

Denominators in Lusztig's asymptotic Hecke algebra via the Plancherel formula

Stefan Dawydiak *

September 1, 2023

Abstract

Let \tilde{W} be an extended affine Weyl group, \mathbf{H} be the corresponding affine Hecke algebra over the ring $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}]$, and J be Lusztig's asymptotic Hecke algebra, viewed as a based ring with basis $\{t_w\}$. Viewing J as a subalgebra of the $(\mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ -adic completion of \mathbf{H} via Lusztig's map ϕ , we use Harish-Chandra's Plancherel formula for p -adic groups to show that the coefficient of T_x in t_w is a rational function of \mathbf{q} , depending only on the two-sided cell containing w , and with no poles outside of a finite set of roots of unity depending only on \tilde{W} . For w in the lowest two-sided cell, and for all cells in types \tilde{A}_n , \tilde{C}_2 , and \tilde{G}_2 , we show that the denominators all divide a power of the Poincaré polynomial of the finite Weyl group. As an application, we conjecture that these denominators encode more detailed information about the failure of the Kazhdan-Lusztig classification at roots of the Poincaré polynomial than is currently known.

Along the way, we show that upon specializing $\mathbf{q} = q > 1$, the map from J to the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra is injective. As an application of injectivity, we give a novel criterion for an Iwahori-spherical representation to have fixed vectors under a larger parahoric subgroup in terms of its Kazhdan-Lusztig parameter.

Keywords— Asymptotic Hecke algebra, Iwahori-Hecke algebra, Plancherel formula, parahoric subgroup

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	The asymptotic Hecke algebra and p -adic groups	3
1.1.1	Denominators in the affine Hecke algebra and injectivity of η	3
1.1.2	Denominators in the affine Hecke and the Kazhdan-Lusztig classification at roots of unity	5
1.1.3	Application: representations with parahoric-fixed vectors	6
1.2	Outline of the argument	7
1.3	The affine Hecke algebra	7
1.4	The asymptotic Hecke algebra	8
1.4.1	Deformations of the group ring	9
1.5	Representation theory of \mathbf{H} and J	9
1.5.1	Involutions on \mathbf{H}	10
1.6	Acknowledgements	11
2	Harish-Chandra's Plancherel formula	12
2.1	Tempered and discrete series representations	12
2.1.1	Formal degrees of discrete series representations	12
2.2	Harish-Chandra's canonical measure	14
2.2.1	Unramified characters	15

*Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik, Vivatsgasse 7, 53111 Bonn Germany; email dawydiak@mpim-bonn.mpg.de

2.2.2	Unitary unramified characters	15
2.2.3	Action by twisting and the canonical measure	15
2.3	The Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra	16
2.4	The algebra J as a subalgebra of the Schwartz algebra.	16
2.5	The Plancherel formula for GL_n	17
2.6	Plancherel measure for GL_n	19
2.7	Beyond type A : the Plancherel formula following Opdam	20
2.8	Regularity of the trace	20
2.8.1	Intertwining operators	20
2.8.2	Conventions on parabolic subgroups	21
2.8.3	Regularity of the trace	21
3	Proof of Conjecture 1 for GL_n, and of Theorem 3 for general \mathbf{G}	23
3.1	The functions f_w for GL_n	23
3.1.1	Example computations and a less singular cell	25
3.1.2	Proofs of Theorem 15, Lemma 6, and Corollary 2	27
3.2	The functions f_w for general \mathbf{G}	31
3.3	Relating t_w and f_w	32
3.3.1	Completions of \mathbf{H} and $J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$	32
3.3.2	The functions f_w and the basis elements t_w	33
3.4	Proof of Conjecture 1 for GL_n	37
3.5	Proof of Theorem 3	38
3.6	Further example: $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$ and $\mathbf{G} = G_2$	38
3.6.1	Case $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$	38
3.6.2	Case $\mathbf{G} = G_2$	39
4	Representations with fixed vectors under parahoric subgroups	40

1 Introduction

Let \tilde{W} be an affine Weyl group or extended affine Weyl group, and let \mathbf{H} be its associated Hecke algebra over $\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{q}^{1/2}, \mathbf{q}^{-1/2}]$, where \mathbf{q} is a formal variable. The representation theory of \mathbf{H} is very well understood, behaving well and uniformly when \mathbf{q} is specialized to any $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ that is not a root of the Poincaré polynomial P_W of the finite Weyl group $W \subset \tilde{W}$.

When \mathbf{q} is specialized to a prime power q , the category of finite-dimensional modules over the specialized algebra H is equivalent to the category of admissible representations with nonzero Iwahori-fixed vector of some p -adic group. A form of local Langlands correspondence, the Deligne-Langlands conjecture, has been established by Kazhdan and Lusztig in [KL87], where they classified modules over the generic algebra \mathbf{H} using algebraic K -theory. A slightly different approach to this classification due to Ginzburg is explained in [CG97]. In both treatments, a first step is to fix a central character. In particular, one must chose a complex number $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ by which \mathbf{q} will act. Decomposing the K -theory of certain subvarieties of Springer fibres into irreducible representations of a certain finite group yields the *standard modules*. It can happen that the standard modules are themselves simple (for example, simple tempered representations, which play an essential role in the present paper, are of this form), but in general simple modules are obtained as a certain unique nonzero quotient of standard modules. This quotient exists when $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ is not a root of unity, but can be zero otherwise. Lusztig conjectured in [Lus89b] that this classification would in fact hold whenever q was not a root of P_W , and this result was proven by Xi in [Xi06]. Xi also showed that the classification fails in general at roots of the Poincaré polynomial, and presented this failure by giving an example related to a lack of simple $\mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q}$ -modules attached to the lowest two-sided cell. Our results in this paper explain that the lowest two-sided cell is, in a precise sense, maximally singular with respect to the parameter \mathbf{q} .

One way Lusztig expressed the uniformity in q of the representation theory of the various algebras $\mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q}$ is via the asymptotic Hecke algebra J . This is a \mathbb{C} -algebra (in fact, a \mathbb{Z} -algebra) J with distinguished basis

$\{t_w\}_{w \in \tilde{W}}$, equipped with an injection $\phi: \mathbf{H} \hookrightarrow J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$. In this way there is a map from J -modules to \mathbf{H} -modules, and Lusztig has shown in [Lus87b] and [Lus89a] that when q is not a root of unity (other than 1), that the specialized map ϕ_q induces a bijection between simple $\mathbf{H}|_{q=q}$ -modules and simple J -modules, these last being defined over \mathbb{C} . Moreover, he showed that when $P_W(q) \neq 0$, the map ϕ_q induces an isomorphism

$$(\phi_q)_*: K_0(J - \mathbf{Mod}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathbf{H}|_{q=q} - \mathbf{Mod})$$

of Grothendieck groups. The map ϕ becomes a bijection after completing \mathbf{H} and $J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$ by replacing \mathcal{A} with $\mathbb{C}((\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}))$ and allowing infinite sums convergent in the $(\mathbf{q}^{-1/2})$ -adic topology. In this way one can write a basis element t_w as an infinite sum

$$()^\dagger \circ \phi^{-1}(t_w) = \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} a_{x,w} T_x, \quad (1)$$

where each $a_{x,w}$ is a formal Laurent series in $\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}$, and $()^\dagger$ is the Goldman involution.

In light of the above, it is natural to ask how $a_{x,w}$ behaves when \mathbf{q} is specialized to a root of unity.

1.1 The asymptotic Hecke algebra and p -adic groups

This paper is prompted by the work of Braverman and Kazhdan in [BK18], who related the asymptotic Hecke algebra to harmonic analysis on p -adic groups. Specifically, in [Lus89a], Lusztig relates simple J -modules to certain $\mathbf{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{q}^{-1/2})$ -modules termed *tempered* because their definition is made in analogy with Casselman's criterion for temperedness of p -adic groups. In [BK18], Braverman and Kazhdan showed essentially that the analytic meaning of the word “tempered” can be substituted into Lusztig's results from [Lus89a].

More precisely, let \mathbf{G} be a connected reductive group defined and split over a non-archimedean local field F whose extended affine Weyl group is \tilde{W} . Then in [BK18], Braverman and Kazhdan define a map expressing J as sitting between the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$ and the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra \mathcal{C} , and propose a spectral characterization of J via the operator Paley-Wiener theorem, obtaining a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H(G, I) & \xhookrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{C}^{I \times I} & & \\ & \searrow \phi_q \circ ()^\dagger & \nearrow \tilde{\phi} & & \\ & & J & & \\ & & \downarrow \eta & & \\ \mathcal{E}^I & \xhookrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{E}_J^I & \xhookrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{E}_t^I, \end{array} \quad (2)$$

where the outer vertical maps are Fourier transform $f \mapsto \pi(f)$ and the rings \mathcal{E}^I and \mathcal{E}_t^I of endomorphisms of forgetful functors to vector spaces are as described by the operator Paley-Wiener theorem, as we recall in Section 2.3.

The map η is defined in [BK18] and we will recall its definition below. In particular, it induces the map $\tilde{\phi}$, which then associates a Harish-Chandra Schwartz function to every element of J such that $\eta(j) = \pi(\tilde{\phi}(j))$, giving another way of associating to t_w an expression similar to (1).

This prompts several questions: whether η (equivalently $\tilde{\phi}$) is injective, whether it is surjective, and the nature of the relationship between the Schwartz function $\phi(t_w)$ and the expression (1).

1.1.1 Denominators in the affine Hecke algebra and injectivity of η

In the first part of this paper we prove that η is injective. Along the way, we prove in Proposition 3 that $\tilde{\phi}$ is essentially the map ϕ^{-1} . Our strategy is to determine that the Schwartz functions f_w on the p -adic group G satisfy the statements of Conjecture 1 below, and are in addition sufficiently well-behaved so as to lift to elements of a certain completion \mathcal{H}^- of \mathbf{H} , thus defining a map

$$\phi_1: J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^-.$$

We therefore obtain two maps $J \subset J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^-$: the inverse $()^\dagger \circ \phi^{-1}$ of Lusztig's map, and our map ϕ_1 induced by the construction in [BK18]. We prove in Proposition 3 that these maps agree, at which point Theorems 17 and 3 below follow.

In particular, ϕ_1 is injective. Using that the representation theory of J is sufficiently independent of q , we then show in Corollary 4 that $\tilde{\phi}$ is injective for any $q > 1$. This is obviously equivalent to

Theorem 1 (Corollary 4). *The map η is injective for any $q > 1$.*

The following conjecture was first made by Kazhdan; we have strengthened it based on the results we obtain in the present paper while proving injectivity.

Conjecture 1. *Let \tilde{W} be an affine Weyl group, \mathbf{H} its affine Hecke algebra over \mathcal{A} , and J its asymptotic Hecke algebra. Let $\phi: \mathbf{H} \hookrightarrow J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$ be Lusztig's map.*

1. *For all $x, w \in \tilde{W}$, $a_{x,w}$ is a rational function of \mathbf{q} . The denominator of $a_{x,w}$ is independent of x . As a function of w , it is constant on two-sided cells.*
2. *There exists $N_{\tilde{W}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that upon writing*

$$()^\dagger \circ \phi^{-1}(t_w) = \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} a_{x,w} T_x,$$

we have

$$P_W(\mathbf{q})^{N_{\tilde{W}}} a_{x,w} \in \mathcal{A}$$

for all $x, w \in \tilde{W}$.

3. *Moreover, there exists $N_{\tilde{W}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$P_W(\mathbf{q})^{N_{\tilde{W}}} d(\omega) \in \mathcal{A}$$

for all formal degrees $d(\omega)$ of discrete series representations of H .

In [Daw21], the author proved Conjecture 1 in type \tilde{A}_1 , but with different conventions. To translate to the conventions of this paper, the reader should replace j with the Goldman involution $()^\dagger$, and the completion of \mathbf{H} with respect to the C_w basis and positive powers of $\mathbf{q}^{1/2}$ with the completion of \mathbf{H} with respect to the basis $\{(-1)^{\ell(w)} C'_w\}_{w \in \tilde{W}}$ and negative powers of $\mathbf{q}^{1/2}$. Note also that we write $a_{x,w}$ instead of $a_{w,x}$ as in [Daw21]. In [Neu06], Neunhöffer described the coefficients $a_{x,w}$ for finite Weyl groups.

Our main result in this paper, which appears as Theorem 17 and Theorem 18 below, is the following

Theorem 2 (Theorem 17 and Theorem 18). *Let \tilde{W} be of type \tilde{A}_n , \tilde{C}_2 , or \tilde{G}_2 . Then Conjecture 1 is true.*

Our main tool is Harish-Chandra's Plancherel formula for the p -adic group G associated to \mathbf{H} . The proof of the theorem relies on certain cancellations taking place while computing the integrals given by the Plancherel formula. In particular, the theorem is sometimes only true thanks to cancellations involving formal degrees. For this reason, for general \mathbf{G} , we can presently only prove the following weaker form of Conjecture 1:

Theorem 3. *Let \tilde{W} be an affine Weyl group, \mathbf{H} its affine Hecke algebra over \mathcal{A} , and J its asymptotic Hecke algebra. Let $\phi: \mathbf{H} \hookrightarrow J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$ be Lusztig's map.*

1. *For all $x, w \in \tilde{W}$, $a_{x,w}$ is a rational function of \mathbf{q} . The denominator of $a_{x,w}$ is independent of x . As a function of w , it is constant on two-sided cells.*
2. *There is a polynomial $P_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{q})$ depending only on \mathbf{G} such that upon writing*

$$()^\dagger \circ \phi^{-1}(t_w) = \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} a_{x,w} T_x,$$

we have

$$P_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{q}) a_{x,w} \in \mathcal{A}$$

for all $x, w \in \tilde{W}$. The roots of $P_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{q})$ are all roots of unity.

3. Conjecture 1 is true for the lowest two-sided cell \mathbf{c}_0 : If $w \in \mathbf{c}_0$, then $P_W(\mathbf{q})a_{x,w} \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $x \in \tilde{W}$. If d is a distinguished involution in \mathbf{c}_0 , then $a_{1,d} = 1/P_W(\mathbf{q})$ exactly.
4. Moreover, $P_G(\mathbf{q})d(\omega) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all formal degrees $d(\omega)$ of discrete series representations of H .

In [Daw21], the author related a conjecture of Kazhdan concerning the positivity of some coefficients related to the coefficients $a_{x,w}$. Historically, proofs of such positivity phenomena have also provided interpretations of the positive quantities in question. While we cannot currently prove the conjecture in [Daw21], our results in Section 4 hint at a possible interpretation of $a_{1,d}$ for certain distinguished involutions d .

Remark 1. It is tempting to pose the following more precise version of Conjecture 1, based on the factorization $P_{\mathbf{M}_P}(\mathbf{q})P_{G/P}(\mathbf{q}) = P_{G/B}(\mathbf{q})$: for every Levi subgroup \mathbf{M}_P of \mathbf{G} and all $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M_P)$, the formal degree $d(\omega)$ is a rational function of q the denominator of which divides a power of $P_{\mathbf{M}_P}(q)$. The integral over all induced twists $\text{Ind}_P^G(\nu \otimes \omega)$ is a rational function of q with denominator dividing a power of the Poincaré polynomial of the partial flag variety $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{P})(\mathbb{C})$. For example, if $G = \text{GL}_6(F)$ and $M = \text{GL}_3(F) \times \text{GL}_3(F)$. In this case the integral itself (omitting the factor C_M in the notation of Section 2.5) is

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{(z_1 - q^3 z_2)(z_1 - q^{-3} z_2)} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} = \frac{(1 - q^3)^2}{(1 - q^6)^2 q^3} + 1 = \frac{(1 - q^3)q^{-3}}{1 + q^3} + 1,$$

and by [BT82] Proposition 23.1, (with $\mathbf{q} = t^2$) we have

$$P_{G/P}(\mathbf{q}) = P_{G(3,6)}(\mathbf{q}) = (1 + \mathbf{q}^2)(1 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}^2 + \mathbf{q}^3 + \mathbf{q}^4)(1 + \mathbf{q}^3).$$

In examples such as the above, this does indeed happen, but only after cancellation with some terms in the numerator. In general, we will not track numerators precisely enough to show this version of Conjecture 1. We shall however see a limited demonstration of this behaviour in Corollary 1.

1.1.2 Denominators in the affine Hecke and the Kazhdan-Lusztig classification at roots of unity

The affine Hecke has a filtration by two-sided ideals

$$\mathbf{H}^{\geq i} = \text{span}\{C_w \mid a(w) \geq i\},$$

where a is Lusztig's a -function. As such, for any $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and any simple $H = \mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q}$ -module M there is an integer $a(M)$ such that $H^{\geq i}M \neq 0$ but $H^{\geq i+1}M = 0$. Define $a(M) = i$ to be this integer. One can also define $a(E) = a(\mathbf{c}(E))$ where E is a simple J -module and $J_{\mathbf{c}(E)}$ is the unique two-sided ideal not annihilating E .

The algebra J linearizes the above filtration into an honest direct sum, and implements the almost-independence on $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ of the representation theory of $H = \mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q}$ as follows.

Theorem 4 ([Xi06]). *1. Suppose that q is not a root of the Poincaré polynomial of \mathbf{G} . Then for each simple J -module E , the H module ${}^{\phi_q}E$ has a unique simple quotient L such that $a(E) = a(L)$. For all other simple subquotients L' of E , we have $a(L') < a(E)$.*

Equivalently, for all admissible triples (u, s, ρ) , the representation $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ of H has a unique nonzero simple quotient $L = L(u, s, \rho, q)$ such that $a(L) = a(\mathbf{c}(u))$. That is, the Deligne-Langlands conjecture is true for $\mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q}$.

2. If q is a root of the Poincaré polynomial of \mathbf{G} , then the Deligne-Langlands conjecture is false for the lowest cell. That is, if $u = \{1\}$, then every simple subquotient L' of $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ has $a(L') < a(\mathbf{c}_0)$.

By Theorem 3, the coefficients $a_{1,d}$ have poles at every root of P_W , for all distinguished involutions d in the lowest two-sided cell \mathbf{c}_0 . On the other hand, as we show in Example 8, there do exist cells $\mathbf{c} \neq \mathbf{c}_0$ such that the coefficients $a_{x,w}$ are nonsingular at certain roots of P_W , for all $w \in \mathbf{c}$ and $x \in \tilde{W}$. We encode the hope that this is no accident as

Conjecture 2. Let \tilde{W} be such that Conjecture 1 holds, and let $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ be a root of P_W . Let \mathbf{c} be a two-sided cell such that if $w \in \mathbf{c}$, then $a_{x,w}$ does not have a pole at $\mathbf{q} = q$ for any $x \in \tilde{W}$. Let $u = u(\mathbf{c})$. Then every standard module $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ has a unique simple quotient $L = L(u, s, \rho, q)$ such that $a(L) = a(E)$, where E is the simple J module corresponding to $K(u, s, \rho, q)$, in the notation of [Lus89a]. Two such simple modules are isomorphic if and only if their corresponding triples are conjugate.

Note that in type \tilde{A}_n , the number of two-sided cells grows as $e^{\sqrt{n}}$, whereas the number of subsets of roots of P_W is $2^{n(n+1)/2}$. For example in type \tilde{A}_1 , there is only one root of $P_W = \mathbf{q} + 1$, but there are two two-sided cells (and both are singular at $\mathbf{q} = -1$.) The same holds for type \tilde{C}_2 considered in Section 3.6: all the cells are singular at all the roots of $P_{\tilde{C}_2}$, and likewise for \tilde{G}_2 . However, already in type \tilde{A}_3 , one can see from Theorem 15 that the two-sided cell corresponding to the partition $4 = 2 + 2$ is not singular at two of the roots of $P_{A_3}(\mathbf{q}) = (1 + \mathbf{q})(1 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}^2)(1 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}^2 + \mathbf{q}^3)$; see Example 8.

