arXiv:math/0703527v3 [math.RT] 22 Mar 2011

ON $\mathbb{F}_q$-RATIONAL STRUCTURE OF NILPOTENT ORBITS

SEMRA KAPTANOGLU, BRIAN PARSHALL AND BIN SHU

Abstract. Let G be a simple algebraic group and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ over $k = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$ where q is a power of the prime characteristic of k, and F a Frobenius morphism on G which can be defined naturally on $\mathfrak{g}$. In this paper, we give the connection between F-stable restricted modules of $\mathfrak{g}$ and closed conical subvarieties defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ in the null cone $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ (Theorem 5.5). Furthermore, we determine which nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$ have $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure under the adjoint action of G when the characteristic of k is good for G and bigger than 3 (Theorem 6.10). The determination also works for classical simple Lie algebras in the sense of [28] under the adjoint group action (Theorem 7.3).

1. Introduction

Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group over the algebraic closure $k = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$ which is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, with corresponding (geometric) Frobenius map F, and let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. Here q is a given power of a prime p, $\mathbb{F}_q$ the finite field of q elements. Then F naturally gives rise to Frobenius mapping $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ admissible with the Lie product and p-mapping. Such a Frobenius mapping on $\mathfrak{g}$ is a so-called a Frobenius-Lie morphism of $\mathfrak{g}$ (to see §3.11).

Recall that Friedlander-Parshall established in [14]-[17] some geometric theory of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules, through introducing cohomological support varieties which can be described with rank varieties inside the null cone of $\mathfrak{g}$. In this paper, we first investigate the relation between the $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable modules and the closed conical subvarieties defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ in the null cone $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. We establish some good correspondence (to see Theorem 5.5).

Then we turn to the investigation on $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure of nilpotent orbits, completing the judgement for a nilpotent of $\mathfrak{g}$ whether or not it admits $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure (to see Theorems 6.10 and 7.3). The argument is dependent heavily on the equivalence classification of Frobenius-Lie morphisms of classical simple Lie algebras presented in [13, Theorem 4.5].

2. $\mathbb{F}_q$-Rational structure on affine varieties

Throughout this paper, let $q = p^n$ be an arbitrary given power of a prime p, $\mathbb{F}_q$ the finite field of q elements and k the algebraic closure $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$ of $\mathbb{F}_q$. For any $n \geqslant 1$, let $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}$ denote the unique extension field of $\mathbb{F}_q$ of degree n contained in $k = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$.

2.1. $\mathbb{F}_q$-Rational structure on affine varieties.

Definition 2.2. Let (X, A) be an affine variety over k, and $F : X \to X$ be a morphism. We say that (X, A) is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, if the following conditions hold for the comorphism $F^* : A \to A$ of F:

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B20, 17B35, 20G15.

The work was done while the first and third authors were visiting University of Virginia in 2004-2005. They would like to thank the institute of mathematical science and the department of mathematics at University of Virginia for the hospitality and support. The work is also partially supported by the NSF of China and CSC. The earlier version was presented in a workshop held at Huazhong Normal University (Wuhan) in July 2007. The third author thanks G. Lusztig for his helpful comments on the presentation. He also thanks Hao Chang for his helpful comments on an earlier version.

(a) F^* is injective and $F^*(A) = A^q$.
(b) For each $f \in A$, there exists some $m \geqslant 1$ such that $(F^*)^m(f) = f^{q^m}$.

In this case, we also say that (X, A) admits an $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure, and that F is the corresponding Frobenius map.

Furthermore, we set $X^F := \{x \in X \mid F(x) = x\}$ for the fixed-point set of F. We also write this set as $X(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and call it the set of $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational points in X.

In Definition 2.2, $F^*(A) = A^q$ and F^* is injective, which give rise to a well-defined map $\sigma : A \to A$ such that $\sigma(f) = (F^*)^{-1}(f^q)$ for all $f \in A$. Such a σ is just an arithmetic Frobenius map satisfying the following:

(a) The map $\sigma : A \to A$ is a bijective $\mathbb{F}_q$-algebra homomorphism such that $\sigma(af) = a^q\sigma(f)$, $a \in k, f \in A$.
(b) For each $f \in A$, there exists some $m \geqslant 1$ such that $\sigma^m(f) = f$.

There are some further basic properties of Frobenius morphisms:

Proposition 2.3. *([18, 4.1.3]) Let (X, A) be an affine variety defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ with corresponding Frobenius map F. Set $A_0 := \{f \in A \mid \sigma(f) = f\} = \{f \in A \mid F^*(f) = f^q\}$. Then A_0 is a finitely generated $\mathbb{F}_q$-subalgebra of A such that the natural map $A_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k \to A$ is an algebra isomorphism. Furthermore, the fixed-point set X^F is finite, and F is a bijective map.*

2.4. Stable variety under a Frobenius map.

Suppose (X, A) is an affine variety over k which is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, and admits corresponding Frobenius map F. Let V be a subvariety of X, not necessary closed. Call V being F-stable if $F(V) \subset V$.

If V is a closed subset of X, then we have the following property when it's F-stable.

Proposition 2.5. *([18, 4.1.5], [12, 3.3]) Let (X, A) be an affine variety over k defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ with corresponding Frobenius map F. Retain the above notations and especially keep $A_0 := \{f \in A \mid \sigma(f) = f\} = \{f \in A \mid F^*(f) = f^q\}$. Then for any closed subset $V \subset X$, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *V is F-stable.*
(b) *$F(V) = V$.*
(c) *The vanishing ideal $\mathbf{I}_A(V)$ of V is generated by elements in A_0.*
(d) *The ideal $\mathbf{I}_A(V)$ has the form $I_0 \otimes k$ where I_0 is an ideal of A_0.*
(e) *$V = \mathbf{V}_X(S)$ for some subset $S \subset A_0$, where $\mathbf{V}_X(S)$ is the algebraic set defined by S.*

Thus, if a closed subvariety V is F-stable, then V is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, thereby V admits a rational $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure.

Example 2.6. Consider the standard Frobenius map $F : k^n \to k^n$. Let $A = k[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$. Let $V \subset k^n$ be an algebraic set. Then A_0 defined in Proposition 2.3 is given by $A_0 = \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$. If V is F-stable, then set $A_0[V] := \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \cdots, x_n]/I_0$, where $I_0 = \mathbf{I}(V) \cap \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$. Then $A_0[V]$ is precisely the subalgebra defined in Proposition 2.3 for $(V, A[V])$.

The following lemma is basic to us, which is an application of Lang-Steinberg theorem.

Theorem 2.7. [30, I.2.7] *Let G be a connected affine algebraic group, and $F : G \to G$ a Frobenius map. Suppose X be a G-variety with G-transitive action and with a Frobenius map $F' : X \to X$, which is compatible with F. This is to say, $F'(g.x) = F(g).F'(x)$ for all $g \in G$ and $x \in X$. Then X admits a fixed point under F'.*

Example 2.8. Let G be a classical group which is a closed subgroup of $GL(m,k)$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}G$. Let F be a standard Frobenius map $F : \mathfrak{gl}(m,k) \to \mathfrak{gl}(m,k)$ which raises all matrix entries to the qth power. Then the restriction of F are a Frobenius map in G and in $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ respectively. In particular, both F are compatible as the above lemma says when G acts on a G-variety in $\mathfrak{g}$ under adjoint action. Recall that any nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ has a representative J corresponding to a partition $\mathbf{d} = (d_1 \geqslant d_2 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant d_r) \vdash m$ such that J admits ordered Jordan blocks $(J_{d_1}, \cdots, J_{d_r})$. Then $J \in \mathfrak{g}^F$. Denote $\mathcal{O}$ by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{d}}$. According to the above lemma, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is F-stable. Notice that

$$\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{d}} = \cup_{\mathbf{a}\in\{\text{all partions corresponding to nilpotent orbits in } \mathrm{Lie}(G)\leqslant \mathbf{d}\}}\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{a}}. \tag{2.8.1}$$

Hence $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is also F-stable. Hence, $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ admits a rational $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure.

3. Frobenius-Lie morphisms on Lie algebras

We first recall the definition of Frobenius mappings and $\mathbb{F}_q$-structures on vector spaces (comparing with the arithmetic Frobenius map in 2.1).

Definition 3.1. (1) Let V and W be two vector space over k. A mapping f from V to W is called a q-semi-linear if it satisfies the following conditions:

(a) f is an $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear;
(b) $f(av) = a^q f(v)$ for all $v \in V$ and $a \in k$.

Furthermore, f is called a q-semi-linear isomorphism if it's bijective. If furthermore $V = W$, then f is called a q-semi-linear automorphism.

(2) A q semi-linear automorphism F on V satisfying that for any $v \in V$, $F^n(v) = v$ for some $n > 0$ is called a q-Frobenius mapping (a Frobenius mapping for short if the q is clear in the context). The smallest r satisfying $F^r(v) = v$ is called a period of v (under F), denoted by $\wp_F(v)$.

Remark 3.2. (1) It's the same thing both to give a Frobenius mapping F on V and to give an $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure V_0 on V which means by definition that the natural homomorphism $V_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k \to V$ is an isomorphism (also, cf. [12, 3.5]). They are related via $V_0 = V^F := \{v \in V \mid F(v) = v\}$. We shall always identify V with $V_0 \otimes k$ in the sequel.

(2) Regard V as a k-vector space variety. Then the coordinate algebra of this variety is the symmetric algebra on V^*: $\mathcal{S}(V^*)$. It's easily seen that F is a morphism of variety.

3.3. Intertwining operator $F_{(V,W)}$.

Let $\mathcal{V}_{k,\mathbb{F}_q}$ be the category whose objects are vector spaces over k with *fixed* $\mathbb{F}_q$-structures and whose morphisms are linear maps $f : V \to W$ defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, namely, $f(V_0) \subseteq W_0$. Clearly, if F_V and F_W are the Frobenius maps on V and W defining V_0 and W_0, respectively, then f is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ if and only if $F_W \circ f = f \circ F_V$. In particular, if F and F' are two Frobenius maps on V, then any $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear isomorphism from V^F to $V^{F'}$ induces a k-linear isomorphism θ on V such that $\theta \circ F = F' \circ \theta$. Thus, up to isomorphism in $\mathcal{V}_{k,\mathbb{F}_q}$, the $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure on V is unique. Note that $\mathcal{V}_{k,\mathbb{F}_q}$ is an abelian category.

