Let $L$ be a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, with the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}$, a uniformizer $\varpi$, and residue field $k$, and let $G = \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and $B$ the subgroup of upper-triangular matrices in $G$.

**Theorem 0.1.** Let $\pi_1, \pi_2$ be smooth, absolutely irreducible $k$-representations of $G$ with a central character. Suppose that $\text{Ext}^1_G(\pi_2, \pi_1) \neq 0$ then after replacing $L$ by a finite extension, we may find integers $(l, k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ and unramified characters $\chi_1, \chi_2 : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to L^\times$ with $\chi_2 \neq \chi_1 | \cdot |$, such that $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$ are subquotients of $\Pi^{ss}$, where $\Pi^{ss}$ is the semi-simplification of the reduction modulo $\varpi$ of an open bounded $G$-invariant lattice in $\Pi$, where $\Pi$ is the universal unitary completion of

$$(\text{Ind}_B^G \chi_1 \otimes \chi_2 | \cdot |^{-l})_{\text{sm}} \otimes \det^l \otimes \text{Sym}^{k-1} L^2.$$ 

The results of Berger-Breuil [3], Berger [2], Breuil-Emerton [6] and [18] describe explicitly the possibilities for $\Pi^{ss}$, see Proposition 2.10. These results and the Theorem imply that $\text{Ext}^1_G(\pi_2, \pi_1)$ vanishes in many cases. Let us make this more precise.

Let $\text{Mod}^{\text{sm}}_G(\mathcal{O})$ be the category of smooth $G$-representation on $\mathcal{O}$-torsion modules. It contains $\text{Mod}^{\text{sm}}_G(k)$, the category of smooth $G$-representations on $k$-vector spaces, as a full subcategory. Every irreducible object $\pi$ of $\text{Mod}^{\text{sm}}_G(\mathcal{O})$ is killed by $\varpi$, and hence is an object of $\text{Mod}^{\text{sm}}_G(k)$. Barthel-Livné [1] and Breuil [4] have classified the absolutely irreducible smooth representations $\pi$ admitting a central character. They fall into four disjoint classes:

(i) characters $\delta \circ \det$;
(ii) special series $Sp \otimes \delta \circ \det$;
(iii) principal series $(\text{Ind}_B^G \delta_1 \otimes \delta_2)_{\text{sm}}$, $\delta_1 \neq \delta_2$;
(iv) supersingular representations,

where $Sp$ is the Steinberg representation, that is the locally constant functions from $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ to $k$ modulo the constant functions; $\delta, \delta_1, \delta_2 : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to k^\times$ are smooth characters and we consider $\delta_1 \otimes \delta_2$ as a character of $B$, which sends $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ to $\delta_1(a) \delta_2(d)$. Using their results and some easy arguments, see [21, §5.3], one may show that for an irreducible smooth representations $\pi$ the following are equivalent: 1) $\pi$ is
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admissible, which means that \( \pi^H \) is finite dimensional for all open subgroups \( H \) of \( G \); 2) \( \text{End}_G(\pi) \) is finite dimensional over \( k \); 3) there exists a finite extension \( k' \) of \( k \), such that \( \pi \otimes_k k' \) is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of distinct absolutely irreducible \( k' \)-representations with a central character.

Let \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \) be the full subcategory of \( \text{Mod}^\text{sm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \), consisting of representations, which are equal to the union of their admissible subrepresentations. The categories \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \) and \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \) are abelian, see [13 Prop.2.2.18]. We define \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(k) \) in exactly the same way with \( \mathcal{O} \) replaced by \( k \). Let \( \text{Irr}^\text{adm}_G \) be the set of irreducible representation in \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \), then \( \text{Irr}^\text{adm}_G \) is the set of irreducible representations in \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \) satisfying the equivalent conditions described above. We define an equivalence relation \( \sim \) on \( \text{Irr}^\text{adm}_G \): \( \pi \sim \tau \) if there exists a sequence of irreducible admissible representations \( \pi = \pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_n = \tau \), such that for each \( i \) one of the following holds: 1) \( \pi_i \cong \pi_{i+1} \); 2) \( \text{Ext}^1_G(\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}) \neq 0 \); 3) \( \text{Ext}^1_G(\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}) = 0 \).

We note that it does not matter for the definition of \( \sim \), whether we compute \( \text{Ext}^1_G \) in \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \), \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(k) \), \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \) or \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(k) \), since we only care about vanishing or non-vanishing of \( \text{Ext}^1_G(\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}) \) for distinct irreducible representations. A block is an equivalence class of \( \sim \).

**Corollary 0.2.** The blocks containing an absolutely irreducible representation are given by the following:

1. \( \mathcal{B} = \{ \pi \} \) with \( \pi \) supersingular;
2. \( \mathcal{B} = \{ (\text{Ind}_B^G \delta_1 \otimes \delta_2 \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}}, (\text{Ind}_B^G \delta_2 \otimes \delta_1 \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}} \} \) with \( \delta_2 \delta_1^{-1} \neq \omega^{\pm 1}, 1 \);
3. \( p > 2 \) and \( \mathcal{B} = \{ (\text{Ind}_B^G \delta \otimes \delta \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}} \} \);
4. \( p = 2 \) and \( \mathcal{B} = \{ 1, \text{Sp} \} \otimes \delta \circ \det \);
5. \( p \geq 5 \) and \( \mathcal{B} = \{ 1, \text{Sp}, (\text{Ind}_B^G \omega \otimes \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}} \} \otimes \delta \circ \det \);
6. \( p = 3 \) and \( \mathcal{B} = \{ 1, \text{Sp}, \omega \otimes \det, \text{Sp} \otimes \omega \otimes \det \} \otimes \delta \circ \det \);

where \( \delta, \delta_1, \delta_2 : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to k^\times \) are smooth characters and where \( \omega : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to k^\times \) is the character \( \omega(x) = x|x| \pmod{\varpi} \).

One may view the cases (iii) to (vi) as degenerations of case (ii). A finitely generated smooth admissible representation of \( G \) is of finite length, [13 Thm.2.3.8]. This makes \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \) into a locally finite category. It follows from [15] that every locally finite category decomposes into blocks. In our situation we obtain:

\[
\text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \cong \coprod_{\mathcal{B} \in \text{Irr}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O})} \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O})[\mathcal{B}],
\]

where \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O})[\mathcal{B}] \) is the full subcategory of \( \text{Mod}^\text{adm}_G(\mathcal{O}) \) consisting of representations, with all irreducible subquotients in \( \mathcal{B} \). One can deduce a similar result for the category of admissible unitary \( L \)-Banach space representations of \( G \), see [21 Prop.5.32].

