arXiv:1911.12570v1 [math.RT] 28 Nov 2019

THE DEGENERATE PRINCIPAL SERIES REPRESENTATIONS OF EXCEPTIONAL GROUPS OF TYPE E_7 OVER p-ADIC FIELDS - February 1, 2022

HEZI HALAWI[1] AND AVNER SEGAL[2]

Abstract. In this paper, we study the degenerate principal series of a split, simply-connected, simple p-adic group of type E_7. We determine the points of reducibility and the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation at each point.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries and Notations 3
3. The Algorithm 7
4. The Degenerate Principal Series of E_7 12
Appendix A. Degenerate Principal Series of Levi Subgroups 34
Appendix B. The Iwahori-Hecke Algebra and The Unramified Principal Series 41
References 46

1. Introduction

This paper is a continuation of our ongoing project which studies the degenerate principal series of exceptional groups of type E_n. More precisely, let F be a non-Archimedean local field and let G denote the group of F-points of a split, simple, simply-connected group of type E_7. We answer the following question:

Question 1. *Let P be a standard proper maximal parabolic subgroup with a Levi subgroup M. Given a one dimensional representation σ of M, is the normalized parabolic induction*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E50, 20G41, 20G05.

$\pi = i_M^G(\sigma)$ reducible? What is the length of its maximal semi-simple quotient and what is the length of its maximal semi-simple subrepresentation?

We mention here that Question 1 was already studied for various groups such as:

- For the general linear group it was answered in a wider generality in [4, 28], and the answer of Question 1 for the special linear group follows from [10] [23].
- Symplectic groups in [13].
- Orthogonal groups in [2, 14].
- Exceptional group of type G_2 in [18].
- Exceptional group of type F_4 in [9].
- Exceptional group of type E_6 in [12].

The main reason that such a study has not been preformed for split exceptional groups of type E_n before is the size and complex structure of their Weyl groups. The computations required for such a study cannot be preformed manually in a reasonable amount of time. To overcome this problem, we harnessed a computer for this task. As in our previous paper, the calculation is implemented using *Sagemath* [25].

Understanding the structure of degenerate principal series is important for the studying automorphic representations. For example, it is conjectured that in the right complex half-plane, a degenerate Eisenstein series would has a pole if and only if the local degenerate principal series is reducible for almost all primes. Moreover, the residual representation at such a point is a sum of restricted tensor products of quotients of the local degenerate principal series.

This paper is arranged as follows:

- Section 2 introduces the notations used in this paper.
- Section 3 outlines our method.
- Section 4 introduces the group G and its structure, states our main theorem, Theorem 4.2, and its proof.
- Appendix A contains the information on representations of Levi subgroups, required for the proof of Theorem 4.2.
- In Appendix B we recall parts of the theory of Iwahori-Hecke algebras and use them to complete the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Acknowledgments: This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation, grant number 421/17 (Segal).

2. Preliminaries and Notations

2.1. Group Structure

Let F be a non-Archimedean local field and G be the group of F-points of an arbitrary split reductive group defined over F.

Fix a maximal split torus T and assume that $rank(G) = n$. We denote by Φ_G the set of roots of G with respect to T. Fixing a Borel subgroup $B \supset T$ determines a partition of Φ_G into positive roots, Φ_G^+, and negative roots, Φ_G^-. Let Δ_G denote the set of simple roots of G relative to B.

For $\alpha \in \Phi_G$, $\alpha^\vee$ stands for the associated co-root , $\bar{\omega}_\alpha$ stands for the associated fundamental weight, and $\bar{\omega}_\alpha^\vee$ stands for the associated co-fundamental weight, namely,

$$\langle \beta, \bar{\omega}_\alpha^\vee \rangle = \langle \bar{\omega}_\beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \Delta_G,$$

where $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}$ is the Kronecker delta function.

Set $W = W_G$ to be the Weyl group of G with respect to T. It is known that

$$W = \langle s_\alpha \, : \, \alpha \in \Delta_G \rangle,$$

where s_α is a simple reflection associated to $\alpha \in \Delta_G$.

For $\Theta \subset \Delta_G$ we let P_Θ denote the parabolic subgroup of G given by

$$P_\Theta = \langle B, s_\alpha \, : \, \alpha \in \Theta \rangle.$$

Such subgroups are called standard parabolic subgroups. Obviously, $B \subseteq P_\Theta$. Each standard parabolic subgroup admits a Levi decomposition $P_\Theta = M_\Theta N_\Theta$, where the factor M_Θ denotes the Levi subgroup of P_Θ, and N_Θ denotes its unipotent radical. In this case, $\Delta_{M_\Theta} = \Theta$, $\Phi_{M_\Theta} = (\mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, \Theta) \cap \Phi_G$ and $\Phi_{M_\Theta}^+ = (\mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, \Theta) \cap \Phi_G^+$. The Weyl group of M_Θ is given by $W_{M_\Theta} = \langle s_\alpha \, : \, \alpha \in \Theta \rangle$. In particular, we let U denote the unipotent radical $N_\emptyset$ of B.

Given an enumeration of $\Delta_G = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$ we fix a notation for (proper) maximal parabolic and Levi subgroups. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ we let $P_i = P_{\Delta_G \setminus \{\alpha_i\}}$ and $M_i = M_{\Delta_G \setminus \{\alpha_i\}}$.

2.2. Characters, W-action and Stabilizers

Let M be a Levi subgroup of G. The complex manifold of (quasi) characters of M is denoted by $\mathbf{X}(M)$ and its structure is described in [12, Section 2].

We say that $\chi \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ is of *finite order* if there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\chi^k = 1$; the smallest such k is called the order of χ and is denoted by $ord(\chi) = k$.

By [12, Section 2], every $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ has the form

$$\Omega = \Omega_G + \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_G \setminus \Delta_M} \Omega_\alpha \circ \bar{\omega}_\alpha, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\Omega_\alpha \in \mathbf{X}(F^\times)$ and Ω_G is the pull-back of a character in $\mathbf{X}(G/[G,G])$.

Any $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(F^\times)$ can be written by

$$\Omega = s + \chi, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\chi \in \mathbf{X}(F^\times)$ is of finite order and $s \in \mathbb{C}$ should be interpreted as the character $s(x) = |x|^s$. We write $\mathrm{Re}(\Omega), \mathrm{Im}(\Omega) \in \mathbf{X}(F^\times)$ for the elements given by

$$\mathrm{Re}(\Omega)(x) = |x|^{\mathrm{Re}(s)}, \quad \mathrm{Im}(\Omega)(x) = \chi(x)|x|^{\mathrm{Im}(s)}.$$

Similarly, for $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ given as in Equation (2.1), we write

$$\mathrm{Re}(\Omega) = \mathrm{Re}(\Omega_G) + \textstyle\sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_G \setminus \Delta_M} \mathrm{Re}(\Omega_\alpha) \circ \bar{\omega}_\alpha,$$

$$\mathrm{Im}(\Omega) = \mathrm{Im}(\Omega_G) + \textstyle\sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_G \setminus \Delta_M} \mathrm{Im}(\Omega_\alpha) \circ \bar{\omega}_\alpha.$$

In particular, if G is simple, then, by Equation (2.1) and Equation (2.2), any complex character of M_i is of the form

$$\Omega^G_{M_i,s,\chi} = (s + \chi) \circ \bar{\omega}_{\alpha_i}, \tag{2.3}$$

with $s \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\chi \in \mathbf{X}(F^\times)$ is of finite order. We write $\Omega_{M_i,s} = \Omega^G_{M_i,s,Triv}$, where $Triv$ stands for the trivial character of M_i. When there is no risk of confusion, we omit the subscript M_i and the superscript G and write $\Omega_{s,\chi}$ for simplicity.

We note that, since W_G acts on T, it also acts on $\mathbf{X}(T)$. The set

$$\left\{ \lambda \in \mathbf{X}(T) \;\middle|\; \mathrm{Re}(\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle) \leq 0 \quad \forall \alpha \in \Delta_G \right\}$$

is a fundamental domain in $\mathbf{X}(T)$ for the action of W. An element $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}(T)$ is called **anti-dominant** if $\mathrm{Re}\left(\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle\right) \leq 0$ for every $\alpha \in \Delta_G$. For every $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}(T)$, the Weyl-orbit of λ contains an anti-dominant element (possibly more than one). We also note that the orbit $W_G \cdot \lambda$ is finite.

By definition, for every $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}(T)$, one has

$$\mathrm{Stab}_{W_G}(\lambda) = \mathrm{Stab}_{W_G}\left(\mathrm{Re}(\lambda)\right) \cap \mathrm{Stab}_{W_G}\left(\mathrm{Im}(\lambda)\right).$$

We note that the stabilizers of the elements in the orbit $W_G \cdot \lambda$ are conjugate, and hence it is enough to determine one of them in order to determine all of them. For computational reasons, it is easier to calculate the stabilizer of an anti-dominant element $\lambda_{a.d} \in W_G \cdot \lambda$.

Choose an anti-dominant element $\lambda_{a.d} \in \mathbf{X}(T)$ in the W_G-orbit of λ. In that case, one has

$$\mathrm{Stab}_{W_G}(\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_{a.d})) = \langle s_\alpha \ : \ \langle \mathrm{Re}(\lambda_{a.d}), \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0, \quad \alpha \in \Delta_G \rangle$$

and

$$\mathrm{Stab}_{W_G}(\lambda_{a.d}) = \{ w \in \mathrm{Stab}_{W_G}(\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_{a.d})) \mid w \cdot \mathrm{Im}(\lambda_{a.d}) = \mathrm{Im}(\lambda_{a.d}) \}. \tag{2.4}$$

2.3. **Representations**

Let $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ denote the category of admissible representations of G. We denote by $i_M^G : \mathrm{Rep}(M) \to \mathrm{Rep}(G)$ the functor of normalized induction from M to G, and by $r_M^G : \mathrm{Rep}(G) \to \mathrm{Rep}(M)$ the functor of normalized Jacquet functor. The Jacquet functor r_M^G is left-adjoint to i_M^G, that is, Frobenius reciprocity holds

$$\mathrm{Hom}_G\left(\pi, i_M^G(\tau)\right) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_M\left(r_M^G(\pi), \tau\right). \tag{2.5}$$

In parts of this work, it is convenient to consider representations of finite length of a group H as elements in the Grothendieck ring $\mathfrak{R}(H)$ of H. Given a representation π of H, we write $[\pi]$ for its class in $\mathfrak{R}(H)$. In particular, we write $[\pi] = [\pi_1] + [\pi_2]$ if for any irreducible representation σ of H one has

$$mult(\sigma, \pi) = mult(\sigma, \pi_1) + mult(\sigma, \pi_2).$$

Here, $mult(\sigma, \pi)$ denotes the multiplicity of σ in the Jordan-Hölder series of π. Furthermore, we write $\pi \leq \pi'$ if, for any irreducible representation σ of H,

$$mult(\sigma, \pi) \leq mult(\sigma, \pi').$$

We quote [5, Lemma. 2.12] , [7, Theorem 6.3.6] which gives another property of r_M^G and i_M^G.

Lemma 2.1 (Geometric Lemma)**.** *For Levi subgroups L and M of G, let*

$$W^{M,L} = \left\{ w \in W \mid w\left(\Phi_M^+\right) \subset \Phi^+, \ w^{-1}\left(\Phi_L^+\right) \subset \Phi^+ \right\}$$

be the set of shortest representatives in W of $W_L\backslash W/W_M$. For a smooth representation Ω of M, the representation $r_L^G i_M^G \Omega$, as an element of $\mathfrak{R}(L)$, is given by:

$$\left[r_L^G i_M^G \Omega\right] = \sum_{w \in W^{M,L}} \left[i_{L'}^L w \circ r_{M'}^M(\Omega)\right], \tag{2.6}$$

where, for $w \in W^{M,L}$,

$$M' = M \cap w^{-1} L w$$
$$L' = wMw^{-1} \cap L.$$

We note that, since the Jacquet functor takes finite length representations to finite length representations, then for any Levi subgroup M of a maximal parabolic subgroup and $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$, the T-module $r_T^G\left(i_M^G(\Omega)\right)$, considered as an element of $\mathfrak{R}(T)$, is a finite sum of one-dimensional representations of T. Each such representation of T is called an **exponent** of $i_M^G(\Omega)$. Moreover,

$$r_T^M(\Omega) = \Omega\Big|_T - \rho_M, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\rho_M = |\cdot| \circ \left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\gamma \in \Phi_M^+} \gamma\right)$. The exponent $\lambda_0 = r_T^M(\Omega)$ is called the **leading exponent** of $i_M^G(\Omega)$. We note that all exponents of $i_M^G(\Omega)$ lie in the W_G-orbit of λ_0.

