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Abstract

Let $F$ be a $p$-adic field, $E$ be a quadratic extension of $F$, and $D$ be an $F$-division algebra of odd index. Set $H = GL(m, D)$ and $G = GL(m, D \otimes_F E)$, we carry out a fine study of local intertwining open periods attached to $H$-distinguished induced representations of inner forms of $G$. These objects have been studied globally in [J-L-R.99] and [L-R.03], and locally in [B-D.08]. Here we give sufficient conditions for the local intertwining periods to have singularities. By a local/global method, we also compute in terms of Asai gamma factors the proportionality constants involved in their functional equations with respect to certain intertwining operators. As a consequence, we classify distinguished unitary and ladder representations of $G$, extending respectively the results of [M.14] and [G.15] for $D = F$, which both relied at some crucial step on the theory of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives. We make use of one of the main results of [BP.17] in our setting, which in the case of the group $G$, asserts that the Jacquet-Langlands correspondence preserves distinction. Such a result is for discrete series representations, but our method in fact allows us to use it only for cuspidal representations of $G$.
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1 Introduction

Let $H$ be a reductive group defined over some number field $k$, and let $\mathbb{A}$ be the ring of adeles of $k$. Let $l$ be a quadratic extension of $k$, and let $G = \text{Res}_{l/k}(H)$. Let $\theta$ be the non trivial element of $\text{Gal}(l)$ and suppose that it stabilizes a minimal parabolic subgroup $P_0$ of $G$. Let $P = \text{MU}$ be a standard parabolic subgroup of $G$ with standard Levi subgroup $M$, and suppose for simplification that $\theta(M) = M$. We denote by $\mathbb{Z}_M$ the connected center of $M$, and identify the dual of the complexification of the character group of $\mathbb{Z}_M$ with $\mathbb{C}^\times$ for some $t$. If $w$ is a Weyl involution stabilizing $M(\mathbb{A})$, we denote by $\mathbb{C}(w, -1)$ the space of $w$-anti-invariant vectors in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\sigma$ be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $M(\mathbb{A})$ which we suppose, for simplification in this introduction, has a trivial central character. Then to $\phi$ in $\text{Ind}_{P(l)}^G(\sigma)$ and certain Weyl involutions $w$ stabilizing $M$, Jacquet, Lapid and Rogawsky ([J-L-R.99] and [L-R.03]) attached the intertwining period $J(w, \phi, \mathfrak{a})$, which is a meromorphic function of the variable $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathbb{C}(w, -1)$. These intertwining periods appeared naturally in [J-L-R.99] and then [L-R.03], in the expression of the regularized $H(\mathfrak{a})$-periods of the Eisenstein series $E(\cdot, \phi, \mathfrak{a})$ on $G(\mathbb{A})$. In particular, writing $\sigma[\mathfrak{a}]$ for the twist of $\sigma$ with the unramified character of $M(\mathbb{A})$ attached to $\mathfrak{a}$, they define for almost all $\mathfrak{a}$ an $H(\mathfrak{a})$-invariant linear form on the space $\text{Ind}_{P(l)}^G(\sigma[\mathfrak{a}])$, and satisfy functional equations with respect to certain standard intertwining operators. These objects are powerful tools to study distinction globally, for example Offen used them in [O.06] and [O.06-2] to determine the residual spectrum of $\text{GL}(2n)$ distinguished by the symplectic group.

Here we are interested in local distinction for a very specific Galois pair. We consider $E/F$ a quadratic extension of $p$-adic fields, $D$ a division algebra of odd index over its center $F$, and set $H = \text{GL}(m, D)$ and $G = \text{GL}(m, D \otimes_F E)$. The group $H$ is the subgroup of $G$ fixed by the Galois involution $\theta$ of $E/F$. We classify $H$-distinguished and unitary representations of $G$, thus extending the results of [G.15] and [M.14] obtained for $D = F$. Both papers make use, at some crucial steps, of the theory of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives, which is not developed for non split $G$. In fact even if it was, it would probably not give as much information on distinction for the pair $(G, H)$ that it gives in the case of split $G$. To circumvent this difficulty, we use the local version of the intertwining periods defined above. Let’s be more specific and give the main point of our method, which already appears in a very elementary form in [M.17]. Let $P = MN$ be a standard parabolic subgroup of $G$, attached to a partition of the form $\mathfrak{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_t)$ of $m$, such that $m_{t+i-1} = m_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$, and let $w$ be the element of $\mathfrak{S}_t$ defined by $w(i) = t + 1 - i$, it acts on $M$ as follows: $w(\text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_t)) = \text{diag}(g_{w(1)}, \ldots, g_{w(t)})$. Setting $\theta_w = w \circ \theta \circ w$, if

$$\sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t$$

is a discrete series representation of $M$ such that $w(\sigma)^\vee = \sigma^{\theta}$, to $L \in \text{Hom}_{M_w}(\sigma, \mathbb{C}) - \{0\}$, Blanc and Delorme attach in [B-D.08] a non zero $H$-invariant linear form $J_{\sigma}(w, \mathfrak{a}, L)$ on $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma[\mathfrak{a}])$ which depends meromorphically on the variable $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathbb{C}(w, -1)$. For $\mathfrak{a}$ in general position, the space $\text{Hom}_H(\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma[\mathfrak{a}]), \mathbb{C})$ is of dimension 1, hence for any $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_t$ commuting with $w$, if $A(\tau, \mathfrak{a})$ is the standard intertwining operator from $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma[\mathfrak{a}])$ to $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma[\tau(\mathfrak{a})])$ (where $Q$ is the appropriate standard parabolic subgroup of $G$), there is a meromorphic function $\alpha(\mathfrak{a})$ such that

$$J_{\sigma}(w, A(\tau, \mathfrak{a}), \tau(\mathfrak{a}), L) = \alpha(\mathfrak{a}) J_{\sigma}(w, \mathfrak{a}, L).$$

Our first main result (Theorem 0.2) is to compute this function in terms of Asai gamma factors, when $t = 2r$ and $\tau = \tau_r := (r, r + 1)$. This is done using the functional equation of the global intertwining period of [J-L-R.99] and [L-R.03], and an unramified computation which follows the one done in [J-L-R.99] (Section 9.1). Notice that we do it only in the case $t = 2r$ and $\tau = \tau_r = (r, r + 1)$, but the same argument would give a similar expression for any $t \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$ and any $\tau$ commuting with $w$.

Then when $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$ is the standard module lying over a proper ladder representation $L$, there is up to scalar a unique non zero $H$-invariant linear form $\Lambda$ on $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$. This implies that $L$ is distinguished if and only if $\Lambda$ descends to $L$. When $t = 2r + 1$ is odd, this is equivalent to
\(\delta_{r+1}\) being distinguished, and the proof for split \(G\) given in [G.15] is valid. When \(t = 2r\), as \(L = J_\sigma(w,\ldots,\underline{0},L)\) \((J_\sigma(w,\ldots,\underline{0},L)\) is holomorphic at \(\underline{0}\) whenever \(\text{Ind}_{G}^G(\sigma)\)'s irreducible quotient is a ladder), the part of the proof for split \(G\) which is still valid shows that \(L\) is distinguished if and only if \(J_\sigma(w,\ldots,\underline{0},L)\) vanishes on the image of the regularized standard intertwining operator \(\mathcal{A}'(\tau_r,-\eta)\) from \(\text{Ind}_{G}^G(\tau_r(\sigma))\) to \(\text{Ind}_{G}^G(\sigma)\). Our second main result (Theorem 10.1) gives a sufficient condition for the intertwining \(J(w,\ldots,\underline{0},L)\) to have a singularity at \((0,\ldots,0,-a_r,a_r,0,\ldots,0)\). Combining this with our formula for \(\alpha\) as well as the knowledge of analytic properties of standard intertwining operators, we show in our third main result (Theorem 10.3) that \(L\) is distinguished if and only if the discrete series \(\delta\) corresponding to the segment which is the union of those corresponding to \(\delta_r\) and \(\delta_{r+1}\) is \(\eta\)-distinguished (here \(\eta\) is the quadratic character attached to the extension \(E/F\)).

Notice that we use [BP.17] Theorem 1, which asserts that a discrete series of \(G\) if and only if its Jacquet-Langlands transfer to the split form is distinguished. In particular, from what is known for the split form, the classification of proper ladders that we get is in terms of cuspidal distinguished representations (see Proposition 5.2). However we show in Section 10.4, using the ideas of our paper, that we only need Beuzart-Plessis’ result in the cuspidal case.

Finally, we classify in Section 10.6 the distinguished ladder (not necessarily proper) and unitary representations of \(G\).

It will be clear to the reader that the ideas of the paper also work when the index of \(D\) over \(F\) is even, however the double cosets \(P\backslash G/H\) \((P\) a standard parabolic subgroup of \(G\)) are different, and the results will not take the same form. We shall investigate this case later for sake of completeness.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank Erez Lapid for a very useful explanation/clarification concerning the paper [J-L-R.99]. We thank Ioan Badulescu for correcting a misconception that the author had concerning the global Jacquet-Langlands correspondence, and Guy Henniart for useful exchanges. We thank Raphaël Beuzart-Plessis for a useful comment concerning infinite products of \(\gamma\) factors. Most importantly we thank the referee for his extremely precise and useful comments and corrections, which allow this updated version to be much more correct. We thank the organizers of the conference "New Developments in Representation Theory" which took place in March 2016 at the National University of Singapore for their invitation, some of the ideas developed here first occurred there to the author. This work benefited from financial support of the grant ANR-13-BS01-0012FERPLAY. Finally, the author thanks M. and M. Planchat for fruitful conversations.

### 2 Notations and preliminaries

#### 2.1 Notations

We denote by \(\mathfrak{S}_n\) the symmetric group of degree \(n\). For \(w \in \mathfrak{S}_n\), we denote by \(\text{Inv}(w)\) the set of inversions of \(w\), i.e. the set couples \((i,j)\) of \(\{1,\ldots,n\} \times \{1,\ldots,n\}\) such that \(i < j\) but \(w(i) > w(j)\). By definition \(l(w)\) is the cardinality of \(\text{Inv}(w)\), it is known to be the length of \(w\) with respect to the set of generators of \(\mathfrak{S}_n\) given by the transpositions \((i,i+1)\). We denote by \(w_n\) the element of \(\mathfrak{S}_n\) of maximal length, which sends \(i\) to \(n+1-i\).

If \(V\) is a complex vector space, and \(v\) and \(w\) are two nonzero elements of \(V\), we write \(v \sim w\) if they span the same line. More generally if \(M\) is an \(R\)-module over some ring \(R\), and \(m\) and \(n\) are two nonzero elements of \(M\), we write \(m \sim R\ n\) if they are equal up to an invertible element of \(R\).

If \(G\) is a group, we denote by \(Z(G)\) or \(Z_G\) its center. If \(G\) acts on \(X\), we denote by \(X^G\) the set of points of \(X\) fixed by \(G\). If \(A\) is a ring (commutative or not, but always unital), we denote by \(\mathcal{M}_{n,m}(A)\) the space of \(n \times m\)-matrices with coefficients in \(A\), and set \(\mathcal{M}_n(A) = \mathcal{M}_{n,n}(A)\).
We denote by $G_n(A)$ the group of invertible elements in $\mathcal{M}_n(A)$. We will often consider $\mathfrak{S}_n$ as a subgroup of $G_n(A)$ via the permutation matrices. If we denote by $A_n(A)$ the diagonal subgroup of $G_n(A)$, and by $T_n(A)$ the center of $A_n(A)$, we will denote by $\alpha_i$ the simple root of $T_n(A)$ defined by $\alpha_i(a) = a_i/a_{i+1}$. It will sometimes be convenient to parametrize $T_n(A)$ as follows: let $Z_{i,n}(A) = \{\text{diag}(ai_1, i_{n-1}), \ a \in \mathbb{Z}(A)\}^+$, then

$$T_n(A) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} Z_{i,n}(A),$$

and

$$\alpha_i(z_1 \ldots z_n) = z_i.$$

We will most of the time drop the subscript $n$ in the notation $Z_{i,n}(A)$, i.e. write $Z_i(A)$ instead of $Z_{i,n}(A)$.

If $\pi = (n_1, \ldots, n_t)$ is a partition of $n$ (i.e. $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_t$ with the $n_i$ positive), we denote by

$$P_{\pi}(A) = P_{i_1, \ldots, i_t}(A)(A)$$

the subgroup of matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\begin{array}{ccc}
g_1 & * & * \\
\vdots & & \\
g_t & * & *
\end{array}
\end{pmatrix}$$

with $g_i \in G_{n_i}(A)$, and call $P_{\pi}(A)$ a standard parabolic subgroup of $G_n(A)$. We denote by $M_{\pi}(A)$ the standard Levi subgroup of $P_{\pi}(A)$, the elements of which are the matrices of the form $\text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_t)$ in $P_{\pi}(A)$, and we denote by $N_{\pi}(A)$ the subgroup of matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix}
I_{n_1} & * & * \\
\vdots & & \\
I_{n_t} & * & *
\end{pmatrix}$$

in $P_{\pi}(A)$. If $\pi = (1, \ldots, 1)$, we will write $B_n(A)$ for $P_{\pi}(A)$, and $N_n(A)$ for $N_{\pi}(A)$. The center of $M_{\pi}(A)$ is the group

$$Z_{n_1, n_1+n_2, \ldots, n_1+\cdots+n_{i-1}, n}(A) := Z_{n_1}(A)Z_{n_1+n_2}(A)\cdots Z_{n_1+\cdots+n_{i-1}}(A)Z_{n}(A).$$

We will sometimes, when convenient, replace the subscript $\pi$ in $P_{\pi}$, $M_{\pi}$, $N_{\pi}$, by the subscript $n_1, n_1 + n_2, \ldots, n_1 + \cdots + n_{t-1}, n$. For example $P_{\pi} = P_{n_1, n_1+n_2, \ldots, n_1+\cdots+n_{t-1}, n}$.

Notice that $M_{\pi}(A)$ being a product of linear groups, we can define in a similar fashion the standard parabolic subgroups of $M_{\pi}(A)$, and they correspond to sub-partitions of $\pi$. To $\pi$, we also associate an injection $w \mapsto w^{\pi}$ of the set $\mathfrak{S}_n$ into $\mathfrak{S}_{\pi}$, where $I_k$ is an interval on integers of length $n_k$, the permutation $w^{\pi}$ just permutates the intervals $I_k$ without changing the order inside such an interval. If the context allows it, we will most of the time remove the exponent $\pi$ of $w^{\pi}$. We say that a partition $\pi = (n_1, \ldots, n_t)$ is self-dual if $n_{w^{\pi}(i)} = n_i$ for all $i$ (remember that $w^{\pi}(i) = t + 1 - i$), in which case we say that the standard parabolic subgroup $P_{\pi}(A)$ is self-dual as well.

We will use the letter $\mathbb{K}$ to denote the fields $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, and we set $|.|_{\mathbb{K}}$ for the absolute value on $\mathbb{K}$, which is the usual one on $\mathbb{R}$, and defined by $|z|_{\mathbb{C}} = |z|$ on $\mathbb{C}$. We will use the letter $F$ to denote a $p$-adic field (a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$), and the letter $E$ to denote a quadratic extension of $F$). We denote by $\varpi_E$ (or simply $\varpi$) a uniformizer of $E$, by $\varpi_F$ a uniformizer of $F$, by $v_E$ (or just $v$) and $v_F$ the valuations on $E$ and $F$, and by $|.|_E$ (or just $|.|$) and $|.|_F$ the normalized absolute values. We denote by $O_E$ (or just $O$) and $O_F$ the respective integer rings, by $q$ or $q_F$ the residual cardinality $|0/\varpi_O|$ of $E$, and by $q_F$ that of $F$. We use the letter $k$ to denote a number field, and the letter $l$ to denote a quadratic extension of $k$. In both cases we denote by $\theta$ the corresponding Galois involution. We denote by $D_F$ a division algebra of center $F$, and of odd index over $F$ (the index being the integer which is the square root of the dimension of a division algebra over its center), in which case $D_F := D_F \otimes_F E$ (which we will also denote by $D$) is a division algebra with center $E$, and same index as $D_F$. We denote by $\text{Nrd}_E$ (or $\text{Nrd}$) and $\text{Nrd}_F$ the reduced norms on $\mathcal{M}_m(D_E)$ and $\mathcal{M}_m(D_F)$. We denote by $\nu_E$ (or $\nu$) the map $|.|_E \circ \text{Nrd}_E$, and set $\nu_F = |.|_F \circ \text{Nrd}_F$, and notice that $\nu_F = ((\nu_E) \circ \mathcal{M}_m(D_F))^{1/2}$. We also denote by $O_{D_F}$ the ring of integers (which is also
the maximal order) of $D_E$, and by $O_{D_F}$ that of $D_F$. Let $N_{E/F}$ be the norm map from $E$ to $F$, and $\eta_{E/F}$ be the quadratic character of $F^\times$ the kernel of which is $N_{E/F}(E^\times)$, we write $\eta$ for the character of $\text{GL}(m, D_F)$ equal to $\eta_{E/F} \circ Nrd_F$. We denote by $\mathbb{A}_k$ the ring of adeles of $k$, and by $\mathbb{A}_l$ that of $l$. We recall that we can view $\mathbb{A}_l$ as the restricted product $\prod l_v$ over the places $v$ of $k$, of the the algebras $l_v := l \otimes_k k_v$ ($k_v$ being the completion of $k$ with respect to $v$), and that either $l_v$ is a field (hence a quadratic extension of $k_v$) if $v$ remains nonsplit in $l$, or $l_v \simeq k_v \times k_v$ if $v$ splits in $l$.

2.2 Haar measures

If $G$ is a locally compact topological group, we denote by $\delta_G$ its modulus character, defined by the fact that $\delta^{-1}_G d_{G \times G}g$ is a right invariant Haar measure on $G$, if $d_{G \times G}g$ is a left invariant one (some authors define the modulus character of $G$ to be $\delta^{-1}_G$). We set $d_G$ to be a right invariant Haar measure on $G$, and most of the time omit the index $G$. More generally, if $H$ is a closed subgroup of $G$, then there is up to scalar a unique nonzero right invariant linear form on the space $C_c(H \setminus G, \delta^{-1}_G \delta_H)$.

\{f : G \to \mathbb{C}, \text{continuous with support compact mod } H, \ f(hg) = \delta^{-1}_G(h)\delta_H(h)f(g), h \in H, g \in G\},

which we will denote by $d_{H \setminus G}g$, or just by $dg$ again.

We recall that if $K < H < G$ is a chain of closed subgroups of $G$, then for $f \in C_c(K \setminus G, \delta^{-1}_G \delta_K)$ and $g \in G$, the map $h \mapsto f(hg)\delta_G(h)\delta_H(h)^{-1}$ belongs to $C_c(K \setminus H, \delta^{-1}_H \delta_K)$, and the map $f^{H, \delta_G \delta_H}$ defined (up to the choice of $d_H h$) by the equality

$$f^{H, \delta_G \delta_H}(g) = \int_{K \setminus H} f(hg)\delta_G(h)\delta_H(h)^{-1}d_{K \setminus H}h$$

belongs to $C_c(H \setminus G, \delta^{-1}_G \delta_H)$. We then have the formula (up to compatible normalizations):

$$\int_{H \setminus G} f^{H, \delta_G \delta_H}(g)dg = \int_{K \setminus G} f(g)dg,$$

which we can also write

$$\int_{H \setminus G} (\int_{K \setminus H} f(hg)\delta_G(h)\delta_H(h)^{-1}d_{H \setminus H}h)dg = \int_{K \setminus G} f(g)dg.$$

The above formula will tacitly be used a lot. In what follows, the Haar measures on the different subgroups of the general linear groups ($p$-adic, real, adellic) involved will be normalized by giving volume $1$ to maximal compact subgroups. In particular such the usual integration formulas with respect to Iwasawa decomposition (for example) will be valid.

3 Representations of real, $p$-adic, and adellic groups

If $\pi$ is a representation of a group or of an algebra, we will write $V_\pi$ for its underlying vector space, or even $\pi$. Moreover we will write $c_\pi$ for its central character whenever it has one.

3.1 Representations of $p$-adic groups

In this subsection we set $G = G_m = G_m(O_E)$, and $K = K_m = G_m(O_{D_E})$. Let $d$ be the index of $D_F$, see $D_E$ as a subalgebra of $M_d(E)$ such that $O_{D_E} \subset M_d(O_E)$, hence $G$ as a closed subgroup of $G_{md}(E)$ such that $K \subset G_{md}(E)$. We define the norm

$$\|g\| = max_{i,j} max(|g_{i,j}|_E, |(g^{-1})_{i,j}|_E)$$
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on $G_{ad}(O_E)$, hence on $G$. Note that $|.|$ is $G_{ad}(O_E)$-invariant on the left and on the right, its $\geq 1$ and satisfies $|g_1 g_2| \leq |g_1| |g_2|$ for $g_1$ and $g_2$ in $G_{ad}(E)$. Similarly we will write $A_m = A_m(D_E)$, $P_m = P_m(D_E)$, $N_m = N_m(D_E)$. We will only consider smooth complex representations of $G$ and its closed subgroups. We will denote by Ind and ind normalized smooth and compact smooth induction respectively. If $M$ is a standard Levi subgroup of $G$, and $M'$ is a standard Levi subgroup of $M$, we will denote by $\tau_{M',M}$ the normalized Jacquet functor. If $\pi$ is a representation of $M$ of finite length, then $\tau_{M',M}(\pi)$ as well, hence the center of $M'$ acts by a character on each irreducible subquotient of $\tau_{M',M}(\pi)$, we denote by $\mathcal{X}_{M'}(\pi)$ this set of characters of $Z(M')$. If $M = G$, and $M' = M_{i_1,\ldots,i_t}$, we will also denote $\mathcal{X}_{M'}(\pi)$ by $\mathcal{X}_{i_1,\ldots,i_t}(\pi)$.

If $\pi$ is a representation of a closed subgroup $L$ of $G$, we call coefficient of $\pi$ a map on $L$ of the form $l \mapsto \langle \pi(l)v, v' \rangle$ for $v \in \pi$, and $v'$ in the smooth dual $\pi^\vee$ of $\pi$. If $\pi$ is irreducible and has a coefficient which belongs to $L^2(L/Z(L))$, we say that $\pi$ is square integrable. If $\chi \otimes \pi$ is square integrable for some character of $L$, we say that $\pi$ is a discrete series representation of $L$.

If $\underline{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_t)$ is a partition of $m$ and $\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_t$ is a representation of $M = M_{\underline{m}} = P_{\underline{m}}/N_{\underline{m}}$, we set

$$\sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_t = \text{Ind}^{G_{\underline{m}}}_{M_{\underline{m}}}(\sigma) = \text{ind}^{G_{\underline{m}}}_{M_{\underline{m}}}(\sigma).$$

If $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t$ are discrete series (i.e. essentially square integrable) representations of $G_{m_i}$, such that $\text{Re}(c_{\delta_1}) \geq \text{Re}(c_{\delta_2})$, then the representation $\delta_1 \times \cdots \times \delta_t$ is called a standard module. By [S.78], it has a unique irreducible quotient $L(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t)$ (its Langlands’ quotient). The representation $\pi = L(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t)$ determines the set $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t\}$ uniquely, it is called the essentially square integrable support of $\pi$. Any irreducible representation $\pi$ of $G$ is obtained in that manner. If $D = F$, we say that $\pi = L(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t)$ is generic if $\pi = \delta_1 \times \cdots \times \delta_t$, in which case the product is necessarily commutative. We shall give a more usual definition of generic representations in Section 6.

Finally we will need some uniform control on the asymptotic behaviour of matrix coefficients of parabolically induced representations. We refer to the beginning of Section 7.1 the definition of flat sections, and the notations $f_{\underline{x}}, \eta_{\underline{x}}$.

**Lemma 3.1.** For $i = 1, \ldots, t$, let $\pi_i$ be a finite length representation of $G_{m_i}$, let $f_{\underline{x}}$ be a flat section for

$$\pi_{\underline{x}} = \nu^{s_1} \pi_1 \times \cdots \times \nu^{s_t} \pi_t$$

and $h_{\underline{x}}$ be a flat section for

$$\pi_{\underline{y}} = \nu^{-s_1} \pi'_{1} \times \cdots \times \nu^{-s_t} \pi'_{t}.$$

Set $G = G_{m_1 + \cdots + m_t}$, $P = P_{(m_1, \ldots, m_t)}$, and define the coefficient $c_{\underline{x}}$ of $\pi_{\underline{x}}$ by:

$$c_{\underline{x}}(g) = \int_{P \backslash G} < f_{\underline{x}}(xg), h_{\underline{x}}(x) > dx$$

where $< \ldots, \ldots >$ is the natural duality between $V_{\pi_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\pi_t}$ and $V_{\pi_1}' \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\pi_t}'$. Then there is $C > 0$ and $a$ and $b \geq 0$ such that for any $g \in G$:

$$|c_{\underline{x}}(g)| \leq C ||g||^a \max(\{\text{Re}(s_i)\})^b.$$

**Proof.** We set $f = f_0$, $h = h_0$ and $c = c_0$. By the Iwasawa decomposition, we have

$$c_{\underline{x}}(g) = \int_{P \cap K} < f_{\underline{x}}(kg), h_{\underline{x}}(k) > dk = \int_{P \cap K} \eta_{\underline{x}}(kg) < f(kg), h(k) > dk$$

We write the Iwasawa decomposition $kg = pk'v$ for $k \in K$, with $p = mn$, $m = \text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_t)$, $n \in N_{(m_1, \ldots, m_t)}$ and $k' \in K$. Using that $||| \cdot ||| \geq 1$:

$$|\eta_{\underline{x}}(kg)| = \prod_j \nu(g_j)^{\text{Re}(s_j)} \leq \prod_j ||g_j||^{\text{Re}(s_j)} \leq \left( \prod ||g_j|| \right)^{\max_j \text{Re}(s_j)}$$

7
\[ \leq ||m||_{\text{max}} \cdot |\text{Re}(s)| \leq ||p||_{\text{max}} \cdot |\text{Re}(s)| = ||g||_{\text{max}} \cdot |\text{Re}(s)|. \]

We obtain
\[ |v_{\pm}(g)| \leq ||g||_{\text{max}} \cdot |\text{Re}(s)| \int_{P \cap K} | | f(kg), h(k) > | dk. \]

Both \( f(K) \) and \( h(K) \) are finite sets, which we respectively denote \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_l\} \) and \( \{w_1, \ldots, w_r\} \). Again we write the Iwasawa decomposition \( kg = pk' \) of \( kg \) for \( k \in K \), with \( p = mn \) and \( k' \in K \).

Then \( | < f(kg), h(k) > | \) is one of the \( \delta_p(m)^{1/2} < \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_l(m) v_i, w_j > |. \) But by [W.03 Corollary I.4.4], there is \( A > 0 \) and \( b \geq 0 \), independent of \( i, j \) and \( m \) such that such that
\[ \delta_p(m)^{1/2} < \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_l(m) v_i, w_j > | \leq A ||m||^b. \]

Hence
\[ | < f(kg), h(k) > | \leq A ||m||^b \leq A ||g||^b \]

as we already saw for the second inequality. The statement follows. \( \square \)

### 3.2 Representations of real groups

In this paragraph, \( G = G_n \) will stand for \( \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{K}) \), for \( \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R} \) or \( \mathbb{C} \). Let \( \pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_l) \) be a partition of \( n \), and write \( P_\pi = P_\pi(\mathbb{K}), M_\pi = M_\pi(\mathbb{K}) \).... If \( \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}, K = K_0 \) will denote the compact orthogonal group \( \text{O}(n, \mathbb{R}) \), whereas it will denote the unitary group \( \text{U}(n, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}) \) if \( \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C} \). We will consider finitely generated admissible (which is the same as finite length) \( \text{Lie}(G), K \)-modules, as in Section 3.3 of [W.88], or more generally finitely generated admissible \( \text{Lie}(M), K \cap M \)-modules for standard Levi subgroups \( M \) of \( G \). We will call such modules Harish-Chandra modules of \( M \).

We will also need to consider finitely generated smooth admissible Fréchet modules of moderate growth (see W.88 Section 1) and [W.92 Chapter 11] for the definition) of \( M \), we will call such modules Casselman-Wallach representations. By the Casselman-Wallach globalization theorem ([CS9], [W.88], [W.92] Chapter 11), it is known that if \( \tau \) is a Harish-Chandra module of \( M \), there is up to isomorphism a unique Casselman-Wallach representation \( \pi_\tau^\infty \), such that \( \pi_\tau \) is the subspace \( \pi_{K \cap M} \) of \( K \cap M \)-finite vectors in \( \pi \), and that the map \( \pi \mapsto \pi_\tau^\infty \) is an equivalence between the categories of \( M \)-Harish-Chandra modules and Casselman-Wallach representations of \( M \), the quasi-inverse of which is given by \( \tau \mapsto \pi_{K \cap M} \). It is shown in these references that one can always realize \( \pi_\tau^\infty \) as the dense subspace of smooth vectors in some Hilbert representation \( \pi_\tau \) (a continuous representation of \( M \) in a Hilbert space), and in fact the space of smooth vectors in any Hilbert completion of \( \pi \) provides a model for \( \pi_\tau^\infty \).

As Casselman-Wallach representations are nuclear Fréchet spaces, the injective and projective completed tensor products of two such representations \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) are the same, and we denote it by \( V_1 \hat{\otimes} V_2 \). If \( \pi_\tau^\infty = \pi_1^\infty \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_l^\infty \) is a Casselman-Wallach representation of \( M = M_\pi = P_\pi/N_\pi \), we set
\[ \sigma_1^\infty \times \cdots \times \sigma_l^\infty = \text{Ind}_{\pi_\tau}^{G_\tau}(\sigma^\infty), \]

where here \( \text{Ind}_{\pi_\tau}^{G_\tau} \) stands for normalized smooth parabolic induction as in Section 2.4 of [A-G-S.15]. If \( \sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_l \) is an \( M \)-Harish-Chandra module, we then set
\[ \text{Ind}_{\pi_\tau}^{G_\tau}(\sigma) = \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_l := (\sigma_1^\infty \times \cdots \times \sigma_l^\infty)_{K}. \]

### 3.3 Automorphic representations

We recall that the notations \( k, l, \theta \) and others have been introduced in Section 2.1. We fix \( \mathcal{D} \) a division algebra with center \( k \) of odd index \( d \), so that the \( l \)-central simple algebra \( \mathcal{D}_l = \mathcal{D} \otimes_k l \) is again a division algebra. For each place \( v \) of \( k \), we set \( D_v = \mathcal{D} \otimes_k k_v \), and we say that \( \mathcal{D} \) is split at \( v \) if \( D_v \simeq M(d, k_v) \), it is in fact split at all places except a finite number. We suppose that \( \mathcal{D} \) is split at the infinite places of \( k \). In any case, \( D_v \) is always of the form \( M(d', D_v) \) for \( D_v \) a \( k_v \)-division algebra, and with our conventions from Section 2.1, one has
$G_m(D_v) = \mathcal{M}(m, D_v)^\times = \mathcal{M}(md', D_v)^\times$. With this identification we set $O_{D_v}$ to be $\mathcal{M}(d', O_{D_v})$ for $O_{D_v}$ the ring of integers of $D_v$. We recall that $l_v = k_v \otimes_k l$, and we set $D_v' = D_v \otimes_k l = D \otimes_k l_v$.

