be the subsets associated to  $\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}$  and  $\sigma_J$ . By definition we have  $\mathcal{S} = J$ ,  $\mathcal{S}^- = \mathcal{S}^+ = \emptyset$ , hence by [BP12, Lemma 15.2] applied to  $\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}$  and  $\sigma_J$ , we deduce that  $\ell(\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}, \sigma_J^{[s]}) = \ell(\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J-1}}, \sigma_J^{[s]})$ . Then by



[BP12, Lemma 15.3] applied to  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\sigma_J^{[s]}$  we deduce that  $\ell(\bar{\rho}, \sigma_J^{[s]}) = \ell(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_J^{[s]})$  (note that the Serre weight  $\sigma^{\text{max}}$  in the statement of [BP12, Lemma 15.3] is our  $\sigma_{\bar{\rho}}$ ), which completes the proof using [BP12, Prop. 13.4].  $\square$

For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  we fix a choice of  $0 \neq v_J \in \pi^{I_1} = D_0(\bar{\rho})^{I_1}$  with  $I$ -character  $\chi_J$ , which is unique up to scalar by Lemma 4.1(ii). The following proposition shows the existence of certain shifts of the elements  $v_J$ . We will apply  $\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  to these elements in order to go beyond  $\pi^{K_1} = D_0(\bar{\rho})$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  (see (8) for  $J^{\text{sh}}$ ). Then there exists a unique  $H$ -eigenvector  $y \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$  satisfying*

- (i)  $Y_j^{i_j+1}y = 0 \ \forall j \in \mathcal{J}$ ;
- (ii)  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{i}}y = v_J$ .

Moreover,  $y$  has  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}}$ . The  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentation of  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  generated by  $y$  lies in  $D_{0, J^{\text{ss}}}(\bar{\rho})$  and has constituents  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with

$$\begin{cases} b_j = \delta_{j \in J} (= \delta_{j \in J^{\text{ss}}}) & \text{if } j \notin J^{\text{ss}} \\ b_j \in \{0, (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}}\} & \text{if } j \in J^{\text{ss}}, i_j = 0 \\ b_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\} & \text{if } j \in J^{\text{ss}}, i_j > 0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

We denote this element  $y$  by  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}}v_J$ .

*Proof.* For each  $y \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$  satisfying (i) and (ii), by Lemma 3.1(ii) the  $I$ -representation generated by  $y$  is an  $I/K_1$ -representation with socle  $\chi_J$  and cosocle  $\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}}$ , and has constituents  $\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}'}$  with  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}' \leq \underline{i}$ , each occurring with multiplicity 1. By [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 6.1.3], such a representation is unique up to isomorphism, and we denote it by  $W'$ . To prove the existence and uniqueness of such  $y$ , it suffices to show that there is a unique (up to scalar)  $I$ -equivariant injection  $W' \hookrightarrow D_0(\bar{\rho})$ . Since  $W'$  is indecomposable with  $I$ -socle  $\chi_J$ , which appears in  $D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$  by Lemma 4.1(iii), any such injection factors through  $D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$ .

**Claim 1.** The  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation  $V' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(W')$  is multiplicity-free and  $\sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}} \in \text{JH}(V')$ .

*Proof.* By [BP12, Lemma 2.2],  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}'})$  and  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}'})^s$  have the same constituents. Since twisting  $\chi_J$  by  $\alpha^{-\underline{i}'}$  corresponds to shifting by  $-2\underline{i}'$  in the extension graph, it follows from Lemma 3.2(i), [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Remark 2.4.5(ii)] and (9) that  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}'})$  is multiplicity-free and has constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $2\underline{i}' \leq \underline{b} \leq 2\underline{i}' + \underline{1}$ . Hence the  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation  $V'$  is multiplicity-free and has constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{b} \leq 2\underline{i} + \underline{1}$ . By Lemma 2.1(i) and taking  $b_j = \delta_{j \in J^{\text{ss}}}$  we deduce that  $\sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}} \in \text{JH}(\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J)) \subseteq \text{JH}(V')$ .  $\square$

It follows from Claim 1 that there is a unique (up to scalar)  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -equivariant map  $f : V' \rightarrow \text{Inj}_{\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)} \sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}$ . We denote by  $V''$  the image of  $f$ .

**Claim 2.** The  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation  $V''$  has constituents  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  for  $\underline{b}$  as in (12).

*Proof.* We let  $\tau, \tau'$  be constituents of  $V'$  such that  $\tau = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  and  $\tau' = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b} + e_{j_0}))$  with  $\underline{0} < \underline{b} \leq 2\underline{i} + \underline{1}$ ,  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $b_{j_0} \neq 0$ . We write  $\underline{b} = 2\underline{c} + \underline{\varepsilon}$  with  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{c} \leq \underline{i}$  and

$\underline{0} \leq \underline{\varepsilon} \leq \underline{1}$ . If  $\varepsilon_{j_0} = 1$ , then both  $\tau$  and  $\tau'$  are constituents of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{\varepsilon}})$ . We deduce from [BP12, Thm. 2.4] that  $V'$  has a length 2 subquotient with socle  $\tau$  and cosocle  $\tau'$ . If  $\varepsilon_{j_0} = 0$ , then we deduce from [HW22, Lemma 3.8] (with  $j = j_0$ ,  $\chi = \chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{\varepsilon}}$ ,  $J(\tau) = \{j : \varepsilon_{j+1} = 0\}$ ,  $J(\tau') = J(\tau) \setminus \{j_0 - 1\}$ ) that  $V'$  has a length 2 subquotient with socle  $\tau'$  and cosocle  $\tau$ . Moreover, these are all possible non-split length 2 subquotients of  $V'$  by [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Lemma 2.4.6].

Then we use the notation of [LLHLM20, §4.1.1]. We make  $\text{JH}(V')$  into a directed graph by letting  $\sigma \in \text{JH}(V')$  point to  $\sigma' \in \text{JH}(V')$  if  $V'$  has a length 2 subquotient with socle  $\sigma'$  and cosocle  $\sigma$ . By construction,  $V''$  is a quotient of  $V'$  with socle  $\sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}$ . It follows from the dual version of [LLHLM20, Prop. 4.1.1] that the constituents of  $V''$  are those  $\sigma \in \text{JH}(V')$  which admit a path towards  $\sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}} = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{ss}}}))$ . From the structure of  $\text{JH}(V')$  we deduce that  $V''$  has constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with

$$\begin{cases} b_j = 0 & \text{if } j \notin J^{\text{ss}} \\ b_j \in \{0, 1\} & \text{if } j \in J^{\text{ss}}, i_j = 0 \\ b_j \in \{0, 1, 2\} & \text{if } j \in J^{\text{ss}}, i_j > 0. \end{cases}$$

Then we conclude (12) by Lemma 2.1 with a case-by-case examination.  $\square$

Since  $V'$  is multiplicity-free, it follows from Claim 2 and (11) that  $f$  factors through  $D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}(\bar{\rho})}$ . Then by Frobenius reciprocity, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \text{Hom}_I(W', D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}(\bar{\rho})}|_I) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \text{Hom}_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(V', D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}(\bar{\rho})}) = 1.$$

To complete the proof, it remains to show that any nonzero  $I$ -equivariant map  $W' \rightarrow D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}(\bar{\rho})}$  is injective. Since  $W'$  has  $I$ -socle  $\chi_J$ , it suffices to show that the image of  $\chi_J$  is nonzero. By Frobenius reciprocity, it suffices to show that the image of the subrepresentation  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J)$  of  $V'$  under  $f$  is nonzero. This follows from the fact that both  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J)$  and  $V''$  contain  $\sigma_{J^{\text{ss}}}$  as a constituent, and  $V'$  is multiplicity-free.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** *When  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \emptyset$ , up to scalars there are more  $I_1$ -invariants than these  $v_J$  for  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . However, Proposition 4.2 does not hold for these extra  $I_1$ -invariants.*

## 5 The relations between $H$ -eigenvectors

In this section, we study various  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentations of  $\pi$  generated by the elements  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J$  defined in Proposition 4.2. The main results are Proposition 5.5 and Proposition 5.8. Then we study the relations between the vectors  $v_J$  for  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . The main results are Proposition 5.10 and Proposition 5.12.

Recall that we have defined  $Q(\chi_{\lambda}^s, J)$  for  $\lambda = (\underline{\lambda}_1, \underline{\lambda}_2) \in X_1(\underline{T})$  such that  $\underline{1} \leq \underline{\lambda}_1 - \underline{\lambda}_2 \leq \underline{p} - \underline{2}$  and  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  in Lemma 3.2(iii). The following lemma is a generalization of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.3.3] (where  $\bar{\rho}$  was assumed to be semisimple).

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ .*

- (i) *The  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentation  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$  of  $\pi$  is multiplicity-free with socle  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} = \sigma_{\underline{e}^{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}$  and cosocle  $\sigma_{\underline{e}}$  with*

$$c_j = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2i_j + 1 + \delta_{j \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} - \delta_{j \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}) \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (13)$$

(ii) We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle / \sum_{\underline{0} \leq i' < i} \langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i'} v_J \rangle \\ & \cong Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^i, \{j : j+1 \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}, i_{j+1} = 0\}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

(iii) Let  $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  with each  $m_j$  between  $\delta_{j \in (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  and  $c_j$  (as in (13)). Then there is a unique subrepresentation  $I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}})$  of  $\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle$  with cosocle  $\sigma_{\underline{m}}$ . In particular,  $\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle = I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{c}})$ . Moreover,  $I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}})$  has constituents  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with each  $b_j$  between  $\delta_{j \in (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  and  $m_j$ , and we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}), \pi) = 1. \quad (15)$$

*Proof.* (i). We follow closely the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.3.3]. The vectors  $\underline{Y}^{-i} v_J$  and  $\underline{Y}^{-i'} v_J$  are defined in Proposition 4.2. We let  $W'$  (resp.  $W$ ) be the  $I$ -subrepresentation of  $\pi$  generated by  $\underline{Y}^{-i} v_J$  (resp.  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J$ ) and  $V \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(W)$ . In particular,  $W'$  is the same representation as in the proof of Proposition 4.2. By the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.3.3], we have:

- (a)  $V$  is multiplicity-free as a  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation with constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  for  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{b} \leq 2\underline{i} + 1$  (they are well-defined by (9));
- (b) For each  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{b} \leq 2\underline{i} + 1$ , the unique subrepresentation of  $V$  with cosocle  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  has constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{a}))$  for  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{a} \leq \underline{b}$ ;
- (c)  $V$  has a filtration with subquotients  $\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s \alpha^{i'})$  for  $\underline{0} \leq i' \leq i$ . Each  $\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s \alpha^{i'})$  has constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $2i' \leq \underline{b} \leq 2i' + 1$ , and the constituent  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  of  $\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s \alpha^{i'})$  corresponds to the subset  $\{j : b_{j+1} \text{ is odd}\} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  (see Lemma 3.2(i)).

The  $I$ -equivariant inclusion  $W' \hookrightarrow D_0(\overline{\rho})$  in the proof of Proposition 4.2 induces an  $I$ -equivariant inclusion  $W \hookrightarrow \pi$  by applying  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . By Frobenius reciprocity, this induces a  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -equivariant map  $V \rightarrow \pi$  with image  $\overline{V} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle = \langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle \subseteq \pi$ . In particular, it follows from (b) that the cosocle of  $\overline{V}$  is  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-(2\underline{i} + 1))) = \sigma_{\underline{c}}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} c_j &= (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}} (- (2i_j + 1) + \delta_{j \in J}) + 2\delta_{j \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}} \\ &= (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2i_j + 1 - \delta_{j \in J} + 2(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} \delta_{j \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}}) \\ &= (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2i_j + 1 + \delta_{j \in (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}} - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 2.1 and the last equality is elementary (for example, one can separate the cases  $j \in (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}$  and  $j \notin (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}$ ).

**Claim.** We have  $W(\overline{\rho}) \cap \mathrm{JH}(V) \subseteq \mathrm{JH}(\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s))$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for each  $\sigma \in W(\overline{\rho})$ , we have  $\sigma = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  for some  $\underline{b} \leq \underline{1}$ . We check it for  $\sigma_{\emptyset}$ , the other cases being similar. By Lemma 2.1 (with  $\underline{a} = \underline{0}$ ), we get  $b_j = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}} (2\delta_{j \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}} + \delta_{j \in J})$ . If  $j \notin J^{\mathrm{sh}}$ , then  $b_j = \delta_{j \in J} \leq 1$ . If  $j \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}$ , then  $b_j = -2 + 1 = -1$ .  $\square$

Recall that  $\mathrm{soc}_{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)} \pi = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in W(\overline{\rho})} \sigma$ . Assume that  $\sigma$  is in the socle of  $\overline{V}$ , then we have  $\sigma \in W(\overline{\rho}) \cap \mathrm{JH}(V) \subseteq \mathrm{JH}(\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s))$  by the claim above. Moreover, the image of the subrepresentation  $\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s)$  of  $V$  in  $\pi$  lies in  $D_0(\overline{\rho})$ , hence lies in the component  $D_{0, \sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}}(\overline{\rho})$

by Lemma 4.1(iii) and Frobenius reciprocity, which implies that  $\sigma$  must be  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}$ , the only Serre weight of  $\bar{\rho}$  appearing in  $D_{0,\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$ . Since  $V$  is multiplicity-free by (a), we deduce that  $\bar{V}$  is the unique quotient of  $V$  with socle  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}$ .

(ii). By Lemma 2.1(ii), we have  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{e}^{J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}))$ , hence  $\bar{V}$  has constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $\delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} \leq b_j \leq 2i_j + 1$  for all  $j$  (or equivalently,  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with each  $b_j$  between  $\delta_{j \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}$  and  $c_j$  by Lemma 2.1). By (c), the LHS of (14) is the quotient of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}})$  whose constituents are  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{b}))$  with  $\max(\delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, 2i_j) \leq b_j \leq 2i_j + 1$ , hence it has irreducible socle  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{a}))$  with  $a_j = \max(\delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, 2i_j)$  by (b). Since  $a_j$  is odd if and only if  $i_j = 0$  and  $j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}$ , it follows from (c) that the constituent  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_J}(-\underline{a}))$  of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}})$  corresponds to the subset  $\{j : j+1 \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}, i_{j+1} = 0\}$ .

(iii). Since  $\sigma_{\underline{m}}$  is a constituent of the multiplicity-free representation  $\bar{V}$  by the previous paragraph, there is a unique subrepresentation of  $\bar{V}$  with cosocle  $\sigma_{\underline{m}}$ , which moreover has constituents as in the statement by (b). We denote it by  $I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}})$ . By the last paragraph of the proof of (i), any constituent of  $I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}})$  which is also an element of  $W(\bar{\rho})$  must appear in  $D_{0,\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$ , hence has to be  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}$ . Together with  $\text{soc}_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)} \pi = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in W(\bar{\rho})} \sigma$ , we deduce that

$$1 \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \text{Hom}_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}), \pi) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \text{Hom}_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \pi) = 1,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 5.2.** For  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in X_1(\underline{T})$ ,  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$  such that  $2\underline{i} + \underline{1} \leq \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \leq \underline{p} - \underline{2}$  and  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we let  $W'$  be the  $I$ -representation as in the proof of Proposition 4.2 with  $\chi_J$  replaced by  $\chi_{\lambda}$ , and we denote by  $Q(\chi_{\lambda}^s, \chi_{\lambda}^s \alpha^{\underline{i}}, J')$  the unique quotient of the  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -representation  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}\left(\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) W'\right)$  whose socle is the constituent of  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_{\lambda}^s)$  corresponding to  $J'$ . Then the proof of Lemma 5.1 shows that  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle \cong Q(\chi_{J'}^s, \chi_{J'}^s \alpha^{\underline{i}}, (J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}) - 1)$ .

**Corollary 5.3.** For each  $J \subseteq J_{\bar{\rho}}$ , we have (see Lemma 5.1(iii) for the notation)

$$D_{0,\sigma_J}(\bar{\rho}) = \sum_{(J')^{\text{ss}}=J} I(\sigma_J, \sigma_{\underline{e}^J + \underline{\varepsilon}^{J'}}) = \sum_{(J')^{\text{ss}}=J} I(\sigma_{\underline{e}^{(J')^{\text{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{e}^{(J')^{\text{ss}}} + \underline{\varepsilon}^{J'}}),$$

where  $\underline{\varepsilon}^{J'} \in \{\pm 1\}^f$  with  $\varepsilon_j^{J'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^{\delta_{j \notin J'}}$ .

*Proof.* For each  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(J')^{\text{ss}} = J$ , by applying Lemma 5.1(i),(iii) with  $(J, \underline{i})$  there being  $(J' + 1, \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{(J'+1)^{\text{sh}}})$ , we see that  $I(\sigma_J, \sigma_{\underline{e}^J + \underline{\varepsilon}^{J'}})$  is well-defined. Then the result follows from Lemma 4.1(i), [BP12, Prop. 13.4] and (15).  $\square$

The following proposition is a generalization of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.3.1] (where  $\bar{\rho}$  was assumed to be semisimple), which gives a first example of the relations between the vectors  $v_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$  and is a special case of Proposition 5.10 below.

**Proposition 5.4.** For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , there exists a unique element  $\mu_{J,(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} \in \mathbb{F}^{\times}$  such that

$$\left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} Y_j^{s_j^{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_J = \mu_{J,(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} v_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}. \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.1(ii) and its proof, we have  $\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_J \rangle \cong Q(\chi_J^s, (J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}) - 1)$  such that  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{pmatrix} v_J$  corresponds to the image of  $\phi \in \mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s)$  (see above (10) for  $\phi$ ) in  $Q(\chi_J^s, (J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}) - 1)$ , and the socle is  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  which corresponds to the subset  $(J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}) - 1$  for  $\mathrm{Ind}_I^{\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s)$  (see Lemma 3.2(i)). By Lemma D.1 applied to  $J$  and  $J' = (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}$ , for  $j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}} - 1$  we have  $(p-2-s_j^J) + \delta_{j-1 \in (J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}) - 1} = s_j^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$ . Then by Lemma 3.2(iii) applied to  $\lambda = \lambda_J$  (and recall that  $\chi_J = \chi_{\lambda_J}$  with  $\lambda_J = (\underline{s}^J + \underline{t}^J, \underline{t}^J)$ ), the LHS of (16) is nonzero in  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  and is the unique (up to scalar)  $H$ -eigenvector in  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  killed by all  $Y_j$ . It follows that the LHS of (16) is a nonzero  $I_1$ -invariant of  $\sigma_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$ , hence is a scalar multiple of  $v_{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$ .  $\square$

For  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we define  $\underline{t}^J(J') \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by

$$t^J(J')_j \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} p-1-s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}, \quad (17)$$

where  $s_j^J$  is defined in (6). In particular, by (9) we have

$$1 \leq t^J(J')_j \leq p-1-2(f-\delta_{j \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}}) \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (18)$$

The following proposition is a generalization of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.3.4] (where  $\bar{\rho}$  was assumed to be semisimple).

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ,  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\mathrm{sh}}}$  and  $i_{j_0+1} = 0$ . Suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}$ . Then for each  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $j_0 \notin J'$ , we have*

$$\left[ Y_{j'}^{\delta_{J'=\emptyset}} \prod_{j \notin J'} Y_j^{2i_j + t^J(J')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J) = 0 \quad \forall j' \in \mathcal{J} \quad . \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* The proof is analogous to the one of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Lemma 3.2.3.4]. We assume that  $J' \neq \emptyset$ . The case  $J = \emptyset$  is similar and is left as an exercise. By Lemma 3.1(ii), it suffices to show that the  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \chi_{J\alpha^{-\underline{i}}} [\prod_{j \notin J'} \alpha_j^{2i_j + p-1-s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}}]$  does not occur in  $\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$ . By Lemma 5.1(ii), it suffices to show that the  $H$ -character  $\chi$  does not occur in  $V_{\underline{i}'} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}'}, J_{\underline{i}'})$  for  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}' \leq \underline{i}$ , where  $J_{\underline{i}'} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{j : j+1 \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}, i'_{j+1} = 0\}$ . Note that  $j_0 \in J_{\underline{i}'}$  for all  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}' \leq \underline{i}$  by assumption.

We have  $\chi_{J\alpha^{-\underline{i}'}} = \chi_{\lambda_{J-\alpha^{\underline{i}'}}}$  (see §2 for the notation). Then by Lemma 3.2(i),(ii),(iii)(b) applied to  $\lambda = \lambda_J - \alpha^{\underline{i}'}$ , the  $H$ -eigencharacters that occur in  $V_{\underline{i}'}$  are  $\chi_{J\alpha^{-\underline{i}'}} \alpha^{-\underline{k}}$  (coming from the element  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_J)$ ), where

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq k_j \leq p-2-(s_j^J-2i'_j) + \delta_{j-1 \in J_0} & \text{if } j \in J_0 \\ p-1-(s_j^J-2i'_j) + \delta_{j-1 \in J_0} \leq k_j \leq p-1 & \text{if } j \notin J_0 \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

for  $J_0 \supseteq J_{\underline{i}'}$ . In particular, we have  $j_0 \in J_0$ .

Assume  $\chi = \chi_{J\alpha^{-\underline{i}'}} \alpha^{\underline{k}}$  for some  $\underline{i}', \underline{k}$  as above, then from the definition of  $\chi$  we have

$$\sum_{j \notin J'} (2i_j + p-1-s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}) p^j - \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (i_j - i'_j) p^j \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} k_j p^j \pmod{(q-1)},$$

or equivalently,

$$\sum_{j \notin J'} (i_j + i'_j + p-1-s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}) p^j - \sum_{j \in J'} (i_j - i'_j) p^j \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} k_j p^j \pmod{(q-1)}. \quad (21)$$

Then we define integers  $\eta_j \in \mathbb{Z}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . For  $j_1 \notin J'$  (such  $j_1$  exists since  $J' \neq \emptyset$ ), we let  $w \in \{0, \dots, f-1\}$  (depending on  $j_1$ ) such that  $j_1 + 1, \dots, j_1 + w \in J'$  and  $j_1 + w + 1 \notin J'$  (so  $w = 0$  if  $j_1 + 1 \notin J'$ ). We define  $\eta_j$  for  $j = j_1 + 1, \dots, j_1 + w + 1$  as follows:

- (i) If  $i_{j_1+w'} = i'_{j_1+w'}$  for all  $1 \leq w' \leq w$  (which is automatic if  $w = 0$ ), then we define  $\eta_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$  for all  $j = j_1 + 1, \dots, j_1 + w + 1$ ;
- (ii) Otherwise, we let  $w_0 \in \{1, \dots, w\}$  be minimal such that  $i_{j_1+w_0} \neq i'_{j_1+w_0}$  and we define

$$\eta_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j = j_1 + 1, \dots, j_1 + w_0 - 1 \text{ (and } w_0 \neq 1) \\ p & \text{if } j = j_1 + w_0 \\ p - 1 & \text{if } j = j_1 + w_0 + 1, \dots, j_1 + w \text{ (and } w_0 \neq w) \\ -1 & \text{if } j = j_1 + w + 1. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

In particular, we have  $\sum_{j=j_1+1}^{j_1+w+1} \eta_j p^j \equiv 0 \pmod{q-1}$ . When we vary  $j_1 \notin J'$ , we get the definition of  $\eta_j$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . By adding  $\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} \eta_j p^j$  to (21) for all  $j_1 \notin J'$ , we get

$$\sum_{j \notin J'} (i_j + i'_j + p - 1 - s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} + \eta_j) p^j + \sum_{j \in J'} (\eta_j - (i_j - i'_j)) p^j \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} k_j p^j \pmod{q-1}. \quad (23)$$

**Claim 1.** Each coefficient of the LHS of (23) is between 0 and  $p-1$ , not all equal to 0 and not all equal to  $p-1$ .

*Proof.* First we prove that each coefficient of the LHS of (23) is between 0 and  $p-1$ . By (9) we have

$$1 \leq p - 1 - s_j^J \leq p - 2 - 2(f - \delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}). \quad (24)$$

We remark that the first inequality of (24) is weaker than (9), and is needed to prove Remark 5.6. If  $j \notin J'$ , then using  $0 \leq i_j, i'_j \leq f - \delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}$ ,  $\delta_{j-1 \in J'} \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\eta_j \in \{-1, 0\}$  since  $j \notin J'$ , we deduce from (24) that  $0 \leq (i_j + i'_j + p - 1 - s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} + \eta_j) \leq p - 1$ . If  $j \in J'$ , by the definition of  $\eta_j$  and a case-by-case examination, we deduce that  $0 \leq \eta_j - (i_j - i'_j) \leq p - 1$ .

Next we prove that the coefficients of the LHS of (23) are not all equal to 0. Otherwise, by the previous paragraph we must in particular have  $\eta_j = -1$  for all  $j \notin J'$ . By the definition of  $\eta_j$  for  $j \notin J'$  (that is, for  $j = j_1 + w + 1$  in (22)), there exists  $j' \in J'$  such that  $\eta_{j'} = p$ , which implies  $\eta_{j'} - (i_{j'} - i'_{j'}) > 0$  since  $p \geq 4f + 4$  by (2), a contradiction.

Finally we prove that the coefficients of the LHS of (23) are not all equal to  $p-1$ . Otherwise, by the first paragraph we must have  $\eta_j = 0$  for all  $j \notin J'$ . By the definition of  $\eta_j$  for  $j \notin J'$ , we must have  $\eta_j = 0$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , hence  $\eta_j - (i_j - i'_j)$  cannot be  $p-1$ . This implies  $J' = \emptyset$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

It follows from Claim 1 that the equation (23) has solution

$$k_j = \begin{cases} i_j + i'_j + p - 1 - s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} + \eta_j & \text{if } j \notin J' \\ \eta_j - (i_j - i'_j) & \text{if } j \in J'. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

**Claim 2.** We have  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$  and  $j_0 - 1 \in J_0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $j_0 \notin J'$  and  $j_0 \in J_0$ , by (20) and (25) we have

$$k_{j_0} = i_{j_0} + i'_{j_0} + p - 1 - s_{j_0}^J + \delta_{j_0-1 \in J'} + \eta_{j_0} \leq p - 2 - s_{j_0}^J + 2i'_{j_0} + \delta_{j_0-1 \in J_0}. \quad (26)$$

By the definition of  $\eta_j$ , if  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ , then  $\eta_{j_0} = 0$  since  $j_0 \notin J'$ , and thus  $\eta_{j_0} = -1$  implies  $j_0 - 1 \in J'$ . In particular, we have  $\delta_{j_0-1 \in J'} + \eta_{j_0} \geq 0$ . Then we deduce from (26) that  $i_{j_0} + 1 \leq i'_{j_0} + \delta_{j_0-1 \in J_0}$ , which implies  $i_{j_0} = i'_{j_0}$  and  $j_0 - 1 \in J_0$  since  $i'_{j_0} \leq i_{j_0}$ .

Then by (20) we have

$$k_{j_0-1} \leq p - 2 - (s_{j_0-1}^J - 2i'_{j_0-1}) + \delta_{j_0-2 \in J_0} \leq p - 1 - s_{j_0-1}^J + 2i'_{j_0-1}. \quad (27)$$

Suppose that  $j_0 - 1 \in J'$ , then by (26) and using  $i_{j_0} = i'_{j_0}$  and  $j_0 - 1 \in J_0$ , we must have  $\eta_{j_0} = -1$ . Then by (22) we have  $\eta_{j_0-1} \geq p - 1$ , which implies  $k_{j_0-1} \geq p - 1 - (i_{j_0-1} - i'_{j_0-1})$  by (25). Combining with (27) we deduce that  $s_{j_0-1}^J \leq i_{j_0-1} + i'_{j_0-1} \leq 2(f - \delta_{j_0-1 \in J^{\text{sh}}})$  since  $\underline{i}' \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ , which contradicts (9). Thus we have  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ .  $\square$

Since Claim 2 proves that  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$  and  $j_0 - 1 \in J_0$  assuming  $j_0 \notin J'$  and  $j_0 \in J_0$ , we can continue this process and finally deduce that  $J' = \emptyset$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 5.6.** Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in X_1(\mathbb{T})$ ,  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$  such that  $2\underline{i} + \underline{1} \leq \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \leq \underline{p} - \underline{2}$ , and  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . Assume that there exists  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $j_0 \in J$ ,  $j_0 \notin J'$  and  $i_{j_0+1} = 0$ . We consider the  $H$ -character

$$\chi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_\lambda \alpha^{-\underline{i}} \prod_{j \notin J'} \alpha_j^{2i_j + p - 1 - (\lambda_{1,j} - \lambda_{2,j}) + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}}.$$

Then the same proof as in Proposition 5.5 shows that (see Remark 5.2 for the notation) the  $H$ -character  $\chi \alpha_{j'}^{\delta_{j'=0}}$  does not occur in  $Q(\chi_\lambda^s, \chi_\lambda^s \alpha^{\underline{i}}, J)$  for all  $j' \in \mathcal{J}$ .

For  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ , we define  $\underline{m} = \underline{m}(\underline{i}, J, J') \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by

$$m_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2i_j + \delta_{j \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}). \quad (28)$$

In particular, if  $2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \geq 0$  for all  $j$ , then by Lemma 5.1(iii),  $\sigma_{\underline{m}}$  is a constituent of  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$ . The following proposition is a generalization of Proposition 5.5.

