Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 20
2026
No. 7

Depth zero representations over $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$

Jean-François Dat and Thomas Lanard

msp

ALGEBRA AND NUMBER THEORY 20:7 (2026)
https://doi.org/10.2140/ant.2026.20.1451

Depth zero representations over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$

Jean-François Dat and Thomas Lanard

We consider the category of depth 0 representations of a p-adic quasisplit reductive group with coefficients in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$. We prove that the blocks of this category are in natural bijection with the connected components of the space of tamely ramified Langlands parameters for G over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$. As a particular case, this depth 0 category is thus indecomposable when the group is tamely ramified. Along the way we prove a similar result for finite reductive groups. As an application, we deduce that the semisimple local Langlands correspondence $\pi \mapsto \varphi_\pi$ constructed by Fargues and Scholze takes depth 0 representations to tamely ramified parameters, using a motivic version of their construction recently announced by Scholze. We also bound the restriction of φ_π to tame inertia in terms of the Deligne–Lusztig parameter of π and show, in particular, that φ_π is unramified if π is unipotent.

1. Main results

We prove two results on the representation theory of finite reductive groups and that of p-adic reductive groups. We first state these results and then explain our motivations and some connections to the existing literature.

Theorem 1.0.1 (= Theorem 2.0.1). *Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be a reductive group over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ and F the Frobenius map associated to a $\mathbb{F}_{p^r}$-rational structure for some $r \geqslant 1$. Then the category $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$ is indecomposable. Equivalently, the central idempotent 1 in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}$ is primitive.*

This result initially appeared as one step in our study of the p-adic case below. We have singled it out because the statement is simple and quite natural. It might be an interesting problem to try and devise criteria for a similar statement to hold true for an abstract finite group G and a prime divisor p of $|G|$.

Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be a reductive group over a local nonarchimedean field F with residue field $k_F := \mathbb{F}_{p^r}$. We put $G := \boldsymbol{G}(F)$. For any commutative ring R in which p is invertible, we denote by $\mathrm{Rep}_R(G)$ the category of smooth RG-modules. The Bernstein center $\mathfrak{Z}_R(G)$ is by definition the center of this category. We refer to Section 3.1 for the definition of smooth RG-modules *of depth* 0. They form a direct factor subcategory $\mathrm{Rep}^0_R(G)$, which corresponds to some idempotent $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathfrak{Z}_R(G)$. The following statement is a sample of what we prove about $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$.

Dat acknowledges the support of the ANR through the grant "Coloss" ANR-19-CE40-0015.
MSC2020: primary 22E50; secondary 11S37.
Keywords: representations of p-adic groups, blocks, local Langlands correspondence, depth 0 representations.

© 2026 The Authors, under license to MSP (Mathematical Sciences Publishers). Distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC BY). Open Access made possible by subscribing institutions via Subscribe to Open.

Theorem 1.0.2 (= Theorem 3.6.1). *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is quasisplit and tamely ramified over F. Then the abelian category* $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ *is indecomposable. Equivalently,* ε_0 *is a primitive idempotent of* $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$.

This result was mainly inspired by its "dual" counterpart in [DHKM20], where the moduli space $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})$ of Langlands parameters for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ was constructed over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{1}{p}]$ and studied. Concretely, $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})$ classifies 1-cocycles $W_F^0 \to \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$, where:

- $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ denotes the dual group of $\boldsymbol{G}$, considered as a split pinned reductive group scheme over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{1}{p}]$, and endowed with an action of the Galois group Γ_F of F that preserves the pinning.
- $W_F^0 \subset W_F \subset \Gamma_F$ is some modification of the Weil group of F.

In [DHKM20], this moduli space is decomposed according to the restriction of 1-cocycles to the wild inertia subgroup $P_F \subset W_F^0$. In particular, the "tame" summand $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ parametrizes 1-cocycles whose restriction to P_F is locally (for the étale topology) conjugate to the trivial cocycle. According to [DHKM20, Theorem 4.29], this summand is connected, provided that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is tamely ramified. Since tame parameters are supposed to correspond to depth 0 representations by any form of local Langlands correspondence, we like to see the last theorem as the group side analogue of this connectedness result on the parameter side. Interestingly, the proof of [DHKM20, Theorem 4.29] consists in, first, classifying the connected components of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell,\mathrm{tame}}$ for each $\ell \neq p$, and then, using different ℓ's to get the result. Similarly, one way to formulate the indecomposability of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ is as follows (we refer to Remark 3.3.4 for the notion of ℓ-block used here).

Corollary 1.0.3. *Under the same hypothesis on $\boldsymbol{G}$, given π, π' two irreducible $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}G$-modules of depth* 0, *there is a sequence of primes $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r$ and a sequence $\pi_0 = \pi, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_r = \pi'$ of irreducible $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}G$-modules such that π_{i-1} and π_i belong to the same ℓ_i-block for each $i = 1, \dots, r$.*

We note that Sécherre and Stevens have used in [SS19] a similar statement in the context of inner forms of $\mathrm{GL}(n)$ (but for arbitrary "endoclasses") in order to gain control on the Jacquet–Langlands correspondence for *complex* representations. This provides a striking example of how to use this kind of results for problems a priori unrelated to congruences. The application we give in Section 1.1 below is actually in the same vein.

Meanwhile, it is not always true, even for $\boldsymbol{G}$ a torus, that the tame summand of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})$ is connected. In Theorem 3.7.3, we work out the decomposition of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ into connected components for general $\boldsymbol{G}$, and we prove in particular that these connected components are simply transitively permuted by a certain abelian p-group of "central cocycles". On the other hand, in Theorem 3.6.2, we work out the decomposition of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ into a product of blocks for quasisplit G, and prove that these blocks are simply transitively permuted by a certain abelian p-group of characters of G. After identifying these two p-groups and matching the principal component with the principal block, we then conclude:

Theorem 1.0.4. *Assume $\boldsymbol{G}$ is quasisplit over F. Then there is a natural bijection between connected components of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ and blocks of* $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$.

Again, this implies that, under the same quasisplitness hypothesis, a $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ of depth 0 can be connected to a depth 0 character of p-power order through a sequence of "congruences" modulo different primes.

For a nonquasisplit group $\boldsymbol{G}$, there is in general an additional "relevance" condition on 1-cocycles for them to provide Langlands parameters of G. Although this relevance condition might mess up with connected components, we believe it does not actually happen, i.e., the above result should be true with no quasisplit assumption. As evidence for this expectation, we prove:

Theorem 1.0.5 (= Corollary 3.4.4). *Suppose that p does not divide $|\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}})|$ and the torus $\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}} := \boldsymbol{G}/[\boldsymbol{G},\boldsymbol{G}]$ is P_F-induced. Then $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ is indecomposable.*

This is in accordance with the fact that, if p does not divide $|\pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))|$ and $(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^\circ)^{P_F}$ is connected, then $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ is connected.

1.1. ***Some applications to the Fargues–Scholze semisimple correspondence.*** Among the major recent breakthroughs towards constructing the conjectural local Langlands correspondence for a p-adic group G, Fargues and Scholze [FS21] have recently used new geometric tools to attach to any irreducible representation π of G, a semisimple local Langlands parameter φ_π. Their construction is compatible with parabolic induction and local class field theory, so that, for example, the semisimple parameter attached to an "unramified principal series" is indeed unramified, as expected. However it is in general very difficult to say anything on this parameter, especially when π is cuspidal. For example, it is not a priori clear that φ_π is tamely ramified whenever π has depth 0. Fargues and Scholze's construction actually provides a map FS_ℓ

$$\mathcal{O}(Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell} \xleftarrow{\approx} \mathcal{E}\mathrm{xc}(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{FS}_\ell} \mathfrak{Z}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}(G)$$

for each prime $\ell \neq p$. Here, $\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xc}(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})$ denotes the so-called "excursion algebra" over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$, and the symbol $\approx$ denotes a universal homeomorphism to $\mathcal{O}(Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}$ (thus inducing a bijection on geometric points and on sets of connected components). The $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ conjugacy class of semisimple parameters φ_π associated to $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(G)$ is then given by the $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$-point of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}) /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ obtained by composing FS_ℓ with the infinitesimal character $\mathfrak{Z}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}(G) \to \mathrm{End}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(\pi) = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. In particular, this construction is compatible with congruences mod ℓ. Thanks to the description of the connected components of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}$ in [DHKM20, Theorem 4.8], this implies for example that if π, π' belong to the same block of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}(G)$, then the restrictions of φ_π and $\varphi_{\pi'}$ to the prime-to-ℓ inertia subgroup I_F^ℓ coincide.

In order to control φ_π for a depth 0 irreducible representation π, one would like to use congruences modulo different primes, as encapsulated in our main results above. This supposes to have some form of "independence of ℓ" for the Fargues–Scholze semisimple correspondence. Recently, Scholze [Sch26] has announced a solution to this problem that uses a version of his work with Fargues with motivic coefficients. For our purposes, the upshot is that the family of maps FS_ℓ for $\ell \neq p$ is induced by base

change from a map $\mathrm{FS}_{\mathrm{mot}}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{O}(Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}} \xleftarrow{\approx} \mathcal{E}\mathrm{xc}(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{FS}_{\mathrm{mot}}} \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G).$$

The following is a consequence of Theorem 1.0.4.

Corollary 1.1.1. *Take the existence of* $\mathrm{FS}_{\mathrm{mot}}$ *for granted and assume that* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ *is quasisplit. Then the Fargues–Scholze parameter* φ_π *of a depth* 0 *irreducible representation* π *is tamely ramified.*

Let us spell out the argument in the case where $\boldsymbol{G}$ is tamely ramified, so that, by Theorem 1.0.2, the depth 0 projector is actually a primitive idempotent in $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. Then the spectrum of $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ is mapped into a single connected component of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})/\!\!/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ under $\mathrm{FS}_{\mathrm{mot}}^*$. In other words, φ_π has to be a geometric point of the same connected component of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})/\!\!/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ as any other $\varphi_{\pi'}$ attached to a depth 0 irreducible representation π'. Take for π' an unramified principal series, for example the trivial representation. As recalled above, compatibility with parabolic induction and local class field theory implies that $\varphi_{\pi'}$ is unramified; hence it is a geometric point of the tame summand $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$, and it follows that the same is true for φ_π. The general case is similar but requires additional notation; see Section 3.8.

Actually, when $\boldsymbol{G}$ is tamely ramified, further considerations based on congruences provide some extra information about the Fargues–Scholze parameter φ_π of any depth 0 irreducible representation π over an algebraically closed field L over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$. Namely, after choosing a generator τ of the tame inertia group I_F/P_F, we get a τ-twisted conjugacy class $\varphi_\pi(\tau)$ in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}(L)$, which corresponds to an L-point of the finite scheme $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$. On the other hand, using type theory and Deligne–Lusztig series, we can directly associate to π an L-point s_π of the same finite scheme (see Section 3.10; note that this Deligne–Lusztig point also depends on τ, now seen as a choice of trivialization of roots of unity in $\overline{k}_F^\times$). It is then expected that $\varphi_\pi(\tau) = s_\pi$. Our considerations here provide the following modest contribution to this question:

Theorem 1.1.2. *Assume that* $\boldsymbol{G}$ *is quasisplit and tamely ramified, and that* $k_F \neq \mathbb{F}_2$. *Then, with the above notation, any prime divisor* ℓ *of the order of* $\varphi_\pi(\tau)$ *divides the order of* s_π. *In particular, if* π *is unipotent* (*i.e.*, $s_\pi = 1$), *then* φ_π *is unramified.*

Here is a sketch of the argument. Using parabolic induction and its compatibility with the map $\mathrm{FS}_{\mathrm{mot}}$, we may argue by induction on the rank of $\boldsymbol{G}$ and focus on the case where π is supercuspidal. A bit of representation theory then allows us to reduce to the case $L = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and π having an admissible $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$-model. Then we use induction on the number of primes dividing the order of s_π, and the crucial case is when this number is 1, i.e., when π is unipotent. In this case, suppose we can find two maximal ideals $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$ with respective residue characteristic $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$, such that the block that contains π [mod $\mathcal{L}_\mathrm{i}$] also contains a noncuspidal unipotent representation. Then, using our induction hypothesis and the description of connected components of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}$ in [DHKM20, Theorem 4.8], we see that both restrictions of φ_π to $I_F^{\ell_i}$, $i = 1, 2$ are trivial, and it follows that φ_π is unramified. Now, the problem of finding two such primes can be reduced to the analogous problem for unipotent cuspidal representations of a finite group of Lie type, where we check existence whenever the base field is not $\mathbb{F}_2$. The detailed argument is given in Section 3.11.

The two above results are consequences of a few formal properties of the Fargues–Scholze construction, and say nothing on the nontriviality of the map $\pi \mapsto \varphi_\pi$. In order to say anything on this matter, one obviously needs to really work (hard!) on the construction itself. Recently, tony Feng proved a remarkable property along these lines, that we extract from Theorem 10.4.1 of [Fen24] and the subsequent remarks therein. Assume that $\boldsymbol{G}(F)$ contains an element of prime order ℓ whose centralizer is an unramified maximal torus $\boldsymbol{T}$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$. Let L have characteristic ℓ and s be an L-point of $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ in the image of the map $\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q} \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$. Then there is $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}_L(G)$ such that $\varphi_\pi(\tau) = s = s_\pi$. If s is strongly regular, then any π with $s_\pi = s$ satisfies $\varphi_\pi(\tau) = s_\pi$. The techniques used by Feng are bound to positive characteristic coefficients, but the last theorem above allows to lift to characteristic 0 under favorable circumstances.