The result has been previously known for \( p > 2 \), Breuil and the author [7 §8], Colmez [8 §VII], Emerton [13 §4] and the author [19] have computed \( \text{Ext}^1_G(\pi_2, \pi_1) \) by different characteristic \( p \) methods, which do not work in the exceptional cases, when \( p = 2 \). In this paper, we go via characteristic 0 and make use of a deep Theorem of Berger-Breuil. The proof is less involved, but it does not give any information about the extensions between irreducible representations lying in the same block.

The motivation for these calculations comes from the \( p \)-adic Langlands correspondence for \( \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p) \). Colmez in [8] to a 2-dimensional absolutely irreducible
L-representation of the absolute Galois group of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ has associated an admissible unitary absolutely irreducible non-ordinary $L$-Banach space representation of $G$. He showed that his construction induces an injection on the isomorphism classes and asked whether it is a bijection, see [8] §0.13. This has been answered affirmatively in [21] for $p \geq 5$, where the knowledge of blocks has been used in an essential way. The results of this paper should be useful in dealing with the remaining cases.

Let us give a rough sketch of the argument. Let $0 \to \pi_1 \to \pi \to \pi_2 \to 0$ be a non-split extension. The method of [7] allows us to embed $\pi$ into $\Omega$, such that $\Omega|_K$ is admissible and an injective object in $\text{Mod}_{K}^{\text{sm}}(k)$, where $K = \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Using the results of [20] we may lift $\Omega$ to an admissible unitary $L$-Banach space representation $E$, in the sense that we may find a $G$-invariant unit ball $E^0$ in $E$, such that $E^0/\varpi E^0 \cong \Omega$. Moreover, $E|_K$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathcal{C}(K, L)\cong \tau$, where $\mathcal{C}(K, L)$ is the space of continuous function with the supremum norm. This implies, using an argument of Emerton, that the $K$-algebraic vectors are dense in $E$. As a consequence we find a closed $G$-invariant subspace $\Pi$ of $E$, such that the reduction of $\Pi \cap E^0$ modulo $\varpi$ contains $\pi$ as a subrepresentation, and $\Pi$ contains $\oplus_{i=1}^{\infty} c\text{-Ind}_{KZ}^G \frac{1}{[G:a_i]} \otimes \det \otimes \text{Sym}^{k-1} L^2$ as a dense subrepresentation, where $Z$ is the centre of $G$, $\bar{1}_i : KZ \to L^\times$ is a character, trivial on $K$, $a_i \in L$, and $T$ is a certain Hecke operator in $\text{End}_{G}(c\text{-Ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{1}_i)$, such that $\frac{c\text{-Ind}_{KZ}^G \bar{1}_i}{[G:a_i]}$ is an unramified principal series representation. Once we have this we are in a good shape to prove Theorem 0.1.

1. Notation

Let $L$ be a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ with the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}$, uniformizer $\varpi$ and residue field $k$. We normalize the valuation $\text{val}$ on $L$ so that $\text{val}(p) = 1$, and the norm $|\cdot|$, so that $|x| = p^{-\text{val}(x)}$, for all $x \in L$. Let $G = \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$; $Z$ the centre of $G$; $B$ the subgroup of upper triangular matrices; $K = \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$; $I = \{g \in K : g \equiv (a_{11}, a_{12}) \mod p\}$; $I_1 = \{g \in K : g \equiv (1, 0) \mod p\}$; let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the $G$-normalizer of $I$; let $H = \{([\lambda], [\mu]) : \lambda, \mu \in F^p\}$, where $[\lambda]$ is the Teichmüller lift of $\lambda$; let $G$ be the subgroup of $G$ generated by matrices $\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $H$. Let $G^+ = \{g \in G : \text{val}(\text{det}(g)) \equiv 0 \mod 2\}$. Since we are working with representations of locally pro-$p$ groups in characteristic $p$, these representations will not be semi-simple in general; so the maximal semi-simple subobject. For example, $\text{soc}_G \tau$ means the maximal semi-simple $G$-subrepresentation of $\tau$. Let $\text{Ban}_G^{\text{adm}}(L)$ be the category of admissible unitary $L$-Banach space representations of $G$, studied in [22]. This category is abelian. Let $\Pi$ be an admissible semisimple $L$-Banach space representation of $G$, and let $\Theta$ be an open bounded $G$-invariant lattice in $\Pi$, then $\Theta/\varpi \Theta$ is a smooth admissible $k$-representation of $G$. If $\Theta/\varpi \Theta$ is of finite length as a $G$-representation, then we let $\Pi^{ss}$ be the semi-simplification of $\Theta/\varpi \Theta$. Since any two such $\Theta$’s are commensurable, $\Pi^{ss}$ is independent of the choice of $\Theta$. Universal unitary completions are discussed in [21] §1.

2. Main

Let $\pi_1, \pi_2$ be distinct smooth absolutely irreducible $k$-representation of $G$ with a central character. It follows from [1] and [4] that $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$ are admissible. We
suppose that there exists a non-split extension in \( \text{Mod}^{\text{fin}}_G(O) \):

\[
0 \to \pi_1 \to \pi \to \pi_2 \to 0.
\]

Since \( \pi_1 \) and \( \pi_2 \) are distinct and irreducible, by examining the long exact sequence induced by multiplication with \( \varpi \), we deduce that \( \pi \) is killed by \( \varpi \). A similar argument shows that the existence of a non-split extension implies that the central character of \( \pi_1 \) is equal to the central character of \( \pi_2 \). Moreover, \( \pi \) also has a central character, which is then equal to the central character of \( \pi_1 \), see [14, Prop.8.1]. We denote this central character by \( \zeta : Z \to k^\times \). After replacing \( L \) by a quadratic extension and twisting by a character we may assume that \( \zeta((0,0)) = 1 \).

**Lemma 2.1.** If \( \pi_1^I \neq \pi_1 \) then Theorem [14, Thm] holds for \( \pi_1 \) and \( \pi_2 \).

**Proof.** Since \( \zeta \) is continuous, it is trivial on the pro-\( p \) group \( Z \cap I_1 \). We thus may extend \( \zeta \) to \( ZI_1 \), by letting \( \zeta(zu) = \zeta(z) \) for all \( z \in Z \), \( u \in I_1 \). If \( \tau \) is a smooth \( k \)-representation of \( G \) with a central character \( \zeta \) then \( \tau^I \equiv \text{Hom}_{I_1Z}(\zeta, \tau) \equiv \text{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_{I_1Z}^G \zeta, \tau) \). Thus \( \tau^I \) is naturally an \( H := \text{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_{I_1Z}^G \zeta) \) module. Taking \( I_1 \)-invariants of \( \tau^I \) we get an exact sequence of \( H \)-modules:

\[
0 \to \pi_1^I \to \pi^I \to \pi_2^I.
\]