If $v$ splits in $l$, then $l_v \simeq k_v \times k_v$ and we identify $O_v$ with $O_{k_v} \times O_{k_v}$. We then define $O_{D_v}'$ by the equality $O_{D_v}' = O_{D_v} \otimes_{O_{k_v}} O_{k_v}$. We denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the ring of adeles of $k$. In this context, by definition

$$G = G_m := G_m(\mathcal{D} \otimes_k \mathcal{A}) = G_m(\mathcal{D} \otimes_l \mathcal{A})$$

is the restricted direct product of the groups $G_v = G_{m,v} = G_m(D'_v)$ (with respect to the compact open subgroups $K_v = K_{m,v} = G_m(O_{D_v})$). More generally, if $S$ is a subset of $G$, we set $S_v = S \cap G_v$. Extending $\theta$ to $G$ in the natural manner, the subgroup $H = G^\theta = G_m(\mathcal{D} \otimes_k \mathcal{A}_k)$ is thus restricted direct product of the groups $H_v = H_{m,v} = G_m(D_v)$ (with respect to the compact open subgroups $K_v^\theta = G_m(O_{D_v})$). We set $G_\infty = \prod_{v | \infty} G_v$, and we identify each $G_v$ in the product to $G_{md}(\mathbb{K})$ for $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, depending of whether $v$ splits or not. We set $K_\infty$ to be the corresponding product of the maximal compact subgroups $O(md, \mathbb{R}) \times O(md, \mathbb{R})$ or $U(md, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R})$ of $G_{md}(\mathbb{K})$. We denote by $K$ the product of $K_\infty$ with the product over $v$ finite of the groups $G_m(O_{D_v})$.

On each $G_v$, the reduced norm $Nrd_{G_v}$ (with values in $l_v$) gives birth to $Nrd_G = \prod_v Nrd_{G_v}$ with values in $\mathcal{A}_1^\times$, and we set $\nu = \nu_{l_v} : g \mapsto |Nrd_{G_v}(g)|_{l_v}$.

If $M = M_{m_1, \ldots, m_l}(\mathcal{D} \otimes_k \mathcal{A}_k)$ is a standard Levi subgroup of $G$, then $Z_M \simeq (\mathcal{A}_1^\times)^l$. We denote by $M^1$ the kernel of the homomorphism

$$\text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_l) \in M \mapsto (\nu(g_1), \ldots, \nu(g_l)) \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^l.$$  

We recall that by definition $l_v = k_v \otimes_k l = \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} l$, and denote by $A_M$ the subgroup of $Z_{M,\infty}$ corresponding to $\langle \mathbb{R}_{>0} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1 \rangle^l$ through the isomorphism above, in particular $M = A_M \times M^1$.

To stick with the frame of [J-L-R.99] and [L-R.03], that we shall refer to a lot, we now consider $\sigma$ a $M \cap K$-finite cuspidal automorphic representation of $M$ ([B-S.74], 4.6). However we shall need to use other results which are written for smooth or $L^2$ automorphic representations. We denote by $\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty$ its smooth completion in the space of smooth cuspidal automorphic forms, and if $\sigma$ is unitary, we denote by $\check{\Sigma}_\sigma$ its completion in the space of $L^2$-cuspidal automorphic forms.

We denote by $\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty$ and by $\check{\Sigma}_\sigma$ the corresponding representations of $M$. If $P = MN$ is the standard parabolic subgroup of $G$ with standard Levi $M$, we define $\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty)$ to be the space of smooth functions from $G(\mathcal{A})$ to $\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty$ satisfying:

$$f(mng)(. ) = \delta^{1/2}(m)f(g)(. m).$$  

We denote by $\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma)$ the subspace of $K$-finite vectors inside $\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty)$. For $f \in \text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty)$, we denote by $f$ the map from $G$ to $\mathbb{C}$ defined by the equality:

$$\forall g \in G, \ f(g) = f(g)(I_v).$$

The map $f \mapsto \check{f}$ is injective from $\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty)$ to its image, and we identify $\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma^\infty)$ with this image, as well as $\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma)$.

Denoting by $A_P(G)_\sigma$ the space of functions $\phi$ from $M(k)N(\mathcal{A}_k)G(\mathcal{A})$ to $\mathbb{C}$, such that for all $k \in K$, the map $m \mapsto \phi(mk)$ belongs to $V_\sigma$, then the vector space $\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma)$ is a subspace of $A_P(G)_\sigma$.

If $\sigma$ decomposes as a module of the global Hecke algebra of $M$:

$$\sigma \simeq \otimes_v \sigma_v,$$

then

$$\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma) \simeq \otimes_v \text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma_v).$$

If $\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_t$, we will again use the notation

$$\text{Ind}_P^G(\check{\Sigma}_\sigma) = \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_t.$$
If \( \sigma \) is unitary, there is also a natural definition for
\[
\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma) = \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_t,
\]
its subspace of smooth vectors being \( \text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma^\infty) \), and its subspace of \( K \)-finite vectors being \( \text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma) \).

4 Local and global Jacquet Langlands correspondence

We state here results from \([Z.80]\), \([D-K-V.84]\), \([T.90]\), \([B.07]\) and \([B.08]\) about discrete series representations of \( G \) in the \( p \)-adic and adelic case, and the Jacquet-Langlands correspondence. Notice that we will use the letter \( G \) for the possibly non split forms of \( \text{GL}(n) \), and \( G' \) for the split form, which is the opposite convention to that used in \([B.08]\) for example.

4.1 The local correspondence

The results here are extracted from \([Z.80]\), \([D-K-V.84]\), and \([T.90]\), we refer to \([D-K-V.84]\) for the definition of the Jacquet-Langlands correspondence. Here \( G_m = \text{GL}(m, D_E) \) is as in Section 3.1, and we set \( n = md \), and \( G_n = \text{GL}(n, E) \). If \( \rho' \) is a cuspidal representation of \( G_n' \), and \( a \leq b \) are two real numbers equal modulo \( \mathbb{Z} \), and if \( \Delta' \) is the cuspidal segment \( \{a, b\} = \{\nu^b \rho', \ldots, \nu^b \rho'\} \), we denote by \( \delta' = L(\Delta') \) the unique irreducible quotient of the induced representation \( \nu^b \rho' \times \cdots \times \nu^b \rho' \).

If \( a = \frac{1}{m} \), and \( b = \frac{1}{n} \), we will also write \( \text{St}_k(\rho') \) for \( L(\Delta') \). If \( \rho' \) is unitary, then \( \text{St}_k(\rho') \) is a unitary discrete series (equivalently square-integrable) representation, and all unitary discrete series are obtained in this manner. Now if \( \rho \) is a cuspidal representation of \( G_m \), then its Jacquet-Langlands transfer \( JL(\rho) \) to \( G_n' \) is of the form \( \text{St}_l(\rho') \) for a unique \( l \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \) and a unique cuspidal representation of \( G_n' \), and we set \( l = 1 \) (it is known that \( l \) divides \( d \) and is coprime to \( m \)). This allows to extend the notion of cuspidal segment to \( G_m \): if \( \rho \) is a cuspidal representation of \( G_m \) with \( l = 1 \), and \( c \leq d \) two real numbers equal modulo \( \mathbb{Z} \), then \( \Delta' = [c, d] \) is the set \( \{\nu^c \rho, \ldots, \nu^d \rho\} \). The induced representation \( \nu^c \rho \times \cdots \times \nu^d \rho \) has a unique irreducible quotient \( \delta = L(\Delta) \), we set \( l = l_\rho \). If \( c = \frac{1}{l_\rho} \), and \( d = \frac{1}{l_\rho} \), we also write \( \text{St}_k(\rho) \) or for \( L(\Delta) \). If \( \rho \) is unitary, then \( \text{St}_k(\rho) \) is a unitary discrete series representation, and all unitary discrete series are obtained in this manner. If \( \rho \) is a cuspidal representation of \( G_m \) such that \( JL(\rho) = \text{St}_l(\rho') \), then for all \( r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), one has \( JL(\text{St}_r(\rho)) = \text{St}_{rl}(\rho') \).

4.2 The global correspondence

We now recall a particular case of the main result of \([B.08]\). Denote by \( \mathcal{P}(k) \) the set of places of \( k \), and by \( \mathcal{P}(l) \) of \( l \). We recall that \( A = \mathbb{A}_l \), and set \( G = G_m = G_m(\mathfrak{D}_l \otimes A) = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{P}(k)} G_v \) as in Section 3.1. Here it will in fact be more convenient to write \( G = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{P}(l)} G_v \), as the fact that \( l \) is a quadratic extension of \( k \) plays no role. We also set \( G' = G_n = G_n(\mathbb{A}_l) = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{P}(l)} G_v' \). Notice that we allow the case \( G = G' \) in what follows. For \( c \) a unitary character of \( A \times /l^{1/2} \), we denote by \( L^2(\mathbb{A}^\times \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{m}_m(\mathcal{D}_l)) \mathcal{G}, c \) the space of functions \( f \) on \( G_m(\mathcal{D}_l) \mathcal{G} \), transforming by \( c \) under the center of \( G \), and such that \( |f|^2 \) is integrable on \( \mathbb{A}^\times \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{m}_m(\mathcal{D}_l) \mathcal{G} \). We call \( \tau \) a square integrable representation of \( G \) if it is an irreducible subspace (in the topological sense) of \( L^2(\mathbb{A}^\times \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{m}_m(\mathcal{D}_l)) \mathcal{G}, c \) for some such unitary character \( c \). If \( \rho \) is a unitary cuspidal representation of \( G \) (in the \( K \)-finite sense), then \( \mathfrak{m} \) is square integrable.

For \( \pi \) a unitary cuspidal representation of \( G \), by \([B.08]\) Theorem 5.1, there exists a square integrable representation \( JL_{w}(\pi) \) of \( G' \) such that for all places \( w \) where \( G_w \) is split (i.e. \( \mathcal{D}_w \) is split), then \( \pi_w = \pi_w = JL_{w}(\pi) \). In fact, if \( W \) is the finite set of finite places such that \( \mathcal{D}_w = \mathcal{D}_l \otimes w \) is non split, by \([B.08]\) Proposition 5.5 together with \([B.08]\) Theorem 5.1, a unitary cuspidal representation \( \pi'_w \) of \( G' \) is such that \( \pi_w = \text{JL} \) is equal to \( JL_{w}(\pi) \) for a (unique) unitary (necessarily) cuspidal representation \( \pi \) of \( G \), if and only if for all \( w \in W \), the representation \( \pi'_w \) is \( d \)-compatible.
In the real affine line \( \subset \) is the flat section (see \[B.08\] Section 2.7). In this case we set \( \pi' = JL(\pi) \), notice that \( \pi' \) is the space of \( K' \)-finite vectors in \( JL(\pi) \). We don’t recall the definition of \( d \)-compatible here but if \( \pi'_w \) is square integrable, then it is \( d \)-compatible; that is all that we need to know. Hence suppose that for all \( w \in W \), the representation \( \pi'_w \) is square integrable, then \[B.08\] Theorem 5.1 tells us that for all places \( w \in W, \pi_w \) is square integrable, and for all such places (hence for all \( w \in \mathcal{P}(l) \) if we set \( JL \) to be the identity for places outside \( W \)), one has \( JL(\pi)_w = JL(\pi_w) = \pi'_w \).

### 4.3 A globalization result

In this section, we explain how to globalize a finite number of local discrete series representations as local components of cuspidal automorphic representations of \( GL(n) \). It seems well-known that this result is true for general reductive groups, and for local cuspidal representations, the proof can be found in \[H.83\] Appendix 3. For local discrete series representations and a general reductive group, we could not find a written proof if the number of these discrete series is greater than one (\[C.91\] Corollary 8). For \( GL(n) \), the arguments of \[A-C.89\] Lemma 6.5 prove the result. More details about the proof sketch of \[A-C.89\] Lemma 6.5 are given \[C.96\] Lecture 9, Theorem 2.1, which we follow, expand, and precise. In particular we explain why a pseudo-coefficient of a discrete series representation of \( GL(n) \) kills the trace of any generic (rather than tempered) representation not isomorphic to it. Notations are as in Section 4.2.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let \( \pi \) be a cuspidal representation of \( G' \), such that for each \( w \in S \), one has \( \pi_w \simeq \sigma_w \).

Proof. We set \( S' = S \cup w' \), where \( w' \) is another finite place of \( l \), and we fix \( \delta_w \), a cuspidal representation of \( G_w' \) with central character \( c_w \). For \( w \) a place of \( l \), \( \gamma_w \) an elliptic element of \( G_w' \) (i.e. with irreducible characteristic polynomial) with centralizer \( G_w'(\gamma_w) \), and \( f_w \in I_w = \mathcal{C}_c(Z_w \backslash G_w', c_w^1) \), we set \( O(\gamma_w, f_w) = \int_{G_w'(\gamma_w) \backslash G_w'} f_w(g^{-1} \gamma_w) dg \) (such an integral is known to converge absolutely).

For each \( w \in S' \), by \[K.86\] Theorem K] or \[C.89\] Proposition 6], there is a function \( f_w \in I_w \) called a pseudo-coefficient of \( \delta_w \), such that \( \text{Tr}(\sigma_w(f_w)) = 0 \) for any tempered representation \( \sigma_w \) with central character \( c_w \) not isomorphic to \( \delta_w \), whereas \( \text{Tr}(\delta_w(f_w)) = 1 \). More generally, let \( \sigma_w \) be a non tempered generic representation of \( G_w' \) with central character \( c_w \). One can write \( \sigma_w = \otimes_{i=1}^t \chi_{\nu_i}^{r_i} \delta_i \), with \( t \geq 2 \), the \( \delta_i \)’s being square integrable, and the \( r_i \)’s being real numbers not all equal to zero. Moreover as \( c_w \) is unitary, one has \( \sum_{i=1}^t r_i = 0 \), and \( c_w = \prod_{i=1}^t c_{\nu_i} \). In this situation the representation \( \sigma_w \) (see the beginning of Section 4.1) is tempered for \( s \) in the real affine line \( \mathbb{R} \cup i \mathbb{R} \subset i \mathbb{R}' \). However, if \( f_w \in I_w \) (see again the beginning of Section 4.1), then the map \( \text{Tr}(\sigma_w(f_w)) \) is holomorphic in the variable \( s \), and as it is zero for \( s \in -\infty + i \mathbb{R} \subset i \mathbb{R} \), it is zero for all \( s \), hence \( \text{Tr}(\sigma_w(f_w)) = 0 \) for any generic representation \( \sigma_w \) with central character \( c_w \) not isomorphic to \( \delta_w \). For \( w \in S', f_w \) a pseudo-character and \( \gamma_w \) an elliptic element in \( G_w' \), it is known that \( O(\gamma_w, f_w) \sim \chi_{\delta_w}(\gamma_w) \) where \( \chi_{\pi} \) is the Harish-Chandra character of \( \pi \), and it is also known that for some elliptic \( \gamma_w \), the value of \( \chi_{\delta_w}(\gamma_w) \) is non zero. In particular, as a function of \( \gamma_w \) in the elliptic set, it is locally constant and non zero for some elliptic element \( \gamma_w \). A pseudo-coefficient \( f_w' \) of \( \delta_w \) can be taken to be any coefficient of \( \delta'_w \). We fix such pairs \( (f_w, \gamma_w) \) for \( w \in S' \), with \( f_w' \) a coefficient of \( \delta'_w \).

By the weak approximation theorem, we can take \( \gamma \in G_n(l) \), close enough to all \( \gamma_w \) for \( w \in S' \), so that \( O(\gamma, f_w') \neq 0 \) for \( w \in S' \). For \( w'' \) a fixed finite place not in \( S' \), we take \( f_w'' \in I_{w''} \) with support in the elliptic set of \( G_{w''} \), such that \( O(\gamma, f_{w''}) \neq 0 \). Denoting by \( S_f \) the set of finite places of \( l \) and \( S'' = S' \cup \{w''\} \) for all \( w \in S_f - S'' \) outside a finite subset \( S_h \), \( S_f - S'' \), the element \( \gamma \) belongs to \( K'' \), and \( c_w \) is unramified, we take \( f_w \) to be the only element in \( I_w \) supported on \( Z_w K''_w \), and equal to 1 on \( K''_w \) for \( w \in S(\gamma) = S_f - (S'' \cup S_h) \). We choose \( f_w \in I_w \) such that \( O(\gamma, f_w) \neq 0 \) for \( w \in S(\gamma) \) (notice that \( S(\gamma) \) could be empty).

At this point, we notice the following fact. We say that an element \( h \) of \( G' \) has a characteristic polynomial \( \chi_h \) if \( \chi_h \in l[X] \) and \( \chi_{h_w} = \chi_h \) for all \( w \in \mathcal{P}(l) \). For each \( w \in S'' \cup S(\gamma) \), we choose
a compact open subset \( C_w \) of \( G_w \) such that \( \text{supp}(f_w) \subset Z_w \cap C_w \). Then there exists a lattice \( L \) of \( l \) such that the elements \( h \) of \( G' \) with a characteristic polynomial, and such that \( h_w \) belongs to \( C_w \) for \( w \in S' \cup S'' \) and to \( M_n(O_w) \) for \( w \in S(\gamma) \), have their characteristic polynomial \( \chi_h \) with coefficients in \( L \). Hence, it is possible to choose, for each \( w \) in the set \( S_\infty \) of infinite places, a small enough open neighborhood \( C_w \) of \( \gamma \) in \( G' \), such that if \( h \in G' \) has a characteristic polynomial and satisfies \( h_w \in C_w \) for \( w \in \mathcal{P}(l) - S(\gamma) \) and \( h_w \in M_n(O_w) \) for \( w \in S(\gamma) \), then \( \chi_h = \chi_\gamma \). We choose \( f_w \in I_w \) for \( w \in S_\infty \) with \( \text{supp} \) in \( Z_w \cap C_w \) and such that \( O(\gamma, f_w) \neq 0 \).

With such choices, setting \( f = \prod_{w \in \mathcal{P}(l)} f_w \), the global orbital integral \( O(\gamma, f) \) is non zero, as it is the product of the nonzero local orbital integrals. Now if \( \nu \) is another element of \( G_\nu(l) \) such that \( O(\nu, f) \neq 0 \), then \( \nu \) is conjugate in \( G' \) to an element \( h \in \text{supp}(f) \), and \( h \) has a characteristic polynomial which is equal to \( \chi_\nu \). For all places \( w \) in \( S(\gamma) - S_\mu \), where \( S_\mu \) is a possibly empty finite subset of \( S(\gamma) \), one has \( h_w \in K'_w \subset M_n(O_w) \). For \( w \in S_\mu \), there is \( \lambda_w \in l_w^\times \) such that \( \lambda_w h_w \in K'_w \), and for \( w \in S'' \cup S_\gamma \), there is also \( \lambda_w \in l_w^\times \) such that \( \lambda_w h_w \in C_w \). By the so called approximation lemma, there is \( \lambda \in l \), close enough to \( \lambda_w \) for \( w \in S'' \cup S_\gamma \), and which belongs to \( O_w \) if \( w \in S(\gamma) - S_\mu \), such that \( \lambda h \) belongs to \( C_w \) for all \( w \in S'' \cup S_\gamma \), and to \( M_n(O_w) \) for \( w \in S(\gamma) \). This implies that \( \chi_\lambda h = \chi_\gamma \), hence that \( \chi_{\lambda \nu} = \chi_\gamma \). As \( \gamma \) is elliptic, this implies that \( \lambda \nu \) and \( \gamma \) are conjugate inside \( G_\nu(n) \), hence that \( \overline{\gamma} \) and \( \overline{\theta} \) are conjugate in \( G_\nu(n)/Z(n) \).

To conclude, we notice that the simple trace formula given in [1.33 4.9, p. 61] applies to \( f \), and the only remaining term on the right hand side is a non zero multiple of the global orbital integral \( O(f, \gamma) \neq 0 \). Considering the left hand side, this implies that there is a cuspidal representation \( \pi \) of \( G' \) such that \( \text{Tr}(\pi(f)) \) is non zero. In particular for all \( w \in S \), \( \text{Tr}(\pi_w(f_w)) \) is non zero, but as \( \pi_w \) is unitary and generic, and as \( f_w \) is a pseudo-coefficient of \( \delta_w \), we deduce that \( \pi_w \simeq \delta_w \) for \( w \in S' \), hence in \( S \).

We will use the following corollary of the result above.

**Corollary 4.1.** With the notations as above, if \( \delta_{w_0} \) is a discrete series representation of \( G_{w_0} \) for \( w_0 \) a finite place of \( l \), then there is a cuspidal automorphic representation \( \pi \) of \( G \), such that \( \pi_{w_0} \simeq \delta_{w_0} \), \( JL(\pi) \) is cuspidal, and \( JL(\pi)|_{w_0} \simeq JL(\delta_{w_0}) \).

**Proof.** Up to torsion by an unramified character, we can assume that \( \delta_{w_0} \) is unitary. As \( l_{w_0}^\times \) identifies with a closed subgroup of \( l_{w_0}^\times \backslash A_{w_0}^\times \), by Pontryagin duality, there is a character \( c \) of \( l_{w_0}^\times \backslash A_{w_0}^\times \) such that \( c_{w_0} \) equals the central character \( c_0 \) of \( \delta'_{w_0} = JL(\delta_{w_0}) \). Now we select for \( w \in W \) (different from \( w_0 \) if \( w_0 \in W \)), a discrete series representation \( \delta'_w \) with central character \( c_w \). We can apply Proposition 4.1 to the family of representations \( \delta'_w \) for \( w \in W \cup w_0 \), to get a cuspidal representation \( \pi' \) of \( G' \) with central character \( c \), such that \( \pi'_w \simeq \delta'_w \) for all \( w \in W \cup w_0 \). This cuspidal representation is of the form \( JL(\pi) \) for some cuspidal representation \( \pi \) of \( G \) according to Section 4.2 and moreover \( JL(\pi)|_{w_0} = JL(\pi|_{w_0}) = \pi'_{w_0} \) for all places \( w \) according to [ibid.]. In particular, \( JL(\pi|_{w_0}) = JL(\delta_{w_0}) \), hence \( \pi_{w_0} = \delta_{w_0} \).

## 5 Basic results on the pair \((G, H)\)

### 5.1 Multiplicity one and distinguished discrete series

In this section, \( G \) is as in Section 3.1 and \( H = G^\theta \) the subgroup of \( G \) fixed by \( \theta \). If \( \pi \) is a representation of \( G \), we say that it is distinguished (we will also say \( H \)-distinguished, or \( \theta \)-distinguished) if \( \text{Hom}_H(\pi, C) \) is non zero. More generally if \( \chi \) is a character of \( H \), we say that \( \pi \) is \( \chi \)-distinguished (we will also say \( (H, \chi) \)-distinguished, or \( (\theta, \chi) \)-distinguished) if \( \text{Hom}_H(\pi, \chi) \) is non zero. A pleasant property of the pair \((G, H)\) is that it affords multiplicity one, as it has been proved by Flicker when \( G \) is split, and his proof has been extended to non split \( G \) by Conligio.

**Proposition 5.1** ([F]). Let \( \pi \) be an irreducible representation of \( G \), then \( \text{Hom}_H(\pi, C) \) is of dimension at most 1.
Another classical result of Flicker ([F.91 Proposition 12]) when $G$ is split is that if $\pi$ is irreducible distinguished, then it is conjugate self-dual, i.e. $\pi^\vee \simeq \pi^\delta$. It is maybe possible to extend Flicker’s proof to the non split case, but we shall obtain it as a corollary of the classification of distinguished standard modules.

For discrete series of split $G$ with central character trivial on the $Z(G)^\circ$, some kind of converse statement is also true and is a result of Kable ([K.04 Theorem 7]). The paper [K.04] has had a great influence on many of the author’s works, and in particular it uses a local-global argument to obtain an equality of local factors, as we shall do later here. The result below is not original, it is a combination of various results of different authors (see the immediate proof for the references), including the very recent [BP.17 Theorem 1] of Beuzart-Plessis already mentioned in the introduction. In fact we shall see in Section 10.3 that we only need this result for cuspidal representations of $G$, as the technique developed here allows to reduce the study of distinction of discrete series representations to cuspidal representations. However for the moment, in order to already state the following result for discrete series representations, we shall use it for discrete series.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let $\delta = St_t(\rho)$ be a discrete series representation of $G$, and $l = l_{\rho}$.

1. The representation $\delta$ is distinguished if and only if the cuspidal representation $\rho$ is $\eta^{l(r+1)}$-distinguished.

2. One has $\delta^\vee \simeq \delta^\theta$ if and only if either $\delta$ is distinguished, or $\delta$ is $\eta$-distinguished. The representation $\delta$ cannot be both distinguished and $\eta$-distinguished at the same time.

**Proof.** We recall that if $JL(\rho) = St_t(\rho')$, then $JL(\delta) = St_t(\rho')$. By [BP.17 Theorem 1], the representation $\delta$ is distinguished if and only if $JL(\delta)$ is distinguished, but by Corollary 4.2 of [M.09] (see also the last section of [A-R.05]), this is the case if and only if $\rho'$ is $\eta^{l-1}$-distinguished, so by the same result, if and only if $St_t(\rho')$ is $\eta^{l(r+1)}$-distinguished, i.e. if and only if $\rho$ is $\eta^{l(r+1)}$-distinguished by [BP.17 Theorem 1] again. The second statement is also a consequence of [BP.17 Theorem 1], [K.04 Theorem 7] and [A-K-T.04 Corollary 1.6].

### 5.2 Double cosets $P \backslash G / H$ and the geometric lemma

We denote by $f$ a field of characteristic different from 2, and by $e$ a quadratic extension of $f$. We choose $\delta_{i,j}$ an element of $e - f$, such that $\overline{\delta_{i,j}} / f \in f$. We denote by $D_f$ a central division algebra of odd index over $f$, and by $D_e$ the division algebra $D_f \otimes_f e$. We denote by $\theta$ the Galois involution of $e$ over $f$ and its various natural extensions. We denote by $G$ the group $G_m(D_e)$, by $H$ the group $G_m(D_f)$, and for $\overline{m} = (m_1,\ldots,m_t)$ a partition of $m$, we set $P = I(\overline{m})$, with its standard Levi decomposition $P = MN$. We denote by $I(\overline{m})$ the set symmetric matrices of size $t$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{N}$, such that the sum of the $i$-th row is equal to $m_i$. In particular if $a$ belongs to $I(\overline{m})$, the sequence of non zero coefficients from the upper left corner to the bottom right corner of $a$ form a subpartition

$$\overline{m_a} = (m_{1,1},m_{1,2},\ldots,m_{t,t-1},m_{1,t})$$

of $\overline{m}$. We denote by $P_{\overline{m}}$, the associated standard parabolic subgroup of $G$, it is contained in $P$. To each $a \in I(\overline{m})$, we associate the element $u_a$ of $G$ defined as follows: the block $m_{i,j} \times m_{k,l}$ of $u_a$ is equal to $0$ if $i \neq j$, and if $i < j$, the block $m_{i,j} \times m_{k,l}$ is equal to $I_{m_{i,j}}$, and if $i < j$, the block $(m_{i,j} \cup m_{j,i}) \times (m_{i,j} \cup m_{j,i})$ (we hope that the reader finds this intuitive notation clear enough, we recall in passing that $m_{i,j} = m_{j,i}$) is equal to

$$\left( \begin{array}{c} I_{m_{i,j}} - \delta_{i,j} / f I_{m_{i,j}} \\ \delta_{i,j} / f I_{m_{i,j}} \end{array} \right).$$

The proof of Propositions 3.7 and 3.9 of [M.11] is valid in the generality in which we state the following result, to which we add obvious observations.
Proposition 5.3. • The matrices $u_a$, when a varies in $I(\mathfrak{m})$, forms a set of representatives $R(P^\mathfrak{m}G/H)$ of the double cosets $P^\mathfrak{m}G/H$.

• The element $w_a = u_a^{-\theta}$ is a permutation matrix of order 2, and if one writes $[1, n] = \{I_{1,1}, I_{1,2}, \ldots, I_{t,1-1}, I_{t,1}\}$ with $I_{i,j}$ of length $m_{i,j}$, then $w_a$ fixes $I_{i,j}$, its restriction to any $I_{i,j}$ is order preserving and it exchanges the intervals $I_{i,j}$ and $I_{j,i}$. Moreover the map $u_a \mapsto w_a$ is injective.

• If one sets $\theta_{w_a} : g \in G \mapsto w_a \theta(g)w_a^{-1}$, then $G^\theta_{w_a} = u_a H u_a^{-1}$, and for

$$m = \text{diag}(g_1, g_1, 2, \ldots, g_{t+1}, 2, g_{t,1}) \in H_w,$$

$$\theta_{w_a}(m)$$

is the element

$$\text{diag}(g_{1,1}', g_{1,2}', \ldots, g_{t,1-1}', g_{t,1}') \in H_w,$$

where $g_{i,j}' = \theta(g_{i,j})$.

We shall as well write $w_a$ instead of $w_a$. We will often write $P_a = M_a N_a$ or $P_{ua} = M_{ua} N_{ua}$ for $H_w$. For $X \subset G$ and $u \in R(P^\mathfrak{m}G/H)$, we will sometimes write $X^u$ or $X^{u_u}$ for $X^{\theta_{u_u}}$, and $X(u)$ for $u^{-1}X u_u$.

Following [J-L-R.99 Definition 1] or [L-R.03 Definition 3.1.2] with $\sigma = I_d$, we say that $u \in R(P^\mathfrak{m}G/H)$ is $P$-admissible if $w_a M_a w_a^{-1} = M$. In particular any $u_a \in R(P^\mathfrak{m}G/H)$ is $H_w$-admissible. If $u$ is $P$-admissible, then $P^u = M^u N^u$, hence $P(u) = M(u) N(u)$. Take $u \in R(P^\mathfrak{m}G/H)$, an easy consequence of the equality $P \cap w_a P w_u^{-1} = P_a$ is the equality (see [M.11 Proposition 4.1])

$$P^u = P_u = M_u^u N_u.$$

Now $f = F$ and $e = E$. We denote by $\sigma$ a smooth representation of $M$. Then according to the discussion before [M.11 Lemma 5.5] (see more generally [G.17 Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 6.9]), one has the following consequence of [B-Z.77 Theorem 5.2].