**Proposition 5.7.** Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  and  $\underline{m} = \underline{m}(\underline{i}, J, J')$ . We denote  $B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\prod_{j \notin J'} Y_j^{2i_j + t^{J'}(j)}] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J) \in \pi$ . Then we have (see Lemma 5.1(iii) for the notation)

$$\begin{cases} Y_{j'}^{\delta_{j'=0}} B = 0 \quad \forall j' \in \mathcal{J} & \text{if } 2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} < 0 \text{ for some } j \\ Y_{j'} \delta_{j'=0} B \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}) \quad \forall j' \in \mathcal{J} & \text{if } 2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \geq 0 \text{ for all } j. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} < 0$  for some  $j$ , then we must have  $i_j = 0$ ,  $j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}$  and  $j-1 \notin J'$ . Hence  $Y_{j'}^{\delta_{j'=0}} B = 0$  by Proposition 5.5 applied to  $(\underline{i}, J, J')$  as above and  $j_0 = j-1$ .

Suppose that  $2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \geq 0$  for all  $j$ . By Lemma 5.1(iii) and Remark 5.2, we have

$$\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle = I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{b}}) \cong Q(\chi_J^s, \chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}}, (J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}) - 1)$$

with  $b_j = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2i_j + \delta_{j \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + 1 - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}})$  for  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Since  $b_j = m_j$  if and only if  $j-1 \in J'$ , to prove  $Y_{j'}^{\delta_{j'=0}} B \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}})$ , it suffices to show that for each  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such

that  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ , the image of  $Y_{j'}^{\delta_{J'=0}} B$  in the unique quotient  $Q$  of  $\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle$  with socle  $\sigma_{\underline{e}^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}} \setminus \{j_0\}} + b_{j_0} e_{j_0}}$  is zero.

By Lemma 3.2(i), we have  $Q \cong Q(\chi_J^s \alpha_{j_0}^{i_{j_0}}, \chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}}, J'')$  with  $J'' \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} ((J \Delta (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}) - 1) \cup \{j_0 - 1\}$ . Since  $(\underline{i} - i_{j_0} e_{j_0})_{j_0} = 0$ ,  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$  and  $j_0 - 1 \in J''$ , it follows from Remark 5.6 (with  $\lambda = \lambda_J \alpha_{j_0}^{-i_{j_0}}$ ,  $\underline{i}$  replaced with  $\underline{i} - i_{j_0} e_{j_0}$  and  $j_0$  replaced with  $j_0 - 1$ ) that the  $H$ -eigencharacter of  $Y_{j'}^{\delta_{J'=0}} B$  does not occur in  $Q$ , hence  $Y_{j'}^{\delta_{J'=0}} B$  maps to zero in  $Q$ .  $\square$

The following proposition studies the overlaps between different  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentations  $\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle$  of  $\pi$ . This phenomenon is new in the non-semisimple case.

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\mathrm{sh}}}$ . Let  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $j_0 + 1 \in (J - 1)^{\mathrm{nss}}$  and  $i_{j_0+1} = 0$ . Let  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $j_0 \in J'$  if  $j_0 + 1 \in J$  and  $j_0 \notin J'$  if  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$ . We let  $J'' \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} J' \Delta \{j_0 + 1\}$  and let  $\underline{i}' \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  be such that  $i'_j = i_j$  if  $j \neq j_0 + 2$  and  $i'_{j_0+2} = i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$ . Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{j_0+1 \notin J}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J'} Y_j^{2i_j + t^J(J')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-i} v_J) \\ = \frac{\mu_{J, (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}}{\mu_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}, (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}} Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{j_0+1 \notin J}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J''} Y_j^{2i'_j + t^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-i'} v_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where  $\mu_{J, (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  and  $\mu_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}, (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  are defined in Proposition 5.4, and we let  $\underline{Y}^{-i'} v_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} 0$  if  $i'_j < 0$  for some  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

Note that the assumption  $j_0 + 1 \in (J - 1)^{\mathrm{nss}}$  implies  $((J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}) - 1)^{\mathrm{ss}} = (J - 1)^{\mathrm{ss}}$ , hence  $\mu_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}, (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}$  is defined in Proposition 5.4. We claim that  $\underline{i}' \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{(J \setminus \{j_0+2\})^{\mathrm{sh}}}$ , which implies that  $\underline{Y}^{-i'} v_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}$  is well-defined by Proposition 4.2. Indeed, if  $j \neq j_0 + 2$  or  $j = j_0 + 2 \notin (J - 1)^{\mathrm{ss}}$ , then we have

$$i'_j \leq i_j \leq f - \delta_{j \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}} \leq f - \delta_{j \in (J \setminus \{j_0+2\})^{\mathrm{sh}}}.$$

If  $j_0 + 2 \in (J - 1)^{\mathrm{ss}}$ , then the assumption  $j_0 + 1 \in (J - 1)^{\mathrm{nss}}$  implies  $j_0 + 2 \in J$  and thus  $j_0 + 2 \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}$ , hence we have

$$i'_{j_0+2} \leq i_{j_0+2} + 1 \leq f - \delta_{j_0+2 \in J^{\mathrm{sh}}} + 1 = f = f - \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J \setminus \{j_0+2\})^{\mathrm{sh}}}.$$

We denote by  $B_1$  (resp.  $B_2$ ) the element on the LHS (resp. RHS) of (29). In order to prove Proposition 5.8, we need the following lemma, and we refer to §D for its proof (see Lemma D.3).

**Lemma 5.9.** *Keep the assumptions of Proposition 5.8.*

- (i) Let  $\underline{m} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \underline{m}(\underline{i}, J, J')$  and  $\underline{m}' \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \underline{m}(\underline{i}', J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}, J'')$  (see (28)). Then we have  $\underline{m} = \underline{m}'$  and  $m_{j_0+1} = m'_{j_0+1} = 0$ .
- (ii) We have (see (17) for  $t^J(J')$ )

$$\begin{aligned} 2i_j + t^J(J')_j &= 2i'_j + t^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_j \text{ if } j \neq j_0 + 1; \\ 2i_{j_0+1} + t^J(J')_{j_0+1} &= r_{j_0+1} + 1; \\ 2i'_{j_0+1} + t^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_{j_0+1} &= p - 1 - r_{j_0+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$



(iii) If  $2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \geq 0$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , then  $B_1, B_2$  are nonzero and have the same  $H$ -eigencharacter.

*Proof of Proposition 5.8.* As in the proof of Proposition 5.5, the  $H$ -eigencharacters that occur in  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$  are those in  $Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}''}, J_{\underline{i}''})$  for  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}'' \leq \underline{i}$  (where  $J_{\underline{i}''} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j : j+1 \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}, i''_{j+1} = 0\}$ ), which are  $\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}''} \alpha^{-\underline{k}}$ , where

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq k_j \leq p-2 - (s_j^J - 2i''_j) + \delta_{j-1 \in J_0} & \text{if } j \in J_0 \\ p-1 - (s_j^J - 2i''_j) + \delta_{j-1 \in J_0} \leq k_j \leq p-1 & \text{if } j \notin J_0 \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

for  $J_0 \supseteq J_{\underline{i}''}$ . By Lemma 3.2(iii), unless  $J_0 = \emptyset$  and  $k_j = p-1 - (s_j^J - 2i''_j)$  for all  $j$ , the  $H$ -eigencharacter in (31) comes from the element  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_J) \in \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_J \rangle$ .

Suppose that  $2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} < 0$  for some  $j$ . By Lemma 5.9(i) and using  $((J \setminus \{j_0+2\}) - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J-1)^{\text{ss}}$ , we have

$$2i'_j - \delta_{j \in (J \setminus \{j_0+2\})\Delta((J \setminus \{j_0+2\})-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J''} < 0$$

for the same  $j$ . Then by Proposition 5.7(i) applied to  $(i, J, J')$  and  $(i', J \setminus \{j_0+2\}, J'')$  we deduce that  $B_1 = B_2 = 0$  (if  $\underline{i}' \not\leq \underline{0}$  then  $B_2 = 0$  by definition), which proves (29). So in the rest of the proof we assume that  $2i_j - \delta_{j \in J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \geq 0$  for all  $j$ , which implies that

$$2i'_j - \delta_{j \in (J \setminus \{j_0+2\})\Delta((J \setminus \{j_0+2\})-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J''} \geq 0$$

for all  $j$ . In particular, this implies  $\underline{i}' \geq \underline{0}$ . Then by Proposition 5.7(ii) applied to  $(i, J, J')$  and  $(i', J \setminus \{j_0+2\}, J'')$  we deduce that  $B_1, B_2 \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}) = I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}'})$  (see Lemma 5.9(i)), which is a subrepresentation of  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$  and of  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}} \rangle$ .

(i). We suppose that  $j_0+1 \in J$ , hence  $j_0 \in J'$ . In this case, we claim that it suffices to prove (29) for  $J' = \mathcal{J}$ , that is (using (30))

$$\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J) = \frac{\mu_{J, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}{\mu_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}} Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}), \quad (32)$$

where  $i'_j = i_j$  if  $j \neq j_0+2$  and  $i'_{j_0+2} = i_{j_0+2} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}$ . Indeed, once (32) is proved, we multiply both sides of (32) by  $\prod_{j \notin J'} Y_j^{2i_j + t^{J'}(j)}$ . If  $j_0+1 \in J'$ , then using (30) we obtain (29) for  $J'$ . If  $j_0+1 \notin J'$ , then using (30) together with Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j = j_0+1$  we obtain (29) for  $J'$ .

Then we prove (32). Since  $B_1, B_2 \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}) \subseteq \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$  have common  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}}$  (see Lemma 5.9(iii)), it suffices to show that the  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}}$  only appears once in  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$ , which implies  $B_1 = B_2$  by Lemma 5.9(iii). Since  $j_0+1 \in J$ , the assumptions  $j_0+1 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}$  and  $i_{j_0+1} = 0$  imply that  $j_0 \in J_{\underline{i}''}$  for all  $\underline{i}''$  as in (31). In particular, we have  $j_0 \in J_0$ . As in the proof of Proposition 5.5, the equation (21) then becomes

$$-\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (i_j - i''_j) p^j \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{f-1} k_j p^j \pmod{(q-1)}, \quad (33)$$

which is congruent to  $\sum_{j=0}^{f-1} (p-1 - (i_j - i''_j)) p^j$  modulo  $(q-1)$ . If  $i_j \neq i''_j$  for some  $j$ , then we must have  $k_{j_0} = p-1 - (i_{j_0} - i''_{j_0})$ . Since  $j_0 \in J_0$ , by (31) we have

$$k_{j_0} = p-1 - (i_{j_0} - i''_{j_0}) \leq p-2 - (s_{j_0}^J - 2i''_{j_0}) + \delta_{j_0-1 \in J_0} \leq p-1 - (s_{j_0}^J - 2i''_{j_0}).$$

Hence  $s_{j_0}^J \leq i_{j_0} + i_{j_0}'' \leq 2(f - \delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}})$ , which contradicts (9). Therefore, we must have  $i_j = i_j''$  for all  $j$  and the LHS of (33) equals 0. Since  $j_0 \in J_0$ , by (31) and (9) we have  $k_{j_0} < p - 1$ . It follows from (33) that  $k_j = 0$  for all  $j$ .

(ii) We suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$  (which implies  $f \geq 2$ ), hence  $j_0 \notin J'$ . We prove (29) by the following steps.

**Step 1.** We prove (29) for  $J' = \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j_0\}$ .

Using (30), it is enough to prove that

$$Y_{j_0}^{2i_{j_0} + p - s_{j_0}^J} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J) = \frac{\mu_{J, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}{\mu_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}} \left[ Y_{j_0}^{2i_{j_0} + p - s_{j_0}^J} Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}), \quad (34)$$

where  $i_j' = i_j$  if  $j \neq j_0 + 2$  and  $i_{j_0+2}' = i_{j_0+2} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}$ . Since  $i_{j_0+1} = i_{j_0+1}' = 0$ , by Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j = j_0$  and Proposition 4.2, if we apply  $Y_{j_0}^{s_{j_0}^J - 2i_{j_0}}$  to either side of (34) we get zero. Moreover,  $B_1, B_2 \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}) \subseteq \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$  have common  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}} \alpha_{j_0}^{2i_{j_0} + p - s_{j_0}^J}$  (see Lemma 5.9(iii)). Hence it suffices to show that up to scalar there exists a unique  $H$ -eigenvector  $C \in \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \rangle$  satisfying  $Y_{j_0}^{s_{j_0}^J - 2i_{j_0}} C = 0$  with  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi$ , which implies  $B_1 = B_2$  by Lemma 5.9(iii).

As in the proof of Proposition 5.5 (in the case  $J' = \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j_0\}$  with the same definition of  $\eta_j$ ), for each  $\underline{i}''$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}'' \leq \underline{i}$ , the equation  $\chi = \chi_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}''} \alpha^{\underline{k}}$  has at most one solution for  $\underline{k}$  as in (31), which is given by (see (25) and since  $j_0 - 1 \in J'$ )

$$\begin{cases} k_{j_0} = i_{j_0} + i_{j_0}'' + p - s_{j_0}^J + \eta_{j_0} \\ k_j = \eta_j - (i_j - i_j'') \end{cases} \quad \text{if } j \neq j_0. \quad (35)$$

It follows from (31) that  $C$  is a linear combination of the elements  $C' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_J) \in \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_J \rangle$  with distinct  $\underline{i}''$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}'' \leq \underline{i}$  and  $\underline{k}$  as in (35), each of which has nonzero image in the quotient  $Q$  of  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_J \rangle$  isomorphic to  $Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}''}, J_{\underline{i}''})$  (see Lemma 5.1(ii)).

We claim that for  $\underline{i}'' \neq \underline{i}$ , the element  $Y_{j_0}^{s_{j_0}^J - 2i_{j_0}} C' \in \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_J \rangle$  also has nonzero image in  $Q \cong Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}''}, J_{\underline{i}''})$ . Then we deduce from Lemma 5.1(ii) that the coefficients of  $C'$  with  $\underline{i}'' \neq \underline{i}$  in the linear combination for  $C$  must be zero, which concludes the proof of (34).

Now we prove the claim. We let  $J_0$  be the subset corresponding to the  $H$ -eigencharacter of  $C' = \underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_J)$  in (31). Suppose that  $j_0 \in J_0$ . Then by Claim 2 in the proof of Proposition 5.5, we deduce from  $j_0 \in J_0$  and  $j_0 \notin J'$  that  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ , which is a contradiction since  $J' = \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j_0\}$ . Hence we must have  $j_0 \notin J_0$ . By the definition of  $\eta_j$  in the case  $J' = \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j_0\}$  (see (22)), we have either  $\eta_{j_0} = -1$  or  $\eta_{j_0} = 0$ . Moreover, if  $\eta_{j_0} = 0$ , then the definition of  $\eta_j$  implies that  $i_j'' = i_j$  for all  $j \neq j_0$ , hence  $i_{j_0}'' < i_{j_0}$  since  $\underline{i}'' \neq \underline{i}$ . In particular, in either case we deduce from (35) that  $k_{j_0} < 2i_{j_0} + p - s_{j_0}^J$ , hence  $(s_{j_0}^J - 2i_{j_0}) + k_{j_0} \leq p - 1$ . Then using  $j_0 \notin J_0$ , the  $H$ -eigencharacter of  $Y_{j_0}^{s_{j_0}^J - 2i_{j_0}} C'$  still appears in (31) (with the corresponding  $\underline{i}''$  and  $J_0$  unchanged), hence has nonzero image in  $Q \cong Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{i}''}, J_{\underline{i}''})$ .

**Step 2.** We prove (29) for all  $J'$  such that  $j_0 \notin J'$  and  $j_0 - 1 \in J'$ .

We multiply both sides of (34) by  $Y_{j_0+1} [\prod_{j \notin J' \cup \{j_0\}} Y_j^{2i_j + t^{J'}(J')_j}]$ . Since  $j_0 - 1 \in J'$ , we deduce that  $t^{J'}(J')_{j_0}$  is the same as in Step 1. If  $j_0 + 1 \in J'$ , then using (30) we obtain (29) for  $J'$ . If  $j_0 + 1 \notin J'$ , then using (30) together with Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j = j_0 + 1$  we obtain (29) for  $J'$ .

**Step 3.** We prove (29) for all  $J'$  such that  $j_0 \notin J'$  and  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ .

We multiply both sides of (34) by  $Y_{j_0+1} [\prod_{j \notin J' \cup \{j_0\}} Y_j^{2i_j + t^{J'}(J')_j}]$ . Similarly to Step 2 but using  $j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ , we get  $Y_{j_0} B_1 = Y_{j_0} B_2$ . Moreover,  $B_1, B_2 \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}) \subseteq \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle$  have  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_J \alpha_{j_0+1} \alpha^{-i} [\prod_{j \notin J'} \alpha_j^{2i_j + p - 1 - s_j^J + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}}]$ . Hence it suffices to show that there is no nonzero  $H$ -eigenvector  $C \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}})$  with  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi$  satisfying  $Y_{j_0} C = 0$ , which implies  $B_1 - B_2 = 0$ .

The rest of the proof is similar to the one of Step 1, and is left as an exercise. Here the analogous assertion  $j_0 \notin J_0$  is guaranteed by the fact that  $C \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}})$  and using Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

The following Proposition is a generalization of Proposition 5.4 and gives more relations between the vectors  $v_J \in D_0(\bar{p})$ .

**Proposition 5.10.** *Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(J')^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$  (i.e.  $(J', J_{\bar{p}}) \neq (\mathcal{J}, \emptyset)$ ) and satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} (J-1)^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}} \\ (J')^{\text{nss}} \subseteq (J-1)^{\text{nss}} \Delta(J'-1)^{\text{nss}}. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Then there exists a unique element  $\mu_{J, J'} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ , such that

$$\left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J \Delta J'} Y_j^{s_j^{J'}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J \Delta J'} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}} v_J \right) = \mu_{J, J'} v_{J'}, \quad (37)$$

where  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}} v_J$  is defined in Proposition 4.2.

*Proof.* If  $f = 1$ , then the assumption implies  $J' = (J-1)^{\text{ss}}$  and  $(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}} = \emptyset$ , and the proposition is already proved in Proposition 5.4. Hence in the rest of the proof we assume that  $f \geq 2$ . We denote by  $B$  the LHS of (37).

**Claim 1.** The element  $B$  is nonzero and has  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_{J'}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.1(ii), the representation  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}} v_J \rangle$  has a quotient  $Q$  isomorphic to  $Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}}, J''')$  with  $J''' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}) \setminus (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}) - 1$ . By the proof of Lemma 5.1,  $Q$  has constituents  $F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_j}(-\underline{b}))$  with

$$\max(\delta_{j \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, 2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}) \leq b_j \leq 2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + 1. \quad (38)$$

We claim that  $\sigma_{J'}$  is a constituent of  $Q$  and corresponds to the subset  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (J \Delta J') - 1$  for  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)} (\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}})$  (see Lemma 3.2(i)). Indeed, by Lemma 2.1(iii), we have  $\sigma_{J'} = F(\mathfrak{t}_{\lambda_j}(-\underline{b}))$  with

$$b_j = \begin{cases} \delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j \in J'} (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J \Delta J'}} & \text{if } j \notin J_{\bar{p}} \\ (\delta_{j \in J} - \delta_{j \notin J'}) (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J}} & \text{if } j \in J_{\bar{p}}. \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

We need to check that  $b_j$  satisfies (38). We assume that  $j \notin J_{\bar{p}}$ , the case  $j \in J_{\bar{p}}$  being similar. By (36), we have  $j \in J'$  implies  $j+1 \in J\Delta J'$ . Hence we have  $\delta_{j \in J'}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J\Delta J'}} = \delta_{j \in J'}$ , and from (38) it suffices to show that

$$\max(\delta_{j \in J}, 2\delta_{j \in J \cap J'}) \leq \delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j \in J'} \leq 2\delta_{j \in J \cap J'} + 1,$$

which is easy. Then we prove the second assertion. By Lemma 3.2(i) applied to  $\lambda = \lambda_J - \alpha^{\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}}$ , it suffices to show that  $b_j = 2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + 1$  if and only if  $j \in J\Delta J'$ . Once again we assume that  $j \notin J_{\bar{p}}$ , and the case  $j \in J_{\bar{p}}$  is similar. Then it suffices to show that  $\delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j \in J'} = 2\delta_{j \in J \cap J'} + 1$  if and only if  $j \in J\Delta J'$ , which is easy.

By Lemma D.1, for  $j \in J''$  we have  $(p-2 - (s_j^J - 2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}})) + \delta_{j-1 \in J''} = s_j^{J'}$ . Then by Lemma 3.2(iii) applied to  $\lambda = \lambda_J - \alpha^{\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}}$ , we deduce that the image of  $B$  in  $Q \cong Q(\chi_J^s \alpha^{\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}}, J''')$  is a nonzero  $I_1$ -invariant of  $\sigma_{J'}$ . In particular,  $B$  is nonzero and has  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_{J'}$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2.** The element  $B$  is  $K_1$ -invariant.

*Proof.* First we claim that  $\underline{m}(\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}, J, J'') = \underline{a}^{J'}$  (see (28) for  $\underline{m}$  and (5) for  $\underline{a}^{J'}$ ). Indeed, using Lemma D.2 it suffices to show that  $\delta_{j \in J'}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} = a_j^{J'}$  for  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . If  $j \in J_{\bar{p}}$ , then the assumption  $(J-1)^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$  implies that  $j \in J-1$  if and only if  $j \in J'$ , hence we have  $\delta_{j \in J'}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} = \delta_{j \in J'}(-1)^{\delta_{j \notin J'}} = \delta_{j \in J'}$ , which equals  $a_j^{J'}$  by (5). If  $j \notin J_{\bar{p}}$ , then  $j \in J'$  implies  $j+1 \in J\Delta J'$  by the second formula of (36), hence we have  $\delta_{j \in J'}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} = \delta_{j \in J'}(-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \in J'}}$ , which equals  $a_j^{J'}$  by (5).

By Proposition 5.7(ii) applied to  $\underline{i} = \underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}$  and with  $J'$  there being  $J''$ , we deduce that

$$Y_{j'} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \notin J\Delta J'} Y_j^{2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + t^J(J'')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}} v_J \right) \in I(\sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{J'}) \subseteq D_{0, \sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho}) \quad (40)$$

for all  $j' \in \mathcal{J}$ , where the last inclusion follows from the fact that  $\sigma_{J'}$  is a constituent of  $D_{0, \sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$  (which follows from Lemma 4.1(iii) and (36)). Since  $s_j^{J'} \geq 1$  and  $2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + t^J(J'')_j \leq p-2$  for all  $j$  by (9), (18) and  $f \geq 2$ , multiplying (40) by a suitable power of  $\underline{Y}$  we deduce that  $B \in D_{0, \sigma_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}(\bar{\rho})$ , hence is  $K_1$ -invariant.  $\square$

**Claim 3.** We have  $Y_{j_0} B = 0$  for all  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$ .

*Proof.* (i). Suppose that  $j_0+1 \notin J\Delta J'$  and  $j_0+1 \notin (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}$ . By Proposition 4.2, we have  $Y_{j_0+1}(\underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}} v_J) = 0$ . Hence it follows from Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j = j_0$  that  $Y_{j_0} B = 0$ .

(ii). Suppose that  $j_0+1 \in J\Delta J'$ , which equals  $J\Delta((J')^{\text{ss}}\Delta(J')^{\text{nss}}) = (J\Delta(J')^{\text{ss}})\Delta(J')^{\text{nss}}$ . Hence for each  $j \in J\Delta J'$ , we have either  $j \in J\Delta(J')^{\text{ss}}$ ,  $j \notin (J')^{\text{nss}}$  or  $j \notin J\Delta(J')^{\text{ss}}$ ,  $j \in (J')^{\text{nss}}$ , and in the latter case we have  $j+1 \in J\Delta J'$  by (36). In particular, since  $(J')^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , there exists  $0 \leq w \leq f-1$  such that  $j \notin J\Delta(J')^{\text{ss}}$ ,  $j \in (J')^{\text{nss}}$  for  $j = j_0+1, \dots, j_0+w$  and  $j_0+w+1 \in J\Delta(J')^{\text{ss}}$ ,  $j_0+w+1 \notin (J')^{\text{nss}}$ .

By (36) we have  $j_0+w+1 \in J\Delta(J')^{\text{ss}} = J\Delta(J-1)^{\text{ss}}$ . Then by proposition 5.5 applied to  $\underline{i} = \underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}$ ,  $j_0$  replaced by  $j_0+w$  and  $J'$  replaced by  $J''-1$  with  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (J\Delta J') \setminus \{j_0+1, \dots, j_0+w+1\}$ , and possibly multiplying (19) by  $Y_{j_0+w+1}$ , we have

$$Y_{j_0+w+1} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \notin J''} Y_j^{2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + p-1-s_j^J + \delta_{j \in J''}} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}}} v_J \right) = 0.$$

Since  $2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + p - 1 - s_j^J + \delta_{j \in J''} \leq p - 1$  for all  $j$  by (9), to prove that  $Y_{j_0} B = 0$ , it suffices (from the formula of  $B$ ) to show that

$$s_{j'}^{j'} + \delta_{j=j_0} = 2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + p - 1 - s_j^J + \delta_{j \in (J \Delta J') \setminus \{j_0+1, \dots, j_0+w+1\}} + \delta_{j=j_0+w+1}$$

for  $j+1 \in (J \Delta J') \setminus J''$ , that is  $j = j_0, \dots, j_0 + w$ . This follows from Lemma D.1 with  $J, J'$  as above noting that  $j = j_0 + w + 1$  and  $j \in \{j_0, \dots, j_0 + w\}$  imply that  $j = j_0$  and  $w = f - 1$ .

(iii). Suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}$ , then by Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j = j_0$  and using  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \Delta J'$ , we have

$$Y_{j_0} B = \left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J \Delta J'} Y_j^{s_j^{j'}} \prod_{j+1 \notin (J \Delta J') \cup \{j_0+1\}} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}} \setminus \{j_0+1\}}} v_J \right). \quad (41)$$

As in (ii) (with the difference that  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \Delta J'$ ), there exists  $1 \leq w \leq f - 1$  such that  $j \notin J \Delta (J')^{\text{ss}}$ ,  $j \in (J')^{\text{nss}}$  for  $j = j_0 + 2, \dots, j_0 + w$  and  $j_0 + w + 1 \in J \Delta (J')^{\text{ss}}$ ,  $j_0 + w + 1 \notin (J')^{\text{nss}}$ . The rest of the proof then follows exactly as in (ii) except that we take  $\underline{i} = \underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{nss}} \setminus \{j_0+1\}}$  and  $J'' = ((J \Delta J') \setminus \{j_0 + 2, \dots, j_0 + w + 1\}) \cup \{j_0 + 1\}$ .  $\square$

From Claim 2 and Claim 3 we deduce that  $B$  is  $I_1$ -invariant. Since  $B \neq 0$  has  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_{J'}$  by Claim 1 and since  $D_0(\bar{\rho})^{I_1}$  is multiplicity-free by Lemma 4.1(ii), we conclude that  $B$  is a scalar multiple of  $v_{J'}$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 5.11.** For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we define the **right boundary** of  $J$  by  $\partial J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j \in J : j+1 \notin J\}$ . Then the second formula in (36) is equivalent to

$$(\partial J')^{\text{nss}} \subseteq (J - 1)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq ((J' \setminus \partial J')^c)^{\text{nss}}.$$

If  $J_{\bar{\rho}} = \emptyset$ , then we define  $x_{\emptyset, \underline{x}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu_{\emptyset, \emptyset}^{-1} \underline{Y}^{p-1-\underline{x}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_{\emptyset}$  so that  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{x}} x_{\emptyset, \underline{x}} = v_{\emptyset}$  by (16) applied to  $J = \emptyset$ . This agrees with the definition of  $x_{\emptyset, \underline{x}}$  given in Theorem 6.3 below (see (C.9)). Then we have the following complement of Proposition 5.10, which together with Proposition 5.10 gives all possible relations between the vectors  $v_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$ .

**Proposition 5.12.** Assume that  $J_{\bar{\rho}} = \emptyset$ . Then for  $\emptyset \neq J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , there exists a unique element  $\mu_{J, \mathcal{J}} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$  such that

$$\left[ \prod_{j+1 \notin J} Y_j^{p-1-r_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_J = \mu_{J, \mathcal{J}} v_{\mathcal{J}} + \mu_{J, \emptyset} x_{\emptyset, \underline{x}},$$

where  $\mu_{J, \emptyset}$  is defined in Proposition 5.4.

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.1(ii) and its proof, the isomorphism  $\text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_{\emptyset}^s) \cong \langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_{\emptyset} \rangle$  identifies the element  $\phi \in \text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_{\emptyset}^s)$  (see §3) with  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{pmatrix} v_{\emptyset}$ , which is a scalar multiple of  $v_{\mathcal{J}}$  since  $\chi_{\mathcal{J}} = \chi_{\emptyset}^s$  when  $J_{\bar{\rho}} = \emptyset$ . Hence by Lemma 3.2(iii)(a) applied to  $\lambda = \lambda_{\emptyset}$ , any nonzero element in the  $I$ -cosocle of  $\sigma_{\emptyset}$  is a linear combination of  $v_{\mathcal{J}}$  and  $x_{\emptyset, \underline{x}}$  with nonzero coefficients.

