On higher regulators of Picard modular surfaces

Linli Shi

University of Connecticut

University of Arizona
Algebra and Number Theory Seminar
October 15, 2024

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Euler's calculations

In the 1700s, Euler made the following famous computations:

- $$1+\frac{1}{2^2}+\frac{1}{3^2}+\frac{1}{4^2}+\cdots=\frac{\pi^2}{6},$$
- $$1+\frac{1}{2^4}+\frac{1}{3^4}+\frac{1}{4^4}+\cdots=\frac{\pi^4}{90}.$$

Notice similar exponents.

Euler's calculations

Definition

Bernoulli numbers $B_k \in \mathbb{Q}$ are given by the expansion

$$\frac{t}{e^t - 1} = \sum_{k \geq 0} B_k \frac{t^k}{k!} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}t + \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{t^2}{2} - \frac{1}{30} \cdot \frac{t^4}{4!} + \cdots .$$

Euler showed the following formula:

$$1 + \frac{1}{2^{2m}} + \frac{1}{3^{2m}} + \frac{1}{4^{2m}} + \cdots = \frac{(2\pi)^{2m}|B_{2m}|}{2(2m)!}, \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Examples

- $(m = 1)$ $1 + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{4^2} + \cdots = \frac{(2\pi)^2}{2 \cdot 2} \cdot \frac{1}{6} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$
- $(m = 2)$ $1 + \frac{1}{2^4} + \frac{1}{3^4} + \frac{1}{4^4} + \cdots = \frac{(2\pi)^4}{2 \cdot 4!} \cdot \frac{1}{30} = \frac{\pi^4}{90}$

Riemann ζ-function

In 1859, Riemann introduced the ζ-function of a complex variable: if $s \in \mathbb{C}$,

- $\zeta(s) := \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n^s}$ for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > 1$.
- (Euler product):
  $\zeta(s) = \prod_p \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p^s}}$ for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > 1$.
- It has meromorphic continuation to $\mathbb{C}$.
- It has a (simple) pole only at $s = 1$.
- (Functional eqn): $\Lambda(s) = \Lambda(1-s)$
  for $\Lambda(s) := \pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})\zeta(s)$.
  Call $\pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})$ a Γ-factor.



Dedekind ζ-function

Dedekind (1879) generalized $\zeta(s)$ to an arbitrary number field F.

- $\zeta_F(s) := \sum_{\mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_F/\mathcal{I}|^s}$, for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > 1$, where $\mathcal{I}$ runs over the non-zero ideals of O_F, so $\zeta_{\mathbb{Q}}(s) = \zeta(s)$.
- (Euler product): $\zeta_F(s) = \prod_{\wp} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_F/\wp|^s}}$ for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > 1$, where $\wp$ runs over the non-zero prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}_F$.
- $\zeta_F(s)$ has meromorphic continuation to $\mathbb{C}$.
- $\zeta_F(s)$ has a (simple) pole only at $s = 1$.
- (Functional eqn): $\Lambda_F(s) = \Lambda_F(1-s)$ for $\Lambda_F(s) :=$ $|d_F|^{\frac{s}{2}}(\pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{s}{2}))^{r_1}((2\pi)^{-s}\Gamma(s))^{r_2}\zeta_F(s)$.

Class number formula

The residue of $\zeta_F(s)$ at $s = 1$ is related to global arithmetic invariants of F by the class number formula:

$$\mathrm{Res}_{s=1}\zeta_F(s) = \frac{2^{r_1}(2\pi)^{r_2}}{|d_F|^{\frac{1}{2}}\omega(F)}h(F)R(F) =_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}^\times} (2\pi)^{r_2}R(F).$$

- d_F: discriminant of F
- $\omega(F)$: the number of roots of unity in F
- $h(F)$: class number of F
- $R(F)$: covolume of Dirichlet regulator map

$$r_{Dir} : O_F^\times \to \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2},$$

$\dim \mathrm{Im}(r_{Dir}) = r_1 + r_2 - 1.$
e.g. $F = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})$, $O_F^\times/\{\pm 1\} = (1+\sqrt{2})^{\mathbb{Z}}$,
$r_{Dir}(1+\sqrt{2}) = (\log(1+\sqrt{2})), -\log(1+\sqrt{2}))$,
$R(F) = \log(1+\sqrt{2})$

