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#### Abstract

Let $G$ be a reductive algebraic group over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{k}$ of prime characteristic not 2 , whose Lie algebra is denoted $\mathfrak{g}$. We call a subvariety $\mathfrak{X}$ of the nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ monogamous if for every $e \in \mathfrak{X}$, the $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples $(e, h, f)$ with $f \in \mathfrak{X}$ are conjugate under the centraliser $C_{G}(e)$. Building on work by the first two authors, we show there is a unique maximal closed $G$-stable monogamous subvariety $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{N}$ and that it is an orbit closure, hence irreducible. We show that $\mathcal{V}$ can also be characterised in terms of Serre's $G$-complete reducibility.


## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{k}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p \neq 2$, and $G$ a simple algebraic $\mathbb{k}$-group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}=\operatorname{Lie}(G)$. Theorems of Jacobson-Morozov and Kostant say that if $\mathbb{k}$ is of characteristic 0 , then for any nilpotent $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ there exists an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, h, f)$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ which is unique up to conjugacy by the centralizer of $e$ in $G$, see [Mor42,Jac51,Kos59]. We continue the investigation into generalising Kostant's uniqueness theorem to fields of small characteristic. Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a subset of the nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. We say that $\mathfrak{X}$ is monogamous if the following property holds:

Let $(e, h, f)$ and $\left(e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right)$ be $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples with $e, f, f^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then $(e, h, f)$ is $C_{G}(e)$-conjugate to $\left(e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right)$.

The main theorem of [ST18] proves that $\mathcal{N}$ is monogamous if and only if $p>h(G)$, where $h(G)$ is the Coxeter number for $G$. When $G$ is of classical type, the first two authors [GP22] found a unique maximal $G$-stable closed subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$ that is monogamous. This paper completes the story by treating the exceptional types. Define the following subset of $\mathcal{N}$ :

$$
\mathcal{V}:=\left\{\begin{array}{l|l}
x \in \mathcal{N} & \begin{array}{l}
x^{[p]}=0, \\
x \text { is not regular in a Levi subalgebra with a factor of type } A_{p-1}, \text { and } \\
x \text { is not subregular if } G \text { is of type } G_{2} \text { and } p=3
\end{array}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

Theorem 1.1. Let $G$ be a simple algebraic group over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{k}$ of characteristic $p>2$. Then $\mathcal{V}$ is the unique maximal $G$-stable closed monogamous subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{V}$ is irreducible, being the closure of a single orbit as specified in Tables 1 and 2 below.

In [Ste10b], a close relationship was found between uniqueness of $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebras and the existence of so-called non- $G$-cr $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebras. The notion of $G$-complete reducibility for subgroups of $G$ is due to Serre [Ser05], and the natural generalisation to subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ was introduced by McNinch [McN07]. Given a subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$, we say that $\mathfrak{h}$ is $G$-completely reducible ( $G$-cr for short) if for every parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}$ such that $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ we have that there exists some Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$ with $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$.

[^0]We say $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ is $A_{1}-G$-cr if every subalgebra generated by an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple ( $e, h, f$ ) with $e, f \in \mathfrak{X}$ is $G$-cr.

Theorem 1.2. Let $G$ be a simple algebraic group over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{k}$ of characteristic $p>2$. Then $\mathcal{V}$ is the unique maximal $G$-stable closed $A_{1}-G$-cr subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$.

The proof follows very quickly from Theorem 1.1; see Section 4.
Remark 1.3. It would be interesting to know more about the geometry of the nilpotent variety $\mathcal{V}$. In type $A$, Donkin [Don90] showed that the closure of all orbits are normal. Orbit closures in the remaining classical types are considered by Xiao and Shu [XS15]. For exceptional types $G_{2}, F_{4}, \ldots, E_{8}$, results of Thomsen [Tho00] show that our varieties $\mathcal{V}$ are in fact Gorenstein normal varieties with rational singularities as long as $p \geq 5,11,7,11,13$, respectively.
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## 2. Preliminaries

Throughout, $\mathbb{k}$ is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p>2$ and $G$ is a simple $\mathbb{k}$-group with $\mathfrak{g}=\operatorname{Lie}(G)$. There is an inherited $[p]$-map on $\mathfrak{g}$ and we use $x^{[p]}$ to denote the image of $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ under this map. The variety of all nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}$, often called the nilpotent cone, is denoted by $\mathcal{N}$. The restricted nullcone is the subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$ consisting of elements $x$ such that $x^{[p]}=0$ and we denote it by $\mathcal{N}_{p}$. The distribution of nilpotent elements among $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ is insensitive to central isogeny, and so we assume that whenever $G$ is classical, it is one of $\mathrm{SL}(V), \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ or $\mathrm{SO}(V)$ and write $G=\mathrm{Cl}(V)$ for brevity; if $G$ is exceptional, we take it to be simply connected.

Recall that a prime $p$ is bad for $G$ if $p=2$ and $G$ is of type $B, C$ or $D$; if $p \leq 3$ and $G$ is exceptional; or if $p \leq 5$ and $G$ is of type $E_{8}$; otherwise it is good. In some examples we require a choice of base for the root system associated to $\mathfrak{g}$; we use Bourbaki notation [Bou05]. Finally, we fix a maximal torus $T$ of $G$.
2.1. Nilpotent orbits and Hasse diagrams. The orbits for the action of $G$ on $\mathcal{N}$ are called nilpotent orbits. There are finitely many such and they are classified. In case $G$ is of exceptional type, we describe an orbit $\mathrm{O}=G \cdot x$ by a label indicating a Levi subalgebra in which $e$ is distinguished; for these labels we refer to [LS12].
When $G=\mathrm{Cl}(V)$, the classification or orbits in terms of actions on $V$ is well-known and can be found in [Jan04, Section 1], but we recap it here for ease of reference. Set $m=\operatorname{dim} V$. If $G=\mathrm{SL}(V)$, orbits are parameterised by partitions of $m$ according to the Jordan decomposition of their elements' actions on $V$; we write $x \sim\left(\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{r}\right)$ where $\lambda_{1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{r}$ is the partition of $m$ corresponding to $x$. In types $B$ and $C$ orbits are parameterised by partitions of $m$ with an even number of even parts and an even number of odd parts, respectively. In type $D$ it is slightly more complicated. A partition is called very even if it only has even parts and they all occur with even


Figure 1. Full Hasse diagram for $G_{2}$ when $p=3$ and partial Hasse diagram for $E_{8}$ when $p=3$.
multiplicity. There is one orbit for each partition of $m$ with an even number of even parts that is not very even; and two orbits for every very even partition of $m$.

To check that $\mathcal{V}$ is a closed subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$ we require information about the Hasse diagrams for the closure relation on nilpotent orbits. For classical types, apart from type $D$, the closure order on orbits is precisely the dominance order on partitions. In type $D$ we start with the Hasse diagram for the dominance order on partitions with an even number of even parts. Then we replace each very even partition $\lambda$ with two nodes $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}$ and replace each edge from $\lambda$ to $\mu$ with two edges from $\lambda_{i}$ to $\mu$. For exceptional types the picture is actually incomplete in general. But if $p$ is good for $G$, the existence of Springer morphisms implies that the Hasse diagrams remain the same as those in characteristic 0; [Spa82, Thèoréme III 5.2]. In bad characteristic, there are not even the same number of nilpotent and unipotent orbits; for certain bad primes there are more nilpotent orbits than in characteristic 0 . To deal with this, Hesselink gives a partition of $\mathcal{N}$ into strata, one for each nilpotent orbit of $G$ in characteristic 0 . These strata are locally closed and $G$-stable.