Proposition 5.4. • There is a vector space injection of $\text{Hom}_H(\text{ind}_G^H(\sigma), \mathbb{C})$ into

$$\prod_{u \in R(P^\mathfrak{m}G/H)} \text{Hom}_{P^u}(\delta_{P^u}^{1/2}, \delta_{P^u}^{-1/2}, \sigma, \mathbb{C}).$$

•

$$\text{Hom}_{P^u}(\delta_{P^u}^{1/2}, \sigma, \mathbb{C}) \simeq \text{Hom}_{M_u}(r_{M_u,M}(\sigma), \mathbb{C})$$

Remark 5.1. The following useful observation is [G.15 Lemma 2.1]. If $u = u_a \in R(P^\mathfrak{m}G/H)$ corresponds to $a \in I(\mathfrak{m})$ (setting $\mathfrak{m}_a = (m_1, 1, \ldots, m_{t-1})$), $\sigma$ is an admissible representation of $M$, and the Jacquet module $r_{M_u,M}(\sigma)$ is a pure tensor $\otimes_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j}$ with $\sigma_{i,j}$ a representation of $G_{m_{i,j}}$, then

$$\text{Hom}_{M_u}(r_{M_u,M}(\sigma), \mathbb{C}) \simeq \bigotimes_{i=1}^t \text{Hom}_{M_{m_{i,j}}}(\sigma_{i,j}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \bigotimes_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} \text{Hom}_{M_{m_{i,j}}}(\sigma_{i,j}, (\sigma_{i,j}^\rho)^{i/j}).$$

If $(\lambda, \ldots, \lambda)$ is a partition of $m$, $\rho$ is a cuspidal representation of $G_{\lambda}$, and $a$ and $b$ are integers with $b + 1 - a = m/\lambda$. We set $\Delta = [a, b]$. We say that a partition $\mathfrak{m} = (m_1, 1, \ldots, m_{t-1})$ of $m$ is $\rho$-adapted if each $m_i$ is a multiple of $\rho$. If $\mathfrak{m}$ is such a partition, by convention, we write $\Delta(\mathfrak{m}) = [\Delta_{i-1}, \Delta_i]$ with $\Delta_{i-1} = \left[a + \frac{m_1 + \cdots + m_{i-1}}{\lambda}, a + \frac{m_1 + \cdots + m_{i-1}}{\lambda} - 1, \rho\right]$, and if $\delta = L(\Delta)$, we set $\delta_i = L(\Delta_i)$. We recall that by [M-S.14 Proposition 7.16],

$$r_{M_{\mathfrak{m}G}}(\delta) = 0$$

if $\mathfrak{m}$ is not $\rho$-adapted, and

$$r_{M_{\mathfrak{m}G}}(\delta) = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t$$

if $\mathfrak{m}$ is $\rho$-adapted. In particular this remark applies to discrete series representations.
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6 Rankin-Selberg and Asai $L$-functions

Notice that for simpler notations, in this section and the rest of the paper, our definition of $\gamma$ and $\epsilon$-factors might differ from that of the usual sources by a sign.

Let $L$ be a $p$-adic field, and $\mu$ a non-trivial character of $L$. Then we denote by $\mu$ again the non-degenerate character of $N_n(L)$ defined by $\mu(u) = \mu(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_{i+1})$. By [Z.80] Theorem 9.7, it is equivalent to say that a representation $\pi$ of $G_n(L)$ is generic or that $\text{Hom}_{N_n(L)}(\pi, \mu) \neq \{0\}$, and in this case, the dimension of $\text{Hom}_{N_n(L)}(\pi, \mu)$ is one by [G-K.73]. This allows to embed in a unique way (up to scaling) a generic representation $\pi$ of $G_n(L)$ in $\text{Ind}_{N_n(L)}^{G_n(L)}(\mu)$, in which case we denote by $W(\pi, \mu)$ the image of this embedding, that we call the Whittaker model of $\pi$. For $W \in W(\pi, \mu)$, the map $\hat{W} : g \mapsto W(w_n g^{-1})$ belongs to $W(\pi^*, \mu^{-1})$. The space $C^\infty_{\text{f}}(L^n)$ is by definition that of smooth functions on $L^n$ with compact support.

6.1 The $p$-adic Asai $L$-factor

Let $\psi$ be a non-trivial character of $E$ trivial on $F$, it is of the form $z \mapsto \psi'(\delta_E \cdot \bar{\theta}(z))$ for a unique non-trivial character $\psi'$ of $F$. We set $\epsilon = \epsilon_n = (0, \ldots, 0, 1)$ in $M_{1,n}(Z)$. If $\pi$ is a generic representation of $G_n(E)$, for $W \in W(\pi, \psi)$, $\phi \in C^\infty_{\text{f}}(F^n)$, and $s \in \mathbb{C}$, we define the Asai integrals

$$I^+(s, W, \phi) = \int_{N_n(F) \backslash G_n(F)} W(h) \phi(\epsilon h) \nu_F(h)^s dh,$$

and

$$I^-(s, W, \phi) = \int_{N_n(F) \backslash G_n(F)} W(h) \phi(\epsilon h) \eta(h) \nu_F(h)^s dh.$$

By the appendix of [F.93], there is $r_\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for $\text{Re}(s) \geq r_\pi$, all integrals $I^+(s, W, \phi)$ (resp. $I^-(s, W, \phi)$) converge absolutely. They in fact extend to elements of $C(\pi^{\text{f}})$, and the vector space they span, as $W$ and $\phi$ vary, is a fractional ideal of $C[\pi^{\text{f}}, q_F^\times]$ with a unique generator normalized by the fact that it is the inverse of a polynomial in $q_F^{\text{f}}$ with constant term 1, which we denote by

$$L^+(s, \pi) \ (\text{resp. } L^-(s, \pi))$$

and call the even (resp. the odd) Asai $L$-function of $\pi$.

The following result describes when the Asai $L$-factor attached to a cuspidal representation has a pole. It is a consequence of [A-K-T.04] Corollary 1.5 (see [M.10] Proposition 3.6) for a different approach.

**Proposition 6.1.** Let $\pi$ be a cuspidal representation of $G_n(E)$. Then the Asai $L$-factor $L^+(s, \pi)$ (resp. $L^-(s, \pi)$) has a pole at $s_0$ if and only if $\pi$ is $\nu_F^{\text{f}}$-distinguished (resp. $\eta \nu_F^{\text{f}}$-distinguished), and such a pole is always simple.

Finally, we recall the local functional equation of the local Asai $L$-factor, which can again be found in the appendix of [F.93]. We denote by $\hat{\phi}$ the Fourier transform of $\phi$ with respect to $\psi'$-self-dual Haar measure on $F^n$.

**Proposition 6.2.** Let $\pi$ be a generic representation of $G_n(E)$, and $\epsilon \in \{+,-\}$, there is a unit $\epsilon^\epsilon(s, \pi, \psi)$ of $C[q_F^{\text{f}}]$ such that if one sets

$$\gamma^\epsilon(s, \pi, \psi) = \epsilon^\epsilon(s, \pi, \psi) \frac{L^\epsilon(1-s, \pi^\vee)}{L^\epsilon(s, \pi)},$$

then for any $W \in W(\pi, \psi)$ and $\phi \in C^\infty_{\text{f}}(F^n)$, one has

$$I^\epsilon(1-s, \hat{W} \hat{\phi}) = \gamma^\epsilon(s, \pi, \psi) I^\epsilon(s, W, \phi).$$
Finally, we will need the following consequence of the inductivity relation of Asai $L$-factors of discrete series representations. First notice that we also denote by $\eta$ (see Section 2.1) any extension of the character $\eta_{E/F} \circ \det$ of $G_n(F)$ to $G_n(E)$.

**Proposition 6.3.** Let $\St_k(\rho)$ be conjugate self-dual a discrete series representation of $G_n(E)$. Then

$$
\gamma^+(s, \St_k(\rho), \psi)^{-1} \gamma^-(s, \St_k(\rho), \psi)^{-1} \sim \frac{L^+(s, \eta^k \rho)}{\mathcal{C}[q^{\pm 1}] \times L^+(s + k, \rho)} \frac{L^+(s, \eta^{k+1} \rho)}{L^+(s + k, \eta \rho)}
$$

**Proof.** We recall that according to [M.09, Corollary 4.2], one has the relation

$$
L^\varepsilon(s, \St_k(\rho)) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} L^\varepsilon(s + i, \eta^{k-1-i} \rho).
$$

In particular:

$$
\frac{L^-(s, \St_k(\rho))}{L^+(1 + s, \St_k(\rho))} = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} L^-(s + i, \eta^{k-1-i} \rho)}{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} L^+(s + i + 1, \eta^{k-1-i} \rho)} = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} L^-(s + i, \eta^{k-1-i} \rho)}{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} L^+(s + i, \eta^{k-1-i} \rho)}
$$

This implies that

$$
\frac{L^+(s, \St_k(\rho))}{L^-(1 - s, \St_k(\rho))} = \frac{L^+(-s, \eta^{k+1} \rho)}{L^-(-s + k, \eta \rho)}
$$

Note that because $\St_k(\rho)$ is conjugate self-dual, one has $L^\varepsilon(s, \St_k(\rho)) = L^\varepsilon(s, \St_k(\rho)) = L^\varepsilon(s, \St_k(\rho))$ for $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$, hence we deduce the relation

$$
\gamma^+(s, \St_k(\rho), \psi)^{-1} \gamma^-(s, \St_k(\rho), \psi)^{-1} \sim \frac{L^+(s, \eta^k \rho)}{\mathcal{C}[q^{\pm 1}] \times L^+(s + k, \rho)} \frac{L^+(s, \eta^{k+1} \rho)}{L^+(s + k, \eta \rho)}
$$

\[ \square \]

### 6.2 The $p$-adic Rankin-Selberg $L$-factor

Let $\psi$ be a non trivial character of $F$, and $\pi$ and $\pi'$ be generic representations of $G_n(F)$. For $W \in W(\pi, \psi)$, $W' \in W(\pi', \psi^{-1})$, $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(F^n)$, and $s \in \mathbb{C}$, we define the the Rankin-Selberg integral

$$
I(s, W, W', \phi) = \int_{N_n(F) \backslash G_n(F)} W(h)W'(h)\phi(h)\nu_F(h)^s dh.
$$

By [J-PS-S.83, there is $r_{\pi, \pi'} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for $\text{Re}(s) \geq r_{\pi, \pi'}$, all integrals $I(s, W, W', \phi)$ converge absolutely. They in fact extend to elements of $\mathcal{C}[q_{\overline{F}}^{-s}]$, and the vector space they span, as $W W'$, and $\phi$ vary, is a fractional ideal of $\mathcal{C}[q_{\overline{F}}^{-s}, q_{\overline{F}}^s]$ with a unique generator normalized by the fact that it is the inverse of a polynomial in $q_{\overline{F}}^{-s}$ with constant term 1, which we denote by $L(s, \pi, \pi')$, and call the Rankin-Selberg $L$-factor of $(\pi, \pi')$.

The poles of Rankin-Selberg $L$-factors attached to a pair of cuspidal representations are described in [J-PS-S.83, Proposition 8.1], the result is as follows.

**Proposition 6.4.** Let $\pi$ and $\pi'$ be cuspidal representations of $G_n(F)$, then the Rankin-Selberg $L$-factor $L(s, \pi, \pi')$ has a pole at $s_0$ if and only if $\pi' \simeq {}^\vee\phi^{-\sigma} \pi'$. Such a pole is always simple.

To state the functional equation of the $p$-adic Rankin-Selberg $L$-factor, for $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(F^n)$, we denote by $\hat{\phi}$ its Fourier transform with respect to a $\psi$-self dual Haar measure on $F^n$. Then by [J-PS-S.83 Theorem 2.7], one has:
Proposition 6.5. Let $\pi$ and $\pi'$ be generic representations of $G_n(F)$, there is a unit $\epsilon(s, \pi, \pi', \psi)$ of $\mathbb{C}[q_F^{\pm 1}]$ such that if one sets

$$
\gamma(s, \pi, \pi', \psi) = \epsilon(s, \pi, \pi', \psi) \frac{L(1-s, \pi', \psi)}{L(s, \pi, \pi')},
$$

then for any $W \in W(\pi, \psi)$, $W' \in W(\pi', \psi^{-1})$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(F^n)$, one has

$$
I(1-s, \tilde{W}, \tilde{W}', \tilde{\phi}) = \gamma(s, \pi, \pi', \psi)I(s, W, W', \phi).
$$

6.3 Archimedean Rankin-Selberg gamma factors

Let $K$ be $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, we recall some results from [4.10], and refer the reader to the references therein for the original bibliography on the subject, which in any case is due to the author of [4.10] and his collaborators. We denote by $\psi$ again a non trivial character of $K$, as well as its extension to $N_n(K)$ as before. If $\pi$ is an irreducible Casselman-Wallach representation of $G_n(K)$, such that there is a nonzero continuous linear form in $\text{Hom}_{N_n(K)}(\pi, \psi)$, we will call $\pi$ a generic representation. If $\pi$ is unitary, it is known that such a linear form is unique by [Shal.74], and for generic $\pi$ (and more generally when $\pi$ is generically induced), this fact still holds as explained in [4.10] p. 4. If $\pi$ is generic, we denote by $W(\pi, \psi)$ its Whittaker model (the space of functions $g \in G_n(K) \mapsto \lambda(\pi(g)v)$ for $v \in V_\pi$ and $\lambda \in \text{Hom}_{N_n(K)}(\pi, \psi)$). Again $\tilde{W} : g \mapsto W(w_g, g^{-1})$ belongs to $W(\pi', \psi^{-1})$ if $W'$ belongs to $W(\pi, \psi)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{S}(K^n)$ the space of Schwartz functions on $K^n$. For $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(K^n)$, we denote by $\hat{\phi}$ its Fourier transform with respect to the $\psi$-self dual Haar measure on $K^n$. For $\pi$ and $\pi'$ two generic representations of $G_n(K)$, $W \in W(\pi, \psi)$, $W' \in W(\pi', \psi^{-1})$, and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(K^n)$, the definition of the archimedean Rankin-Selberg integral $I(s, W, W', \phi)$ is the same as in the $p$-adic case. The following assertions are a consequence of [4.10] Theorem 2.1 and its proof.

Proposition 6.6. Let $\pi$ and $\pi'$ two generic representations of $G_n(K)$.

- There is $r_{\pi, \pi'} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for $\text{Re}(s) \geq r_{\pi, \pi'}$, all integrals $I(s, W, W', \phi)$ converge absolutely for $W \in W(\pi, \psi)$, $W' \in W(\pi', \psi^{-1})$, and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(K^n)$, and they extend to meromorphic functions on $\mathbb{C}$.

- There is a meromorphic function $\gamma(s, \pi, \pi', \psi)$ such that for all $W \in W(\pi, \psi)$, $W' \in W(\pi', \psi^{-1})$, and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(K^n)$, the following equality holds:

$$
I(1-s, \tilde{W}, \tilde{W}', \tilde{\phi}) = \gamma(s, \pi, \pi', \psi)I(s, W, W', \phi).
$$

6.4 The functional equation of the global Asai and Rankin-Selberg $L$-functions

First we need to set up a convention. Let $F$ be a $p$-adic field, $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, and $\psi$ be a non trivial character of $F$. Let $\pi$ and $\pi'$ be generic representations of $G_n(F)$, so that $\pi \otimes \pi'$ is a smooth representation of $G_n(F) \times G_n(F)$ if $F$ is $p$-adic, and $\pi \otimes \pi'$ is a Casselman-Wallach representation of $G_n(F) \times G_n(F)$ if $F = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Then by definition, we set

$$
L^+(s, \pi \otimes \pi') = L^-(s, \pi \otimes \pi') = L(s, \pi, \pi'),
$$

$$
\epsilon^+(s, \pi \otimes \pi', \psi \otimes \psi^{-1}) = \epsilon^-(s, \pi \otimes \pi', \psi \otimes \psi^{-1}) = \epsilon(s, \pi, \pi', \psi),
$$

and

$$
\gamma^+(s, \pi \otimes \pi', \psi \otimes \psi^{-1}) = \gamma^-(s, \pi \otimes \pi', \psi \otimes \psi^{-1}) = \gamma(s, \pi, \pi', \psi),
$$
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when $F$ is $p$-adic, and
\[
\gamma^+(s, \pi \otimes \pi', \psi \otimes \psi^{-1}) = \gamma^-(s, \pi \otimes \pi', \psi \otimes \psi^{-1}) = \gamma(s, \pi, \pi', \psi)
\]
when $F = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. In fact, if $F = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, and $\pi$ and $\pi'$ are Harish-Chandra modules of $G_n(F)$ such that $\mathfrak{m}_1$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2$ are generic, we set
\[
\gamma^e(s, \pi \otimes \pi', \psi \otimes \psi^{-1}) = \gamma^e(s, \mathfrak{m}_1 \hat{\otimes} \mathfrak{m}_2, \psi \otimes \psi^{-1})
\]
for $e \in \{+, -\}$.

We now suppose that the number fields $k$ and $l$ are such that all infinite places of $k$ in split $l$. We denote by $\pi$ a cuspidal representation of $G_n(k_l) = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{P}(k)} G_v$, so that $\pi = \otimes_{v \in \mathcal{P}(k)} \pi_v$. Finally we take $\psi$ a non trivial character of $k_l$, trivial on $l + k$, so that $\psi = \otimes_{v \in \mathcal{P}(k)} \psi_v$, where $\psi_v$ is a character of $l_v$ trivial on $k_v$. The functional equation of the global Asai integrals is proved in [F.88] but not explicitly stated there, so we refer to [K.04, Propositions 5 and 6] for it.

**Proposition 6.7.** Take $\pi$ and $\psi$ as above, and $e \in \{+, -\}$. For any finite set $S \subset \mathcal{P}(k)$ which contains all archimedean and ramified places (by ramified we mean that either the representation, or the additive character, or the quadratic extension is ramified). The product $\prod_{v \in S} L^f(s, \pi_v)$ is convergent for Re$(s)$ large enough, and it extends to a meromorphic function $L^{S,f}(s, \pi)$. The global functional equation of the Asai $L$-function is:
\[
\prod_{v \in S} \gamma^e(s, \pi_v, \psi_v) L^{S,f}(1 - s, \pi^\vee) = L^{S,f}(s, \pi). \tag{1}
\]

We shall also need the following basic result on the partial Rankin-Selberg $L$-function which can be extracted from Section 4 of [J.S.S1]. We will use the following convention: for $v \in \mathcal{P}(k)$, we will write $L(s, \pi_v, \pi'_v)$ for $L(s, \pi_v, \pi'_w)$ if $v$ does not split in $l$ and $w$ is the unique place of $l$ dividing $v$, or for the product $L(s, \pi_v, \pi'_v) L(s, \pi_w, \pi'_w)$ if $v$ splits in $l$ into the places $w_1$ and $w_2$.

**Proposition 6.8.** Take $\pi, \psi$ and $S$ as above, and $\pi'$ another cuspidal automorphic representation of $G_n(k_l)$. The product $\prod_{v \in S} L(s, \pi_v, \pi'_v)$ is convergent for Re$(s)$ large enough and it extends to a meromorphic function $L^S(s, \pi, \pi')$.

## 7 Standard intertwining operators

### 7.1 Generalities

Here we consider $G$ as in one of the paragraphs 3.1, 3.2 or 3.3. We take $M = M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ a standard Levi subgroup of $G$ for $\mathfrak{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_t)$, $P = P_{\mathfrak{m}}$, and $N = N_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Let
\[
\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_t
\]
be a representation of $M$. If $G$ is $p$-adic, $\sigma$ is smooth of finite length, if $G$ is real, $\sigma$ is a Harish-Chandra module (of finite length by definition), and if $G$ is adelic, $\sigma$ is $K$-finite cuspidal automorphic representation.

For $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_t) \in \mathcal{C}'$, we write $\sigma[s] = \nu^{s_1} \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu^{s_t} \sigma_t$, and $\text{Ind}^G_P(\sigma, s) = \text{Ind}^G_P(\sigma[s])$. If $\pi = \text{Ind}^G_P(\sigma)$, we write $\pi_s$ for $\text{Ind}^G_P(\sigma[s])$. If we write $m \in M$ as $m = \text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_t)$, then in terms of the Iwasawa decomposition of $G$, one defines
\[
n_{\mathcal{E}}(umk) = \prod_{i=1}^t \nu(g_i)^{s_i}.
\]
We then define, for $f$ in $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}'$, the map $f_a = \eta_a f$ which belongs to $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma, a)$. We call $f_a$ a flat section (which means that the restriction of $f_a$ to $K$ is independent of $a$). We denote by $\mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ the space of flat sections of $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma, a)$. We shall need the following lemma concerning flat sections in the next section.

**Lemma 7.1.** Take $G$ as in Section 3.4 Suppose that $t = 2r$ is even, and that $m_{r+1-i} = m_i$ for $i \in [1, t]$, then the map

$$R : f_a \mapsto [g \mapsto f_a(\text{diag}(I_{m_1}, \ldots, I_{m_{r-1}}, g, I_{m_{r+2}}, \ldots, I_{m_t}))]$$

defines a surjection from the space $\mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ to the space

$$V_{\sigma_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\sigma_{r-1}} \otimes \mathcal{F}(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_{r+1}) \otimes V_{\sigma_{r+2}} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\sigma_t}.$$ 

**Proof.** The assumptions on the $m_i$’s guarantee that the modulus character of $P$ restricts to $P_{(m_r, m_{r+1})}$ as its modulus character, so the image of $R$ is indeed a subspace of

$$V_{\sigma_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\sigma_{r-1}} \otimes \mathcal{F}(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_{r+1}) \otimes V_{\sigma_{r+2}} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{\sigma_t}.$$ 

Take now $h_{(r, r+1)}$ an element of $\mathcal{F}(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_{r+1})$, and $v_i \in V_{\sigma_i}$ for $i \notin \{r, r + 1\}$, to show the surjectivity of $R$, it is enough to find a flat section $f_a$ in $\mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ such that

$$R(f_a) = v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r-1} \otimes h_{(s_1, s_2)} \otimes v_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_t.$$ 

Let’s denote by $L$ the standard Levi subgroup $M_{(m_1, \ldots, m_{r-1}, 2m_r, m_{r+2}, \ldots, m_t)}$, and by $Q = LU$ the associated standard parabolic subgroup. Fix $c \geq 1$ large enough for $K_m(c) = I_m + \varpi^c M_m(O_E)$ to fix $v_i$ for $i \notin \{r, r + 1\}$, and for $K_{2m_r}(c)$ to fix $h_{(r, r+1)}$. Then, because $K_m(c)$ has an Iwahori decomposition with respect to $Q$, the map with support in $LU K_m(c)$, defined on this set by the equality

$$f_a(luk) = \delta_Q(l) f_a(g_1) v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_a(g_r) v_{r-1} \otimes h_{(r, r+1)}(g) \otimes \sigma_{r+2}(g_{r+2}) v_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_a(g_t) v_t$$

for $l = \text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_{r-1}, g, g_{r+2}, \ldots, g_t)$ is well defined and does the job.

For $w \in G$, we set $w(luk) = (m_{w^{-1}(1)}, \ldots, m_{w^{-1}(t)})$, hence

$$w(M) := M_{w(luk)} = wMw^{-1},$$

$w(\sigma)$ for the representation $\sigma(w^{-1} \cdot w)$ of $w(M)$, in other words

$$w(\sigma) = \sigma_{w^{-1}(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{w^{-1}(t)}.$$ 

Let $Q = P_{w(luk)}$, $L = M_{w(luk)}$ and $U = N_{w(luk)}$. For $r \in \mathbb{R}$, and $w \in G$, we set

$$D(w, r) = \{a \in \mathbb{C}' \mid \forall (i, j) \in \text{Inv}(w), \text{ Re}(s_i - s_j) > r \}.$$ 

It is proved for example in [Sh.81, Section 2], [W.92, Chapter 10], [M-W.94, II.1.6], that there is $r = r_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, such that for $a \in D(w, r_\sigma)$, the following integral is absolutely convergent for all $f_a$ in $\text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma, a)$, and all $g \in G$:

$$A_\sigma(w, a) f_a(g) = \int_{wNw^{-1} \cap U \setminus U} f_a(w^{-1}ng) dn.$$ 

In both the $p$-adic and real case, a way to give a meaning to the absolute convergence of the integral above is to realize (it is always possible) the space $V_\sigma$ of $\sigma$ as a dense subset of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$, such that $\sigma$ extends to a continuous representation of $M$ on this space ($V_\sigma$ is the space
of smooth vectors in $V_{\sigma}$ in the $p$-adic case, and $M \cap K$-finite vectors in the real case). In the $p$-adic case, it is equivalent to say that for all $v^\vee \in V_{\sigma}^\vee$, the integral
\[ \int_{wNw^{-1} \cap U \setminus U} < f_{\sigma}(w^{-1}ng), v^\vee > dn \]
is absolutely convergent. We set
\[ D_{\sigma}^A(w) = D(w, r_\sigma). \]

It is shown in the same references ([M-W 93] IV.1 for the adelic case) that if $f_{\sigma}$ is a flat section, then for $g \in G$, the integral $A_{\sigma}(w, s)f_{\sigma}(g)$ extends to a meromorphic function of $w$. Whenever $A_{\sigma}(w, s)$ is holomorphic at $s_0$ (meaning that $A_{\sigma}(w, s)f_{\sigma}(g)$ is holomorphic at $s = s_0$ for all $f$ and $g$), which is the case for $s_0$ in a dense open subset of $C^\vee$, then
\[ A_{\sigma}(w, s_0)f_{\sigma} \in \text{Ind}_Q^2(w(\sigma), w(s_0)) = \nu^0 w^{-1(1)} \sigma_{w^{-1(1)}} \times \cdots \times \nu^0 w^{-1(1)} \sigma_{w^{-1(1)}}. \]
Moreover, for each $s_0 \in C$, there is a nonzero polynomial $P_{\sigma}(s)$, such that $P_{\sigma}(s)A_{\sigma}(w, s)f_{\sigma}(g)$ is holomorphic at $s_0$ for all $f$ and $g$. In the $p$-adic case, one can in fact choose $P \in \mathbb{C}[q^{-1}] \setminus \{0\}$, such that $P(q^{-1})A_{\sigma}(w, s)f_{\sigma}(g)$ belongs to $\mathbb{C}[q^{-1}] \otimes V_{\sigma}$ for all $f$ and $g$.
Finally, in all cases, if $w_1$ and $w_2$ are elements of $K$, such that $\ell(w_1 \circ w_2) = \ell(w_1) + \ell(w_2)$, then
\[ A_{\sigma}(w_1 \circ w_2, s) = A_{\sigma}(w_1, w_2(s)) \circ A_{\sigma}(w_2, s). \]

### 7.2 Poles of certain $p$-adic intertwining operators

In this section $G$ is as in Section 5.1. We will mainly recall some results from [M-W 93], and explain why they hold for inner forms of $GL(n)$ as well. We say that a cuspidal segment $\Delta$ precedes a cuspidal segment $\Delta'$ and we write $\Delta \prec \Delta'$, if $\Delta$ is of the form $[b, c]$, $\Delta'$ of the form $[b', c']$, for $\rho$ cuspidal, with $b' - b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b \leq b' - 1 \leq e' - e - 1$. We say that $\Delta$ and $\Delta'$ are linked if either $\Delta$ precedes $\Delta'$ or $\Delta'$ precedes $\Delta$. We say that $\Delta$ and $\Delta'$ are juxtaposed if they are linked, and either $b' = e + 1$ or $b = e' + 1$. We consider $M = M_{(m_1, \ldots, m_i)}$, with $t = 2r$ an even number. We denote by $r_{\sigma}$ the transposition $(r + 1)$ in $K$. We consider a discrete series representation $\sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_l$ of $M$, such that $\delta_r = \delta[s_r]$ and $\delta_{r+1} = \mu[s_{r+1}]$ with $\delta$ and $\mu$ unitary, $s_r$ and $s_{r+1} \in \mathbb{R}$, and moreover $\delta = St_{k_1}(\rho)$ and $\mu = St_{k_2}(\rho)$ for $\rho$ the same cuspidal representation. Let’s write
\[ \sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \delta_{r-1} \otimes \delta \otimes \mu \otimes \delta_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_l. \]

For
\[ s = (0, \ldots, 0, s_r, s_{r+1} - s_r, 0, \ldots, 0) \in C^l, \]
we set
\[ A_{\sigma}(\tau_r, s) = A_{\sigma}(\tau_r, s). \]

For each $\delta_i$, we recall that $\delta_i = L(\Delta_i)$ for a cuspidal segment $\Delta_i$.

**Proposition 7.1.** Suppose that the situation is as above and set $l = l_\rho$. If $s_r - s_{r+1} < -\frac{(k_1 - k_2)}{2}$, then the standard intertwining operator $A_{\sigma}(\tau_r, s)$ has a (necessarily simple) pole at $s = s_r$ if and only if $\Delta_r \prec \Delta_{r+1}$ but $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are not juxtaposed, otherwise we recall that it is automatically (holomorphic and) nonzero. If $s_r > s_{r+1}$, then $A_{\sigma}(\tau_r, s)$ is defined by absolutely convergent integrals at $s = s_r$ and is in particular holomorphic at this point.

