

# VANISHING THEOREMS FOR SHIMURA VARIETIES AT UNIPOTENT LEVEL

ANA CARAIANI, DANIEL R. GULOTTA, CHRISTIAN JOHANSSON

ABSTRACT. We show that the compactly supported cohomology of Shimura varieties of Hodge type of infinite  $\Gamma_1(p^\infty)$ -level (defined with respect to a Borel subgroup) vanishes above the middle degree, under the assumption that the group of the Shimura datum splits at  $p$ . This generalizes and strengthens the vanishing result proved in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18]. As an application of this vanishing theorem, we prove a result on the codimensions of ordinary completed homology for the same groups, analogous to conjectures of Calegari–Emerton for completed (Borel–Moore) homology.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper proves a generalization of the main geometric result of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18], and gives an application to the bounds on the codimensions of ordinary completed cohomology groups for certain Shimura varieties. Along the way we prove results on finite group quotients of adic spaces and diamonds, and a Poincaré duality spectral sequence for ordinary completed cohomology, which we consider to be of independent interest. Before giving a brief introduction to our results, we refer the interested reader to the introduction of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] for further context.

Fix a prime  $p$ . We give an overview of the setup, referring to the main text for details. Let  $G$  be a connected reductive group over  $\mathbb{Q}$  admitting a Shimura datum of Hodge type. Assume that  $G$  is split at  $p$  and choose a split model over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . Choosing a Borel subgroup  $B$  of  $G$  over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  and let  $U \subseteq B$  be its unipotent radical. If  $K \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  is a compact open subgroup, we write  $X_K$  for the complex Shimura variety for  $G$  of level  $K$  at  $p$  and some fixed tame level<sup>1</sup>  $K^p \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f^p)$ , viewed as an algebraic variety. We write  $X_K(\mathbb{C})$  for the corresponding complex manifold. We may state our main vanishing theorem as follows:

**Theorem 1.1** (Corollary 4.1.2, Remark 4.1.3). *Let  $d$  be the complex dimension of the Shimura varieties for  $G$ . Let  $H \subseteq U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  be a closed subgroup. Then*

$$\lim_{K \supseteq H} H_c^i(X_K(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}/p^r) = 0$$

for all  $r \geq 1$  and all  $i > d$ .

The cohomology groups here are singular cohomology with compact support. This theorem generalizes [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Theorem 1.1.2] in two ways. First, that theorem only treats Shimura varieties for quasi-split (general) unitary and symplectic groups over totally real fields — here we generalize this to all Hodge type Shimura varieties (in both cases assuming the same splitness condition at  $p$ ). Second, in

---

<sup>1</sup> $K^p$  is assumed to be sufficiently small in a way that we make precise in §3.2.

[CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Theorem 1.1.2] we require the subgroup  $H$  to be contained in the  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -points of the unipotent radical of the Siegel parabolic; this is a stronger assumption than the containment  $H \subseteq U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  in Theorem 1.1.

The method of proof is a variation of that of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Theorem 1.1.2], and we refer to the introduction of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] for a more elaborate sketch. Choosing an embedding  $\mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow C$  into algebraically closed non-archimedean field  $C$  we may view base change the  $X_K$  to  $C$  and then analytify to get rigid analytic varieties  $\mathcal{X}_K$ . As in [Sch15], we make use of compactifications  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_K$  of the  $\mathcal{X}_K$  which are closely related to the minimal compactifications. Through a string of comparison theorems, one reduces Theorem 1.1 to proving that  $H_{\text{ét}}^i(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, j_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a = 0$  for  $i > d$ , where

$$j : \mathcal{X}_H := \varprojlim_{K \supseteq H} \mathcal{X}_K \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{X}}_H := \varprojlim_{K \supseteq H} \overline{\mathcal{X}}_K$$

is the inclusion, the inverse limits are taken as diamonds in the sense of [Sch17], and  $-^a$  denotes the corresponding almost module with respect to  $\mathcal{O}_C$  and its maximal ideal. As in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18],  $H_{\text{ét}}^i(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H, j_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a$  is analyzed using the Leray spectral sequence for a descent  $\pi$  of the Hodge–Tate period map which goes from  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H$  to a quotient of a partial flag variety  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\mu}$  for  $G$ , and the “Bruhat” stratification of  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\mu}$  into Schubert cells for the action of  $B$ .

Apart from the fact that we treat more general Shimura varieties, there are two principal differences between the argument presented here and that of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] that we wish to point out. The first is that we need to adapt the results of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §4] on the Schubert cells for the Siegel parabolic on  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\mu}$  to the Schubert cells for  $B$ . In fact, it turns out that the arguments flow more naturally in this setting. The second is that our analysis of the fibers of  $\pi$  uses some new and different techniques. The argument in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] relies heavily on a general result about the existence of invariant rational neighborhoods for profinite group actions on affinoid adic spaces ([CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 5.2.1]). Here, we instead make use of some new results on quotients of diamonds by finite groups, which we consider to be of independent interest. A corollary is a strengthening of [Han16, Theorem 1.4] showing that quotients of affinoid perfectoid spaces are affinoid perfectoid; see Theorem 2.1.2. We discuss the differences between our argument and the argument of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] more in detail in the introduction to §4 and in Remark 4.2.8.

We give one application of Theorem 1.1 in this paper. Colimits (or limits) of (co)homology groups of locally symmetric spaces, which we will loosely refer to as “completed (co)homology”, play a prominent role in the  $p$ -adic Langlands program at present; see [CE12, Eme14] for surveys. Following Hida, we look at the ordinary completed (Borel–Moore) homology groups

$$\widetilde{H}_i^{(\text{BM}),\text{ord}} := \varprojlim_{K \supseteq U(\mathbb{Z}_p)} H_i^{(\text{BM})}(X_K(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}_p)^{\text{ord}},$$

where on the right hand side  $H_i^{(\text{BM})}$  denotes  $i$ -th (Borel–Moore) homology and the superscript  $-\text{ord}$  denotes the “ordinary part”, i.e. the direct summand where certain  $U_p$ -like operators for  $G$  act invertibly<sup>2</sup>. If  $T \subseteq B$  is a maximal split torus, then  $\widetilde{H}_i^{(\text{BM}),\text{ord}}$  is a finitely generated module over the Iwasawa algebra  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$ , where  $T_0 := T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ . Our second main result is then the following.

<sup>2</sup>This definition, suitably adapted, makes sense for all connected reductive groups that are split at  $p$ . See § 5.4 for a precise definition.

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 5.5.1). *We have the following:*

- (1)  $\tilde{H}_i^{\text{BM,ord}} = 0$  for  $i > d$ . In fact more is true: Let  $H \subseteq U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  be a closed subgroup. Then

$$\varprojlim_{K \supseteq H} H_i^{\text{BM}}(X_K(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}_p) = 0$$

for  $i > d$ .

- (2) We have

$$\text{codim}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)} \tilde{H}_i^{\text{ord}} \geq d - i$$

for all  $0 \leq i \leq d$ .

The codimension function may be defined as

$$\text{codim}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)} \tilde{H}_i^{\text{ord}} = \inf_j \{j \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(\tilde{H}_i^{\text{ord}}, \mathcal{D}(T_0))\};$$

we discuss it further in §5.5. Theorem 1.2 is an analogue of a conjecture of Calegari and Emerton for completed homology and completed Borel–Moore homology [CE12, Conjecture 1.5]. The analogue of Theorem 1.2 in that setting was proved by Scholze for Shimura varieties of Hodge type [Sch15, Corollary 4.2.3]. The main ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.2 are Theorem 1.1 and a “Poincaré duality” spectral sequence relating ordinary completed Borel–Moore homology to ordinary completed homology, which we consider to be of independent interest. Such a result has previously been announced by Emerton, though relying on a different method than ours.

The conjecture [CE12, Conjecture 1.5] is symmetric when swapping the roles of homology and Borel–Moore homology. However, we remark that one will need more care when formulating (conjectural) versions of Theorem 1.2 with homology and Borel–Moore homology swapped, or in analogous situations like eigenvarieties. When swapping homology and Borel–Moore homology, one has to factor in contributions from ordinary boundary homology. In particular, we remark that Theorem 1.1 fails if one replaces compactly supported cohomology with cohomology, and Theorem 1.2(1) should fail if one replaces Borel–Moore homology with homology due to the presence of boundary homology. For eigenvarieties, conjectures on codimensions have been given by Urban [Urb11, Conjecture 5.7.5], with partial results by Hansen and Newton [Han17] that are somewhat orthogonal to our Theorem 1.2.

Let us now give short overview of the paper. Section 2 discusses results on quotients of diamonds by (pro)finite groups which are used in the analysis of the fibers of the Hodge–Tate period map. Section 3 introduces the Shimura varieties we consider in this paper and proves the perfectoidness results needed for Theorem 1.1, and section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally, section 5 introduces ordinary completed (Borel–Moore) homology and proves Theorem 1.2.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors wish to thank David Hansen, whose joint work in progress with one of us (C.J.) has had an impact on the material in §5. A.C. and D.G. wish to thank Matthew Emerton for discussions on ordinary parts and in particular for explaining his approach to the Poincaré duality spectral sequence. This paper arose as a continuation of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18], which in turn came out of A.C. and C.J.’s project group at the 2017 Arizona Winter School. We wish to thank the organizers of the A.W.S. again for the fantastic experience, and we wish to thank our collaborators from [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] and all participants of the project group.

A.C. was supported by a Royal Society University Research Fellowship and by ERC Starting Grant 804176. D.G. was supported by Royal Society grant RP\EA\180020.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES ON DIAMONDS

In this section, we will prove some results on diamonds and v-sheaves that will be used later in the paper. We use the notation, terminology and conventions regarding diamonds and v-sheaves of [Sch17]. Unless otherwise specified, v-sheaves are assumed to be on the category  $\text{Perf}$  of perfectoid spaces of characteristic  $p$ .

### 2.1. Quotients of diamond spectra and perfectoid spaces by finite groups.

**Proposition 2.1.1.** *Let  $A$  be a complete Tate  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -algebra with a continuous left action of a finite group  $G$ , and let  $A^+$  be an open and integrally closed subring of  $A$  that is preserved by  $G$ . Let  $X = \text{Spd}(A, A^+)$ ,  $X_G = \text{Spd}(A^G, A^{+G})$ . Then  $X \times \underline{G} \rightrightarrows X$  is a presentation of  $X_G$  as a v-sheaf.*

*Proof.* We need to show that  $X \rightarrow X_G$  and  $X \times \underline{G} \rightarrow X \times_{X_G} X$  are surjections of v-sheaves.

The diamonds  $X$ ,  $X_G$ ,  $X \times \underline{G}$ , and  $X \times_{X_G} X$  are spatial (in the last case we use [Sch17, Corollary 11.29]), hence qcqs. So  $X \rightarrow X_G$  and  $X \times \underline{G} \rightarrow X \times_{X_G} X$  are qc. So by [Sch17, Lemma 12.11], it suffices to show that  $|X| \rightarrow |X_G|$  and  $|X \times \underline{G}| \rightarrow |X \times_{X_G} X|$  are surjections. The former map is surjective by [Han16, Theorem 3.1].

To prove that the latter map is surjective, we use the characterization of the topological space of a diamond given in [Sch17, Proposition 11.13]. It suffices to show that if  $(K, K^+)$  is a perfectoid field and  $\phi_1, \phi_2: (A, A^+) \rightarrow (K, K^+)$  have the same restriction to  $(A^G, A^{+G})$ , then  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are related by an element of  $G$ . Let  $Y = \text{Spec}(A)$ ,  $Y_G = \text{Spec}(A^G)$ . Let  $y_1, y_2$  be points of  $Y(K)$  corresponding to  $\phi_1, \phi_2$ . By [SGA11, Thm. V.4.1(iii)],  $Y \times \underline{G} \rightarrow Y \times_{Y_G} Y$  is surjective. It follows that after extending  $K$ ,  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  become related by an element of  $G$ . But then they must already be related by an element of  $G$  over  $K$ . So  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are related by an element of  $G$ .  $\square$

Our main motivation for introducing the above result is to prove Proposition 3.2.2, but we also mention the following generalization of [Han16, Theorem 1.4], which will not be used in the rest of the paper.

**Theorem 2.1.2.** *Let  $X$  be a perfectoid space with a right action of a finite group  $G$ . Suppose that  $X$  has a covering by  $G$ -stable subspaces of the form  $\text{Spa}(A, A^+)$  with  $A$  perfectoid Tate. Let  $X/G$  be the coequalizer of  $X \times \underline{G} \rightrightarrows X$  in the category of v-ringded spaces. Then  $X/G$  is perfectoid.*

The theorem is an immediate consequence of item (2) of the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.1.3.** *Let  $(A, A^+)$  be a perfectoid Tate-Huber pair with a continuous left action of a finite group  $G$ . Let  $X = \text{Spa}(A, A^+)$ , and let  $X_G = \text{Spa}(A^G, A^{+G})$ . Then:*

- (1)  $X \times \underline{G} \rightrightarrows X \rightarrow X_G$  represents  $X_G$  as a coequalizer in the category of v-sheaves on  $\text{Perfd}$ .

- (2)  $X \times \underline{G} \rightrightarrows X \rightarrow X_G$  represents  $X_G$  as a coequalizer in the category of  $v$ -ringed spaces.

*Proof.* In the statement of the proposition, we are implicitly using the fact that  $A^G$  is perfectoid [KL16, Thm. 3.3.25] and that any perfectoid space may be regarded as  $v$ -sheaf on  $\text{Perfd}$  since the  $v$ -site is subcanonical [Sch17, Thm. 8.7].

By the same argument as in Lemma 2.1.1,  $X \rightarrow X_G$  and  $X \times \underline{G} \rightarrow X \times_{X_G} X$  are  $v$ -covers. This proves item (1).

By the argument of [Han16, Thm. 3.3], to prove item (2), it is enough to show that if  $U = X_G \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle$  is a rational subset of  $X_G$ , then the natural map  $A^G \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle \rightarrow A \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle^G$  is an isomorphism.

By item (1), in the category of  $v$ -sheaves on  $\text{Perfd}$ ,  $\text{Spa} \left( A \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle^G, A \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle^{+G} \right)$  is the coequalizer of  $(X \times_{X_G} U) \times \underline{G} \rightrightarrows X \times_{X_G} U$ . In a topos, coequalizers commute with base change, so this  $v$ -sheaf is canonically isomorphic to  $X_G \times_{X_G} U = U = \text{Spa} \left( A^G \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle, A^G \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle^+ \right)$ . Therefore  $A^G \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle \rightarrow A \langle \frac{T}{s} \rangle^G$  must be an isomorphism.  $\square$

*Remark 2.1.4.* The above argument seems to indicate that for general  $A$ , the map  $A^G \langle T/s \rangle \rightarrow A \langle T/s \rangle^G$  must be “totally inseparable” (since  $v$ -sheafifying generally loses information about nilpotents and totally inseparable field extensions), but any “totally inseparable” extension of perfectoid rings must be an isomorphism, giving the result.

This observation led us to find a more direct proof of Proposition 2.1.3(2), which we now sketch. Again we show that  $A^G \langle T/s \rangle \rightarrow A \langle T/s \rangle^G$  is an isomorphism. By the tilting correspondence, it is enough to consider the case where  $A$  has characteristic  $p$ . Since  $A^G \langle T/s \rangle \rightarrow A \langle T/s \rangle^G$  induces a bijection of adic spectra and  $A^G \langle T/s \rangle$  is uniform, the map is injective and  $A^G \langle T/s \rangle$  has the subspace topology. Let  $p^m$  be the largest power of  $p$  dividing the order of  $G$ . Any  $a \in A \langle T/s \rangle^G$  is a limit of elements of  $A[1/s]$ ; then  $\binom{|G|}{p^m} a^{p^m}$  is a limit of the  $p^m$ th elementary symmetric polynomials in the translates of each element. So  $\binom{|G|}{p^m} a^{p^m}$  is a limit of elements of  $A^G[1/s]$ ; hence  $\binom{|G|}{p^m} a^{p^m} \in A^G \langle T/s \rangle$ . Since  $\binom{|G|}{p^m}$  is not divisible by  $p$ ,  $a^{p^m} \in A^G \langle T/s \rangle$ , implying  $a \in A^G \langle T/s \rangle$  since  $A^G \langle T/s \rangle$  is perfect and  $A \langle T/s \rangle^G$  is reduced.

**2.2. Inverse limits of surjections of  $v$ -sheaves.** This short subsection consists of a single lemma, we will later need. While we state the lemma in its natural generality, in practice we will only need the case when the indexing system  $I$  has a cofinal subsystem isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \leq)$ .