We shall represent the fixed $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure on a k-space V by a Frobenius map F_V. Thus, the objects V in $\mathcal{V}_{k,\mathbb{F}_q}$ are, sometimes, written as (V, F_V), and

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{V}_{k,\mathbb{F}_q}}(V,W) = \{f \in \mathrm{Hom}_k(V,W) \mid F_W \circ f = f \circ F_V\}.$$

For $(V, F_V), (W, F_W) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{V}_{k,\mathbb{F}_q})$, there is an induced $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear map

$$F_{(V,W)} : \mathrm{Hom}_k(V,W) \to \mathrm{Hom}_k(V,W); f \mapsto F_{(V,W)}(f) = F_W \circ f \circ F_V^{-1}.$$

Note that, when V is *infinite dimensional*, $F_{(V,W)}$ is not necessarily a Frobenius map on $\mathrm{Hom}_k(V,W)$. However, we have the following.

Lemma 3.4. *(cf.* [10] *or* [11, §2.3]*) Maintain the notation introduced above and let $F = F_{(V,W)}$. We have an $\mathbb{F}_q$-space isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(V^{F_V}, W^{F_W}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{V}_{k,\mathbb{F}_q}}(V, W) = \mathrm{Hom}_k(V, W)^F.$$

In particular, if V is finite dimensional, then F is a Frobenius map on $\mathrm{Hom}_k(V, W)$.

3.5. Frobenius-Lie morphisms.

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a finite-dimensional Lie algebra over k. A mapping $F : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$ is called a *Frobenius-Lie morphism* on $\mathfrak{g}$ if it is a Frobenius mapping on the k-space $\mathfrak{g}$, and if it preserves the Lie product: $F[x, y] = [F(x), F(y)]$ for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$. Clearly, a Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}$ is also a Lie algebra $\mathbb{F}_q$-automorphism. Also, if $\mathfrak{g} = A^-$ is the Lie algebra obtained from an associative algebra A with the Lie product $[x, y] = xy - yx$ for all $x, y \in A$, then any Frobenius morphism on A induces a Frobenius-Lie morphism on A^-.

The set of all Frobenius-Lie morphisms on $\mathfrak{g}$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{g})$. For any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$, it's easy to see by direct verification that $\sigma_* F := \sigma^{-1} F \sigma$ is still a Frobenius-Lie morphisms on $\mathfrak{g}$. Two Frobenius-Lie morphisms F_1 and F_2 on $\mathfrak{g}$ are called equivalent (denoted $F_1 \sim F_2$) provided that $\mathfrak{g}^{F_1} \cong \mathfrak{g}^{F_2}$ as Lie $\mathbb{F}_q$-algebras. The following Lemma is clear.

Lemma 3.6. *(*[13, Lemma 2.6]*) Let F_1 and F_2 be two Frobenius Lie morphisms on $\mathfrak{g}$.*

(a) *$F_1 = F_2$ if and only if $\mathfrak{g}^{F_1} = \mathfrak{g}^{F_2}$;*
(b) *$F_1 \sim F_2$ if and only if $F_1 = \sigma_*(F_2)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

3.7. Restricted Frobenius morphisms on restricted Lie algebras.

From this section on, we will focus our discussion on restricted Lie algebras. Always suppose the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is endowed with a p-mapping $[p]$. Suppose F is still a Frobenius-Lie morphism. Call F a restricted Frobenius morphism if it satisfies an additional condition $F(x^{[p]}) = F(x)^{[p]}$. The following facts are clear.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose F is a Frobenius-Lie morphism on a restricted Lie algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, [p])$. Then*

(a) *F is a restricted morphism if and only if $\mathfrak{g}^F$ is a restricted subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$.*
(b) *If F is a restricted morphism, then (q^n-)Frobenius-Lie morphism F^n is also restricted.*

3.9. Frobenius-Lie morphisms for classical simple Lie algebras and the graph automorphisms of Dynkin diagrams.

In this subsection, we assume $p > 3$. Recall that a classical simple Lie algebra is classified by Dynkin diagrams labelled by A_n $(n \geqslant 1), B_n$ $(n \geqslant 2), C_n$ $(n \geqslant 3), D_n$ $(n \geqslant 4), E_n$ $(n = 6, 7, 8), F_4, G_2$ (see [28, II.10.1]). We may view such a $\mathfrak{g}$ as reduction modulo p via a Chevalley basis of the corresponding complex simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ except for A_n with $p|n + 1$. In the exceptional cases (i.e. A_n with $p|n + 1$), $\mathfrak{g}$ is a quotient of the reduction modulo p via Chevalley basis by the one-dimensional center which is in Cartan subalgebras. The Chevalley basis of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ induces a basis on $\mathfrak{g}$—still called a Chevalley basis; see the discussion below. Let G be the adjoint group of $\mathfrak{g}$. By Chevalley-Dickson's result, G is simple (cf. [31, §4, Theorem 5] or [28, Theorem 3.1]) with $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ for non-exceptional cases, and $\mathfrak{g} = [\mathrm{Lie}(G), \mathrm{Lie}(G)]$ or $\mathfrak{g} = [\mathrm{Lie}(G), \mathrm{Lie}(G)]/$ 1-dimensional center of $[\mathrm{Lie}(G), \mathrm{Lie}(G)]$ for the exceptional case ([19, 5.4]).

We have a realization of G in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ as follows. Denote by $G_{\mathbb{C}} \subset GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ the simply connected simple algebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Lie}(G_{\mathbb{C}}) = \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$, associated with root system Φ and simple root system. Let $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{Lie}(G_{\mathbb{C}})$ and let $\mathcal{B} = \{X_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\} \bigcup \{H_i \mid i = 1, \cdots, r = \mathrm{rank}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})\}$. Here the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} = \sum_i \mathbb{C} H_i$. Set $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Z}} = \sum_i \mathbb{Z} H_i$ (resp. $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{Z}} = \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi} \mathbb{Z} X_\alpha + \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Z}}$) and $\mathfrak{h}_k = \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} k$ (resp. $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} k$). Note that $\mathfrak{g}_k$ has a Chevalley basis $\mathcal{B}_k = \{e_\alpha := X_\alpha \otimes 1 \mid \alpha \in \Phi\} \bigcup \{h_{\alpha_i} := H_{\alpha_i} \otimes 1 \mid i = 1, \cdots, r\}$, where $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i = 1, 2, \cdots, r\}$ is the simple root set of Φ.

Let $\bar{G}$ be the simply-connected simple algebraic group over k, associated with the irreducible root system Φ. Then $\mathrm{Lie}(\bar{G}) = \mathfrak{g}_k$ (cf. [2, 3.3]). Note that the center of $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is contained in $\mathfrak{h}_k$ which is nontrivial only in the exceptional case, we have a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ arising from $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, which is equal to $\mathfrak{h}_k$ for non-exceptional cases, and isomorphic to $\mathfrak{h}_k/Z(\mathfrak{g}_k)$ for the exceptional case. Here $Z(\mathfrak{g}_k)$ means the center of $\mathfrak{g}_k$. Thus, we have a Cartan-decomposition relative to $\mathfrak{h}$: $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} + \sum_{\alpha\in\Phi(\mathfrak{h})} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. Let $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_r\}$ be a set of simple roots in the root system $\Phi := \Phi(\mathfrak{h})$. Then we have a Chevalley basis in the sense of the above meaning: $\{h_i, e_\alpha \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant r', \alpha \in \Phi\}$ where $r' = r-1$ if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of the exceptional case, $r' = r$ otherwise. Here e_α may be naturally regarded as $X_\alpha \otimes 1$ whether or not it's the exceptional case since the possible non-trivial center is in $\mathfrak{h}_k$. Additionally, each e_α defines a (nilpotent) linear transformation $\mathrm{ad}e_\alpha$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ by sending $y \in \mathfrak{g}$ to $[e_\alpha y]$. Thus, for any $a \in k$, set $x_\alpha(a) := \exp(\mathrm{ad}ae_\alpha)$, which is easily seen to be a linear automorphism on $\mathfrak{g}$. Denote by $G(\mathfrak{h})$ the group generated by all $x_\alpha(a)$ which is called the Chevalley group of $\mathfrak{g}$ (constructed relative to $\mathfrak{h}$). Then $G(\mathfrak{h})$ coincides with of G, which is independent of the choice of $\mathfrak{h}$ as k is algebraically closed ([28, III.4.1, IV. 1.1 and IV.1.2]). Actually, all Cartan subalgebras are conjugate under G ([28, IV.1.2]). Furthermore, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}) = G \rtimes \Gamma$ is a semi-direct product of G and the graph automorphism of Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}$ (cf. [28, III.Theorem 5.1 and §3]).

Let F_0 be a *standard* (or in other words, *splitting*) Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}$ which fixes the Chevalley basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}^{F_0}$ is a *split* classical Lie algebra over $\mathbb{F}_q$ (of the same type as $\mathfrak{g}$) with respect to the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$. (Thus, $\mathfrak{g}_0$ has a Cartan decomposition of the form $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}^{F_0} + \sum_\alpha \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{F_0}$). By Lang-Steinberg Theorem, it's proved in [13] that any Frobenius morphism F on $\mathfrak{g}$ is a split Frobenius morphism followed by a graph automorphism: $F = \gamma \cdot F_0'$ where $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $F_0' \in G * F_0 := \{g * F_0 := g^{-1}F_0 g \mid g \in G\}$. Moreover, such a decomposition is unique, and there is a one-to-one correspondence between the equivalence classes of Frobenius morphisms on $\mathfrak{g}$ and the conjugacy classes in Γ of graph automorphisms on $\mathfrak{g}$.

Remark 3.10. Precisely speaking, the number of (non-equivalent) Frobenius-Lie morphisms of a classical simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over k with $p > 3$ is as follows: one for types $A_1, B, C, G_2, F_4, E_7, E_8$: two for types $A_n (n > 1), D_n (n \geqslant 5), E_6$, and three for type D_4. Especially, the representatives of equivalent Frobenius-Lie morphisms for D_4 arises from $\sigma_0 = Id$, $\sigma_1 = (34)$ and $\sigma_2 = (134)$ where (ij) or (ijk) means the graph automorphism arising from the permutation corresponding to the i-th, j-th or k-th nodes in the standard Dynkin diagram of type D_4, fixing the other nodes. In the sequel, the corresponding Frobenius-Lie morphism is denoted by F_0, F_1 and F_2 respectively.