**Proof.** We use the notations of Lemma 7.1 If
\[ R(f_{\sigma}) = v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r-1} \otimes h_{\sigma} \otimes v_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_l, \]
then
\[ R(A_{\sigma}(\tau_r, s)f_{\sigma}) = v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r-1} \otimes A_{\sigma}[s \otimes \mu][s_r + s_{r+1} - s](1, 2)h_{\sigma} \otimes v_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_l. \]
hence it is enough to treat the case where \( t = 2 \) thanks to Lemma 7.1. The second assertion follows from [W.03 Proposition IV.2.1]. Let’s justify the first. We want to use Lemma I.4 of [M-W.89], in the context of inner forms of GL(\( n \)). We claim that it is still valid. It is proved in [A-C.89] Lemma 2.1 that the normalization factors of normalized intertwining operators can be taken to be the Langlands-Shahidi normalizing factors of the Jacquet-Langlands lifts, in order for the expected properties stated in [M-W.89] I.1 to be satisfied. More precisely Properties I.1(1) follows from [A-C.89] Lemma 2.1, I.1(3) follows from the references stated in [M-W.89], as well as from the fact that parabolically induced representations from irreducible unitary representations remain irreducible, a result which is also true for inner forms of GL(\( n \)) thanks to [S.09]. The proof of I.1(2) and (4) then holds without modification (notice that the case of (2) where Re(\( s_i - s_j \)) > 0 is true for general reductive groups by [W.03 Proposition IV.2.1]). This implies that I.2(1), hence Lemma I.2 (ii) hold too. Finally, replacing the reference to Zelevinsky by the reference to [T.90], the proof of Lemma I.4 in [M-W.89] is reduced to the classical result of [O.74] concerning poles of standard intertwining operators between representations induced by two cuspidal ones, and this result is for all inner forms of GL(\( n \)). Now set \( \tau = (1 2) \), we recall that JL(\( \rho \)) = St_1(\( \rho' \)) for \( l = l_\rho \). We set \( \delta' = JL(\delta) = St_{k_2}(<\delta', \rho'>) \), \( \mu' = JL(\mu) = St_{k_2}(\rho') \) and denote by \( r_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s) \) the normalizing factor of \( A_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s) \). By definition, and using the equality of the Langlands-Shahidi factors and the factors defined in [J-PS-S.83] (see [Sh.84]), we have

\[
r_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s) = r_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s).
\]

By a reformulation of [M-W.89] Lemma I.4, the normalized intertwining operator

\[
r_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s)A_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s)
\]

has a simple pole at \( s = s_r \) if and only if \( \Delta_r < \Delta_{r+1} \). By [ibid.] again, one has:

\[
r_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s) \sim L(2s - (s_r + s_{r+1}) + \frac{|k_1 - k_2|}{2}, \rho', (\rho')^\vee)L(2s - (s_r + s_{r+1}) + \frac{(k_1 + k_2)}{2}, \rho', (\rho')^\vee)^{-1}.
\]

Hence \( r_{\delta' \otimes \mu}(\tau, s) \) has no pole at \( s_r \) as \( s_r - s_{r+1} < -\frac{|k_1 - k_2|}{2} \), and it has a zero at \( s_r \) if and only if \( \Delta_r < \Delta_{r+1} \) and \( \Delta_r < \Delta_{r+1} \) are juxtaposed. The statement follows.

8 Open intertwining periods

The intertwining periods appear naturally in the study of the relative trace formula investigated in [J-L-R.99] and [L-R.03], and more precisely in the formula which computes the period integral of truncated Eisenstein series. We will recall results from [L-R.03] in this context. However, we notice that [L-R.03] extends the results of [J-L-R.99] from the pair (\( G_n(A_t), G_n(A_k) \)) to general reductive Galois pairs. Here the set of double cosets \( P_{\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{D}_t)} \backslash G_m(\mathcal{D}_t) / G_m(\mathcal{D}_k) \) canonically identifies with \( P_{\mathfrak{m}}(l) \backslash G_m(l) / G_m(k) \), which is the case considered in [J-L-R.99]. Hence, the results of [J-L-R.99] Chapter VII as well as their proofs hold without modification for the non split case, so we could most of the time refer directly to [J-L-R.99].

If \( w \) is an involution in \( \mathfrak{S}_t \), we set \( C'(w, -1) = \{ s \in \mathbb{C}^t, w(s) = -s \} \).

8.1 Global intertwining periods

Here \( G \) is as in Section 5.3, we take \( t = 2r \) with \( r \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\} \), and \( \mathfrak{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_t) \) a self-dual partition of \( m \). We set \( P = P_{\mathfrak{m}} = P_{(m_1, \ldots, m_t)} = MN \) as before. For \( S \) a subgroup of \( G \), we will write \( S(l) \) for \( S \cap G(l) \).
We set
\[ u = \begin{pmatrix}
I_{m_1} & I_{m_2} & \cdots & I_{m_r} \\
I_{m_2} & I_{m_1} & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
I_{m_r} & \cdots & \cdots & I_{m_1}
\end{pmatrix} \]

It is the representative \( u \in R(P_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathfrak{O}_t) \backslash G_m(\mathfrak{O}_t)/G_m(\mathfrak{O}_k)) \) such that \( u\theta(u)^{-1} \) is the longest Weyl element \( w = w_t \) of \( \mathfrak{S}_t \) (associated to the partition \( \mathbf{m} \)). It is \( P \)-admissible. For any subgroup \( S \) of \( G \), we denote by \( S^u \) the subgroup of fixed points of the involution \( g \mapsto w\theta(g)w^{-1} \) of \( G \) in \( S \), and we denote by \( S(u) \) the group \( w^{-1}S^u w \), in particular \( S(u) \subset H = G^\theta \).

Let \( \sigma \) be a cuspidal automorphic representation of \( M \), the space of which is included in \( L^2(A_M M(\mathfrak{l}) \backslash M) \), i.e. \( \sigma \) is unitary, and its central character is trivial on \( A_M \). We moreover suppose that
\[ \sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_t \]
with \( \sigma_{t+1-i} = \sigma_i^\vee \) for all \( i \). To \( f \in \text{Ind}^G_G(\sigma) \) and \( \mathfrak{z} \in \mathbb{C}^t(w, -1) \), one can attach ([J-L-R.99 Chapter VII where the parabolic induction is not normalized, or [L-R.03 Definition 5.1]) the intertwining period (note that \( P(u) = M(u) \)):
\[ J_\sigma(w, f_\mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z}) = \int_{P(u) \backslash H} \int_{A_M^a M(\mathfrak{l})^a \backslash M^a} f_\mathfrak{z}(muh)dmdh. \]

Notice that our definition is the same as that of [J-L-R.99], as \( \eta_s \) is left invariant under \( M^a \), but the notation slightly differs as we write \( J_\sigma(w, f_\mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z}) \) instead of \( J(w, f, \mathfrak{z}) \).

By [J-L-R.99 Theorem 31], [L-R.03 Proposition 5.2.1 and Theorem 10.2.1], there is \( q_\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \) such that all such integrals are absolutely convergent for
\[ \mathfrak{z} \in D_\sigma^2(w) = \mathbb{C}^t(w, -1) \cap D(w, q_\sigma) \]
and extends to a meromorphic function on \( \mathbb{C}^t(w, -1) \). Moreover, by [ibid.], it satisfies a series of functional equations with respect to standard intertwining operators associated to certain Weyl elements. Here we will only be interested with the Weyl element \( \tau_r = (r+1) \in \mathfrak{S}_r \). Clearly \( w \) commutes with \( \tau_r \), hence, in order to state the functional equation of the intertwining periods, we only need to check that \( \tau_r \) belongs to the set denoted by \( W(w, w) \) in Section 3.4 of [L-R.03 (\( \Omega(w, w) \) in [J-L-R.99 Chapter VII]). But noticing that there is no positive root of the center of \( M \) which is fixed by \( w \), the first part of [L-R.03 Proposition 3.4.1] tells us that \( \tau_r \) indeed belongs to \( W(w, w) \). Then, for \( \mathfrak{z} \in \mathbb{C}^t(w, -1) \), according to [L-R.03 Theorem 10.2.1], the intertwining period satisfies the functional equation:
\[ J_\sigma(w, A_\sigma(\tau_r, \mathfrak{z}) f_\mathfrak{z}, \tau_r(\mathfrak{z})) = J_\sigma(w, f_\mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{z}). \]

\[ \text{(2)} \]

### 8.2 Local open periods and their associated equation

#### 8.2.1 The non archimedean non-split case

Here \( G = G_m \) and the other notations are as in Section [8.1]. We take \( t = 2r \) with \( r \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\} \), and \( \mathbf{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_t) \) a self-dual partition of \( m \). We set \( P = P_{\mathbf{m}} = P_{(m_1, \ldots, m_t)} = MN \). The element \( u \) is as in Section [8.1] but with \( \delta_{E/F} \) instead of \( \delta_{l/k} \), and for \( S \) a subgroup of \( G \), the definitions of
\( S^n \) and \( S(u) \) are the same. Moreover, in this situation, for \( w = u \theta(u)^{-1} \), the involution \( \theta^w \) sends \( P \) to \( P' = P^t \). In particular the double coset \( PuH \) is open in \( G \).

For each \( i \), let \( \sigma_i \) be a finite length representation of \( G_{m_i} \), and assume that \( \sigma_{i+1}^\sigma = \sigma_i^\sigma \) for all \( i \). We set \( \sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_\ell \) as usual. The representation \( \sigma \) is \( M^\sigma \)-distinguished, and we denote by \( L \) the nonzero \( M^\sigma \)-invariant linear form on \( V_{\sigma} \) defined by

\[
L : v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_t \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^t < v_i, v_{t+i-1} >
\]

where \( < , > \) is the natural pairing between a representation and its contragredient. More generally for \( x = (s_1, \ldots, s_\ell) \in \mathbb{C}^\ell(w, -1) \), the linear form \( L \) belongs to \( \text{Hom}_{M^\sigma}(\sigma[x], \mathbb{C}) \). For \( \mathfrak{f}_x \) a flat section in the space of \( \pi_{\sigma} = \text{Ind}^G_{\sigma}(\sigma[x]) \), we define:

\[
J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) = \int_{P(u) \backslash H} L(\mathfrak{f}_x(uh)) dh.
\]

This is the situation studied in [B-D.08]. Here we summarize how their results apply in our particular situation. The following theorem follows from [B-D.08] Theorems 2.8 and 2.16, and the fact that the condition on \( \eta \) in Theorem 2.16 of [ibid.] is always satisfied by Theorem 4(i) of [L.08].

**Theorem 8.1.** There is \( q_\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \), such that the integral \( J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) is absolutely convergent for

\[
s \in D_{\sigma}^{J,L}(w) = \mathbb{C}^\ell(w, -1) \cap D(w, q_\sigma).
\]

For \( x \in D_{\sigma}^{J,L}(w) \), the map \( \mathfrak{f}_x \mapsto J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) defines a nonzero \( H \)-invariant linear form on \( V_{\pi_{\sigma}} \). Moreover, there is a nonzero Laurent polynomial \( P \) such that \( P(q^{1/2})J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) belongs to \( \mathbb{C}[q^{1/2}] \) for all \( f \).

**Remark 8.1.** Notice that for some well chosen \( f = \mathfrak{f}_x \) in the subspace \( C^\infty_c(P \backslash PuH, \delta_p^{1/2} \sigma) \subset \pi = \pi_{\sigma} \), the local intertwining/open period \( J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) is identically equal to 1.

We will say that \( J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) has a singularity (a pole if \( x \) consists of one complex variable) at \( x = x_0 \) if for some flat section \( \mathfrak{f}_x \), the function \( J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) has a singularity at \( x = x_0 \). Otherwise we will say that \( J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) is holomorphic or regular at \( x = x_0 \). By Remark 8.1 if \( J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) is holomorphic or regular at \( x = x_0 \), then \( J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L) \) is nonzero.

We now suppose that \( \sigma \) is irreducible. By Theorem 5.1 and because \( \pi_{\sigma} \) is irreducible for all \( x \) in a Zariski open subset of \( \mathbb{C}^\ell(w, -1) \), we deduce the following functional equation.

**Proposition 8.1.** If \( \sigma \) is irreducible, there exists an element \( \alpha_\sigma \) (depending on \( w, \tau_r \) and \( L \)) of \( \mathbb{C}(q^{-1}) \), such that for any flat section \( \mathfrak{f}_x \) in \( \pi_{\sigma} \):

\[
J_{\tau_r(w)}(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, \tau_r(x), \pi_{\sigma}, \tau_r(x), L) = \alpha_\sigma(x) J_\sigma(w, \mathfrak{f}_x, x, L).
\]

### 8.2.2 The non-Archimedean split case

As above, the reference for the results of this paragraph can be chosen to be [B-D.08], but the results also follow from the usual properties of intertwining operators. The field \( F \) is \( p \)-adic and \( E = F \times F \). The involution \( \theta \) of \( E \) is just \( \theta : (x, y) \mapsto (y, x) \). The group \( G \) is \( G_m(\mathfrak{O}_E) = G_m(\mathfrak{O}_F) \times G_m(\mathfrak{O}_F) \), and \( H = G_0 \) is just \( G_m(\mathfrak{O}_F) \) embedded diagonally inside \( G \). We take \( t = 2r \) with \( r \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\} \), and \( \mathfrak{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_t) \) a self-dual partition of \( m \). We set

\[
P = P_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathfrak{O}_F) \times P_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathfrak{O}_F) = MN.
\]
We consider \( \kappa_i \), a finite length representation of \( G_{m_i}(\mathcal{O}_F) \) for all \( i \) from 1 to \( t \), and set
\[
\kappa = \kappa_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \kappa_t.
\]

We denote by \( w \) the element \( w_t \) of \( \mathcal{S}_t \), then set
\[
w(\kappa)^\vee = \kappa_t^\vee \otimes \cdots \otimes \kappa_1^\vee,
\]
and define the representation \( \sigma \) of \( M = M_{m_1(\mathcal{O}_F)} \times M_{m_t(\mathcal{O}_F)} \) to be the tensor product
\[
\sigma = \kappa \otimes w(\kappa)^\vee.
\]

We then set \( u = (I_n, w) \in G \), hence \( w \theta(u)^{-1} = (w, w) \), or just \( w \) seen as an element inside \( H \). The definitions of \( \theta^w \), \( S^w \) and \( S(u) \) for \( S \) a subgroup of \( G \) are as before. For \( \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C}^t \), we set
\[
\sigma[\mathbf{s}] = \kappa[\mathbf{s}] \otimes w(\kappa[\mathbf{s}])^\vee,
\]
and
\[
\pi_{\mathbf{s}} = \text{Ind}^G_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}]) = \text{Ind}^G_{\mathcal{F}}(\kappa[\mathbf{s}]) \otimes \text{Ind}^G_{\mathcal{F}}(w(\kappa[\mathbf{s}])^\vee).
\]

We define the linear form \( L \in \text{Hom}_{M^+}(\sigma_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbb{C}) - \{0\} \) by the formula:
\[
L : ( \otimes_{i=1}^t v_i, \otimes_{i=1}^t w_i ) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^t <v_i, w_{t+1-i}>.
\]

With these notations the definition of the intertwining period \( J_{\theta}(w, f_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathcal{O}_F, L) \) is the same as above for \( f_{\mathbf{s}} \) a flat section of \( \pi_{\mathbf{s}} \). In fact, if \( f_{\mathbf{s}} \) is a pure tensor \( h_{\mathbf{s}} \otimes g_{\mathbf{s}} \), the intertwining period is related to the standard operator associated to \( w \) by the following identity:
\[
J_{\theta}(w, h_{\mathbf{s}} \otimes g_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathcal{O}_F, L) = \langle A_r(w, \mathbf{s}) h_{\mathbf{s}}, g_{\mathbf{s}} \rangle,
\]
where \( \langle \ , \ \rangle \) is the natural pairing between a representation and its contragredient.

The immediate analogues of Theorems 8.1, Remark 8.1, and Proposition 8.1 are then valid, and we don’t state them (in fact we state their exact analogues in the archimedean split case hereunder), they either follow from [B-D.08], or from the usual properties of standard intertwining operators.

### 8.2.3 The archimedean split case

Now we recall the similar results in the archimedean situation. They can either be deduced from [B-D.92] and [C-D.94] or from the usual properties of standard intertwining operators in the archimedean situation. The only reason why we need to consider archimedean intertwining periods being for our local-global application, we thus restrict to the split case (in the sense that the group and the quadratic algebra are split). Hence \( F = \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C}, E = F \times F, \theta(x, y) = (y, x) \) for \( x \) and \( y \) in \( F \). We set \( G = G_n(E) \), and define \( H, \) and \( P = MU \) (associated to self dual partition \( \Pi = (n_1, \ldots, n_t) \) of \( n \), with \( t = 2r \) an even positive integer), \( u, w, S^w \) and \( S(u) \) for \( S \) a closed subgroup of \( G \) as in Section 8.2.2. We consider for each \( i \) from 1 to \( t \) a Harish-Chandra module of \( G_{m_i}(F) \), and set
\[
\kappa = \kappa_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \kappa_t.
\]
For \( \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C}^t(w, -1) \), we define \( \kappa[\mathbf{s}] \) and \( w(\kappa[\mathbf{s}])^\vee \) as in Section 8.2.2 and set
\[
\sigma[\mathbf{s}] = \kappa[\mathbf{s}] \otimes w(\kappa[\mathbf{s}])^\vee.
\]

\( \text{together with its Casselman-Wallach completion } \sigma[\mathbf{s}]^\infty. \) We define \( L \in \text{Hom}_{M^+}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}], \mathbb{C}) - \{0\} \) as in Section 8.2.2. We then set
\[
\pi_{\mathbf{s}}^\infty = \text{Ind}_F^G(\sigma[\mathbf{s}]^\infty),
\]
and define the representation \( \sigma[\mathbf{s}] \) of \( M = M_{m_1(\mathcal{O}_F)} \times M_{m_t(\mathcal{O}_F)} \) to be the tensor product
and $\pi_\sigma$ the Harish-Chandra subspace of $K$-finite vectors in $\pi_{\infty, \sigma}$. For $f_\omega$ a flat section in the normalized smooth induced representation $\pi_{\infty, \sigma}$, we set

$$J_{\sigma}(w, f_\omega, \omega, L) = \int_{P(w)\backslash H} L(f_\omega(uh))dh.$$ 

Because of Equation [3], the following result can be seen either as a consequence of the basic properties of standard intertwining operators, or of [C-D.94, Theorem 3]. Its statement will be enough for our purpose.

**Theorem 8.2.** There is $q_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, such that the integral $J_{\sigma}(w, f_\omega, \omega, L)$ is absolutely convergent for

$$\omega \in D^{\Pi}_{\sigma}(w) = C'(w, -1) \cap D(w, q_\sigma).$$ 

For $\omega \in D^{\Pi}_{\sigma}(w)$, the map $f_\omega \mapsto J_{\sigma}(w, f_\omega, \omega, L)$ defines a nonzero $H$-invariant linear form on $V_{\infty, \sigma}$, which is moreover continuous.

As the representation $\pi_\sigma$ is dense in $\pi_{\infty, \sigma}$, because it is by definition the subspace of $K$-finite vectors in there, we deduce the following corollary.

**Corollary 8.1.** There is $f \in \pi = \pi_0$, such that the archimedean intertwining period $J_{\sigma}(w, f_\omega, \omega, L)$ is nonzero.

We suppose that $\sigma$ is irreducible, hence $\pi_{\infty, \sigma}$ is irreducible for all $\omega$ in a Zariski open subset of $C'(w, -1)$, and so by Schur’s lemma, there is up to scaling a unique nonzero $H$-invariant continuous linear form on $\pi_{\infty, \sigma}$. This implies the following functional equation.

**Proposition 8.2.** If $\sigma$ is irreducible, there is a meromorphic function $\alpha_{\sigma}$ on $C'(w, -1)$, such that for all $f \in \pi_{\infty}$, one has the equality:

$$J_{\tau_r(\sigma)}(w, A_\sigma(\tau_r, \omega)f_\omega, \tau_r(\omega), L) = \alpha_{\sigma}(\omega)J_{\sigma}(w, f_\omega, \omega, L).$$

In fact, when we moreover suppose that $\sigma$ is generic unitary, which is the case when it is the local component of a cuspidal automorphic representation, this functional equation can be obtained by a direct computation, which moreover gives a formula for $\alpha_{\sigma}(\omega)$ that we shall use in our local-global application.

**Proposition 8.3.** Suppose that $\sigma$ is generic unitary, and that $\psi$ is a non trivial character of $K$, then

$$\alpha_{\sigma}(\omega) \sim \gamma(2s_r, \kappa_r, \kappa_{r+1}', \psi)^{-1}\gamma(-2s_r, \kappa_r', \kappa_{r+1}, \psi)^{-1}.$$ 

**Proof.** Take $f = h \otimes g \in \pi$, then it is shown in [B-D.92, Section 4] that

$$J_{\sigma}(w, f_\omega, \omega, L) = \langle A_\kappa(w, \omega)h_\omega, g_\omega \rangle,$$

where

$$\langle u, v \rangle = \int_K <u(k), v(k)>dk,$$

and

$$\langle v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_1, v_1' \otimes \cdots v_1' \rangle = \prod_{i=1}^\ell \langle v_i, v_i' \rangle.$$ 

Set $w'' = w \circ (\tau_r)^{-1}$, so that $\ell(w) = \ell(\tau_r) + \ell(w'')$. Hence

$$J_{\tau_r(\sigma)}(w, A_\kappa(\tau_r, \omega) f_\omega, \tau_r(\omega)) = \langle A_{\tau_r(\kappa)}(w, \tau_r(\omega)) A_\kappa(\tau_r, \omega)h_\omega, A_{\omega(\kappa')}(\tau_r, -\omega)g_\omega \rangle$$

$$= \langle A_{\kappa''}(w'', \omega) A_{\tau_r(\kappa)}(\tau_r, \omega) A_\kappa(\tau_r, \omega)h_\omega, A_{\omega(\kappa')}(\tau_r, -\omega)g_\omega \rangle$$

$$\sim \gamma(2s_r, \kappa_r, \kappa_{r+1}', \psi)^{-1}\gamma(-2s_r, \kappa_r', \kappa_{r+1}, \psi)^{-1} \langle A_{\kappa''}(w'', \omega)h_\omega, A_{\omega(\kappa')}\tau_r(\omega)g_\omega \rangle.$$ 
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where the relation

\[ A_{r,(\kappa)}(\tau_r, \tau_r) A_{\kappa}(\tau_r, \omega) \sim \gamma(2s_r, \kappa_r, \kappa_{r+1}, \psi)^{-1}\gamma(-2s_r, \kappa_r+1, \kappa_r, \psi)^{-1} Id \]

follows from \cite{A.89} Section 3], which applies here as for some choice of \( \omega \), the representation \( \pi_\omega \) is tempered. Finally

\[ < A_{w''}(w'', \omega) h_{\omega}, A_{w''}(w'', \omega) g_{\omega} >= < A_{w''}(w'', \omega) A_{w''}(w'', \omega) h_{\omega}, g_{\omega} > \]

by \cite{A.89} (J4)], which is in turn equal to \( < A_{w}(w, \omega) h_{\omega}, g_{\omega} > \), and this ends the computation. □

9 Computation of the local proportionality constants

9.1 Unramified computations

In this section, we take \( D = F \) so that \( D_E = E \). We now focus on the explicit computation of intertwining periods at the unramified places following \cite{J-L-R.99, Chapter VII, 20}], so the notations will be those of Section 8.1 Setting \( B_n = B_n(E) \), we recall that a generic unramified representation \( \pi \) of \( G_n \) can always be written as a commutative product

\[ \pi = \chi_1 \times \cdots \times \chi_n = \text{Ind}_{B_n}^{G_n} (\chi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \chi_n), \]

where the \( \chi_i \)'s are unramified characters of \( G_1 \), which don’t differ from one another by \( \nu^{\pm 1} \).

Notations being as in section 8.1 we set \( G = G_n \), we write \( H \) or \( H_n \) for \( G_{n_0}^{0} \), \( A = A_n \), \( U = N_n(E) \) (or \( N_n \)), so \( B = A U \). If \( \pi \) is an unramified generic representation, we denote by \( \phi_0 \) the normalized spherical vector in \( \pi_0 = \pi \), hence \( \phi_\omega \) that in \( \pi_\omega \). Following \cite{J-L-R.99, Chapter VII, 20}], we are going to define the unramified intertwining periods attached to more general Weyl elements than just \( w = w_1 \) considered before, when the representation is induced from the Borel subgroup. This is the generality of \cite{J-L-R.99} and \cite{L-R.03} but in this paper, we mainly need the intertwining period attached to \( w_1 \) except in this section. Hence let’s consider \( \overline{\pi}^{B} = (1, \ldots , 1) \), and take \( u = u_c \) for \( c = (n_{i,j}) \in I(\pi^{B}) \). It is automatically \( B \)-admissible, and we denote by \( \xi \) the involution \( uu^{-9} \) in \( G_0 < G \). Again for any subgroup \( S \) of \( G \), we denote by \( S^n \) the fixed points in \( S \) of the involution \( x \mapsto \xi \theta(g) \xi^{-1} \) of \( G \), and by \( S(u) \) the group \( uu^{-1}S^n u \). Let

\[ \chi = \chi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \chi_n \]

be an unramified character of \( A \) which is distinguished by \( A^w \) and \( \omega \) an element of \( \mathbb{C}^n(\xi, -1) \), then \( \chi|_\omega \) is still \( A^w \)-distinguished. Set

\[ \pi_\omega = \chi_1 \nu^{\pm 1} \times \cdots \times \chi_n \nu^{\pm n}, \]

and suppose that \( \pi \) is irreducible (i.e. unramified generic). For \( f_\omega \) a flat section for \( \pi_\omega \), we formally define the following integral:

\[ J_\chi(\xi, f_\omega, s) = \int_{B(\omega)H} f_\omega(h)dh. \]

It is well defined and absolutely convergent for \( s \) in a cone of the form \( \mathbb{D}_\chi(\xi) = \mathbb{C}^n(\xi, -1) \cap D(\xi, q_\chi) \) for some \( q_\chi > 0 \). This latter claim can be checked for example by induction on the number of transpositions occurring in the support of \( \xi \), reducing to the \( n = 2 \) and \( \xi = (1, 2) \) computation, for which the absolute convergence follows from Theorem 8.1. Then, for all values of \( s \) in a Zariski open subset of \( \mathbb{C}^n(\xi, -1) \) the representation \( \pi_\omega \) is irreducible, hence \( \text{Hom}_\chi(\pi_\omega, 1) \) has dimension 1 and one can apply Bernstein’s principle recalled in \cite{M.14} Theorem 2.11] to conclude that
$J_\sigma(\xi, f_\alpha, s)$ extends to a rational function of $q^{-s}$ for $s \in \mathbb{C}'(\xi, -1)$.

Now we want to state explicitly the functional equations satisfied by those unramified intertwining periods. This is given once again by [J-L-R.99], where it has been noticed in Proposition 39, that the analogue of Proposition 33 of [ibid.] holds in the local unramified situation. For the reader’s convenience, we recall their proof.

**Proposition 9.1.** Let $\pi$ and $\chi$ be as above, $u \in R(B\backslash G/H)$ and set $\xi = uw^{-\theta}$. Take $\alpha = e_i - e_{i+1}$ a simple root which satisfies $\xi(\alpha) < 0$ but $\xi(\alpha) \neq -\alpha$. Denoting by $s_\alpha$ the permutation matrix corresponding to the transposition $(i \ i + 1)$, then one has for $f_\alpha$ a flat section in $\pi_z$:

$$J_\chi(\xi, f_\alpha, s) = J_{s_\alpha(\chi)}(s_\alpha\xi s_\alpha^{-1}, A(s_\alpha, \xi)f_\alpha s_\alpha) = J_{s_\alpha(\chi)}(s_\alpha\xi s_\alpha^{-1}, A(s_\alpha, \xi)f_\alpha s_\alpha(\xi)).$$

**Proof.** Thanks to meromorphic continuation, it is enough to prove it for $s \in D^+_B(\xi)$. We first set $\xi' = s_\alpha\xi s_\alpha^{-1}$, $u' = s_\alpha u$. We denote by $U_\alpha$ the elementary subgroup of $U$ attached to the simple root $\alpha$, and by $R = LV$ the standard parabolic subgroup of $G$ generated by $B$ and $U_\alpha$. We introduce $p : U^u \rightarrow L$, which to an element in $U^u \subset U \subset R$, associates its $L$-part. By definition of $R$, one has $U = U_\alpha.V$, with $U_\alpha \subset L$, hence $p$ is in fact a morphism from $U^u$ to $U_\alpha$. Clearly, the kernel of $p$ is equal to $V^u = V \cap U^u$. Moreover $V \cap U^u' \neq U^u$ thanks to our hypothesis on $\xi$ and $\alpha$, so that $p$ is nontrivial, hence surjective. Thus $p$ induces a continuous isomorphism still denoted $p$ from $V^u \backslash U^u$ to $U_\alpha$. Then one has (up to the convergence issue, which will follow from Fubini’s theorem at the end of the proof)

$$J_{s_\alpha(\chi)}(s_\alpha\xi s_\alpha^{-1}, A(s_\alpha, \xi)f_\alpha s_\alpha(\xi)) = \int_{B(u') \backslash H} A(s_\alpha, \xi)f_\alpha(u'h)dh = \int_{B(u') \backslash H} \int_{U^u \backslash U} f_\alpha(s_\alpha^{-1}u'h)dnudh.$$  

Notice that for fixed $g$, the map $n \mapsto f_\alpha(s_\alpha^{-1}ng)$ is left $V$-invariant, hence the above integral equals

$$\int_{B(u') \backslash H} \int_{n \in U^u \backslash U} f_\alpha(s_\alpha^{-1}u'h)dnudh = \int_{B(u') \backslash H} \int_{V^u \backslash U} f_\alpha(s_\alpha^{-1}u'nh)dnudh$$

$$= \int_{B(u') \backslash H} \int_{V^u \backslash U} f_\alpha(u'nh)dnudh.$$  

Again, seeing the integrand as a function of $n$, it is left $A(u')$-equivariant. Moreover, as $u'$ is $B$-admissible, one has $B(u') = A(u')U(u')$, hence the above integral is equal to

$$\int_{B(u') \backslash H} \int_{A(u')V^u \backslash A(u')U(u')} f_\alpha(u'nh)dnudh = \int_{A(u')V^u \backslash H} f_\alpha(u'nh)dnudh.$$  

Now we assert that one has the semi-direct product decomposition

$$B(u) = B(u').u'^{-1}U_\alpha,$$

which amounts to prove the equality

$$s_\alpha B^u s_\alpha^{-1} = B^u U_\alpha.$$

It remains to show that $B(u) = A(u')V(u')$ to end the proof, or what amounts to the same:

$$s_\alpha B^u s_\alpha^{-1} = A^u V^u.$$  

Notice that for any subgroup $S$ of $G$ normalized by $s_\alpha$ (for example $A$ or $V$), one has the equality $S^u = s_\alpha S^u s_\alpha^{-1}$. In particular

$$s_\alpha B^u s_\alpha^{-1} = (s_\alpha A^u s_\alpha^{-1}) (s_\alpha U^u s_\alpha^{-1}) = A^u s_\alpha U^u s_\alpha^{-1},$$
As \( U^n \) is the set of elements \( n \in U \) such that \( \theta(n) = \xi^{-1} n \xi \), one has \( U^n \subset U \cap \xi^{-1} U \xi \subset V \) (the last inclusion because \( \xi(\alpha) < 0 \)). Hence, finally:
\[
 s_o U^n s_o^{-1} = s_o (U^n \cap V) s_o^{-1} = s_o (U \cap G^n \cap V) s_o^{-1} = s_o (V^n) s_o^{-1} = V^n.
\]

We will apply this proposition repeatedly thanks to the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 9.1.** Let \( c = 2a + 2b \), write \([1, c] = [A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2] \), with \( A_1 \) and \( B_1 \) of length \( a \), and \( A_2 \) and \( B_2 \) of length \( b \). Denote by \( w \) the element of \( \mathcal{G}_c \) which exchanges \( A_1 \) and \( B_1 \) for \( i = 1, 2 \), and by \( \mu \) the element of \( \mathcal{G}_c \) which exchanges \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \). One has \( \mu = \mu_a \circ \mu_{a-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_2 \circ \mu_1 \), where
\[
 \mu_i = s_{a+b+i+1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+b-1} \circ s_{a+b+i+b}
\]
with \( s_{a+b+i+k} = (a + b + i + k - 1) \), which gives a reduced expression of \( \mu \). For \( 1 \leq i \leq a \), set
\[
 w_{i,r} = (s_{a+b+i+r} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+b}) \circ (\mu_i \circ \cdots \circ \mu_1) \circ w \circ (\mu_1^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_i^{-1}) \circ (s_{a+b+i+b} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+r})
\]
for \( r \) between 1 and \( b \). Write \( \alpha = c_{i-1} - c_1 \) with \( l = \alpha + b + i + r - 1 \) if \( r \geq 2 \), and \( l = \alpha + b + i + 1 + b \) if \( r = 1 \) and \( i \leq a - 1 \). Then \( w_{i,r}(\alpha) \) is \( < 0 \), but not equal to \( -\alpha \).