Corollary 1.1.3. *With Feng's hypothesis above on $\boldsymbol{G}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$, let s be a $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-point of $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ in the image of the map $\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q} \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ and of order prime to ℓ. Then there is $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ such that $\varphi_\pi(\tau) = s = s_\pi$. If s is strongly regular, then any π with $s_\pi = s$ satisfies $\varphi_\pi(\tau) = s_\pi$.*

2. Finite groups

Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be a reductive group over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ and F the Frobenius map associated to an $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure on $\boldsymbol{G}$, where $q = p^r$ for some $r \geqslant 1$. The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.0.1. *The category* $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$ *is indecomposable. Equivalently, the central idempotent* 1 *in* $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}$ *is primitive.*

2.1. ***General facts on blocks of finite groups.*** Let us start with an abstract finite group G. For any commutative ring Λ, denote by $\mathrm{Rep}_\Lambda G$ the abelian category of ΛG-modules. Recall that a block of ΛG is an indecomposable direct summand of the category $\mathrm{Rep}_\Lambda G$. These blocks correspond bijectively to indecomposable two-sided ideals of the ring ΛG which are direct factors and to primitive ideals in the center $Z(\Lambda G)$ of the ring ΛG, which is also the center of the category $\mathrm{Rep}_\Lambda G$. Note that the center $Z(\Lambda G)$ is the submodule of G-invariant elements in ΛG, so that any base change map $\Lambda' \otimes_\Lambda Z(\Lambda G) \to Z(\Lambda' G)$ is an isomorphism.

For a prime ℓ, the center $Z(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell G)$ is finite over the Henselian local ring $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell$; hence the reduction map $Z(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell G) \to \overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell} Z(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell G) = Z(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell G)$ induces a bijection on primitive idempotents, whence a bijection between blocks of $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell G$ and of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell G$. The decomposition of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell} G$ as a direct sum of blocks induces a partition of the set $\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(G)$ of isomorphism classes of simple $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell G$-modules. The action of the group of automorphisms of the field $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ on the group algebra $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell G$ preserves the integral algebra $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell G$; hence its action on the set $\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(G)$ preserves the above partition (permuting the parts). It follows that this partition can be transported unambiguously to a partition of the set $\mathrm{Irr}(G)$ of irreducible complex representations of G. Each factor set occurring in this partition will be called an ℓ-block of $\mathrm{Irr}(G)$.

Here is another point of view on ℓ-blocks of $\mathrm{Irr}(G)$. In $\mathbb{C}G$ we have the decomposition $1 = \sum_{\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)} e_\pi$ of 1, where $e_\pi = (\dim \pi / |G|) \sum_{g \in G} \mathrm{tr}(\pi(g)) g$ are the primitive central idempotents of $\mathbb{C}G$. As the formula

shows, each e_π belongs to $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/|G|]G$ so that this decomposition of 1 actually holds in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/|G|]G$. Denote by $|G|_{\ell'}$ the prime-to-ℓ factor of $|G|$, and declare that a subset $I \subset \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ is ℓ-integral if $\sum_{\pi\in I} e_\pi \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/|G|_{\ell'}]G$. Clearly, ℓ-integral subsets of $\mathrm{Irr}(G)$ are stable under taking unions, intersections and complementary subsets.

Lemma 2.1.1. *The ℓ-blocks of* $\mathrm{Irr}(G)$ *are the minimal nonempty ℓ-integral subsets.*

Proof. Since both the property of being an ℓ-block and of being ℓ-integral are invariant under field automorphisms, we may transport the statement to $\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(G)$, where it follows from the fact that for any block B of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}G$, the corresponding primitive central idempotent e_B in $Z(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell G)$ is given by $e_B = \sum_{\pi\in\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(G)\cap B} e_\pi$. □

Let us denote by $\sim_\ell$ the equivalence relation on $\mathrm{Irr}(G)$ whose equivalence classes are the ℓ-blocks. Now, fix a prime p, and denote by $\sim$ the equivalence relation generated by all $\sim_\ell$ for $\ell \neq p$. Explicitly, we thus have $\pi \sim \pi'$ if and only if there exist $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r$ a sequence of primes different from p and $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{r-1} \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ such that

$$\pi \sim_{\ell_1} \pi_1 \sim_{\ell_2} \pi_2 \sim_{\ell_3} \cdots \sim_{\ell_r} \pi'.$$

Proposition 2.1.2. *The $\sim$-equivalence classes are the minimal nonempty subsets $I \subset \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ such that $e_I := \sum_{\pi\in I} e_\pi \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]G$. The map $I \mapsto e_I$ is a bijection from* $\mathrm{Irr}(G)/\sim$ *onto the set of primitive idempotents of* $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]G$.

Proof. Follows from the previous lemma and the equality $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big] \cap \overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/|G|] = \bigcap_{\ell\neq p} \overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/|G|_{\ell'}]$. □

Specializing our discussion to the case $G = \boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}$, the last proposition shows that proving Theorem 2.0.1 is equivalent to proving that there is only one $\sim$-equivalence class in $\mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$. Before doing so, we need a recollection of Deligne–Lusztig theory.

2.2. ***Blocks of finite reductive groups.*** Fix a reductive group $(\boldsymbol{G}^*, \mathsf{F}^*)$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ that is dual to $(\boldsymbol{G}, \mathsf{F})$ in the sense of Lusztig. Using their "twisted" induction functors, Deligne and Lusztig define a partition $\mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}) = \bigsqcup_s \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s)$ of irreducible representations into "Deligne–Lusztig series" associated to semisimple elements s of $\boldsymbol{G}^{*\mathsf{F}^*}$ up to $\boldsymbol{G}^{*\mathsf{F}^*}$-conjugacy. Note that this partition depends on certain compatible choices of roots of unity, but these choices will be irrelevant to our matters.

For a prime $\ell \neq p$ and a semisimple element $s \in \boldsymbol{G}^{*\mathsf{F}^*}$ of order prime to ℓ, we put

$$\mathcal{E}_\ell(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s) := \bigcup_{t_{\ell'}=s} \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, t),$$

where $t_{\ell'}$ denotes the prime-to-ℓ part of t (i.e., we write $t = t_{\ell'}t_\ell$ in $\langle t\rangle$, with t_ℓ of order a power of ℓ and $t_{\ell'}$ of order prime to ℓ). The following fundamental results, due to Broué, Michel, and Hiss, are stated in [CE04, Theorem 9.12].

(1) $\mathcal{E}_\ell(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s)$ is a union of ℓ-blocks.

(2) For each ℓ-block B such that $\mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, B) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_\ell(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s)$, one has $\mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, B) \cap \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s) \neq 0$.

From these results we easily deduce the following fact.

Proposition 2.2.1. *Any representation π in $\mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$ is $\sim$-equivalent to a representation in $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$.*

Proof. Let s be a semisimple element in $\boldsymbol{G}^{*\mathsf{F}^*}$ such that $\pi \in \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s)$, and let ℓ be a prime that divides the order of s. Note that $\ell \neq p$. As above, denote by $s_{\ell'}$ the prime-to-ℓ part of s. Then (2) above tells us that the ℓ-block containing π intersects $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s_{\ell'})$. Therefore, the $\sim$-equivalence class of π intersects $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, s_{\ell'})$ too. But the order of $s_{\ell'}$ is the prime-to-ℓ factor of the order of s. So, arguing inductively on the number of prime divisors of the order of s, we conclude that the $\sim$-equivalence class of π intersects $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$. □

Let us now denote by $\sim^1$ the equivalence relation on $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ defined in the same way as $\sim$, with every intermediate representation π_i taken in $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$. By the last proposition, in order to prove Theorem 2.0.1, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ has a unique $\sim^1$-equivalence class.

Proposition 2.2.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}$ be the adjoint group of $\boldsymbol{G}$, denote by $\pi : \boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}} \to \boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}^{\mathsf{F}}$ the natural map and by π^* the associated pullback on representations. Then π^* induces a bijection on unipotent representations $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ that is compatible with $\sim^1$-equivalence on both sides.*

Proof. The fact that π^* induces a bijection on unipotent representations is clear from the very definition of these representations. For a prime ℓ different from p, [CE04, Theorem 17.1] tells us that $\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}$ and ${\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}}^{\mathsf{F}}$ have the same number of unipotent ℓ-blocks and that $\pi^* : \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{E}_\ell({\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1) \to \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{E}_\ell(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ preserves the orthogonal decomposition induced by ℓ-blocks. It follows that the bijection $\pi^* : \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ on unipotent representations is compatible with the respective ℓ-block partitions. Since the $\sim^1$-equivalence classes are the subsets which are stable under $\sim_\ell$-equivalence for $\ell \neq p$ and minimal for this property, π^* is also compatible with the partition into $\sim^1$-equivalence classes. □

This proposition allows us to reduce the general case to the case where $\boldsymbol{G}$ is of adjoint type. But a group of adjoint type is a direct product of restriction of scalars of simple groups [Con14, Proposition 6.4.4 and Remark 6.4.5]. So, in the sequel we may restrict attention to simple groups. It turns out that in some cases, there is a quick argument using 2-block theory.

Theorem 2.2.3. *Suppose q is odd and $\boldsymbol{G}$ has type $\boldsymbol{A}_n$, ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$, $\boldsymbol{B}_n$, $\boldsymbol{C}_n$, $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ or ${}^2\boldsymbol{D}_n$. Then $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is composed of only one $\sim^1$-equivalence class.*

Proof. Indeed, by [CE04, Theorem 21.14], $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is included in the principal 2-block. So all the unipotent representations are already $\sim_2$-equivalent. □

In order to deal with q even and the exceptional groups, we need to recall more results about blocks that contain a unipotent representation.

2.3. *d-series.* The unipotent ℓ-blocks can be obtained using d-Harish-Chandra theory, which provides a partition of $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ into *d-series*, and where $d \geqslant 1$ is an integer. When $d = 1$, the 1-series are the usual Harish-Chandra series constructed via parabolic induction. In general, they are defined through an analogous pattern, relying on Deligne–Lusztig induction and the following definitions.

- An F-stable Levi subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$ is called a *d-split Levi subgroup* if it is the centralizer of a Φ_d-torus, i.e., an F-stable torus $\boldsymbol{S}$ such that $|\boldsymbol{S}^{\mathsf{F}^n}| = \Phi_d(q^n)$ for a certain $a \geqslant 1$ and all $n > 0$ with $n \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Here, Φ_d denotes the d-cyclotomic polynomial.
- An irreducible representation $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$ is called *d-cuspidal* if for all proper d-split Levi subgroups $\boldsymbol{L}$ and all parabolic subgroups $\boldsymbol{P}$ with Levi $\boldsymbol{L}$, the Deligne–Lusztig twisted restriction ${}^*R^{\boldsymbol{G}}_{\boldsymbol{L}\subset\boldsymbol{P}}[\pi]$ vanishes.
- A *d-cuspidal pair* for $\boldsymbol{G}$ is a pair $(\boldsymbol{L}, \sigma)$ with $\boldsymbol{L}$ a d-split Levi subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$ and $\sigma \in \mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{L}^{\mathsf{F}})$ d-cuspidal.
- The *d-cuspidal support* of $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$ is the set of all d-cuspidal pairs $(\boldsymbol{L}, \sigma)$ such that π appears with nonzero multiplicity in the virtual character $R^{\boldsymbol{G}}_{\boldsymbol{L}\subset\boldsymbol{P}}[\sigma]$.

According to [BMM93, Theorem 3.2], the d-cuspidal support of any unipotent $\pi \in \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ consists of a single $\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}$-conjugacy class of d-cuspidal pairs $(\boldsymbol{L}, \sigma)$. We thus get a partition of $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ labeled by conjugacy classes of unipotent d-cuspidal pairs. The summands appearing in this partition are called *d-series*. The remarkable relevance of d-series to the study of ℓ-blocks is summarized in the following statement.

Theorem 2.3.1 [CE94, Theorem 4.4]. *Let ℓ be a prime not dividing q and let d be the order of q in $\mathbb{F}_\ell^\times$. We assume that ℓ is odd, good for $\boldsymbol{G}$, and $\ell \neq 3$ if ${}^3\boldsymbol{D}_4$ is involved in $(\boldsymbol{G}, \mathsf{F})$. Then, the map $B \mapsto B \cap \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ induces a bijection*

$$\{\ell\text{-blocks } B \subset \mathcal{E}_\ell(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)\} \xrightarrow{\sim} \{d\text{-series in } \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)\}.$$

This theorem suggests the following strategy to prove that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ has only one $\sim^1$-equivalence class. If $D \subset \mathbb{N}^*$ is a finite set of nonzero integers, define a *D-series* as a subset of $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ that is a union of d-series for each $d \in D$, and which is *minimal* for this property.

Lemma 2.3.2. *Suppose there exists D such that*

(1) *$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a D-series, and*

(2) *each $d \in D$ is the order of q modulo some ℓ as in Theorem 2.3.1.*

Then $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ consists of a unique $\sim^1$-equivalence class.

Proof. Use (2) to pick a prime ℓ_d satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.3.1 and such that q has order d modulo ℓ_d, for each $d \in D$. Then (1) tells us that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is the only nonempty subset of itself that is stable under $\sim_{\ell_d}$-equivalence for all $d \in D$. A fortiori, it is the only nonempty subset of itself that is stable under $\sim_\ell$-equivalence for all primes $\ell \neq p$. Hence it is a single $\sim^1$-equivalence class. □

Finding a suitable D will be done below via a case-by-case analysis (recall that we have reduced to the case where $\boldsymbol{G}$ is simple). Then, in order to find suitable primes, the following result will be useful.

Theorem 2.3.3 ([BV04, Theorem V]). *For any $d \geqslant 3$, there exists a prime number ℓ such that q has order d modulo ℓ, with the exception of $(q, d) = (2, 6)$.*

Note that if d is the order of q modulo ℓ, then obviously $\ell > d$. We now proceed to the case-by-case analysis.

Theorem 2.3.4. *If $\boldsymbol{G}$ has type $\boldsymbol{A}_n$ or ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$ then $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is composed of only one $\sim^1$-equivalence class.*

Proof. The case q odd is covered by Theorem 2.2.3, so let us assume q even. Since $q+1$ is odd, any prime divisor ℓ of $q+1$ is odd and good for $\boldsymbol{G}$, and the order of q modulo ℓ is 2. Therefore Theorem 2.3.1 tells us that the ℓ-blocks of $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ are the 2-series.