3.11. Compatibility of Frobenius morphisms on algebraic groups and their Lie algebras.

In general, for G a connected algebraic group over k, defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, with Frobenius map F, consider $A := k[G]$ and $F^* : A \to A$. Set $\sigma : A \to A$ to be defined via $\sigma(f) = (F^*)^{-1}(f^q)$ for all $f \in A$. Then σ is an arithmetic Frobenius map satisfying the condition that σ is a bijective $\mathbb{F}_q$-algebra homomorphism with $\sigma(af) = a^q\sigma(f)$, $a \in k, f \in A$ and that there exists some $m \geqslant 1$ such that $\sigma^m(f) = f$. Denote by A^σ the set of fixed points of σ in A, which is often simply denoted by A_0. Then A_0 is an $\mathbb{F}_q$-algebra, satisfying $A \cong A_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$. Set $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g} \cap \mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A_0) = \{D \in \mathrm{Der}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A_0) \mid (1 \otimes D) \circ \Delta = \Delta \circ D\}$ for the co-multiplication Δ on Hopf algebra A. Then $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g}_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$ (cf. [2, I.3.4]). With such an $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure of $\mathfrak{g}$, we have a natural "Frobenius" map $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$, exactly a "Frobenius-Lie morphism" over $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let G be a connected semi-simple algebraic group over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p > 3$, which is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ with corresponding Frobenius map F. Let $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the corresponding Frobenius-Lie morphism of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. Let T be a fixed maximal torus of G, and Δ (resp. Π) be the root system of G (resp. simple root system) associated with T. We may suppose $F_{\mathfrak{g}} = \sigma \cdot F_0$, where F_0 is the splitting Frobenius-Lie morphism associated with $\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{Lie}(T)$ (cf. §3.9).

We consider the corresponding complex semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ with triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathbb{C}}^- + \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} + \mathfrak{n}_{\mathbb{C}}^+$. Take in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ a Chevalley basis $\{X_\alpha, X_{-\alpha}, H_i \mid \alpha \in \Delta_+, i = 1, 2, \cdots l := \dim(T)$.

By [31], there is a faithful finite-dimensional representation (π, V) of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ with the weight lattice equal to the character group $X^*(T) = \mathrm{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m)$, and an admissible $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice M of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$-module V. Then G can be realized as the Chevalley group G_V which is a closed subgroup of $GL(V_k)$ for $V_k = M \otimes k$. Recall that G_V is generated by elements: $x_\alpha^\pi(t) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \pi(X_\alpha^{(n)})t^n$, for $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $t \in k$. Here $X_\alpha^{(n)} = \frac{X_\alpha^n}{n!}$. So we have a Frobenius map F on G via $F(x_\alpha^\pi(t)) = x_{\sigma(\alpha)}^\pi(t^q)$.

Lemma 3.12. *For any $g \in G$ and $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, $F_{\mathfrak{g}}(g \cdot X) = F(g) \cdot F_{\mathfrak{g}}(X)$.*

Proof. We identify $\mathfrak{g}$ with $\mathrm{Lie}(G_V)$, which is a linear Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}(V_k)$. By [2, 3.3], $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_\pi \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} k$, where $\mathfrak{g}_\pi = \sum \mathbb{Z}X_\alpha + \mathfrak{h}_\pi$, and $\mathfrak{h}_\pi = \{h \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}} \mid \alpha(h) \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall \alpha \in X(T)\}$. So we can suppose the splitting Frobenius mapping F_0 is associated with a Chevalley basis $\mathcal{B}_\pi = \{X_\alpha, H_i' \mid \alpha \in \Delta, i = 1, \cdots, l\}$. Then $F_{\mathfrak{g}}(\sum_\alpha a_\alpha X_\alpha + \sum_i b_i H_i') = \sum_\alpha a_\alpha^q X_{\sigma(\alpha)} + \sum_i b_i^q H_i'$ for all $a_\alpha, b_i \in k$.

Then we have $x_\alpha^\pi(t) \cdot Y = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \mathrm{ad}(X_\alpha^{(n)})(Y)$ for $Y = X_\beta$ or H_i'.

Case 1. $Y = X_\beta$.

Observe that the lengths of root chains in Δ are 4 at most, which is less than p. And furthermore, $\mathrm{ad}(X_\alpha)^n(X_\beta) = C_{\alpha,\beta,n} X_{n\alpha+\beta}$ if $n\alpha+\beta \in \Delta$, and 0 if $n\alpha+\beta$ is not a root, with $C_{\alpha,\beta,n} \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying that

(3.12.1)
$$\mathrm{ad}(X_{\sigma(\alpha)})^n(X_{\sigma(\beta)}) = C_{\alpha,\beta,n} X_{n\sigma(\alpha)+\sigma(\beta)} \text{ if } n\alpha+\beta \in \Delta, \text{ and } 0 \text{ if } n\alpha+\beta \text{ is not a root.}$$

Thus, we have

$$F_{\mathfrak{g}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{ad}(X_\alpha^n)(X_\beta)}{n!}\right) = C_{\alpha,\beta,n} \frac{X_{n\sigma(\alpha)+\sigma(\beta)}}{n!} = \frac{\mathrm{ad}(X_{\sigma(\alpha)})^n(X_{\sigma(\beta)})}{n!}. \tag{3.12.2}$$

Hence, we have

$$F_G(x_\alpha^\pi(t)) \cdot F_{\mathfrak{g}}(X_\beta) = x_{\sigma(\alpha)}^\pi(t^q) \cdot X_{\sigma(\beta)} = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{\mathrm{ad}(X_{\sigma(\alpha)})^n(X_{\sigma(\beta)})}{n!} t^{nq} \tag{3.12.3}$$

On the other hand,

(3.12.4)
$$F_{\mathfrak{g}}(x_\alpha^\pi(t) \cdot X_\beta) = F_{\mathfrak{g}}\left(\sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{(\mathrm{ad}(X_\alpha)^n(X_\beta))}{n!} t^n\right) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty F_{\mathfrak{g}}\left(\frac{(\mathrm{ad}(X_\alpha)^n(X_\beta))}{n!}\right) t^{nq}.$$

By (3.12.2), we have $F_{\mathfrak{g}}(g \cdot Y) = F(g) F_{\mathfrak{g}}(Y)$ for $g = x_\alpha^\pi(t)$ and $Y = X_\beta$.

Case 2. $Y = H_i'$.

In this case, $\mathrm{ad}(X_\alpha)H_i' = -\langle \alpha, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle X_\alpha$ and $\mathrm{ad}(X_\alpha)^n H_i' = 0$ for $n > 1$. So it's more easily seen by the same argument that $F_{\mathfrak{g}}(g \cdot Y) = F(g) \cdot F_{\mathfrak{g}}(Y)$ for $g = x_\alpha^\pi(t)$ and $Y = H_i'$.

□

3.13. $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable modules.

Let V be a finite dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module and let $\rho = \rho_V : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ be the corresponding representation. We say that V is $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-*stable* (or simply F-stable) if there is an $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure V_0 of V such that ρ induces a representation $\rho_0 : \mathfrak{g}^F \to \mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(V_0)$ of $\mathfrak{g}^F$. By the definition of an $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure, V is F-stable if and only if there is a Frobenius map $F_V : V \to V$ such that

$$F_V(xv) = F_{\mathfrak{g}}(x) F_V(v), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathfrak{g}, v \in V. \tag{3.13.1}$$

In terms of the corresponding representation ρ, the F-stability of V simply means that there is a Frobenius map F_V on V such that $\rho \circ F_{\mathfrak{g}} = F_{(V,V)} \circ \rho$. Thus, if V is an F-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-module with respect to F_V, then $V = V^F \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$, $F_V(v \otimes a) = v \otimes a^q$ for all $v \in V^F$, $a \in k$, and V^F is a $\mathfrak{g}^F$-module.

Here, again for notational simplicity, we write V^F for V^{F_V}. What's more, we sometimes use $\mathfrak{g}^F$ and V^F in the meantime, but obviously with different meanings of both F's.

Up to isomorphism, it doesn't matter which Frobenius maps (or $\mathbb{F}_q$-structures) on V we shall work with when considering F-stable modules. This is because we have the following lemma which directly follows from Noether-Deuring Theorem (c.f. [9, p.139]).

Lemma 3.14. *Let (V_1, F_1) and (V_2, F_2) be two F-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. Then $V_1^{F_1} \cong V_2^{F_2}$ as $\mathfrak{g}^F$-modules if and only if $V_1 \cong V_2$ as $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. In particular, if $V_1 = V_2 = V$, then $V^{F_1} \cong V^{F_2}$ as $\mathfrak{g}^F$-modules.*

In the following, we sometimes use the notation (V, F_V) for an F-stable module V. Let $\mathbf{mod}^F$-$\mathfrak{g}$ denote the category whose objects are F-stable modules $V = (V, F_V)$. The morphisms from (V, F_V) to (W, F_W) are given by homomorphisms $\theta \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(V, W)$ such that $\theta \circ F_V = F_W \circ \theta$, that is, $\mathfrak{g}$-module homomorphisms compatible with their $\mathbb{F}_q$-structures. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{mod}^F$-$\mathfrak{g}$ is an abelian $\mathbb{F}_q$-category. The following result allows us to embed a module category over a finite field into a category over the algebraic closure of the finite field. According to [13, Theorem 2.9] or [11, Theorem 2.16], we have the following result.

Theorem 3.15. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a finite-dimensional Lie algebra over k. The abelian category $\mathbf{mod}^F$-$\mathfrak{g}$ is equivalent to the category $\mathbf{mod}$-$\mathfrak{g}^F$ of finite dimensional $\mathfrak{g}^F$-modules. In particular, there is a one-to-one correspondence between isoclasses of irreducible (indecomposable, resp.) $\mathfrak{g}^F$-modules and isoclasses of irreducible (indecomposable, resp) F-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-modules.*

Remark 3.16. In general, a $\mathfrak{g}$-module may not be F-stable. But each finite-dimensional module V must be $F^{n(V)}$-stable for a certain $n(V) \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, for a given finite-dimensional module V there is a so-called F-orbit of V, arising from V under some twisted action of $\mathfrak{g}$. The sum of twisted modules running through the orbit is F-stable. Furthermore, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the isoclasses of indecomposable (resp. irreducible) $\mathfrak{g}^F$-modules and the F-orbits of the isoclasses of indecomposable (resp. irreducible) $\mathfrak{g}$-modules.

