A VANISHING CONJECTURE: THE GL_n CASE

TS AO-HSIEN CHEN

ABSTRACT. In this article we propose a vanishing conjecture for a certain class of \( \ell \)-adic complexes on a reductive group \( G \) which can be regraded as a generalization of the acyclicity of the Artin-Schreier sheaf. We show that the vanishing conjecture contains, as a special case, a conjecture of Braverman and Kazhdan on the acyclicity of \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves [BK1]. Along the way, we introduce a certain class of Weyl group equivariant \( \ell \)-adic complexes on a maximal torus called central complexes and relate the category of central complexes to the Whittaker category on \( G \). We prove the vanishing conjecture in the case when \( G = \text{GL}_n \).
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Artin-Schreier sheaf \( \mathcal{L}_\psi \) on the additive group \( \mathbb{G}_a \) over an algebraic closure of a finite field has the following basic and important cohomology vanishing property

\[ H^*_c(\mathbb{G}_a, \mathcal{L}_\psi) = 0. \]

If we identify \( \mathbb{G}_a \) as the unipotent radical \( U \) of the standard Borel \( B \) in \( \text{SL}_2 \), then the acyclicity of the Artin-Schreier sheaf above can be restated as follows. Let \( \text{tr} : \text{SL}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a \) be the trace map and consider the pull back \( \Phi = \text{tr}^* \mathcal{L}_\psi \). For any \( x \in \text{SL}_2 \setminus B \), we have the following cohomology vanishing property

\[ H^*_c(Ux, i^* \Phi) = 0. \] (1.1)

Here \( i : Ux \rightarrow \text{SL}_2 \) is the natural inclusion map. Indeed, it follows from the fact that the trace map \( \text{tr} \) restricts to an isomorphism \( Ux \simeq \mathbb{G}_a \) for \( x \in \text{SL}_2 \setminus B \).

In this article we propose a vanishing conjecture for a certain class of \( \ell \)-adic complexes on a reductive group \( G \) generalizing the cohomology vanishing in (1.1), and hence can be regraded as a generalization of the acyclicity of the Artin-Schreier sheaf.
We show that the vanishing conjecture implies a conjecture of Braverman and Kazhdan on the acyclicity of \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves \( \text{[BK]} \) (Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5) and we prove the vanishing conjecture in the case \( G = \text{GL}_n \) (Theorem 1.6). Along the way, we introduce a certain class of Weyl group equivariant \( \ell \)-adic complexes on a maximal torus called \textit{central complexes} and relate the category of central complexes to the Whittaker category on \( G \) (or rather, the de Rham counterpart of the Whittaker category).

The proof of the vanishing conjecture for \( \text{GL}_n \) generalizes the one in \( \text{[CN]} \) for the proof of Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture for \( \text{GL}_n \) using mirabolic subgroups. A new ingredient here is a generalization of Deligne’s result of symmetric group actions on Kloosterman sheaves to the setting of central complexes (Proposition 1.6).

We now describe the paper in more details.

1.2. Central complexes. Let \( k \) be an algebraic closure of a finite field \( k_0 \) with \( q \)-element of characteristic \( p > 0 \). We fix a prime number \( \ell \) different from \( p \). Let \( G \) be a connected reductive group over \( k \). Let \( T \) be a maximal torus of \( G \) and \( B \) be a Borel subgroup containing \( T \) with unipotent radical \( U \). Denote by \( W = T \setminus N_G(T) \) the Weyl group, where \( N_G(T) \) is the normalizer of \( T \) in \( G \).

Let \( \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{Q}_\ell) \) be the set consisting of characters of the tame étale fundamental group \( \pi_1(T)^\ell \) (see Section 1.1). For any \( \chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{Q}_\ell) \) we denote by \( L_\chi \) the corresponding tame local system on \( T \) (a.k.a. the Kummer local system associated to \( \chi \)). The Weyl group \( W \) acts naturally on \( \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{Q}_\ell) \) and for any \( \chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{Q}_\ell) \) we denote by \( W_\chi \) the stabilizer of \( \chi \) in \( W \) and \( W_\chi \subset W_\chi' \), the subgroup of \( W_\chi' \) generated by those reflections \( s_\alpha \) such that the pull-back \( (\hat{\alpha})^*L_\chi \) is isomorphic to the trivial local system, where \( \hat{\alpha} : \mathbb{G}_m \to T \) is the coroot associated to \( \alpha \). The group \( W_\chi \) is a normal subgroup of \( W_\chi' \) and, in general, we have \( W_\chi \subset W_\chi' \) (see Example 1.1).

Denote by \( \mathcal{D}_W(T) \) the \( W \)-equivariant derived category of constructible \( \ell \)-adic complexes on \( T \). For any \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T) \) and \( \chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{Q}_\ell) \), the \( W \)-equivariant structure on \( \mathcal{F} \) together with the natural \( W_\chi' \)-equivariant structure on \( L_\chi \) give rise to an action of \( W_\chi' \) on the étale cohomology groups \( H^*_\chi(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes L_\chi) \) (resp. \( H^*(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes L_\chi) \)). In particular, we get an action of the subgroup \( W_\chi \subset W_\chi' \) on the cohomology groups above. Denote by \( \text{sign}_W : W \to \{\pm 1\} \) the sign character of \( W \).

We have the following key definition.

**Definition 1.1.** A \( W \)-equivariant complex \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T) \) is called \textit{central} (resp. \textit{\( \ast \)-central}) if for any tame character \( \chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{Q}_\ell) \), the group \( W_\chi \) acts on

\[
H^*_\chi(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes L_\chi) \quad \text{(resp. } H^*(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes L_\chi)\text{)}
\]

via the sign character \( \text{sign}_W \).

**Remark 1.1.** The Verdier duality maps central objects to \( \ast \)-central objects and vice versa.

**Example 1.2.** Consider the case \( G = \text{SL}_2 \). Let \( \text{tr}_T : T \simeq \mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{G}_a, t \to t + t^{-1} \) and consider \( \mathcal{F} = \text{tr}_T^*L_\psi[1] \) with the canonical \( W \)-equivariant structure. We claim that \( \mathcal{F} \) is central. For this we observe that \( W_\chi \neq e \) if and only if \( \chi \) is trivial. Thus \( \mathcal{F} \) is central if and only if \( W \) acts on \( H^*_\chi(T, \mathcal{F}) \) by the sign character, equivalently, the non-trivial involution \( \sigma \in W \) acts by \(-1\) on \( H^*_\chi(T, \mathcal{F}) \). On the other hand, we have \( H^*_\chi(T, \mathcal{F})^\sigma \simeq H^*_\chi(\mathbb{G}_a, L_\psi \otimes (\text{tr}_T[1]\overline{Q}_\ell)^\sigma) \simeq H^*_\chi(\mathbb{G}_a, L_\psi) = 0 \) and it implies \( \mathcal{F} \) is central.

**Example 1.3.** Using Mellin transforms in \( \text{[GL]} \), one can associate to each \( W \)-orbit \( \theta \) in \( \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{Q}_\ell) \) a tame central local system on \( T \) (see Section 4.5).

\(^1\)The group \( W_\chi \) plays an important role in the study of representations of finite reductive groups and character sheaves (see, e.g., \( \text{[LH]} \)).
1.3. **Statement of the vanishing conjecture.** We have the induction functor

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G : \mathcal{D}(T) \to \mathcal{D}(G)$$

between the derived categories of $\ell$-adic sheaves on $T$ and $G$. For $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T)$, the $W$-equivariant structure on $\mathcal{F}$ defines a $W$-action on $\mathrm{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})$ and we denote by

$$\Phi_\mathcal{F} := \mathrm{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W$$

the $W$-invariant factor in $\mathrm{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})$ (see Section 3.2). We propose the following conjecture on acyclicity of $\Phi_\mathcal{F}$ over certain affine subspaces of $G$, called the vanishing conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.2.** Assume $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T)$ is central (resp. $\ast$-central). For any $x \in G \setminus B$, we have the following cohomology vanishing

$$H^*_c(U_x, i^* \Phi_\mathcal{F}) = 0 \quad (\text{resp. } H^*(U_x, i^! \Phi_\mathcal{F}) = 0)$$

where $i : U_x \to G$ is the natural inclusion map. Equivalently, the complex $\pi_!(\Phi_\mathcal{F})$ (resp. $\pi_*(\Phi_\mathcal{F})$) is supported on the closed subset $T = U \setminus B \subset U \setminus G$. Here $\pi : G \to U \setminus G$ is the quotient map.

**Remark 1.4.** Note that the Verdier duality $\mathbb{D}$ interchanges central objects with $\ast$-central objects and $H^*_c(U_x, i^* \Phi_\mathcal{F})$ is dual to $H^*(U_x, i^! \mathbb{D} \Phi_\mathcal{F})$. Thus the conjecture above for central objects implies the one for $\ast$-central objects and vice versa.

**Remark 1.5.** The acyclicity of Artin-Schreier sheaf is an essential ingredient in the proof that the $\ell$-adic Fourier transform is a $\ell$-exact equivalence of categories. This property of $\ell$-adic Fourier transform had found several applications in number theory and representation theory. We expect the vanishing conjecture would also has applications in number theory and representation theory (see Section 1.4 and 1.5 below for applications in the Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture).

**Remark 1.6.** Denote by $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ the $G$-conjugation equivariant derived category on $G$ and by $\mathcal{D}_U(U \setminus G)$, the Hecke category of $U$-equivariant derived category on $U \setminus G$. Let $\pi : G \to U \setminus G$ be the quotient map. The push-forward $\pi_!$ induces a functor

$$\pi_! : \mathcal{D}_G(G) \to \mathcal{D}_U(U \setminus G),$$

and it is known that for any $M \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, the image of $\pi_!(M) \in \mathcal{D}_U(U \setminus G)$ carries a canonical central structure, that is, we have a canonical isomorphism $\pi_!(M) \ast_! \mathcal{G} \simeq \mathcal{G} \ast_! \pi_!(M)$ for any $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{D}_U(U \setminus G)$ (here $\ast_!$ is the convolution product on the Hecke category with respect to shriek push-forward). It follows from Conjecture 1.2 that $\pi_!(\Phi_\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathcal{F}$ for any central complex $\mathcal{F}$. In particular, it implies that any central complex $\mathcal{F}$ carries a canonical central structure. This explains the origin of the name "central complexes".