Now, for type $\boldsymbol{A}_n$ (split case), it is well known that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a single 1-series. Now for type ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$ we can use an "Ennola duality" [BMM93, Theorem 3.3] to reduce ourselves to the case of $\boldsymbol{A}_n$. More specifically, [BMM93, Theorem 3.3] implies that there is a bijection between the set of unipotent characters for a group of type $\boldsymbol{A}_n$ and that of ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$. This bijection sends d-series to d'-series, where d' is such that $\Phi_{d'}(-x) = \varepsilon\Phi_d(x)$ with $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Since $\Phi_2(-x) = -x+1 = -\Phi_1(x)$, it sends 1-series to 2-series. It follows that in type ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$, the set $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a single 2-series. Therefore it is a single ℓ-block for $\ell|(q+1)$, hence also a single $\sim^1$-equivalence class.

Similarly, when $q > 2$, any prime ℓ dividing $q-1$ is odd and good for $\boldsymbol{G}$; hence Theorem 2.3.1 tells us that the ℓ-blocks of $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ for $\ell|(q-1)$ are the 1-series. In type $\boldsymbol{A}_n$ and for such an ℓ, it follows that the set $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a single ℓ-block, hence also a single $\sim^1$-equivalence class.

It remains to deal with the case $q = 2$ in type $\boldsymbol{A}_n$. In this case, we will show that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a $\{2, 3\}$-series, and then we can conclude using Theorem 2.3.3 and Lemma 2.3.2. To compute $\{2, 3\}$-series for $\boldsymbol{A}_n$, we again use Ennola duality, which asserts that they correspond bijectively to $\{1, 6\}$-series for ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$. These $\{1, 6\}$-series have been computed in [Lan23, Section 3.3], to which we refer for the notion of "defect" of a 1-series. In particular, [Lan23, Proposition 3.3.11] shows that there is a unique $\{1, 6\}$-series for ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$ provided we can prove that the defect k of any 1-series of ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$ satisfies $(k^2-3k+2)/2 \leqslant n-2$. But by [Lan23, Lem. 3.3.8], we at least have $k(k+1)/2 \leqslant n+1$. Since $(k^2-3k+2)/2 = k(k+1)/2-(2k-1)$, we thus get the desired equality if $2k-1 \geqslant 3$, that is $k \geqslant 2$. For $k = 1$, we have $(k^2-3k+2)/2 = 0$; thus the desired inequality also holds. □

Theorem 2.3.5. *If $\boldsymbol{G}$ has type $\boldsymbol{B}_n$, $\boldsymbol{C}_n$, $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ or ${}^2\boldsymbol{D}_n$ then $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is composed of only one $\sim^1$-equivalence class.*

Proof. Again, the case q odd is covered by Theorem 2.2.3, so we assume q is even. Picking a divisor of $q+1$ and applying Theorem 2.3.3 to $d = 4$, we see thanks to Lemma 2.3.2 that it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a single $\{2, 4\}$-series.

We will first exhibit a bijection between $\{2, 4\}$-series and $\{1, 4\}$-series, which will leave us with actually proving that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a single $\{1, 4\}$-series.

To do so, we use the combinatorics of Lusztig symbols as in [Lan23, Section 3.4]. Let $\Sigma = \{S, T\}$ be a symbol ($S, T \subseteq \mathbb{N}$). We define S_e to be the subset of S composed of the even elements, that is $S_e := S \cap 2\mathbb{N}$, and S_o for the subset of odd elements, $S_o := S \cap (2\mathbb{N}+1)$. We do the same thing for T: $T = T_e \cup T_o$. Now, we define an involution φ on symbols by $\varphi(\Sigma) := \{S_e \cup T_o, T_e \cup S_o\}$. Note that $\operatorname{rank}(\Sigma) = \operatorname{rank}(\varphi(\Sigma))$ and that $\operatorname{defect}(\Sigma)$ and $\operatorname{defect}(\varphi(\Sigma))$ have the same parity. In the case of $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ or ${}^2\boldsymbol{D}_n$, when the defect is

even, the congruence modulo 4 is not necessarily preserved by φ. However, the congruence mod 4 of defect$(\varphi(\Sigma))$ only depends on the congruence modulo 4 of defect(Σ) and rank(Σ). Indeed

$$\text{defect}(\varphi(\Sigma)) - \text{defect}(\Sigma) = \big||S_e| + |T_o| - |S_o| - |T_e|\big| - \big||S_e| + |S_o| - |T_e| - |T_o|\big|.$$

Thus, the congruence modulo 4 of defect$(\varphi(\Sigma)) - $ defect(Σ) depends on the parity of $|S_o| + |T_o|$ (or $|S_e| + |T_e|$). Since the defect is even, $|S| + |T|$ is even; hence $|S_o| + |T_o| \equiv |S_e| + |T_e| \pmod 2$. Now,

$$\text{rank}(\Sigma) = \sum_{x \in S} x + \sum_{y \in T} y + \left[\left(\frac{|S|+|T|-1}{2}\right)^2\right];$$

thus

$$\text{rank}(\Sigma) \equiv |S_o| + |T_o| + \left[\left(\frac{|S|+|T|-1}{2}\right)^2\right] \pmod 2.$$

But, $|S| + |T|$ is even, $|S| + |T| = 2k$ and $[((|S| + |T| - 1)/2)^2] = k(k-1)$ is even. Thus defect$(\varphi(\Sigma)) -$ defect(Σ) only depends modulo 4 on the parity of rank(Σ).

Now, under the involution φ, 1-hooks correspond to 1-cohooks and 2-cohooks to 2-cohooks. Hence, φ sends $\{2, 4\}$-series to $\{1, 4\}$-series, as claimed above.

We now prove that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is a $\{1, 4\}$-series in the different cases.

For $\boldsymbol{G}$ of type $\boldsymbol{B}_n$ or $\boldsymbol{C}_n$, by [Lan23, Proposition 3.4.6], we need to show that if we have a 1-series of defect k then $(k^2 - 4k + 3)/4 \leqslant n - 2$. If we have a 1-series of defect k and rank n then $(k^2 - 1)/4 \leqslant n$. Since $(k^2 - 4k + 3)/4 = (k^2 - 1)/4 - (k - 1)$, we get the desired equality if $k - 1 \geqslant 2$, that is $k \geqslant 3$. For $k = 1$, $(k^2 - 4k + 3)/4 = 0$, thus the desired inequality also holds.

For $\boldsymbol{G}$ of type $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ or ${}^2\boldsymbol{D}_n$, by [Lan23, Proposition 3.4.6], we need to show that if we have a 1-series of defect k then $(k^2 - 4k + 4)/4 \leqslant n - 2$. If we have a 1-series of defect k and rank n then $k^2/4 \leqslant n$. Since $(k^2 - 4k + 4)/4 = k^2/4 - (k - 1)$, we get the desired equality if $k - 1 \geqslant 2$, that is $k \geqslant 3$. For $k = 2$, $(k^2 - 4k + 3)/4 = 0$, thus the desired inequality still holds. □

Theorem 2.3.6. *If $\boldsymbol{G}$ has type $\boldsymbol{F}_4$, ${}^3\boldsymbol{D}_4$, $\boldsymbol{G}_2$, $\boldsymbol{E}_6$, ${}^2\boldsymbol{E}_6$, $\boldsymbol{E}_7$ or $\boldsymbol{E}_8$ then $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is composed of only one $\sim_1$-equivalence class.*

Proof. First, let us begin by $\boldsymbol{G}$ of type ${}^3\boldsymbol{D}_4$, $\boldsymbol{E}_6$, ${}^2\boldsymbol{E}_6$ or $\boldsymbol{E}_7$. to use Theorem 2.3.1, we need to have $\ell \geqslant 5$. Thus by Theorem 2.3.3 we can use every $d \geqslant 3$ and $d \neq 6$. Looking at the list of unipotent characters in [Car85, §13.9] and tables of d-series in [BMM93], we see that we may apply Lemma 2.3.2 with the following sets: $D = \{3, 12\}$ for ${}^3\boldsymbol{D}_4$, $D = \{3, 4\}$ for $\boldsymbol{E}_6$, $D = \{3, 4, 12, 18\}$ for ${}^2\boldsymbol{E}_6$ and $D = \{3, 4, 14\}$ for $\boldsymbol{E}_7$.

For $\boldsymbol{E}_8$, we need $\ell \geqslant 7$ to use Theorem 2.3.1. We will again conclude with Lemma 2.3.2 by looking at tables. If $q \neq 2$, we can take $d \geqslant 5$ by Theorem 2.3.3 and $D = \{5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 30\}$ works. If $q = 2$, we can take this time $d \geqslant 3$ $d \neq 4, 6$ (since the order of 2 modulo 7 is 3) and we choose $D = \{3, 5, 8, 10, 15\}$.

For $\boldsymbol{F}_4$, the same methods apply for $q \neq 2$ with $D = \{3, 4, 6, 12\}$ (we can choose any $d \geqslant 3$). When $q = 2$, Lemma 2.3.2 is not enough to conclude. The set of d such that q is of order d modulo some

$\ell \geqslant 3$ is $d \geqslant 3$ and $d \neq 6$ by Theorem 2.3.3. However, the two unipotent characters $\phi'_{9,6}$ and $\phi''_{9,6}$ (with the notations of [Car85, Section 13.9]) are d-cuspidal for every $d \geqslant 3$, $d \neq 6$. The rest of the unipotent characters $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1) \setminus \{\phi'_{9,6}, \phi''_{9,6}\}$ form a $\{3, 4, 8, 12\}$-series. to deal with $\phi'_{9,6}$ and $\phi''_{9,6}$, we take $\ell = 3$, and they are in the principal 3-block of $\boldsymbol{F}_4(2)$ by [His97].

We are left with $\boldsymbol{G}_2$. If q is odd, we can take $d \geqslant 3$. The two unipotent characters $\phi'_{1,3}$ and $\phi''_{1,3}$ are d-cuspidal for every $d \geqslant 3$ and $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1) \setminus \{\phi'_{1,3}, \phi''_{1,3}\}$ is a $\{3, 6\}$-series. We take $\ell = 2$ and the tables in [HS92] give us that $\phi'_{1,3}$ and $\phi''_{1,3}$ are in the principal 2-block. This concludes the case q odd. Now, if q is even and $q \neq 2$, we can still use $d \geqslant 3$. Thus, we have the same issue with $\phi'_{1,3}$ and $\phi''_{1,3}$. We can no longer use $\ell = 2$ but we can use $\ell = 3$, and the tables in [HS90] gives us that $\phi'_{1,3}$ and $\phi''_{1,3}$ are in the principal 3-block. Finally, if $q = 2$, we can now use $d \geqslant 3$ and $d \neq 6$. All the unipotent characters are in the principal 3-series apart from $\phi'_{1,3}$, $\phi''_{1,3}$, $\phi_{2,1}$ and $\boldsymbol{G}_2[-1]$. But we see in [HS90] that they all are in the principal 3-block. □

We have now completed the proof of Theorem 2.0.1 for all reductive $(\boldsymbol{G}, \mathsf{F})$. Indeed, by Proposition 2.1.2, the statement of this theorem is equivalent to the statement that there is only one $\sim$-equivalence class in $\mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$. Then Proposition 2.2.1 shows it is enough to prove that there is only one $\sim^1$-equivalence class in $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$, and Proposition 2.2.2 reduces to the case of simple (and adjoint) $\boldsymbol{G}$. All the simple cases are then covered by Theorems 2.2.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.6.

3. *p*-adic groups

Here $\boldsymbol{G}$ is a reductive group over a local nonarchimedean field F with residue field $k_F := \mathbb{F}_q$. We put $G := \boldsymbol{G}(F)$. For any commutative ring R in which p is invertible, we denote by $\mathrm{Rep}_R(G)$ the category of smooth RG-modules. The Bernstein center $\mathfrak{Z}_R(G)$ is by definition the center of this category.

3.1. ***The depth* 0 *summand.*** Denote by $\mathcal{B}$ the (reduced) Bruhat–Tits building associated with $\boldsymbol{G}$. This is a polysimplicial complex equipped with a polysimplicial action of G. We will write $\mathcal{B}_\bullet$ for the set of polysimplices of $\mathcal{B}$, which are also called facets. to any facet σ of $\mathcal{B}$ is associated a parahoric subgroup G_σ, which is open, compact and contained in the pointwise stabilizer of σ. It is the group $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma(\mathcal{O}_F)$ of $\mathcal{O}_F$-valued points of a certain smooth $\mathcal{O}_F$-model $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$. We denote by $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma$ the reductive quotient of the special fiber of $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma$. Then $\overline{G}_\sigma := \overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is also the quotient of G_σ by its pro-p-radical G_σ^+. Since G_σ^+ is open and pro-p, there is an averaging idempotent $e_\sigma^+ \in \mathcal{H}_R(G_\sigma) \subset \mathcal{H}_R(G)$ in the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_R(G)$ of G with coefficients in R. Here $\mathcal{H}_R(G)$ denotes the R-algebra of locally constant R-valued distributions on G, which acts on any smooth RG-module V, and e_σ^+ denotes the distribution that averages a function over G_σ^+.

Definition 3.1.1. A smooth RG-module V has *depth* 0 if $V = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}_0} e_x^+ V$.

Here $\mathcal{B}_0$ is the set of vertices of $\mathcal{B}$. It is known [Dat09, Appendice A] that the full subcategory $\mathrm{Rep}_R^0(G)$ of $\mathrm{Rep}_R(G)$ composed of depth 0 objects is a direct factor abelian subcategory. Correspondingly, there is

an idempotent $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathfrak{Z}_R(G)$ that projects any object V onto its depth 0 factor. When $R = \mathbb{C}$, the Bernstein decomposition of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ as a sum of blocks was made explicit by Morris in [Mor99].