2.4. **Intertwining Operators**

Let $\mathbf{X}^{un}(T)$ denote the group of characters of T of the form

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i \circ \bar{\omega}_{\alpha_i}, \quad (s_1, ..., s_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Given $w \in W_G$ we let

$$R(w) = \{\alpha > 0 \ : \ w\alpha < 0\}.$$

We fix $w \in W_G$. For $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}^{un}(T)$ such that $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle > 0$ for every $\alpha \in R(w)$, the integral

$$\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda) f(g) = \int_{U \cap wUw^{-1}\backslash U} f(w^{-1}ug)du \tag{2.8}$$

converges for every $f \in i_T^G(\lambda)$ and satisfies the following properties:

(P1) $\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda)$ admits a meromorphic continuation to all $\mathbf{X}^{un}(T)$ and defines an intertwining operator $M_w(\lambda) : i_T^G(\lambda) \to i_T^G(w \cdot \lambda)$.

(P2) If $w = w_1 w_2$ such that $l(w) = l(w_1) + l(w_2)$, then $\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda) = \mathcal{M}_{w_1}(w_2 \cdot \lambda) \circ \mathcal{M}_{w_2}(\lambda)$.

(P3) Suppose that $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle > 0$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta_G$. Then, $\ker \mathcal{M}_{s_\alpha}(\lambda) \neq 0$ if and only if $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 1$.

It is customary to use the normalized intertwining operator

$$N_w(\lambda) = \prod_{\gamma \in R(w)} \frac{\zeta(\langle \lambda, \gamma^\vee \rangle + 1)}{\zeta(\langle \lambda, \gamma^\vee \rangle)} \mathcal{M}_w(\chi),$$

where $\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{1-q^{-z}}$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. The normalized intertwining operator $N_w(\lambda)$ satisfies the same properties as $\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda)$, while (P2) holds in an even wider generality, namely,

$$N_{w_1 w_2}(\lambda) = N_{w_1}(w_2 \cdot \lambda) \circ N_{w_2}(\lambda) \quad \forall \quad w_1, w_2 \in W_G.$$

Set $z = \langle \chi, \alpha^\vee \rangle$ and assume that $\mathrm{Re}(z) > 0$. Then, by [27, Section 6], the operator $N_{s_\alpha}(\lambda)$ is holomorphic at λ.

3. **The Algorithm**

In this section, we survey the method used in this paper to determine the reducibility of degenerate principal series and their maximal semi-simple subrepresentation and quotient. These ideas go back to works of Bernstein, Zelevenisky, Sally, Tadić, Muíc, Jantzen, Casselman, Iwahori and others. For more information one should consult [12, Section 3]. We fix a maximal parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ of a simple group G. Let $\Omega = \Omega_{M,s,\chi}$ be as in (2.3) and $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$.

We recall, from [12, Subsection 3.1], that if π is reducible, then $|x|^{\mathrm{Im}(s)}$ is of finite order. Hence, we assume that $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

We start by addressing the reducibility of π. For this purpose we make a distinction between regular and non-regular cases.

The representation π is called **regular** if $\mathrm{Stab}_{W_G}(\lambda) = \{e\}$ for any (and hence all) $\lambda \leq r_T^G(\pi)$.

We point out that the structure of π in the regular case is completely determined by [13, Theorem. 3.1.2], while in the non-regular case there currently is no such general result regarding its reducibility and structure. In Subsection 3.2, Subsection 3.3 and Subsection 3.4, we outline tools which will allow us to solve Question 1 in most cases. The remaining cases are dealt with in Subsection 4.4.

3.1. **Regular Cases**

We recall [13, Theorem. 3.1.2]. The setting of this theorem is as follows. Let $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$ be a regular representation. For any $\alpha_i \in \Delta_G$, let L_{α_i} be the Levi subgroup of the standard parabolic subgroup $Q_{\alpha_i} = \langle B, s_{\alpha_i} \rangle$ and let $BZ_i(\pi)$ stand for the set of representations $i_{L'}^{L_{\alpha_i}}(w \circ \tau)$, where w runs over all $w \in W^{M,L_{\alpha_i}}$ and for each $w \in W^{M,L_{\alpha_i}}$:

(1) $L' = wMw^{-1} \cap L_{\alpha_i}$.
(2) τ is a component of $r_{M'}^M(\Omega)$, where $M' = M \cap w^{-1}L_{\alpha_i}w$.

Under these assumptions one has:

Theorem 3.1. *The following are equivalent:*

(REG1) π *is irreducible.*
(REG2) For every i *and for every* $\sigma \in BZ_i(\pi)$, σ *is irreducible.*
(REG3) $\langle r_T^M(\Omega), \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \{\pm 1\}$ *for every* $\alpha \in \Phi_G^+ \setminus \Phi_M$.

The equivalence of (REG1) and (REG2) is the content of [13, Theorem. 3.1.2], while the equivalence of (REG2) and (REG3) is explained in [12, Subsection 3.1].

Thus, the regular reducible cases are determined by two linear conditions, Equation (2.4) and (REG3), and hence is simple to implement. We conclude the discussion on the regular case by recalling from [12, Subsection 3.1] that there are only finitely many non-regular $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ and only finitely many regular $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ such that $i_M^G\Omega$ is reducible.

In the remainder of this section, we assume that π is non-regular.

3.2. **Non Regular Cases - Reducibility Test**

To deal with the reducibility of non-regular representations, we quote the following reducibility criterion of Tadić [24, Lemma 3.1],

Lemma 3.2 (**RC**). *Let* π *be a smooth representation of* G *of finite-length. Suppose that there is a Levi subgroup* L *of* G *and there are smooth representations* σ *and* Π *of* G *of finite-length such that*

(1) $\sigma \leq \Pi, \pi \leq \Pi$.
(2) $r_L^G(\pi) + r_L^G(\sigma) \not\leq r_L^G(\Pi)$.
(3) $r_L^G(\pi) \not\leq r_L^G(\sigma)$.

Then π is reducible. Moreover, π and σ share a common irreducible subquotient.

In many cases we are able to prove the reducibility of $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$ by applying Lemma 3.2 to the following data:

- $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$.
- $\Pi = i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d.})$, where $\lambda_{a.d.}$ is an anti-dominant exponent in the W_G-orbit of $r_M^T(\Omega)$.
- $\sigma = i_L^G\tau$, where L is a standard Levi of G and τ is a one-dimensional representation of L such that $r_T^L(\tau) \in W_G \cdot \lambda_{a.d.}$.

Here condition *(1)* is automatically satisfied. By [12, Lemma 3.4], it holds that

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(i_L^G\tau\right)\right) = |\operatorname{Stab}_{W_G}(\lambda_{a.d})|. \tag{3.1}$$

Hence, condition *(2)* of Lemma 3.2 is also satisfied. Condition *(3)*, on the other hand, needs to be checked for any candidate $\sigma = i_L^G\tau$ by comparing $mult\left(\lambda, r_T^G(\pi)\right)$ and $mult\left(\lambda, r_T^G(\sigma)\right)$ for any $\lambda \in r_T^G(\pi)$.

We point out that, in most cases where π is reducible, one can use a comparison with another degenerate principal series, that is, by taking $\sigma = i_L^G\tau$ with L being a maximal Levi subgroup too.

Note that τ is determined by $r_T^L(\tau)$. It follows that, since the number of standard Levi subgroups is finite and so is $W_G \cdot \lambda_{a.d.}$, the number of possible candidates $i_L^G\tau$ is finite.

3.3. **Non-Regular Case - Irreducibility Test**

We now describe the main method of proving the irreducibility of $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$ implemented in this paper.

We consider the set of functions

$$\mathcal{S} = \{f \,:\, \mathbf{X}(T) \to \mathbb{N} \,:\, f \text{ has a finite support }\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}$ has a natural partial order. To any admissible representation σ of G we associate a function $f_\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ by the following recipe

$$f_\sigma(\lambda) = mult\left(\lambda, r_T^G(\sigma)\right).$$

We say that a finite sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$ in $\mathcal{S}$ is **σ-dominated** if it satisfies:

$(F1)$ $f_k \le f_\sigma$ for every $k \le n$.

$(F2)$ $f_k \le f_{k+1}$ for every $k \le n$.

($F3$) There exists $\lambda' \in \mathbf{X}(T)$ such that $f_0(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 1 & \lambda = \lambda' \\ 0 & \lambda \neq \lambda'. \end{cases}$

If $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$ satisfies only ($F1$) and ($F2$), we say that it is **non-unital**.

Proposition 3.3. *If there exists an irreducible subquotient σ of π and a σ-dominated sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$ in $\mathcal{S}$ such that $f_n = f_\pi$, then π is irreducible and $\pi = \sigma$.*

The proof for this can be found in [12, Subsection 3.3]. We use Proposition 3.3 to show the irreducibility of π in many cases by the following construction.

Fix an anti-dominant exponent $\lambda_{a.d}$ of π. Since

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d})\right)\right),$$

any irreducible representation σ of G such that $\lambda_{a.d} \leq r_T^G(\sigma)$ is a subquotient of π. We fix such a σ and construct a σ-dominated sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$. Note that f_σ has finite support.

Let

$$\Gamma = \left\{ (\lambda, L, \tau) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} \lambda \in r_T^G \pi \\ L \text{ is a standard Levi subgroup of } G \\ \tau \text{ is the unique irreducible representaion of } L \text{ such that } \lambda \leq r_T^L(\tau) \end{array} \right\}.$$

The set Γ is finite since $W_G \cdot \lambda_{a.d.}$ is finite, the number of standard Levi subgroups is finite and that for each λ and L, $i_T^L \lambda$ is of finite length.

We construct the sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$ as follows:

(1) Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ be defined by $f_0(\lambda) = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda_{a.d}}$, where $\delta_{\lambda, \lambda_{a.d}}$ is the Kronecker delta function.

(2) Given the element f_k and a triple $(\lambda, L, \tau) \in \Gamma$, let $g \in \mathcal{S}$ be defined by

$$g(\mu) = \max\left\{ f_k(\mu), \left\lceil \frac{f_k(\lambda)}{mult\left(\lambda, r_T^L(\tau)\right)} \right\rceil \cdot mult\left(\mu, r_T^L(\tau)\right) \right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

(3) If $g > f_k$, take $f_{k+1} = g$ and go back to step (2).

(4) If $g = f_k$ for all triples $(\lambda, L, \tau) \in \Gamma$, take $n = k$. If $f_n = f_\pi$, then π is irreducible.

By [12, Subsection 3.3], the sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$ a σ-dominated sequence. Also, since Γ is finite and there are only finitely many $g \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $g < f_\sigma$, this process terminates

after a finite number of steps. We also note, that f_n is independent of the string of triples (λ, L, τ) chosen in step (2).

Note that, if $f_n \neq f_\pi$, it does not imply that π is reducible, as one can see from Proposition 4.5. Also, in this case, f_n is σ-dominated for any subquotient σ of π which satisfy $\lambda_{a.d.} \leq r_T^G(\pi)$.

Throughout this paper, when we say a **branching rule calculation** we refer to a σ-dominated sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$, not necessarily unital, constructed using steps (2) and (3) for a given f_0. We then interpret the sequence as the following inference rule

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathrm{Supp}\, f_0} f_0(\lambda) \times [\lambda] \leq r_T^G(\sigma) \quad \Rightarrow \sum_{\lambda \in \mathrm{Supp}\, f_n} f_n(\lambda) \times [\lambda] \leq r_T^G(\sigma).$$

The list of triples $(\lambda, L, \sigma) \in \Gamma$ which were used in this paper can be found in Appendix A. An explicit example for this process can be found in [12, Appendix A] and the proof of Proposition 4.5.

3.4. **Length of Maximal Semi-Simple Subrepresentation**

We now turn to the calculation of the length of the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation and quotient of $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$ when π is reducible. First we note that, by contragredience, it suffices to answer the former. Recall that, if τ is a subrepresentation of $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$, then, by induction in stages, one has $\tau \hookrightarrow i_T^G(\lambda_0)$, where $\lambda_0 = r_T^M(\Omega)$. Thus, by (2.5),

$$1 \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{Hom}_T\left(r_T^G(\tau), \lambda_0\right). \tag{3.3}$$

In particular, the length of the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of π is at most $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right)$.

Using Equation (3.3), we phrase a criterion for π to have a unique irreducible subrepresentation.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\lambda_0 = r_T^M(\Omega)$ be the leading exponent of $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$.*

1. *For any irreducible subrepresentation τ of $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$, it holds that $\lambda_0 \leq r_T^G(\tau)$.*
2. *If τ is an irreducible constituent of π which satisfy $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\tau)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right)$, then π admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation and this subrepresentation is τ.*

Proof. The first item is a direct consequence of Equation (2.5). For the second item, we argue as follows. By Proposition 3.4(1), each irreducible subrepresentation τ of π has $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\tau)\right) \neq 0$. However, there is exactly one irreducible constituent with that property. Hence, π admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation. □

As a result, in order to show that π admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation it would be enough to show one of the following:

- $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 1$.
- There exists a subquotient σ of π such that $\lambda_{a.d} \leq r_T^G(\sigma)$, and a σ-dominated sequence of functions $\{f_i\}_{i=0}^n$ such that $f_n(\lambda_0) = f_\pi(\lambda_0)$.