The following forthcoming theorem of Premet [Pre] is sufficient for our needs; it reduces the determination of the Hasse diagram of nilpotent orbit closures to establishing the extra edges needed to accommodate when the Hesselink strata split into multiple orbits.

Theorem 2.1. Let $S_{i} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be a Hesselink stratum and let $\mathrm{O}_{i}$ be the orbit of maximal dimension contained in $S_{i}$. Then the Hasse diagram of the closure relation on the nilpotent orbits $\left\{\mathrm{O}_{i}\right\}$ is the same as the Hasse diagram for the closure relation on all nilpotent orbits in characteristic 0 .

Since $p>2$, there are precisely two cases where the Hesselink strata contains more than one orbit, namely when $p=3$ and $G$ is of type $G_{2}$ or $E_{8}$. In these cases precisely one stratum of each splits into two orbits. Away from those cases then, the Hasse diagrams are the same as in characteristic 0 ; these can be found in [Car93, Section 13.4]. However, two edges are missing in the $E_{8}$ diagram: there should be edges between the pairs of labels $\left(E_{6}+A_{1}, E_{8}\left(b_{6}\right)\right)$ and $\left(A_{3}+A_{1}, A_{3}\right)$ (see [Spa82, p. 249]). The Hasse diagram for $G_{2}$ when $p=3$ can be deduced from [Stu71] and is reproduced in the left of Figure 1.

| $G$ | $m$ | $\lambda$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $A_{m-1}$ | $a(p-1)+r$ | $\left((p-1)^{a}, r\right)$ |  |
| $B_{\frac{m-1}{2}}$ | $p+a(p-1)+r(r>0)$ | $\left(p,(p-1)^{a}, r-1,1\right)$ | $a$ even |
|  | $p+a(p-1)$ | $\left(p,(p-1)^{a-1}, p-2, r+1\right)$ | $a$ odd |
|  | $\leq p$ | $\left(p,(p-1)^{a}\right)$ |  |
| $C_{\frac{m}{2}}$ | $a(p-1)+r$ | $(m)$ | $\left((p-1)^{a}, r\right)$ |
| $D_{\frac{m}{2}}$ | $p+a(p-1)+r$ | $\left(p,(p-1)^{a}, r\right)$ | $a$ even |
|  | $\leq p$ | $\left(p,(p-1)^{a-1}, p-2, r, 1\right)$ | $a$ odd |
|  |  | $(m-1,1)$ |  |

Table 1. Partition $\lambda$ corresponding to the orbit $\mathrm{O}_{\lambda}$ such that $\mathcal{V}=\overline{\mathrm{O}}_{\lambda}$ in the classical types, where $a \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r<p-1$.

| $G$ | $p$ | O | $G$ | $p$ | O | $G$ | $p$ | O | $G$ | $p$ | O |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $G_{2}$ | 3 | $\tilde{A}_{1}^{(3)}$ | $E_{6}$ | 3 | $A_{1}^{3}$ | $E_{7}$ | 3 | $A_{1}^{4}$ | $E_{8}$ | 3 | $A_{1}^{4}$ |
|  | 5 | $G_{2}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |  | 5 | $D_{4}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |  | 5 | $A_{3} A_{2} A_{1}$ |  | 5 | $A_{3}^{2}$ |
|  | $\geq 7$ | $G_{2}$ |  | 7 | $E_{6}\left(a_{3}\right)$ |  | 7 | $E_{7}\left(a_{5}\right)$ |  | 7 | $A_{4}^{2}$ |
| $F_{4}$ | 3 | $A_{1} \tilde{A}_{1}$ |  | 11 | $E_{6}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |  | 11 | $E_{7}\left(a_{3}\right)$ |  | 11 | $E_{8}\left(a_{6}\right)$ |
|  | 5 | $F_{4}\left(a_{3}\right)$ |  | $\geq 13$ | $E_{6}$ |  | 13 | $E_{7}\left(a_{2}\right)$ |  | 13 | $E_{8}\left(a_{5}\right)$ |
|  | 7 | $F_{4}\left(a_{2}\right)$ |  |  |  |  | 17 | $E_{7}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |  | 17 | $E_{8}\left(a_{4}\right)$ |
|  | 11 | $F_{4}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |  |  |  |  | $\geq 23$ | $E_{7}$ |  | 19 | $E_{8}\left(a_{3}\right)$ |
|  | $\geq 13$ | $F_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | $E_{8}\left(a_{2}\right)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | $E_{8}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\geq 31$ | $E_{8}$ |

Table 2. Orbit O such that $\mathcal{V}=\overline{\mathrm{O}}$ in the exceptional types.

We can now prove part of Theorem 1.1.
Lemma 2.2. The subset $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ is a closed $G$-stable subvariety; moreover, it is the closure of $a$ single orbit in every case, as specified in Tables 1 and 2.

Proof. Suppose $G=\mathrm{Cl}(V)$ with $\operatorname{dim} V=m$. An orbit corresponding to a partition $\lambda$ of $m$ is contained in the restricted nullcone if and only if the largest part of $\lambda$ is at most $p$. Let $G=\operatorname{SL}(V)$ or $\operatorname{Sp}(V)$ (resp. $\mathrm{SO}(V)$ ), and let $x \in \mathcal{N}$ with partition represented by $\lambda$. Then $x$ is not regular in a Levi subalgebra with a factor of type $A_{p-1}$ if $\lambda$ contains no parts of size $p$ (resp. at most one part of size $p$ ). Now every orbit represented in Table 1 represents a single orbit in $\mathcal{V}$ : for $G$ of type $D$, each $\lambda$ given in Table 1 is not very even. Observe that any other orbit in $\mathcal{V}$ must be represented by a partition lower than $\lambda$ in the dominance ordering, and hence is contained in $\overline{\mathrm{O}}_{\lambda}$; and vice-versa, by definition of $\mathcal{V}$.
Now suppose $G$ is of exceptional type. We use the tables in [Ste16] to determine the orbits in the restricted nullcone. Note that the $A_{7}$ orbit is not restricted in $E_{8}$ when $p=3$ so we may appeal to Theorem 2.1 and inspect the Hasse diagrams.

Let $X$ be a node in the Hasse diagram for the closure order on nilpotent orbits of $\mathfrak{g}$. We call $X$ a neighbour of $\mathcal{V}$ if $\mathcal{V}$ does not contain the orbit corresponding to $X$ but there is an edge from $X$ to some orbit contained in $\mathcal{V}$. We say $Y$ is a minimal neighbour of $\mathcal{V}$ if $Y$ is a neighbour of $\mathcal{V}$ and the closure of $Y$ contains no other neighbours of $\mathcal{V}$.