Since \( \pi_2 \) is irreducible, \( \pi_2^I \) is an irreducible \( H \)-module by [13]. Hence, if \( \pi_1^I \neq \pi_1 \), then the last arrow is surjective. It is shown in [16, Lem.2.1], that if \( \tau \) is a smooth \( k \)-representation of \( G \), with a central character \( \zeta \), then the sequence \( 0 \to \pi_1^I \to \pi^I \to \pi_2^I \to 0 \) is non-split, and hence defines a non-zero element of \( \text{Ext}^1_H(\pi_2^I, \pi_1^I) \). Since \( \pi_1^I \equiv \pi_1^I \otimes c \text{-Ind}_{I_1Z}^G \zeta \) for \( i = 1, 2 \), the \( H \)-modules \( \pi_1^I \) and \( \pi_2^I \) are non-isomorphic. Non-vanishing of \( \text{Ext}^1_H(\pi_2^I, \pi_1^I) \) implies that there exists a smooth character \( \eta : G \to k^\times \) such that either \( (\pi_1 \equiv \eta) \) and \( \pi_2 \equiv \text{Sp} \otimes \eta \) or \( (\pi_2 \equiv \eta) \) and \( \pi_1 \equiv \text{Sp} \otimes \eta \), [21, Lem.5.24], where \( \text{Sp} \) is the Steinberg representation. In both cases there exists a smooth principal series representation defined over a finite extension of \( L \), such that its universal unitary completion is ordinary, and the reduction of the unit ball modulo \( \varpi \) is an extension of \( \pi_1 \) by \( \pi_2 \).

Lemma 2.1 allows to assume that \( \pi^I = \pi_1^I \). We note that this implies that \( \text{soc}_K \pi_1 = \text{soc}_K \pi \), and, since \( I_1 \) is contained in \( G^+ \), the restriction of \( (2) \) to \( G^+ \) is a non-split extension of \( G^+ \)-representations.

Now we perform a renaming trick, the purpose of which is to get around some technical issues, when \( p = 2 \). If either \( p > 2 \) or \( p = 2 \) and \( \pi_1 \) is neither a special series nor a character then we let \( \tau_1 = \pi_1 \), \( \tau = \pi \) and \( \tau_2 = \pi_2 \). If \( p = 2 \) and \( \pi_1 \) is a special series representation or a character, then we let \( 0 \to \tau_1 \to \tau \to \tau_2 \to 0 \) be the exact sequence obtained by tensoring \( (2) \) with \( \text{Ind}_{G^+}^G \). In particular, \( \tau \equiv \pi \otimes \text{Ind}_{G^+} G^+ \), which implies that \( \tau|_{G^+} \equiv \pi|_{G^+} \oplus \pi|_{G^+} \) and \( \tau_1|_{G^+} \equiv \pi_1|_{G^+} \oplus \pi_1|_{G^+} \). Hence, \( \tau^I = \tau_1^I \) and \( \text{soc}_K \tau \equiv \text{soc}_K \tau_1 \equiv \text{soc}_K \pi_1 \oplus \text{soc}_K \pi \). This implies that \( \text{soc}_K \tau \equiv \text{soc}_K \pi_1 \).

**Lemma 2.2.** \( \text{soc}_G \tau \equiv \text{soc}_G \tau_1 \equiv \pi_1 \).

**Proof.** We already know that \( \text{soc}_G \tau \equiv \text{soc}_G \tau_1 \) and we only need to consider the case \( p = 2 \) and \( \pi_1 \) is either special series or a character. The assumption on \( \pi_1 \) implies that \( \pi_1^I \) is one dimensional. Let \( \mathcal{N} \) be the normalizer of \( I_1 \) in \( G \), then \( I_1 \mathcal{N} \).
is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{R}$ of index 2. We note that $I = I_1$ as $p = 2$. Thus $\mathfrak{R}$ acts on $\pi_1^i$ by a character $\chi$, such that the restriction of $\chi$ to $I_1Z$ is equal to $\zeta$. Since $p = 2$, we have an exact non-split sequence of $G$-representations $0 \to 1 \to \text{Ind}_{G+}^G 1 \to 1 \to 0$.

We note that $G^+$ and hence $ZI_1$ act trivially on all the terms in this sequence. By tensoring with $\pi_1$ we obtain an exact sequence $0 \to \pi_1 \to \tau_1 \to \pi_1 \to 0$ of $G$-representations. Taking a character $\chi$, Proposition 2.3. allows us to apply \cite[Cor.9.11]{7} to obtain:

$$\text{Mod} K \text{smooth Corollary 2.4.}$$

Proof. We may choose $\tau_1 = \tau_1^1$, \cite[Prop.9.2]{7} implies that the inclusion $\tau_1 \hookrightarrow \tau$ has a $G$-equivariant section. This allows us to apply \cite[Cor.9.11]{7} to obtain:

**Proposition 2.3.** There exists a $G$-equivariant injection $\tau \hookrightarrow \Omega$, where $\Omega$ is a smooth $k$-representation of $G$, such that $\Omega|_K$ is an injective envelope of $\text{soc}_K \tau$ in $\text{Mod}_K^\text{aug}(k)$ and $(p^0 0)$ acts trivially on $\Omega$.

**Corollary 2.4.** Let $\Omega$ be as above then $\text{soc}_K \Omega \cong \text{soc}_K \tau_1$ and $\text{soc}_G \Omega \cong \pi_1$.

Proof. Since $\tau$ is a subrepresentation of $\Omega$, $\text{soc}_K \tau$ is contained in $\text{soc}_K \Omega$. Since $\Omega|_K$ is an injective envelope of $\text{soc}_K \tau$, every non-zero $K$-invariant subspace of $\Omega$ intersects $\text{soc}_K \tau$ non-trivially. This implies that $\text{soc}_K \tau \cong \text{soc}_K \Omega$. This implies the first assertion, as $\text{soc}_K \tau \cong \text{soc}_K \tau_1$. Moreover, every $G$-invariant non-zero subspace of $\Omega$ intersects $\tau$ non-trivially, since those are also $K$-invariant. This implies $\text{soc}_G \Omega \cong \text{soc}_G \tau \cong \pi_1$, where the last isomorphism follows from Lemma 2.2.

**Theorem 2.5.** We may choose $\Omega$ as in Proposition 2.3 and such that there exists an admissible unitary $L$-Banach space representation $(E, \| \cdot \|)$ of $G$, such that $\|E\| \subset |E|$, $(p^0 0)$ acts trivially on $E$, and the reduction modulo $\varpi$ of the unit ball in $E$ is isomorphic to $\Omega$ as a $G$-representation.

Proof. If $p \neq 2$ this is shown in \cite[Thm.6.1]{20}. We will observe that the renaming trick allows us to carry out essentially the same proof when $p = 2$. We make no assumption on $p$. Let $\Omega$ be any representation given by Proposition 2.3.