In some cases, where this approach does not suffice, we will use the following Corollary of Proposition 3.4 to prove that π admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation.

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$ admits an embedding into $i_T^G(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in W_G \cdot \lambda_0$, where $\lambda_0 = r_T^M(\Omega)$, and there is a unique irreducible constituent τ of π such that $mult\left(\lambda, r_T^G(\tau)\right) = mult\left(\lambda, r_T^G(\pi)\right)$. Then, π has a unique irreducible subrepresentation.*

A direct computation shows that, if $\mathrm{Re}(s_0) > 0$, then $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 1$. In particular, π admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation. As a result we will consider only the cases where $\mathrm{Re}(s_0) \leq 0$.

4. The Degenerate Principal Series of E_7

In this section we state and prove our main theorem using the algorithm and tools presented in Section 3. The outline of this section is as follows:

- In Subsection 4.1, we recall the structure of the split, simple, simply-connected exceptional group of type E_7.
- In Subsection 4.2, we state our main theorem about the points of reducibility of the degenerate principal series of G and the length of the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation.
- In Subsection 4.3 and Subsection 4.4 we prove the theorem. Subsection 4.3 is dedicated to the cases where the algorithm in Section 3 yielded a complete answer, the remaining cases are dealt with in Subsection 4.4.


4.1. **The Structure of the Exceptional Group of Type E_7**

Let G be the split, semi-simple, simply-connected group of type E_7. In this section we describe the structure of G and set notations for the rest of the section. We fix a Borel subgroup B and a maximal split torus $T \subset B$. The set of roots, Φ_G, contains 126 roots. The group G is generated by symbols

$$\{x_\alpha(r) \,:\, \alpha \in \Phi_G, r \in F\}$$

subject to the Chevalley relations as in [22, Section 6].

We label the simple roots Δ_G and the Dynkin diagram of G as follows:



Recall that for $\Theta \subset \Delta_G$ we denote by M_Θ the standard Levi subgroup of G such that $\Delta_M = \Theta$. If P is a maximal parabolic subgroup, we let M_i denote the Levi subgroup of $P_i = P_{\Delta_G \setminus \{\alpha_i\}}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Under these notations, it holds that:*

(1) $M_1 \simeq GSpin_{12}$.
(2) $M_2 \simeq GL_7$.
(3) $M_3 = \{(g_1, g_2) \in GL_2 \times GL_6 \,:\, \det g_1 = \det g_2\}$.
(4) $M_4 = \{(g_1, g_2, g_3) \in GL_2 \times GL_3 \times GL_4 \,:\, \det g_1 = \det g_2 = \det g_3\}$.
(5) $M_5 = \{(g_1, g_2) \in GL_5 \times GL_3 \,:\, \det g_1 = \det g_2\}$.
(6) $M_6 = \{(g_1, g_2) \in GL_2 \times GSpin_{10} \,:\, \det g_1 = \det g_2\}$.
(7) $M_7 \simeq GE_6$

We record here, for $1 \le i \le 7$, the cardinality of $W^{M_i,T}$, the set of shortest representatives of W_G / W_{M_i}

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$\lvert W^{M_i,T}\rvert$	126	576	2,016	10,080	4,032	756	56

We also mention that $|W_G| = 2,903,040$. By Equation (2.1), every $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}(T)$ is of the form

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{7} \Omega_{\alpha_i} \circ \bar{\omega}_{\alpha_i}.$$

As a shorthand, we will write

$$\begin{pmatrix} & \Omega_2 & & & & \\ \Omega_1 & \Omega_3 & \Omega_4 & \Omega_5 & \Omega_6 & \Omega_7 \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^{7} \Omega_{\alpha_i} \circ \bar{\omega}_{\alpha_i}.$$

Also, let $\begin{bmatrix} & \Omega_2 & & & & \\ \Omega_1 & \Omega_3 & \Omega_4 & \Omega_5 & \Omega_6 & \Omega_7 \end{bmatrix}$ denote its class in $\mathfrak{R}(T)$.

4.2. **Main Theorem**

Theorem 4.2. *(1) For any $1 \leq i \leq 7$, all reducible regular $i^G_{M_i}(\Omega_{M_i,s,\chi})$ and all non-regular $i^G_{M_i}(\Omega_{M_i,s,\chi})$ are given in the following tables. For every maximal parabolic subgroup P_i, the table lists the values of $s \leq 0$ and $k = ord(\chi)$ such that π is regular and reducible or non-regular. In particular, irr. stands for non-regular and reducible, red. stands for non-regular and reducible, while red.* stands for regular and reducible. For any triple $[i, s, k]$, not appearing in the table, the degenerate principal series $i^G_{M_i}(\Omega_{M_i,s,\chi})$, with $ord(\chi) = k$, is regular and irreducible.*

- *For $P = P_1$*

$ord(\chi)$ \ s	$-\frac{17}{2}$	$-\frac{15}{2}$	$-\frac{13}{2}$	$-\frac{11}{2}$	$-\frac{9}{2}$	$-\frac{7}{2}$	$-\frac{5}{2}$	$-\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
1	*red.**	*irr.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*
2									*red.**	*irr.*

Table 1: P_1- Reducibility Points

- *For $P = P_2$*

$ord(\chi)$ \ s	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	$-\frac{3}{2}$	-1	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
1	*red.**	*irr.*	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*
2						*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*red.*

Table 2: P_2- Reducibility Points

- *For $P = P_3$*

$ord(\chi)$ \ s	$-\frac{11}{2}$	$-\frac{9}{2}$	$-\frac{7}{2}$	$-\frac{5}{2}$	-2	$-\frac{3}{2}$	-1	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{6}$	0
1	*red.**	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*
2				*red.**	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*red.*		*irr.*
3								*red.**	*irr.*	

Table 3: P_3- Reducibility Points

- *For $P = P_4$*

$ord(\chi)$ \ s	-4	-3	-2	$-\frac{3}{2}$	-1	$-\frac{2}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	0
1	*red.**	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*
2			*red.**	*red.*	*red.*		*red.*		*irr.*	*red.*
3					*red.**	*red.*		*irr.*		*irr.*
4							*red.*		*irr.*	*irr.*

Table 4: P_4- Reducibility Points

- *For* $P = P_5$

$ord(\chi)$ \ s	-5	-4	-3	-2	$-\frac{3}{2}$	-1	$-\frac{2}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	0
1	*red.**	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*
2				*red.*	*red.*	*red.*		*irr.*		*irr.*
3						*red.**	*irr.*		*irr.*	*irr.*

Table 5: P_5- Reducibility Points

- *For* $P = P_6$

$ord(\chi)$ \ s	$-\frac{13}{2}$	$-\frac{11}{2}$	$-\frac{9}{2}$	$-\frac{7}{2}$	$-\frac{5}{2}$	-2	$-\frac{3}{2}$	-1	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
1	*red.**	*red.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*
2					*red.**	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*

Table 6: P_6- Reducibility Points

- *For* $P = P_7$

$ord(\chi)$ \ s	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0
1	*red.**	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*irr.*	*red.*	*irr.*
2										*red.*

Table 7: P_7- Reducibility Points

(2) With the exception of the cases listed below, $\pi = i_{M_i}^G(\Omega_{M_i,s,\chi})$ admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation. In the remaining cases, listed below, the length of the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation is 2*:*

(a) $i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-1,triv})$.
(b) $i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,0,\chi})$, *where* $ord(\chi)=2$.
(c) $i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-2,\chi})$, *where* $ord(\chi)=2$.
(d) $i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,0,\chi})$, *where* $ord(\chi)=2$.
(e) $i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,-\frac{1}{2},\chi})$, *where* $ord(\chi)=4$.
(f) $i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,-2,\chi})$, *where* $ord(\chi)=2$.
(g) $i_{M_7}^G(\Omega_{M_7,0,\chi})$, *where* $ord(\chi)=2$.

Remark 4.3. We point out that the results depend only on $ord(\chi)$ and not on the choice of χ.

Remark 4.4. The reducibility of the degenerate principal series of G can be partially studied using the results of [19, Section 3], in the unramified case, and [26], in the case of $M=M_7$. The results of both agree with our calculations.

Furthermore, by [26], the unique irreducible subrepresentation in the case $[7,-5,1]$ is the minimal representation of G. From the proof of Theorem 5.2, it follows that the minimal representation is also the unique irreducible subrepresentation of $[1,-11/2,1]$ and $[2,-5,1]$.

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 4.2 - Part I**

For most triples (M_i,s,χ), the proof of the reducibility or irreducibility of $\pi=i_{M_i}^G(\Omega_{M_i,s,\chi})$ and the proof that it admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation can be performed using the algorithm outlined in Section 3. More precisely:

- For most proofs of reducibility, we use Lemma 3.2 with π as above, Π being $i_T^G(r_T^{M_i}(\Omega_{M_1,s,\chi}))$ and σ is given in Tables 8 through 15. A triple $[j,t,k]$ stands for a degenerate principal series $\sigma=i_{M_j}^G(\Omega_{M_j,t,\chi})$, where $ord(\chi)=k$, while a triple $[(j_1,j_2),(s_1,s_2),(k_1,k_2)]$ stands for $i_M^G(\Omega)$, where $M=M_{\Delta_G\setminus\{\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}\}}$ and

$$\Omega=(s_1+\chi_1)\circ\bar{\omega}_{j_1}+(s_2+\chi_2)\circ\bar{\omega}_{j_2},\quad \text{where } ord(\chi_i)=j_i.$$

  - For $P=P_1$

s \ $ord(\chi)$	1
$-\frac{11}{2}$	$[2,-5,1]$
$-\frac{7}{2}$	$\left[6,-\frac{7}{2},1\right]$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$[(2,7),(1,3),(0,0)]$

Table 8: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i_{M_1}^G(\Omega_{M_{1,s,\chi}})$

– For $P = P_2$

s \ $ord(\chi)$	1	2
-5	$\left[1,-\frac{11}{2},1\right]$	
-4	$[7,-2,1]$	
-3	$\left[1,-\frac{3}{2},1\right]$	
-2	$[(6,7),(2,4),(0,0)]$	$[5,-2,2]$
-1	$\left[3,-\frac{3}{2},1\right]$	

Table 9: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_{2,s,\chi}})$

– For $P = P_3$

s \ $ord(\chi)$	1	2
$-\frac{9}{2}$	$\left[1,-\frac{13}{2},1\right]$	
$-\frac{7}{2}$	$[7,-3,1]$	
$-\frac{5}{2}$	$\left[1,-\frac{1}{2},1\right]$	
$-\frac{3}{2}$	$[2,-1,1]$	$\left[6,-\frac{1}{2},2\right]$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$[(2,3),(1,2),(0,0)]$	$[(2,3),(1,2),(0,1)]$

Table 10: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i_{M_3}^G(\Omega_{M_{3,s,\chi}})$

– For $P = P_4$

s \ $ord(\chi)$	1	2
-3	$\left[1,-\frac{11}{2},1\right]$	
-2	$\left[1,-\frac{1}{2},1\right]$	
$-\frac{3}{2}$	$[6,-1,1]$	$[6,-1,2]$
-1	$\left[3,-\frac{1}{2},1\right]$	$\left[3,-\frac{1}{2},2\right]$
$-\frac{2}{3}$	$\left[5,-\frac{1}{3},1\right]$	
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\left[(2,6),\left(3,\frac{5}{2}\right),(0,0)\right]$	$\left[(5,7),\left(\frac{7}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right),(1,1)\right]$
0		$[(1,4),(1,2),(1,0)]$

Table 11: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_{4,s,\chi}})$ - part 1

s \ $ord(\chi)$	3	4
$-\frac{2}{3}$	$\left[(4,7),\left(\frac{10}{3},-\frac{7}{3}\right),(1,2)\right]$	
$-\frac{1}{2}$		$\left[(2,5),\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{5}{2}\right),(1,1)\right]$

Table 12: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i^G_{M_4}(\Omega_{M_{4,s,\chi}})$ - part 2

– For $P = P_5$

s \ $ord(\chi)$	1	2
-4	$[7,-6,1]$	
-3	$\left[1,-\frac{7}{2},1\right]$	
-2	$[2,-2,1]$	$[2,-2,2]$
$-\frac{3}{2}$	$\left[2,-\frac{1}{2},1\right]$	$\left[2,-\frac{1}{2},2\right]$
-1	$\left[3,-\frac{1}{2},1\right]$	$[(1,2),(3,3),(0,1)]$

Table 13: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i^G_{M_5}(\Omega_{M_{5,s,\chi}})$

– For $P = P_6$

s \ $ord(\chi)$	1
$-\frac{11}{2}$	$[7,-7,1]$
$-\frac{7}{2}$	$\left[1,-\frac{7}{2},1\right]$
$-\frac{5}{2}$	$\left[1,-\frac{1}{2},1\right]$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$[2,-1,1]$

Table 14: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i_{M_6}^G(\Omega_{M_{6,s,\chi}})$

– For $P = P_7$

s \ $ord(\chi)$	1
-5	$\left[1,-\frac{11}{2},1\right]$
-1	$\left[1,-\frac{7}{2},1\right]$

Table 15: Data for the proof of the reducibility of $i_{M_7}^G(\Omega_{M_{7,s,\chi}})$

- The irreducibility of π is proven, in most cases, using the algorithm in Subsection 3.3. We start with an anti-dominant exponent $\lambda_{a.d}$ and a function $f_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ given by $f_0 = \delta_{\lambda_{a.d}}$ and an irreducible subquotient σ of π such that $\lambda_{a.d} \leq r_T^G(\sigma)$. Using the branching rules in Appendix A, we construct a σ-dominated sequence in $\mathcal{S}$ such that, at some point, $f_n = f_\pi$.
- For most reducible π in the list which admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation, this can be proven using the algorithm described in Subsection 3.4.

