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Abstract. In the case of complex symplectic and orthogonal groups, we find \((\mathfrak{g}, K)\)-modules with the property that their \(K\)-structure matches the structure of regular functions on the closures of nilpotent orbits.
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1. Preliminaries

1.1. Introduction. In this manuscript, we study regular functions of complex symplectic nilpotent varieties \(\mathcal{O}\), i.e. Zariski closures of nilpotent orbits \(\mathcal{O}\) in \(\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{C})\) and \(\mathfrak{so}(m, \mathbb{C})\).

In [Br], Ranee Brylinski constructs a Dixmier algebra \(B(\mathcal{O})\) associated to each complex classical nilpotent variety \(\mathcal{O}\). In particular, \(B(\mathcal{O})\) has a \((\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)\)-module structure, with its \(K_c \cong G\) spectrum isomorphic to \(R(\mathcal{O})\), the ring of regular functions of \(\mathcal{O}\). In this manuscript, we write down the composition factors of \(B(\mathcal{O})\) for all special nilpotent orbits of Type \(C\). For Types \(B\) and \(D\), we write down the corresponding results without proofs; they are essentially the same as in Type \(C\).

The study of nilpotent varieties is of interest in both algebraic geometry and representation theory. We state a couple of representation theoretic perspectives on this topic. A standard fact about the geometry of nilpotent orbits is that \(R(\mathcal{O}) \subset R(\mathcal{O})\), and \(\mathcal{O}\) is normal if and only if

\[
R(\mathcal{O}) = R(\mathcal{O}).
\]
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Put a different way, \( \mathfrak{O} \) is not normal if and only if there exist regular functions of \( \mathfrak{O} \) which do not extend to its boundary. It is natural to ask which nilpotent varieties \( \mathfrak{O} \) are not normal, and to make the discrepancy between \( R(\mathfrak{O}) \) and \( R(\mathfrak{O}) \) explicit.

The classification of normal classical nilpotent varieties is given by Kraft-Procesi [KP]. In fact, the construction of \( B(\mathfrak{O}) \) given by R. Brylinski is based on that of Kraft and Procesi. On the other hand, a corollary of our main result gives the multiplicities of any \( \mathfrak{K}_c \)-type appearing in \( B(\mathfrak{O}) \) and therefore also \( R(\mathfrak{O}) \) (see Example 6.4). Comparing our results with the \( \mathfrak{K}_c \)-spectrum of \( R(\mathfrak{O}) \) given in [B5], one can recover the normality criterion of \( \mathfrak{O} \) in [KP]. More precisely, we verify a conjecture made by the second author [Wo3] that when \( \mathfrak{O} \) is not normal, then the first occurrence of the discrepancy between \( R(\mathfrak{O}) \) and \( R(\mathfrak{O}) \) appears at small \( \mathfrak{K}_c \)-types [B1, Definition 3.1] (Corollary 7.3). Since there is an older definition of small in [V], we will call these \( \mathfrak{K}_c \)-types diminutive to avoid possible confusion.

From another perspective, the non-normality of \( \mathfrak{O} \) affects the quantizations of certain complex nilpotent orbits, which amounts to ‘attaching’ a unitarizable \((\mathfrak{g}_c, \mathfrak{K}_c)\)-module to the orbits. Work of Vogan, for example, [V1, Section 5 and 6], suggests that the lack of normality of certain nilpotent varieties complicates the quantization scheme of these orbits. Another consequence of our main result implies that when \( \mathfrak{O} \) is not normal, then the \((\mathfrak{g}_c, \mathfrak{K}_c)\)-module \( B(\mathfrak{O}) \) has more than one composition factor. Informally speaking, the number of composition factors of \( B(\mathfrak{O}) \) increases with the ‘non-normality’ of \( \mathfrak{O} \).

Our techniques apply to all classical special nilpotent varieties. For clearness of exposition we focus on a special class of nilpotent orbits in Type \( C \) only. Recall that a nilpotent orbit in type \( C_n \) can be classified by Young diagrams of size \( 2n \), whose row sizes are the Jordan block sizes of the corresponding orbit (note that not all Young diagrams of \( 2n \) correspond to a nilpotent orbit of type \( C_n \)). From now on, we specify nilpotent orbits \( \mathfrak{O} \) of Type \( C \) using the columns of its corresponding Young diagram. This perspective appears already in Kraft and Procesi, [KP]. Our results are best phrased in these terms as well.

A nilpotent orbit in type \( C \) is parametrized by the columns of its corresponding Young diagram \( (c_0 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p+1}) \) (set \( c_{2p+1} = 0 \) if necessary), so that \( c_{2i} + c_{2i+1} \) is even. A special nilpotent orbit in the sense of [L] satisfies the additional condition that if \( c_{2i} \) is odd, then \( c_{2i} = c_{2i+1} \).

We will break down the columns of \( \mathfrak{O} \) into smaller parts called chains:
Definition 1.1.
(a) A chain $C$ is a sequence of integers of the form
- $[b_0 \geq (b_1 = b_2) \geq \cdots \geq (b_{2k-1} = b_{2k}) \geq b_{2k+1}]$, where $b_i \in 2\mathbb{N}$ for all $i$,
or
- a single pair $[b_0, b_1]$ satisfying $b_0 = b_1 \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$.
(b) A chain $[b_0(b_1 = b_2) \ldots (b_{2k-1} = b_{2k})b_{2k+1}]$ is called generic if it only consists of even entries, and satisfies one of the following:
- $k = 0$,
or
- $k > 0$, and $b_{2i} > b_{2i+1}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k$.

Definition 1.2. For each special nilpotent orbit $O$ of Type $C$ with Jordan form $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2p+1})$, we form a union of chains as follows:
1. Find the largest integer $q$ such that the integers $[c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2q+1}]$ form a chain. That is, $2q + 1$ is the first odd index so that $c_{2q+1} > c_{2q+2}$.
2. Perform Step (1) on the remaining entries $(c_{2q+2}, c_{2q+3}, \ldots, c_{2p+1})$, until there are no coordinates left.

Suppose $O$ has $l$ chains $C_1, \ldots, C_l$, where the entries of $C_i$ are strictly larger than those of $C_j$ whenever $i < j$. We denote the chains of $O$ as

$$C(O) := C_1 \sqcup C_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup C_l.$$ 

Remark 1.3. Let $G = \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{C})$ and $C(O) = C_1 \sqcup C_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup C_l$ be the chains of a nilpotent orbit $O$ in $\mathfrak{g}$. The fundamental group of the nilpotent orbit $O$ is given by $A(O) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^l$. Suppose $l' \leq l$ of the chains end with a positive even integer. Then the Lusztig quotient (see [L] for the definition) is given by $\overline{A}(O) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{l'}$.

Example 1.4. The orbit $O = (10, 8, 8, 4, 4, 4, 3, 2, 0)$ has three chains

$$C_1 : [10 \geq 8 = 8 \geq 4 = 4 \geq 4], \quad C_2 : [3 = 3], \quad C_3 : [2 \geq 0].$$

In this case, $A(O) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3$ and $\overline{A}(O) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

We recall the necessary and sufficient conditions for a special orbit $O$ of Type $C$ to be non-normal:

Theorem 1.5 (Kraft-Procesi, [KP]). A special nilpotent orbit $O$ of Type $C$ has non-normal closure if and only if one of the chains, $[b_0(b_1b_2) \ldots (b_{2k-1}b_{2k})b_{2k+1}]$, satisfies

$$b_{2i-2} > (b_{2i-1} = b_{2i}) = \cdots = (b_{2j-1} = b_{2j}) > b_{2j+1}$$

for some $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k$.

For instance, the first example is the chain $[42220]$.

Proof. Consider the closure of the orbit

$$O = (\ldots, b_{2i-2} > b_{2i-1} = b_{2i} = \cdots = b_{2j-1} = b_{2j} > b_{2j+1}, \ldots).$$
Then its minimal degeneration to
\[ O' = (\ldots, b_{2i-2}, b_{2i-1} + 2, b_{2i}, \ldots, b_{2j-1}, b_{2j} - 2, b_{2j+1}, \ldots) \]
is of type \( A_{2n-1} \cup A_{2n-1} \) by Table I of \([KP]\), with \( n = 2(i - j + 1) \). By Theorem 2 of \([KP]\), this is the only type of non-normal singularity that can occur in \( \overline{O} \). \( \square \)

**Example 1.6.** The closure of \( O = (8,8,6,6,6,4,4,2) \) in \( \mathfrak{sp}(44,\mathbb{C}) \) is not normal, since \( C(O) = [88][6(66)(44)2] \), and the second chain has entries \( b_2 = 6 > b_3 = 4 = b_4 = 4 > b_5 = 2 \).

In fact, by the main results of \([KP]\), the singularity type of the orbit
\[ O' = (8,8,6,6,6,6,2,2) \subset \overline{O} = (8,8,6,6,6,4,4,2) \]
is equivalent to that of
\[ (6,2,2) \subset (4,4,2) \]
in \( \mathfrak{o}(10,\mathbb{C}) \) by removing the common columns of \( O' \) and \( O \) on the left, which in turn is equivalent to that of
\[ (4) \subset (2,2) \]
in \( \mathfrak{o}(4,\mathbb{C}) \) by removing the first two common rows. This is of type \( A_1 \cup A_1 \) from Table I of \([KP]\), which is not normal.

We will study the Brylinski model \( B(\overline{O}) \) in full detail for \( O \) satisfying the following:

**Assumption 1.7.** All chains of \( O \) are generic.

1.3. **Langlands Parameters.** We recall the Langlands parametrization of irreducible \((\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)\)-modules for a complex Lie group \( G \) viewed as a real Lie group. Fix a maximal compact subgroup \( K \), and a pair \((B, H = TA)\) where \( B \) is a real Borel subgroup and \( H \) is a \( \theta \)-stable Cartan subgroup such that \( T = B \cap H \), and \( A \) the complement stabilized by \( \theta \).

The **Langlands parameter** of any irreducible module is a pair \((\lambda_L, \lambda_R)\) such that \( \mu := \lambda_L - \lambda_R \) is the parameter of a character of \( T \) in the decomposition of the \( \theta \)-stable Cartan subalgebra \( H = T \cdot A \), and \( \nu := \lambda_L + \lambda_R \) the \( A \)-character. The principal series representation associated to \((\lambda_L, \lambda_R)\) is the \((\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)\)-module
\[ X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) = \text{Ind}^G_B(e^\mu \otimes e^\nu \otimes 1)_{K \text{-finite}}. \]
The symbol \( \text{Ind} \) refers to Harish-Chandra induction. The infinitesimal character, when \( \mathfrak{g}_c \) is identified with \( \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \), is \((\lambda_L, \lambda_R)\). Since \( e^{(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)}|_T = e^\mu \),
\[ X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) \mid_K = \text{Ind}_K^B(e^\mu). \]

Let \( \overline{X}(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) \) be the unique irreducible subquotient of \( X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) \) containing the \( K \)-type with extremal weight \( \mu = \lambda_L - \lambda_R \). This is called the Langlands subquotient.

**Proposition 1.8** (Parthasarathy-Rao-Varadarajan, Zhelobenko). Let \((\lambda_L, \lambda_R)\) and \((\lambda'_L, \lambda'_R)\) be parameters. The following are equivalent:

- \((\lambda_L, \lambda_R) = (w\lambda'_L, w\lambda'_R)\) for some \( w \in W \).
• $X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ and $X(\lambda'_L, \lambda'_R)$ have the same composition factors with same multiplicities.

• The Langlands subquotient of $X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$, written as $\overline{X}(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$, is the same as that of $X(\lambda'_L, \lambda'_R)$.

Furthermore:

• Every irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)$-module is equivalent to some $\overline{X}(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$.

• When Re $\nu$ is dominant with respect to the roots in $B$, $X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ has a unique irreducible quotient identical to $\overline{X}(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$; it is the image of the long intertwining operator given by integration see [Kn] for details.

If we need to specify the group, the standard module and Langlands quotient will acquire a subscript, e.g. $X_G(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ or $\overline{X}_G(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$. If $G$ is omitted in the notation, $G$ is assumed Type $C$.

We will often write $(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ in matrix notation $(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) \cong (\lambda_L \lambda_R)$. Also, we introduce some shorthand notations for the Langlands parameters:

**Definition 1.9.** Let $0 \leq y \leq x$ be two integers. We denote by $\{2x, 2y\}^+ \subset \mathbb{Z}$ the spherical Langlands parameter

$$\{2x, 2y\}^+ := \begin{pmatrix} -y + 1, & -y + 2, & \ldots & x - 1, & x \end{pmatrix}$$

and by $\{2x + 1, 2x + 1\}^+$ the

$$\{2x + 1, 2x + 1\}^+ := \begin{pmatrix} -x, & -x + 1, & \ldots & x - 1, & x \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $y \geq 1$, we denote by $\{2x, 2y\}^- \subset \mathbb{Z}$ the non-spherical parameter

$$\{2x, 2y\}^- := \begin{pmatrix} -y + 1, & \ldots & y - 1, & y, & y + 1, & \ldots & x \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Remark 1.10.** Here is a justification on the above definition: Let

$$c_0 \geq c_1 > c_2 \geq c_3 > \cdots > c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1}$$

be non-negative integers such that $\mathcal{O} = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2p+1})$ form a special nilpotent orbit of Type $C$. By Definition 1.2, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0, c_1][c_2, c_3] \cdots [c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}]$, hence $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}) = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{p+1}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{O}) = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^q$ by Remark 1.3, where $q$ is the number of even $c_{2i}$’s for $i = 0, \ldots, p$. According to [BV2], the number of special unipotent representations attached to $\mathcal{O}$ is given by the number of irreducible representations of $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{O})$. Indeed, these representations are precisely of the form

$$\overline{X}([c_0, c_1]^{\epsilon_0} \cdots [c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}]^{\epsilon_p}),$$

where $\epsilon_i \in \{+,-\}$ if $c_{2i}$ is even, and $\epsilon_i = +$ if $c_{2i} = c_{2i+1}$ is odd.