**Proof.** First suppose that \( l = a + b + i + r - 1 \) with \( r \geq 2 \). Then \( l \) is sent to \( a + b + i + b \) by \( s_{a+b+i+b} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+r} \), which remains untouched by \( \mu_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mu_i^{-1} \), which is then sent to \( i \) by \( w \), and \( i \) is untouched again by \( \mu_i \circ \cdots \circ \mu_1 \) and by \( s_{a+b+i+r} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+b} \), i.e. \( w_{i,r}(l) = i \). On the other hand, one has \( (s_{a+b+i+b} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+r})(l-1) = l - 1 \), then
\[
 l - 1 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - 2 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - 3 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - i = a + b + r - 1,
\]
w(\( a + b + r - 1 \)) = a + r - 1, and \( s_{a+b+i+r} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+b} \) fixes \( a + r - 1 \), hence \( w_{i,r}(l - 1) = a + r - 1 \), in particular \( w_{i,r}(\alpha) \) is negative, and not equal to \( -\alpha \).

Now suppose that \( r = 1 \), hence \( l = a + b + i + 1 + b \), then \( \mu_j^{-1}(l) = l \) for all \( j \) from 1 to \( i \), \( w(l) = i + 1 \), and \( \mu_k(i + 1) = i + 1 \) for all \( k \) from 1 to \( i \), hence \( w_{i,1}(l) = i + 1 \). On the other hand
\[
 l - 1 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - 2 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - 3 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - i - 1 = a + b + b,
\]
w(\( a + b + b \)) = \( a + b \), and \( \mu(\alpha) = a + b \), hence \( w_{i,1}(l - 1) = a + b \). In particular \( w_{i,1}(\alpha) \) is negative and \( \neq -\alpha \).

**Lemma 9.2.** Let \( c = 2a + 2b \), write \([1, c] = [A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2] \), with \( A_1 \) and \( B_1 \) of length \( a \), and \( A_2 \) and \( B_2 \) of length \( b \). Denote by \( w \) the element of \( \mathcal{G}_c \) which exchanges \( A_1 \) and \( B_1 \), for \( i = 1, 2 \), and by \( \mu \) the element of \( \mathcal{G}_c \) which exchanges \( A_2 \) and \( B_1 \). One has \( \mu = \mu_a \circ \mu_{a-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_2 \circ \mu_1 \), where
\[
 \mu_i = s_{a+i} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+i+b-1} \circ s_{a+i+b}
\]
with \( s_{a+i+k} = (a + i + k - 1) \), which gives a reduced expression of \( \mu \). For \( 1 \leq i \leq a \), set
\[
 w_{i,r} = (s_{a+i+r} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+i+b}) \circ (\mu_i \circ \cdots \circ \mu_1) \circ w \circ (\mu_1^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_i^{-1}) \circ (s_{a+i+b} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+i+r})
\]
for \( r \) between 1 and \( b \). Write \( \alpha = c_{i-1} - c_1 \) with \( l = a + i + r - 1 \) if \( r \geq 2 \), and \( l = a + i + 1 + b \) if \( r = 1 \) and \( i \leq a - 1 \). Then \( w_{i,r}(\alpha) \) is \( < 0 \), but not equal to \( -\alpha \).

**Proof.** If \( r \geq 2 \), hence \( l = a + i + r - 1 \) then \((s_{a+b+i+r} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+b})(l) = a + i + b \), \( \mu_j^{-1}(a + i + b) = a + i + b \) for \( j \) from \( i - 1 \) to 1, then \( w(a + i + b) = i, \mu(k)(i) = i \) for \( k \) from 1 to \( i - 1 \), and \( s_{a+i+k'}(l) = i \) for \( k' \) from \( r \) to \( b \), hence \( w_{i,r}(l) = i \). On the other hand, one has \((s_{a+b+i+b} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+i+r})(l - 1) = l - 1 \), then
\[
 l - 1 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - 2 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - 3 \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mu_i^{-1}} l - i = a + r - 1,
\]
$w(a + r - 1) = 2a + b + r - 1$, and $s_{a+b+r} \circ \cdots \circ s_{a+b+b}$ fixes $2a + b + r - 1$, in particular $w_{l, r}(l - 1) = 2a + b + r - 1$, hence $w_{l, r}(l - 1) = 2a + b + r - 1$, and not equal to $-\alpha$. If $r = 1$, hence $l = a + i + 1 + b$, then $\mu_j^{-1}(l) = l$ for all $j$ from $i$ to $1$, $w(l) = i + 1$, and $\mu_k(i + 1) = i + 1$ for all $k$ from $1$ to $i$, hence $w_{i, 1}(l) = i + 1$. On the other hand

$$l - 1 \xrightarrow{\mu_{i - 1}} l - 2 \xrightarrow{\mu_{i - 2}} l - 3 \xrightarrow{\mu_{i - 3}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mu_1} l - i = a + b,$$

$w(a + b) = c$, and $\mu(c) = c$, hence $w_{i, 1}(l - 1) = c$. In particular $w_{i, 1}(\alpha)$ is negative and $\neq -\alpha$. 

We will also need to know that the intertwining periods are multiplicative in a certain sense.

**Proposition 9.2.** Let $l_1$ and $l_2$ be positive integers, $l = l_1 + l_2$, choose $u_1 = u_{c_1}$ for $c_1 \in I(1, \ldots, 1)$, $u_2 = u_{c_2}$ for $c_2 \in I(1, \ldots, 1)$, and set $w_i = u_i \theta(u_i)^{-1}$. Set $u = \text{diag}(u_1, u_2) \in G$, so that the Weyl element $w = u \theta(u)^{-1}$ is equal to $\text{diag}(w_1, w_2)$. Let $\chi_1^i \otimes \cdots \otimes \chi_i^k$ be an unramified character of $A_{i1}$ which is $\nu^{n_{i1}}$-distinguished, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^k(w_i, -1)$, so that $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2)$ belongs to $\mathbb{C}^i(w_i, -1)$. Denote by $\phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}$ the normalized unramified vector in $\pi_{\mathbf{a}_1} = \nu^{n_{i1}} \chi_1^i \times \cdots \times \nu^{n_{i1}} \chi_i^k$, and by $\phi_{\mathbf{a}_2}$ that in $\pi_{\mathbf{a}_2} = \pi_{\mathbf{a}_1} \times \pi_{\mathbf{a}_2}$, then one has

$$J_{\chi}(w, \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}, \mathbf{a}_1) = J_{\chi_1}(w_1, \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}, \mathbf{a}_1) J_{\chi_2}(w_2, \phi_{\mathbf{a}_2}, \mathbf{a}_2).$$

**Proof.** Take $\mathbf{a}_1 \in D_{\chi_1}(w_1)$. Then writing

$$B = \text{diag}(B_{l_1}, B_{l_2}) N_{(l_1, l_2)},$$

one has $B(u) = \text{diag}(B_{l_1}(u_1), B_{l_2}(u_2)) N_{(l_1, l_2)}^\theta$. We thus obtain

$$J_{\chi}(w, \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}, \mathbf{a}_1) = \int_{B(u) \backslash H} \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}(uh) dh = \int_{B(u) \backslash P_{(1, l_2)}^\theta} \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}(uh) dh$$

$$= \int_{B_{l_1}(u_1) \backslash H_{l_1}} \int_{B_{l_2}(u_2) \backslash H_{l_2}} \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}(\text{diag}(uh_1, uh_2)) dh_1 dh_2$$

$$= \int_{B_{l_1}(u_1) \backslash H_{l_1}} \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}(uh_1) dh_1 \int_{B_{l_2}(u_2) \backslash H_{l_2}} \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}(uh_2) dh_2 = J_{\chi_1}(w_1, \phi_{\mathbf{a}_1}, \mathbf{a}_1) J_{\chi_2}(w_2, \phi_{\mathbf{a}_2}, \mathbf{a}_2).$$

Now consider two generic unramified representations of $G_n$ and $G_m$ respectively,

$$\pi = \chi_1 \times \cdots \times \chi_n$$

and

$$\pi' = \chi_1' \times \cdots \times \chi_m'.$$

Then by the inductivity relation of the Rankin-Selberg $L$-factors proved in [JPS-S.83] Proposition (9.4)], one has:

$$L(s, \pi, \pi') = \prod_{i,j} L(s, \chi_i, \chi_j'),$$

where the factors $L(s, \chi_i, \chi_j')$ are those defined in Tate’s thesis. By [ML.11 Theorem 5.3], the Asai $L$-factors also satisfy a similar relation:

$$L^+(s, \pi) = \prod_{i<j} L(s, \chi_i, \chi_j) \prod_k L(s, \chi_{k|F^+}),$$
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\[ L^-(s, \pi) = \prod_{i<j} L(s, \chi_i, \chi_j) \prod_k L(s, \eta_{E/F} \chi_k | F^*) \]  

Notice that for \( \pi \) as above (and in fact it is true for any standard module but we don’t need this result here):

\[ L^+(s, \pi) L^-(s, \pi) = L(s, \pi, \pi^\theta). \]

Now suppose that \( \sigma_i = \chi_{i,1} \times \cdots \times \chi_{i,n_i} \) is an unramified generic representation of \( G_{n_i} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, t \). We identify \( \pi = \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_t \) with \( \chi_{1,1} \times \cdots \times \chi_{t,n_t} \) via the map

\[ f \mapsto [g \mapsto f(g(I_{n_1}, \ldots, I_{n_t}))]. \]

In particular we will talk of the normalized spherical vector \( \phi \in \pi \), hence of the normalized spherical vector \( \phi_{\underline{s}} \) in \( \pi_{\underline{s}} \) for \( \underline{s} \in \mathbb{C}^t \). The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the Gindikin-Karpelevic formula of [L.71].

**Lemma 9.3.** Suppose that \( n = n_1 + \cdots + n_t \), and let \( \sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_t \) be a generic unramified representation of \( G_{n_1} \times \cdots \times G_{n_t} \). We write \([1, n] = [I_1, \ldots, I_t] \), with \( I_i \) of length \( n_i \), and for \( 1 \leq j \leq t - 1 \) let \( \tau_j = (j, j + 1) \). If \( \phi \) is the normalized spherical vector in \( \pi = \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_t \), one has

\[ A_\nu(\tau_j, \underline{2}) \phi_{\underline{2}} = \frac{L(s_j - s_{j+1}, \sigma_j, \sigma_{j+1}^\vee)}{L(s_j - s_{j+1} + 1, \sigma_j, \sigma_{j+1}^\vee)} \phi_{\underline{2}}. \]

Before we state the next result, let’s identify two intertwining periods seen as intertwining periods for the same representation, but induced from different Levi subgroups. As in Section we start with \( \underline{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_t) \) a self-dual partition of \( n \), and \( P = P_{\underline{n}} = MN \) the corresponding parabolic subgroup of \( G \). As in Section [S.2.1] we let \( u \in R(P \backslash G/H) \) be the \( P \)-admissible element corresponding to the open orbit, and \( w = w_t = u \theta(u)^{-1} \) the associated permutation matrix. We then consider \( \sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_t \) a generic unramified representation of \( G_{n_1} \times \cdots \times G_{n_t} \), with \( \sigma_i = \chi_{i,1} \times \cdots \times \chi_{i,n_i} \). We set \( \chi = \chi_{1,1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \chi_{t,n_t} \), it is an unramified character of \( \mathbb{C}^t \). Note that \( \sigma_i^\vee \) canonically identifies with \( \chi_{i,1}^{-1} \times \cdots \times \chi_{i,n_i} \) via the pairing given by integrating on \( B_{n_i} \backslash G_{n_i} \). We moreover suppose that \( \sigma \) is \( M^u \)-distinguished, i.e. that \( \sigma_{w(i)} = (\sigma_i^\vee)^w \) for all \( i \), or equivalently \( \sigma_{w(i)} = \sigma_i^\vee \) as the \( \sigma_i \)'s are unramified. With the chosen identifications, this is equivalent to \( \chi_{w(i),j} = \chi_{i,j}^{-1} \) for all \( i \) and \( j \). Note that for \( \underline{s} \in \mathbb{C}^t(w, -1) \), the representation \( \sigma_{\underline{s}} \) is still \( M^u \)-distinguished, and in this situation there is a canonical \( M^u \)-invariant linear form on \( \sigma_{\underline{s}} \) given by:

\[ L(\psi_{\underline{s}}) = \int_{B_{n_i} \backslash G_{n_i}} \psi_{\underline{s}}(m) dm. \]

The corresponding open intertwining period attached to a flat section \( f_{\underline{s}} : G \to V_\nu \) is then

\[ J_\sigma(w, f_{\underline{s}} \hat{\rho}, L) = \int_{P(u) \backslash H} L(f_{\underline{s}})(h) dh. \]

As the linear form \( L \) is canonical, we set

\[ J_\sigma(w, f_{\underline{s}} \hat{\rho}, L) = J_\lambda(w, f_{\underline{s}} \hat{\rho}, L) \]

Now identify \( \pi = \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_t \) and \( \chi_{1,1} \times \cdots \otimes \chi_{t,n_t} \) as already explained, then an immediate generalization of the computation before [L.L-R.99, Theorem 36] shows the equality:

\[ J_\sigma(w, f_{\underline{s}} \hat{\rho}) = J_\lambda(w, f_{\underline{s}} \hat{\rho}). \]

We can now state the main result of this section, which is the explicit computation of the open intertwining period of Section [S] for spherical vectors.
**Theorem 9.1.** Let $r$ be a positive integer, $t = 2r$, and $\pi = (n_1, \ldots, n_t)$ be a self-dual partition of $n$, and $w = w_1 \in \mathcal{G}_r$. Let $\sigma_i$ be an unramified generic representation of $G_{n_i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, t$, and suppose that $\sigma_{\nu_i}^1 = \sigma_i^0$. Write $[1, n] = [I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_t, J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_t]$, with each interval $I_k$ and $J_k$ of length $n_k$. Set for $w \in \mathcal{C}_r(w, -1)$, $\pi_\omega = \nu_1 \times \cdots \times \nu_t$ and $\phi_\omega$ the normalized spherical vector in $\pi_\omega$. Then

$$J_r(w, \phi_\omega, \pi_\omega) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} L(s_i - s_j, (\sigma_i^0) \gamma, \sigma_j^0) L(s_i + s_j, \sigma_i, \sigma_j^0) \prod_{k=1}^r \frac{L^+(2s_k, \sigma_k)}{L^-(2s_k + 1, \sigma_k)}.$$  

**Proof.** We take $w \in \mathcal{D}_r(w)$ as it is sufficient to prove the equality there, hence all the integrals we consider will be absolutely convergent. We proceed exactly as in [J-L-R.99, Proposition 39], where the case $r = 1$ is treated, with an induction on $r$. We suppose $r \geq 2$. We denote by $\beta$ the permutation of $[1, n]$ which acts like this on the intervals: $J_1 \rightarrow I_2, I_2 \rightarrow I_3, \ldots, I_{r-1} \rightarrow I_r, I_r \rightarrow J_r, J_r \rightarrow J_{r-1}, J_{r-1} \rightarrow J_1$. For $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, write

$$[1, n] = [A_1, \ldots, A_i, B_i, \ldots, B_{i+1}, B_i, B_i, \ldots, B_2],$$

with each $A_k$ and $B_k$ of size $n_k$, then define $\beta_i$ as the permutation exchanging $B_{i+1}$ and $B_i$. Similarly for $1 \leq j \leq r - 1$, write

$$[1, n] = [A_1, \ldots, A_j+1, B_1, A_{j+2}, \ldots, A_r, B_r, \ldots, B_2],$$

with each $A_k$ and $B_k$ of size $n_k$, then define $\beta_j$ as the permutation exchanging $A_{j+1}$ and $B_1$. One can decompose $\beta$ as

$$\beta = \beta_1' \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{r-1}' \circ \beta_{r-1} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1.$$

Counting the number of inversions, we see that $\ell(\beta) = \ell(\beta_1') + \cdots + \ell(\beta_{r-1}') + \ell(\beta_{r-1}) + \cdots + \ell(\beta_1)$. Hence we can factorize $A(\beta, s)$ as

$$A(\beta, s) = A(\beta_1', \beta_2' \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1(\pi)) \circ \cdots \circ A(\beta_2, \beta_1(\pi)) \circ A(\beta_1, \pi)$$

We set

$$\gamma_i = \beta_i \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1$$

for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, and

$$w_i = \gamma_i \circ w \circ \gamma_i^{-1}.$$

We also put

$$\gamma_j' = \beta_j' \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{r-1}' \circ \beta_{r-1} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1' = \beta_j' \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{r-1}' \circ \gamma_{r-1}^{-1}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq r - 1$, and:

$$w_j' = \gamma_j' \circ w \circ \gamma_j'^{-1}.$$

Hence, writing

$$[1, n] = [A_1, \ldots, A_r, B_r, \ldots, B_{i+1}, B_i, B_{i+1}, \ldots, B_2]$$

with $A_k$ and $B_k$ of length $n_k$, $w_i$ exchanges $A_k$ and $B_k$ for all $k$. Similarly, writing

$$[1, n] = [A_1, \ldots, A_j, B_1, A_{j+1}, \ldots, A_r, B_r, \ldots, B_2],$$

then $w'_j$ exchanges $A_l$ and $B_l$ for all $l$. Setting $w_0 = w, \gamma_0 = Id, w'_j = w_{r-1},$ and $\gamma'_r = \gamma_{r-1}$, we claim that

$$J_{\gamma_i-1}(w_{i-1}, \phi_{\gamma_i-1}(\omega), \gamma_i-1(\omega)) = \frac{L(s_i - s_{i+1}, (\sigma_i^0) \gamma, \sigma_{i+1}^0)}{L(s_i - s_{i+1} + 1, (\sigma_i^0) \gamma, \sigma_{i+1}^0)} J_{\gamma_i}(w_i, \phi_{\gamma_i}(\omega), \gamma_i(\omega))$$

(4) for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ and

$$J_{\gamma_{j+1}}(w_{j+1}', \phi_{\gamma_{j+1}}'(\omega), \gamma_{j+1}'(\omega)) = \frac{L(s_i + s_{i+1}, \sigma_{j+1}^0 \gamma, \sigma_{j+1}')}{L(s_i + s_{i+1} + 1, \sigma_{j+1}^0 \gamma, \sigma_{j+1}')} J_{\gamma_{j+1}}(w_j', \phi_{\gamma_{j+1}}'(\omega), \gamma_{j+1}'(\omega))$$

(5)
for $1 \leq j \leq r-1$. Indeed, by Lemma 9.1 applied to the restriction of $w_{i-1}$ to $[A_1, A_{i+1}, B_{i+1}, B_1]$, and $\beta_i$, we can apply Proposition 9.1 repeatedly, and this gives the equality

$$J_{\gamma_i(\chi)}(w_{i-1}, \phi_{\gamma_i(\chi)}, \gamma_{i-1}(2)) = J_{\gamma_i(\chi)}(w_i, A(\beta_i, \gamma_{i-1}(2))\phi_{\gamma_i(\chi)}, \gamma_i(2)).$$

Similarly Lemma 9.2 applied to the restriction of $w_{j+1}'$ to $[A_1, A_{j+1}, B_1, B_{j+1}]$, and $\beta_j'$, allows to apply Proposition 9.1 repeatedly, and this gives the equality

$$J_{\gamma^i_{j+1}(\chi)}(w_j', \phi_{\gamma^i_{j+1}(\chi)}, \gamma_{j+1}'(2)) = J_{\gamma^i_{j+1}(\chi)}(w_j', A(\beta_j', \gamma_{j+1}'(2))\phi_{\gamma^i_{j+1}(\chi)}, \gamma_j'(2)).$$

Equalities (1) and (5) now follow from Proposition 9.3. Hence we get that:

$$J_\chi(w, \phi_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{L}) = \prod_{1 \leq s \leq r-1} \frac{L(s_1 - s_{i+1}, (\sigma^0_1)^{\vee}, \sigma^0_1) L(s_1 + s_{i+1}, \sigma^0_{r+1}, \sigma^0_1)}{L(s_1 - s_{i+1} + 1, (\sigma^0_{r+1})^{\vee}, \sigma^0_1) L(s_1 + s_{i+1} + 1, \sigma^0_{r+1}, \sigma^0_1)} J_{\beta(\chi)}(\beta^{-1} w, \phi(\mathcal{L}), \beta(\mathcal{L}))$$

However $\beta^{-1} w \beta = w^\sigma \circ w^\omega$, where if one writes

$$[1, n] = [A_1, B_1, A_2, \ldots, A_r, B_r, \ldots, B_2],$$

the permutation $w^\sigma$ exchanges $A_1$ and $B_1$, whereas $w^\omega$ exchanges $A_i$ and $B_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq r$. In particular, setting $s^\sigma = (s_2, \ldots, s_r, -s_1, \ldots, -s_2)$, $s^\omega = \sigma_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_r \otimes \sigma^0 \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma^0_2$ and applying Proposition 9.2 and the case $r = 1$, we obtain:

$$J_\sigma(w, \phi_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{L}) = J_\chi(w, \phi_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{L}) = \prod_{2 \leq t \leq r} \frac{L(s_1 - s_{i+1}, (\sigma^0_1)^{\vee}, \sigma^0_1) L(s_1 + s_{i+1}, \sigma^0_{r+1}, \sigma^0_1)}{L(s_1 - s_{i+1} + 1, (\sigma^0_{r+1})^{\vee}, \sigma^0_1) L(s_1 + s_{i+1} + 1, \sigma^0_{r+1}, \sigma^0_1)} J_{\sigma^-}(w^\sigma, \phi_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{L}^-)$$

The statement follows by induction.

Finally, we just say a word about the easier case where $E = F \times F$, with $\theta(x, y) = (x, y)$ for $x$ and $y$ in $F$. In this situation the statement of Theorem 9.1 is still valid, and can be proved in a similar but easier fashion. It is in fact a direct consequence of the Gindikin-Karpelevich formula thanks to Equality (3).

### 9.2 Ramified proportionality constants

In this paragraph, we will use a local-global method to obtain an explicit expression of the constant $\alpha_\sigma(s)$ of Proposition 8.1, when the intertwining period is induced from a discrete series representation. We take $E/F$ a quadratic extension of $p$-adic fields, and $\mathcal{D}_F$ a division algebra of odd index $d$ over its center $F$. Thanks to Lemma 5 and the proof of Theorem 6 in [K.04], we can choose $l/k$ a quadratic extension of number fields, such that:
1) there is a unique place $v_0$ of $k$ lying over $p$ and $F \simeq k_{v_0}$,
2) $v_0$ is non split in $l$, and if $v_0$ is the place of $l$ dividing it, then $E \simeq l_{v_0}$,
3) every infinite place of $k$ splits in $l$.

Thanks to the Brauer-Hasse-Noether theorem ([P-R.91, Theorem 1.12]), we also choose $\mathcal{D}$ a division algebra with center $k$, such that $\mathcal{D}_{v_0} = \mathcal{D}_F$: it automatically splits at every infinite place because its index is odd. We denote by $\theta$ the involution associated to $l/k$, hence to $l_{v_0}/k_{v_0}$ for every place $v$ of $k$. The central simple $l$-algebra $\mathcal{D}_l = \mathcal{D} \otimes_k l$ is also a division algebra. Now the group $G_l$ is as in Section 8.1 for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, as well as the other associated subgroups such as $H_l = G^0_l$. For $t = 2r$ a positive even integer, and $\mathfrak{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_k)$ a self-dual partition of $m$, we consider for each $i$ between 1 and $r$ a quasi-square integrable representation $\delta_i$ of $G_{m_i}$, and suppose that $\delta_{i+1} = (\delta_i)^{\vee}$ for all $i$ between 1 and $t$. We set $w = w_i$ and $\mathcal{A} = A_i$. Thanks to Corollary 1.1 for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, we consider $\delta_i$ as the component of the (only) place (dividing) $v_0$.
of a cuspidal automorphic representation $\sigma$, of $G_m(\mathfrak{O} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{A})$ such that $\text{JL}(\sigma)$ is also cuspidal, and $\text{JL}(\sigma_0) = \text{JL}(\sigma)$ (the first equality is our convention). We then set

$$\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_r \otimes (\sigma_0^\vee) \otimes \cdots \otimes (\sigma_0^\vee) = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_r.$$ 

It is a cuspidal automorphic representation of $M(\mathbb{A})$, and there is a unique $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{C}(w, -1)$ such that $\sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is trivial on $A_M$, this observation will thus allow to consider the global intertwining period attached to $\sigma$ and $w$. For $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{C}(w, -1)$, we define as usual $\pi_{\mathfrak{g}} = \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{A}}^{G} (\sigma_{\mathfrak{g}})$. The linear form

$$L : \psi_\mathfrak{g} \in \sigma[\mathfrak{g}] \mapsto \int (\text{Ad}(v) \rho(\mathfrak{a}))^n \psi_\mathfrak{g}(m)dm$$

is defined by convergent integrals thanks to [A-G-R.93 Proposition 1], and it provides a linear form $L_v$ (independent of $\mathfrak{g}$) on each $\sigma_v[\mathfrak{g}]$, which is $(M_v)^n \cap K_v$-invariant and cancelled by $\text{Lie}(M_v)^n$ when $v$ is infinite, and $(M_v)^n$-invariant when $v$ is finite. Notice that when $v$ is infinite, such a linear form automatically extends to a unique continuous $(M_v)^n$-invariant linear form on $\sigma_v[\mathfrak{g}]$ by [B-D.92 Theorem 1]. By local multiplicity one, this implies that the global intertwining period attached to a flat section $f_\mathfrak{g} = \otimes \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{g} \in \pi_{\mathfrak{g}}$ decomposes for $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{C}(w, -1) \cap D(w, q_\mathfrak{g})$ with $q_\mathfrak{g}$ large enough, as an infinite product of the intertwining periods studied in Section S.2 for good choices of $L_v$:

$$J_\sigma(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}) = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{g})} J_{\sigma_v}(w, f_{v, \mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}, L_v).$$

Moreover, thanks to Theorem [9.1] and its non inert analogue, and Corollary [8.1] for some good choice of decomposable $f$, we obtain the following result.

**Proposition 9.3.** For some choice of decomposable $f$, the function $\mathfrak{g} \mapsto J_\sigma(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})$ is nonzero.

In fact, taking $S$ as in Propositions [6.7] and [6.8] the $f_\mathfrak{g}$ above can be taken such that $f_{v, \mathfrak{g}}$ is spherical for $v \notin S$. We set

$$J_{\sigma, S}(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}) = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{g})} J_{\sigma_v}(w, f_{v, \mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{g}, L_v)$$

and

$$J_{\sigma}^S(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}) = \frac{J_{\sigma}(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})}{J_{\sigma, S}(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})}.$$ 

We enlarge $S$ if necessary, so that it contains all places $v$ of $k$ such that $\mathfrak{O}$ is non split. Hence for $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathfrak{C}(w, -1) \cap D(w, q_\mathfrak{g})$ with $q_\mathfrak{g}$ large enough, Theorem [9.1] and its split analogue yields the following equality where both sides converge:

$$\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} L^S(s_i - s_j + 1, (\text{JL}(\sigma_j)^\vee, \text{JL}(\sigma_i)^\vee)L^S(s_i + s_j + 1, \text{JL}(\sigma_i), \text{JL}(\sigma_j)^\vee)\times$$

$$\prod_{k = 1}^{r} L^S(-2s_k + 1, \text{JL}(\sigma_k))J_{\sigma}^S(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})$$

$$= \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} L^S(s_i - s_j, (\text{JL}(\sigma_j)^\vee, \text{JL}(\sigma_i)^\vee)L^S(s_i + s_j, \text{JL}(\sigma_i), \text{JL}(\sigma_j)^\vee)\prod_{k = 1}^{r} L^S(2s_k, \text{JL}(\sigma_k)). \quad (6)$$

By extension of meromorphic identities Equality [6.6] is true everywhere. Using the relation $L^S(\text{JL}(\sigma_r), \text{JL}(\sigma_r)^\vee) = L^S(s, \text{JL}(\sigma_r))L^S(-s, \text{JL}(\sigma_r))$ and after simplifications, we obtain the following equality of meromorphic functions:

$$\frac{J_{\sigma_1}(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})J_{\sigma_r}(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})}{J_{\sigma}^S(w, f_\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})} = \frac{L^S(-2s_r, \text{JL}(\sigma_r))}{L^S(1 - 2s_r, \text{JL}(\sigma_r))} \frac{L^S(-2s_r, \text{JL}(\sigma_r))}{L^S(1 + 2s_r, \text{JL}(\sigma_r))}. \quad (7)$$
Applying Proposition 6.7, we deduce:

\[
\frac{J_S^{\tau}(w,A(\tau_r,s),\tau'_r(s))}{J^2_S(w,\tau(s))} = \prod_{v \in S} \gamma(2s_r, JL(\sigma_{r,v}), \psi_v) \gamma(\psi, -2s_r, JL(\sigma_{r,v}), \psi_v). \tag{8}
\]

We will need the following elementary lemma.