We first lift $\Omega|_K$ to characteristic 0. Let $\sigma$ be the $K$-socle of $\Omega$, we may write $\sigma \cong \sigma_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \sigma_r$, with $\sigma_i$ absolutely irreducible $k$-representations of $K$. Pontryagin duality induces an anti-equivalence of categories between $\text{Mod}_K^\text{aug}(k)$ and the category of pseudocompact $k[\mathbb{Z}]$-modules, which we denote by $\text{Mod}_K^\text{pro-aug}(k)$. Since $\Omega$ is an injective envelope of $\sigma$ in $\text{Mod}_K^\text{aug}(k)$, its Pontryagin dual $\Omega^\vee$ is a projective envelope of $\sigma^\vee$ in $\text{Mod}_K^\text{pro-aug}(k)$. Since injective and projective envelopes are unique up to isomorphism, $\Omega^\vee \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_{\sigma_i}^\vee$, where $P_{\sigma_i}^\vee$ is a projective envelope of $\sigma_i^\vee$ in the category of pseudocompact $k[\mathbb{Z}]$-modules. Let $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee$ be the projective envelope of $\sigma_i^\vee$ in the category of pseudocompact $\mathcal{O}[\mathbb{Z}]$-modules. We have $\tilde{P} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee$, where $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee$ is a projective envelope of $\sigma_i^\vee$ in $\text{Mod}_K^\text{pro-aug}(\mathcal{O})$, because projective envelopes are unique up to isomorphism. Each $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{O}[K]$, see \cite[Prop.4.2]{20}. Thus $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee$ is $O$-torsion free and a finitely generated $\mathcal{O}[K]$-module. Moreover, one may show that $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee / \varpi \tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee \cong P_{\sigma_i}^\vee$. Hence $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_i}^\vee$ is an
$\mathcal{O}$-torsion free, finitely generated $\mathcal{O}[K]$-module, and its reduction modulo $\varpi$ is isomorphic to $\Omega^\vee$ in $\text{Mod}_{K}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(k)$. Let $E_0 = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{O}^{\text{cont}}(\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee, L)$, and let $\| \cdot \|_0$ be the supremum norm. It follows from [22, Thm.1.2] that $E_0$ is an admissible unitary $L$-Banach space representation of $K$. Moreover, the unit ball $E_0^0$ in $E_0$ is $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{O}^{\text{cont}}(\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee, \mathcal{O})$ and

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{O}^{\text{cont}}(\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee, \mathcal{O}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{O}^{\text{cont}}(\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee, k) \cong \text{Hom}_k^{\text{cont}}(P_\sigma^\vee, k) \cong (\Omega^\vee)^\vee \cong \Omega,$$

see [20, §5] for details. We extend the action of $K$ on $E_0$ to the action of $KZ$ by letting $\left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right)$ act trivially.

Suppose that there exists a unitary $L$-Banach space representation $(E_1, \| \cdot \|_1)$ of $\mathfrak{A}$, such that $\| E \| \subseteq |L|$, $\left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right)$ acts trivially on $E_1$ and the reduction of the unit ball $E_0^0$ in $E_1$ modulo $\varpi$ is isomorphic to $\Omega|_{\mathfrak{A}}$. We claim that there exists an isometric, $IZ$-equivariant isomorphism $\varphi : E_1 \to E_0$ such that the following diagram in $IZ$-representations:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
E_1^0 / \varpi E_1^0 & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & E_0^0 / \varpi E_0^0 \\
\downarrow \approx & & \downarrow \approx \\
\Omega & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \Omega
\end{array}
$$

commutes, where the left vertical arrow is the given $\mathfrak{A}$-equivariant isomorphism $E_1^0 / \varpi E_1^0 \cong \Omega|_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and the right vertical arrow is the given $KZ$-equivariant isomorphism $E_0^0 / \varpi E_0^0 \cong \Omega|_{KZ}$. Granting the claim, we may transport the action of $\mathfrak{A}$ on $E_0$ by using $\varphi$ to obtain a unitary action of $KZ$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ on $E_0$, such that the two actions agree on $KZ \cap \mathfrak{A}$, which is equal to $IZ$. The resulting action glues to the unitary action of $G$ on $E_0$, since $G$ is an amalgam of $KZ$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ along $IZ$. The commutativity of the above diagram implies that $E_0^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k \cong \Omega$ as a $G$-representation.

We will prove the claim now. Let $M = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{O}^{\text{cont}}(E_1^0, \mathcal{O})$ equipped with the topology of pointwise convergence. Then $M$ is an object of $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(\mathcal{O})$, and $M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k \cong \Omega^\vee$ in $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(k)$, see [20, Lem.5.4]. Since $\Omega|_K$ is injective in $\text{Mod}_{K}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(k)$, $\Omega|_I$ is injective in $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(k)$. Since $I_1$ is a pro-$p$ group, every non-zero $I$-invariant subspace of $\Omega$ intersects $\Omega|_{I_1}$ non-trivially. Thus $\Omega|_I$ is an injective envelope of $\Omega|_{I_1}$ in $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{proj}}(k)$. Hence, $\Omega^\vee$ is a projective envelope of $(\Omega|_{I_1})^\vee$ in $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(k)$. Since $M$ is $\mathcal{O}$-torsion free, and $M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} k$ is a projective envelope of $(\Omega|_{I_1})^\vee$ in $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(k)$, [20, Prop.4.6] implies that $M$ is a projective envelope of $(\Omega|_{I_1})^\vee$ in $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(\mathcal{O})$. The same holds for $\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee$. Since projective envelopes are unique up to isomorphism, there exists an isomorphism $\psi : \tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee \xrightarrow{\cong} M$ in $\text{Mod}_{I}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(\mathcal{O})$. It follows from [20, Cor.4.7] that the natural map $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{O}[I]}(\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee) \to \text{Aut}_{k[I]}(\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee / \varpi \tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee)$ is surjective. Using this we may choose $\psi$ so that the following diagram in $\text{Mod}_{K}^{\text{pro-\text{aug}}}(k)$:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee / \varpi \tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee & \xrightarrow{\psi} & M / \varpi M \\
\downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\
\Omega^\vee & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \Omega^\vee
\end{array}
$$

commutes. Dually we obtain an isometric $I$-equivariant isomorphism of unitary $L$-Banach space representations of $I$, $\psi^d : \text{Hom}_\mathcal{O}^{\text{cont}}(M, L) \to \text{Hom}_\mathcal{O}^{\text{cont}}(\tilde{P}_\sigma^\vee, L)$. It follows from [22, Thm.1.2] that $(E_1, \| \cdot \|_1)$ is naturally and isometrically isomorphic
to \( \text{Hom}^{\text{cont}}(M, L) \) with the supremum norm. This gives our \( \varphi \). The commutativity of the second diagram implies the commutativity of the diagram in the claim.