**Example 1.7.** Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathrm{tr}_T^* \mathcal{L}_\psi[1]$ be as in Example 1.2. We claim that $\Phi_\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathrm{tr}_T^* \mathcal{L}_\psi[\dim \ SL_2]$. Indeed, both complexes are isomorphic to the IC-extensions of their restrictions to the regular semi-simple locus $\ SL_2^\sigma$, and using the fact that Grothendieck-Springer simultaneous resolution (7.1) is a Cartesian over $SL_2^R$, it is easy to show that $\Phi_\mathcal{F}|_{SL_2^\sigma} \simeq \mathrm{tr}_T^* \mathcal{L}_\psi[\dim \ SL_2]|_{SL_2^\sigma}$. Thus the vanishing conjecture becomes (1.1), which is exactly the acyclicity of Artin-Schreier sheaf.

1.4. **Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture.** We recall a construction, due to Braverman and Kazhdan, of $\rho$-Bessel sheaf $\Phi_{G, \rho}$ attached to a $r$-dimensional complex representation $\rho$ of the complex dual group $\hat{G}$.

Let $\rho : \hat{G} \to \mathrm{GL}(V_\rho)$ be such a representation. The restriction of $\rho$ to the maximal torus $\bar{T}$ is diagonalizable and there exists a collection of weights

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r\} \subset X^*(\bar{T}) := \text{Hom}(\bar{T}, \mathbb{C}^\times)$$

...
such that there is an eigenspace decomposition

\[ V_\rho = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} V_{\lambda_i} \]

of \( V_\rho \), where \( \hat{T} \) acts on \( V_{\lambda_i} \) via the character \( \lambda_i \). One can regard \( \lambda \) as collection of co-characters of \( T \) using the the canonical isomorphism \( X^*(\hat{T}) \simeq X^*_\bullet(T) \), and define

\[ \Phi_{T,\rho} = \text{pr}_\lambda \Tr^* L_\psi[r] \]

\[ \Phi_{T,\rho}^* = \text{pr}_\lambda^* \Tr^* L_\psi[r] \]

where

\[ \text{pr}_\lambda := \prod_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i : \mathbb{G}_m^r \to T, \quad \text{tr} : \mathbb{G}_m^r \to \mathbb{G}_a, (x_1, \ldots, x_r) \to \sum_{i=1}^{r} x_i. \]

It is shown in [BK2], using Deligne’s result about symmetric group actions on hypergeometric sheaves (see Proposition 5.2), that both \( \Phi_{T,\rho} \) and \( \Phi_{T,\rho}^* \) carry natural \( W \)-equivariant structures and the resulting objects in \( D_W(T) \), denote again by \( \Phi_{T,\rho} \) and \( \Phi_{T,\rho}^* \), are called \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves on \( T \).

The \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves on \( G \) attached to \( \rho \), denoted by \( \Phi_{G,\rho} \) and \( \Phi_{G,\rho}^* \), are defined as

\[ \Phi_{G,\rho} = \text{Ind}^G_T(\Phi_{T,\rho})^W \]

\[ \Phi_{G,\rho}^* = \text{Ind}^G_T(\Phi_{T,\rho}^*)^W. \]

In [BK1, Conjecture 9.12], Braverman-Kazhdan proposed the following conjecture on acyclicity of \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves over certain affine subspaces of \( G \):

**Conjecture 1.3.** Let \( \Phi_{G,\rho} \) (resp. \( \Phi_{G,\rho}^* \)) be the \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaf attached to a representation \( \rho : \hat{G} \to \text{GL}(V_\rho) \) of the dual group. Then for any \( x \in G \setminus B \), we have the following cohomology vanishing

\[ H^i_c(Ux, i^* \Phi_{G,\rho}) = 0 \quad (\text{resp. } H^i(Ux, i^* \Phi_{G,\rho}^*) = 0) \]

where \( i : Ux \to G \) is the natural inclusion map. Equivalently, the complex \( \pi_! \Phi_{G,\rho} \) (resp. \( \pi_* \Phi_{G,\rho}^* \)) is supported on the closed subset \( T = U \setminus B \subset U \setminus G \). Here \( \pi : G \to U \setminus G \) is the quotient map.

**Remark 1.8.** In loc.cit. Conjecture 1.3 was stated for those representations \( \rho \) with \( \sigma \)-positive weights (see Section 5.1 for the definition of \( \sigma \)-positive weights). It is shown in [CN, BK2] that, under this positivity assumption, the \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves \( \Phi_{G,\rho} \) and \( \Phi_{G,\rho}^* \) (resp. \( \Phi_{T,\rho} \) and \( \Phi_{T,\rho}^* \)) are in fact perverse sheaves and we have \( \Phi_{G,\rho} \simeq \Phi_{G,\rho}^* \) (resp. \( \Phi_{T,\rho} \simeq \Phi_{T,\rho}^* \)) (see Proposition 5.1). This is a generalization of Deligne’s theorem on Kloosterman sheaves [17]. We will see below that the vanishing conjecture (Conjecture 1.2) implies the Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture for \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves attached to arbitrary representation \( \rho \) of the dual group \( \hat{G} \).

**Remark 1.9.** For a motivated introduction to the Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture and its role in the Langlands program see [BK1, BK2, Ngo]

\[ ^2 \text{In [BK1, BK2], the authors called } \Phi_{T,\rho} \gamma \text{-sheaves on } T. \text{ However, based on the fact that the classical } \gamma \text{-function is the Mellin transform of the Bessel function, we follow [Ngo] and use the term } \rho \text{-Bessel sheaves instead of } \gamma \text{-sheaves.} \]
1.5. **Main results.** The following is the first main result of the paper. Let $\Phi_{T,\rho}$ (resp. $\Phi^*_{T,\rho}$) be the $\rho$-Bessel sheaf on $T$ attached to a representation $\rho : \hat{G} \to \text{GL}(V_\rho)$ of the dual group.

**Theorem 1.4.** For any tame character $\chi$ of $T$, the stabilizer subgroup $W'_\chi$ acts on

\[ H^\ast_c(T, \Phi_{T,\rho} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \]  

(resp. $H^\ast(T, \Phi^*_{T,\rho} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$)

via the sign character $\text{sign}_{W}$. In particular, the $\rho$-Bessel sheaf $\Phi_{T,\rho}$ (resp. $\Phi^*_{T,\rho}$) is central (resp. $\ast$-central)

**Corollary 1.5.** Conjecture 1.2 implies Conjecture 1.3

**Remark 1.10.** Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5 put the Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture in a wider context: it is a special case of a more general vanishing conjecture whose formulation does not involve representations of the dual group.

Here is the second main result of the paper.

**Theorem 1.6.** Conjecture 1.2 is true for $G = \text{GL}_n$.

Now Corollary 1.5 immediately implies:

**Corollary 1.7.** Conjecture 1.3 is true for $G = \text{GL}_n$.

Conjecture 1.3 for $\text{GL}_n$ was proved by Cheng and Ngô [CN, Theorem 2.4] under some assumption on $\rho$. The proof of Conjecture 1.2 for $\text{GL}_n$, and hence Conjecture 1.3 for $\text{GL}_n$ and arbitrary $\rho$, follows the one in [CN] using mirabolic subgroups. However, in order to deal with the more general case of central complexes, one needs a new ingredient: a generalization of Deligne’s result of symmetric group action on hypergeometric sheaves to the setting of central complexes (see Proposition 7.6).

The discussions in the previous sections have obvious counterpart in the de Rham setting, where Artin-Schreier sheaf $\mathcal{L}_\psi$ is replaced by the exponential $D$-module $e^x$ and $\ell$-adic sheaves are replaced by holonomic $D$-modules. The proof of the main results that will be given in this paper is entirely geometric and hence can be also applied to the de Rham setting.

1.6. **Whittaker categories.** The de Rham counterpart of the category of $\ast$-central perverse sheaves on $T$, to be called the category of $\ast$-central $D$-modules on $T$, also appears in the recent works of Ginzburg and Lonergan [G, L] on Whittaker $D$-modules, nil Hecke algebras, and quantum Toda lattices. To be specific, in loc.cit. the authors proved that the category of Whittaker $D$-modules on $G$, denoted by Whit($G$), is equivalent to a certain full subcategory of the category of $W$-equivariant $D$-modules on $T$. It turns out that, as proven in [C, Theorem 1.8], the later full subcategory, and hence the Whittaker category Whit($G$), is equivalence to the categroy of $\ast$-central $D$-modules on $T$. It would be interesting to establish similar results in the $\ell$-adic setting and use it to give a description of $\ell$-adic counterpart of the Whittaker category in terms of $W$-equivariant sheaves on the maximal torus $T$[3].

The equivalence bewteen Whit($G$) and the category of $\ast$-central $D$-modules on $T$ gives rise to a functor Whit($G$) $\to$ D-mod($G\backslash G$), where D-mod($G\backslash G$) is the category of $G$-conjugation equivariant $D$-modules on $G$. In [BG], Ben-Zvi and Gunningham gave another construction of a functor from Whit($G$) to D-mod($G\backslash G$) and they conjectured that the essential image of their functor satisfies the same acyclicity in (1.2), see [BG] Conjecture 2.9 and 2.14. Our results might be useful for studying their conjecture.

---

3 An question raised by V.Drinfeld according to [C, Section 1.5].
1.7. Recent developments. In the recent work [C], we established the vanishing conjecture for general reductive group \( G \) and hence, by Corollary 1.5, the Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture for almost all characteristics. The proof given in loc. cit. is different form the one given here: it first established the vanishing conjecture in the de Rham setting using the theory of Harish-Chandra bimodules and character \( D \)-modules and then deduced the positive characteristic case using character sheaves in mixed-characteristic and a spreading out argument. The proof makes use of Harish-Chandra bimodules and hence is algebraic. It will be interesting to have a geometric proof of the vanishing conjecture for general reductive groups, like the proof given here for \( \text{GL}_n \), which treats the case of various ground fields and sheaf theories uniformly.

In the recent work [LL], G. Laumon and E. Letellier established the function theoretical version of Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture for all reductive groups \( G \).

1.8. Organization. We briefly summarize here the main goals of each section. In Section 2 we collect standard notation in algebraic geometry and \( \ell \)-adic sheaves. In Section 3 we study induction and restriction functors for \( \ell \)-adic sheaves on reductive groups. In Section 4 we give a characterization of central complexes using the \( \ell \)-adic Mellin transform and use it to construct examples tame central (resp. \( * \)-central) local systems on \( T \). In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.4. In Section 7 we prove Theorem 1.6.

Acknowledgement. The paper is inspired by the lectures given by Ginzburg and Ngô on their works [G] and [CN]. I thank Roman Bezrukavnikov, Tanmay Deshpande, Victor Ginzburg, Sam Gunningham, Augustus Lonergan, David Nadler, Ngô Bao Châu, Lue Pan, and Zhiwei Yun for useful discussions. I am grateful for the support of NSF grant DMS-1702337.

