On equivariant bundles and their moduli spaces

Chiara Damiolini

arXiv:2109.08698v1 (2021)

https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.08698v1

Problem and setup

Let k be a field, let Γ be a finite group with $\mathrm{char}(k) \nmid |\Gamma|$, and let G be an affine algebraic group over k equipped with an action $\rho\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{Aut}(G)$. A possibly ramified Γ-covering in the paper is a finite flat map $\pi\colon \widetilde{X} \to X$ whose automorphism group over X is Γ, and which is generically an étale Γ-torsor. A (Γ, G)-bundle $\mathcal{P}$ on $\widetilde{X}$ is a right G-torsor with a lifted left Γ-action satisfying

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(pg) = \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(p)\,\gamma_G(g).$$

No smoothness or curve hypothesis on X and $\widetilde{X}$ is imposed in the main theorem.

Fix such a bundle $\mathcal{P}$, put $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathrm{Iso}_G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P})$, and form the smooth group scheme

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}} := (\pi_* \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{P}})^{\Gamma}$$

on X, where π_* is Weil restriction. For another equivariant bundle $\mathcal{P}'$, write $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}') = \mathrm{Iso}_G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}')$. The exceptional convention is the paper's notion of *local type*: $\mathcal{P}' \sim \mathcal{P}$ means that for every geometric point x of X,

$$\mathrm{Iso}_G\big(\mathcal{P}|_{\pi^{-1}\{x\}}, \mathcal{P}'|_{\pi^{-1}\{x\}}\big)^{\Gamma} \neq \varnothing.$$

Thus one remembers the equivariant structure over the entire (possibly nonreduced) ramified fibre, not merely the underlying G-torsor.

The equivalence (Theorem 3.2)

Let $\mathrm{Bun}^{\mathcal{P}}_{(\Gamma,G)}$ denote the stack of (Γ, G)-bundles on $\widetilde{X}$ having the same local type as $\mathcal{P}$, and let $\mathrm{Bun}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}}$ be the stack of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$-torsors on X. Then the two functors

$$\mathcal{P}' \longmapsto \big(\pi_* \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}')\big)^{\Gamma}, \qquad \mathcal{F} \longmapsto \pi^*\mathcal{F} \times^{\pi^*\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}} \mathcal{P}$$

are quasi-inverse equivalences

$$\mathrm{Bun}^{\mathcal{P}}_{(\Gamma,G)} \simeq \mathrm{Bun}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}}\,.$$

For the trivial equivariant G-bundle $\mathcal{P} = \widetilde{X} \times G$, this specializes to the equivalence announced in the introduction between locally trivial-type (Γ, G)-bundles and torsors under $\mathcal{H} = (\pi_*(\widetilde{X} \times G))^{\Gamma}$.

The point is not merely descent along an unramified cover. Ramification allows inequivalent lifted Γ-actions on the same underlying G-torsor; the group scheme $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$ detects exactly the substack of equivariant bundles having the local behaviour of the chosen reference $\mathcal{P}$. This also removes the inner-automorphism restriction from the earlier formulation discussed in the paper.

Why local type cannot be omitted

Example 2.4 is a small diagnostic model. Take $\Gamma = \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$, $G = \mathfrak{S}_4$, and $\operatorname{Spec} k[t] \to \operatorname{Spec} k[t^2]$. The paper gives two equivariant structures on the trivial G-bundle. At the ramified point the invariant fibre for the reference structure contains the identity, whereas the corresponding invariant fibre for the second structure is empty by parity. Hence invariant pushforward of the latter cannot be an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$-torsor. This example isolates precisely what disappears in the étale case: away from the branch locus, Lemma 2.8 shows that any two equivariant bundles have the same local type.

Proof mechanism

The proof has three linked steps.

1. **Invariant pushforward is a torsor exactly on one local type.** Before taking invariants, $\pi_*\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}')$ is a torsor under $\pi_*\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{P}}$ (Lemma 2.2). The usual torsor isomorphism is Γ-equivariant, so its invariant part has the correct action by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$. Proposition 2.9 supplies the missing local nonemptiness: invariant sections exist étale-locally at x if and only if $\mathcal{P}'$ and $\mathcal{P}$ are equivariantly isomorphic over $\pi^{-1}\{x\}$. Smoothness then promotes surjectivity on geometric fibres to étale-local sections. This is the hardest conceptual point, because taking invariants preserves the torsor identity but does not by itself preserve local nonemptiness.
2. **The reverse construction lands in the prescribed local type.** Adjunction applied to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}} \hookrightarrow \pi_*\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{P}}$ gives $\pi^*\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}} \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{P}}$, hence an action on $\mathcal{P}$. Proposition 3.1 uses it to form the contracted product $\pi^*\mathcal{F} \times^{\pi^*\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}} \mathcal{P}$. Compatibility of the action makes this a (Γ, G)-bundle. After restricting to a geometric fibre and trivializing the torsor $\mathcal{F}|_x$, one obtains a Γ-invariant isomorphism with $\mathcal{P}|_{\pi^{-1}\{x\}}$, so its local type is correct.
3. **The two composites are evaluation maps.** For an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$-torsor $\mathcal{F}$, the map $f \mapsto [p \mapsto (f, p)]$ becomes, after pushforward and invariants, a locally $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$-equivariant isomorphism back to $\mathcal{F}$. Conversely, for $\mathcal{P}' \sim \mathcal{P}$, adjunction maps the pullback of $(\pi_*\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}'))^{\Gamma}$ into $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}')$; composing its contracted-product extension with evaluation yields the required map to $\mathcal{P}'$. It is G-equivariant by construction, hence an isomorphism of G-torsors, and it is Γ-equivariant because the isomorphisms being evaluated are themselves Γ-equivariant.

Scope and omissions

For smooth curves the construction connects equivariant bundles with parahoric Bruhat–Tits groups, but the paper does not prove that every parahoric group arises from a covering with arbitrary automorphism action. It also leaves the explicit classification of local types for general automorphisms to future work. Lemmas 2.7–2.8 give useful tests (reduction of ramified fibres and restriction to the branch locus), but they are not dependencies of Theorem 3.2; the digest includes only the second as context for the toy model.