3.2. ***Depth 0 types.*** Following Moy and Prasad, we define an *unrefined depth* 0 *type* to be a pair (σ, π), where $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet$ is a facet and π is an irreducible complex cuspidal representation of $\overline{G}_\sigma$. We also denote by π the inflation of π to G_σ. Then [Mor99, Theorem 4.8] tells us that $\mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma}^G(\pi)$ is a projective generator for a certain sum of Bernstein components of depth 0. Obviously, this representation only depends on the G-conjugacy class $\mathfrak{t}$ of (σ, π), whence a direct factor $\mathrm{Rep}^{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$. Denote by $\mathfrak{T}$ the set of G-conjugacy classes of such pairs. It turns out that, for $\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}' \in \mathfrak{T}$, the factors $\mathrm{Rep}^{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ and $\mathrm{Rep}^{\mathfrak{t}'}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ are either orthogonal or equal. Whence an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\mathfrak{T}$ and a decomposition

$$\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{C}}(G) = \prod_{[\mathfrak{t}] \in \mathfrak{T}/\sim} \mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\mathbb{C}}(G).$$

We refer to [Lan23, Section 2.2] for an explicit description of the relation $\sim$.

In general, the factors $\mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ are further decomposable. Suppose $(\sigma, \pi) \in [\mathfrak{t}]$ and denote by G^1_σ the pointwise stabilizer of σ in the closed subgroup G^1 of G generated by compact subgroups (see [KP23, §7.7]). By [Mor99, Theorem 4.9], for any irreducible subquotient π^1 of $\mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma}^{G^1_\sigma}(\pi)$, the representation $\mathrm{ind}_{G^1_\sigma}^{G}(\pi^1)$ is the projective generator of a single Bernstein block. Also, any block inside $\mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ is obtained in this way. For later reference, let us notice that, since G^1_σ / G_σ is abelian, any other irreducible subquotient of $\mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma}^{G^1_\sigma}(\pi)$ is a twist of π^1 by a character of G^1_σ / G_σ.

3.3. ***Systems of idempotents.*** Fix $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{T}$, and let $[\mathfrak{t}]$ denote its equivalence class. For a facet $\tau \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet$, define $e_{[\mathfrak{t}],\tau} \in \mathcal{H}_R(G_\tau)$ to be the idempotent that cuts out all irreducible representations of $\overline{G}_\tau$ whose cuspidal support contains $(\overline{G}_\sigma, \pi)$ for some facet σ containing τ and π such that $(\sigma, \pi) \in [\mathfrak{t}]$. Then the system $(e_{[\mathfrak{t}],\tau})_{\tau \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet}$ is 0-*consistent* in the sense of [Lan23, Def. 2.1.4], that is:

(1) $\forall x \in \mathcal{B}_0, \forall g \in G, e_{[\mathfrak{t}],gx} = g e_{[\mathfrak{t}],x} g^{-1}$

(2) $\forall \tau \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet, \forall x \in \mathcal{B}_0, x \in \bar{\tau} \Rightarrow e_{[\mathfrak{t}],\tau} = e^+_\tau e_{[\mathfrak{t}],x}$.

Proposition 2.2.3 of [Lan23] implies that

$$\mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\mathbb{C}}(G) = \left\{ V \in \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}}(G),\ V = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}_0} e_{[\mathfrak{t}],x} V \right\}.$$

Denote by N the lcm of all $|\overline{G}_\tau|$, $\tau \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet$. Since each $e_{[\mathfrak{t}],\tau}$ lies in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G)$, we see that the summand $\mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ is "defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{N}\big]$" in the sense that the corresponding idempotent $\varepsilon_{[\mathfrak{t}]}$ of $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ lies in $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G)$, and we have a decomposition

$$\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G) = \prod_{[\mathfrak{t}] \in \mathfrak{T}/\sim} \mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G).$$

Now, to a subset T of $\mathfrak{T}/\sim$ we associate an idempotent $\varepsilon_T := \sum_{[\mathfrak{t}]\in T} \varepsilon_{[\mathfrak{t}]} \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G)$ in the Bernstein center, and a consistent system of idempotents $(e_{T,\tau})_{\tau\in\mathcal{B}_\bullet}$ given by $e_{T,\tau} := \sum_{[\mathfrak{t}]\in T} e_{[\mathfrak{t}],\tau}$ for any facet $\tau \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet$. The following observation is crucial for the argument.

Proposition 3.3.1. *We have* $\varepsilon_T \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G) \Leftrightarrow \forall \tau \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet,\ e_{T,\tau} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G_\tau)$.

Proof. As recalled above, the direct factor category associated to the idempotent ε_T is given by

$$\varepsilon_T \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G) = \left\{ V \in \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G),\ V = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}_0} e_{T,x} V \right\}.$$

Its orthogonal complement in $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G)$ is the category similarly associated to the complement subset T^c of T in $\mathfrak{T}/\sim$. Therefore, if all $e_{T,\tau}$ are $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$-valued, then so are all $e_{T^c,\tau} = e^+_\tau - e_{T,\tau}$, so the decomposition $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G) = \varepsilon_T \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G) \times \varepsilon_{T^c}\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{N}]}(G)$ is defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$; hence the idempotents ε_T and ε_{T^c} belong to $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. Conversely, if $\varepsilon_T \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$, then the equality $e_{T,\tau} = \varepsilon_T * e^+_\tau$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ from the proof of Lemma 4.1.2 in [Lan23], shows that $e_{T,\tau} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. □

Recall the notation ε_0 introduced in Section 3.1 for the central idempotent corresponding to the depth 0 factor.

Corollary 3.3.2. *We have* $\varepsilon_T \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ *if and only if* $T = \mathfrak{T}/\sim$, *i.e., if and only if* $\varepsilon_T = \varepsilon_0$.

Proof. Suppose $\varepsilon_T \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. By the last proposition, for any facet τ in $\mathcal{B}_\bullet$, the idempotent $e_{T,\tau}$ is inflated from a central idempotent of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]\overline{G}_\tau$. By Theorem 2.0.1, there is no nontrivial central idempotent in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]\overline{G}_\tau$. So $e_{T,\tau}$ is either e^+_τ or 0. There is certainly a vertex x such that $e_{T,x} \neq 0$, and thus $e_{T,x} = e^+_x$. Then, for a chamber σ containing x, we have $e_{T,\sigma} = e^+_\sigma e_{T,x} = e^+_\sigma$. By G-equivariance it follows that $e_{T,\tau} = e^+_\tau$ for all chambers, which implies $e_{T,\tau} \neq 0$ and therefore $e_{T,\tau} = e^+_\tau$ for all facets. Hence $\varepsilon_T = \varepsilon_0$ and $T = \mathfrak{T}/\sim$. □

When G is semisimple and simply connected, we have $G_\tau = G^1_\tau$ for all facets τ so, from our discussion of depth 0 types above, each $\mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ is already a block of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ and, therefore, any idempotent of $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ is equal to some ε_T for $T \subset \mathfrak{T}/\sim$. So we have proved:

Corollary 3.3.3. *If G is semisimple and simply connected,* $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/p]}(G)$ *is a block* (*equivalently,* ε_0 *is primitive in* $\mathfrak{Z}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/p]}(G)$).

Remark 3.3.4. As in the case of finite groups, this kind of results can be interpreted at the level of irreducible $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}G$-modules in the following way. For $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$, denote by $\varepsilon_{M,\pi}$ the unique primitive idempotent of $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[1/M]}(G)$ that acts as identity on π. So, if $M = N$ (defined as above), $\varepsilon_{N,\pi}$ is also primitive in $\mathfrak{Z}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ and defines the Bernstein component that contains π. Let $\ell \neq p$ be a prime and denote by $N_{\ell'}$ the prime-to-ℓ part of N. Then, for $\pi, \pi' \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$, the following properties are equivalent:

(1) $\varepsilon_{N_{\ell'},\pi} = \varepsilon_{N_{\ell'},\pi'}$.

(2) For any embedding $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$, the base changed representations π, π' belong to the same block of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}(G)$.

This justifies calling the equivalence classes for the relation $\pi \sim_\ell \pi' \Leftrightarrow \varepsilon_{N_{\ell'},\pi} = \varepsilon_{N_{\ell'},\pi'}$ the *ℓ-blocks of* $\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$. They correspond to minimal "ℓ-integral subsets" of the set of Bernstein blocks. Similarly, the blocks of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ correspond to minimal subsets of the set of Bernstein blocks that are ℓ-integral for all $\ell \neq p$. In other words, the equivalence relation $\sim$ generated on $\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ by all $\sim_\ell$, $\ell \neq p$ satisfies $\pi \sim \pi' \Leftrightarrow \pi$ and π' belong to the same block of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$.

Now, to tackle the general case, we need to recall some facts about the quotients G^1_τ/G_τ.

3.4. ***The Kottwitz map.*** We first recall a definition of Borovoi:

$$\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}) := X_*(\boldsymbol{T})/\langle \Phi^\vee \rangle = \mathrm{coker}(X_*(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathrm{sc}}) \to X_*(\boldsymbol{T})).$$

Here $\boldsymbol{T}$ is a maximal torus of $\boldsymbol{G}$, $\Phi^\vee \subset X_*(\boldsymbol{T})$ is the set of (absolute) coroots, and $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathrm{sc}}$ is the inverse image of $\boldsymbol{T}$ in the simply connected covering $\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{sc}}$ of the derived group $\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}}$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$. Using the fact that all tori are conjugate, the group $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G})$ turns out to be canonically independent of the choice of $\boldsymbol{T}$. If $\boldsymbol{T}$ is chosen so as to be defined over F, then $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G})$ gets a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear action of the Galois group $\Gamma_F = \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{F}/F)$. Again, this action does not depend on the choice of F-rational torus $\boldsymbol{T}$ (although two such choices may not be $\boldsymbol{G}(F)$-conjugate).

Now, let $I_F \subset \Gamma_F$ denote the inertia subgroup and let F denote the geometric Frobenius in Γ_F/I_F. Kottwitz has defined a surjective morphism

$$\kappa_G :\ G = \boldsymbol{G}(F) \to \pi_1(G) := \left(\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G})_{I_F}\right)^{\mathsf{F}}.$$

We refer to [KP23, Chap. 11] for the detailed construction of this map. The following properties of this map are particularly relevant to our problem:

- The kernel $G^0 := \ker\kappa_G$ is the subgroup of G generated by parahoric subgroups and, for any facet $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet$, the parahoric group G_σ is the pointwise stabilizer of σ in G^0 (and actually also the stabilizer).
- The inverse image $G^1 := \kappa_G^{-1}(\pi_1(G)_{\mathrm{tors}})$ is the subgroup of G generated by compact subgroups and, for any facet $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet$, the compact open group G^1_σ introduced above is the pointwise stabilizer of σ in G^1.

In particular, we have $G^1_\sigma \subset G^1$ and $G_\sigma = G^0 \cap G^1_\sigma$.

Now let Ψ_G be the diagonalizable algebraic group scheme over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$ associated to the finitely generated abelian group $\pi_1(G)$. Its maximal subtorus Ψ_G^t is the usual "torus of unramified characters" of G, while the quotient $\Psi_G^f := \Psi_G/\Psi_G^t$ is the diagonalizable group scheme associated to the finite group $\pi_1(G)_{\mathrm{tors}}$.

For any $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$-algebra R, the group $\Psi_G(R) = \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1(G), R^\times)$ identifies via κ_G to a group of R-valued characters of G; hence it acts on the category $\mathrm{Rep}_R(G)$ by twisting the representations. Since this action is R-linear, this induces in turn an action of $\Psi_G(R)$ by automorphisms of R-algebra on $\mathfrak{Z}_R(G)$, hence an action on the set $\mathrm{Idemp}(\mathfrak{Z}_R(G))$ of idempotents of $\mathfrak{Z}_R(G)$.

The idempotents of $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ are known to be supported on the set of compact elements [Dat03, Cor. 2.11], hence in particular on G^1, so the action of $\Psi_G(\mathbb{C})$ on $\mathrm{Idemp}(\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G))$ factors through an action of

$\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C}) = \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1(G)_{\mathrm{tors}}, \mathbb{C}^\times) = \pi_0(\Psi_{G,\mathbb{C}})$. Further, the depth 0 projector ε_0 is known to be supported on the set of topologically unipotent elements [BKV16, Corollary 1.9(b)], hence in particular on G^0, so ε_0 is invariant under the action of $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C})$.

Lemma 3.4.1. *For each* $[\mathfrak{t}] \in \mathfrak{T}/\sim$, *the associated idempotent* $\varepsilon_{[\mathfrak{t}]}$ *in* $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ *is invariant by* $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C})$. *The primitive idempotents that refine* $\varepsilon_{[\mathfrak{t}]}$ *form a single* $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C})$*-orbit.*

Proof. Pick $(\sigma, \pi) \in [\mathfrak{t}]$. We know that the direct factor category $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}(G)$ is generated by the projective object $\mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma}^G(\pi)$. For any $\psi \in \Psi_G(\mathbb{C})$, we have $\mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma}^G(\pi) \otimes \psi = \mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma}^G(\pi \otimes \psi_{|G_\sigma}) = \mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma}^G(\pi)$. It follows that $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}(G)$ is stable under the action of $\Psi_G(\mathbb{C})$; hence $\varepsilon_{[\mathfrak{t}]}$ is invariant.

Now, we also know that any block of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{C}}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}(G)$ is generated by a projective object of the form $\mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma^1}^G(\pi^1)$, where π^1 is an irreducible constituent of $\mathrm{ind}_{G_\sigma^1}^{G_\sigma}(\pi)$. But any two such irreducible constituents are twists of one another by a character of G_σ^1/G_σ. The latter group embeds in $\pi_1(G)_{\mathrm{tors}}$ via κ_G; hence the restriction map $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Hom}(G_\sigma^1/G_\sigma, \mathbb{C}^\times)$ is surjective, and the second statement of the lemma follows. □

This lemma implies that the only central idempotents of depth 0 in $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ that are invariant by $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C})$ are the ε_T for $T \subset \mathfrak{T}/\sim$. Now, observe that the action of $\Psi_G\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ on $\mathrm{Idemp}(\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G))$ factors over $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$, which is equal to $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C})$. In other words, $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C})$ preserves the subset of idempotents of $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ that belong to $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. Therefore, we can restate Corollary 3.3.2 as follows:

Corollary 3.4.2. *The only* $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$*-invariant idempotent of* $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ *is* ε_0. *Hence* $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ *acts transitively on the set of primitive idempotents of* $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$.