2. Notations

In this article \( k \) will be an algebraic closure of a finite field \( k_0 \) with \( q \)-element of characteristic \( p > 0 \). We fix a prime number \( \ell \) different from \( p \).

For an algebraic stack \( \mathcal{X} \) over \( k \), we denote by \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Q}_\ell) \) the bounded derived category of constructible \( \ell \)-adic complexes on \( \mathcal{X} \). For a representable morphism \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y} \), the six functors \( f^*, f_*, f!, g^*, \otimes, \text{Hom} \) are understood in the derived sense. For a \( k \)-scheme \( X \), sometimes we will write \( R\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}) = f_*\mathcal{F} \) (resp. \( \Gamma_c(X, \mathcal{F}) = f_c\mathcal{F} \)), where \( f : X \to \text{Spec} \ k \) is the structure map.

For an algebraic group \( H \) over \( k \) acting on a \( k \)-scheme \( X \), we denote by \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}) \), the corresponding quotient stack. Consider the case when \( H \) is a finite group. Then the pull-back along the quotient map \( X \to H \backslash X \) induces an equivalence between \( \mathcal{D}(H \backslash X) \) and the (naive) \( H \)-equivariant derived category of \( \ell \)-adic complexes on \( X \), denoted by \( \mathcal{D}_H(X) \), whose objects consist of pair \((\mathcal{F}, \phi)\), where \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(X) \) and \( \phi : a^*\mathcal{F} \simeq \text{pr}^*\mathcal{F} \) is an isomorphism satisfying the usual compatibility conditions (here \( a \) and \( \text{pr} \) are the action and projection map from \( H \times X \) to \( X \) respectively). We will call an object \((\mathcal{F}, \phi)\) in \( \mathcal{D}_H(X) \) a \( H \)-equivariant complex and \( \phi \) a \( H \)-equivariant structure on \( \mathcal{F} \). For simplicity, we will write \( \mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}, \phi) \) for an object in \( \mathcal{D}_H(X) \).

The category \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}) \) has a natural perverse \( \ell \)-structure and we denote by \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X})^\circ \) the corresponding heart and \( p^{\tau_{\leq n}}, p^{\tau_{\geq n}}, p^{\tau_{< n}}, p^{\tau_{> n}}, p^{\tau_{\leq n}}, p^{\tau_{< n}}(\mathcal{F}) \) the perverse truncation functors. For any \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}) \), the \( n \)-the perverse cohomology sheaf is defined as \( p^{\tau_{\leq n}}(\mathcal{F}) = p^{\tau_{\geq n}}(\mathcal{F})[n] \).

\footnote{This holds in a more general situation when the neutral component of \( H \) is unipotent.}
We will denote by $\mathbb{G}_a$ the additive group over $k$ and $\mathbb{G}_m$ the multiplicative group over $k$. We will fix a non-trivial character $\psi : F_q \to \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_l^\times$ and denote by $L_\psi$ the corresponding Artin-Schreier sheaf on $\mathbb{G}_a$.

\section{Induction and restriction functors}

Let $G$ be a connected reductive group over $k$. Let $T$ be a maximal torus of $G$, $B$ a Borel subgroup containing $T$ with unipotent radical $U$. We denote by $W = T\setminus N_G(T)$ the Weyl group of $G$, where $N_G(T)$ is the normalizer of $T$ in $G$. We denote by sign $= \text{pr}^* \text{sign}_W \in \mathcal{D}_W(T)$ the pull back of the sign representation $\text{sign}_W$ of $W$ (regarding as an object in $\mathcal{D}_W(\text{pt})$) along the projection $\text{pr} : T \to \text{pt}$. Throughout the paper, we assume $p$ does not divide the order of the Weyl group $W$.

\subsection{Recall the Grothendieck-Springer simultaneous resolution of the Steinberg map $c : G \to W \setminus T$}

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{G} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{q}} & T \\
\tilde{c} & \downarrow & \downarrow q \\
G & \xrightarrow{c} & W \setminus T
\end{array}
\end{equation}

where $\tilde{G}$ is the closed subvariety of $G \times G/B$ consisting of pairs $(g, xB)$ such that $x^{-1}gx \in B$. The map $\tilde{c}$ is given by $(g, xB) \to g$, and the map $\tilde{q}$ is given by $(g, xB) \to x^{-1}gx \mod U \in B/U = T$. The induction functor $\text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G : \mathcal{D}(T) \to \mathcal{D}(G)$ is given by

$$\text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(F) = \tilde{c}^*\tilde{q}^*(F)[\dim G - \dim T].$$

We have the following exactness properties of induction and restriction functors:

\begin{equation}
\text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(F) \simeq (p_G)!((p_T^*F) \otimes \text{IC}(S, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_l))[\dim G - \dim T]
\end{equation}

where $p_T : S \to T$ and $p_G : S \to G$ are the natural projection maps.

Let functor $\text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G$ admits a left adjoint $\text{Res}_{T \subset B}^G : \mathcal{D}(G) \to \mathcal{D}(T)$, called the restriction functor, and is given by

$$\text{Res}_{T \subset B}^G(F) = (q_B)!i_B^*(F)$$

where $i_B : B \to G$ is the natural inclusion and $q_B : B \to T = U \setminus B$ is the quotient map. More generally, one could define $\text{Res}_{L \subset P}^G : \mathcal{D}(G) \to \mathcal{D}(L)$, for any pair $(L, P)$ where $L$ is a Levi subgroup of a parabolic subgroup $P$ of $G$.

We have the following exactness properties of induction and restriction functors:

**Proposition 3.1.** [BY] Theorem 5.4] (1) The functor $\text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G$ maps perverse sheaves on $T$ to perverse sheaves on $G$. (2) The functor $\text{Res}_{T \subset B}^G$ maps $G$-conjugation equivariant perverse sheaves on $G$ to $L$-conjugation equivariant perverse sheaves on $L.$
Remark 3.1. The proposition above generalizes well-known results of Lusztig’s on exactness of induction and restriction functors for character sheaves \[ \text{[Lu]} \].

3.3. \text{W-action.}

Proposition 3.2. (1) Let \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(T) \). For every \( w \in W \) one has a canonical isomorphism
\[
\text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(w^* \mathcal{F}) \simeq \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}).
\]

(2) Let \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T) \). There is a natural \( W \)-action on \( \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}) \) in \( \mathcal{D}(G) \) and, for any irreducible representation \( \xi : W \to \text{GL}(V_\xi) \) of \( W \), there is canonical direct summand
\[
\text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W,\xi \in \mathcal{D}(G)
\]
of \( \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}) \) such that we have a \( W \)-equivariant decomposition in \( \mathcal{D}(G) \)
\[
\text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \bigoplus_{(\xi, V_\xi) \in \text{Irr}_W} V_\xi \otimes \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W,\xi.
\]

(3) Let \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T)^{\rtimes} \) be a \( W \)-equivariant perverse sheaf. Then the direct summand \( \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W,\xi \) in (3.6) is also a perverse sheaf.

Proof. We have a \( W \)-action on \( S = G \times_{W \setminus T} T \) given by \( (g, t) \to (g, wt) \), \( w \in W \), and the projection maps \( p_G \) and \( p_T \) form \( S \) to \( G \) and \( T \) are \( W \)-equivariant (for \( p_G \), the \( W \)-action on \( G \) is the trivial action). Consider the following commutative diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
G & \xrightarrow{p_G} & S \\
\downarrow{id} & & \downarrow{\pi'} \\
G & \xrightarrow{p_G'} & W \setminus T
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
S & \xrightarrow{p_T} & T \\
\downarrow{\pi} & & \downarrow{\pi} \\
W \setminus T & \xrightarrow{p_T'} & W \setminus T
\end{array}
\]
where \( \pi', p_G', p_T' \) are the natural quotient maps. Note that, since \( S^{rs} \) is \( W \)-invariant, the IC-complex \( \text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell) = j_{!*}\overline{Q}_\ell[\dim G] \) (here \( j : S^{rs} \to S \) is the projection) descends to the IC-complex \( \text{IC}(W \setminus S, \overline{Q}_\ell) \) on \( W \setminus S \), in particular, \( \text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell) \) is \( W \)-equivariant. It follows from (3.1) that
\[
\text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(w^* \mathcal{F}) \simeq (p_G)_!(w^* p_T^*(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell))[\dim T] \simeq (p_G)_!(w^* p_T^*(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell))[\dim T] \simeq (p_G)_!(w^* (p_T^*(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell))[\dim T] \simeq (p_G)_!(p_T^*(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell))[\dim T] \simeq \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}).
\]
Part (1) follows.

Let \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T) \). Since \( w^* \mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{F} \) for any \( w \in W \), we have a canonical isomorphism
\[
a_w : \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(w^* \mathcal{F}) \simeq \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}),
\]
and the assignment \( w \to a_w, w \in W \) defines a \( W \)-action on \( \text{Ind}_{T \subseteq B}^G(\mathcal{F}) \). To show (3.6), we observe that
\[
\text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell) \simeq (\pi')^* \text{IC}(W \setminus S, \overline{Q}_\ell),
\]
and it implies
\[
(\pi')^* \text{IC}(S, \overline{Q}_\ell) \simeq (\pi')_!(\pi')^* \text{IC}(W \setminus S, \overline{Q}_\ell) \simeq \bigoplus_{(\xi, V_\xi) \in \text{Irr}_W} V_\xi \otimes (\text{IC}(W \setminus S, \overline{Q}_\ell) \otimes V_\xi, S)
\]
where \( V_\xi, S \in \mathcal{D}(W \setminus S) \) is the pull back of \( (\xi, V_\xi) \in \text{Rep} W \simeq \mathcal{D}(W \setminus S) \) along the projection \( W \setminus S \to W \setminus \text{pt} \).
Let \( \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{D}(W\setminus T) \) be such that \( \pi^*\mathcal{F}' \simeq \mathcal{F} \). It follows that

\[
\text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F}) \simeq (p_G)_!(p_T^* (\mathcal{F} \otimes IC(S, \overline{Q}_\ell)))[\dim T] 
\]

\[
\simeq (p'_{G,T}!)((\pi')^* (p_T^* (\mathcal{F} \otimes IC(S, \overline{Q}_\ell)))[\dim T] \simeq (p'_{G,T}!)((\pi')^* (\mathcal{F} \otimes IC(S, \overline{Q}_\ell)))[\dim T] \overset{\text{(3.11)}}{\simeq} \bigoplus_{(\xi, V_\xi) \in \text{irr } W} V_\xi \otimes \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W, \xi
\]

where

\[
(3.10) \quad \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W, \xi := (p'_{G,T}!)((\pi')^* (\mathcal{F} \otimes IC(W \setminus S, \overline{Q}_\ell) \otimes V_\xi, S)[\dim T].
\]

Part (2) follows. Part (3) follows from Proposition 3.1.