We will show that we may lift \( \Omega|_{\mathcal{R}} \) to a unitary \( L \)-Banach space representation of \( \mathcal{R} \), thus finishing the proof. Let \( \mathcal{R}/p^2 \) be the subgroup of \( G \) generated by \( \left( \begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \). Note that \( \mathcal{R}/p^2 \) is a profinite group and we may view \( \Omega \) as a representation of \( \mathcal{R}/p^2 \). If \( p \neq 2 \) then the pro-\( p \) Sylow subgroup of \( \mathcal{R}/p^2 \) is equal to \( I_1 \). Since \( \Omega|_{I_1} \) is injective, we deduce that \( \Omega|_{\mathcal{R}/p^2} \) is injective in \( \text{Mod}^{\text{sm}}_{\mathcal{R}/p^2}(k) \). Thus we may lift \( \Omega|_{\mathcal{R}/p^2} \) to a Banach space representation by exactly the same procedure as we have lifted \( \Omega|_{K} \).

Suppose that \( p = 2 \) and let \( \kappa \) be a finite dimensional \( k \)-representation of \( \mathcal{R}/p^2 \).

We claim that we may lift \( (\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{R}/p^2} \kappa)_{\text{sm}} \) to a Banach space representation of \( \mathcal{R}/p^2 \).

We may assume that \( \kappa \) is indecomposable. Since the order of \( H \) is prime to \( p \), and \( H \) has index 2 in \( G/p^2 \), \( \kappa \) is either a character or an induction of a character from \( H \) to \( G/p^2 \). In both cases we may lift \( \kappa \) to a representation \( \tilde{\kappa}^0 \) of \( G/p^2 \) on a free \( \mathcal{O} \)-module of rank 1 or rank 2 respectively. Let \( \tilde{\kappa} = \tilde{\kappa}^0 \otimes \kappa \) and let \( \| \cdot \| \) be the gauge of \( \tilde{\kappa}^0 \). Then \( \| \cdot \| \) is \( G \)-invariant and \( \tilde{\kappa}^0 \) is the unit ball with respect to \( \| \cdot \| \). Then \( (\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{R}/p^2} \tilde{\kappa})_{\text{cont}} \) with the norm \( \| f \|_1 := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{R}/p^2} \| f(g) \| \) is a lift of \( (\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{R}/p^2} \kappa)_{\text{sm}} \), where the subscript cont indicates continuous induction: the space of continuous functions with the right transformation property. If we examine the construction of \( \Omega \) in the proof of [7, Thm.9.8], we see that \( \Omega|_{R} \cong (\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{R}/p^2} \kappa)_{\text{sm}} \), where \( \kappa \) is a finite dimensional representation \( G/p^2 \), see [7] Lem.9.5, 9.6. This allows us to conclude.

Corollary 2.6. The Banach space representation \( (E, \| \cdot \|) \) constructed in Theorem 2.5 is isometrically, \( K \)-equivariantly isomorphic to a direct summand of \( C(K, L)^{\oplus r} \), where \( C(K, L) \) is the space of continuous functions from \( K \) to \( L \), equipped with the supremum norm, and \( r \) is a positive integer.

Proof. It follows from the construction of \( E \), that \( (E, \| \cdot \|) \) is isometrically, \( K \)-equivariantly isomorphic to \( \text{Hom}^{\text{cont}}(P_{\sigma^r}, L) \) with the supremum norm. Moreover, \( P_{\sigma^r} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} P_{\sigma^i} \), where \( \sigma_i \) are irreducible smooth \( k \)-representations of \( K \). Each \( P_{\sigma^i} \) is a direct summand of \( \mathcal{O}[K] \), see for example [20] Prop.4.2. Thus \( P_{\sigma^r} \) is a direct summand of \( \mathcal{O}[K]^{\oplus r} \). It is shown in [22] Lem.2.1, Cor.2.2 that the natural map \( K \to \mathcal{O}[K], g \mapsto g \) induces an isometric, \( K \)-equivariant isomorphism between \( C(K, L) \) and \( \text{Hom}^{\text{cont}}(\mathcal{O}[K], L) \).

If \( F \) is a finite extension of \( \mathbb{Q}_p \) contained in \( L \), exactly the same proof works. We note that [7] Thm.9.8 is proved for \( \text{GL}_2(F) \). We record this as a corollary below. Let \( \mathcal{O}_F \) be the ring of integers of \( F \), \( \varpi_F \) a uniformizer, \( k_F \) the residue field, let \( \mathcal{G}_F \) be the subgroup of \( \text{GL}_2(F) \) generated by the matrices \( \left( \begin{smallmatrix} \varpi_F & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi_F \end{smallmatrix} \right), \left( \begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \varpi_F \\ \varpi_F & 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \) and \( \left( \begin{smallmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & |\lambda| \end{smallmatrix} \right) \), for \( \lambda, \mu \in k_F^\times \), where \( |\lambda| \) is the Teichmüller lift of \( \lambda \). Let \( I_1 \) be the standard pro-\( p \) Iwahori subgroup of \( G \).

Corollary 2.7. Let \( \tau \) be an admissible smooth \( k \)-representation of \( \text{GL}_2(F) \), such that \( \left( \begin{smallmatrix} \varpi_F & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi_F \end{smallmatrix} \right) \) acts trivially on \( \tau \) and if \( p = 2 \) assume that the inclusion \( \tau_1 \hookrightarrow \tau \) has a \( \mathcal{G}_F \)-equivariant section. Then there exists a \( \text{GL}_2(F) \)-equivariant embedding \( \tau \hookrightarrow \Omega \), such that \( \Omega|_{\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_F)} \) is an injective envelope of \( \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_F) \)-socle of \( \tau \) in the category of smooth \( k \)-representations of \( \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_F) \) and \( \left( \begin{smallmatrix} \varpi_F & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi_F \end{smallmatrix} \right) \) acts trivially on \( \Omega \).
Moreover, we may lift Ω to an admissible unitary L-Banach space representation of GL₂(F).

**Remark 2.8.** We also note that one could work with a fixed central character throughout.

Let \( V_{l,k} = \det^l \otimes \text{Sym}^{k-1} L^2 \), for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( l \in \mathbb{Z} \). We think of \( V_{l,k} \) as the space of homogeneous polynomials in 2 variables of degree \( k-1 \), with the \( G \)-action \((a \ b \ c \ d) P(x, y) = (ad - bc)^j P(ax + by, cx + dy)\). Rather unfortunately \( k \) also denotes the residue field of \( L \), we hope that this will not cause any confusion.

**Proposition 2.9.** Let \((E, \| \cdot \|)\) be a unitary \( L \)-Banach space representation of \( K \) isomorphic in the category of unitary admissible \( L \)-Banach space representations of \( K \) to a direct summand of \( \mathcal{C}(K, L)^{\otimes r} \). The evaluation map

\[
\bigoplus_{(l,k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}} \text{Hom}_K(V_{l,k}, E) \otimes V_{l,k} \to E
\]

is injective and the image is equal to the space of \( K \)-algebraic vectors in \( E \). In particular, the image is a dense subspace of \( E \). Moreover, the subspaces \( \text{Hom}_K(V_{l,k}, E) \) are finite dimensional.