**Lemma 2.2.1.** *Suppose we have cofiltered inverse systems of  $v$ -sheaves  $X_i, Y_i, i \in I$ , with compatible morphisms  $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$  that are qcqs and surjective. Let  $X := \varprojlim_i X_i$  and  $Y := \varprojlim_i Y_i$ . Then  $X \rightarrow Y$  is surjective.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for any qcqs  $Z$  with a map  $Z \rightarrow Y$ ,  $Z \times_Y X \rightarrow Z$  is surjective. For each  $i$ , let  $Z_i := Z \times_{Y_i} X_i$ ; then  $Z \times_Y X = \varprojlim_i Z_i$ . For each  $i < j$ , the map  $Z_j \rightarrow Z_i$  is qcqs since it is a base change of  $X_j \rightarrow X_i \times_{Y_i} Y_j$ , and  $X_j \rightarrow Y_j$  is qcqs and  $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$  is qs. By the argument of [Sch17, Lemma 12.17], we can find a diagram  $W_i$  of spatial diamonds with compatible qcqs surjections  $W_i \rightarrow Z_i$ . Then

each  $W_i \rightarrow Z$  is qcqs and surjective. By the argument of loc. cit.,  $\varprojlim_i W_i \rightarrow Z$  is surjective. So  $\varprojlim_i Z_i \rightarrow Z$  must be surjective.  $\square$

**2.3. Subsheaves and quotients.** Recall that if  $S$  is any topological space, then  $\underline{S}$  denotes the  $v$ -sheaf  $Z \mapsto \text{Map}_{cts}(|Z|, S)$  on  $\text{Perf}$ . In the following, subsets of topological spaces will be equipped with the subspace topology.

**Lemma 2.3.1.** *Let  $X$  be a spatial  $v$ -sheaf, and let  $S$  be a qc and generalizing subset of  $|X|$ . Then:*

- (1)  $X \times_{|X|} \underline{S} = \varprojlim_{U \supseteq S} U$ , where  $U$  runs over qc open sheaves of  $X$  containing  $S$ .
- (2)  $X \times_{|X|} \underline{S}$  is spatial.
- (3) If  $X$  is a diamond, then  $X \times_{|X|} \underline{S}$  is a diamond.

*Proof.* The first claim follows from [Sch17, Prop. 12.9] (since  $S = \bigcap |U|$ ), and then the remaining claims follow immediately from the first claim and [Sch17, Lem. 12.17] and [Sch17, Lem. 11.22], respectively.  $\square$

The following lemma will be key to the arguments of this paper.

**Lemma 2.3.2.** *Let  $X$  be a spatial  $v$ -sheaf with a right action of a profinite group  $G$ . Let  $X/G$  denote the quotient of  $X$  by  $G$  in the category of  $v$ -sheaves, and let  $\pi: X \rightarrow X/G$  be the quotient map. Let  $S \subset |X|$  be a qc and generalizing subset. Suppose that the multiplication map  $S \times G \rightarrow S \cdot G$  is a bijection. Then the natural map  $X \times_{|X|} \underline{S} \rightarrow X/G \times_{|X/G|} \pi(S)$  is an isomorphism of  $v$ -sheaves.*

*Proof.* The product  $X/G \times_{|X/G|} \pi(S)$  can be identified with  $(X \times_{|X|} \underline{S \cdot G})/G$ . Since  $((X \times_{|X|} \underline{S}) \times \underline{G})/G \cong X \times_{|X|} \underline{S}$ , it is enough to show that  $(X \times_{|X|} \underline{S}) \times \underline{G} \rightarrow X \times_{|X|} (\underline{S \cdot G})$  is an isomorphism, for which it is enough to show that  $\underline{S} \times \underline{G} \rightarrow \underline{S \cdot G}$  is an isomorphism. This, in turn, reduces to showing that  $S \times G \rightarrow S \cdot G$  is a homeomorphism. But this map is easily seen to be spectral and generalizing, and it is bijective by assumption. It is then a homeomorphism by [Sta18, Tag 09XU].  $\square$

### 3. SHIMURA VARIETIES

In this section we define the Shimura varieties that we will work with and prove the perfectoidness results and results on flag varieties that we will need.

**3.1. Setup.** We start by setting up some notation and assumptions. We let  $(G, \mathcal{H})$  be a Shimura datum of Hodge type, and we assume (crucially!) that  $G$  is *split* over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ . Being split over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ ,  $G$  has a natural split reductive model over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  [Con14, Theorem 6.1.16], and we will use the letter  $G$  for this model as well, or sometimes  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  for emphasis. Let  $E = E(G, \mathcal{H})$  be the reflex field of  $(G, \mathcal{H})$ . Since  $G$  is split over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ ,  $E_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathbb{Q}_p$  for every prime  $\mathfrak{p}$  above  $p$  (the local reflex field is the localization of the global reflex field). From now on we fix such a prime  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $E$  above  $p$ , or equivalently an embedding  $E \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p$ . The remainder of this subsection will be devoted to constructing a particular embedding  $(G, \mathcal{H}) \hookrightarrow (\tilde{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}})$  into a Siegel Shimura datum  $(\tilde{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}})$  with certain convenient properties. We start by recalling a lemma from [Kis10].

**Lemma 3.1.1.** *Let  $G$  be a reductive group over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . Let  $V$  be a finite-dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ , and let  $\rho: G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V)$  be a closed embedding of algebraic groups. Then there exists a lattice  $\Lambda \subset V$  so that  $\rho$  extends to a map  $G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$ .*

*Proof.* This is proved in [Kis10, Lemma 2.3.1]. The statement of that lemma includes some additional hypotheses when  $p = 2$ , but these are only used to guarantee that the map of integral models is a closed embedding, which we do not need.  $\square$

Next we recall a version of Zarhin's trick.

**Lemma 3.1.2** (Zarhin's trick, [Zar77, §2]). *Let  $V$  be a finite-dimensional symplectic  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space and let  $(\mathrm{GSp}(V), \mathcal{H}_V)$  be the associated Siegel Shimura datum. Let  $\Lambda \subset V$  be a lattice. Then there is a symplectic form on  $W = V^4 \oplus (V^\vee)^4$  preserved up to scaling by  $\mathrm{GSp}(V)$  that makes the lattice  $\Lambda^4 \oplus (\Lambda^\vee)^4 \subset V^4 \oplus (V^\vee)^4$  self-dual. Moreover, the closed embedding  $\mathrm{GSp}(V) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GSp}(W)$  induces a closed embedding  $(\mathrm{GSp}(V), \mathcal{H}_V) \hookrightarrow (\mathrm{GSp}(W), \mathcal{H}_W)$  of Siegel Shimura data.*

For convenience, we make the following definition.

**Definition 3.1.3.** *Let  $R$  be a principal ideal domain, and let  $\Lambda$  be finite free module over  $R$  equipped with a symplectic form. Let  $\mu: (\mathbb{G}_m)_R \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}(\Lambda)$  be a cocharacter. Recall [SGA11, Proposition I.4.7.3] that  $\mu$  induces a decomposition  $\Lambda = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Lambda_n$ , where  $\mu$  acts on  $\Lambda_n$  by  $\mu(z)(v) = z^n v$ .*

*We say that  $\mu$  is standard if  $\Lambda_0$  and  $\Lambda_1$  are nonzero and all other  $\Lambda_i$  are zero.*

For any cocharacter  $\mu: (\mathbb{G}_m)_R \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}(\Lambda)$ , the composition of  $\mu$  with the similitude factor  $\mathrm{GSp}(\Lambda) \rightarrow (\mathbb{G}_m)_R$  must be of the form  $z \mapsto z^n$  for some integer  $n$ . Then for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the symplectic form pairs  $\Lambda_i$  with  $\Lambda_{-i}$ . If  $\mu$  is standard, then the nondegeneracy of the symplectic form forces  $n = 1$  and  $\Lambda_0$  and  $\Lambda_1$  to be maximal isotropic.

We now return to our Hodge type Shimura datum  $(G, \mathcal{H})$  and the split integral model  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$ . Let us fix a choice of Hodge cocharacter  $\mu$  for  $G$ , viewed as a cocharacter over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . If  $\rho': (G, \mathcal{H}) \hookrightarrow (\mathrm{GSp}(V), \mathcal{H}_V)$  is any closed embedding into a Siegel Shimura datum, then  $\rho' \circ \mu_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  is standard (i.e. a Hodge cocharacter for  $(\mathrm{GSp}(V), \mathcal{H}_V)$ , over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ ). The following proposition summarizes the extra conditions we would like to put on our embedding and shows that they are possible to achieve.

**Proposition 3.1.4.** *Let  $(G, \mathcal{H})$ ,  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  and  $\mu$  be as above. Then there exists a symplectic  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space  $W$  and a closed embedding  $\rho_{\mathbb{Q}}: (G, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathrm{GSp}(W), \mathcal{H}_W)$  satisfying the following conditions: There exists a self-dual  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -lattice  $\Lambda \subset W \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{Q}_p$  such that  $\rho_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  extends to a homomorphism  $\rho_{\mathbb{Z}_p}: G_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \rightarrow \mathrm{GSp}(\Lambda)$ , and  $\rho_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \circ \mu$  is standard.*

*Under these conditions, let  $P_\mu$  and  $\tilde{P}_\mu$  be the parabolic subgroups of  $G$  and  $\tilde{G} := \mathrm{GSp}(\Lambda)$  corresponding to  $\mu$  and  $\tilde{\mu} := \rho_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \circ \mu$ , respectively, as defined in [CS17, §2.1] (we remark that these are the parabolics opposite to the ones defined by the Hodge filtration). Then  $G(\mathbb{Z}_p) = G(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  and  $P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p) = P_\mu(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \tilde{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ .*

*Proof.* Choose an arbitrary closed embedding  $\rho': (G, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathrm{GSp}(V), \mathcal{H}_V)$  into a Siegel Shimura datum. By Lemma 3.1.1, we can find a  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -lattice  $\Lambda_{V_{\mathbb{Q}_p}} \subset V \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{Q}_p$  such that  $\rho'_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  extends to a map  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(\Lambda_{V_{\mathbb{Q}_p}})$ . There exists a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -lattice  $\Lambda_V \subset V$  such that  $\Lambda_{V_{\mathbb{Q}_p}} = \Lambda_V \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p$ . Set  $W = V^4 \oplus (V^\vee)^4$ ,  $\Lambda = \Lambda_{V_{\mathbb{Q}_p}}^4 \oplus (\Lambda_{V_{\mathbb{Q}_p}}^\vee)^4$  and

$\Lambda_W = \Lambda_V^4 \oplus (\Lambda_V^\vee)^4$ . Applying Lemma 3.1.2, we can choose a symplectic form on  $W$  giving us an embedding of Shimura data  $\rho_{\mathbb{Q}}: (G, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathrm{GSp}(W), \mathcal{H}_W)$  such that  $\Lambda_W$  is selfdual. Then  $\Lambda$  is also self-dual. The composition

$$G_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(\Lambda_{V_{\mathbb{Q}_p}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$$

maps  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  to  $\mathrm{GSp}(W)$ , so since  $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  is dense in the reduced scheme  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$ , the image of  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  is contained in  $\mathrm{GSp}(\Lambda)$ . This gives the  $\rho_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  in the statement of the theorem. The cocharacter  $\tilde{\mu} := \rho_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \circ \mu$  is then standard since its generic fiber  $\rho_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \circ \mu_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  is.

Now set  $\tilde{G} := \mathrm{GSp}(\Lambda)$ . To prove the final part of the proposition, first note that it is clear that  $G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \subseteq G(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ . Equality must then hold since  $G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  is a maximal compact subgroup of  $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ . Then we compute

$$P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p) = G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cap P_\mu(\mathbb{Q}_p) = \tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cap P_\mu(\mathbb{Q}_p) = \tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cap G(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap P_\mu^\sim(\mathbb{Q}_p) = G(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap P_\mu^\sim(\mathbb{Z}_p),$$

finishing the proof.  $\square$

From now on, we fix an embedding  $(G, \mathcal{H}) \hookrightarrow (\tilde{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}})$  into a Siegel Shimura datum satisfying the conditions of Proposition 3.1.4. As with  $G$ , we will use  $\tilde{G}$ , or sometimes  $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  for emphasis, to denote the split model of  $\tilde{G}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  given by Proposition 3.1.4. Composing our fixed  $\mu$  with  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \rightarrow \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  gives a Hodge cocharacter  $\tilde{\mu}$  for  $\tilde{G}$ , which by Proposition 3.1.4 is conjugate over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  to the standard cocharacter  $z \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} zI & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$  in  $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$ . We let  $P_\mu$  and  $P_\mu^\sim$  be the parabolic subgroups of  $G$  and  $\tilde{G}$ , respectively, that are defined in Proposition 3.1.4.

**3.2. The anticanonical tower.** We now start discussing Shimura varieties. Our notation and definitions will be similar to those of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18], so we will occasionally be rather brief. From now on, we fix a complete algebraically closed extension  $C$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ . To start with, it will be more convenient to indicate the full level subgroup in our notation but later we will fix the tame level and only specify the level at  $p$ . For any compact open subgroup  $K \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ , always assumed to be neat throughout this paper, we let  $X_K$  denote the canonical model (defined over the reflex field  $E$ ) of the Shimura variety of  $(G, \mathcal{H})$  of level  $K^p K$ . We set

$$\mathcal{X}_K := (X_K \otimes_E C)^{an},$$

the analytification (as an adic space over  $C$ ) of the base change of  $X_K$  to  $C$ , via our fixed embedding  $E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p$ . If  $H \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  is an arbitrary compact subgroup, we set

$$\mathcal{X}_H := \varprojlim_{K \supseteq H} \mathcal{X}_K^\diamond,$$

where  $-\diamond$  denotes the diamondification functor on analytic adic spaces over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  [Sch17, Definition 15.5], the inverse limit is taken over all open  $K \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  containing  $H$ , and the inverse limit exists in the category of diamonds and is locally spatial by [Sch17, Lemma 11.22]. We note that this is a mild abuse of notation when  $H$  itself is open; see [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Remark 3.2.8(1)] for more details. We define Shimura varieties  $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{K}}$  (over  $E$ , not  $\mathbb{Q}$ ),  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}}$  for  $\tilde{G}$  completely analogously, whenever  $\tilde{K} \subseteq \tilde{G}(\mathbb{A}_f)$  is a compact open subgroup, and  $\tilde{H} \subseteq \tilde{G}(\mathbb{A}_f)$  is a compact subgroup.



Next, we introduce compactifications. Whenever  $K \subseteq \tilde{K}$ , there is a natural finite étale map  $X_K \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\tilde{K}}$ , which extends to a finite map  $X_K^* \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\tilde{K}}^*$  of minimal compactifications. When  $K = \tilde{K} \cap G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  by [Del71, Proposition 1.15], the map  $X_K \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\tilde{K}}$  is a closed immersion but the extension  $X_K^* \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\tilde{K}}^*$  need not be. Following [Sch15, §4], we define the ad hoc compactification  $X_K^* \rightarrow \overline{X}_K$  to be the universal finite map over which all the  $X_K^* \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\tilde{K}}^*$  factor (for varying  $\tilde{K}$  satisfying  $K = \tilde{K} \cap G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ ); as noted by Scholze  $\overline{X}_K$  is the scheme-theoretic image of  $X_K^* \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\tilde{K}}^*$  for sufficiently small  $\tilde{K}$ . The right action of  $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  on the tower  $(X_K)_K$  extends to an action on  $(\overline{X}_K)_K$ . We may then analytify: Set  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_K = (\overline{X} \otimes_E C)^{an}$  and, for  $H \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  compact, set  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H = \varprojlim_{K \supseteq H} \overline{\mathcal{X}}_K^\diamond$ . The latter is a spatial diamond by [Sch17, Lemma 11.22]. We also define  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}}^*$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_H^*$  analogously for  $\tilde{G}$  (we use minimal compactifications here). We collect some facts about these diamonds.

**Lemma 3.2.1.** *Note that any compact subgroup  $H \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  is also a compact subgroup of  $\tilde{G}(\mathbb{A}_f)$ .*

- (1) *Let  $H_2 \subseteq H_1$  be neat compact subgroups of  $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ , with  $H_2$  normal in  $H_1$ . Then  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}| = |\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}|/(H_1/H_2)$ . Moreover,  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H|$  is the closure of  $|\mathcal{X}_H|$  inside  $|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_H^*|$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H = \underline{|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H|} \times_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*|} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*$ , for any neat compact subgroup  $H \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ .*
- (2) *Let  $\tilde{H}_2 \subseteq \tilde{H}_1$  be neat compact subgroups of  $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ , with  $\tilde{H}_2$  normal in  $\tilde{H}_1$ . Then  $|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_1}^*| = |\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^*|/(\tilde{H}_1/\tilde{H}_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Part (2) is [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemma 3.2.11]. For part (1), the first statement is essentially [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 3.2.15] and the second statement is essentially [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Corollary 3.2.14]; in both cases the proofs of the cited results only use an embedding into a Siegel Shimura datum and go through verbatim in our situation.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.2.** (1) *For any neat compact subgroups  $H_2 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  with  $H_2$  normal in  $H_1$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2} \times \underline{H_1/H_2} \Rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}$  is a presentation of  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}$  as a v-sheaf.*

- (2) *For any neat compact subgroups  $\tilde{H}_2 \subseteq \tilde{H}_1 \subseteq \tilde{G}(\mathbb{A}_f)$  with  $\tilde{H}_2$  normal in  $\tilde{H}_1$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^* \times \underline{\tilde{H}_1/\tilde{H}_2} \Rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^*$  is a presentation of  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_1}^*$  as a v-sheaf.*

*Proof.* We first prove part (2). Consider the case where  $\tilde{H}_1$  and  $\tilde{H}_2$  are open subgroups of  $\tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ . Then we can consider  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_1}^*$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^*$  as adic spaces. By [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lem. 3.2.2],  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^* \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_1}^*$  identifies  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^*$  with  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^*/(\tilde{H}_1/\tilde{H}_2)$  (here we take the quotient in the category of v-ringed spaces). This morphism is finite, so we can cover  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_1}^*$  with affinoids whose pullback to  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}_2}^*$  is affinoid. Then the result follows from Proposition 2.1.1 and [Han16, Thm. 1.2].