□

Remark 3.2. Part (1) of the proposition generalizes [BK1, Theorem 2.5(3)].

Definition 3.3. For any W-equivariant complex \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(W\setminus T) \), we will write

\[
(3.11) \quad \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W := \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})^{W, \text{triv}} = (p'_{G,T}!)((\pi')^* (\mathcal{F} \otimes IC(W \setminus S, \overline{Q}_\ell)))[\dim T],
\]

(here \( p'_G, p'_T \) are the morphisms in (3.7)) for the summand in (3.5) corresponding to the trivial representation \( (\text{triv}, V_{\text{triv}} = \overline{Q}_\ell) \).

In the case when \( \mathcal{F} \) is a W-equivariant perverse local system on \( T \), we have the following description of (3.11): Let \( q^s : T^{rs} \to W \setminus T^{rs} \) and \( c^s : G \to W \setminus T^{rs} \) be the restriction of the maps in (7.1) to the regular semi-simple locus. As \( q^s \) is an étale covering, the restriction of \( \mathcal{F} \) to \( T^{rs} \) descends to a perverse local system \( \mathcal{F}' \) on \( W \setminus T^{rs} \) and we have

\[
\text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W \simeq j_*(c^s)^* \mathcal{F}'[\dim G - \dim T].
\]

Let \( P \) be a standard parabolic subgroup containing \( B \) and let \( L \) be the unique Levi subgroup of \( P \) containing \( T \) with Borel subgroup \( B_L = B \cap L \). Let \( W_L \) be the Weyl group of \( L \), which is naturally a subgroup of \( W \).

Proposition 3.4. Let \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}(W\setminus T)^\mathcal{O} \). (1) We have a canonical isomorphism

\[
\text{Res}_{L \subset P} ^G \circ \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F}_T) \simeq \text{Ind}_{W_L}^W \text{Ind}_{T \subset B_L}^F(\mathcal{F}_T)
\]

which is compatible with the nature W-actions on both sides. (2) There is a canonical isomorphism

\[
\text{Res}_{L \subset P} ^G \circ \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^F(\mathcal{F})^W \simeq \text{Ind}_{T \subset B_L}^F(\mathcal{F})^W.
\]

Proof. Part (2) follows from part (1) by taking W-invariants on both sides. Part (1) is proved in [BK2, Theorem 2.7].

\[\text{In loc. cit.} \] the authors assumed \( \mathcal{F} \) is irreducible with support a \( W \)-stable sub tours in \( T \). This is because the proof makes use of the isomorphism \( \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}^G(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \text{Ind}_{T \subset B}(w^* \mathcal{F}) \) which was constructed only for those \( \mathcal{F} \) satisfying the assumption above (see [BK1, Theorem 2.5(3)]). Now, with Proposition 3.2 the same argument works for arbitrary W-equivariant perverse sheaves on \( T \).
4. Characterization of central complexes

4.1. The scheme of tame characters. Let $\pi_1(T)$ be the étale fundamental group of $T$ and let $\pi_1(T)^t$ be its tame quotient. A continuous character $\chi : \pi_1(T) \to \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell^\times$ is called tame if it factors through $\pi_1(T)^t$. For any continuous character $\chi : \pi_1(T) \to \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell^\times$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_\chi$ the corresponding rank one local system on $T$. A rank one local system $\mathcal{L}$ on $T$ is called tame if $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathcal{L}_\chi$ for a tame character $\chi$.

In [GL], a $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$-scheme $\mathcal{C}(T)$ is defined, whose $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$-points are in bijection with tame characters of $\pi_1(T)$. There is decomposition

\[ \mathcal{C}(T) = \bigsqcup_{\chi_f \in \mathcal{C}(T)_f} \{ \chi_f \} \times \mathcal{C}(T)_\ell \]

into connected components, where $\mathcal{C}(T)_f \subset \mathcal{C}(T)$ is the subset consisting of tame characters of order prime to $\ell$ and $\mathcal{C}(T)_\ell$ is the connected component of $\mathcal{C}(T)$ containing the trivial character. It is shown in loc. cit. that $\mathcal{C}(T)$ is Noetherian and regular and there is an isomorphism

\[ \mathcal{C}(T)_\ell \simeq \text{Spec}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_\ell} \mathbb{Z}_\ell[[x_1, \ldots, x_r]]) . \]

In addition, the $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$-points of $\mathcal{C}(T)_\ell$ are in bijection with pro-$\ell$ characters of $\pi_1(T)$ (i.e. characters of the pro-$\ell$ quotient $\pi_1(T)_\ell$ of $\pi_1(T)^t$).

4.2. The group $W_\chi$. The Weyl group $W$ acts naturally on $\mathcal{C}(T)$. For any $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ we denote by $W'_\chi$ the stabilizer of $\chi$ in $W$. Equivalently, $W'_\chi$ is the group consisting of $w \in W$ such that $w^*\mathcal{L}_\chi \simeq \mathcal{L}_\chi$. Let $W_\chi$ to be the subgroup of $W'_\chi$ generated by reflections $s_\alpha$ satisfying the following property: Let $\tilde{\alpha} : \mathbb{G}_m \to T$ be the coroot corresponding to $\alpha$. The pullback $(\tilde{\alpha})^*\mathcal{L}_\chi$ is isomorphic to the trivial local system on $\mathbb{G}_m$.

Example 4.1. Let $G = \text{SL}_2$ and let $\chi : \pi_1(T)^t \to \{\pm 1\}$ be the character corresponding to the tame covering $T \to T, x \to x^2$. Then we have $W'_\chi = W$ but $W_\chi = e$ is trivial.

4.3. Central complexes. Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T)$. For any tame character $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ the stabilizer $W'_\chi$, hence also its subgroup $W_\chi$, acts naturally on the étale cohomology groups $H^*_c(T, \mathcal{F}_T \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$ (resp. $H^*(T, \mathcal{F}_T \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$).

Definition 4.1. A $W$-equivariant complex $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T)$ is called central (resp. *-central) if the following holds: for any tame character $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$, the group $W_\chi$ acts on $H^*_c(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$ (resp. $H^*(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$) through the sign character $\text{sign}_W : W_\chi \to \{\pm 1\}$.

4.4. Mellin transforms. In [GL], the authors constructed the Mellin transforms

\[ M_t : \mathcal{D}(T) \to D^b_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{C}(T)) \]
\[ M_s : \mathcal{D}(T) \to D^b_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{C}(T)) \]

with the following properties:

1. Let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ and $i_\chi : \{\chi\} \to \mathcal{C}(T)$ be the natural inclusion. We have

\[ R\Gamma_c(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \simeq i_\chi^* M_t(\mathcal{F}) \]
\[ R\Gamma(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \simeq i_\chi^* M_s(\mathcal{F}) . \]

2. We have natural isomorphism $D(M_t(\mathcal{F})) \simeq \text{inv}^* M_s(D(\mathcal{F}))$. 
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Proposition 4.2. Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{R}_W(T)$ be a W-equivariant complex. The following are equivalent:

1. $\mathcal{F}$ is central.
2. For any $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ the action of $W_\chi$ on $i_\ast^6 M_i(\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{sign})$ is trivial.
   
   Assume further that $W_\chi = W'_{\chi}$ for all $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$, then above statements are equivalent to
3. The restriction of the Mellin transform $M_i(\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{sign}) \in D^b_{coh}(\mathcal{C}(T))$ to each connected component $\mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi f} := \{ \chi_f \} \times \mathcal{C}(T)_\ell$ of $\mathcal{C}(T)$ (see (4.1)) descends to the quotient $W_{\chi_f} \downarrow \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi f}$.

The same is true for $\ast$-central complexes if we replace $M_i$ by $M_\ast$.

Proof. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) follows from the property (1) of Mellin transform above. Assume $W_\chi = W'_{\chi}$ for all $\chi$. Then for any $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi f}$ we have $W_\chi = W'_{\chi} \subset W'_{\chi_f} = W_{\chi_f}$ and it follows that the stabilizer of $\chi$ in $W_{\chi_f}$ is equal to $W_\chi$ and (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) follows from the descent criterion for coherent complexes in [N] Theorem 1.3] (or [Q] Lemma 5.3)).

4.5. Examples of tame central local systems. Consider the quotient map $\pi_\chi : \mathcal{C}(T)_\ell \to W_\chi \downarrow \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell}$. Let $0 \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ be the trivial character and let $\pi_\chi(0)$ be its image in $W_\chi \downarrow \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell}$. Let $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_\chi(0)}$ be the structure sheaf of the point $\pi_\chi(0)$ and we define

$$R_\chi := \pi_\chi^* \mathcal{O}_{\pi_\chi(0)}$$

which a $W_\chi$-equivariant coherent sheaf on $\mathcal{C}(T)_\ell$. Note that, as $W_\chi$ is normal subgroup of $W'_{\chi}$, the $W'_{\chi}$-action on $\mathcal{C}(T)_\ell$ descends to a $W'_{\chi}$-action on the quotient $W_\chi \downarrow \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell}$ fixing $\pi_\chi(0)$ and it follows that $R_\chi$ has a canonical $W'_{\chi}$-equivariant structure.

---

6Note that $\mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi f}$ is stable under the $W_{\chi_f}$-action.
We will regard \( R_\chi \) as a coherent sheaf on \( \mathcal{C}(T) \) supported at the component \( \mathcal{C}(T)_\ell = \{ 0 \} \times \mathcal{C}(T)_\ell \) and define \( S_\chi := m_\chi^*(R_\chi) \) where \( m_\chi : \mathcal{C}(T) \to \mathcal{C}(T) \) be the morphism of translation by \( \chi \). Since \( m_\chi \) intertwines the \( W_\chi \)-action on \( \mathcal{C}(T) \), \( S_\chi \) is \( W_\chi \)-equivariant, moreover, there is natural isomorphism
\[
(4.5) \quad w^*S_\chi \simeq S_{w^{-1}\chi}
\]
for any \( w \in W \). For any \( W \)-orbit \( \theta \) in \( \mathcal{C}(T) \), we define the following \( W \)-equivariant coherent sheaf with finite support
\[
S_\theta = \bigoplus_{\chi \in \theta} S_\chi
\]
where the \( W \)-equivariant structure is given by the isomorphisms in (4.5).