BSD conjecture

- For an elliptic curve E over $\mathbb{Q}$, we can define its L-function $L(E,s)$ and regulator $R(E)$ similarly.
- Birch and Swinnerton–Dyer conjecture predicts that

$$\frac{L^{(r)}(E,1)}{r!} =_{\mathbb{Q}^\times} \Omega(E)R(E),$$

  where
  - $r = \mathrm{ord}_{s=1} L(E,s)$, so $\frac{L^{(r)}(E,s)}{r!}$ is lead. coeff. of $L(E,s)$ at $s=1$.
  - $\Omega(E)$: the period of E

e.g. $E : y^2 = x^3 - 2$, $r = 1$, $E(\mathbb{Q})/E(\mathbb{Q})_{tor} = \langle P \rangle = \langle (3,5) \rangle$

$$\Omega(E) \approx 2.16368,\ R(E) = \widehat{h}(P) \approx 1.34957$$

$$\Omega(E)R(E) \approx 2.92003,\ L'(E,1) \approx 2.92005,$$

$$L'(E,1) = \Omega(E)R(E)$$

Beilinson's conjectures

In the 1980s, Beilinson made a deep conjecture about special values of motivic L-functions generalizing the classical analytic class number formula.

Let X be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{Q}$, $i \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $2n > i$. Replace ingredients of class number formula:

- $O_F^\times \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ (Motivic cohomology)
  - If $2n = i + 1$, then $\mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \cong \mathrm{CH}^n(X)_\mathbb{Q}$.
  - If $n = 1, i = 0$, then $\mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n)) = \mathrm{H}_M^1(X, \mathbb{Q}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Q}(X)^\times$.

Beilinson's conjectures

In the 1980s, Beilinson made a deep conjecture about special values of motivic L-functions generalizing the classical analytic class number formula.

Let X be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{Q}$, $i \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $2n > i$. Replace ingredients of class number formula:

- $O_F^\times \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ (Motivic cohomology)
  - If $2n = i + 1$, then $\mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \cong \mathrm{CH}^n(X)_\mathbb{Q}$.
  - If $n = 1, i = 0$, then $\mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n)) = \mathrm{H}_M^1(X, \mathbb{Q}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Q}(X)^\times$.
- $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2} \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{H}_H^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{R}(n))$ (Absolute Hodge cohomology)

Beilinson's conjectures

In the 1980s, Beilinson made a deep conjecture about special values of motivic L-functions generalizing the classical analytic class number formula.

Let X be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{Q}$, $i \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $2n > i$. Replace ingredients of class number formula:

- $O_F^\times \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ (Motivic cohomology)
  - If $2n = i + 1$, then $\mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \cong \mathrm{CH}^n(X)_{\mathbb{Q}}$.
  - If $n = 1, i = 0$, then $\mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n)) = \mathrm{H}_M^1(X, \mathbb{Q}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Q}(X)^\times$.
- $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2} \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{H}_H^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{R}(n))$ (Absolute Hodge cohomology)
- $r_{Dir} \rightsquigarrow r_H$

  $r_H : \mathrm{H}_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \to \mathrm{H}_H^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{R}(n))$ (Beilinson's higher regulator)

  - If $n = 1, i = 0$, then $r_H : f \in \mathbb{Q}(X)^\times \mapsto \log |f|$

Beilinson's conjectures

- $M = h^i(X)(n)$: a pure motive associated to X and n.
  $w = i - 2n$: its weight, so $2n > i$ implies $w < 0$.
- $\zeta_F(s) \rightsquigarrow L(M,s)$ (Motivic L-function),
  - For $\mathrm{Re}(s) > \frac{w}{2} + 1$, $L(M,s)$ is convergent Euler product.
  - A meromorphic cont. and functional equation of $L(M,s)$ relating s and $w+1-s$ is conjectured, mainly still open.
  - $w < 0 \Rightarrow w \leq -1$, so $0 \geq \frac{w+1}{2}$: center of $L(M,s)$.