**Lemma 9.4.** Let \( (p_1, \ldots, p_l) \) be a finite family of prime numbers, and let \( r \) belong to \( \mathbb{N}^r \), then the family of functions \( (p_i^{−s_j})_{i=1, \ldots, l; j=1, \ldots, r} \) of the variable \( s \in \mathbb{C}^r \) is algebraically independent over \( \mathbb{C} \).

**Proof.** We recall that if \( u_1, \ldots, u_m \) are different complexe numbers, then the functions of the complex variable \( t: e^{u_1t}, \ldots, e^{u_mt} \), are linearly independent over \( \mathbb{C} \) (by a Vandermonde determinant argument for example). This implies at once that if \( a_1, \ldots, a_l \) are linearly independent over \( \mathbb{Z} \), then the functions \( e^{a_1t}, \ldots, e^{a_lt} \) are algebraically independent over \( \mathbb{C} \). By the prime factorization theorem, this applies to the family \( a_1 = \ln(p_1), \ldots, a_l = \ln(p_l) \), hence for all \( i = 1, \ldots, r \), the functions \( (p_i^{s_1}, \ldots, p_i^{s_r}) \) are algebraically independent over \( \mathbb{C} \). Now suppose that \( P(p_i^{s_1}, \ldots, p_i^{s_r}) = 0 \) for \( P \) a polynomial with coefficients in \( \mathbb{C} \). Writing this equality

\[
\sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_l} A_{i_1, \ldots, i_l}(p_1^{s_1}, \ldots, p_l^{s_r}) = 0,
\]

and fixing \( s_1, \ldots, s_r-1 \), we deduce that \( A_{i_1, \ldots, i_l}(p_1^{s_1}, \ldots, p_l^{s_r}) = 0 \) for all values of \( s_1, \ldots, s_r-1 \). By induction we deduce that \( P = 0 \), which proves the statement of the Lemma. \( \square \)

It has the following corollary, which generalizes [K,04] Lemma 3].

**Lemma 9.5.** Let \( F \) be a finite set of primes, and for each prime \( p \in F \), let \( R_p(s_1, \ldots, s_r) \) be an element of \( \mathbb{C}(p^{-s_1}, \ldots, p^{-s_r}) \), such that

\[
\prod_{p \in F} R_p(s_1, \ldots, s_r) = 1,
\]

Then each \( R_p \sim 1 \).

**Proof.** Write \( R_p = A_p / B_p \), with \( A_p \) and \( B_p \) in \( \mathbb{C}[p^{-s_1}, \ldots, p^{-s_r}] - \{0\} \). This implies that

\[
\prod_{p \in F} A_p(s_1, \ldots, s_r) \prod_{p \in F} B_p(s_1, \ldots, s_r).
\]

By Lemma 9.4, we can read this

\[
\prod_{p \in F} A_p(X_p) = \prod_{p \in F} B_p(X_p),
\]

with the variables \( X_{p,i} \) algebraically independent. Hence we can specialize all \( X_p \) except one (say \( p_0 \)) to \( x_p \in \mathbb{C}^r \) such that \( A_p(x_p) \neq 0 \), from which we get \( A_{p_0} \sim B_{p_0} \). \( \square \)

Now considering for each place \( v \) of \( k \), the proportionality constants \( \alpha_v = \alpha_{\sigma,v} \) defined in Propositions 8.1 and 8.2. Using the functional equation of global intertwining periods and global Asai L-functions with our unramified and Archimedean computations, we obtain the following formula.

**Theorem 9.2.** Let \( \delta = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t \) be a discrete series representation of \( M \) with \( t = 2r \) and \( \delta_{t+1} = (\delta_t^*)^t \), let \( \psi \) be a non trivial character of \( E \), trivial on \( F \). Then one has the up to scalar equality of meromorphic functions on \( \mathbb{C}^*(w, -1) \):

\[
\alpha_{\delta}(w) \sim \gamma(2s_r, JL(\delta_r), \psi)^{-1} \gamma(\psi, -2s_r, JL(\delta_r), \psi)^{-1}.
\]
Proof. We consider \( l, k, \sigma, \pi \) etc. as in the beginning of the section, hence \( \sigma_{v_0} = \delta \). Let \( \prod_{v \in P(k)} \psi_v \) a non trivial character of \( \mathbb{A}_k \) trivial on \( 1 + \mathbb{A}_k \) such that \( \psi_{v_0} = \psi \). We take \( S \) and \( f_\sigma \) with the same requirements as those before Equality \([8]\), in particular \( v_0 \in S \). Thanks to the functional equation of \( J_\sigma (w, f_\sigma, 2) \) (Equation \([2]\) of Section \([8.1]\)) and the local functional equations for \( v \in S \), we have:

\[
\prod_{v \in S} \alpha_v(s) = \frac{J_{\tau, \sigma}(w, A(\tau, 2) f_\sigma, \tau(2))}{J_{\sigma, w}(w, f_\sigma, \sigma(2))} = \frac{J_{\sigma}^S(w, f_\sigma)}{J_{\tau, \sigma}^S(w, A(\tau, s) f_\sigma, \tau(s))}
\]

which is in turn equal to

\[
\prod_{v \in S} \gamma^{-2s_r, JL(\sigma_{v, v_0})} V^{-1}(-2s_r, (\text{JL}(\sigma_{v, v_0}) V, \psi_v)^{-1}
\]

thanks to Equation \([8]\). Then thanks to Proposition \([8.3]\) and Lemma \([9.5]\) using our assumption on \( v_0 \), we deduce as expected that

\[
\alpha_v(s) \sim \gamma^{-2s_r, JL(\sigma_{v, v_0})} V^{-1}(-2s_r, (\text{JL}(\sigma_{v, v_0}) V, \psi_v)^{-1}
\]

\[\square\]

10 Distinguished representations of \( \text{GL}(m, D) \)

Following the authors of \([L-M, 14]\), we make the following definition.

**Definition 10.1.**

- Let \((\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t)\) be a sequence of cuspidal segments, we say that they form a ladder if there is a cuspidal representation \( \rho \) such that \( \Delta_i = [a_i, b_i]_\rho \), with \( a_1 > \cdots > a_t \) and \( b_1 > \cdots > b_t \). We also say that the discrete series \( \delta_i = L(\Delta_1, \ldots, \delta, \Delta_t) \) form a ladder in this case. We say that the \( \Delta_i \)'s (or the \( \delta_i \)'s) form an anti-ladder if the \( \Delta_{\omega_i} \) form a ladder.

- We say that the ladder is proper if \( \Delta_{i+1} \subset \Delta_i \) for all \( i \), and that the anti-ladder is proper if \( \Delta_i \subset \Delta_{i+1} \) for all \( i \).

- If \((\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t)\) is a ladder of discrete series, we call the Langlands' quotient \( L(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t) \) of the standard module \( \delta_1 \times \cdots \times \delta_t \) a ladder representation, or just a ladder. We say that it is proper if \((\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t)\) is proper.

In this section, we will use the functional equation of \( p \)-adic open periods to classify distinguished ladder representations. We will also show that thanks to our method, we in fact only need Beuzart-Plessis' result in the cuspidal case (see Section \([10.3]\) for the reduction to this case). The main step will be to understand the singularities of these open periods, this will be done in Section \([10.4]\). Many proofs of known results for \( G = \text{GL}(m, E) \) are valid for \( G = \text{GL}(m, \mathbb{D}_E) \). Whenever we refer for non split \( G \) to a result proved only in the split case, this means that the proof still holds for the inner form without modification.

10.1 Distinguished induced representations

We complete the results of Paragraph \([5.2]\) the notations are the same. Most of the results here are consequences of Proposition \([5.4]\). We first recall Proposition \([10.14]\) Proposition 7.1.

**Proposition 10.1.** Let \( \sigma \) be a representation of \( M \) such that \( \text{Hom}_{M \subset H}(\sigma, \mathbb{C}) \neq 0 \), then \( \text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma) \) is \( H \)-distinguished. Moreover for \( \lambda \in \text{Hom}_{M \subset H}(\sigma, \mathbb{C}) \), the linear map

\[
J_\sigma(., \lambda) : f \mapsto J_\sigma(f, \lambda) = \int_{P \cap H \setminus H} \lambda(f(h)) dh
\]

is \( H \)-invariant on \( \text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma) \), and the map \( \lambda \mapsto J_\sigma(., \lambda) \) is injective.
We now suppose that $P = P_{(m_1, \ldots, m_t)}$ is self-dual, and let $u$ be the element of $R(P \setminus G/H)$ attached to $w = w_t$, with $t$ even or odd. Then the following is a consequence of Theorem 8.1 (see [G.15, Proposition 2.3] and more generally [O.17, Proposition 2.1]). The definition of $J_\sigma$ hereunder is straightforward when $t$ is odd (we only defined it when $t$ is even) and the properties of such a map are the same according to [B-D.08].

**Proposition 10.2.** With notations as above, and $\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_t$ is a finite length representation of $M$, such that $\text{Hom}_{M^t}((\sigma, C) \neq \{0\}$, then if $L \in \text{Hom}_{M^t}((\sigma, C) \neq \{0\}$, there is an element $\theta \in C^t(w, -1) - \{0\}$, and $o \in \mathbb{Z}$ (and in fact necessarily in $\mathbb{N}$), such that

$$\Gamma_L : f \mapsto \lim_{s \to 0} s^o J_\sigma(w, f_{\theta^o} s_{\theta^o}) L$$

defines a nonzero $H$-invariant linear form on $\text{Ind}_{P}^G(\sigma)$.

**Remark 10.1.** The integer $m$ is indeed in $\mathbb{N}$, because of Remark 8.1

Let us state some consequences of the results stated above. We have the following result due to Gurevich.

**Proposition 10.3.** A standard module $\delta_1 \times \cdots \times \delta_t$ of $G$ is distinguished if and only if there is $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$ such that $\delta_i(i) = (\delta_i^0)^\vee$ for all $i$, and $\delta_i(i)$ is moreover $\theta$-distinguished if $\epsilon(i) = i$.

**Proof.** One direction is [G.15, Proposition 3.4], its proof is essentially based on Remark 5.1. The converse direction is explained in [M-0.17, Proposition 2.9], and uses Propositions 10.1 and 10.2.

**Corollary 10.1.** If $\pi$ is an irreducible representation of $G$, which is $H$-distinguished, then $\pi^\vee = \pi^0$.

**Proof.** It is a consequence of the statement [M-0.17, Proposition 2.9], the Langlands’ quotient theorem, and (2) of Proposition 5.2.

Let’s go back to the setting of Proposition 10.2 and Remark 10.1. A favorable situation is when $o = 0$. This is the case in the following situation.

**Proposition 10.4.** In the situation of Proposition 10.2, suppose that among all $u_i \in R(P \setminus G/H)$, the only $M^u_i$-distinguished Jacquet module $r_{M^u_i, M}((\sigma, C) = \sigma$, then $J_\sigma(w, \ldots, L)$ is holomorphic at $\theta$. Moreover, the map

$$L \mapsto J_\sigma(w, \ldots, \theta L)$$

is an isomorphism between $\text{Hom}_{M^t}(\sigma, C)$ and $\text{Hom}_H(\text{ind}_{P}^G(\sigma), C)$. The inverse map between $\text{Hom}_H(\text{ind}_{P}^G(\sigma), C)$ and $\text{Hom}_{M^t}(\sigma, C) \simeq \text{Hom}_{H}(\text{ind}_{M^t}^G((\sigma, C) \simeq \text{Hom}_H(C^\infty(P \setminus P, H, \delta^0)^2), C)$ is given by the following isomorphism composed with the natural isomorphisms above

$$J \mapsto J_{\xi^\vee(P \setminus P, H, \delta^0)^2}(\sigma).$$

**Proof.** It follows from Proposition 5.4 that there is a natural injection of $\text{Hom}_H(\text{ind}_{P}^G(\sigma), C)$ into $\text{Hom}_{M^t}(\sigma, C)$ in this situation. However [O.17, Proposition 7.2] and its proof show that the map

$$L \mapsto J_\sigma(w, \ldots, \theta L)$$

is an injection in the other direction. The two maps can be shown to be inverse of each other.

The proposition above applies in the following situation.

**Proposition 10.5.** Let $\sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t$ be such that $\text{Ind}_{P}^G(\sigma)$ is a standard module, and suppose moreover that $\delta_i$ and $\delta_j$ are not isomorphic whenever $i \neq j$. If $\text{Hom}_{M^t}(\sigma, C) \neq 0$, then we are in the situation of Proposition 10.4 and $\text{Hom}_H(\text{ind}_{P}^G(\sigma), C)$ is one dimensional.
Proof. This is the content of the proof of [G.15, Proposition 3.6].

We will also need to apply Proposition 10.3 to the following extra cases.

**Proposition 10.6.** Let \( \delta_1 = L(\Delta_1), \ldots, \delta_r = L(\Delta_r) \) be an anti-ladder of discrete series, such that there is a cuspidal unitary representation \( \rho \), with \( \Delta_i = [a_i, b_i]_H \), and \( a_{i+1} - i = -b_i \) for all \( i \). Suppose moreover that the \( \Delta_i \) and \( \Delta_{i+1} \) are juxtaposed if they are linked. Set

\[
\sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t.
\]

Then the condition \( \text{Hom}_{M^s}(\sigma, C) \neq 0 \) is equivalent to the condition \( \text{Hom}_{H}(\text{Ind}_G^P(\sigma), C) \neq 0 \). If \( \text{Hom}_{M^s}(\sigma, C) \neq 0 \), then we are in the situation of Proposition 10.4 (and \( \text{Hom}_{H}(\text{Ind}_G^P(\sigma), C) \) is of dimension 1).

**Proof.** We do an induction on \( t \), the case \( t = 1 \) being trivial. If \( t \geq 2 \), we write each \( \delta_i \) under the form \( L([c_i, d_i]) \), and we only need to consider the Jacquet modules \( r_{M_i, M}(\delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t) \) with \( \alpha \in R(P \backslash G/H) \), and \( \overline{m}_\alpha \) a \( \rho \)-adapted sub-partition (see Remark 10.5.2 and the conventions there for the notations here) of \( \overline{m} \). By Proposition 10.3.1, it is enough to show by induction that if \( r_{M_i, M}(\delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t) \) is \( M^{u_\alpha} \)-distinguished, then \( u_\alpha = u \). Hence we assume that \( r_{M_i, M}(\delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t) \) is \( M^{u_\alpha} \)-distinguished. We write \( \delta_j = [\delta_{j,1}, \ldots, \delta_{j,t}] \), with each \( \delta_{j,s} \) corresponding to a possibly empty segment (i.e. not appearing in \( \delta_t \)) of length \( m_{j,t} \) with \( a = (m_{j,t}) \). Let \( i_0 \) be the largest integer \( \geq 1 \) such that \( \delta_{i_0} \) appears in \( \delta_t \), so that \( \delta_1 = [\ldots, \delta_{i_0}] \). The Jacquet module

\[
r_{M_i, M}(\delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t) = (\delta_{i_0} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{i_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes (\delta_{i_m} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{i_n}) \otimes \cdots \otimes (\delta_{t,t} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t)
\]

being \( M^{u_\alpha} \)-distinguished forces \( \delta_{i_0} = (\delta_{i_0}^\alpha)^\vee \), and this implies that \( i_0 = t \) because of the anti-ladder condition and the condition on the left and right ends of the segments. We write \( \delta_t = [\delta_{t,1}, \ldots, \delta_{t,t}] \). Suppose that there was \( k_0 > 1 \) such that \( \delta_t = [\delta_{2k_0}, \delta_{t,k_0}, \ldots] \), then we would have \( \delta_{k_0} = [\ldots, \delta_{k_0}] \). The only way that \( \delta_1 \) and \( \delta_{k_0} \) would be non linked or juxtaposed, which respects the anti-ladder condition is that \( \delta_1 = \delta_{t,t} \), and this is absurd as \( \delta_t \) and \( \delta_1 \) have the same length. Thus \( \delta_t = \delta_{t,1} \) and so \( \delta_1 = \delta_{t,1} = (\delta_{t,1}^\alpha)^\vee \). Writing \( b = (a_{i,j})_{2 \leq i \leq 1, 2 \leq j \leq t-1} \), and \( M' = M_{(m_2, \ldots, m_{t-1})} \), then \( r_{M_i, M'}(\delta_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{t-1}) \) is \( M^{u_\alpha} \)-distinguished, and we conclude by induction. The space \( \text{Hom}_{H}(\text{Ind}_G^P(\sigma), C) \) has dimension one because \( \text{Hom}_{M^s}(\sigma, C) \) has dimension one.

**Proposition 10.7.** Let \( \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t \) be a proper ladder of discrete series, with \( t = 2r \) a positive even integer. Set \( \sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t \). Suppose moreover that \( \delta_t \) and \( \delta_{t+1} \) are juxtaposed and set \( \tau = (r + 1) \). If \( \text{Hom}_{M^s}(\sigma, C) \neq 0 \), then Proposition 10.4 applies to \( \text{Ind}_G^P(\tau, (\sigma)) \) (and \( \text{Hom}_{H}(\text{Ind}_G^P(\tau, (\sigma)), C) \) is of dimension 1).

**Proof.** We do an induction on \( r \). If \( r = 1 \), then we are in the anti-ladder situation of Proposition 10.6. If \( r \geq 2 \), we have \( \tau_r(1) = 1 \) and \( \tau_r(t) = t \). Each \( \delta_i \) is of the form \( L([c_i, d_i]) \), and we only need to consider the Jacquet modules \( r_{M_r, M}(\delta_{\tau_r(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{\tau_r(t)}) \) with \( \alpha \in R(P \backslash G/H) \), and \( \overline{m}_\alpha \) a \( \rho \)-adapted sub-partition. Suppose that \( r_{M_r, M}(\delta_{\tau_r(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{\tau_r(t)}) \) is \( M^{u_\alpha} \)-distinguished. We proceed as in the proof above, and write again \( \delta_j = [\delta_{j,1}, \ldots, \delta_{j,t}] \). Let \( i_0 \) be the smallest integer \( \geq 1 \) such that \( \delta_{i_0} \) appears in \( \delta_t \), so that \( \delta_1 = [\ldots, \delta_{i_0}] \). Then \( \delta_{i_0} = (\delta_{i_0}^\alpha)^\vee \), this implies that \( i_0 = t \) because of the ladder condition and because \( \delta_t = (\delta_t^\alpha)^\vee \). Hence \( \delta_1 = [\ldots, \delta_{i_0}] \) with \( \delta_{i_1} = (\delta_{i_1}^\alpha)^\vee \). As \( \delta_1 = (\delta_1^\alpha)^\vee \), this in turn implies that \( \delta_{i_1} = \delta_1 \) and that \( \delta_{i_1} = \delta_{t,t} \). Writing \( b = (a_{i,j})_{2 \leq i \leq 1, 2 \leq j \leq t-1} \), and \( M' = M_{(m_2, \ldots, m_{t-1})} \), then \( r_{M_r, M'}(\delta_{\tau_r(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{\tau_r(t-1)}) \) is \( M^{u_\alpha} \)-distinguished, and we conclude by induction. The multiplicity one statement is proved as in Proposition 10.6.

10.2 Properties of p-adic open periods

In this quite technical section, we establish that local open periods are compatible in a certain way with the associativity of parabolic induction (of \( x \)), see Proposition 10.9 for the precise
Let $m_1, \ldots, m_r$ be positive integers, with $m_n = n + n'$ for $n$ and $n' \in \mathbb{N}$. We set $m = 2(m_1 + \cdots + m_r)$, $\underline{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_r, m_r, \ldots, m_1)$, and $\overline{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_r-1, n, n', n, m_r-1, \ldots, m_1)$, and introduce the following self-dual parabolic subgroups of $G = G_{2(m_1 + \cdots + m_r)}$ with their standard Levi decompositions (notice that $U$ here is not the unipotent radical of the standard Borel subgroup of $GL(n,E)$ as in Section 9.1):

$$P = P_{\overline{m}} = MN, \quad Q = P_{\underline{m}} = LU.$$ 

For $u \in C$, we consider

$$\tau_u = \tau_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_{r-1} \otimes (\mu[u] \times \mu') \otimes ((\mu^\vee)^{\theta} \times (\mu^\vee)^{\theta}[-u]) \otimes (\tau_{r-1}^{\vee})^\theta \otimes \cdots \otimes (\tau_1^{\vee})^\theta$$

a finite length representation of $M$, with $\mu$ and $\mu'$ representations of $G_n$ and $G_{n'}$ respectively. We set $t = 2r$ and $w = w_1$, and for $\underline{s} \in C^t(w, -1)$, we denote by

$$\Phi : F \mapsto F(.)(I_{m_r}, I_{m_r})$$

the canonical isomorphism corresponding to associativity of parabolic induction from $\text{Ind}_G^G(\tau_u[\underline{s}])$ to $\tau_{\underline{s}u} = \text{Ind}_G^G(\tau[\underline{s}, u])$, where we set

$$\tau[\underline{s}, u] = \tau_1[s_1] \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_{r-1}[s_{r-1}] \otimes \mu[s_r+u] \otimes \mu'[s_r] \otimes (\mu^\vee)^{\theta}[-s_r] \otimes (\mu^\vee)^{\theta}[-u-s_r] \otimes (\tau_{r-1}^{\vee})^\theta[-s_{r-1}] \otimes \cdots \otimes (\tau_1^{\vee})^\theta[-s_1],$$

and by $F : f \mapsto F_f$ its inverse isomorphism. Now we denote by

$$A(u) = A(\mu^\vee)^{\theta} \otimes (\mu^\vee)^{\theta}(-2, 0, -u)$$

the standard intertwining operator from $(\mu^\vee)^{\theta} \times (\mu^\vee)^{\theta}[-u]$ to $(\mu^\vee)^{\theta}[-u] \times (\mu^\vee)^{\theta}$. Denote by $I$ the linear form on $C^\infty(P_{(n,n')} \setminus G_{m_r} \\delta_{P_{m_r,m_r}})$ given by

$$I : j \mapsto \int_{P_{(n,n')} \setminus G_{m_r}} j(g) dg = \int_{K_{m_r}} j(k) dk.$$

We denote by $R(A)$ the subset of $C$ where the intertwining operator $A$ is holomorphic. For $u \in R(A)$, one defines a linear form

$$I_u : f \otimes f' \mapsto I(< f, A(u)f^\theta >)$$

on

$$(\mu[u] \times \mu') \otimes ((\mu^\vee)^{\theta} \times (\mu^\vee)^{\theta}[-u]).$$

This linear form belongs to the set

$$\text{Hom}_H^{\rho_{w_2}}(\tau_u, C) - \{0\}.$$ 

For $u$ still in $R(A)$, this gives birth to a linear form $L_u \in \text{Hom}_H^{\rho_{w_2}} (\tau_u, C) - \{0\}$ defined by

$$L_u : v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r-1} \otimes f \otimes g \otimes v_{r-1}^{\vee} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_1^{\vee} \mapsto I_u(f \otimes g) \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} < v_i, v_i^{\vee} > .$$

We also define, for $w' = w_{2+2}$, the linear form $\ell \in \text{Hom}_H^{\rho_{w_2}} (\tau[\underline{s}, u], C) - \{0\}$ for all $\underline{s}$ and $u$ by

$$\ell : v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r-1} \otimes v \otimes v' \otimes v'^{\vee} \otimes v'^{\vee} \otimes v_{r-1}^{\vee} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_1^{\vee} \mapsto < v, v'^{\vee} > < v', v'^{\vee} > \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} < v_i, v_i^{\vee} > .$$

We will need a few technical results, the first one being the following.
Lemma 10.1. Let $f_{k,u}$ be a flat section of $\pi_{k,u}$, and set $F_{k,u} = F_{k,u}$. For fixed $g \in G$, the vector $F_{0,u}(g)$ can be written as a finite sum

$$\sum_i \lambda_i(u)v_{1,i} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r-1,i} \otimes f_{i,u} \otimes f_{i,u}' \otimes v_{r-1,i} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{1,i}^\gamma,$$

where $f_{i,u}$ and $f_{i,u}'$ are respectively flat sections of $\mu[u] \times \mu'$ and $(\mu^\gamma)^\theta \times (\mu^\gamma)^\theta[u]$, and the functions $\lambda_i$ are holomorphic. Moreover, the map $u \mapsto L_u(F_{0,u}(g))$ is holomorphic in the variable $u$ on $R(A)$.

Proof. The element $g$ is fixed. By definition (and smoothness and admissibility properties), one can write

$$F(u)(g) := F_{0,u}(g)$$

as a finite sum

$$\sum_i \lambda_i(u)v_{1,i} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r-1,i} \otimes f_{i,u} \otimes f_{i,u}' \otimes v_{r-1,i} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{1,i}^\gamma,$$

where the $f_{i,u}$’s belong to a basis of the space of flat sections in $\tau[u] \times \tau'$ (with possibly $f_{i,u} = f_{j,u}$ for $i \neq j$), the $f_{i,u}'$’s belong to a basis of the space of flat sections in $(\tau'^\gamma)^\theta \times (\tau'^\gamma)^\theta[u]$, and for fixed $k$, the $v_{k,i}$’s belong to a basis $\tau_k$, and the $v_{k,i}^\gamma$’s belong to a basis $\tau_k$. Moreover two pure tensors with different indices $i$ are never equal. Now for all $(k_1, k_2) \in K_m \times K_m$, one has

$$(F(u)(g))(k_1, k_2) = \sum_i \lambda_i(u)v_{1,i} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r,i} \otimes f_{i,k_1} \otimes f_{i,k_2} \otimes v_{2,i} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{1,i}^\gamma.$$

Because

$$F(u)(g)(k_1, k_2) = F(u)(\text{diag}(k_1, k_2)g)(I_{m_1}, I_{m_2}) = f_{0,u}(\text{diag}(k_1, k_2)g),$$

and as $f_{0,u}$ is a flat section, the map $u \mapsto F(u)(g)(k_1, k_2)$ is holomorphic in the variable $u$ for all $k_1$ and $k_2$ in $G_{m_1}$. However, as the map $a \mapsto a|_{K_m}$ is injective on $\tau[u] \times \tau'$ and $(\tau'^\gamma)^\theta \times (\tau'^\gamma)^\theta[u]$, this implies that the functions $u \mapsto \lambda_i(u)$ are also holomorphic. Now by definition, in a neighbourhood of $u_0$ where $A(\cdot)$ is holomorphic, the map $u \mapsto L_u(F(u)(g))$ is equal to

$$\sum_i \lambda_i(u) \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} <v_{j,i}, v_{j,i}^\gamma>_g I(<f_{i,u}, A(u)f_{i,u}^\theta>_g),$$

and $I(<f_{i,u}, A(u)f_{i,u}^\theta>_g)$ is just a finite sum of functions of the form $<f_{i,u}(k), A(u)f_{i,u}'(k)>$ for $k \in K_m$. This ends the proof. ∎

We keep the same notations as above.

Lemma 10.2. There are positive real numbers $x, \alpha$ and $\beta$, such that for any $u$ and any coefficient $c_u$ of the representation

$$\tau_u = \tau_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_{r-1} \otimes (\mu[u] \times \mu'),$$

there is $C_u \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, which satisfies for all $(g_1, \ldots, g_r) \in G_{m_1} \times \cdots \times G_{m_r}$:

$$|c_u(g_1, \ldots, g_{r-1})| \leq C_u||g_1||^\alpha \cdots ||g_{r-1}||^\alpha ||g_r||^\alpha|\text{Re}(u)|^\beta.$$

Proof. Writing $g = \text{diag}(g_1, \ldots, g_{r-1}, g_r)$, it is enough to prove the result when $c_u$ is of the form

$$c_u(g) = c_1(g_1) \cdots c_{r-1}(g_{r-1}) c_{r,u}(g_r),$$

where each $c_i$ is a coefficient of $\tau_i$ for $i \leq r - 1$, and $c_{r,u}$ is a coefficient of $\mu[u] \times \mu'$. The result then follows directly from Lemma 8.3 (note that for fixed $u$, any function in $\mu[u] \times \mu'$ can be extended to a flat section). ∎
We now need to go deeper into the technicalities of [B-D.08]. We denote by \( u_w \) the element of \( R(P', G/H) \) such that \( u_w \theta(u_w^{-1}) = w \), and set \( H' = u_w H u_w^{-1} = G^\theta u_w \). A norm map, that we denote \( ||| \cdot |||_{\text{BD}} \), is defined before [B-D.08 Proposition 2.14] on the set \( M \cap H' \setminus M \). We won’t really need its definition as the reader shall see in the proof of the following lemma, we will in fact use another norm. However, the constant \( r \) in Theorem 2.16 of [B-D.08] depends on this norm so we temporarily introduce it because we first need a majorization of this constant. As we already used the letter \( r \) for something else, we will denote it by \( r_0 \). This constant always exists by the results of [L.08] and [K-T.10] but we shall in fact reprove this fact in our context, it can be taken to be any real number which satisfies that for any \( v_\mu \in \tau_\mu \), there is \( C_\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \) such that

\[
|L_u(\tau_\mu(m)v_\mu)| \leq C_\mu ||m||_{\text{BD}}^{r_0}
\]

for all \( m \) in \( M \) (where we write \( ||m||_{\text{BD}} \) for \( ||(M \cap H').m||_{\text{BD}} \)).

**Lemma 10.3.** There are two positive real numbers \( x \) and \( y \) such that for any \( u \in R(A) \) and any \( v_\mu \in \tau_\mu \), there is \( C_\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \) such that

\[
|L_u(\tau_\mu(m)v_\mu)| \leq C_\mu ||m||_{\text{BD}}^{x Re(\mu)+y}
\]

for all \( m \) in \( M \). If moreover \( v_\mu \) is of the form \( F_{\mu,a}(g) \) for \( g \in G \) independent of \( u \), one can take \( u \mapsto C_\mu \) to be continuous.