For example,

$$\overline{X}([6, 4]^{-} \{2, 2\}^{+}) = \overline{X}\left(\begin{array}{cccc} -1, & 0, & 1, & 2, & 3; & 0, & 1 \\ -2, & -1, & 0, & 1, & 3; & 0, & 1 \end{array}\right)$$
is a (non-spherical) special unipotent representation attached to the orbit \((6, 4, 2, 2)\)

We also introduce some shorthand notation for induced modules:

**Definition 1.11.** Let \(G'\) be the Lie group with the same type as \(G\) of lower rank, and \(\Psi\) be a representation of \(G'\). We write

\[
I^G_{\Psi} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\lambda_L \\
\lambda_R
\end{array} \right) := \text{Ind}_{GL \times \ldots \times GL \times G'} (X_{GL} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\lambda_L \\
\lambda_R
\end{array} \right) \boxtimes \ldots \boxtimes X_{GL} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\lambda_L' \\
\lambda_R'
\end{array} \right))
\]

Similarly, we write

\[
I^G_{\Psi} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\lambda_L \\
\lambda_R
\end{array} \right) := \text{Ind}_{GL \times \ldots \times GL \times G'} (X_{GL} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\lambda_L \\
\lambda_R
\end{array} \right) \boxtimes \ldots \boxtimes X_{GL} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\lambda_L' \\
\lambda_R'
\end{array} \right))
\]

Since diminutive \(K\)-types are of utmost importance in this manuscript, we make the following definition:

**Definition 1.12.** Let \(X, Y\) be two admissible \((\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)\)-modules. We write

\[
X \approx Y \quad \text{if} \quad [X : \mu] = [Y : \mu] \quad \text{for all diminutive} \ \mu.
\]

As an example, we will use the following Lemma several times in this manuscript:

**Lemma 1.13.** Let \(c_0 \geq c_1 > c_2 > \cdots > c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1}\) be non-negative integers such that \(O = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2p+1})\) form a special nilpotent orbit of Type \(C\). Then the special unipotent representations attached to \(O\), given in Remark 1.10, satisfies the following:

\[
X((c_0, c_1)^{\epsilon_0} \ldots (c_{2p}, c_{2p+1})^{\epsilon_p}) \approx I^G((c_0, c_1)^{\epsilon_0} \ldots (c_{2p}, c_{2p+1})^{\epsilon_p}),
\]

where each \(\{c, c'\}^\epsilon \longleftrightarrow X_{GL}(\{c, c'\}^\epsilon)\) appearing in the right module (here we use the shorthand in Definition 1.11) is of the form

\[
X_{GL}(\{c, c'\}^\epsilon) = \begin{cases} 
|\det \frac{c-c'+2}{4} | & \text{if } c \in 2\mathbb{N} \text{ and } \epsilon = + \\
\text{Ind}_{GL(c') \times GL(c-c')} |\det \frac{c-c'+2}{4} | & \text{if } c \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1 \text{ and } \epsilon = + \\
\text{triv} & \text{if } c \in 2\mathbb{N} \text{ and } \epsilon = -
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** The last statement comes directly from the study of irreducible \(GL(n)\) modules in [Vj]. Therefore, the \(K\)-types of the induced module on the right of Equation (1) can be computed explicitly via Frobenius reciprocity. On the other hand, for the special unipotent representation on the left of Equation (1), its \(K\)-type multiplicities are known by [BV]. One can check that the modules in Equation (1) have the same diminutive \(K\)-type multiplicities.

Since the induced module in Equation (1) contains the irreducible module as a composition factor, our desired result follows.

**Example 1.14.** We continue with the example of the special unipotent representation \(X((6, 4)^{-\{2, 2\}^+})\) in Remark 1.10. Its character formula can be obtained by Theorem III
of [BV2]. Using the techniques in [Wo3], we record the first three terms and the last term of its K-type decomposition:

\[ \bar{X}(\{6, 4\}^\times \{2, 2\}^+) \]

\[ \cong \text{Ind}_F^G(1111000) - \text{Ind}_F^G(1111110) - 3\text{Ind}_F^G(2110000) + \cdots - \text{Ind}_F^G(6331111). \]

(Note that this can also be checked by the atlas software (www.liegroups.org).) On the other hand, the induced module on the right hand side of Equation (11) is of the form:

\[ I^G(\{6, 4\}^\times \{2, 2\}^+) = I^G(\begin{pmatrix} -1, & 0, & 1, & 2 \\ -2, & -1, & 0, & 1 \end{pmatrix}) \]

\[ = \text{Ind}_{GL(4) \times GL(1) \times GL(2)}^G(\det \otimes | \det \otimes | \det \otimes), \]

which has character formula:

\[ I^G(\{6, 4\}^\times \{2, 2\}^+) \]

\[ \cong \sum_{w \in S_1 \times S_1 \times S_2} \text{sgn}(w) \text{Ind}_F^G((2, 1, 0, -1; 3; 1, 0) - w(1, 0, -1, -2; 3; 1, 0)) \]

\[ = \text{Ind}_F^G(1111000) - \text{Ind}_F^G(1111110) - 3\text{Ind}_F^G(2110000) + \cdots - \text{Ind}_F^G(4221100). \]

Comparing the two character formulas, one sees that when the highest weight \( \mu \) is diminutive, i.e. the coordinates of \( \mu \) consist of 1 and 0 only, the coefficients of \( \text{Ind}_F^G(\mu) \) for both equations are the same (yet the formulas will be very different for large \( \mu \)'s). Therefore, they must have the same diminutive K-type multiplicities.

1.4. Outline of the Manuscript. We outline the main results of this manuscript for orbits \( \mathcal{O} \) satisfying Assumption \([\mathcal{L}]\) with \( \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \).

In Section 2, we recall some results on intertwining operators studied in [Br], which will be used extensively for the rest of the manuscript.

Section 3 begins with recalling the construction of \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) in [Br]. The construction involves the dual pair correspondence. The results in [AB] imply the following:

**Theorem 1.15** (Corollary \([3.10]\)). Let \( \mathcal{O} \) be an orbit satisfying Assumption \([\mathcal{L}]\) with \( \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \). There is a non-trivial \((\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)\)-equivariant map

\[ \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) := I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \ldots \{c_{2p-1}c_{2p}\}^+ X(\{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+)). \]

with the spherical vector in its image. In particular, \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) contains all the factors of the spherical cyclic submodule (i.e. the submodule generated by the trivial K-type) of \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \).

We compute all possible composition factors of \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) (and therefore \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) as well) in Section 4. The precise result is Proposition \([4.7] \) which implies that all these modules have diminutive lowest K-type. These factors are parametrized by a set of nilpotent orbits \( \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}) \); in particular, every composition factor of \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) and \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) must have associated variety \( \mathcal{O}' \) for some \( \mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}) \). These factors were determined in [Wo1].

In Section 5, we define a sub-collection of the factors obtained in Section 4 called distinguished modules. More precisely, for each auxiliary orbit \( \mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}) \), there is a unique distinguished module \( \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'} \) attached to it. The main result of the section is the following:
Theorem 1.16 (Proposition 5.4). Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a nilpotent orbit of Type $C$ satisfying Assumption 1.7 with $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0c_1 \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}]$. Then the sum of the distinguished modules satisfies the following:

$$\bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})} \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'} \approx I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \ldots \{c_{2p}c_{2p+1}\}^+).$$

In Section 6, we prove the main result of the manuscript:

Theorem 1.17 (Theorem 6.2). The composition factors appearing in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ are precisely the distinguished modules $\{\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'}, \mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})\}$.

The key observation is that the composition factors of the cyclic submodule of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ is equal to $\{\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'}, \mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})\}$ (Proposition 6.1). Then Theorem 1.15 implies that the composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ must contain these modules as well. Therefore, the induced module on the right hand side of Theorem 1.16 above gives a lower bound on the diminutive $K$-type multiplicities of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$.

On the other hand, for each $\mathcal{O}$, we define

$$\mathcal{O}^\# = \left(\frac{c_0 + c_1}{2}, \frac{c_0 + c_1}{2}, \frac{c_2 + c_3}{2}, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p} + c_{2p+1}}{2}, \frac{c_{2p} + c_{2p+1}}{2}\right)$$

with the following properties:

1. $\overline{\mathcal{O}}^\#$ is normal and $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \subset \mathcal{O}^\#$;
2. $R(\mathcal{O}^\#)$ and $I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \ldots \{c_{2p}c_{2p+1}\}^+)$ has the same $K$-spectrum.

The first point implies that $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}^\#) = R(\mathcal{O}^\#)$ gives an upper bound on the $K$-type multiplicities of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \cong R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$. The second point says this upper bound is exactly equal to the lower bound for diminutive $K$-types. So the main theorem follows from the fact that all possible composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ have diminutive $K$-types.

2. Intertwining Operators

A careful study of various intertwining operators was done in Section 6 of [B4]. There are two types of intertwining operators that play a role in this manuscript: Let $a \leq A$, $b \leq B$ be such that $A - a$, $B - b \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\iota : I^G(\ldots (a, \ldots, A) (b, \ldots, B) \ldots) \rightarrow I^G(\ldots \left(\frac{b}{b}, \ldots, B\right) \left(\frac{a}{a}, \ldots, A\right) \ldots)$$

$$\sigma : I^G(\ldots \left(\frac{b}{b}, \ldots, B\right) \mathcal{X} \left(1, \ldots, L\right) \ldots) \rightarrow I^G(\ldots \left(-\frac{b}{b}, \ldots, -b\right) \mathcal{X} \left(1, \ldots, L\right))$$

(or without $\mathcal{X} \left(1, \ldots, L\right)$)

We begin the study of intertwining operators in Type $A$.

Let $(a, a+1, \ldots, A-1, A)$ and $(b, b+1, \ldots, B-1, B)$ be strings of real numbers. Following [B4, Section 2], we say that the strings are nested, if one of the following conditions hold:

- $a - b \notin \mathbb{N},$
• $b = a$,
• $a - b \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $A < B + 1$,
• $a - b \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $B + 1 < a$.

**Lemma 2.1.** Consider the intertwining operator

$$I_{GL} \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} a, \ldots, A \\ a, \ldots, A \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} b, \ldots, B \\ b, \ldots, B \end{array} \right) \right) \mapsto I_{GL} \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} b, \ldots, B \\ b, \ldots, B \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} a, \ldots, A \\ a, \ldots, A \end{array} \right) \right).$$

**(a):** If the parameter is nested, then $\iota$ is an isomorphism on the level of diminutive $K$-types.

**(b):** If $a - b \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $a \leq B + 1 \leq A$, then the kernel of $\iota$ is the irreducible module with parameter

$$\left( \begin{array}{cccccc} a - 1 & \ldots & B & a & \ldots & B + 2 \\ a & \ldots & B + 1 & a - 1 & \ldots & A \end{array} \right).$$

The image of $\iota$ is equal to

$$I_{GL} \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} b, \ldots, A \\ b, \ldots, A \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} a, \ldots, B \\ a, \ldots, B \end{array} \right) \right).$$

**Proof.** Detailed calculations for intertwining operators and diminutive $K$-types can be found in [B4]; they exploit the relations between diminutive $K$-types and Weyl group representations. The composition factors of modules of $GL(m + n)$ induced from characters on $GL(m) \times GL(n)$ can be obtained from the techniques employed in [BSS]. We omit further details. □

Consider the operator $\iota$ with integral infinitesimal character in Type $C$:

**Proposition 2.2.** Let $c_0 \geq c_1 \geq c_2 \geq c_3$ be non-negative even numbers. Consider the intertwining operator

$$\iota : I^G(\{c_0, c_3\}^+ \{c_1, c_2\}^+) \to I^G(\{c_1, c_2\}^+ \{c_0, c_3\}^+)$$

**(a):** If $c_0 = c_1$ or $c_2 = c_3$, then $\ker \iota$ has no composition factors with diminutive lowest $K$-type.

**(b):** If $c_0 > c_1$ and $c_2 > c_3$, the only composition factor in $\ker \iota$ with diminutive lowest $K$-type is

$$\overline{X}(\{c_0, c_1 + 2\}^- \{c_1 - 2, c_3\}^-).$$

The image of $\iota$ is equal to

$$I^G(\{c_0, c_2\}^+ \{c_1, c_3\}^+).$$

**Proof.** The intertwining operator $\iota$ is induced from $GL$ to $Sp$, so we can use the result in Lemma 2.1 with

$$a = \frac{c_3}{2} + 1, \quad A = \frac{c_0}{2}, \quad b = \frac{c_2}{2} + 1, \quad B = \frac{c_1}{2}.$$ 

Hence (a) follows immediately from Lemma 2.1(a) (this amounts to checking the highest weight $\mu$ of a diminutive $K$-type in $GL$ is a Weyl group conjugate of the highest weight of a diminutive $K$-type in $Sp$).
As for (b), the image of $\iota$ is immediate from the last statement of Lemma 2.1(b). Also, the same Lemma implies that $\ker \iota$ is equal to

\[(2) \quad \text{I}^\text{Sp} \left( \Xi_{\text{GL}} \left( \begin{array}{cccccccc} a-1 & \ldots & B & a & \ldots & B+1 & B+2 & \ldots & A & b & \ldots & a-2 \\ a & \ldots & B+1 & a-1 & \ldots & B & B+2 & \ldots & A & b & \ldots & a-2 \end{array} \right) \right),\]

which contains the irreducible module

\[(3) \quad \Xi \left( \begin{array}{cccccccc} a-1 & \ldots & B & a & \ldots & B+1 & B+2 & \ldots & A & b & \ldots & a-2 \\ a & \ldots & B+1 & a-1 & \ldots & B & B+2 & \ldots & A & b & \ldots & a-2 \end{array} \right),\]

as a composition factor. By Proposition 1.8, this is equal to

\[= \Xi \left( \begin{array}{cccccccc} -B & \ldots & -a+1 & a & \ldots & B+1 & B+2 & \ldots & A & -a+2 & \ldots & -b \\ -B-1 & \ldots & -a & a-1 & \ldots & B & B+2 & \ldots & A & -a+2 & \ldots & -b \end{array} \right) \]

\[= \Xi \left( \begin{array}{cccccccc} -B & \ldots & B+1 & a & \ldots & -a+1 & B+2 & \ldots & A & -a+2 & \ldots & -b \\ -B-1 & \ldots & B & a-1 & \ldots & -a & B+2 & \ldots & A & -a+2 & \ldots & -b \end{array} \right) \]

\[= \Xi \left( \begin{array}{cccccccc} -B & \ldots & B+1 & B+2 & \ldots & A & a & \ldots & -a+1 & -a+2 & \ldots & -b \\ -B-1 & \ldots & B & B+2 & \ldots & A & a-1 & \ldots & -a & -a+2 & \ldots & -b \end{array} \right),\]

\[= \Xi \{c_0, c_1 + 2\}^\sim \{c_2 - 2, c_3\}^\sim.\]