In the general case, choose an open compact subgroup  $\tilde{K}_0$  containing  $\tilde{H}$  and let  $\{\tilde{K}_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  be a shrinking family of open normal subgroups of  $\tilde{K}_0$  with  $\bigcap_i \tilde{K}_i = \{1\}$ . For each  $i$ , we have shown that  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_2}^* \times \underline{\tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_1 / \tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_2} \Rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_2}^*$  is a presentation of

$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_1}^*$  as a v-sheaf. The diamonds  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_i \tilde{H}_j}^*$  are spatial, so by many applications of [Sch17, Corollary 11.29], the relevant maps are qcqs. Applying Lemma 2.2.1 then finishes the proof of part (2).

We now prove part (1). By Lemma 3.2.1,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1} = \underline{|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}|} \times_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*|} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*$ . Since coequalizers commute with fibre products, we conclude from part (2) that

$$\underline{|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}|} \times_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*|} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}^* \times \underline{H_1/H_2} \rightrightarrows \underline{|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}|} \times_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*|} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}^*$$

is a presentation of  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}$  as a v-sheaf. It remains to show that  $\underline{|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}|} \times_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*|} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}^* = \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}$ , which in turns reduces to showing that  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}| \times_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_1}^*|} |\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}^*| = |\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_2}|$ . But this follows directly from Lemma 3.2.1.  $\square$

We will now start to only indicate the level at  $p$  in the notation for our Shimura varieties. Let  $\tilde{K}^p \subseteq \tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^p)$  be a neat open subgroup, which we assume<sup>3</sup> to be contained inside the principal congruence subgroup of level  $N$  for some  $N \geq 3$ ,  $p \nmid N$ . The choice of  $\tilde{K}^p$  is arbitrary but fixed, unless otherwise indicated. If  $\tilde{H} \subseteq \tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  is a closed subgroup, we now write  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}}^*$  for what was previously denoted by  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}^p \tilde{H}}^*$ , and so on. We make similar conventions for the Shimura varieties, with  $K^p \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  a compact open subgroup contained in  $\tilde{K}^p$ , and  $H \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  a closed subgroup.

Recall the parabolic subgroups  $P_\mu \subseteq G$  and  $P_\mu^\sim \subseteq \tilde{G}$  defined at the end of §3.1. Let  $\tilde{K}_0(p)$  denote the parahoric subgroup of  $\tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  with respect to the *opposite* parabolic  $\overline{P}_\mu^\sim$  of  $P_\mu^\sim$ . The Shimura variety  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_0(p)}^\sim$  is the moduli space of principally polarized abelian varieties  $(A, \lambda)$  together with a  $\tilde{K}^p$ -level structure and a subspace  $W \subseteq A[p]$  which is Lagrangian with respect to the  $\lambda$ -Weil pairing. For any  $\epsilon \in [0, 1/2)$ , we let  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_0(p)}^\sim(\epsilon)_a \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_0(p)}^\sim$  denote the anticanonical locus of level  $\tilde{K}_0(p)$  and radius of overconvergence  $\epsilon$ , which is defined in [Sch15, Theorem 3.2.15(iii)]<sup>4</sup>. We then set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}}^\sim(\epsilon)_a := \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_0(p)}^\sim(\epsilon)_a \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_0(p)}^\sim} \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}}^\sim$$

for all closed subgroups  $\tilde{H} \subseteq \tilde{K}_0(p)$  and similarly for minimal compactifications. Furthermore, whenever  $H \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cap \tilde{K}_0(p)$  is a closed subgroup, we set

$$\mathcal{X}_H(\epsilon)_a := \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_0(p)}^\sim(\epsilon)_a \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{K}_0(p)}^\sim} \mathcal{X}_H$$

and similarly for the ad hoc compactifications. We then have the following basic perfectoidness results.

**Theorem 3.2.3.** *If  $\tilde{H} \subseteq \overline{P}_\mu^\sim(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  is a closed subgroup, then the diamond  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}}^\sim(\epsilon)_a$  is affinoid perfectoid, and the boundary  $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{\tilde{H}}^\sim(\epsilon)_a := \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}}^\sim(\epsilon)_a \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{\tilde{H}}^\sim(\epsilon)_a$  is Zariski closed.*

<sup>3</sup>This (rather mild) assumption is imposed to be able to apply the perfectoidness results from [Sch15] later. It is possible to remove this assumption using the results of [Han16], but we do not go into this. Also recall that the proof of Proposition 3.1.4 furnishes us with a split model of  $\tilde{G}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , so it makes sense to talk about  $\tilde{G}(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^p)$  and its principal congruence subgroups.

<sup>4</sup>Up to a minor difference in level structures; see the proof of Theorem 3.2.3 for more details.

*Proof.* This is [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Corollary 3.2.17], up to a minor difference in the level structure. In [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] the anticanonical locus is defined on the Shimura variety whose level is contained in the parahoric subgroup corresponding to the parabolic  $P_\mu^\sim$  (following [Sch15]), but  $P_\mu^\sim$  and  $\overline{P}_\mu^\sim$  are conjugate (by the longest element of the Weyl group) and the anticanonical loci corresponds, so we may conjugate to get the result.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.4.** *If  $H \subseteq \overline{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , then the diamond  $\mathcal{X}_H^*(\epsilon)_a$  is affinoid perfectoid, and the boundary  $\mathcal{Z}_H(\epsilon)_a := \mathcal{X}_H^*(\epsilon)_a \setminus \mathcal{X}_H(\epsilon)_a$  is Zariski closed.*

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 3.2.3 in exactly the same way as [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Theorem 3.2.18] follows from [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Corollary 3.2.17].  $\square$

We remark that at this stage we haven't proved that  $\mathcal{X}_H^*(\epsilon)_a$  is non-empty, but the result and its proof still make sense. In fact we will not need to separately prove the non-emptiness; it follows from Theorem 3.4.1.

**3.3. Flag varieties and the Hodge–Tate period map.** We begin by briefly recalling some material from [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §4]. Let  $G$  be a split connected reductive group over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  with a split maximal torus  $T$  and a Borel subgroup  $B \supseteq T$ . Let  $\Phi = \Phi(G, T)$  be the roots of  $G$  with respect to  $T$ , let  $\Phi^+ \subseteq \Phi$  (resp.  $\Phi^- \subseteq \Phi$ ) denote the positive (resp. negative) roots with respect to  $B$ , and let  $\Delta \subseteq \Phi^+$  be the simple roots. Let  $P = P_I \supseteq B$  be the standard parabolic corresponding to a subset  $I \subseteq \Delta$ , with unipotent radical  $N = N$ , and let  $\Phi_P \subseteq \Phi$  be the root system of the Levi factor of  $P$  with respect to (the image of)  $T$ . Let  $W := W(G, T)$  and  $W_P := W(P/N, T)$  be the respective Weyl groups.

Let  $U \subseteq B$  be the unipotent radical. As before, we use overlines to denote opposites: We have  $\overline{B}$ , the opposite Borel of  $B$ , with unipotent radical  $\overline{U}$ . Recall that  $\overline{B} = w_0 B w_0$ , where  $w_0 \in W$  is the longest element. We will look at the stratification of the flag variety  $G/P$  into orbits for  $\overline{B}$ . To this end, we recall the generalized Bruhat decomposition

$$G = \bigsqcup_{w \in W/W_P} BwP$$

from [BT65, Corollaire 5.20]. From this one easily deduces the decomposition

$$G = \bigsqcup_{w \in W/W_P} \overline{B}wP$$

using that  $\overline{B} = w_0 B w_0$ . We note that  $\overline{B}P$  is the “big cell”, which is open in  $G$ . The following is [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemma 4.3.1].

**Lemma 3.3.1.** *For any  $w \in W$ ,  $\overline{B}wP \subseteq w\overline{B}P$ . In particular, we have the open cover*

$$G = \bigcup_{w \in W/W_P} w\overline{B}P.$$

We now introduce some more notation. We let  $\text{Fl}_G := G/P$  be the partial flag variety of parabolics conjugate to  $P$ . For  $w \in W$ , we have affine open subsets  $w\overline{B}P/P \subseteq \text{Fl}_G$ , whose stabilizer is  $\overline{P}_w := w\overline{P}w^{-1}$  (since  $\overline{B}P = \overline{P}P$ ). The following is the analogue of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemma 4.3.2]; it is key to proving the stronger vanishing theorem in this article.

**Lemma 3.3.2.** *We have  $\dim \bar{U} - \dim(\bar{U} \cap \bar{P}_w) + \dim(\bar{B}wP/P) = \dim \bar{N}$ .*

*Proof.* We start by observing that  $\dim \bar{U} = \#\Phi^-$ . Then, note that the second term  $\dim(\bar{U} \cap \bar{P}_w)$  is equal to  $\#(\Phi^- \cap w(\Phi^- \cup \Phi_P))$ . For the third term, we first observe that

$$\bar{B}wP/P \cong \bar{B}/(\bar{B} \cap wPw^{-1})$$

and then the latter has dimension

$$(\dim T + \#\Phi^-) - (\dim T + \#(\Phi^- \cap w(\Phi^+ \cup \Phi_P))) = \#\Phi^- - \#(\Phi^- \cap w(\Phi^+ \cup \Phi_P)).$$

The left hand side of the equality we want to prove is then

$$\#\Phi^- - \#(\Phi^- \cap w(\Phi^- \cup \Phi_P)) + \#\Phi^- - \#(\Phi^- \cap w(\Phi^+ \cup \Phi_P)),$$

which is equal to

$$\#(\Phi^- \setminus w(\Phi^- \cup \Phi_P)) + \#(\Phi^- \setminus w(\Phi^+ \cup \Phi_P)).$$

But this last line is just

$$\#(\Phi^- \setminus w(\Phi_P)),$$

and this is independent of  $w$ , since  $\alpha \in \Phi_P$  if and only if  $-\alpha \in \Phi_P$ , and hence precisely one of  $w(\alpha)$  and  $w(-\alpha) = -w(\alpha)$  will be negative. In particular, if we set  $w = 1$ , we get  $\#(\Phi^- \setminus \Phi_P)$ , which is equal to the dimension of  $\bar{N}$  as desired.  $\square$

Next, we leave the setting above and discuss the Hodge–Tate period map for our Shimura varieties. Let  $\mathbf{1} \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \subseteq \tilde{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  denote the trivial subgroup, and set  $\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu} := (G/P_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} C)^{an}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}l_{\tilde{G},\tilde{\mu}} := (\tilde{G}/P_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} C)^{an}$ . These flag varieties have natural models over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ , and there is a natural Zariski closed embedding  $\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}l_{\tilde{G},\tilde{\mu}}$ . We have Hodge–Tate period maps

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\text{HT}} : \mathcal{X}_1 &\rightarrow \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}, \\ \tilde{\pi}_{\text{HT}} : \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1^* &\rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}l_{\tilde{G},\tilde{\mu}} \end{aligned}$$

constructed in [Sch15, CS17]. When  $K^p \subseteq \tilde{K}^p$ , we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\mathcal{X}}_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{HT}}} & \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1^* & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{HT}}} & \tilde{\mathcal{F}}l_{\tilde{G},\tilde{\mu}} \end{array}$$

By [Sch15, Theorem 4.1.1],  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_1$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1^*$  are perfectoid spaces. The existence of the commutative diagram follows by combining the proof of [CS17, Theorem 2.1.3(i)] with the proof of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Theorem 3.3.1]. We remark that  $\pi_{\text{HT}}$  is equivariant for the action of  $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ , where  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_1$  is given the standard right  $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ -action and  $\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}$  is given the right  $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ -action that is inverse to the standard left action (the analogous remark applies to  $\tilde{\pi}_{\text{HT}}$ ). Next, we define some “topological” Hodge–Tate period maps, as in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §4.5]. By Lemma 3.2.1 we may, for any closed subgroup  $H \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , define a map

$$|\pi_H| : |\bar{\mathcal{X}}_H| \rightarrow |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}|/H$$

by quotienting out the map  $|\pi_{\text{HT}}|$  by  $H$ . Moreover, we define a morphism

$$\pi_H : (\bar{\mathcal{X}}_H)_{\text{ét}} \rightarrow |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}|/H$$

of sites by precomposing  $|\pi_H|$  with the natural map  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H)_{\acute{e}t} \rightarrow |\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H|$ .

**3.4. Perfectoid loci.** Choose a maximal split torus and a Borel subgroup  $T \subseteq B \subseteq P_\mu$  of  $G$ , all over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ . Let  $W$  be the Weyl group of  $G$  with respect to  $T$  and let  $W_\mu := W_{P_\mu}$  in the notation of the previous subsection. We will define two open covers of  $\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}$ . The first is by Zariski open affine subsets. We set

$$V_w := (w\overline{B}P_\mu/P_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} C)^{an}$$

for any  $w \in W$ ; this is an open cover by Lemma 3.3.1 and  $V_w$  only depends on the coset  $wW_\mu$ . The second cover is the analogous cover by open affinoid subsets  $\mathcal{V}_w$ ,  $w \in W/W_\mu$ . One way to define  $\mathcal{V}_w$  is as the rigid generic fibre of the formal completion along  $p = 0$  of the  $\mathcal{O}_C$ -scheme

$$(w\overline{B}_{\mathbb{Z}_p}P_{\mu,\mathbb{Z}_p}/P_{\mu,\mathbb{Z}_p}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{O}_C,$$

where we have added the subscript  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  to emphasize that we are consider the models of these algebraic groups over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  (all parabolic subgroups of  $G$  over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  extend uniquely to parabolic subgroups of  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$ ). Set

$$\gamma := \mu(p) \in G(\mathbb{Q}_p).$$

Then, by the definition of  $P_\mu$ , it follows that

$$V_1 = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{V}_1 \gamma^{-k}.$$

Moreover, the open subsets  $\mathcal{V}_1 \gamma^k$ , for  $k \leq 0$ , form a basis of open neighborhoods of the base point in  $\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}$ . For any closed subgroup  $H \subseteq P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , we set  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,1} := \pi_H^{-1}(|V_1|/H)$ ; this is a locally spatial diamond. Note that  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{1,1}$  is non-empty since its translates by elements in  $W$  cover  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1$ . It follows that  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,1}$  is non-empty as well, for all  $H \subseteq P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ . Our next result generalizes [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Theorem 4.5.2].

**Theorem 3.4.1.** *For any closed subgroup  $H \subseteq \overline{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , the locally spatial diamond  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,1}$  is a perfectoid space. More precisely,  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,1}|$  is covered by the increasing union of quasi-compact open subsets  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1(\epsilon)_a| \gamma^{-k}/H$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  (and sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ ), and the corresponding spatial diamonds are affinoid perfectoid with Zariski closed boundary.*

*Proof.* We may identify  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,1}|$  with  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{1,1}|/H$ . The first step is to show that the  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1(\epsilon)_a| \gamma^{-k}$  cover  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{1,1}|$ . By [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 3.3.4],  $|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1^*(\epsilon)_a| \gamma^{-k}$  cover  $|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{1,1}^*|$ . Then we just need to observe that  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1(\epsilon)_a| \gamma^{-k} = |\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1^*(\epsilon)_a| \gamma^{-k} \cap |\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1|$  and  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{1,1}| \subseteq |\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{1,1}^*| \cap |\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1|$ . After this, it remains to show that the open subdiamonds of  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H$  given by the open subsets  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1(\epsilon)_a| \gamma^{-k}/H$  are affinoid perfectoid with Zariski closed boundary. But  $\gamma^k$  induces an isomorphism

$$\gamma^k : \overline{\mathcal{X}}_H \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\gamma^{-k}H\gamma^k}$$

which identifies  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1(\epsilon)_a| \gamma^{-k}/H$  with  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\gamma^{-k}H\gamma^k}(\epsilon)_a|$ , and  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\gamma^{-k}H\gamma^k}(\epsilon)_a$  is affinoid perfectoid with Zariski closed boundary by Corollary 3.2.4, since

$$\gamma^{-k}H\gamma^k \subseteq \gamma^{-k}\overline{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)\gamma^k \subseteq \overline{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

□

We now consider the situation for general  $w$ . In this case, the parabolic  $\overline{P}_{\mu,w} := w\overline{P}_{\mu}w^{-1}$  stabilizes  $V_w$ . Note that  $\overline{P}_{\mu,w}(\mathbb{Z}_p) = w\overline{P}_{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}_p)w^{-1}$  since  $G$  is split over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  and we have chosen the natural split model over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , so  $w$  has a representative in  $G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ . For any closed subgroup  $H \subseteq \overline{P}_{\mu,w}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , we may define

$$\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,w} := \pi_H^{-1}(|V_w|/H).$$

Then these spaces are perfectoid.