**Proof.** Now, denoting by \( ||.||_0 \) the norm \( ||m||_0 = ||\theta_w(m)^{-1}m|| \) on \( M^{\theta_w}\setminus M \), it is shown in Section 3.2 of [L.08] that there are \( C' > 0 \) and \( c' > 0 \), such that \( ||.||_{\text{BD}} \leq C'||.||_0^{c'} \). The map

\[
\Phi : (m_1, \ldots, m_r, m'_1, \ldots, m'_r) \mapsto ((m_1)^{-\theta} m_1, \ldots, (m'_r)^{-\theta} m_r)
\]

identifies \( M^{\theta_w}\setminus M \) and \( G_{m_1} \times \cdots \times G_{m_r} \), and \( ||\Phi(\cdot)|| = ||.||_0 \). Moreover the map \( L_u(\tau_\mu(\cdot)v_\mu) \) on \( M^{\theta_w}\setminus M \) can be identified via \( \Phi \) to a coefficient \( c_\mu \) of the representation

\[
\tau_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_{\mu-1} \otimes (\mu|u] \times \mu').
\]

Hence for any \( r_0 \in \mathbb{R} \), to say that

\[
|L_u(\tau_\mu(m)v_\mu)| \leq C'C||m||_0^{c'r_0}
\]

for all \( m \) in \( M \) amounts to saying that

\[
|c_\mu(x)| \leq C'C||x||_0^{c'r_0}
\]

for all \( x \in G_{m_1} \times \cdots \times G_{m_r} \). The first part of the statement of the lemma now follows from Lemma 10.2. If moreover \( v_\mu = F_{\mu,a}(g) \), then the second part of the statement is a consequence of the discussion above and Equality (9) in the proof of Lemma 10.1. \( \square \)

We keep on digging into [B-D.08]. In Theorem [B-D.08 2.16], the authors use in a crucial manner a certain function \( \epsilon \), the properties of which we shall use soon. Let us first recall its definition, keeping the same notations. We extend \( \tau_\mu \) to \( P \) trivially on \( N \), and define for \( u \in R(A) \) a map from \( G \) to \( \text{Hom}_C(\tau_\mu, C) \) which vanishes outside \( PH' \), and is defined on \( PH' \) by the formula:

\[
\epsilon_{\mu,u}(ph') = \delta^{1/2}(p)L_u \circ \tau_\mu[f](p^{-1}).
\]

The following proposition contains important properties of \( \epsilon_{\mu,u} \), from which we deduce a result about the holomorphy of intertwining periods.

**Proposition 10.8.** There are positive real numbers \( a \) and \( b \) such that if we set

\[
U(a, b) = \{(x, u), u \in R(A), x \in C'(w, -1) \cap D(w, a|\text{Re}(u)| + b)\},
\]

the following assertions are satisfied:
1. If \( f_{\alpha} \) is a flat section in \( \pi_{\alpha} \) and \( F_{x,u} = F_{f_{\alpha}} \), the map 
\[
(\pi, u, g) \mapsto \epsilon_{\pi, u}(g)(F_{x,u}(gu))
\]
is continuous on the open set \( U(a, b) \times G \).

2. For \((\pi, u) \in U(a, b)\) and any \( F(s, u) \in \text{ind}_G(\tau_{\pi, u})\), the map \( g \mapsto \epsilon_{\pi, u}(g)F(\pi, u)(gu_\pi) \) is continuous on \( G \) and left \( \delta_P \)-equivariant, moreover 
\[
J_{\tau, u}(w, F(\pi, u), \pi L_u) = \int_{K \cap P \setminus K} \epsilon_{\pi, u}(k)(F(\pi, u)(ku_\pi))dk.
\]

3. For \( F_{x,u} \) as in \([1] \) the map 
\[
(\pi, u) \mapsto J_{\tau, u}(w, F_{x,u}, \pi L_u)
\]
is holomorphic on \( U(a, b) \).

Proof. Property 1 is the most difficult. Suppose that the sequence \((\pi, u_\pi, g_k)\) converges to \((\pi, u, g) \in U(a, b) \times G\), we want to show that \( \epsilon_{\pi, u_\pi}(g_k)(F_{\pi, u_\pi}(g_ku_\pi)) \) tends to \( \epsilon_{\pi, u}(g)(F_{\pi, u}(gu_\pi)) \).

If \( g \) is not in the closure \( \overline{PH}' \) of \( PH' \), then the property is immediate and the limit is zero. If it is sufficient to consider \( g_k \in PH' \). Hence we write \( g_k = n_k m_k h_k \) with \( n_k \in N, m_k \in M \) and \( H_k \in H' \). We distinguish two cases:

a) \( g \in PH' \).

b) \( g \notin PH' \).

In case \([3] \), the map \( g_k^{-\theta_{\pi}} = n_k(m_k m_k^{-\theta_{\pi}})n_k^{-\theta_{\pi}} \) tends to an element in \( NM\theta_{\pi}(N) \). However, as \( \theta_{\pi}(N) \) is opposite to \( N \), the map \( (n, m, n') \Rightarrow nmn' \) is a homeomorphism from \( N \times M \times \theta_{\pi}(N) \) to \( NM\theta_{\pi}(N) \) (see for example before \([3] \) Proposition 1.3.2) and \( n_k \) converges to an element \( n \in N \). This implies that \( m_k m_k^{-\theta_{\pi}} \) also tends to an element of \( M \). Then by \([1] \) Proof of Proposition 2.12, end of p. 254, we deduce that \( m_k \) converges to \( m \in M \), hence that \( h_k \) converges to \( h \in H \).

We now write 
\[
\epsilon_{\pi, u}(g_k)(F_{x,u_k}(g_ku_k)) = \delta_P(m_k^{1/2}n_k^{-1/2})(h_ku_k)L_{\tau_k}(m_k)F_{0,u_k}(g_ku_k)
\] 
and notice that \( F_{0,u_k}(g_ku_k) = F_{0,u_k}(g_ku_k) \) for \( k \) large enough so case \( b \) follows from Lemma \([1] \).1

It remains to treat case \([3] \): we want to show that for \( a \) and \( b \) large enough in the statement of the proposition, the sequence \( \epsilon_{\pi, u_k}(g_k)(F_{x,u_k}(g_ku_k)) \) tends to zero. Thanks to Equation \([10] \), we deduce for \( k \) large enough:

\[
|\epsilon_{\pi, u_k}(g_k)(F_{x,u_k}(g_ku_k))| \leq \delta_P(m_k^{1/2}n_k^{-1/2})(m_k^{-1})||L_{\tau_k}(m_k)F_{0,u_k}(g_ku_k)||.
\]

By the second part of Lemma \([10] \), we obtain

\[
|\epsilon_{\pi, u_k}(g_k)(F_{x,u_k}(g_ku_k))| \leq C_u \delta_P(m_k^{1/2}n_k^{-1})(n_k^{-1})(m_k^{-1})||L_{\tau_k}(m_k)F_{0,u_k}(g_ku_k)||
\]

with \( C_u \) continuous with respect to \( u \). The quantity \( C_u \) converges to \( C_{u_\pi} \) and \( n_k^{-1} \) converges to \( n_\pi^{-1} \) hence they are bounded. Now by \([1] \) Proposition 2.14\([1] \) taking \( g_n := g_n^{-1} \) as we consider \( PH \) and not \( H/P \) here, there is \( A > 0 \) such that

\[
||m_k||_B^{1}(x) < A\eta(x, [\tau_{\pi, u_\pi}] + y)\eta_k(n_k)
\]
for some \( \tau_0 \in C^t(w, -1) \cap \mathbb{R}^t \), so \( \epsilon_{\pi, u_k}(g_k)(F_{x,u_k}(g_ku_k)) \) is bounded by

\[
|n_k^{-1}||L_{\tau_k}(x) + y)\tau_k(n_k^{-1})| = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \left( \frac{\nu(m_k)^{1}}{\nu(m_k, 2r + 1 + i)} \right)^{-(x, y)\tau_k(n_k^{-1})}.
\]
For $a$ and $b$ large enough, the sequence $(\text{Re}(s_{k,i}^{(a)}) - \frac{\nu(m_{k,i})}{\nu(m_{k,2r+1-i})})_{i=1,\ldots,r}$ converges to an element in $(a_1,\ldots,a_r)$ such that $a_1 > a_2 > \cdots > a_r > 0$, in particular one can find real numbers $b_1$ and $c_i$ such that $b_1 > a_1 > c_1 > b_2 > a_2 > b_2 > \cdots > b_r > a_r > c_r$, and for $k$ large enough:

$$
\left( \frac{\nu(m_{k,i})}{\nu(m_{k,2r+1-i})} \right)^{\nu(s_{k,i}^{(a)}) - \frac{\nu(m_{k,i})}{\nu(m_{k,2r+1-i})}} \leq \max \left( \nu(m_{k,i})^{\nu(s_{k,i}^{(a)}) - \frac{\nu(m_{k,i})}{\nu(m_{k,2r+1-i})}}^{b_1}, \nu(m_{k,2r+1-i})^{\nu(s_{k,i}^{(a)}) - \frac{\nu(m_{k,i})}{\nu(m_{k,2r+1-i})}}^{c_1} \right).
$$

We consider the finite number of elements $d = (d_1,\ldots,d_{r'},-d_{r'},\ldots,-d_1)$ of $C^{(w)}$ with $d_1 > \cdots > d_{r'} > 0$ such that for each $i$, $d_i = b_i$ or $c_i$. Thanks to the previous inequality, we have

$$
|\eta_{\mathbb{A}} - \frac{\nu(s_{k,i}^{(a)})}{\nu(m_{k,i})} \nu(m_{k,2r+1-i})| \leq \max_{d} \eta_d(m_k^{-1}),
$$

but the right hand side of this inequality tends to zero according to [B-D.08] Proposition 2.12, (iii), and this concludes the proof of the statement 1.

We now fix until the end of the proof $a$ and $b$ such that point 1 is true. Then the first part of point 2 is immediate from the definitions and point 1. The second part can be found in the proof of [B-D.08] Theorem 2.16.

Finally for fixed $k$, the integrand $\epsilon_{\mathbb{A}}^{(a,b)}(F_{\mathbb{s},u}(ku_w))$ is holomorphic in the variables $(\mathbb{s},u) \in U(a,b)$ and for $(\mathbb{s},u)$ in a compact set $C$ of $U(a,b)$, the integrand is bounded on $C \times K$ thanks to point 1. As we integrate on $K$ which is compact, this implies that $J_{\mathbb{s}}^{(w),F_{\mathbb{s},u}}(u)$ is holomorphic on $U(a,b)$.

We now apply the technical propositions above. We recall that for $u \in R(A)$, the intertwining period $J_{\mathbb{s}}^{(w),F_{\mathbb{s},u}}(u)$ is meromorphic in the variable $\mathbb{s}$. Moreover, by the proposition above, considered as a map of two variables, it is holomorphic on the connected open set $U(a,b)$. On the other hand, setting $w' = w_{t+2} \in \mathbb{G}_{t+2}$, $\tau = \tau[0,1]$ and

$$
\mathbb{s}(u) = (s_1,\ldots,s_{r-1},s_r + u,s_{r-1},-s_r,u-s_{r-1},-s_{r-1},\ldots,-s_1) \in C^{t+2},
$$

the map $J_{\tau}(w',f_{\mathbb{s},u},\mathbb{s}(u),L)$ is meromorphic as a map of the variable $(\mathbb{s},u) \in C^{(w,-1)} \times C$. We set

$$
z = \text{diag}(I_{u+n'},(I_{n}\ I_{n'}))
$$

and

$$
b(z) = \text{diag}(I_{m_1},\ldots,I_{m_{r-1}},z,I_{m_{r-1}},\ldots,I_{m_1}).
$$

We are going to prove that for $u$ fixed in $R(A)$, the meromorphic functions $J_{\mathbb{s}}^{(w),F_{\mathbb{s},u}}(u)$ and $J_{\mathbb{s}}^{(w'},f_{\mathbb{s},u}}(u)$ of the variable $\mathbb{s}$ are equal.

**Proposition 10.9.** Take $u \in R(A)$ and $\mathbb{s} \in C^{(w,-1)}$, then for all $f \in \pi$:

$$
J_{\mathbb{s}}^{(w),F_{\mathbb{s},u}}(u) = J_{\mathbb{s}}^{(w'),f_{\mathbb{s},u}}(u),
$$

**Proof.** First note that for fixed $u \in R(A)$, it is sufficient to prove the equality for $\mathbb{s} \in D(w,\alpha(u))$ for $\alpha(u)$ large enough, hence we can suppose that $(\mathbb{s},u)$ belongs to $U(a,b)$. Moreover as $U(a,b)$ is open and connected, and the intertwining periods on each side of the equality are holomorphic as functions of $(\mathbb{s},u)$ on this set, they will agree if they do an open subset of $U(a,b)$ of the form \{$(\mathbb{s},u) \in U(a,b),\ \text{Re}(u) > \beta$\}. We will take $\beta$ large enough for $A$ to be given by an absolutely convergent integral and also greater than the constant $q_r$ of the statement Theorem [S.1]. Hence we can thus suppose that $\text{Re}(u) > \beta$, and that for such a fixed $u$, the vector $\mathbb{s}$ belongs to $D(w,\alpha(u))$ for $\alpha(u)$ large enough so that the intertwining periods on both sides of the equation are given by
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absolutely convergent integrals. For \( \bullet \in \mathcal{M}_{2m_r} \), we set

\[
a(\bullet) = \begin{pmatrix}
I_{m_1} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & -\delta I_{m_2} \\
\vdots & I_{m_{r-1}} & -\delta I_{m_{r-1}} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \cdots & I_{m_{r-1}} & -\delta I_{m_{r-1}} & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & I_{m_{r-1}} & -\delta I_{m_{r-1}} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & I_{m_1}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

In particular, for

\[
x = \begin{pmatrix}
I_n \\
I_{n'} \\
\vdots \\
I_{n'} \\
I_n
\end{pmatrix}
\]

the matrix \( a(x) \) is the representative in \( R(Q \backslash G/H) \) which corresponds to \( w' \), whereas for

\[
y = \begin{pmatrix}
I_{m_r} & -\delta I_{m_r} \\
-\delta I_{m_r} & I_{m_r}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

the matrix \( a(y) \) is the representative in \( R(P \backslash G/H) \) which corresponds to \( w \). We notice that \( x = zyz^{-1} = zy, \) hence \( a(x) = b(z)a(y)b(z) \). One has

\[
J_r(w', f_{\Delta u}, \delta(u), \ell) = \int_{Q(a(x)) \backslash G^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(a(x)h))dh
\]

\[
= \int_{Q^a \backslash G^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(ha(x)))dh = \int_{L^a \backslash G^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(ha(x)))dh
\]

\[
= \int_{L^a \backslash G^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(hb(z)a(y)b(z)))dh = \int_{L^a \backslash G^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(b(z)ha(y)b(z)))dh
\]

\[
= \int_{M^a \backslash G^a} \int_{L^a \backslash M^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(b(z)mha(y)b(z)))dmdh.
\]

For \( H \) a subgroup of \( G \), we denote by \( H' \) its intersection with the group \( G' \) of matrices

\[
\text{diag}(I_{m_1}, \ldots, I_{m_{r-1}}, g, I_{m_{r-1}}, \ldots, I_{m_1})
\]

with \( g \in G_{2m_r} \). The integral over \( L^a \backslash M^a \) can be rewritten:

\[
\int_{L^a \backslash M^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(b(z)mha(y)b(z)))dm = \int_{L^a \backslash M^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(b(z)mha(y)b(z)))dm
\]

\[
= \int_{Q^a \backslash M^a} \left( \int_{L^a \backslash Q^a} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(b(z)qha(y)b(z)))d_{Q^a}(q) \right) dm.
\]

We define the matrix

\[
v(x_1, x_2) = \text{diag}(I_{m_1}, \ldots, I_{m_{r-1}}, (I_n \ x_1), (I_n \ x_2), I_{m_{r-1}}, \ldots, I_{m_1})
\]

for \( x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{n, n'} \). The inner integral above is thus equal to

\[
\int_{Q^a \backslash M^a} \left( \int_{x_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{n, n'}} \ell(f_{\Delta u}(b(z)v(x_1, x_2)mha(y)b(z))dx_1 \right) dm.
\]
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= \int_{Q^u \setminus M^u} \left( \int_{x_1 \in M_{n,n'}} \ell(f_{\mathcal{L}u}(b(z)v(0,x_1)mha(y)b(z))dx_1 \right) \, dm
= \int_{Q^u \setminus M^u} \ell \left( \int_{x_1 \in M_{n,n'}} f_{\mathcal{L}u}(b(z)v(0,x_1)mha(y)b(z))dx_1 \right) \, dm = L_u(f_{\mathcal{L}u}(ha(y)b(z)))

Hence

J_{\pi}(w', f_{\mathcal{L}u}, \mathcal{L}(u), \ell) = \int_{M^u \setminus G^u} L_u(f_{\mathcal{L}u}(ha(y)b(z))) \, dh = \int_{P(a(y)) \setminus G^u} L_u(f_{\mathcal{L}u}(a(y)b(b(z))) \, dh

and we recognize the integral defining the intertwining period $J_{\pi}(w, \rho(b(z))f_{\mathcal{L}u}, \mathcal{L}_u)$.

10.3 Poles of certain $p$-adic open periods

The following result is a consequence of multiplicity one. We send the reader back to Propositions [10.1] and [10.2] for a better understanding of the following result. In what follows, if we write $\lim_{s \to a} L_s = L$ for some linear form $L_s$ on an induced representation $\pi_s$, it will mean that $L_s$ is a linear form on $\pi_s$, and $\lim_{s \to a} L_s(f_s)$ tends to $L_a(f_a)$ for any flat section $f_s$.

**Proposition 10.10.** Let $\pi$ be a distinguished representation of $G_m$, such that $\pi \times \pi$ is irreducible (in particular $\pi$ is irreducible hence $\pi^\theta = \pi^\vee$ by Corollary [10.1]). Take

$$\lambda \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}^\theta_{t_{(m,m)}}}(\pi \otimes \pi, \mathcal{C}) \setminus \{0\},$$

and

$$L \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}^\theta_{t_{(m,m)}}}(\pi \otimes \pi, \mathcal{C}) \setminus \{0\}.$$ 

Then $J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(w_2, -(s,s), L)$ has a pole at zero, and if this pole has order $k \geq 1$, one has:

$$\lim_{s \to 0} s^k J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(w_2, -(s,s), L) \sim J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(\cdot, \lambda).$$

**Proof.** By Proposition [10.2] there is $k \geq 0$ such that the linear form $\lim_{s \to 0} s^k J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(w_2, -(s,s), L)$ is nonzero. As it lives together with $J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(\cdot, \lambda)$ in the line (Theorem [5.1]) $\operatorname{Hom}_{H_m}(\pi \times \pi, \mathcal{C})$, the relation $\lim_{s \to 0} s^k J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(w_2, -(s,s), L) \sim J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(\cdot, \lambda)$ follows. It remains to show that $k \geq 1$, but if $k$ was equal to 0, this would imply that $J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(\cdot, \lambda)$ is non vanishing on the space

$$\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(P_{(m,m)} \setminus P_{(m,m)} \, w_2 H_{2m}, \delta_{P_{(m,m)}}^{1/2} \pi \otimes \pi),$$

a contradiction.

We can extend the result above to the following useful situation. Let $\pi$ be distinguished representation of $G_{m+1}$, such that $\pi \times \pi$ is irreducible (in particular $\pi^\theta = \pi^\vee$). Let $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r$ be finite length representations of $G_{m_1}, \ldots, G_{m_r}$. Set $m = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} m_i)$, $t = 2r$, and

$$\overline{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_{r+1}, m_{r+1}, \ldots, m_1).$$

Set $w = w_{t+2}$, $\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \ldots \sigma_r \otimes \pi \otimes \pi \otimes (\sigma_1^\theta)^\vee \otimes \cdots \otimes (\sigma_r^\theta)^\vee$, and define $\ell \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}^\theta_{\overline{m}}}(\sigma, \mathcal{C}) \setminus \{0\}$, by

$$\ell : v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_r \otimes v \otimes v^\vee \otimes v^\vee \otimes v_{1}^\vee \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{r}^\vee \mapsto v, v^\vee > 1 \quad \prod_{i=1}^{r} < v_i, v_i^\vee >,$$

We set $P = \text{P}_{\overline{m}}$, $G = G_m$, $H = H_m$ and denote by $u_0$ the element of $R(P \setminus G/H)$ corresponding to $w$. 
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Proposition 10.11. With notations as above, set 
\[ \mathcal{H} = \{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{l+2}(w, -1), s_{r+1} = 0 \}. \]

Then there is \( f \in \text{Ind}_G^F(\sigma) \) such that for any \( \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{H} \),
\[ \lim_{s \to -1} J_\sigma(w, f, \mathbf{z}, \ell) = \infty. \]

Proof. We set \( \mathbf{m'} = (m_1, \ldots, m_r, 2m_{r+1}, m_r, \ldots, m_1) \), \( Q = P_{\mathbf{m'}} \), \( w' = w_{t+1} \) and denote by \( u_1 \) the (admissible) element of \( R(Q \backslash G/H) \) corresponding to \( w' \). Let \( LU \) be the standard Levi decomposition of \( Q \), and \( \ell' \) be the linear form
\[ \ell' : v \otimes v' \mapsto <v, v'> \]
on \( \pi \otimes \pi \), and take any \( h_{s_{r+1}} \in \nu^{s_{r+1}} \pi \times \nu^{-s_{r+1}} \pi \). For \( i = 1, \ldots, r \), take \( v_i \) and \( v_i' \) such that \( <v_i, v_i'> \neq 0 \), and take \( k \) large enough so that \( L \cap K_n(k) \) fixes \( v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_r \otimes h_{s_{r+1}} \otimes v_1' \otimes \cdots \otimes v_r' \).
We set \( H(k) = H \cap u_1^{-1}K_m(k)u_1 \), and define a map \( f_\mathbf{z} \) on \( G \) supported on \( Qu_1H(k) = ULu_1H(k) \) (which is open in \( G \)) by the formula
\[ f_\mathbf{z}(au_1h) = \delta_{Q}^{1/2}(l)\sigma_l(l)v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_r(l) v_r \otimes h_{s_{r+1}}(l_{r+1}) \otimes (\sigma_r)^{\vee}(l_{r+2}) v_r' \otimes \cdots \otimes (\sigma_1)^{\vee}(l_1)v_1'. \]

This map belongs to \( \pi_m \), and
\[ J_\sigma(w, f_\mathbf{z}, \ell) \sim J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(w_2, h_{s_{r+1}}, (s_{r+1} - s_{r+1}), \ell'). \]

Indeed, set \( n = m_1 + \cdots + m_r \),
\[ G' = \{ g' \} := \text{diag}(I_n, g, I_n), g \in G_{2m_{r+1}} \}< G, \]
\[ H' = H \cap G', P' = P \cap G', \] and \( u_0' = g' \left( L_{m_{r+1}} \right) \). Then for \( \mathbf{z} \in D_{\mathbf{z}}^g(w) \), one has
\[ J_\sigma(w, f_\mathbf{z}, \ell) = \int_{Q(u_1) \backslash H} \int_{P(u_0') \backslash H'} \ell(f_\mathbf{z}(u_0'h'u_1h))dh'dh = \int_{Q(u_1) \backslash H} \int_{P(u_0') \backslash H'} \ell(f_\mathbf{z}(u_0'h'u_1h))dh'dh \]
\[ = \prod_{i=1}^r <v_i, v_i'> \int_{P(u_0') \backslash H'} \ell(h_{s_{r+1}}(u_0'h'))dh' \]
\[ = J_{\pi \otimes \pi}(w_2, h_{s_{r+1}}, (s_{r+1} - s_{r+1}), \ell'). \]

The statement of the proposition now follows from Proposition 10.10. \( \square \)

Remark 10.2. Keeping the notations of the proof of Proposition 10.11 we denote by \( \lambda \) the up to scalar unique element of \( \text{Hom}_{M_m^{2m_{r+1}}}(\pi \times \pi, \mathbb{C}) \). We define \( \Lambda \in \text{Hom}_{M_m^{2m_{r+1}}}(\sigma, \mathbb{C}) - \{ 0 \} \) by
\[ \Lambda : v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_r \otimes v \otimes v' \otimes v'_r \otimes \cdots \otimes v'_1 \mapsto \lambda(v \otimes v') \prod_{i=1}^r <v_i, v_i'>. \]

For \( \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{l+2}(w, -1) \), we set \( \mathbf{z}^- = (s_1, \ldots, s_r, 0, -s_r, \ldots, -s_1) \in \mathbb{C}^{l+1}(w', -1) \) and we define \( J_\sigma(w', \mathbf{z}^-, \Lambda) \) to be the meromorphic continuation of the following linear form (given by convergent integrals for \( \mathbf{z}^- \in D(w', r_\sigma) \) for \( r_\sigma \) large according to [B-D.08, Theorems 2.8 and 2.16] again)
\[ J_\sigma(w', \mathbf{z}^-, \Lambda) : f_\mathbf{z}^- \mapsto \int_{Q(u_1) \backslash H} \Lambda(f_\mathbf{z}^-(u_1h))dh. \]
For $k$ as in Proposition 10.10 we define

$$F(\underline{s}) = s_{r+1}^k J_\sigma(w,.,\underline{s},\ell),$$

it would be interesting to know if it satisfies the relation

$$F(\underline{s})|_H = J_\sigma(w',.,\underline{s},\Lambda).$$

We notice that $P(u_0) \subset Q(u_1)$, and also that $P(u_0) \setminus Q(u_1) \simeq P'(u'_0) \setminus H'$. We formally have

$$J_\sigma(w, f_{\underline{s}}, \bar{\ell}) = \int_{Q(u_1) \setminus H} \int_{P'(u'_0) \setminus H'} \ell(f_{\underline{s}}(u_0h'h))dh'dh.'$$

By Proposition 10.10 we know that

$$\lim_{s_{r+1} \to 0} s_{r+1} \int_{P'(u'_0) \setminus H'} \ell(f_{\underline{s}}(u_0h'h))dh' = \int_{P'_r \setminus H' \setminus H'} \Lambda(f_{\underline{s}}(u_1h'h))dh',$$

hence

$$\lim_{s_{r+1} \to 0} s_{r+1} J_\sigma(w, f_{\underline{s}}, \bar{\ell}) = \int_{Q(u_1) \setminus H} \int_{P'_r \setminus H' \setminus H'} \Lambda(f_{\underline{s}}(u_1h'h))dh'dh' = J_\sigma(w', f_{\underline{s}}, \bar{\ell}, \Lambda).$$

But the intertwining periods are defined by integrals only in some cone, and the inversion of the limit and of the integral does not make sense as there is no reason that the cone of convergence should intersect $H$.

Now, as a consequence of the results above and those of Section 10.2, we state and prove the main result of the section (and one of the main results of the paper as well).

**Theorem 10.1.** Let $(\delta_1 = L(\Delta_1), \ldots, \delta_t = L(\Delta_t))$ be a proper ladder of discrete series with $t = 2r$ a positive even integer, write $\sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t$, and suppose that

$$\text{Hom}_{M_{m_1, \ldots, m_t}}(\delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t, C)$$

is nonzero for $w = w_t$. Take $\Lambda \in \text{Hom}_{M_{m_1, \ldots, m_t}}(\delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t, C) - \{0\}$, and write $\delta_r = \delta[s_r]$, with $\delta^v = \delta^0$, so that $\delta_{r+1} = \delta[-s_r]$. More generally write $\sigma[s]$ for $\sigma[\underline{s}]$, with

$$s = (0, \ldots, 0, s - s_r, s_r - s, 0, \ldots, 0),$$

i.e.

$$\sigma[s] = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{r-1} \otimes \delta[s] \otimes \delta[-s] \otimes \delta_{r+2} \cdots \otimes \delta_r.$$ 

Suppose that $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are juxtaposed, then the open period

$$J_{\sigma[w]}(w,.,s,L) := J_{\sigma[w]}(w,.,s,L)$$

is holomorphic at $s = -s_r$, whereas if $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are non juxtaposed and if $L(\Delta_r \cap \Delta_{r+1})$ is distinguished, then the open period $J_{\sigma[w]}(w,.,s,L) has a pole at s = -s_r$.