By Lemma 5.1(i),(ii) and its proof, the representation  $\langle \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_J \rangle \cong Q(\chi_J^s, J - 1)$  has socle  $\sigma_{\emptyset}$ , and identifies  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ p & 0 \end{pmatrix} v_J$  with the image of  $\phi \in \text{Ind}_I^{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)}(\chi_J^s)$  in  $Q(\chi_J^s, J - 1)$ .

Since  $J \neq \emptyset$ , we deduce from Lemma 3.2(iii)(b) applied to  $\lambda = \lambda_J$  that the element  $B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \notin J} Y_j^{p-1-r_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_J$  is nonzero and lies in the  $I$ -cosocle of  $\sigma_{\emptyset}$ , hence  $B = \mu_{J, \mathcal{J}} v_{\mathcal{J}} + \mu'_{J, \emptyset} x_{\emptyset, \underline{x}}$  for some  $\mu_{J, \mathcal{J}}, \mu'_{J, \emptyset} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$  by the previous paragraph. Finally, by applying  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{x}}$  to  $B$  and using  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{x}} v_{\mathcal{J}} = 0$  since  $v_{\mathcal{J}}$  is  $I_1$ -invariant, we deduce from Proposition 5.4 (with  $J_{\bar{\rho}} = J = \emptyset$ ) that  $\mu'_{J, \emptyset} = \mu_{J, \emptyset}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.13.** *Let  $J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4 \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that the pairs  $(J_1, J_3), (J_1, J_4), (J_2, J_3), (J_2, J_4)$  satisfy the assumptions of either Proposition 5.10 or Proposition 5.12 (here we say that  $(J, J')$  satisfies the assumption of Proposition 5.12 if  $J_{\bar{p}} = \emptyset$ ,  $J \neq \emptyset$  and  $J' = \mathcal{J}$ ). Then we have*

$$\frac{\mu_{J_1, J_3}}{\mu_{J_1, J_4}} = \frac{\mu_{J_2, J_3}}{\mu_{J_2, J_4}}, \quad (42)$$

where each term of (42) is defined in either Proposition 5.10 or Proposition 5.12.

*Proof.* First we suppose that  $J_{\bar{p}} = \emptyset$  and  $J_4 = \mathcal{J}$ . If  $J_3 = \mathcal{J}$ , then (42) is clear. If  $J_3 \neq \mathcal{J}$ , then by the proof of Proposition 5.12 and using that the  $I$ -cosocle of  $\sigma_{\emptyset}$  has dimension 1 over  $\mathbb{F}$ , the ratio  $\mu_{J, \mathcal{J}}/\mu_{J, \emptyset}$  does not depend on  $J$ , hence we can replace  $J_4 = \mathcal{J}$  by  $J_4 = \emptyset$ .

From now on, we assume that all the pairs  $(J_1, J_3), (J_1, J_4), (J_2, J_3), (J_2, J_4)$  satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 5.10. In particular, we have  $(J_1 - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J_2 - 1)^{\text{ss}} = J_3^{\text{ss}} = J_4^{\text{ss}}$ . Using that  $\mu_{J_i, J_3}/\mu_{J_i, J_4} = (\mu_{J_i, J_3}/\mu_{J_i, J_4^{\text{ss}}})/(\mu_{J_i, J_4}/\mu_{J_i, J_4^{\text{ss}}})$  for  $i = 1, 2$  with each term defined in Proposition 5.10, we may assume that  $J_4 = J_4^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_{\bar{p}}$ .

Then using Remark 5.11, the assumption (36) for the pairs  $(J_1, J_3), (J_1, J_4), (J_2, J_3), (J_2, J_4)$  is equivalent to

$$(\partial J_3)^{\text{nss}} \sqcup J_4 \subseteq J_i - 1 \subseteq ((J_3 \setminus \partial J_3)^c)^{\text{nss}} \sqcup J_4 \quad (43)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . By choosing a sequence  $J^0, J^1, \dots, J^r \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  for some  $r \geq 0$  such that  $J^0 = J_1$ ,  $J^r = J_2$ ,  $|J^i \Delta J^{i-1}| = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and

$$(\partial J_3)^{\text{nss}} \sqcup J_4 \subseteq J^i - 1 \subseteq ((J_3 \setminus \partial J_3)^c)^{\text{nss}} \sqcup J_4$$

for  $0 \leq i \leq r$ , it suffices to prove the proposition with  $J_1, J_2$  as in (43) such that  $(J_1 - 1) = (J_2 - 1) \sqcup \{j_0 + 1\}$  for some  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$ . In particular, we have  $j_0 + 1 \in (J_1 - 1)^{\text{nss}}$  (since  $(J_1 - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J_2 - 1)^{\text{ss}} = J_4$ ) and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J_3$ .

(i). Suppose that  $j_0 \in J_1 - 1$ . By Proposition 5.10 applied to  $(J_1, J_3)$ , we have

$$\left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J_1 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{s_j^{J_3}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J_1 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{nss}}}} v_{J_1} \right) = \mu_{J_1, J_3} v_{J_3}. \quad (44)$$

Since  $j_0 + 1 \in J_1$  and  $j_0 + 1 \notin (J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{nss}}$  (since  $j_0 + 1 \notin J_3$ ), by Proposition 5.8 applied to  $(\underline{j}, J, J') = (\underline{e}^{(J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{nss}}}, J_1, \mathcal{J})$  with  $j_0$  as above together with (30) (and note that  $(J_1 - 1)^{\text{ss}} = J_4$ ), we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{nss}}}} v_{J_1} \right) = \frac{\mu_{J_1, J_4} Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}}}{\mu_{J_2, J_4}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J_2} \right) \quad (45)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{i}' &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{e}^{(J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{nss}}} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J_4} e_{j_0+2} \\ &= (\underline{e}^{(J_2 \cap J_3)^{\text{nss}}} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J_3^{\text{nss}}} e_{j_0+2}) + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J_3^{\text{ss}}} e_{j_0+2} = \underline{e}^{(J_2 \cap J_3)^{\text{nss}}} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J_3} e_{j_0+2}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the second equality uses  $J_1 \setminus J_2 = \{j_0 + 2\}$  and  $J_3^{\text{ss}} = J_4$ . We assume that  $j_0 + 2 \in J_3$ , the case  $j_0 + 2 \notin J_3$  being similar. Since  $j_0 + 1 \notin J_3$ , we have  $s_{j_0+1}^{J_3} = p - 2 - r_{j_0+1}$  by (6). Combining (44) and (45), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{J_1, J_3} v_{J_3} &= \frac{\mu_{J_1, J_4}}{\mu_{J_2, J_4}} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J_1 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{s_j^{J_3}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J_1 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{p-1} \right] Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J_2} \right) \\ &= \frac{\mu_{J_1, J_4}}{\mu_{J_2, J_4}} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J_2 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{s_j^{J_3}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J_2 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{p-1} \right] Y_{j_0+1}^{r_{j_0+1}} Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J_2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\mu_{J_1, J_4}}{\mu_{J_2, J_4}} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J_2 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{s_j^{J_3}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J_2 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J_2 \cap J_3)^{\text{NSS}}}} v_{J_2} \right) \\
&= \frac{\mu_{J_1, J_4}}{\mu_{J_2, J_4}} \mu_{J_2, J_3} v_{J_3},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses  $j_0 + 2 \in J_1$ ,  $j_0 + 2 \notin J_2$ ,  $j_0 + 2 \in J_3$  (hence  $j_0 + 2 \notin J_1 \Delta J_3$  and  $j_0 + 2 \in J_2 \Delta J_3$ ) and  $s_{j_0+1}^{J_3} = p - 2 - r_{j_0+1}$ , the third equality follows from Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j = j_0 + 1$  and (46) using  $j_0 + 2 \in J_3$ , and the last equality follows from Proposition 5.10 applied to  $(J_2, J_3)$ . Therefore, we have  $\mu_{J_1, J_3} = (\mu_{J_1, J_4} / \mu_{J_2, J_4}) \mu_{J_2, J_3}$ , which completes the proof.

(ii). Suppose that  $j_0 \notin J_1 - 1$  (which implies  $f \geq 2$ ). Similar to (i), by Proposition 5.8 applied to  $(\underline{i}, J, J') = (\underline{e}^{(J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{NSS}}}, J_1, \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j_0\})$  with  $j_0$  as above together with (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[ Y_{j_0+1} Y_{j_0}^{2\delta_{j_0 \in (J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{NSS}} + p - s_{j_0}^{J_1}}} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \right) \\
&= \frac{\mu_{J_1, J_4}}{\mu_{J_2, J_4}} \left[ Y_{j_0+1} Y_{j_0}^{2\delta_{j_0 \in (J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{NSS}} + p - s_{j_0}^{J_1}}} \right] Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{\mathcal{J} \setminus \{j_0+2\}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\underline{i}' = \underline{e}^{(J_2 \cap J_3)^{\text{NSS}}} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J_3} e_{j_0+2}$ . We claim that  $\left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J_1 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{s_j^{J_3}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J_1 \Delta J_3} Y_j^{p-1} \right]$  is a multiple of  $Y_{j_0+1} Y_{j_0}^{2\delta_{j_0 \in (J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{NSS}} + p - s_{j_0}^{J_1}}}$ . Indeed, since  $s_{j_0+1}^{J_3} \geq 1$  and  $2\delta_{j_0 \in (J_1 \cap J_3)^{\text{NSS}} + p - s_{j_0}^{J_1}} \leq p - 1$  by (9), the claim follows from the fact that  $j_0 + 1 \notin J_1$ ,  $j_0 + 1 \notin J_3$  (hence  $j_0 + 1 \notin J_1 \Delta J_3$ ) and  $j_0 + 1 \neq j_0$ . Once we have the claim, we can argue exactly as in (i) to conclude the proof.  $\square$

To end this section, we extend the definition of  $\mu_{J, J'}$  to all  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(J - 1)^{\text{SS}} = (J')^{\text{SS}}$  as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \mu_{J, J'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mu_{((J')^{\text{SS}} \sqcup (\partial J')^{\text{NSS}}) + 1, J'} \mu_{J, (J')^{\text{SS}}}}{\mu_{((J')^{\text{SS}} \sqcup (\partial J')^{\text{NSS}}) + 1, (J')^{\text{SS}}}} & \text{if } (J_{\overline{p}}, J') \neq (\emptyset, \mathcal{J}) \\ \mu_{\emptyset, \mathcal{J}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mu_{\emptyset, \emptyset} \mu_{\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}}}{\mu_{J, \emptyset}} & \text{if } J_{\overline{p}} = \emptyset \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

(and  $\mu_{J, \mathcal{J}}$  as in Proposition 5.12 if  $J_{\overline{p}} = \emptyset$  and  $J \neq \emptyset$ ), where each term on the RHS of (47) are defined in either Proposition 5.10 or Proposition 5.12. Then the equation (42) holds for arbitrary  $J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4 \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(J_1 - 1)^{\text{SS}} = (J_2 - 1)^{\text{SS}} = J_3^{\text{SS}} = J_4^{\text{SS}}$ . In particular, for  $J, J'$  such that  $(J - 1)^{\text{SS}} = (J' - 1)^{\text{SS}}$ , the quantity  $\mu_{J, J''} / \mu_{J', J''}$  does not depend on  $J''$  for  $(J'')^{\text{SS}} = (J - 1)^{\text{SS}}$  and we denote it by  $\mu_{J, *} / \mu_{J', *}$ . Similarly, for  $J, J'$  such that  $J^{\text{SS}} = (J')^{\text{SS}}$ , the quantity  $\mu_{J'', J} / \mu_{J'', J'}$  does not depend on  $J''$  for  $(J'' - 1)^{\text{SS}} = J^{\text{SS}}$  and we denote it by  $\mu_{*, J} / \mu_{*, J'}$ .

## 6 Projective systems in $\pi$

In this section, we define certain projective systems  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  of elements of  $\pi$  indexed by  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ , see Theorem 6.3. They will give rise to a basis of the  $A$ -module  $D_A(\pi)$ . The definition of these elements is much more involved than in the semisimple case (compared with [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, (104)]).

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ .

(i) We define  $\underline{r}^J \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by

$$r_j^J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \notin J \\ -1 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \notin J \\ r_j + 1 & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \in J \\ r_j & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J. \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

(ii) We define  $\underline{c}^J \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by

$$c_j^J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} p-1 & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \notin J \\ r_j+1 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \notin J \\ p-2-r_j & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \in J \\ 0 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J. \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

(iii) We define  $\varepsilon_J \in \{\pm 1\}$  by (see Remark 5.11 for  $\partial J$ )

$$\varepsilon_J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} (-1)^{f-1} & \text{if } J_{\bar{p}} = \emptyset, J = \mathcal{J} \\ (-1)^{|(J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

**Remark 6.2.** (i) By definition, for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have

$$r_j^J = \delta_{j+1 \in J}(r_j+1) - \delta_{j \in J}; \quad (51)$$

$$c_j^J = \delta_{j \notin J}(p-2-r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j+1). \quad (52)$$

(ii) The definition of  $\underline{c}^J$  is a variant of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, (95)] (where  $\bar{p}$  was assumed to be semisimple). Also, by (2) we have  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{c}^J \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ .

**Theorem 6.3.** There exists a unique family of elements  $\{x_{J, \underline{i}} : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}, \underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f\}$  of  $\pi$  satisfying the following properties:

- (i) For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we have  $x_{J, \underline{f}} = \underline{Y}^{-(\underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}})} v_J$  (defined in Proposition 4.2).
- (ii) For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $\underline{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$ , we have  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} x_{J, \underline{i}} = x_{J, \underline{i} - \underline{k}}$ .
- (iii) For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ , we have (see Proposition 5.10 and (47) for  $\mu_{J+1, J'}$ )

$$\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}} = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}}.$$

**Remark 6.4.** The extra term  $\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  in Theorem 6.3(i) has the advantage that the constants  $\underline{c}^J$  and  $\underline{r}^J$  in Theorem 6.3(iii) work for arbitrary  $J_{\bar{p}}$ .

**Remark 6.5.** Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k$ . Then by Theorem 6.3(ii), (iii), for all  $|J| \leq k$ ,  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$  we have

$$\underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}} = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} - \underline{\ell}}. \quad (53)$$

Moreover, the LHS and each term of the summation in (53) are  $H$ -eigenvectors with common  $H$ -eigencharacter  $\chi_J \alpha^{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} + \underline{\ell} - \underline{i}}$ , see the proof of Corollary 6.10(ii) below.

*Proof of Theorem 6.3.* We define the elements  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in \pi$  by increasing induction on  $|J|$  and on  $\max_j i_j$ . For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ , we define (see Proposition 4.2)

$$x_{J, \underline{i}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \underline{Y}^{-(\underline{i} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}})} v_J & \text{if } \underline{i} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

Then we let  $|J| = k$  for  $0 \leq k \leq f$  and  $\max_j i_j = m > f$ . Assume that  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  is defined for  $|J| \leq k-1$  and all  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ , and for  $|J| = k$  and  $\max_j i_j \leq m-1$ . We write  $\underline{i} = p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^J - \underline{\ell}$



for the unique  $\underline{i}', \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ . Then we claim that  $\max_j i'_j < \max_j i_j = m$ . Indeed, for each  $j$  we have

$$i'_{j+1} = (i_j - c_j^J + \ell_j) / p \leq (m - 0 + (p - 1)) / p < m/p + 1 < m, \quad (55)$$

where the last inequality uses  $m > f \geq 1$ . Then we define  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  by the formula

$$\varepsilon_{J\mu_{J+1, J} x_{J, \underline{i}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}'} - \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} \varepsilon_{J' \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', \underline{i} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}}}, \quad (56)$$

where each term on the RHS of (56) is defined by the induction hypothesis (hence a priori (56) holds for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\max_j i_j > f$ ).

**Lemma 6.6.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k - 1$ . If (56) holds for  $|J| = k$  and  $\underline{i} = \underline{f}$ , then Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| = k$ .*

*Proof.* By (54) and Proposition 4.2, Theorem 6.3(ii) is true for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ . Then we let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $|J| = k$ . We define  $\underline{c}^J \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by

$$\underline{c}_j^J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} p - 1 - f & \text{if } j \notin J, j + 1 \notin J \\ r_j + 1 - f & \text{if } j \in J, j + 1 \notin J \\ p - 2 - r_j - f & \text{if } j \notin J, j + 1 \in J \\ p - f & \text{if } j \in J, j + 1 \in J. \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

In particular, by (2) we have  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{c}^J \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ , and by (57) and (49) we have

$$\underline{f} = p\delta(\underline{c}^{J \cap (J+1)}) + \underline{c}^J - \underline{c}'^J. \quad (58)$$

Since (56) holds for  $J$  as above and  $\underline{i} = \underline{f}$  by assumption, using (58) we have

$$\varepsilon_{J\mu_{J+1, J} x_{J, \underline{f}}} = \underline{Y}^{\underline{c}'^J} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)}} - \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} \varepsilon_{J' \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', \underline{f} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}}}. \quad (59)$$

For each  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ , we write  $\underline{i} = p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^J - \underline{\ell}$  as in (56). In particular, comparing with (58) we have  $\underline{i}' \leq \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)}$ . By Lemma 3.1(i) and Theorem 6.3(ii) (applied with  $(J, \underline{i}, \underline{k})$  there replaced by  $(J + 1, \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)}, \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)} - \underline{i}')$  and using  $\underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)} \leq \underline{f}$ ) we deduce that

$$\underline{Y}^{\underline{f} - \underline{i}} \left[ \underline{Y}^{\underline{c}'^J} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)}} \right] = \underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}'}. \quad (60)$$

Since Theorem 6.3(ii) is true for  $|J| \leq k - 1$ , by applying  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{f} - \underline{i}}$  to (59) and using (60) we deduce that (56) is true for  $J$  as above and  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ , hence for all  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by definition.

Then we use increasing induction on  $\max_j i_j$  to prove that Theorem 6.3(ii) is true (for  $J$  as above, which satisfies  $|J| = k$ ). We already know that Theorem 6.3(ii) is true for  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ . Then for each  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $\underline{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$ , if we write  $\underline{i} - \underline{k} = p\delta(\underline{i}'') + \underline{c}^J - \underline{\ell}'$  for the unique  $\underline{i}'', \underline{\ell}' \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell}' \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \varepsilon_{J\mu_{J+1, J} x_{J, \underline{i}}} &= \underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} \left[ \underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}'} - \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} \varepsilon_{J' \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', \underline{i} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} \right] \\ &= \underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}'} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}''} - \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} \varepsilon_{J' \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', \underline{i} - \underline{k} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \varepsilon_J \mu_{J+1, J} x_{J, \underline{i}-\underline{k}},$$

where the first and the third equality follow from (56), and the second equality follows in a similar way as (60) using the induction hypothesis. This shows that  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}} x_{J, \underline{i}} = x_{J, \underline{i}-\underline{k}}$ .

Finally, by taking  $\underline{i}$  such that  $\underline{\ell} = \underline{0}$  in (56), we conclude that Theorem 6.3(iii) is true (for  $J$  as above).  $\square$

Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k-1$ . By Lemma 6.6, it suffices to prove that (56) is true for  $|J| = k$  and  $\underline{i} = \underline{f}$ . For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we denote (see (57) for  $\underline{c}^J$ )

$$\begin{aligned} z_J &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{Y}^{\underline{c}^J} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)}} = \underline{Y}^{\underline{c}^J} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap (J+1))^{\text{NSS}}}} v_{J+1} \right) \in \pi; \\ w_J &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{J^{\text{SS}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', \underline{f} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} \in \pi. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Then by (59), it is equivalent to proving that for  $|J| = k$  we have

$$z_J - w_J = \varepsilon_J \mu_{J+1, J} x_{J, \underline{f}} = \varepsilon_J \mu_{J+1, J} \underline{Y}^{-(\underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}})} v_J. \quad (62)$$

The proof of (62) consists of the following three lemmas, where we need to use some results of Appendix A.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k-1$ . Then for  $|J| \leq k$ , we have  $z_J, w_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$ .*

*Proof.* (i). First we prove that  $z_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$ . Let  $\underline{i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{e}^{(J \cap (J+1))^{\text{NSS}}}$ ,  $J_1'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} J \Delta (J-1)$  and  $\underline{m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{m}(\underline{i}, J+1, J_1'')$  (see (28)). By Lemma D.2 applied with  $(J, J')$  there replaced by  $(J+1, J)$ , we have  $m_j = \delta_{j \in J} (-1)^{\delta_{j \notin J}} = \delta_{j \in J}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Then by Proposition 5.7(ii) applied to  $(\underline{i}, J+1, J_1'')$ , we have for all  $j' \in \mathcal{J}$

$$Y_{j'}^{\delta_{J_1''=0}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J_1''} Y_j^{2i_j + t^{J+1}(J_1'')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_{J+1} \right) \in I(\sigma_{J^{\text{SS}}}, \sigma_{\underline{e}^J}) = I(\sigma_{J^{\text{SS}}}, \sigma_{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{SS}} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{NSS}}}}}) \subseteq D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\text{SS}}}}(\bar{\rho}),$$

where the last inclusion follows from Corollary 5.3. To prove that  $z_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$ , it suffices to show that for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have

$$c_j^J \geq \delta_{j \notin J_1''} (2i_j + t^{J+1}(J_1'')_j) + \delta_{J_1''=0}.$$

This is a consequence of Lemma D.4(iv) applied with  $J' = J$  and  $\underline{\delta} = \underline{0}$ , and (58).

(ii). Next we prove that  $w_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$ . To do this, we prove by increasing induction on  $|J'|$  that  $x_{J', \underline{f} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$  for each  $J'$  such that  $J^{\text{SS}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$  (which implies  $(J')^{\text{SS}} = J^{\text{SS}}$ ). Let  $\underline{i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{e}^{(J'+1) \cap J} - \underline{e}^{(J'+1)^{\text{sh}}} = \underline{e}^{((J'+1) \cap J)^{\text{NSS}}}$  (using  $(J')^{\text{SS}} = J^{\text{SS}}$ ),  $J_2'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} J' \Delta (J-1)$  and  $\underline{m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{m}(\underline{i}, J'+1, J_2'')$  (see (28)). By Proposition 5.7(ii) applied to  $(\underline{i}, J'+1, J_2'')$ , we have for all  $j' \in \mathcal{J}$

$$Y_{j'}^{\delta_{J_2''=0}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J_2''} Y_j^{2i_j + t^{J'+1}(J_2'')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_{J'+1} \right) \in I(\sigma_{(J')^{\text{SS}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}). \quad (63)$$

By Lemma D.2 applied with  $(J, J')$  there replaced by  $(J'+1, J)$ , we have  $m_j = \delta_{j \in J} (-1)^{\delta_{j \notin J'}}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Then a case-by-case examination using  $J^{\text{SS}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$  shows that  $m_j - \delta_{j \in (J')^{\text{SS}}}$  equals 0 if  $j \in J_{\bar{\rho}}$  and equals  $\delta_{j \in J} (-1)^{\delta_{j \notin J'}}$  if  $j \notin J_{\bar{\rho}}$ . Hence by Corollary 5.3 we deduce that  $I(\sigma_{(J')^{\text{SS}}}, \sigma_{\underline{m}}) \subseteq D_{0, \sigma_{(J')^{\text{SS}}}}(\bar{\rho})$ .

We let  $\underline{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  be as in Lemma D.4(iv). On one hand, since  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{c}} v_{J'+1} = x_{J'+1, \underline{c}^{(J'+1) \cap J}}$  by (54), multiplying (63) by a suitable power of  $\underline{Y}$  and using Lemma D.4(iv) (with  $\underline{\delta} = \underline{0}$ ) we deduce that

$$\underline{Y}^{\underline{c}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J'+1, \underline{c}^{(J'+1) \cap J}} \in D_0(\bar{\rho}).$$

On the other hand, since  $|J'| \leq k-1$  by assumption, by (53) applied to  $J'$  and using  $(J')^{\text{ss}} = J^{\text{ss}}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Y}^{\underline{c}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J'+1, \underline{c}^{(J'+1) \cap J}} &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon^{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J'', (p\delta(\underline{c}^{(J'+1) \cap J}) + \underline{c}^{J'} + \underline{r}^{J' \setminus J''} - \underline{c})} \\ &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon^{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J'', (\underline{r}^{J' \setminus J''} + \underline{f} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'})} \\ &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon^{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J'', \underline{f} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the definition of  $\underline{c}$  and the last equality follows from Lemma D.4(ii). By the induction hypothesis, we have  $x_{J'', \underline{f} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''}} \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$  for all  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J'$ . It follows that  $x_{J', \underline{f} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.8.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k-1$ . Then for  $|J| \leq k$ , we have (see Remark 5.11 for  $\partial J$ )*

$$Y_{j_0}^{f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}}} z_J = \begin{cases} \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} \varepsilon^{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', (\underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{f} - (f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}})e_{j_0})} & \text{if } j_0+1 \in J^{\text{nss}} \\ 0 & \text{if } j_0+1 \notin J^{\text{nss}}; \end{cases}$$

$$\underline{Y}^{\underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} z_J = \begin{cases} \mu_{J+1, J^{\vee} J}, & \text{if } J^{\text{nss}} = (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \\ 0, & \text{if } J^{\text{nss}} \neq (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \text{ and } J^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J} \\ \mu_{J, J^{\vee} J} + \mu_{J, \emptyset} x_{\emptyset, \underline{r}}, & \text{if } J^{\text{nss}} = \mathcal{J}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* (i) We prove the first equality. Using the decomposition

$$\mathcal{J} = (J^c \cap (J+1)^c) \sqcup ((J+1)\Delta J^{\text{ss}}) \cup J^{\text{nss}} \sqcup (J+1)^{\text{sh}}, \quad (64)$$

we separate the proof into the following five cases.

(a). Suppose that  $j_0 \notin J$  and  $j_0+1 \notin J$ , which implies  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ . Since  $j_0+1 \notin (J \cap (J+1))^{\text{nss}}$ , by Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j_0$  and Proposition 4.2 we have

$$Y_{j_0}^p \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J \cap (J+1))^{\text{nss}}}} v_{J+1} \right) = 0. \quad (65)$$

Since  $c_{j_0}^J = p-1-f$  by (57), we deduce from (61) and (65) that  $Y_{j_0}^{f+1} z_J = 0$ .

(b). Suppose that  $j_0+1 \in (J+1)^{\text{sh}}$ , which implies  $j_0+1 \notin (J \cap (J+1))^{\text{nss}}$ . In particular, the equality (65) still holds as in (a). Since  $c_{j_0}^J = p-f$  by (57), we deduce from (61) and (65) that  $Y_{j_0}^{f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}}} z_J = 0$ .

(c). Suppose that  $j_0+1 \in (J+1)\Delta J^{\text{ss}}$  and  $j_0+1 \notin J^{\text{nss}}$ , which implies  $f \geq 2$  and  $j_0 \in J\Delta(J-1)$ . In particular, we have  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ . By (6) we have

$$s_j^{J+1} - 2\delta_{j \in (J \cap (J+1))^{\text{nss}}} = \begin{cases} (r_j + \delta_{j-1 \in J}) - 0 & \text{if } j \notin J \\ (p-1-r_j - \delta_{j-1 \notin J} - 2\delta_{j \in (J+1)^{\text{ss}}}) - 2\delta_{j \in (J+1)^{\text{nss}}} & \text{if } j \in J \end{cases}$$

$$= \begin{cases} r_j + \delta_{j-1 \in J\Delta(J-1)} & \text{if } j \notin J \\ p - 3 - r_j + \delta_{j-1 \in J\Delta(J-1)} & \text{if } j \in J. \end{cases}$$

We let  $\underline{i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{e}^{(J \cap (J+1))^{\text{nss}}}$  and  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (J\Delta(J-1)) \setminus \{j_0\}$ . In particular, we have  $i_{j_0+1} = 0$ . Then by (17), for  $j \neq j_0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{j \notin J''} (2i_j + t^{J+1}(J'')_j) &= \delta_{j \notin J''} (2\delta_{j \in (J \cap (J+1))^{\text{nss}}} + p - 1 - s_j^{J+1} + \delta_{j-1 \in J''}) \\ &= \begin{cases} p - 1 - r_j - \delta_{j=j_0+1} & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \notin J \\ r_j + 2 - \delta_{j=j_0+1} & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

and  $2i_{j_0} + t^{J+1}(J'')_{j_0}$  equals  $p - 1 - r_j$  if  $j_0 \notin J$  (which implies  $j_0 + 1 \in J$ ), and equals  $r_j + 2$  if  $j_0 \in J$  (which implies  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$ ). In particular, by (57) we have  $2i_{j_0} + t^{J+1}(J'')_{j_0} = f + 1 + c'_{j_0}$ .