Beilinson's conjectures

- $M = h^i(X)(n)$: a pure motive associated to X and n. $w = i - 2n$: its weight, so $2n > i$ implies $w < 0$.
- $\zeta_F(s) \rightsquigarrow L(M, s)$ (Motivic L-function),
  - For $\mathrm{Re}(s) > \frac{w}{2} + 1$, $L(M, s)$ is convergent Euler product.
  - A meromorphic cont. and functional equation of $L(M, s)$ relating s and $w + 1 - s$ is conjectured, mainly still open.
  - $w < 0 \Rightarrow w \leq -1$, so $0 \geq \frac{w+1}{2}$: center of $L(M, s)$.
- Critical points vs. Non-critical points
  Let $\Gamma_\infty(M, s)$ be associated Gamma factor of $L(M, s)$. Call $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ **critical** for $L(M, s)$ if it is not a pole of $\Gamma_\infty(M, s)$ or $\Gamma_\infty(M, w + 1 - s)$. Otherwise, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called **non-critical**.

Beilinson's conjectures

- $M = h^i(X)(n)$: a pure motive associated to X and n.
  $w = i - 2n$: its weight, so $2n > i$ implies $w < 0$.
- $\zeta_F(s) \rightsquigarrow L(M,s)$ (Motivic L-function),
  - For $\mathrm{Re}(s) > \frac{w}{2} + 1$, $L(M,s)$ is convergent Euler product.
  - A meromorphic cont. and functional equation of $L(M,s)$ relating s and $w+1-s$ is conjectured, mainly still open.
  - $w < 0 \Rightarrow w \leq -1$, so $0 \geq \frac{w+1}{2}$: center of $L(M,s)$.
- Critical points vs. Non-critical points
  Let $\Gamma_\infty(M,s)$ be associated Gamma factor of $L(M,s)$. Call $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ **critical** for $L(M,s)$ if it is not a pole of $\Gamma_\infty(M,s)$ or $\Gamma_\infty(M, w+1-s)$. Otherwise, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called **non-critical**.
  - For $\zeta(s)$, $w = 0$, $\Gamma_\infty(\mathbb{Q}, s) = \pi^{-s/2}\Gamma(s/2)$, critical points are positive even integers and negative odd integers. Non-critical points are positive odd integers and non-positive even integers.

Beilinson's conjectures

- $M = h^i(X)(n)$: a pure motive associated to X and n.
  $w = i - 2n$: its weight, so $2n > i$ implies $w < 0$.
- $\zeta_F(s) \rightsquigarrow L(M,s)$ (Motivic L-function),
  - For $\mathrm{Re}(s) > \frac{w}{2} + 1$, $L(M,s)$ is convergent Euler product.
  - A meromorphic cont. and functional equation of $L(M,s)$ relating s and $w+1-s$ is conjectured, mainly still open.
  - $w < 0 \Rightarrow w \leq -1$, so $0 \geq \frac{w+1}{2}$: center of $L(M,s)$.
- Critical points vs. Non-critical points
  Let $\Gamma_\infty(M,s)$ be associated Gamma factor of $L(M,s)$. Call $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ **critical** for $L(M,s)$ if it is not a pole of $\Gamma_\infty(M,s)$ or $\Gamma_\infty(M,w+1-s)$. Otherwise, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called **non-critical**.
  - For $\zeta(s)$, $w = 0$, $\Gamma_\infty(\mathbb{Q},s) = \pi^{-s/2}\Gamma(s/2)$, critical points are positive even integers and negative odd integers. Non-critical points are positive odd integers and non-positive even integers.
  - For $L(E,s)$, $w = 1$, $\Gamma_\infty(E,s) = 2(2\pi)^{-s}\Gamma(s)$, critical point is $s = 1$. Non-critical points are integers not equal to 1.

Beilinson's conjectures

- If $s = 0$ is *critical* for M, Deligne conjectured that

$$\boxed{L(M,0) \in c^+(M)\mathbb{Q}^\times},$$

where $c^+(M)$ is Deligne period.
e.g. If $M = \mathbb{Q}(2m)$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, then $L(M,s) = \zeta(s+2m)$ and $c^+(M) = (2\pi i)^{2m}$: Euler's $\zeta(2m)$-formula.

- If $s = 0$ is *non-critical* for M and $2n \geq i+3$, then $w = i - 2n \leq -3$ and $\frac{w}{2} + 1 \leq -\frac{1}{2} < 0$, so $L(M,0)$ makes sense as an Euler product. Beilinson conjectured that

$$\wedge^{\mathrm{top}} r_H(H_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n))) =_{\mathbb{Q}^\times} L(M,0)\mathcal{D}(M),$$

where $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is the Deligne rational structure.
e.g. If $M = \mathbb{Q}(3)$, $L(M,s) = \zeta(s+3)$, so $L(M,0) = \zeta(3)$, $r_H = r_B$, where $r_B : K_5(\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel regulator.