4. Projectiveness and extensions for F-stable restricted modules

We always suppose in this section that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a restricted Lie algebra with a Frobenius-Lie morphism $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

4.1. Projectiveness

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a finite dimensional restricted Lie algebra over k, with a restricted Frobenius morphism $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$, and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}^{F_{\mathfrak{g}}}$. Suppose (P, F) is an $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-module (or simply: F-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-module), and $P_0 = P^F$. Then P is a projective $\mathfrak{g}$-module if and only if P_0 is a projective $\mathfrak{g}_0$-module.*

Proof. (1) It follows from the exactness of the field extension functor that the projectiveness of P_0 implies the projectiveness of P.

(2) Now assume that P is a projective $\mathfrak{g}$-module. In order to verify the projectiveness of P_0, it's sufficient to prove that any short exact sequence of $\mathfrak{g}_0$-modules

$$0 \longrightarrow M_0 \xrightarrow{\phi} N_0 \xrightarrow{\psi} P_0 \longrightarrow 0 \tag{4.2.1}$$

is split. Set $M = M_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$, and $N = N_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$. Then we have a short exact sequence of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules

$$0 \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{\phi\otimes 1} N \xrightarrow{\psi\otimes 1} P \longrightarrow 0. \tag{4.2.2}$$

The projectiveness of P implies that the short exact sequence (4.2.2) is split. Hence $(\phi \otimes 1)(M)$ is a direct summand of N and $N \cong P \oplus M$, as $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. The split injective homomorphism $\phi \otimes 1$ gives rise to a fact that ϕ is split injective too. Actually, suppose $\Theta : N \longrightarrow M$, with

$$\Theta \circ (\phi \otimes 1) = 1_M. \tag{4.2.3}$$

Suppose $\Theta(\phi(m_0)\otimes 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} m_0^{(i)}\otimes c^{(i)}$, both sets $\{m_0^{(i)}\}\subset M_0$ and $\{c^{(i)}\}\subset k$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_q$ respectively. The equation (4.2.3) implies that $d=1$ and $c^{(1)}\in\mathbb{F}_q$. And then ϕ is split injective. Thus the exact sequence (4.2.1) is split. Hence P_0 is really projective. The other way is an application of Noether-Deuring Theorem (cf. [9, p.139]) which can be also directly used to explain that $N_0\cong M_0\oplus P_0$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $\mathfrak{g}$ is a restricted Lie algebra with a restricted Frobenius-Lie morphism $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$. If all restricted simple modules of $\mathfrak{g}$ are F-stable, then all restricted projective $\mathfrak{g}$-modules are F-stable. Especially, for $\mathfrak{g}$ a classical Lie algebra in sense of* [28]*, all restricted projective modules of $\mathfrak{g}$ are F-stable under any given Frobenius-Lie morphism $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$.*

Proof. Consider restricted $u(\mathfrak{g})$-module category **mod**-$u(\mathfrak{g})$ and $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-module category **mod**-$u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$. Suppose (S,F_S) is a simple F-stable $u(\mathfrak{g})$-module. Set $S_0=S^{F_S}$, which is a simple $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-module (cf. Theorem 3.15). For the projective cover $P(S_0)$ in **mod**-$u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$, set $P(S_0)_k := P(S_0)\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$. Then $P(S_0)_k$ is a projective cover of S, thereby it is an indecomposable projective $\mathfrak{g}$-module (cf. Theorem 3.15). Recall that indecomposable projective $u(\mathfrak{g})$-modules (resp. $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-modules) are in one-to-one correspondence to irreducible $u(\mathfrak{g})$-modules (resp. $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-modules) (cf. [9]). By Lemma 4.2, all indecomposable projective $u(\mathfrak{g})$-modules are F-stable provided that all restricted simple modules of $\mathfrak{g}$ are F-stable. Thus, all projective $u(\mathfrak{g})$-modules are F-stable as long as all restricted simple modules of $\mathfrak{g}$ are F-stable.

As to the second statement concerning the classical Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, we only need to prove that all simple restricted $\mathfrak{g}$-modules are F-stable. Recall from [13, Lemma 4.2] that any Frobenius-Lie morphism $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is of the form $F_{\mathfrak{g}}=\gamma\cdot g^{-1}F_0 g$ for $\gamma\in\Gamma$ a graph automorphism of the Dynkin diagram, and for $g\in G$ which coincides with the Chevalley group $G(\mathfrak{h})$ constructed relative to $\mathfrak{h}$ (cf. [28, IV.6]). Here F_0 is a split Frobenius-Lie morphism, related to $\mathfrak{h}$, i.e. the fixed-point space of F_0 is just the split $\mathbb{F}_q$-form of $\mathfrak{g}$. Hence $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is restricted, thereby $\mathfrak{g}_0:=\mathfrak{g}^{F_g}$ is a restricted Lie subalgebra over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Note that there is an $h\in G$ such that $\gamma\cdot F_0 = hF_{\mathfrak{g}}h^{-1}$ ([13, Corollary 4.3]). We may assume $F_{\mathfrak{g}}=\gamma\cdot F_0$ in the following argument for simplicity, without a loss of universality. Recall that $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{n}^-\oplus\mathfrak{h}\oplus\mathfrak{n}$, where $\mathfrak{h}$ is a given Cartan subalgebra, $\mathfrak{n}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{n}^-$) is the sum of positive root spaces (resp. the sum for negative root spaces), associated with $\mathfrak{h}$. Set $\mathfrak{b}:=\mathfrak{n}\oplus\mathfrak{h}$, a Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Hence $\mathfrak{n}$, $\mathfrak{h}$, $\mathfrak{n}^-$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ are all $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable. Correspondingly, we have the triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_0=\mathfrak{n}_0^-\oplus\mathfrak{h}_0\oplus\mathfrak{n}_0$, and $\mathfrak{b}_0=\mathfrak{h}_0\oplus\mathfrak{n}_0$ with $\mathfrak{h}_0=\mathfrak{h}^{F_{\mathfrak{g}}}$, $\mathfrak{n}_0^-=(\mathfrak{n}^-)^{F_{\mathfrak{g}}}$, $\mathfrak{n}_0=\mathfrak{n}^{F_{\mathfrak{g}}}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_0=\mathfrak{b}^{F_{\mathfrak{g}}}$. Notice that irreducible restricted $\mathfrak{g}$-modules are parameterized by $\Lambda:=\{\lambda\in\mathfrak{h}^*\mid\lambda(h)^p=\lambda(h)\text{ for }h\in\mathfrak{h}_0\}$ as follows: each simple module $L(\lambda)$ for $\lambda\in\Lambda$ is the unique quotient of the baby Verma module $Z(\lambda)$ by the unique maximal submodule M in $Z(\lambda)$. Here $Z(\lambda)=u(\mathfrak{g})\otimes_{u(\mathfrak{b})}k_\lambda$, for the one dimensional module k_λ with $\mathfrak{h}$-action by multiplicity λ and trivial $\mathfrak{n}$-action. And M is the sum of all proper submodules which can be described by not containing the $u(\mathfrak{g})$-generator $1\otimes 1$ in $Z(\lambda)$. Also, all simple restricted $\mathfrak{g}_0$-modules can be parameterized by a counterpart $L_0(\lambda)$, λ in $\Lambda_0=\{\lambda\in\mathfrak{h}_0^*\mid\lambda(h)\in\mathbb{F}_p\text{ for }h\in\mathfrak{h}_0\}$. Obviously, Λ_0 can be identified with Λ. Furthermore, $L_0(\lambda)=Z_0(\lambda)/M_0$ for $Z_0(\lambda)_0=u(\mathfrak{g}_0)\otimes_{u(\mathfrak{b}_0)}(\mathbb{F}_q)_\lambda$ with the same meaning as for $Z(\lambda)$, M_0 is the unique maximal submodule of $Z(\lambda)_0$. Those $L(\lambda)$ just have $\mathbb{F}_q$-structures $L(\lambda)_0$. Hence all of them are F-stable. □

4.4. Extensions.

Let us first recall of the following fact.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a restricted Lie algebra over k, (V,F_V) and (W,F_W) two given F-stable restricted $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. Set $V_0=V^{F_V}$ and $W_0=W^{F_W}$. Then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(V,W)^{F_{(V,W)}}\cong\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}_0}(V_0,W_0)$, where the Frobenius mapping $F_{(V,W)}$ sends ϕ to $F_W\circ\phi\circ F_V^{-1}$.*

Proof. It can be verified by straightforward computation that $F_{(V,W)}$ preserves $\mathfrak{g}$-module homomorphisms. Then it follows from Lemma 3.4. □

In the following, we will see that the above isomorphism can be extended to the higher extensions between V and W. Set $\mathbf{P}(V_0)$ be a projective resolution of V_0 in $\mathbf{mod}$-$u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$, where $\mathbf{P}(V_0)$ is as follows:

$$\mathbf{P}(V_0) : \cdots \longrightarrow P_0^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\delta_n} P_0^{(n-1)} \xrightarrow{\delta_{n-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta_1} P_0^{(0)} \xrightarrow{\delta_0} V_0.$$

Set the contravariant functor $\Gamma_0 = \mathrm{Hom}_{u(\mathfrak{g}_0)}(-, W_0)$. We have a complex $(\Gamma_0(\mathbf{P}(V_0)), \delta^*)$, where $\delta_n^* : \Gamma_0(P_0^{n-1}) \to \Gamma_0(P_0^n)$ with $\delta_n^*(\phi) = \phi \circ \delta_n$. And we have $\mathrm{Ext}_0^n(V_0, W_0) = R^n\Gamma_0(\mathbf{P}(V_0))$. Now arising from the field extension $\mathbb{F}_q \hookrightarrow k$, there is a projective resolution of the $u(\mathfrak{g})$-module V

$$\mathbf{P}(V) : \cdots \longrightarrow P^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\delta_n \otimes 1} P^{(n-1)} \xrightarrow{\delta_{n-1} \otimes 1} \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta_1 \otimes 1} P^{(0)} \xrightarrow{\delta_0 \otimes 1} V$$

where $P^{(n)} = P_0^{(n)} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$ with natural Frobenius mappings denoted by F_n . The contravariant functor $\Gamma = \mathrm{Hom}_{u(\mathfrak{g})}(-, W)$ gives rise to the cohomology of the complex $\Gamma(\mathbf{P}(V))$: $\mathrm{Ext}^*(V, W)$. Recall that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^n(V, W) = \{\bar{\phi} \in \mathrm{Ker}(\delta_{n+1} \otimes 1)^* / \mathrm{Im}(\delta_n \otimes 1)^* \mid \phi \in \mathrm{Ker}(\delta_{n+1} \otimes 1)^*\}.$$