**Proof.** First, according to Proposition 10.5, the intertwining period $J_{\sigma[w]}(w,.,s,L)$ is well defined and holomorphic at $s = s_r$, in particular it defines a meromorphic function of $s$. Notice that Proposition 10.7 gives the first part of the statement, i.e. that $J_{\sigma[w]}(w,.,s,L)$ is holomorphic at $s = -s_r$ if $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are juxtaposed. Suppose now that $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are linked non juxtaposed. Write $\Delta(a) = \Delta_r \cap \Delta_{r+1}$, it is a non empty centered segment. Write $\Delta(b) = \Delta_{r+1} - \Delta(a)$, it is a possibly empty segment. Write moreover $\delta_a = L(\Delta(a))[s_r]$ and $\delta_b = L(\Delta(b))[s_r]$, so that $\delta$ is the unique irreducible quotient of $\delta_a \times \delta_b$. Notice that $\delta_a[-s_r] = L(\Delta(a)) = (L(\Delta(a))\delta)^0 = (\delta_a^0)^0[s_r].$ 
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Call $A : \delta_b[s] \times \delta_a[s] \to \delta[s]$ the (unique up to scaling) nonzero intertwining operator, which we can choose independent of $s$, and pick similarly $B : (\delta'_{a})^{\theta}[-s] \times (\delta'_{b})^{\theta}[-s] \to \delta[-s]$. Set
\[
\gamma[s] = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{r-1} \otimes (\delta_{b}[s] \times \delta_a[s]) \otimes ((\delta'_{a})^{\theta}[-s] \times (\delta'_{b})^{\theta}[-s]) \otimes \delta_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t.
\]

Then $A$ and $B$ define a surjective intertwining operator
\[
C = Id_{\delta_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes Id_{\delta_{r-1}} \otimes A \otimes B \otimes Id_{\delta_{r+2}} \otimes \cdots \otimes Id_{\delta_t} : \gamma[s] \to \sigma[s].
\]

Notice that if $F_s$ is a flat section in $\text{Ind}_F^C(\gamma[s])$, then $C(F_s)$ is a flat section in $\pi_s = \text{Ind}_F^C(\sigma[s])$, and any flat section in $\pi_s$ is of that form. Setting $L_0 = L \circ C$, and taking a flat section $F_s \in \text{Ind}_F^C(\mu[s])$, then by definition, with obvious notations, one has
\[
J_{\pi[s]}(w, C(F_s), s, L_0) = J_{\gamma[s]}(w, F_s, s, L_0).
\]

Hence we just need to prove that $J_{\gamma[s]}(w, F_s, s, L_0)$ has a pole at $s = -s_r$ for some $F$. Now notice that
\[
\gamma[-s_r] = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{r-1} \otimes (\delta_{b}[-s_r] \times \text{L}(\Delta(a))) \otimes (\text{L}(\Delta(a)) \times (\delta'_{a})^{\theta}[s_r]) \otimes \delta_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t.
\]

To compare with the notations of Section 10.2, one has $\delta_i = \tau_i$ for $i \leq r-1$, $\text{L}(\Delta(b))[s_r] = \delta_b = \mu$, and $\text{L}(\Delta(a))[s_r] = \delta_a = \mu'$. A flat section $F_s$ is of the form $F_{s,u}$ for
\[
\mathbf{z} = (0, \ldots, 0, s, -s, 0, \ldots, 0),
\]
and $u = 0$, $\gamma = \tau_0$ (i.e., $\tau_u$ for $u = 0$) and finally $L_0$ is in fact $L_u$ for $u = 0$. In this case, according to Proposition 7.1, the standard intertwining operator from $\text{L}(\Delta(a))[-u] \times \text{L}(\Delta(b))^{\gamma}$ to $\text{L}(\Delta(b))^{\gamma} \times \text{L}(\Delta(a))[-u]$ is holomorphic at $u = 0$ because $\Delta(a)$ and $\Delta(b)$ are juxtaposed segments. Then we set
\[
\gamma'[s] = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{r-1} \otimes \delta_{b}[s] \otimes \delta_a[s] \otimes (\delta'_{a})^{\theta}[-s] \otimes (\delta'_{b})^{\theta}[-s] \otimes \delta_{r+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t
\]
and take $\mathbf{f}_s$ to be a flat section in
\[
\pi_s = \delta_1 \times \cdots \times \delta_{r-1} \times \delta_{b}[s] \times \delta_a[s] \times (\delta'_{a})^{\theta}[-s] \times (\delta'_{b})^{\theta}[-s] \times \delta_{r+2} \times \cdots \times \delta_t,
\]
so with the notations of Section 10.2 is $\tau_{\mathbf{z}, u}$ for $u = 0$ and $\mathbf{z}$ as above. We define
\[
\ell \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Ind}_{\mathbf{m}_{u+2}, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{r+1}}} (\gamma', C)
\]
as in Section 10.2. According to Proposition 10.3, one has:
\[
J_{\gamma[s]}(w, \rho(b(z))F_{\mathbf{f}_s}, s, L_0) = J_{\gamma'[s]}(w_{u+2}, \mathbf{f}_s, s, \ell).
\]

Equivalently
\[
J_{\gamma[s]}(w, F_{\mathbf{f}_s}, s, L_0) = J_{\gamma'[s]}(w_{u+2}, \rho(b(z))F_{\mathbf{f}_s}, s, \ell),
\]
for any flat section $F_{\mathbf{f}_s} \in \pi_s$. However, as $\text{L}(\Delta(a))$ is distinguished, the local open period $J_{\gamma'[s]}(w_{u+2}, g_s, s, \ell)$ has a pole at $s = -s_r$ for some flat section $g_s \in \pi_s$ according to Proposition 10.1. As $\rho(b(z))g_s$ is a finite sum $\sum \lambda_i(s) f_i s$ for $f_i s$ independent flat sections in $\pi_s$, and $\lambda_i(s)$ holomorphic functions of $s$, i.e., $g_s = \sum \lambda_i(s) \rho(b(z)) f_i s$, this implies that $J_{\gamma'[s]}(w_{u+2}, \rho(b(z))F_{\mathbf{f}_s}, s, \ell)$ has a pole at $s = -s_r$ for $f = f_i$ for some $i$. This implies that $J_{\gamma[s]}(w, F_{\mathbf{f}_s}, s, L_0)$, i.e., that $J_{\sigma[s]}(w, C(F_{\mathbf{f}_s}), s, L)$ has a pole at $s = -s_r$ and as $F_{\mathbf{f}_s}$ (hence $C(F_{\mathbf{f}_s})$) is also a flat section, this ends the proof.

**Remark 10.3.** It can be shown that the sufficient condition above is also necessary when the standard module above is induced from two discrete series representations.
10.4 Distinction of discrete series

We keep the notations of Section 3.1. We first show that our method reduces the use of \[\text{Proposition 6.1}\] for discrete series of \(G\) representations to its cuspidal case, which we thus assume, i.e. we assume that a cuspidal representation \(\rho\) of \(G\) is distinguished if and only if \(\text{JL}(\rho)\) is.

We first start with a simple case of our main result to come on ladder representations. Its proof already contains the main idea of the general proof, which is to use the functional equation of the corresponding intertwining period. If \(\Delta = [a, b]_\rho\), we set \(Z(\Delta) = L(\nu^{j,b}_\rho, \ldots, \nu^{a,j}_\rho)\); it is a ladder representation, and it is also the unique irreducible submodule of \(\nu^{j,a}_\rho \times \cdots \times \nu^{b,j}_\rho\).

**Proposition 10.12.** Let \(\rho\) be a cuspidal representation of \(G\) and set \(l = l_\rho\), then \(Z([-1/2, 1/2]_\rho)\) is distinguished if and only if \(\rho\) is \(\eta^{-1}\)-distinguished.

**Proof.** If \(G = G_m\), we denote by \(P = MN\) the standard parabolic subgroup of \(G_{2m}\) attached to the partition \((m, m)\). We have \(\text{JL}(\rho) = \text{St}_l(\rho\').\) First, we notice that if \(Z([-1/2, 1/2]_\rho)\) is distinguished, then \(\nu^{j/2}_\rho \times \nu^{-j/2}_\rho\) is distinguished. It then follows from **Proposition 10.3** that \(\rho\)' is \(\eta^{-1}\)-self-dual. Hence we can assume that \(\rho\) is conjugate self-dual while proving the statement (we recall that by the cuspidal case of \[\text{BP.17}\] Theorem 1, if \(\rho\) is distinguished, it is indeed conjugate self-dual as this is true in the split case). Set \(\sigma = \rho \otimes \rho\). By **Proposition 10.3**, the intertwining period \(J_{\sigma}(w_2, \ldots, l/2, \ell)\) is (up to scaling) the only nonzero invariant linear form on \(\nu^{j/2}_\rho \times \nu^{-j/2}_\rho\), and \(J_{\sigma}(w_2, -l/2, \ell)\) is (up to scaling) the only nonzero invariant linear form on \(\nu^{-j/2}_\rho \times \nu^{j/2}_\rho\). By Proposition 10.12, the intertwining operator \(A_\sigma(w_2, -l/2)\) is well defined and nonzero. As the space of intertwining operators between \(\nu^{-j/2}_\rho \times \nu^{j/2}_\rho\) and \(\nu^{j/2}_\rho \times \nu^{-j/2}_\rho\) is one dimensional by adjunction and an easy Jacquet module computation, its image must be the unique proper submodule of \(\nu^{j/2}_\rho \times \nu^{-j/2}_\rho\) as this submodule is a quotient of \(\nu^{-j/2}_\rho \times \nu^{j/2}_\rho\) (see \[\text{L.40}\] Proposition 2.7), so we deduce that \(Z([-1/2, 1/2]_\rho)\) is distinguished if and only if \(J_{\sigma}(w_2, -l/2, \ell)\) vanishes on the image \(A_\sigma(w_2, -l/2)\). By the functional equation (Theorem 10.2) of \(J_{\sigma}(w_2, s, \ell)\) and Proposition 6.3 denoting by \(\eta\) any extension of \(\eta\) to \(\text{GL}(m/l, E)\), we have:

\[
J_{\sigma}(w_2, A_\sigma(w_2, s)f_s, -s, \ell) \sim \frac{L^+(2s, \eta^l\rho') L^+(-2s, \eta^{-l+1}\rho')}{L^+(2s + l, \rho') L^+(-2s + l, \eta\rho')} J_{\sigma}(w_2, f_s, s, \ell).
\]

However, thanks to **Proposition 6.1** the quotient

\[
\frac{L^+(2s, \eta^l\rho') L^+(-2s, \eta^{-l+1}\rho')}{L^+(2s + l, \rho') L^+(-2s + l, \eta\rho')}
\]

has a zero at \(s = -l/2\) if and only if \(\rho\)' is distinguished, i.e. if and only if if \(\text{St}(\rho')\) is \(\eta^{-1}\)-self-dual, which is the same as \(\rho\) being \(\eta^{-1}\)-distinguished. It thus follows that \(J_{\sigma}(w_2, l/2, \ell)\) vanishes on the image of \(A_\sigma(w_2, -l/2)\) if and only if \(\rho\) is \(\eta^{-1}\)-distinguished.

As a consequence, we have the following result.

**Lemma 10.4.** Let \(\rho\) be a conjugate self-dual cuspidal representation of \(G_r\), and set \(l = l_\rho\). The representation

\[
\pi_j(\rho) = \nu^{\frac{(j-1)}{2}}_\rho \times \cdots \times \nu^{\frac{(j-3)}{2}}_\rho \times \text{Z}(\frac{j-1}{2}, \frac{j+1}{2}, \cdots, \frac{j+k-1}{2})_\rho \times \nu^{\frac{(j+1)}{2}}_\rho \times \cdots \times \nu^{\frac{(k-1)}{2}}_\rho
\]

(with \(j \equiv k \mod 2\)) is not distinguished if \(j \neq 0\), or if \(j = 0\) (hence \(k\) is even) and \(\rho\) is \(\eta^{-1}\)-distinguished.

**Proof.** Set \(\tau = \pi_j(\rho)\)

\[
\tau = \nu^{\frac{(j+k)}{2}}_\rho \times \cdots \times \nu^{\frac{(j-1)}{2}}_\rho \times \text{Z}(\frac{j-1}{2}, \frac{j+1}{2}, \cdots, \frac{j+k-1}{2})_\rho \times \nu^{\frac{(j+1)}{2}}_\rho \times \cdots \times \nu^{\frac{(k-1)}{2}}_\rho
\]
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Let \( m = kr \), and \( \overline{m} = (r, \ldots, r, 2r, \ldots, r) \) with \( 2r \) in position \( \frac{k+1}{2} \). If \( \pi \) is distinguished, then by Proposition 5.3 there is an element \( \alpha \in I(\overline{m}) \) such that \( r_{M_{M},M}(\tau) \) is \( M^{u}_{\alpha} \)-distinguished. Notice that the only nonzero Jacquet modules of \( \tau \) are obtained for \( \overline{m}_{a} = \overline{m} \), in which case \( r_{M_{a},M}(\tau) = \tau \), and \( \overline{m}_{a} = (r, \ldots, r) \), in which case

\[
r_{M_{a},M}(\tau) = \nu^{(1-k)\rho} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu^{(k-1)\rho}.
\]

In the first case, writing \( a = (m_{i,j}) \), for \( r_{M_{a},M}(\tau) \) to be \( M^{u}_{\alpha} \)-distinguished one should have \( m_{i} = m_{i,k+1} = 2r \) for \( i = \frac{k+1}{2} \). Hence in this case \( Z([\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k+1}{2}]) \) should be distinguished, but this is impossible if \( j \neq 0 \) because the central character of \( Z([\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k+1}{2}]) \) is not unitary, and it is also impossible if \( j = 0 \) and \( \rho \) is \( \eta^j \)-distinguished according to Proposition 10.12. In the second case, the only possibility would be \( m_{i} = m_{i,k+1} = \infty \), which is not the case.

We now recover the distinction result concerning discrete series representations of \( G \). We recall from the proof of Proposition 1.90, Proposition 2.7] that the kernel of the surjective intertwining operator from \( \nu^{(1-k)\rho} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu^{(k-1)\rho} \) to \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is equal to the sum of the representations \( \pi_{j}(\rho) \) from \( j = 2 - k \) to \( j = 2 \) with \( j \equiv \frac{k}{2} \).

**Proposition 10.13.** Let \( \rho \) be a cuspidal representation of \( G_{f} \), and \( l = l_{p} \).

If \( k \) is odd: \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished if and only if \( \rho \) is.

If \( k \) is even: \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished if and only if \( JL(\rho) \) is \( \eta \)-distinguished, i.e. if and only if \( \rho \) is \( \eta \)-distinguished.

In both cases \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished if and only \( JL(St_{k}(\rho)) \) is.

**Proof.** We set \( M = M(f, \ldots, f) \). First we start with \( k \) odd. If \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished, then by Proposition 10.6 the representation \( \nu^{(1-k)\rho} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu^{(k-1)\rho} \) is \( M^{u} \)-distinguished, hence \( \rho \) is distinguished. Conversely, if \( \rho \) is distinguished, as \( \rho^{\nu} = \rho^\theta \), then \( \nu^{(1-k)\rho} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu^{(k-1)\rho} \) is distinguished according to Proposition 10.2. However, no \( \pi_{j}(\rho) \) is distinguished according to Lemma 10.3, so \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished. When \( k = 2r \) is even, if \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished, then again by Proposition 10.6 the Jacquet module \( \nu^{(1-k)\rho} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu^{(k-1)\rho} \) is \( M^{u} \)-distinguished, hence \( \rho^{\nu} \simeq \rho^{\theta} \). We can thus consider, for \( \sigma[s] = \rho(l(1-k)) \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho(-3l/2) \otimes \rho(l) \otimes \rho(l) \otimes \rho(l(1-k)) \), the intertwining period \( J_{\sigma}(w_{e}, s, L) \) with \( L \in \text{Hom}_{M^{u}}(\sigma, C) \). As we supposed that \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished, it in particular implies that the linear form \( J_{\sigma}(w_{e}, -l/2, L) \) which is well defined according to Proposition 10.6, must vanish on \( \pi_{a}(\rho) = \text{Im}(\text{Ad}(\sigma_{\tau}, l/2) \text{ Ad}(\tau, l/2)) \) is well defined by Proposition 10.1. However, by Theorem 9.2 setting \( JL(\rho) = St_{k}(\rho^b) \) and denoting again by \( \eta \) any extension of \( \eta \) to \( GL(f, l, E) \):

\[
J_{\sigma}(\tau_{\sigma}, A_{\sigma}(\tau_{\sigma}, s, L) \otimes \sigma[s], s, L) \cong L^{\sigma}(2s, \eta^{\nu} \rho') L^{\sigma}(-2s, \eta^{\nu+1} \rho') L^{\sigma}(2s + l, \rho') L^{\sigma}(-2s + l, \eta \rho').
\]

Making \( s \) tend to \( l/2 \), above, the only possibility that is the quotient

\[
L^{\sigma}(2s, \eta^{\nu} \rho') L^{\sigma}(-2s, \eta^{\nu+1} \rho') L^{\sigma}(2s + l, \rho') L^{\sigma}(-2s + l, \eta \rho').
\]

has a zero at \( s = l/2 \), i.e. that \( \rho' \) is \( \eta \)-distinguished (and then also that \( J_{\sigma}(\tau_{\sigma}, s, L) \) is holomorphic at \( l/2 \), this is in fact automatic but we don’t need to know it), i.e. that \( \rho \) is \( \eta \)-distinguished. Conversely, if \( \rho \) is \( \eta \)-distinguished, the linear form \( J_{\sigma}(w_{e}, -l/2, L) \) vanishes on all \( \pi_{j}(\rho) \) according to Lemma 10.3, hence \( St_{k}(\rho) \) is distinguished.

**Remark 10.4.** For \( D = F \), Theorem 10.13 which is [M.09, Corollary 4.2], was mainly proved in [A-R.05], as a consequence of their proof of the equality of the Flicker and Langlands-Shahidi Asai \( L \)-factor for discrete series. Here we give a different proof, even in the case \( D = F \), which is still local/global as in [A-R.05].
10.5 Distinction of proper ladders

Now we recall [LM14] Theorem 1.1 (i), which is valid for non split G as noticed in the introduction of [ibid.].

Theorem 10.2. Let $S$ be a standard module attached to a proper ladder $(\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t)$. Then the kernel of the nonzero intertwining operator from $S$ to $L = L(\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t)$ is equal to the sum for $i$ between 1 and $t - 1$ of the standard modules

$$S_i = L(\Delta_1) \times \cdots \times L(\Delta_{i-1}) \times L(\Delta_i \cup \Delta_{i+1}) \times L(\Delta_{i+2}) \times \cdots \times L(\Delta_t).$$

We want to know when certain $H$-invariant linear forms on $S$ descend to $L$. Clearly, this is the case if and only if each $S_i$ lies in the kernel of such a linear form. The following easy consequence of Proposition 10.3, which is a special case of a part of the proof of [G15, Theorem 4.2], will thus be useful.

Lemma 10.5. Let $\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t$ be a proper ladder, such that $L(\Delta_{t+1} - 1) = L(\Delta_i)^9$ for all $i$.

If $t \geq 2$ is odd, then no $S_i$ is distinguished. If $t = 2r$ is even, then no $S_i$ is distinguished for $i \neq r$, and $S_r$ is distinguished if and only if $L(\Delta_r \cup \Delta_{r+1})$ is distinguished. This latter condition is equivalent to $L(\Delta_r \cap \Delta_{r+1})$ being distinguished if $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are non juxtaposed.

Proof. Suppose that $S_i$ is distinguished. We set $\Delta'_k = \Delta_k$ if $k \notin \{i, i + 1\}$, $\Delta'_k = \Delta_k \cap \Delta_{k+1}$ and $\Delta'_{i+1} = \Delta_i \cup \Delta_{i+1}$. Suppose that $S_i = \Delta'_1 \times \cdots \times \Delta'_t$ is distinguished, and let $\epsilon$ be the associated involution of Proposition 10.3 (with the convention that $\epsilon(i) = i$ if $\Delta'_i$ is empty). We do an induction on $t \geq 2$. If $t = 2$, then $L(\Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2) \times L(\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2)$ is distinguished, and as the segments $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ and $\Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2$ have different lengths, the involution $\epsilon$ must be the identity and we are done. Suppose that $t \geq 3$. First we consider the case $i \neq 1$.

If $i < t - 1$, then $L(\Delta_{i+1}) = (L(\Delta_i)^9)^{\epsilon}$ must be equal to $L(\Delta_1)$, so $\epsilon(t) = 1$. Hence if $i \neq t - 1$, we conclude by induction applied to

$$L(\Delta_2) \times \cdots \times L(\Delta_{i-1}) \times L(\Delta_i \cup \Delta_{i+1}) \times L(\Delta_i \cap \Delta_{i+1}) \times L(\Delta_{i+2}) \times \cdots \times L(\Delta_{t-1}).$$

If $i = t - 1$, then $(L(\Delta_{t-1} \cup \Delta_t)^9)^{\epsilon}$ should be equal to $L(\Delta_1)$ considering the end of the segment associated to $(L(\Delta_{t-1} \cup \Delta_t)^9)^{\epsilon}$, and this is impossible for length reasons.

Finally the remaining case $i = 1$ is also impossible for the same argument as above, hence we are done with the first assertion. For the second, write $L(\Delta_r \cap \Delta_{r+1}) = St_k(\rho)$ for $\rho = \rho'$. Then $L(\Delta_r \cup \Delta_{r+1})$ is of the form $St_{k+2b}(\rho)$ for $b \in \mathbb{N}$, and the assertion follows from Proposition 10.2. 

Using Theorem 10.2 and Proposition 10.3 we easily obtain the following result. It is stated and proved in [G15, Thm. 10.3] in different terms.

Proposition 10.14. Let $L = L(\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t)$ be a proper ladder representation, with $t$ odd. Then $L$ is distinguished if and only if $L^\vee = L^\rho$ and the middle discrete series $L(\Delta_{t+1})$ is distinguished.

Proof. We set $\delta_1 = L(\Delta_1)$, and $w = w_1$. If $L$ is distinguished, then the conditions $L^\vee = L^\rho$ and $L(\Delta_{t+1})$ distinguished are a consequence of Proposition 10.3 where we notice that the ladder condition implies that $\epsilon = w_1$. Conversely, let $M$ be the standard Levi subgroup of which $\sigma = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t$ is a representation. If $L^\vee = L^\rho$ and $L(\Delta_{t+1})$ is distinguished, i.e. if $\text{Hom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(\sigma, \mathbb{C}) \neq 0$, then

$$S = \Delta_1 \times \cdots \times \Delta_t$$

is distinguished by Proposition 10.3 again, but no $S_i$ by Lemma 10.5. Hence $L$ is distinguished.

Finally we are now able to prove the main theorem of the paper.

Theorem 10.3. Let $L = L(\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_t)$ be a proper ladder representation, with $t = 2r$ even.

Then $L$ is distinguished if and only if $L^\vee = L^\rho$ and $L(\Delta_r \cup \Delta_{r+1})$ is $\eta$-distinguished.
Proof. We set 

$$\sigma[s] = \delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_{s-1} \otimes \delta[s] \otimes \delta[s] \otimes \delta_{s+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta_t.$$ 

By Proposition 10.3, we can assume that $\sigma$ is $M^w$-distinguished. In this situation, thanks to Proposition 10.3, the ladder $L$ is distinguished if and only if the $H$-invariant linear form $\Lambda$ on $L$ descends to $L$. According to Lemma 10.4, this is equivalent to $\Lambda$ being zero on $\mathcal{S}_r = \text{Im}(M_r)$, where $M_r$ is the regularized intertwining operator from $\text{Ind}^G_H(\sigma[-s_r])$ to $L = \text{Ind}^G_H(\sigma[s_r])$. We set $\delta = \text{St}_k(\rho)$, and $J_{\sigma}(\rho) = \text{St}_l(\rho')$, hence $J_{\delta}(\delta) = \text{St}_{kl}(\rho')$. Let us write the functional equation in this case:

$$J_{\sigma}(w, A_\sigma(\tau_r, s), f_s, -s, L) \sim \frac{L^+(2s, \eta^k\rho')}{L^+(2s + kl, \rho')} L^+(2s + k\eta, \rho') J_{\sigma}(w, f_s, s, L).$$

Notice that $J_{\sigma}(w, s_r, L)$ is always well defined. There are then two cases. Either $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are juxtaposed, which amounts to saying that $s_r = lk/2$. In this case $J_{\sigma}(w, s_r, L)$ and $A_\sigma(\tau_r, -s_r)$ are well defined thanks to Theorem 10.1 and Proposition 7.1. The functional equation thus tells us that $J_{\sigma}(w, A_\sigma(\tau_r, -s_r), f_s, s_r, L)$ will vanish for all $f$ if and only if $L^+(-2s_r + kl, \rho') = \infty$, i.e. if and only if $\rho'$ is distinguished. This is then equivalent to $\text{St}_{2lk}(\rho')$ being $\eta$-distinguished, i.e. to $J_{\text{St}_{2lk}(\rho')}$ being $\eta$-distinguished by Proposition 10.13. Now if $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_{r+1}$ are linked but not juxtaposed, i.e. $s_r < lk/2$. Then one has

$$\frac{L^+(2s_r, \eta^k\rho')}{L^+(2s_r + kl, \rho')} L^+(2s_r + k\eta, \rho') \neq 0.$$ 

On the other hand $A_\sigma(\tau_r, s)$ has a simple pole at $-s_r$, i.e. $M_r = \lim_{s \to -s_r} (s + s_r) A_\sigma(\tau_r, s)$. Hence $J_{\sigma}(w, A_\sigma(\tau_r, -s_r), f_s, s_r, L)$ is zero for all $f$ if and only if $\lim_{s \to -s_r} (s + s_r) J_{\sigma}(w, s, L)$ is zero. This is the case if and only if $J_{\sigma}(w, s, L)$ is holomorphic at $s = -s_r$. In particular according to Theorem 10.1 this implies that $L(\Delta_r \cap \Delta_{r+1})$ is not distinguished, i.e. is $\eta$-distinguished. Conversely, if $L(\Delta_r \cap \Delta_{r+1})$ is $\eta$-distinguished, in particular not distinguished according to Proposition 5.2, this implies that $\mathcal{S}_r$ is not distinguished thanks to Lemma 10.5. Hence $L$ is distinguished.

**Remark 10.5.** Notice that the above proof implies that $J_{\sigma}(w, s, L)$ is holomorphic at $s = -s_r$ if and only if $L(\Delta_r \cap \Delta_{r+1})$ is not distinguished, and moreover that if $J_{\sigma}(w, s, L)$ has a pole at $s = -s_r$, then it is simple.

**10.6 Distinguished ladder and unitary representations.**

The notations are as above. If $\delta$ is a unitary discrete series representation of $G$ and $k \geq 1$, we set $l = l_\delta$ and denote by $u(\delta, k)$ the ladder representation

$$u(\delta, k) = \mathcal{L}(\nu^{-\frac{lk}{2}}\delta, \ldots, \nu^{-\frac{lk-k}{2}}\delta).$$

By [T.90], [B-R.04], and [S.09], any unitary representation of $G$ can be written in a unique manner as a commutative product of representations of the type:

- $u(\delta, k)$ for $\delta$ a unitary discrete series. We call $u(\delta, k)$ a Spelc representation.
- $\nu^{-\frac{lk}{2}}u(\delta, k) \times \nu^{-\frac{lk-k}{2}}u(\delta, k)$ for $\delta$ a unitary discrete series, and $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$.

If $\pi = L_1 \times \cdots \times L_t$ is a commutative product of proper ladders, we say that $\pi$ is $\theta$-induced if there is an involution $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{S}_t$, such that $\mathcal{L}^\epsilon_{i(i)} = L^0_i$ for all $i$, and $L_i$ is distinguished whenever $\epsilon(i) = i$. We say that proper ladder representations $L_1, \ldots, L_t$ are (mutually) unlinked if no segment occurring in a $L_i$ is linked with a segment occurring in $L_j$ if $i \neq j$, and in this case their product is commutative. The following result, which is [G-M-M.17, Proposition 7.3], is true for non split $G$ with the same proof.

**Proposition 10.15.** Let $L_1, \ldots, L_t$ be mutually unlinked ladders, then the product $L_1 \times \cdots \times L_t$ is distinguished if and only if it is $\theta$-induced.
In particular, as a ladder representation is a product of unlinked proper ladder representations, this classifies distinguished ladder representations in terms of distinguished discrete series (and in fact cuspidal representations by Theorem 10.13). It also reduces the classification of distinguished unitary representations to the following statement.

**Theorem 10.4.** Let \( \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t \) be unitary discrete series representations with each \( \delta_i \) of the form \( L([-a_i, a_i])_\rho \) with \( a_i \in \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{N} \), and \( \rho \) a conjugate self-dual cuspidal representation. The unitary representation \( \pi = u(\delta_1, k_1) \times \cdots \times u(\delta_t, k_t) \) is distinguished if and only if it is \( \theta \)-induced.

**Proof.** Each \( \delta_i \) is a representation of \( G_{1,i} \), and we set \( m_i = k_1 l_i \) and \( m = (m_1, \ldots, m_t) \). We can always switch the order in the product, so that \( m_i \geq m_{i+1} \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq t-1 \). If \( \pi \) is \( \theta \)-induced, it is certainly distinguished as an application of Propositions 10.1 and 10.2. For the converse direction, according to Proposition 5.3 it is enough to prove the following statement: “let \( \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t \) be unitary discrete series representations which have cuspidal support on the same cuspidal line. If the unitary representation \( \pi = u(\delta_1, k_1) \times \cdots \times u(\delta_t, k_t) \) induced from the standard Levi \( M = M_{m} \) is such that \( \mu = u(\delta_1, k_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes u(\delta_t, k_t) \) has a Jacquet-module \( r_{M_{m}, M}(\mu) \) which is \( \theta_{u,a} \)-distinguished for \( a \in \mathbb{I}^{(m)} \), then it is \( \theta \)-induced.”

So let’s prove it by induction on \( t \). It will be more convenient to write

\[
\pi = u(\delta_1, k_1) \times \cdots \times u(\delta_t, k_t) = L_{a},
\]

with \( \delta_{i,j} \succ \delta_{i,j+1} \). Thanks to our assumption, and the description of Jacquet modules of ladder representations given in [K-L.12] (see the picture there for a visual description of ladders and their Jacquet modules as well), we can write each \( \delta_{i,j} \) as \( \delta_{i,j} = [\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{i,j}] \) with \((\delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i,j}}, \delta_{2,2}^{\delta_{i,j}}, \ldots, \delta_{i,k_i}^{\delta_{i,j}}, \delta_{i,k_i}^{\delta_{i,j}})\) forming a ladder of all \( k \), so that if we set

\[
L_{i}^{k} = L(\delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i,j}}, \delta_{2,2}^{\delta_{i,j}}, \ldots, \delta_{i,k_i}^{\delta_{i,j}}, \delta_{i,k_i}^{\delta_{i,j}}),
\]

then \( L_{i}^{k} \) is a (possibly trivial) ladder, and the representation

\[
L_{i}^{1} \otimes L_{i}^{2} \otimes \cdots \otimes L_{i}^{i-1} \otimes L_{i}^{i} \otimes \cdots \otimes L_{i}^{t-1} \otimes L_{i}^{t}
\]

is \( \theta_{u,a} \)-distinguished. We select \( i_0 \) the smallest integer between 1 and \( t \), such that \( \delta_{i_0}^{\delta_{i_0,1}} \) is non trivial. If \( i_0 = 1 \), then \( L_{1}^{1} \) is conjugate selfdual. As \( \delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i_0,1}} \) corresponds to the upper right bit of the ladder \( L_{1}^{1} \), then \((\delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i_0,1}})^{\theta} \) corresponds to its lower left bit. The representation \( \delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i_0,1}} \) is also the upper right bit of \( L_{1}^{1} \), and \((\delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i_0,1}})^{\theta} \) its lower left bit because \( L_{1}^{1} \) is a Speh representation. In particular \( L_{1}^{1} \) necessarily has \( k_1 \) floors, and using the intuitive notation for concatenation of ladder representations

\[
L_{1} = [L_{1}^{1}, \ldots, L_{1}^{i}] = \mathcal{L}_{1,i}.
\]

we see that it implies that \( L_{1}^{1} = L_{1} \). Notice that the visual picture of the ladder from [K-L.12] that we use to describe it does not match with the notation \( L_{1} = [L_{1}^{1}, \ldots, L_{1}^{i}] \) which is more adapted to Jacquet modules, right and left should be reversed. Hence if \( i_0 = 1 \), we can conclude by induction applied to

\[
L_{2} \times \cdots \times L_{t}.
\]

If \( i_0 > 1 \), then consider

\[
L_{i_0} = [L_{i_0}^{1}, \ldots, L_{i_0}^{i_0}].
\]

As \( L_{i_0}^{1} = L_{i_0}^{1} \), then \((\delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i_0,1}})^{\theta} \) is the lower left bit of the “right” sub-ladder \( L_{i_0}^{1} \) of \( L_{i_0} \). As \( m_1 \geq m_i \) for all \( i \), and because all \( L_{i} \) are Speh representations, the beginning of the segment corresponding to the representation \((\delta_{1,1}^{\delta_{i_0,1}})^{\theta} \) is the smallest of all beginnings of all segments occurring in the \( L_{i} \)'s. This implies that \( L_{i_0} = L_{i_0,1}^{1} \), hence that \( L_{1} = L_{1,i_0} \). We conclude by induction applied to

\[
L_{2} \times \cdots \times L_{i_0-1} \times L_{i_0+1} \times \cdots \times L_{t}.
\]

\[\square\]
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