Table of Contents

The setup

Notations

- Let E be an imaginary quadratic field of discriminant $-D$, and let $x \mapsto \bar{x}$ be the nontrivial Galois automorphism of E over $\mathbb{Q}$.
- Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the ring of integers of E.
- Fix an identification of $E \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{C}$ s.t. the imaginary part of $\delta := \sqrt{-D}$ is positive.

The group $G = GU(2,1)$

Definition

Let $J \in \mathrm{GL}_3(E)$ be the Hermitian matrix

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\delta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \delta = \sqrt{-D},$$

and let $G = \mathrm{GU}(2,1)$ be the group scheme over $\mathbb{Z}$ such that for $\mathbb{Z}$-algebras R, we have for units $\mu \in R^\times$,

$$G(R) = \{(g, \mu) \in \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathcal{O} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R) \times R^\times \,|\, {}^t\bar{g}Jg = \mu J\}.$$

Let H be the group scheme over $\mathbb{Z}$ such that for $\mathbb{Z}$-algebras R,

$$H(R) = \{(g, z) \in \mathrm{GL}_2(R) \times (\mathcal{O} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R)^\times \,|\, \det(g) = z\bar{z}\}.$$

Modular curves

Definition

Let $\mathcal{H} = \{\tau = x + iy | x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$ be the upper half plane. Let $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, acting on $\mathcal{H}$ by

$$\tau \mapsto \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}.$$

The modular curve $Y(1)$ is defined as

$$Y(1) := \Gamma \backslash \mathcal{H}.$$

It is an affine algebraic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Picard modular surfaces

- Picard modular surfaces are certain 2-dimensional Shimura varieties over E that generalize modular curves over $\mathbb{Q}$.
- $\mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow$ complex 2-ball X in $\mathbb{C}^2$ ($|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 < 1$)
- $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \rightsquigarrow \Gamma = \mathrm{GU}(2,1)(\mathbb{Z})$ (Picard modular group)
- Picard modular surface of level Γ is defined as $\mathrm{Sh}_G(\Gamma) := \Gamma \backslash X$
- Picard modular surfaces are algebraic surfaces over E. (Note E used to define J which appears in the definition of G.)

Charles Émile Picard

Goro Shimura

Galois representations

- For an elliptic curve $E/\mathbb{Q}$ which is defined by the equation $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$, for a fixed prime p, its Tate module $T_p(E)$ is defined as

$$T_p(E) = \varprojlim_n E[p^n]$$

  where $E[p^n]$ is the p^n-torsion points of E.
- There is a natural action ρ_E of $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$ on $T_p(E)$ called the p-adic Galois representation associated to E.
- For a cusp form f with weight 2 and level $\Gamma_0(N)$, can define its Galois representation ρ_f.
- [C. Breuil-B. Conrad-F. Diamond-R. Taylor 1999] To each $E/\mathbb{Q}$, $\rho_E \cong \rho_f$ for some f of weight 2.
- Galois representations are étale realizations of motives.

Automorphic motives

- For a cusp form f, can construct its Grothendieck motive $M(f)$ by work of Scholl.
- $GL_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{GU}(2,1)$
- $$f \rightsquigarrow \pi = \pi_f \otimes \pi_\infty,$$
  where π is some "cohomological" irreducible cuspidal automorphic representation of $GU(2,1)$.
- π can be thought as some kind of Picard modular form.
- $$M(f) \rightsquigarrow M(\pi_f, V),$$
  where the $M(\pi_f, V)$ is a Grothendieck motive associated to π.

Table of Contents

Outline

Beilinson's conjectures

When $2n \geq i+3$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} H_H^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{R}(n)) = 1$,

$$\boxed{r_H(H_M^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n))) =_{\mathbb{Q}^\times} L(M,0)\mathcal{D}(M)}.$$

Let $S := \mathrm{Sh}_G$, $G = \mathrm{GU}(2,1)$ and $M = \mathrm{Sh}_H$.

