Title

D. Zack Garza

Contents

1 | Monday, November 09

1.1 Strong Linkage

We have two categories:

- $G_r T$, with a notion of *strong linkage*, and
- G_r, which instead only has *linkage*.

We'll restate a few theorems.

> **Theorem 1.1.1***(?).*
> Let $\lambda, \mu \in X(T)$.
>
> 1. If $[\widehat{Z}_r(\lambda) : \widehat{L}_r(\mu)]_{G_r T} \neq 0$, then $\mu \uparrow \lambda$ are strongly linked.
>
> 2. If $[Z_r(\lambda) : L_r(\mu)]_{G_r} \neq 0$, then $\mu \in W_p \cdot \lambda + p^r X(T)$.

Example 1.1.1 (?): In the case of $\Phi = A_2$, we'll consider the two different categories.

We have the following picture for $\widehat{Z}$:

Figure 1: Image

Considering $X_1(T)$ and $[\widehat{Z}_1(\lambda) : \widehat{L}_1(\mu)] \neq 0$, and $\widehat{Z}_1(\lambda)$ has 6 composition factors as G_1T-modules.

On the other hand, for Z, we have the following:

Figure 2: Image

This again has 6 composition factors, obtained by ??

What's the main difference?

1.2 Extensions

Let $\lambda, \mu \in X(T)$. We can use the Chevalley anti-automorphism (essentially the transpose) to obtain a form of duality for extensions:

$$\mathrm{Ext}^j_{G_r T}\left(\widehat{L}_r(\lambda), \widehat{L}_r(\mu)\right) = \mathrm{Ext}^j_{G_r}\left(\widehat{L}_r(\mu), \widehat{L}_r(\lambda)\right) \qquad \text{for } j \geq 0.$$

We have a form of a weight space decomposition

$$\mathrm{Ext}^j_{G_r}\left(L_r(\lambda), L_r(\mu)\right) = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in X(T)} \mathrm{Ext}^j_{G_r}\left(L_r(\lambda), L_r(\mu)\right)_\gamma$$

where we are taking the fixed points under the torus T action on the first factor (for which T_r acts

trivially). We can write this as

$$\cdots = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in X(T)} \operatorname{Ext}^j_{G_r} \left(L_r(\lambda), L_r(\mu) \otimes \gamma \right)$$

$$= \bigoplus_{\gamma \in X(T)} \operatorname{Ext}^j_{G_r T} \left(L_r(\lambda), L_r(\mu) \otimes p^r v \right)$$

$$= \bigoplus_{v \in X(T)} \operatorname{Ext}^j_{G_r T} \left(\widehat{L}_r(\lambda), \widehat{L}_r(\mu + p^r v) \right).$$

So if we know extensions in the G_r category, we know them in the $G_r T$ category.

There is an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{G_r T} \left(\widehat{L}_r(\lambda), \widehat{L}_r(\mu) \right) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{G_R T} \left(\operatorname{rad}_{G_r T} \widehat{Z}_r(\lambda), \widehat{L}_r(\mu) \right).$$

Finally, for $\lambda, \mu \in X(T)$, if the above Ext^1 vanishes, then $\lambda \in W_p \cdot \mu$ (i.e. λ and μ are linked).

## 1.3 The Steinberg Modules

Example 1.3.1 (Steinberg): Consider A_2:

Figure 3: Image

Taking the representation corresponding to $(p-1, p-1)$ yields the "first Steinberg module"

$$L(p-1, p-1) = L((p-1)\rho) := \mathrm{St}_1.$$

In this case, we have an equality of many modules:

$$H^0((p-1)\rho) = L((p-1)\rho) = V((p-1)\rho) = T((p-1)\rho).$$

> **Definition 1.3.1** (Steinberg Modules)**.**
> The rth **Steinberg module** is defined to be $L((p^r - 1)\rho)$.

Remark 1.3.1 : In general, we have

$$L((p^r - 1)\rho) = H^0((p^r - 1)\rho) = V((p^r - 1)\rho).$$

We also have

$$\widehat{Z}_r((p^r - 1)\rho) \cong L((p^r - 1)\rho) \downarrow_{G_rT} .$$

> **Theorem 1.3.1***(?)*.
> The Steinberg module is both injective and projective as both a G_r-module and a G_rT-module.

Proof (?).
It suffices to prove that St_r is projective over G_rT, then by a previous theorem, it will also be projective over G_r. Let $\widehat{L}_r(\mu)$ be a simple G_rT-module, and consider

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_{G_rT}(\mathrm{St}_r, \widehat{L}_r(\mu)) = \mathrm{Ext}^1_{G_rT}(\widehat{L}_r((p^r - 1)\rho), \widehat{L}_r(\mu)).$$

If we show this is zero for every simple module, the result will follow.
Suppose $(p^r - 1)\rho \not< \mu$. In this case, the RHS above is zero.

> Missed why: something to do with radical of the first term?

Otherwise, we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_{G_rT}(\widehat{L}_r(\mu), \mathrm{St}_r) = \mathrm{Hom}_{G_rT}(\mathrm{rad}(\widehat{Z}_r(\mu)), \mathrm{St}_r).$$

Suppose that the RHS is nonzero. Then $\mathrm{rad}\left(\widehat{Z}_r(\mu)\right) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{St}_r$, and thus

$$\dim \mathrm{rad}\left(\widehat{Z}_r(\mu)\right) \geq \dim \mathrm{St}_r = p^{r|\Phi^+|}$$

But we know that

$$\dim \mathrm{rad}\left(\widehat{Z}_r(\mu)\right) < \dim \widehat{Z}_r(\mu) = p^{r|\Phi^+|},$$

so we've reached a contradiction and the hom must be zero. ∎

> **Proposition 1.3.1***(Open Conjecture, Donkin, MSRI 1990: 'DFilt Conjecture')*.
> Let G be a reductive group and M a finite-dimensional G-module. Then M has a good (p, r)-filtration iff $\mathrm{St}_r \otimes M$ has a good filtration.

Remark 1.3.2 : See NK (Nakano-Kildetoft, 2015) and BNPS (Bendel-Nakano-Pillen-Subaje, 2018-).

Remark 1.3.3 (Important! What we've been working toward stating): The forward direction is equivalent to the statement that $\mathrm{St}_r \otimes L(\lambda)$ has a good filtration for $\lambda \in X_r(T)$.

> **Proposition 1.3.2***(Conjecture)*.
> The Dfilt conjecture in the forward direction holds for all p.

Remark 1.3.4 : This is known for $p \geq 2h - 4$? BNPS has shown that this holds for all rank 2 groups, which is strong evidence. The reverse implication is **not** true: BNPS-Crelle 2020 shows that for

$\Phi = G_2, p = 2$, there exists an $H^0(\lambda)$ that does not have a good (p, r)-filtration. There is a similar conjecture for tilting modules ("DTilt").

Main difference to category $\mathcal{O}$: infinitely many highest weight representations?

Upcoming:

- Viewing the $G_r T$ category as "almost" a highest weight category
- Defining standard and costandard modules $\Delta(\lambda)$ and $\nabla(\lambda)$.
- Injective $G_r T$-modules
- Results of Verma and Humphreys on the Lifting Conjecture: does every $G_r T$-module come from a G-module?
- Donkin's Tilting Module Conjecture (DTilt)

> **Proposition 1.3.3** *(Statement of DTilt Conjecture, Kildetoft-Nakano-Subaje MSRI 1990).*
> DFilt implies DTilt, and DTilt implies the forward direction of DFilt.