Therefore we need to show the two modules (2) and (3) have the same diminutive $K$-type multiplicities. Indeed, the diminutive $K$-type multiplicities of (2) can be computed by the difference between $\text{I}^\text{G} \{c_0 c_3^+ + c_1 c_2^+\} \cong \text{Ind}^{\text{Sp}}_{\text{GL}(c_0 + c_3) \times \text{GL}(c_1 + c_2)} (\text{triv})$ and $\text{I}^\text{G} \{c_0 c_2^+ + c_1 c_3^+\} \cong \text{Ind}^{\text{Sp}}_{\text{GL}(c_0 + c_3^+ \times \text{GL}(c_1 + c_2^+)} (\text{triv})$. On the other hand, by Lemma 1.13, the diminutive $K$-type multiplicities of (3) is given by

\[\text{I}^\text{G} \{c_0, c_1 + 2\}^\sim \{c_1 - c_2^+ + c_3\}^\sim \cong \text{Ind}^{\text{Sp}}_{\text{GL}(c_1 + 2) \times \text{GL}(c_3) \times \text{GL}(c_0 + c_2^+) \times \text{GL}(c_1 + c_3^+)} (\text{det} \otimes \text{det} \otimes \text{triv} \otimes \text{triv}),\]

(note that the $\text{GL}(n)$-module $|\det|^c$ is isomorphic to the trivial representation upon restricting to $K = \text{U}(n)$). One can check that their multiplicities coincide with each other, hence the result follows.

\[\square\]

**Proposition 2.3.** The kernel of $\sigma$ does not contain any diminutive $K$-types.

**Proof.** This follows from a special case in Section 6 of [34].

The intertwining operators of induced modules with more than two strings are induced from the operators in the above two propositions. If we only keep track on diminutive $K$-types, the composition factors of the kernel and image of the intertwining operators with diminutive lowest $K$-types can be deduced from the above propositions.
3. Dual Pairs

3.1. The Kraft-Procesi Model $B(\mathcal{O})$. The Kraft-Procesi model, introduced in Definition 6.1 in [Br], is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)$-module whose $K$-structure matches $R(\mathcal{O})$. Under Assumption 1.7 it is well adapted to the $\Theta$-correspondence. We recall the details.

Given a nilpotent orbit in type $C$ with columns $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2p+1})$, let $G_{2i}$ be $Sp(c_{2i} + \cdots + c_{2p+1}, \mathbb{C})$ and $G_{2i+1} = O(c_{2i+1} + \cdots + c_{2p+1}, \mathbb{C})$. We denote $G = G_0$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_j$ be the corresponding Lie algebras, and $K_j$ the maximal compact subgroups. Let $G_j \times G_{j+1}$ be a reductive dual pair, and $\Omega_j \times \Omega_{j+1}$ be the oscillator representation as in [AB].

Let $K^1 := K_1 \times \ldots \times K_{2p+1}$, and $(K^1)^0$ be the connected component of the identity.

**Definition 3.1 (Kraft-Procesi Model).** Let

$$\Omega(\mathcal{O}) := \Omega_1 \otimes \Omega_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}/(\mathfrak{g}_1 \times \cdots \otimes \mathfrak{g}_{2p+1})(\Omega_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}).$$

This is a $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-module. Then $(K^1)^0$ acts trivially on $\Omega(\mathcal{O})$. So $K^1/(K^1)^0$ acts on $\Omega(\mathcal{O})$.

**Theorem 3.2 ([Br], Theorem 6.3).** Let $B(\mathcal{O}) := \Omega(\mathcal{O})^{K^1/(K^1)^0}$, then

$$B(\mathcal{O}) \cong R(\mathcal{O})$$

as $K_0$-modules. We have identified the complex group $G_0$ with the complexification of $K_0$.

3.2. The Induction Principle for Dual Pairs. Since the definition of $B(\mathcal{O})$ involves oscillator representations, we first recall some results in [AB] on the dual pair correspondence:

**Theorem 3.3 ([AB], Corollary 3.21).** Let $H_1 \times H_2$ be a reductive dual pair, and $P = MN = P_1 \times P_2 = M_1N_1 \times M_2N_2 \subset H_1 \times H_2$ a real parabolic subgroup:

$$H_1 = O(2m + \tau), \quad M_1 = GL(k) \times O(2m + \tau - 2k);$$

$$H_2 = Sp(2n), \quad M_2 = GL(\ell) \times Sp(2n - 2\ell);$$

with $\tau = 0, 1$. Suppose there is a nontrivial $M$-equivariant map $\Omega_M \rightarrow \sigma_1 \boxtimes \sigma_2$. Then there is a nontrivial map

$$\Omega \rightarrow \text{Ind}^{H_1}_{P_1}[\alpha_1 \sigma_1] \boxtimes \text{Ind}^{H_2}_{P_2}[\alpha_2 \sigma_2],$$

where

$$\alpha_1(g_1) = |\det g_1|^{2n-2m-\tau-k+\ell+1}, \quad \alpha_2(g_2) = |\det g_2|^{-2n+2m+\tau-k+\ell-1}.$$

**Remark 3.4.** The exponents in $\alpha_1$, $\alpha_2$ are reversed because the parabolic subgroups in [AB] are opposite from the ones used here.

**Corollary 3.5.**

(a) Let $\Omega$ be the oscillator representation corresponding to the dual pair $O(2n + 2M) \times O(2n + 2M)$.
\[\text{Sp}(2n)\]. Then there is a non-trivial map
\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega \rightarrow &I^{O(2n+2M)}(a, \ldots, A) (b, \ldots, B) (-M + 1, \ldots, L) \otimes \\
I^{\text{Sp}(2n)}(A, \ldots, -a) & \otimes (1, \ldots, L)
\end{align*}
\]
with the spherical vector in its image.

(b) Let \(\Omega\) be the oscillator representation corresponding to the dual pair \(O(2m) \times \text{Sp}(2m + 2L)\). Then there is a non-trivial map
\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega \rightarrow &I^{O(2m)}(A, \ldots, -a) (B, \ldots, -b) \otimes \\
I^{\text{Sp}(2m+2L)}(A, \ldots, A) & \otimes (1, \ldots, L)
\end{align*}
\]
with the spherical vector in its image.

Proof. We prove (a) by induction on the number of \(GL\)-factors. When there are no \(GL\)-factors, i.e. \(n = L\), consider the dual pairs
\[
\begin{align*}
H_1 &= O(2L + 2M), & M_1 &= GL(L + M) \times O(0); \\
H_2 &= Sp(2L), & M_2 &= GL(0) \times Sp(2L);
\end{align*}
\]
and \(\Omega_M \rightarrow \text{triv} \otimes \text{triv} = X_{\text{GL}}(\frac{L+M-1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{L+M-1}{2}) \otimes X(1, \ldots, L). \) Then
\[2n - 2m - \tau + k - \ell + 1 = 2L - (2L + 2M) - 0 + (L + M) - 0 + 1 = L - M + 1 \]
and Theorem 3.3 implies there is a non-trivial map
\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega \rightarrow &I^{O(2L+2M)}(A, \ldots, A) (1, \ldots, L) \otimes \\
I^{\text{Sp}(2m+2L)}(A, \ldots, A) & \otimes (1, \ldots, L)
\end{align*}
\]
Therefore the corollary holds for \(k = 0\).

Now suppose (a) holds when there are \(k\) \(GL\)-factors, i.e. there is a non-trivial map
\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega' \rightarrow &I^{O(2m')}((a', \ldots, A') (b, \ldots, B) (-M + 1, \ldots, L) \otimes \\
I^{\text{Sp}(2n')}((A', \ldots, -a') & \otimes (1, \ldots, L)
\end{align*}
\]
with image containing the spherical vector. We denote the above correspondence by
\[\Omega' \rightarrow \theta(\Pi) \otimes \Pi,\]
and consider the dual pairs
\[ H_1 = O(2m), \quad M_1 = GL(A - a + 1) \times O(2m); \]
\[ H_2 = Sp(2n), \quad M_2 = GL(A - a + 1) \times Sp(2n), \]
where \( m - m' = n - n' = (A - a + 1) \) and \( \Omega_M \rightarrow (\chi \otimes \theta(\Pi)) \boxtimes (\chi^* \otimes \Pi) \), with
\[
\chi = X_{GL}\left(a - \frac{2n'-2m'+1}{2}, \ldots, A - \frac{2n'-2m'+1}{2}\right)
\]
\[
\chi^* = X_{GL}\left(-A + \frac{2n'-2m'+1}{2}, \ldots, -a + \frac{2n'-2m'+1}{2}\right)
\]
are some characters of \( GL(A - a + 1) \). Then Theorem 3.3 implies the existence of the map
\[
\Omega \rightarrow I^{O(2m)}\left(\left(a, \ldots, A \atop a, \ldots, A\right) \theta(\Pi) \boxtimes I^{Sp(2n)}\left(\left(-A, \ldots, -a \atop -A, \ldots, -a\right) \Pi\right) \right)
\]
with image containing the spherical vector. So the result follows from induction in stages.

For part (b), we give details when there is only one \( GL \)–factor. Consider the dual pairs
\[ H_1 = O(2m), \quad M_1 = GL(m) \times O(0); \]
\[ H_2 = Sp(2m + 2L), \quad M_2 = GL(m) \times Sp(2L) \]
where \( m = A - a + 1 \), and \( \Omega_M \rightarrow \chi^* \boxtimes (\chi \otimes \text{triv}) \), with \( \chi = |\det g|^{x} \) for some suitable \( x \).

We obtain a non-trivial map
\[
\Omega \rightarrow I^{O(2m)}\left(\left(-A, \ldots, -a \atop -A, \ldots, -a\right) \boxtimes I^{Sp(2m+2L)}\left(\left(a, \ldots, A \atop a, \ldots, A\right) \boxtimes \left(1, \ldots, L \atop 1, \ldots, L\right)\right) \right). 
\]

The rest of the proof of part (b) is omitted. \( \square \)

3.3. A Non-trivial Map to an Induced Module. We apply the results in the previous section to construct a non-trivial \((g_e, K_e)\)-equivariant map from \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) to an induced module. As before, the spherical vector is in the image.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let \( \mathcal{O} \) be a nilpotent orbit of Type C consisting of even columns with only one chain \( \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \cdots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \). There is a non-trivial \((g_e, K_e)\)-equivariant map
\[
\Omega(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow I^G\left(\left(-\frac{c_0}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \atop -\frac{c_0}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2}\right) \cdots \left(-\frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} \atop -\frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2}\right) (0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1) \boxtimes \left(1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \atop 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2}\right) \right)
\]
with the spherical vector in its image.

**Proof.** We do an induction on the number of columns of \( \mathcal{O} \). First of all, consider the case when \( p = 0 \), i.e. \( \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0, c_1] \).
If \( c_1 = 0 \), the result is obvious. Suppose \( c_1 \neq 0 \). There are non-trivial maps
\[
\Omega_1 \to I^{O(c_1)} \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, 0 \right) \otimes I^{Sp(c_0 + c_1)} \left( 0, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} - 1 \right) X \left( 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \right)
\]
\[
\to X_{O(c_1)} \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, 0 \right) \otimes I^{Sp(c_0 + c_1)} \left( 0, \ldots, \frac{c_1}{2} - 1 \right) X \left( 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \right),
\]
where the first map comes from Corollary 3.5(b) with the dual pair \( O(c_1) \times Sp(c_0 + c_1) \), and the second map is the quotient map to the Langlands quotient.

Note that \( X_{O(c_1)} \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, 0 \right) \) is the trivial \( G_1 \)-module, so the above map factors through \( g_1 \Omega_1 \), i.e.
\[
\frac{\Omega_1}{g_1 \Omega_1} \to I^{Sp(c_0 + c_1)} \left( 0, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} - 1 \right) X \left( 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \right).
\]

Suppose the Proposition holds for \( O' = (c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_{2p+1}) \), i.e. there is a non-trivial map
\[
\Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}/(g_3 \times \cdots \times g_{2p+1})(\Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}) \to
\]
\[
\Pi_2 := I^{G_2} \left( -\frac{c_3}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_4}{2} \right) \cdots \left( -\frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+2}}{2} \right) \left( 0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1 \right) X \left( 1, \ldots, \frac{c_2}{2} \right)
\]

Consider the oscillator representation \( \Omega_2 \) with dual pair \( G_1 \times G_2 \). By Corollary 3.5(a) with \( 2M = c_1 \), there is a non-trivial map
\[
\Omega_2 \to \Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2
\]
with \( \Pi_1 \) equal to
\[
\Pi_1 := I^{G_1} \left( -\frac{c_3}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_4}{2} \right) \cdots \left( -\frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+2}}{2} \right) \left( 0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1 \right) \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_2}{2} \right)
\]
Therefore, we have a non-trivial map
\[
\Omega_2 \otimes (\Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}/(g_3 \times \cdots \times g_{2p+1})(\Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1})) \to (\Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2) \otimes \Pi_2
\]
\[
\to \Pi_1 \otimes \text{triv}_{G_2},
\]
where the last map is given by projecting \( \Pi_2 \otimes \Pi_2 \) onto the trivial representation. Note that the final image does not depend on the \( G_2 \)-module structure, so the map factors through \( g_2 \Omega_2 \), and we obtain a non-trivial map
\[
\Omega_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}/(g_2 \times \cdots \times g_{2p+1})(\Omega_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}) \to \Pi_1.
\]
Finally, Corollary 3.5(b) with \( 2L = c_0 \) implies that there is a non-trivial map
\[
\Omega_1 \to \Pi_0 \otimes \Pi_0^*,
\]
where \( \Pi_0 \) is the induced module
\[
\Pi_0 := I^G \left( -\frac{c_2}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_3}{2} \right) \cdots \left( -\frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+2}}{2} \right) \left( 0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1 \right) X \left( 1, \ldots, \frac{c_2}{2} \right)
\]
as in the proposition. Then the above contraction argument applies again to give the result. We omit the details about the spherical vector. \( \square \)
Remark 3.7. The proof of the above lemma also yields the analogous result to Proposition 3.6 for the closure of the nilpotent orbit $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$, corresponding to $\mathcal{Q} = (c_1, \ldots, c_{2p+1})$ in the orthogonal case.