Example 2.3. Let $G$ be of type $E_{8}$, with $p=3$. The bottom of the Hasse diagram is as shown on the right of Figure 1. By Lemma 2.2, $\mathcal{V}$ is the closure of the $4 A_{1}$ orbit. Therefore $A_{2}$ and $A_{2}+A_{1}$ are the only neighbours of $\mathcal{V}$. As $A_{2}$ is in the closure of the $A_{2}+A_{1}$ orbit, $A_{2}$ is the only minimal neighbour of $\mathcal{V}$.

Lemma 2.4. Let $G$ be of exceptional type. Table 3 lists the minimal neighbours of $\mathcal{V}$.

| $G$ | $p$ | min. orbs. | $G$ | $p$ | min. orbs. | $G$ | $p$ | min. orbs. | $G$ | $p$ | min. orbs. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $G_{2}$ | 3 | $G_{2}\left(a_{1}\right)$ | $E_{6}$ | 3 | $A_{2}$ | $E_{7}$ | 3 | $A_{2}$ | $E_{8}$ | 3 | $A_{2}$ |
|  | 5 | $G_{2}$ |  | 5 | $A_{4}, D_{4}$ |  | 5 | $A_{4}, D_{4}$ |  | 5 | $A_{4}, D_{4}$ |
| $F_{4}$ | 3 | $A_{2}, \tilde{A}_{2}$ |  | 7 | $D_{5}$ |  | 7 | $D_{5}, A_{6}$ |  | 7 | $D_{5}, A_{6}$ |
|  | 5 | $C_{3}, B_{3}$ |  | 11 | $E_{6}$ |  | 11 | $E_{6}$ |  | 11 | $E_{6}, D_{7}$ |
|  | 7 | $F_{4}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |  |  |  |  | 13 | $E_{7}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |  | 13 | $E_{7}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |
|  | 11 | $F_{4}$ |  |  |  |  | 17 | $E_{7}$ |  | 17 | $E_{7}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | $E_{8}\left(a_{2}\right)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | $E_{8}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. Minimal neighbours of $\mathcal{V}$.

Proof. When the Hasse diagram is known, the result follows by inspection. For $G$ of type $E_{8}$ with $p=3$ we need to rule out $A_{7}$ as a minimal neighbour of $\mathcal{V}$. However, since an element in this orbit is regular in a Levi subalgebra of type $A_{7}$, it must be connected to $A_{6}$, hence cannot be a minimal neighbour.

## 2.2. $G$-cr subalgebras.

Proposition 2.5. Suppose $e \in \mathcal{N}_{p}$. If $e$ is contained in an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple then there exists a $G$-cr subgroup $X \leq G$ of type $A_{1}$ such that $\operatorname{Lie}(X)$ contains $e$.

Proof. If $G=\operatorname{SL}(V)$ then $e^{[p]}=0$ implies $e$ has Jordan blocks of size at most $p$, which means $e$ is regular in a Levi subalgebra of type $A_{r_{1}} \times \cdots \times A_{r_{i}}$ with each $r_{i} \leq p-1$. The image of $X=\mathrm{SL}_{2}$ under the completely reducible representation given by $L\left(r_{1}\right) \oplus \cdots \oplus L\left(r_{i}\right)$ satisfies the demands of the theorem, where $r_{j}$ now represents a (restricted) high weight. So assume $G$ is not of type $A$. Then if $p$ is good for $G$, it is very good, and the result follows from [McN05, Propositions 33, 52].

So we may assume $p$ is bad, and therefore that $G$ is exceptional. As before, the orbits of $\mathcal{N}_{p}$ can be worked out from the tables in [Ste16] and there are not very many. By inspection, it follows that the label of every restricted nilpotent class is denoted by sums of $A_{r}$ for $r<p$ and $D_{4}\left(a_{1}\right)$ if $G=E_{8}, p=5$ or is $G_{2}\left(a_{1}\right)$ when $G=G_{2}, p=3$; note that the class $\left(\tilde{A}_{1}\right)_{(3)}$ is excluded since it is not contained in an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple.
We first deal with the final case. The subsystem subgroup $A_{2}<G_{2}$ contains an $A_{2}$-irreducible subgroup $X$ of type $A_{1}$. By [Ste10a, Theorem 1], all simple subgroups of $G_{2}$ are $G_{2}$-cr when $p=3$.

The restriction of the nontrivial 7-dimensional $G_{2}$-module to $X$ is $L(2)^{2}+L(0)$. It follows that the nilpotent elements contained in $\operatorname{Lie}(X)$ have Jordan blocks of size $3^{2}, 1$ and thus are in the $G_{2}\left(a_{1}\right)$ class by [Ste16, Table 4].
In the remaining cases, every class is a distinguished element in $\mathfrak{l}=\operatorname{Lie}(L)$ for some Levi subgroup $L$ with simple factors only of type $A_{r}$ with $r<p$ or $D_{4}$. By [Ser05, Proposition 3.2], a subgroup $X$ of $L$ is $G$-cr if and only if it is $L$-cr. Furthermore a subgroup $X$ of a central product $L=L_{1} L_{2}$ is $L$-cr if and only if the projection of $X$ to both $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$ is $L$-cr. Therefore, it suffices to deal with the cases where $L$ is simple and simply connected of type $A_{r}(r<p)$ or $D_{4}$-but these cases have already been tackled.

If $X$ is $G$-cr then so is $\operatorname{Lie}(X)$ by [McN07, Theorem 1]; so we get the following.
Corollary 2.6. Suppose $e \in \mathcal{N}_{p}$. Then there exists a $G$-cr subalgebra $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{s l}_{2}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing $e$.
The following is used a couple of times, and is [McN07, Lemma 4].
Lemma 2.7. Let $L$ be a Levi factor of a parabolic subgroup of $G$. Suppose that we have a Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{l}=\operatorname{Lie}(L)$. Then $\mathfrak{s}$ is $G$-cr if and only if $\mathfrak{s}$ is $L$-cr.

Proposition 2.8. Suppose $e \in \mathcal{N}$ is distinguished in a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}=\operatorname{Lie}(L)$ with a factor of type $A_{p-1}$. Then there is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, h, f)$ such that $\mathfrak{s}:=\langle e, h, f\rangle$ is non- $G$-cr and $f \in \overline{L \cdot e}$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.7 it suffices to treat the case that $L=\mathrm{SL}(V)$ with $\operatorname{dim} V=p$. In that case, let $\mathfrak{s}=\langle e, h, f\rangle$ be the image of $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$ under the representation given by the $p$-dimensional baby Verma module $Z_{0}(0)$; cf. [Jan98, Section 5.4]. As $V \downarrow X=Z_{0}(0)$ is a non-trivial extension of the irreducible module $L(p-2)$ by the trivial module we have that $\mathfrak{s}$ is not $L$-cr. It is easy to see that one of $e$ or $f$ has a full Jordan block on $V$ and is therefore regular. But the whole of $\mathcal{N}(L)$ is the closure of a regular nilpotent element so we are done.

Lemma 2.9. Let $(e, h, f)$ be an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple with $e, f \in \mathcal{N}$. Suppose that $e$ and $f$ are distinguished in Levi subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ with no factors of type $A_{p-1}$. If $\mathfrak{s}:=\langle e, f\rangle$ is $G$-cr then $\mathfrak{s}$ is a p-subalgebra.