Finally, we define the following \( W \)-equivariant perverse local systems on \( T \):
\[
\mathcal{E}_\theta^\dagger := M_\theta^{-1}(S_\theta) \otimes \text{sign}
\]
\[
\mathcal{E}_\theta := M_\theta^{-1}(S_\theta) \otimes \text{sign}.
\]
Here \( M_\theta^{-1}, M_\theta^{-1} \) are the inverse of the Mellin transforms in (4.3).\footnote{Indeed, we have \( w^*S_\chi \simeq w^*m_\chi^*R_\chi \simeq m_{w^{-1}\chi}^*w^*R_\chi \simeq m_{w^{-1}\chi}^*R_{w^{-1}\chi} \simeq S_{w^{-1}\chi} \), where we use the observation that \( w^{-1}W_\chi w = W_{w^{-1}\chi} \) and hence \( w^*R_\chi \simeq R_{w^{-1}\chi} \).}

**Lemma 4.3.** \( \mathcal{E}_\theta^\dagger \) is central and \( \mathcal{E}_\theta \) is \(*\)-central.

**Proof.** Since \( S_\theta \) is supported on \( \theta^{-1} = \{ \chi^{-1} | \chi \in \theta \} \), by Proposition 4.2, it suffices to show that the action of \( W_{\chi^{-1}} \) (note that \( W_{\chi^{-1}} = W_\chi \)) on the fiber
\[
i_{\chi^{-1}}^*M_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta \otimes \text{sign}) \simeq i_{\chi^{-1}}^*M_\theta(M_\theta^{-1}(S_\theta)) \simeq i_{\chi^{-1}}^*S_\theta \simeq i_{\chi^{-1}}^*S_\chi
\]
is trivial. Let \( \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi^{-1}} \subset \mathcal{C}(T) \) be the component containing \( \chi^{-1} \). Then the translation map \( m_\chi \) restricts to a map \( m_\chi : \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi^{-1}} \to \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell} \), moreover, we have the following commutative diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi^{-1}} & \xrightarrow{m_\chi} & \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell} \\
\pi_{\ell,\chi^{-1}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_{\ell} \\
W_{\chi^{-1}} \setminus \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi^{-1}} & \xrightarrow{\bar{m}_\chi} & W_{\chi^{-1}} \setminus \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell}
\end{array}
\]
where \( \bar{m}_\chi \) is the descent of \( m_\chi \). It follows that the restriction of \( S_\chi = m_\chi^*\pi_{\chi}^*O_{\pi_{\chi}(0)} \simeq \pi_{\ell,\chi^{-1}}^*\bar{m}_\chi^*O_{\pi_{\chi}(0)} \) to \( \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi^{-1}} \) descends to \( W_{\chi^{-1}} \setminus \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell,\chi^{-1}} \) and it implies the action of \( W_{\chi^{-1}} \) on \( i_{\chi^{-1}}^*S_\chi \) is trivial. \( \square \)

### 5. \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves

#### 5.1. Hypergeometric sheaves

Let \( \Delta = \{ \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r \} \subset X_\bullet(T) \) be a collection of possible repeated cocharacters. Consider the following maps
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbb{G}_m & \xleftarrow{\text{tr}} & \mathbb{G}_m^r \\
\xrightarrow{\text{pr}_\Delta} & & \xrightarrow{T}
\end{array}
\]
where \( \text{tr}(x_1, \ldots, x_r) = \sum_{i=1}^r x_i \) and \( \text{pr}_\Delta(x_1, \ldots, x_r) = \prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(x_i) \). Consider the following complexes:
\[
(5.1) \quad \Phi_\Delta := \text{pr}_\Delta^*\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi[r], \quad \Phi_\Delta^* := \text{pr}_\Delta^*\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi[r]
\]
in \( D(T) \). Note that we have a natural forget supports map
\[
(5.2) \quad \Phi_\Delta \to \Phi_\Delta^*
\]
\footnote{Note that \( S_\theta \) has finite support and hence the inverse of the Mellin transform is well-defined by (4.3).}
Following Katz [K], we will call the complexes in (5.1) hypergeometric sheaves.

Let \( \sigma : T \to \mathbb{G}_m \) be a character \( \lambda \). A cocharacter is called \( \sigma \)-positive if \( \langle \sigma, \lambda \rangle \) is positive.

**Proposition 5.1.** Let \( \Delta = \{ \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r \} \subset X^\bullet(T) \) be a collection of cocharacters.

1. Assume that each \( \lambda_i \) is nontrivial. Then \( \Phi_\Delta \) and \( \Phi^*_\Delta \) are perverse sheaves.
2. Assume that each \( \lambda_i \) is \( \sigma \)-positive. Then the map \( \Phi_\Delta \to \Phi^*_\Delta \) in (5.2) is an isomorphism and \( \Phi_\Delta \simeq \Phi^*_\Delta \) is a perverse local system over the image of \( p_\Delta \), which is a subtorus of \( T \).

**Proof.** This is [BK2, Theorem 4.2], and [CN, Appendix B] □

**Example 5.1.** For \( T = \mathbb{G}_m \) and \( \lambda_i = \text{id} : \mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{G}_m \) for all \( i \). Then each \( \lambda_i \) is \( \sigma \)-positive for \( \sigma = \text{id} \), and the corresponding perverse local system \( \Phi_\Delta \) on \( \mathbb{G}_m \) is the Kloosterman sheaf considered by Deligne in [D].

Let \( S_\Delta \) be the subgroup of the symmetric group \( S_r \) consisting of permutations \( \tau \) such that for all \( i \in \{1, ..., r\} \), we have \( \lambda_{\tau(i)} = \lambda_i \). We have the following result due to Deligne [D, Proposition 7.20]:

**Proposition 5.2.** The group \( S_\Delta \) acts on \( \Phi_\Delta \) (resp. \( \Phi^*_\Delta \)) via the sign character \( \text{sign}_r : S_r \to \{ \pm 1 \} \).

### 5.2. \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves on \( T \)

We recall the construction of Braverman-Kazhdan’s \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves on \( T \) attached to a representation of the dual group \( \hat{G} \). Let \( \rho : \hat{G} \to \text{GL}(V_\rho) \) be a \( r \)-dimensional complex representation of \( \hat{G} \). The restriction of \( \rho \) to \( \hat{T} \) is diagonalizable and there exists a collection of weights

\[ \sigma = \{ \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r \} \subset X^\bullet(T) := \text{Hom}(\hat{T}, \mathbb{C}^\times) \]

such that there is an eigenspace decomposition

\[ V_\rho = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r V_{\lambda_i} \]

of \( V_\rho \), where \( \hat{T} \) acts on \( V_{\lambda_i} \) via the character \( \lambda_i \).

We can regard \( \sigma \) as collection of cocharacters of \( T \) using the the canonical isomorphism \( X^\bullet(T) \simeq X^\bullet(T) \) and we denote by

\[ \Phi_{T, \rho} := \Phi_\sigma, \quad \Phi^*_{T, \rho} := \Phi^*_\sigma \]

the hypergeometric sheaves associated to \( \sigma \) in (5.1). We will call them \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves.

Following [BK2] (see also [CN]), we shall construct a \( \text{W} \)-equivariant structure on \( \rho \)-Bessel sheaves. Let \( \{ \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_k \} \) be the distinct cocharacters appearing in \( \sigma \) and \( m_i \) be the multiplicity of \( \lambda_i \) \( \in \sigma \). Let \( A_m = \{ \lambda_j | \lambda_j = \lambda_i \} \). Then we have \( \{ \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r \} = A_1 \sqcup ... \sqcup A_k \). The symmetric group on \( r \)-letters \( S_r \) acts naturally on \( \{ \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r \} \) and we define \( S_\Delta = \{ \sigma \in S_r | \sigma(A_i) = A_i \} \). There is a canonical isomorphism

\[ S_\Delta \simeq S_{m_1} \times \cdots \times S_{m_k} \]

Define \( S'_\Delta = \{ \eta \in S_r | \text{such that } \eta(A_i) = A_{\tau(i)} \text{ for a } \tau \in S_k \} \). We have a natural map \( \pi_k : S'_\Delta \to S_k \) sending \( \eta \) to \( \tau \). The kernel of \( \pi_k \) is isomorphic to \( S_\Delta \) and its image, denote by \( S_{k, \Delta} \), consists of \( \tau \in S_k \) such that \( m_i = m_{\tau(i)} \). In other words, there is a short exact sequence

\[ 0 \to S_\Delta \to S'_{\Delta} \xrightarrow{\pi_k} S_{k, \Delta} \to 0. \]

Notice that the Weyl group \( W \) acts on \( \{ \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_k \} \) and the induced map \( W \to S_{k, \Delta} \). Pulling back the short exact sequence above along \( \rho \), we get an extension of \( W' \) of \( W \) by \( S_{k, \Delta} \)

\[ 0 \to S_{k, \Delta} \to W' \to W \to 0 \]
where an element in \( w' \in W' \) consists of pair \((w, \eta) \in W \times S_r \) such that \( \rho(w) = \pi_k(\eta) \in S_k \Delta_r \).

The group \( W' \) acts on \( G_r^m \) (resp. \( T \)) via the composition of the action of \( S_r \) (reps. \( W' \)) with the natural projection \( W' \rightarrow S_r^m \subset S_r \) (resp. \( W' \rightarrow W' \)) and the map \( pr_\Delta : G_r^m \rightarrow T \) and \( tr : G_r^m \rightarrow G_m \) is \( W' \)-equivariant where \( W' \) acts trivially on \( G_m \).

Since \( \Phi_{T, \rho} = \text{pr}_\Delta \circ tr^* L_\psi[r] \) (resp. \( \Phi_{T, \rho}^* = \text{pr}_\Delta \circ tr^* L_\psi[r] \)), the discussion above implies for each \( w' = (w, \eta) \in W' \) there is an isomorphism

\[
i'_w : \Phi_{T, \rho} \simeq w^* \Phi_{T, \rho}
\]

We define

\[
i_w = \text{sign}_W(w) \text{sign}_r(\eta)i'_w : \Phi_{T, \rho} \simeq w^* \Phi_{T, \rho}
\]

where \( \text{sign}_r \) is the sign character of \( S_r \). It follows from Proposition 5.2 that the isomorphism \( i_w \) depends only on \( w \). Denote the resting isomorphism by \( i_w \), then the data \((\Phi_{T, \rho}, \{i_w\}_{w \in W})\) (resp. \( (\Phi_{T, \rho}^*, \{i_w\}_{w \in W}) \)) defines an object in \( \mathcal{D}_W(T) \) which, by abuse of notation, we still denote by \( \Phi_{T, \rho} \) (resp. \( \Phi_{T, \rho}^* \)).