1.1.3 Application: representations with parahoric-fixed vectors

In Section 4, we use the existence of the action of the asymptotic Hecke algebra on tempered G -representations to give a simple criterion for the existence of vectors fixed under a parahoric subgroup of G :

Theorem 5 (Theorem 19). Let $\pi = K(u, s, \rho)$ be a simple tempered I -spherical representation of G . Let \mathcal{P} be a parahoric subgroup of G and let $w_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the longest element in the corresponding subgroup of \tilde{W} . Let \mathcal{B}_u^\vee be the Springer fibre for u .

1. If $\ell(w_{\mathcal{P}}) > \dim \mathcal{B}_u^\vee$, then $\pi^{\mathcal{P}} = \{0\}$.
2. Conversely, let $u_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the unipotent conjugacy class corresponding to the two-sided cell containing $w_{\mathcal{P}}$. Then there exists a semisimple element $s \in Z_{G^\vee}(u_{\mathcal{P}})$, a Levi subgroup M^\vee of G^\vee minimal such that $(u_{\mathcal{P}}, s) \in M^\vee$, and a discrete series representation $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M)$ such that

$$\pi^{\mathcal{P}} = i_{P_M}^G(\omega \otimes \nu)^{\mathcal{P}} \neq \{0\}$$

for all ν non-strictly positive and the parameter of π is $(u_{\mathcal{P}}, s)$.

Thus starting from the regular unipotent class, $\pi(t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}) = 0$ until reaching the unipotent attached to $w_{\mathcal{P}}$. At this unipotent, \mathcal{P} -fixed vectors are first encountered, and $t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}$ acts by a nonzero projector with image contained in $\pi^{\mathcal{P}}$. For lower cells, it may still be the case that $\pi^{\mathcal{P}} \neq 0$, but $t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}$ will act by zero on such representations, too. Therefore the nonzero action of $t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}$ detects the precisely the “most regular” unipotent attached to \mathcal{P} -spherical representations, in the sense that if a representation π such that $\pi^{\mathcal{P}} \neq 0$ has the unipotent part of its parameter equal to u , then $a(u) \geq a(u_{\mathcal{P}})$. In this way the distinguished involutions $t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}$ are more exact versions of the corresponding indicator functions $1_{\mathcal{P}}$, at the expense of being more complicated to understand.

Remark 2. Recall from Section 1.1.2 that for every simple H -module M there is a number $a(M)$ such that $H^{\geq i}M = 0$ for all $i > a(M)$. However, if (u, s, ρ) is the KL -parameter of M , then without knowing that M extends to a simple J -module, it does not follow that $a(M) = \dim \mathcal{B}_u^\vee$.

Remark 3. By [Lus89a, Theorem 4.8(d)] and the proof of [Lus89a, Lemma 5.5], every two-sided cell contains a distinguished involution contained in a finite parabolic subgroup of \tilde{W} , but not every distinguished involution of a finite Coxeter group is the longest word of a parabolic subgroup, *i.e.* is of the form $w_{\mathcal{P}}$; approximately half of two-sided cells of the finite Weyl group $W \subset \tilde{W}$ do not contain any distinguished involutions contained in proper parabolic subgroups, because of the cell-preserving bijection $w \mapsto w_0 w$. For example, this happens for the second-lowest cell for E_8 .

The existence of parahoric-fixed vectors is a rigid question, in the sense of the rigid cocentre of Ciubotaru-He [CH14]. We investigate this connection further in forthcoming work.

Some time after completing the present paper, we became aware of [GP19], which also studies the connection between the asymptotic Hecke algebra and the Plancherel theorem in type \tilde{G}_2 , for unequal parameters. In *op. cit.* the authors speculate that the “asymptotic Plancherel measure” of *op. cit.* should

be related to the perspective of [BK18] on J . We defer investigation of this to future work, but note that in light of both the classic work [Mor93] of Morris, and recent work [Sol22] of Solleveld, the unequal parameters case is relevant even to split p -adic groups. In particular, establishing results similar to those of the present paper for unequal parameters may provide an effective way to study the algebra \mathcal{J} of Braverman and Kazhdan given in Definition 1.9 of [BK18].

1.2 Outline of the argument

This paper is organized according to our strategy for proving Theorems 2 and 3, and Corollary 4.

These results are each simple corollaries of computations with the Plancherel formula and some of Lusztig's results on J . The remainder of this section will introduce \mathbf{H} and J precisely, and recall their basic representation theory. In Section 2, we introduce Harish-Chandra's Plancherel formula in detail, along with all the numerical constants that appear in it. In Section 2.4, we recall the results of Braverman-Kazhdan from [BK18]. There is no original material in the first two sections. In Section 2.8, we prepare to apply the Plancherel formula by proving that, if f_w is the Schwartz function associated by Braverman-Kazhdan to t_w , and π is a tempered representation, then $\text{trace}(\pi, f_w)$ is sufficiently regular so as not to complicate the denominators of $a_{x,w}$. This section is also mostly a recollection of standard material, the only original result being Lemma 4.

In Section 3, we prove most of our main results. As we are able to be more precise in type \tilde{A}_n , we perform each step in parallel for type \tilde{A}_n and for other types: in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 we prove statements like those of Conjecture 1 for the Schwartz functions f_w . In these sections \mathbf{q} is specialized to a prime power q . In Section 3.3 we relate the functions f_w to the basis elements t_w , turning statements that hold for all prime powers q into statements that hold for the formal variable \mathbf{q} . We are then able to prove our main results. In Section 3.6, we show that Conjecture 1 also holds for types \tilde{C}_2 and \tilde{G}_2 .

In Section 4, we state our application about the existence of parahoric-fixed vectors.

1.3 The affine Hecke algebra

Let F be a non-archimedean local field, \mathcal{O} its ring of integers and ϖ be a uniformizer. Let q be the cardinality of the residue field. Then $q = p^r$ is a prime power. We write $|\cdot|_F$ for the p -adic absolute value on F ; when necessary, $|\cdot|_\infty$ will denote the archimedean absolute value on \mathbb{C} .

Let \mathbf{G} be a connected reductive algebraic group defined and split over F , \mathbf{A} a maximal torus of \mathbf{G} , and $X_* = X_*(\mathbf{A})$ the cocharacter lattice of \mathbf{A} . Let \mathbf{N} be unipotent radical of a chosen Borel subgroup \mathbf{B} , so that $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{N}$. Let W be the finite Weyl group of \mathbf{G} , and $\tilde{W} = W \ltimes X_*(\mathbf{A})$ be the extended affine Weyl group. Write S for the set of simple reflections in \tilde{W} . Let \mathbf{G}^\vee be the Langlands dual group of \mathbf{G} , taken over \mathbb{C} . We write $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$, $A = \mathbf{A}(F)$, etc. Where there is no danger of confusion, we also write G^\vee for $\mathbf{G}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$, M^\vee for $\mathbf{M}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$, etc. Let K be the maximal compact subgroup $\mathbf{G}(\mathcal{O})$. Also let I be the Iwahori subgroup of G that is the preimage of $\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. We sometimes write $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}$ for P_W , as this polynomial is also the Poincaré polynomial of the flag variety $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B})(\mathbb{C})$.

We write \mathbf{H} for the affine Hecke algebra of \tilde{W} . It is a unital associative algebra over the ring $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}]$ (in fact, it is defined over $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}]$ but we will work over \mathbb{C} to avoid having to introduce extra notation later), where $\mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a formal variable. We will think of \mathbb{C}^\times as $\text{Spec } \mathcal{A}$. The algebra \mathbf{H} has the Coxeter presentation with standard basis $\{T_w\}_{w \in \tilde{W}}$ with $T_w T_{w'} = T_{ww'}$ if $\ell(ww') = \ell(w) + \ell(w')$ and quadratic relation $(T_s + 1)(T_s - \mathbf{q}) = 0$ for $s \in S$. We write θ_λ for the generators of the Bernstein subalgebra.

Recall from [KL79] the two Kazhdan-Lusztig bases $\{C_w\}_{w \in \tilde{W}}$ and $\{C'_w\}_{w \in \tilde{W}}$ of \mathbf{H} and write $C_x C_y = \sum_{z \in \tilde{W}} h_{x,y,z} C_z$. The *inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials* $Q_{y,x}$ are the unique family of polynomials satisfying

$$T_x = \sum_{y \leq x} (-1)^{\ell(x) - \ell(y)} \mathbf{q}^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} Q_{y,x}(\mathbf{q}) C'_y,$$

or equivalently,

$$\sum_{z \leq y \leq x} (-1)^{\ell(x) - \ell(y)} Q_{y,x}(\mathbf{q}) P_{z,y}(\mathbf{q}) = \delta_{z,x}$$

along with some restrictions on their degrees. For example, we shall use in Section 3.3.2 that $\deg Q_{y,x} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\ell(x) - \ell(y) - 1)$. See [BB05] for further exposition.

It is well-known that there is an isomorphism of associative \mathbb{C} -algebras

$$\mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q} := \mathbf{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow C_c^\infty(G)^{I \times I} =: H,$$

where \mathbf{q} acts on \mathbb{C} by multiplication by q .

1.4 The asymptotic Hecke algebra

Definition 1. *Lusztig's a -function* $a: \tilde{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is defined such that $a(w)$ is the minimal value such that $\mathbf{q}^{\frac{a(w)}{2}} h_{x,y,w} \in \mathcal{A}^+ = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{q}^{1/2}]$ for all $x, y \in \tilde{W}$.

The a -function is constant of two-sided cells of \tilde{W} . Obviously, $a(1) = 1$, and the a -function obtains its maximum, equal to the number of positive roots, on the two-sided cell containing the longest word $w_0 \in W$. In general, under the bijection between two-sided cells \mathbf{c} of \tilde{W} and unipotent conjugacy classes $u = u(\mathbf{c})$ in G^\vee of [Lus89a], we have

$$a(\mathbf{c}) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{B}_u^\vee),$$

where \mathcal{B}_u^\vee is the Springer fibre of u . We have $a(w) \leq \ell(w)$ for all $w \in \tilde{W}$.

In [Lus87a], Lusztig defined an associative algebra J over \mathbb{C} equipped with an injection $\phi: \mathbf{H} \hookrightarrow J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$ which becomes an isomorphism after taking a certain completion, to be recalled in Section 3.3.1, of both sides. As an abelian group, J is free with basis $\{t_w\}_{w \in \tilde{W}}$. The structure constants of J are obtained from those of \mathbf{H} written in the $\{C_w\}_{w \in \tilde{W}}$ -basis under the following procedure: first, the integer $\gamma_{x,y,z}$ is defined by the condition

$$\mathbf{q}^{\frac{a(z)}{2}} h_{x,y,z^{-1}} - \gamma_{x,y,z} \in \mathbf{q}\mathcal{A}^+.$$

One then defines

$$t_x t_y = \sum_{z \in \tilde{W}} \gamma_{x,y,z} t_{z^{-1}}.$$

Surprisingly, this defines a unital associative algebra with unit

$$1_J = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} t_d,$$

where \mathcal{D} is the (finite) set of *distinguished involutions* [Lus87a]. The elements t_d are orthogonal idempotents in J , which decomposes as a direct sum indexed by the two-sided cells of \tilde{W} in the sense of [Lus85]. Each left cell, again in the sense of *op. cit.*, contains a single distinguished involution which is the unit in the ring $t_d J t_d$. If \mathbf{c} is a two-sided cell, then $J_{\mathbf{c}}$ is a unital ring with unit

$$1_{J_{\mathbf{c}}} = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathbf{c}} t_d.$$

Lusztig further defined a map of algebras

$$\phi: \mathbf{H} \rightarrow J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$$

given by

$$\phi(C_w) = \sum_{z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}, a(z)=a(d)} h_{x,d,z} t_z.$$

Write ϕ_q for the specialization of this map when $\mathbf{q} = q$. It is known [Lus87b, Proposition 1.7] that ϕ_q is injective for all $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$.

1.4.1 Deformations of the group ring

Upon setting $\mathbf{q} = 1$, $\mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=1}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{W}]$, and so \mathbf{H} is a deformation of the group algebra of \tilde{W} .

Let, temporarily, W be any finite Coxeter group. Then one can define its Hecke algebra \mathbf{H} , an algebra over $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}]$ which deforms the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[W]$. Let $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. For all but finitely-many values of q , all roots of unity, the algebras $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{q}=q}$ are trivial deformations of $\mathbb{C}[W]$, and hence are all isomorphic. However, this isomorphism requires choosing a square root of q . The affine Hecke algebra provides a canonical isomorphism: away from finitely-many q , we have that $\mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q}$ is isomorphic to J , and J is defined over \mathbb{Z} (although, as stated above, we will view it as a \mathbb{C} -algebra to unburden notation), see [Lus03, Section 20.1 (e)].

Example 1. Let $W = \langle 1, s \mid s^2 = 1 \rangle$ be the Weyl group of type A_1 . The Kazhdan-Lusztig C_w -basis elements are $C_1 = T_1$ and $C_s = \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}T_s - \mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}}T_1$. There are two two-sided cells in W , and one can easily check that

$$\phi: C_1 \mapsto t_1 + t_s$$

and

$$\phi: C_s \mapsto -\left(\mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)t_s.$$

Specializing $\mathbf{q} = q$, we see that ϕ becomes an isomorphism whenever $\left(q^{\frac{1}{2}} + q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \neq 0$, that is, whenever $q \neq -1$.

1.5 Representation theory of \mathbf{H} and J

Recall the classification of finite-dimensional \mathbf{H} -modules given in [KL87]. For an extended exposition with slightly different conventions, we refer the reader to [CG97]. The primary difference between the setup we require and that of [CG97] is that we must be able to defer specializing \mathbf{q} until the last possible moment, whereas specializing \mathbf{q} is the first step of the construction as given in [CG97]. In particular, let $u \in \mathbf{G}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$ be a unipotent element, and $s \in \mathbf{G}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$ be a semisimple element such that $us = su$. Let ρ be an irreducible representation of the simultaneous centralizer $Z_{G^\vee}(s, u)$. The *standard H -module* $K(s, u, \rho)$ is a certain, and in general reducible, H -module defined using the geometry of the flag variety of the Langlands dual group. It may be the zero module; we say that (u, s, ρ) is *admissible* when this does not happen. Having fixed s and u , we say that ρ is admissible if (u, s, ρ) is.

We now recall an algebraic version of the Langlands classification. As we do not have access to the notion of absolute value of \mathbf{q} , the classical definitions of tempered and discrete-series representations of the corresponding p -adic group G are not available to us. However, Kazhdan-Lusztig provide the following algebraic generalization. Let $\kappa = \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ and $\bar{\kappa}$ be the algebraic closure of κ . We write $\mathbf{H}_{\bar{\kappa}}$ for $\mathbf{H} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \bar{\kappa}$ and recall another definition of Lusztig's from [Lus89a].

Definition 2. Let M be a $H_{\bar{\kappa}}$ -module finite-dimensional over $\bar{\kappa}$. Say that $m \in M$ is an *eigenvector* if $\theta_x \cdot m = \chi_m(x)m$ for all dominant x in X_* . As χ_m is a character of the coweight lattice, it corresponds to an element $\sigma_m \in \mathbf{A}^\vee(\bar{\kappa})$ in the sense that, for all cocharacters x of A , we have

$$\chi_m(x) = x(\sigma_m)$$

where x is viewed as a character of \mathbf{A}^\vee . Then M is of *constant type* if there is a semisimple element $s' \in \mathbf{G}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$ and a morphism of algebraic groups

$$\phi': \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow Z_{G^\vee}^0(s')$$

such that for all eigenvectors m of M , the element σ_m is $\mathbf{G}^\vee(\bar{\kappa})$ -conjugate to

$$\phi'(\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{q}^{1/2}, \mathbf{q}^{-1/2}))s',$$

where by abuse of notation we have written ϕ' again for the base-change to $\bar{\kappa}$.

The idea of the name of the definition is that $s' \in \mathbf{G}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$ is a “constant element” not depending on \mathbf{q} .

Next is a generalization of Casselman’s criterion, which as such, requires a choice of dominant weights. The definitions in both [KL87] and [Lus89a] are both given under the choice of positive roots to be those associated to the opposite Borel (the so-called geometric choice of dominance). On the other hand, for purposes of harmonic analysis, Casselman’s criterion as usually stated uses the standard choice of positive roots.

Following [Lus89a], we choose a morphism of groups $V: \bar{\kappa}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $V(\mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = 1$ and $V(a\mathbf{q}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + b) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{C}$, $b \in \mathbb{C}^\times$.

Definition 3 ([Lus89a], c.f. [KL87]). Let M be any finite-dimensional $\mathbf{H}_{\bar{\kappa}}$ -module and fix the geometric notion of dominance for $X_*(\mathbf{A})$. We say that M is *V-geometrically anti-tempered* if all eigenvalues ν of θ_λ for all geometrically dominant $\lambda \in X_*(\mathbf{A})$ satisfy $V(\nu) \geq 0$. We say that M is *V-geometrically anti-square-integrable* if $V(\nu) > 0$.

When \mathbf{q} is specialized a prime power $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $V(z) = \log|z|$, we recover that our *anti-tempered for the geometric choice of dominance* modules are *tempered* in the traditional analytic sense after twisting by the Goldman involution, and likewise for square-integrability, by the Casselman criterion.

The representation theory of J is very well understood. We shall recall some notation and then state some major classification results of Lusztig, which relate the representation theory of J to certain \mathbf{H} -modules defined by Kazhdan-Lusztig.

Definition 4. Let E be a J -module. Then $E \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \kappa$ is a $J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \kappa$ -module. Hence \mathbf{H}_κ acts on E via ϕ . Denote the resulting \mathbf{H}_κ module by ${}^\phi E$.

1.5.1 Involutions on \mathbf{H}

Definition 5. Let $j: \mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ be the ring (and not \mathcal{A} -algebra) involution of \mathbf{H} defined by $j(\sum_w a_w T_w) = \sum_w \bar{a}_w (-1)^{\ell(w)} \mathbf{q}^{-\ell(w)} T_w$.

The j -involution exchanges the $\{C_w\}$ and $\{C'_w\}$ -bases [KL79].

The reason for our choice of conventions, which match those of [Lus87b] and [Lus89a], is the presence of the Goldman involution and its exchange of temperedness and anti-temperedness in the relationship between H -modules and J -modules; see Theorem 6 and Lemma 1 below.

Definition 6. The *Goldman involution* $h \mapsto h^\dagger$ is the \mathcal{A} -algebra involution of \mathbf{H} defined by setting

$$T_w^\dagger = (-1)^{\ell(w)} \mathbf{q}^{\ell(w)} T_{w^{-1}}^{-1}.$$

Given an \mathbf{H} (or \mathbf{H}_κ)-module M , define ${}^\dagger M$ to be the same vector space with the \mathbf{H} -action twisted by this involution.

Let Δ be the usual positive system determined by \mathbf{B} and let Δ^- be the geometric system. Then we have

Lemma 1. *We have*

1.

$$\overline{h^\dagger} = (\bar{h})^\dagger = j(h)$$

as \mathcal{A} -antilinear involutions. In particular, $C_w^\dagger = j(C_w) = (-1)^{\ell(w)} C'_w$.