Proof. Suppose $\mathfrak{s}$ is not a $p$-subalgebra. Then by [ST18, Lemma 4.3], $\mathfrak{s}$ must be $L$-irreducible in a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}=\operatorname{Lie}(L)$ with $L=L_{1} L_{2} \ldots L_{r}$ and $L_{1}$ of type $A_{p-1}$, say. Therefore, the projection $\overline{\mathfrak{s}}$ of $\mathfrak{s}$ to $\mathfrak{l}_{1}=\operatorname{Lie}\left(L_{1}\right)$ is also $L_{1}$-irreducible, so that $\overline{\mathfrak{s}}$ acts irreducibly on the $p$-dimensional natural $L_{1}$-module. However, the classification of $p$-dimensional irreducible $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-modules in [Jan98, Section 5.4] shows that the image of $e$ or $f$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{s}}$ is regular in $L_{1}$, a contradiction.

## 3. Monogamy of $\mathcal{V}$

We start with an observation that $\mathcal{V}$ can be characterised using the following partial order on $\mathcal{N}$.
Definition 3.1. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{N}$. We say $x \preceq y($ resp. $x \prec y)$ if $\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(x)^{p-1}\right) \leq \operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(y)^{p-1}\right)$ (resp. $\left.\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(x)^{p-1}\right)<\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(y)^{p-1}\right)\right)$.

Note that $\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(x)^{p-1}\right)$ can be calculated from the adjoint Jordan blocks of $x$ of size at least $p$, and if $G$ is exceptional, this can be done by reference to [Ste16, Section 3.1]. Now if $G$ is classical and $e, f \in \mathcal{V}$ one always has $e \in G \cdot f$. Therefore, the next lemma follows from a simple case-by-case check, using Tables $1 \& 2$, the Hasse diagrams for nilpotent orbit closures and [Ste16, Section 3.1].

Lemma 3.2. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $x \in \mathcal{V}$, and $y \notin \mathcal{V}$. Then $x \prec y$.
Remark 3.3. Comparing ranks of $(p-1)$-th powers is necessary for the partial order to differentiate nilpotent orbits contained in $\mathcal{V}$. For example, let be $G$ of type $E_{6}, p=5$, and take $x, y \in \mathcal{N}$ to be representatives of the $D_{4}\left(a_{1}\right)$ and $A_{4}$ classes respectively. Then we have $x \in \mathcal{V}$ and $y \notin \mathcal{V}$. Using [Ste16, Table 16] we see that $\operatorname{rank}(\operatorname{ad}(x))=\operatorname{rank}(\operatorname{ad}(y))=78$, however $\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(x)^{p-1}\right)=$ $11<15=\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(y)^{p-1}\right)$.

Let $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. We say that $\mathfrak{X}$ is partially monogamous if the following holds.
Whenever $(e, h, f)$ and $\left(e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right)$ are two $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples with $e, f, f^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $f, f^{\prime} \preceq e$, then $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ are conjugate under the action of $C_{G}(e)$.
Lemma 3.4. Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a subvariety of $\mathcal{N}_{p}$. Then $\mathfrak{X}$ is monogamous if and only if it is partially monogamous.

Proof. One direction is trivial. Suppose $\mathfrak{X}$ is partially monogamous but not monogamous. Then there exist $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples $(e, h, f)$ and $\left(e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right)$ with $e, f, f^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{X}$ such that $(e, h, f)$ is not $C_{G}(e)$ conjugate to $\left(e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right)$. Since $\mathfrak{X}$ is partially monogamous it follows that either $f \npreceq e$ or $f^{\prime} \npreceq e$; without loss of generality we assume the former. Thus $\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(e)^{p-1}\right)<\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(f)^{p-1}\right)$, and in particular, $e$ and $f$ are not conjugate.

Let $(f, \tilde{h}, \tilde{e})$ be an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple with $f$ conjugate to $\tilde{e}$, which exists by Proposition 2.5 . Then the two $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples $(f,-h, e)$ and $(f, \tilde{h}, \tilde{e})$ satisfy $f, e, \tilde{e} \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $e, \tilde{e} \preceq f$. But as $\mathfrak{X}$ is partially monogamous, we must have that $f$ conjugate to $\tilde{e}$, which is in turn conjugate to $e$, a contradiction.

Theorem 1.1 for classical types follows from Lemma 2.2 and the main theorem of [GP22]. For the remainder of this section we suppose $G$ is of exceptional type.
3.1. Bad characteristic. We first treat the case when $p$ is bad for $G$. Fix $0 \neq e \in \mathcal{V}$ for the remainder of this section. We use the representatives as in [LS04], presented in [Ste16]. If $G$ is of type $G_{2}$ and $p=3$, then the element $e$ with label $\left(\tilde{A}_{1}\right)_{(3)}$ cannot be extended to an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple by [ST18, Theorem 1.7]. So we exclude that case from now on.

Lemma 3.5. The normaliser $N_{G}(\langle e\rangle)$ (and centraliser $\left.C_{G}(e)\right)$ is smooth if and only if the class of $e$ does not occur in the following table.

| $G$ | $p$ | class of $e$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $G_{2}$ | 3 | $G_{2}\left(a_{1}\right)$ |
| $F_{4}$ | 3 | $F_{4}, \tilde{A}_{2} A_{1}$ |
| $E_{6}$ | 3 | $E_{6}, E_{6}\left(a_{1}\right), E_{6}\left(a_{3}\right), A_{5}, A_{2}^{2} A_{1}, A_{2}^{2}$ |
| $E_{8}$ | 3 | $E_{8}, E_{8}\left(a_{1}\right), E_{8}\left(a_{3}\right), E_{7}, E_{6} A_{1}, E_{8}\left(b_{6}\right), A_{7}, E_{6}, E_{6}\left(a_{3}\right) A_{1}, A_{5} A_{1}, A_{2}^{2} A_{1}^{2}, A_{2}^{2} A_{1}$ |
|  | 5 | $E_{8}, A_{4} A_{3}$ |

Proof. Every element $e$ has a cocharacter $\tau$ for which $\operatorname{im}(\tau)$ is contained in $N_{G}(\langle e\rangle)$ but not $C_{G}(e)$. Therefore, the dimension of $N_{G}(\langle e\rangle)$ is precisely $\operatorname{dim} C_{G}(e)+1$. Similarly, $\operatorname{dim} \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)=$ $\operatorname{dim} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(\langle e\rangle)+1$ thanks to the existence of $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples. Therefore $N_{G}(\langle e\rangle)$ is smooth precisely when $C_{G}(e)$ is smooth.

It is straightforward to use Magma to calculate the dimension of $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e)$. Comparing these dimensions with the dimension of $C_{G}(e)$ presented in [LS04, Tables 22.1.1-22.1.5] completes the proof.

We may now deduce an important reduction.
Proposition 3.6. There exists an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, \bar{h}, \bar{f})$ with $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\bar{h} \in \mathfrak{t}=\operatorname{Lie}(T)$. Moreover, if $(e, h, f)$ is also an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple then $h$ is $C_{G}(e)$-conjugate to $\bar{h}$.