- **Step one**: Construct motivic classes c in $\mathrm{H}^3_M(S, V(2))$, where S is the Picard modular surface and V is some non-trivial nice "motivic local system" on it;
- **Step two**: Prove that the classes c lie in a "nice" subspace of $\mathrm{H}^3_M(S, V(2))$;
- **Step three**: Compute image of c under higher regulator r_H and relate to $L(M(\pi_f, V(2)), 0)$.

The L-value result I

Theorem (S. 2024)

For suitable non-trivial algebraic representations V of G, if we choose some "cohomological" irreducible cuspidal automorphic representation π of G that appears in $\mathrm{H}^2_{B,!}(S, V(2))$, we get:

$$\mathcal{K}(\pi_f, V(2)) = C \cdot L(M(\pi_f, V(2)), 0)\mathcal{D}(\pi_f, V(2))$$

where $C \in (E(\pi_f) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{C})^\times$,

- *$M(\pi_f, V(2))$ is a motive associated to π.*
- *$\mathcal{K}(\pi_f, V(2))$: 1-dim $E(\pi_f)$-subspace of a certain rank one $E(\pi_f) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$-module generated by $r_H(c)$, c is the constructed motivic class in $\mathrm{H}^3_M(S, V(2))$.*
- *$\mathcal{D}(\pi_f, V(2))$: another 1-dim $E(\pi_f)$-subspace of the same $E(\pi_f) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$-module, called the Deligne $E(\pi_f)$-structure.*

The L-value result II

Remark

- This result gives evidence towards Beilinson's conjectures.
- Constant C should be in $E(\pi_f)^\times$ but we have not proven it.
- $\mathcal{K}(\pi_f, V(2)) = C \cdot L(M(\pi_f, V(2)), 0)\mathcal{D}(\pi_f, V(2))$, $C \neq 0$, $L(M(\pi_f, V(2)), 0) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{D}(\pi_f, V(2)) \neq \{0\}$, so we proved the motivic class c that generates the left side is non-trivial, which answers a question raised in [D. Loeffler-C. Skinner-S. Zerbes 2022]. In their paper, they *assume* the class c is non-trivial and use it to construct an Euler system for GU$(2,1)$ based on the nontriviality.

The L-value result II

Remark

- This result gives evidence towards Beilinson's conjectures.
- Constant C should be in $E(\pi_f)^\times$ but we have not proven it.
- $\mathcal{K}(\pi_f, V(2)) = C \cdot L(M(\pi_f, V(2)), 0)\mathcal{D}(\pi_f, V(2))$, $C \neq 0$, $L(M(\pi_f, V(2)), 0) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{D}(\pi_f, V(2)) \neq \{0\}$, so we proved the motivic class c that generates the left side is non-trivial, which answers a question raised in [D. Loeffler-C. Skinner-S. Zerbes 2022]. In their paper, they *assume* the class c is non-trivial and use it to construct an Euler system for $\mathrm{GU}(2,1)$ based on the nontriviality.
- If V is trivial, similar results were obtained in [A. Pollack-S. Shah 2018].
- Similar relations with non-trivial coefficients were obtained in [G. Kings 1998] and [F. Lemma 2017].

The construction of motivic classes

- **Starting point**: [Beilinson 83] The **Eisenstein symbol**:

$$B_n \xrightarrow{Eis^n_M} \mathrm{H}^1_M(\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{GL}_2}, \mathrm{Sym}^n V_2(1)),$$

where $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{GL}_2}$ is a modular curve. It can be seen as incarnation of real analytic Eisenstein series in the motivic world.

- Define the following two maps:

$$\iota : H \hookrightarrow G, \quad (\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, z) \mapsto (\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & b \\ 0 & z & 0 \\ c & 0 & d \end{pmatrix}, z\bar{z})$$

and

$$p : H \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2, \quad (\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, z) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

- The maps $\iota : H \hookrightarrow G$ and $p : H \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2$ of algebraic groups will induce the following morphisms of Shimura varieties:

$$p : M = \mathrm{Sh}_H \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{GL}_2}, \ \iota : M = \mathrm{Sh}_H \to S = \mathrm{Sh}_G.$$