  We point out that, in the case $[4,0,2]$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 and Equation (3.3) that, since $i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_{4,0,\chi}})$ is reducible and semi-simple such that $r_T^G\left(i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_{4,0,\chi}})\right)$ contains the initial exponent with multiplicity 2, then it is of length 2.
- For a number of cases, listed below, the algorithm of Section 3 was inconclusive. These cases are treated separately, with different methods, in Subsection 4.4.

- Irreducible points: $[4,0,1]$, $[5,0,1]$, $[5,0,2]$.
- Unique irreducible subrepresentation: $[4,-\frac{1}{2},4]$, $[4,-1,1]$ and $[5,-1,1]$.
- Maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of length 2: $[2,0,2]$, $[2,-1,1]$, $[2,-2,2]$ and $[5,-2,2]$, $[7,0,2]$.

4.4. **Proof of Theorem 4.2 - Part II, the Remaining Cases**

In this subsection we deal with the remaining cases in which the algorithm in Section 3 was inconclusive.

Proposition 4.5. *The representation $\pi = i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_0)$ is irreducible.*

Proof. We begin by noting that π is unitary and hence semi-simple. Therefore, in order to show irreducibility, it is enough to show that it admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation. For this purpose, we fix the following notations

$$\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & 0 & & & \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \lambda_0 = \begin{bmatrix} & & -1 & & & \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 4 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\lambda_1 = \begin{bmatrix} & & -1 & & & \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \lambda_2 = \begin{bmatrix} & & -1 & & & \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

and proceed as follows:

- Let σ be an irreducible constituent of π having $mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) \neq 0$. Using a sequence of branching rules we show that

  $$mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 216.$$

  This calculation is preformed in Table 16 below.
- Let τ be an irreducible constituent of π having $\lambda_2 \leq r_T^G(\tau)$. Applying a sequence of branching rules, detailed in Table 17 below, yields that

  $$mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\tau)\right) \geq 12.$$

  It follows that $\tau = \sigma$ is the unique irreducible subquotient of π having

  $$mult\left(\lambda_2, r_T^G(\tau)\right) \neq 0.$$

  In particular,

  $$mult\left(\lambda_2, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_2, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 72.$$

- Applying a sequence of branching rules, summarized in Table 18 below, it follows that

$$mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 2.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.4(2), π admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation, and hence, π is irreducible.

We explain how the following tables should be read. Each line represents a branching rule of the type

$$k \times [\lambda] \leq r_T^G(\tau) \Rightarrow l \times [\mu] \leq r_T^G(\tau).$$

The first two columns are λ and k, then the third lists the type of the rule, as it is labeled in Appendix A, the forth is the Levi subgroup with respect to which it is applied. For shorthand, we write $\{b_1, \dots b_d\}$ for the Levi subgroup M which has $\Delta_M = \{\alpha_j : j \in \{b_1, \dots b_d\}\}$. The fifth column lists the Weyl element which is applied. The last two columns list μ and l.

σ						
λ	k	Rule	Levi	Weyl word	μ	l
$\lambda_{a.d}$	1	OR			$\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \end{bmatrix}$	288
$\lambda_{a.d}$	288	A_4	$\{4,5,6,7\}$	s_{α_4}	$\lambda_1 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \end{bmatrix}$	216

Table 16: Proposition 4.5, part 1

τ						
λ	k	Rule	Levi	Weyl word	μ	l
λ_2	1	OR			$\lambda_2 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \end{bmatrix}$	36
λ_2	36	A_3	$\{1,3,4\}$	$s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_1}$	$\lambda_1 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \end{bmatrix}$	12

Table 17: Proposition 4.5, part 2

σ						
λ	k	Rule	Levi	Weyl word	μ	l
λ_2	72	A_3	$\{2,3,4\}$	$s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}$	$\lambda_3 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & 0 & & \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	24
λ_3	24	A_1		$s_{\alpha_7}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_5}$	$\lambda_4 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & 0 & & \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	24
λ_4	24	A_3	$\{4,5,6\}$	$s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_4}$	$\lambda_5 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & 1 & & \\ 1 & -2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	8
λ_5	8	A_1		$s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_7}$	$\lambda_6 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & -1 & & \\ -1 & 0 & 2 & -1 & -2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	8
λ_6	8	A_2	$\{1,3\}$	s_{α_1}	$\lambda_7 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & -1 & & \\ 1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & -2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	4
λ_7	4	A_1		$s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_7}s_{\alpha_6}$	$\lambda_8 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & -1 & & \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 3 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$	4
λ_8	4	A_2	$\{4,5\}$	s_{α_4}	$\lambda_9 = \begin{bmatrix} & & -2 & & & \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & -1 & 3 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$	2
λ_9	2	A_1		$s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}$	$\lambda_0 = \begin{bmatrix} & & & -1 & & \\ -1 & -1 & - & 4 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$	2

Table 18: Proposition 4.5, part 3

□

Proposition 4.6. *The following representations admit a unique irreducible subrepresentation:*

(1) $i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,-1})$.
(2) $i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,-1})$.

Proof. We start by recalling more properties of the standard intertwining operators. Let M be a standard Levi subgroup of G. To $w \in W_M$ we may associate an intertwining operator

$$\mathcal{M}_w^M \ : \ i_T^M(\lambda) \to i_T^M(w \cdot \lambda)$$

on the unramified principal series $i_T^M(\lambda)$ in a similar fashion to that of Subsection 2.4. By Equation (2.8) and the induction in stages $i_T^G(\lambda) = i_M^G\left(i_T^M(\lambda)\right)$, it follows that:

$$\mathcal{M}_w(f)(g) = \mathcal{M}_w^M(f(g)) \quad \forall f \in i_M^G\left(i_T^M(\lambda)\right), \quad g \in G. \tag{4.1}$$

Given an irreducible subrepresentation of σ of $i_T^M(\lambda)$ such that $\mathcal{M}_w^M\Big|_\sigma$ is injective , it follows from Equation (4.1) that $\mathcal{M}_w\Big|_{i_M^G(\sigma)}$ is also injective.

(1) Denote $M = M_{\{\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_5,\alpha_6\}}$ and $L = M_{\{\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_5,\alpha_4,\alpha_6\}}$ and let $Triv_M$ be the trivial representation of M. By induction in stages, one has

$$\begin{aligned} i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,-1}) &\hookrightarrow i_{M_4}^G(i_M^{M_4}(Triv_M)\otimes\Omega_{M_4,-1}) \\ &\hookrightarrow i_M^G(-\bar{\omega}_4 \underbrace{-\frac{1}{2}(3\bar{\omega}_1+6\bar{\omega}_4+4\bar{\omega}_7)}_{\rho_M} + \frac{1}{2}\underbrace{(8\bar{\omega}_4)}_{\rho_{M_4}}) \simeq i_M^G(-\frac{3}{2}\bar{\omega}_1 - 2\bar{\omega}_7) \\ &\simeq i_L^G(i_M^L(\Omega_{M,0}^L)\otimes -\frac{3}{2}\bar{\omega}_1 - 2\bar{\omega}_7). \end{aligned}$$

Denote the right hand side by Π. Let $u = s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}$. By Lemma A.7 (after relabeling), the operator $\mathcal{M}_u(\lambda_0)$ induces an injection,

$$\Pi \hookrightarrow i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d}),$$

where $\lambda_{a.d}$ is the anti-dominant exponent of π and $\lambda_0 = r_T^{M_4}(\Omega_{M_4,-1})$. By the Langlands' unique irreducible subrepresentation theorem [15, Section 1], Π admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation. Since $\pi \hookrightarrow \Pi$, so does π.

(2) In order to show that $\pi = i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,-1})$ admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation, we proceed as follows.

- Let $\lambda_{a.d}$ be the anti-dominant exponent of π. Set σ to be the unique irreducible subquotient of π having $mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) \neq 0$. In that case, it follows from the rule (OR), see Appendix A, that

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) = 72, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_{a.d} = -\bar{\omega}_4 - \bar{\omega}_7.$$

- On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1, it follows that $mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 48$, where $\lambda_1 = s_{\alpha_7}\lambda_{a.d}$.
- Applying the rule (A_n) on $\lambda_{a.d}$ with respect to $M_{\{\alpha_5,\alpha_6,\alpha_7\}}$ implies that

$$mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) \geq 48 = mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\pi)\right).$$

- Hence, σ is the unique irreducible constituent of π with the property

$$mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) \neq 0.$$

- Let $M = M_{\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_4,\alpha_6\}}$ and $L = M_{\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_4,\alpha_5,\alpha_6\}}$. Then, by induction in stages, one has

$$\begin{aligned} i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,-1}) \hookrightarrow i_M^G &\left(-\bar{\omega}_5 - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}(9\bar{\omega}_5 + 3\bar{\omega}_7)}_{\rho_M} + \underbrace{5\bar{\omega}_5}_{\rho_{M_5}} \right) \\ \simeq i_M^G &\left(-\frac{1}{2}\bar{\omega}_5 - \frac{3}{2}\bar{\omega}_7 \right) \simeq i_L^G \left(i_M^L(\Omega_{M,-\frac{1}{2}}^L) \otimes -\frac{7}{3}\bar{\omega}_7 \right). \end{aligned}$$

  Denote the right hand side by Π.
- Let $u = s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_5}$. By Lemma A.8, $\mathcal{M}_u\Big|_{\Pi}$ is injective. Hence,

$$\pi \hookrightarrow \Pi \hookrightarrow i_T^G(\lambda_1).$$

- Applying Corollary 3.5, the claim follows.

□

Proposition 4.7. *Let χ be a character of order 2. Then*

(1) $i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,0,\chi})$ and $i_{M_7}^G(\Omega_{M_7,0,\chi})$ are semi-simple unitary representations of length 2.
(2) $i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-2,\chi})$ and $i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,-2,\chi})$ admit a maximal semi-simple representation of length 2.
(3) $i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,0,\chi})$ is irreducible.

Proof. In all cases, π satisfies $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 2$, where λ_0 is the leading exponent of π.

For each case, we will fix an anti-dominant exponent $\lambda_{a.d}$ and a Levi subgroup L of G such that $i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})$ is tempered and for each irreducible constituent σ of $i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})$, $i_L^G(\sigma)$ is a standard module, in the sense of [3, Section 1]. We then use Langlands' unique irreducible subrepresentation theorem to determine the reducibility and number of irreducible subrepresentations of π.

In order to decompose $i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})$ into irreducible constituents, we first restrict it to the derived subgroup L^{der} and decompose it as a representation of L^{der}. We then study the way in which these irreducible representations of L^{der} are glued into the irreducible constituents of $i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})$ as a representation of L.

In particular, if $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega_{M,0,\chi})$, then π is unitary and semi-simple of length at most 2. Hence, it is of length 2 if and only if it is reducible.

(1) $\underline{i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,0,\chi})}$ Let $\pi = i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,0,\chi})$ and fix an anti-dominant exponent

$$\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & \chi & & & \\ \chi, & \chi, & -1, & \chi, & -1, & \chi \end{bmatrix}$$

of π. We start by studying the principal series representation $i_T^L \lambda_{a.d.}$, where $L = M_{\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_5,\alpha_7\}}$. We note that

$$L^{der} = \mathrm{SL}_3^{\alpha_1,\alpha_3} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_2} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_5} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_7},$$

where the superscripts indicate the simple roots in the copy of SL_2. By [10], it holds that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})\Big|_{L^{der}} = \bigoplus_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3 \in \{\pm 1\}} \underbrace{\sigma_\chi^{(3)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_1,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_2,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_3,\chi}^{(2)}}_{\tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}},$$

where $\sigma_\chi^{(3)} = i_{T_{\mathrm{SL}_3}}^{\mathrm{SL}_3}(\chi \circ (\bar{\omega}_1 + \bar{\omega}_3))$ is irreducible, and $i_{T_{\mathrm{SL}_2}}^{\mathrm{SL}_2}(\chi) = \sigma_{1,\chi}^{(2)} \oplus \sigma_{-1,\chi}^{(2)}$ is semi-simple of length 2.