Notice that $(\delta_n \otimes 1) \circ F_n = F_{n-1} \circ (\delta_n \otimes 1)$. It's easily verified by direct computation that both $F_{(P_n,W)}|_{\mathrm{Im}(\delta_n \otimes 1)^*}$ and $F_{(P_n,W)}|_{\mathrm{Ker}(\delta_{n+1} \otimes 1)^*}$ are Frobenius mappings in the respective vector spaces. Define $\mathfrak{F}_n : \mathrm{Ext}^n(V, W) \to \mathrm{Ext}^n(V, W)$ by $\mathfrak{F}_n(\bar{\phi}) = \overline{F_{(P_n,W)}(\phi)}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\mathfrak{n}$ is really a Frobenius mapping of $\mathrm{Ext}^n(V, W)$, whose fixed point space is just $\mathrm{Ext}_0^n(V_0, W_0)$. Hence we have

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose $\mathfrak{g}$ is a restricted Lie algebra with a Frobenius-Lie morphism $F_\mathfrak{g}$. Suppose (V, F_V) and (W, F_W) are two finite-dimensional restricted F-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-modules with $V_0 = V^{F_V}$ and $W_0 = W^{F_W}$. Denote by $\mathrm{Ext}^n(V, W)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Ext}_0^n(V_0, W_0)$) the n-th extension between restricted $\mathfrak{g}$-modules V and W over $u(\mathfrak{g})$ (resp. the n-th extension for $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-modules V_0 and W_0). Then $\mathrm{Ext}^n(V, W)^{\mathfrak{F}_n} \cong \mathrm{Ext}_0^n(V_0, W_0)$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$.*

Remark 4.7. The result in more general cases can be found in [32, 2.7]. We thank E. M. Friedlander for reminding us about this.

Next we will give a corollary which will be useful in the next section. Before this, we need the following obvious fact.

Lemma 4.8. *Let (A, F_A) be a finite-dimensional associative algebra over k with a Frobenius morphism. (V, F_M) is a finite-dimensional F_A-stable A-module (which has the same meaning as $F_\mathfrak{g}$-stable modules, cf. [10]). Set $A_0 = A^{F_A}$ and $M_0 = M^{F_M}$. Then $\mathrm{Ann}_A(M) = \mathrm{Ann}_{A_0}(M_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$.*

Corollary 4.9. *Maintain the same notations as in Proposition 4.6. Then*

$$\mathrm{Ann}_{H^{ev}(u(\mathfrak{g}),k)}(\mathrm{Ext}^{ev}(M, M)) = \mathrm{Ann}_{H^{ev}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0),\mathbb{F}_q)}(\mathrm{Ext}_0^{ev}(M_0, M_0)) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k.$$

5. $\mathbb{F}_q$-RATIONAL STRUCTURE ON SUPPORT VARIETIES

5.1. We recall some facts about support varieties for restricted Lie algebras as follows (cf. [14], [15] and [16]).

For any restricted Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ one has the cohomology variety $|\mathfrak{g}|$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ which is the affine variety associated to $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k)^{(-1)}$. Here and further, for a k-vector space V, the $V^{(-1)}$ means the twisted space obtained by making scalars $a \in k$ act on V by multiplication by a^p. So defined, $|\mathfrak{g}|$ is a closed conical subset of affine space over k given as the zeros of certain homogeneous polynomial equations. Let V be a finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module, the support variety $|\mathfrak{g}|_V$ is the support in $|\mathfrak{g}|$ of the $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k)^{(-1)}$-module $H^\bullet(u(\mathfrak{g}), V \otimes V^*)^{(-1)}$, $|\mathfrak{g}|_V := \mathrm{Supp}(H^\bullet(u(\mathfrak{g}), V \otimes V^*)^{(-1)})$ (cf.

[15], [16]). Denote by $\Phi : |\mathfrak{g}| \to \mathfrak{g}$ the morphism of varieties associated with the natural map $\Phi^* : S^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}^*) \to H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k)^{(-1)}$, where $S^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ is the symmetric algebra on the dual of $\mathfrak{g}$. The variety $|\mathfrak{g}|$ is homeomorphic to $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$ which is equal to the restricted null-cone $\mathcal{N}_1(\mathfrak{g}) := \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid x^{[p]} = 0\}$. So defined, $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$ is a conical closed subvariety of the restricted null-cone $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V) = \{x \in \mathcal{N}_1 \mid V$ is not projective as a restricted $\langle x\rangle$-module $\} \cup \{0\}$ (cf. [22] and [15]). For notational convenience, we will often omit the superscript "(-1)" in what follows.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $\mathfrak{g}$ is a restricted Lie algebra over k, defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ with respect to Frobenius-Lie morphism $F_\mathfrak{g}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$ is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ such that the associated $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure is given by the restriction of $F_\mathfrak{g}$ in $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$.*

Proof. Regard $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$ as a closed variety of k-vector space variety $\mathfrak{g}$. According to the argument in the proof of Proposition 4.3, $F_\mathfrak{g}$ is restricted. Hence $F_\mathfrak{g}(\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)) \subset \Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$. By Remark 3.2 and Proposition 2.5, $F_\mathfrak{g}$ is a morphism of variety, and $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$ is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ with the restriction of $F_\mathfrak{g}$, as the corresponding Frobenius map. □

The above fact in the situation when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ can be read off in [5, Theorem 2] (also, cf. [6]) for G simple algebraic group and p good (see in §6.5).

By Proposition 4.6, $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k) \cong H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$. This means that there is a rational $\mathbb{F}_q$-structure over $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k)$. The corresponding Frobenius mapping is denoted by $\mathfrak{F}$, which arises from $\mathfrak{F}_n$ defined before Proposition 4.6 with $V = W = k$. So $\mathfrak{F}$ is actually controlled by $F_\mathfrak{g}$. We have the following fact:

Lemma 5.3. *$\Phi : |\mathfrak{g}| \to \mathfrak{g}$ is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, i.e. Φ commutes with $\mathfrak{F}$ and $F_\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1.7 in [18], we only need to prove that

$$\Phi^*(S^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}_0)) \subset H_p^{\mathrm{ev}}(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathbb{F}_q). \tag{5.3.1}$$

According to [21, Lemma II. 9.16], over the perfect field $\mathbb{F}_q$ with $p > 2$ one has a $\mathfrak{g}_0$-version of the typical spectral sequence over k for $\mathbb{F}_\mathfrak{g}$-stable (restricted) module M as follows:

$$E_2^{2i,j} = (S^i\mathfrak{g}_0^*)^{(1)} \otimes H^j(\mathfrak{g}_0, M_0) \Longrightarrow H_p^{2i+j}(\mathfrak{g}_0, M_0).$$

From the above spectral sequence, one has an edge mapping $\Phi_0^* : \Phi^*(S^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}_0)) \to H_p^{\mathrm{ev}}(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathbb{F}_q)$, which is actually some restriction of Φ^*. So (5.3.1) holds. The proof is completed. □

Suppose V_0 is a restricted $\mathfrak{g}_0$-module. Recall of the construction of a minimal projective resolution $\cdots \to P_0^{(n)} \to \cdots P_0^{(0)} \to V_0$ of V_0. Set $P_0^{(0)} = P(V_0)$, the projective cover of V_0, and define the *syzygy* module $\Omega(V_0)$ as the kernel of the given map $P(V_0) \to V_0$. Inductively, set $P_0^{(n)} = P(\Omega^n(V_0))$ and $\Omega^n(V_0) = \Omega(\Omega^{n-1}(V_0)$. When $V_0 = \mathbb{F}_q$, then $H^n(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{u(\mathfrak{g}_0)}(\Omega^n(\mathbb{F}_q), \mathbb{F}_q)$. Suppose $\zeta \in H^{2n}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q)$. Such a ζ can be represented by a map $\zeta : \Omega^{2n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \to \mathbb{F}_q$ whose kernel is the $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-module $\mathbb{L}_\zeta$. In the meantime, we have for $V = V_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$, $P^{(n)} = P(\Omega^n(V))$ and $\Omega^n(V) = \Omega(\Omega^{n-1}(V))$. By Proposition 4.3 and the exactness of the field extension functor from the $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-module category to the $u(\mathfrak{g})$-module category, $P^{(n)} \cong P_0^{(n)} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$, and $\Omega^n(V) \cong \Omega^n(V_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$. Especially, $\Omega^{2n}(k) \cong \Omega^{2n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$.

Lemma 5.4. *Maintain the notations as above. Set $L_\zeta = \mathbb{L}_\zeta \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$, which is a restricted $\mathfrak{g}$-module. Then L_ζ is the kernel of $\zeta \otimes 1 : \Omega^{2n}(k) \to k$.*

Proof. We only need to prove that $\ker(\zeta \otimes 1) = \ker(\zeta) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$. Actually, any short exact sequence of $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-modules $S_1 \hookrightarrow S_2 \twoheadrightarrow S_3$ gives rise to the short exact sequence of $u(\mathfrak{g})$-modules: $T_1 \hookrightarrow T_2 \twoheadrightarrow T_3$ for $T_i = S_i \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. This fact implies that $\ker(\zeta \otimes 1) = \ker(\zeta) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$. □

Theorem 5.5. *Maintain the notations as in Lemma 5.2. If V is a restricted $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-module, then there is an $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure on $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$. Conversely, if X is a closed conical subvariety of $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$ which admits an $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure arising from $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$, then there exists a restricted $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-module V such that $X = \Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$.*

Proof. (1) Suppose (V, F_V) is an F-stable restricted $\mathfrak{g}$-module, $V_0 = V^{F_V}$. We will prove that $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$ is really defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Recall $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$ is a closed subvariety of $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$, the latter of which is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ (Lemma 5.2). By Lemma 5.3 and Proposition 2.5, it's sufficient to prove that the defining ideal of $|\mathfrak{g}|_V$ is of the form $I_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$ where I_0 is an ideal of $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q)$. This follows from Corollary 4.9.

(2) Suppose X is a closed conical subvariety of $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$ defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$. We will construct a restricted F-stable $\mathfrak{g}$-module V such that $X = \Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$. Recall that in [15], any closed conical subvariety of $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|)$ can be realized as a support variety of a restricted $\mathfrak{g}$-modules, which follows from the Carlson's construction in [4]. What we need to do in our case is to prove that such a construction of modules can be defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ (cf. [1, Theorem, 2.26.9]).