The construction of motivic classes

The construction II

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{B}_n \arrow[r, "Eis^n_M"] & \mathrm{H}^1_M(\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{GL}_2}, \mathrm{Sym}^n V_2(1)) \arrow[r, "p^*"] & \mathrm{H}^1_M(M, W(1)) \arrow[r, "\iota_*"] & \mathrm{H}^3_M(S, V(2)) \\
\phi_f \arrow[r, mapsto] & \mathrm{Eis}^n_M(\phi_f) \arrow[r, mapsto] & p^* \mathrm{Eis}^n_M(\phi_f) \arrow[r, mapsto] & c = \iota_* p^* \mathrm{Eis}^n_M(\phi_f)
\end{tikzcd}$$

The construction of motivic classes

The construction II

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathcal{B}_n & \xrightarrow{Eis^n_M} & \mathrm{H}^1_M(\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{GL}_2}, \mathrm{Sym}^n V_2(1)) & \xrightarrow{p^*} & \mathrm{H}^1_M(M, W(1)) & \xrightarrow{\iota_*} & \mathrm{H}^3_M(S, V(2)) \\
\phi_f & \longmapsto & \mathrm{Eis}^n_M(\phi_f) & \longmapsto & p^*\mathrm{Eis}^n_M(\phi_f) & \longmapsto & c = \iota_* p^* \mathrm{Eis}^n_M(\phi_f)
\end{array}$$

Remark

- The construction is due to [D. Loeffler-C. Skinner-S. Zerbes 2022].
- When $V = \mathbb{Q}$, [A. Pollack-S. Shah 2018] gave an essentially similar construction of motivic classes.

The Hodge result

Notations

- $\mathcal{E}is^n_M := \iota_* p^*$
- $\mathcal{E}is^n_H := r_H(\mathcal{E}is^n_M)$
- $\mathrm{H}^2_{B,!}(S, V(2)) := \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{H}^2_{B,c}(S, V(2)) \to \mathrm{H}^2_B(S, V(2)))$

Theorem (S. 2024)

For suitable non-trivial *algebraic representations V of G, the map $\mathcal{E}is^n_H : \mathcal{B}_{n,\mathbb{R}} \to \mathrm{H}^3_H(S, V(2))$ factors through the inclusion*

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathrm{MHS}^+_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathbf{1}, \mathrm{H}^2_{B,!}(S, V(2))) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}^3_H(S, V(2)),$$

where $\mathrm{MHS}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the abelian category of mixed $\mathbb{R}$-Hodge structures and $\mathbf{1}$ denotes trivial Hodge structure, i.e., the unit of $\mathrm{MHS}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Remarks on Theorem

Theorem (S. 2024)

For suitable non-trivial algebraic representations V of G, the map $\mathcal{E}is_H^n : \mathcal{B}_{n,\mathbb{R}} \to \mathrm{H}^3_H(S, V(2))$ factors through the inclusion

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathrm{MHS}^+_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathbf{1}, \mathrm{H}^2_{B,!}(S, V(2))) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}^3_H(S, V(2)),$$

where $\mathrm{MHS}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the abelian category of mixed $\mathbb{R}$-Hodge structures and $\mathbf{1}$ denotes trivial Hodge structure, i.e., the unit of $\mathrm{MHS}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Remark

- The proof uses a lot of Hodge theoretical computations.
- The Hodge theoretical vanishing on the boundary result for Eisenstein classes is also obtained in [G. Kings 1998] for Hilbert modular surfaces and in [F. Lemma 2015] for Siegel 3-folds. Our method is similar to theirs.

The motivic result

Theorem (S. 2024)

For suitable non-trivial alg. representations V of G, the motivic map $\mathcal{E}is^n_M : \mathcal{B}_n \to \mathrm{H}^3_M(S, V(2))$ factors through the inclusion

$$\mathrm{H}_M^{3+a-b+3(r-s)}(\mathrm{Gr}_0\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{gm}}(S, V), \mathbb{Q}(2+a+2r-s)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}^3_M(S, V(2)).$$

Remark

- $\mathrm{H}_M^{3+a-b+3(r-s)}(\mathrm{Gr}_0\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{gm}}(S, V), \mathbb{Q}(2+a+2r-s))$ is the motivic incarnation for $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathrm{MHS}^+_{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathbf{1}, \mathrm{H}^2_{B,!}(S, V(2)))$, where a, b, r, s are the integer parameters defining V.
- G. Kings asked in 1998 whether we can prove the vanishing on the boundary for Eisenstein classes in the motivic world.
- My result is the first about vanishing on the boundary for Eisenstein classes in the motivic world beyond the dim 1 case.

Thank you!