Proof. We know from Proposition 2.5 that there is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, \bar{h}, \bar{f})$ with $\bar{f}$ in the same nilpotent class as $e$. By Lemma 3.5, the group $N_{G}(\langle e\rangle)$ is smooth. Therefore, all maximal tori in $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)$ are $N_{G}(\langle e\rangle)$-conjugate. A computation in Magma shows that $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle) \cap \mathfrak{t}$ is a maximal torus of $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)$. So we may assume that $\bar{h}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{t}$.
For the final part, first note that since $[h, e]=2 e$ we have $\left[h^{[p]}, e\right]=\operatorname{ad}(h)^{p} e=2 e$ thanks to Fermat's Little Theorem. Therefore $\mathfrak{h}=\left\langle h^{[p]^{r}} \mid r=0,1, \ldots\right\rangle$ is an abelian $p$-closed subalgebra of $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)$. It follows from [SF88, Chapter 2, Corollary 4.2] that $\mathfrak{h}=\mathfrak{t}^{\prime} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^{\prime}$ where $\mathfrak{t}^{\prime}$ is the set of semisimple elements of $\mathfrak{h}$. Since $\mathfrak{t}^{\prime}$ is a torus, the above argument shows that up to $N_{G}(\langle e\rangle)$-conjugacy we may assume that $\mathfrak{t}^{\prime}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{t}$. In particular, $\bar{h} \in \mathfrak{t}^{\prime}$.

Because $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)$ has codimension 1 in $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)$ and $\bar{h} \notin \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)$ we see that the torus $\mathfrak{t}^{\prime}$ decomposes as $\mathfrak{t}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}^{\prime}}(e) \oplus\langle\bar{h}\rangle$. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{n}^{\prime} \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e\rangle)$. It follows that $h=\bar{h}+h^{\prime}$ for some $h^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e) \cap \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\bar{h})$.
Since $h=[e, f]$ and $\bar{h}=[e, \bar{f}]$ we also have $h^{\prime} \in \operatorname{im}(\operatorname{ad}(e))$. Thus

$$
h^{\prime} \in W=\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\langle e, h\rangle) \cap \operatorname{im}(\operatorname{ad}(e)) .
$$

Another Magma check shows that every element in $W$ is $p$-nilpotent.
In particular, all eigenvalues of $h^{\prime}$ are 0 . Since $h=\bar{h}+h^{\prime}$ and $[h, f]=-2 f$ we must have $[\bar{h}, f]=-2 f$. Therefore, $f \in F=\operatorname{ker}\left(\operatorname{ad}(\bar{h})+2 I_{\text {dim }}\right)$ and so $h=[e, f] \in \operatorname{im}(\operatorname{ad}(e))(F)$. Note that $\bar{f} \in F$ also, so $\bar{h} \in \operatorname{im}(\operatorname{ad}(e))(F)$ and hence $h^{\prime} \in \operatorname{im}(\operatorname{ad}(e))(F)$.

Thus $h^{\prime} \in W \cap \operatorname{im}(\operatorname{ad}(e))(F)$. A final easy check in Magma shows that $W \cap \operatorname{im}(\operatorname{ad}(e))(F)=0$, as required.

We now describe an ad-hoc method to prove that if $\left(e, h, f^{\prime}\right)$ is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple with $f^{\prime} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $f^{\prime} \preceq e$ then $f^{\prime}$ is uniquely determined up to $C:=\left(C_{G}(e) \cap C_{G}(h)\right)$-conjugacy. In principle, this can be implemented by hand, but for speed and accuracy we have used the Magma algebra system. Applying Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 3.4 then completes the proof that $\mathcal{V}$ is monogamous.
Setup:
By Proposition 3.6, there exists an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, h, f)$ with $h \in \mathfrak{t}=\operatorname{Lie}(T)$ and $f \in \mathcal{V}$ in the same nilpotent class as $e$. Let $\left(e, h, f^{\prime}\right)$ be an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple with $f^{\prime} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $f^{\prime} \preceq e$. Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[h, f^{\prime}\right]=-2 f^{\prime} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have $f^{\prime} \in F:=\operatorname{ker}\left(\operatorname{ad}(h)+2 I_{\operatorname{dim}(\mathfrak{g})}\right)$. We setup a generic element of the subspace $F$, namely $\tilde{f}=\sum x_{i} v_{i} \in \mathfrak{g}$ where the $x_{i}$ are variables and $v_{1}, \ldots, v_{\operatorname{dim}(F)}$ is a basis for $F$. One can view $\tilde{f}$ as describing a $\operatorname{dim}(F)$-dimensional subvariety $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Step 1: The equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
[e, \tilde{f}]=h, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

yields a set of linear equations among the $x_{i}$. We use these to constrain $\tilde{f}$ and thus reduce the dimension of $\mathcal{F}$. Now every element of $\mathcal{F}$ forms an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple with $e$.

Example 3.7. We give an example where Step 1 is sufficient. Let $G$ be of type $E_{7}, p=3$ and $e=e_{\alpha_{2}}+e_{\alpha_{5}}+e_{\alpha_{7}}$. Then $e$ is a representative of the $\left(A_{1}^{3}\right)^{(1)}$ orbit and $e \in \mathcal{V}$ by Lemma 2.2. On this occasion it is obvious that $(e, h, f)$ is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple with $h=h_{2}+h_{5}+h_{7} \in \mathfrak{t}$ and $f=e_{-\alpha_{2}}+e_{-\alpha_{5}}+e_{-\alpha_{7}}$.
Let $F:=\operatorname{ker}\left(\operatorname{ad}(h)+2 I_{\operatorname{dim}(\mathfrak{g})}\right)$. A straightforward calculation shows that the space $F$ is 27 dimensional with a basis of root vectors $v_{1}=e_{r_{1}}, \ldots, v_{27}=e_{r_{27}}$ for some set of roots $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{27}$; in particular $r_{12}=-\alpha_{2}, r_{13}=-\alpha_{5}$ and $r_{14}=-\alpha_{7}$.
We let $\tilde{f}=\sum_{i} x_{i} v_{i}$ as above. We then compute $[e, \tilde{f}]=h$. For $i \neq 12,13,14$ we find that the left hand side has a coordinate of the form $\lambda x_{i}$ for $\lambda=1$ or 2 . Thus $x_{i}=0$ for $i \neq 12,13,14$. On the other hand the coordinate of $h_{2}$ is seen to be equal to $x_{14}+2$. Thus $x_{14}$ must be 1 . Similarly, the coordinates of $h_{5}$ and $h_{7}$ are $x_{13}+2$ and $x_{12}+2$, respectively. We have therefore determined all the variables in $\tilde{f}$ and found it must be $f$, as required.