Before stating an analogous result of Proposition 3.6 for multiple chains, we rewrite our results using the notations in Definition 1.9.

Corollary 3.8. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a nilpotent orbit of Type C satisfying Assumption 1.7 with only one chain $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}]$. There is a non-trivial $(\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)$-equivariant map

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}^G((c_1c_2)^+ \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})^+X((c_0c_{2p+1})^+)),$$

with the spherical vector in its image.

Proof. By Proposition 3.6 there is a non-trivial $G$-equivariant map

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}^G\left((\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{c_0}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \\ \frac{c_0}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \end{pmatrix}) \cdots \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} \\ \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1 \\ 0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1 \end{pmatrix} X(1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2})\right).$$

with the same properties. The result follows from our definition of $\{2x, 2y\}^+$ in Definition 1.9 and the fact that the module $\mathcal{I}^S_p\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1 \\ 0, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} - 1 \end{pmatrix} X(1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2})\right)$ maps onto the Langlands quotient $X\left(\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \\ \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2} \end{pmatrix}\right) = X((c_0c_{2p+1})^+)$.

Proposition 3.9. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a nilpotent orbit of Type C satisfying Assumption 1.7 with

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0(d_1d_2) \ldots (d_{2q-1}d_{2q})d_{2q+1}].$$

Then there is a $(\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)$-equivariant map $\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ with the spherical vector in its image, where

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) := \mathcal{I}^G((c_1c_2)^+ \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})^+ \ldots (d_1d_2)^+ \ldots (d_{2q-1}d_{2q})^+X((c_0c_{2p+1})^+ \ldots (d_0d_{2q+1})^+))$$

Note that by Lemma 3.13, $X((c_0c_{2p+1})^+ \ldots (d_0d_{2q+1})^+))$ is the spherical special unipotent representation attached to the orbit $(c_0, c_{2p+1}, \ldots, d_0, d_{2q+1})$, therefore $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ has associated variety equal to the closure of $\mathcal{O}$ by construction. This observation is essential in our following work (see beginning of Section 3).

Proof. We give details of the proof when $\mathcal{O}$ has two chains, i.e.

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \sqcup [d_0(d_1d_2) \ldots (d_{2q-1}d_{2q})d_{2q+1}].$$
The results in Proposition 3.6 can be generalized such that there exists a non-trivial map
\[\Omega(\mathcal{O}) \longrightarrow\]
\[I^G\left(\begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_1}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_2}{2} \\ -\frac{d_1}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_2}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_{2p}}{2} \\ -\frac{d_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_{2p}}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_0}{2} \\ -\frac{d_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_0}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0, & \cdots, d_{2q+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0, & \cdots, d_{2q} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_0}{2} \end{pmatrix}\]

The intertwining operator
\[I^G\left(\begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_1}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_2}{2} \\ -\frac{d_1}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_2}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_{2p}}{2} \\ -\frac{d_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_{2p}}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_0}{2} \\ -\frac{d_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_0}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0, & \cdots, d_{2q+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0, & \cdots, d_{2q} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_0}{2} \end{pmatrix}\]

is an isomorphism on the diminutive \(K\)-types since the strings are nested (Lemma 2.1(a)).

The quotient map
\[I^G\left(\begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_1}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_2}{2} \\ -\frac{d_1}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_2}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_{2p}}{2} \\ -\frac{d_{2p-1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_{2p}}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_0}{2} \\ -\frac{d_{2p+1}}{2} + 1, & \cdots, \frac{d_0}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0, & \cdots, d_{2q+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0, & \cdots, d_{2q} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_0}{2} \end{pmatrix}\]

and all the other intertwining operators are nonzero on the trivial \(K\)-type. Hence the last module in Equation (4) maps to \(I^G\left(\begin{pmatrix} c_1 & c_2 \\ c_{2p-1} & c_{2p} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c_{2p+1} & d_0 \\ c_{2p+1} & d_0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_{2p+1} \\ c_0 & c_{2p+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_0 & d_{2q+1} \\ d_0 & d_{2q+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1, & \cdots, \frac{c_0}{2} \end{pmatrix}\)

with the trivial \(K\)-type in its image, and the result follows. \(\square\)

**Corollary 3.10.** Under the setting of Proposition 3.7, there is a \((g_c, K_c)\)-equivariant map \(B(\mathcal{O}) \longrightarrow B(O)\) with the spherical vector in its image.

**Proof.** The inclusion map
\[B(\mathcal{O}) := \Omega(\mathcal{O}) K^1/(K_\delta)^0 \hookrightarrow \Omega(\mathcal{O})\]

has the trivial \(K\)-type in its image. Then the result follows directly from the above inclusion and Proposition 3.9. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.11.** We also present the case when \(Q = (c_1, c_2, \ldots)\) is an orthogonal nilpotent orbit. Writing \(\mathcal{O} = (c_0, c_1, c_2, \ldots)\) as the symplectic nilpotent orbit by adding a column
Note that when fundamental collapse \( O \) is a nilpotent orbit satisfying Assumption 1.7, the spherical unipotent representation attached to \( O \) is irreducible (see [BV2] for details). The composition factors of \( B(O) \) with infinitesimal character \( \lambda \) are as in Proposition 3.9, then there exists a morphism \( B(\overline{O}) \rightarrow B(Q) \) that is isomorphic on the trivial \( K \)-type, where

\[
B(Q) := I^Q((c_1 c_2) \cdots (c_{2p-1} c_{2p}) + \cdots + (d_1 d_2) + \cdots + (d_{2q-1} d_{2q}) + X_O((c_{2p+1}) \cdots (d_0 d_{2q+1}))
\]

with \( X_O((c_{2p+1}) \cdots (d_0 d_{2q+1})) \) being the spherical unipotent orbit associated with \( O \) as in Equation (5). There is a \( \lambda \)-unipotent orbit \( (c_{2p+1}, \ldots, d_0, d_{2q+1}) \).

### 4. Parameters Attached to a Nilpotent Orbit

In this section, we list the possible Langlands parameters that can appear in the composition series of \( B(\overline{O}) \).

For \( O = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2p+1}) \) satisfying Assumption 1.7, the infinitesimal character attached to \( B(\overline{O}) \) is

\[
(5) \quad c_{2i} \rightarrow \left( \frac{c_{2i}}{2}, \ldots, 1 \right); \quad c_{2i+1} \rightarrow \left( \frac{c_{2i+1}}{2}, 1, \ldots, 1, 0 \right)
\]

This is implicit from the constructions in Proposition 3.6. It also matches the dual pair correspondence in, for example, [PZ].

Fix an orbit \( O \) satisfying Assumption 1.7 and let \( \lambda \) be as in Equation (5). There is a unique maximal primitive ideal \( I(\lambda) \subset U(g) \) with a given infinitesimal character \( \lambda \). This determines a nilpotent orbit \( O_\lambda \) such that any admissible irreducible \((g_c, K_c)\)-module will have at least \( O_\lambda \) as its associated variety. In particular, the spherical irreducible module with infinitesimal character \( \lambda \) has associated variety precisely the closure of \( O_\lambda \) (see [BV2] for details). The composition factors of \( B(\overline{O}) \) are irreducible \((g_c, K_c)\)-modules with infinitesimal character \( \lambda \) and associated varieties contained in \( \overline{O} \) and containing \( \overline{O_\lambda} \).

#### 4.1. Definition of \( \text{Norm}(O) \)

We list all the orbits between \( O \) and \( O_\lambda \). The collection of such orbits is denoted by \( \text{Norm}(O) \).

**Definition 4.1.** Let \( (c_{2i}, c_{2i+1} = c_{2i+2}, c_{2i+3}) \) be four even columns of a nilpotent orbit \( O \). A fundamental collapse of \( O \) is

- \( (c_{2i} > c_{2i+1} = c_{2i+2} > c_{2i+3}) \rightarrow (c_{2i}, c_{2i+1} + 2, c_{2i+2} - 2, c_{2i+3}) \).
- \( (c_{2i} = c_{2i+1} = c_{2i+2} > c_{2i+3}) \rightarrow (c_{2i}, c_{2i+1} + 1, c_{2i+2} - 2, c_{2i+3}) \).
- \( (c_{2i} > c_{2i+1} = c_{2i+2} = c_{2i+3}) \rightarrow (c_{2i}, c_{2i+1} + 2, c_{2i+2} - 1, c_{2i+3} - 1) \).
- \( (c_{2i} = c_{2i+1} = c_{2i+2} = c_{2i+3}) \rightarrow (c_{2i}, c_{2i+1} + 1, c_{2i+2} - 1, c_{2i+3} - 1) \).

In the first two cases, we omit the columns \( c_{2i+2} \) and \( c_{2i+3} \) if both terms are equal to zero. Note that when \( c_{2i} \neq c_{2i+1} \), the size of \( c_{2i} \) remains unchanged after collapse. Similarly, if \( c_{2i+2} \neq c_{2i+3} \), the size of \( c_{2i+2} \) is the same after collapse.

**Definition 4.2.** Let \( O \) be a nilpotent orbit satisfying Assumption 1.7. The collection of auxiliary orbits obtained as follows will be called \( \text{Norm}(O) \).
(1) Select an even column pair of the form \((c_{2j-1} = c_{2j})\) appearing in \(O\). Consider the four columns \(c_{2j-2} \geq c_{2j-1} = c_{2j} \geq c_{2j+1}\). The columns \(c_{2j-2}, c_{2j+1}\) may or may not be paired with each other. Replace these columns with their corresponding fundamental collapse \(c_{2j-2}', c_{2j-1}', c_{2j}', c_{2j+1}'\) and obtain a new orbit.

(2) For all new orbits obtained in Step (1), repeat Step (1) on them until there are no more \((c_{2j-1} = c_{2j})\)'s.

**Remark 4.3.**

(a) The smallest orbit in \(\text{Norm}(O)\) obtained in the above definition is precisely \(O_\lambda\) mentioned at the beginning of this section.

(b) Suppose \(O\) satisfies Assumption [1.7], then the orbits \(O' \in \text{Norm}(O)\) do not necessarily satisfy Assumption [1.7]. Nevertheless, \(O'\) is still special and one can still consider \(C(O')\) (which may no longer be generic).

**Example 4.4.** Let \(O = (8, 6, 6, 4, 2, 2, 0)\). Then the chains \(C(O')\) for each \(O' \in \text{Norm}(O)\) are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
[8(66)(44)(22)0] & \quad [8(66)6][2(22)0] & \quad [8(66)(44)4] \\
[88][4(44)(22)0] & \quad [8(66)6][2(22)0] & \quad [8(66)(44)4] \\
[88][55][2(22)0] & \quad [88][4(44)4] & \quad [8(66)6][33] \\
& \quad [88][55][33]
\end{align*}
\]

In this case, all orbits \(O' \in \text{Norm}(O)\) other than \(O\) do not satisfy Assumption [1.7].

**4.2. Parameters attached to \(O' \in \text{Norm}(O)\).** We list the parameters of the irreducible representations with associated variety contained in \(O\), and infinitesimal character given in the beginning of this section.

**Definition 4.5.** Let

\[
C(O') = [c_0'(c_1'c_2') \ldots (c_{p-1}'c_p')c_{p+1}'] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0'(d_1'd_2') \ldots (d_{q-1}'d_q')d_{q+1}']
\]

be the chains of \(O'\). For each chain \([b_0'(b_1'b_2') \ldots (b_{2k-1}'b_{2k})b_{2k+1}']\) in \(C(O')\):

- If \(b_{2k+1}' = 0\) in \(2N^+\), we assign **two** parameters to \(C_{b'}\)
  \[
  [b_0'(b_1'b_2') \ldots (b_{2k-1}'b_{2k})b_{2k+1}]^+ := \{b_1'b_2'\}^+ \ldots \{b_{2k-1}'b_{2k}\}^+ \{b_0'b_{2k+1}\}^+;
  \]
  \[
  [b_0'(b_1'b_2') \ldots (b_{2k-1}'b_{2k})b_{2k+1}]^- := \{b_1'b_2'\}^- \ldots \{b_{2k-1}'b_{2k}\}^- \{b_0'b_{2k+1}\}^-.
  \]

- If \(b_{2k+1}' = 0\) (which can only happen in the last chain \(C_d\)), assign **one** parameter
  \[
  [b_0'(b_1'b_2') \ldots (b_{2k-1}'b_{2k})b_{2k+1}0]^+ := \{b_1'b_2'\}^+ \ldots \{b_{2k-1}'b_{2k}\}^- \{b_0\}^+.
  \]

- If \(b_0' = b_1'\) with \(b_0, b_1' \in 2N + 1\), assign **one** parameter
  \[
  [b_0'b_1']^+ := \{b_0'b_1'\}^+.
  \]
Then a parameter attached to $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$ is defined as 
\[ [c_0'(c_1' c_2') \ldots (c_{2p-1}'c_{2p})c_{2p+1}']^{\epsilon_c'} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0'(d_1'd_2') \ldots (d_{2q-1}'d_{2q})d_{2q+1}']^{\epsilon_d'}, \]
where $\epsilon_c', \ldots, \epsilon_d' \in \{+, -\}$ are chosen such that the above rules are satisfied for all chains.

By Remark 4.3, the number of parameters attached to $O'$ is equal to $|A(O')|$, the cardinality of the Lusztig quotient of $O'$.

The fact that these parameters exhaust all possible factors of $B(O)$ is detailed in Proposition 4.7. As a result, the number of possible distinct irreducible modules appearing in $B(O)$ is equal to $\sum_{O' \in \text{Norm}(O)} |A(O')|$.