2. Let λ be dominant for Δ and let θ_λ^Δ and $\theta_\lambda^{\Delta^-}$ denote Bernstein elements with respect to Δ and Δ^- , respectively. Then

$$\theta_\lambda^{\Delta^\dagger} = (-1)^{\ell(\lambda)} \theta_\lambda^{\Delta^-}.$$

Proof. We compute

$$\overline{\sum_x b_x T_x^\dagger} = \sum_x \bar{b}_x (-1)^{\ell(x)} \overline{\mathbf{q}^{\ell(x)} T_x} = \sum_x \bar{b}_x (-1)^{\ell(x)} \mathbf{q}^{-\ell(x)} T_x = j\left(\sum_x b_x T_x\right)$$

whereas

$$\left(\overline{\sum_x b_x T_x}\right)^\dagger = \left(\sum_x \bar{b}_x (-1)^{\ell(x)} \mathbf{q}^{-\ell(x)} T_x^\dagger\right)^\dagger.$$

Thus we have $\bar{C}_w^\dagger = (-1)^{\ell(w)} C'_w$, whence the first claim.

Next,

$$\theta_\lambda^{\Delta^\dagger} = (-1)^{\ell(\lambda)} \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{\ell(\lambda)}{2}} \mathbf{q}^{\ell(\lambda)} T_{-\lambda}^{-1} = (-1)^{\ell(\lambda)} \theta_\lambda^{\Delta^-},$$

noting that $-\lambda$ is dominant with respect to Δ^- and so can appear as a label with respect to Δ^- . \square

We now summarize the relationship between representations of \mathbf{H} and of J .

Theorem 6 ([Lus89a], Prop. 2.11, Thm. 4.2, Prop. 4.4). *Fix the geometric notion of dominance for $X_*(\mathbf{A})$. Then there are bijections of sets*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (u, s, \rho) & & \{(u, s, \rho) \mid \rho \text{ admissible, } us = su\} / \mathbf{G}^\vee(\mathbb{C}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K(s, u, \rho) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \kappa & & \{M \in \mathbf{H}_\kappa - \mathbf{Mod} \mid M \otimes_\kappa \bar{\kappa} \text{ simple, } V - \text{geometrically anti-tempered}\} \\ \parallel & & \\ \phi E = E \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \kappa \in \mathbf{H}_\kappa - \mathbf{Mod} & & H_{\bar{\kappa}} - \text{module of constant type} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ E & & \{E \in J - \mathbf{Mod} \mid E \text{ is simple}\}. \end{array}$$

Moreover, for a simple J -module E ,

1. E is finite-dimensional over \mathbb{C} ;
2. There is a unique two-sided cell $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(E)$ of \tilde{W} such that $\text{trace}(E, t_w) \neq 0$ implies $w \in \mathbf{c}$.
3. $\text{trace}(E, t_w)$ is the constant term of the polynomial

$$(-\mathbf{q}^{1/2})^{a(\mathbf{c}(E))} \text{trace}(M, C_w) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{q}^{\frac{1}{2}}]$$

where $M \simeq \phi E$.

In particular, $\text{trace}(E, t_w)$ is independent of \mathbf{q} , and upon specializing $\mathbf{q} = q$ a prime power, will be a regular function in the twisting character in the setting of the Payley-Weiner theorem for the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of the p -adic group G , as we will explain in greater detail below.

That is, in our conventions, simple tempered $\mathbf{H}|_{\mathbf{q}=q}$ -modules in the sense of harmonic analysis will extend to simple J -modules via $\phi \circ ()^\dagger$.

We will comment even further on the necessity of twisting by the Goldman involution in Section 2.4.

1.6 Acknowledgements

Earlier versions of Sections 1–3 made up part of the author's PhD thesis and were written with the support of NSERC. The author thanks Alexander Braverman for introducing him to this material and the problem, for suggesting the use of the Plancherel formula, and for helpful conversations.

The author also thanks Roman Bezrukavnikov, Itai Bar-Natan, Gurbir Dhillon, Malors Espinosa-Lara, Julia Gordon, George Lusztig, and Matthew Sunohara for helpful conversations. The author thanks Maarten Solleveld for explaining the generalization in [Sol21] of the results of [FOS21], suggesting the reference [ABPS17], and for careful reading of an early version of this manuscript.

2 Harish-Chandra's Plancherel formula

We recall the notation and classical results we will need about the Plancherel formula. For Iwahori-biinvariant Schwartz functions, the Plancherel formula is known explicitly for all connected reductive groups, and is due to Opdam in [Opd04]. In the case of $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(F)$, we shall refer instead to [AP05] (where in fact the Plancherel formula is computed explicitly in its entirety for GL_n). In the case $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$, we shall refer to the unpublished work [AK00] of Aubert and Kim. For $\mathbf{G} = G_2$, we will refer to Parkinson [Par14].

In this section q is a prime power (or at least a real number of absolute value strictly greater than 1). The formal variable \mathbf{q} will not appear in this section.

2.1 Tempered and discrete series representations

Definition 7. A smooth representation π of G is *tempered* if π is unitary, of finite length, and all matrix coefficients of π belong to $L^{2+\epsilon}(G/Z(G))$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. We write $\mathcal{M}_t(G)$ for the category of tempered representations of G .

In particular, the central character of such a representation takes values in the circle group $\mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{C}^\times$.

Definition 8. A smooth finite-length representation ω of G belongs to the *discrete series* if all matrix coefficients of ω are square-integrable modulo $Z(G)$. We write $\mathcal{E}_2(G)$ for the space of unitary discrete series, and $\mathcal{E}_2(G)^I$ for the space of unitary discrete series with nontrivial Iwahori-fixed vectors.

The tempered representations are built from the discrete series according to the following theorem of Harish-Chandra, as related in [Wal03, Prop. III.4.1].

Theorem 7 (Harish-Chandra). *Let P be a parabolic subgroup of G with Levi subgroup M , and let $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M)$. Let ν be a unitary character of M . Then $\pi = \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu)$ is a tempered representation. Every simple tempered representation is a direct summand of a representation of this form.*

By induction we always understand normalized induction.

2.1.1 Formal degrees of discrete series representations

We will soon study the Plancherel decomposition $f = \sum_M f_M$ of the Schwartz function f determined by an element of J as explained in Section 2.4. As will be explained below, each function f_M is given by an integral formula that involves several constants that depend on the Levi subgroup M , or are functions on the discrete series of M . These constants are rational functions of q , the most sensitive of which is the formal degree $d(\omega)$ of $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M)^I$. Much is known about formal degrees for I -spherical ω , and we summarize the known formulas here, rewriting Macdonald's formulas to emphasize that all the denominators appearing divide a power of the Poincaré polynomial of W .

Theorem 8 ([Bor76]). *Let ω be a discrete series representation of G such that $\dim \omega^I = 1$. Then a complete list of formal degrees of such ω not isomorphic to the Steinberg representation St_G is, in the notation of [Mac72]:*

1. For \mathbf{G} of type B_ℓ ($\ell \geq 3$), $d(\omega)$ is equal to

$$\tilde{W}_{B_\ell}(q^{-1}, q)^{-1} = \pm \frac{q^\ell(1+q^\ell)(1-q^{2-\ell})(1-q^{3-\ell})}{(1+q)(1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{2\ell-1})} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \frac{q^{2i-1}}{1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{2i-1}} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^{\ell-1} \frac{q^{2i-2}(1-q^{1-\ell})(1-q^{2-\ell+i})}{1-q^{2i-2}}.$$

2. For \mathbf{G} of type C_ℓ ($\ell \geq 2$), $d(\omega)$ is equal to either

(a)

$$\tilde{W}_{C_\ell}(q^{-1}, q^{-1}, q)^{-1} = \tilde{W}_{C_\ell}(q^{-1}, q, q^{-1})^{-1} = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{(1 - q^{-1})(1 - q^{-\ell-i+1})}{(1 - q^{-i-1})(1 + q^{-i-1})(1 + q^{-i+1})};$$

or, occurring only for $\ell \geq 4$,

(b)

$$\tilde{W}_{C_\ell}(q^{-1}, q, q)^{-1} = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{(1 - q^{-1})(1 + q^{-\ell-i+3})}{(1 - q^{-i-1})(1 + q^{-i+1})(1 + q^{-i+1})}.$$

3. For \mathbf{G} of type F_4 , $d(\omega)$ is equal to

$$\tilde{W}_{F_4}(q^{-1}, q)^{-1} = \prod_{i=0}^3 \frac{(1 - q^{-1})(1 - q)}{(1 - q^{i-1})(1 + q^{-i+1})(1 - q^i)}.$$

For any \mathbf{G} , $d(\text{St}_G)$ is exactly the reciprocal of the Poincaré series of \tilde{W} .

Hence, given Theorem 8 and Bott's theorem on the Poincaré series of \tilde{W} [BB05, Thm. 7.1.10], we have

$$d(\text{St}_G) = \frac{1}{P_W(q)} \prod_{e_i} (1 - q^{e_i}),$$

where the e_i are the exponents of the finite Weyl group W .

Borel also treated the case G_2 , but we will use the formal degree of the unique non-Steinberg discrete series representation ω coming from a character of H that appears below.

An essentially disjoint set of discrete series representations is studied by Reeder in [Ree94]. A general formula was obtained in *op. cit.*, but its denominator is given by a complicated expression. Thankfully, Reeder computed some examples using a computer algebra system. Reeder points out that his formulas have a geometric interpretation in terms of the complex flag variety, which gives hope that one might understand the poles at the level of detail we require. We will not pursue this hope in the present paper.

Theorem 9 ([Ree94]). *The examples computed in [Ree94] by specializing Formula A of op. cit. give the following formal degrees of some Iwahori-spherical discrete series representations admitting a Whittaker model:*

1. If \mathbf{G} is of type \mathbf{G}_2 , then a complete list of formal degrees of elements of $\mathcal{E}_2(G)^I$ is

$$d(\tau_1) = \frac{(q^5 - 1)(q - 1)^2}{(q^6 - 1)(q + 1)}, \quad d(\tau_2) = \frac{1}{2} d(\tau_2)' = \frac{q(1 + q^3)(q - 1)^2}{6(1 + q + q^2 + q^3 + q^4 + q^5)(1 + q)^2},$$

and

$$d(\tau_3) = \frac{q(q - 1)^2(1 + q + q^2)}{2(1 + q + q^2 + q^3 + q^4 + q^5)(1 + q)}, \quad d(\tau_4) = \frac{q(q - 1)^2(q + 1)}{3(q^6 - 1)}.$$

2. If $G = \text{SO}_5(F)$, then

$$d(\pm\tau_2) = \frac{q(q - 1)^2}{2(q^2 + 1)(q + 1)^2}.$$

3. If $G = \text{SO}_7(F)$, then

$$d(\tau_2) = d(\tau_2)' = \frac{q(q - 1)^3}{4(q^2 + 1)(q + 1)^3},$$

and

$$d(\tau_3) = \frac{q(q - 1)^2(q^3 - 1)}{4(q^3 + 1)(q^2 + 1)(q + 1)}.$$

4. If $G = \mathrm{SO}_9(F)$, then in the case of τ_i regular (when reviewed as a root of the complex dual group) we have

$$d(\pm\tau_1) = \frac{(q^4 - 1)(q^3 - 1)(q^7 - 1)(q^2 - 1)^2(q - 1)^2}{2(q^8 - 1)(q^6 - 1)(q^4 - 1)^2(q + 1)^3},$$

$$d(\pm\tau_3) = \frac{q(q^5 - 1)(q - 1)^3}{4(q^4 + 1)(q^3 + 1)(q + 1)^3},$$

and

$$d(\pm\tau_5) = \frac{q^2(q^3 - 1)^2(q - 1)^2}{2(q^4 + 1)(q^2 + 1)(q + 1)^4}.$$

5. If \mathbf{G} is of type \mathbf{F}_4 , then

$$d(\tau) = \frac{q(q^{10} - 1)(q^7 - 1)(q^3 - 1)(q - 1)^3(1 + q + q^2)}{2(q^{12} - 1)(q^8 - 1)(1 + q + q^2 + q^3 + q^4 + q^5)(q + 1)^2}.$$

Together, Reeder's formulas plus Borel's cover all of $\mathcal{E}_2(G)^I$ for \mathbf{G} of rank at most 3. Finally, the most general current result seems to be

Theorem 10 ([Sol21], [FOS21], Theorem 5.1 (b), [GR10] Proposition 4.1). *Let \mathbf{G} be connected reductive over F . Let ω be any unipotent—in particular, any Iwahori-spherical—discrete series representation of $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$. Then $d(\omega)$ is a rational function of q , the numerator and denominator of which are products of factors of the form $q^{m/2}$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $(q^n - 1)$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, there is a polynomial Δ_G depending only on G and F such that $\Delta_G d(\omega)$ is a polynomial in q .*

This result is proven by first proving that the Hiraga-Ichino-Ikeda conjecture [HII08] holds for unipotent discrete series representations. Note that [Sol21], [FOS21] and [HII08] all use the normalization of the Haar measure on G defined in [HII08]. This normalization gives in our setting $\mu_{\mathrm{HII}}(K) = q^{\dim \mathbf{G}} \# \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Hence, noting that $\# \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q) = P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q) \cdot \# \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and that, as \mathbb{F}_q is perfect, $\# \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is a polynomial in q , we have

$$\mu_I = \frac{1}{q^{\dim \mathbf{G}} \# \mathbf{B}(\mathbb{F}_q)} \mu_{\mathrm{HII}},$$

and so this question of normalization cannot affect the denominators of $d(\omega)$, for any Levi subgroup.

In the Iwahori-spherical case, Opdam showed the above result in [Opd04, Proposition 3.27 (v)], although with less control over the possible factors appearing in the numerator and denominator of $d(\omega)$. We emphasize that *op. cit.* does not make the splitness assumption we allow ourselves.

Remark 4. Proposition 4.1 of [GR10] studies not the γ -factor we are interested in, but rather its quotient by the γ -factor for the Steinberg representation. However, accounting for the use of the Euler-Poincaré measure μ_{HII} on G , and known formula for the formal degree of the Steinberg representation, one may recover our desired statement about formal degrees from the main theorem and equation (61) of [GR10].

2.2 Harish-Chandra's canonical measure

In this section, we recall the standard coordinates used in [AP05], and [Wal03]. We follow both references closely. These conventions differ slightly from the original [HC84b]. Everything in this section is standard, but we include details because we do require explicit measures with which to compute. We state the below for general \mathbf{G} , for application to each standard Levi subgroup of \mathbf{G} .

2.2.1 Unramified characters

Let $X(\mathbf{G}) = \text{Hom}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{G}_m)$ denote the rational characters of \mathbf{G} defined over F . Let $\mathfrak{a}_G := (X^*(\mathbf{A}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R})^* = (X^*(\mathbf{G}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R})^*$ be the real Lie algebra of the maximal split central torus $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_G$ of \mathbf{G} and let $\mathfrak{a}_{G\mathbb{C}}$ be its complexification. We have a map

$$X(\mathbf{G}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(G/G^1, \mathbb{C}^\times) =: \mathcal{X}(G)$$

given by $\chi \mapsto |\chi|_F$, where $|\chi|_F(g) = |\chi(g)|_F$ and $G^1 = \bigcap_{\chi \in X(\mathbf{G})} \ker |\chi|_F$. This gives the unramified characters $\mathcal{X}(G)$ a complex manifold structure under which $\mathcal{X}(G) \simeq (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{a}_G}$. For indeed, we have

$$\mathfrak{a}_{G\mathbb{C}}^* \longrightarrow \mathcal{X}(G) \longrightarrow 1$$

given by

$$\chi \otimes s \mapsto (g \mapsto |\chi(g)|_F^s = q^{-s \text{val}(\chi(g))}).$$

The kernel is spanned by all $\chi \otimes s$ such that $s \text{val}(\chi(g)) \in \frac{2\pi i}{\log q} \mathbb{Z}$ for all $g \in G$. Hence the kernel is $\frac{2\pi i}{\log q} R$, where $R \subset X^*(\mathbf{A}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ is a lattice. In this way the quotient $\mathcal{X}(G)$ is a complex manifold.

2.2.2 Unitary unramified characters

Denote $\text{Im } \mathcal{X}(G)$ the set of unitary unramified characters taking values in the unit circle $\mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{C}^\times$. This notation is justified, as if $|\chi|_F = |\chi'|_F$, then $\text{Re}(\chi) = \text{Re}(\chi') \in \mathfrak{a}_G$. Hence we can define $\text{Im } \mathcal{X}(G)$ to be the unramified characters coming from pure imaginary elements of $\mathfrak{a}_{G\mathbb{C}}$.

The surjection $\text{Im } \mathcal{X}(G) \rightarrow \text{Im } \mathcal{X}(A)$ has finite kernel, and $\text{Im } \mathcal{X}(A)$ is compact. We chose the Haar measure on it with volume one.

2.2.3 Action by twisting and the canonical measure

The group $\mathcal{X}(G)$ acts on admissible representations of G by twisting: $\omega \mapsto \omega \otimes \nu$ for $\nu \in \mathcal{X}(G)$. This restricts to an action the unitary unramified characters on $\mathcal{E}_2(G)$.

Pulling this action back to $i\mathfrak{a}_G$, and given a representation ω , let L^* be its stabilizer in $i\mathfrak{a}_G$, so that the orbit \mathfrak{o} of ω is identified as $i\mathfrak{a}_G/L^*$. This gives $\mathfrak{o} = \text{Im } \mathcal{X}(G) \cdot \omega$ the structure of a real submanifold of the larger orbit $\mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{a}_{G\mathbb{C}}/L^* = \mathcal{X}(G) \cdot \omega$.

Definition 9. Given an orbit $\mathfrak{o} \subset \mathcal{E}_2(G)$, the *Harish-Chandra canonical measure* on \mathfrak{o} is the Euclidean measure on \mathfrak{o} whose pullback to $\text{Im } \mathcal{X}(G)$ agrees with the pullback of the Haar measure on $\text{Im } \mathcal{X}(A)$.

Hence even though the construction of the canonical measure is slightly involved, in practice it will be easy to recognize as being essentially the Haar measure on the compact torus $\text{Im } \mathcal{X}(A)$.

Example 2. If $G = \text{SL}_2(F)$ and $M = A$ is the diagonal torus, we have $\mathfrak{a}_G^* \simeq \mathbb{R}$ and $R = \mathbb{Z}$ so that a fundamental domain for $\mathfrak{a}_G^*/\frac{2\pi}{\log q} R$ is $\left[-\frac{\pi}{\log q}, \frac{\pi}{\log q}\right)$ and the canonical measure $d\nu = \frac{\log q}{2\pi} dx$, where dx is the Lebesgue measure. To obtain quasicharacters of G , we associate to $\nu \in \mathfrak{a}_{G\mathbb{C}}$ the quasicharacter $\chi_\nu(g) = q^{i\langle \nu, H_G(g) \rangle}$.

Therefore to compute the integral of a function f on $\mathcal{E}_2(G)$ supported on the unramified unitary characters of A , we compute

$$\int_{\mathcal{E}_2(A)} f(\omega) d\omega = \int f(\chi_\nu) d\nu = \frac{\log q}{2\pi} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{\log q}}^{\frac{\pi}{\log q}} f(e^{it \log q}) dt = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{f(z)}{z} dz$$

if $t \mapsto e^{it \log q} = q^s =: z$ (here $s = it$) parameterizes the unit circle \mathbb{T} .

In general, $\mathcal{E}_2(M_P)$ is a disjoint union of compact tori, and the Plancherel density descends to the quotients of these compact tori by certain finite groups, namely, the Weyl groups of (P, A_P) . The set $\mathcal{E}_2(M_P)^I$ is finite up to twist by unramified characters, by a result of Harish-Chandra [Wal03].

2.3 The Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra

Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(G)$ be the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra of G ; see [HC84a], [Wal03], or [BK18] for the definition and associated notation. In particular, we will record for future comparison with the argument in the proof of Proposition 2 that

$$q^{\frac{\ell(w)}{2}} q^{-\#W} \leq \Delta(IwI) \leq q^{\frac{\ell(w)}{2}}.$$

Let $\mathcal{C}^{I \times I}$ the subalgebra of Iwahori-biinvariant functions. As explained in [Wal03], the Fourier transform $f \mapsto \pi(f)$ defines an endomorphism of π for every $f \in \mathcal{C}$ and every tempered representation π .