**Corollary 3.4.2.** *For any closed subgroup  $H \subseteq \overline{P}_{\mu,w}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , the locally spatial diamond  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,w}$  is a perfectoid space. More precisely,  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H,w}|$  is covered by the increasing union of quasi-compact open subsets  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1(\epsilon)_a|_{\gamma^{-k}w^{-1}/H}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  (and sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ ), and the corresponding spatial diamonds are affinoid perfectoid with Zariski closed boundary.*

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 3.4.1 by looking at the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{w^{-1}Hw})_{\acute{e}t} & \xrightarrow{w^{-1}} & (\overline{\mathcal{X}}_H)_{\acute{e}t} \\ \downarrow \pi_{w^{-1}Hw} & & \downarrow \pi_H \\ |\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}|/w^{-1}Hw & \xrightarrow{w^{-1}} & |\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}|/H, \end{array}$$

where the horizontal maps are isomorphisms, since  $V_w = V_1w^{-1}$  so  $\mathcal{X}_{w^{-1}Hw,1}^{*}w^{-1} = \mathcal{X}_{H,w}^{*}$ .  $\square$

In this paper, we will only use Corollary 3.4.2 in the situation when  $H \subseteq \overline{U}_w(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , where  $\overline{U}_w = \overline{U} \cap \overline{P}_{\mu,w}$  and we recall that  $\overline{U}$  is the unipotent radical of  $\overline{B}$ .

#### 4. THE VANISHING THEOREM

In this section we prove Theorem 4.1.1, our main result. Our arguments follow those of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §5] closely, with a few differences. As these are somewhat technical, we discuss them in Remark 4.2.8 when all necessary objects have been introduced. For the sake of readability, we have elected to reproduce some arguments that appear in identical form in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18].

**4.1. First reductions.** We start by stating our main theorem. To state it, we define, for  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ ,

$$K_1(p^m) := \{g \in G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \mid (g \bmod p) \in \overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}/p^m)\}.$$

Note that  $\bigcap_{m \geq 1} K_1(p^m) = \overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ . We let  $d$  be the dimension of the Shimura varieties for our Shimura datum  $(G, \mathcal{H})$ ; we have  $d = \dim \overline{N}_{\mu}$ .

**Theorem 4.1.1.** *Let  $K \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  be an open compact subgroup. Then*

$$\varinjlim_m H_c^i(X_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}/p^r) = 0$$

for all  $r \geq 1$  and all  $i > d$ .

Here the cohomology is singular cohomology (with compact supports) of the complex manifold  $X_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}(\mathbb{C})$ . The following more general version follows directly.

**Corollary 4.1.2.** *Let  $H \subseteq \overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  be a closed subgroup. Then*

$$\varinjlim_{K \supseteq H} H_c^i(X_K(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}/p^r) = 0$$

for all  $r \geq 1$  and all  $i > d$ .

*Remark 4.1.3.* This is Theorem 1.1. In the formulation of Theorem 1.1, the  $U$  used there was the unipotent radical of an arbitrarily chosen Borel subgroup of  $G$  over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , whereas Corollary 4.1.2 is formulated in terms of a specific choice (depending on the choice of  $\mu$ ). The two formulations are easily seen to be equivalent, since all Borel subgroups over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  are conjugate by elements of  $G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  (see e.g. [Con14, Corollary 5.2.13]). Equivalently, it is possible to conjugate the choice of  $\mu$  to make  $\overline{U}$  arbitrary.

In this subsection we make a series of arguments, as in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §5.1], to reduce Theorem 4.1.1 to particular statement in  $p$ -adic geometry. First, note that by dévissage it suffices to treat the case  $r = 1$ , and that by applying comparison theorems (between singular and étale cohomology of varieties over  $\mathbb{C}$ , between étale cohomology of varieties over  $C$  and their analytification, and also invariance of algebraically closed field for étale cohomology of varieties), Theorem 4.1.1 is equivalent to

$$\varinjlim_m H_{\text{ét}}^i(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}, j_! \mathbb{F}_p) = 0$$

for  $i > d$ . Here and in the rest of this section we write  $j$  for any open immersion  $Y \rightarrow \overline{Y}$  where  $\overline{Y}$  is a locally spatial diamond with a (fixed) map to  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{G(\mathbb{Z}_p)}$ ,  $Y = \overline{Y} \times_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{G(\mathbb{Z}_p)}} \mathcal{X}_{G(\mathbb{Z}_p)}$  and  $Y \rightarrow \overline{Y}$  is the projection onto the first factor. Applying the primitive comparison theorem [Sch13, Theorem 3.13] and [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemma 5.1.3] gives us

$$\varinjlim_m H_{\text{ét}}^i(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}, j_! \mathbb{F}_p)^a \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathcal{O}_C/p = \varinjlim_m H_{\text{ét}}^i(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}, j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}}/p))^a,$$

where  $-^a$  denotes the almost setting with respect to the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}_C$ . Applying the almost version of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 2.2.1] and some results from [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §2.3] (see the paragraph after [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 5.1.4] for more details), we get

$$\varinjlim_m H_{\text{ét}}^i(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}, j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{K \cap K_1(p^m)}}/p))^a = H_{\text{ét}}^i(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{K \cap \overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)}, j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{K \cap \overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)}}/p))^a.$$

From here on we make the following convention: For any quasi-pro-étale  $Y \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{G(\mathbb{Z}_p)}$ , we write  $\mathcal{O}_Y^+/p$  for the étale sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_Y^+/p$ ; this is somewhat justified by [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemmas 2.3.2 and 2.3.3].

From now on, we set  $H_w := K \cap \overline{U}_w(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  for any  $w \in W/W_\mu$ , and we let  $H := H_1 = K \cap \overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  for simplicity. We consider the morphism

$$\pi_H : (\mathcal{X}_H^*)_{\text{ét}} \rightarrow |\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}|/H$$

and its Leray spectral sequence

$$E_2^{r,s} = H^r(|\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}|/H, R^s \pi_{H,*} j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a) \implies H_{\text{ét}}^{r+s}(\mathcal{X}_H^*, j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a).$$

Define, for  $w \in W/W_\mu$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}^w := (\overline{B}wP_\mu/P_\mu \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} C)^{an}.$$

These are generalized Schubert cells, and they form a Zariski stratification of  $\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}$ . Note also that they are stable under  $H$ . The following is the key result.

**Theorem 4.1.4.** *Let  $w \in W/W_\mu$  and let  $x \in |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w|/H$ . Then*

$$(R^i \pi_{H,*} j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a)_x = 0$$

for  $i > d - \dim \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.1.* By the Leray spectral sequence for  $\pi_H$  it suffices to prove that  $H^r(|\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}|/H, R^s \pi_{H,*} j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a) = 0$  for  $r + s > d$ . Fix  $r$  and assume that  $s > d - r$ . Let  $S_r$  be the set of  $w \in W/W_\mu$  for which  $\dim \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w < r$ , set  $Y_r := \bigcup_{w \in S_r} \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w$  and let  $\overline{Y}_r$  be the Zariski closure of  $Y_r$ . Since  $Y_r$  is  $\overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ -invariant and has dimension  $< r$ , the same holds for  $\overline{Y}_r$ . By [BFH<sup>+</sup>17, Lemma 3.2.3],  $|\overline{Y}_r|/H$  is a spectral space of dimension  $< r$ . Set  $\mathcal{F}^s := R^s \pi_{H,*} j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a$ ; we claim that it is supported on  $|\overline{Y}_r|/H$ . Take  $x \notin |\overline{Y}_r|/H$ ; by construction  $x \notin |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w|/H$  for all  $w \in S_r$ . It follows that  $x \in |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^{w'}|/H$  for some  $w'$  such that  $\dim \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^{w'} \geq r$ . Hence  $\mathcal{F}^s = 0$  by Theorem 4.1.4 since  $s > d - r \geq d - \dim \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^{w'}$ , so  $c\mathcal{F}^s$  is indeed supported on  $|\overline{Y}_r|/H$ . By [Sch92, Corollary 4.6],

$$H^r(|\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}|/H, \mathcal{F}^s) = H^r(|\overline{Y}_r|/H, \mathcal{F}^s) = 0,$$

since  $|\overline{Y}_r|/H$  is a spectral space of dimension  $< r$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1.4.** The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.1.4. Our argument differs from that in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §5.3] in that we make no use of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 5.2.1]. Instead we use the results from §2 of this paper.

Fix  $w$  and  $x$  as in the statement of Theorem 4.1.4, and write  $d(w)$  for  $\dim \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w$ . As in the proof of Theorem 4.1.1, we write  $\mathcal{F}^i$  for  $R^i \pi_{H,*} j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a$ . Recall the notion of a rank one point on the topological space of a locally spatial diamond from [BFH<sup>+</sup>17, Definition 3.2.1]; this means that the point has no proper generalizations. Recall further from the end of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, §2.1] that, if  $Y$  is a spatial diamond,  $S$  is a profinite set and  $q : |Y| \rightarrow S$  is a spectral map, then we define the fiber  $q^{-1}(s)$  for any point  $s \in S$  to be

$$q^{-1}(s) := \varprojlim_{s \in U} q^{-1}(U).$$

This is naturally a spatial diamond, with an injective quasi-pro-étale morphism  $q^{-1}(s) \rightarrow Y$ . By [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 2.2.5, Lemma 2.2.6], we have

$$\mathcal{F}^i \cong H_{\text{ét}}^i(\pi_H^{-1}(x), j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a).$$

**Lemma 4.2.1.** *It suffices to prove Theorem 4.1.4 for points  $x$  with no proper generalizations.*

*Proof.* This is the precise analogue of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemma 5.3.1] in our situation, and the same proof works.  $\square$

From now on, we assume that  $x \in |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w|/H$  has no proper generalizations. Let  $\tilde{x} \in |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w|$  be any lift of  $x$ ; this is a rank one point. By Lemma 3.3.1, we have  $\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w \subseteq V_w$  and we let  $x_w := \tilde{x}H_w \in |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}^w|/H_w$ . Now consider the set



$(\tilde{x}H)/H_w \subseteq |\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}^w|/H_w$  (which contains  $x_w$ ), equipped with the subspace topology. On the one hand,  $(\tilde{x}H)/H_w$  consists only of points with no proper generalizations in the spectral space  $|\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}^w|/H_w$ , so it is Hausdorff. It is also compact, since it is the image of  $\tilde{x}H \subseteq |\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}|$ . Finally, it is spectral, since it is the preimage of  $x$  under the map  $|\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}^w|/H_w \rightarrow |\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}^w|/H$ . Therefore it is profinite, e.g. by [Sta18, Tag 0905, Lemma 5.23.7]. Consider the spatial diamond  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}((\tilde{x}H)/H_w)$ . Our first goal is to prove that  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}((\tilde{x}H)/H_w)$  is an affinoid perfectoid space. This is proved in Corollary 4.2.7 below, but it requires some preliminary results.

**Lemma 4.2.2.** *Let  $Y$  be a spatial diamond, let  $S$  be a profinite set and assume that we have a spectral map  $q : |Y| \rightarrow S$ . If  $q^{-1}(s)$  is affinoid perfectoid for all  $s \in S$ , then  $Y$  is affinoid perfectoid.*

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of [Sch17, Lemma 11.27].  $\square$

As  $x_w \in (\tilde{x}H)/H_w$  is arbitrary by construction, it therefore suffices to prove that  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}(x_w)$  is affinoid perfectoid. To show this, we will use the following simple group-theoretical lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.3.** *In this lemma and its proof only, let  $G$  be a group, let  $H \subseteq G$  be a subgroup and let  $Z_0 \subseteq Z_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_r = G$  be a sequence of normal subgroups of  $G$  such that  $Z_{i+1}/Z_i$  is central in  $G/Z_i$ . Then  $HZ_0 \subseteq HZ_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq HZ_r = G$  is a sequence of subgroups of  $G$ , and  $HZ_i$  is normal in  $HZ_{i+1}$ .*

*Proof.* That the  $HZ_i$  are subgroups is clear. For the final assertion, take  $z_1 \in Z_i$ ,  $z_2 \in Z_{i+1}$  and  $h_1, h_2 \in H$ . Since  $Z_{i+1}/Z_i$  is central in  $G/Z_i$ , we can write  $z_2 h_1 = h_1 z_2 w$  for some  $w \in Z_i$ . Then we compute

$$(h_2 z_2)(h_1 z_1)(h_2 z_2)^{-1} = h_2 h_1 (z_2 (w z_1) z_2^{-1}) h_2^{-1},$$

which is in  $HZ_i$  as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.4.** *There is a sequence of normal subgroups  $1 = Z_0 \subseteq Z_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_r = \bar{U}$  such that  $Z_{i+1}/Z_i$  is central in  $\bar{U}/Z_i$  and each  $Z_i$  is a product (as a subscheme, not necessarily as a subgroup) of root subgroups of  $G$  with respect to  $T$ . Moreover, the product  $\bar{U}_w Z_i$  is a product of root subgroups and  $\bar{U} Z_i$  is normal in  $\bar{U}_w Z_{i+1}$ , and  $\bar{U}_w Z_{i+1}/\bar{U}_w Z_i$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{G}_a^{d_i}$  for  $d_i = \dim \bar{U}_w Z_{i+1}/\bar{U}_w Z_i$ .*

*Proof.* The first part follows from [Con14, Proposition 5.1.16(2)]; one can take the  $Z_i$  to be the groups called  $U_{\geq n}$  in *loc.cit.*, with  $\Psi = \Phi^+$  in the notation of *loc.cit.* The fact that  $Z_{i+1}/Z_i$  is central in  $\bar{U}/Z_i$  follows from the same calculation that shows that  $U_{\geq n}/U_{\geq n+1}$  is abelian in the proof of [Con14, Proposition 5.1.16].

For the second part, first note that  $\bar{U}_w Z_i$  is a product of root subgroups as a subscheme since  $\bar{U}_w$  and  $Z_i$  are, and it is a subgroup since  $Z_i$  is normal. The normality of  $\bar{U}_w Z_i$  in  $\bar{U}_w Z_{i+1}$  then follows by applying Lemma 4.2.3 to the functors of points. Finally,  $\bar{U}_w Z_{i+1}/\bar{U}_w Z_i$  is isomorphic to  $Z_{i+1}/(Z_{i+1} \cap \bar{U}_w Z_i) \subseteq Z_{i+1}/Z_i$  and the latter is isomorphic, as groups, to the product of the root subgroups in  $Z_{i+1}$  but not in  $Z_i$  by construction (i.e. [Con14, Proposition 5.1.16(2)]), so  $\bar{U}_w Z_{i+1}/\bar{U}_w Z_i$  is isomorphic as groups to the product of root subgroups in  $Z_{i+1}$  but not in  $\bar{U}_w Z_i$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.2.5.** *Let  $\Gamma_{x,w} := \text{Stab}_{H_w}(\tilde{x})$  and consider the point  $\tilde{x}_\Gamma = \tilde{x}\Gamma_{x,w} \in |\mathcal{F}\ell_{G,\mu}|/\Gamma_{x,w}$ . Then the natural map*

$$\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}_\Gamma) \rightarrow \pi_{H_w}^{-1}(x_w)$$

is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* We will apply Lemma 2.3.2 repeatedly (once is not enough, since  $\Gamma_{x,w}$  might not be normal in  $H_w$ ). The group  $H_w$  is nilpotent, so let  $Z_0 = 1 \subseteq Z_1 = Z(H_w) \subseteq Z_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_r = H_w$  be the upper central series of  $H_w$  and set  $H_i = \Gamma_{x,w}Z_i$ . Consider the points  $\tilde{x}H_i \in |\mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}|/H_i$ . We claim that the natural maps

$$\pi_{H_i}^{-1}(\tilde{x}H_i) \rightarrow \pi_{H_{i+1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}H_{i+1})$$

are isomorphisms for all  $i = 0, \dots, r-1$ . Since the composition of all these maps is the map in the statement of the Proposition, this suffices. But this is a direct application of Lemma 2.3.2, setting (in the notation of that lemma)  $G = H_{i+1}/H_i$ ,  $X = \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_i}$ ,  $S = |\pi_{H_i}^{-1}(\tilde{x}H_i)|$ ,  $X \times_{|X|} \underline{S} = \pi_{H_i}^{-1}(\tilde{x}H_i)$  (note that  $H_i$  is normal in  $H_{i+1}$  by Lemma 4.2.3, and that  $X/G$  can be identified with  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{H_{i+1}}$  by Lemma 3.2.2).  $\square$

We now study  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}_\Gamma)$ . First, consider  $\pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x})$ . Recall the standard affinoid open  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}l_{G,\mu}$  from §3.4. By Theorem 3.4.2 and the definitions, we have

$$\pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(V_w) = \bigcup_{k' \geq 0} \pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\gamma^{-k'}w^{-1}) = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbf{1}}(\epsilon)_a\gamma^{-k}w^{-1}.$$

It follows that we may choose  $k$  and  $k'$  such that  $\tilde{x} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\gamma^{-k'}w^{-1}$  and

$$\pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbf{1}}(\epsilon)_a\gamma^{-k}w^{-1} \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\gamma^{-k'}w^{-1}).$$

Using that  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}}$  is stable under  $\overline{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  and that  $\gamma^{k'}\overline{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)\gamma^{-k'} \supseteq \overline{P}_\mu(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , we see that  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\gamma^{-k'}w^{-1}$  is stable under  $\overline{P}_{\mu,w}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , and hence a fortiori stable under  $H_w$  and  $\Gamma_{x,w}$ . Since  $\Gamma_{x,w}$  stabilizes the rank one point  $\tilde{x}$ , we may choose a basis of open neighbourhoods  $U_t$ ,  $t \in T$  (some index set) of  $\tilde{x}$  such that, for all  $t$ ,  $U_t$  is a  $\Gamma_{x,w}$ -stable rational subset of  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\gamma^{-k'}w^{-1}$  and  $\pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(U_t) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbf{1}}(\epsilon)_a\gamma^{-k}w^{-1}$ . (Any rational subset of  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\gamma^{-k'}w^{-1}$  has finitely many  $\Gamma_{x,w}$ -translates by [Sch18, Lemma 2.2] or [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemma 5.2.2], so their intersection is again a rational subset.) Then we see that

$$\tilde{x}_\Gamma = \bigcap_{t \in T} |U_t|/\Gamma_{x,w}$$

and hence that

$$\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}_\Gamma) = \varprojlim_{t \in T} \pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(|U_t|/\Gamma_{x,w}),$$

so to prove that  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}_\Gamma)$  is affinoid perfectoid it suffices to prove that each  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(|U_t|/\Gamma_{x,w})$  is affinoid perfectoid. For convenience, we introduce the principal congruence subgroups

$$K(p^m) := \{g \in G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \mid (g \bmod p) = 1\}.$$

Note that we may write

$$\pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(U_t) = \varprojlim_{m \geq 0} \pi_{\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m)}^{-1}(|U_t|/(\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m))),$$

and that  $\pi_{\mathbf{1}}^{-1}(U_t)$  is a rational subset of  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbf{1}}(\epsilon)_a\gamma^{-k}w^{-1}$  by construction. Since rational subsets come from finite level in an inverse limit, it follows that there is an  $m$  such that  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m)}^{-1}(|U_t|/(\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m)))$  is a rational subset of  $|\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbf{1}}(\epsilon)_a\gamma^{-k}w^{-1}|/(\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m))$  (which is affinoid perfectoid by Corollary 3.4.2), hence affinoid perfectoid. Let  $G_m := \Gamma_{x,w}/(\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m))$ ; this is a finite group. Note that  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(|U_t|/\Gamma_{x,w})$ ,

being a quasicompact open subset of  $|\mathcal{X}_1^*(\epsilon)|\gamma^{-k}w^{-1}/\Gamma_{x,w}$ , is a quasicompact perfectoid space.