In order to better understand the action of $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ on $\mathrm{Idemp}(\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G))$, write this group as a product $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big) = \Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p \times \Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_{p'}$ of a p-group and a p'-group.

Lemma 3.4.3. *Any idempotent of* $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ *is invariant under* $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_{p'}$.

Proof. Let ε be an idempotent of $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ and assume, without loss of generality, that it is primitive. On the other hand, let $\psi \in \Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_{p'}$ and assume, without loss of generality that ψ has order a power of some prime $\ell \neq p$. In order to prove that $\psi \cdot \varepsilon = \varepsilon$, it suffices to find a nonzero object (V, π) in $\varepsilon\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ such that $\pi \otimes \psi \simeq \pi$. Since the composition of $\psi : \pi_1(G)_{\mathrm{tors}} \to \overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]^\times$ with any morphism $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big] \to \overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$ is trivial, it suffices to find a nonzero object (V, π) in $\varepsilon\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ whose $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$-module structure factors over a morphism $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big] \to \overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$. But $\varepsilon\mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ certainly contains a representation of the form $\varepsilon.\mathrm{ind}_H^G\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ for some open pro-p-subgroup H of G. Such a representation being projective as a $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$-module, its reduction modulo any maximal ideal containing ℓ is nonzero and satisfies the desired property. □

In the next statement, we say that a torus $\boldsymbol{T}$ defined over F is *P_F-induced* if the action of the wild inertia subgroup P_F permutes a basis of $X_*(\boldsymbol{T})$.

Corollary 3.4.4. *Suppose that* p *does not divide* $|\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}})|$ *and that the torus* $\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}}$ *is* P_F*-induced. Then* ε_0 *is a primitive idempotent of* $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$.

Proof. From the inclusions $X_*(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathrm{sc}}) \subset X_*(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathrm{der}}) \subset X_*(\boldsymbol{T})$ and the isomorphism $X_*(\boldsymbol{T})/X_*(\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathrm{der}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} X_*(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}})$, we get an exact sequence $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}}) \hookrightarrow \pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}) \twoheadrightarrow X_*(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}})$. Applying I_F-coinvariants, we get an exact sequence $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}})_{I_F} \to \pi_1(\boldsymbol{G})_{I_F} \twoheadrightarrow X_*(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}})_{I_F}$. Since $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}})$ is finite, this sequence remains exact on the torsion subgroups and the p-torsion subgroups, so we get an exact sequence

$$\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}} \to \pi_1(\boldsymbol{G})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}} \twoheadrightarrow X_*(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}.$$

Our first assumption implies that $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}} = 0$, and the second implies that $X_*(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}} = (X_*(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}})_{P_F,\mathrm{tors}})_{I_F} = 0$. Here the first equality is because I_F acts on P_F-coinvariants through a finite quotient of order *prime to* p, and the vanishing claim is because $X_*(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}})_{P_F}$ is torsion free since $\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ab}}$ is P_F-induced. Therefore $\pi_1(G)_{p\text{-tors}} = \{0\}$, thus $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p = \{1\}$ and we conclude thanks to Lemma 3.4.3 and Corollary 3.4.2. □

The following example shows that the condition on $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{der}})$ is not always necessary for ε_0 to be a primitive idempotent.

Example 3.4.5. Let $\boldsymbol{G} = \mathrm{PGL}_p$ with split F-structure, so that $\pi_1(G) = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and $\kappa_G : G \to \pi_1(G)$ is induced by the valuation of the determinant. Then any irreducible supercuspidal representation of the form $\pi = \mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{PGL}_p(O_F)}^G(\bar{\pi})$ is invariant under torsion by the group $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C})$ of characters of $\pi_1(G)$; hence so is the only primitive idempotent ε of $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ such that $\varepsilon\pi \neq 0$, showing that $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon$ is primitive by Corollary 3.4.2.

The next paragraph generalizes this observation about PGL_p.

3.5. ***Special points.*** Let $\boldsymbol{S}$ be a maximal split torus in $\boldsymbol{G}$ and let $\boldsymbol{Z}$ be the centralizer of $\boldsymbol{S}$ in $\boldsymbol{G}$. This is a Levi component of a minimal F-rational parabolic subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$. By [KP23, Lemma 11.5.6], we know that the canonical map $\pi_1(Z) \to \pi_1(G)$ is injective on torsion subgroups. Correspondingly, the map $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big) \to \Psi_Z^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ is surjective. Note that the quotient of $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ thus obtained is independent of the choice of $\boldsymbol{S}$ since all maximal split tori are G-conjugate.

Lemma 3.5.1. *The action of* $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ *on the set of idempotents of* $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ *factors over the quotient* $\Psi_Z^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$.

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{S}$ and $\boldsymbol{Z}$ be as above, and pick a special vertex x in the apartment corresponding to $\boldsymbol{S}$ in $\mathcal{B}$. By [KP23, Proposition 7.7.5] (which reconciles our definition of G_σ^1 with the one they introduce in the beginning of their section 7.7), we have $G_x^1 = G_x Z^1$; hence $G_x^1/G_x = Z^1/Z^0 = \pi_1(Z)_{\mathrm{tors}}$. Therefore, if we pick a supercuspidal representation π of $\overline{G}_x$, and an irreducible subquotient π^1 of $\mathrm{ind}_{G_x}^{G_x^1}(\pi)$, then the corresponding primitive central idempotent $\varepsilon_{(x,\pi^1)} \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ is invariant under the kernel of $\Psi_G^f(\mathbb{C}) \to \Psi_Z^f(\mathbb{C})$. So let ε be the unique primitive idempotent of $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ such that $\varepsilon.\varepsilon_{(x,\pi^1)} = \varepsilon_{(x,\pi^1)}$. By uniqueness, ε is also invariant under the kernel of $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big) \to \Psi_Z^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$. Since $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ acts transitively on the set of primitive idempotents of $\varepsilon_0\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$, we conclude that this action factors over $\Psi_Z^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$. □

3.6. ***The quasisplit case: group side.*** In this subsection, we assume that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is quasisplit over F. In this case, the centralizer $\boldsymbol{Z}$ of a maximal split torus $\boldsymbol{S}$ is itself a torus, that we denote by $\boldsymbol{T} := \boldsymbol{Z}$. According to Lemma 3.5.1, Lemma 3.4.3 and Corollary 3.4.2, the natural action of $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big) = \mathrm{Hom}\big(\pi_1(G)_{\mathrm{tors}}, \overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]^\times\big)$ induces a transitive action of $\Psi_T^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p = \mathrm{Hom}\big(\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}}, \overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]^\times\big)$ on the set of primitive idempotents of $\varepsilon_0 \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. Therefore, if $\boldsymbol{T}$ is P_F-induced, we have $\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}} = 1$, so it follows that ε_0 is a primitive idempotent in $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. In particular we have proven the following result.

Theorem 3.6.1. *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is quasisplit and tamely ramified over F. Then ε_0 is a primitive idempotent of $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$.*

This theorem mirrors the fact that the space of tamely ramified Langlands parameters for G is connected over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$, under the same hypothesis, as proved in [DHKM20, Theorem 4.29]. Below we will prove more generally that for any quasisplit $\boldsymbol{G}$, there is a natural bijection between connected components of the space of tamely ramified Langlands parameters for G and the set of primitive idempotents in $\varepsilon_0 \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. On the $\boldsymbol{G}$-side, the main result is the following one.

Theorem 3.6.2. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{G}$ is quasisplit. Then the action of $\Psi_T^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p$ on the set of primitive idempotents of $\varepsilon_0 \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ is simply transitive.*

Proof. Let $G' := \kappa_G^{-1}(\pi_1(T)_{p-\mathrm{tors}})$ be the inverse image in G of $\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}}$ by κ_G (recall from above that the map $\pi_1(T) \to \pi_1(G)$ is injective on torsion subgroups). As already mentioned, it does not depend on the choice of $\boldsymbol{S}$. For any facet σ in $\mathcal{B}_\bullet$, we denote by G'_σ the pointwise stabilizer of σ in G', so that we have $G'_\sigma := G^1_\sigma \cap G'$. If σ belongs to the apartment associated to $\boldsymbol{S}$, then $G'_\sigma = G_\sigma T'$ where $T' = T \cap G' = \kappa_T^{-1}(\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}})$. Since $G_\sigma \cap T = T^0$, we have a short exact sequence

$$\overline{G}_\sigma = G_\sigma / G^+_\sigma \hookrightarrow G'_\sigma / G^+_\sigma \twoheadrightarrow \pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}}. \tag{3-1}$$

We claim that this sequence splits canonically and, more precisely, that there is a canonical decomposition

$$G'_\sigma / G^+_\sigma = \big(G_\sigma / G^+_\sigma\big) \times \pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}}. \tag{3-2}$$

To see this, recall that there are canonical smooth $\mathcal{O}_F$-models $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma \subset \boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$ such that

(1) $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma(\mathcal{O}_F) = G_\sigma$ and $\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma(\mathcal{O}_F) = G'_\sigma$ and $(\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma)_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q} = ((\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma)_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q})^\circ$.

(2) $\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma$ contains the canonical model $\boldsymbol{T}'$ of $\boldsymbol{T}$ such that $\boldsymbol{T}'(\mathcal{O}_F) = T'$, and $\pi_0(\boldsymbol{T}'_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_0((\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma)_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q})$, while we also have $\pi_0(\boldsymbol{T}'_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F, p\text{-tors}}$.

(3) Denote by $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma}$ the quotient of the special fiber $(\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma)_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ of $\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma$ by its unipotent radical. Then the short exact sequence (3-1) is obtained by taking the $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational points of the sequence

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma} \hookrightarrow \overline{\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma} \twoheadrightarrow \pi_0((\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma)_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q}) = \pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F, p\text{-tors}}.$$

(4) Denote by $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}$ the quotient of the special fiber of $\boldsymbol{T}'$ by its unipotent radical. Then $\boldsymbol{T}' \hookrightarrow \boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma$ induces a closed immersion $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}'} \hookrightarrow \overline{\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}'} \cap \overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma} = \overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}^\circ$ is a maximal torus of $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma}$ and we have an exact

sequence

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}^{\circ} = \overline{\boldsymbol{T}'} \cap \overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma} \hookrightarrow \overline{\boldsymbol{T}'} \twoheadrightarrow \pi_0((\boldsymbol{T}')_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q}) = \pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}.$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma$ is the model that would be denoted by $\mathcal{G}^0_\sigma$ in the notation of [KP23, §8.3], while $\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma$ is a variant of the model denoted by $\mathcal{G}^b_\sigma$ there (the latter would correspond to $\kappa_G^{-1}(\pi_1(T)_{\text{tors}})$ rather than $\kappa_G^{-1}(\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}})$), whose existence follows from Proposition A.5.23 (3) of [KP23]. Then (2) follows from (p-primary variants of) Corollaries 11.1.6 and 11.2.1 there. Items (3) and (4) follow from the constructions and Corollary 11.7.2 of [KP23].

Now, since $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}^{\circ}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ is a p'-torsion abelian group, $H^1(\pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{p\text{-tors}}, \overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}^{\circ}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)) = \{1\}$ so there exists a splitting $\iota : \pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}} \hookrightarrow \overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ of the last exact sequence. This ι also provides a splitting $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}} \hookrightarrow \overline{\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ of the short exact sequence in item 3 above. But since $\boldsymbol{T}'$ is an abelian group scheme, we see that the conjugation action of $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}$ on $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma}$ through ι fixes pointwise the maximal torus $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}^{\circ}$ of $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma}$. It follows that this action is inner and, more precisely, given by a morphism from $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}$ to the image of $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}'}^{\circ}$ in the adjoint group of $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma}$. But such a morphism has to be trivial since $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}$ is a p-group. Hence the action of $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}$ through ι is trivial on $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma}$ and we get a decomposition $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}'_\sigma} = \overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma} \times \pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}$, which is unique because $\mathrm{Hom}\big(\pi_1(\boldsymbol{T})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}, Z(\overline{\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p))\big) = \{1\}$. Taking $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational points, we get the claimed canonical decomposition (3-2).