By Proposition 5.5 applied to  $(\underline{i}, J+1, J'')$  with  $j_0$  as above, taking  $j' = j_0 + 1$  in (19) when  $J'' = \emptyset$  and multiplying  $Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{J'' \neq \emptyset}}$  when  $j_0 + 1 \notin J'$ , we deduce that

$$\left[ Y_{j_0}^{f+1+c'_{j_0}} \prod_{j \notin J, j+1 \notin J} Y_j^{p-1-r_j} \prod_{j \in J, j+1 \in J} Y_j^{r_j+2} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_{J+1}) = 0. \quad (67)$$

Comparing (61) and (67), to prove  $Y_{j_0}^{f+1} z_J = 0$ , it is enough to show that

$$c'_j \geq \begin{cases} p - 1 - r_j & \text{if } j \notin J, j+1 \notin J \\ r_j + 2 & \text{if } j \in J, j+1 \in J, \end{cases} \quad (68)$$

which follows directly from (57) and (2).

(d). Suppose that  $j_0 \notin J$  and  $j_0 + 1 \in J^{\text{nss}}$ , which implies  $f \geq 2$  and  $j_0 \in J\Delta(J-1)$ . In particular, we have  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ . We let  $\underline{i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{e}^{(J \cap (J+1))^{\text{nss}}}$  and  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (J\Delta(J-1)) \setminus \{j_0\}$ . In particular, we have  $i_{j_0+1} = 0$ . As in (c), the equality (66) still holds and we have  $2i_{j_0} + t^{J+1}(J'')_{j_0} = f + 1 + c'_{j_0}$ . We denote

$$Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{j+1 \notin J, j+2 \notin J} Y_j^{p-1-r_j} \prod_{j+1 \in J, j+2 \in J} Y_j^{r_j+2} \in \mathbb{F}[N_0].$$

Then by Proposition 5.8 applied to  $(\underline{i}, J+1, J'')$  with  $j_0$  as above, using (30) and together with Lemma 3.1(i) applied to  $j_0 + 1$  if moreover  $j_0 + 1 \notin J''$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[ Y_{j_0+1} Y_{j_0}^{f+1+c'_{j_0}} Z \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_{J+1}) \\ &= \frac{\mu_{J+1,*}}{\mu_{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\},*}} Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}} \left[ Y_{j_0+1} Y_{j_0}^{f+1+c'_{j_0}} Z \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\}}), \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where  $\underline{i}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{i} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J^{\text{ss}}} e_{j_0+2}$ . Then using (68) together with  $c'_{j_0+1} \geq 1$  by (57) and (2), we deduce from (61) and (69) that

$$Y_{j_0}^{f+1} z_J = \frac{\mu_{J+1,*}}{\mu_{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\},*}} \left[ Y_{j_0}^{f+1} Y_{j_0+1}^{p-1-r_{j_0+1}} \underline{Y}^{\underline{i}'} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\}}). \quad (70)$$

Since we have

$$\underline{i}' + \underline{e}^{((J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\})^{\text{sh}}} = \underline{i} + \underline{e}^{(J+1)^{\text{sh}}} = \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)},$$

by (54) we have  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{(J+1)\setminus\{j_0+2\}} = x_{(J+1)\setminus\{j_0+2\}, \underline{e}^{J\cap(J+1)}}$ . Then by (53) applied to  $J \setminus \{j_0 + 1\}$  and  $\underline{i} = \underline{e}^{J\cap(J+1)}$ , and using  $j_0 + 1 \notin J^{\text{ss}}$ , we deduce from (70) that

$$Y_{j_0}^{f+1} z_J = \frac{\mu_{J+1,*}}{\mu_{(J+1)\setminus\{j_0+2\},*}} \left[ \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} \mu_{(J+1)\setminus\{j_0+2\}, J' \mathcal{X}_{J', \underline{c}(J')}} \right] = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} \mu_{J+1, J' \mathcal{X}_{J', \underline{c}(J')}}$$

with  $\underline{c}(J') \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} c(J')_j &= p\delta_{j+1 \in J\cap(J+1)} + c_j^{J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} + r_j^{(J \setminus \{j_0+1\}) \setminus J'} - c_j^{J'} - (p-1-r_{j_0+1})\delta_{j=j_0+1} - (f+1)\delta_{j=j_0} \\ &= c_j^{J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} + r_j^{(J \setminus \{j_0+1\}) \setminus J'} - c_j^{J'} - (p-1-r_{j_0+1})\delta_{j=j_0+1} + f - (f+1)\delta_{j=j_0} \\ &= r_j^{(J \setminus \{j_0+1\}) \setminus J'} + r_j^{\{j_0+1\}} + f - (f+1)\delta_{j=j_0} \\ &= r_j^{J \setminus J'} + f - (f+1)\delta_{j=j_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (58), the third equality follows from Lemma D.4(v) applied to  $J' = J \setminus \{j_0 + 1\}$ , and the last equality follows from Lemma D.4(ii). This proves the desired formula.

(e). Suppose that  $j_0 \in J$  and  $j_0 + 1 \in J^{\text{nss}}$ . The proof is similar to (d), except that we take  $\underline{i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{e}^{(J\cap(J+1))^{\text{nss}} \setminus \{j_0+1\}}$  and  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J}$ .

(ii). We prove the second equality. By (61) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Y}^{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} z_J &= \underline{Y}^{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} + \underline{e}'^J} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{J\cap(J+1)}} \\ &= \underline{Y}^{\underline{e}^{J+(p-1)} \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{\underline{e}^{(J\cap(J+1))^{\text{nss}}+1}} x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{J\cap(J+1)}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

$$= \underline{Y}^{\underline{e}^{J+(p-1)} \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{(J^{\text{sh}}+1)}}, \quad (72)$$

where the second equality follows from (58) and Lemma 3.1(i), and the last equality follows from (54) and the equality  $(J \cap (J+1)) \setminus ((J \cap (J-1))^{\text{nss}} + 1) = J^{\text{sh}} + 1$ .

Suppose that  $J^{\text{nss}} = (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}$ , or equivalently  $(J \cap (J-1))^{\text{nss}} = \emptyset$ . Then using (6) and (49), a case-by-case examination shows that

$$\underline{e}^J + (p-1)\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = \begin{cases} s_j^J & \text{if } j \in J\Delta(J-1) \\ p-1 & \text{if } j \notin J\Delta(J-1). \end{cases}$$

We also have  $x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{J\cap(J+1)}} = \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J\cap(J+1))^{\text{nss}}}} v_{J+1}$  by (54). Then by Proposition 5.10 applied to  $(J+1, J)$ , we deduce from (71) that  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} z_J = \mu_{J+1, J} v_J$ .

Suppose that  $J^{\text{nss}} \neq (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}$  and  $J^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , which implies  $J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subsetneq J$ . Then by Lemma A.6 applied to  $(J, J)$  and using  $\underline{r}^\emptyset = \underline{0}$  by (48), we deduce from (72) that  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} z_J = 0$ .

Suppose that  $J^{\text{nss}} = \mathcal{J}$ , or equivalently  $(J, J_{\overline{p}}) = (\mathcal{J}, \emptyset)$ , which implies  $J+1 = J$  and  $J^{\text{sh}} = \emptyset$ . Then by Proposition 5.12 applied to  $\mathcal{J}$  and using  $\underline{e}^{\mathcal{J}} = \underline{0}$  by (49), we deduce from (72) that  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} z_J = \mu_{J, J} v_J + \mu_{J, \emptyset} x_{\emptyset, \underline{r}}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k - 1$ . Then for  $|J| \leq k$ , we have*

$$Y_{j_0}^{f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}}} w_J = \begin{cases} \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J'} (\underline{x}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{f} - (f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}}) e_{j_0}) & \text{if } j_0 + 1 \in J^{\text{ss}} \\ 0 & \text{if } j_0 + 1 \notin J^{\text{ss}}; \end{cases}$$

$$\underline{Y}_{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} w_J = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } J^{\text{ss}} = (\partial J)^{\text{ss}} \\ (-1)^{|(J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{ss}}|+1} \mu_{J+1, J} v_J & \text{if } J^{\text{ss}} \neq (\partial J)^{\text{ss}} \text{ and } J^{\text{ss}} \neq \mathcal{J} \\ (1 + (-1)^f) \mu_{J, J} v_J + \mu_{J, \emptyset} x_{\emptyset, \underline{x}} & \text{if } J^{\text{ss}} = \mathcal{J}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* (i). We prove the first equality. By definition and Theorem 6.3(ii) (applied to  $J'$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ , which implies  $|J'| \leq k - 1$ ), we have

$$Y_{j_0}^{f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}}} w_J = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J'} (\underline{x}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{f} - (f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}}) e_{j_0}).$$

By Corollary A.5, we have  $x_{J'} (\underline{x}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{f} - (f+1-\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}}) e_{j_0}) = 0$  if  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J$  and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J'$ . Then we easily conclude.

(ii). We prove the second equality. We assume that  $J^{\text{ss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , the case  $J^{\text{ss}} = \mathcal{J}$  being similar. Then by Theorem 6.3(ii) (applied to  $J'$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ ) and Proposition A.7(i) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Y}_{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} w_J &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J'} \underline{x}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = \left[ \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J} (-1)^{|(J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{ss}}|} \mu_{J+1, J'} v_J \right] \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } J^{\text{ss}} = (\partial J)^{\text{ss}} \\ (-1)^{|(J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{ss}}|+1} \mu_{J+1, J} v_J & \text{if } J^{\text{ss}} \neq (\partial J)^{\text{ss}}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows as in (A.23).  $\square$

In particular, by Lemma 6.8 and Lemma 6.9 with a case-by-case examination, we have

$$Y_j^{f+1-\delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}}} (z_J - w_J) = 0 \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J};$$

$$\underline{Y}_{\underline{f}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} (z_J - w_J) = \varepsilon_J v_J.$$

Then (62) is a consequence of Lemma 6.7 and Proposition 4.2. This proves the existence of the family  $\{x_{J, \underline{i}} : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}, \underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f\}$ . Finally, the uniqueness is clear from the construction. This completes the proof of Theorem 6.3.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.10.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . Then  $H$  acts on  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  (possibly zero) by the character  $\chi'_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}}$ , where  $\chi'_J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_J \alpha^{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}}$  (see §2 for  $\chi_J$ ).*

*Proof.* We prove the result by increasing induction on  $|J|$  and  $\max_j i_j$ . If  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ , then the claim follows from (54) and Proposition 4.2. Next we assume that  $\max_j i_j > f$  and write  $\underline{i} = p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{e}^J - \underline{\ell}$  for the unique  $\underline{i}', \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ . In particular, we have  $\max_j i'_j < \max_j i_j$  (see 55). By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.1(ii),  $H$  acts on  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \binom{p}{0} x_{J+1, \underline{i}'}$  by the character

$$\chi'_{J+1} \alpha^{-\underline{i}'+\underline{\ell}} = \chi'_{J+1} \alpha^{-p\delta(\underline{i}')+\underline{\ell}} = \chi'_J \alpha^{\underline{e}^J - \underline{e}^{J+1} - p\delta(\underline{i}')+\underline{\ell}} = \chi'_J \alpha^{-\underline{e}^J - p\delta(\underline{i}')+\underline{\ell}} = \chi'_J \alpha^{-\underline{i}},$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma D.4(i) and the third equality follows from Lemma D.4(iii). By the induction hypothesis, for each  $J'$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ ,  $H$  acts on  $x_{J', \underline{i} + \underline{r}^{\wedge J'}}$  by the character

$$\chi'_{J'} \alpha^{-\underline{i} - \underline{r}^{\wedge J'}} = \chi'_{J'} \alpha^{\underline{r}^J - \underline{r}^{J'} - \underline{i} - \underline{r}^{\wedge J'}} = \chi'_{J'} \alpha^{-\underline{i}},$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma D.4(i) and the second equality follows from Lemma D.4(ii). Hence we deduce from (56) that  $H$  acts on  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  by the character  $\chi'_{J'} \alpha^{-\underline{i}}$ .  $\square$

## 7 The finiteness condition

In this section, we prove the crucial finiteness condition for the family of elements  $(x_{J, \underline{i}})_{J, \underline{i}}$  of Theorem 6.3 to give rise to a basis of  $D_A(\pi)$ . The main result is Theorem 7.5. The proof is by induction on  $\underline{i}$ , the base case being a consequence of the vanishing result: Proposition A.4.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . Suppose that  $x_{J', \underline{i}} = 0$  for all  $|J'| \leq |J|$ . Then we have  $x_{J, p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We use increasing induction on  $|J|$ . By Theorem 6.3(iii) we have

$$0 = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}} = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{\wedge J'}}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, for all  $J' \subsetneq J$  we have  $x_{J', p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^{J'}} = 0$ . Since  $\underline{c}^{J'} \geq \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{\wedge J'}$  by Lemma D.4(v), we deduce from Theorem 6.3(ii) that  $x_{J', p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{\wedge J'}} = 0$  for all  $J' \subsetneq J$ . Hence we conclude that  $x_{J, p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J} = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 7.2.** *Let  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  satisfying*

- (i)  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq f$ ;
- (ii)  $i_j \leq -1$  for some  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

*Then we have  $x_{J, \underline{i}} = 0$  for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $f = 1$ , then we conclude using (54). From now on we assume that  $f \geq 2$ . We use increasing induction on  $\max_j i_j$ . If  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ , then the lemma follows from (54). Then we assume that  $\max_j i_j > f$  and let  $J_0 \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . We write  $\underline{i} = p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^{J_0} - \underline{\ell}$  for the unique  $\underline{i}', \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ . In particular, we have  $\max_j i'_j < \max_j i_j$  (see (55)). Since  $\underline{c}^{J_0} \geq \underline{0}$  by (49), we also have

$$\|\underline{i}'\| = (\|\underline{i}\| - \|\underline{c}^{J_0}\| + \|\underline{\ell}\|) / p \leq (f - 0 + (p - 1)f) / p = f.$$

Suppose that  $i'_j < 0$  for some  $j$ . Then by the induction hypothesis, we have  $x_{J, \underline{i}'} = 0$  for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  (in particular, for all  $|J| \leq |J_0|$ ). Since  $p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^{J_0} \geq \underline{i}$ , we deduce from Lemma 7.1 and Theorem 6.3(ii) that  $x_{J_0, \underline{i}} = 0$ .

Suppose that  $i'_j \geq 0$  for all  $j$ , which implies  $i_j \geq -(p - 1)$  for all  $j$ . Since  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq f$ , we deduce that  $i_j \leq (f - 1)(p - 1) + f$  for all  $j$ . We write  $\min_j i_j = -m'$  with  $1 \leq m' \leq p - 1$  and fix  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $i_{j_0} = -m'$ . Then we let  $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  with  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$ ,  $n_j = m'$  for  $j \neq j_0 + 1$  if  $1 \leq m' \leq 2f - 2$ , and  $n_j = 2f - 1$  for  $j \neq j_0 + 1$  if  $2f - 1 \leq m' \leq p - 1$ . In particular,  $\underline{n}$  satisfies the conditions in Definition A.2(ii) for  $J_0$  and  $j_0$ . By Proposition A.4 applied to  $J_0$  and  $j_0$  we have  $x_{J_0, \underline{a}^{J_0}(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$  (see Definition A.2 for  $\underline{a}^{J_0}(\underline{n})$ ). Then the result follows from Theorem 6.3(ii) and the Claim below.

**Claim.** We have  $\underline{a}^{J_0}(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1} \geq \underline{i}$ .

*Proof.* We assume that  $1 \leq m' \leq 2f - 2$ , the case  $2f - 1 \leq m' \leq p - 1$  being similar. Since  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq f$  and  $i_j \geq -m'$  for all  $j$ , we deduce that  $i_j \leq (f - 1)m' + f$  for all  $j$ . Hence it suffices to show that

$$\begin{cases} a^{J_0}(\underline{n})_{j_0} \geq -m' \\ a^{J_0}(\underline{n})_j - \delta_{j=j_0+1} \geq (f - 1)m' + f \quad \text{if } j \neq j_0. \end{cases}$$

By Definition A.2(ii), we have  $a^{J_0}(\underline{n})_{j_0} = 0 \geq -m'$  if  $j_0 \in J_0^{\text{sh}}$ , and  $a^{J_0}(\underline{n})_{j_0} = t_{j_0}^{J_0}(0) - n_{j_0} = -m'$  (since  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$ ) if  $j_0 \notin J_0^{\text{sh}}$ . For  $j \neq j_0$ , by Definition A.2(i),(ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} a^{J_0}(\underline{n})_j - \delta_{j=j_0+1} &= t_j^{J_0}(m') - n_j - \delta_{j=j_0+1} \\ &= p[m'/2] + \delta_{2 \nmid m'}(\delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J}(p - 1 - r_j)) - (n_j + \delta_{j=j_0+1}) \\ &\geq (4f + 4)[m'/2] + \delta_{2 \nmid m'}(2f + 2) - 1 \\ &= (2f + 2)m' - 1 = fm' + fm' + (2m' - 1) > (f - 1)m' + f, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses (2) and  $p \geq 4f + 4$ , and the last inequality uses  $m' \geq 1$ . Here for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $[x]$  the largest integer which is smaller than or equal to  $x$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.3.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $\underline{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$ .*

- (i) *If  $\|\underline{k}\| > \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$ , then we have  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}}x_{J,\underline{i}} = 0$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\|\underline{k}\| = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$  and  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}}x_{J,\underline{i}} \neq 0$ , then we have  $\underline{k} = \underline{i} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 6.3(ii) we have  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{k}}x_{J,\underline{i}} = x_{J,\underline{\ell}}$  with  $\underline{\ell} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{i} - \underline{k}$ . In both cases, we have  $\|\underline{\ell}\| \leq f$  since  $|J^{\text{sh}}| \leq f$ . If  $\underline{\ell} \geq \underline{0}$ , then we have  $\underline{\ell} \leq \underline{f}$ , and the result follows from (54). If  $\underline{\ell} \not\geq \underline{0}$ , then the result follows from Proposition 7.2.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.4.** *Let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  satisfying*

- (i)  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq p^m + f - 1$ ;
- (ii)  $i_j \leq -p^m$  for some  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

*Then we have  $x_{J,\underline{i}} = 0$  for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the result by increasing induction on  $m$ . For  $m = 0$ , this is exactly Proposition 7.2. Then we let  $m \geq 1$  and fix  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . We write  $\underline{i} = p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^J - \underline{\ell}$  for the unique  $\underline{i}', \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$  and fix  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $i_{j_0} \leq -p^m$ . Since  $\underline{c}^J \geq \underline{0}$  by (49), we have

$$\|\underline{i}'\| = (\|\underline{i}\| - \|\underline{c}^{J+1}\| + \|\underline{\ell}\|) / p \leq ((p^m + f - 1) - 0 + (p - 1)f) / p = p^{m-1} + f - 1/p,$$

which implies  $\|\underline{i}'\| \leq p^{m-1} + f - 1$ . We also have

$$i'_{j_0+1} = (i_{j_0} - c_{j_0}^{J+1} + \ell_{j_0}) / p \leq (-p^m - 0 + (p - 1)) / p = -p^{m-1} + (p - 1)/p,$$

which implies  $i'_{j_0+1} \leq -p^{m-1}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $x_{J',\underline{i}'} = 0$  for all  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . Since  $p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^J \geq \underline{i}$ , we conclude from Lemma 7.1 and Theorem 6.3(ii) that  $x_{J,\underline{i}} = 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 7.5** (Finiteness condition). *For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $M \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the set  $\{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f : x_{J,\underline{i}} \neq 0, \|\underline{i}\| = M\}$  is finite.*

*Proof.* We choose  $m$  large enough such that  $p^m + f - 1 \geq M$ . If  $i_{j_0} \leq -p^m$  for some  $j_0$ , then by Proposition 7.4 we have  $x_{J,\underline{i}} = 0$ . Otherwise, we have  $i_j > -p^m$  for all  $j$ . Together with the restriction  $\|\underline{i}\| = M$ , this set is finite.  $\square$



## 8 An explicit basis of $\mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$

In this section, we construct an explicit basis of  $\mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ . In particular, we prove that  $D_A(\pi)$  has rank  $2^f$ , see Theorem 8.2. As a corollary, we finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

First we recall the definition of the ring  $A$  and the  $A$ -module  $D_A(\pi)$ . We let  $\mathfrak{m}_{N_0}$  be the maximal ideal of  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]$ . Then we have  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]] = \mathbb{F}[[Y_0, \dots, Y_{f-1}]]$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_{N_0} = (Y_0, \dots, Y_{f-1})$ . Consider the multiplicative subset  $S \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{(Y_0 \cdots Y_{f-1})^n : n \geq 0\}$  of  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]$ . Then  $A \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \widehat{\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]_S}$  is the completion of the localization  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]_S$  with respect to the  $\mathfrak{m}_{N_0}$ -adic filtration

$$F_n(\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]_S) = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{(Y_0 \cdots Y_{f-1})^k} \mathfrak{m}_{N_0}^{kf-n},$$

where  $\mathfrak{m}_{N_0}^m \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbb{F}[[N_0]]$  if  $m \leq 0$ . We denote by  $F_n A$  ( $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) the induced filtration on  $A$  and endow  $A$  with the associated topology ([LvO96, §1.3]). There is an  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear action of  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]$  given by multiplication on  $N_0 \cong \mathcal{O}_K$ , and an  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear Frobenius  $\varphi$  on  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]$  given by multiplication by  $p$  on  $N_0 \cong \mathcal{O}_K$ . They extend canonically by continuity to commuting continuous  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $A$  which satisfies (for each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(Y_j) &= Y_{j-1}^p; \\ [a](Y_j) &= a^{p^j} Y_j \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times. \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

We let  $\pi^\vee$  be the  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear dual of  $\pi$ , which is a finitely generated  $\mathbb{F}[[I_1]]$ -module and is endowed with the  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}$ -adic topology, where  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}$  is the maximal ideal of  $\mathbb{F}[[I_1]]$ . We define  $D_A(\pi)$  to be the completion of  $\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]_S \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[[N_0]]} \pi^\vee$  with respect to the tensor product topology. The  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action on  $\pi^\vee$  given by  $f \mapsto f \circ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  (for  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ) extends by continuity to  $D_A(\pi)$ , and the  $\psi$ -action on  $\pi^\vee$  given by  $f \mapsto f \circ \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  induces a continuous  $A$ -linear map  $\beta : D_A(\pi) \rightarrow A \otimes_{\varphi, A} D_A(\pi)$ . Moreover,  $D_A(\pi)$  is a finite free  $A$ -module by [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Remark 3.3.2.6(ii)], [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Cor. 3.1.2.9] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Remark. 2.6.2].

As in [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, (87)], there exists an injective  $A$ -linear map

$$\mu_* : \mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F}). \tag{74}$$

By [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.2.3],  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$  is identified with the set of sequences  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  with  $x_k \in \pi$  and

- (i)  $\underline{Y}^1 x_k = x_{k-1}$  for all  $k \geq 1$ ;
- (ii) there exists  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x_k \in \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{fk+d+1}]$  for all  $k \geq 0$  (where  $\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^j] \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} 0$  if  $j \leq 0$ ),

and the  $A$ -module structure on  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$  is given as follows: for  $a \in A$  and  $x = (x_k)_{k \geq 0} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$ , we have  $a(x) = (y_k)_{k \geq 0}$  with

$$y_k = (\underline{Y}^{\ell-k} a) x_\ell \tag{75}$$

for  $\ell \gg_k 0$ . See [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Remark 3.8.2] for the explanation of (75).

For  $v \in \pi$ , we define  $\mathrm{deg}(v) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \min\{n \geq -1 : v \in \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{n+1}]\} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}$  as in [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, §3.5]. The following proposition is a generalization of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.5.1] (where  $\bar{\rho}$  was assumed to be semisimple), and we refer to §B for its proof (see Proposition B.4).

**Proposition 8.1.** *For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\mathrm{sh}}}$ , we have  $\mathrm{deg}(x_{J, \underline{i}}) = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\mathrm{sh}}|$ .*

For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we define the sequence  $x_J = (x_{J,k})_{k \geq 0}$  by  $x_{J,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_{J,\underline{k}}$ , which is defined in Theorem 6.3. Since  $x_{J,k} \in \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{kf - |J^{\text{sh}}| + 1}]$  for all  $k \geq 0$  by Proposition 8.1, we have  $x_J \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\text{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$ . Then we have the following generalization of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Thm. 3.7.1] (where  $\bar{\rho}$  was assumed to be semisimple).

**Theorem 8.2.** *The sequences  $\{x_J : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  are contained in the image of the injection*

$$\mu_* : \text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\text{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$$

and form an  $A$ -basis of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ . In particular,  $D_A(\pi)$  is a free  $A$ -module of rank  $2^f$ .

*Proof.* We follow closely the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Thm. 3.7.1] and use without comment the notation of *loc.cit.*

First, the proof of *loc.cit.* using Theorem 7.5 shows that each sequence  $x_J \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\text{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$  comes from an element of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ , and we still denote it by  $x_J$ .

For each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we define another sequence  $x'_J = (x'_{J,k})_{k \geq 0}$  by  $x'_{J,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_{J,\underline{k} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}}$ . In particular, we have  $x'_{J,0} = v_J$  by (54). By (75) we have  $x'_J = \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} x_J$ , which implies that  $x'_J \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\text{cont}}(D_A(\pi), \mathbb{F})$  and comes from an element of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$  (recall  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} \in A$ ), and we still denote it by  $x'_J$ .

Since  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}}$  is invertible in  $A$ , to prove that  $\{x_J, J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  form an  $A$ -basis of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ , it suffices to show that  $\{x'_J, J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  form an  $A$ -basis of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ . As in the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Thm. 3.7.1], it suffices to show that the elements  $\{\text{gr}(x'_J) : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  form a  $\text{gr } A$ -basis of  $\text{Hom}_{\text{gr } A}(\text{gr } D_A(\pi), \text{gr } A)$ .

Since  $\pi^{I_1} = D_0(\bar{\rho})^{I_1}$  is multiplicity-free by Lemma 4.1(ii) (see the assumptions on  $\pi$  above Theorem 1.1), there exist unique  $I$ -eigenvectors  $v_J^* \in (\pi^{I_1})^\vee = \text{gr}_0(\pi^\vee)$  for  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $\langle v_J, v_{J'}^* \rangle = \delta_{J=J'}$ . As in the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Lemma 3.7.2], we know that  $\text{gr } D_A(\pi)$  is a free  $\text{gr } A$ -module, and that there exists a surjection of  $\text{gr } A$ -modules

$$\bigoplus_{J \subseteq \mathcal{J}} \text{gr } A \rightarrow \text{gr } D_A(\pi), \quad (76)$$

sending the standard basis element indexed by  $J$  on the left to the image of  $v_J^*$  in  $\text{gr } D_A(\pi)$  (still denoted  $v_J^*$ ). To complete the proof, it is enough to show that  $\langle \text{gr}(x'_J), v_{J'}^* \rangle = \delta_{J=J'} \underline{y}^{-1}$  in  $\text{gr } A$  for all  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , which implies that the surjection (76) is an isomorphism. The argument here is completely analogous to that of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Thm. 3.7.1], using Corollary 7.3 and Proposition 8.1.  $\square$

By definition,  $D_A(\pi)$  is a finite free  $(\psi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module over  $A$  in the sense of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Def. 3.1.2.1]. Then the construction of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, §3.2] makes  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  a  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module, which is étale if and only if  $\beta$  as in (1) is an isomorphism. Here for  $D$  a  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module over  $A$ , we write  $D(1)$  to be  $D$  with the action of  $\varphi$  unchanged and the action of  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$  multiplied by  $N_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(\bar{a})$ . Then by [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Lemma 3.8.1(ii)] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, (114)], under the injection (74) the actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  can be expressed in terms of sequences as follows:

(i) for  $k \geq 0$  and  $p\ell \geq k$ , we have

$$(\varphi(x_J))_k = (-1)^{f-1} \underline{Y}^{p\ell-k} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J,\ell}; \quad (77)$$

(ii) for  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ,  $k \geq 0$  and  $\ell \gg_k 0$ , we have

$$(a(x_J))_k = \frac{a(\underline{Y}^k)}{\underline{Y}^k} \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J,\ell}. \quad (78)$$

We denote by  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)$  and  $\text{Mat}(a)$  ( $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ) the matrices of the actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  with respect to the basis  $\{x_J : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  of Theorem 8.2, whose rows and columns are indexed by the subsets of  $\mathcal{J}$ . For  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(J-1)^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$ , we let

$$\gamma_{J,J'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^{f-1} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J,J'}, \quad (79)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{J'}$  is defined in (50) and  $\mu_{J,J'}$  is defined in (47). Then by definition and the sentence after (47), for  $J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4 \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(J_1-1)^{\text{ss}} = (J_2-1)^{\text{ss}} = J_3^{\text{ss}} = J_4^{\text{ss}}$  we have  $\gamma_{J_1, J_3} / \gamma_{J_1, J_4} = \gamma_{J_2, J_3} / \gamma_{J_2, J_4}$ . We define  $\gamma_{*,J} / \gamma_{*,J'}$  for  $J^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$  in a similar way as  $\mu_{*,J} / \mu_{*,J'}$ .