By the property (5.3.1) of Φ_0^*, we might as well suppose that X is defined by an ideal I generated by elements of $H_0^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q)$ (Proposition 2.5). This is to say, we might as well directly regard X to be closed and conical in $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k)$ defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Since $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k)$ is Noetherian (cf. [14]), I is finitely generated by some homogeneous elements $I = \langle \zeta_1, \cdots, \zeta_r \rangle$. Recall that $H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k)$ has an $\mathbb{F}_q$-form $H_0^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q)$ (Proposition 4.6), i.e.

$$H^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}), k) \cong H_0^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k,$$

as k-algebras. These ζ_i can be chosen in $H_0^{\mathrm{ev}}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q))$. Suppose $\zeta_i \in H^{2n}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q)$. By Lemma 5.4, there is a $u(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-submodule $\mathbb{L}_{\zeta_i} \in \Omega^{2n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $\mathbb{L}_{\zeta_i}$ is just the kernel of $\zeta_i : \Omega^n(\mathbb{F}_q) \to \mathbb{F}_q$ which represents the cohomology class $\zeta_i \in H^{2n}(u(\mathfrak{g}_0), \mathbb{F}_q) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{u(\mathfrak{g}_0)}(\Omega^{2n}(\mathbb{F}_q), \mathbb{F}_q)$. And $L_{\zeta_i} = \mathbb{L}_{\zeta_i} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} k$ is just the Carlson's module (cf. [4]). Set $V = L_{\zeta_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes L_{\zeta_r}$, then by [15, Theorem 2.2] $X = \Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$. And this V is $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable. The proof is completed. □

Let G be an affine algebraic group over k, defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$, and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. We call a rational G-module stable if it's $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module. By [15, Theorem 1.2], we have a corollary to the above theorem.

Corollary 5.6. *Suppose V is a finite-dimensional rational stable G-module V. Then $\Phi(|\mathfrak{g}|_V)$ is a closed conical G-stable variety defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$.*

Remark 5.7. As Friedlander-Parshall hoped ([15]), each closed conical G-stable subvariety of $\mathcal{N}_1(\mathfrak{g})$ is conversely the support variety of a finite-dimensional rational G-module V (cf. [25]). Correspondingly, we address here an expection that each closed conical G-stable subvariety can be realized as the support variety of a finite-dimensional rational stable G-module.

6. F-stable Nilpotent Orbits

Unless other statements, in the whole section we assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a simple classical Lie algebra over k an algebraically closed filed of characteristic $p > 3$, which we will additionally assume to be good for the root system of $\mathfrak{g}$ in the subsection 6.5 (cf. [7, p.14]).

6.1. G-equivariant bijection on nilpotent orbits.

We always fix a Frobenius-Lie morphism F on $\mathfrak{g}$ in the sequel, which has form $F = \gamma \cdot F_0'$. This is to say, from this section on, we will use the same notation for a Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}$ as the Frobinius morphism for the corresponding algebraic group G, in stead of using $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$ for simplicity, as long as there is no confusion in context.

Assume that G is the adjoint group of $\mathfrak{g}$, and $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is the Lie algebra of the $\bar{G}$ of simply-connected type. In the following we will discuss the relations between both of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_k$ in the nilpotent orbits and the Frobenius morphisms. First, we recall that G is naturally isomorphic to $\bar{G}/Z(\bar{G})$ where $Z(\bar{G})$ is the center of $\bar{G}$ which is in maximal tori of $\bar{G}$. Note that $Z(\bar{G}) = \ker(\mathrm{Ad})$ (cf. [3, 3.15]), and that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_k/Z(\mathfrak{g}_k)$ with $Z(\mathfrak{g}_k) \subset \mathfrak{h}_k$. The following lemma is clear, which implies that we can replace G by $\bar{G}$ without affecting the structure of nilpotent orbit.

Lemma 6.2. *There is a G-equivariant bijection between $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}_k)$.*

Furthermore, such a bijection gives rise to a bijection between the nilpotent orbits of $\mathfrak{g}$ under G and the nilpotent orbits of $\mathfrak{g}_k$ under $\bar{G}$. Denote such a bijection by Ξ.

Now we look into the change of Frobenius morphisms from $\mathfrak{g}$ to $\mathfrak{g}_k$. In non-exceptional cases, there is no more words to say about this since $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_k$. Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_n with $p \mid n+1$, then $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_k/Z(\mathfrak{g}_k)$. Let F be an arbitrary given Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}$. By the argument in §5.1, we may suppose that

$$F = \sigma \circ F_0', \text{ for } F_0' = gF_0g^{-1} \text{ with } g \in G. \tag{6.2.1}$$

The Frobenius-Lie morphism F gives rise to a unique one $\bar{F}$ on $\mathfrak{g}_k$ which is of form

$$\sigma \circ (\bar{g}\bar{F}_0\bar{g}^{-1}), \tag{6.2.2}$$

where $\bar{g}$ means a representative in $\bar{G}$ of g in connection with the quotient $\bar{G}/Z(\bar{G})$, and $\bar{F}_0$ means the standard Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}_k$ with respect to the Chevalley basis $\mathcal{B}_k$ of $\mathfrak{g}_k$. We denote by $\bar{F}$ such a Frobenius-Lie morphism of $\mathfrak{g}_k$, arising from F. Obviously, the form of $\bar{F}$ is independent of the choice of $\bar{g} \in \bar{G}$ because $Z(\bar{G}) = \ker(\mathrm{Ad})$. We have the following

Lemma 6.3. *The correspondence $F \to \bar{F}$ is a bijection from the set of Frobenius-Lie morphisms on $\mathfrak{g}$ to the set of the Frobenius-Lie morphisms on $\mathfrak{g}_k$ of the form $\sigma \cdot (g\bar{F}_0g^{-1})$, $\sigma \in \Gamma$ and $g \in \bar{G}$.*

Combining the above lemmas, we have the following proposition which shows that the F-stability of nilpotent orbits of $\mathfrak{g}$ under G-conjugation is equivalent to the $\bar{F}$-stability of nilpotent orbits of $\mathfrak{g}_k$ under $\bar{G}$-conjugation.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$, and F a Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\mathcal{O}$ is F-stable if and only if $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ is $\bar{F}$-stable.*

6.5. Weighted Dynkin diagrams and F-stability of nilpotent orbits in a good characteristic.

We will determine all F-stable nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$. According to the previous arguments, we may replace $\mathfrak{g}$ by $\mathfrak{g}_k$. Recall that good characteristic means that p is bigger than any coefficient of any root in Φ^+ expressed as a linear combination of simple roots. Equivalently, p is good provided: $p > 2$ when G has a component of type B, C or D; $p > 3$ when G has a component of type G_2, F_4, E_6 or E_7; and $p > 5$ when G has a component of type E_8. If $p \geqslant$ the Coxeter number h for $\mathfrak{g}$, then the nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$ coincides with the restricted nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N}_1(\mathfrak{g})$; vice versa (cf. [6, 2.2] and [24, 4.1]).

Suppose G is a simply-connected simple algebraic group. By the previous notations $G = \bar{G}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$, where $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is defined as in the previous subsection. Let $\mathcal{O}_X$ be an arbitrary given nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}_k$. By Lemma 6.4, we only need to investigate the $\bar{F}$-stability of $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $\mathfrak{g}_k$ under G, where the form of $\bar{F}$ is as defined as in Lemma 6.3.

Recall that the nilpotent orbits in a semi-simple Lie algebra in characteristic zero are classified by weighted Dynkin diagrams through Jacobson Morozov theorem (cf. [7, Ch.5 and Ch.13], or [8]). This classification still works in good characteristic for $\mathfrak{g}$. Let's mention some related theory on this topic briefly. With the characteristic p being good for G, the modular version of Jacobson-Morozov theorem says there is a standard $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\{Y, H, X\}$ (cf. [26, 3.2], or [7, 5.3.2 and

5.5.2] under stronger condition on p). Furthermore, under the condition that $p > 2h-1$, one may have an analogous approach to the weighted-Dynkin classification theory as in characteristic 0 by attaching its weighted Dynkin diagram on $\mathcal{O}_X$, obtained by choosing a suitable standard triple $\{Y, H, X\}$, a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ containing H, and a set of simple roots Π making H dominant with $\langle \alpha_i, H\rangle \in \{0,1,2\}$ (to see [26, §3.4] and [7, §5.6] under stronger condition on p; [8] in characteristic 0), and then labelling every vertex corresponding to a simple root α with the integer $\langle \alpha, H\rangle$. Recall that all Cartan subalgebras in $\mathfrak{g}_k$ are conjugate under adjoint action of G, and for the fixed T and then $\mathfrak{h}_k$, the corresponding root system $\Phi(\mathfrak{h}_k)$, the sets of simple roots are transitively acted by the Weyl group $W = N_G(T)/T$. Hence, attached with an integer $\langle \alpha_i, H\rangle$ to the ith-node. the weighted Dynkin diagram $\Delta(\mathcal{O}_X)$ depends only on the orbit $\mathcal{O}_X$. Under the condition that $p > 2h-1$ the following Dynkin-Kostant theorem was proved in McGovern's paper [26, §3.4]. The condition is required for the complete reducibility for $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-representations, which is necessary in McGovern's proof. With aid of McGovern's theory, the argument on the F-stability of nilpotent orbits can be done through analysis on the situation of H in a suitable standard triple.Here we need a presentation of this theory in good characteristic as below.

Theorem 6.6. *(Kostant) Assume p is good for G.*

(1) *Each nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}$ in $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is attached with a weighted Dynkin diagram $\Delta(\mathcal{O})$.*
(2) *Let $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ be nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}_k$. $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}_2$ if and only if $\Delta(\mathcal{O}_1) = \Delta(\mathcal{O}_2)$.*

Under the condition that p is good, Premet proved the above theorm in [27, 2.4, 2.6 and 2.7] in a different way, not directly using $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$-triple from Jacobson-Morozov theorem. As the substitute for $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-representation theory, we will use Premet's presentation of Kempf-Rousseau theory in good characteristic as below.

Retain the notations used in §3.9. Let $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the simply-connected simple algebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$. And $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{Lie}(G_{\mathbb{C}})$. By Jacobson-Morozov theorem, any nilpotent element $e \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ belongs to an $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$-triple $\{e, h, f\} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Replacing e by its $G_{\mathbb{C}}$-conjugate we may assume that $h = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i H_i$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and each $b_i := \alpha_i(h)$ is in $\{0,1,2\}$ (cf. [7, 5.6.6]). And then we obtain the so-called weighted Dynkin program denoted by $\Delta(e)$, which is only dependent on the $G_{\mathbb{C}}$-conjugate class where e lies. Moreover, $\Delta(e_1) = \Delta(e_2)$ if and only if the nilpotent elements e_1 and e_2 are $G_{\mathbb{C}}$-conjugate. The set of all weighted Dynkin diagrams will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}(\Pi)$.