Step 2: Consider the action of $C$ on $\mathcal{F}$ by applying elements $g \in C$ to $\tilde{f}$. Find a set of variables $\overline{\left\{x_{i} \mid i \in Z\right\}}$ such that every $C$-orbit in $\mathcal{F}$ contains a representative with $x_{i}=0$ for $i \in Z$. Thus we may assume that these variables are zero in $\tilde{f}$, further reducing $\mathcal{F}$.
Example 3.8. We give an example where Steps 1 and 2 are sufficient. Let $G$ be of type $G_{2}$ and $p=3$. Consider $e=e_{10}$ which is a representative of the $\tilde{A}_{1}$ orbit, thus contained in $\mathcal{V}$ by Lemma 2.2.

Clearly, if $h=h_{10}, f=e_{-10}$, then $(e, h, f)$ is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple with $f \in \mathcal{V}$. Define $F:=\operatorname{ker}(\operatorname{ad}(h)+$ $\left.2 I_{\operatorname{dim}(\mathfrak{g})}\right)$. This is 3 -dimensional and we build $\tilde{f}$ as above:

$$
\tilde{f}=x_{1} e_{-11}+x_{2} e_{-10}+x_{3} e_{21} .
$$

After Step 1 we find

$$
\tilde{f}=x_{1} e_{-11}+e_{-10}+x_{3} e_{21}
$$

Now we apply elements of $C=C_{G}(e) \cap C_{G}(h)$ to $\tilde{f}$. First consider $x_{-01}(t) \in C$. We calculate that

$$
x_{-01}(t) \cdot \tilde{f}=\left(t+x_{1}\right) e_{-11}+e_{-10}+x_{3} e_{21} .
$$

Therefore, by setting $t=-x_{1}$, we see that every $C$-orbit in $\mathcal{F}$ contains a representative with $x_{1}=0$. We're down to

$$
\tilde{f}=e_{-10}+x_{3} e_{21} .
$$

Finally, conjugation by $x_{31}(t)$ sends $\tilde{f}$ to $e_{-10}+\left(t+x_{3}\right) e_{21}$. Thus we may conclude that $\tilde{f}=f$, as required.

Step 3: Finally, we impose the condition that $\tilde{f}$ should represent an element $f^{\prime} \in \mathcal{V}$ with $f^{\prime} \preceq e$. In particular, every element in $\mathcal{V}$ is $p$-nilpotent. Therefore, the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ad}(\tilde{f})^{p}=0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

yields further polynomial equations we want the $x_{i}$ to satisfy.
Forcing $\mathcal{F}$ to only contain elements $f^{\prime}$ with $f^{\prime} \preceq e$ is slightly more subtle since we cannot simply calculate the 'rank' of $M=\operatorname{ad}(\tilde{f})^{p-1}$. Let $R=\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(e)^{p-1}\right)$ and $\epsilon$ be a map evaluating the remaining variables to choices in $\mathbb{k}$ (so each $f^{\prime} \in \mathcal{F}$ is simply some $\epsilon(\tilde{f})$ ). We find a subset $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{R}$ of rows and subset $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{R}$ of columns such that, up to the reordering of rows and columns, the corresponding submatrix $S$ of $M$ is upper triangular and all diagonal entries are elements of $\mathbb{F}_{p}^{*}$.

Then any element $f^{\prime} \in \mathcal{F}$ will satisfy $\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}\left(f^{\prime}\right)^{p-1}\right) \geq R$. We only want those elements $f^{\prime} \preceq e$ which means $\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}\left(f^{\prime}\right)^{p-1}\right) \leq R$. Thus, given any row $r$ of $M$ we must have $\epsilon(r)$ is in the span of $\epsilon\left(r_{1}\right), \ldots, \epsilon\left(r_{R}\right)$. In particular, a row $r^{\prime}$ of $M$ with zeroes at all columns $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{R}$ must evaluate to zero. This final set of conditions is enough to force all remaining variables to be 0 .

Example 3.9. We give an example where we require Step 3. Let $G$ be of type $G_{2}$ and $p=3$. Consider $e=e_{01}$ which is a representative of the $A_{1}$ orbit, thus contained in $\mathcal{V}$ by Lemma 2.2.
Take $h=h_{01}, f=e_{-01}$, then $(e, h, f)$ is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple in $\mathfrak{g}$ with $f \in \mathcal{V}$. Define $F:=\operatorname{ker}(\operatorname{ad}(h)+$ $\left.2 I_{\operatorname{dim}(\mathfrak{g})}\right)$. This is 5 -dimensional and we build $\tilde{f}$ as above:

$$
\tilde{f}=x_{1} e_{-32}+x_{2} e_{-01}+x_{3} e_{-10}+x_{4} e_{11}+x_{5} e_{32}
$$

After Step 1 we find

$$
\tilde{f}=x_{1} e_{-32}+e_{-01}+x_{3} e_{-10}+x_{4} e_{11}+x_{5} e_{32} .
$$

There are no elements of $C=C_{G}(e) \cap C_{G}(h)$ which we can use to reduce $\tilde{f}$, so we move onto Step 3.

The equation $\operatorname{ad}(\tilde{f})^{p}=0$ gives many relations amongst the remaining variables but none that allow us to conveniently reduce $\tilde{f}$. Consider the matrix $M=\operatorname{ad}(\tilde{f})^{p-1}$. The first, eighth, tenth and thirteenth column of $M$ consist only of zeroes, so we remove them, leaving the matrix $M^{\prime}$ as follows.

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
x_{1} x_{5} & 0 & 0 & x_{5} & 2 x_{4}^{2} & 0 & 0 & x_{4} x_{5} & 0 & x_{5}^{2} \\
0 & 2 x_{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{5} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 2 x_{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{5} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 x_{1} x_{5}+x_{3} x_{4} & 0 & 0 & x_{3} x_{5}+x_{4}^{2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 2 x_{1} x_{4}+2 x_{3}^{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{1} x_{5}+2 x_{3} x_{4} & 0 & 0 & x_{3} x_{5}+x_{4}^{2} & 0 \\
0 & x_{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 x_{4} & 0 & 0 & x_{5} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & x_{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{1} x_{4}+x_{3}^{2} & 0 & 0 & 2 x_{1} x_{5}+x_{3} x_{4} & 0 & 0 \\
x_{1} & 0 & 0 & 1 & x_{3} & 0 & 0 & x_{4} & 0 & x_{5} \\
0 & 2 x_{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 x_{3} & 0 & 0 & 2 x_{4} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 2 x_{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
x_{1}^{2} & 0 & 0 & x_{1} & x_{1} x_{3} & 0 & 0 & 2 x_{3}^{2} & 0 & x_{1} x_{5} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{1} & 0 & 0 & x_{3} & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

We calculate that $R=\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(e)^{p-1}\right)=1$. Therefore, if $\epsilon(\tilde{f})=f^{\prime} \preceq e$ for some evaluation map $\epsilon$, we must have that the rank of $\epsilon\left(M^{\prime}\right)$ is at most one. Observe that $M_{10,4}^{\prime}=1$ and so the rank of $\epsilon\left(M^{\prime}\right)$ is at least one. It follows that every row of $\epsilon\left(M^{\prime}\right)$ must be a multiple of the tenth row of $\epsilon\left(M^{\prime}\right)$.

Consider the sixth row of $M^{\prime}$. This only has nonzero entries in columns 2, 6 and 9 , namely $x_{3}, 2 x_{4}$ and $x_{5}$. Since the tenth row is zero in columns 2,6 and 9 it must be the case that the sixth row of $\epsilon\left(M^{\prime}\right)$ is zero. Hence $x_{3}=x_{4}=x_{5}=0$.