We give a preliminary result on the actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  which suffices to finish the proof of Theorem 1.1. We refer to Appendix C for a more detailed study.

**Proposition 8.3.** (i) We have (see (49) for  $\underline{c}^J$  and (48) for  $\underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}$ )

$$\text{Mat}(\varphi)_{J', J+1} = \begin{cases} \gamma_{J+1, J'} \underline{Y}^{-(\underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'})} & \text{if } J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) For  $a \in [\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$ ,  $\text{Mat}(a)$  is a diagonal matrix with  $\text{Mat}(a)_{J,J} = \bar{a}^{\underline{r}^{J^c}}$ .

*Proof.* (i). Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . For  $k \geq 0$  and  $p\ell \geq k$ , by (77) and (53) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi(x_{J+1}))_k &= (-1)^{f-1} \underline{Y}^{p\ell-k} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{\ell}} = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J} (-1)^{f-1} \varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J+1, J'} x_{J', (p\ell + \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} - (p\ell - k))} \\ &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J} \gamma_{J+1, J'} x_{J', \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then using (75) one easily checks that

$$\varphi(x_{J+1}) = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J} \gamma_{J+1, J'} \underline{Y}^{-(\underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'})} (x_{J'}),$$

which proves (i).

(ii). Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $a \in [\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$ . By Corollary 6.10(ii) we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J, \underline{i}} = \chi_J \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \bar{a}^{-\underline{i}} x_{J, \underline{i}} = \bar{a}^{\underline{r} - \underline{r}^J - \underline{i}} x_{J, \underline{i}} = \bar{a}^{\underline{r}^{\mathcal{J}} - \underline{r}^J - \underline{i}} x_{J, \underline{i}} = \bar{a}^{\underline{r}^{J^c} - \underline{i}} x_{J, \underline{i}},$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma D.4(i), the third equality follows from (48), and the last equality follows from Lemma D.4(ii). Then for  $k \geq 0$ , by (78) we have

$$(a(x_J))_k = \frac{a(\underline{Y}^k)}{\underline{Y}^k} \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J,k} = \bar{a}^k \left( \bar{a}^{\underline{r}^{J^c} - k} x_{J,k} \right) = \bar{a}^{\underline{r}^{J^c}} x_{J,k},$$

where the second equality follows from (73). Using (75), we conclude that  $a(x_J) = \bar{a}^{\underline{r}^{J^c}} (x_J)$ , which proves (ii).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* By Theorem 8.2,  $\pi$  is in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $D_A(\pi)$  has rank  $2^f$ . Moreover, by Proposition 8.3(i) we have  $\text{Mat}(\varphi) \in \text{GL}_{2^f}(A)$ , hence  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$  is an étale  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module over  $A$ , which implies that  $\beta$  as in (1) is an isomorphism.  $\square$

## 9 On the subrepresentations of $\pi$

In this section, we finish the proof of Theorem 1.2, see Theorem 9.2. This theorem is crucially needed to prove that  $\pi$  is of finite length in the non-semisimple case in [BHH<sup>+</sup>a]. As a corollary, we prove that  $\pi$  is generated by  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  under the assumption that  $\pi^\vee$  is essentially self-dual of grade  $2f$  in the sense of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, (176)] (which is satisfied for those  $\pi$  coming from the cohomology of towers of Shimura curves by [HW22, Thm. 8.2]), see Corollary 9.3, which gives another proof of [HW22, Thm. 1.6] (but under a stronger genericity condition).

**Lemma 9.1.** *Let  $\pi_1$  be a subrepresentation of  $\pi$ . Then there exists a set  $S$  of subsets of  $\mathcal{J}$  which is stable under  $J \mapsto J-1$ , and is moreover stable under taking subsets if  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1}) \cap W(\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}) &= \{\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^J} : J \in S\}; \\ \mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1}) &= \{\sigma_{\underline{b}} \in \mathrm{JH}(D_0(\bar{\rho})) : \{j : b_j \geq 1\} \in S\}, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where  $\bar{\rho}^{\mathrm{ss}}$  is the semisimplification of  $\bar{\rho}$ ,  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  and  $\underline{\varepsilon}^J$  are defined in §2, and see Lemma 4.1(i) for  $\mathrm{JH}(D_0(\bar{\rho}))$ .

*Proof.* We recall from Corollary 5.3 that for each  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  we have  $\underline{\varepsilon}^J \in \{\pm 1\}^J$  with  $\varepsilon_j^J = (-1)^{\delta_{j \notin J}}$ . We also recall from (5) that  $\sigma_J = \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^J}$  for  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\rho}}$ .

**Claim 1.** If  $\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^J} \in \mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$  for some  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , then  $\pi_1^{K_1}$  contains  $I(\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}} + \underline{\varepsilon}^{J-1}})$  and  $I(\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J^{\mathrm{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J^{\mathrm{ss}}} + \underline{\varepsilon}^J})$  (see Lemma 5.1(iii) for the notation).

*Proof.* We prove the claim by increasing induction on  $|J|$ . Fix  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and assume that  $\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^J} \in \mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$ . Since  $\pi_1^{K_1}$  is a  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentation of  $\pi^{K_1} = D_0(\bar{\rho})$  and  $\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^J} \in \mathrm{JH}(D_{0, \sigma_{J^{\mathrm{ss}}}(\bar{\rho}))}$  by Lemma 4.1(i), we deduce from Corollary 5.3 that  $\pi_1^{K_1}$  contains  $I(\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J^{\mathrm{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^J})$ , which is a subrepresentation of  $I(\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J^{\mathrm{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J^{\mathrm{ss}}} + \underline{\varepsilon}^J})$  by Lemma 5.1(iii). In particular, for each  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $J^{\mathrm{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ , we have  $\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J'}} \in \mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$ . Then by the induction hypothesis and using  $(J')^{\mathrm{ss}} = J^{\mathrm{ss}}$ , we deduce that  $\pi_1^{K_1}$  contains  $I(\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J^{\mathrm{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{J^{\mathrm{ss}}} + \underline{\varepsilon}^{J'}})$ . In particular, by Lemma 5.1(iii),  $\mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$  contains all  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with

$$\begin{cases} b_j = \delta_{j \in J^{\mathrm{ss}}} & \text{if } j \notin J^{\mathrm{ns}} \\ b_j \in \{0, -1\} & \text{if } j \in J^{\mathrm{ns}}, j \notin J' \\ b_j \in \{0, 1\} & \text{if } j \in J^{\mathrm{ns}}, j \in J'. \end{cases}$$

By varying  $J'$  such that  $J^{\mathrm{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$  and using  $\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^J} \in \mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$ , we deduce that  $\mathrm{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$  contains  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with

$$\begin{cases} b_j = \delta_{j \in J^{\mathrm{ss}}} & \text{if } j \notin J^{\mathrm{ns}} \\ b_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\} & \text{if } j \in J^{\mathrm{ns}}. \end{cases}$$

Hence we have  $\underline{Y}^{-1}v_J \in \pi_1^{K_1}$  by Proposition 4.2.

By Lemma 5.1(i),(iii), we have

$$\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-1}v_J \rangle = I(\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}} + \underline{\varepsilon}}) \subseteq \pi_1 \quad (81)$$

with  $c_j = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}}(3 - \delta_{j \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}})$ . Since  $\varepsilon_j^{J-1} = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}}$  and  $3 - \delta_{j \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}} \geq 1$ , we deduce from (81) and Corollary 5.3 that

$$I(\sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{\varepsilon}^{(J-1)^{\mathrm{ss}}} + \underline{\varepsilon}^{J-1}}) \subseteq \pi_1 \cap \pi^{K_1} = \pi_1^{K_1}, \quad (82)$$

which proves the first part of the claim.

By Lemma 5.1(iii) and (82), we have  $\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J-1}} \in \text{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$ . Continuing the above process with  $J$  replaced with  $J-1$  and so on, we deduce that  $\pi_1^{K_1}$  contains  $I(\sigma_{\underline{e}^{(J-i)\text{ss}}}, \sigma_{\underline{e}^{(J-i)\text{ss}} + \underline{e}^{J-i}})$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . In particular, the second part of the claim follows by taking  $i = f$  since  $J - \underline{f} = J$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2.** Suppose that  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ . If  $\sigma_{\underline{e}^J} \in \text{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$  for some  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , then  $\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J'}} \in \text{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$  for all  $J' \subseteq J$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $|J \setminus J'| = 1$  and write  $J \setminus J' = \{j_0\}$  for some  $j_0 \in J$ . Since  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , by replacing  $(J, J', j_0)$  with  $(J+i, J'+i, j_0+i)$  for some  $0 \leq i \leq f-1$  using Claim 1, we may assume that  $j_0 \notin J_{\bar{\rho}}$ , which implies  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ . Then we have  $\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J'}} \in \text{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})$  by the first paragraph of the proof of Claim 1.  $\square$

We let  $S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{J \subseteq \mathcal{J} : \sigma_{\underline{e}^J} \in \text{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1})\}$ . Then by Claim 1 and Claim 2,  $S$  is stable under  $J \mapsto J-1$ , and is moreover stable under taking subsets if  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ . By (4), we have  $W(\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}) = \{\sigma_{\underline{e}^J} : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$ , hence the first formula of (80) follows from the definition of  $S$ .

Then by Claim 1, we have

$$\pi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{J \in S} I(\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{ss}}} + \underline{e}^J}) \subseteq \pi_1^{K_1} \subseteq \pi^{K_1} = D_0(\bar{\rho}). \quad (83)$$

Since  $\text{JH}(\pi') = \{\sigma_{\underline{b}} \in \text{JH}(D_0(\bar{\rho})) : \{j : b_j \geq 1\} \in S\}$  by Lemma 5.1(iii), to prove the second formula of (80), it suffices to show that the first inclusion in (83) is an equality.

Suppose on the contrary that the first inclusion in (83) is strict, then there exists  $\sigma_{\underline{b}} \in \pi_1^{K_1} \subseteq D_0(\bar{\rho})$  such that  $J_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j : b_j \geq 1\} \notin S$ . By Corollary 5.3,  $\pi_1^{K_1}$  must contain  $I(\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J_0^{\text{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{b}})$ , which contains  $\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J_0}}$  as a constituent by Lemma 5.1(iii). This contradicts the definition of  $S$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 9.2.** *Let  $\pi_1$  be a subrepresentation of  $\pi$ . Then we have*

$$\text{rank}_A D_A(\pi_1) = \left| \text{JH}(\pi_1^{K_1}) \cap W(\bar{\rho}^{\text{ss}}) \right|.$$

*Proof.* Recall from Theorem 8.2 that  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$  has rank  $2^f$  with  $A$ -basis  $\{x_J : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$ , where  $x_J$  is defined before Theorem 8.2. Let  $S$  be the set of subsets of  $\mathcal{J}$  in Lemma 9.1. It suffices to show that  $\{x_J : J \in S\}$  form an  $A$ -basis of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi_1), A) \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ .

First we prove that  $x_J$  is an element of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi_1), A)$  for all  $J \in S$ . By Proposition 4.2, for all  $J \in S$  and  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ , the element  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$  lies in the subrepresentation of  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  with constituents  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  for  $\underline{b}$  as in (12). Hence we have  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J \in \pi_1^{K_1}$  for all  $J \in S$  and  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  by the second equality in (80), which implies that  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in \pi_1$  for all  $J \in S$  and  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$  by (54). Since  $S$  is stable under  $J \mapsto J-1$ , and is moreover stable under taking subsets if  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , using (56), an increasing induction on  $|J|$  and on  $\max_j i_j$  shows that  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in \pi_1$  for all  $J \in S$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  (if  $J_{\bar{\rho}} = \mathcal{J}$  then we have  $J^{\text{ss}} = J$  for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and we only use increasing induction on  $\max_j i_j$ ). By the definition of  $x_J$  and Proposition 8.1, we have  $x_J \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\text{cont}}(D_A(\pi_1), \mathbb{F})$  for all  $J \in S$ . Then as in the proof of 8.2, we deduce from Theorem 7.5 that  $x_J \in \text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi_1), A)$  for all  $J \in S$ .

Next we prove that any element of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi_1), A)$  is an  $A$ -linear combination of  $x_J$  for  $J \in S$ . Suppose on the contrary that  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_{J_i} x_{J_i} \in \text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi_1), A)$  for  $J_i \notin S$  distinct and  $a_{J_i} \in A \setminus \{0\}$ . We let  $J_0$  be a maximal (under inclusion) element among those  $J_i$  such that

$\deg(a_{J_i}) - |\partial J_i|$  is minimal for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  (see the proof of Lemma C.2(iii) for the definition of the degree and see Remark 5.11 for  $\partial J_i$ ). Up to rescaling  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_{J_i} x_{J_i}$  by a suitable  $\lambda \underline{Y}^{\underline{s}} \in A^\times$  with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^\times$  and  $\underline{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ , we may assume that

$$a_{J_0} = \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}} + (\text{terms of degree } \geq -|J_0 \setminus \partial J_0| \text{ and not in } \mathbb{F} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}}), \quad (84)$$

which has degree  $-|J_0 \setminus \partial J_0|$ , hence we have  $\deg(a_{J_0}) - |\partial J_0| = -|J_0|$ . Then by the assumption on  $J_0$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} \deg(a_{J_i}) \geq -|J_0| + |\partial J_i| + 1 = -(|J_i \setminus \partial J_i| - |J_i \setminus J_0| - 1) & \text{if } J_i \supsetneq J_0 \\ \deg(a_{J_i}) \geq -|J_0| + |\partial J_i| \geq -f & \text{if } J_i \not\supsetneq J_0. \end{cases} \quad (85)$$

We define the following  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentation of  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  (see Corollary 5.3):

$$V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \sum_{J \not\supsetneq J_0} I(\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{ss}}} + \underline{e}^J}) & \text{if } J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J} \\ \sum_{J \neq J_0} I(\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{ss}}}}, \sigma_{\underline{e}^{J^{\text{ss}}} + \underline{e}^J}) = \bigoplus_{J \neq J_0} D_{0, \sigma_J}(\bar{\rho}) & \text{if } J_{\bar{\rho}} = \mathcal{J}, \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.1(iii),  $V$  has constituents  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  with  $\{j : b_j \geq 1\} \not\supsetneq J_0$  if  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , and  $\{j : b_j \geq 1\} \neq J_0$  if  $J_{\bar{\rho}} = \mathcal{J}$ . In particular, since  $J_0 \notin S$  and  $S$  is stable under taking subsets if  $J_{\bar{\rho}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , we deduce from the second equality in (80) that  $\pi_1^{K_1} \subseteq V$ .

**Claim.** We have the following properties:

- (i) If  $J \not\supsetneq J_0$  and  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq f$ , then  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in V$ .
- (ii) If  $J \supsetneq J_0$  and  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq |J \setminus \partial J| - |J \setminus J_0| - 1$ , then  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in V$ .
- (iii) If  $J = J_0$  and  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq |J_0 \setminus \partial J_0|$ , then we have  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in V$  if  $\underline{i} \neq \underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}$ , and  $x_{J, \underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}} \in D_0(\bar{\rho}) \setminus V$ .

*Proof.* (i). By (54), we may assume that  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ , in which case we have  $x_{J, \underline{i}} = \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_J \in D_0(\bar{\rho})$  with  $\underline{i}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{i} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ , which is defined in Proposition 4.2 since  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}' \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ . We let  $\sigma_{\underline{b}} \in \text{JH}(D_0(\bar{\rho}))$  be an arbitrary constituent of the  $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentation of  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  generated by  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$ . Then by (12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{j : b_j \geq 1\} &\subseteq J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup \{j \in J^{\text{nss}} : i'_j > 0\} \sqcup \{j : j \in (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} : i'_j = 0\} \\ &= J \setminus \{j \in (J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}} : i'_j = 0\} \subseteq J. \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

In particular, if  $J \not\supsetneq J_0$ , then we deduce from (86) that  $\{j : b_j \geq 1\} \not\supsetneq J_0$ , hence  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  is a constituent of  $V$ , which proves that  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in V$ .

(ii). By (86), we also have

$$|\{j : b_j \geq 1\}| \leq |J| - |\{j \in (J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}} : i'_j = 0\}| \leq |J| - (|(J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}| - \|\underline{i}'\|), \quad (87)$$

where the second inequality becomes an equality if and only if  $\underline{i}' = \underline{e}^{J_1}$  for some  $J_1 \subseteq (J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}$ , which is equivalent to  $\underline{i} = \underline{e}^{J_2}$  for some  $J^{\text{sh}} \subseteq J_2 \subseteq J \setminus \partial J$ . If  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq |J \setminus \partial J| - |J \setminus J_0| - 1$ , which implies  $\|\underline{i}'\| \leq |(J \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}| - |J \setminus J_0| - 1$ , then we deduce from (87) that  $|\{j : b_j \geq 1\}| \leq |J_0| - 1$ , which implies  $\{j : b_j \geq 1\} \not\supsetneq J_0$ , hence  $\sigma_{\underline{b}}$  is a constituent of  $V$ , which proves that  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in V$ .

(iii). Suppose that  $J = J_0$  and  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq |J_0 \setminus \partial J_0|$ . Then by (87) we have

$$|\{j : b_j \geq 1\}| \leq |J_0| - (|(J_0 \setminus \partial J_0)^{\text{nss}}| - \|\underline{i}'\|) = |J_0| - (|J_0 \setminus \partial J_0| - \|\underline{i}\|) \leq |J_0|,$$

and at least one inequality is strict if  $\underline{i} \neq \underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}$ , in which case we have  $\{j : b_j \geq 1\} \not\supseteq J_0$ , hence  $\sigma_{\underline{i}}$  is a constituent of  $V$ . This proves  $x_{J_0, \underline{i}} \in V$  if  $\|\underline{i}\| \leq |J_0 \setminus \partial J_0|$  and  $\underline{i} \neq \underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}$ . Finally, the  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentation of  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$  generated by  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J_0 \setminus \partial J_0)^{\mathrm{NSS}}}} v_{J_0}$  has  $\sigma_{\underline{e}^{J_0}}$  as a constituent by (12), hence it follows from (54) and the description of the constituents of  $V$  that  $x_{J_0, \underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}} = \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{(J_0 \setminus \partial J_0)^{\mathrm{NSS}}}} v_{J_0} \in D_0(\bar{\rho}) \setminus V$ .  $\square$

Using (74), we identify  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_{J_i} x_{J_i} \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi_1), A)$  as  $(z_k)_{k \geq 0} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathrm{cont}}(D_A(\pi_1), \mathbb{F})$ , which is a sequence of elements of  $\pi_1$ . By writing each  $a_{J_i} \in A$  as an infinite sum of monomials in  $\underline{Y}$  together with (84) and (85), we deduce from (75), [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Remark 3.8.2] and the definition of  $x_{J_i}$  that the zeroth term  $z_0$  of the sequence  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_{J_i} x_{J_i}$  is a linear combination of  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  satisfying the assumptions of (i),(ii),(iii) of the claim above and with exactly one of the terms equals  $x_{J_0, \underline{e}^{J_0 \setminus \partial J_0}}$ , hence is an element of  $D_0(\bar{\rho}) \setminus V$ . By definition, we also have  $z_0 \in \pi_1$ , hence  $z_0 \in \pi_1 \cap D_0(\bar{\rho}) = \pi_1^{K_1} \subseteq V$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 9.3.** *Assume moreover that  $\pi^\vee$  is essentially self-dual of grade  $2f$  in the sense of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, (176)]. Then as a  $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ -representation,  $\pi$  is generated by  $D_0(\bar{\rho})$ .*

*Proof.* We use the notation of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Prop. 3.3.5.3]. By Theorem 1.1 and the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Prop. 3.3.5.3(i)], we deduce that  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}((X))} D_\xi^\vee(\pi') = \mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{p}_0}(\pi'^\vee)$  for any subquotient  $\pi'$  of  $\pi$ . By Theorem 9.2 and [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Remark 3.3.5.4(ii)], we deduce that  $D_\xi^\vee(\pi') \neq 0$  for  $\pi'$  a subrepresentation of  $\pi$ . Then the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Prop. 3.3.5.3(iii)] shows that  $D_\xi^\vee(\pi') \neq 0$  for  $\pi'$  a quotient of  $\pi$ , see [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Remark 3.3.5.4(i)]. Then we can conclude as in the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>b, Thm. 3.3.5.5].  $\square$

## Appendix

### A Some vanishing results

In this appendix, we give a careful study of the elements  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  defined in §6 for small  $\underline{i}$ . In particular, we use the results of §5 to prove that many of these elements are zero. The main results are Proposition A.4, Corollary A.5 and Proposition A.7. The results of this appendix are needed in the proof of Theorem 6.3, and to prove the finiteness results in §7.

We refer to Definition 6.1 for  $\underline{r}^J, \underline{c}^J \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $\varepsilon_J \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and refer to (54) and (56) for the definition of  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in \pi$ .

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k$ . Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  with  $|J| \leq k$ ,  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . Suppose that  $j_0 \notin J$ ,  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$  and  $i_{j_0} < 0$ . Then we have  $x_{J, \underline{i}} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the result by increasing induction on  $|J| \leq k$  and on  $\max_j i_j$  (the base case being  $|J| = -1$ , which is automatic). We let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $|J| \leq k$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . If  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$ , then the lemma follows directly from (54). If  $\max_j i_j > f$ , then we write  $\underline{i} = p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^{J+1} - \underline{\ell}$  for the unique  $\underline{i}', \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ . In particular, we have  $\max_j i'_j < \max_j i_j$  (see (55)). Since  $i_{j_0} < 0$  and  $c_{j_0}^{J+1} = p - 1$  by (49), we have  $i'_{j_0+1} < 0$ , hence by the induction hypothesis on  $\max_j i_j$  we deduce that  $x_{J+1, \underline{i}'} = 0$ . For each  $J' \subsetneq J$ , by (48) we have  $i_{j_0} + r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} = i_{j_0} < 0$ , hence by the induction hypothesis on  $|J|$  we deduce that  $x_{J', \underline{i} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} = 0$  for  $J' \subsetneq J$ . Then by (56) we conclude that  $x_{J, \underline{i}} = 0$ .  $\square$

To prove more vanishing results, we need some variants of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Lemma 3.4.2] and [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Lemma 3.4.4] (where  $\bar{\rho}$  was assumed to be semisimple). Since there could be overlaps

between different  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$ -subrepresentations  $\langle \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K) \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \underline{Y}^{-i} v_J \rangle$  of  $\pi$  (see Proposition 5.8), we need to be more precise about the region where the elements  $x_{J,\underline{i}}$  vanish. This motivates the following somewhat technical definition.

**Definition A.2.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ .*

(i) *Let  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We write  $x = 2n + \delta$  with  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then we define*

$$t_j^J(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} np + \delta (\delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J}(p - 1 - r_j)).$$

(ii) *Let  $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . Suppose that there exists  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that*

- (a)  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$ ;
- (b)  $1 \leq n_j \leq 2f - \delta_{j \in J}$  if  $j \neq j_0 + 1$ ,

*then we define  $\underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  by*

$$a^J(\underline{n})_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} t_{j_0}^J(n_{j_0+1}) = 0 & \text{if } j = j_0 \text{ and } j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}} \\ t_j^J(n_{j+1}) - n_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  as in Definition A.2(ii). Let  $J' \subseteq J$  such that  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J'$ . Suppose that either  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$  or  $J^{\text{ss}} \cup \{j_0 + 1\} \subseteq J'$ , then we have (see §2 for  $\underline{e}^{J \setminus J'}$ )*

$$\underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} = \underline{a}^{J'}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J'}).$$

*Proof.* Since  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J'$ , we have  $(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J'})_{j_0+1} = n_{j_0+1} + \delta_{j_0+1 \in J \setminus J'} = 0$ . By definition, we also have for  $j \neq j_0 + 1$

$$1 \leq n_j \leq n_j + \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'} \leq (2f - \delta_{j \in J}) + \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'} = 2f - \delta_{j \in J}.$$

Hence  $\underline{a}^{J'}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J'})$  is well-defined.

First we suppose that  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ . We need to prove that for each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have

$$t_j^J(n_{j+1}) - n_j + r_j^{J \setminus J'} = t_j^{J'}(n_{j+1} + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}) - (n_j + \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'}).$$

Since  $r_j^{J \setminus J'} = \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'}$  by (48) (see (51) below), it suffices to show that for each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have

$$t_j^J(n_{j+1}) + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(r_j + 1) = t_j^{J'}(n_{j+1} + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We fix  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and write  $n_{j+1} = 2n + \delta$  with  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ . If  $\delta = 0$ , then we have (as  $\delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'} \delta_{j+1 \in J'} = 0$ )

$$\begin{aligned} t_j^{J'}(n_{j+1} + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}) &= np + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'} (\delta_{j+1 \notin J'}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J'}(p - 1 - r_j)) \\ &= np + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(r_j + 1) \\ &= t_j^J(n_{j+1}) + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(r_j + 1). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\delta = 1$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_j^J(n_{j+1}) + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(r_j + 1) &= np + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(r_j + 1) \\ &= np + \delta_{j+1 \notin J'}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J}(p - 1 - r_j); \\ t_j^{J'}(n_{j+1} + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}) &= np + \delta_{j+1 \notin J'}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J'}(p - 1 - r_j) \\ &\quad + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'} (\delta_{j+1 \notin J'}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \in J'}(r_j + 1)) \\ &= np + \delta_{j+1 \notin J'}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J'}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(p - 1 - r_j) \\ &= np + \delta_{j+1 \notin J'}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \in J}(p - 1 - r_j). \end{aligned}$$



Then it remains to show that  $a^J(\underline{n})_{j_0} + r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} = a^{J'}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J'})_{j_0}$  when  $j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}$  and  $J^{\text{ss}} \cup \{j_0 + 1\} \subseteq J' \subseteq J$ . By assumption we have  $j_0 \in (J')^{\text{sh}}$ , hence by definition we have  $a^{J'}(\underline{n})_{j_0} = \underline{a}^{J'}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J'})_{j_0} = 0$ . By assumption we also have  $j_0, j_0 + 1 \in J'$ , hence  $j_0, j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J'$  and  $r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} = 0$  by (48). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition A.4.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k$ . Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  with  $|J| \leq k$ . Let  $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  be as in Definition A.2(ii). Then we have  $x_{J, \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $f = 1$ , then we have  $a^J(0) - 1 = -1$ , and the proposition follows directly from (54). Hence in the rest of the proof we assume that  $f \geq 2$ , and we prove the result by increasing induction on  $|J|$ . We let  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  be the unique pair such that

$$n_j = 2i_j - \delta_{j \in J+1} + \delta_{j \notin J} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . In particular, we have  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$  since  $n_j \leq 2f - \delta_{j \in J}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

**Claim 1.** We let  $\underline{i}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{i} - \underline{e}^{(J+1)^{\text{sh}}}$ . Then we have for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$

$$n_j = 2i'_j - \delta_{j \in (J+1) \Delta J^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j \notin J^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Indeed, this follows from (A.2) and the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} & -2\delta_{j \in (J+1)^{\text{sh}}} - \delta_{j \in (J+1) \Delta J^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j \notin J^{\text{ss}}} \\ &= -2\delta_{j \in J+1} \delta_{j \in J^{\text{ss}}} - (\delta_{j \in J+1} + \delta_{j \in J^{\text{ss}}} - 2\delta_{j \in J+1} \delta_{j \in J^{\text{ss}}}) + (\delta_{j \notin J} - \delta_{j \in J^{\text{ss}}}) \\ &= -\delta_{j \in J+1} + \delta_{j \notin J}. \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 2:** We let  $\underline{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that (see (17) for  $t^{J+1}(J)_j$ )

$$c_j = pi_{j+1} + c_j^J - \delta_{j \notin J'}(2i'_j + t^{J+1}(J)_j). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

If either  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$  or  $j_0 \in J'$ , then we have

$$\begin{cases} c_j \geq a^J(\underline{n})_j - 1 & \text{if } j = j_0 + 1, j_0 + 1 \in J' \text{ and } j_0 + 1 \notin J \\ c_j \geq a^J(\underline{n})_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

*Proof.* Indeed, by (6) and a case-by-case examination we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2i'_j + t^{J+1}(J)_j &= 2i_j + p - 1 - (s_j^{J+1} + 2\delta_{j \in (J+1)^{\text{sh}}}) + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \\ &= 2i_j + \delta_{j \notin J}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j \in J}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \in J+1} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

If  $j \in J'$ , then by definition and a case-by-case examination we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_j^J(n_{j+1}) &= t_j^J(2i_{j+1} - \delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j+1 \notin J} + 1) = t_j^J(2i_{j+1} + \delta_{j \notin J} + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}) \\ &= pi_{j+1} + \delta_{j \notin J}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Combining (52), (A.6) and (A.7) we deduce that

$$c_j - a^J(\underline{n})_j = n_j - \delta_{j \notin J} \geq -\delta_{j=j_0+1, j_0+1 \notin J},$$

unless when  $j = j_0$  and  $j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}$ , in which case we have  $c_{j_0} - a^J(\underline{n})_{j_0} = -\delta_{j_0 \notin J} = 0$ . If  $j \notin J'$ , then by assumption we have either  $j \neq j_0$  or  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ . By definition and a case-by-case examination we have

$$t_j^J(n_{j+1}) = t_j^J(2i_{j+1} - \delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}) = pi_{j+1} - \delta_{j \in J}(r_j + 1) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Combining (52), (A.2), (A.6) and (A.8) we deduce that  $c_j = a^J(\underline{n})_j$ .  $\square$

Using the decomposition (64), we separate the proof into the following four cases.