Let ϖ be the uniformizer. We recall that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi \end{pmatrix} \cdot \sigma_{\epsilon,\chi}^{(2)} = \sigma_{-\epsilon,\chi}^{(2)}.$$

Hence, $\alpha_4^\vee(\varpi)\tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3} = \tau_{-\epsilon_1,-\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}$ and $\alpha_6^\vee(\varpi)\tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3} = \tau_{\epsilon_1,-\epsilon_2,-\epsilon_3}$.
Since $L = \langle L^{der}, \alpha_4^\vee(x_1), \alpha_6^\vee(x_2) \ : \ x_1, x_2 \in F \rangle$, it follows that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d}) = \tau_{-1} \oplus \tau_1,$$

where $\tau_\epsilon = \sum_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2\epsilon_3=\epsilon} \tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}$ are irreducible tempered representations of L. Namely, $i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})$ is semi-simple of length 2, and each irreducible constituent is glued out of 4 irreducible representations of L^{der}.

By the Langlands' subrepresentation theorem, each $i_L^G(\tau_\epsilon)$ admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation, say Π_ϵ. By Proposition 3.4(1),

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\Pi_\epsilon)\right) \geq 1.$$

In particular, there are at least two irreducible subquotients of $i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d})$ having $\lambda_{a.d}$ as an exponent. Since

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d})\right)\right),$$

it follows that π is reducible.

$\underline{i_{M_7}^G(\Omega_{M_7,0,\chi})}$ Let $\pi = i_{M_7}^G(\Omega_{M_7,0,\chi})$ and fix an anti-dominant exponent

$$\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & \chi & & \\ -1, & -1, & -1, & \chi, & -1, & \chi \end{bmatrix}$$

of π. Similarly to the previous case, we study the principal series representation $i_T^L\lambda_{a.d.}$, where $L = M_{\{\alpha_2,\alpha_5,\alpha_7\}}$. We note that

$$L^{der} = \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_2} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_5} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_7}$$

By [10], it holds that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})\Big|_{L^{der}} = \bigoplus_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3\in\{\pm1\}} \underbrace{\sigma_{\epsilon_1,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_2,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_3,\chi}^{(2)}}_{\tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}}.$$

Since $L = \langle L^{der}, \alpha_1^\vee(x_1), \alpha_3^\vee(x_2), \alpha_4^\vee(x_3)\alpha_6^\vee(x_4) \,:\, x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4 \in F\rangle$, it follows that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d}) = \tau_{-1} \oplus \tau_1,$$

where $\tau_\epsilon = \sum_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2\epsilon_3=\epsilon} \tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3}$ are irreducible tempered representations of L. Namely, $i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})$ is semi-simple of length 2, and each irreducible constituent is glued out of 4 irreducible representations of L^{der}.

The remainder of the argument is identical to the previous case.

(2) Let π be $i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-2,\chi})$ or $i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,-2,\chi})$. Both representations admit the following anti-dominant exponent,

$$\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & \chi & & \\ -1, & \chi, & -1, & \chi, & -1, & \chi \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $L = M_{\{\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_5,\alpha_7\}}$ and note that

$$L^{der} = \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_2} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_3} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_5} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_7}.$$

It holds that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})\Big|_{L^{der}} = \bigoplus_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4\in\{\pm1\}} \underbrace{\sigma_{\epsilon_1,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_2,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_3,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon_4,\chi}^{(2)}}_{\tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4}}.$$

Since $L = \langle L^{der}, \alpha_1^\vee(x_1), \alpha_4^\vee(x_2)\alpha_6^\vee(x_3) \ : \ x_1, x_2, x_3 \in F \rangle$, it follows that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d}) = \tau_{-1} \oplus \tau_1,$$

where $\tau_\epsilon = \sum_{\epsilon_2\epsilon_3\epsilon_4=\epsilon} \tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4}$ are irreducible tempered representations of L. Namely, $i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})$ is semi-simple of length 2, and each irreducible constituent is glued out of 8 irreducible representations of L^{der}.

By the Langlands' subrepresentation theorem, each $i_L^G(\tau_\epsilon)$ admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation, say Π_ϵ. Furthermore, by Proposition 3.4(1), it holds that

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(\Pi_\epsilon\right)\right) \geq 1.$$

Since

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(\pi\right)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d})\right)\right) = 2,$$

it follows that $\Pi_1 \oplus \Pi_{-1}$ is the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of $i_T^G\lambda_{a.d.}$. On the other hand,

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(\pi\right)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d})\right)\right) = 2,$$

and hence, both Π_1 and Π_{-1} are subquotients of π. On the other hand, a branching rule calculation shows that

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(\Pi_\epsilon\right)\right) \geq 1.$$

Let λ_0 be the initial exponent of π and

$$w = \begin{cases} s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_1}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}, & \pi = i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-2,\chi}) \\ s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_5}, & \pi = i_{M_5}^G(\Omega_{M_5,-2,\chi}). \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_w\left(\lambda_0\right)$ is an isomorphism, it follows that $\pi \hookrightarrow i_T^G\lambda_{a.d.}$. It follows that $\Pi_1 \oplus \Pi_{-1}$ is the unique irreducible subrepresentation of π.

(3) Let

$$\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & \chi & & & \\ \chi, & \chi, & -1, & \chi, & \chi, & \chi \end{bmatrix}$$

and let $L = M_4$. We note that

$$L^{der} = \mathrm{SL}_3^{\alpha_1,\alpha_3} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_2} \times \mathrm{SL}_4^{\alpha_5,\alpha_6,\alpha_7}$$

and that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})\Big|_{L^{der}} = \bigoplus_{\epsilon\in\{\pm 1\}} \underbrace{\sigma_\chi^{(3)} \boxtimes \sigma_{\epsilon,\chi}^{(2)} \boxtimes \sigma_\chi^{(4)}}_{\tau_\epsilon},$$

where $\sigma_{\epsilon,\chi}^{(2)}, \sigma_\chi^{(3)}$ are as above and $\sigma_\chi^{(4)} = i_{T_{\mathrm{SL}_4}}^{\mathrm{SL}_4}(\chi \circ (\bar{\omega}_1 + \bar{\omega}_2 + \bar{\omega}_3))$ is irreducible by [10].

Since $L = \langle L^{der}, \alpha_4^\vee(x) \,:\, x \in F\rangle$ and $\alpha_4^\vee(\bar{\omega}) \cdot \tau_\epsilon = \tau_{-\epsilon}$, it follows that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d}) = \tau,$$

where $\tau = \tau_1 \oplus \tau_{-1}$ is an irreducible tempered representation of L, glued from 2 irreducible representations of L^{der}. Hence, $i_L^G(\tau)$ is a standard module and, by the Langlands' subrepresentation theorem, it admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation Π. Furthermore, $mult\left(\Pi, i_L^G(\tau)\right) = 1$.

By Proposition 3.4(1), Π is the unique subquotient of $i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d}) = i_M^G(\tau)$ satisfying

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\Pi)\right) \neq 0.$$

Otherwise, there would be a different subquotient Π' of $i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d})$ such that

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(\Pi'\right)\right) \neq 0.$$

This implies that either $\Pi \simeq \Pi'$ or, by a central character argument, see [12, Lemma. 3.12], that

$$\Pi' \hookrightarrow i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d}).$$

Both would bring us to a contradiction. See [3, §5] for an alternative proof of this fact.

We conclude that

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\Pi)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G\left(i_T^G(\lambda_{a.d})\right)\right) = 16.$$

A branching rule calculation implies that

$$16 \times [\lambda_{a.d}] \leq r_T^G(\Pi) \Rightarrow 2 \times [\lambda_0] \leq r_T^G(\Pi).$$

Namely, there exist a non-unital σ-dominated sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$ in $\mathcal{S}$ such that $f_0(\lambda_{a.d.}) = 16$ and $f_n(\lambda_0) = 2$. Hence, $\Pi = \pi$ is irreducible.

□

Remark 4.8. This method can also be used to prove that $i_{M_7}^G(\Omega_{M_7,0,\chi})$ is of length 2.

Similarly, we prove the following.

Proposition 4.9. *Let χ be a finite character of order 4. Then, the representation $\pi = i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,-\frac{1}{2},\chi})$ admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation.*

Proof. Let $\lambda_0 = r_T^{M_4}\left(\Omega_{M_4,-\frac{1}{2},\chi}\right)$ and fix an anti-dominant exponent

$$\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & 2\chi & & & \\ -\frac{1}{2}+3\chi, & 2\chi, & -\frac{1}{2}+\chi, & \chi, & -\frac{1}{2}+3\chi, & 2\chi \end{bmatrix}$$

of π. We remind the reader that we use an additive notation for $\mathbf{X}(F^\times)$, namely,

$$(n\chi)(x) = (\chi(x))^n.$$

Let $L = M_{\{\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_5,\alpha_7\}}$ and note that

$$L^{der} = \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_2} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_3} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_5} \times \mathrm{SL}_2^{\alpha_7}\,.$$

We note that 2χ is a character of order 2. As in case (2) of Proposition 4.7, it holds that

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d})\Big|_{L^{der}} = \bigoplus_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4\in\{\pm1\}} \underbrace{\sigma^{(2)}_{\epsilon_1,2\chi} \boxtimes \sigma^{(2)}_{\epsilon_2,2\chi} \boxtimes \sigma^{(2)}_{\epsilon_3,2\chi} \boxtimes \sigma^{(2)}_{\epsilon_4,2\chi}}_{\tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4}}$$

and

$$i_T^L(\lambda_{a.d}) = \tau_{-1} \oplus \tau_1,$$

where $\tau_\epsilon = \sum_{\epsilon_2\epsilon_3\epsilon_4=\epsilon} \tau_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4}$ are irreducible tempered representations of L. By the Langlands' subrepresentation theorem, each $i_L^G(\tau_\epsilon)$ admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation, say Π_ϵ. Further more, a similar argument shows that $\Pi_1 \oplus \Pi_{-1}$ is the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of $i_T^G\lambda_{a.d.}$ and that both Π_1 and Π_{-1} are subquotients of π.

The intertwining operator $\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda_0)$, where

$$w = s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_1}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_1}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_4},$$

is an isomorphism and hence $\pi \hookrightarrow i_T^G\lambda_{a.d.}$. It follows that $\Pi_1 \oplus \Pi_{-1}$ is the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of π.

□

Next we turn to deal with two cases where we were not able to determine the length of the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation using the tools described in Section 3. We deal with these cases using a calculation in the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of G, which can be

done since both of these representations are unramified. We outline the proof here, while the part which uses the Iwahori-Hecke algebra is left to Appendix B.

Proposition 4.10.

(1) The representation $\pi = i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-1})$ admits a maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of length two.
(2) The representation $\pi = i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,0})$ is irreducible.

Proof. Both cases are proven using the same approach. We first outline our approach and then list the data required for each case, while postponing part of the calculation to Appendix B. Let π be one of the above representations, λ_0 (resp. $\lambda_{a.d}$) be the leading (resp. anti-dominant) exponent of π and note that $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 2$. Hence, the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of π is of length at most 2.

We choose a subrepresentation σ of π, a Weyl element $w \in W^{M,T}$ and an exponent $\lambda_1 = w \cdot \lambda_0$, which satisfy the following properties:

- $mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = mult\left(\lambda_1, r_T^G(\sigma)\right) \neq 0$. In particular, σ is the unique subquotient of π with λ_1 as an exponent.
- $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is non-zero.

Such triples (σ, w, λ_1) exist as will be shown bellow. We start by explaining how such a triple can be used in order to determine the length of the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of π.

Let (σ, w, λ_1) be such a triple. It follows from Proposition 3.4(1) that σ is the unique subquotient of π which admits an embedding into $i_T^G\lambda_1$. It also follows that σ appears in π with multiplicity one.

By our assumptions, the image of $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is a non-zero subrepresentation of $i_T^G\lambda_1$ and hence,

$$\lambda_1 \leq r_T^G\left(N_w(\lambda_0)(\pi)\right).$$

In particular, one concludes that σ is the unique irreducible subrepresentation of the image $N_w(\lambda_0)(\pi)$. Since it appears in π with multiplicity one, it is not contained in the kernel.