Now, this decomposition (3-2) implies that the pro-p-radical ${G'_\sigma}^{+}$ of G'_σ surjects onto $\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}}$. For any character ψ of $\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}}$, we therefore get a central idempotent $e^{\psi}_\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G'_\sigma)$ supported on ${G'_\sigma}^{+}$, and we have $e^{+}_\sigma = \sum_\psi e^{\psi}_\sigma$. Again, these idempotents do not depend on the choice of apartment containing σ, since they are given by the restriction of a global character of G' to $(G'_\sigma)^{+}$. In particular, they are invariant under the action of G, in the sense that $e^{\psi}_{g\sigma} = g e^{\psi}_\sigma g^{-1}$ for all $g \in G$. If x is a vertex of the facet σ, the pro-p-radical ${G'_x}^{+}$ of G'_x is a normal subgroup of ${G'_\sigma}^{+}$ and we have ${G'_\sigma}^{+} = {G'_x}^{+} G^{+}_\sigma$. In terms of idempotents, it follows that $e^{\psi}_\sigma = e^{+}_\sigma e^{\psi}_x$ for all ψ. But then, the proof of [Lan18, Proposition 1.0.6] shows that the system of idempotents $(e^{\psi}_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_\bullet}$ is consistent in the sense of [MS10, Def. 2.1] (note that in [Lan18, Proposition 1.0.6] the idempotents are assumed to be supported on the parahoric subgroups while here we allow support on a slightly bigger subgroup, but this is harmless for the argument there). Then, [MS10, Theorem 3.1] tells us that the full subcategories $\mathrm{Rep}^{\psi}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G) := \big\{V \in \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G),\ V = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}_0} e^{\psi}_x V\big\}$ are Serre subcategories of $\mathrm{Rep}^{0}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. Since for all σ, ψ and ψ' we have $\psi \neq \psi' \Rightarrow e^{\psi}_\sigma e^{\psi'}_\sigma = 0$, these categories are pairwise orthogonal. Since for all σ we have $e^{+}_\sigma = \sum_\psi e^{\psi}_\sigma$, we actually get a decomposition $\mathrm{Rep}^{0}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G) = \prod_\psi \mathrm{Rep}^{\psi}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. Correspondingly, we get a decomposition of ε_0 as a sum of pairwise orthogonal idempotents $\varepsilon_0 = \sum_\psi \varepsilon_0^{\psi}$ in $\mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$. Finally, identifying $\pi_0(\Psi_T)_p$ to the group of characters of $\pi_1(T)_{p\text{-tors}}$, our constructions make it clear that the action of $\pi_0(\Psi_T)_p$ is given by $\psi \cdot \varepsilon_0^{\psi'} = \varepsilon_0^{\psi\psi'}$. Since we already know that the action of $\pi_0(\Psi_T)_p$ is transitive on primitive idempotents, we conclude that each ε_0^{ψ} has to be primitive, and that this action is simply transitive. □

Remark 3.6.3. Before turning to the dual side, we give an interpretation of the group $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p$ (through which the natural action of $\Psi_G\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ on the set of idempotents in $\varepsilon_0 \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ factors) in terms of the group $\pi_0(\Psi_G)$ of connected components of Ψ_G. Indeed, more generally, for any diagonalizable group

scheme $A = D(M)$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$, we have an exact sequence $A^\circ \hookrightarrow A \twoheadrightarrow \pi_0(A)$ where $A^\circ = D(M/M_{p\text{-tors}})$ is the "maximal" connected diagonalizable subgroup scheme of A and $\pi_0(A) = D(M_{p\text{-tors}})$ is a (constant) finite étale diagonalizable group scheme. In the case $A = \Psi_G$, we thus see that $\pi_0(\Psi_G) = D(\pi_1(G)_{p\text{-tors}})$ is the finite constant group scheme associated to the abstract group $\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p = \mathrm{Hom}\big(\pi_1(G)_{p\text{-tors}}, \overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]^\times\big)$, and we shall abuse notation a bit by writing

$$\pi_0(\Psi_G) = \Psi_G^f(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[\tfrac{1}{p}])_p.$$

3.7. ***The quasisplit case: dual group side.*** We now explain how the description of primitive idempotents in the last theorem matches the parametrization of connected components of the space of tamely ramified Langlands parameters for G. We will use the definitions and notation from [DHKM20]. Let us denote by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ "the" dual group of $\boldsymbol{G}$, considered as a split reductive group scheme over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$. Pick a pinning $\rho := \big(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{B}}, X = \sum_{\alpha\in\Delta^\vee} X_\alpha\big)$ of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$, whose underlying Borel pair is dual to a Borel pair $(\boldsymbol{T}, \boldsymbol{B})$ where $\boldsymbol{T}$ is as above (a maximally split maximal torus) and $\boldsymbol{B}$ is a Borel subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$ defined over F. Then the F-rational structure on $\boldsymbol{G}$ induces an action of W_F on the root datum of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$, which induces in turn an action of W_F on $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ preserving the pinning ρ.

Remark 3.7.1. Since the morphism $\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathrm{sc}} \to \boldsymbol{T}$ is dual to the morphism $\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}} \to \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\mathrm{ad}}$, we see that $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{G})$ is the group of characters of the center $Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}) = \ker(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}} \to \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\mathrm{ad}})$. It follows that

$$\Psi_G = (Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}},$$

as group schemes over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$.

Then, using the last remark, we may slightly abusively identify

$$\Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\tfrac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p = \pi_0((Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}}).$$

Let us now choose a topological generator σ of the tame inertia group I_F/P_F and denote by W_F^0 the inverse image in W_F of the discrete subgroup of W_F/P_F generated by σ and Frobenius. According to [DHKM20, §1.2], there is an affine scheme $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$ that classifies 1-cocycles $W_F \to \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ whose restriction to P_F is étale-locally conjugate to the trivial 1-cocycle $\phi = 1_{P_F} : P_F \to \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$. This affine scheme carries an action of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$ and factors as

$$Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \times^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}} Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{1_{P_F}},$$

where $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{1_{P_F}}$ is the closed subscheme of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ where the restriction of parameters to P_F is trivial, and where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}$ is the closed subgroup scheme of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ fixed by P_F. Note that, in the notation of [DHKM20], $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}$ would be denoted $C_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\phi)$ if $\phi = 1_{P_F}$. Since $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{1_{P_F}} = Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})$, we get on quotient stacks

$$Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} = Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}. \tag{3-3}$$

We are interested in parametrizing the connected components of these stacks. According to Proposition A.13 and Theorem A.12 of [DHKM20], the $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$-group scheme $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}$ has split reductive neutral component

$\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}$ and finite constant $\pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})$. We are going to prove that the fibers of the morphism

$$Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F} \xrightarrow{\mu} H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})) \tag{3-4}$$

(whose target is a finite discrete scheme) are the connected components of its source. to this aim, observe that the diagonalizable group scheme $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})$ acts on the scheme $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})$ by multiplication of cocycles, and this action is compatible with $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}$-(twisted) conjugation on $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})$. Furthermore, the map μ is equivariant if we let $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})$ act on $H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}))$ through $H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F}))$.

Lemma 3.7.2. *With the foregoing notation*:

(1) *The natural map* $\pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{P_F}) \to \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})$ *is a bijection. In particular,* $\pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})$ *is an abelian* p*-group.*

(2) *The natural map*

$$\pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}} = H^1(\langle \mathsf{F}\rangle, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{I_F})) \to H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F}))$$

is an isomorphism.

(3) *Similarly, we have an isomorphism* $\pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}} \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{P_F}))$.

(4) *The natural map* $H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})) \to H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{P_F}))$ *is surjective.*

Proof. (1) This is Proposition 4.1(d) of [Hai15].

(2) Recall first that $\pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})$ is a finite abelian p-group, and the action of I_F on it is through a cyclic p'-group. It follows that $H^1(I_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})) = \{1\}$ and therefore the map $H^1(\langle \mathsf{F}\rangle, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})^{I_F}) \to H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F}))$ is an isomorphism. So it remains to see that $\pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})^{I_F} = \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{I_F})$, which follows from the fact that $(X^*(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))_{P_F,p\text{-tors}})_{I_F} = X^*(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}$ since, as above, the action of I_F on $X^*(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))_{P_F}$ is through a cyclic p'-group.

(3) Apply (2) to $\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}$ instead of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$.

(4) By (2) and (3), it suffices to prove surjectivity of $\pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{I_F}) \to \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{I_F})$, i.e., injectivity of $X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_{I_F,p\text{-tors}} \to X^*(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))_{I_F,p\text{-tors}}$. We start from the exact sequence

$$X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\mathrm{ad}})_{I_F} \to X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_{I_F} \to X^*(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))_{I_F} \to 0$$

and we observe that, since $X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\mathrm{ad}})$ has a basis permuted by I_F (given by simple roots), its co-invariants $X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\mathrm{ad}})_{I_F}$ are a free abelian group. Since the above sequence is exact on the left once tensored with $\mathbb{Q}$, it follows that $X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\mathrm{ad}})_{I_F} \to X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_{I_F}$ is injective; hence $X^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_{I_F,\mathrm{tors}} \to X^*(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}))_{I_F,\mathrm{tors}}$ is injective too. □

The following theorem, together with the identification $\Psi_T^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)_p = \pi_0((\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}}) = \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}}$ of Remark 3.7.1 is the dual companion of Theorem 3.6.2.

Theorem 3.7.3. *The connected components of* $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ *are the fibers of the map* μ *of* (3-4) *through the identification* (3-3):

$$Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F} = Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}.$$

The action of $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F})$ *on* $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F})$ *induces a simply transitive action of* $\pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}}$ *on connected components of* $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}/\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$.

Proof. By construction, the action of $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F}))$ on $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F}))$ induces an action of $H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(Z(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{P_F}))$ on the set of fibers of the map μ. By (1) and (4) of the last lemma, the latter action is transitive, and actually factors over a simply transitive action of $H^1(W_F^0/P_F, \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{P_F})) = \pi_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{I_F})_{\mathsf{F}}$. So, to prove the theorem, it suffices to prove that one fiber of μ is connected. The fiber $\mu^{-1}(1)$ of the trivial cohomology class is $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ})/N\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}$, where

$$N\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ} = \{g \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F},\, g^{-1}\sigma(g) \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ},\, g^{-1}\mathsf{F}(g) \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}\}.$$

So we are left with proving that $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ})$ is connected. In order to apply [DHKM20, Theorem 4.29], we need to show that the action of W_F/I_F on $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}$ fixes a pinning. Thanks to [Hai15, Proposition 4.1(a)], we know that $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{B}}^{P_F,\circ}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{P_F,\circ})$ is a Borel pair of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}$ (over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$) and even that $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{B}}^{P_F,\circ}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{P_F,\circ}, X)$ is a pinning of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}$, *at least over* $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}[\frac{1}{2p}]$. Note that this Borel pair and this pinning are clearly stable under W_F/I_F. So, when $p = 2$, we are done. On the other hand, as explained in the proof of [Hai15, Proposition 4.1], the failure for X to provide a pinning of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}$ in characteristic 2 only happens when an orbit of simple roots under P_F contains two roots that add up to a root. In this case, the orbit must have even order, and this can't happen if p is odd. So, in all cases, $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{B}}^{P_F,\circ}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}^{P_F,\circ}, X)$ is a pinning of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ}$ and we get connectedness of $Z^1(W_F^0/P_F, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}^{P_F,\circ})$ from [DHKM20, Theorem 4.29]. □

3.8. ***Proofs of Theorem 1.0.4 and Corollary 1.1.1.*** Finally, Theorem 1.0.4 follows from Theorems 3.7.3 and 3.6.2 through the identification of Remark 3.7.1, once we choose base points in the respective sets of connected components. Any "natural" such choice should be compatible with parabolic induction from the minimal Levi subgroup $\boldsymbol{T}$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$. But the Langlands correspondence for tori tells us that the principal block of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(T)$ (i.e., the one that contains the trivial representation) should match the principal component of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ (i.e., the one that contains the trivial parameter).

As for Corollary 1.1.1, let π be a depth 0 irreducible representation of G with coefficients in an algebraically closed field L over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$. By Theorem 3.6.2, there is an element $\psi \in \Psi_G^f\big(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]\big)$ that provides a character $\psi : G \to \pi_1(G) \to \overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]^\times \to L^\times$ of G that belongs to the same block of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ as π. Hence the Fargues–Scholze parameters φ_π and φ_ψ are L-points of the same connected component of the $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\big[\frac{1}{p}\big]$-scheme $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}) /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$. Since $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\mathrm{tame}}$ is a sum of connected components, all we need to do is to check that φ_ψ is tamely ramified. By compatibility with parabolic induction [FS21, IX.7.2] this parameter is the pushforward along $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}) /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}} \to Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}) /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ of the Fargues–Scholze parameter of the character $\delta_B^{1/2}.\psi_{|T}$ of T, where B is any Borel subgroup of G with Levi T and δ_B is its modulus character. Since the Fargues–Scholze correspondence for tori is the usual one [FS21, IX.6.4], and the character $\delta_B^{1/2}.\psi_{|T}$ is trivial on T^0, its parameter is actually trivial on I_F (see [Mis15, Theorem 1]), hence a fortiori on P_F.

3.9. ***On the general case.*** We do not know an analogue of Theorem 3.6.2 in the nonquasisplit case, but we believe that Theorem 3.6.1 holds for all groups that split over a tamely ramified extension, or more

generally, that have a P_F-induced maximal F-torus. The following example is not accounted for by our different results.

Example 3.9.1. Let D be a division algebra of dimension p^2 over F and $\boldsymbol{G}$ the inner form of PGL_p such that $G = D^\times/F^\times$. Here, $\pi_1(G) = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and $\kappa_G : G \to \pi_1(G)$ is induced by the valuation of the reduced norm map. Note that $G^0 = O_D^\times/O_F^\times$ surjects onto $\mathbb{F}_{q^p}^\times/\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ and that the action of a suitable generator of $G^1/G^0 = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ on $\mathbb{F}_{q^p}^\times$ is via the q^{th}-power map (relative Frobenius over $\mathbb{F}_q$). Hence, if χ is any character of $\mathbb{F}_{q^p}^\times/\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ in general position for the action of Frobenius, the induced representation $\pi := \mathrm{ind}_{O_D^\times/O_F^\times}^G \chi$ is irreducible, of depth 0, and invariant under twisting by characters of G^1/G^0. Therefore, the unique primitive idempotent ε of $\varepsilon_0 \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]}(G)$ such that $\varepsilon\pi \neq 0$ is also invariant under such twisting, showing that $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon$ is primitive by Corollary 3.4.2.

3.10. ***Deligne–Lusztig parameters.*** Assuming that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is quasisplit and tamely ramified, we recall here the Deligne–Lusztig invariant $\pi \mapsto s_\pi$ used in Theorem 1.1.2. This is a direct generalization of [Lan18, §3.4] to the tamely ramified setting, and with slightly different notation.