**Proof.** The argument is essentially the same as given in the proof of [12, Prop.5.4.1]. It is enough to prove the statement for \( \mathcal{C}(K, L) \), since then it is true for \( \mathcal{C}(K, L)^{\otimes r} \) and by applying the idempotent, which cuts out \( E \), we may deduce the same statement for \( E \).

Let \( V \) be a finite dimensional \( L \)-vector space with a continuous, absolutely irreducible \( K \)-action. Since \( V \) is finite dimensional every \( L \)-linear homomorphism from \( V \) to \( \mathcal{C}(K, L) \) is continuous. The evaluation at the identity induces an isomorphism between \( \text{Hom}_K(V, \mathcal{C}(K, L)) \) and the \( L \)-linear dual of \( V \). The inverse map is given by \( \ell \mapsto [v \mapsto [g \mapsto \ell(gv)]] \), for all \( v \in V \). In particular, \( \text{Hom}_K(V, \mathcal{C}(K, L)) \) is finite dimensional. As a \( K \)-representation \( \text{Hom}_K(V, \mathcal{C}(K, L)) \otimes V \) is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of \( V \)'s. Since \( V \) is irreducible, the image of the evaluation map \( \text{Hom}_K(V, \mathcal{C}(K, L)) \otimes V \to \mathcal{C}(K, L) \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\otimes s} \). Now \( s \) is the dimension \( \text{Hom}_K(V, \mathcal{C}(K, L)) \), hence the kernel of the evaluation map is zero. Since the representations \( V_{l,k} \) corresponding to different pairs \((l, k)\) are non-isomorphic and absolutely irreducible, we deduce that (4) is injective.

The \( K \)-algebraic vectors of \( \mathcal{C}(K, L) \) are polynomials in the matrix entries and the inverse of the determinant. Functions \((a \ b \ c \ d) \mapsto a^i b^j c^m d^n (ad - bc)^{-r} + i, j, m, n, r \) non-negative integers build a basis for this space. Every such monomial can be realized as a sum of matrix coefficients of suitable \( V_{l,k} \)'s. To see this let \( V \) be a finite dimensional \( L \)-vector spaces with a continuous \( K \)-action. As already observed, a linear form \( \ell : V \to L \) defines a \( K \)-equivariant homomorphism \( \varphi_\ell : V \to \mathcal{C}(K, L), v \mapsto [g \mapsto \ell(gv)] \). If we fix \( v \in V \), then the function \( m_{v, \ell} : K \to L, m_{v, \ell}(g) = [\varphi_\ell(v)](g) = \ell(gv) \) is called a matrix coefficient. If we are given another linear form \( \ell' : V' \to L \), where \( V' \) is a finite dimensional \( L \)-vector spaces with a continuous \( K \)-action, then \( \ell \otimes \ell' \) is a linear form on \( V \otimes V' \) and we get that \( m_{v \otimes v', \ell \otimes \ell'}(g) = m_{v, \ell}(g)m_{v', \ell'}(g) \), for all \( g \in K \). A function mapping \((a \ b \ c \ d) \) to either \( a, b, c, \) or \( d \) maybe realized as a matrix coefficients of \( V = L^2 \) with the natural \( K \)-action. Hence, there exists a \( K \)-equivariant homomorphism \( \varphi : (L^2)^{\otimes r} \otimes \text{det} \to \mathcal{C}(K, L) \), such that the monomial considered above lies in the image of \( \varphi \). The tensor product decomposes into a direct sum of \( V_{l,k} \)'s, which proves the claim. Hence, the image
of \([2]\) contains the \(K\)-algebraic vectors in \(\mathcal{C}(K, L)\). The other inclusion is trivial. According to \([12]\) Prop.5.4.1 the density of \(K\)-algebraic vectors in \(\mathcal{C}(K, L)\) follows from the theory of Mahler expansions.

\[\Box\]

**Proposition 2.10.** Let \(\rho = (\text{Ind}^G_B \chi_1 \otimes \chi_2 \cdot |^{-1})_{ss}\) be a smooth principal series representation of \(G\), where \(\chi_1, \chi_2 : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^\times\) unramified characters with \(\chi_1 \not= \chi_2\). Let \(\Pi\) be the universal unitary completion of \(\rho \otimes V_{l,k}\). Then \(\Pi\) is an admissible, finite length \(L\)-Banach space representation of \(G\). Moreover, if \(\Pi\) is non-zero and we let \(\Pi^{ss}\) be the semi-simplification of the reduction modulo \(\varpi\) of an open bounded \(G\)-invariant lattice in \(\Pi\), then either \(\Pi^{ss}\) is irreducible supersingular, or

\[\Pi^{ss} \subseteq (\text{Ind}^G_B \delta_1 \otimes \delta_2 \omega^{-1})_{ss} \oplus (\text{Ind}^G_B \delta_2 \otimes \delta_1 \omega^{-1})_{ss},\]

for some smooth characters \(\delta_1, \delta_2 : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \rightarrow k^\times\), where the superscript \(ss\) indicates the semi-simplification.

**Proof.** If \(\Pi \neq 0\) then \(-(k + l) \leq \text{val}(\chi_1(p)) \leq -l, -(k + l) \leq \text{val}(\chi_2(p)) \leq -l\) and \(\text{val}(\chi_1(p)) + \text{val}(\chi_2(p)) = -(k + 2l)\). \([20]\) Lem.7.9, \([9]\) Lem.2.1. If both inequalities are strict and \(\chi_1 \neq \chi_2\) then it is shown in \([9]\) 5.3.3 that \(\Pi\) is non-zero, admissible and absolutely irreducible. The assertion about \(\Pi^{ss}\) then follows from \([2]\).

If both inequalities are strict, \(\chi_1 = \chi_2\) and \(\Pi\) is non-zero it is shown in \([18]\) Prop.4.2 that there exist \(\mathcal{O}\)-lattices \(M\) in \(\rho \otimes V_{l,k}\) and \(M' \otimes V_{l,k}\), where \(\rho' = (\text{Ind}^G_B \chi_1' \otimes \chi_2' \cdot |^{-1})_{ss}\) for some distinct unramified characters, \(\chi_1', \chi_2' : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^\times\) congruent to \(\chi_1, \chi_2\) modulo \(1 + (\varpi)\), such that both lattices are finitely generated \(\mathcal{O}[G]\)-modules and their reductions modulo \(\varpi\) are isomorphic. Since \(M\) is \(\mathcal{O}\)-torsion free, the completion of \(\rho \otimes V_{l,k}\) with respect to the gauge of \(M\) is non-zero, and since \(M\) is a finitely generated \(\mathcal{O}[G]\)-module, the completion is the universal unitary completion, \([9]\) Prop.1.17, thus is isomorphic to \(\Pi\). Let \(\Pi^0\) be the unit ball in \(\Pi\) with respect to the gauge of \(M\). Then \(\Pi^0/\varpi\Pi^0 \cong M/\varpi M \cong M'/\varpi M'\). Now by the same argument the completion of \(\rho' \otimes V_{l,k}\) with respect to the gauge of \(M'\) is the universal unitary completion of \((\rho' \otimes V_{l,k})\). Since \(\chi_1' \neq \chi_2'\) we may apply the results of Berger-Breuil \([3]\) to conclude that the semi-simplification of \(M'/\varpi M'\) has the desired form.