**Example 4.6.** Let $O = (8, 6, 6, 4, 2, 2, 0)$. By looking at (6), the 17 parameters attached to each $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$ are given by 
\[ [8(66)(44)(22)0]^+ \]
\[ [88]^+ [4(44)(22)0]^+ \quad [8(66)6]^+ [2(22)0]^+ \quad [8(66)(44)4]^\pm \]
\[ [88]^+ [55]^+ [2(22)0]^+ \quad [88]^+ [4(44)4]^\pm \quad [8(66)6]^+ [33]^+ \]
\[ [88]^+ [55]^+ [33]^+ \]

Using the notations of Definition 1.9, these parameters can be expressed as:
\[ \{66\} - \{44\} - \{22\} - \{80\}^+ \]
\[ \{88\}^+ \{44\} - \{22\} - \{40\}^+ \quad \{66\} - \{86\}^+ \{22\} - \{20\}^+ \quad \{66\} - \{44\} - \{84\}^\pm \]
\[ \{88\}^+ \{55\}^+ \{22\} - \{20\}^+ \quad \{88\}^\pm \{44\} - \{44\}^\pm \quad \{66\} - \{86\}^\pm \{33\}^+ \]
\[ \{88\}^\pm \{55\}^+ \{33\}^+ \]

As another example, let $O = (10, 8, 8, 4, 4, 2)$. Then $\text{Norm}(O) = \{O, (10, 8, 8, 6, 2, 2), (10, 10, 6, 4, 4, 2), (10, 10, 6, 6, 2, 2)\}$.

The parameters attached to each $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$ are given by 
\[ [10(88)(44)2]^\pm \]
\[ [10(88)6]^+ [22]^\pm \quad [10, 10]^\pm [6(44)2]^\pm \]
\[ [10, 10]^\pm [66]^\pm [22]^\pm \]
4.3. Construction of Irreducible Modules. The following proposition gives an explicit construction of the irreducible modules corresponding to each parameter attached to $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$ in Definition 4.5. In particular, the lists exhaust all possibilities of the composition factors of $B(O')$. We will determine which of them appear in $B(O')$ in Section 6.

**Proposition 4.7.** Let $O$ be a nilpotent orbit satisfying Assumption 1.4, and a parameter attached to $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$ (Definition 4.5) is given by

$$[c'_0(c'_1c'_2)\ldots(c'_2p_1 \cdots c'_2p_1)c'_2p_1+1]^ε^a \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d'_0(d'_1d'_2)\ldots(d'_{2q-1}d'_{2q})d'_{2q+1}]^{ε^a}.$$  

Then the irreducible module with this parameter equals the induced module

$$I^G((c'_0c'_1c'_2)\ldots(c'_2p_1 \cdots c'_2p_1)c'_2p_1+1)^{ε^a} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d'_0(d'_1d'_2)\ldots(d'_{2q-1}d'_{2q})d'_{2q+1}]^{ε^a}) =$$

In this formula, $X((c'_0c'_2p_1+1)^{ε^a} \cdots [d'_0d'_{2q+1}]^{ε^a})$ is the irreducible (unipotent) representation attached to the special orbit $(c'_0, c'_2p_1+1, \ldots, d'_0, d'_{2q+1})$, with the listed parameter.

Moreover, the irreducible modules constructed above exhaust all irreducible modules having associated variety contained in $O'$, and infinitesimal character given by Equation 5.

**Proof.** The proof is in Section 8.  

**Example 4.8.** Going back to the parameters in (7), the irreducible modules corresponding to these parameters are given by:

$$X([866)(4220]^+) = I^G((66)\{422\}^{-}(80)^+)$$
$$X([88]^{\pm}[44220]^+) = I^G((44)\{22\}^{-}(88)^{\pm}(40)^+)$$
$$X([866)_{\pm}[220]^+) = I^G((66)\{22\}^{-}(86)^{\pm}(20)^+)$$
$$X([866)(444]^+) = I^G((66)\{44\}^{-}(84)^+)$$
$$X([88]^{\pm}[55]^{\pm}[2220]^+) = I^G((22)\{88]^{\pm}(55)^{\pm}(20)^+)$$
$$X([88]^{\pm}[444]^+] = I^G((44)\{88]^{\pm}(44)^+)$$
$$X([866)(444]^+) = I^G((66)\{86]^{\pm}(33)^+$$
$$X([88]^{\pm}[55]^{\pm}[33]^+) = X([88]^{\pm}(55)^{\pm}(33)^+).$$

**Remark 4.9.** By Lemma 3.13, the module in Equation 8 satisfies

$$X((c'_0c'_1c'_2)\ldots(c'_2p_1 \cdots c'_2p_1)c'_2p_1+1)^{ε^a} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d'_0(d'_1d'_2)\ldots(d'_{2q-1}d'_{2q})d'_{2q+1}]^{ε^a} \approx$$

$$I^G((c'_0c'_1c'_2)\ldots(c'_2p_1 \cdots c'_2p_1)c'_2p_1+1)^{ε^a} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d'_0(d'_1d'_2)\ldots(d'_{2q-1}d'_{2q})d'_{2q+1}]^{ε^a}.$$  

In particular, every module in Proposition 4.7 has diminutive lowest $K$-types.
5. Distinguished Parameters

In the previous section, we have defined the set $\text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ and listed the parameters attached to each $\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ for all $\mathcal{O}$ satisfying Assumption 1.7. They are the candidates of the parameters of the composition factors of $B(\mathcal{O})$. We now define a distinguished parameter for each $\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$. It will be proved in Section 6 that they are precisely the composition factors of $B(\mathcal{O})$.

Definition 5.1. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a nilpotent orbit satisfying Assumption 1.7, and

$$[c'_0(c'_1c'_2)\ldots(c'_{2p'-1}c'_{2p'})c'_{2p'+1}]^E \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d'_0(d'_1d'_2)\ldots(d'_{2q'-1}d'_{2q'})d'_{2q'+1}]^F$$

be a parameter attached to $\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ (Definition 4.5). Then the parameter is distinguished in $\mathcal{O}'$ if each of the $[b'_0(b'_1b'_2)\ldots(b'_{2l-1}b'_{2l})b'_{2l+1}]^G$ appearing in the above parameter satisfies the following condition:

whenever $b'_{2l+1} \in 2\mathbb{N}^+$, $\epsilon_V = \text{sgn}(-1)^l$.

One can check directly from the definition that each $\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ contains exactly one distinguished parameter. Therefore we can make the following definition:

Definition 5.2. In the setting of Definition 5.1, the irreducible module $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'}$ corresponding to the distinguished parameter in $\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ is called the distinguished module in $\mathcal{O}'$.

Example 5.3. Let $\mathcal{O} = (8, 6, 6, 4, 2, 0)$. Among all parameters given in Equation (7), the distinguished ones are given by:

$$[8(66)(44)(22)0]^+$$

$$[88]^+[4(44)(22)0]^+ [8(66)6]^+ [2(22)0]^+ [8(66)44]^+$$

$$[88]^+[55]^+[2(22)0]^+ [88]^+[4(44)4]^+ [8(66)6][33]^+$$

$$[88]^+[55][33]^+$$

Also, for $\mathcal{O} = (10, 8, 8, 4, 4, 2)$, the distinguished parameters are given by:

$$[10(88)(44)2]^+$$

$$[10(88)6][22]^+ [10, 10]^+[6(44)2]^+$$

$$[10, 10]^+[66]^+[22]^+$$

5.1. Sum of distinguished modules. The following proposition gives the multiplicities of the diminutive $K$-types in the sum of $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'}$:

Proposition 5.4. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a nilpotent orbit of Type $C$ satisfying Assumption 1.7 with chains

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2)\ldots(c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0(d_1d_2)\ldots(d_{2q-1}d_{2q})d_{2q+1}].$$
Then the sum of distinguished modules has diminutive $K$-type multiplicities equal to that of the induced module

$$\bigoplus_{O' \in \text{Norm}(O)} \Pi_{O'} \approx I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \ldots \{c_{2p}c_{2p+1}\}^+ \ldots \{d_0d_1\}^+ \ldots \{d_{2q}d_{2q+1}\}^+).$$

**Corollary 5.5.** Let $O$ be a nilpotent orbit given by $[5.4]$. Then for any diminutive $K$-type $V$, we have

$$\bigoplus_{O' \in \text{Norm}(O)} \Pi_{O'} : V = [R(O^\#) : V],$$

where

$$O^\# := \left(\frac{c_0 + c_1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{c_{2p} + c_{2p+1}}{2}, \ldots, \frac{d_0 + d_1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{d_{2q} + d_{2q+1}}{2}\right).$$

**Proof.** By construction, $O^\#$ is a Richardson orbit whose closure is normal (Theorem 1.5). Therefore the $K$–spectrum of $R(O^\#) = R(O^\#)$ equals that of

$$\text{Ind}^G_{GL(\frac{c_0 + c_1}{2}) \times \cdots \times GL(\frac{c_{2p} + c_{2p+1}}{2}) \times \cdots \times GL(\frac{d_0 + d_1}{2}) \times \cdots \times GL(\frac{d_{2q} + d_{2q+1}}{2})} (\text{triv}).$$

In turn this is isomorphic to the $K$–spectrum of

$$I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \ldots \{c_{2p}c_{2p+1}\}^+ \ldots \{d_0d_1\}^+ \ldots \{d_{2q}d_{2q+1}\}^+).$$

$\square$

### 5.2. Proof of Proposition 5.4 - One Chain.

We prove the proposition when $O$ has only one chain. First of all, we study the proposition for $\mathcal{C}(O) = [c_0(c_1c_2)c_3]$:

**Lemma 5.6.** Let $O = (c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3)$ be an orbit satisfying $\mathcal{C}(O) = [c_0(c_1c_2)c_3]$ with $\text{Norm}(O) = \{O, O'\}$ (we do not assume $\mathcal{C}(O)$ to be generic here), where $O' = (c_0', c_1', c_2', c_3')$ is obtained from $O$ by a fundamental collapse (Definition 4.7). Then

$$I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \{c_2c_3\}^+) \approx \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(c_0c_1c_2c_3^-) \oplus \mathcal{X}(c_0'c'_1c'_2c'_3^+) & \text{if } c_3 > 0; \\ \mathcal{X}(c_0c_1c_2c_3^+) \oplus \mathcal{X}(c_0'c'_1c'_2c'_3^+) & \text{if } c_2 > 0, c_3 = 0; \\ \mathcal{X}(c_0c_1c_2c_3^+) \oplus \mathcal{X}(c_0'c'_1c'_3^+) & \text{if } c_2 = c_3 = 0. \end{cases}$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{C}(O)$ is generic, then $\text{Norm}(O) = \{O, O'\}$, and the two summands on the above equation are precisely the distinguished modules $\Pi_{O}$ and $\Pi_{O'}$. Hence Proposition 5.4 holds for $O$.

**Proof.** Consider the intertwining operators

$$I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \{c_2c_3\}^+) = I^G(-\frac{c_0}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2}) \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_1}{2} \right) \left( -\frac{c_2}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_2}{2} \right) \rightarrow$$

(10)

$$I^G(-\frac{c_0}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2}) \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_1}{2} \right) \left( -\frac{c_2}{2}, \ldots, \frac{c_2}{2} - 1 \right) \rightarrow$$

$$I^G(-\frac{c_0}{2}, \ldots, -\frac{1}{2} \frac{c_2}{2} - 1) \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{c_1}{2} \right) \left( -\frac{c_2}{2}, \ldots, \frac{c_2}{2} - 1 \right).$$
By Proposition 2.3, the first map of (10) is an isomorphism on the diminutive $K$-types. So we keep track on the kernel and image of the second map $\iota$ on the level of diminutive $K$-types.

By Lemma 2.1(b), $\text{im} \iota$ is equal to

$$I^G\left(\left(-\frac{c_1}{2}, \ldots, -\frac{c_3}{2}\right) \left(-\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, -\frac{c_3}{2} - 1\right)\right) \approx I^G\left(\left(-\frac{c_1}{2}, \ldots, -\frac{c_3}{2}\right) \left(-\frac{c_1}{2} + 1, \ldots, -\frac{c_3}{2} - 1\right)\right)$$

$$= I^G(\{c_0 + 1, c_1 + 1\}^+ \{c_2 - 2, c_3\}^+) \quad \text{if } c_0 > c_1 = c_2 > c_3$$

$$= I^G(\{c_0 + 1, c_1\}^+ \{c_2 - 1, c_3 - 1\}^+) \quad \text{if } c_0 = c_1 = c_2 > c_3$$

$$= I^G(\{c_0, c_1\}^+ \{c_2, c_3\}^+)$$

(if $c_2 = c_3 = 0$ then the $[c_2'c_3']^+$ is non-existent). By Lemma 1.13, the last module satisfies

$$I^G([c_0'c_1']^+ [c_2'c_3']^+) \approx \overline{X}(c_0'c_1') \oplus \overline{X}(c_2'c_3')$$

so we have accounted for the second summand in the lemma.

Similarly, one can apply the techniques in the proof of Proposition 2.2(b) to show that $\text{ker} \iota$ in (10) is equal to the first summand in the lemma on the level of diminutive lowest $K$-types. So the result follows.

Remark 5.7. By a similar argument as above, we can also get the composition factors of $I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \{c_2c_3\}^-)$. More precisely, when $[c_0(c_1c_2)c_3]$ is generic and $c_3 \neq 0$, then

$$I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \{c_2c_3\}^-) \approx \overline{X}(c_0(c_1c_2)c_3^-) \oplus \overline{X}(c_0'c_1') \oplus \overline{X}(c_2'c_3').$$

(11) for $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$.

We now prove Proposition 5.4 in the single chain setting by induction on the length of a chain:

Suppose the Proposition holds for $\mathcal{C}(O_k) = [c_2(c_3c_4) \ldots (c_{2k-1}c_{2k})c_{2k+1}]$, then it also holds for $\mathcal{C}(O_{k+1}) = [c_0(c_1c_2)(c_3c_4) \ldots (c_{2k-1}c_{2k})c_{2k+1}]$.