**Proposition 4.2.6.**  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(|U_t|/\Gamma_{x,w})$  is the quotient of  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m)}^{-1}(|U_t|/(\Gamma_{x,w} \cap K(p^m)))$  by the finite group  $G_m$ . Hence it is affinoid perfectoid.

*Proof.* The first claim follows from Proposition 3.2.2, and then the second follows from Proposition 2.1.1 and [KL16, Thm. 3.3.25].  $\square$

We now summarize our discussion so far.

**Corollary 4.2.7.**  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}((\tilde{x}H)/H_w)$  is affinoid perfectoid with Zariski closed boundary.

*Proof.* We begin by showing that  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}((\tilde{x}H)/H_w)$  is affinoid perfectoid, summarizing the arguments above. First, by Lemma 4.2.2 it is enough to show that  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}(x_w)$  is affinoid perfectoid, which by Proposition 4.2.5 is equivalent to showing that  $\pi_{\Gamma_{x,w}}^{-1}(|U_t|/\Gamma_{x,w})$  is affinoid perfectoid, and this is Proposition 4.2.6. That the boundary is Zariski closed is then immediate.  $\square$

*Remark 4.2.8.* Let us now make a few remarks on the differences between the arguments of this paper and that of [CGH<sup>+</sup>18]. Thanks to the results in §2, our results of the fibers of  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}$  are slightly stronger in the sense that we can prove Corollary 4.2.7; in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] we could essentially only prove that it is affinoid perfectoid after a possible modification of the boundary, which was enough to deduce the cohomological consequences that we needed. We also note that Proposition 4.2.5, where Lemma 2.3.2 is the key ingredient, allows us to bypass the technical but powerful [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 5.2.1]. Indeed for our argument here it suffices to produce neighbourhoods of points which are stable under the stabilizer of the point rather than stable under the whole group. The former is almost trivial in comparison to the latter.

From here, we wish to compute cohomology on  $\pi_H^{-1}(x)$  using the cover  $\pi_{H_w}^{-1}((\tilde{x}H)/H_w)$ . Again, we are faced with the issue that  $H_w$  may not be normal in  $H$ , but the fact that  $H$  is nilpotent comes to the rescue. Recall that, by Lemma 4.2.1 and the paragraph preceding it, we need to show that

$$H_{\text{ét}}^i(\pi_H^{-1}(x), (j_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a) = 0$$

for all  $i > d - \dim \mathcal{F}_{G,\mu}^w$ . Choose a series of subgroups  $1 = Z_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_r = \overline{U}$  as in Lemma 4.2.4, and set  $H_{w,i} = K \cap \overline{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)Z_i(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  for  $i = 0, \dots, r$ . Note that we have  $H_{w,0} = H_w$  and  $H_{w,r} = H$ . Moreover,  $H_{w,i}$  is normal in  $H_{w,i+1}$  and  $H_{w,i+1}/H_{w,i}$  embeds naturally as a finite index subgroup of  $(\overline{U}_w Z_{i+1}/\overline{U}_w Z_i)(\mathbb{Z}_p) = \overline{U}_w Z_{i+1}(\mathbb{Z}_p)/\overline{U}_w Z_i(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  (this equality follows by looking at the decomposition into root spaces), so it is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_p^{d_i}$  (in the notation of Lemma 4.2.4). By [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Theorem 2.2.7], we have Hochschild–Serre spectral sequences with  $E_2$ -page

$$\begin{aligned} & H_{cts}^s(H_{w,i+1}/H_{w,i}, H_{\text{ét}}^t(\pi_{H_{w,i}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}H/H_{w,i}), j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a)) \\ & \implies H_{\text{ét}}^{s+t}(\pi_{H_{w,i+1}}^{-1}(\tilde{x}H/H_{w,i+1}), j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i = 0, \dots, r-1$ . By Corollary 4.2.7 and [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Proposition 5.1.4], we have

$$H_{\text{ét}}^t(\pi_{H_w}^{-1}(\tilde{x}H/H_w), j_!(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^+/p)^a) = 0$$

for all  $t > 0$ .

*Remark 4.2.9.* Here we use the fact that the notions of Zariski closed and strongly Zariski closed subsets of affinoid perfectoid spaces are now known to agree, by [BS19, Remark 7.5]. It is perhaps worth noting that, just like in [CGH<sup>+</sup>18], one may prove directly that the sets relevant to our arguments are strongly Zariski closed; the general result from [BS19] is strictly speaking not needed.

From this, we deduce by induction using the Hochschild–Serre spectral sequences above and the fact that  $H_{w,i+1}/H_{w,i} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p^{d_i}$  has cohomological dimension  $d_i$  for continuous cohomology that

$$H_{\text{ét}}^i(\pi_H^{-1}(x), (j_! \mathcal{O}_X^+/p)^a) = 0$$

for all  $i > d_0 + \cdots + d_{r-1} = \dim \bar{U} - \dim \bar{U}_w$ . We then finish the proof of Theorem 4.1.4 by noting that, by Lemma 3.3.2,

$$\dim \bar{U} - \dim \bar{U}_w = \dim \bar{N}_\mu - \dim \mathcal{F}_{G,\mu}^w = d - \dim \mathcal{F}_{G,\mu}^w.$$

## 5. BOUNDS ON CODIMENSIONS FOR ORDINARY PARTS

In this section, we deduce an application of Theorem 4.1.1, namely we bound the codimension over the Iwasawa algebra of the ordinary part of completed cohomology of the Shimura varieties for  $G$ . The application is Theorem 5.5.1 and it relies on a Poincaré duality spectral sequence for the ordinary part of the homology of locally symmetric spaces; most of the work in this section is on constructing this spectral sequence. We work with a group  $G/\mathbb{Q}$  which is split at  $p$ , but, for most of this section, we do not need to know that  $G$  admits Shimura varieties: until we appeal to Theorem 4.1.1 we only need to consider the locally symmetric spaces associated to  $G$ .

We note that the existence of such a spectral sequence has been previously announced by Emerton, relying on his theory of ordinary parts [Eme10a, Eme10b]. In this paper, we give a different construction relying on computations of (co)homology using singular and simplicial chains, in the style of Ash–Stevens [AS07], as well as ideas of Hill [Hil10].

**5.1. Completed cohomology and distributions.** We begin by recalling some standard material; the reader is referred to [BS73] for more details and to [NT16, §3.1] for a useful summary. Let  $G$  be a connected reductive group over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and assume it admits a flat affine model over  $\mathbb{Z}$  which is split at  $p$ . Let  $X$  denote the symmetric space for  $G(\mathbb{R})$  in the sense of [BS73, §2]. Let  $D := \dim_{\mathbb{R}} X$ .

For simplicity, we will consider neat compact open subgroups  $K \subset G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  which are of the form  $K = \prod_{\ell} K_{\ell}$ , where  $\ell$  runs over finite primes and  $K_{\ell} \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_{\ell})$ . Let  $G^{\text{ad}}$  denote the adjoint group of  $G$ , and let  $G^{\text{ad}}(\mathbb{R})^+$  denote the identity component of  $G^{\text{ad}}(\mathbb{R})$  in the real topology. We let  $G(\mathbb{R})_+$  denote the preimage of  $G^{\text{ad}}(\mathbb{R})^+$  under the natural map  $G(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow G^{\text{ad}}(\mathbb{R})$ , and we set  $G(\mathbb{Q})_+ = G(\mathbb{Q}) \cap G(\mathbb{R})_+$ . For  $K$  as above, we define a locally symmetric space

$$X_K := G(\mathbb{Q})_+ \backslash X \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)/K.$$

As is well known, the fact that  $K$  is neat implies that  $X_K$  is a smooth manifold;  $X_K$  is orientable because  $X$  is and  $G(\mathbb{R})$  is connected.

*Remark 5.1.1.* The reader familiar with the literature on adelic locally symmetric spaces will know that other sources use slightly different definitions. For example, it is common to quotient out on the left either by the full  $G(\mathbb{Q})$  or the smaller  $G(\mathbb{Q}) \cap G(\mathbb{R})^+$ , where  $G(\mathbb{R})^+ \subseteq G(\mathbb{R})$  is the identity component. Roughly speaking, the difference between these definitions is only in the structure of the set of components and the theory developed here could be developed for either of these choices (at least for sufficiently small  $K$ ). The reason for our convention is that, when  $G$  admits a Shimura datum of Hodge type,  $X_K$  is exactly the complex points of the Shimura variety for  $G$  with level  $K$ . This follows from [Mil05, Lemma 5.11] and the fact that in this case, the maximal  $\mathbb{R}$ -split torus in the center of  $G$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -split.

Following [NT16], we will also make use of the space

$$\mathfrak{X} := G(\mathbb{Q})_+ \backslash X \times G(\mathbb{A}_f),$$

where  $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  is given the discrete topology prior to taking the quotient. As a topological space, this is an uncountable disjoint union of copies of  $X$ .

The symmetric space  $X$  admits a partial (Borel–Serre) compactification  $X^{\text{BS}}$ , to which the  $G(\mathbb{Q})$ -action extends, and we set

$$X_K^{\text{BS}} := G(\mathbb{Q})_+ \backslash X^{\text{BS}} \times G(\mathbb{A}_f) / K;$$

this is a compactification of  $X_K$  and the inclusion  $X_K \hookrightarrow X_K^{\text{BS}}$  is a homotopy equivalence. We also consider the boundaries  $\partial X^{\text{BS}} := X^{\text{BS}} \setminus X$  and  $\partial X_K^{\text{BS}} := X_K^{\text{BS}} \setminus X_K$ . We also consider the space

$$\mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}} := G(\mathbb{Q})_+ \backslash X^{\text{BS}} \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)$$

where again  $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  is given the discrete topology. We set  $\partial \mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}} = \mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}} \setminus \mathfrak{X}$ , and note that all these spaces carry right actions of  $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ , whose restrictions to neat compact opens  $K \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  are free. In other words,  $\mathfrak{X} \rightarrow X_K$  etc. are  $K$ -covers. We let  $C_\bullet$  and  $\partial C_\bullet$  denote the complexes of singular chains with  $\mathbb{Z}$ -coefficients on  $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}}$  and  $\partial \mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}}$  respectively; these are right  $\mathbb{Z}[G(\mathbb{A}_f)]$ -modules. There is a natural morphism of complexes  $\partial C_\bullet \rightarrow C_\bullet$  and we define  $C_\bullet^{\text{BM}}$  to be the cone of this morphism. Given a left  $\mathbb{Z}[K]$ -module  $M$ , we define

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K, M) := C_\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[K]} M$$

and

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K, M) := C_\bullet^{\text{BM}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[K]} M.$$

These complexes compute the homology, respectively the Borel–Moore homology, of  $X_K$  with coefficients in the local system  $\widetilde{M}$  determined by  $M$  via the  $K$ -cover  $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}} \rightarrow X_K^{\text{BS}}$ ; we record this as a proposition.

**Proposition 5.1.2.** *Let  $M$  be a left  $K$ -module. There are canonical isomorphisms*

$$H_*(X_K, \widetilde{M}) \simeq H_*(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K, M)) \text{ and } H_*^{\text{BM}}(X_K, \widetilde{M}) \simeq H_*(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K, M))$$

*Remark 5.1.3.* Choose a finite (combinatorial) triangulation of  $X_K^{\text{BS}}$  such that  $\partial X_K^{\text{BS}}$  is a simplicial subcomplex ( $X_K^{\text{BS}}$  is homeomorphic to a smooth compact manifold with boundary [BS73, §11.1], so this can be done using e.g. [Mun66, Theorem 10.6]). Pulling back these triangulations to  $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}}$  and  $\partial \mathfrak{X}^{\text{BS}}$  we obtain bounded complexes  $F_\bullet$  and  $\partial F_\bullet$  of finite free right  $\mathbb{Z}[K]$ -modules which are homotopy equivalent to  $C_\bullet$  and  $\partial C_\bullet$ , respectively. We let  $F_\bullet^{\text{BM}}$  denote the cone of  $\partial F_\bullet \rightarrow F_\bullet$ , which is then homotopy equivalent to  $C_\bullet^{\text{BM}}$ .

This allows us to construct complexes  $C_{\bullet}(K, M)$  and  $C_{\bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K, M)$  which have good finiteness properties and are homotopy equivalent to  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K, M)$  and  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K, M)$ , respectively<sup>5</sup>, by setting

$$C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K, M) := F_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[K]} M.$$

Here and elsewhere we write (BM) to mean that one can either make the same construction for the complexes with no superscript or with the BM superscript.

Analogous constructions can be made for cohomology and cohomology with compact support. If  $M$  is a right  $K$ -module, define

$$C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(K, M) := \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]} \left( C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}, M \right).$$

We have the following analogue of Proposition 5.1.2, which once again is an instance of descent.

**Proposition 5.1.4.** *Let  $M$  be a right  $K$ -module. There are canonical isomorphisms*

$$H^*(X_K, \widetilde{M}) \simeq H^*(C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet}(K, M)) \quad \text{and} \quad H_c^*(X_K, \widetilde{M}) \simeq H^*(C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, \text{BM}}(K, M))$$

We also have complexes  $C^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(K, M) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]} \left( F_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}, M \right)$  with good finiteness properties as in Remark 5.1.3.

We now discuss the action of  $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  on the adelic complexes we have defined above. Let  $S$  be a finite set of finite primes, not necessarily containing  $p$ . Assume that  $M$  is a left  $\mathbb{Z}[G(\mathbb{A}^S) \times K_S]$ -module. For any  $g \in G(\mathbb{A}^S)$ , we have an isomorphism

$$g_* : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K, M) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(g^{-1}Kg, M), \quad \sigma \otimes m \mapsto \sigma g \otimes g^{-1}m.$$

This can be translated into a Hecke action of the double coset  $[KgK]$  for  $g \in G(\mathbb{A}^S)$  by taking the composition

(5.1.1)

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K, M) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K \cap gKg^{-1}, M) \xrightarrow{g^*} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(g^{-1}Kg \cap K, M) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K, M),$$

where the first morphism is the trace map

$$\sigma \otimes m \mapsto \sum \sigma k \otimes k^{-1}m,$$

where the sum runs over a set of coset representatives  $k$  for  $K/(K \cap gKg^{-1})$ , and the last morphism is restriction  $\sigma \otimes m \mapsto \sigma \otimes m$ . One can check that this recovers the usual Hecke action on homology / Borel–Moore homology.

Assume now that  $M$  is a right  $\mathbb{Z}[G(\mathbb{A}^S) \times K_S]$ -module. For any  $g \in G(\mathbb{A}^S)$ , we have an isomorphism

$$g^* : C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(K, M) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(gKg^{-1}, M), \quad g^*(\phi)(\sigma) = \phi(\sigma g)g^{-1}.$$

This can be translated into a Hecke action of the double coset  $[KgK]$  for  $g \in G(\mathbb{A}^S)$  by taking the composition

(5.1.2)

$$C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(K, M) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(K \cap g^{-1}Kg, M) \xrightarrow{g^*} C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(gKg^{-1} \cap K, M) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet, (\text{BM})}(K, M),$$

<sup>5</sup>The resulting complexes are called Borel–Serre complexes in [Han17], though they are constructed slightly differently there.

where the first morphism is restriction and the third morphism is the trace map

$$\phi \mapsto \psi(\sigma) := \sum \phi(\sigma k)k^{-1},$$

where the sum runs over a set of coset representatives  $k$  for  $K/(K \cap g^{-1}Kg)$ . One can check that this recovers the usual Hecke action on cohomology / cohomology with compact support.