Similarly, row 11 of $\epsilon\left(M^{\prime}\right)$ must be zero. Thus $x_{1}=0$, and we may conclude that $\tilde{f}=f$.
3.2. Good characteristic. Suppose $p$ is a good prime for $G$. As in the bad characteristic case, we describe an algorithm to deduce that $\mathcal{V}$ is monogamous. In good characteristic there is a considerable amount of theory at our disposal. In particular, every $e \in \mathcal{N}$ has an associated
cocharacter: that is a homomorphism $\tau: \mathbb{G}_{m} \rightarrow G$ such that under the adjoint action, we have $\tau(t) \cdot e=t^{2} e$ and $\tau$ evaluates in the derived subgroup of the Levi subgroup in which $e$ is distinguished.

Lemma 3.10. Suppose $p$ is good for $G$. Let $\left(e, h_{1}, f_{1}\right)$ and $\left(e, h_{2}, f_{2}\right)$ be $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples with $e, f_{1}, f_{2} \in \mathcal{V}$. Then we may assume that $h_{1}=h_{2}=h$, up to $C_{G}(e)$-conjugacy. More precisely, there exists a cocharacter $\tau$ associated to $e$ such that $\operatorname{Lie}\left(\tau\left(\mathbb{G}_{m}\right)\right)=\langle h\rangle$. Furthermore if $\mathfrak{g}=\bigoplus_{i} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ is the grading of $\mathfrak{g}$ with respect to $\tau$ we have

$$
f-f^{\prime} \in \bigoplus_{r>0} \mathfrak{g}_{e}(-2+r p),
$$

where $\mathfrak{g}_{e}(i):=\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e) \cap \mathfrak{g}(i)$.
Proof. We start by proving that $h_{i}$ is toral. By Lemma 2.9, the subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}_{i}=\left\langle e, h_{i}, f_{i}\right\rangle$ is either a $p$-subalgebra or non- $G$-cr. In the former case, we are done. In the latter case, the argument in the proof of [ST18, Lemma 6.1] applies, showing $h_{i}$ is toral.
Now we apply [ST18, Proposition 2.8]. This yields cocharacters $\tau_{i}$ associated to $e$ such that $\operatorname{Lie}\left(\tau_{i}\left(\mathbb{G}_{m}\right)\right)=\left\langle h_{i}\right\rangle$. By [Jan03, Lemma 5.3], any two cocharacters associated to $e$ are $C_{G}(e)$ conjugate. Therefore, $h_{1}$ and $h_{2}$ are $C_{G}(e)$-conjugate and so up to $C_{G}(e)$-conjugacy we may assume they are equal. Set $h=h_{1}=h_{2}$.
Since $\left[e, f_{1}-f_{2}\right]=h-h=0$ we know $f_{1}-f_{2} \in \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e)$. Furthermore, $\left[h, f_{1}-f_{2}\right]=-2\left(f_{1}-f_{2}\right)$ and hence $f_{1}-f_{2} \in \bigoplus_{r} \mathfrak{g}(-2+r p)$. The conclusion follows by noting that $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e)$ is contained in the nonnegative graded part of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Fix $0 \neq e \in \mathcal{V}$ for the remainder of this section. Choose a cocharacter $\tau$ associated to $e$ such that $h \in \operatorname{Lie}\left(\tau\left(\mathbb{G}_{m}\right)\right) \subset \mathfrak{t}$ with $[h, e]=2 e$. In practice, we use the representatives and associated cocharacters given in [LT11]. We know from Pommerening [Pom77, Pom80] and Lemma 3.10 that there exists a unique $\bar{f} \in \mathfrak{g}(-2)$ such that $(e, h, \bar{f})$ is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple. Furthermore, if $(e, h, f)$ is another $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple then $f=\bar{f}+f^{\prime}$ with $f^{\prime} \in \bigoplus_{r>0} \mathfrak{g}_{e}(-2+r p)$. Therefore, we need to prove that if $f \in \mathcal{V}$ then up to $C=C_{G}(e) \cap C_{G}(h)$-conjugacy we have $f=\bar{f}$, i.e. that $f^{\prime}=0$.

To do this we use the ad-hoc method from Section 3.1. Indeed, by Lemma 3.4 it suffices to prove that $f=\bar{f}$ when $f \preceq e$. We now apply Steps $1-3$ starting with the space $F=f+\bigoplus_{r>0} \mathfrak{g}_{e}(-2+r p)$.
Example 3.11. We give a final example, this time in good characteristic. Let $G$ be of type $E_{7}$ and $p=7$. Consider $e=e_{100000}+e_{010000}+e_{001000}+e_{000100}+e_{000010}$ which is a representative of the $\left(A_{5}\right)^{(2)}$ orbit; thus $e \in \mathcal{V}$ by Lemma 2.2. Furthermore, by [LT11, p. 108], $e$ has the associated cocharacter $\tau=\begin{array}{rr}22 & 222-5 \\ & -9\end{array}$. It follows that $h=2 h_{1}+6 h_{3}+5 h_{4}+6 h_{5}+2 h_{6} \in \operatorname{Lie}\left(\tau\left(\mathbb{G}_{m}\right)\right)$.
The unique $\bar{f} \in \mathfrak{g}(-2)$ such that $(e, h, \bar{f})$ is an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple is then given by $\bar{f}=2 e_{-100000}+6 e_{-010000}+$ $5 e_{-001000}^{0}+6 e_{-000100}^{0}+2 e_{-000010}$.
Let $F=f+\bigoplus_{r>0} \mathfrak{g}_{e}(-2+r p)$, which is 6-dimensional. We build a generic element $\tilde{f}$ of $F$ as in Section 3.1 with six variables. Following Step 1 by enforcing the linear equations from $[e, \tilde{f}]=h$ yields
$\tilde{f}=\bar{f}+x_{1} e_{-123211}+x_{2} e_{-001100}+x_{2} e_{-011000}+x_{3} e_{-000001}+x_{4} e_{111111}-x_{5} e_{122110}+x_{5} e_{112210}+x_{6} e_{234321}$.
On this occasion $C:=C_{G}(e) \cap C_{G}(h)$ is finite and we move onto Step 3.

Let $M=\operatorname{ad}(\tilde{f})^{p-1}$. We calculate that $R=\operatorname{rank}\left(\operatorname{ad}(e)^{p-1}\right)=13$. So if $\epsilon(\tilde{f})=f^{\prime} \preceq e$ for some evaluation map $\epsilon$, we must have that the $\operatorname{rank}$ of $\epsilon(M)$ is at most 13 .

