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Let $E_{n} \mid E$ be the degree $n$ unramified extension and $X_{n}:=X \otimes_{E} E_{n}$. Let $X_{n}^{\prime}:=X \otimes_{E} E\left(\pi^{1 / n}\right)$. There are two morphisms

$$
X_{n} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X} \text { and } X_{n}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}
$$

I think the following is true.
Proposition 1. The category of vector bundles on $\mathfrak{X}$ is equivalent to the category of vector bundles $\mathscr{E}$ on $X_{n}$ and $\mathscr{E}^{\prime}$ on $X_{n}^{\prime}$ together with an isomorphism of their pullback to $X \otimes_{E} E_{n}\left(\pi^{1 / n}\right)$.

The point would be the following. Consider

$$
X_{n} \times_{\mathfrak{X}} X_{n} \longrightarrow X_{n} \times_{X} X_{n}=\coprod_{\tau} X_{n}
$$

where $\tau \in \operatorname{Gal}\left(E_{n} \mid E\right)$. Now one has, with respect to this decomposition,

$$
X_{n} \times_{\mathfrak{X}} X_{n}=\coprod_{\tau} T_{\tau}
$$

where $T_{\tau} \rightarrow X_{n}$ is the $\mu_{n}$-torsor of isomorphisms between $\tau^{*} \mathcal{O}_{X_{n}}(1)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{X_{n}}(1)$ as $n$-roots of $\mathcal{O}_{X}(1)$. Now, the isomorphism class of this torsor lies in

$$
H^{1}\left(X_{n}, \mu_{n}\right)=E_{n}^{*} /\left(E_{n}^{*}\right)^{n}
$$

via the identification with $H^{1}\left(E_{n}, \mu_{n}\right)$ and Kummer theory.
Lemma 1. If $\tau=\sigma^{i}$, the preceding torsor is identified with the torsor of $n$-roots of $\pi^{-i}$.
Proof. The functor from $\mu_{n}$-torsors over $\operatorname{Spec}\left(E_{n}\right)$ toward the one over $X_{n}$ is an equivalence. Via the functors $\varphi-\bmod _{L} \rightarrow \operatorname{Bun}_{X}$ and $\varphi^{n}-\bmod _{L} \rightarrow \operatorname{Bun}_{X_{n}}$, the base change functor $\operatorname{Bun}_{X} \rightarrow \operatorname{Bun}_{X_{n}}$ is identified with $(D, \varphi) \mapsto\left(D,{\underset{\sim}{r}}^{n}\right)$. Moreover the identification $\tau^{*} \mathscr{E}\left(D, \varphi^{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathscr{E}\left(D, \varphi^{n}\right)$ is given by $\varphi^{i} \otimes 1:\left(D, \varphi^{n}\right) \otimes_{E_{n}, \sigma^{i}} E_{n} \xrightarrow{\sim}\left(D, \varphi^{n}\right)$.

Now, $\mathcal{O}_{X_{n}}(1)$ corresponds to the isocrystal $\left(L, \pi^{-1} \varphi^{n}\right)$ together with the identification $\left(L, \pi^{-1} \varphi^{n}\right)^{\otimes n}=$ $\left(L,\left(\pi^{-1} \varphi\right)^{n}\right)$. Moreover $\tau^{*} \mathcal{O}_{X_{n}}(1)$ corresponds to the same but with the preceding identification multiplied by $\pi^{-i}$. Thus, our torsor sends the étale $E$-algebra $A$ to the set of automorphisms of $\left(L, \pi^{-1} \varphi^{n}\right) \otimes_{E} A$ that respect the preceding identifications.

Thus,

$$
T_{\tau}=X \otimes_{E} E_{n}[T] /\left(T^{n}-\pi^{-i}\right)
$$

and in particular, $T_{\sigma}=X \otimes_{E} E_{n}\left(\pi^{1 / n}\right)$.
Now, we have to look at

$$
X_{n} \times_{\mathfrak{X}} X_{n} \times \mathfrak{X} X_{n} \longrightarrow \coprod_{\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}} X_{n}
$$

which, I think, is equal to

$$
\coprod_{\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}} T_{\tau_{1}} \times T_{\tau_{2}}
$$

together with morphisms from $T_{\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}}$ toward $T_{\tau_{1}}, T_{\tau_{2}}$ and $T_{\tau_{1} \tau_{2}}$. Try to conclude using this! Maybe I'm wrong, I don't know, the cocyle condition has to be written carefully.