Let's turn to the simply-connected simple algebraic group G over k. Assume that the characteristic p is good for the root system of G. Let $X_*(G) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_m, G)$. Given $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}(\Pi)$, there exists a one-parameter subgroup $\lambda_\Delta \in X_*(G)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathrm{Ad}\lambda_\Delta(t))e_{\pm\alpha_i} = t^{\pm b_i} e_{\pm\alpha_i}, \\ &(\mathrm{Ad}\lambda_\Delta(t))z = z, \quad \forall \alpha_i \in \Pi; z \in \mathfrak{h}_k; t \in k^*. \end{aligned} \tag{6.6.1}$$

Actually, it's enough to set $\lambda_\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \alpha_i^\vee$, where $\alpha_i^\vee$ is the coroot. One then assigns to λ_Δ a parabolic subgroup $P(\lambda_\Delta)$ of G (cf. [29, 8.4.5]). Let $Z(\lambda_\Delta)$ be the Levi subgroup of G containing in $P(\lambda_\Delta)$ with $P(\lambda_\Delta) = Z(\lambda_\Delta)U(\lambda_\Delta)$.

Lemma 6.7. *$Z(\lambda_\Delta)$ is $\bar{F}_0$-stable, where the Frobenius map $\bar{F}_0$ on $\bar{G}$ arises from the definition as in §3.11.*

Proof. As presented before the lemma, we may take $\lambda_\Delta \in X_*(T)$. The statement is then directly from the definition of F_0. □

Set $g(\lambda_\Delta, i) := \{X \in \mathfrak{g}_k \mid (\mathrm{Ad}\lambda_\Delta(t))X = t^i X \text{ for all } t \in k^*\}$. It follows from the finiteness of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$ that the Levi subgroup $Z(\lambda_\Delta)$ has only a finite number of orbits on the weight space $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda_\Delta, 2)$ (cf. [26, §3.6]). Therefore, there is a unique dense open orbit in $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda_\Delta, 2)$ under $Z(\lambda_\Delta)$-conjugation, denoted by $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda_\Delta, 2)_{\mathrm{reg}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{O}(\Delta)$ the nilpotent orbit $(\mathrm{Ad}G)\mathfrak{g}(\lambda_\Delta, 2)_{\mathrm{reg}}$.

According to Premet's presentation in good characteristic (cf. [27, Theorems 2.6 and 2.7]), each nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}$ lies in one of the orbits $\mathcal{O}(\Delta)$. And the orbits associated with different weighted Dynkin diagrams are distinct. Then Theorem 6.6 is proved.

In the following arguments, we will always assume that p is good. Now let's begin to investigate the $\bar{F}$-stability on the nilpotent orbits with the situation when it's a standard Frobenius-Lie morphism $\bar{F}_0$, and then to give a general property for $\bar{F} = \sigma.\bar{F}_0'$ as in (6.2.2). As the other notational preparation, recall that each automorphism σ of Dynkin diagram can be uniquely extended to a Lie automorphism of the Lie algebra, which will be still denoted by σ.

Lemma 6.8. *Retain the notations used in §6.1. The following statements hold.*

(1) *All nilpotent orbits $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $\mathfrak{g}_k$ are $\bar{F}_0$-stable.*
(2) *Consequently, the nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}_X$ is $\bar{F}$-stable if and only if it's σ-stable.*

Proof. (1) According to Theorem 6.6 and the above arguments, each nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}_X$ is associated with a unique weighted Dynkin diagram Δ, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}(\Delta)$. Set $\lambda = \lambda_\Delta$. Up to G-conjugacy, we might as well suppose $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\lambda, 2)_{\mathrm{reg}}$. This is to say, $Z.X = \mathfrak{g}(\lambda, 2)_{\mathrm{reg}}$.

We assert that the G-conjugacy of $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda, 2)_{\mathrm{reg}}$ is $\bar{F}_0$-stable. By Lemma 3.12, $\bar{F}_0(g.X) = \bar{F}_0(g).\bar{F}_0(X)$ for $g \in Z(\lambda_\Delta)$. Set $Z = Z(\lambda_\Delta)$. Note that Z is F_0-stable, and $Z.X$ is open dense in $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda, 2)$. The irreducibility of $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda, 2)$ implies the same property of $Z.X$. Hence the image of $Z.X$ under the injective morphism $\bar{F}_0$ is still dense in $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda, 2)$. Hence, the Z-orbit where $\bar{F}_0(X)$ lies coincides with $\mathfrak{g}(\lambda, 2)_{\mathrm{reg}}$. This means that the G-orbit where $\bar{F}_0(X)$ lies coincides with $\mathcal{O}_X$, from which the statement follows.

(2) Recall that $\bar{F}_0'(O_X) = g^{-1} \circ \bar{F}_0 \circ g(G.X)$. By Statement (1), $\mathcal{O}_X$ is a $\bar{F}_0'$-stable. The forms of Frobenius morphisms as in (6.2.1) and (6.2.2) yield the second statement. □

Next, we will suppose that $\bar{F}$ is a twisted Frobenius-Lie morphism, i.e. $\bar{F} = \gamma \cdot \bar{F}_0'$ with γ a non-trivial graph automorphism. Surely, this happens only in the case of types A_n, D_n and E_6. Recall that for $\mathfrak{g}_k$ of type A_n and D_n, each nilpotent orbit uniquely corresponds to a partition of n and $2n$ respectively. Precisely speaking, nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the set $\mathcal{P}(n)$ of partitions of n. Nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{so}_{2n}$ are parameterized by partitions of $2n$ in which even parts occur with even multiplicity, except that "very even" partitions $\mathbf{d} := [d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_{2n}]$ (those with only even parts, each having even multiplicity) correspond to two orbits, denoted by $\mathcal{O}^I_{[d_1,d_2,\cdots,d_{2n}]}$ and $\mathcal{O}^{II}_{[d_1,d_2,\cdots,d_{2n}]}$. For their weighted Dynkin diagrams, we have the following results.

Proposition 6.9. *([26, §3.4 and §5.7] and [8]) (1) For $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathfrak{sl}_n$, let $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{[d_1,\cdots,d_n]}$. Then the weighted Dynkin diagram $\Delta(\mathcal{O})$ is given by*



where h_i has the following meaning. Replace each part d_i by the list $d_i - 1, d_i - 3, \cdots, -d_i + 1$ of weights in the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-module of dimension d_i and combine the resulting lists into one, rearranging its terms in non-increasing order as $h_1, \cdots, h_n$.

(2) For $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathfrak{so}_{2n}$, $n > 4$, let $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{d}}$ for $\mathbf{d} = [d_1, \ldots, d_{2n}]$. If $\mathbf{d}$ is not very even, then the weighted Dynkin diagram of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is



If $\mathbf{d}$ *is very even, then the weighted diagrams of* $\mathcal{O}^I_{\mathbf{d}}$ *and* $\mathcal{O}^{II}_{\mathbf{d}}$ *are given by*





Here the meaning of h_i *is the same as in the case* $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ *whenever* d *is very even or not; and* $a = 0$ *if* n *is a multiple of* 4, $a = 2$ *otherwise, and* $b = 2 - a$ *for the very even case* $\mathcal{O}^I_{\mathbf{d}}$ *and* $\mathcal{O}^{II}_{\mathbf{d}}$.

(3) Let $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathfrak{so}_8$. *We have the following complete list of weighted Dynkin diagrams of all nilpotent orbits.*

(i) The weighted Dynkin diagrams corresponding to the nilpotent orbits with partitions $\mathbf{d} = [7,1],[5,3],[2^2,1^4]$ *and* $[1^8]$ *are listed respectively as follows:*



(ii) The weighted Dynkin Diagrams corresponding to the nilpotent orbits $\mathcal{O}^I_{[4^2]}, \mathcal{O}^{II}_{[4^2]}$ *and* $\mathcal{O}_{[5,1^3]}$ *are listed respectively in the following*



(iii) The weighted Dynkin Diagrams corresponding to the nilpotent orbits $\mathcal{O}^I_{[2^4]}, \mathcal{O}^{II}_{[2^4]}$ *and* $\mathcal{O}_{[3,1^5]}$ *are listed respectively in the following*



(4) When $\mathfrak{g}_k$ *is of type* E_6, *there are 21 nilpotent orbits whose weighted Dynkin diagrams admit symmetric labels in accordance with the symmetry of the Dynkin diagram (to see* [26, Page 202]*).*

We have the following result.

Theorem 6.10. *Let* G *be a simply-connected simple algebraic group over* k *of a good characteristic* $p > 3$ *associated to the root system of* G, $\mathfrak{g}_k$ *the Lie algebra of* G. *Assume a Frobenius-Lie morphism* $\bar{F} = \sigma\circ(\bar{F}'_0)$ *with* $\bar{F}'_0 = g{\cdot}F_0 g^{-1}$ *as defined as in the previous subsection. For* $\mathcal{O}_X$ *a non-zero nilpotent orbit in* $\mathfrak{g}_k$ *we have*

(1) If $\mathfrak{g}_k$ *is of type* A_n *or type* E_6, *then* $\mathcal{O}_X$ *is* $\bar{F}$*-stable.*

(2) Let $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is of type D_n with $n > 4$. Then $\mathcal{O}_X$ is $\bar{F}$-stable for all such $\bar{F}$ with exception when $\mathcal{O}_X$ is very-even, and $\bar{F}$ is twisted. In the exceptional cases, the nilpotent orbits $\mathcal{O}^I_{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\mathcal{O}^{II}_{\mathbf{d}}$ are exchanged under a twisted $\bar{F}$.

(3) Let $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is of type D_4. Keep the notations as in Remark 3.10,

(i) $\bar{F}_0$ stabilizes all nilpotent orbits.

(ii) $\bar{F}_1 : \mathcal{O}^I_{[4^2]} \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{II}_{[4^2]}$, and $\mathcal{O}^I_{[2^4]} \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{II}_{[2^4]}$, keeping the other nilpotent orbits fixed.

(iii) $\bar{F}_2 : \mathcal{O}^I_{[4^2]} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{[5,1^3]} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{II}_{[4^2]} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^I_{[4^2]}$, and $\mathcal{O}^I_{[2^4]} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{[3,1^5]} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{II}_{[2^4]} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^I_{[2^4]}$.