If  $R$  is a commutative ring and  $M, N$  are  $R$ -modules, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$(5.1.3) \quad \mathrm{RHom}_R \left( C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, M), N \right) \simeq C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\bullet, (\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathrm{RHom}_R(M, N)),$$

from the adjunction between tensor products and homomorphisms. For example, if  $R = N = \mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain the universal coefficient isomorphism between homology and cohomology, respectively between Borel–Moore homology and cohomology with compact support. One can check from the explicit descriptions (5.1.1) and (5.1.2) that the universal coefficient isomorphism is equivariant for the Hecke action of  $[KgK]$ .

Our goal is now to use these explicit adelic complexes to describe ordinary completed (co)homology. Let  $K'_p \subseteq K_p$  be a compact open subgroup; set  $K' := K^p K'_p$ , this is a compact open subgroup of  $K$ .

**Lemma 5.1.5.**

- (1) For any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , there is a canonical isomorphism

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K', \mathbb{Z}/p^n \mathbb{Z}) \simeq C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n \mathbb{Z}[K_p/K'_p]),$$

where  $K^p$  acts trivially and  $K_p$  acts by left translation on  $\mathbb{Z}/p^n \mathbb{Z}[K_p/K'_p]$ .

- (2) As  $K^p$  varies, this isomorphism is equivariant for the action of  $g^p \in G(\mathbb{A}_f^p)$ .  
 (3) If  $g \in G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  and  $K_{i,p} \subseteq K_p$  for  $i = 1, 2$  with  $g^{-1}K_{1,p}g \subseteq K_{2,p}$  and  $K_i := K^p K_{i,p}$ , the morphism

$$g_* : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^n) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K_2, \mathbb{Z}/p^n), \quad g_*(\sigma \otimes \lambda) = \sigma g \otimes \lambda$$

corresponds to the morphism

$$g_* : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K_{1,p}]) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K_{2,p}]),$$

$$g_*(\sigma \otimes \lambda k) = \sigma k g \otimes \lambda.$$

- (4) If  $K_{2,p} \subseteq K_{1,p} \subseteq K_p$ , and  $K_i := K^p K_{i,p}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , the trace morphism  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^n) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K_2, \mathbb{Z}/p^n)$  corresponds to the morphism

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K_{1,p}]) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K_{2,p}])$$

induced by the natural trace map  $\mathrm{tr} : \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K_{1,p}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K_{2,p}]$ .

*Proof.* The first assertion is a simple adjunction, but to make the verification of formulas easier for the reader we give explicit isomorphisms. So, define morphisms

$$\iota : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K', \mathbb{Z}/p^n) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K'_p])$$

given by  $\sigma \otimes \lambda \mapsto \sigma \otimes \lambda$  and

$$\eta : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_p/K'_p]) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\mathrm{BM})}(K', \mathbb{Z}/p^n)$$

given by  $\sigma \otimes \lambda k \mapsto \sigma k \otimes \lambda$ . It is not hard to check that  $\iota$  and  $\eta$  are well-defined, and that they are mutual inverses. The Hecke equivariance away from  $p$  is immediate, and the Hecke-equivariance at  $p$  can be checked by direct computation:

$$(\iota_2 \circ g_* \circ \eta_1)(\sigma \otimes \lambda k) = \sigma k g \otimes \lambda.$$

Finally, the last assertion can also be checked by direct computation.  $\square$

We now begin to describe ordinary completed homology in this language. We fix the tame level  $K^p$  and denote all locally symmetric spaces of this fixed tame level by  $X_{K^p}$ , where  $K^p \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  is a compact open subgroup. Similarly, we will often omit the tame level when using the complexes defined above; for example, we will write  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_p, M)$  for  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K^p K_p, M)$ . Recall the assumption that  $G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$  is split. Choose a split Borel subgroup  $B \subset G_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$ , with Levi decomposition  $B = T \rtimes U$ , where  $T$  is the split torus and  $U$  is the unipotent subgroup, with opposite unipotent subgroup  $\bar{U}$ . Let  $T_0 := T(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , and, for  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , set  $T_i := \ker(T(\mathbb{Z}_p) \rightarrow T(\mathbb{Z}/p^i))$ . Similarly, for  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , define  $N_j := \ker U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \rightarrow U(\mathbb{Z}/p^j)$  and  $\bar{N}_j := \ker \bar{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \rightarrow \bar{U}(\mathbb{Z}/p^j)$ . For  $j \geq 0$  and  $i \geq \max(j, 1)$ , set  $K_{ij} := \bar{N}_i T_j N_1 \subset G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ . To simplify notation, we will also set  $K_1 := K_{10}$ .

Define the completed homology / Borel–Moore homology at level  $N_1$  by

$$\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1) := \varprojlim_{i,j,n} H_*^{(\text{BM})}(X_{K_{ij}}, \mathbb{Z}/p^n).$$

This is equipped with a Hecke action of  $[K^p g^p K^p]$  for  $g^p \in G(\mathbb{A}_f^p)$  in the usual way. There is also a Hecke action at  $p$ . Let

$$T^+ := \{t \in T(\mathbb{Q}_p) \mid t N_1 t^{-1} \subseteq N_1\}.$$

Also define

$$T^- := \{t \in T(\mathbb{Q}_p) \mid t \bar{N}_1 t^{-1} \subseteq \bar{N}_1\}.$$

For  $t \in T^+$ , set  $\bar{N}_t := t^{-1} \bar{N}_1 t$ , and  $N_t := t N_1 t^{-1}$ . For any  $t \in T^+$ , we have a Hecke action of  $[N_1 t N_1]$  on  $\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1)$  given by the composition

$$\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} \tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_t) \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1),$$

where the first map is the natural trace map. Here  $\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_t)$  is defined as

$$\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_t) := \varprojlim_{i,j,n} H_*^{(\text{BM})}(X_{t K_{ij} t^{-1}}, \mathbb{Z}/p^n).$$

The Hecke action above is compatible with the Hecke action of  $[K_{ij} t K_{ij}]$  on each  $H_*^{(\text{BM})}(X_{K_{ij}}, \mathbb{Z}/p^n \mathbb{Z})$  as described in (5.1.1).

We wish to describe  $\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1)$  with its Hecke actions in terms of the adelic complexes defined above, with coefficients in a certain algebra of  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -valued distributions. If  $X$  is a profinite set, let  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  denote the space of continuous  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -valued distributions on  $X$ ; if  $X$  is a profinite group then this carries a natural  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -algebra structure. In particular, we have

$$(5.1.4) \quad \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1) = \mathbb{Z}_p[[K_1/N_1]] = \varprojlim_{i,j,n} \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_1/K_{ij}].$$



Set  $K'_t := K_1 \cap tK_1t^{-1}$  and  $K_t := K_1 \cap t^{-1}K_1t$ . For  $t \in T^+$ , we have an isomorphism

$$(5.1.5) \quad \iota_{K_t, K_1} \circ t_* \circ \eta_{K_1, K'_t} : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t)) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)),$$

that we describe explicitly as the composition of three isomorphisms. The first is an isomorphism

$$\eta_{K_1, K'_t} : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t)) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K'_t, \mathcal{D}(K'_t/N_t)).$$

Choose a set  $S$  of coset representatives for  $K_1/K'_t$ . Any  $\mu \in \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t)$  can be written uniquely as  $\sum_{s \in S} s\mu_s$  with  $\mu_s \in \mathcal{D}(K'_t/N_t)$ . Set

$$\eta_{K_1, K'_t}(\sigma \otimes \mu) := \sum_{s \in S} \sigma s \otimes \mu_s.$$

This is well-defined, independent of the choice of  $S$  and it is an isomorphism since it has the inverse  $\iota_{K'_t, K_1}(\sigma \otimes \mu) := \sigma \otimes \mu$ . The second is the isomorphism

$$t_* : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K'_t, \mathcal{D}(K'_t/N_t)) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1))$$

given by  $\sigma \otimes \mu \mapsto \sigma t \otimes t^{-1}\mu t$ . Finally, the third is the isomorphism

$$\iota_{K_t, K_1} : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)).$$

Note that  $K_1/K'_t \simeq N_1/N_t$ . We obtain

$$\iota_{K_t, K_1} \circ t_* \circ \eta_{K_1, K'_t}(\sigma \otimes \mu) = \sum_{s \in N_1/N_t} \sigma s t \otimes t^{-1}\mu_s t.$$

**Theorem 5.1.6.** *There exist canonical isomorphisms*

$$\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1) \simeq H_* \left( C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \right).$$

*These are equivariant for the Hecke action of  $[K^p g^p K^p]$  for all  $g^p \in G(\mathbb{A}_f^p)$ . For  $t \in T^+$ , the Hecke action of  $[N_1 t N_1]$  on  $\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1)$  is induced from the composition*

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t)) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)),$$

*where tr is induced from the natural trace map  $\mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t)$  and the isomorphism is given by  $\iota_{K_t, K_1} \circ t_* \circ \eta_{K_1, K'_t}$ .*

*Proof.* We claim first that the natural map of complexes

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \rightarrow \varprojlim_{i, j, n} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_1/K_{ij}])$$

is a homotopy equivalence. Up to homotopy equivalences<sup>6</sup>, we can replace the above complexes with the corresponding Borel–Serre complexes as in Remark 5.1.3, and we have a natural map

$$C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \rightarrow \varprojlim_{i, j, n} C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_1/K_{ij}]),$$

which can be seen by inspection to be an isomorphism using (5.1.4).

<sup>6</sup>These can be chosen to be functorial in the coefficients, and compatible with the transition morphisms between different levels.

We now claim that the homology of the complex  $\varprojlim_{i,j,n} C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_1/K_{ij}])$  computes  $\tilde{H}_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1)$ . By combining Lemma 5.1.5 and Proposition 5.1.2, we have an isomorphism

$$H_*^{(\text{BM})}(X_{K_{ij}}, \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_* \left( C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^n[K_1/K_{ij}]) \right)$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and at each finite level  $K_{ij}$ . To conclude, we replace each finite level complex by the corresponding Borel–Serre complex. We obtain complexes of abelian compact Hausdorff groups with continuous differentials. We conclude by noting that the category of abelian compact Hausdorff groups is abelian, and inverse limits exist and are exact in this category.

The Hecke equivariance away from  $p$  is clear. To prove that the isomorphism is equivariant for the action of  $[N_1 t N_1]$ , it is enough to show that it is equivariant for  $\text{tr}$  and  $t_*$ . The equivariance for  $\text{tr}$  follows from part (4) of Lemma 5.1.5. The equivariance for  $t_*$  follows from parts (1) and (3) of Lemma 5.1.5.  $\square$

**5.2. The universal coefficient isomorphism at infinite level.** For  $t \in T^+$ , recall that  $K_t = K_1 \cap t^{-1} K_1 t = \overline{N}_t T_0 N_1$ . We consider  $\mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)$  as a  $\mathcal{D}(K_t) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{D}(T_0)$ -module, where  $K_t$  acts by multiplication on the left and  $T_0$  acts by multiplication on the right.  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$  is a semi-local ring and is complete with respect to its  $J$ -adic topology, where we let  $J$  denote its Jacobson radical. Define

$$\mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}^{\text{cont}}(\mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0));$$

this is a  $\mathcal{D}(T_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{D}(K_t)$ -module. Here  $\mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)$  carries the inverse limit topology from equation 5.1.4, and we give  $\mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$  the  $J$ -adic topology.

**Lemma 5.2.1.** *We have a natural isomorphism*

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(\mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0)) \simeq \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1).$$

and, for all  $i > 0$ ,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}^i(\mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0)) = 0$ . (We note that all  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$ -linear homomorphisms are automatically continuous for  $J$ -adic topology.)

*Proof.* From the definition, we have

$$(5.2.1) \quad \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1) \cong \varprojlim_{j,k} \varinjlim_i \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j)}(\mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_i T_j N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j)) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}/p^k.$$

Since  $T_0$  normalizes  $\overline{N}_i$ , there is an isomorphism of profinite sets with  $T_0$ -action

$$\overline{N}_t/\overline{N}_i \times T_0/T_j \xrightarrow{\sim} K_t/\overline{N}_i T_j N_1$$

where  $T_0$  acts trivially on  $\overline{N}_t/\overline{N}_i$ . Consequently, as a  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$ -module,

$$\mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_i T_j N_1) \cong \mathcal{D}(\overline{N}_t/\overline{N}_i) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j),$$

where  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$  acts trivially on  $\mathcal{D}(\overline{N}_t/\overline{N}_i)$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_i T_j N_1)$  is a finite free  $\mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j)$ -module, hence it is also reflexive. This, together with the explicit description (5.2.1) proves the first claim of the lemma.

For the second claim, observe that  $\mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$  is the  $J$ -adic completion of  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$  of the free  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$ -module

$$\varinjlim_i \varprojlim_{j,k} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(\mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_i T_j N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j)) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k.$$

Then by [Sta18, Tag 06LE],  $\mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$  is a flat  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$ -module. Hence, by [Jen70, Theorem 1],  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}^i(\mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0)) = 0$  for  $i > 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.2.2.** *We have a natural isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)), \mathcal{D}(T_0)) \simeq C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)).$$

*Proof.* This follows from combining the isomorphism (5.1.3) with Lemma 5.2.1.  $\square$

**5.3. Poincaré duality.** We start by recalling Poincaré duality between Borel–Moore homology and cohomology; recall that  $X_K^{\mathrm{BS}}$  is homeomorphic to a smooth compact orientable manifold with boundary.

**Lemma 5.3.1.** *Let  $K \subseteq G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  be a compact open subgroup. There are homotopy equivalences of complexes of  $\mathbb{Z}[K]$ -modules*

$$F_{\bullet}^{\mathrm{BM}}[D] \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]}(F_{\bullet}, \mathbb{Z}[K])$$

$$F_{\bullet}[D] \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]}(F_{\bullet}^{\mathrm{BM}}, \mathbb{Z}[K]).$$

*On the right hand sides,  $F_{\bullet}^{\mathrm{BM}}$  is viewed as a left  $K$ -module by inverting the natural right  $K$ -module structure.*

*Proof.* We sketch a proof of the second quasi-isomorphism, the proof of the first is completely analogous. As mentioned in Remark 5.1.3, the complex  $F_{\bullet}$  comes from a combinatorial triangulation  $T$  of  $X_K^{\mathrm{BS}}$ , which can even be chosen such that  $\partial X_K^{\mathrm{BS}}$  is a simplicial subcomplex. For such a  $T$ , we can construct the dual  $T^{\vee}$  of this triangulation (this construction and the remaining assertions in this paragraph seem to be well known in topology, see for example [Tur01, Ch. 14]), which is a CW decomposition of  $X_K^{\mathrm{BS}}$ . Let  $S_{\bullet}(T)$  denote the simplicial homology complex attached to  $T$  and let  $S_{\bullet}(T^{\vee}, T_{\partial}^{\vee})$  denote the relative cellular homology complex of  $T^{\vee}$  with respect to the boundary  $T_{\partial}^{\vee}$  (which is a sub-CW complex). There are natural perfect pairings

$$S_{D-k}(T) \times S_k(T^{\vee}, T_{\partial}^{\vee}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

where a simplex pairs to 1 with its dual cell and to 0 with the other cells. The induced map  $S_{\bullet}(T)[D] \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(S_{\bullet}(T^{\vee}, T_{\partial}^{\vee}), \mathbb{Z})$  is an isomorphism of complexes.