Firstly, we study the relation between $\text{Norm}(O_k)$ and $\text{Norm}(O_{k+1})$. Let

$$O'_k = (b_2, b_3, b_4, \ldots, b_{2k+1}) = (c_2, b_3, b_4, \ldots, b_{2k+1}) \in \text{Norm}(O_k)$$

(Note that $b_2 = c_2$ by the definition of fundamental collapse). Consider the two orbits

$$(O'_k)_u := (c_0, c_1, c_2, b_3, b_4, \ldots, b_{2k+1}), \quad (O'_k)_d := (c_0', c_1', c_2, b_3, b_4, \ldots, b_{2k+1}),$$

where $(O'_k)_u$ is obtained by concatenating $O'_k$ with $(c_0, c_1)$ on the left, and $(O'_k)_d$ is obtained by performing the fundamental collapse on $c_0, c_1, c_2, b_3$ of $(O'_k)_u$. Then

$$\text{Norm}(O_{k+1}) = \bigcup_{O'_k \in \text{Norm}(O_k)} \{(O'_k)_u, (O'_k)_d\}.$$

In particular, the cardinality of $\text{Norm}(O_{k+1})$ is twice of that of $\text{Norm}(O_k)$.
Let $\Pi O'_k = \overline{X}([c_2(b_3b_4) \ldots (b_{2l-1}b_{2l})b_{2l+1}]^\epsilon \sqcup \cdots)$ be the distinguished module in $O'_k \in \text{Norm}(O_k)$. Note that the chain $[c_2(b_3b_4) \ldots (b_{2l-1}b_{2l})b_{2l+1}]$ can be non-generic when $O'_k \neq O_k$. Consider the induced module

$$I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \Pi O'_k) = I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \overline{X}([c_2(b_3b_4) \ldots (b_{2l-1}b_{2l})b_{2l+1}]^\epsilon \sqcup \cdots))$$

$$\approx I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ I^{G'}([b_3b_4]^\epsilon \ldots \{b_{2l-1}b_{2l}\}^\epsilon \{c_2b_{2l+1}\}^\epsilon \ldots))$$

$$= I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \{b_3b_4\}^\epsilon \ldots \{b_{2l-1}b_{2l}\}^\epsilon \{c_2b_{2l+1}\}^\epsilon \cdots)$$

$$\approx I^G(\{b_3b_4\}^\epsilon \ldots \{b_{2l-1}b_{2l}\}^\epsilon \cdots \{c_0c_1\}^+ \{c_2b_{2l+1}\}^\epsilon)$$

$$= I^G(\{b_3b_4\}^\epsilon \ldots \{b_{2l-1}b_{2l}\}^\epsilon \cdots I^{G''}(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \{c_2b_{2l+1}\}^\epsilon)),$$

where the first $\approx$ comes from Remark 4.9, second $\approx$ comes from induction in stages, second $\approx$ comes from applying intertwining operators $\iota$, and the last equality follows again from induction in stages.

By applying Equation (11) with $(c_0, c_1, c_2, b_{2l+1})$ when $c_0 > c_1 = c_2 > b_{2l+1} \neq 0$ (the study of other cases is left to the reader), the induced module in Equation (12) contains exactly two diminutive lowest $K$-type modules

$$I^G(\{b_3b_4\}^\epsilon \ldots \{b_{2l-1}b_{2l}\}^\epsilon \cdots \overline{X}(\{c_0(c_1c_2)\}^\epsilon (b_{2l-1}b_{2l})b_{2l+1}]^\epsilon \sqcup \cdots)$$

and

$$I^G(\{b_3b_4\}^\epsilon \ldots \{b_{2l-1}b_{2l}\}^\epsilon \cdots \overline{X}(\{c_0'c_1\}^+ [c_2b_{2l+1}]^\epsilon))$$

which are precisely the distinguished modules $\Pi(\sigma'_k)_u$ and $\Pi(\sigma'_k)_d$ corresponding to $(\sigma'_k)_u$, $(\sigma'_k)_d \in \text{Norm}(O_{k+1})$ respectively. So we have

$$I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \Pi(\sigma'_k)_d) \approx \Pi(\sigma'_k)_u \oplus \Pi(\sigma'_k)_d.$$
Therefore,

\[
\bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}'_{k+1} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}_{k+1})} \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_{k+1}} = \bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}'_k \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}_k)} (\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_k}^u \oplus \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_k}^d)
\]

\[
\approx \bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}'_k \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}_k)} I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_k})
\]

\[
\approx I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+I^G(\{c_2c_3\}^+\ldots\{c_{2k}c_{2k+1}\}^+))
\]

\[
= I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+\{c_2c_3\}^+\ldots\{c_{2k}c_{2k+1}\}^+).
\]

The first \(\approx\) comes from Equation (13), and the second \(\approx\) comes from induction hypothesis, and the last equality comes from induction in stages. \(\blacksquare\)

**Proof of Proposition 5.4 - Multiple Chains** We will show how Proposition 5.4 holds when \(C(\mathcal{O})\) has two chains, and the general case is analogous.

Assume

\[
C(\mathcal{O}) = [c_0(c_1c_2)\ldots(c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \sqcup [d_0(d_1d_2)\ldots(d_{2q-1}d_{2q})d_{2q+1}].
\]

Also, let \(\mathcal{O}_1 = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2p+1})\) and \(\mathcal{O}_2 = (d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_{2q+1})\). Then for all \(\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})\), the chains of \(\mathcal{O}'\) is of the form \(C(\mathcal{O}') = C(\mathcal{O}'_1) \sqcup C(\mathcal{O}'_2)\), where \(\mathcal{O}'_i \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}_i)\) for \(i = 1, 2\).

By the results in the previous section,

\[
I^{Sp}(\{c_0c_1\}^+\ldots\{c_{2p}c_{2p+1}\}^+) \approx \bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}'_i \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}_i)} \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_i},
\]

\[
I^{Sp}(\{d_0d_1\}^+\ldots\{d_{2q}d_{2q+1}\}^+) \approx \bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}'_i \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}_i)} \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_i},
\]

where each \(\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_i}\) is of the form

\[
\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_1} = X([r_0(r_1r_2)\ldots(r_{2i-1}r_{2i})r_{2i+1}]^e \sqcup \ldots \sqcup [s_0(s_1s_2)\ldots(s_{2j-1}s_{2j})s_{2j+1}]^e)
\]

\[
\cong I^{Sp}(\{r_1r_2\}^-\ldots\{r_{2i-1}r_{2i}\}^-\ldots\{s_1s_2\}^-\ldots\{s_{2j-1}s_{2j}\}^-\{r_0r_{2i+1}\}^e \ldots \{s_0s_{2j+1}\}^e).
\]

\[
\Pi_{\mathcal{O}'_2} = X([t_0(t_1t_2)\ldots(t_{2l-1}t_{2l})t_{2l+1}]^e \sqcup \ldots \sqcup [u_0(u_1u_2)\ldots(u_{2k-1}u_{2k})u_{2k+1}]^e)
\]

\[
\cong I^{Sp}(\{t_1t_2\}^-\ldots\{t_{2l-1}t_{2l}\}^-\ldots\{u_1u_2\}^-\ldots\{u_{2k-1}u_{2k}\}^-\{t_0t_{2l+1}\}^e \ldots \{u_0u_{2k+1}\}^e).
\]
Now consider

\[ \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{O'} \in \text{Norm}(\mathfrak{O})} \Pi_{\mathfrak{O'}} \]

\[ \approx \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{O'} \in \text{Norm}(\mathfrak{O}), i} \mathcal{G} \left( \sum_{i} \left[ r_{0}(r_{1}r_{2}) \cdots (r_{2i-1}r_{2i})r_{2i+1} \right]^{e_{r}} \cup \cdots \cup \left[ s_{0}(s_{1}s_{2}) \cdots (s_{2j-1}s_{2j})s_{2j+1} \right]^{e_{s}} \cup \left[ t_{0}(t_{1}t_{2}) \cdots (t_{2k-1}t_{2k})t_{2k+1} \right]^{e_{t}} \cup \cdots \cup \left[ u_{0}(u_{1}u_{2}) \cdots (u_{2k-1}u_{2k})u_{2k+1} \right]^{e_{u}} \right) \]

\[ \approx \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{O'} \in \text{Norm}(\mathfrak{O}), i} \mathcal{G} \left( \prod_{i} \left[ \sum_{r=0}^{d_{0}d_{1}+1} \right]^{e_{r}} \cdots \sum_{s=0}^{d_{2q}d_{2q+1}+1} \right) \]

Consequently, the result follows.

6. The Main Theorem

In Corollary 3.10 we have constructed a map

\[ \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \]

which is isomorphic on the trivial \( K \)-type. By construction, \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \) has associated variety \( \mathcal{O} \) and hence its composition factors must come from the irreducible modules constructed in Section 4.

Instead of looking at the whole module \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \), we will study its cyclic submodule, i.e., the submodule generated by the trivial \( K \)-type:
Proposition 6.1. Let $O$ be an orbit satisfying Assumption 1.7 with
\[
\mathcal{C}(O) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0(d_1d_2) \ldots (d_{2q-1}d_{2q})d_{2q+1}],
\]
and $B(O)$ be the induced module given in Corollary 3.11. Then the composition factors of its cyclic submodule are precisely the distinguished modules $\{\Pi_{O'} \mid O' \in \text{Norm}(O)\}$ given in Definition 5.2.

Proof. Let
\[
I(O) := I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p-1}c_{2p}\}^+ \{d_1d_2\}^+ \cdots \{d_{2q-1}d_{2q}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+ \cdots \{d_0d_{2q+1}\}^+),
\]
then we have the surjective map
\[
(18) \quad I(O) \twoheadrightarrow B(O)
\]
be a surjective morphism induced from the quotient map
\[
I^G(\{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+ \cdots \{d_0d_{2q+1}\}^+) \twoheadrightarrow \Xi(\{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+ \cdots \{d_0d_{2q+1}\}^+)
\]
which is isomorphic on the level of diminutive $K$-type by Lemma 1.13. We make the following claims:

Claim 1: $I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p-1}c_{2p+1}\}^+ \{d_0d_1\}^+ \cdots \{d_{2q}d_{2q+1}\}^+)$ is a submodule of $I(O)$.

Proof of Claim 1: We will prove the above result on the level $G = GL$, and the result for $G = Sp$ follows by induction in stages. Firstly, consider the case when there are only $c_i$’s. We will prove the claim by induction on the length of $\mathcal{C}(O)$. The result is automatic if $\mathcal{C}(O) = [c_0c_1]$. Now suppose $\mathcal{C}(O) = [c_0(c_1c_2)c_3]$, consider the intertwining operator
\[
I^G(\{c_0c_3\}^+\{c_1c_2\}^+) \hookrightarrow I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+\{c_0c_3\}^+) = I(O)
\]
which has image $I^G(\{c_0c_3\}^+\{c_2c_3\}^+) \subset I(O)$ by Proposition 2.2(b).

Suppose the result holds for $\mathcal{C}(O_p) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}]$, i.e.
\[
(19) \quad I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p-1}c_{2p}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+) \subset I(O_p) = I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p-2}c_{2p}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+).
\]

Consider $\mathcal{C}(O_{p+1}) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p+1}c_{2p+2})c_{2p+3}]$ and the intertwining operator
\[
I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p+3}\}^+) \hookrightarrow I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p+1}c_{2p+2}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+3}\}^+)\]
which has image
\[
I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_2c_{2p+3}\}^+) \subset I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p+1}c_{2p+2}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+3}\}^+)\]
by Equation (19), we also have
\[
I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p-1}c_{2p+1}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+3}\}^+) \subset I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+ \{c_2c_{2p+3}\}^+) \subset I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p+1}c_{2p+2}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+3}\}^+)
= I(O_{p+1}).
\]
Consequently, the claim is proved when there are only $c_i$’s.

Now suppose there are only $c_i$’s and $d_i$’s. Since $\{c_0c_{2p+1}\}$ are nested with all $\{d_{2i-1}d_{2i}\}$, we have
\[
 I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p-1}c_{2p}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+ \{d_1d_2\}^+ \cdots \{d_{2q-1}d_{2q}\}^+ \{d_0d_{2q+1}\}^+) \to 
 I^G(\{c_1c_2\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p-1}c_{2p}\}^+ \{d_1d_2\}^+ \cdots \{d_{2q-1}d_{2q}\}^+ \{c_0c_{2p+1}\}^+ \{d_0d_{2q+1}\}^+).
\]

Then the result follows from the case when there are only $c_i$’s or $d_i$’s. And the argument can be easily generalized to an arbitrary number of chains of $C(O)$.

\[\text{Claim 2:}\] The induced module $I^G(\{c_0c_1\}^+ \cdots \{c_{2p}c_{2p+1}\}^+ \cdots \{d_0d_1\}^+ \cdots \{d_{2q}d_{2q+1}\}^+)$ is cyclic.

\[\text{Proof of Claim 2:}\] We prove the claim by induction on the length of chains. Suppose $O$ is a nilpotent orbit such that
\[
 C(O) = [c_0(c_1c_2) \cdots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0(d_1d_2) \cdots (d_{2q-1}d_{2q})d_{2q+1}].
\]

Rearrange the infinitesimal character given in Equation (5) into the form
\[
 \lambda^0 = \left( \frac{c_0}{2}, \frac{c_0}{2} - 1, \ldots, r, \ldots, r, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, 0, \ldots, 0 \right)
\]
with $n_r \leq n_{r+1}$ and $n_1 \leq 2n_0 + 1$. This is the dominant form of the parameter. Consider the principal series
\[
 X \left( \begin{smallmatrix} \lambda^0 \\ \lambda^0 \end{smallmatrix} \right) = I^G(\lambda^0),
\]
where $\lambda^0 := \left( \begin{smallmatrix} \frac{c_0}{2} & \frac{c_0}{2} - 1 \\ \frac{c_0}{2} & \frac{c_0}{2} - 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \cdots \left( \begin{smallmatrix} r & \frac{r}{r} \\ r & \frac{r}{r} \end{smallmatrix} \right) \cdots \left( \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{1} \\ 1 & \frac{1}{1} \end{smallmatrix} \right) \cdots \left( \begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right).
\]

Repeating use of $\iota$ (Lemma 2.1) implies that
\[
 I^G(\left( \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \frac{c_0}{2} \\ 1 & \frac{c_0}{2} \end{smallmatrix} \right) \lambda^1)
\]
is a homomorphich image of the cyclic spherical module $X \left( \begin{smallmatrix} \lambda^0 \\ \lambda^0 \end{smallmatrix} \right)$ (and hence cyclic), where $\lambda^1$ is obtained from $\lambda^0$ by removing one copy of $\{1, 2, \ldots, \frac{c_0}{2}\}$ from $\lambda^0$.