Proof. Thanks to Lemma 6.8, we only need to work with a twisted Frobenius-Lie morphism $\bar{F}$. In the meantime, Lemma 6.8 implies that the $\bar{F}$-stability of $\mathcal{O}_X$ is equivalent to its γ-stability.

Recall that $\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}(\Delta)$ for a unique $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}(\Pi)$. Consider $\lambda_\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i\alpha_i^\vee$. Then we have a new one-parameter subgroup $\gamma(\lambda_\Delta) = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i\alpha_{\gamma(i)}^\vee \in X_*(T)$. As γ is an automorphism of Dynkin diagram, $\langle \alpha_{\gamma(i)}, \alpha_{\gamma(j)}^\vee\rangle = \langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j^\vee\rangle$ for all $i, j = 1, \cdots, r$. Hence we have

$$\langle \alpha_{\gamma(i)}, \gamma(\lambda_\Delta)\rangle = \langle \alpha_i, \lambda_\Delta\rangle, \quad \forall i = 1, \cdots, r. \tag{6.10.1}$$

According to the construction of the weighted Dynkin diagrams Δ presented before Lemma 6.7 and of the one-parameter subgroups λ_Δ, we know that after conjugation of γ, the weighted Dynkin diagram arising from $\gamma(\lambda_\Delta)$ just corresponds to the nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\gamma(X)}$ which coincides with $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{F}(X)} \supset \bar{F}(\mathcal{O}_X)$. The preceding inclusion follows from Lemma 3.12. Hence, the $\bar{F}$-stability of a nilpotent orbit is equivalent to the invariant property of the corresponding weighted Dynkin diagram under the automorphism γ of the diagram. The new weighted Dynkin diagram through $\bar{F}$ is denoted by $\bar{F}(\Delta)$.

Comparing the weighted Dynkin diagrams for type A_n, D_n and E_6 (cf. [26, 3.4 and 5.7] and [8, 3.6, 5.3 and 8.4]), we know that $\Delta(X)$ coincides with $\Delta(\gamma(X))$ for all cases except that $\mathcal{O}_X$ is very even with a very even partition $\mathbf{d}$ which happens in the case of D_n. In the exceptional cases, $\bar{F}(\Delta(\mathcal{O}^I_{\mathbf{d}})) = \Delta(\mathcal{O}^{II}_{\mathbf{d}})$ for D_n with $n > 4$. When $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is of D_4, then it's not hard to get the result by comparing the weighted Dynkin diagrams in Propositoin 6.9. □

By Lemma 6.3 and Proposition 6.4, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.11. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a classical simple Lie algebra over $k = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$, defined over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ of a good characteristic $p > 3$, with correspondence to Frobenius map F, let G the adjoint group of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then the following statements hold:*

(1) $F = \sigma \cdot (gF_0g^{-1})$, where $\sigma \in \Gamma$, $g \in G$ and F_0 is a standard Frobenius morphism associated with a Chevalley basis (in the sense of §3.9).

(2) For a nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ under the action of G, all statements in Theorem 6.10 hold.

7. $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure on nilpotent orbits in classical simple Lie algebras

Keep the notations and assumptions as the last section. Combining Lemma 3.12 and Theorem 2.7, we have

Proposition 7.1. *Let G be a simple algebraic group over an algebraically closed field F of characteristic $p > 3$, which is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ with a Frobenius map F. Let $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the corresponding Frobenius-Lie morphism of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. Then any $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-stable orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$ admits $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure, thereby admits $F_{\mathfrak{g}}$-fixed points. Especially, if $\bar{G}$ is a simply-connected simple algebraic group, $\mathfrak{g}_k$ is the Lie algebra of G, then $\bar{F}$ as defined as in Lemma 6.3 is a Frobenius-Lie morphism arising from a Frobenius map on G. Therefore, any $\bar{F}$-stable orbit in $\mathfrak{g}_k$ under the action of $\bar{G}$ admits an $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure, thereby admits $\bar{F}$-fixed points.*

Furthermore, we have the following:

Proposition 7.2. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a classical simple Lie algebra over $k = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$, defined over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ of a good characteristic $p > 3$, with correspondence to Frobenius map F, let G the adjoint group of $\mathfrak{g}$. For an F-stable nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}$ which is listed in 6.10, $\mathcal{O}$ admits an $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure, thereby admits F-fixed points.*

Proof. As shown as in Lemma 3.12 for the case of Lie algebras of connected semi-simple Lie algebras, we may define a Frobenius map F_G on G such that the Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}$ arising from F_G is just F. Observe that all Cartan subalgebra are conjugate under G ([28, IV.1.2]). We might as well assume that $\mathfrak{h}$ is such a Cartan subalgebra that $F = \sigma \circ F_0$ for a splitting Frobenius-Lie morphism F_0, associated with $\mathfrak{h}$. As stated in §3.9, there are generators in G: $x_\alpha(a) = \exp(\mathrm{ad} a e_\alpha)$ for $a \in k$. We may define F_G via $F_G(x_\alpha(a) = x_{\sigma(\alpha)}(a^q)$. Then for every orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$ under the action of G, the Frobenius maps are admissible with the action of G. This is to say, $F(g.X) = F_G(g).F(X)$ because F is a Frobenius-Lie morphism. The proposition follows from Lemma 2.7. □

In the following theorem, we continue to assume:

(1) $\mathfrak{g}$ is a classical simple Lie algebra, and G is an adjoint group of $\mathfrak{g}$. F is an arbitrary given Frobenius-Lie morphism on $\mathfrak{g}$.
(2) $\bar{G}$ is a simply-connected simple algebraic group and $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. $\bar{F}$ is as defined as in Lemma 6.10.

Summing up the above results, we can state the following theorem.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $\mathcal{O}_X$ is a nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$ under G-action, or in $\mathfrak{g}_k$ under $\bar{G}$-action over $k = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$, defined over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ of a good characteristic $p > 3$. Then $\mathcal{O}_X$ admits $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational structure if and only if $\mathcal{O}_X$ is F-stable (resp. $\bar{F}$-stable for $\mathfrak{g}_k$), which is completely listed in Theorem 6.10.*

References

[1] Benson, D., *Modular representation theory: new trends and methods*, Springer-Verlag, LNM 1081, 1984.
[2] Borel, A., *Properties and linear representations of Chevalley groups*, pages 1-55, in "Seminar on algebraic groups and related finite groups, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 131, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.
[3] Borel, A., *Linear algebraic groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
[4] Calson, J., *The variety of an indecomposable module is connected*, Inven. Math. (1987)
[5] Carlson, J., Lin, Z. and Nakano, D., *Support varieties for modules over Chevalley groups and classical Lie algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 360 (2008), 1879-1906.
[6] Carlson, J., Lin, Z., Nakano, D., and Parshall, B., *The restricted nullcone*, Contemp. Math. 325(2003), 51-75.
[7] Carter, R. W., *Finite groups of Lie type*, Wiley-Interscience, 1985.
[8] Collingwood, D. H. and McGovern, W. M., *Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1993.
[9] Curtis, C. W. and Reiner, I., *Methods of representation theory. With applications to finite groups and orders*, Vol.I, A Wiley-Interscience Publication, New York, 1981.
[10] Deng, B. and Du, J., *Frobenius morphisms and representations of algebras*, Trans. Amer.Math. Soc. 358 (2006), 3591-3622.
[11] Deng, B., Du, J., Parshall, B. and Wang, J., *Fininte Dimensional Algebras and Quantum Groups*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence RI, 2008
[12] Digne, F. and Michel, J., *Representations of finite grouops of Lie type*, London Math. Soc., Student Texts, 21. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
[13] Du, J. and Shu, B., *On finite Lie algebras and their representations*, J. Algebra 321 (2009), 3197-3225.
[14] Friedlander, E. M. and Parshall, B. J., *Cohomlolgy of algebraic and related finite groups*, Inv. Math. 74 (1983), 85-117.
[15] Friedlander, E. M. and Parshall, B. J., *Support varieties for restricted Lie algebras*, Inv. Math. 86 (1986), 553-562.
[16] Friedlander, E. M. and Parshall, B. J., *Geometry of p-unipotent Lie algebras*, J. Algebra 109 (1987), 25-45.
[17] Friedlander, E. M. and Parshall, B. J., *Modular representations theroy of Lie algebras*, Amer. J. Math. 110 (1988), 117-126.
[18] Geck, M., *An introduction to algebraic geometry and algebraic groups*, Oxford University Press, 2003.

[19] Humphreys, J. E., *Algebraic groups and modular Lie algebras*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 71, 1967.

[20] Humphreys, J. E., *Conjugacy classes in semisimple algebraic groups*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995.

[21] Jantzen, J. C., *Representations of algebraic groups*, 2nd edition, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.

[22] Jantzen, J. C., *Restricted Lie alegbra cohomology*, pp. 91-108, in *Algebraic groups: Proceedings of a conference in honor of T. A. Springer*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1271, Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[23] Jantzen, J. C. *Nilpotent orbits in representation theory*, pages 1-221, in "Lie Theory, Lie algebras and representations", Progress in Mathematics 228, Birhauser, Boston.Basel.Berlin, 2004.

[24] Nakano, D., Parshall, B. and Vella, D., *Support varieties for algebraic groups*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 547(2002), 15-49.

[25] Nakano, D. and Tanisaki, T., *On the realization of orbit closures as support varieties*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 206(2006), 66-82.

[26] McGovern, W. M., *The adjoint representation and the adjoint action*, in *Algebraic Quotients. Torus actions and cohomology. The adjoint representation and the adjoint action*, Springer 2002, 150-238.

[27] Premet, A., *Nilpotent orbits in good characteristic and the Kempf-Rousseau theory*, Journal of Algebra, 260(2003), 338-366.

[28] Seligmen, G., *Modular Lie algebras*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1967.

[29] Springer, T. A. *Linear algebraic groups*, Birkhäuser Boston, 2nd edition, 1998.

[30] Springer, T. A. and Steinberg, R., *Conjugacy class*, pages 167-266, in "Seminar on algebraic groups and related finite groups, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 131, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.

[31] Steinberg, R., *Lectures on Chevalley groups*, Yale University, 1968.

[32] Suslin, A., Friedlander, E. M. and Bendel, C., *Infinitesimal 1-parameter subgroups and cohomology*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 10 (1997), 693-728.

Department of Mathematics, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
E-mail address: sozkap@metu.edu.tr

Department of Mathematics, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904
E-mail address: bjp8w@virginia.edu

Department of Mathematics, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200062, China.
E-mail address: bshu@math.ecnu.edu.cn