Transfer maps. Besides Deligne–Lusztig theory itself, the main point is the existence of natural morphisms of finite schemes:

$$(\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q} \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q} \tag{3-5}$$

for all facets σ of $\mathfrak{B}$. Here, τ is a topological generator of tame inertia, all duals are taken over $\mathbb{Z}$, and $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma$ denotes the reductive quotient of the special fiber of the Bruhat–Tits $\mathcal{O}_F$-model $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$ attached to σ. to define the map (3-5), let $\boldsymbol{S}$ be a maximal split torus of $\boldsymbol{G}$ whose apartment contains σ, and write also $\boldsymbol{S}$ for its schematic closure in $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma$, which is a maximal split torus therein. Denote by $\boldsymbol{T}_\sigma$ the centralizer of $\boldsymbol{S}$ in $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma$ and by $\boldsymbol{N}_\sigma$ its normalizer. These are smooth group schemes over $\mathcal{O}_F$ and the quotient $\boldsymbol{W}_\sigma := \boldsymbol{N}_\sigma/\boldsymbol{T}_\sigma$ is an étale group scheme. By our assumptions on $\boldsymbol{G}$, the generic fiber $\boldsymbol{T}$ of $\boldsymbol{T}_\sigma$ is a maximal F-torus of $\boldsymbol{G}$ that is tamely ramified and contained in a Borel subgroup defined over F, while the reductive quotient $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}_\sigma$ of its special fiber identifies to a maximal torus in $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma$. Actually, $\boldsymbol{T}_\sigma$ is the connected Neron model of $\boldsymbol{T}$ over $\mathcal{O}_F$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}_\sigma$ is the toric part of its special fiber (compare [KP23, Proposition 8.2.4]), so that, taking cocharacters over geometric points, we have an Fr-equivariant identification $X_*(\boldsymbol{T}_\sigma) = X_*(\boldsymbol{T})^{I_F} = X_*(\boldsymbol{T})^\tau$, by [KP23, B.7.9]. The latter identification is equivariant with respect to the specialization map $\boldsymbol{W}_\sigma(\bar{k}_F) \to \boldsymbol{W}_\sigma(\bar{F})^{I_F}$ (where bars denote a choice of algebraic closure). Then, going to the dual tori, this means that we have an Fr-equivariant identification $\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}}_\sigma = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_{I_F} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau$ that is equivariant with respect to the map $W_{\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma}(\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}}_\sigma) \hookrightarrow W_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})^\tau$ provided by the identifications $W_{\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma}(\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}}_\sigma) = \boldsymbol{W}_\sigma(\bar{k}_F)$ and $W_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}) = \boldsymbol{W}_\sigma(\bar{F})$. Then the desired map (3-5) is induced by the Fr-equivariant composition

$$\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma = \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ W_{\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma}(\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}}_\sigma) \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau /\!\!/ W_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})^\tau \simeq (\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}} \rtimes \tau) /\!\!/ N_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau \xrightarrow{\sim} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau) /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}},$$

where $N_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau = \{n \in N_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}), n\tau(n)^{-1} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}\}$. Here, we have implicitly chosen $\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}}_\sigma$, resp. $\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}}$, as the maximal torus entering the construction of the dual group $\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma$, resp. $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$, with its pinned action by Fr, resp. $\langle\tau, \mathrm{Fr}\rangle$. The fact that the last map is an isomorphism is a twisted version of the Chevalley–Steinberg

theorem, see for example [DHKM20, Proposition 6.6]. The above construction of the map (3-5) is independent of the choice of $\boldsymbol{S}$, since a different choice would be conjugated under $\boldsymbol{G}_\sigma(\mathcal{O}_F)$, leading to compatible identifications between cocharacter groups of the generic and special fibers of the centralizer, as in [Lan18, Lemme 3.2.1].

Specialization. The isomorphism $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau /\!\!/ W_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})^\tau \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ shows that $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ is a finite scheme. More precisely, if N denotes the exponent of the image of $W_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})^\tau \rtimes \langle \mathrm{Fr}\rangle$ in $\mathrm{Aut}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau$, we see that the natural morphism $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau[q^N-1] \to ((\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau /\!\!/ W_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})^\tau)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ is surjective (where the bracket denotes the kernel of $t \mapsto t^{q^N-1}$). This also allows us to speak of *the order* of a geometric point of $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ as the order of any lift in $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau$.

Now, by finiteness we have specialization maps

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(K) \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(k)$$

for any discrete valuation ring Λ with fraction field K and residue field k. When Λ is strictly henselian, this map has a section coming from the canonical lifting of roots of unity from k to Λ, which induces a section $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau[q^N-1](k) \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{T}})_\tau[q^N-1](\Lambda)$.

From this we see that for each prime $\ell \neq p$ we have a specialization map

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell) \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell)$$

with a natural section with image the subset of elements of *prime-to-ℓ order* on the left-hand side. Actually the composition of the section with specialization is the map that takes a conjugacy class s to its "prime-to-ℓ order" (or "ℓ-regular") part. Similarly, for each maximal ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ containing ℓ, we have a specialization map

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}) \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell)$$

with a section as above.

The Deligne–Lusztig decomposition of $\mathrm{Rep}^0_L(G)$. For $\ell \neq p$, Deligne–Lusztig theory provides a surjective map $\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma(k_F)) \to (\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ whose fibers are called "Deligne–Lusztig geometric series". This map only depends on a choice of isomorphism $(\overline{k}_F)^\times \simeq (\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})_{p'}$, which we have already made when picking the topological generator τ of I_F/P_F. In particular, it is invariant under automorphisms of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ and descends to a map $\mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma(k_F)) \to (\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ canonically. For a $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-point t of $(\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ we denote by $e^t_{\sigma,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ the central idempotent of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma(k_F)]$ that selects the corresponding geometric series. It is known [CE04, Theorem 9.12] that if t has prime-to-ℓ order then $\sum_{t',t'_{\ell'}=t} e^{t'}_{\sigma,\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ is ℓ-integral, in the sense that it belongs to $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{(\ell)}[\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma(k_F)]$. This allows us to associate a central idempotent $e^t_{\sigma,\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell}$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell[\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma(k_F)]$ to any $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$-point t of $(\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ (this is independent of the choice of a maximal ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{(\ell)}$). In this way we get for any algebraically closed field L over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$ a decomposition

$$1 = \sum_{t \in (\widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(L)} e^t_{\sigma,L}$$

of the unit in $L[\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_\sigma(k_F)]$ as a sum of pairwise orthogonal central idempotents.

Now, for $s \in (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(L)$, we write $e^s_{\sigma,L} := \sum_{t \mapsto s} e^t_{\sigma,L}$. Then the same argument as in [Lan18, §3.4] shows that $\sigma \mapsto e^s_{\sigma,L}$ is a 0-consistent system of idempotents, so that we have a decomposition

$$\mathrm{Rep}^0_L(G) = \prod_{s \in (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(L)} \mathrm{Rep}^s_L(G),$$

where $\mathrm{Rep}^s_L(G) := \left\{ V \in \mathrm{Rep}_L(G),\ V = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_\bullet} e^s_{\sigma,L} V \right\}$. When L has characteristic 0, the relation to the decomposition of Section 3.2 is the following. For $\mathfrak{t} = (\sigma, \pi_\sigma)$ a cuspidal pair, denote by t_{π_σ} the L-point of $(\widehat{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma /\!\!/ \widehat{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}_\sigma)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ corresponding to the geometric Deligne–Lusztig series of π_σ, and by s the image of t_{π_σ} by the map (3-5). Then we have $\mathrm{Rep}^{\mathfrak{t}}_L(G) \subset \mathrm{Rep}^s_L(G)$.

Deligne–Lusztig parameters. For any irreducible depth 0 smooth L-representation π, we define s_π to be the unique L-point of $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$ such that π is an object of $\mathrm{Rep}^{s_\pi}_L(G)$. The map $\pi \mapsto s_\pi$ satisfies the following:

(1) Suppose π is a subquotient of a parabolically induced module $i^G_P(\rho)$ for some F-parabolic subgroup $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{U}$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{P}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{M}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}$ be a W_F-stable parabolic subgroup of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}$ corresponding to $\boldsymbol{P}$. Then s_π is the image of s_ρ by the natural map $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{M}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{M}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q} \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}$.

(2) Suppose $L = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ and π is ℓ-integral (i.e., admits an admissible $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell$-model L_π), and let $\bar{\pi}$ be any irreducible constituent of the reduction of L_π to $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$. Then $s_{\bar{\pi}}$ is the image of s_π by the specialization map $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell) \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell)$.

(3) Suppose $L = \overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$ and let $\tilde{s}_\pi$ be the image of s_π by the natural section $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell) \to (\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \rtimes \tau /\!\!/ \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$. Then there is an ℓ-integral $\tilde{\pi} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(G)$ with $s_{\tilde{\pi}} = \tilde{s}_\pi$ and such that π is a constituent of the reduction of (any stable lattice in) $\tilde{\pi}$. The same statement holds if we replace $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ by $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and consider specialization and section maps associated to a choice of a prime ideal $\mathcal{L}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ containing ℓ.

Property (1) is proved like in [Lan18, théorème 4.4.3] and property (2) follows from the constructions. For property (3) we may use (1) and an inductive argument to reduce to the case where π is supercuspidal. It is then a Jordan–Hölder factor of a finite length $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$-representation of the form $\pi = \mathrm{ind}^G_{G_x Z} \pi_x$ for some supercuspidal $\pi_x \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell}(\overline{G}_x)$. Denote by $t_{\pi_x} \in (\widehat{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}_x /\!\!/ \widehat{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}_x)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell)$ its Deligne–Lusztig geometric series and $\tilde{t}_{\pi_x}$ its natural lift in $(\widehat{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}_x /\!\!/ \widehat{\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}}_x)^{\mathrm{Fr}=(\cdot)^q}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$. Then π_x is certainly a Jordan–Hölder constituent of the reduction to $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$ of some $\tilde{\pi}_x \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}(\overline{G}_x)$ with $t_{\tilde{\pi}_x} = \tilde{t}_{\pi_x}$. By supercuspidality of π_x, $\tilde{\pi}_x$ also has to be cuspidal, so that the induction $\tilde{\rho} := \mathrm{ind}^G_{G_x Z} \tilde{\pi}_x$ is cuspidal with finite length and trivial central character; hence it is ℓ-integral. Since π is a Jordan–Hölder constituent of the reduction of $\tilde{\rho}$, it is a constituent of the reduction of some irreducible subquotient $\tilde{\pi}$ of $\tilde{\rho}$. By construction, $s_{\tilde{\pi}}$ is the image of $t_{\tilde{\pi}_x}$; hence it equals $\tilde{s}_\pi$.

3.11. ***Proof of Theorem 1.1.2.*** As explained in the introduction, we argue on the semisimple rank of $\boldsymbol{G}$. In rank 0, $\boldsymbol{G}$ is a torus and the result follows from the compatibility of $\mathrm{FS}_{\mathrm{mot}}$ with local class field theory

(which follows from the construction just as for the ℓ-adic version FS_ℓ in [FS21, Proposition IX.6.5]). For general $\boldsymbol{G}$, the compatibility of $\pi \mapsto \varphi_\pi(\tau)$ and $\pi \mapsto s_\pi$ with parabolic induction and dual Levi functoriality allows us to focus on π supercuspidal. After maybe twisting by an unramified character of G, we may assume that π is defined over the closure of the prime subfield of L, which reduces the problem to the cases $L = \overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$ or $L = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. But property (3) above reduces the case $L = \overline{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$ to the characteristic 0 case, i.e., we may assume $L = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Finally, after maybe twisting, we may assume that our supercuspidal π has an admissible model over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$.

We now argue on the number n_π of prime divisors of the order of s_π. Assume first that $n_\pi > 1$ and let ℓ be such a prime number, and $(s_\pi)^{(\ell)}$ the prime-to-ℓ part of s_π. Pick any maximal ideal $\mathcal{L}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ containing ℓ. By properties (2) and (3) above, there is an $\mathcal{L}$-integral $\pi' \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ with $s_{\pi'} = (s_\pi)^{(\ell)}$ and whose reduction has a common irreducible constituent $\bar{\pi}$ with the reduction of π. By our induction hypothesis, any prime dividing the order of $\varphi_{\pi'}(\tau)$ divides that of $s_\pi^{(\ell)}$; hence the same is true for any prime dividing the order of $\varphi_{\bar{\pi}}(\tau)$. But $\varphi_{\bar{\pi}}(\tau)$ is the image of $\varphi_\pi(\tau)$ by the specialization map, so any prime dividing the order of $\varphi_\pi(\tau)$ either divides that of $\varphi_{\bar{\pi}}(\tau)$ or is ℓ; hence it divides the order of s_π.

It remains to deal with the case $n_\pi = 1$, i.e., when π is unipotent. In this case, Proposition 3.11.3 below provides us with two prime numbers $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$ different from p and two *noncuspidal* unipotent representations $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ such that $\pi \sim_{\ell_i} \pi_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Recall from Remark 3.3.4 that this means that for any embeddings $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell_i}$, $\pi \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell_i}$ and $\pi_i \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell_i}$ belong to the same block of $\mathrm{Rep}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{\ell_i}}(G)$. By the description of connected components of $Z^1(W_F^0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}})_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell}$ in [DHKM20, Theorem 4.8], it follows that we have $(\varphi_\pi)_{|I_F^{\ell_i}} = (\varphi_{\pi_i})_{|I_F^{\ell_i}}$. On the other hand, by our induction hypothesis, $\varphi_{\pi_i}(\tau)$ is trivial, i.e., φ_{π_i} is trivial on I_F. So we see that φ_π is trivial on both $I_F^{\ell_1}$ and $I_F^{\ell_2}$; hence it is trivial on I_F and $\varphi_\pi(\tau) = 1$.

We are now left to prove Proposition 3.11.3, and we start with a finite field analogue:

Proposition 3.11.1. *Let us assume that $q \neq 2$. Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be a finite reductive group with positive semisimple rank, and $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$ a unipotent cuspidal representation of $\boldsymbol{G}$. Then there exists two prime numbers $\ell_1, \ell_2 \neq p$, $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$ and two noncuspidal unipotent representations $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathrm{Irr}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}})$ such that $\pi \sim_{\ell_1} \pi_1$ and $\pi \sim_{\ell_2} \pi_2$.*

Proof. Similarly as in Section 2.2 (the bijection $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ on unipotent representations is compatible with the respective ℓ-block partitions; and a group of adjoint type is a direct product of restriction of scalars of simple groups), we can restrict ourselves to the case where $\boldsymbol{G}$ is a simple group.

There are no unipotent cuspidal in type $\boldsymbol{A}_n$. If $\boldsymbol{G}$ has type ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{B}_n$, resp. $\boldsymbol{C}_n$, resp. $\boldsymbol{D}_n$, resp. ${}^2\boldsymbol{D}_n$) there is no cuspidal unipotent unless $n = s(s+1)/2 - 1$ (resp. $n = s(s+1)$, resp. $n = s(s+1)$, resp. $n = s^2$, resp. $n = s^2$) for some s and in this case there is only one.

If q is odd, by [CE04, Theorem 21.14], $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{G}^{\mathsf{F}}, 1)$ is included in the principal 2-block, so we can take $\ell_1 = 2$.