Repeating the process with $\lambda^1$, we find
\[
 I^G(\left( \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \frac{c_0}{2} \\ 1 & \frac{c_0}{2} \end{smallmatrix} \right) \lambda^2 \left( \begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \frac{c_1}{2} - 1 \\ 0 & \frac{c_1}{2} - 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right)) \cong I^G(\left( \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \frac{c_0}{2} \\ 1 & \frac{c_0}{2} \end{smallmatrix} \right) \lambda^2 \left( \begin{smallmatrix} -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right)).
\]
as a homomorphic image of $X \left( \lambda^0 \right)$. Now pass $\left( \begin{array}{c} -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1 \ldots 0 \\ -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1 \ldots 0 \end{array} \right)$ past $\lambda^2$ to conclude that

$$I^G \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \ldots \frac{c_0}{2} \\ 1 \ldots \frac{c_0}{2} \end{array} \right) \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1 \ldots \frac{c_1}{2} \right) \lambda^3$$

is a homomorphic image of $X \left( \lambda^0 \right)$. Then we apply $\iota$ on $\left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \ldots \frac{c_0}{2} \\ 1 \ldots \frac{c_0}{2} \end{array} \right) \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1 \ldots \frac{c_1}{2} \right)$ to conclude that

$$I^G \left( \begin{array}{c} -\frac{c_1}{2} + 1 \ldots \frac{c_0}{2} \\ 1 \ldots \frac{c_0}{2} \end{array} \right) \left( 1 \ldots \frac{c_1}{2} \right) \lambda^3 = I^G \left( \{ c_0 c_1 \}^+ \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \ldots \frac{c_1}{2} \\ 1 \ldots \frac{c_1}{2} \end{array} \right) \lambda^3 \right)$$

is a homomorphic image of $X \left( \lambda^0 \right)$. Therefore, we are back to the situation of Equation (20) without $c_0$ and $c_1$, and the result follows from induction on the number of columns. ■

Combining Claim 1 and Claim 2, the cyclic submodule of $I(O)$ is equal to

$$I^G(\{ c_0 c_1 \}^+ \ldots \{ c_{2q} c_{2q+1} \}^+ \ldots \{ d_0 d_1 \}^+ \ldots \{ d_{2q} d_{2q+1} \}^+).$$

By Proposition 5.4 its composition factors of diminutive $K$-types are the distinguished modules. Since the map in Equation (18) is an isomorphism on diminutive $K$-types, this implies the distinguished modules are precisely the distinguished modules of $B(O)$. □

We are now in the position to state and prove the main theorem of this manuscript:

**Theorem 6.2.** Let $O$ be a nilpotent orbit of Type C satisfying Assumption 1.7. Then composition factors of $B(O)$ are precisely the distinguished modules given in Definition 5.1.

**Proof.** Recall that the $(\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)$-module morphism

$$B(O) \rightarrow B(O)$$

is an isomorphism on the trivial $K$-type, therefore the factors of the cyclic module of $B(O)$ must appear in $B(O)$ as well. Therefore, the composition factors of $B(O)$ contains the distinguished modules $\Pi_{O'}$ by Proposition 6.1.

Now suppose on the contrary that $B(O)$ has a factor other than $\Pi_{O'}$. Let $\Psi$ be one of such factor; its lowest $K$-type, $V_\gamma$, must be diminutive by Theorem 4.7. Then

$$[R(O) : V_\gamma] = [B(O) : V_\gamma]$$

$$\geq \left[ \Psi \bigoplus \bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(O)} \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'} : V_\gamma \right]$$

$$> \left[ \bigoplus_{\mathcal{O}' \in \text{Norm}(O)} \Pi_{\mathcal{O}'} : V_\gamma \right]$$

(21)

$$[R(O#) : V_\gamma] = [R(O#) : V_\gamma]$$
where $\mathcal{O}^#$ is given in Corollary 5.5. On the other hand, $\mathcal{O} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}^#$ as $G$-varieties. This implies that there is a $G$-module surjection $R(\mathcal{O}^#) \twoheadrightarrow R(\mathcal{O})$. In particular, $[R(\mathcal{O}) : V] \leq [R(\mathcal{O}^#) : V]$ for all irreducible, finite-dimensional representations of $G$. This contradicts Equation (21), and consequently there are no composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ other than the ones listed in Theorem 6.2.

Corollary 6.3. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a nilpotent orbit satisfying Assumption 1.7. The diminutive $K$-type multiplicity of $R(\mathcal{O})$ is equal to that of $R(\mathcal{O}^#)$, where $\mathcal{O}^# \supset \mathcal{O}$ is given in Corollary 5.5. Moreover, $\mathcal{O}$ is not normal if $R(\mathcal{O})$ and $R(\mathcal{O})^#$ have different multiplicities on the level of diminutive $K$-types.

Proof. The statement on diminutive $K$-type multiplicities are precisely Theorem 6.2 and Corollary 5.5. For the second statement, let $\mathcal{O}$ be an orbit satisfying Assumption 1.7 with chains

$$C(\mathcal{O}) = [(c_0(c_1c_2) \ldots (c_{2p-1}c_{2p})c_{2p+1}] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0(d_1d_2) \ldots (d_{2q-1}d_{2q})d_{2q+1}].$$

By the first statement of the corollary and [B5], the diminutive $K$-type multiplicities of $R(\mathcal{O})$ and $R(\mathcal{O})^#$ are given by

$$\text{Ind}^G_{GL(d_0d_1)} \cdots \times GL(d_{2q-1}d_{2q}) \times GL(d_{2q+1}) \times GL(d_{2q+1})^{(\text{triv})}; \text{ and}$$

$$\text{Ind}^G_{GL(d_0d_1) \times \cdots \times GL(d_{2q-1}d_{2q}) \times GL(d_{2q+1}) \times GL(d_{2q+1})^{(\text{triv})}}$$

respectively. These two induced modules have the same multiplicities iff they are induced from the same Levi type, which forces each chain to be of length 2. By Theorem 1.5 this implies $\mathcal{O}$ is normal.

More generally, an expression for the character formula of the sum of distinguished modules is given in [Wo1]. One can therefore compute the multiplicities of any $K$-type appearing $R(\mathcal{O})$.

Example 6.4. We present the formula of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ when $\mathcal{O} = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2p}, c_{2p+1})$ satisfies Assumption 1.7.

For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, p + 1$, let

$$\mu_i := \left(\begin{array}{c} c_0 \vdash 2 \\
2i \vdash 2 \
\vdash 1 \end{array}\right), \quad \nu_i := \left(\begin{array}{c} c_0 \vdash 2 \\
2i \vdash 2 \
\vdash 1 \end{array}\right).$$

For any subset $I \subset \{0, 1, \ldots, p + 1\}$, we define

$$W_I := \prod_{j \notin I} [W(C_{2j}/2) \times W(D_{c_{2j}+1/2})] \times \prod_{i \in I} [W(C_{2i+1/2} - 2) \times W(D_{c_{2i+1}/2} - 2)].$$

so that each $w_j \in W(C_{2j}/2) \times W(D_{c_{2j}+1/2})$ acts on $\mu_j$, and $w_i \in W(C_{2i+1/2} - 2) \times W(D_{c_{2i+1}/2} - 2)$ acts on $\nu_i$. Then the character formula for $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \cong \frac{1}{2^{p+1}} \text{sgn}(w) \text{Ind}^G_{\mathcal{O}} ((\bigcup_{j \notin I} \mu_j \cup \nu_i) \text{sgn}(w) \text{Ind}^G_{\mathcal{O}} ((\bigcup_{j \notin I} \mu_j \cup \nu_i)).$$

For example, if \( O = (6, 4, 4, 2) \), then

\[
R(O) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \sum_{w \in C_3 \times D_2 \times C_2 \times D_1} \text{sgn}(w) \text{Ind}^G_T((321; 10; 21; 0) - w(321; 10; 21; 0)) + \sum_{w \in C_3 \times D_2 \times D_3} \text{sgn}(w) \text{Ind}^G_T((321; 10; 210) - w(321; 10; 210)) + \sum_{w \in C_1 \times D_1 \times C_2 \times D_1} \text{sgn}(w) \text{Ind}^G_T((1; 3210; 210) - w(1; 3210; 210)) + \sum_{w \in C_1 \times D_1 \times D_3} \text{sgn}(w) \text{Ind}^G_T((1; 3210; 210) - w(1; 3210; 210)))
\]

7. General Structure of \( 
\mathcal{B}(\overline{O}) \)

We have explicitly found the composition factors of the Brylinski model for all orbits of Type \( C \) satisfying Assumption \( \text{I.7} \). In this section, we present the case for all special nilpotent orbits of Type \( C \).

7.1. Symplectic Orbits with Even Columns Only. For any special symplectic orbit \( O \) with even column sizes, we can separate as few column pairs \( (c_i, c_i) \) as possible such that:

\[ O = O_{\text{gen}} \cup (c_1, c_1) \cup \cdots \cup (c_r, c_r), \]

where \( O_{\text{gen}} \) satisfies Assumption \( \text{I.7} \). For example, if \( O = (8, 6, 6, 4, 2, 2, 2, 0) \), then \( O_{\text{gen}} = (8, 6, 4, 2, 2, 0) \) and \( \mathcal{O} = O_{\text{gen}} \cup (6, 6) \cup (2, 2) \).

We claim that the composition factors of \( \mathcal{B}(\overline{O}) \) are given by the irreducible factors of

\[ I^G(\{c_1, c_1\}^+ \cdots \{c_r, c_r\}^+ \Pi_{O_{\text{gen}}}), \]

where \( \Pi_{O_{\text{gen}}} \) is the distinguished module in \( O_{\text{gen}}' \in \text{Norm}(O_{\text{gen}}) \). Note that the modules in Equation \( \text{23} \) can be reducible.

Example 7.1. Let \( O = (6, 4, 4, 4, 2, 2) = (6, 4, 4, 2) \cup (4, 4) \), i.e. \( O_{\text{gen}} = (6, 4, 4, 2) \). As in Proposition \( \text{6.4} \) the submodule

\[ I^G(\{6, 4\}^+ \{4, 4\}^+ \{4, 2\}^+) \subset I(O) := I^G(\{4, 4\}^+ \{4, 4\}^+ \{6, 2\}^+) \]

is cyclic. Since \( \{6, 4\}^+ \) and \( \{4, 4\}^+ \) are nested, we have

\[ I^G(\{6, 4\}^+ \{4, 4\}^+ \{4, 2\}^+) \approx I^G(\{4, 4\}^+ \{6, 4\}^+ \{4, 2\}^+) \approx \bigoplus_{O_{\text{gen}}' \in \text{Norm}(O_{\text{gen}})} I^G(\{4, 4\}^+ \Pi_{O_{\text{gen}}'}). \]

So the modules in \( \text{23} \) constitute the composition series of \( \mathcal{B}(\overline{O}) \).

In order to show the exhaust the whole composition series of \( \mathcal{B}(\overline{O}) \), one also needs to show that all modules attached to \( O' \in \text{Norm}(O) \) have diminutive \( K \)-types. This is indeed the case by some constructions of irreducible modules analogous to Section 4.
7.2. Special Symplectic Orbits. Finally, we present the case for all special symplectic orbits. The only difference between all special orbits and orbits with only even columns is the existence of odd column pairs \((2k + 1, 2k + 1)\). More precisely, all special orbits can be written as

\[
\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{\text{even}} \cup (2k_1 + 1, 2k_1 + 1) \cup \cdots \cup (2k_r + 1, 2k_r + 1),
\]

where \(\mathcal{O}_{\text{even}}\) is an orbit of the same type with even columns only.

By denoting \(\{2k + 1, 2k + 1\}_\mathcal{O}^+ := \left(\frac{-2k+1}{2}, \frac{-2k+3}{2}, \ldots, \frac{2k+1}{2}\right)\) (which is different from \(\{2k + 1, 2k + 1\}_\mathcal{O}^+\)), we claim that the composition factors of \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})\) are given by

\[
\Pi^G(\{2k_1 + 1, 2k_1 + 1\}_\mathcal{O}) \cdots \{2k_r + 1, 2k_r + 1\}_\mathcal{O}^+ \Pi_{\text{even}},
\]

where \(\Pi_{\text{even}}\) are the composition factors of \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_{\text{even}})\).

**Example 7.2.** Let \(\mathcal{O} = (4, 4, 3, 3) = (4, 4) \cup (3, 3)\). Following the construction of \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})\) in Section 3, the columns \((3, 3)\) yield infinitesimal character \(\{3, 3\}_\mathcal{O}^+\).

Consider the intertwining operator

\[
I^G(\{4, 4\}_\mathcal{O}^+ \{3, 3\}_\mathcal{O}^+) \to I^G(\{3, 3\}_\mathcal{O}^+ \{4, 4\}_\mathcal{O}^+).
\]

Note that the character \(\{4, 4\}_\mathcal{O}^+\) is integral, while \(\{3, 3\}_\mathcal{O}^+\) is half-integral. By Lemma 7.7(a), the intertwining operator has no diminutive lowest \(K\)-types. As in the previous subsection, one can conclude that the modules in \((24)\) constitute the composition series of \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})\).

In conclusion, we have the following:

**Corollary 7.3** ([Wo3], Conjecture 5.3). Let \(\mathcal{O} = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{2k+1})\) be a special orbit of Type C. For any diminutive \(K\)-type \(V\), its multiplicity in \(R(\mathcal{O})\) is given by

\[
[R(\mathcal{O}) : V] = [\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{GL}(\sum_{r=0}^{c_r+1})}^{\mathcal{G}\times \cdots \times \mathcal{G}(\sum_{r=0}^{c_r+1})}(\text{triv}) : V].
\]

Moreover, \(\mathcal{O}\) is not normal iff there exists a diminutive \(K\)-type \(V'\) such that \([R(\mathcal{O}) : V'] < [R(\mathcal{O}) : V]\).