Suppose that either \(\text{val}(\chi_1(p)) = -l\) or \(\text{val}(\chi_2(p)) = -l\). If \(\chi_1 = \chi_2\) then this forces \(k = 1\), so that \(V_{l,k}\) is a character and \(\rho \otimes V_{l,k} \cong (\text{Ind}_B^G \chi \cdot | \otimes \chi^{-1})_{ss} \otimes \eta\), where \(\eta : G \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^\times\) is a unitary character. It follows from \([11]\) Lem.5.3.18 that the universal unitary completion of \(\rho \otimes V_{l,k}\) is admissible and of length 2. Moreover, \(\Pi^{ss} \cong \eta \otimes \text{Sp} \otimes \eta \cong (\text{Ind}_B^G \eta \otimes \eta)_{ss}\). If \(\chi_1 \neq \chi_2\cdot|\) it follows from \([3]\) Lem.2.2.1 that the universal unitary completion of \(\rho \otimes V_{l,k}\) is isomorphic to a continuous induction of a unitary character. Hence \(\Pi^{ss}\) is isomorphic to the semi-simplification of a principal series representation.

\[\Box\]

**Proof of Theorem 2.11** Let \((E, \|\cdot\|)\) be the unitary \(L\)-Banach space representation of \(G\) constructed in the proof of Theorem 2.8. Let \(E^0\) be the unit ball in \(E\), then by construction we have \(E^0/\varpi E^0 \cong \Omega\), where \(\Omega\) is a smooth \(k\)-representation of \(G\), satisfying the conditions of Proposition 2.3. Let \(V = \oplus \text{Hom}_k(V_{l,k}, E) \otimes V_{l,k}\), where the sum is taken over all \((l, k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}\). It follows from Corollary 2.6 and Proposition 2.9 that the natural map \(V \rightarrow E\) is injective and the image is dense. Let \(\{V^i\}_{i \geq 0}\) be any increasing, exhaustive filtration of \(\overline{V}\) by finite dimensional \(K\)-invariant subspaces. Then \(V^i \cap E^0\) is a \(K\)-invariant \(\mathcal{O}\)-lattice in \(V^i\), and we denote by \(\overline{V}^i\) its reduction modulo \(\varpi\). It follows from \([20]\) Lem.5.5 that the reduction
modulo $\varpi$ induces a $K$-equivariant injection $V^i \hookrightarrow \Omega$. The density of $V$ in $E$ implies that $\{V^i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is an increasing, exhaustive filtration of $\Omega$ by finite dimensional, $K$-invariant subspaces. Recall that $\Omega$ contains $\tau$ as a subrepresentation, see Proposition 2.3. Now $\tau$ is finitely generated as a $G$-representation, since it is of finite length. Thus we may conclude, that there exists a finite dimensional $K$-invariant subspace $W$ of $V$, such that $\tau$ is contained in the $G$-subrepresentation of $\Omega$ generated by $\varpi$.

Let $\varphi : V_{i,k} \to E$ be a non-zero $K$-equivariant, $L$-linear homomorphism. Let $R(\varphi)$ be the $G$-subrepresentation of $E$ in the category of (abstract) $G$-representations on $L$-vector spaces, generated by the image of $\varphi$. Frobenius reciprocity gives us a surjection $c \text{-}\text{Ind}_{KZ}^G \mathbf{1} \otimes V_{i,k} \twoheadrightarrow R(\varphi)$, where $\mathbf{1} : KZ \to L^\times$ is an unramified character, such that $(\mathbf{1}_p^0)$ acts trivially on $V_{i,k} \otimes \mathbf{1}$. Now $\text{End}_G(c \text{-}\text{Ind}_{KZ}^G \mathbf{1})$ is isomorphic to the ring of polynomials over $L$ in one variable $T$. It follows from the proof of [20, Cor.7.4] that the surjection factors through $c \text{-}\text{Ind}_{P(T)}^G \mathbf{1} \otimes V_{i,k} \twoheadrightarrow R(\varphi)$, for some non-zero $P(T) \in L[T]$.

Let $\tilde{R}$ be the (abstract) $G$-subrepresentation of $E$ generated by $W$, and let $\Pi$ be the closure of $\tilde{R}$ in $E$. Since $W$ is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of $V_{i,k}$’s, we deduce that if we replace $L$ by a finite extension there exists a surjection:

$$
\bigoplus_{i=1}^m c \text{-}\text{Ind}_{KZ}^G \mathbf{1}_i \otimes V_{i,k} \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{R},
$$

for some $a_i \in L$, $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(i_k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$. Let $\rho_i = \frac{c \text{-}\text{Ind}_{KZ}^G \mathbf{1}}{T - a_i}$, then using (9) we may construct a finite, increasing, exhaustive filtration $\{R^j\}_{j \geq 0}$ of $\tilde{R}$ by $G$-invariant subspaces, such that for each $j$ there exists a surjection $\rho_i \otimes V_{i,k} \twoheadrightarrow R^j/R^{j-1}$, for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. Moreover, by choosing $n_i$ and $m$ to be minimal, we may assume that $\text{Hom}_G(\rho_i \otimes V_{i,k}, R)$ is non-zero for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $\Pi^j$ be the closure of $R^j$ in $E$. We note that since $E$ is admissible, $\Pi^j$ is an admissible unitary $L$-Banach space representation of $G$, moreover the category $\text{Ban}_{G}^{\text{adm}}(L)$ is abelian. Since $R^j$ is dense in $\Pi^j$, its image is dense in $\Pi^j/\Pi^{j-1}$. Hence, for each $j$ there exists a $G$-equivariant map $\varphi_j : \Pi_i \otimes V_{i,k} \to \Pi^j/\Pi^{j-1}$ with a dense image. Let $\Pi_j$ be the universal unitary completion of $\rho_i \otimes V_{i,k}$. Since the target of $\varphi_j$ is unitary, we can extend it to a continuous $G$-equivariant map $\tilde{\varphi}_j : \Pi_i \to \Pi^j/\Pi^{j-1}$. Moreover, since the target of $\varphi_j$ is admissible and the image is dense, $\tilde{\varphi}_j$ is surjective.