The Plancherel theorem is the statement (see [Wal03, Thm. VIII.1.1]) that this assignment defines an isomorphism of rings

$$\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_t(G),$$

where $\mathcal{E}_t(G)$ is the subring of the endomorphism ring of the forgetful functor $\mathcal{M}_t(G) \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by the following conditions:

1. For all $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\nu \otimes \omega)$, the endomorphism $\eta_\pi = \eta_{\nu, \omega}$ is a smooth function of the unramified unitary character ν and $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M_P)$;
2. The endomorphism η_π is biinvariant with respect to some open compact subgroup of G .

We have the obvious inclusion $\iota: H \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{I \times I}$.

Define the subring $\mathcal{E}(G)$ of the endomorphism ring of the forgetful functor $\mathcal{M}(G) \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{C}}$ from the category of all smooth representations, by replacing, in (1) above, $\mathcal{E}_2(M)$ with $\mathcal{M}(M)$, unitary characters with all unramified characters, and “smooth” with “algebraic.” The matrix Paley-Wiener theorem of Bernstein [Ber92] says that $f \mapsto \pi(f)$ is an isomorphism from the full Hecke algebra of G onto $\mathcal{E}(G)$. Denote \mathcal{E}^I and \mathcal{E}_t the subrings of I -invariant endomorphisms.

For computational purposes such as ours, we require that these isomorphisms be explicit. In the Iwahori-spherical case, harmonic analysis on $\mathcal{C}^{I \times I}$ can be phrased internally to H and various completions of H . In this setting Opdam gave an explicit Plancherel formula in [Opd04]. In more general settings there are explicit formulas for $\text{GL}_n(F)$, $\text{Sp}_4(F)$, and $G_2(F)$, which we will also make use of.

2.4 The algebra J as a subalgebra of the Schwartz algebra.

In [BK18], Braverman and Kazhdan constructed a map of \mathbb{C} -algebras $J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{I \times I}$. We shall review this construction now.

Definition 10 ([BK18], Section 1.7). Let $P = M_P N_P$. A character $\chi: M_P \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ of M_P is *non-strictly positive* if for all root subgroups $U_\alpha \subset N_P$, we have $|\chi(\alpha^\vee(x))|_\infty \geq 1$ for $|x|_F \geq 1$.

We say a non-strictly positive character χ is *strictly positive* if for all root subgroups $U_\alpha \subset N_P$, we have $|\chi(\alpha^\vee(x))|_\infty > 1$ for $|x|_F \geq 1$.

Of course, it suffices to test this for $x = \varpi^{-1}$. The condition for χ^{-1} to be non-strictly positive is then that $|\chi(\alpha^\vee(\varpi))|_\infty \geq 1$.

Example 3. For $\mathbf{G} = \text{SL}_2$, in the conventions fixed in Example 2, an unramified character χ of A is non-strictly positive if χ^{-1} corresponds to z such that $|z| \geq 1$.

If $\mathbf{G} = \text{GL}_n$ and ν corresponds to the vector $(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, then the condition that ν^{-1} is non-strictly positive translate to $|z_n| \geq |z_{n-1}| \geq \dots \geq |z_1|$. Such conditions divide \mathbb{C}^n into chambers, on which the Weyl group \mathfrak{S}_n clearly acts simply-transitively. Interior points correspond to ν such that ν^{-1} is strictly positive.

Following *op. cit.*, let $\mathcal{E}_J^I(G)$ denote the subring of $\mathcal{E}_t(G)$ defined by the following conditions on the endomorphisms η_π :

1. For all $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\nu \otimes \omega)$, the endomorphism $\eta_\pi = \eta_{\nu, \omega}$ is a rational function of ν , regular on the set of ν such that ν^{-1} is non-strictly positive.
2. The endomorphism η_π is $I \times I$ -biinvariant.

Theorem 11 ([BK18], Theorem 1.8). *Let \mathbf{G} be a connected reductive group defined and split over F . Then the following statements hold:*

1. *Let π be a tempered representation of G . Then the action of H on π^I extends uniquely to J .*
2. *Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup of G with Levi subgroup M and let ω an irreducible tempered representation of M . Let ν be a non-strictly positive character of M and let $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu^{-1})$. Then the action of $H(G, I)$ on π^I extends uniquely to an action of J .*
3. *The map $t_w \mapsto (\eta_\pi(w))_{\pi \in \mathcal{M}_t(G)}$ defines a homomorphism*

$$\eta: J \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_J^I(G).$$

Composing this isomorphism with the inverse Fourier transform, Braverman and Kazhdan define an algebra map

$$\tilde{\phi}: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{I \times I}$$

sending

$$t_w \mapsto (\eta_\pi(w))_{\pi \in \mathcal{M}_t(G)} \mapsto f_w = \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} A_{x,w} T_x \in \mathcal{C}^{I \times I},$$

where $A_{x,w} = f_w(IxI)$. By definition, $\eta_\pi(w) = \pi(f_w)$ as endomorphisms of π . We will show later that $\tilde{\phi}$ is essentially the map ϕ^{-1} .

Remark 5. There are gaps in the proofs of injectivity and surjectivity of the map η in [BK18]. However, we shall prove injectivity by proving injectivity of $\tilde{\phi}$ in Corollary 4. We prove surjectivity in forthcoming work.

Implicit in [BK18] is

Lemma 2. *We have the commutative diagram (2).*

Proof. Let π be a tempered representation of G . By [BK18], the H -action on it extends to a J -action, and by Corollary 2.6 of *loc. cit.*, we have $\eta_\pi(\phi_q(f^\dagger)) = \pi(f)$ in \mathcal{E}_t^I for any $f \in H$. Therefore $\tilde{\phi} \circ \phi_q(f^\dagger) = f$ by the Plancherel theorem. \square

Remark 6. The presence of the Goldman involution is necessary for tempered representations of J to restrict to tempered representations of H . For example, in [BK18], Braverman and Kazhdan showed for $G = \text{SL}_2(F)$, that $\mathcal{E}_J^I(G) = \text{End}(\text{St}^I) \oplus \text{End}_{\Phi, X_*}(\mathcal{S}^I)$, matching the decomposition $J = \mathbb{C}t_1 \oplus J_0$, where Φ is the Fourier transform on the Schwartz space of the basic affine space \mathcal{S} [BK99], and St is the Steinberg representation. In this case J has three one-dimensional representations, whereas H has one one-dimensional discrete series representation St , two tempered one-dimensional representations not belonging to the discrete series, and one non-tempered one-dimensional representation, the trivial representation. It is easy to compute using the formulas of [Daw21] that $\phi_q(T_s)t_1 = qt_1$, whereas $\phi_q(T_s^\dagger)t_1 = -t_1$. Thus for the Steinberg representation to restrict to the Steinberg representation, the twist is required.

2.5 The Plancherel formula for GL_n

For $G = \text{GL}_n(F)$, we have access to an explicit Plancherel measure and its Bernstein decomposition, thanks to [AP05].

Recall that for $G = \text{GL}_n(F)$, we have bijections

$$\{\text{partitions of } n\} \leftrightarrow \{\text{Standard Levi subgroups } M \text{ of } \text{GL}_n(F)\} \tag{3}$$

$$\leftrightarrow \{\text{unipotent conjugacy classes in } \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})\} \tag{4}$$

$$\leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}/\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$$

$$\leftrightarrow \{2\text{-sided cells } \mathbf{c} \text{ in } \tilde{W}\} \tag{5}$$

$$\leftrightarrow \{\text{direct summands } J_{\mathbf{c}} \text{ of } J\}$$

where (3) \leftrightarrow (4) sends a unipotent conjugacy class u to the standard Levi M such that a member of u is distinguished in M^\vee , and (4) \leftrightarrow (5) is Lusztig's bijection from [Lus89a].

Definition 11. Let u be a unipotent element of a semisimple group S over the complex numbers. Then u is *distinguished in S* if $Z_S(u)$ contains no nontrivial torus.

Let $P = M_P N_P$ be a parabolic subgroup of G and let \mathcal{O} be an orbit in $\mathcal{E}_2(M_P)$ under the action of the unitary unramified characters of M_P as explained in Section 2.2. Write $W_{M_P} \subset W$ for the finite Weyl group of (M_P, A_P) . Let $\text{Stab}_{W_M}(\mathcal{O})$ be the stabilizer of \mathcal{O} . Recall that a parabolic subgroup of G is said to be *semistandard* if it contains A . Then the Plancherel decomposition reads

$$f = \sum_{(P=M_P N_P, \mathcal{O})/\text{association}} f_{M_P, \mathcal{O}}$$

where $f \in \mathcal{C}(G)$, the sum is taken over semistandard parabolic subgroups P up to association, and

$$f_{M_P, \mathcal{O}}(g) = c(G/M)^{-2} \gamma(G/M)^{-1} \# \text{Stab}_{W_M}(\mathcal{O})^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{O}} \mu_{G/M}(\omega) d(\omega) \text{trace}(\pi, R_g(f)) d\omega,$$

where $R_g f(x) = f(xg)$ is the right translation of f and $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\nu \otimes \omega)$ is the normalized parabolic induction of the twist of ω by a unitary unramified character ν of M . In [AP05], each term above is explicitly calculated as a rational function of q .

Lemma 3. *There is a finite set $S = \{(M, \omega) \mid \omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M)^I\}$ such that $\text{trace}(\text{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu), f)$ is nonzero only for $\omega \in S$, for all I -biinvariant Schwartz functions f .*

Proof. This is entirely standard. As $\mathcal{E}_2(M)^{I_M}$ is finite for every M , and there are finitely-many standard parabolics of G , we need only show that $\text{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu)^I \neq 0$ only if $\omega^{I_M} \neq 0$, where I_M is the Iwahori subgroup of the reductive group M relative to the Borel subgroup $M(\mathbb{F}_q) \cap B(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of $M(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Note that I_M is naturally a subgroup of I . For any representation σ of M , if $f \in \text{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$ is I -fixed, then for $i_M \in I_M$, we have

$$f(i_M) = \sigma(i_M) \delta_P^{\frac{1}{2}}(i_M) f(1) = f(1),$$

and so if $\delta_P^{\frac{1}{2}}(i_M) = 1$, then it must be that $f(1) \in \sigma^{I_M}$. The Iwahori factorization

$$I_M = N_P^-(\pi \mathcal{O}) A(\mathcal{O}) N_M(\mathcal{O})$$

and the fact that Ad_{n_P} is a representation implies that

$$\delta_P^{\frac{1}{2}}(i_M) = |\det \text{Ad}_{n_P}(N_P^-(i_M) A(i_M) N_M(i_M))|_F = |\det \text{Ad}_{n_P}(A(i_M))|_F = 1$$

by unipotence of the groups N_P^- and N_M and the fact that the image of i_M in $M(\mathbb{F}_q)$ lies in the Borel. \square

Let $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu)$ be a tempered representation and let (u, s) be the KL-parameter of its discrete support. Then by [KL87, Theorem 8.3], \mathbf{M}_P^\vee is minimal such that $(u, s) \in M_P^\vee$. By *op. cit.*, this condition is equivalent to $Z_M(s)$ being semisimple and u being distinguished in $Z_M(s)$.

Proposition 1 (c.f. [Opd04] Proposition 8.3). *The Plancherel decomposition is compatible with the decomposition $J = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{c}} J_{\mathbf{c}}$ in the sense that if $w \in \mathbf{c}$, $f = f_w$ and $u = u(\mathbf{c})$ under Lusztig's bijection, then $f_M \neq 0$ only for those M such that there exists $s \in M^\vee(\mathbb{C})$ such that $Z_{M^\vee}(s)$ is semisimple and $Z_{M^\vee}(s) \cap Z_{M^\vee}(u)$ contains no nontrivial torus.*

Proof. Let $\pi := \text{Ind}_P^G(\nu \otimes \omega)$ be a tempered irreducible representation of G induced as usual from a standard parabolic subgroup P with Levi subgroup M . Then π^I is a tempered irreducible H -module, and is of the form $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ for $u, s \in \mathbf{G}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$ and ρ a representation of $\pi_0(Z_{G^\vee}(u, s))$ with s compact. By [BK18], Corollary 2.6, $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ extends to a J -module. By definition of Lusztig's bijection, $\pi(f_w) \neq 0$ only if w is in the two-sided cell $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(u)$ of \tilde{W} corresponding to u . On the other hand, $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ is induced from a square-integrable standard module $K_M(u, s, \tilde{\rho}, q)$ of $H(M, I_M)$. But now [KL87, Theorem 8.3] says that (u, s) must be precisely as in the statement of the proposition. Thus only such summands $(f_w)_M$ in the Plancherel decomposition of f_w are nonzero. \square

Of course, when $\mathbf{G} = \text{GL}_n$, the bijections (3), (4), and (5), imply that there is a unique nonzero summand $(f_w)_M$ for each w .

2.6 Plancherel measure for GL_n

We refer to [AP05, Section 5], for a summary of the Bernstein decomposition of the tempered irreducible representations of GL_n , in particular we use the description in *loc. cit.* of the Bernstein component parameterizing the I -spherical representations of G .

As we shall be applying the Plancherel formula only to Iwahori-biinvariant functions, it suffices to consider only irreducible tempered representations with Iwahori-fixed vectors. For GL_n , the only such representations are of the form

$$\pi = \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\nu_1 \mathrm{St}_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \nu_k \mathrm{St}_k)$$

where St_i is the Steinberg representation of GL_i , and $P \supset M = \mathrm{GL}_{l_1} \times \cdots \times \mathrm{GL}_{l_k}$.

These representations are parameterized as follows. Let M be a Levi subgroup corresponding to the partition $l_1 + \cdots + l_k = n$, and recall that we write \mathbb{T} for the circle group. Define $\gamma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ by $\gamma = (1 \dots l_1)(1 \dots l_2) \cdots (1 \dots l_k)$, so that the fixed-point set $(\mathbb{T}^n)^\gamma = \{(z_1, \dots, z_1, \dots, z_k, \dots, z_k)\} \simeq \mathbb{T}^k$. Then the irreducible tempered representations with Iwahori-fixed vectors induced from M are parameterized by the compact orbifold $(\mathbb{T}^n)^\gamma / Z_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(\gamma)$.

Theorem 12 ([AP05], Remark 5.6). *Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$ and $M = \mathrm{GL}_{l_1} \times \cdots \times \mathrm{GL}_{l_k}$ be a Levi subgroup. Then the Plancherel measure of H on $(\mathbb{T}^n)^\gamma / Z_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(\gamma)$ is*

$$d\nu_H(\omega) = \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{q^{l_i^2 - l_i} (q-1)^{l_i}}{l_i (q^{l_i} - 1)} \cdot q^{\frac{n-n^2}{2}} \cdot \prod_{(i,j,g)} \frac{q^{2g+1} (z_i - z_j q^g) (z_i - q^{-g} z_j)}{(z_i - z_j q^{-g-1}) (z_i - q^{g+1} z_j)},$$

where the tuples $(i, j, g) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ are tuples such that $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and $|g_i - g_j| \leq g \leq g_i + g_j$, where $g_i = \frac{l_i - 1}{2}$.

This is the measure that we will integrate against, by successively applying the residue theorem. When carrying out explicit calculations, we will usually elide the constant

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \frac{q^{l_i^2 - l_i} (q-1)^{l_i}}{l_i (q^{l_i} - 1)} \cdot q^{\frac{n-n^2}{2}}$$

as it depends only on M . We shall abbreviate

$$\Gamma_{i,j,g} := q^{-2g-1} \left| \Gamma_F \left(q^{-g} \frac{z_i}{z_j} \right) \right|^2 = \frac{(z_i - q^g z_j) (z_i - q^{-g} z_j)}{(z_i - z_j q^{-g-1}) (z_i - q^{g+1} z_j)},$$

and recall that, as noted in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [AP05], the function $(z_1, \dots, z_k) \mapsto \prod_{(i,j,g)} \Gamma_{i,j,g}$ is $Z_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(\gamma)$ -invariant. Hence for the purposes of integration, we may allow ourselves to integrate simply over \mathbb{T}^k . Moreover, there are many cancellations between the $\Gamma_{i,j,g}$ for a fixed pair $i < j$ as g varies. Indeed, putting $q_{ij} = q^{|g_i - g_j|}$, $q^{ij} = q^{g_i + g_j + 1}$, and

$$\Gamma^{ij} := \frac{(z_i - q_{ij} z_j) (z_i - (q_{ij})^{-1} z_j)}{(z_i - q^{ij} z_j) (z_i - (q^{ij})^{-1} z_j)}$$

we have

$$\prod \Gamma_{i,j,g} = \Gamma^{ij},$$

where the product is taken over all integers g appearing in triples (i, j, g) for $i < j$ fixed. We set

$$c_M := \prod_{(i,j,g)} q^{2g+1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{q^{l_i^2 - l_i} (q-1)^{l_i}}{l_i (q^{l_i} - 1)} \cdot q^{\frac{n-n^2}{2}},$$

where the first product is taken over (i, j, g) such that $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and $|g_i - g_j| \leq g \leq g_i + g_j$.

2.7 Beyond type A: the Plancherel formula following Opdam

Beyond type A, we still have available Opdam's explicit Plancherel formula for the Iwahori-Hecke algebra [Opd04]. Let \mathbf{G} be a connected reductive algebraic group defined and split over F , of Dynkin type other than type A (to avoid redundancy). Let f be an Iwahori-biinvariant Schwartz function on G and let M be a Levi subgroup of G . Given a parabolic subgroup \mathbf{P} of \mathbf{G} , let $R_{1,+}$ and $R_{P,1,+}$ be defined as in [Opd04], Section 2.3. Recall that the group of unramified characters of a Levi subgroup M has the structure of a complex torus, and is in fact a maximal torus of $\mathbf{M}^\vee(\mathbb{C})$. In particular, if P is a parabolic subgroup and α is a root of (M_P, A_P) , then it makes sense to write $\alpha(\nu)$ for any unramified character ν of M . Then, altering Opdam's notation to match our own from Section 2.5, the Plancherel formula reads

Theorem 13 ([Opd04] Thm. 4.43).

$$f_{M,\mathcal{O}}(1) = \frac{q^{-\ell(w^P)}}{\#\text{Stab}_{W_M}(\mathcal{O})} \int_{\mathcal{O}} d(\omega) \prod_{\alpha^\vee \in R_{1,+} \setminus R_{P,1,+}} \frac{|1 - \alpha^\vee(\nu)|^2}{|1 + q^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha^\vee(\nu)^{1/2}|^2 |1 - q^{\frac{1}{2}} q_{2\alpha} \alpha^\vee(\nu)^{1/2}|^2} \text{trace}(\pi, f) d\omega, \quad (6)$$

where $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu)$, $P \supset M$, and where q_α and $q_{2\alpha}$ are powers of q , and w^P is the longest element in the complement W^P to the parabolic subgroup W_P of W .

Note that whenever $q_{2\alpha} = 1$, which holds whenever $\alpha^\vee \notin 2X_*$, the factor for α reduces to

$$\frac{|1 - \alpha^\vee(\nu)|^2}{|1 - q_\alpha \alpha^\vee(\nu)|^2}. \quad (7)$$

In types A (as we have used above) and D, this simplification always occurs. In types B and C, it happens for all roots except $\alpha = 2\varepsilon_i \in R_{1,+}(B_n)$ and $\alpha = 4\varepsilon_i \in R_{1,+}(C_n)$, where ε_i is the character $\text{diag}(a, \dots, a_n) \mapsto a_i$.