Now pull back  $T^{\vee}$  to a  $K$ -equivariant CW decomposition of  $\mathfrak{X}^{\mathrm{BS}}$ , and let  $F_{\bullet}^{\vee}$  denote the corresponding relative cellular homology complex with respect to the boundary. Note that the pullback of  $T^{\vee}$  is the dual cell decomposition of the pullback of  $T$ . Define a pairing

$$F_{D-k} \times F_k^{\vee} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[K]$$

by declaring that a simplex  $\sigma$  in  $F_{D-k}$  pair to 0 with a cell  $\tau$  in  $F_k^{\vee}$  unless  $\tau = \sigma^{\vee}k$  for some  $k \in K$ , in which case we pair them to  $k^{-1}$ . From the definitions this pairing induces a maps  $F_{D-k} \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]}(F_k^{\vee}, \mathbb{Z}[K])$ , where we view  $F_{\bullet}^{\vee}$  as a left  $K$ -module by inverting the natural right  $K$ -module structure. Using that  $S_{\bullet}(T)[D] \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(S_{\bullet}(T^{\vee}, T_{\partial}^{\vee}), \mathbb{Z})$  is an isomorphism, one sees that the maps above form an chain isomorphism  $F_{\bullet}[D] \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]}(F_{\bullet}^{\vee}, \mathbb{Z}[K])$  of complexes of right  $K$ -modules. The proof is then finished by noting that  $F_{\bullet}^{\vee}$  is chain homotopic to  $F_{\bullet}^{\mathrm{BM}}$ , since they come from  $K$ -equivariant CW decompositions of the same manifold with boundary.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.3.2.** *For any compact open  $K \subset G(\mathbb{A}_f)$  and any left  $K$ -module  $M$  (which we also view as a right  $K$ -module by inverting the left  $K$ -module structure), there is a natural quasi-isomorphism*

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\mathrm{BM}}(K, M)[D] \simeq C_{\mathbb{A}}^{\bullet}(K, M).$$

*Proof.* Recall that we have homotopy equivalences

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K, M) \simeq F_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[K]} M.$$

Then the result follows from Lemma 5.3.1 along with the fact that  $F_{\bullet}$ ,  $F_{\bullet}^{\text{BM}}$  are complexes of finite free  $\mathbb{Z}[K]$ -modules and, for any finite free  $\mathbb{Z}[K]$ -module  $F$  and any  $\mathbb{Z}[K]$ -module  $N$ ,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]}(F, N) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K]}(F, \mathbb{Z}[K]) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[K]} N$ .  $\square$

Let  $w \in G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  be a representative of the longest element of the Weyl group. We have an involution  $t \mapsto w^{-1}t^{-1}w$  of  $T^+$ . Let  $\tau : K_1 \rightarrow T_0$  be the map that sends  $\bar{n}tn \mapsto t$  for  $\bar{n} \in \bar{N}_1$ ,  $t \in T_0$  and  $n \in N_1$ . Note that  $\tau$  is not a homomorphism, but it satisfies  $\tau(\bar{b}kb) = \tau(\bar{b})\tau(k)\tau(b)$  for any  $\bar{b} \in \bar{N}_1T_0$ ,  $k \in K_1$  and  $b \in T_0N_1$ . We consider the pairing

$$\mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1) \times \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(T_0), \langle k_1N_1, k_2N_2 \rangle := \tau(wk_2^{-1}w^{-1}k_1), \forall k_1, k_2 \in K_1$$

where the  $K_1$  acts on the LHS by left multiplication and on the RHS by left multiplication by the inverse. This induces a morphism of left  $K_1$ -modules

$$\kappa : \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1) \rightarrow (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1),$$

where  $(w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)$  denotes  $\mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)$  with the  $K_1$  action twisted such that  $k \in K_1$  acts by  $wkw^{-1}$ . In turn,  $\kappa$  induces a morphism of complexes

$$\kappa_* : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)) \simeq C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))$$

We now consider the composition of morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_w : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))[D] &\xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ &\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)), \mathcal{D}(T_0)) \rightarrow \\ &\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)), \mathcal{D}(T_0)) \end{aligned}$$

The first morphism is the Poincaré duality isomorphism of Corollary 5.3.2, the second is the isomorphism in Corollary 5.2.2 in the case  $t = 1$ , and the third is the morphism induced by precomposition with  $\kappa_*$ .

**Proposition 5.3.3.** *For any  $t \in T^+$ , the morphism*

$$\pi_w : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))[D] \rightarrow \text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)), \mathcal{D}(T_0))$$

*is equivariant for the Hecke action of  $[N_1tN_1]$  on  $\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)), \mathcal{D}(T_0))$  and the Hecke action of  $[N_1w^{-1}t^{-1}wN_1]$  on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))[D]$ .*

*The morphism  $\pi_w$  is also equivariant for the Hecke action of  $[K^p(g^p)^{-1}K^p]$  on the LHS and the Hecke action of  $[K^pg^pK^p]$  on the RHS.*

*Proof.* By translating the Hecke action of  $[N_1w^{-1}t^{-1}wN_1]$  on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))[D]$ , as described in Theorem 5.1.6, under the inverse of the isomorphism

$$\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)), \mathcal{D}(T_0)) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))[D],$$

we obtain the following composition:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)) &\xrightarrow{\eta_{\kappa_1, \kappa_t}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)) \xrightarrow{\iota_{\kappa'_t, \kappa_1} \circ (w^{-1}tw)_*} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_t)) \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{tr}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)). \end{aligned}$$

We have to check that the Hecke action of  $[N_1tN_1]$  on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))$  corresponds to this composition under the morphism  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))$

induced by  $\kappa_w$ . Again, using the explicit description of the Hecke action in Theorem 5.1.6, we obtain the composition

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) &\xrightarrow{\text{tr}} C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t)) \xrightarrow{t_* \circ \eta_{K_1, K'_t}} C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)) \\ &\xrightarrow{\iota_{K_t, K_1}} C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)). \end{aligned}$$

We now define a morphism  $\kappa_t : \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1) \rightarrow ((t^{-1}w)^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$  from the pairing

$$\mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1) \times \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(T_0), \langle k_1 N_1, k_2 N_1 \rangle \mapsto \tau(wk_2^{-1}w^{-1}tk_1t^{-1}),$$

where note that  $wk_2^{-1}w^{-1}tk_1t^{-1} \in tK_1t^{-1} \subseteq K_1$ . We obtain an induced map

$$\kappa_{t*} : C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)).$$

The Hecke equivariance at  $p$  now follows from Lemmas 5.3.4 and 5.3.5 below.

The Hecke equivariance away from  $p$  is clear, taking into account that the Poincaré duality isomorphism matches  $[K^p(g^p)^{-1}K^p]$  on  $C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))[D]$  with  $[K^p g^p K^p]$  on  $C_{\mathbb{A}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))$ , and that the other morphisms are Hecke equivariant away from  $p$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.4.** *The following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} & C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t)) \xrightarrow{t_* \circ \eta_{K_1, K'_t}} C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)) \\ \downarrow \kappa_* & & \downarrow \kappa_{t*} \\ C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{K_1, K_t}} & C_{\mathbb{A},\bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)) \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We have the Cartesian diagram

$$(5.3.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X_{K_t} & \xrightarrow{t^{-1}w} & X_{K_t} \\ \downarrow t^{-1} & & \downarrow 1 \\ X_{K_1} & \xrightarrow{w} & X_{K_1} \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrows are isomorphisms, the left vertical arrow is right multiplication by  $t^{-1}$  followed by the natural projection, and the right vertical arrow is the natural projection. Using the maps in this diagram, we obtain the following diagram of local systems on  $X_{K_1}$ :

$$(5.3.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1) & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} & \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t) & \xrightarrow{t_*} & (t^{-1})_* \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1) \\ \downarrow \kappa & & & & \downarrow (t^{-1})_*(\kappa_t) \\ (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & (w^{-1})_* 1_* \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & (t^{-1})_* ((t^{-1}w)^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1) \end{array}$$

Note that  $(t^{-1})_* ((t^{-1}w)^{-1})_* = (w^{-1})_* 1_*$  by (5.3.1). We will prove that this diagram commutes.

To see this, we claim that the map  $\mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t) \rightarrow (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)$  obtained by going clockwise around (5.3.2) is induced from the pairing

$$\mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t) \times (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)$$

given by

$$(5.3.3) \quad \langle k_1 N_t, k_2 N_1 \rangle = \begin{cases} \tau(wk_2^{-1}w^{-1}k_1) & \text{if } wk_2^{-1}w^{-1}k_1 \in \overline{N}_1 T_0 N_t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Indeed, the map  $t_* : \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t) \rightarrow (t^{-1})_* \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)$  factors as

$$\mathcal{D}(K_1/N_t) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Ind}_{K'_t}^{K_1} \mathcal{D}(K'_t/N_t) \xrightarrow{\sim} (t^{-1})_* \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1),$$

where the first map is given by  $\mu = \sum_{s \in K_1/K'_t} s\mu_s \mapsto (\mu_s)_{s \in K_1/K'_t}$  and the second map is given by  $(\mu_s)_s \mapsto (t^{-1}\mu_s t)_s$ . Similarly, the map  $\mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1) \xrightarrow{\sim} 1_* \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$  identifies  $\mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)$  with  $\text{Ind}_{K'_t}^{K_1} \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$ . Recall that  $K'_t = \overline{N}_1 T_0 N_t = wK_t w^{-1}$ . The map

$$\text{Ind}_{K'_t}^{K_1} \mathcal{D}(K'_t/N_t) \rightarrow (w^{-1})_* \text{Ind}_{K'_t}^{K_1} \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$$

obtained by going clockwise around (5.3.2) is simply induced from the map  $\mathcal{D}(K'_t/N_t) \rightarrow (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)$  determined by the pairing

$$\langle k_1 N_t, k_2 N_1 \rangle = \tau(wk_2^{-1}w^{-1}k_1).$$

The claim now follows from the definition of the two inductions.

Now that this claim is established, we notice that any left coset  $k_1 N_1$  with  $k_1 \in K_1$  gets sent to  $[N_1 : N_t]$  left  $N_t$ -cosets under  $\text{tr}$ , and precisely one of these pairs non-trivially with  $k_2 N_1$  with  $k_2 \in K_1$  under the pairing in (5.3.3). This proves that the diagram (5.3.2) commutes and therefore proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.5.** *The following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)) & \xrightarrow{\iota_{K_t, K_1}} & C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_t/N_1)) \\ \downarrow \kappa_{t*} & & \downarrow \kappa_* \\ C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{C}(K_t/N_1)) & \xrightarrow{\iota_{K'_t, K_1} \circ (w^{-1}tw)_*} & C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_t)) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)). \end{array}$$

*Proof.* The proof is analogous to that of Lemma 5.3.4.  $\square$

**5.4. Ordinary parts.** The goal of this section is to show that the morphism  $\pi_w$  in Proposition 5.3.3 induces an isomorphism on ordinary parts.

We start by defining the ordinary part of homology at finite level. Let  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and  $t \in T^+$ . Assume that the compact open subgroup  $\overline{N}_t T_j N_1 \subseteq K_1$  admits an Iwahori factorisation; this can always be ensured by choosing  $t$  large enough with respect to  $j$ . For any  $s \in T^+$ , we let  $U_s$  denote the double coset operator  $[\overline{N}_t T_j N_1 s \overline{N}_t T_j N_1]$  acting on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(\overline{N}_t T_j N_1, \mathbb{Z}_p) \simeq C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))$ .

**Lemma 5.4.1.**

- (1) For  $s_1, s_2 \in T^+$  we have  $U_{s_1 s_2} = U_{s_1} \circ U_{s_2}$ . In particular, all these operators commute.
- (2) For  $t' \geq t$ ,  $j' \geq j$ , the restriction morphism

$$\text{res} : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_{t'} T_{j'} N_1)) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))$$

is  $U_s$ -equivariant for all  $s \in T^+$ .

(3) For any  $s \in T^+$ , we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1)) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}} & C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_tT_jN_1)) \\
 \downarrow U_s & \swarrow s_* \text{otr} & \downarrow U_s \\
 C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1)) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}} & C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_tT_jN_1))
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* The first part follows from the explicit description of the Hecke operators  $U_{s_1}$ ,  $U_{s_2}$ , and  $U_{s_1s_2}$ , cf. (5.1.1) and from the same computation as in [Eme10a, Lemma 3.1.4]. The second part again follows from the explicit description in (5.1.1) and from the fact that the Iwahori factorisation gives a bijection  $\overline{N}_tT_jN_1/\overline{N}_tT_jN_s \xrightarrow{\sim} N_1/N_s$ , which shows that the coset representatives can be chosen independently of  $j$  and  $t$ . We now prove the third part. The commutativity of the lower triangle follows from the definition of  $U_s$ . For the upper triangle, we write the definition of  $U_s$  acting on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1)) \simeq C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p)$ . By definition, this is equal to

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_s, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{s_*} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts^2}T_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{\text{res}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p),$$

which can be rewritten as  
(5.4.1)

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_s, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{\text{res}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_tT_jN_s, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{s_*} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_tT_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p).$$

We claim that the diagram of locally symmetric spaces with natural projection morphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X_{\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_s} & \longrightarrow & X_{\overline{N}_tT_jN_s} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 X_{\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1} & \longrightarrow & X_{\overline{N}_tT_jN_1}
 \end{array}$$

is Cartesian. To see this, it is enough to see that the morphism

$$X_{\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_s} \rightarrow X_{\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1} \times_{X_{\overline{N}_tT_jN_1}} X_{\overline{N}_tT_jN_s}$$

induces an isomorphism of the fibers over  $X_{\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1}$ . Indeed, the fibers on the RHS can be identified with  $\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1/\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_s$  and the fibers on the LHS can be identified with  $\overline{N}_tT_jN_1/\overline{N}_tT_jN_s$ , cf [CGH<sup>+</sup>18, Lemma 6.2.1]. The claim now follows from the Iwahori factorisation, since all the fibers are identified with  $N_1/N_s$ . Using proper base change, we rewrite (5.4.1) as

$$C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{\text{res}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_tT_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{\text{tr}} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_tT_jN_s, \mathbb{Z}_p) \xrightarrow{s_*} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(\overline{N}_{ts}T_jN_1, \mathbb{Z}_p).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We call  $s \in T^+$  a *controlling element* if  $\cap_{i \geq 1} s^i N_1 s^{-i} = \{1\}$ . Such a controlling element always exists, for example by taking  $s = \prod_{\alpha} p^{\alpha}$ , where the product runs over the positive coroots of  $G$ .

**Lemma 5.4.2.** *Let  $s \in T^+$  be a controlling element. For any  $s_1 \in T^+$ , there exists  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  such that  $s_1 s_2 = s^i$  for some  $s_2 \in T^+$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\cap_{i \geq 1} s^i N_1 s^{-i} = \{1\}$ , there exists  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  such that  $s^i N_1 s^{-i} \subseteq s_1 N_1 s_1^{-1}$ . This shows that  $s_2 := s_1^{-1} s^i \in T^+$ .  $\square$

Let  $s_0$  be a controlling element. Using homotopy equivalences, we transport  $U_{s_0}$  on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k)$  to an operator  $\tilde{U}_{s_0}$  on the corresponding Borel–Serre complex  $C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k)$ , which acts as  $U_{s_0}$  up to homotopy and, in particular, induces the same action on homology. Since the latter is a complex of finite projective  $\mathbb{Z}/p^k$ -modules,  $\tilde{U}_{s_0}^{N!}$  stabilises to an idempotent. We denote the corresponding direct summand by  $C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k)^{T^+ - \text{ord}}$ . We define

$$C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^+ - \text{ord}} := \varprojlim_k C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k)^{T^+ - \text{ord}}.$$

By [KT17, Lemma 2.13], this is a direct summand of  $C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))$  whose homology recovers the ordinary part of homology / Borel–Moore homology with respect to  $s_0$ .

Note that the homotopy equivalences between the adelic and the Borel–Serre complexes are functorial in the coefficients. Therefore, the formation of the direct summands is compatible with the transition morphisms between different levels, and we can also define the ordinary part

$$C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))^{T^+ - \text{ord}} := \varprojlim_{j,t} C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^+ - \text{ord}}$$

of  $C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))$  with respect to  $s_0$ . This is a direct summand of  $C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))$  and its homology recovers  $H_*^{(\text{BM})}(N_1)^{T^+ - \text{ord}}$  by [KT17, Lemma 2.13].

Using Lemma 5.4.2, one can check that all this is independent of the choice of controlling element  $s_0$ . By Lemma 5.4.2 and part (1) of Lemma 5.4.1, we see that  $U_s$  acts as a quasi-isomorphism on  $C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^+ - \text{ord}}$  for any  $s \in T^+$ . As a result, we obtain the following horizontal control theorem.

**Proposition 5.4.3.** *For any  $s \in T^+$ , the transition morphisms*

$$C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_{ts} T_j N_1))^{T^+ - \text{ord}} \rightarrow C_{\bullet}^{(\text{BM})}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^+ - \text{ord}},$$

*are quasi-isomorphisms.*

*Proof.* It is enough to show that the transition morphisms induce an isomorphism on the ordinary part of homology / Borel–Moore homology. Surjectivity follows from the commutativity of the lower triangle in part (3) of Lemma 5.4.1, since  $U_s$  acts as an isomorphism on homology. Injectivity follows from the commutativity of the upper triangle in part (3) of Lemma 5.4.1.  $\square$

Assume again that  $\overline{N}_t T_j N_1$  admits an Iwahori factorisation. Set

$$\mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}(\mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j)).$$

We also have an action of  $s \in T^-$  on each  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))$  via a double coset operator  $U_s$ . We define the analogous notion of controlling element and use it to define the ordinary part  $C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^- - \text{ord}}$  with respect to  $T^-$ . In this setting, we have the following horizontal control theorem.

**Proposition 5.4.4.** *For any  $s \in T^+$ , the transition morphisms*

$$C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^- - \text{ord}} \rightarrow C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_{ts} T_j N_1))^{T^- - \text{ord}},$$

*are quasi-isomorphisms.*



*Proof.* This is proved analogously to Proposition 5.4.3.  $\square$

Set  $\mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^k) := \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}/p^k$ . We have

$$\mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1) \simeq \varprojlim_{j,k} \varinjlim_t \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^k),$$

where the inverse limit runs over  $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and the direct limit runs over those  $t \in T^+$  that are sufficiently large with respect to  $j$ . We define

$$C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))^{T^- \text{-ord}} := \varprojlim_{j,k} \varinjlim_t C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1, \mathbb{Z}/p^k))^{T^- \text{-ord}},$$

the ordinary part of  $C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))$  with respect to  $T^-$ .