**Example 5.2.** Consider the case \( G = \text{GL}_r \) and \( \rho \) is the standard representation of \( G = \text{GL}_r(\mathbb{C}) \). We have \( \Phi_{T, \rho} = tr^* L_\psi[r] \in \mathcal{D}_W(T) \), where \( tr : G_r^m \rightarrow G_m \) is the trace map.

### 6. Proof of Theorem 1.3

Recall the maps

\[
G_m \xleftarrow{tr} G_r^m \xrightarrow{pr_\Delta} T.
\]

Let \( \chi \in \mathcal{C}(G_r^m)(\mathbb{C}_\ell) \) be a tame character. The permutation action of \( S_r \) on \( G_r^m \) induces an action of \( S_r \) on \( \mathcal{C}(G_r^m) \) and let \( S_{r, \chi} \) be the stabilizer of \( \chi \) in \( S_r \). The pullback \( tr^* L_\psi \) is naturally \( S_r \)-equivariant and we have a natural \( S_{r, \chi} \)-action on the cohomology \( H^*(G_r^m, tr^* L_\psi \otimes L_\chi) \) (resp. \( H^*_c(G_r^m, tr^* L_\psi \otimes L_\chi) \)).

**Lemma 6.1.** The \( S_{r, \chi} \)-action on \( H^*_c(G_r^m, tr^* L_\psi \otimes L_\chi) \) is given by \( \text{sign}_r : S_{r, \chi} \rightarrow \{ \pm 1 \} \).

**Proof.** Let \( \sigma = (i, j) \in S_{r, \chi} \) be a simple reflection. It suffices to show that \( \sigma \) acts on \( H^*(G_r^m, tr^* L_\psi \otimes L_\chi) \) by \(-1\), or equivalently, the \( \sigma \)-invariant \( H^*_c(G_m, tr^* L_\psi \otimes L_\chi) \) is zero. Write \( L_\chi = L_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes L_r \), where each \( L_k \) is a tame local system on \( G_m \). Note that \( \sigma \)-stable \( L_\chi \) implies \( \sigma(L_i) \simeq L_i \). Consider the quotient map

\[
q : G_r^m \rightarrow G_m = A_1^r \times G_m \times \prod_{k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}, k \neq i, j} G_m,
\]

given by

\[
q(x_1, \ldots, x_r) = (x_i + x_j, x_i x_j, \prod_{k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}, k \neq i, j} x_k).
\]

Using the fact that \( L \boxtimes L \simeq m^* L \), where \( m : G_m^2 \rightarrow G_m \) is the multiplication map, we see that

\[
tr^* L_\psi \otimes L_\chi \simeq q^*(L_\psi \boxtimes L \boxtimes (tr^* L_\psi \otimes \prod_{k \neq i, j} L_k)).
\]
The proof of Theorem 1.4 is complete.

The permutation $\sigma$ acts naturally on $q_*(\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$ and it follows from the isomorphism above that

$$(q_*(\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi))^{\sigma} \simeq (q_*q^*(\mathcal{L}_\psi \boxtimes \mathcal{L} \otimes (\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi \otimes \prod_{k \neq i,j} \mathcal{L}_k)))^{\sigma} \simeq \mathcal{L}_\psi \boxtimes \mathcal{L} \otimes (\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi \otimes \prod_{k \neq i,j} \mathcal{L}_k).$$

This implies

$$H^*_c(G^r_m, \text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)^{\sigma} \simeq H^*_c(G^r_m \setminus G^r_m, \mathcal{L}_\psi \boxtimes \mathcal{L} \otimes (\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi \otimes \prod_{k \neq i,j} \mathcal{L}_k)) = 0$$

where the last equality follows from the cohomology vanishing $H^*_c(A^1, \mathcal{L}_\psi) = 0$. The lemma follows.

To proceed, let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}(T)(\overline{\mathcal{O}_\ell})$ and let $\chi' = \text{pr}_r^*\chi \in \mathcal{C}(G^r_m)(\overline{\mathcal{O}_\ell})$ be the pull back of $\chi$. We have

$$\text{pr}_r^*\mathcal{L}_\chi \simeq \mathcal{L}_{\chi'}$$

and

$$H^*_c(T, \Phi_{T,\rho} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \simeq H^*_c(T, \text{pr}_r^*\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi[r] \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \simeq H^*_c(G^r_m, \text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi[r] \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\chi'})$$

where the second isomorphism comes from the projection formula. Let $w \in W'_\chi$ and choose a lift $w' = (w, \eta) \in W'$ of $w$. Note that the following diagram is commutative

![Diagram](image)

It follows that $\eta^*\mathcal{L}_{\chi'} \simeq \eta^*\text{pr}_r^*\mathcal{L}_\chi \simeq \text{pr}_r^*w^*\mathcal{L}_\chi \simeq \text{pr}_r^*\mathcal{L}_\chi \simeq \mathcal{L}_{\chi'}$, that is, $\eta \in S_{r,\chi'}$. Moreover, we have the following commutative diagram

![Diagram](image)

where the horizontal arrows are the isomorphism (6.1), the left vertical arrow is the isomorphism induced by the isomorphism the $i'_{w'}$ in (5.3), and the right vertical arrow is the action of $\eta$ on $H^*_c(G^r_m, \text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi[r] \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\chi'})$ coming from the $S_{r,\chi'}$-equivariant structure on $\text{tr}^*\mathcal{L}_\psi[r] \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\chi'}$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.1, we see that $i'_{w'} = \text{sign}_r(\eta)$ and it follow from the definition of $W$-equivariant structure of $\rho$-Bessel sheaf in (5.4) that the action of $w$ on the cohomology group $H^*_c(T, \Phi_{T,\rho} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$ is given by

$$i_{w'} = \text{sign}_W(w) \text{sign}_r(\eta)i'_{w'} = \text{sign}_W(w) \text{sign}_r(\eta) \text{sign}_r(\eta) = \text{sign}_W(w).$$

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is complete.

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

In this section we shall prove the vanishing conjecture for $G = \text{GL}_n$. 
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7.1. The GL₂-example. Let us first consider the simple but important case \( G = \text{GL}_2 \). Let \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{D}_W(T) \) be a \( W \)-equivariant complex on \( T = \mathbb{G}_m^2 \) and let \( \Phi_\mathcal{F} = \text{Ind}_{T \leq B}^G(\mathcal{F})^W \). Note that, for \( x \in G \setminus B \), the coset \( Ux \subset G^{\text{reg}} \) consists of regular elements. Note also that the Grothendieck-Springer simultaneous resolution is Cartesian over \( G^{\text{reg}} \):

\[
\tilde{G}^{\text{reg}} \simeq G^{\text{reg}} \times_{W \setminus T} T \xrightarrow{\tilde{q}} T \xleftarrow{\tilde{e}} G^{\text{reg}} \xrightarrow{e} W \setminus T
\]

All together, we obtain

\[
H^*_c(Ux, \Phi_\mathcal{F}) \simeq H^*_c(Ux, \tilde{e} \tilde{q}^* \mathcal{F})^W \simeq H^*_c(Ux, c^* q \mathcal{F})^W
\]

Under the identification \( W \setminus T \simeq G_a \times G_m \), the maps \( c \) (resp. \( q \)) is given by \( c(g) = (\text{tr}_G(g), \text{det}(g)) \) (resp. \( q(t) = (\text{tr}_T(t), \text{det}(t)) \)), and a direct calculation shows that \( c \) restricts to an isomorphism

\[
c : Ux \simeq G_a \times \text{det}(x) \subset G_a \times G_m \simeq W \setminus T.
\]

Thus we have

\[
H^*_c(Ux, \Phi_\mathcal{F}) \simeq H^*_c(Ux, c^* q \mathcal{F})^W \simeq (m_i \mathcal{F})^W|_{\text{det}(x)},
\]

where \( m = \text{pr}_{G_m} \circ q : T = \mathbb{G}_m^2 \rightarrow G_m, (x,y) \rightarrow xy \). As \( \text{det}|_{G \setminus B} : G \setminus B \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m \) is surjective, it follows from (7.3) that \( H^*_c(Ux, \Phi_\mathcal{F}) = 0 \) for all \( x \in G \setminus B \) if and only if \( W \) acts on \( m_i \mathcal{F} \) via the sign character. We claim that the later property of \( m_i \mathcal{F} \) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{F} \) being central. Thus we conclude that \( H^*_c(Ux, \Phi_\mathcal{F}) = 0 \) for all \( x \in G \setminus B \) if and only if \( \mathcal{F} \) is central. This completes the proof of the vanishing conjecture for \( \text{GL}_2 \).

To prove the claim we observe that \( W \) acts on \( m_i \mathcal{F} \) via the sign character if and only if \( (m_i \mathcal{F})^W = 0 \). By [GL, Proposition 3.4.5], \( (m_i \mathcal{F})^W = 0 \) is equivalent to

\[
H^*_c(G_m, (m_i \mathcal{F})^W \otimes \mathcal{L}') \simeq H^*_c(G_m, m_i \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}')^W \simeq H^*_c(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes m^* \mathcal{L}')^W = 0
\]

for all tame local system \( \mathcal{L}' \) on \( G_m \). Note that we have \( W_\chi \neq e \) if and only if \( \mathcal{L}_\chi \simeq \mathcal{L}' \otimes \mathcal{L}' \simeq m^* \mathcal{L}' \) for some tame local system \( \mathcal{L}' \) on \( G_m \), thus (7.4) is equivalent to the condition that \( W_\chi \) acts on \( H^*_c(T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \) via the sign character for any tame character \( \chi \), that is, \( \mathcal{F} \) is central. The claim follows.

We shall generalize the proof above for \( \text{GL}_2 \) to \( \text{GL}_n \). The argument involves mirabolic subgroups of \( \text{GL}_n \) as an essential ingredient.

7.2. Mirabolic subgroups. We recall some geometric facts about Mirabolic subgroups, established in [CN], that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Let \( V = \mathbb{A}^n \) be the standard \( n \)-dimensional vector space over \( k \) with the standard basis \( e_1, \ldots, e_n \). For any \( 1 \leq m \leq n \) We define \( F_m \) (resp. \( E_m \)) to be the subspace generated by \( e_1, \ldots, e_m \) (resp. \( e_{m+1}, \ldots, e_n \)).