For explicit evaluation we rewrite (6) in coordinates as follows. Recalling the setup of Section 2.2.1, a chose basis $\{\beta_i^\vee\}$ of the coweight lattice of \mathbf{G} . Then we obtain coordinates z_i , such that if $\alpha^\vee = \sum_i e_i \beta_i^\vee$, then the factor in (6) labelled by α^\vee is

$$\frac{|1 - z_1^{e_1} \dots z_n^{e_n}|^2}{|1 + q^{\frac{1}{2}} (z_1^{e_1} \dots z_n^{e_n})^{1/2}|^2 |1 - q^{\frac{1}{2}} q_{2\alpha} (z_1^{e_1} \dots z_n^{e_n})^{1/2}|^2}. \quad (8)$$

When integrating, the coordinates z_i are restricted to the residual coset corresponding to \mathcal{O} , in the sense of [Opd04]; the examples of Section 3.6 shows the effect of this restriction in practice. For $\mathbf{G} = \text{GL}_n$, we used the basis afforded by the characters ε_i .

2.8 Regularity of the trace

In order to extract information about the expansion of the elements t_w in terms of the basis T_x via the Plancherel formula, we must establish a regularity property of $\text{trace}(\pi, f_w)$ where π is an irreducible tempered representation of G . The needed property follows trivially from Theorem 11.

2.8.1 Intertwining operators

The goal is to use the property that elements of $\mathcal{E}_f^I(G)$ commute with all intertwining operators in $\mathcal{M}_t(G)$, and regularity of the trace for unitary and non-strictly positive characters of M to deduce regularity of the trace at all characters of M .

Let ω be a discrete series representation of a Levi subgroup M of G , and let ν be any unramified character of M , not necessarily unitary. Then we may form the representation $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^B(\nu \otimes \omega)$ of G , where P is a parabolic with Levi factor M . We will now recall some well-known facts about the action of the Weyl group of M on such representations π . Let θ and θ' be two subsets of Δ corresponding to Levi subgroups M and M' . Let $w \in W$ be such that $w\theta = \theta'$. Then there is an intertwining operator

$$J_{P|P'}(\omega, \nu): \text{Ind}_P^B(\nu \otimes \omega) \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{P'}^B(\nu \otimes \omega)$$

for each $w \in W(\theta, \theta') = \{w \in W \mid w(\theta) = \theta'\}$. For $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n$, this set is nonempty only if

$$M_\theta = \mathrm{GL}_{l_1} \times \cdots \times \mathrm{GL}_{l_N} \quad M_{\theta'} = \mathrm{GL}_{l'_1} \times \cdots \times \mathrm{GL}_{l'_N}$$

and $\{l_1, \dots, l_N\} = \{l'_1, \dots, l'_N\}$ are equal multisets. In this case, $W(\theta, \theta') \simeq \mathfrak{S}_N$ can be viewed as acting by permuting the blocks of M . It is well-known that $J_{P|P'}(\omega, \nu)$ is a meromorphic function of ν with simple poles. The poles of these operators have been studied by Shahidi in [Sha81], and in the language of modules over the full Hecke algebra by Arthur in [Art89]. The results will be stated for certain renormalizations $A(\nu, \omega, w)$ of the operators $J_{P|P'}(\omega, \nu)$ as explained in equation (2.2.1) of [Sha81].

2.8.2 Conventions on parabolic subgroups

We now recall the notation of Shahidi [Sha81]. Given a subset θ , we set $\Sigma_\theta = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \theta$, and $\Sigma_\theta^+ = \Psi^+ \cap \Sigma_\theta$ and likewise define Σ_θ^- . Let $\Sigma(\theta)$ be the roots of (P, A_P) . Define the positive roots $\Sigma^+(\theta)$ to be the roots obtained by restriction of an element of $\Psi^+ \setminus \Sigma_\theta^-$.

Given two subsets $\theta, \theta' \subset \Delta$, following [Sha81] we set

$$W(\theta, \theta') = \{w \in W \mid w(\theta) = \theta'\},$$

and then for $w \in W(\theta, \theta')$, we define

$$\Sigma(\theta, \theta', w) = \{[\beta] \in \Sigma^+(\theta) \mid \beta \in \Psi^+ - \Sigma_\theta^+ \text{ and } w(\beta) \in \Psi^-\},$$

and then

$$\Sigma^\circ(\theta, \theta', w) := \{[\beta] \in \Sigma(\theta, \theta', w) \mid w_{[\beta]} \in W(A_P)\}.$$

Remark 7. In [Sha81] additional care about the relative case is taken in the notation. In our simple case this is of course unnecessary, and we omit it.

In the case $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n$, this specializes as follows. Let $\alpha_{ij}: \mathrm{diag}(t_i) \mapsto t_i t_j^{-1}$ be characters of T . The α_{ij} for $j > i$ are the positive roots of (\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{A}) and $\beta_i := \alpha_{ii+1}$ are our chosen simple roots. If P corresponds to the partition $n_1 + \cdots + n_p$ of n and subset $\theta \subset \Delta$, then

$$\Sigma(\theta) = \mathrm{span} \{\beta_{n_1}, \beta_{n_1+n_2}, \dots\},$$

where we view β_i as restricted to $\mathfrak{a}_P \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{a}_G$. Note that all the positive roots $\Sigma^+(\theta)$ of (P_θ, N_θ) are in N_P . Denoting by $[\alpha]$ the coset representing a root α of G restricted to P , the positive roots in N_P are the α_{ij} such that $[\alpha_{ij}] = [\beta_{n_1+\cdots+n_k}]$.

Example 4. If $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{GL}_6$ and P be the parabolic subgroup of block upper-triangular matrices corresponding to the partition $6 = 2 + 2 + 1 + 1$ and $\theta = \{\alpha_{12}, \alpha_{34}\}$, then we have

$$A_P = \{\mathrm{diag}(t_1, t_1, t_2, t_2, t_3, t_4)\}.$$

The positive simple roots are $\Sigma^+(\theta) = \{[\beta_2], [\beta_4], [\beta_5]\}$. The Weyl group $W(A_P) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_2$ acts by permuting the blocks. Note that the simple reflection sending $\beta_4 \mapsto -\beta_4$ does not arise by permuting the blocks (*i.e.* $\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$ does not send blocks to blocks), hence $w_{[\beta_4]} \notin W(A_P)$. Hence for any $w \in W(\theta, \theta')$ we have $\Sigma^\circ(\theta, \theta', w) \subseteq \{[\beta_2], [\beta_5]\}$.

2.8.3 Regularity of the trace

We have the following information about the poles of intertwining operators, due, according to [Sha81], to Harish-Chandra:

Theorem 14 ([Sha81], Theorem 2.2.1). *Let ω be an irreducible unitary representation of M . Say that ω is a subrepresentation of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P_*}^M(\omega_*)$ for a parabolic subgroup $P_* = M_* N_*$ and ω_* is an irreducible supercuspidal representation of M_* . Let $\theta_* \subset \Delta$ be such that $P_* = P_{\theta_*}$ as parabolic subgroups of M_* .*

Then the operator

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Sigma_r^0(\theta_*, w\theta_*, w)} (1 - \chi_{\omega, \nu}^2(h_\alpha)) A(\nu, \omega, w)$$

is holomorphic on $\mathfrak{a}_{\theta\mathbb{C}^*}$. Here $\chi_{\omega, \nu}$ is the central character of the twisted representation $\omega \otimes q^{\langle \nu, H_\theta(-) \rangle}$.

In particular for the purposes of the Plancherel formula, the only relevant ω are unitary, hence have unitary central characters. Therefore $A(\nu, \omega, w)$ is holomorphic at ν if $|q^{\langle \nu, H_\theta(-) \rangle}| \neq 1$, or equivalently if

$$\Re(\langle \nu, H_\theta(-) \rangle) \neq 0.$$

In particular, there is a finite union of hyperplanes away from which each operator $A(\nu, \pi, w)$ is holomorphic, for any $w \in W$.

Lemma 4. *Let M be a Levi subgroup of $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$ and let ω be a discrete series representation of M . Let $P = M_P A_P N_P$ be the standard parabolic subgroup containing $M = M_P$ and let $k = \text{rk } A_P$. Let $z_1, \dots, z_k \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^k = X^*(A_P) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}$ define an unramified quasicharacter $\nu = \nu(z_1, \dots, z_k)$ of A_P as in Section 2.2. Let $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu)$. Let $f \in J$. Then*

$$\text{trace}(\pi, f) \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_k, z_1^{-1}, \dots, z_k^{-1}].$$

That is, the trace is a regular function on $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$.

Proof. We know *a priori* that

$$\text{trace}(\pi, f) \in \mathbb{C}(z_1, \dots, z_k)$$

is a rational function of ν , as the operator $\pi(f)$ itself depends rationally on the variables z_i by Theorem 11. Therefore

$$\text{trace}(\pi, f) = \frac{p(\nu)}{h(\nu)} \in \mathbb{C}(z_1, \dots, z_k).$$

By Theorem 14 and the discussion following it, there is an open subset U of the unitary characters, such that for all $\nu \in U$, and all $w \in W$ we have

$$\frac{p(\nu)}{h(\nu)} = \frac{p(w(\nu))}{h(w(\nu))}. \quad (9)$$

Holding z_2, \dots, z_n constant and in U , (9) becomes an equality of meromorphic functions of z_1 that holds on a set with an accumulation point, and hence (9) holds for all $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Now holding $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ constant and arbitrary, and z_3, \dots, z_k constant and in U , we see that (9) holds also for all $z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Therefore (9) actually holds for all ν , *i.e.* $\text{trace}(\pi, f)$ is a W -invariant rational function of ν .

When ν is non-strictly positive with respect to M , by Theorem 11, $\text{trace}(\pi, f)$ has poles only of the form $z_i^{n_i} = 0$. The claim now follows from the W -invariance, and thus $\text{trace}(\pi, f)$ is a regular function on $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^k$. \square

We will therefore allow ourselves to write $\text{trace}(\pi, f)$ for functions $f \in J$ even for ν such that the operator $\pi(f)$ itself is not defined.

Lemma 5. *Let $d \in \tilde{W}$ be a distinguished involution and π be a tempered representation induced from one of the Levi subgroups attached to the two-sided cell containing d in the sense of Proposition 1. Then $\text{trace}(\pi, f_d)$ is constant and a natural number. In fact, the same is true for any idempotent in J .*


Proof. Let j be an idempotent in J . We have $\text{trace}(\pi, f_j) = \text{rank}(\pi(f_j))$. The trace is continuous in ν by Lemma 4, and the present lemma follows as \mathbb{T} is connected. \square

3 Proof of Conjecture 1 for GL_n , and of Theorem 3 for general G

3.1 The functions f_w for GL_n

In this section, $q > 1$.

To compute with the Plancherel formula, we will need to apply the residue theorem successively in each variables z_i , and in doing so we will need to sum over a certain tree that will track, for each variable, at which residues we evaluated. Upon integrating with respect to each variable z_i , we will have poles of the form $z_i = 0$ or $z_i = (q^{ij})^{-1}z_j$. For example, if we have 4 variables z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 corresponding to a Levi subgroup $\mathrm{GL}_{l_1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{l_2} \times \mathrm{GL}_{l_3} \times \mathrm{GL}_{l_4}$, then some of the summands obtained by successively applying the residue theorem are labelled by paths on the tree



Of course, to evaluate the entire integral for M , we would also need to consider trees whose roots are decorated with $z_1 = (q^{12})^{-1}z_2$, and so on, for a total of four trees.

Definition 12. Given a Levi subgroup M with $N + 1$ blocks, a *bookkeeping tree* T for M is a rooted tree with N levels such that the vertices on the i -th level below the root each have $N - i$ child vertices, and each vertex is decorated with an equation of the form $z_i = 0$ or $z_i = (q^{ij})^{-1}z_j$, where the index j does not appear along the path from the vertex to the root, and the parent root is decorated with an equation $z_k = (q^{ki})^{-1}z_i$ for some k . Moreover, we require that the root be decorated with an equation of the form $z_i = 0$ or $z_i = (q^{ij})^{-1}z_j$ for i minimal. A *branch* of T is a simple path in T from the root to one of the leaves.

Definition 13. Given a branch B of a bookkeeping tree, a *clump* in B is an ordered subset of indices i appearing in the decorations of successive parent-child vertices, such that no decoration of the form $z_i = 0$ occurs along the path from the closest index to the root to the farthest index from the root. We write $C \prec B$ if C is a clump of B .

Example 5. The sets of indices $\{3, 4\}$, $\{2, 3, 4\}$, $\{2, 3\}$, $\{2, 4\}$, and $\{2, 4, 3\}$ (note the ordering) are all the clumps of the above tree. The sets $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\{1, 2, 4\}$ are not clumps.

Theorem 15. Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(F)$ and let d be a distinguished involution such that the two-sided cell containing d corresponds to the Levi subgroup M . Let $N + 1$ be the number of blocks in M such that the i -th block has size l_i . Let m_j be the number l_i that are equal to j . Define for $r \leq k$

$$Q_{rk} = q^{i_k i_{k+1}} q^{i_{k-1} i_k} \dots q^{i_r i_{r+1}}$$

in the notation of 2.6. Then if f_d is as in Sections 2.4,

$$f_d(1) = \frac{\mathrm{rank}(\pi(f_d))}{m_1! \dots m_n!} c_M \sum_{\text{trees } T} \sum_{\text{branches } B \text{ of } T} \prod_{\substack{C \prec B \\ C = \{i_0, \dots, i_t\}}} \frac{(1 - q^{l_{i_0}})(1 - q^{l_{i_1}})}{1 - q^{l_{i_0} + l_{i_1}}} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{t-1} \frac{(1 - q^{l_{i_{k+1}}})}{(1 - q^{l_{i_k} + l_{i_{k+1}}})} \prod_{r=0}^{k-1} \frac{R_{rk}}{1 - Q_{rk} q^{i_r i_{k+1}}}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$R_{rk} = \begin{cases} 1 - Q_{rk} q^{g_{i_r} - g_{i_k}} & \text{if } k < t - 1 \\ (1 - Q_{r,t-1} q^{g_{i_r} - g_{i_{t-1}}})(1 - Q_{r,t-1} q^{g_{i_k} - g_{i_r}}) & \text{if } k = t - 1 \end{cases}.$$

Corollary 1. *The denominator of $f_d(1)$ divides a power of the Poincaré polynomial $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q) = P_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(q)$ of \mathbf{G} . Moreover, when d is in lowest two-sided cell, corresponding to $M = T$, $f_d(1) = \text{rank}(\pi(f_d))/P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)$ exactly.*

Proof of Corollary 1. We will show that each of the three forms of denominator that appear in the conclusion of Theorem 15 divide $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)$, and thus that their product divides a power of $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)$. The denominators of c_M are all of the form $1 + q + \dots + q^{l_i-1}$, and so divide $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)$ as $l_i \leq n$ for all i . Note that as $l_{i_i} + l_{i_{k+1}} \leq n$, the leftmost denominators in (10) satisfy the conclusion of the corollary also. Finally, $Q_{rk} q^{i_r i_{k+1}} = q^{l_{i_{k+1}} + l_{i_k} + \dots + l_{i_r}}$, and R_{rk} is likewise always a polynomial in q (as opposed to q^{-1}) divisible by $1 - q$. Again using that $l_{i_{k+1}} + l_{i_k} + \dots + l_{i_r} \leq n$, we are done with the first statement.

We now take up the second statement, the proof¹ of which does not require any computations at all and which holds for any $w \in \mathbf{c}_0$. Recalling that the only K -spherical tempered representations of G are principal series representations [Mac71], let μ_K be the Haar measure on G such that $\mu_K(K) = 1$, μ_I be the Haar measure such that $\mu_I(I) = 1$, and denote temporarily $d\pi_\mu$ the Plancherel measure normalized according to a chosen Haar measure μ on G . Likewise write $\pi_K(f)$ for the Fourier transform with respect to μ_K and $\pi_I(f)$ for the Fourier transform with respect to μ_I .

As we have

$$\mu_I = P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)\mu_K,$$

and formal degrees scale inversely to the Haar measure, we have

$$d\pi_{\mu_I} = \frac{1}{P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)} d\pi_{\mu_K} \quad (11)$$

for tempered principal series. Now let $w \in \mathbf{c}_0$. By Lemma 4 and the Satake isomorphism, there is a function h_w in the spherical Hecke algebra such that for all principal series π ,

$$\text{trace}(\pi_I(f_w)) = \text{trace}(\pi_K(h_w))$$

as regular Weyl-invariant functions of the Satake parameter. By the Plancherel formula and (11),

$$f_w(1) = \int \text{trace}(\pi_I(f_w)) d\pi_{\mu_I} = \int \text{trace}(\pi_K(h_w)) d\pi_{\mu_I} = \frac{1}{P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)} \int \text{trace}(\pi_K(h_w)) d\pi_{\mu_K} = \frac{h_w(1)}{P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)}. \quad (12)$$

In particular, if $w = d$ is a distinguished involution in the lowest two-sided cell, then

$$\text{trace}(\pi_I(f_d)) = \text{rank}(\pi_I(f_d)) = \text{rank}(\pi_I(f_d)) \cdot \text{trace}(\pi_K(1_K)),$$

and (12) becomes

$$f_d(1) = \frac{\text{rank}(\pi(f_d))}{P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)} = \frac{1}{P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)}. \quad (13)$$

Here the rank is given by [Xi90], Proposition 5.5. (In *op. cit.* there is the assumption of simple-connectedness, but it is easy to see that the distinguished involutions for the extended affine Weyl group $\tilde{W}(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(F))$ of the universal cover $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ are distinguished involutions for \tilde{W} using the definition in [Lus87a] and uniqueness of the $\{C_w\}$ -basis, and that the lowest cell is just the lowest cell of $\tilde{W}(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(F))$ intersected with \tilde{W} .) \square

Once we have established injectivity of $\tilde{\phi}$, we will show by a counting argument in Corollary 5 that $\text{rank}(\pi(t_d)) = 1$ for any distinguished involution d , in the case $G = \text{GL}_n$. Note that (13) is an example of the behaviour conjectured in Remark 1.

Remark 8. It would be interesting to find I -biinvariant Schwartz functions h playing the role of h_w for the other two-sided cells, namely such that $\text{trace}(\pi, h)$ was regular, nonzero only for a single pair (M, ω) , and the value $h(1)$ was known as a function of $q^{1/2}$.

¹We thank A. Braverman for explaining to us the observation whose obvious generalization we present below.

Remark 9. If \mathcal{P} is a maximal parahoric subgroup of G , then the longest word $w_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a distinguished involution in the lowest two-sided cell. As above, and as we will explain again in Section 4, $\pi(f_{w_{\mathcal{P}}})$ is nonzero only for the principal series representations, and its image is contained in $\pi^{\mathcal{P}}$. Thus after we will have shown injectivity, [Key82] gives another proof that $\text{rank}(\pi(f_{w_{\mathcal{P}}})) = 1$, and more generally that $\pi(t_d)$ has rank 1 on the principal series for any distinguished involution $d \in \mathbf{c}_0$.

Lemma 6. *Let $e_0, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{T}} z_0^{e_0} \cdots z_N^{e_N} \prod_{i < j} \Gamma^{ij} dz_0 \cdots dz_N = 0 \quad (14)$$

unless $e_0 + \cdots + e_N = -N$.

Although we do not use the Lemma in the sequel, we include it because it illustrates an efficient way to compute the functions f_w in practice, as we explain after its proof.