Ordering the basis of $\mathfrak{g}$ as in Magma, we use the $13 \times 13$ submatrix $S$ of $M$ corresponding to the rows $r$ and columns $c$ where

$$
\begin{aligned}
r & =\{75,125,62,94,87,129,120,97,42,82,23,34,108\}, \\
c & =\{37,100,24,52,50,109,92,60,14,40,5,9,72\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The submatrix $S$ is upper triangular and all diagonal entries are elements of $\mathbb{F}_{p}^{*}$. The only other nonzero entries in $S$ can be found in row one, which is

$$
\left(\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}
1 & 0 & 4 x_{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 x_{5} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right) .
$$

We find that 42 rows of $M$ have zero entries in every column in $c$, so each of these rows must be zero. An example of such a row is the eighth row of $M$. In row 8 we find $x_{4}, 3 x_{5}$ and $-x_{6}$ in columns 11,15 and 70 respectively. It follows that $x_{4}=x_{5}=x_{6}=0$. Similarly the 133rd row of $M$ then allows us to deduce that $x_{1}=x_{2}=x_{3}=0$. Thus $\tilde{f}=f$ as required.

## 4. Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

Proposition 2.5 shows that for each $e \in \mathcal{V}$ there exists an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, h, f)$ with $\mathfrak{s}=\langle e, h, f\rangle=$ $\operatorname{Lie}(X)$ for a $G$-cr subgroup $X<G$ of type $A_{1}$. Thus $f$ must be $G$-conjugate to $e$ and hence $f \in \mathcal{V}$. We have demonstrated in Section 3 that any other $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple ( $e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}$ ) with $f^{\prime} \in \mathcal{V}$ is $C_{G}(e)$-conjugate to $(e, h, f)$. Therefore $\mathfrak{s}^{\prime}=\left\langle e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right\rangle$ is $G$-conjugate to $\mathfrak{s}$ and hence $G$-cr.
Now all that remains is to prove that $\mathcal{V}$ is the maximal closed $G$-stable subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$ satisfying both the monogamy and $A_{1}-G$-cr conditions.

For $G$ of classical type, it follows from [GP22, Theorem 1] that $\mathcal{V}$ is maximal with respect to being monogamous. For the $A_{1}-G$-cr property, the ingredients are there but let us spell out the details, as these essentially make up the strategy for the groups of exceptional type used below.

Proposition 4.1. Let $G$ be a simple algebraic group of classical type. Then $\mathcal{V}$ is the maximal closed $G$-stable $A_{1}-G$-cr subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathfrak{X}$ is a closed $G$-stable $A_{1}-G$-cr variety. Let $e \in \mathfrak{X} \backslash \mathcal{V}$. If $e$ is distinguished in a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}=\operatorname{Lie}(L)$ with $L$ having a factor of type $A_{p-1}$ then Proposition 2.8 shows that $e$ is contained in an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple generating a non- $G$-cr subalgebra (these non- $G$-cr subalgebras are also exhibited in [GP22, Section 2.4]).
Therefore we may assume that $e^{[p]} \neq 0$. The discussion before Proposition 2.2 in ibid. exhibits an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, h, f)$ with $f^{[p]}=0$ and $f$ in $\overline{G \cdot e}$, thus $f \in \mathfrak{X}$. By Lemma 2.9, the $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebra generated by $(e, h, f)$ must be $G$-cr.

For the remainder of the section we assume $G$ is of exceptional type.
Proposition 4.2. The variety $\mathcal{V}$ is the maximal closed $G$-stable subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$ satisfying both the monogamy and $A_{1}-G$-cr conditions.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a $G$-stable closed subvariety of $\mathcal{N}$ satisfying either the monogamy or $A_{1}-G$-cr condition and $\mathfrak{X} \not \subset \mathcal{V}$. By Lemma 2.4, we may assume that $\mathfrak{X}$ contains an orbit from Table 3.

First suppose that there exists $e \in \mathfrak{X}$ which is distinguished in a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}=\operatorname{Lie}(L)$ with a factor of type $A_{p-1}$. Then Propositions 2.5 and 2.8 furnish us with two $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples $(e, h, f)$ and $\left(e, h^{\prime}, f^{\prime}\right)$ such that the first generates a $G$-cr subalgebra and the second generates a non- $G$-cr subalgebra. Moreover, $f$ is in the same $G$-class as $e$ and $f^{\prime}$ is in the closure of the $G$-class of $e$. Hence $\mathfrak{X}$ does not satisfy either condition, a contradiction.
Now suppose there is some minimal neighbour $e \in \mathfrak{X}$ such that $e^{[p]} \neq 0$. By consideration of Table 3 we see in each such case, $e$ is distinguished in some Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}=\operatorname{Lie}(L)$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ for which $p$ is good for $L$ and $L$ has no factors of type $A_{p-1}$.
From [PS19, Section 2.4] we find an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, h, f)$ of $\mathfrak{l}$ with $f^{[p]}=0$. Since $L$ has no factor of type $A_{p-1}$ it follows that $f \in \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}$. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{s}=\langle e, f\rangle \cong \mathfrak{s l}_{2}$ is a non- $L$-cr subalgebra by Lemma 2.9. Hence by Lemma 2.7, $\mathfrak{X}$ does not satisfy the $A_{1}-G$-cr condition. Proposition 2.5 yields an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $\left(f, h^{\prime}, e^{\prime}\right)$ which generates a $G$-cr $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebra. Therefore, $f$ is contained in two non-conjugate $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triples. Thus $\mathfrak{X}$ does not satisfy the monogamy condition either.
Finally, let $G$ be of type $G_{2}$ and $p=3$. The only minimal neighbour of $\mathcal{V}$ is the subregular orbit $G_{2}\left(a_{1}\right)$. A representative for this orbit is $e=e_{\alpha_{2}}+e_{-3 \alpha_{1}-\alpha_{2}}$. This is regular in $\mathfrak{m}=$ $\operatorname{Lie}(M)$ where $M$ is the standard subsystem subgroup of type $A_{2}$ corresponding to the subsystem $\pm \alpha_{2}, \pm\left(3 \alpha_{1}+2 \alpha_{2}\right), \pm\left(3 \alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}\right)$.

As in the proof of Proposition 2.8, there exists an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(e, h, f)$ in $\mathfrak{m}$ such that $\mathfrak{s}=\langle e, f\rangle$ is non- $M$-cr. Furthermore, $f$ is in the orbit labelled $A_{1}$ (both as an $A_{2}$-orbit and $G_{2}$-orbit). We claim that $\mathfrak{s}$ is non- $G$-cr. By Proposition 2.5 , the element $f$ is contained in an $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple generating a $G$-cr subalgebra and by the claim, the $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-triple $(f,-h, e)$ generates a non- $G$-cr subalgebra. Hence $\mathfrak{X}$ does not satisfy either condition.

For the claim, note that $\mathfrak{s}$ is certainly $G$-reducible since it is non- $M$-cr. All $G$-cr $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebras which are $G$-reducible are contained in a Levi subalgebra. In this low-rank case, it immediately follows that all such $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebras are $G$-conjugate to either $\mathfrak{l}_{1}=\left\langle e_{ \pm \alpha_{1}}\right\rangle$ or $\mathfrak{l}_{2}=\left\langle e_{ \pm \alpha_{2}}\right\rangle$. Therefore a $G$-cr $\mathfrak{s l}_{2}$-subalgebra only contains nilpotent elements in the $A_{1}$ or $\tilde{A}_{1}$ classes. The claim follows since $\mathfrak{s}$ contains $e$ which is in the subregular class.
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