Let \( Q \) be the mirabolic subgroup of \( G = \text{GL}(V) \) consisting of \( g \in G \) fixing the line generated by \( v := e_1 \). Let \( U_Q \) be the unipotent radical of \( Q \). Consider the \( Q \)-conjugation equivariant stratification

---

\(^9\) As mentioned in loc. cit. the geometry of the conjugation action of Mirabolic has been described by Bernstein in [B].
of $G$

\[(7.5) \quad G = \bigsqcup_{m=1}^{n} X_m,\]

where $X_m$ the subset of $G$ consisting of $g \in G$ such that the span of the vectors $v, gv, g^2v, \ldots$ is of dimension $m$.

**Lemma 7.1.** Consider the Chevalley quotient map $c : G \to W \setminus T \simeq \mathbb{A}^{n-1} \times G_m$, $c(x) = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ where $t^n + a_1t^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n$ is the characteristic polynomial of $x \in G$. Let $x \in X_n$. Then the map $u \mapsto c(u^x) - c(x)$ induces a linear isomorphism

\[
U_Q \simeq \mathbb{A}^{n-1} \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{A}^{n-1} \times G_m
\]

between $U_Q$ and the subspace of $\mathbb{A}^{n-1} \times G_m$ defined by $a_n = 0$. In particular, the map $c$ restricts to an isomorphism $U_Qx \simeq \mathbb{A}^{n-1} \times \{a_n\} \subset \mathbb{A}^{n-1} \times G_m$.

**Proof.** This is [CN, Proposition 4.1]. □

**Remark 7.1.** The lemma above is a generalization of the isomorphism in (7.2) to the setting of mirabolic subgroups.

**Lemma 7.2.** Let $x \in X_m$. There exists an element $q \in Q$ such that $q x q^{-1}$ is of the form

\[(7.6) \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_{F_m} & y \\ 0 & x_{E_m} \end{bmatrix}\]

where $x_{E_m} \in \text{GL}(E_m)$, and $x_{F_m} \in \text{GL}(F_m)$ has the form of a companion matrix

\[(7.7) \quad x_{F_m} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -a_m \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -a_{m-1} \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & -a_{m-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -a_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -a_1 \end{bmatrix}\]

**Proof.** Straightforward exercise in linear algebra. □

Let $P_m$ be the parabolic group of $G$ consisting of $g$ such that $g F_m = F_m$. Let $L_m$ be the standard Levi subgroup of $P_m$ and $U_m$ be the unipotent radical of $P_m$ consisting of matrices of the form

\[u_m = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id}_{F_m} & v_m \\ 0 & \text{Id}_{E_m} \end{bmatrix}\]

where $u_m \in \text{Hom}(E_m, F_m)$. Let $U_1$ and $U_{m-1}$ be the subgroup of $U_m$ consisting of $u_m$ as above with $v_m \in \text{Hom}(E_m, F_1)$ and $v_m \in \text{Hom}(E_m, F_{m-1})$ respectively.

**Lemma 7.3.** Let $x_{F_m} \in \text{GL}(F_m)$ be a linear map such that, for any $1 \leq j \leq m$, $x_{F_m}(F_j) \subset F_{j+1}$ and the induced map $F_j/F_{j-1} \to F_{j+1}/F_j$ is an isomorphism. Let $x_{E_m} \in \text{GL}(E_m)$ be an arbitrary linear map. Then the action of $U_1 \times U_{m-1}$ on the space of matrices of the form

\[(7.8) \quad x = \begin{bmatrix} x_{F_m} & y \\ 0 & x_{E_m} \end{bmatrix}\]

given by $(u_1, u_{m-1})x = u_{m-1} u_1 x u_{m-1}^{-1}$ is simply transitive.\[10\]

\[10\text{Note that } u_{m-1} u_1 x u_{m-1}^{-1} = u_1 u_{m-1} x u_{m-1}^{-1}.\]
Thus, by Lemma 7.3, we have an isomorphism
\[ \pi \] 

Lemma 7.5. Assume 7.3.

**Proof of Theorem 1.6.**

Let \( Q_{L_m} = L_m \cap Q \) be a mirabolic subgroup of \( L_m \) and let \( U_{Q_{L_m}} \) be the unipotent radical of \( Q_{L_m} \) consisting of matrices
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & v & 0 \\
0 & \text{Id}_{m-1} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \text{Id}_{n-m}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( v = (v_1, \ldots, v_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{A}^{m-1} \) is a row vector.

**Lemma 7.4.** Let \( x \in X_m \) be as in (1.6) with \( x_{F_m} \) being as in (1.7). The morphism
\[ U_Q \times U_{m-1} \to U_m U_{Q_{L_m}} x \]
given by \((u_Q, u_{m-1}) \to u_{m-1} u_Q x u_{m-1}^{-1}\) is an isomorphism
\[ U_Q \times U_{m-1} \to U_m x \]

**Proof.** Recall the subgroup \( U_1 \) of \( U_m \) consisting of matrices of the form
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{Id}_m & v \\
0 & \text{Id}_{m-n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( v \in \text{Hom}(E_m, F_1) \). Note that the multiplication map
\[ U_1 \times U_{Q_{L_m}} \simeq U_Q, \ (u_1, u) \to u_1 u \]
is an isomorphism. Note also that, for any \( u \in U_{Q_{L_m}} \), the \( U_m \)-orbit \( U_m u x \) through \( u x \) consists of matrices of the form (1.8) with \( x_{F_m}, x_{E_m} \) fixed, and \( x_{F_m} \) satisfies the assumption of Lemma 7.3.

Thus, by Lemma 7.3 we have an isomorphism
\[ U_1 \times U_{m-1} \to U_m x \]
given by \((u_1, u_{m-1}) \to u_{m-1} u_1 x u_{m-1}^{-1}\). As \( u \) varies over \( U_{Q_{L_m}} \), we obtain the desired isomorphism
\[ U_Q \times U_{m-1} \simeq U_1 \times U_{Q_{L_m}} \times U_{m-1} \to U_m U_{Q_{L_m}} x, \ (u_Q = u_1 u, u_{m-1}) \to u_{m-1} u_1 x u_{m-1}^{-1}. \]

**Proof.** By Remark 1.4 it is enough to prove the statement for \( \ast \)-central complexes. By induction on the (finite) number of non vanishing perverse cohomology sheaves, we can assume the conjecture is true for \( \ast \)-central complexes in \( p \mathcal{D}_W^{[a,b]} (T), |a-b| \leq l \). Let \( \mathcal{F} \in p \mathcal{D}_W^{[a,b+1]} (T) \) be a \( \ast \)-central complex.

We need to show that \( \pi_* \Phi_{\mathcal{F}} \) is supported on \( T = U \setminus B \subset U \setminus G \), where \( \pi : G \to U \setminus G \) is the quotient map. Consider the following distinguished triangle
\[ p_{\tau \leq b} \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F} \to p_{\mathcal{H}^{b+1}} (\mathcal{F}) [-b-1] \to \phi. \]

\footnote{There is minor mistake in the computation of \( u_1 u_m x u_m^{-1} \) in loc. cit.: is should be \( u_1 u_m x u_m^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} x_F & y + v_1 x_E + v_{m-1} x_E - x_F v_{m-1} \\ 0 & x_E \end{bmatrix} \). The same proof goes through after this minor correction.}

\footnote{The isomorphism was used in [CN, p17].}

\footnote{In fact, the Lemma remains true without the assumption \( G = \text{GL}_n \), see [CN, Lemma 7.5].}

\[ \square \]

7.3. Proof of Theorem 1.6

**Lemma 7.5.** Assume \( G = \text{GL}_n \). If Conjecture 1.2 is true for perverse central sheaves (resp. perverse central sheaves), then it is true for arbitrary central complexes (resp. arbitrary \( \ast \)-central complexes).

**Proof.** By Remark 1.4 it is enough to prove the statement for \( \ast \)-central complexes. By induction on the (finite) number of non vanishing perverse cohomology sheaves, we can assume the conjecture is true for \( \ast \)-central complexes in \( p \mathcal{D}_W^{[a,b]} (T), |a-b| \leq l \). Let \( \mathcal{F} \in p \mathcal{D}_W^{[a,b+1]} (T) \) be a \( \ast \)-central complex.

We need to show that \( \pi_* \Phi_{\mathcal{F}} \) is supported on \( T = U \setminus B \subset U \setminus G \), where \( \pi : G \to U \setminus G \) is the quotient map. Consider the following distinguished triangle
\[ p_{\tau \leq b} \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F} \to p_{\mathcal{H}^{b+1}} (\mathcal{F}) [-b-1] \to \phi. \]
We claim that both \( p_{\tau \leq b}^* F, p_* \mathcal{H}^{b+1} (F) \) are \( * \)-central. Applying the functor \( \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{D}}^G \) to the above distinguished triangle, we obtain
\[
\Phi_{p_{\tau \leq b}^* F} \to \Phi_{F} \to \Phi_{p_* \mathcal{H}^{b+1} (F)}[-b - 1] \to .
\]
By induction, both \( \pi_* (\Phi_{p_{\tau \leq b}^* F}) \) and \( \pi_* (\Phi_{p_* \mathcal{H}^{b+1} (F)}) \) are supported on \( T = U \setminus B \subset U \setminus G \) and it implies \( \pi_* \Phi_{F} \) is also supported on \( T \).

It remains to prove the claim. Let \( \chi_f \in \mathcal{C}(T_f) \) and let \( \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell, \chi_f} = \{ \chi_f \} \times \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell} \) be the corresponding component. Let \( q : \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell, \chi_f} \to W_{\chi_f} \setminus \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell, \chi_f} \) be the quotient map. Note that for \( G = \text{GL}_n \) we have \( W_{\chi} = W_{\chi}^i \) for all \( \chi \) and hence by Proposition 7.6 we have
\[
M_* (\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{sign})|_{\mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell, \chi_f}} = q^* \mathcal{G}
\]
for a \( \mathcal{G} \in D^b_{\text{coh}} (W_{\chi_f} \setminus \mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell, \chi_f}) \). Since both \( M_* \) and \( q^* \) are exact, we have
\[
M_* (p_{\tau \leq b}^* (\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{sign}))|_{\mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell, \chi_f}} = q^* (\tau \leq b \mathcal{G}), \quad M_* (p_* \mathcal{H}^{b+1} (\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{sign}))|_{\mathcal{C}(T)_{\ell, \chi_f}} = q^* \mathcal{H}^{b+1} (\mathcal{G}),
\]
and by Proposition 4.2 again it implies \( p_{\tau \leq b}^* F \) and \( p_* \mathcal{H}^{b+1} (F) \) are \( * \)-central. The proof is complete. \( \square \)

Consider \( G = (\prod_{i \neq j} \text{GL}_{n_i}) \times \text{GL}_{n_j} \) with maximal torus \( T = (\prod_{i \neq j} T_i) \times T_j \), and Weyl group \( W = (\prod_{i \neq j} W_i) \times W_j \). Here \( W_k \) denotes the symmetric group of degree \( n_k \). Consider the following map
\[
\eta = \text{id} \times \text{det} : T = (\prod_{i \neq j} T_i) \times T_j \longrightarrow T' := (\prod_{i \neq j} T_i) \times \mathbb{G}_m.
\]
The symmetric group \( W_j \) of degree \( n_j \) acts on \( T \) via the permutation action on the factor \( T_j \) and \( \eta \) is \( W_j \)-invariant. Thus for any \( F \in \mathcal{D}_W (T) \) the push-forward \( \eta_* (\mathcal{F}) \) carries a natural \( W_j \)-action. We have the following generalization of Deligne’s result about \( S_\Sigma \)-action on hypergeometric sheaves \( \Phi_\Sigma \) (see Proposition 5.2) to central complexes.