Corollary 2. *Let $w \in \tilde{W}$. Then $f_w(1)$ is a rational function of q with denominator dividing a power of the Poincaré polynomial of \mathbf{G} . The numerator is a Laurent polynomial $p_1(q^{1/2}) + p_2(q^{-1/2})$ in $q^{1/2}$, where the degree of p_1 is bounded uniformly in terms of \tilde{W} . The denominator of $f_w(1)$ depends only on the two-sided cell containing w .*

Remark 10. In light of Lemma 4, Lemma 6 and Corollary 2 have the following interpretation. Let Γ be a left cell in a two-sided cell \mathbf{c} . Then in [Xi02], Xi shows that all the rings $J_{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ are isomorphic to the representation ring of the associated Levi subgroup $M_{\mathbf{c}}$, and $J_{\mathbf{c}}$ is a matrix algebra over $J_{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$. Therefore $w \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}$ are labelled by dominant weights of $M_{\mathbf{c}}$, and if t_{λ} is such an element, Xi's results show that if $\mathbf{q} = q$ and $\pi = \text{Ind}_B^G(\nu)$ is an irreducible representation of $J_{\mathbf{c}}$, then

$$\text{trace}(\pi, t_{\lambda}) = \text{trace}(V(\lambda), \nu),$$

where we view ν as a semisimple conjugacy class in $M_{\mathbf{c}}$, and $V(\lambda)$ is the irreducible representation of $M_{\mathbf{c}}$ of highest weight λ . Then we have that $f_{\lambda}(1) \neq 0$ only if λ is of height 0 with respect to the basis $\varepsilon_i: \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto a_i$.

The proofs of Lemma 6 and Corollary 2 will use the notation of the proof of Theorem 15, and we defer them until after the proof of the theorem.

3.1.1 Example computations and a less singular cell

In this section we provide three example computations to elucidate the coming proof of Theorem 15.

Example 6. Let $G = \text{GL}_2$ and $M = A$. Then $l_1 = l_2 = 1$ and $g_1 = g_2 = 0$. Let $d = s_0$ or s_1 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_d(1) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{1}{2\pi i} q^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} q \frac{(z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{(z_1 - q^{-1}z_2)(z_1 - qz_2)} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \text{Res}_{z_1=q^{-1}z_2} \frac{(z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{(z_1 - q^{-1}z_2)(z_1 - qz_2)} \frac{1}{z_1} + \text{Res}_{z_1=0} \frac{(z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{(z_1 - q^{-1}z_2)(z_1 - qz_2)} \frac{1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(q^{-1}z_2 - z_2)(q^{-1}z_2 - z_2)}{(q^{-1}z_2 - qz_2)q^{-1}z_2} + \frac{z_2^2}{z_2^2} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(q^{-1} - 1)^2}{q^{-2} - 1} + 1 \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(q^{-1} - 1)^2}{q^{-2} - 1} + 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{q + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

The factor $\frac{1}{2}$ reflects the fact that we integrate with the respect to the pushforward of the above \mathfrak{S}_2 -invariant measure to the quotient $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}/\mathfrak{S}_2$.

Reassuringly, this agrees with the theorem, which instructs us to calculate $f_d(1)$ as follows: There are two trees, each of which has one vertex and no edges. The trees are $z_1 = 0$ and $z_1 = q^{-1}z_2$. Each has one branch. The first has no clumps, so the entire is product is empty. The second tree has one clump $C = \{1, 2\}$ for which $t = 1$, and we obtain

$$f_d(1) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1-q}{1+q} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{1+q} = \frac{1}{1+q}.$$

In rank three, the computation is similar but slightly more involved.

Example 7. If $G = \mathrm{GL}_3$ and $M = A$, recalling the definition of $c_M = c_A$, we want to show that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^3 \iiint_{\mathbb{T}^3} \frac{(z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{(z_1 - qz_2)(z_1 - q^{-1}z_2)} \frac{(z_1 - z_3)(z_1 - z_3)}{(z_1 - qz_3)(z_1 - q^{-1}z_3)} \frac{(z_2 - z_3)(z_2 - z_3)}{(z_2 - qz_3)(z_2 - q^{-1}z_3)} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \frac{dz_3}{z_3} = 6!.$$

There are three bookkeeping trees to consider, corresponding to residues at $z_1 = 0$, $z_1 = q^{-1}z_2$, and $z_1 = q^{-2}z_3$. Reusing our computation from the previous example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^3 \iiint_{\mathbb{T}^3} \underbrace{\frac{(z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{(z_1 - qz_2)(z_1 - q^{-1}z_2)} \frac{(z_1 - z_3)(z_1 - z_3)}{(z_1 - qz_3)(z_1 - q^{-1}z_3)} \frac{(z_2 - z_3)(z_2 - z_3)}{(z_2 - qz_3)(z_2 - q^{-1}z_3)}}_{\mu(z_1, z_2, z_3)} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \frac{dz_3}{z_3} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^2 \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathrm{Res}_{z_1=0} \frac{\mu(z_1, z_2, z_3)}{z_1 z_2 z_3} + \mathrm{Res}_{z_1=q^{-1}z_2} \frac{\mu(z_1, z_2, z_3)}{z_1 z_2 z_3} + \mathrm{Res}_{z_1=q^{-1}z_3} \frac{\mu(z_1, z_2, z_3)}{z_1 z_2 z_3} dz_2 dz_3 \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^2 \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{(z_2 - z_3)(z_2 - z_3)}{(z_2 - qz_3)(z_2 - q^{-1}z_3)} \frac{1}{z_2 z_3} dz_2 dz_3 \\ &+ \frac{(q^{-1} - 1)(q^{-1} - 1)}{(q^{-1} - q)q^{-1}} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^2 \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{(q^{-1}z_2 - z_3)(q^{-1}z_2 - z_3)}{(q^{-1}z_2 - qz_3)(q^{-1}z_2 - q^{-1}z_3)} \frac{(z_2 - z_3)(z_2 - z_3)}{(z_2 - qz_3)(z_2 - q^{-1}z_3)} \frac{1}{z_2 z_3} dz_2 dz_3 \\ &+ \frac{(q^{-1} - 1)(q^{-1} - 1)}{(q^{-1} - q)q^{-1}} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^2 \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \underbrace{\frac{(q^{-1}z_3 - z_2)(q^{-1}z_3 - z_2)}{(q^{-1}z_3 - qz_2)(q^{-1}z_3 - q^{-1}z_2)} \frac{(z_2 - z_3)(z_2 - z_3)}{(z_2 - qz_3)(z_2 - q^{-1}z_3)}}_{\mu_2(z_3, z_2)} \frac{1}{z_2 z_3} dz_2 dz_3 \\ &= \frac{2}{1+q} + 2 \frac{1-q}{1+q} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathrm{Res}_{z_2=0} \frac{\mu_2(z_2, z_3)}{z_2 z_3} + \mathrm{Res}_{z_2=q^{-1}z_3} \frac{\mu_2(z_2, z_3)}{z_2 z_3} dz_3 \\ &= \frac{2}{1+q} + 2 \frac{1-q}{1+q} \left(1 + \frac{(1-q^2)}{1+q+q^2} \right) \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{1}{1+q} + \frac{(1-q)(1+q+q^2) + (1-q)(1-q^2)}{(1+q)(1+q+q^2)} \right) \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{1+q+q^2 + (1-q)(1+q+q^2) + (1+q)(1-q)^2}{(1+q)(1+q+q^2)} \right) \\ &= \frac{6!}{(1+q)(1+q+q^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we give an example of a less singular cell.

Example 8. Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_4$, and let \mathbf{c} be the two-sided cell corresponding to the partition $4 = 2 + 2$. Then $P_W(\mathbf{q}) = (1 + \mathbf{q})(1 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}^2)(1 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}^2 + \mathbf{q}^3)$ has five distinct roots $\mathbf{q} = -1, \pm i, \zeta_1, \zeta_2$, where ζ_i are primitive third roots of unity. We compute $P_{\mathbf{c}}$ using the Plancherel formula. We have

We have $l_1 = l_2 = 2$, $q_{12} = 1$, $q^{12} = q^2$,

$$c_M = \frac{q^4(q-1)^2}{2(q+1)^2},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^2 \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \Gamma^{12} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^2 \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \frac{(z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{(z_1 - q^2 z_2)(z_1 - q^{-2} z_2)} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \text{Res}_{z_1=0} \frac{\Gamma^{12}}{z_1} + \text{Res}_{z_1=q^{-2} z_2} \frac{\Gamma^{12}}{z_1} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(q^{-2} - 1)^2 q^2}{(q^{-2} - q^2)} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} \\
&= 1 + \frac{(1+q)(1-q^2)}{1+q+q^2+q^3} \\
&= \frac{2}{1+q^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Accounting for c_M , we see that $J_{\mathbf{c}}$ is regular at $\mathbf{q} = \zeta_1, \zeta_2$.

3.1.2 Proofs of Theorem 15, Lemma 6, and Corollary 2

Proof of Theorem 15. Let $n = l_0 + \dots + l_N$. We may assume that $l_0 \leq l_2 \leq \dots \leq l_N$. It suffices to evaluate the integral

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^{N+1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod \Gamma_{i,j,g} \frac{dz_0}{z_0} \dots \frac{dz_N}{z_N} = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^{N+1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{i < j} \Gamma^{ij} \frac{dz_0}{z_0} \dots \frac{dz_N}{z_N}.$$

We claim that the value of this integral is

$$\begin{aligned}
c_M \sum_{\text{trees}} \sum_{T \text{ branches}} \prod_{\substack{C \prec B \\ C=\{i_0, \dots, i_t\}}} \prod_{k=0}^{t-1} \frac{(1 - q^{i_k i_{k+1}} q_{i_k i_{k+1}})(1 - q^{i_k i_{k+1}} (q_{i_k i_{k+1}})^{-1})}{1 - (q^{i_k i_{k+1}})^2} \\
\cdot \prod_{r=0}^{k-1} \frac{(1 - Q_{rk} q_{i_r i_{k+1}})(1 - Q_{rk} (q_{i_r i_{k+1}})^{-1})}{(1 - Q_{rk} q^{i_r i_{k+1}})(1 - Q_{rk} (q^{i_r i_{k+1}})^{-1})}, \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

where the sum over trees is taken over all bookkeeping trees for the integral. When $k = 0$, we interpret the product over r as being empty.

First we explain how (15) simplifies to (10). All cancellations will take place within the same clump C of some branch B , which we now fix. We have

$$1 - Q_{rk}(q^{i_r i_{k+1}})^{-1} = 1 - q^{g_{i_k} + g_{i_{k+1}} + 1} q^{i_k i_{k+1}} \dots q^{i_r i_{r+1}} q^{-g_{i_r} - g_{i_{k+1}}} = 1 - Q_{r,k-1} q^{g_{i_k} - g_{i_r}},$$

which is one of the factors in the product $(1 - Q_{r,k-1} q_{i_r i_k})(Q_{r,k-1} (q_{i_r i_k})^{-1})$. The surviving factor in the numerator at index $(k-1, r)$ is then equal to $(1 - Q_{r,k-1} q^{g_{i_r} - g_{i_k}})$. In short, the above factors in the denominator cancel with a numerator occurring with the same r -index but k -index one lower. Such a factor occurs whenever $r < k-1$ (note that this inequality does not hold when $k = 1$ and $r = 0$). When $r = k-1$, we have

$$1 - Q_{k-1,k}(q^{i_k i_{k+1}})^{-1} = 1 - q^{i_k i_{k+1}} q^{i_{k-1} i_k} (q^{i_{k-1} i_{k+1}})^{-1} = q^{g_{i_k} + g_{i_{k+1}} + 1} q^{g_{i_{k-1}} - g_{i_{k+1}}} = 1 - q^{2g_{i_k} + 1},$$

which is one of the factors in $(1 - q^{i_{k+1} i_k} q_{i_k i_{k+1}})(1 - q^{i_k i_{k+1}} (q_{i_k i_{k+1}})^{-1})$. The cancellation leaves behind the factor $1 - q^{l_{i_{k+1}}}$ in the numerator, except for $k = 0$; this term keeps both its denominators. At this point we have shown that the factor corresponding to C in (15) simplifies to

$$\frac{(1 - q^{l_{i_0}})(1 - q^{l_{i_1}})}{1 - q^{l_{i_0} + l_{i_1}}} \prod_{k=1}^{t-1} \frac{(1 - q^{l_{i_{k+1}}})}{(1 - q^{l_{i_k} + l_{i_{k+1}}})} \prod_{r=0}^{k-1} \frac{R_{rk}}{1 - Q_{rk} q^{i_r i_{k+1}}},$$

where

$$R_{rk} = \begin{cases} 1 - Q_{rk} q^{g_{ir} - g_{ik}} & \text{if } k < t - 1 \\ (1 - Q_{r,t-1} q^{g_{ir} - g_{it-1}})(1 - Q_{r,t-1} q^{g_{ik} - g_{ir}}) & \text{if } k = t - 1 \end{cases}.$$

This means that (15) simplifies to (10).

To prove (15), we will use the residue theorem for each variable consecutively, keeping track of the constant expressions in q that we extract after integrating with respect to each variable z_i . More precisely, we will track what happens in a single summand corresponding to some set of successive choices of poles to take residues at. Note that all the rational functions that will appear, namely the Γ^{ij} or the rational functions that result from substitutions into the Γ^{ij} , become equal to 1 once z_i or z_j is set to zero. Therefore poles at $z_i = 0$ serve simply to remove all factors involving z_i from inside the integrand (we will see what these rational functions are below). It follows that the summand whose branch we are computing is a product over clumps in the corresponding branch, so it suffices to compute the value of a given clump for some ordered subsets $\{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_l\}$ of the indices $\{0, \dots, N\}$. As we are inside a clump, we will consider only poles occurring at nonzero complex numbers. Thus we are left only to determine what happens within a single clump.

We first integrate with respect to the variable z_{i_0} . The residue theorem gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{l+1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{i < j} \Gamma^{ij} \frac{dz_{i_0}}{z_{i_0}} \dots \frac{dz_{i_l}}{z_{i_l}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^l \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sum_{l \neq i_0} \text{Res}_{z_{i_0} = (q^{i_0 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_1}} \frac{1}{z_{i_0}} \prod_{i < j} \Gamma^{ij} \frac{dz_{i_1}}{z_{i_1}} \dots \frac{dz_{i_l}}{z_{i_l}} + \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^l \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{\substack{i < j \\ i, j \neq i_0}} \Gamma^{ij} \frac{dz_{i_1}}{z_{i_1}} \dots \frac{dz_{i_l}}{z_{i_l}}. \end{aligned}$$

As noted above, the second integral belongs to a different branch (in fact, in the case of i_0 , to a different tree); our procedure will deal with it separately, and we will now consider what happens with the first integral.

For the first integral, consider one of the summands corresponding to $z_{i_0} = (q^{i_0 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_1}$ for some i_1 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^l \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \text{Res}_{z_{i_0} = (q^{i_0 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_1}} \frac{1}{z_{i_0}} \prod_{i < j} \Gamma^{ij} \frac{dz_{i_1}}{z_{i_1}} \dots \frac{dz_{i_l}}{z_{i_l}} \\ &= \frac{(1 - q^{i_0 i_1} q_{i_0 i_1})(1 - q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 i_1})^{-1})}{1 - (q^{i_0 i_1})^2} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^l \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{j \neq i_1, i_0} \frac{(z_{i_1} - q^{i_0 i_1} q_{i_0 j} z_j)(z_{i_1} - q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 j})^{-1} z_j)}{(z_{i_1} - q^{i_0 i_1} q^{i_0 j} z_j)(z_{i_1} - q^{i_0 i_1} (q^{i_0 j})^{-1} z_j)} \\ & \quad \prod_{\substack{i < j \\ i, j \neq i_0}} \Gamma^{ij} \frac{dz_{i_1}}{z_{i_1}} \frac{dz_{i_2}}{z_{i_2}} \dots \frac{dz_{i_l}}{z_{i_l}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that, if $i_1 > 2$, even though formally we have defined the symbols q_{ij} and q^{ij} only for $i < j$, the symmetry of the factors allows us to write q_{ij} even if $i > j$, thanks to the factor with $(q_{ij})^{-1}$ also present in the numerator.

Now we integrate with respect to z_{i_1} . Observe that the leftmost product over $j \neq i_1, i_0$ does not contribute poles. Indeed, the first factor each denominator does not have its zero contained in \mathbb{T} , and the second factor in each denominator has its zero at $z_{i_1} = q^{i_0 i_1} (q^{i_0 i_2})^{-1} z_{i_2}$. The power of q appearing is

$$g_{i_0} + g_{i_1} + 1 - (g_{i_0} + g_{i_2} + 1) = g_{i_1} - g_{i_2},$$

and so $q^{i_0 i_1} (q^{i_0 i_2})^{-1}$ is equal to $q_{i_1 i_2}$ or $(q_{i_2 i_1})^{-1}$, whichever is defined. Thus this zero cancels with a zero in the numerator of $\Gamma^{i_1 i_2}$ or $\Gamma^{i_2 i_1}$, whichever is defined. Therefore we need only consider the simple poles at $z_{i_1} = (q^{i_1 i_2})^{-1} z_{i_2}$ for $i_1 < i_2$ and $z_{i_1} = (q^{i_2 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_2}$ for $i_2 < i_1$. Observe that the residues will be the same for either inequality. In the case $i_2 < i_1$, for example, $\Gamma^{i_2 i_1}$ needs to be rewritten so that its simple pole

inside \mathbb{T} is in the correct format to calculate the residue by substitution:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Res}_{z_{i_1}=(q^{i_2 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_2}} \frac{(z_{i_2} - q_{i_2 i_1} z_{i_1})(z_{i_2} - (q_{i_2 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_1})}{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_2 i_1} z_{i_1})(z_{i_2} - (q^{i_2 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_1})} \frac{1}{z_{i_1}} \\
&= \text{Res}_{z_{i_1}=(q^{i_2 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_2}} \frac{-(q^{i_2 i_1})^{-1} (z_{i_2} - q_{i_2 i_1} z_{i_1})(z_{i_2} - (q_{i_2 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_1})}{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_2 i_1} z_{i_1})(z_{i_2} - (q^{i_2 i_1})^{-1} z_{i_1})} \frac{1}{z_{i_1}} \\
&= \frac{(1 - q^{i_2 i_1} q_{i_2 i_1})(1 - q^{i_2 i_1} (q_{i_2 i_1})^{-1})}{1 - (q^{i_2 i_1})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore after integrating within the clump at hand with respect to z_{i_0} and then z_{i_1} , we have the expression

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(1 - q^{i_0 i_1} q_{i_0 i_1})(1 - q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 i_1})^{-1})}{1 - (q^{i_0 i_1})^2} \frac{(1 - q^{i_2 i_1} q^{i_0 i_1} q_{i_0 i_2})(1 - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 i_2})^{-1})}{(1 - q^{i_2 i_1} q^{i_0 i_1} q^{i_0 i_2})(1 - q^{i_2 i_1} q^{i_0 i_1} (q^{i_0 i_2})^{-1})} \\
& \cdot \frac{(1 - q^{i_2 i_1} q_{i_2 i_1})(1 - q^{i_2 i_1} (q_{i_2 i_1})^{-1})}{(1 - (q^{i_2 i_1})^2)} \\
& \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{l-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{j \neq i_0, i_1, i_2} \frac{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} q_{i_0 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 j})^{-1} z_j)}{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} q^{i_0 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q^{i_0 j})^{-1} z_j)} \\
& \cdot \prod_{j \neq i_0, i_1, i_2} \frac{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q_{i_1 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} (q_{i_1 j})^{-1} z_j)}{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_1 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} (q^{i_1 j})^{-1} z_j)} \prod_{\substack{i < j \\ i, j \neq i_0, i_1}} \Gamma^{ij} \frac{dz_{i_2}}{z_{i_2}} \cdots \frac{dz_{i_l}}{z_{i_l}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Now we integrate with respect to z_{i_2} . Again, only poles from the product of Γ^{ij} 's occur with nonzero residues: in total we have simple poles contained in \mathbb{T} possibly at $z_{i_2} = q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q^{i_0 j})^{-1} z_j$, at $z_{i_2} = q^{i_1 i_2} (q^{i_1 j})^{-1} z_j$ and at $z_{i_2} = (q^{i_2 j})^{-1} z_j$ for $j \neq i_0, i_1, i_2$. It may happen that these poles are not all distinct, but all zeros in the denominator of the former two types are in fact cancelled by zeros of denominator anyway. The necessary factors occur in the product immediately adjacent on the right. Indeed, we have

$$g_{i_1} + g_{i_2} + 1 + g_{i_0} + g_{i_1} + 1 - g_{i_0} - g_j - 1 = g_{i_1} + g_{i_2} + 1 + g_{i_1} - g_j$$

and so either $q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 j})^{-1} = q^{i_1 i_2} q_{i_1 j}$ or $q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 j})^{-1} = q^{i_1 i_2} (q_{i_1 j})^{-1}$ (or $q_{j i_1}$ or $(q_{j i_1})^{-1}$).