Moreover, by Example 6.4, we are able to get the character formula for \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \cong R(\mathcal{O})\) for all special nilpotent orbits. In other words, we are able to compute the multiplicity of any \(K\)-type appearing in \(R(\mathcal{O})\).

7.3. Remarks on Orthogonal Nilpotent Orbits. We end our discussions on the generalizations of Theorem 6.2 by looking at the orthogonal orbits \(\mathcal{Q}\).

As mentioned in Remark 3.11, one can construct a morphism \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q})\) which is isomorphic on the trivial \(K\)-type. Moreover, one can also construct an induced module \(I(\mathcal{Q})\) as in Equation 18 such that

- \(I(\mathcal{Q}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q})\) is isomorphic on the level of diminutive \(K\)-type.
- The cyclic submodule \(I(\mathcal{Q})\) of \(I(\mathcal{Q})\) has the ‘correct’ diminutive \(K\)-type multiplicities so that the arguments in the proof of Theorem 6.2 hold.
Suppose we know that all irreducible modules attached $Q' \in \text{Norm}(Q)$ have diminutive $K$-types, then we can conclude as before that the composition factors in $I(Q)$ with diminutive lowest $K$-types are precisely the composition factors of $B(\overline{Q})$. This can be checked for special orthogonal orbits as in the symplectic case, and we expect it holds for all nilpotent orbits using the validity of Kazhdan-Lusztig conjectures (e.g. [11, Section 4.2]).

We observe that there is a dual pair correspondence between the composition factors of $B(Q)$ and $B(O)$, where $O$ is obtained from $Q$ by adding an extra column on the left as in Remark 3.11. In fact, this can be checked by computing the composition factors of $B(Q)$ by the above method, and compare them with the composition factors of $B(O)$ using the results in [AB]. It would be of interest to give a theoretical account of this observation.

8. Proof of Proposition 4.7

We will prove Proposition 4.7 for $O$ where the infinitesimal character $\lambda$ in Equation (5) is integral. In other words, we require that $O$ contains columns of even sizes only.

Given the integral infinitesimal character $(\lambda, \lambda)$ in Equation (5), we study the left cone representation corresponding to the orbit $O_\lambda$ as described in the beginning of Section 4:

$V^L(w_0w_\lambda) = \text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^{W}(\text{triv}),$

where $W(\lambda)$ is the largest Weyl Levi subgroup of $W$ fixing $\lambda$, and $w_\lambda$ is the longest element in $W(\lambda)$.

For any special orbit $O'$, the number of irreducible representations with infinitesimal character $(\lambda, \lambda)$ and associated variety $O'$ is given by

$[V^L(w_0w_\lambda) : V(O')] = [\text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^{W}(\text{triv}) : V(O')],$

where $V(O')$ is the left cell representation corresponding to the orbit $O'$. In particular, each $V(O')$ contains $|\text{A}(O')|$ distinct irreducible representations of $W$ (see [BV2, Proposition 5.28 for instance]).

The decomposition of $V^L(w_0w_\lambda) = \text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^{W}(\text{triv})$ into irreducible representations can be easily computed using the Robinson-Schensted algorithm. In particular, one can check that for any even $O$ and any $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$, each irreducible factor of $V(O')$ appears in $\text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^{W}(\text{triv})$ exactly once.

Therefore, the number of irreducible modules with infinitesimal character $(\lambda, \lambda)$ and associated variety $\overline{O'}$ for each $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$ is equal to $|\text{A}(O')|$, which is precisely the number of parameters attached to $O'$.

Example 8.1. Consider $O = (6, 4, 4, 2, 2, 0)$ with $\lambda = (32211100)$. Then

$\text{Norm}(O) = \{O, O_1 := (6, 4, 4, 4), O_2 := (6, 6, 2, 2, 2, 0), O_\lambda = (6, 6, 3, 3)\}$

and $W(\lambda) = W(A_0) \times W(A_1) \times W(A_3) \times W(C_2)$.

The left cell representation for each $O' \in \text{Norm}(O)$ is given by the following:

- $O$: $(21 \times 321)$.
- $O_1$: $(22 \times 32), (43 \times 11)$. 
\[ \bullet \mathcal{O}_2: (31 \times 311), (41 \times 211). \\
\bullet \mathcal{O}_3: (32 \times 31), (42 \times 21). \]

Note that the Young diagrams are all described in terms of columns, i.e. \((43 \times 11)\) = \[(\begin{array}{c}
\end{array})\].

One can easily show that each irreducible representation shows up exactly once in \(\text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^W(\text{triv})\). In other words, there is only one way to fill up the Young diagrams into semi-standard Young tableaux using the coordinates of \(\lambda\) with the first row of the left Young diagram filled with zeros. For example, the only way to fill up \((43 \times 11)\) is given by \[(\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 &\ \\
2 & 2 &\ \\
3 & &
\end{array})\].

For an arbitrary orbit \(O\) with even columns, there is a systematic way of describing the left cell representations for all \(O' \in \text{Norm}(O)\) (c.f. [L Chapter 4]) and the same results hold. We omit the details here.

We are left to show that all the induced modules in Equation (8) are irreducible, have the correct associated variety and are of multiplicity one. In fact, the last two properties follow directly from the definition of the module, so we only need to check that they are irreducible.

**Lemma 8.2.** Let \(I_{O',e'}\) be the induced module in Equation (8), and \(\overline{X}_{O',e'}\) be its lowest K-type subquotient. Then for any diminutive K-type \(V\), we have
\[ [I_{O',e'} : V] = [\overline{X}_{O',e'} : V] \]

**Proof.** We present the proof for the parameter
\[ [c_0(c'_1c'_2) \ldots (c'_{2p-1}c'_{2p})c'_{2p+1}]^{-} \cup [d'_0(d'_1d'_2) \ldots (d'_{2q-1}d'_{2q})d'_{2q+1}]^{+} \]
attached to \(C(O') = [c_0(c'_1c'_2) \ldots (c'_{2p-1}c'_{2p})c'_{2p+1}] \cup [d'_0(d'_1d'_2) \ldots (d'_{2q-1}d'_{2q})d'_{2q+1}]\), and the general case follows from this example.

By Remark 4.9 the multiplicity of a diminutive K-type \(V_{2y}\) of highest weight \((1,2y,0)^{\pm}\) in \(I_{O',e'}\) is given by
\[
[I_{O',e'} : V_{2y}] = [I^G(\{c'_1c'_2\}^{-} \ldots (c'_{2p-1}c'_{2p})^{-}(c'_0c'_{2p+1})^{-}(d'_1d'_2)^{-} \ldots (d'_{2q-1}d'_{2q})^{-}(d'_0d'_{2q+1})^{+}) : V_{2y}] \\
= [I^G(\Delta_{c'_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Delta_{c'_{2p-1}} \otimes \Delta_{c'_{2p}}^{-} \otimes \Delta(\frac{(c'_0+c'_{2p+1})+2}{4}) / \Delta(\frac{(c'_0-c'_{2p+1})+2}{4}) : V_{2y}] \\
= [I^G(\Delta_{d'_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Delta_{d'_{2q-1}} \otimes \Delta(\frac{(d'_0+d'_{2q+1})+2}{4}) / \Delta(\frac{(d'_0-d'_{2q+1})+2}{4}) : V_{2y}] \\
= [I^G(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{p+1} \Delta_{c'_{2i-1}} \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{q} \Delta_{d'_{2j-1}} \otimes I^{Sp}(\Delta(\frac{(c'_0+c'_{2p+1})+2}{4}) / \Delta(\frac{(c'_0-c'_{2p+1})+2}{4}) : V_{2y}],
\]
where the second equality comes from Lemma 1.13 with $\Delta_a := \det_{GL(a)}$ and $|\Delta|^e_b := (\det |GL(b)|)^e$.

Let $M := GL(c_1') \times \cdots \times GL(c_{2p+1}') \times GL(d_1') \times \cdots \times GL(d_{2q-1}') \times Sp$, and consider the decomposition of

$$V_{2y} \mid M = \Delta'_{c_1} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \Delta'_d \boxtimes V_{2y-m} \oplus \cdots$$

to irreducible modules, where $m = \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} c_{2i-1}' + \sum_{j=1}^q d_{2j-1}'$. By Frobenius reciprocity

$$[I_{O',\epsilon'} : V_{2y}] = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{p+1} \Delta'_{c_{2i-1}} \boxtimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^q \Delta'_d \boxtimes ISp \left( \frac{[c_{2p+1}' + 2]}{[c_0' - c_{2p+1}']/2} \boxtimes \Delta \left( \frac{[d_{2q+1}' + 2]}{[d_0' + d_{2q+1}']/2} \right) : V_{2y} \mid M \right)$$

$$= ISp \left( \frac{[c_{2p+1}'] + 1 \cdots \frac{c_0'}{2}}{[c_0' - c_{2p+1}']/2} \right) \Delta \left( \frac{[d_{2q+1}'] + 1 \cdots \frac{d_0'}{2}}{[d_0' + d_{2q+1}']/2} \right) : V_{2y-m} \right)$$

On the other hand, $\mathbb{X}_{O',\epsilon'}$ is the irreducible subquotient of the induced module

$$I^G(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{p+1} \{c_{2i-1}' \cdots c_{2i}' \} - \bigotimes_{j=1}^q \{d_{2j-1}' \cdots d_{2j}' \}) \mathbb{X}_{Sp} \left( \frac{[c_{2p+1}'] + 1 \cdots \frac{c_0'}{2} - \frac{d_{2q+1}'}{2} + 1 \cdots \frac{d_0'}{2}}{[c_0' - c_{2p+1}']/2} \right) \right)$$

By [SV], $V_{2y}$ is a $M'$-bottom layer $K$-type of $\mathbb{X}_{O',\epsilon'}$, where $M' = GL \times Sp$ is the Levi subgroup of the above module is induced from. Then Proposition 2.7 of [B1] says

$$[\mathbb{X}_{O',\epsilon'} : V_{2y}] = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{p+1} \Delta'_{c_{2i-1}} \boxtimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^q \Delta'_d \boxtimes ISp \left( \frac{[c_{2p+1}'] + 1 \cdots \frac{c_0'}{2} - \frac{d_{2q+1}'}{2} + 1 \cdots \frac{d_0'}{2}}{[c_0' - c_{2p+1}']/2} \right) : V_{2y-m} \right)$$

$$= ISp \left( \frac{[c_{2p+1}'] + 1 \cdots \frac{c_0'}{2} - \frac{d_{2q+1}'}{2} + 1 \cdots \frac{d_0'}{2}}{[c_0' - c_{2p+1}']/2} \right) : V_{2y-m} \right)$$

where the second equality comes from the irreducibility results in [V4].

Comparing Equations (25) and (26), one therefore needs to show that

$$ISp \left( \frac{[c_{2p+1}'] + 1 \cdots \frac{c_0'}{2} - \frac{d_{2q+1}'}{2} + 1 \cdots \frac{d_0'}{2}}{[c_0' - c_{2p+1}']/2} \right) \approx ISp \left( \frac{[c_{2p+1}'] + 1 \cdots \frac{c_0'}{2} - \frac{d_{2q+1}'}{2} + 1 \cdots \frac{d_0'}{2}}{[c_0' - c_{2p+1}']/2} \right)$$
This can be seen by the following: Let $\beta$ be the dominant form of the infinitesimal character of the modules in (27). Consider the intertwining operators

$$X \left( \frac{\beta}{\beta} \right) \rightarrow X \left( -\frac{\beta}{\beta} \right)$$

by $\iota$ and $\sigma$ in Section 2, which has homomorphic image $X \left( \frac{\beta}{\beta} \right)$ equal to the irreducible module in Equation (27). On the other hand, by Propositions 2.2 and 2.3 (the arguments are analogous to that in Claim 2 of Proposition 6.1), the image of the intertwining operators is equal to

$$I_{Sp} \left( \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} \cdots -\frac{c_{p+1}}{2} - 1 \right) \left( -\frac{d_1}{2} \cdots -\frac{d_{q+1}}{2} - 1 \right) \left( -\frac{c_1}{2} \cdots -\frac{c_{p+1}}{2} - 1 \right) \right)$$

on the level of diminutive $K$-types (here we use the fact that the two strings

$$\left( -\frac{c_1}{2}, \ldots, -\frac{c_{p+1}}{2} \right), \left( -\frac{d_1}{2}, \ldots, -\frac{d_{q+1}}{2} \right)$$

are nested). Since this induced module has the same $K$-type multiplicities as the left module in Equation (27), our desired result follows.

We can now prove Proposition 4.7 by induction on the closure ordering of the orbits in $Norm(O)$:

For the smallest orbit $O_\lambda \in Norm(O)$, its chains $C(O_\lambda) = [c_0^\lambda c_1^\lambda] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [d_0^\lambda d_1^\lambda]$ are all of length 2. Therefore, the module $I_{O_\lambda, \epsilon_\lambda}$ in Equation (8) is equal to a special unipotent representation $I_{O_\lambda, \epsilon_\lambda} = X(O_\lambda) \otimes (\epsilon_\lambda)$, which is known to be irreducible.

Now consider any nilpotent orbit $O' \in Norm(O)$. By induction hypothesis, we assume that for all $O'' \subsetneq O'$, all the modules $I_{O''} = X(O'')$ are irreducible.

Suppose on the contrary that $W$ is a composition factor of $I_{O', \epsilon'}$ other than $X(O', \epsilon')$, then $W$ must have associated variety $O'' \subsetneq O'$ since $I_{O', \epsilon'}$ is of multiplicity one. Hence $W = X(O'', \epsilon'') = I_{O'', \epsilon''}$ for some $\epsilon''$. By Remark 4.9, $W$ has diminutive lowest $K$-type $V_{2w}$. So we have

$$[I_{O', \epsilon'} : V_{2w}] \geq [X(O', \epsilon') \oplus W : V_{2w}] = [X(O', \epsilon') : V_{2w}] + [W : V_{2w}] \geq [I_{O', \epsilon'} : V_{2w}] + 1,$$

which gives a contradiction.

\[ \square \]

References