(a). Suppose that  $j_0 \notin J$  and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$  (which implies  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ ). Since  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$  and  $n_{j_0} > 0$  by assumption (recall that  $f \geq 2$ ), we have  $(\underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1})_{j_0} = -n_{j_0} - 0 < 0$ . Then we deduce from Lemma A.1 that  $x_{J, \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$ .

(b). Suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \in (J + 1)\Delta J^{\text{ss}}$  and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J^{\text{nss}}$  (which implies  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ ). Using (A.3), we deduce from  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$  that  $i'_{j_0+1} = 0$  and  $j_0 \notin J'$ , and deduce from  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$  that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}' \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{(J+1)^{\text{sh}}}$ . By Proposition 5.5 applied to  $(\underline{i}', J + 1, J')$  with  $j_0$  as above, we have

$$Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{J'=\emptyset}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J'} Y_j^{2i'_j + t^{J+1}(J')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J+1} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Multiplying (A.9) by  $Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'}}$  when  $J' \neq \emptyset$  and using (54), we deduce that

$$Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J'} Y_j^{2i'_j + t^{J+1}(J')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1, \underline{i}} = 0.$$

Then by (53) we have (see (A.4) for  $\underline{c}$ )

$$\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J_1} \mu_{J+1, J_1} x_{J_1, (\underline{c} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J_1} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} e_{j_0+1})} = 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

By (A.5) we have  $\underline{c} \geq \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - \delta_{j_0+1 \in J' \setminus J} e_{j_0+1} \geq \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'} e_{j_0+1}$ . Moreover, for each  $J_1 \subseteq J$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J$ , we have  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J_1$  (since  $j_0 + 1 \notin J^{\text{nss}}$ ), hence by Lemma A.3 (recall that  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ ) we have  $\underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J_1} = \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1})$ . In particular, multiplying (A.10) by a suitable power of  $\underline{Y}$  and using Theorem 6.3(ii) (applied to  $J_1$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J$ ) we deduce that

$$\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J_1} \mu_{J+1, J_1} x_{J_1, \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have  $x_{J_1, \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$  for all  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subsetneq J$ , hence we conclude that  $x_{J, \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$ .

(c). Suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \in J^{\text{nss}}$ . Using (A.3), we deduce from  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$  that  $i'_{j_0+1} = 0$ , and  $j_0 \in J'$  if and only if  $j_0 + 1 \in J + 1$ . Then we deduce from (A.3) and  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f}$  that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{i}' \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{(J+1)^{\text{sh}}}$ . By Proposition 5.8 applied to  $(\underline{i}', J + 1, J')$  with  $j_0$  as above, we have (see the end of §5 for  $\mu_{J_1, *}/\mu_{J_2, *}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} & Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{j_0 \notin J}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J'} Y_j^{2i'_j + t^{J+1}(J')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}'} v_{J+1} \right) \\ &= \frac{\mu_{J+1, *}}{\mu_{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\}, *}} Y_{j_0+1}^{\delta_{j_0 \notin J}} \left[ \prod_{j \notin J''} Y_j^{2i''_j + t^{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}''} v_{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\underline{i}'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{i}' - \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'} e_{j_0+2} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J^{\text{ss}}} e_{j_0+2}$  and  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} J' \Delta \{j_0 + 1\}$ . As in (b), using (54), (53) and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J^{\text{ss}}$ , we deduce that

$$\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J_1} \mu_{J+1, J_1} x_{J_1, (\underline{c} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J_1} - \delta_{j_0 \notin J} e_{j_0+1})}$$

$$= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_2 \subseteq J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} \varepsilon_{J_2} \mu_{J+1, J_2} x_{J_2, (\underline{c}' + \underline{r}^{(J \setminus \{j_0+1\}) \setminus J_2} - \delta_{j_0 \notin J} e_{j_0+1})}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where  $\underline{c}$  is defined in (A.4) and  $c'_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p i''_{j+1} + c_j^{J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} - \delta_{j \notin J'} (2i''_j + t^{(J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_j)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{i}''' &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{i}'' + \underline{e}^{((J+1) \setminus \{j_0+2\})^{\text{sh}}} = \underline{i}'' + \underline{e}^{(J+1)^{\text{sh}}} - \delta_{j_0+2 \in J^{\text{ss}}} e_{j_0+2} \\ &= \underline{i}' + \underline{e}^{(J+1)^{\text{sh}}} - \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'} e_{j_0+2} = \underline{i} - \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'} e_{j_0+2}. \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 3:** We have  $\underline{c}' = \underline{c} + \underline{r}^{\{j_0+1\}}$ .

*Proof.* By (30) we have  $c_j = c'_j$  for  $j \neq j_0$  and  $j \neq j_0 + 1$ . If  $j = j_0$ , then by (30) and (49) we deduce that  $c'_{j_0} - c_{j_0} = c_{j_0}^{J \setminus \{j_0+1\}} - c_{j_0}^J = r_{j_0} + 1$ . If  $j = j_0 + 1$ , we assume that  $j_0 + 2 \in J$ , the case  $j_0 + 2 \notin J$  being similar. Then by (30) and (49) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} c'_{j_0+1} &= p(i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'}) + (p - 2 - r_{j_0+1}) - \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'}(p - 1 - r_{j_0+1}) \\ &= p i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'}(r_{j_0+1} + 1) - (\delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} - 1 + \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'})(p - 1 - r_{j_0+1}) - 1 \\ &= p i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'}(r_{j_0+1} + 1) - 1 = c_{j_0+1} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

The claim then follows from (48).  $\square$

By Lemma D.4(ii), for each  $J_2 \subseteq J \setminus \{j_0 + 1\}$  we have  $\underline{r}^{\{j_0+1\}} + \underline{r}^{(J \setminus \{j_0+1\}) \setminus J_2} = \underline{r}^{J \setminus J_2}$ , hence the RHS of (A.11) cancels with the terms in the LHS of (A.11) for the  $J_1$  such that  $j_0 + 1 \notin J_1$ . Since  $j_0 + 1 \in J$ , and  $j_0 \in J'$  whenever  $j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}$ , by (A.5) we have  $\underline{c} \geq \underline{a}^J(\underline{n})$ . Moreover, for each  $J_1 \subseteq J$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \cup \{j_0+1\} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J$ , by Lemma A.3 we have  $\underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J_1} = \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1})$ . Then multiplying (A.11) by a suitable power of  $\underline{y}$  and using Theorem 6.3(ii) we deduce that

$$\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \cup \{j_0+1\} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J_1} \mu_{J+1, J_1} x_{J_1, \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have  $x_{J_1, \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$  for all  $J^{\text{ss}} \cup \{j_0 + 1\} \subseteq J_1 \subsetneq J$ , hence we conclude that  $x_{J, \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$ .

(d). Suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \in (J + 1)^{\text{sh}}$ . By (A.3) we have  $i'_{j_0+1} = -1$  and  $j_0 \in J'$ , hence  $x_{J+1, \underline{i}} = 0$  by (54). Then by (53), we have

$$0 = \binom{p \ 0}{0 \ 1} x_{J+1, \underline{i}} = \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J_1} \mu_{J+1, J_1} x_{J_1, p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J_1}}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By (A.5) we have  $p\delta(\underline{i}) + \underline{c}^J \geq \underline{c} \geq \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}$ . Moreover, for each  $J_1 \subseteq J$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J$ , by assumption we have  $j_0 + 1 \in (J + 1)^{\text{sh}} \subseteq J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1$ . Then as in (c), we deduce from (A.12), Lemma A.3 and Theorem 6.3(ii) that

$$\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subseteq J} \varepsilon_{J_1} \mu_{J+1, J_1} x_{J_1, \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have  $x_{J_1, \underline{a}^{J_1}(\underline{n} + \underline{e}^{J \setminus J_1}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$  for all  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_1 \subsetneq J$ , hence we conclude that  $x_{J, \underline{a}^J(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary A.5.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Suppose that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k-1$ . Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  with  $|J| \leq k$  and  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . Let  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J'$ . Then we have  $x_{J', (\underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{f} - (f+1 - \delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}})e_{j_0})} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $f = 1$ , then the assumption is never satisfied. Hence in the rest of the proof we assume that  $f \geq 2$ . We let  $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$ ,  $n_{j_0} = 1 + \delta_{j_0 \in J \setminus J'}$  and  $n_j = 2$  for  $j \neq j_0, j_0 + 1$ . In particular,  $\underline{n}$  satisfies the conditions in Definition A.2(ii) for  $J'$  and  $j_0$ . Since  $|J'| \leq k-1$  by assumption, we deduce from Proposition A.4 applied to  $J'$  and  $j_0$  that  $x_{J', \underline{a}^{J'}(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1}} = 0$ . Then the result follows Theorem 6.3(ii) (applied to  $J'$ ) and the Claim below.

**Claim.** We have

$$\underline{a}^{J'}(\underline{n}) - e_{j_0+1} \geq \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{f} - (f+1 - \delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}})e_{j_0}.$$

*Proof.* If either  $j \neq j_0, j_0 - 1$ , or  $j = j_0 - 1$  and  $j_0 \in J \setminus J'$ , then we have  $n_{j+1} = 2$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} a^{J'}(\underline{n})_j - \delta_{j=j_0+1} &= t_j^{J'}(2) - n_j - \delta_{j=j_0+1} \\ &\geq p - 2 - 1 \geq (p - 2 - 2f) + f \geq r_j + 1 + f \geq r_j^{J \setminus J'} + f, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from (2) and the last inequality follows from (48).

If  $j = j_0 - 1$  and  $j_0 \notin J \setminus J'$ , then we have  $n_{j_0} = 1$ , and  $r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} \leq 0$  by (48). Hence

$$\begin{aligned} a^{J'}(\underline{n})_{j_0-1} - \delta_{j_0-1=j_0+1} &= t_{j_0-1}^{J'}(1) - n_{j_0-1} - \delta_{j_0-1=j_0+1} \\ &\geq (\delta_{j_0 \notin J'}(r_{j_0-1} + 1) + \delta_{j_0 \in J'}(p - 1 - r_{j_0-1})) - 2 - 1 \\ &\geq (2f + 2) - 3 \geq f \geq r_{j_0-1}^{J \setminus J'} + f, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (2).

Finally, we let  $j = j_0$ . Since  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J'$ , by (48) we have  $r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} = -\delta_{j_0 \in J \setminus J'}$ . If  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ , then we have (using  $n_{j_0+1} = 0$ )

$$a^{J'}(\underline{n})_{j_0} - \delta_{j_0=j_0+1} = t_{j_0}^{J'}(0) - n_{j_0} = -n_{j_0} = -\delta_{j_0 \in J \setminus J'} - 1 = r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} + f - (f+1).$$

If  $j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}$ , then  $J^{\text{sh}} \subseteq J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'$  implies  $j_0 \in J'$ , hence  $j_0 \notin J \setminus J'$ , which implies  $r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} = 0$ . Then we have

$$a^{J'}(\underline{n})_{j_0} - \delta_{j_0=j_0+1} = 0 = r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} + f - f,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma A.6.** *Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subsetneq J' \subseteq J$  (see Remark 5.11 for  $\partial J$ ) and  $J^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ . Then we have*

$$\underline{Y}^{\underline{c}^{J'} + (p-1)\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} - \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} \binom{p \ 0}{0 \ 1} x_{J'+1, \underline{e}^{(J^{\text{sh}+1)}}} = 0. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

*Proof.* Our assumption implies  $f \geq 2$ . By Lemma D.4(v), the LHS of (A.13) is well-defined (since  $\underline{c}^J \geq \underline{0}$ ) and it suffices to show that

$$\left[ \underline{Y}^{\underline{c}^J + (p-1)\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} \prod_{j \in J \setminus J'} Y_j^{p-1-r_j} \right] \binom{p \ 0}{0 \ 1} x_{J'+1, \underline{e}^{(J^{\text{sh}+1)}}} = 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

We let  $\underline{i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}+1} - \underline{e}^{(J'+1)^{\text{sh}}}$ . If  $\underline{i} \not\geq \underline{0}$ , then by (54) we have  $x_{J'+1, \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}+1}} = 0$ , which proves (A.14). From now on we assume that  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{0}$ , which implies  $(J'+1)^{\text{sh}} \subseteq J^{\text{sh}} + 1$ . Then we claim that

$$(J')^{\text{nss}} \cap (J^{\text{ss}} - 1) = \emptyset. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Otherwise, there exists  $j_1 \in (J')^{\text{nss}}$  such that  $j_1 + 1 \in J^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$ , which implies  $j_1 + 1 \in (J'+1)^{\text{sh}} \subseteq J^{\text{sh}} + 1$ . Hence  $j_1 \in J^{\text{sh}}$ , which is a contradiction since  $j_1 \notin J_{\bar{p}}$ .

Since  $J^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$  by assumption, we divide  $J^{\text{nss}}$  into a disjoint union of intervals not adjacent to each other. Since  $(\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subsetneq (J')^{\text{nss}} \subseteq J^{\text{nss}}$  by assumption, we choose an interval  $I$  as above such that  $(J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}} \cap I \neq \emptyset$  and denote by  $j_0$  the right boundary of  $I$ . Since  $j_0 + 1 \notin J^{\text{nss}}$  by construction, we have either  $j_0 + 1 \in J^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$ , which implies  $j_0 \notin J'$  by (A.15), or  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$ , which implies  $j_0 \in (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq J'$ . In particular, in both cases we have  $j_0 \notin (J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}$  and  $j_0 + 1 \in (J'+1)\Delta(J')^{\text{ss}}$ .

(a). First we suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$ , which implies  $j_0 \in (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq J'$ . We let  $1 \leq w \leq f - 1$  be minimal such that  $j_0 - w \in (J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}$ . By the construction of  $I$  we have  $j_0 - w, j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 \in J^{\text{nss}}$  and  $j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ . Then by (6) we have if  $w \geq 2$

$$s_j^{J'+1} = \begin{cases} p - 2 - r_j & \text{if } j = j_0 \\ r_j & \text{if } j = j_0 - w + 2, \dots, j_0 - 1 \text{ (and } w \geq 3) \\ r_j + 1 & \text{if } j = j_0 - w + 1, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

and  $s_{j_0}^{J'+1} = p - 1 - r_{j_0}$  if  $w = 1$ .

Then we let  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0\}$ . For each  $j = j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 + 1$  we have  $j - 1 \notin J_{\bar{p}}$  by construction, hence  $j \notin J^{\text{sh}} + 1$ , which implies  $i_j \leq 0$  and hence  $i_j = 0$  (since  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{0}$ ). Then by (17) and (A.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2i_j + t^{J'+1}(J'')_j &= p - 1 - s_j^{J'+1} + \delta_{j-1 \in J''} \\ &= \begin{cases} r_j + 1 & \text{if } j = j_0 \\ p - 1 - r_j & \text{if } j = j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 - 1 \text{ (and } w \geq 2). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.5 applied to  $(\underline{i}, J' + 1, J'')$  with  $j_0$  as above and using (54), we have

$$\left[ Y_{j_0}^{r_{j_0}+1} \prod_{j=j_0-w+1}^{j_0-1} Y_j^{p-1-r_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J'+1, \underline{e}^{(J^{\text{sh}}+1)}} = 0.$$

Since  $j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 - 1 \in J \setminus J'$ , to prove (A.14) it is enough to show that  $c_{j_0}^{J'} + (p-1)\delta_{j_0 \in J^{\text{sh}}} \geq r_{j_0} + 1$ , which follows from (49) since  $j_0 \in J$  and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$ .

(b). Then we suppose that  $j_0 + 1 \in J^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$ , which implies  $j_0 \notin J'$ . We use the same definition of  $w, J''$  as in (a). In particular, we still have  $j_0 - w, j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 \in J^{\text{nss}}$  and  $j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 - 1 \notin J'$ . Then by (6) and (17) we have

$$s_j^{J'+1} = \begin{cases} r_j & \text{if } j = j_0 - w + 2, \dots, j_0 \\ r_j + 1 & \text{if } j = j_0 - w + 1 \end{cases}$$

and  $2i_j + t^{J'+1}(J'')_j = p - 1 - r_j$  for  $j = j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0$ . By Proposition 5.5 applied to  $(\underline{i}, J' + 1, J'')$  with  $j_0$  as above and using (54), we have

$$\left[ \prod_{j=j_0-w+1}^{j_0} Y_j^{p-1-r_j} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J'+1, \underline{e}^{(J^{\text{sh}}+1)}} = 0.$$

Since  $j_0 - w + 1, \dots, j_0 \in J \setminus J'$ , this completes the proof of (A.14).  $\square$

**Proposition A.7.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq f$ . Assume that Theorem 6.3 is true for  $|J| \leq k - 1$ . Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $|J| \leq k$  and  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ .*

(i) *If  $J^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , then we have (see the end of §5 for  $\mu_{*,J}/\mu_{*,J'}$ )*

$$\varepsilon_{J'} x_{J', \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } J' \not\supseteq J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \\ (-1)^{|(J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|} \frac{\mu_{*,J}}{\mu_{*,J'}} v_J, & \text{if } J' \supseteq J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}. \end{cases}$$

(ii) *If  $J^{\text{nss}} = \mathcal{J}$  (i.e.  $(J, J_{\bar{p}}) = (\mathcal{J}, \emptyset)$ , which implies  $k = f$ ) and  $J' \neq \emptyset$ , then we have*

$$\varepsilon_{J'} x_{J', \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} = (-1)^{|J'|+1} \frac{\mu_{*,J}}{\mu_{*,J'}} v_J.$$

*Proof.* (i). We let  $J^{\text{nss}} \neq \mathcal{J}$  and separate the following cases:

(a). Suppose that  $J' \not\supseteq J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}$ . Since  $J' \supseteq J^{\text{ss}}$ , we have  $J' \not\supseteq \partial J$ . Then we let  $j_0 \in \partial J$  (i.e.  $j_0 \in J$  and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J$ ) and  $j_0 \notin J'$ . This implies  $j_0 \in J \setminus J'$  and  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \setminus J'$ , hence  $r_{j_0}^{J \setminus J'} = -1$  by (48). We also have  $j_0 \notin J^{\text{sh}}$ . Then we deduce from Lemma A.1 that  $x_{J', \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} = 0$ .

(b). Suppose that  $J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ . We use increasing induction on  $|J' \setminus (J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}})|$ , which equals  $|(J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|$ .

First we assume that  $J' = J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}$ . By Proposition 5.10 applied to  $(J' + 1, J)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{J'+1, J} v_J &= \left[ \prod_{j \in J_0} Y_j^{s_j^J} \prod_{j \notin J_0} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left( \underline{Y}^{-\underline{e}^{((J'+1) \cap J)^{\text{nss}}}} v_{J'+1} \right) \\ &= \left[ \prod_{j \in J_0} Y_j^{s_j^J} \prod_{j \notin J_0} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J'+1, \underline{e}^{J_1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where the second equality follows from (54) and

$$\begin{aligned} J_0 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((J' + 1) \Delta J) - 1 = J' \Delta (J - 1) = (J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}) \Delta ((J - 1)^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (J - 1)^{\text{nss}}) \\ &= (J \Delta (J - 1))^{\text{ss}} \sqcup ((\partial J) \Delta (J - 1))^{\text{nss}} = (J \Delta (J - 1))^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (J \cup (J - 1))^{\text{nss}}; \\ J_1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((J' + 1) \cap J)^{\text{nss}} \sqcup (J' + 1)^{\text{sh}} = ((J' + 1) \cap J^{\text{nss}}) \sqcup ((J' + 1) \cap (J')^{\text{ss}}) \\ &= ((J' + 1) \cap J^{\text{nss}}) \sqcup ((J' + 1) \cap J^{\text{ss}}) = (J' + 1) \cap J = (J' \cap (J - 1)) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

We write  $\underline{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  with  $s_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_j^J$  if  $j \in J_0$  and  $s_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p - 1$  if  $j \notin J_0$ .

**Claim.** We have

$$p \underline{e}^{J_1-1} + \underline{e}^{J'} - \underline{s} = \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

*Proof.* Fix  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . We assume that  $j \in J_{\bar{p}}$ , the case  $j \notin J_{\bar{p}}$  being similar. In particular, we have  $j \in J'$  if and only if  $j \in J$ , which implies

$$p \delta_{j \in J_1-1} - \delta_{j \in J^{\text{sh}}} = (p - 1) \delta_{j \in J \cap (J-1)}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Since  $j \in J'$  if and only if  $j \in J$ , and  $j \in J_0$  if and only if  $j \in J \Delta (J - 1)$ , by (48), (49) and (6) with a case-by-case examination we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_j^{J \setminus J'} &= \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'} (r_j + 1); \\ c_j^{J'} &= \delta_{j \notin J'} (p - 2 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J'} (r_j + 1) = \delta_{j \notin J} (p - 2 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J'} (r_j + 1); \\ s_j &= \delta_{j \notin J} (p - 2 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J} (r_j + 1) + (p - 1) \delta_{j \in J \cap (J-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Combining (A.19) and (A.20) we get (A.18).  $\square$

By (53) applied to  $J' + 1$  and using  $(J')^{\text{ss}} = J^{\text{ss}}$ , we deduce from (A.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{J'+1, J^{\vee} J} &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon_{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J''} \left( p \underline{e}^{J_1-1} + \underline{e}^{J'} + \underline{r}^{J' \setminus J''} - \underline{s} \right) \\ &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon_{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J''} \left( \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{r}^{J' \setminus J''} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon_{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J''} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}},\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (A.18) and the last equality follows from Lemma D.4(ii). We know from (a) that  $x_{J''} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = 0$  for  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J'$ , hence we conclude that

$$\varepsilon_{J'} \mu_{J'+1, J'} x_{J'} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = \mu_{J'+1, J^{\vee} J},$$

which proves (i) when  $J' = J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}$ .

Next we assume that  $J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subsetneq J' \subsetneq J$ . By Lemma A.6, (53) applied to  $J' + 1$  and using  $(J')^{\text{ss}} = J^{\text{ss}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \underline{y} \underline{e}^{J'} + (p-1) \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} - \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J'+1, \underline{e}^{(J^{\text{sh}}+1)}} \\ &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon_{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J''} \left( p \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} + \underline{e}^{J'} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''} - \left( \underline{e}^{J'} + (p-1) \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} - \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon_{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J''} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}},\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma D.4(ii). We know from (a) that  $x_{J''} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = 0$  for  $J'' \not\subseteq J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}}$ , hence we have

$$\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J'} \varepsilon_{J''} \mu_{J'+1, J''} x_{J''} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = 0. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have for  $J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J'$

$$\varepsilon_{J''} x_{J''} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J''} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = (-1)^{|(J'' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|} \frac{\mu_{*, J}}{\mu_{*, J''}} v_J. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Moreover, if we denote  $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |(J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|$ , then (by the definition of  $\mu_{*, J} / \mu_{*, J''}$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \sqcup (\partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J'} (-1)^{|(J'' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|} \frac{\mu_{*, J}}{\mu_{*, J''}} \mu_{J'+1, J''} &= \left[ \sum_{(J'' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}} \subseteq (J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}} (-1)^{|(J'' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|} \mu_{J'+1, J} \right] \\ &= \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (-1)^i \binom{m}{i} \right] \mu_{J'+1, J} = (-1)^{m+1} \mu_{J'+1, J}.\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Combining (A.21), (A.22) and (A.23), we conclude that

$$\varepsilon_{J'} x_{J'} \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'} + \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} = (-1)^{|(J' \setminus \partial J)^{\text{nss}}|} \frac{\mu_{*, J}}{\mu_{*, J'}} v_J,$$

which proves (i).

(ii). Let  $(J, J_{\bar{p}}) = (\mathcal{J}, \emptyset)$  and  $\emptyset \neq J' \neq \mathcal{J}$ . The proof is by increasing induction on  $|J'|$  and is similar to (i), but using Proposition 5.12 instead of Proposition 5.10. We leave it as an exercise.  $\square$

## B The degree function

In this appendix, we study the degree function on  $\pi$  and give a proof of Proposition 8.1, see Proposition B.4. It guarantees that the elements  $x_{J, \underline{i}}$  defined in §6 give rise to elements in the dual module  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$ , and is needed to prove Theorem 8.2.

Let  $Z_1 \cong 1 + p\mathcal{O}_K$  be the center of  $I_1$ . Since  $\pi$  has a central character,  $Z_1$  acts trivially on  $\pi$ . We still denote by  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}$  the maximal ideal of  $\mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]]$  when there is no possible confusion. For  $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ , we view  $Y_j$  as an element of  $\mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]]$  and we define

$$Z_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times} \lambda^{-p^j} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ p[\lambda] & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]].$$

Since  $Z_j$  commutes with each other, for  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$  we write  $\underline{Z}^{\underline{i}}$  for  $\prod_{j=0}^{f-1} Z_j^{i_j}$ . For  $0 \leq j \leq f-1$ , we denote by  $y_j, z_j \in \text{gr}(\mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]])$  (the graded ring for the  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}$ -adic filtration) the associated elements of  $Y_j, Z_j \in \mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]]$ . We define the  $\text{gr}(\mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]])$ -module

$$\text{gr}(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{n+1}]/\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^n].$$

By the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Cor. 5.3.5] using condition (ii) on  $\pi$  (see above Theorem 1.1) and taking  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear dual, the  $\text{gr}(\mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]])$ -module  $\text{gr}(\pi)$  is annihilated by the ideal  $(y_j z_j, z_j y_j; 0 \leq j \leq f-1)$ , hence becomes a graded module over  $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{gr}(\mathbb{F}[[I_1/Z_1]])/(y_j z_j, z_j y_j; 0 \leq j \leq f-1)$ , which is a commutative ring, isomorphic to  $\mathbb{F}[y_j, z_j]/(y_j z_j; 0 \leq j \leq f-1)$  with  $y_j, z_j$  of degree  $-1$  (see [BHH<sup>+</sup>23, Thm. 5.3.4]). For  $v \in \pi$ , as in [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, §3.5] we define

$$\text{deg}(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{n \geq -1 : v \in \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{n+1}]\} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}.$$

We denote  $\text{gr}(v) \in \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{\text{deg}(v)+1}]/\pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{\text{deg}(v)}] \subseteq \text{gr}(\pi)$  if  $v \neq 0$  and  $\text{gr}(v) = 0$  if  $v = 0$  the associated graded element of  $v$ .

**Lemma B.1.** *Let  $v \in \pi$  with  $\text{deg}(v) = d \geq 0$ .*

- (i) *For  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we have  $\text{deg}(Y_j v) \leq \text{deg}(v) - 1$ . If moreover  $d > 0$ , then the equality holds if and only if  $y_j \text{gr}(v) = \text{gr}(Y_j v) \neq 0$  in  $\text{gr}(\pi)$ . Similar statements hold for  $Z_j$ .*
- (ii) *There exists  $\underline{a}, \underline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$  satisfying  $\|\underline{a}\| + \|\underline{b}\| = d$  such that  $0 \neq \underline{Y}^{\underline{a}} \underline{Z}^{\underline{b}} v \in \pi^{I_1}$ .*
- (iii) *We have  $\text{deg}\left(\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v\right) \leq pd + (p-1)f$ .*

*Proof.* (i). This follows from the fact that  $y_j, z_j \in R$  has degree  $-1$ .

(ii). If  $d = 0$ , then the statement is trivial, so we let  $d > 0$ . Since  $y_0, \dots, y_{f-1}, z_0, \dots, z_{f-1}$  form an  $\mathbb{F}$ -basis of the degree  $-1$  part of  $R$ , which equals  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}/\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^2$ , there exists one of them, say  $y_j$ , such that  $y_j \text{gr}(v) \neq 0$  (otherwise,  $\text{gr}(v)$  is annihilated by  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}/\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^2$  in  $\text{gr}(\pi)$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}_{I_1} v \subseteq \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^{d-1}]$ , i.e.  $v \in \pi[\mathfrak{m}_{I_1}^d]$ , a contradiction). By (i), we have  $\text{deg}(Y_j v) = d - 1$ . If  $d - 1 > 0$ , continue this process to  $Y_j v \in \pi$  and so on.



In particular, there exist  $W_1, \dots, W_d \in \{Y_0, \dots, Y_{f-1}, Z_0, \dots, Z_{f-1}\}$  such that  $W_1 \cdots W_d v \in \pi$  has degree 0 and  $w_1 \cdots w_d \operatorname{gr}(v) \neq 0$  in  $\operatorname{gr}(\pi)$ , where  $w_i \in R$  is the associated graded element of  $W_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . We let  $W'_1, \dots, W'_d$  be a permutation of  $W_1, \dots, W_d$  such that  $W'_1 \cdots W'_d$  is of the form  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{a}} \underline{Z}^{\underline{b}}$  as in the statement. Since  $R$  is commutative, we have  $w'_1 \cdots w'_d \operatorname{gr}(v) \neq 0$  in  $\operatorname{gr}(\pi)$ . As a consequence,  $W'_1 \cdots W'_d v \neq 0$  and has degree zero by (i), hence belongs to  $\pi^{I_1}$ .