Likewise we have

$$g_{i_1} + g_{i_2} + 1 - g_{i_1} - g_j - 1 = g_{i_2} - g_j$$

as happened when we integrated with respect to z_{i_0} .

Now we see the following pattern: At each stage, we integrate with respect to the variable we took a residue at in the previous step. When integrating with respect to z_{i_r} , there will be $r+1$ products of rational functions, and each rational function in the leftmost r products will contribute a pole, in addition to the pole contributed by $\Gamma^{i_r, i_{r+1}}$ or Γ^{i_{r+1}, i_r} , whichever is defined. However, each is nullified by having zero residue thanks to a denominator in the product immediately to the right. Integrating with respect to z_{i_r} will result in extracting $r+1$ new rational factors, each of the form claimed in the theorem. When it comes to integrating with respect to z_{i_l} , all variables z_{i_l} will cancel from the remains of the Gamma functions by homogeneity, and the factor $\frac{1}{z_{i_l}}$ will result in the final integral contributing just the remaining $l+1$ rational factors. \square

Lemma 6 is a porism of the preceding proof.

Proof of Lemma 6. We will evaluate the integral (14) by applying the residue theorem successively for each variable as in the proof of Theorem 15. Note that as functions of any variable z_k , the functions $\prod_{i < j} \Gamma^{ij}$ and all the other products, for example those appearing in (16), have numerator and denominator with equal degrees. Thus the overall sum of powers of all z_i in the integrand of (14) is $e_0 + \cdots + e_N$, and in general, the sum of powers of all z_i in the integrand of an expression like (16) is the sum of the degrees of the monomial z_{i_j} terms.

When evaluating (14) along a single branch, we find again that the only poles that appear are of the form $z_i = (q^{ij})^{-1}z_j$, or $z_i^{e_i} = 0$ for $e_i < 0$. We will track the effect that evaluating each successive residue has on the total degree of the integrand, and then conclude using the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} z^r dz = 2\pi i \delta_{r,-1}$. First, observe that evaluating a residue of the form $z_i = (q^{ij})^{-1}z_j$ increases the sum of all powers by 1; a factor z_j is contributed to the resulting integrand. The sum of all powers is likewise increased by 1 when evaluating the residue at a simple pole of z_i^{-1} at 0. To compute the residue at a pole of $z_i^{-e_i}$ at 0 for $e_i > 1$, consider the Taylor expansion at 0 of Γ^{ij} . We have

$$\frac{1}{z_i - q^{ij}z_j} = -\frac{1}{q^{ij}z_j} - \frac{z_i}{(q^{ij}z_j)^2} - \frac{z_i^2}{(q^{ij}z_j)^3} - \dots$$

and

$$\frac{1}{z_i - (q^{ij})^{-1}z_j} = -\frac{q^{ij}}{z_j} - \left(\frac{q^{ij}}{z_j}\right)^2 z_i - \left(\frac{q^{ij}}{z_j}\right)^3 z_i^2 - \dots$$

Multiplying these series and further multiplying by the denominator $z_i^2 - (q_{ij} + q_{ij}^{-1})z_i z_j + z_j$, it follows that the Taylor expansion of Γ^{ij} is

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{q^{ij} + (q^{ij})^{-1} - q_{ij} - q_{ij}^{-1}}{z_j} z_i + \frac{(q^{ij})^2 + 2 + (q^{ij})^{-2} - (q_{ij} + q_{ij}^{-1})(q^{ij} + q^{-ij})}{z_j} z_i^2 + \dots \\ + \frac{-(q_{ij} + q_{ij}^{-1})((q^{ij})^{n-1} + \dots + (q^{ij})^{-n+1}) + (q^{ij})^{n-2} + \dots + (q^{ij})^{-n+2} + (q^{ij})^n + \dots + (q^{ij})^{-n}}{z_j^n} z_i^n \\ + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

It is clear that the salient point of (17), that z_i^n appears with a coefficient proportional to z_j^{-n} , holds also for the all the products like those in (16). Thus computing a residue at the pole of $z_i^{-e_i}$ at 0 will result in a new integrand, the total degree of which has increased by $e_i - e_i + 1 = 1$. It now follows that after integrating with respect to $N - 1$ variables, the final integral to be computed will be a constant times $(2\pi i)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} z_N^{e_0 + \dots + e_N + N - 1} dz_N$. This is nonzero if and only if $e_0 + \dots + e_N = -N$. Summing over all branches of a bookkeeping tree, we see that (14) is nonzero only if $e_0 + \dots + e_N = -N$. \square

The lemma is helpful for computing explicit examples, as it points out that one can always avoid dealing with higher-order poles. Indeed, given an integral of the form (14), we may assume by Lemma 6 that $e_0 + \dots + e_N = -N$. If $e_i = -1$ for all i then the integral (14) is just the integral from Theorem 15. Otherwise there is some $e_{i_0} \geq 0$. We may assume that $i_0 = 0$. Then the only poles in z_0 are of the form $z_0 = (q^{0i_1})^{-1}z_{i_1}$ for indices $i_1 > 0$. Therefore we compute that (14) is equal to a sum of terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1 - q^{0i_1} q_{0i_1})(1 - q^{0i_1} (q_{0i_1})^{-1})}{1 - (q^{0i_1})^2} (q^{0i_1})^{-e_0 - 1} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{T}} z_{i_1}^{e_{i_1} + 1 + e_0} z_{i_2}^{e_{i_2}} \dots z_{i_N}^{e_{i_N}} \\ \cdot \prod_{j \neq i_1, 0} \frac{(z_{i_1} - q^{0i_1} q_{0j} z_j)(z_{i_1} - q^{0i_1} (q_{0j})^{-1} z_j)}{(z_{i_1} - q^{0i_1} q^{0j} z_j)(z_{i_1} - q^{0i_1} (q^{0j})^{-1} z_j)} \prod_{\substack{i < j \\ i, j \neq 0}} \Gamma^{ij} dz_{i_1} \dots dz_{i_N}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The total degree of the integrand is now $e_0 + \dots + e_N + 1 = -(N - 1)$. Therefore either $e_{i_0} + e_{i_1} + 1 = e_{i_2} = \dots = e_{-N} = -1$, or we may again assume without loss of generality that the exponent of some z_{i_j} is nonnegative, and proceed with evaluating (18) by integrating with respect to z_{i_j} . We may continue in this way, never having to deal with more than a simple pole at 0. (Of course, the resulting order of integration need not be the same as the order used in the proofs of Theorem 15 and Corollary 2.)

We can now prove Corollary 2.

Proof of Corollary 2. In light of Lemma 4, it is enough to prove that the conclusions of the present corollary hold for integrals of the form (14). We again follow the algorithm from the proof of Theorem 15, so it is

sufficient to consider a single branch, and for this it suffices to observe that, given, for example, a variant

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{l-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{j \neq i_0, i_1, i_2} \frac{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} q_{i_0 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 j})^{-1} z_j)}{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} q_{i_0 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q^{i_0 i_1} (q_{i_0 j})^{-1} z_j)} \\ & \cdot \prod_{j \neq i_0, i_1, i_2} \frac{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q_{i_1 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} (q_{i_1 j})^{-1} z_j)}{(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} q_{i_1 j} z_j)(z_{i_2} - q^{i_1 i_2} (q_{i_1 j})^{-1} z_j)} \prod_{\substack{i < j \\ i, j \neq i_0, i_1}} \Gamma^{ij} z_{i_2}^{e_{i_2}} \cdots z_{i_l}^{e_{i_l}} dz_{i_2} \cdots dz_{i_l} \end{aligned}$$

of (16) in which $e_{i_2} < -1$, the quotient rule gives that the residue at $z_{i_2} = 0$ is equal to a linear combination over $\mathbb{Q}[q^{\frac{1}{2}}, q^{-\frac{1}{2}}]$ of integrals of the form

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{l-2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{\substack{i < j \\ i, j \neq i_0, i_1, i_2}} \Gamma^{ij} z_{i_3}^{e'_{i_3}} \cdots z_{i_l}^{e'_{i_l}} dz_{i_3} \cdots dz_{i_l}$$

for new exponents e'_{i_k} . This and the calculations in the proof of Theorem 15 make clear that the only positive powers of $q^{1/2}$ that appear in the any denominator are those that appeared as in Theorem 15. These are controlled by the possible block sizes of M , and hence are bounded in terms of \tilde{W} . Throughout this procedure, the denominator has been contributed to only by the Plancherel density itself, which depends only on M . The last claim of the corollary now follows from Proposition 1. \square

3.2 The functions f_w for general \mathbf{G}

For general \mathbf{G} , we will follow the same plan as for $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n$. The only difference is that we have less control over which denominators can appear. Indeed, this is true even for formal degrees, but complications are also introduced by residual coset we integrate over, or equivalently, by lack of explicit control of the Satake parameter of $\pi = i_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu)$ for arbitrary discrete series representations $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2^I(M)$.

Theorem 16. *Let $w \in \tilde{W}$. Then $f_w(1)$ is a rational function of q with poles drawn from a finite set of roots of unity depending only on \tilde{W} . The numerator is a Laurent polynomial in $q^{1/2}$. The denominator depends only on the two-sided cell containing w . If w is in the lowest two-sided cell, then the denominator divides the Poincaré polynomial of \mathbf{G} .*

In the proof, we do not attempt to record in any information about degrees of the numerators. It will therefore be necessary to control the possible numerators of $f_w(1)$ in a different manner than for $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n$ in order to prove Proposition 2 below.

Proof of Theorem 16. First, we note that the reasoning for the lowest cell used in the proof of Corollary 1 holds for arbitrary G . Therefore (12) proves the last claim just as for GL_n .

More generally, let $w \in \tilde{W}$ and M_P be a Levi subgroup corresponding to the two-sided cell containing w . Let $N = \mathrm{rk} A_P$. Given a coroot α^\vee and a basis of the cocharacter lattice as explained in Section 2.7, we write $\alpha^\vee = z_1^{e_1} \cdots z_n^{e_n}$ for integers $e_i = e_i(\alpha)$.

By Lemma 4 and Theorem 10, it suffices to show the conclusions of the theorem hold for integrals of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^n \int_{\mathbb{T}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{T}} \prod_{\alpha \in R_{1,+} \setminus R_{P,1,+}} \frac{q_\alpha (z_1^{e_1} z_2^{e_2} \cdots z_n^{e_n} - q_\omega) (z_1^{e_1} z_2^{e_2} \cdots z_n^{e_n} - q_\omega^{-1})}{\left(z_1^{\frac{e_1}{2}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{2}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{2}} + q_\omega^{1/2} q_\alpha^{1/2} \right) \left(z_1^{\frac{e_1}{2}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{2}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{2}} + q_\omega^{-1/2} q_\alpha^{-1/2} \right)} \\ & \cdot \frac{1}{\left(z_1^{\frac{e_1}{2}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{2}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{2}} - q_\omega^{1/2} q_\alpha^{1/2} q_{2\alpha} \right) \left(z_1^{\frac{e_1}{2}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{2}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{2}} - q_\omega^{-1/2} q_\alpha^{-1/2} q_{2\alpha} \right)} z_1^{f_1} \cdots z_n^{f_n} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \cdots \frac{dz_n}{z_n}, \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

where $f_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q_\omega = q_{\omega, \alpha}$ is the value of α^\vee on the Satake parameter of ω —this is a positive power of $q^{1/2}$ (of q if $\alpha^\vee/2$ is a coroot) by Sections 7 and 8 of [Opd04]. We have $q_{2\alpha} = 1$ and the resulting simplification (7) whenever $\alpha^\vee/2$ is not a coroot.

With notation fixed, the theorem is essentially an observation. Indeed, suppose that we integrate with respect to z_1 , and wish to compute the contribution to the residue at a pole

$$z_1 = \xi q_\omega^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} q_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{e_1}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{e_1}}$$

arising from the factor

$$\frac{q_\alpha(z_1^{e_1} z_2^{e_2} \cdots z_n^{e_n} - q_\omega)(z_1^{e_1} z_2^{e_2} \cdots z_n^{e_n} - q_\omega^{-1})}{(z_1^{e_1} z_2^{e_2} \cdots z_n^{e_n} - q_\omega q_\alpha)(z_1^{e_1} z_2^{e_2} \cdots z_n^{e_n} - q_\omega^{-1} q_\alpha^{-1})} \frac{1}{z_1} =$$

$$\frac{q_\alpha(z_1^{e_1} - q_\omega z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n})(z_1^{e_1} - q_\omega^{-1} z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n})}{(z_1^{e_1} - q_\omega q_\alpha z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n}) \prod_\zeta (z_1 - \zeta q_\omega^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} q_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{e_1}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{e_1}})} \frac{1}{z_1},$$

where ξ and the ζ are primitive e_1 -st roots of unity. The contribution is then

$$\frac{q_\alpha(q_\omega^{-1} q_\alpha^{-1} z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n} - q_\omega z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n})(q_\omega^{-1} q_\alpha^{-1} z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n} - q_\omega^{-1} z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n})}{(q_\omega^{-1} q_\alpha^{-1} z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n} - q_\omega q_\alpha z_2^{-e_2} \cdots z_n^{-e_n}) \prod_{\zeta \neq \xi} (\xi q_\omega^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} q_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{e_1}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{e_1}} - \zeta q_\omega^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{e_1}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{e_1}})} \cdot \frac{1}{\xi q_\omega^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} q_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{e_1}} z_2^{\frac{e_2}{e_1}} \cdots z_n^{\frac{e_n}{e_1}}}, \quad (20)$$

which simplifies to

$$\frac{(1 - q_\alpha q_\omega^2)(1 - q_\alpha)}{(1 - q_\alpha^2 q_\omega^2) \prod_{\zeta \neq \xi} (1 - \xi^{-1} \zeta)}. \quad (21)$$

We have used no special properties of the integers e_i or f_j , and thus after integrating with respect to z_1 , (19) is equal to a sum of integrals with respect to z_2, \dots, z_n again of the form (19), except the factors in the denominator will now involve powers $q_\omega(\alpha)q_\omega(\alpha')^{1/2}$ and $q_\omega(\alpha)q_\omega(\alpha')^{-1/2}$, as for $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n$. The coefficients of the this sum are the form

$$\frac{Q}{(1 \pm q^{r_1})^{c_1} \cdots (1 \pm q^{r_k})^{c_k}},$$

where Q is a Laurent polynomial in $q^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $r_i \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$ with, *a priori*, complex coefficients, and $c_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, as we never required any cancellations with the numerator to extract rational functions of q of the required form, it is clear that the simplification of (20) to (21) works essentially the same way for any higher order poles that appear—again thanks to the quotient rule—and that when integrating with respect to subsequent variables, the additional rational functions of q appearing have the same shape as in the proof of Theorem 15. It is also clear that the factors corresponding to non-reduced roots behave similarly.

Therefore (19) has poles in q only at a finite number of roots of unity. Again by the quotient rule, exponents r_i and c_i depend only on M . Clearly there are only finitely-many exponents r_i that appear for any M . The theorem now follows. \square

3.3 Relating t_w and f_w

We will now relate the Schwartz functions f_w on G to the elements $\phi^{-1}(t_w)$ of a completion \mathcal{H}^- of \mathbf{H} , whose definition we will now recall. In this section \mathbf{G} is general.

3.3.1 Completions of \mathbf{H} and $J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$

Let $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{C}((\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}))$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^- = \mathbb{C}[[\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}]]$. Write \mathcal{H}^- for the $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ -algebra

$$\mathcal{H}^- := \left\{ \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} b_x T_x \left| b_x \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, b_x \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \ell(x) \rightarrow \infty \right. \right\},$$

where we say that $b_x \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell(x) \rightarrow \infty$ if for all $N > 0$, $b_x \in (\mathbf{q}^{-1/2})^N \hat{\mathcal{A}}^-$ for all x sufficiently long.

Consider also the completions

$$\mathcal{H}_{C'}^- := \left\{ \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} b_x C'_x \mid b_x \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, b_x \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \ell(x) \rightarrow \infty \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_C^- := \left\{ \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} b_x C_x \mid b_x \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, b_x \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \ell(x) \rightarrow \infty \right\}$$

of \mathbf{H} (note the difference between C'_x and C_x), as well as the completion

$$\mathcal{J} := \left\{ \sum_{x \in \tilde{W}} b_x t_x \mid b_x \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, b_x \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \ell(x) \rightarrow \infty \right\}$$

of $J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}$.

In [Lus87a], Lusztig shows that ϕ extends to an isomorphism of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ -algebras $\mathcal{H}_C^- \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$. In this way the elements $t_w \in J \subset \mathcal{J}$ may be identified with elements of \mathcal{H}^- .

Lemma 7. *We have $\mathcal{H}_{C'}^- \subset \mathcal{H}^-$. The inclusion is continuous.*

Proof. Given an infinite sum $\sum_x b_x C'_x$, upon rewriting this sum in the standard basis, the coefficient of some T_y is

$$a_y := \sum_{x \geq y} b_x \mathbf{q}^{-\frac{\ell(x)}{2}} P_{y,x}(\mathbf{q}).$$

As $\deg P_{y,x} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\ell(x) - \ell(y) - 1)$, we have that $\mathbf{q}^{-\frac{\ell(x)}{2}} P_{y,x}(\mathbf{q})$ is a polynomial in $\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}$. Therefore the above sum defines a formal Laurent series. Moreover, as $\ell(y) \rightarrow \infty$, it is clear that $a_y \rightarrow 0$. Continuity of the inclusion is clear from the formula for a_y . \square

3.3.2 The functions f_w and the basis elements t_w

We shall now explain how the map $\tilde{\phi}: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(G)^I$ induces a map of \mathcal{A} -algebras $\phi_1: J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^-$.

Proposition 2. *There is a map of \mathcal{A} -algebras $\phi_1: J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^-$ such that if $\phi_1(t_w) = \sum_x a_{x,w} T_x$, then $a_{x,w}(q) = f_w(x)$. Moreover, there is a constant N depending only on \tilde{W} such that $a_{x,w} \in (\mathbf{q}^{1/2})^N \hat{\mathcal{A}}^-$ for all $x, w \in \tilde{W}$.*

The most difficult part of the proof of the proposition is showing that $a_{x,w} \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell(x) \rightarrow \infty$. To this end we have

Lemma 8. *Let $w \in \tilde{W}$. Then the degree in q of the numerator of $f_w(1)$ is bounded uniformly in w by some N depending only on \tilde{W} , and hence in the notation of Proposition 2 above, we have $a_{1,w} \in (\mathbf{q}^{1/2})^N \hat{\mathcal{A}}^-$ for all $w \in \tilde{W}$.*

Remark 11. In type A , the Lemma follows immediately from the order of integration given after the proof of Lemma 6.