**Proposition 7.6.** Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a central complex in \( \mathcal{D}_W (T) \). Then the above \( W_j \)-action on \( \eta_* (\mathcal{F}) \) is given by the sign character \( \text{sign} : W_j \to \{ \pm 1 \} \).

**Proof.** It suffices to show that \( \eta_* (\mathcal{F})^\sigma = \text{id} \) for any involution \( \sigma \in W_j \). By a result of Laumon [GL Proposition 3.4.5], it is enough to show that for any tame local system \( \mathcal{L}_\chi \) on \( T' \) we have
\[
H^*_c (T', \eta_* (\mathcal{F})^\sigma = \text{id} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) = 0.
\]
Note that, for any such \( \mathcal{L}_\chi \), we have
\[
H^*_c (T', \eta_* (\mathcal{F})^\sigma = \text{id} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \simeq H^*_c (T', \eta_*(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)^\sigma = \text{id} \simeq H^*_c (T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \eta^* \mathcal{L}_\chi)^\sigma = \text{id}.
\]
Since \( \eta^* \mathcal{L}_\chi \) is a tame local system on \( T \) fixed by \( \sigma \), the central property of \( \mathcal{F} \) implies that the action of \( \sigma \) on \( H^*_c (T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \eta^* \mathcal{L}_\chi) \) is trivial. Thus we have \( H^*_c (T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \eta^* \mathcal{L}_\chi)^\sigma = \text{id} = 0 \) and the isomorphism above implies \( H^*_c (T, \eta_* (\mathcal{F})^\sigma = \text{id} \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) = 0 \) for all tame local system \( \mathcal{L}_\chi \). The proposition follows. \( \square \)

The following proposition generalizes [CN Proposition 5.1] to central complexes:

**Proposition 7.7.** Let \( G \) be a direct product of general linear group and let \( Q \) be a mirabolic subgroup of \( G \) of the form
\[
Q = (\prod_{i \neq j} \text{GL}_{n_i}) \times Q_j \subset G = \prod_i \text{GL}_{n_i}
\]
where $Q_j$ is the mirabolic subgroup of $GL_{n_j}$. Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{R}_W(T)^{\vee}$ be a $W$-equivariant central perverse sheaf on $T$. Then for any $x \in G \setminus Q$, we have

$$H^*_c(U_Q x, i^* \Phi_\mathcal{F}) = 0$$

where $i : U_Q x \to G$ is the inclusion map.

Proof. If $n_j = 1$, then $Q = G$ and the proposition holds vacuously. Assume $n_j \geq 2$. Consider the following stratification of $G$

$$G = \bigsqcup_{m=1}^{n_j} X_m = \bigsqcup_{m=1}^{n_j} \left( \prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i} \times X_{j,m} \right)$$

where $X_{j,m} \subset GL_{n_j}$ is the subset introduced in (7.10). We have $Q = X_1$, thus the assumption $x \notin Q$ implies $x \in X_m$ for some $2 \leq m \leq n_j$.

Consider the case $x \in X_{j,n_j}$. Since $X_{j,n_j}$ is contained in $GL_{n_j}^{\text{reg}}$, the Grothendieck-Springer simultaneous resolution implies a Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X_{j,n_j} & \xrightarrow{c} & (\prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i}) \times T_j \\
\downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \psi \\
X_{j,n_j} & \xrightarrow{e} & (\prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i}) \times W_j \setminus \setminus T_j
\end{array}$$

It follows that

$$\Phi_\mathcal{F}|_{X_{j,n_j}} \simeq c^* q_!(\Phi_{L_j,\mathcal{F}})^{W_j}$$

where $L_j = (\prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i}) \times T_j$ and $\Phi_{L_j,\mathcal{F}} = \text{Ind}_{T}^{L_j}(\mathcal{F})^{W_{L_j}}$. Consider the map

$$\text{det}_{W_j} = \text{Id} \times \sigma : \left( \prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i} \right) \times W_j \setminus \setminus T_j \to \left( \prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i} \right) \times \mathbb{G}_m$$

(7.10)

where $\sigma : W_j \setminus \setminus T_j \simeq GL_{n_j} \setminus \setminus GL_{n_j} \to \mathbb{G}_m$ is given by the determinant function on $GL_{n_j}$. By Lemma (7.10) the restriction of $c$ to $U_Q x$ induces an isomorphism between $U_Q x$ and the fiber of (7.10) over the image $\text{det}_{W_j} \circ c(x)$ of $x$. Thus, to prove the desired vanishing, it is enough to show that

$$\text{det}_{j!*}(\Phi_{L_j,\mathcal{F}})^{W_j} \simeq \text{det}_{W_j!*} q_!(\Phi_{L_j,\mathcal{F}})^{W_j} = 0$$

(7.11)

where

$$\text{det}_j = \text{det}_{W_j} \circ c : L_j = \left( \prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i} \right) \times T_j \to \left( \prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i} \right) \times \mathbb{G}_m$$

is the determinant map on the $j$th component. Consider the following Cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
L_j = (\prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i}) \times T_j & \xrightarrow{\text{det}_j = \text{Id} \times \text{det}} & T = (\prod_{i \neq j} T_i) \times T_j \\
\downarrow \text{id} \times \text{det} & & \downarrow \text{id} \times \text{det} \\
L_j' = (\prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i}) \times \mathbb{G}_m & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times \text{det}} & T' = (\prod_{i \neq j} T_i) \times \mathbb{G}_m
\end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrows are the map induced by the Grothendieck-Springer simultaneous resolution (see (7.11)). It follows that

$$\text{det}_j ! \Phi_{L_j,\mathcal{F}} \simeq \text{det}_j ! \text{Ind}_{T}^{L_j}(\mathcal{F})^{W_{L_j}} = \prod_{i \neq j} \text{Ind}_{T_i}^{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) \Pi_{i \neq j} W_i$$

(7.12)
Now assume for all \( u \in U \) where \( \det_W : W \to \{\pm 1\} \).

Therefore, by (7.12), the action \( W_j \) on \( \det_j ! \Phi_{L_j,T} \) is by the sign character and we have

\[
\det_j ! (\Phi_{L_j,T})^{W_j} = 0
\]
as for \( n_j \geq 2 \) the sign character of \( W_j \) is non-trivial. This concludes the case when \( x \in X_{n_j} \).

Consider the general case \( x \in X_m \) with \( 2 \leq m \leq n_j \).

By Lemma 7.2 we can assume the \( j \)th component \( x_j \in GL_{n_j} \) of \( x \) is of the form form (7.3) with \( x_{j,F} \) being a companion form in (7.7).

Let \( P = \prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i} \times P_m \) denote the parabolic subgroup of \( G \) where \( P_m \) is the parabolic subgroup of \( GL_{n_j} \) introduced in Section 7.2.

Let \( L = (\prod_{i \neq j} GL_{n_i}) \times L_m \) and \( U_P = (\prod_{i \neq j} Id_{n_i}) \times U_m \) be the standard Levi subgroup of \( P \) and its unipotent radical. We have \( x \in P \) and let \( x_L \) be its image in \( L \).

Consider the mirabolic subgroup \( Q_L \) of \( L \) with unipotent radical \( U_{Q_L} = (\prod_{i \neq j} Id_{n_i}) \times Q_{L_m} \).

By applying the result obtained above to the case to \( L \), we obtain

\[
H^*_c(U_{Q_L} x_L, \Phi_{L,T}^{U_{Q_L} x_L}) = 0,
\]

where \( \Phi_{L,T} = \text{Ind}^L_P (\mathcal{F})^{W_L} \).

Note that, by Proposition 3.4, we have \( \Phi_{L,T} \simeq \text{Res}^G_{L \subset P} \Phi_T \), and above cohomology vanishing implies

(7.13)

\[
H^*_c(U_P U_{Q_L} x, \Phi_T|_{U_P U_{Q_L} x}) = 0.
\]

Using Lemma 7.4 we see that the map

\[
U_Q \times (\prod_{i \neq j} \text{Id}_{n_i} \times U_{m-1}) \to U_P U_{Q_L} x
\]
given by \( (u_q, u_{m-1}) \to u_{m-1} u_q x u_{m-1}^{-1} \) is an isomorphism. Since \( \Phi_T \) is \( G \)-conjugation equivariant, (7.13) implies

\[
H^*_c(U_Q x, \Phi_T|_{U_Q x}) = 0.
\]

The proposition follows.

We are ready to prove Theorem 1.6. Let \( G = GL_n \) and let \( Q \) be the mirabolic subgroup. Let \( \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_W (T) \) be a central complex. We would like to show that \( H^*_c(U x, \Phi_T|_{U x}) = 0 \) for \( x \in G \setminus B \).

By Lemma 7.5, we can assume \( \mathcal{F} \) is a perverse sheaf. Consider the case \( x \notin Q \). Then \( u x \notin Q \) for all \( u \in U \) and, by Proposition 7.4, we have \( H^*_c(U Q u x, \Phi_T|_{U Q u x}) = 0 \). The desired vanishing \( H^*_c(U x, \Phi_T|_{U x}) = 0 \) follows from the Leray spectral sequence associated to the map \( U x \to U Q \setminus U x \).

Now assume \( x \in Q \). Let \( x_L \) be the image of \( x \) in the standard Levi \( L \) of \( Q \). Note that we have \( x_L \notin B_L = B \cap L \) and

\[
H^*_c(U x, \Phi_T|_{U x}) = H^*_c(U_{B_L} x_L, \text{Res}_{L}^{L} \Phi_T|_{U_{B_L} x_L}) = H^*_c(U_{B_L} x_L, \Phi_{L,T}|_{U_{B_L} x_L})
\]

where \( U_{B_L} \) is the unipotent radical of \( B_L \). Now, using Proposition 7.7, we can conclude by an induction argument.
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