On the other hand, any other irreducible subrepresentation of π is necessarily contained in the kernel of $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$. More precisely,

- Assume that $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is not injective and let $\tau \neq 0$ be an irreducible subrepresentation of $\ker N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$. In particular, $\tau \neq \sigma$, since σ appears in π with multiplicity 1. Hence, $\sigma \oplus \tau$ is the maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of π.
- Assume that $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is injective. It follows that $\pi \hookrightarrow i_T^G \lambda_1$. In this case, any subrepresentation of π, is a subrepresentation of $i_T^G \lambda_1$. Since σ is the unique subquotient of π with that property, it follows that σ is the unique irreducible subrepresentation of π.

It remains to show that there exists a choice of (σ, w, λ_1) which satisfy the stated properties and determine the injectivity of $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$.

First, let σ be the unique (by Lemma A.1) subquotient of π such that $\lambda_{a.d.} \leq r_T^G(\sigma)$. In fact, by Lemma A.1, σ appears in the principal series $i_T^G \lambda_0$ with multiplicity one. Fix a σ-dominated sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$ in $\mathcal{S}$ constructed by the process described in Subsection 3.3.

We prove the σ admits an embedding into π as follows:

(1) In the case $\pi = i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-1})$, it holds that $f_n(\lambda_0) = 1$. By the central character argument, see [12, Lemma. 3.12], it follows that

$$\sigma \hookrightarrow i_T^G \lambda_0.$$

Since σ appears in $i_T^G \lambda_0$ with multiplicity one, it follows that σ is a subrepresentation of π.

(2) The representation $\pi = i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,0})$ is unitary and hence semi-simple.

We point out that the triple $(\sigma, w, \lambda_{a.d.})$, with w to be the shortest Weyl word such that $w \cdot \lambda_0 = \lambda_{a.d.}$, satisfies the assumptions given above. However, in order to simplify the calculation of $\ker N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ as much as possible, it is preferable to choose w and λ_1 so that w will be as short as possible (in terms of the length function on W_G). To that end, we consider all $w \in W^{M,T}$ such that

$$f_n(w \cdot \lambda_0) = f_\pi(w \cdot \lambda_0) \neq 0$$

and choose a w of minimal length together with $\lambda_1 = w \cdot \lambda_0$. In this case, it holds that

$$\langle \lambda_0, \gamma^\vee \rangle > 0 \qquad \forall \gamma \in R(w)$$

and hence, the operator $N_w(\lambda)$ is holomorphic at λ_0. In particular, $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is non-zero by the Gindikin-Karpelevich formula (see [16, Chapter 4]).

In the following table, we list the relevant data ($\lambda_{a.d.}$, λ_0, λ_1 and w) for each case.

	$i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-1})$	$i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,0})$
$\lambda_{a.d}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \ 0 \ -1 \ 0 \ 0 \ -1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ -1 \ 0 \ 0 \end{bmatrix}$
λ_0	$\begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \ -1 \ 3 \ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \end{bmatrix}$
λ_1	$\begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \ 3 \ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \ -1 \ 2 \ -1 \ -1 \ -1 \end{bmatrix}$
w	$s_{\alpha_7}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}$	$s_{\alpha_7}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_4}$

Table 19: Proof Proposition 4.10

It remains to determine whether $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is injective or not. This is done in Appendix B with the following conclusions:

(1) In case (1) it is shown that $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is not injective and hence $\pi = i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-1})$ admits a maximal semi-simple subrepresentation of length 2.

(2) In case (2), $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ is shown to be injective and hence $\pi = i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,0})$ admits a unique irreducible subrepresentation. Hence, it is irreducible.

□

Appendices

Appendix A. Degenerate Principal Series of Levi Subgroups

In this section, we list various branching rules used in this article. We start by explaining how new branching rules can be inferred using the Aubert involution. We then make a list of various branching rules associated with Levi subgroups of G, organized by the type of the Levi subgroup. Most of these rules arise from irreducible degenerate principal series of the Levi subgroup, while some are proven by other methods.

Note that it is convenient to encode the branching rules in terms of the action of Weyl elements.

A.1. **Generalized Degenerate Principal Series**

Let M be a Levi subgroup of a maximal parabolic subgroup of H. Let Ω be as in Equation (2.3). Let $\Pi_{triv,\Omega} = i_M^H(\Omega)$. We set $\Pi_{St,\Omega} = i_M^H(St_M \otimes \Omega)$, where St_M is the Steinberg representation of M, to be the generalized degenerate principal series associated with $\Pi_{triv,\Omega}$, i.e. Π_{St} is the Aubert involution of $\Pi_{triv,\Omega}$. By [1, Lemma 3.1], the representation $\Pi_{triv,\Omega}$ is irreducible if and only if $\Pi_{St,\Omega}$ is irreducible.

Suppose that $\Pi_{triv,\Omega}$ is irreducible. Let $\lambda_0 = r_T^M(\Omega)$ be the leading exponent of $\Pi_{triv,\Omega}$ and let $\lambda_{a.d}$ be an anti-dominant exponent of Π_{triv}. Since $\Pi_{triv,\Omega}$ is irreducible,

$$mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^H(\Pi_{triv,\Omega})\right) = |Stab_{W_H}(\lambda)|.$$

Thus, there exists a unique irreducible representation σ of H having $mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^H(\sigma)\right) \neq 0$, namely, $\sigma = \Pi_{triv,\Omega}$. Fix $u \in W_H$ such that $u\lambda_0 = \lambda_{a.d}$. Lemma 2.1 implies that

$$r_T^G(\Pi_{triv,\Omega}) = \sum_{w \in W^{M,T}} [w\lambda_0] = \sum_{w \in W^{M,T}} \left[wu^{-1}\lambda_{a.d}\right].$$

Since $\Pi_{triv,\Omega}$ is irreducible, so is $\Pi_{St,\Omega}$. Let $\lambda_1 = r_T^M(St \otimes \Omega) = \Omega\Big|_T + \rho_M$, and let λ_d be a dominant exponent in the orbit $W_H \cdot \lambda_1$, i.e. for every $\alpha \in \Delta_H$ one has $\mathrm{Re}(\langle \lambda_d, \alpha^\vee \rangle) \geq 0$. Using [17, Subsection 5.3.2], it follows that $\lambda_d \leq r_T^H(\Pi_{St,\Omega})$. Fix $u_d \in W_H$, such that $u_d\lambda_1 = \lambda_d$ then

$$r_T^H(\Pi_{St,\Omega}) = \sum_{w \in W^{M,T}} [w\lambda_1] = \sum_{w \in W^{M,T}} \left[wu_d^{-1}\lambda_d\right].$$

A.2. **Different types of Rules**

A.2.1. **Orthogonality Rule**

We recall the Orthogonality Rule from [12, A.1]. Let $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}(T)$ and set $\Theta_\lambda = \{\alpha \,:\, \alpha \in \Delta_G,\ \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0\}$. Then

(OR)	$\lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi) \Longrightarrow \left\lvert W_{M_{\Theta_\lambda}} \right\rvert \times [\lambda] \leq \left[r_T^H(\pi)\right].$

A direct consequence of (OR) is the following Lemma.

Lemma A.1. *Let M be a maximal Levi subgroup of G, $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ such that $\Omega = \mathrm{Re}(\Omega)$ and let $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$. Then:*

(1) $r_T^H(\pi)$ contains a unique anti-dominant exponent $\lambda_{a.d}$.

(2) Let σ be an irreducible constituent of π, having mult $\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^H(\sigma)\right) \neq 0$. Then mult $\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^H(\pi)\right) =$ mult $\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^H(\sigma)\right) = |\operatorname{Stab}_{W_H}(\lambda_{a.d})|$.

(3) σ is the unique irreducible representation of H with the property $\lambda_{a.d} \leq r_T^H(\sigma)$.

Proof. (1) The existence of $\lambda_{a.d}$ follows from [12, Lemma 3.4]. The uniqueness is due to the assumption $\mathrm{Re}(\Omega) = \Omega$.


(2) Follows from (OR).

(3) Follows from the second part.

□

A.2.2. **Rules Coming From Levi Subgroups Of Type A_n**

We fix the following labeling of the Dynkin diagram of a group H of type A_n.



We recall the Branching rule of type A_2 [12, A.3]

$$(A_2) \quad \lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi),\ \left\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \right\rangle = \pm 1,\ \left\langle \lambda, \beta^\vee \right\rangle = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad 2 \times [\lambda] + [s_\alpha \cdot \lambda] \leq \left[r_T^H(\pi)\right].$$

As a consequence, one gets

Corollary A.2. *Suppose that H is a group of type A_2. Let $\pi = i_T^H(\lambda)$ where $\lambda \in \{\pm\bar{\omega}_1\}$. Then π is of length two. Set $\sigma_{A_2}^1$ to be the unique irreducible subquotient of π having mult $\left(\lambda, r_T^H(\pi)\right) \neq 0$ and let $\sigma_{A_2}^2$ denote the other one. Then, one has that,*

$$r_T^H\left(\sigma_{A_2}^1\right) = 2 \times [\lambda] + [s_{\alpha_1}\lambda]$$
$$r_T^H\left(\sigma_{A_2}^2\right) = 2 \times [s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1}\lambda] + [s_{\alpha_1}\lambda].$$

Moreover, there are exactly two irreducible representations σ of G having $s_{\alpha_1}\lambda \leq r_T^G(\sigma)$.

Proof. Suppose $\lambda = -\bar{\omega}_1$. Applying (A_2) with respect to Levi subgroup M_{α_1} implies that

$$r_T^H\left(\sigma_{A_2}^1\right) \geq 2 \times [\lambda] + [s_{\alpha_1}\lambda].$$

Recall that the rule (A_2) comes from the fact that the representation $i^H_{M_{\alpha_2}}(\Omega_{-1})$ is irreducible. Thus π, is at least of length 2. Let $\sigma^2_{A_2}$ be an irreducible subquotient of π having $mult\left(s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1}\lambda, r^H_T\left(\sigma^2_{A_2}\right)\right) \neq 0$. Applying (A_2) on $s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1}\lambda$ with respect to the Levi subgroup $M_2 = M_{\alpha_2}$ implies that

$$r^H_T\left(\sigma^2_{A_2}\right) \geq 2 \times [s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1}\lambda] + [s_{\alpha_1}\lambda].$$

Thus,

$$r^H_T(\pi) \geq r^G_T\left(\sigma^1_{A_2}\right) + r^H_T\left(\sigma^2_{A_2}\right).$$

In particular $\dim r^H_T(\pi) \geq 6$ since $|W_H| = 6$ we deduce that

$$\left[r^H_T(\pi)\right] = \left[r^H_T\left(\sigma^1_{A_2}\right)\right] + \left[r^H_T\left(\sigma^2_{A_2}\right)\right].$$

□

Lemma A.3. *Let π be an irreducible representation of a group H of type A_3 having $\lambda \leq r^H_T(\pi)$ where $\langle\lambda, \alpha_1^\vee\rangle = \pm 1$ and $\langle\lambda, \alpha_2^\vee\rangle = \langle\lambda, \alpha_3^\vee\rangle = 0$. Then,*

(A.3(a)) $\quad \lambda \leq r^H_T(\pi) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad 6 \times [\lambda] + 4 \times [s_{\alpha_1} \cdot \lambda] + 2\,[s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1} \cdot \lambda] \leq \left[r^G_T(\pi)\right]$

Proof. Let $M = M_{\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2\}}$ and write $\left[r^H_M(\pi)\right] = \sum n_\sigma \times [\sigma]$, where σ are irreducible non-equivalent representations of M.

- Since $\lambda \leq r^H_T(\pi)$, applying (OR) implies that $6 \times [\lambda] \leq r^H_T(\pi)$.
- On the other hand, since $|\operatorname{Stab}_{W_H}(\lambda)| = 6$, it follows that
$$mult\left(\lambda, r^H_T(\pi)\right) = 6.$$
- By (A_2) it holds that,
$$\lambda \leq r^H_T(\pi) \Rightarrow 2 \times [\lambda] + [s_{\alpha_1}\lambda] \leq \left[r^H_T(\pi)\right]$$
- Combing the above yields $mult\left(\sigma_1^{A_2}, r^H_M(\pi)\right) = 3$. In particular, $mult\left(s_{\alpha_1}\lambda, r^H_T(\pi)\right) \geq 3$.
- Applying (OR) on $s_{\alpha_1}\lambda$ yields
$$|W_\Theta| \,\Big|\, mult\left(s_{\alpha_1}\lambda, r^H_T(\pi)\right)$$
where $\Theta = \{\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta_H : \langle s_{\alpha_1}\lambda, \alpha^\vee\rangle = 0\}$. Hence, $mult\left(s_{\alpha_1}\lambda, r^H_T(\pi)\right) \geq 4$.