(iii). By (ii), it suffices to show that  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{a}} \underline{Z}^{\underline{b}} \binom{p}{0} \binom{0}{1} v = 0$  for all  $\underline{a}, \underline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$  such that  $\|\underline{a}\| + \|\underline{b}\| \geq pd + (p-1)f + 1$ . We write  $\underline{a} = p\underline{c} + \underline{\ell}$  for the unique  $\underline{c} \geq \underline{0}$  and  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$ . One easily checks that  $Z_j \binom{p}{0} \binom{0}{1} = \binom{p}{0} \binom{0}{1} Z_{j-1}^p$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Together with Lemma 3.1(i), we have

$$\underline{Y}^{\underline{a}} \underline{Z}^{\underline{b}} \binom{p}{0} \binom{0}{1} v = \underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \underline{Y}^{p\underline{c}} \binom{p}{0} \binom{0}{1} \underline{Z}^{p\underline{\delta}(\underline{b})} v = \underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \binom{p}{0} \binom{0}{1} \underline{Y}^{\delta^{-1}(\underline{c})} \underline{Z}^{p\underline{\delta}(\underline{b})} v.$$

Since  $\deg(v) = d$ , using (i) it suffices to show that  $\|\delta^{-1}(\underline{c})\| + \|p\underline{\delta}(\underline{b})\| > d$ . Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta^{-1}(\underline{c})\| + \|p\underline{\delta}(\underline{b})\| &= \|\underline{c}\| + p\|\underline{b}\| = (\|\underline{a}\| - \|\underline{\ell}\|)/p + p\|\underline{b}\| \\ &\geq (\|\underline{a}\| - (p-1)f)/p + p\|\underline{b}\| \geq (\|\underline{a}\| + \|\underline{b}\| - (p-1)f)/p \geq (pd+1)/p > d, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Recall that we have constructed  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in \pi$  for  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  in Theorem 6.3.

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  (see §2 for  $\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  and note that  $\|\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}\| = |J^{\text{sh}}|$ ).*

- (i) *If  $z_j \operatorname{gr}(x_{J, \underline{i}}) = 0$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , then we have  $\deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) > \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$ , then there exists  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $\deg(x_{J, \underline{i}+e_{j_0}}) \geq \deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) + 2$ .*

*Proof.* (i). By the second paragraph of the proof of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.5.1], there exists  $\underline{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^f$  such that  $0 \neq \underline{Y}^{\underline{a}} x_{J, \underline{i}} \in \pi^{I_1}$  and  $\deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) = \|\underline{a}\|$ . By Theorem 6.3(ii) and (56), we have  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{i}-\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} x_{J, \underline{i}} = x_{J, \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}} = v_J \neq 0$ , hence  $\|\underline{a}\| = \deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) \geq \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$  by Lemma B.1(i). Then by Corollary 7.3(i),(ii), we must have  $\underline{a} = \underline{i} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ , hence  $\deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$ .

(ii). By (i), there exists  $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $z_{j_0} \operatorname{gr}(x_{J, \underline{i}}) \neq 0$ . Since  $Y_{j_0} x_{J, \underline{i}+e_{j_0}} = x_{J, \underline{i}}$  by Theorem 6.3(ii), we have  $\deg(x_{J, \underline{i}+e_{j_0}}) \geq \deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) + 1$  by Lemma B.1(i). Assume on the contrary that  $\deg(x_{J, \underline{i}+e_{j_0}}) = \deg(x_{J, \underline{i}}) + 1$ , then by Lemma B.1(i) we have  $y_{j_0} \operatorname{gr}(x_{J, \underline{i}+e_{j_0}}) = \operatorname{gr}(x_{J, \underline{i}})$ , hence  $z_{j_0} y_{j_0} \operatorname{gr}(x_{J, \underline{i}+e_{j_0}}) = z_{j_0} \operatorname{gr}(x_{J, \underline{i}}) \neq 0$ . This is a contradiction since  $z_{j_0} y_{j_0} = 0$  in  $R$ .  $\square$

**Lemma B.3.** *For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f} + \underline{1}$ , we have  $x_{J, \underline{i}} \in \pi^{K_1}$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 6.3(ii), it suffices to show that  $x_{J, \underline{f}+\underline{1}} \in \pi^{K_1}$ .

Recall that  $\underline{c}^{J'} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  is defined in (57), which satisfies  $\underline{1} \leq \underline{c}^{J'} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$  by (2). By the proof of Lemma 6.7 except that we apply Lemma D.4(iv) with  $\underline{\delta} = \underline{1}$  instead of  $\underline{\delta} = \underline{0}$ , we have

- (i)  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{c}^{J'} - \underline{1}} \binom{p}{0} \binom{0}{1} x_{J+1, \underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)}} \in \pi^{K_1}$ ;
- (ii)  $x_{J', \underline{f}+\underline{1}+\underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}} \in \pi^{K_1}$  for each  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$  (see (48) for  $\underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}$ ).

Moreover, by (58) we have (see (49) for  $\underline{c}^J$ )

$$\underline{f} + \underline{1} = p\underline{\delta}(\underline{e}^{J \cap (J+1)}) + \underline{c}^J - (\underline{c}^J - \underline{1}).$$

Hence we deduce from (56) (with  $\underline{i} = \underline{f} + \underline{1}$ ) that  $x_{J, \underline{f}+\underline{1}} \in \pi^{K_1}$ .  $\square$

The following proposition is a generalization of [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.5.1] (where  $\bar{\rho}$  was assumed to be semisimple).

**Proposition B.4.** For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ , we have  $\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) \leq \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$ . If moreover  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ , then we have  $\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$ .

*Proof.* First we make the following observation. Let  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $m \geq 1$ . Assume that  $\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$  for all  $\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{m}$ , then we have  $\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) \leq \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$  for all  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{m}$ . Indeed, by Theorem 6.3(ii) we have  $x_{J,\underline{i}} = \underline{Y}^{\underline{m}-\underline{i}} x_{J,\underline{m}}$ , hence  $\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) \leq (\|\underline{m}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|) - \|\underline{m}-\underline{i}\| = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$  by Lemma B.1(i). In particular, we only need to prove the result for  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ .

We prove the result by increasing induction on  $|J|$  and on  $\max_j i_j$ . For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}} \leq \underline{i} \leq \underline{f} + \underline{1}$ , by Lemma B.3 we have  $Z_j x_{J,\underline{i}} = 0$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , hence  $z_j \text{gr}(x_{J,\underline{i}}) = 0$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . By Lemma B.2(i) we deduce that  $\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) = \|\underline{i}\| - |J^{\text{sh}}|$ .

Then we let  $0 \leq k \leq f - 1$  and  $m \geq f + 1$ . Assume that the result is true for

- (a)  $|J| \leq k - 1$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ ;
- (b)  $|J| = k$  and  $\max_j i_j \leq m$ ,

we prove the result for  $|J| = k$  and  $\underline{i} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  such that  $\max_j i_j = m + 1$ .

**Claim.** For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $|J| = k$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\max_j i_j \leq pm$ , we have

$$\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) \leq \|\underline{i}\| + (p - 1)f.$$

*Proof.* We write  $\underline{i} = p\delta(\underline{i}') + \underline{c}^J - \underline{\ell}$  for the unique  $\underline{i}', \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\underline{0} \leq \underline{\ell} \leq \underline{p} - \underline{1}$  (see (49) for  $\underline{c}^J$ ). Then we claim that  $\max_j i'_j \leq m$ . Indeed, for each  $j$  we have

$$i'_{j+1} = (i_j - c_j^J + \ell_j) / p \leq (pm - 0 + (p - 1)) / p < m + 1,$$

hence  $i'_{j+1} \leq m$ . Since  $|J + 1| = |J| = k$ , by (b) we have  $\deg(x_{J+1,\underline{i}'}) \leq \|\underline{i}'\| - |(J + 1)^{\text{sh}}| \leq \|\underline{i}'\|$ . Then by Lemma B.1(i),(iii) we have

$$\deg\left(\underline{Y}^{\underline{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x_{J+1,\underline{i}'}\right) \leq p\|\underline{i}'\| + (p - 1)f - \|\underline{\ell}\| = \|\underline{i}\| - \|\underline{c}^J\| + (p - 1)f \leq \|\underline{i}\| + (p - 1)f, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the last inequality uses  $\underline{c}^J \geq \underline{0}$ . For  $J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J$ , by (a) we have (see (48) for  $\underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}$ )

$$\deg(x_{J',\underline{i} + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}}) \leq \|\underline{i}\| + \|\underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}\| - |(J')^{\text{sh}}| \leq \|\underline{i}\| + (p - 1)f, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where the last inequality uses  $r_j^{J \setminus J'} \leq p - 1$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  by (2). Combining (56), (B.1) and (B.2), we deduce that  $\deg(x_{J,\underline{i}}) \leq \|\underline{i}\| + (p - 1)f$ .  $\square$

Assume on the contrary that  $\deg(x_{J_0,\underline{i}^{(1)}}) \geq \|\underline{i}^{(1)}\| - |J_0^{\text{sh}}| + 1$  for some  $|J_0| = k$  and  $\underline{i}^{(1)} \geq \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  such that  $\max_j i_j^{(1)} = m + 1$ . By Lemma B.2(ii), there exists  $\underline{i}^{(2)} = \underline{i}^{(1)} + e_{j_1}$  for some  $j_1 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $\deg(x_{J_0,\underline{i}^{(2)}}) \geq \|\underline{i}^{(1)}\| - |J_0^{\text{sh}}| + 3 = \|\underline{i}^{(2)}\| - |J_0^{\text{sh}}| + 2$ . Moreover, we have  $\max_j i_j^{(2)} \leq m + 2$ . Similarly, there exists  $\underline{i}^{(3)} = \underline{i}^{(2)} + e_{j_2}$  for some  $j_2 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $\deg(x_{J_0,\underline{i}^{(3)}}) \geq \|\underline{i}^{(3)}\| - |J_0^{\text{sh}}| + 3$ , which moreover satisfies  $\max_j i_j^{(3)} \leq m + 3$ . Continue this process, there exists  $\underline{i}^{((p-1)m)} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $\max_j i_j^{((p-1)m)} \leq pm$  and

$$\deg(x_{J_0,\underline{i}^{((p-1)m)}}) \geq \|\underline{i}^{((p-1)m)}\| - |J_0^{\text{sh}}| + (p - 1)m.$$

By the Claim above, we also have

$$\deg(x_{J_0,\underline{i}^{((p-1)m)}}) \leq \|\underline{i}^{((p-1)m)}\| + (p - 1)f.$$

This is a contradiction since  $m \geq f + 1$  and  $|J_0^{\text{sh}}| \leq f \leq p - 2$  by (2).  $\square$

## C The actions of $\varphi$ and $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ on $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)$

In this appendix, we determine the actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$ . The main results are Proposition C.3 and Corollary C.4. Here the  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action is much more technical to compute explicitly than in the semisimple case (see [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.8.3]). Instead, we give a congruence relation which uniquely determines the  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action. The results of this appendix will be used in [Wan].

**Lemma C.1.** *Let  $a \in A$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^\times$  and  $\underline{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that  $a = \lambda \underline{Y}^{\underline{s}} \varphi_q(a)$ . If  $\underline{s} = (q-1)\underline{t}$  for some  $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $\lambda = 1$ , then we have  $a \in \mathbb{F} \underline{Y}^{-\underline{t}}$ . Otherwise, we have  $a = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $m > 0$  be large enough such that  $q^m$  is a multiple of  $|\mathbb{F}|$  and  $\lambda^m = 1$ . In particular,  $\varphi_q^m$  acts as  $x \mapsto x^{q^m}$  on  $A$ . By iteration, we have  $a^{q^m} = \underline{Y}^{-((q^m-1)/(q-1))\underline{s}} a$ . Suppose that  $a \neq 0$ . Since  $A$  is an integral domain, we have  $a^{q^m-1} = \underline{Y}^{-((q^m-1)/(q-1))\underline{s}}$ . In particular, we have  $a \in A^\times$ , hence we can write  $a = c \underline{Y}^{-\underline{t}} a_1$  with  $c \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ ,  $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  and  $a_1 \in 1 + F_{-1}A$ . Then we deduce that  $a_1 = 1$  and  $(q^m-1)\underline{t} = ((q^m-1)/(q-1))\underline{s}$ , which implies  $\underline{s} = (q-1)\underline{t}$ , and we necessarily have  $\lambda = 1$ .  $\square$

For  $a \in A^\times$  and  $k = \sum_{i=0}^m k_i \varphi^i \in \mathbb{Z}[\varphi]$  with  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , we define  $a^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=0}^m \varphi^i(a^{k_i}) \in A^\times$ . This makes  $A^\times$  a  $\mathbb{Z}[\varphi]$ -module. By completeness,  $1 + F_{-1}A$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[\varphi]$ -module, where  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$  is the localization of  $\mathbb{Z}$  with respect to the prime ideal  $(p)$ .

**Lemma C.2.** *Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{F}^\times$  and  $1 \leq h_j \leq p-2$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Consider the map*

$$\theta : (A^{[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]})^f \rightarrow (A^{[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]})^f$$

$$(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \mapsto \left( a_i - \lambda_i \left[ \prod_{j-i \in J \setminus J'} Y_j^{h_j(1-\varphi)} \prod_{j-i \in J' \setminus J} Y_j^{-h_j(1-\varphi)} \right] \varphi(a_{i+1}) \right)_{i \in \mathcal{J}}.$$

- (i) *If  $J' \neq J$ , then  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{0}$  implies  $\underline{a} = \underline{0}$ .*
- (ii) *If  $J' = J$  and  $\lambda_i = 1$  for all  $i$ , then  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{0}$  implies  $\underline{a} = \underline{\mu}$  for some  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathbb{F}$ .*
- (iii) *If  $J' = J \setminus \{j_0\}$  for some  $j_0 \in J$  and  $\underline{0} \neq \underline{b} \in ((F_0A \setminus F_{-1}A) \cap A^{[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]})^f$ , then the equation  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{b}$  has no solution.*
- (iv) *If  $J' \subsetneq J$  and  $b_i \in F_{|J \setminus J'| (1-p)} A \cap A^{[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]}$  for all  $i$ , then the equation  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{b}$  has at most one solution. If moreover  $1 \leq h_j \leq p-1-f$  for all  $j$ , then there is a unique solution which moreover satisfies  $a_i \equiv b_i \pmod{F_{(f+1)(1-p)} A}$  for all  $i$ .*

*Proof.* (i). We write  $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=0}^{f-1} \lambda_i$  and  $h^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} h_{j+i} p^i$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . If  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{0}$ , then by iteration we have  $a_0 = \lambda \underline{Y}^{\underline{s}} \varphi_q(a_0)$ , where

$$\underline{s} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j \in J \setminus J'} h^{(j)} (e_j - p e_{j-1}) - \sum_{j \in J' \setminus J} h^{(j)} (e_j - p e_{j-1}) \neq \underline{0}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

**Claim.** Suppose that  $\underline{s} = (q-1)\underline{t}$  for some  $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ . Then we have  $|t_j| \leq p-1$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $\underline{0} \neq \underline{t} \neq \pm(p-1)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $0 \leq h^{(j)} \leq (p-2)(1+p+\dots+p^{f-1})$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we deduce from (C.1) that

$$|t_j| \leq \frac{(p-2)(1+p+\dots+p^{f-1})(p+1)}{q-1} = \frac{(p-2)(p+1)}{p-1} < p,$$

hence  $|t_j| \leq p-1$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . We also deduce from (C.1) that

$$\|\underline{t}\| \leq \frac{(p-2)(1+p+\dots+p^{f-1})(p-1)f}{q-1} = (p-2)f,$$

which implies  $\underline{t} \neq \pm(\underline{p}-\underline{1})$ .  $\square$

By Lemma C.1, the only possible nonzero solution for  $a_0$  in  $A$  is a scalar multiple of  $\underline{Y}^{-\underline{t}}$ , which is not fixed by  $[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$  since  $-(\underline{p}-\underline{1}) < \underline{t} < \underline{p}-\underline{1}$  and  $\underline{t} \neq \underline{0}$ . Hence  $a_0 = 0$ , and we conclude that  $a_i = 0$  for all  $i$ .

(ii). If  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{0}$ , then by iteration we have  $a_0 = \varphi_q(a_0)$ . By Lemma C.1, we deduce that  $a_0 = \mu \in \mathbb{F}$ , hence  $a_i = \mu$  for all  $i$ .

(iii). In this case, the equation  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{b}$  becomes

$$a_i = \lambda_i Y_{j_0+i}^{h_{j_0+i}(1-\varphi)} \varphi(a_{i+1}) + b_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

For  $0 \neq a \in A$ , we say that  $a$  has degree  $m$  if  $a \in F_{-m}A \setminus F_{-(m+1)}A$ . We also define  $\deg(0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \infty$ . In particular, a nonzero scalar has degree zero, and  $\varphi$  multiplies the degree by  $p$  (see (73)). We choose  $i_0 \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $b_{i_0} \neq 0$  (hence  $\deg(b_{i_0}) = 0$ ) and let  $i = i_0$  in (C.2). Since the degree of  $Y_{j_0+i_0}^{h_{j_0+i_0}(1-\varphi)}$  is not a multiple of  $p$ , the two terms of the RHS of (C.2) have different degrees. Comparing the degrees of both sides of (C.2), we deduce that  $\deg(a_{i_0}) \leq 0$ .

Then we let  $i = i_0 - 1$  in (C.2). Since  $\deg(a_{i_0}) \leq 0$ , we have

$$\deg\left(Y_{j_0+i_0-1}^{h_{j_0+i_0-1}(1-\varphi)} \varphi(a_{i_0})\right) = p \deg(a_{i_0}) - (p-1)h_{j_0+i_0-1} < \min\{\deg(a_{i_0}), 0\}.$$

Comparing the degrees of both sides of (C.2), we deduce that  $\deg(a_{i_0-1}) < \deg(a_{i_0})$ .

Then we let  $i = i_0 - 2$  in (C.2) and continue this process. We finally deduce that

$$\deg(a_{i_0}) = \deg(a_{i_0-f}) < \deg(a_{i_0-f+1}) < \dots < \deg(a_{i_0-1}) < \deg(a_{i_0}),$$

which is a contradiction.

(iv). By (i), the equation  $\theta(\underline{a}) = \underline{b}$  has at most one solution. If moreover  $1 \leq h_j \leq p-1-f$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , since  $b_i \in F_{|J \setminus J'|_{(1-p)}}A$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{J}$ , we have for all  $i \in \mathcal{J}$

$$\begin{aligned} \deg\left(\left((\text{id} - \theta)(\underline{b})\right)_i\right) &= \deg\left(\lambda_i \left[\prod_{j-i \in J \setminus J'} Y_j^{h_j(1-\varphi)}\right] \varphi(b_{i+1})\right) \\ &\geq p \deg(b_{i+1}) - |J \setminus J'| (p-1)(p-1-f) \\ &\geq \max\{(f+1)(p-1), \deg(b_{i+1}) + 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the series  $\underline{a} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{b} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\text{id} - \theta)^k(\underline{b})$  converges in  $(A^{[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]})^f$ , gives a solution of the equation and satisfies the required congruence relation.  $\square$

Recall from §8 that  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  is an étale  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -module of rank  $2^f$ . We denote by  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)$  and  $\text{Mat}(a)$  ( $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ) the matrices of the actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  with respect to the basis  $\{x_J : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  of Theorem 8.2, whose rows and columns are indexed by the subsets of  $\mathcal{J}$ .

Let  $Q \in \text{GL}_{2^f}(A)$  be the diagonal matrix with  $Q_{J,J} = \underline{Y}^{r^{J^c}}$  for  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  (see (48) for  $r^{J^c}$ ). Then the matrices  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)'$ ,  $\text{Mat}(a)'$  ( $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ) with respect to the new basis  $\{x_J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{Y}^{-r^{J^c}}(x_J) : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  of  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  are given by  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)' = Q \text{Mat}(\varphi) \varphi(Q)^{-1}$  and  $\text{Mat}(a)' = Q \text{Mat}(a) a(Q)^{-1}$ .

**Proposition C.3.** (i) We have (see (79) for  $\gamma_{J+1, J'}$ )

$$\text{Mat}(\varphi)'_{J', J+1} = \begin{cases} \gamma_{J+1, J'} \prod_{j \notin J} Y_j^{(r_j+1)(1-\varphi)} & \text{if } J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) For  $a \in [\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$ , we have  $\text{Mat}(a)' = I$ .

(iii) Assume that  $J_{\bar{p}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ . Up to twist by a continuous character  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\times$ , there exists a unique  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  which satisfies (ii) and commutes with  $\varphi$  as in (i). Moreover, the matrix  $\text{Mat}(a)'$  ( $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ) satisfies for  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$

- (a)  $\text{Mat}(a)'_{J', J} = 0$  if  $J' \not\subseteq J$ ;
- (b)  $\text{Mat}(a)'_{J', J} \in F_{|J \setminus J'|} A$  if  $J' \subseteq J$ .

(iv) Assume that  $J_{\bar{p}} = \mathcal{J}$ . Up to diagonal matrices  $B \in \text{GL}_{2f}(\mathbb{F})$  such that  $B_{J, J} = B_{J+1, J+1}$  for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , there exists a unique  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  which satisfies (ii) and commutes with  $\varphi$  as in (i). Moreover, the matrix  $\text{Mat}(a)'$  is diagonal for all  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ .

*Proof.* (i). We have  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)'_{J', J+1} = Q_{J', J'} \text{Mat}(\varphi)_{J', J+1} \varphi(Q_{J+1, J+1})^{-1}$ . Hence we deduce from Proposition 8.3(i) that  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)'_{J', J+1} \neq 0$  if and only if  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J$ , in which case we have (see (49) for  $\underline{c}^J$ )

$$\text{Mat}(\varphi)'_{J', J+1} = \gamma_{J+1, J'} \underline{Y}^{\underline{r}^{(J')^c}} \underline{Y}^{-(\underline{c}^J + \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'})} \varphi(\underline{Y}^{\underline{r}^{(J+1)^c}})^{-1} = \gamma_{J+1, J'} \underline{Y}^{\underline{r}^{J^c} - \underline{c}^J - p\delta(\underline{r}^{(J+1)^c})},$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma D.4(ii) and (73). By (51) and (52) we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_j^{J^c} - c_j^J - p r_{j+1}^{(J+1)^c} &= (\delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \notin J}) - (\delta_{j \notin J}(p - 2 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1)) \\ &\quad - p(\delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_{j+1} + 1) - \delta_{j \notin J}) \\ &= \delta_{j \notin J}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(p(r_{j+1} + 1)), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the required formula for  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)'_{J', J+1}$  using (73).

(ii). Let  $a \in [\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$ . We deduce from Proposition 8.3(ii) and (73) that  $\text{Mat}(a)'$  is a diagonal matrix with

$$\text{Mat}(a)'_{J, J} = Q_{J, J} \text{Mat}(a)_{J, J} a(Q_{J, J})^{-1} = \underline{Y}^{\underline{r}^{J^c}} \bar{a}^{\underline{r}^{J^c}} a(\underline{Y}^{\underline{r}^{J^c}})^{-1} = 1.$$

(iii) and (iv). For simplicity, we denote by  $P_\varphi$  the matrix  $\text{Mat}(\varphi)'$  and we let  $P_a \in \text{GL}_{2f}(A)$  ( $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ ) be the matrices for the  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action. Since  $[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$  fixes the basis  $\{x_J'' : J \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$  by (ii), it also fixes the matrices  $P_a$ . By the commutativity of the actions of  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ , we have

$$P_a a(P_\varphi) = P_\varphi \varphi(P_a). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Since  $(P_\varphi)_{J', J+1} \neq 0$  if and only if  $J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J$  by (i), comparing the  $(J', J+1)$ -entries of (C.3) we get

$$\sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J} (P_a)_{J', J''} a(P_\varphi)_{J'', J+1} = \sum_{J'' : (J'')^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J''} (P_\varphi)_{J', J''+1} \varphi(P_a)_{J''+1, J+1}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

**Claim 1.** For  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we let  $P_{a, j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f_{a, j}^{h^{(j)}(1-\varphi)/(1-q)} \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$ , where  $f_{a, j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{a}^{p_j} Y_j / a(Y_j) \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$  and  $h^{(j)} = \sum_{i=0}^{f-1} h_{j+i} p^i$  as in the proof of Lemma C.2 with  $h_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r_j + 1$ . For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  we let  $P_{a, J} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{j \notin J} P_{a, j} \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$ . In particular,  $P_{a, J}$  is fixed by  $[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$ . Then for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we have

$$P_{a, J} a(P_\varphi)_{J, J+1} = (P_\varphi)_{J, J+1} \varphi(P_{a, J+1}).$$

*Proof.* By (i) and by definition, it suffices to show that for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have

$$P_{a,j} a \left( Y_j^{(r_j+1)(1-\varphi)} \right) = Y_j^{(r_j+1)(1-\varphi)} \varphi(P_{a,j+1}).$$

Since  $\varphi(Y_{j+1}) = Y_j^p$  by (73), it suffices to show that for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have

$$f_{a,j}^{h^{(j)}/(1-q)} a(Y_j^{r_j+1}) = Y_j^{r_j+1} f_{a,j}^{ph^{(j+1)}/(1-q)},$$

which follows from the equality  $ph^{(j+1)} - h^{(j)} = (q-1)(r_j+1)$ .  $\square$

We define  $Q_a \in \text{GL}_{2f}(A)$  by  $(Q_a)_{J',J} = (P_a)_{J',J} P_{a,J}^{-1}$ , which is fixed by  $[\mathbb{F}_q^\times]$ . Then it suffices to prove the uniqueness for  $Q_a$ . Dividing the LHS of (C.4) by  $P_{a,J} a(P_\varphi)_{J,J+1} \in A^\times$  and the RHS of (C.4) by  $(P_\varphi)_{J,J+1} \varphi(P_{a,J+1}) \in A^\times$  using Claim 1 and (i), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{*,J''}}{\gamma_{*,J}} (Q_a)_{J',J''} \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} P_{a,j} \right] \\ &= \sum_{J'' : (J'')^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J''} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{J''+1,J'}}{\gamma_{J+1,J}} \left( \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} Y_j^{h_j(1-\varphi)} \prod_{j \in J'' \setminus J} Y_j^{-h_j(1-\varphi)} \right) \varphi(Q_a)_{J''+1,J+1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

(a). We assume that  $J' \not\subseteq J$ . We use increasing induction on  $|J| - |J'|$  (which ranges from  $-f$  to  $f$ ) to show that  $(Q_a)_{J',J} = 0$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $(Q_a)_{J',J''} = 0$  if  $J'' \subsetneq J$ , and  $(Q_a)_{J''+1,J+1} = 0$  if  $J'' \supsetneq J'$ . Hence it follows from (C.5) that

$$(Q_a)_{J',J} = \frac{\gamma_{J'+1,J'}}{\gamma_{J+1,J}} \left[ \prod_{j \in J \setminus J'} Y_j^{h_j(1-\varphi)} \prod_{j \in J' \setminus J} Y_j^{-h_j(1-\varphi)} \right] \varphi(Q_a)_{J'+1,J+1}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

A similar equality holds replacing  $(J', J)$  with  $(J' + i, J + i)$  (for all  $i \in \mathcal{J}$ ), hence it follows from Lemma C.2(i) (with  $\lambda_i = \gamma_{J'+i+1,J'+i} / \gamma_{J+i+1,J+i}$ ) that  $(Q_a)_{J',J} = 0$ .

In the case  $J_{\overline{p}} = \mathcal{J}$ , which implies  $J^{\text{ss}} = J$  for all  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , the equation (C.5) is the same as (C.6). Then as in the previous paragraph, we deduce from Lemma C.2(i) that  $(Q_a)_{J',J} = 0$  for all  $J' \neq J$ .

(b). We assume that  $J' = J$ . Then by a similar argument, the equation (C.6) still holds and becomes  $(Q_a)_{J,J} = \varphi(Q_a)_{J+1,J+1}$ . By Lemma C.2(ii), we deduce that  $(Q_a)_{J,J} = \xi_{a,J}$  for some  $\xi_{a,J} \in \mathbb{F}^\times$  (nonzero since  $Q_a$  is invertible), and we have  $\xi_{a,J} = \xi_{a,J+1}$ . In particular, this completes the proof of (iv).