For each closed subspace $U$ of $E$, we let $\overline{U}$ be the reduction of $(U \cap E^0)$ modulo $\varpi$. It follows from [20, Lem.5.5] that the reduction modulo $\varpi$ induces an injection $U \hookrightarrow \Omega$. Since $\Pi$ contains $W$, $\Pi$ will contain $\overline{W}$. Since $\Pi$ is $G$-invariant, it will contain $\tau$. Now $\{\overline{\Pi}^j\}_{j \geq 0}$ defines a finite, increasing, exhaustive filtration of $\overline{\Pi}$ by $G$-invariant subspaces. Since $\tau_2$ is an irreducible subquotient of $\tau$, there exists $j$, such that $\tau_2$ is an irreducible subquotient of $\overline{\Pi}^j/\overline{\Pi}^{j-1}$.

Each representation $\rho_i$ is an unramified principal series representation, considered in Proposition 2.10, see [5, Prop.3.2.1]. Hence, $\Pi_i$ is an admissible, finite length $L$-Banach space representation of $G$, moreover $\overline{\Pi}_i^{ss}$ is of finite length as described in Proposition 2.10. The surjection $\tilde{\varphi}_j : \Pi_i \to \Pi^j/\Pi^{j-1}$ induces a surjection $\overline{\Pi}_i^{ss} \twoheadrightarrow \overline{(\Pi^j/\Pi^{j-1})}^{ss}$. It follows from [20, Lem.5.5] that the semi-simplification of $\overline{\Pi}^j/\overline{\Pi}^{j-1}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{(\Pi^j/\Pi^{j-1})}^{ss}$. Thus $\tau_2$ is a subquotient of $\overline{\Pi}_i^{ss}$. 
Since $\text{Hom}_G(\rho \otimes V_{i,k}, \Pi)$ is non-zero, there exists a non-zero continuous $G$-invariant homomorphism $\varphi : \Pi_i \to \Pi$. Let $\Sigma$ be the image of $\varphi$. Since $\Pi_i$ and $\Pi$ are admissible, we have a surjection $\Pi_i \twoheadrightarrow \Sigma$ and an injection $\Sigma \hookrightarrow \Pi$ in the abelian category $\text{Ban}_G^{\text{adm}}(L)$. The surjection induces a surjection $\Pi_i^{ss} \twoheadrightarrow \Sigma^{ss}$. The injection induces an injection $\Sigma \hookrightarrow \Pi \hookrightarrow \Omega$. Since $\text{soc}_G \Omega \cong \pi_1$ by Corollary 2.11, and $\Sigma$ is non-zero, we deduce that $\pi_1 \cong \text{soc}_G \Sigma$. Hence, $\pi_1$ is a subquotient of $\Pi_i^{ss}$.

Lemma 2.11. Let $\kappa$ and $\lambda$ be smooth $k$-representations of $G$ and let $l$ be a finite extension of $k$. Then $\text{Ext}^i_G(\kappa, \lambda) \otimes_k l \cong \text{Ext}^i_g(\kappa \otimes_k l, \lambda \otimes_k l)$, for all $i \geq 0$, where the Ext groups are computed in $\text{Mod}_G^{\text{sm}}(k)$ and $\text{Mod}_G^{\text{sm}}(l)$, respectively.

Proof. The assertion for $i = 0$ follows from [21, Lem.5.1]. Hence, it is enough to find an injective resolution of $\lambda$ in $\text{Mod}_G^{\text{sm}}(k)$, which remains injective after tensoring with $l$. Such resolution may be obtained by considering $(\text{Ind}_{G}^{G}(1))_{\text{sm}}$, where $(1)$ is the trivial subgroup of $G$ and $V$ is a $k$-vector space. We note that $(\text{Ind}_{G}^{G}(1))_{\text{sm}} \otimes_k l \cong (\text{Ind}_{G}^{G}(1) V \otimes_k l)_{\text{sm}}$, since $l$ is finite over $k$.

Proof of Corollary 2.11. Lemma 2.11 implies that replacing $L$ by a finite extension does not change the blocks. It follows from Proposition 2.11 and Theorem 0.1 that an irreducible supersingular representation is in a block on its own. Let $\pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ be the semi-simple representation defined by [5], where $\delta_1, \delta_2 : \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \to k^\times$ are smooth characters. We have to show that all irreducible subquotients of $\pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ lie in the same block. We adopt an argument used in [8]. It follows from [5], 5.3.3.1, 5.3.3.2, 5.3.4.1 that there exists an irreducible unitary $L$-Banach space representation $\Pi$ of $G$, such that $\Pi^{ss} \cong \pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, then [8, Prop.VII.4.5(i)] asserts that we may choose an open bounded $G$-invariant lattice $\Theta$ in $\Pi$ such that $\Theta/\varpi\Theta$ is indecomposable. It follows from [11] that all the irreducible subquotients of $\Theta/\varpi\Theta$ lie in the same block.

We will list explicitly the irreducible subquotients of $\pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. It is shown in [11] that if $\delta_2\delta_1^{-1} \neq \omega^\pm 1$, 1 then

\begin{equation}
0 \to \delta_1 \otimes \det \to (\text{Ind}_G^G \delta_1 \otimes \delta_2 \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}} \to \text{Sp} \otimes \delta_1 \otimes \det \to 0
\end{equation}

if $\delta_2\delta_1^{-1} = \omega$. Taking this into account there are the following possibilities for decomposing $\pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ into irreducible direct summands depending on $\delta_1, \delta_2$ and $p$:

(i) If $\delta_2\delta_1^{-1} \neq \omega^\pm 1, 1$ then

$\pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} \cong (\text{Ind}_B^G \delta_1 \otimes \delta_2 \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}} \oplus (\text{Ind}_B^G \delta_2 \otimes \delta_1 \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}}$;

(ii) if $\delta_2 = \delta_1 = \delta$ then

(a) if $p > 2$ then $\pi\{\delta, \delta\} \cong (\text{Ind}_B^G \delta \otimes \delta \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}}$;

(b) if $p = 2$ then $\pi\{\delta, \delta\} \cong (\text{Sp}^{\otimes 2} \oplus 1^{\otimes 2}) \otimes \delta \circ \det$.

(iii) if $\delta_2\delta_1^{-1} = \omega^\pm 1$ then

(a) if $p \geq 5$ then $\pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} \cong (1 \oplus \text{Sp} \oplus (\text{Ind}_B^G \omega \otimes \omega^{-1})_{\text{sm}}) \otimes \delta \circ \det$;

(b) if $p = 3$ then $\pi\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} \cong (1 \oplus \text{Sp} \otimes \det \oplus \text{Sp} \otimes \omega \circ \det) \otimes \delta \circ \det$;

(c) if $p = 2$ then we are in the case (ii)(b), where $\delta$ is either $\delta_1$ or $\delta_2$.

Finally, we note that in the case (ii)(b) instead of using [5, 5.3.3.2], which is stated without proof, we could have observed that since (7) is non-split, $\text{Sp} \otimes \delta_1 \circ \det$ and $\delta_1 \circ \det$ lie in the same block. 

□
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