- Since, up to equivalence, the only irreducible representations τ of M such that $s_{\alpha_1}\lambda \leq r_T^M(\tau)$ are $\sigma^1_{A_2}$ and $\sigma^2_{A_2}$ it follows that $n_{\sigma^2_{A_2}} \geq 1$.
- In summary

$$r_M^H(\pi) \geq 3 \times \left[\sigma^1_{A_2}\right] + 1 \times \left[\sigma^2_{A_2}\right].$$

- Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} r_T^H(\pi) \geq & 3 \times \left[r_T^M\left(\sigma^1_{A_2}\right)\right] + 1 \times \left[r_T^M\left(\sigma^2_{A_2}\right)\right] \\ = & 6 \times [\lambda] + 3 \times s_{\alpha_1}\lambda + 2 \times s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1}\lambda + 1 s_{\alpha_1}\lambda \\ = & 6 \times [\lambda] + 4 \times s_{\alpha_1}\lambda + 2 \times s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1}\lambda \end{aligned}$$

□

A similar argument yields the following, more general, rule

Lemma A.4. *Let H be a group of type A_n where $n \geq 2$ and let π be an irreducible representation of H having mult $\left(\lambda, r_T^H(\pi)\right) \neq 0$, where $\lambda \in \{\pm\bar{\omega}_1\}$. Set $M = M_{\{\alpha_1,\ldots\alpha_{n-1}\}}$. Then*

$$(A_n) \qquad \lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi) \Longrightarrow \sum_{w \in W^{M,T}} (n - l(w)) \cdot (n-1)! \, [w\lambda] = \left[r_T^H(\pi)\right].$$

We record all Branching rules of type A_n that we used in this paper. For more information, one should consult [12, Appendix A]. The labeling of the rule indicates which type of Levi subgroup we refer to.

$$(A_1) \qquad \lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi), \ \left\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \right\rangle \neq \pm 1 \Longrightarrow [\lambda] + [s_\alpha \cdot \lambda] \leq \left[r_T^H(\pi)\right].$$

$$(A_2) \qquad \lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi), \ \lambda \in \{\pm\bar{\omega}_1\} \Longrightarrow 2 \times [\lambda] + [s_{\alpha_1} \cdot \lambda] \leq \left[r_T^H(\pi)\right].$$


(A_3)
$$\lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi),\ \lambda \in \{\pm(\bar{\omega}_1 - \bar{\omega}_3)\}$$
$$\Longrightarrow 2 \times [\lambda] + [s_{\alpha_1} \cdot \lambda] + [s_{\alpha_3} \cdot \lambda] + 2 \times [s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_3} \cdot \lambda] \leq \left[r_T^H(\pi)\right].$$

(A_n) $\quad \lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi),\ \lambda = \pm\bar{\omega}_1 \Longrightarrow \sum_{w \in W^{M,T}} (n - l(w)) \cdot (n-1)! [w\lambda] = \left[r_T^H(\pi)\right]$

where $M = M_{\{\alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n\}}$.

A.2.3. **Rules Coming From Levi Subgroups Of Type D_n**

We fix the following labeling of the Dynkin diagram of a group H of type D_n.



Lemma A.5. *Let H be a group of type D_5. Let π be an irreducible representation of H having mult $\left(\lambda, r_T^G(\pi)\right) \neq 0$, where $\lambda = \bar{\omega}_5$. Then, one has the following rule*

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda \leq r_T^H(\pi) \Rightarrow\ & 120 \times [\lambda] + 96 \times [s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 72 \times [s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \\ & + 48 \times [s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 48 \times [s_{\alpha_4} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 32 \times [s_{\alpha_4} s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \\ & + 24 \times [s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 16 \times [s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_4} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 16 \times [s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_4} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \\ & + 8 \times [s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_4} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda].\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

- By (OR), one has $120 \times \lambda \leq r_T^G(\pi)$.
- Applying (A_n), with respect to $M_4 = M_{\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_5\}}$ yields $mult\left(\sigma_{A_4}^1, r_{M_4}^H(\pi)\right) = 5$. In particular, one has

$$120 \times [\lambda] + 90 \times [s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 60 \times [s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 30 \times [s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \leq r_T^H(\pi).$$

- By (OR), one has
$$12 \Big| mult\left(s_{\alpha_5}\lambda, r_T^H(\pi)\right).$$
Thus, $mult\left(s_{\alpha_5}\lambda, r_T^H(\pi)\right) \geq 96$. In particular, $mult\left(\sigma_{A_4}^2, r_{M_4}^H(\pi)\right) \geq 1$.
- We conclude that,
$$r_{M_4}^H(\pi) \geq 5 \times \sigma_{A_4}^1 + \sigma_{A_4}^2.$$
Thus,
$$\begin{aligned} r_T^H(\pi) \geq & 120 \times [\lambda] + 96 \times [s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 72 \times [s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \\ & + 48 \times [s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 24 \times [s_{\alpha_1}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda]. \end{aligned}$$
- On the other hand, applying (A_n) on λ with respect to $M_{1,2} = M_{\{\alpha_3,\alpha_4,\alpha_5\}}$ yields that $mult\left(\sigma_{A_3}^1, r_{M_{1,2}}^G(\pi)\right) = 20$.
- Since $mult\left(s_{\alpha_5}\lambda, r_T^H(\pi)\right) \geq 96$ and $20 \times \sigma_{A_3}^1$ contributes only 80 copies of $s_{\alpha_5}\lambda$, we deduce that
$$r_{M_{1,2}}^H(\pi) \geq 20 \times \sigma_{A_3}^1 + 8 \times \sigma_{A_3}^2.$$
In particular, one has $48 \times [s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \leq r_T^H(\pi)$.
- Applying (A_n) on $s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda$ yields that
$$32 \times [s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 16 \times [s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \leq r_T^H(\pi).$$
- By Applying (A_3) on $16 \times [s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda]$ with respect to $M_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3}$ one has
$$16 \times [s_{\alpha_1}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] + 8 \times [s_{\alpha_1}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}\lambda] \leq r_T^H(\pi).$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma A.6. *Let H be a group of type D_6. There exists a unique irreducible subquotient σ_1 of H having $mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^H(\sigma_1)\right) \neq 0$, where $\lambda_{a.d} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \end{bmatrix}$. In that case, one has $mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\sigma_1)\right) = 24$ and $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^H(\sigma_1)\right) = 1$, where*
$$\lambda_0 = s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_1}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_4} \cdot \lambda_{a.d}.$$

Proof. Let $\pi = i_{M_3}^G(\Omega_0)$. By [2, Theorem 5.3], π is semi-simple of length two. We write $\pi = \sigma_1 \oplus \sigma_2$. Applying Lemma A.1, there exists a unique irreducible subrepresentation τ of π having $mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^G(\tau)\right) \neq 0$, say $\tau = \sigma_1$ and $mult\left(\lambda_{a.d}, r_T^H(\sigma_1)\right) = 24$.


Note that $\lambda_0 = r_T^{M_3}(\Omega_0)$. By Proposition 3.4(1) , $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\sigma_i)\right) \neq 0$, while, by Lemma 2.1, one has $mult\left(\lambda_0, r_T^G(\pi)\right) = 2$. Thus the claim follows. □

Lemma A.7. *Let H be a group of type D_5 and let $\pi = i_{M_3}^H(\Omega_0)$. Then, π is irreducible and $\mathcal{M}_u\Big|_\pi$, where $u = s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_3}$, is injective.*

Proof. By [2, Theorem 5.3], π is irreducible. Let $\lambda_0 = r_T^{M_3}(\Omega_0)$ be the leading exponent of π and let $\lambda_{a.d}$ be the anti-dominant exponent of π. Note that $u\lambda_0 = \lambda_{a.d}$. Thus, it induces a map between $i_{M_3}^H(\Omega_0)$ and $i_T^H(\lambda_{a.d})$. Since π is irreducible, and $\mathcal{M}_u\Big|_\pi \neq 0$ the map is an isomorphism. □

A.2.4. **Rules Coming From Levi Subgroups Of Type E_6**

Let H be a group of type E_6. We fix the following labeling of the Dynkin diagram of group of type E_6.



Lemma A.8. *(1) The representation $\pi = i_{M_5}^H(\Omega_{-\frac{1}{2}})$ is irreducible.*

(2) $\mathcal{M}_u\Big|_\pi$, where $u = s_{\alpha_4}.s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_5}$, is injective.

Proof. The first part follows from [12]. For the second part, we argue as in Lemma A.7. □

Appendix B. **The Iwahori-Hecke Algebra and The Unramified Principal Series**

In this section we recall the theory of finitely-generated modules over the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of G and their relation to the unramified principal series of G and use it to complete the proof of Proposition 4.10. For more information on the structure of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra and its modules see [20] and [11].

B.1. **Notations**

As before, F is a non-Archimedean local field. Let $\mathcal{O}$ denote its ring of integers and $\mathcal{P}$ be the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}$. Let $q = |\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P}|$ and $\mathbb{F}_q \simeq \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P}$, the field of q elements. Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a split, semi-simple, simply-connected group scheme such that $G = \mathbb{G}(F)$ and assume that

$\mathbb{G}$ is defined over $\mathcal{O}$. Let $\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{T}$ be a Borel subgroup and a maximal split torus such that $\mathbb{B}(F) = B$ and $\mathbb{T}(F) = T$. We fix a hyper-special maximal compact subgroup $K = \mathbb{G}(\mathcal{O})$ of G and let

$$\Psi \ : \ K \ \to \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$$

denote the projection modulo $\mathcal{P}$.

We note that $\mathbf{X}^{un}(T)$ is the group of all characters $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}(T)$ such that $\lambda\Big|_{T\cap K}$ is trivial. It is possible to extend the usual pairing between rational characters and co-characters to $\mathbf{X}^{un}(T)$ (see Subsection 2.4) by

$$\lambda(\alpha^\vee(\varpi)) = q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle},$$

where ϖ is a generator of $\mathcal{P}$.

Let $J = \Psi^{-1}(\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{F}_q))$ be an Iwahori subgroup of G. The subgroup J plays an important role in the study of unramified principal series representations of G. By [8, Proposition 2.7], if λ is unramified, then $\Pi = i_T^G(\lambda)$ is generated by its Iwahori fixed vectors and so are all of its subquotients.

We continue by recalling the definition of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}$. The algebra $\mathcal{H}$ consists of all compactly supported J -bi-invariant complex functions on $G(F)$, namely,

$$\mathcal{H} = \{f \in C_c(G(F)) \ : \ f(j_1 g j_2) = f(g) \quad \forall j_1, j_2 \in J, \quad g \in G(F)\}.$$

The multiplication in $\mathcal{H}$ is given by convolution and the measure of J is set to be 1. By [7, Section 3] and [6], there is an equivalence of categories between the category of admissible representations of G which are generated by their J-fixed vectors and the category of finitely generated $\mathcal{H}$-modules. This equivalence of categories sends an admissible representation π of G to the $\mathcal{H}$-module π^J of J-fixed vectors in π. Thus, in order to study the structure of $i_T^G(\lambda)$ it is sufficient to study the corresponding finite dimensional $\mathcal{H}$-module.

B.2. **The Bernstein Presentation And Unramified Principal Series**

The Iwahori-Hecke algebra, $\mathcal{H}$, can be described in terms of generators and relations. One such presentation is known as the Bernstein's presentation. $\mathcal{H}$ is generated by a set of generators $\{T_{s_\alpha}, \theta_{\alpha^\vee} \ : \ \alpha \in \Delta_G\}$ subject to certain relations listed in [20, Section 3]. The algebra $\mathcal{H}$ admits two important subalgebras:

- A finite dimensional algebra $\mathcal{H}_0 = \langle T_{s_\alpha} \ : \ \alpha \in \Delta_G \rangle = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}} \{T_w \ : \ w \in W_G\}$ of dimension $|W_G|$.
- An infinite dimensional commutative algebra

$$\Theta = \langle \theta_{\alpha^\vee} \ : \ \alpha \in \Delta_G \rangle = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ \theta_x \ : \ x \in \mathbb{Z}[\Delta_G^\vee] \right\},$$

  where $\mathbb{Z}[\Delta_G^\vee]$ is the co-root lattice of T.