If q is even, then take for ℓ_1 a prime divisor of $q+1$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3.5 we can use the combinatorics of Lusztig symbols and β-sets to classify unipotent characters and compute their d-series. When $d = 2$, a symbol corresponds to a 2-cuspidal representation if it is itself a 1-cocore. In the above

unipotent cuspidal representations	(d_1, d_2)
$\boldsymbol{F}_4[-1]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[-1]$	(6, 8)
$\boldsymbol{F}_4[-i]$, $\boldsymbol{F}_4[i]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[i]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[-i]$	(4, 8)
$\boldsymbol{F}_4[\theta]$, $\boldsymbol{F}_4[\theta^2]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_6[\theta]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_6[\theta^2]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[\theta^2]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[\theta]$, $\boldsymbol{G}_2[\theta]$, $\boldsymbol{G}_2[\theta^2]$, ${}^3\boldsymbol{D}_4[1]$, ${}^2\boldsymbol{E}_6[\theta]$, ${}^2\boldsymbol{E}_6[\theta^2]$	(3, 6)
$\boldsymbol{F}_4'[1]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8''[1]$	(4, 6)
$\boldsymbol{F}_4''[1]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8'[1]$, ${}^2\boldsymbol{E}_6[1]$	(3, 4)
$\boldsymbol{E}_7[\xi]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_7[-\xi]$	(6, 14)
$\boldsymbol{E}_8[-\theta^2]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[-\theta]$	(6, 24)
$\boldsymbol{E}_8[\xi^4]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[\xi^3]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[\xi^2]$, $\boldsymbol{E}_8[\xi]$	(5, 10)
${}^3\boldsymbol{D}_4[-1]$	(6, 12)

Table 1. Suitable pairs (d_1, d_2) for unipotent cuspidal representations of exceptional groups.

list of cuspidal characters, none of them are 1-cocores, so there are no 2-cuspidals. This means that they all belong to the same 2-series as another unipotent character; hence ℓ_1 suits.

Similarly, the cuspidal unipotent of ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_n$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{B}_n$, $\boldsymbol{C}_n$,$\boldsymbol{D}_n$ or ${}^2\boldsymbol{D}_n$) is in the same 6-series (resp. 4-series) as another unipotent representation, so we can take ℓ_2 such that q is of order 6 (resp. 4) mod ℓ_2 by Theorem 2.3.3. This ℓ_2 also suits.

We are left with the exceptional groups $\boldsymbol{F}_4$, ${}^3\boldsymbol{D}_4$, $\boldsymbol{G}_2$, $\boldsymbol{E}_6$, ${}^2\boldsymbol{E}_6$, $\boldsymbol{E}_7$ and $\boldsymbol{E}_8$. For these groups, we use a weaker version of Theorem 2.3.1 that works also with bad primes [Eng00, Theorem A]. It states that if two unipotent representations are in the same d-series then they are in the same block. Then, looking at tables, for each unipotent cuspidal representation π but two exceptions, we can find two distinct integers d_1, d_2, different from 2, and such that π is in the same d_i-series as a noncuspidal representation (see Table 1 with the notations of [Car85, §13.9]). It then remains to pick any primes ℓ_1, ℓ_2 such that q has order d_i modulo ℓ_i thanks to Theorem 2.3.3.

The two exceptions are the representations $\boldsymbol{G}_2[1]$ and $\boldsymbol{G}_2[-1]$ in the notation from [Car85, §13.9]. The representation $\boldsymbol{G}_2[1]$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{G}_2[-1]$) is in the same 2-series and 3-series (resp. 2-series and 6-series) as the trivial representation, so we can at least take ℓ_1 such that q has order 3 modulo ℓ_1 (resp. q has order 6 modulo ℓ_1). If there also exists ℓ_2 such that the order of q modulo ℓ_2 is 2 then we are done. So the only issue is when $q = 2^k - 1$, for some integer $k \geqslant 2$. In this case, we set $\ell_2 = 2$ and we conclude with [Eng00, Theorem A.bis], which implies that two unipotent representations in the same d-series are in the same 2-block, if d is the order of q modulo 4, which is 2 here. □

Remark 3.11.2. The assumption $q \neq 2$ is needed here for the simple group ${}^2\boldsymbol{A}_2$. For instance the group $U_3(\mathbb{F}_2)$ has three unipotent representations, the trivial, the Steinberg and σ a cuspidal representation. When $\ell = 3$, these three representations are in the same 3-block. However, the cardinal of $U_3(\mathbb{F}_2)$ is $2^3 3^4$, so every odd prime $\ell \neq 3$ is banal, and $\{\sigma\}$ is an ℓ-block.

Proposition 3.11.3. *Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be a reductive group of positive semisimple rank over F, and assume that $k_F \neq \mathbb{F}_2$. Let π be a unipotent supercuspidal $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-representation of $\boldsymbol{G}$. Then there exist prime numbers $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$ different from p and two **noncuspidal** unipotent representations $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ such that $\pi \sim_{\ell_i} \pi_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{T}$ be an unrefined depth 0 type such that $\pi \in \mathrm{Rep}^{[\mathfrak{t}]}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$. Necessarily, $\mathfrak{t} = [x, \pi_x]$ with x a vertex, since π is supercuspidal. Then $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_x$ has positive semisimple rank; hence, by Proposition 3.11.1, there exist two prime numbers ℓ_1, ℓ_2 and two unipotent noncuspidal representations $\pi_{x,1}$ and $\pi_{x,2}$ of $\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_x(k_F)$ such that $\pi_x \sim_{\ell_1} \pi_{x,1}$ and $\pi_x \sim_{\ell_2} \pi_{x,2}$. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We consider the cuspidal support of $\pi_{x,i}$ which is of the form $(\overline{\boldsymbol{G}}_{\sigma_i}(k_F), \tau_i)$ and provides us with an unrefined depth 0 type $\mathfrak{t}_i \in \mathfrak{T}$. Let T be a minimal subset of $\mathfrak{T}/\sim$ containing $\mathfrak{t}$ such that the idempotent ε_T is ℓ_i-integral, i.e., it belongs to $\mathfrak{Z}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{(\ell_i)}}(G)$. As in Proposition 3.3.1, we have $\mathfrak{t}_i \in T$; hence the summand $\varepsilon_T \mathrm{Rep}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ contains noncuspidal irreducible representations. Although ε_T need not be primitive, we deduce from Lemma 3.4.1 that $\Psi^f_G(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ acts transitively on the set of primitive idempotents in $\mathfrak{Z}_{\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_{(\ell_i)}}(G)$ that refine ε_T. It follows that any ℓ_i-block inside $\varepsilon_T \mathrm{Rep}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(G)$ contains noncuspidal irreducible representations. This applies in particular to the one that contains π. □

References

[BKV16] R. Bezrukavnikov, D. Kazhdan, and Y. Varshavsky, "On the depth r Bernstein projector", *Selecta Math.* (*N.S.*) **22**:4 (2016), 2271–2311. MR

[BMM93] M. Broué, G. Malle, and J. Michel, "Generic blocks of finite reductive groups", pp. 7–92 in *Représentations unipotentes génériques et blocs des groupes réductifs finis*, Astérisque **212**, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1993. MR

[BV04] G. D. Birkhoff and H. S. Vandiver, "On the integral divisors of $a^n - b^n$", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **5**:4 (1904), 173–180. MR

[Car85] R. W. Carter, *Finite groups of Lie type: conjugacy classes and complex characters*, Wiley, Chichester, 1985. MR

[CE04] M. Cabanes and M. Enguehard, *Representation theory of finite reductive groups*, New Mathematical Monographs **1**, Cambridge University Press, 2004. MR

[CE94] M. Cabanes and M. Enguehard, "On unipotent blocks and their ordinary characters", *Invent. Math.* **117**:1 (1994), 149–164. MR

[Con14] B. Conrad, "Reductive group schemes", pp. 93–444 in *Autour des schémas en groupes*, Panor. Synthèses **42**, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2014. MR

[Dat03] J.-F. Dat, "Quelques propriétés des idempotents centraux des groupes p-adiques", *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **554** (2003), 69–103. MR

[Dat09] J.-F. Dat, "Finitude pour les représentations lisses de groupes p-adiques", *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* **8**:2 (2009), 261–333. MR

[DHKM20] J.-F. Dat, D. Helm, R. Kurinczuk, and G. Moss, "Moduli of Langlands parameters", preprint, 2020. arXiv 2009.06708

[Eng00] M. Enguehard, "Sur les l-blocs unipotents des groupes réductifs finis quand l est mauvais", *J. Algebra* **230**:2 (2000), 334–377. MR

[Fen24] T. Feng, "Modular functoriality in the local Langlands correspondence", preprint, 2024. arXiv 2312.12542

[FS21] L. Fargues and P. Scholze, "Geometrization of the local Langlands correspondence", preprint, 2021. arXiv 2102.13459

[Hai15] T. J. Haines, "On Satake parameters for representations with parahoric fixed vectors", *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2015**:20 (2015), 10367–10398. MR

[His97] G. Hiss, "Decomposition matrices of the Chevalley group $F_4(2)$ and its covering group", *Comm. Algebra* **25**:8 (1997), 2539–2555. MR

[HS90] G. Hiss and J. Shamash, "3-blocks and 3-modular characters of $G_2(q)$", *J. Algebra* **131**:2 (1990), 371–387. MR

[HS92] G. Hiss and J. Shamash, "2-blocks and 2-modular characters of the Chevalley groups $G_2(q)$", *Math. Comp.* **59**:200 (1992), 645–672. MR

[KP23] T. Kaletha and G. Prasad, *Bruhat–Tits theory*: *a new approach*, New Mathematical Monographs **44**, Cambridge University Press, 2023. MR

[Lan18] T. Lanard, "Sur les ℓ-blocs de niveau zéro des groupes p-adiques", *Compos. Math.* **154**:7 (2018), 1473–1507. MR

[Lan23] T. Lanard, "Unipotent ℓ-blocks for simply connected p-adic groups", *Algebra Number Theory* **17**:9 (2023), 1533–1572. MR

[Mis15] M. Mishra, "Langlands parameters associated to special maximal parahoric spherical representations", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **143**:5 (2015), 1933–1941. MR

[Mor99] L. Morris, "Level zero **G**-types", *Compositio Math.* **118**:2 (1999), 135–157. MR

[MS10] R. Meyer and M. Solleveld, "Resolutions for representations of reductive p-adic groups via their buildings", *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **647** (2010), 115–150. MR

[Sch26] P. Scholze, "Geometrization of the local Langlands correspondence, motivically", *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **835** (2026), 301–327. MR

[SS19] V. Sécherre and S. Stevens, "Towards an explicit local Jacquet–Langlands correspondence beyond the cuspidal case", *Compos. Math.* **155**:10 (2019), 1853–1887. MR

Communicated by Wee Teck Gan
Received 2024-05-23 Revised 2025-02-07 Accepted 2025-06-27

jean-francois.dat@imj-prg.fr *Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu, Sorbonne Université – Université de Paris – CNRS, Paris, France*

thomas.lanard@uvsq.fr *Laboratoire de Mathematiques de Versailles (LMV), Université Paris-Saclay, Versailles, France*

Algebra & Number Theory

msp.org/ant

EDITORS

MANAGING EDITOR

Antoine Chambert-Loir
Université Paris-Diderot
France

EDITORIAL BOARD CHAIR

David Eisenbud
University of California
Berkeley, USA

BOARD OF EDITORS

Jason P. Bell	University of Waterloo, Canada	Michael J. Larsen	Indiana University Bloomington, USA
Olivier Benoist	Ecole Normale Supérieure, France	Philippe Michel	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne
Bhargav Bhatt	University of Michigan, USA	Martin Olsson	University of California, Berkeley, USA
Frank Calegari	University of Chicago, USA	Irena Peeva	Cornell University, USA
J-L. Colliot-Thélène	CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, France	Jonathan Pila	University of Oxford, UK
Brian D. Conrad	Stanford University, USA	Anand Pillay	University of Notre Dame, USA
Samit Dasgupta	Duke University, USA	Bjorn Poonen	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA
Hélène Esnault	Freie Universität Berlin, Germany	Victor Reiner	University of Minnesota, USA
Gavril Farkas	Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany	Peter Sarnak	Princeton University, USA
Sergey Fomin	University of Michigan, USA	Benjamin Schraen	Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, France
Edward Frenkel	University of California, Berkeley, USA	Michael Singer	North Carolina State University, USA
Wee Teck Gan	National University of Singapore	Vasudevan Srinivas	SUNY Buffalo, USA
Andrew Granville	Université de Montréal, Canada	Shunsuke Takagi	University of Tokyo, Japan
Ben J. Green	University of Oxford, UK	Pham Huu Tiep	Rutgers University, USA
Christopher Hacon	University of Utah, USA	Ravi Vakil	Stanford University, USA
Roger Heath-Brown	Oxford University, UK	Akshay Venkatesh	Institute for Advanced Study, USA
János Kollár	Princeton University, USA	Melanie Matchett Wood	Harvard University, USA
		Shou-Wu Zhang	Princeton University, USA

PRODUCTION

production@msp.org
Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

See inside back cover or msp.org/ant for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2026 is US $590/year for the electronic version, and $865/year (+$75, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to MSP.

Algebra & Number Theory (ISSN 1944-7833 electronic, 1937-0652 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 2000 Allston Way # 59, Berkeley, CA 94701-4004, is published continuously online.

ANT peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW® from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

mathematical sciences publishers

nonprofit scientific publishing

http://msp.org/

© 2026 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 20 No. 7 2026

The role of primes of good reduction in the Brauer–Manin obstruction 1263
MARGHERITA PAGANO

Absolute calculus and prismatic crystals on cyclotomic rings 1301
MICHEL GROS, BERNARD LE STUM and ADOLFO QUIRÓS

Equivariant line bundles with connection on the p-adic upper half-plane 1385
KONSTANTIN ARDAKOV and SIMON WADSLEY

Depth zero representations over $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$ 1451
JEAN-FRANÇOIS DAT and THOMAS LANARD