**Claim 2.** If  $J_{\overline{p}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , then  $\xi_{a,J}$  does not depend on  $J$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $\xi_{a,J} = \xi_{a,J'}$  for all  $J, J'$  such that  $J' = J \setminus \{j_0\}$  for some  $j_0 \in J$ . Since  $(Q_a)_{J',J} = 0$  for  $J' \not\subseteq J$ , we deduce from (C.5) that

$$(Q_a)_{J',J} + \delta_{j_0 \notin J_{\overline{p}}} \frac{\gamma_{*,J'}}{\gamma_{*,J}} \xi_{a,J'} P_{a,j_0} = \frac{\gamma_{J'+1,J'}}{\gamma_{J+1,J}} Y_{j_0}^{h_{j_0}(1-\varphi)} \varphi(Q_a)_{J'+1,J+1} + \delta_{j_0 \notin J_{\overline{p}}} \frac{\gamma_{*,J'}}{\gamma_{*,J}} \xi_{a,J}.$$

A similar equality holds replacing  $(J', J)$  with  $(J' + i, J + i)$  (hence  $j_0$  is replaced with  $j_0 + i$ ). For each  $i \in \mathcal{J}$ , we let

$$b_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta_{j_0+i \notin J_{\overline{p}}} \frac{\gamma_{*,J'+i}}{\gamma_{*,J+i}} (\xi_{a,J+i} - \xi_{a,J'+i} P_{a,j_0+i}) = \delta_{j_0+i \notin J_{\overline{p}}} \frac{\gamma_{*,J'+i}}{\gamma_{*,J+i}} (\xi_{a,J} - \xi_{a,J'} P_{a,j_0+i}).$$

Suppose on the contrary that  $\xi_{a,J} \neq \xi_{a,J'}$ . Since  $P_{a,j} \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$  for all  $j$ , we deduce that  $b_i \in (F_0A \setminus F_{-1}A) \cap A^{\times}$  for all  $i$ , and not all equal to 0 since  $J_{\bar{p}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ . Then by Lemma C.2(iii) (with  $\lambda_i = \gamma_{J'+i+1, J'+i} / \gamma_{J+i+1, J+i}$ ) we deduce a contradiction.  $\square$

(c). In the rest of the proof we assume that  $J_{\bar{p}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ . Since  $\xi_{a,J}$  does not depend on  $J$  by Claim 2, we denote it by  $\xi_a$ . Since  $(Q_a)_{J',J} = 0$  for all  $J' \not\subseteq J$  by (a), the assignment  $a \mapsto \xi_a$  defines a continuous character of  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$  with values in  $\mathbb{F}^\times$ . By considering  $\xi_a^{-1}P_a$ , we may assume that  $\xi_a = 1$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ . To finish the proof of (iii), we use increasing induction on  $|J \setminus J'|$  to show that for  $J' \subseteq J$  there is a unique choice of  $(Q_a)_{J',J}$ , which moreover satisfies

$$(Q_a)_{J',J} \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma_{*,J'}}{\gamma_{*,J}} \prod_{j \in J \setminus J'} (1 - P_{a,j}) \pmod{F_{(f+1)(1-p)}A} & \text{if } J' \supseteq J^{\text{ss}} \\ 0 & \text{if } J' \not\supseteq J^{\text{ss}}. \end{cases}$$

Since  $(Q_a)_{J,J} = \xi_a = 1$  by (b) and assumption, the case  $J' = J$  is true. Then we assume that  $J' \subsetneq J$ . Since  $(Q_a)_{J',J} = 0$  for  $J' \not\subseteq J$  by (a), (C.5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{J' \cup J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subseteq J} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{*,J''}}{\gamma_{*,J}} (Q_a)_{J',J''} \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} P_{a,j} \right] \\ = \sum_{J'' : (J'')^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subseteq J'' \subseteq J} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{J''+1, J'}}{\gamma_{J+1, J}} \left( \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} Y_j^{h_j(1-\varphi)} \right) \varphi(Q_a)_{J''+1, J+1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

which implies that

$$(Q_a)_{J',J} - \frac{\gamma_{J'+1, J'}}{\gamma_{J+1, J}} \left[ \prod_{j \in J \setminus J'} Y_j^{h_j(1-\varphi)} \right] \varphi(Q_a)_{J'+1, J+1} = b_0, \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where  $b_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b_{0,1} - b_{0,2}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} b_{0,1} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{J'' : (J'')^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J' \subsetneq J'' \subseteq J} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{J''+1, J'}}{\gamma_{J+1, J}} \left( \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} Y_j^{h_j(1-\varphi)} \right) \varphi(Q_a)_{J''+1, J+1} \right]; \\ b_{0,2} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{J' \cup J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{*,J''}}{\gamma_{*,J}} (Q_a)_{J',J''} \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} P_{a,j} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis together with  $1 - P_{a,j} \in F_{1-p}A$  and  $h_j \leq p-1-f$  (by (2)), each term in the summation of  $b_{0,1}$  lies in  $F_{(f+1)(1-p)}A$  unless the term for  $J'' = J$ , which appears if and only if  $J' \supseteq J^{\text{ss}}$ . If  $J' \not\supseteq J^{\text{ss}}$ , then we have  $b_{0,1} \in F_{(f+1)(1-p)}A$ . Moreover, for each  $J''$  such that  $J' \cup J^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J$ , we have  $J' \not\supseteq J^{\text{ss}} = (J'')^{\text{ss}}$ . Hence by the induction hypothesis, we deduce that  $b_{0,2} \in F_{(f+1)(1-p)}A$ , hence  $b_0 \in F_{(f+1)(1-p)}A$ . If  $J' \supseteq J^{\text{ss}}$ , then by the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_0 = b_{0,1} - b_{0,2} &\equiv \frac{\gamma_{*,J'}}{\gamma_{*,J}} - \sum_{J' \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{*,J''}}{\gamma_{*,J}} \frac{\gamma_{*,J'}}{\gamma_{*,J''}} \prod_{j \in J'' \setminus J'} (1 - P_{a,j}) \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} P_{a,j} \right] \\ &= \frac{\gamma_{*,J'}}{\gamma_{*,J}} \left[ \prod_{j \in J \setminus J'} ((1 - P_{a,j}) + P_{a,j}) - \sum_{J' \subseteq J'' \subsetneq J} \left( \prod_{j \in J'' \setminus J'} (1 - P_{a,j}) \prod_{j \in J \setminus J''} P_{a,j} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{\gamma_{*,J'}}{\gamma_{*,J}} \prod_{j \in J \setminus J'} (1 - P_{a,j}) \pmod{F_{(f+1)(1-p)}A}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have  $b_0 \in F_{|J \setminus J'|_{(1-p)}}A$  since  $1 - P_{a,j} \in F_{1-p}A$  for all  $j$ . For  $i \in \mathcal{J}$ , we define  $b_i$  in a similar way as  $b_0$  replacing  $(J', J)$  with  $(J' + i, J + i)$ , and a similar equality as (C.8) holds replacing  $(J', J)$  with  $(J' + i, J + i)$  and  $b_0$  with  $b_i$ . Then we deduce from Lemma C.2(iv) (with  $\lambda_i = \gamma_{J'+i+1, J'+i} / \gamma_{J+i+1, J+i}$ ) that there is a unique solution of  $(Q_a)_{J', J}$ , which satisfies

$$(Q_a)_{J', J} \equiv b_0 \pmod{F_{(f+1)(1-p)}A}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, we can determine the  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$ . In the semisimple case, this is computed explicitly in [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.8.3].

**Corollary C.4.** *If  $J_{\overline{p}} \neq \mathcal{J}$ , then the  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  is the unique one in Proposition C.3(iii) which satisfies  $\text{Mat}(a)'_{J, J} \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$  and  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ .*

*Proof.* By the proof of Proposition C.3(iii), there exists a continuous character  $\xi : \mathcal{O}_K^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\times$  such that for all  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$  and  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  we have  $\text{Mat}(a)'_{J, J} = \xi(a)P_{a, J}$  with  $P_{a, J} \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$ . To prove that  $\xi$  is trivial, it suffices to show that  $\text{Mat}(a)'_{\emptyset, \emptyset} \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$ . Using the change of basis matrix  $Q$  which is diagonal, it suffices to show that  $\text{Mat}(a)_{\emptyset, \emptyset} \in \underline{a}^{\underline{z}}(1 + F_{1-p}A)$ . Hence it is enough to prove that  $a(x_{\emptyset}) \in \underline{a}^{\underline{z}}(1 + F_{1-p}A)x_{\emptyset}$ .

We claim that for all  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ , we have

$$x_{\emptyset, \underline{i}} = \mu_{\emptyset, \emptyset}^{-n} \underline{Y}^{\underline{p}^n - \underline{1} - \underline{i}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^n v_{\emptyset} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

for any  $n \geq 0$  such that  $\underline{p}^n - \underline{1} - \underline{i} \geq \underline{0}$ . Indeed, by Proposition 5.4 with  $J = \emptyset$ , we have  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{p}^n - \underline{1}} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_{\emptyset} = \mu_{\emptyset, \emptyset} v_{\emptyset}$ , hence using Lemma 3.1(i) the RHS of (C.9) does not depend on  $n$ . By (54) and (62) with  $J = \emptyset$ , we deduce that (C.9) is true for  $\underline{i} = \underline{f}$ . Moreover, using Lemma 3.1(i) one easily checks that the RHS of (C.9) satisfies Theorem 6.3(ii),(iii) for  $J = \emptyset$ . Hence by the uniqueness of  $x_{\emptyset, \underline{i}}$  (see Theorem 6.3 and its proof) we deduce that (C.9) is true for all  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^f$ .

In particular,  $x_{\emptyset, \underline{i}}$  has the same expression as in the semisimple case, see [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, (103)]. Then we conclude by the explicit computation for the semisimple case, see [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.8.3].  $\square$

**Remark C.5.** *If  $J_{\overline{p}} = \mathcal{J}$ , then similar to the proof of Corollary C.4 and using the explicit computation in [BHH<sup>+</sup>c, Prop. 3.8.3] for all  $J$ , one can show that the  $\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ -action on  $\text{Hom}_A(D_A(\pi), A)(1)$  is the unique one in Proposition C.3(iv) which satisfies  $\text{Mat}(a)'_{J, J} \in 1 + F_{1-p}A$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$  and  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ .*

## D Some relations between constants

In this appendix, we collect some equalities among the various constants defined throughout this article, whose proofs are elementary. They are used throughout this article.

**Lemma D.1.** *Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  satisfying  $(J - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$ . Then for each  $j \in (J \Delta J') - 1$ , we have (see (6) for  $\underline{s}^J$ )*

$$2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{nss}}} + (p - 2 - s_j^J) + \delta_{j \in J \Delta J'} = s_j^{J'}.$$

*Proof.* We assume that  $j + 1 \in J$  and  $j + 1 \notin J'$ . Otherwise we have  $j + 1 \notin J$  and  $j + 1 \in J'$ , and the proof is similar. We separate the following cases.

If  $j \in J$  and  $j \in J'$ , then the LHS equals  $2\delta_{j \notin J_{\overline{p}}} + (p - 2 - (p - 3 - r_j + 2\delta_{j \notin J_{\overline{p}}})) + 0 = r_j + 1$ , which equals the RHS.



If  $j \in J$  and  $j \notin J'$ , then the LHS equals  $0 + (p - 2 - (p - 3 - r_j + 2\delta_{j \notin J_{\overline{p}}})) + 1 = r_j + 2 - 2\delta_{j \notin J_{\overline{p}}}$ . Hence it suffices to show that  $j \notin J_{\overline{p}}$ . Indeed, if  $j \in J_{\overline{p}}$ , then  $j \in (J - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J'$ , which is a contradiction.

If  $j \notin J$  and  $j \in J'$ , then the LHS equals  $0 + (p - 2 - (p - 2 - r_j)) + 1 = r_j + 1$ , which equals the RHS.

If  $j \notin J$  and  $j \notin J'$ , then the LHS equals  $0 + (p - 2 - (p - 2 - r_j)) + 0 = r_j$ , which equals the RHS.  $\square$

**Lemma D.2.** *Let  $J, J' \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  satisfying  $(J - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$ , and let  $\underline{m} = \underline{m}(\underline{e}^{(J \cap J')^{\text{ss}}}, J, (J \Delta J') - 1)$  (see (28)). Then we have*

$$m_j = \delta_{j \in J'} (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

*Proof.* For  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , by definition we have

$$m_j = (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2\delta_{j \in (J \cap J')^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j \in (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} - \delta_{j \in J \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j \in J \Delta J'}).$$

If  $j \notin J_{\overline{p}}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_j &= (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2\delta_{j \in J \cap J'} + 0 - \delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j \in J \Delta J'}) \\ &= (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (2\delta_{j \in J} \delta_{j \in J'} - \delta_{j \in J} + (\delta_{j \in J} + \delta_{j \in J'} - 2\delta_{j \in J} \delta_{j \in J'})) = \delta_{j \in J'} (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $j \in J_{\overline{p}}$ , then the assumption  $(J - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J')^{\text{ss}}$  implies that  $j \in J - 1$  if and only if  $j \in J'$ , hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_j &= (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (0 + \delta_{j \in J - 1} - \delta_{j \in J \Delta (J - 1)} + \delta_{j \in J \Delta J'}) \\ &= (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}} (\delta_{j \in J'} - \delta_{j \in J \Delta J'} + \delta_{j \in J \Delta J'}) = \delta_{j \in J'} (-1)^{\delta_{j+1 \notin J}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma D.3.** *Keep the assumptions of Proposition 5.8.*

- (i) *Let  $\underline{m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{m}(\underline{i}, J, J')$  and  $\underline{m}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{m}(\underline{i}', J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}, J'')$  (see (28)). Then we have  $\underline{m} = \underline{m}'$  and  $m_{j_0+1} = m'_{j_0+1} = 0$ .*  
(ii) *We have (see (17) for  $t^J(J')$ )*

$$\begin{aligned} 2i_j + t^J(J')_j &= 2i'_j + t^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_j \quad \text{if } j \neq j_0 + 1; \\ 2i_{j_0+1} + t^J(J')_{j_0+1} &= r_{j_0+1} + 1; \\ 2i'_{j_0+1} + t^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_{j_0+1} &= p - 1 - r_{j_0+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

- (iii) *We let  $\underline{c}, \underline{c}' \in \mathbb{Z}^f$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} c_j &= pi_{j+1} + \delta_{j+1 \in J \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} s_j^{(J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} \\ &\quad + \delta_{j+1 \notin J \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} (p - 1) - \delta_{j \notin J'} (2i_j + t^J(J')_j) - \delta_{j=j_0+1} \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J}; \\ c'_j &= pi'_{j+1} + \delta_{j+1 \in (J \setminus \{j_0+2\}) \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} s_j^{(J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} \\ &\quad + \delta_{j+1 \notin (J \setminus \{j_0+2\}) \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} (p - 1) - \delta_{j \notin J''} (2i'_j + t^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}(J'')_j) - \delta_{j=j_0+1} \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J}. \end{aligned}$$

*Then we have  $\underline{c} = \underline{c}'$ .*

- (iv) *If moreover  $2i_j - \delta_{j \in J \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j-1 \in J'} \geq 0$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , then we have  $\underline{c} = \underline{c}' \geq \underline{0}$  and  $\underline{Y}^{\underline{c}} B_1 = \underline{Y}^{\underline{c}'} B_2 \neq 0$ . In particular,  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  have the same  $H$ -eigencharacter.*

*Proof.* (i). If  $j \neq j_0 + 2$  or  $f = 1$ , then by definition we have  $m_j = m'_j$  and  $m_{j_0+1} = m'_{j_0+1} = 0$ . If  $j = j_0 + 2$  and  $f \geq 2$ , using  $j_0 + 1 \in (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}$  (which implies  $j_0 + 2 \in J$ ) and  $j_0 + 3 \neq j_0 + 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^{\delta_{j_0+3 \notin J}} m'_{j_0+2} &= (-1)^{\delta_{j_0+3 \notin J \setminus \{j_0+2\}}} m'_{j_0+2} \\
&= 2i'_{j_0+2} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in ((J \setminus \{j_0+2\}) - 1)^{\text{ss}}} - \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J \setminus \{j_0+2\}) \Delta ((J \setminus \{j_0+2\}) - 1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j_0+1 \in J''} \\
&= 2(i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}) + \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} - \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} \\
&= 2i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} + 2\delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} \\
&= 2i_{j_0+2} - 1 + \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + 1 - \delta_{j_0+2 \notin (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} \\
&= 2i_{j_0+2} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} - \delta_{j_0+2 \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'} \\
&= (-1)^{\delta_{j_0+3 \notin J}} m_{j_0+2},
\end{aligned}$$

hence  $m_{j_0+2} = m'_{j_0+2}$ .

(ii). We prove the case  $j = j_0 + 2$  and  $f \geq 2$ , the other cases being similar and simpler. We also assume that  $j_0 + 3 \in J$ , the case  $j_0 + 3 \notin J$  being similar. Then using (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2i'_{j_0+2} + t^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}} (J'')_{j_0+2} &= 2i'_{j_0+2} + p - 1 - s_{j_0+2}^{J \setminus \{j_0+2\}} + \delta_{j_0+1 \in J''} \\
&= 2(i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} + \delta_{j_0+2 \in J_{\overline{p}}}) + p - 1 - (p - 2 - r_{j_0+2}) + \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} \\
&= 2i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} + p - 1 - (p - 1 - r_{j_0+2} - 2\delta_{j_0+2 \in J_{\overline{p}}}) + 1 \\
&= 2i_{j_0+2} + p - 1 - s_{j_0+2}^J + \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'} \\
&= 2i_{j_0+2} + t^J (J')_{j_0+2}.
\end{aligned}$$

(iii). By (D.1) we have  $c_j = c'_j$  for  $j \neq j_0 + 1$ , so it remains to prove that  $c_{j_0+1} = c'_{j_0+1}$ . We assume that  $j_0 + 2 \in (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}$ , the case  $j_0 + 2 \notin (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}$  being similar. Then using (6) and (D.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c'_{j_0+1} &= p(i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} + 1) + (p - 2 - r_{j_0+1}) + 0 - \delta_{j_0+1 \in J'}(p - 1 - r_{j_0+1}) - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J} \\
&= p(i_{j_0+2} - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'} + 1) - 1 + \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'}(p - 1 - r_{j_0+1}) - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J} \\
&= pi_{j_0+2} + 0 + (p - 1) - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J'}(r_{j_0+1} + 1) - \delta_{j_0+1 \notin J} = c_{j_0+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

(iv). If  $j \in J'$ , then by the definition of  $c_j$  and using  $i_{j+1} \geq 0$ , we have

$$c_j \geq \min \left\{ s_j^{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, p - 1 \right\} - 1 \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from (9).

If  $j \notin J'$ , then the assumption  $2i_{j+1} - \delta_{j+1 \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} + \delta_{j \in J'} \geq 0$  implies that either  $i_{j+1} \geq 1$  or  $j + 1 \notin J \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}$ . By the definition of  $c_j$  and using  $i_{j+1} \geq 0$ , we have if  $j \neq j_0 + 1$

$$c_j \geq \min \{p, p - 1\} - (2i_j + t^J (J')_j) \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from (18) and  $\underline{i} \leq \underline{f} - \underline{e}^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ . By the definition of  $c_{j_0+1}$  and using  $i_{j_0+1} = 0$  (hence  $j_0 + 1 \notin J \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}$ ) and (D.1), we have  $c_{j_0+1} \geq (p - 1) - (r_{j_0+1} + 1) - 1 \geq 0$ , where the last inequality follows from (2).

By the definition of  $\underline{c}$  and since  $\underline{c} \geq \underline{0}$ , we have

$$\underline{Y}^{\underline{c}} B_1 = \underline{Y}^{p\delta(\underline{i})} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} Y_j^{s_j^{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\underline{Y}^{-\underline{i}} v_J)$$

$$= \left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} Y_j^{s_j^{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J \Delta (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_J = \mu_{J, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} v_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}},$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 3.1(i) and the last equality follows from Proposition 5.4 applied to  $J$ . Similarly, we have (recall that  $((J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}) - 1)^{\text{ss}} = (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Y}^c B_2 &= \underline{Y}^{c'} B_2 = \frac{\mu_{J, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}}{\mu_{J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}}} \left[ \prod_{j+1 \in J''' } Y_j^{s_j^{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}} \prod_{j+1 \notin J''' } Y_j^{p-1} \right] \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} v_{J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}} \\ &= \mu_{J, (J-1)^{\text{ss}}} v_{(J-1)^{\text{ss}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $J''' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}) \Delta (J - 1)^{\text{ss}}$  and the last equality follows from Proposition 5.4 applied to  $J \setminus \{j_0 + 2\}$ . In particular, we deduce from Lemma 3.1(ii) that  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  have the same  $H$ -eigencharacter.  $\square$

- Lemma D.4.** (i) For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we have  $\chi'_J \alpha^{z^J} = \chi_{(\underline{r}, \underline{0})}$ , where  $\chi'_J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_J \alpha^{e^{J^{\text{sh}}}}$  (see (48) for  $\underline{r}^J$  and §2 for  $\chi_J$ ,  $\chi_{(\underline{r}, \underline{0})}$ ,  $\alpha^{\underline{z}}$  and  $e^{J^{\text{sh}}}$ ).
- (ii) For  $J_1, J_2 \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  such that  $J_1 \cap J_2 = \emptyset$ , we have  $\underline{r}^{J_1 \cup J_2} = \underline{r}^{J_1} + \underline{r}^{J_2}$  (see (48) for  $\underline{r}^J$ ).
- (iii) For  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ , we have  $\alpha^{z^J} = \alpha^{z^{J+1} - \underline{r}^J}$  (see (49) for  $\underline{c}^J$ ).
- (iv) Let  $J' \subseteq J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  and  $J'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} J' \Delta (J - 1)$ . Write  $\underline{c} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p \underline{c}^{J' \cap (J-1)} + \underline{c}^{J'} - \underline{f} - \underline{r}^{J \setminus J'}$  and let  $\underline{\delta} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{J}}$ . Then for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have (see (17) for  $\underline{t}^J(J')$ )

$$c_j - \delta_j \geq \delta_{j \notin J''} \left[ 2(\delta_{j \in (J'+1) \cap J} - \delta_{j \in (J'+1)^{\text{sh}}}) + t^{J'+1}(J'')_j \right] + \delta_{J'' = \emptyset}.$$

- (v) Let  $J' \subseteq J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ . Then for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  we have

$$c_j^{J'} - r_j^{J \setminus J'} = c_j^J + \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'}(p - 1 - r_j).$$

*Proof.* (i). By definition, we have  $\underline{t}^J = \underline{r}^J + e^{J^{\text{sh}}}$  for  $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  (see (7) for  $\underline{t}^J$ ). Hence it suffices to show that  $\chi_J \alpha^{\underline{t}^J} = \chi_{(\underline{r}, \underline{0})}$ . By definition, we have  $\chi_J \alpha^{\underline{t}^J} = \chi_\lambda$  with (see §2 for  $\chi_\lambda$  and  $\underline{s}^J$ )

$$\lambda = \lambda_J + \alpha^{\underline{t}^J} = (\underline{s}^J + \underline{t}^J, \underline{t}^J) + (\underline{t}^J, -\underline{t}^J) = (\underline{s}^J + 2\underline{t}^J, \underline{0}).$$

Since  $\sigma_J = (\underline{s}^J) \otimes \det^{\underline{t}^J}$  (see §2) has the same central character as  $\sigma_\emptyset = (\underline{r})$ , we deduce that  $a^{\underline{s}^J + 2\underline{t}^J} = a^{\underline{r}}$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , which completes the proof.

(ii). This follows immediately from (51).

(iii). By (51) and (52) we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_j^J + r_j^J - r_j^{J+1} &= (\delta_{j \notin J}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \notin J}) \\ &\quad + (\delta_{j+1 \in J}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \in J}) - (\delta_{j \in J}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j-1 \in J}) \\ &= p\delta_{j \notin J} - (\delta_{j \notin J} + \delta_{j \in J})(r_j + 1) \\ &\quad + (\delta_{j+1 \notin J} + \delta_{j+1 \in J})(r_j + 1) - (\delta_{j \notin J} + \delta_{j \in J}) + \delta_{j-1 \in J} \\ &= p\delta_{j \notin J} - 1 + \delta_{j-1 \in J} = p\delta_{j \notin J} - \delta_{j-1 \notin J}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\alpha^{c^J + r^J - \underline{r}^{J+1}} = \prod_{j \notin J} \alpha_j^p \prod_{j-1 \notin J} \alpha_j^{-1} = \prod_{j \notin J} \alpha_{j+1} \prod_{j-1 \notin J} \alpha_j^{-1} = 1,$$

which proves (iii).

(iv). We assume that  $j \notin J''$ , the case  $j \in J''$  being similar and simpler. By definition we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2(\delta_{j \in (J'+1) \cap J} - \delta_{j \in (J'+1)^{\text{sh}}}) + (t^{J'+1}(J'')_j + \delta_{J''=\emptyset}) + \delta_j \\
& \leq 2(\delta_{j \in (J'+1) \cap J} - \delta_{j \in (J'+1)^{\text{sh}}}) + (p - 1 - s_j^{J'+1} + 1) + 1 \\
& \leq 2(\delta_{j \in (J'+1) \cap J} - \delta_{j \in (J'+1)^{\text{sh}}}) + p - 1 - (2(f - \delta_{j \in (J'+1)^{\text{sh}}}) + 1 + \delta_{f=1}) + 1 + 1 \\
& = p - 2f + 2\delta_{j \in (J'+1) \cap J} - \delta_{f=1} \leq p - 2f + 2 - \delta_{f=1} \leq p - f,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (9). Since  $j \notin J''$ , we have either  $j \in J' \cap (J - 1)$ , or  $j \notin J'$  and  $j \notin J - 1$ . We give the proof when  $j \in J' \cap (J - 1)$ , the other case being similar. By the definition of  $\underline{c}$ , (48) and (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_j &= \begin{cases} p + 0 - f - 0 & \text{if } j + 1 \in J' \\ p + (r_j + 1) - f - (r_j + 1) & \text{if } j + 1 \notin J' \end{cases} \\
&= p - f,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (iv).

(v). By (51) and (52) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_j^{J'} - r_j^{J \setminus J'} - c_j^J &= (\delta_{j \notin J'}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J'}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \notin J'}) - (\delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'}) \\
&\quad - (\delta_{j \notin J}(p - 1 - r_j) + \delta_{j+1 \notin J}(r_j + 1) - \delta_{j \notin J}) \\
&= (\delta_{j \notin J'} - \delta_{j \notin J})(p - 1 - r_j) + (\delta_{j+1 \notin J'} - \delta_{j+1 \in J \setminus J'} - \delta_{j+1 \notin J})(r_j + 1) \\
&\quad - (\delta_{j \notin J'} - \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'} - \delta_{j \notin J}) \\
&= \delta_{j \in J \setminus J'}(p - 1 - r_j).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (v). □

## References

- [BDJ10] Kevin Buzzard, Fred Diamond, and Frazer Jarvis. On Serre's conjecture for mod  $\ell$  Galois representations over totally real fields. *Duke Math. J.*, 155(1):105–161, 2010.
- [BHH<sup>+</sup>a] Christophe Breuil, Florian Herzig, Yongquan Hu, Stefano Morra, and Benjamin Schraen. In Preparation.
- [BHH<sup>+</sup>b] Christophe Breuil, Florian Herzig, Yongquan Hu, Stefano Morra, and Benjamin Schraen. Conjectures and results on modular representations of  $\text{GL}_n(K)$  for a  $p$ -adic field  $K$ .
- [BHH<sup>+</sup>c] Christophe Breuil, Florian Herzig, Yongquan Hu, Stefano Morra, and Benjamin Schraen. Multivariable  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -modules and local-global compatibility.
- [BHH<sup>+</sup>23] Christophe Breuil, Florian Herzig, Yongquan Hu, Stefano Morra, and Benjamin Schraen. Gelfand-Kirillov dimension and mod  $p$  cohomology for  $\text{GL}_2$ . *Invent. Math.*, 234(1):1–128, 2023.
- [BP12] Christophe Breuil and Vyttautas Paškūnas. Towards a modulo  $p$  Langlands correspondence for  $\text{GL}_2$ . *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 216(1016):vi+114, 2012.

- [Bre14] Christophe Breuil. Sur un problème de compatibilité local-global modulo  $p$  pour  $GL_2$ . *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 692:1–76, 2014.
- [Col10] Pierre Colmez. Représentations de  $GL_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$  et  $(\phi, \Gamma)$ -modules. *Astérisque*, (330):281–509, 2010.
- [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.
- [HW22] Yongquan Hu and Haoran Wang. On the mod  $p$  cohomology for  $GL_2$ : the non-semisimple case. *Camb. J. Math.*, 10(2):261–431, 2022.
- [Le19] Daniel Le. Multiplicity one for wildly ramified representations. *Algebra Number Theory*, 13(8):1807–1827, 2019.
- [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.
- [LvO96] Huishi Li and Freddy van Oystaeyen. *Zariskian filtrations*, volume 2 of *K-Monographs in Mathematics*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1996.
- [Sch15] Benjamin Schraen. Sur la présentation des représentations supersingulières de  $GL_2(F)$ . *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 704:187–208, 2015.
- [Wan] Yitong Wang. Lubin–Tate and multivariable  $(\varphi, \mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ -modules in dimension 2. *preprint*, 2024.
- [Wan23] Yitong Wang. On the mod  $p$  cohomology for  $GL_2$ . *J. Algebra*, 636:20–41, 2023.
- [Wu21] Zhixiang Wu. A note on presentations of supersingular representations of  $GL_2(F)$ . *Manuscripta Math.*, 165(3-4):583–596, 2021.