In particular, as vector spaces,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 \otimes \Theta.$$

Given an unramified principal series $\Pi = i_T^G(\lambda)$, we describe the left $\mathcal{H}$-module, $\Pi^J = \mathcal{H}(\lambda)$, corresponding to it by the equivalence of categories of [6] using the Bernstein presentation. This module is given by the left $\mathcal{H}$-action on $\mathcal{H}(\lambda) = \mathcal{H} \otimes_\Theta \mathbb{C}_\lambda$, where $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$ is the one-dimensional representation of Θ, given by λ. In other words, $\mathcal{H}(\lambda)$ can be identified, as a vector space, with $\mathcal{H}_0$, while the action of $\mathcal{H}$ is given as follows:

- The action of $\mathcal{H}_0 \leq \mathcal{H}$ on $\mathcal{H}(\lambda)$ is given by left multiplication.
- By the Bernstein presentation, the action of Θ on $\mathcal{H}(\lambda)$ is determined by the action of the generators $\theta_{\alpha^\vee} \in \Theta$ on $T_e \in \mathcal{H}(\lambda)$. Let

$$\theta_{\alpha^\vee} \cdot T_e = q^{\langle \lambda, \bar{\omega}_\alpha^\vee \rangle} T_e.$$

B.3. **Intertwining Operators**

We recall the normalized intertwining operators $N_w(\lambda)$, which were introduced in Subsection 2.4 for $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}^{un}(T)$. For a subrepresentation π of $\Pi = i_T^G(\lambda)$, these operators induce a map $N_w(\lambda)\Big|_{\pi^J}$ of $\mathcal{H}$-modules. By [11, Section 2], the action of $N_{s_\alpha}(\lambda)\Big|_{\Pi^J}$ is given by **right**-multiplication by the following element

$$n_{s_\alpha}(\lambda) = \frac{q-1}{q^{z+1}-1} T_e + \frac{q^z - 1}{q^{z+1}-1} T_{s_\alpha} \in \mathcal{H}_0,$$

where $z = \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{Re}(z) > -1$. Then, $N_{s_\alpha}(\lambda)$ is holomorphic there. Furthermore, considered as an element of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_0)$, $N_{s_\alpha}(\lambda)\Big|_{\Pi^J}$ is a diagonalizable linear operator with two eigenvalues given by

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{q-1}{q^{z+1}-1} + q\frac{q^z-1}{q^{z+1}-1} = 1, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{q-1}{q^{z+1}-1} - \frac{q^z-1}{q^{z+1}-1} = \frac{q-q^z}{q^{z+1}-1},$$

with the exception of $z = 0$, where $n_{s_\alpha}(\lambda) = T_e$ is the identity element and $N_{s_\alpha}(\lambda) = \mathrm{Id}$.

Thus, $N_{s_\alpha}(\lambda)\Big|_{\Pi^J}$ has a kernel if and only if $\lambda_2 = 0$, which happens only if $z \in 1 + \frac{2\pi i}{log(q)}\mathbb{Z}$. It follows that, for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, the injectivity of $N_{s_\alpha}(\lambda)\Big|_{\Pi^J}$ does not depend on the value of q.

B.4. **The Submodule $\mathcal{H}_P(\Omega)$**

Let P be a parabolic subgroup of G with Levi part M and let χ be an unramified character of M with respect to $M \cap K$. We denote the longest Weyl element of W_M by w_M^0. Let $\pi = i_M^G\Omega$, with $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ unramified, $\lambda_0 = r_T^M(\Omega)$ and

$$\mathcal{H}_P(\Omega) = \pi^J.$$

We recall that

$$\pi = i_M^G(\Omega) = \operatorname{Im}\mathcal{M}_{w_M^0}(\Omega + \rho_M) = \operatorname{Im} N_{w_M^0}(\Omega + \rho_M).$$

It follows that $\mathcal{H}_P(\Omega)$ is the image of $N_{w_M^0}(\Omega + \rho_M)$ and hence, it has a basis given by

$$\{T_u \cdot triv \,:\, u \in W_G/W_M\}, \quad \text{where} \quad triv = \sum_{w \in W_M} T_w. \tag{B.1}$$

Under the equivalence of categories of [6], for any $w \in W_G$, the operator $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ has a non-trivial kernel if and only if $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_{\pi^J}$ does. This, in turn, can be determined by calculating the rank of the matrix Λ of $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_{\pi^J}$ with respect to the basis of $\mathcal{H}_P(\Omega)$ given in Equation (B.1) and the basis of $\mathcal{H}(w \cdot \lambda_0)$ given by $\{T_w \,:\, w \in W_G\}$.

On the other hand, by the equivalence of categories described in [21, Section 4], it holds that for any $w \in W^{M,T}$, the injectivity of $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_{\pi^J}$ does not depend on the value of q. Thus, in order to determine whether $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_{\pi^J}$ is injective for any value of q, it is enough to check it for a particular prime power q. In the realization of the calculation described in Appendix B.5, we used the value $q = 2$.

B.5. **Computing the Dimension of Kernels**

We conclude this section by outlining the calculation of $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\operatorname{Ker} N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_{\pi^J}\right)$ required in the proof of Proposition 4.10. In preforming this calculation we had three limitations: computational speed, available *RAM* (Random Access Memory) and hard drive space.

In order to minimize computational time, all steps in the calculation were broken down to smaller steps which were calculated in parallel on a number of processors. This, in turn, resulted in a higher RAM usage. Naively, finding the rank of the operator requires holding a matrix with m columns , where $m = 2,903,040$. However, such a matrix requires more RAM than was available to us. We now explain how the calculation of the rank was organized so as to be completed in a reasonable amount of time with the resources available to us.

Fix a maximal parabolic subgroup P with a Levi subgroup M. Let $\Omega \in \mathbf{X}(M)$ such that $\Omega = \mathrm{Re}(\Omega)$. In other words, Ω is unramified. Let $\pi = i_M^G(\Omega)$ and $\lambda_0 = r_T^M(\Omega)$.

Given $w \in W_G$, our goal is to determine whether the normalized intertwining operator, $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_\pi$ has a kernel. This is equivalent to determine the codimension of the row space of Λ. Since $\mathcal{H}_0$ is of finite dimension, this is a problem in finite-dimensional linear algebra.

It is convenient to calculate the matrix Λ using the element $n_w(\lambda_0)$. The rows of the matrix are given by $v_u = T_u \cdot triv \cdot n_w(\lambda_0)$ for $u \in W^{M,T}$. In particular,

$$\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda) = \dim \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ v_u \;\middle|\; u \in W^{M,T} \right\}.$$

Due to RAM limitations, this cannot be done in a straight-forward way and needs to be done in parts. In order to generate the rows of Λ we start by separately calculating

$$v_{u,u',w} = T_u \cdot T_{u'} \cdot n_w \quad \forall u \in W^{M,T}, u' \in W_M$$

and saving each one to the hard-drive. It is then possible sum the elements

$$v_u = \sum_{u' \in W_M} v_{u,u',w} \forall u \in W^{M,T}$$

and write each to the hard-drive.

While it is possible to calculate the coordinate vector of v_u for each $u \in W^{M,T}$ separately, we were not able to load all of them at once and generate Λ, again due to RAM limitations. However, we were able, by writing the coordinates into text files, to write the transposed matrix Λ^T into a text file. While $\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda) = \mathrm{rank}(\Lambda^T)$, it is simpler to compute the latter. The idea is that Λ^T is a matrix of dimension $|W_G| \times |W^{M,T}|$, instead of $|W^{M,T}| \times |W_G|$ (note the values of $|W^{M,T}|$ and $|W_G|$ given in Subsection 4.1). It is then possible, to break Λ^T into smaller blocks and perform the Gauss elimination process on each separately, then to combine the resulting non-zero rows to a new matrix and repeat the process until we

are left with one matrix whose rows are linearly independent. The rank of the resulting matrix equals $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\operatorname{Im} N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_{\pi^J}\right)$, the co-dimension of the kernel.

We close by collecting the relevant data for the proof of Proposition 4.10:

	$i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-1})$	$i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,0})$
w	$s_{\alpha_7}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_2}$	$s_{\alpha_7}s_{\alpha_6}s_{\alpha_5}s_{\alpha_4}s_{\alpha_3}s_{\alpha_2}s_{\alpha_4}$
$\dim \mathcal{H}_P(\Omega)$	576	10,080
$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\operatorname{Im} N_w(\lambda_0)\Big\|_{\pi^J}\right)$	561	10,080
$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\operatorname{Ker} N_w(\lambda_0)\Big\|_{\pi^J}\right)$	15	0

Table 20: Dimensions of kernels in Proposition 4.10

In particular, $N_w(\lambda_0)\Big|_{\pi^J}$ is not injective in the case of $\pi = i_{M_2}^G(\Omega_{M_2,-1})$ and is injective in the case of $\pi = i_{M_4}^G(\Omega_{M_4,0})$.

References

[1] Dubravka Ban. The Aubert involution and R-groups. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 35(5):673–693, 2002.

[2] Dubravka Ban and Chris Jantzen. Degenerate principal series for even-orthogonal groups. *Represent. Theory*, 7:440–480, 2003.

[3] Dubravka Ban and Chris Jantzen. Jacquet modules and the Langlands classification. *Michigan Math. J.*, 56(3):637–653, 2008.

[4] I. N. Bernšteĭn and A. V. Zelevinskiĭ. Representations of the group $GL(n, F)$, where F is a local non-Archimedean field. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 31(3(189)):5–70, 1976.

[5] I. N. Bernstein and A. V. Zelevinsky. Induced representations of reductive $\mathfrak{p}$-adic groups. I. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 10(4):441–472, 1977.

[6] Armand Borel. Admissible representations of a semi-simple group over a local field with vectors fixed under an iwahori subgroup. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 35(1):233–259, Dec 1976.

[7] W. Casselman. Introduction to the theory of admissible representations of p-adic reductive groups. `http://www.math.ubc.ca/~cass/research/pdf/p-adic-book.pdf`, 1974.

[8] W. Casselman. The unramified principal series of p-adic groups. I. The spherical function. *Compositio Math.*, 40(3):387–406, 1980.

[9] Seungil Choi and Chris Jantzen. Degenerate principal series for the exceptional p-adic groups of type F_4. *J. Lie Theory*, 20(4):785–806, 2010.

[10] S. S. Gelbart and A. W. Knapp. Irreducible constituents of principal series of $\mathrm{SL}_n(k)$. *Duke Math. J.*, 48(2):313–326, 1981.

[11] Thomas J. Haines, Robert E. Kottwitz, and Amritanshu Prasad. Iwahori-Hecke algebras. *J. Ramanujan Math. Soc.*, 25(2):113–145, 2010.

[12] Hezi Halawi and Avner Segal. The structure of degenerate principal series representations of exceptional groups of type E_6 over p-adic fields, To appear in the Israel Jornal of Mathematics.

[13] Chris Jantzen. Degenerate principal series for symplectic groups. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 102(488):xiv+111, 1993.

[14] Chris Jantzen. Degenerate principal series for symplectic and odd-orthogonal groups. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 124(590):viii+100, 1996.

[15] Chris Jantzen. Some remarks on degenerate principal series. *Pacific J. Math.*, 186(1):67–87, 1998.

[16] Robert P. Langlands. *Euler products*. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.-London, 1971. A James K. Whittemore Lecture in Mathematics given at Yale University, 1967, Yale Mathematical Monographs, 1.

[17] M.A.A. Leeuwen, van, A.M. Cohen, and B. Lisser. *Lie : a package for Lie group computations*. Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica, 1992.

[18] Goran Muić. The unitary dual of p-adic G_2. *Duke Math. J.*, 90(3):465–493, 1997.

[19] Goran Muić and Freydoon Shahidi. Irreducibility of standard representations for Iwahori-spherical representations. *Math. Ann.*, 312(1):151–165, 1998.

[20] Amritanshu Prasad. On Bernstein's presentation of Iwahori-Hecke algebras and representations of split reductive groups over non-Archimedean local fields. *Bull. Kerala Math. Assoc.*, (Special Issue):31–51 (2007), 2005.

[21] Maarten Solleveld. On the classification of irreducible representations of affine Hecke algebras with unequal parameters. *Represent. Theory*, 16:1–87, 2012.

[22] Robert Steinberg. *Lectures on Chevalley groups*. Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 1968. Notes prepared by John Faulkner and Robert Wilson.

[23] Marko Tadić. Notes on representations of non-Archimedean $\mathrm{SL}(n)$. *Pacific J. Math.*, 152(2):375–396, 1992.

[24] Marko Tadić. On reducibility of parabolic induction. *Israel J. Math.*, 107:29–91, 1998.

[25] The Sage Developers. *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version x.y.z)*, YYYY. `http://www.sagemath.org`.

[26] Martin H. Weissman. The Fourier-Jacobi map and small representations. *Represent. Theory*, 7:275–299 (electronic), 2003.

[27] Norman Winarsky. Reducibility of principal series representations of p-adic Chevalley groups. *Amer. J. Math.*, 100(5):941–956, 1978.

[28] A. V. Zelevinsky. Induced representations of reductive $\mathfrak{p}$-adic groups. II. On irreducible representations of $\mathrm{GL}(n)$. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 13(2):165–210, 1980.

[1] School of Mathematics, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, POB 653, Be'er Sheva 84105, Israel

[2] Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University , Ramat-Gan, 5290002 Israel
E-mail address: halawi@post.bgu.ac.il, segalavner@gmail.com