Also set

$$(w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}((w^{-1})_* \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1), \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j)).$$

For each  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , the map  $\kappa : \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1) \rightarrow (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1)$  induces a finite level map

$$\kappa_j : \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \rightarrow (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1),$$

whenever  $t \in T^+$  is such that  $\overline{N}_t T_j N_1$  admits an Iwahori factorisation.

**Lemma 5.4.5.** *The morphism*

$$(\kappa_j)_* : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1)) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))$$

*induces a quasi-isomorphism*

$$(\kappa_j)_*^{\text{ord}} : C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^+ \text{-ord}} \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))^{T^- \text{-ord}}.$$

*Proof.* We have the following finite-level version of (5.3.2):

(5.4.2)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_1 T_j N_1) & \xrightarrow{t_* \sim} & (t^{-1})_* \mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \\ \downarrow \kappa_j & & & & \downarrow (t^{-1})_* (\kappa_{j,t}) \\ (w^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & (w^{-1})_* 1_* \mathcal{C}(K_t/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & (t^{-1})_* ((t^{-1}w)^{-1})_* \mathcal{C}(K_t/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \end{array},$$

where the top row is part of the definition of the double coset operator corresponding to  $t$ . More precisely, in order to get the double coset operator  $U_t$  acting on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))$ , one needs to apply  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \ )$  to the top row and compose with the isomorphism

$$\iota_{K_t, K_1} : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_t, \mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1)) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1)).$$

We claim that the right vertical arrow in (5.4.2) is an isomorphism. For this, observe that the natural map  $K_t/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1 \rightarrow T_0/T_j$  is a bijection, so the pairing

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \times ((t^{-1}w)^{-1})_* \mathcal{D}(K_t/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j) \\ & \langle t_1 \overline{N}_t T_j N_1, t_2 \overline{N}_t T_j N_1 \rangle = wt_2^{-1} w^{-1} t t_1 t^{-1} T_j = wt_2^{-1} w^{-1} t_1 T_j \end{aligned}$$

is perfect. All of this implies that  $(\kappa_j)_*$  is the composite of the double coset operator  $U_t$  acting on  $C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1))$  with an isomorphism.

In order to prove the lemma, it suffices to check that  $(\kappa_j)_*$  induces an isomorphism on the ordinary part of homology. The map induced by  $(\kappa_j)_*$  on homology induces a morphism of ordinary parts of homology (where the ordinary part is taken with respect to  $T^+$  on the RHS and with respect to  $T^-$  on the LHS), which factors

as  $U_t$  composed with an isomorphism. Since  $U_t$  acts as an isomorphism on the ordinary part of homology, the lemma follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.4.6.** *The map*

$$\kappa_* : C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1)) \rightarrow C_{\mathbb{A}, \bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))$$

*induces a quasi-isomorphism*

$$\kappa_*^{\text{ord}} : C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))^{T^+ \text{-ord}} \xrightarrow{\sim} C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))^{T^- \text{-ord}}.$$

*Proof.* This follows by combining Lemma 5.4.5 and Propositions 5.4.3 and 5.4.4.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.4.7.** *The morphism  $\pi_w$  induces a quasi-isomorphism of ordinary parts*

$$\pi_w^{\text{ord}} : C_{\bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))^{T^+ \text{-ord}}[D] \rightarrow \text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)} \left( C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))^{T^+ \text{-ord}}, \mathcal{D}(T_0) \right).$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.4.6, we have a quasi-isomorphism:

$$\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)} \left( C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))^{T^- \text{-ord}}, \mathcal{D}(T_0) \right) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)} \left( C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))^{T^+ \text{-ord}}, \mathcal{D}(T_0) \right).$$

For each  $k, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , Poincaré duality and the universal coefficient isomorphism (at each level  $\overline{N}_t T_j N_1$ ) induce quasi-isomorphisms

$$\varprojlim_t C_{\bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k)^{T^+ \text{-ord}}[D] \xrightarrow{\sim}$$

$$\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k} \left( \varprojlim_t C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/\overline{N}_t T_j N_1) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k)^{T^- \text{-ord}}, \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k \right),$$

where the transition morphisms in both the inverse and the direct limit are isomorphisms by the horizontal control theorems. The morphism is a quasi-isomorphism, since on perfect complexes of  $\mathbb{Z}/p^k$ -modules, the ordinary part is simply the largest direct summand on which  $U_{s_0}$  acts invertibly, and this commutes with

$$\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k}(-, \mathcal{D}(T_0/T_j) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p^k).$$

Taking inverse limits with respect to  $j, k$ , we obtain a quasi-isomorphism

$$C_{\bullet}^{\text{BM}}(K_1, \mathcal{D}(K_1/N_1))^{T^+ \text{-ord}}[D] \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{RHom}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)} \left( C_{\bullet}(K_1, \mathcal{C}(K_1/N_1))^{T^- \text{-ord}}, \mathcal{D}(T_0) \right).$$

The theorem follows.  $\square$

**5.5. An application of Theorem 4.1.1.** We will give some implications of Theorem 4.1.1 for completed homology and completed Borel–Moore homology groups. In the cases we will be interested in below,  $T$  is split over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  and hence  $T_0 \cong (\mathbb{Z}_p^\times)^{\dim T}$ . The ring  $\mathcal{D}(T_0)$  is then isomorphic to a finite product of regular complete local Noetherian rings. For any such ring  $A = \prod_i A_i$ , with the  $A_i$  regular complete local Noetherian, any finitely generated  $A$ -module  $M$  decomposes uniquely as a product  $M = \prod_i M_i$  of finitely generated  $A_i$ -modules  $M_i$ . Each  $M_i$  has a well defined codimension  $\text{codim}_{A_i} M_i$ , being the codimension of the support of  $M_i$ . It is well known that

$$\text{codim}_{A_i} M_i = \inf_j \{j \mid \text{Ext}_{A_i}^j(M_i, A_i) \neq 0\}.$$

For  $M$ , we define  $\text{codim}_A M = \inf_i \text{codim}_{A_i} M_i$ . It follows immediately that

$$\text{codim}_A M = \inf_j \{j \mid \text{Ext}_A^j(M, A) \neq 0\}.$$

For a closed subgroup  $H \subset G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , we let

$$\tilde{H}_i(H) := \varprojlim_{n, K \supseteq H} H_i(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^n).$$

**Theorem 5.5.1.** *Assume that  $G$  admits a Shimura datum of Hodge type and that  $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$  is split. Recall that  $d = D/2$  is the complex dimension of the Shimura varieties for  $G$ .*

(1) *Let  $H \subseteq U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  be a closed subgroup. Then*

$$\varprojlim_{K \supseteq H} H_i^{\text{BM}}(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r) = 0$$

*for all  $r \geq 1$  and  $i > d$ .*

(2) *We have*

$$\text{codim}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)} \tilde{H}_i(N_1)^{T^+ \text{-ord}} \geq d - i$$

*for all  $0 \leq i \leq d$ .*

*Remark 5.5.2.* The slightly unusual level  $N_1$  was chosen for convenience. The groups  $\tilde{H}^i(N)^{T^+ \text{-ord}}$  for  $N$  a compact open subgroup of  $U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  are all isomorphic. For  $N' \subseteq N \subseteq U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , the trace map  $\tilde{H}^i(N)^{T^+ \text{-ord}} \rightarrow \tilde{H}^i(N')^{T^+ \text{-ord}}$  is an isomorphism for the following reason. We can find  $s \in T^+$  so that  $sNs^{-1} \subseteq N'$ . Consider the diagram

$$\tilde{H}_i(N)^{T^+ \text{-ord}} \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_1} \tilde{H}_i(N')^{T^+ \text{-ord}} \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_2} \tilde{H}_i(sNs^{-1})^{T^+ \text{-ord}} \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_3} \tilde{H}_i(sN's^{-1})^{T^+ \text{-ord}}.$$

The maps  $\text{tr}_2 \circ \text{tr}_1 = [NsN]s^{-1}$  and  $\text{tr}_3 \circ \text{tr}_2 = [N'sN']s^{-1}$  are isomorphisms. Then  $(\text{tr}_2 \circ \text{tr}_1)^{-1} \circ \text{tr}_2$  is both a left and right inverse of  $\text{tr}_1$  since

$$\text{tr}_1 \circ (\text{tr}_2 \circ \text{tr}_1)^{-1} \circ \text{tr}_2 = (\text{tr}_3 \circ \text{tr}_2)^{-1} \circ \text{tr}_3 \circ \text{tr}_2 \circ \text{tr}_1 \circ (\text{tr}_2 \circ \text{tr}_1)^{-1} \circ \text{tr}_2 = \text{id}.$$

**Lemma 5.5.3.** *For each compact open subgroup  $K \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ , there is an isomorphism of  $\mathbb{Z}/p^r$ -modules*

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^r}(H_c^\bullet(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r), \mathbb{Z}/p^r) \simeq H_\bullet^{\text{BM}}(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r),$$

*and these isomorphisms are compatible with changing the level.*

*Proof.* The result can be obtained by applying the functor  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^r}(-, \mathbb{Z}/p^r)$  to the universal coefficient isomorphism

$$H_c^\bullet(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^r}(H_\bullet^{\text{BM}}(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r), \mathbb{Z}/p^r),$$

and using the fact that any finite  $\mathbb{Z}/p^r$ -module is naturally isomorphic to its double dual.

The universal coefficient isomorphism can be proved as follows. We have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} H_*^{\text{BM}}(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r) &\simeq H_* (F_\bullet^{\text{BM}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[K^p K]} \mathbb{Z}/p^r) \\ H_c^*(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r) &\simeq H^* (\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K^p K]}(F_\bullet^{\text{BM}}, \mathbb{Z}/p^r)) \end{aligned}$$

By the adjunction between tensor products and homomorphisms,

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[K^p K]}(F_\bullet^{\text{BM}}, \mathbb{Z}/p^r) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^r}(F_\bullet^{\text{BM}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[K^p K]} \mathbb{Z}/p^r, \mathbb{Z}/p^r).$$

Then the universal coefficient isomorphism follows by taking cohomology and observing that  $\mathbb{Z}/p^r$  is an injective  $\mathbb{Z}/p^r$ -module. All of these isomorphisms are compatible with changing the level.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.5.1.* To prove the first claim, we use Lemma 5.5.3 to write

$$\varinjlim_{K \supseteq H} H_i^{\text{BM}}(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^r} \left( \varinjlim_{K \supseteq H} \text{Hom}(H_c^i(X_K, \mathbb{Z}/p^r), \mathbb{Z}/p^r) \right)$$

and then apply Corollary 4.1.2. From Theorem 5.4.7 and Theorem 5.1.6, we obtain the Poincaré duality spectral sequence

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}(T_0)}^i(\tilde{H}_j(N_1)^{T^+ - \text{ord}}, \mathcal{D}(T_0)) \Rightarrow \tilde{H}_{2d-i-j}^{\text{BM}}(N_1)^{T^+ - \text{ord}}.$$

Then the second claim follows from the first claim and the above spectral sequence by the same argument as in [Sch15, Corollary 4.2.3] (note that  $D$  from Theorem 5.4.7 can be identified with  $2d$ ).  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [AS07] Avner Ash and Glenn Stevens, *p-adic deformations of arithmetic cohomology*, preprint, 2007.
- [BFH<sup>+</sup>17] Christopher Birkbeck, Tony Feng, David Hansen, Serin Hong, Qirui Li, Anthony Wang, and Lynelle Ye, *Extensions of vector bundles on the Fargues–Fontaine curve*, arXiv:1705.00710.
- [BS73] Armand Borel and Jean-Pierre Serre, *Corners and arithmetic groups*, Comment. Math. Helv. **48** (1973), 436–491, Avec un appendice: Arrondissement des variétés à coins, par A. Douady et L. Hérault.
- [BS19] Bhargav Bhatt and Peter Scholze, *Prisms and prismatic cohomology*, arXiv:1905.08229.
- [BT65] Armand Borel and Jacques Tits, *Groupes réductifs*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1965), no. 27, 55–150.
- [CE12] Frank Calegari and Matthew Emerton, *Completed cohomology—a survey*, Non-abelian fundamental groups and Iwasawa theory, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 393, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2012, pp. 239–257.
- [CGH<sup>+</sup>18] Ana Caraiani, Daniel Gulotta, Chi-Yun Hsu, Christian Johansson, Lucia Mocz, Emanuel Reinecke, and Sheng-Chi Shih, *Shimura varieties at level  $\Gamma_1(p^\infty)$  and Galois representations*, arXiv:1804.00136.
- [Con14] Brian Conrad, *Reductive group schemes*, Autour des schémas en groupes, Panoramas et synthèses, vol. 42-43, Société mathématique de France, 2014, pp. 93–444.
- [CS17] Ana Caraiani and Peter Scholze, *On the generic part of the cohomology of compact unitary Shimura varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **186** (2017), no. 3, 649–766.
- [Del71] Pierre Deligne, *Travaux de Shimura*, Séminaire Bourbaki, 23ème année (1970/71), Exp. No. 389, Springer, Berlin, 1971, pp. 123–165. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 244.
- [Eme10a] Matthew Emerton, *Ordinary parts of admissible representations of p-adic reductive groups I. Definition and first properties*, Astérisque (2010), no. 331, 355–402.
- [Eme10b] ———, *Ordinary parts of admissible representations of p-adic reductive groups II. Derived functors*, Astérisque (2010), no. 331, 403–459.
- [Eme14] ———, *Completed cohomology and the p-adic Langlands program*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Seoul 2014. Vol. II, Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014, pp. 319–342.
- [Han16] David Hansen, *Quotients of adic spaces by finite groups*, Math. Research Letters (2016), to appear, <http://www.math.columbia.edu/~hansen/adicgpquotient.pdf>.
- [Han17] ———, *Universal eigenvarieties, trianguline Galois representations, and p-adic Langlands functoriality*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **730** (2017), 1–64, With an appendix by James Newton.
- [Hil10] Richard Hill, *On Emerton’s p-adic Banach spaces*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2010), no. 18, 3588–3632.
- [Jen70] C. U. Jensen, *On the vanishing of  $\varinjlim^{(i)}$* , J. Algebra **15** (1970), 151–166.
- [Kis10] Mark Kisin, *Integral models for Shimura varieties of abelian type*, Journal of the A.M.S. **23** (2010), no. 4, 967–1012.

- [KL16] Kiran S. Kedlaya and Ruochuan Liu, *Relative  $p$ -adic Hodge theory, II: Imperfect period rings*, arXiv:1602.06899.
- [KT17] Chandrashekar B. Khare and Jack A. Thorne, *Potential automorphy and the Leopoldt conjecture*, Amer. J. Math. **139** (2017), no. 5, 1205–1273.
- [Mil05] J. S. Milne, *Introduction to Shimura varieties*, Harmonic analysis, the trace formula, and Shimura varieties, Clay Math. Proc., vol. 4, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005, pp. 265–378.
- [Mun66] James R. Munkres, *Elementary differential topology*, Lectures given at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Fall, vol. 1961, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1966.
- [NT16] James Newton and Jack A. Thorne, *Torsion Galois representations over CM fields and Hecke algebras in the derived category*, Forum Math. Sigma **4** (2016), e21, 88.
- [Sch92] Claus Scheiderer, *Quasi-augmented simplicial spaces, with an application to cohomological dimension*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **81** (1992), no. 3, 293–311.
- [Sch13] Peter Scholze, *Perfectoid Spaces: A survey*, Current Developments in Mathematics 2012, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2013, pp. 193–227.
- [Sch15] ———, *On torsion in the cohomology of locally symmetric varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **182** (2015), no. 3, 945–1066.
- [Sch17] ———, *Étale cohomology of Diamonds*, arXiv:1709.07343.
- [Sch18] ———, *On the  $p$ -adic cohomology of the Lubin-Tate tower*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **51** (2018), no. 4, 811–863, With an appendix by Michael Rapoport.
- [SGA11] *Schémas en groupes (SGA 3). Tome I. Propriétés générales des schémas en groupes*, xxviii+610, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1962–64. [Algebraic Geometry Seminar of Bois Marie 1962–64], A seminar directed by M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck with the collaboration of M. Artin, J.-E. Bertin, P. Gabriel, M. Raynaud and J.-P. Serre, Revised and annotated edition of the 1970 French original.
- [Sta18] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, 2018, <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>.
- [Tur01] Vladimir Turaev, *Introduction to combinatorial torsions*, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2001, Notes taken by Felix Schlenk.
- [Urb11] Eric Urban, *Eigenvarieties for reductive groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **174** (2011), no. 3, 1685–1784.
- [Zar77] Ju. G. Zarhin, *Endomorphisms of abelian varieties and points of finite order in characteristic  $P$* , Mat. Zametki **21** (1977), no. 6, 737–744.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON, LONDON SW7 2AZ, UK  
*E-mail address:* [caraiani.ana@gmail.com](mailto:caraiani.ana@gmail.com)

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, OXFORD OX2 6GG, UK  
*E-mail address:* [Daniel.Gulotta@maths.ox.ac.uk](mailto:Daniel.Gulotta@maths.ox.ac.uk)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG, SE-412 96, SWEDEN  
*E-mail address:* [chrjohv@chalmers.se](mailto:chrjohv@chalmers.se)