Proof of Lemma 8. Let $\pi_\omega = \text{Ind}_P^G(\nu \otimes \omega)$ be a tempered I -spherical representation of G arising by induction from a parabolic P such that $\text{rank } A_P = k$. Let \mathbb{T}_ω^k be the compact torus parametrizing twists of ω , and let t_w be given. By Lemma 4, $\text{trace}(\pi, f_w)$ is a regular function on \mathbb{T}^k , i.e. a Laurent polynomial in the coordinates z_1, \dots, z_k on \mathbb{T}^k . The coefficients of this Laurent polynomial are independent of q , as J and its representation theory are independent of q . As we have

$$|1 - q^r| \leq |z_i - q^r z_1^{e_1} \cdots z_k^{e_k}| \leq |1 + q^r|$$

for all $z_i \in \mathbb{T}$ and r , we may bound, for large q , the absolute value $|\mu_{M_P}(z)|$ of the Plancherel density for M_P by a rational function $U_{M_P, \omega}(q)$. By Theorem 10, we may do the same for formal degrees $d(\omega)$, bounding $|d(\omega)|$ by a rational function $D_\omega(q)$. Thus we define a rational function of q by

$$\frac{h_1(q) + h_2(q^{-1})}{k_1(q) + k_2(q^{-1})} = \sum_{\omega} U_{M_P, \omega}(q) D_\omega(q) \max_{z \in \mathbb{T}_\omega^k} |\text{trace}(\pi_\omega, f_w)|,$$

where $h_1, k_1 \in \mathbb{C}[q]$ and $h_2, k_2 \in q^{-1}\mathbb{C}[q^{-1}]$, and the sum is over the finitely many, up to unitary twist, pairs (M, ω) , for $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M)$, such that $\text{trace}(\pi_\omega, f_w) \neq 0$.

Fix $w \in \tilde{W}$. Then

$$|f_w(1)| = \left| \sum_{(P, \omega)} \int_{\mathcal{O}(\omega)} \text{trace}(\pi_\omega, f_w) d(\omega) d\mu_{M_P}(z) \right| \leq \frac{h_1(q) + h_2(q^{-1})}{k_1(q) + k_2(q^{-1})}.$$

Crucially, this expression holds for all $q \gg 1$.

On the other hand, by Corollary 2 and Theorem 16, $f_w(1)$ is a rational function of q , and for q sufficiently large, we may write

$$|f_w(1)| = \frac{f_1(q) + f_2(q^{-1})}{d_1(q) + d_2(q^{-1})}$$

where $f_1, d_1 \in \mathbb{C}[q]$ and $f_2, d_2 \in q^{-1}\mathbb{C}[q^{-1}]$. Therefore for all $q \gg 1$ we have

$$|(f_1(q) + f_2(q^{-1}))|(k_1(q) + k_2(q^{-1}))| \leq |(d_1(q) + d_2(q^{-1}))|(h_1(q) + h_2(q^{-1}))|. \quad (22)$$

We claim that this implies

$$|f_1(q)k_1(q)| \leq |d_1(q)h_1(q)| \quad (23)$$

for q sufficiently large. Indeed, let $\epsilon > 0$ be given and choose $q \gg 1$ such that

$$|(f_1(q) + f_2(q^{-1}))|(k_1(q) + k_2(q^{-1}))| - |f_1(q)k_1(q)| \leq \epsilon$$

and

$$|(d_1(q) + d_2(q^{-1}))|(h_1(q) + h_2(q^{-1}))| - |d_1(q)h_1(q)| \leq \epsilon,$$

and (22) holds. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_1(q)k_1(q)| &\leq |(f_1(q) + f_2(q^{-1}))|(k_1(q) + k_2(q^{-1}))| + \epsilon \\ &\leq |(d_1(q) + d_2(q^{-1}))|(h_1(q) + h_2(q^{-1}))| + \epsilon \\ &\leq |d_1(q)h_1(q)| + 2\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (23).

Therefore

$$\deg f_1 \leq \deg f_1 + \deg k_1 \leq \deg d_1 + \deg h_1.$$

Now, the denominator of $f_w(1)$, and hence $\deg d_1$, depends only on the two-sided cell containing w , again by Corollary 2 and Theorem 16. We can also bound $\deg h_1$ uniformly in terms of \tilde{W} , as it depends only on the Plancherel measure and the finitely many possible formal degrees appearing in the parametrization of the I -spherical part of the tempered dual of G . This proves the lemma. \square

If $t_w \in t_d J t_{d'}$ for $d \neq d'$, then t_w is a commutator. We record this observation as

Lemma 9. *We have that $f_w(1) = 0$ unless $f_d \star f_w \star f_d \neq 0$ for some distinguished involution d .*

Now we can prove the proposition.

Proof of Proposition 2. Let $w \in \tilde{W}$. Write $\tilde{\phi}(t_w) = f_w = \sum_x A_{x,w} T_x$ as Schwartz functions on G so that $A_{x,w} = f_w(x)$. We must show that there is a unique element $a_{x,w} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $a_{x,w}(q) = A_{x,w}$ as complex numbers. We will then check that $a_{x,w} \rightarrow 0$ rapidly enough as $\ell(x) \rightarrow \infty$ for $\sum_x a_{x,w} T_x$ to define an element of \mathcal{H}^- .

By Corollary 2 and Theorem 16, there is a formal power series in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^-$ with constant term equal to 1 that specializes to the denominator of $A_{1,w}$ when $\mathbf{q} = q$. Moreover, there is a unique formal Laurent series $a_{1,w} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $a_{1,w}(q) = A_{1,w}$ for all prime powers. Indeed, $a_{1,w}$ is convergent for $\mathbf{q} = q$, and the difference of any two such series defines a meromorphic function of $\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}$ outside the unit disk with zeros at $q = p^r$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$. As these prime powers accumulate at ∞ , such a meromorphic function must be identically zero.

If $f \in \mathcal{C}^{I \times I}$ is a Harish-Chandra Schwartz function, then

$$\begin{aligned} q^{-\ell(x)}(f \star T_{x^{-1}})(1) &= q^{-\ell(x)} \int_G f(g) T_{x^{-1}}(g^{-1}) d\mu_I(g) \\ &= q^{-\ell(x)} \int_{IxI} f(g) d\mu_I(g) = q^{-\ell(x)} \mu_I(IxI) f(x) = f(x). \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $f_w(x) = A_{x,w}$. On the other hand, according to Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q^{-\ell(x)}(f_w \star T_{x^{-1}})(1) &= q^{-\ell(x)} \left(\tilde{\phi}(t_w) \star \tilde{\phi} \left(\phi_q(T_{x^{-1}}^\dagger) \right) \right) (1) \\ &= q^{-\ell(x)} \tilde{\phi} \left(t_w \phi_q(T_{x^{-1}}^\dagger) \right) (1) \\ &= q^{-\ell(x)} \tilde{\phi} \left(t_w \phi_q \left(\sum_{y \leq x^{-1}} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} (-1)^{\ell(x^{-1}) - \ell(y)} Q_{y,x^{-1}}(q) (C'_y)^\dagger \right) \right) (1) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$= q^{-\ell(x)} \tilde{\phi} \left(t_w \phi_q \left(\sum_{y \leq x^{-1}} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} (-1)^{\ell(x^{-1})} Q_{y,x^{-1}}(q) (C_y) \right) \right) (1) \quad (25)$$

$$= q^{-\ell(x)} \tilde{\phi} \left(t_w \sum_{y \leq x^{-1}} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} (-1)^{\ell(x^{-1})} Q_{y,x^{-1}}(q) \sum_{\substack{r \sim_L d \\ d \in \mathcal{D} \\ a(d)=a(r)}} h_{y,d,r} t_r \right) (1) \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= q^{-\ell(x)} \tilde{\phi} \left(\sum_{y \leq x^{-1}} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} (-1)^{\ell(x^{-1})} Q_{y,x^{-1}}(q) \sum_{\substack{r \sim_L d \\ d \in \mathcal{D} \\ a(d)=a(r)=a(w)}} h_{y,d,r} t_w t_r \right) (1) \\ &= q^{-\ell(x)} \sum_{y \leq x^{-1}} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} (-1)^{\ell(x^{-1})} Q_{y,x^{-1}}(q) \sum_{\substack{r \sim_L d \\ a(r)=a(w)}} h_{y,d_w,r} (f_w \star f_r)(1), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where d_w is the unique distinguished involution in the right cell containing w .

In line (24), we rewrote $T_{x^{-1}}$ in terms of the C' -basis of H , using the inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials $Q_{y,x^{-1}}$. In line (25), we applied the Goldman involution (see Lemma 1). In line (26) we applied Lusztig's map ϕ_q , and then in line (27), we applied the map $\tilde{\phi}$. Also in line (27), we used that left (respectively right) cells give left (respectively right) ideals of J , and so $t_w t_r$ is an integral linear combination of $t_{z^{-1}}$, with $d \sim_L z^{-1} \sim_R d_w$. By lemma 9, $f_{z^{-1}}(1) \neq 0$ only if $d = d_w$, that is, $z^{-1} \sim_L d_w$.

We use (27) to define $a_{x,w} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$. By the same arguments as above, $a_{x,w}$ is unique and defines a meromorphic function of $\mathbf{q}^{-1/2}$. It remains to show that as $\ell(x) \rightarrow \infty$, $a_{x,w} \rightarrow 0$ in the $(\mathbf{q}^{-1/2})$ -adic topology. This follows in fact from (27). Indeed, the product $f_w \star f_r$ is an \mathbb{N} -linear combination of functions f_z , and

the values $f_z(1)$ are rational functions of q , the numerators of which have uniformly bounded degree in q by Lemma 8. The polynomials $h_{y,d_w,r}$ have bounded degree in q (for example in terms of the a -function). Finally, the degree in q of

$$q^{-\ell(x)} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} Q_{y,x^{-1}}(q)$$

is at most

$$q^{-\ell(x)} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} q^{\frac{\ell(x^{-1}) - \ell(y) - 1}{2}} = q^{-\ell(x)} q^{\frac{\ell(y)}{2}} q^{\frac{\ell(x) - \ell(y) - 1}{2}} = q^{\frac{-\ell(x) - 1}{2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (28)$$

as $\ell(x) \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the definition of ϕ_1 as a map of \mathcal{A} -modules.

It is easy to see that ϕ_1 is a morphism of rings, essentially because $\tilde{\phi}$ is. Indeed, we have

$$\phi_1(t_w t_{w'}) = \sum_z \gamma_{w,w',z^{-1}} \sum_x a_{x,z} T_x \quad (29)$$

while on the other hand

$$\phi_1(t_w) \phi_1(t_{w'}) = \sum_x a_{x,w} T_x \cdot \sum_y a_{y,w'} T_y \quad (30)$$

and when $\mathbf{q} = q$, we have that (30) becomes by definition

$$\tilde{\phi}(t_w) \star \tilde{\phi}(t_{w'}) = \tilde{\phi} \left(\sum_z \gamma_{w,w',z^{-1}} t_z \right) = \sum_z \sum_x \gamma_{w,w',z^{-1}} A_{x,z} T_x.$$

Hence for infinitely many prime powers we have that the specializations of (29) agrees with those of (30), and hence (29) is equal to (30) in \mathcal{H}^- . A similar argument shows that ϕ_1 preserves units. \square

Remark 12. The proof, specifically (28), gives a necessary condition for an element of \mathcal{H}^- to belong to the image of ϕ_1 : the coefficients must decay asymptotically at least as fast as $\mathbf{q}^{-\frac{\ell(x)}{2}}$.

Proposition 3. *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{H} & \xrightarrow{\phi} & J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\phi_1} & \mathcal{H}^- \\ & & \downarrow \phi^{-1} & & \uparrow \\ & & \mathcal{H}_C^- & \xrightarrow{(\cdot)^\dagger} & \mathcal{H}_{C'}^-, \end{array}$$

and we have $\phi_1 = (\cdot)^\dagger \circ \phi^{-1}$ as morphisms of \mathcal{A} -algebras $J \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^-$. In particular, $a_{x,w}$ has integer coefficients for all $x, w \in \tilde{W}$.

Proof. The second claim follows from the first if we show that ϕ_1 extends to a continuous morphism $\mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^-$, by density of $\phi(\mathbf{H})$ in $\mathcal{J} \simeq \mathcal{H}_C^-$, and the third claim follows from the second and the fact that the completions we consider are actually defined over \mathbb{Z} [Lus87a, Thm. 2.8].

Note that as $\tilde{\phi} \circ \phi_q = (\cdot)^\dagger$ on H for all q , we have that $\phi_1 = (\cdot)^\dagger \circ \phi^{-1}$ on $\phi(\mathbf{H})$. This says that the diagram commutes.

We now show that ϕ_1 extends to a continuous map $\mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_C^-$. Let $\sum_w b_w t_w$ define an element of \mathcal{J} and define

$$\phi_1 \left(\sum_w b_w t_w \right) = \sum_y b'_y T_y,$$

where

$$b'_y = \sum_w b_w a_{y,w}.$$

We must first show that this infinite sum of elements of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is well-defined. By Lemma 8 and (27), we have that there is $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_{y,w} \in (\mathbf{q}^{1/2})^M \hat{\mathcal{A}}^-$ for all y, w . Therefore b'_y is well-defined, and as $a_{y,w} \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell(y) \rightarrow \infty$, we have $b'_y \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell(y) \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore ϕ_1 extends to \mathcal{J} .

To show continuity, it suffices to show that if $\{\sum_w b_{w,n} t_w\}_n$ is a sequence of elements of \mathcal{J} tending to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sum_w b_{w,n} \phi_1(t_w) = \sum_y b'_{y,n} T_y \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in \mathcal{H}^- , where $b'_{y,n} = \sum_w b_{w,n} a_{y,w}$. For all $R > 0$, there is $N > 0$ such that $n > N$ implies $b_{x,n} \in (\mathbf{q}^{-1/2})^R \hat{\mathcal{A}}^-$ for all x . We have seen that there is M depending only on \tilde{W} such that $a_{y,w} \in (\mathbf{q}^{1/2})^M \hat{\mathcal{A}}^-$ for all w, y . Therefore $b'_{y,n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, because $b_{w,n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Note that Proposition 3 means in particular that $\phi_1(J) \subset \mathcal{H}_{C'}^-$.

Corollary 3. *We have*

$$(\phi \circ ())^\dagger)^{-1}(t_1) = f_1(1) \sum_{w \in \tilde{W}} (-1)^{\ell(w)} q^{-\ell(w)} T_w.$$

Proof. If $w = 1$, everything in (27) reduces to $r = d_w = y = 1$, and we need only recall that $Q_{1,x}(\mathbf{q}) = 1$ for any $x \in \tilde{W}$. This follows from unicity of the inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials and the identity $\sum_{x \leq w} (-1)^{\ell(x)} P_{x,w}(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ for $w \neq 1$ [BB05, Exercise 5.17]. \square

Corollary 4. *The map $\tilde{\phi}$ defined in [BK18] and recalled in diagram (2) is injective.*

Proof. Let $q > 1$ and let $j \neq 0$ be an element of J . We must show that $\tilde{\phi}(j) \neq 0$. By injectivity of ϕ_1 , we have $\phi_1(j) \neq 0$. By definition of the map ϕ_1 , this means that there exists $q_0 > 1$, $u, s \in G^\vee$ such that $us = su$ with s compact, and a representation ρ of $\pi_0(Z_{G^\vee}(u, s))$ such that $jK(u, s, \rho, q_0) \neq 0$. But then $jK(u, s, \rho, q) \neq 0$, $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ being a different specialization of the restriction of the same J -module $E(u, s, \rho)$ as for $K(u, s, \rho, q_0)$, and $K(u, s, \rho, q)$ is also tempered. It follows that $\tilde{\phi}(j) \neq 0$. \square

3.4 Proof of Conjecture 1 for GL_n

Theorem 17. *Let \tilde{W} be of type \tilde{A}_n . Then Conjecture 1 is true.*

Proof. The third statement follows from the standard formula for the formal degree of the Steinberg representation and multiplicativity of the formal degree under external tensor product.

By Corollary 2 and Propositions 2 and 3, $a_{1,x}$ is a rational function of \mathbf{q} for all w . Then equation (27) implies that $a_{x,w}$, being a sum of rational functions with Laurent polynomial coefficients, is a rational function of \mathbf{q} for all x . The same equation, together with the fact that $J_{\mathbf{c}}$ is a two-sided ideal for each cell \mathbf{c} shows that the denominator of $a_{x,w}$ depends only on the two-sided cell containing w . This proves the first claim. The second claim now follows from the first claim and the first statement of Corollary 2 and the fact that \tilde{W} has finitely-many two-sided cells. \square

Corollary 5. *Let $u = (r_1, \dots, r_k)$ be a unipotent conjugacy class in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Let d be a distinguished involution in the two-sided cell $\mathbf{c}(u) \subset \tilde{W}(\mathrm{GL}_n)$ corresponding to u . Let π be the unique family of parabolic inductions that t_d does not annihilate. Then $\mathrm{rank} \pi(t_d) = 1$.*

Proof. Let $u = (r_1, \dots, r_k)$. We have $\pi = \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\mathrm{St}_{M_P} \otimes \nu)$, for the unique Levi M_P such that u is distinguished in M_P^\vee , and as $\dim \mathrm{St}_{M_P}^I = 1$, clearly we have

$$\dim \pi^I = \frac{n!}{r_1! \cdots r_k!}.$$

This is also the number of distinguished involutions in $\mathbf{c}(u)$, by [Shi06]. The claim follows from Corollary 4. \square

3.5 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof of Theorem 3. Theorem 16 together with Propositions 2 and 3 show that $a_{1,w}$ is a rational function of \mathbf{q} with denominator depending only on the two-sided cell containing w . Equation (27) again shows that $a_{x,w}$ is a rational function of \mathbf{q} with denominator depending only on the two-sided cell containing w ; up to twists the set $\mathcal{E}_2(M)^I$ is finite for every Levi subgroup M , so we may multiply through to include the denominators of all required formal degrees, which are in fact rational of the correct form by Theorem 10. As there are finitely-many Levi subgroups of G up to association, this defines a polynomial $P_{\mathbf{G}}^1(\mathbf{q})$ satisfying the first two statements of the theorem. Moreover, Theorems 10 and 16 give that $a_{x,w}$ has poles occurring only in a finite set of roots of unity. The statement about distinguished involutions in the lowest two-sided cell follows from (13). The statement about arbitrary $a_{x,w}$ for $w \in \mathbf{c}_0$ follows from the last statement of Theorem 16 and (27). The fourth statement follows immediately from Theorem 10 by putting $P_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{q}) = \Delta(\mathbf{q})P_{\mathbf{G}}^1(\mathbf{q})$. \square

3.6 Further example: $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$ and $\mathbf{G} = G_2$

In this section we will provide some further evidence for Conjecture 1 by proving it in types \tilde{C}_2 and \tilde{G}_2 . For $\mathrm{Sp}_4(F)$, the entire Plancherel formula, not just the Iwahori-spherical part, has been computed explicitly by Aubert and Kim in [AK00]. In the case of type \tilde{G}_2 , we follow Parkinson [Par14]. We will use their calculations to prove a final

Theorem 18. *Conjecture 1 is true for $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$ and for $\mathbf{G} = G_2$.*

3.6.1 Case $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$

We will first briefly recall some facts about Sp_4 and notation from [AK00]. Set $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{Sp}_4$ and $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$. The Poincaré polynomial of Sp_4 is

$$(1 + \mathbf{q})(1 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}^2 + \mathbf{q}^3) = (1 + \mathbf{q})^2(1 + \mathbf{q}^2).$$

There are four two-sided cells of \tilde{W} , corresponding as follows to the unipotent conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{SO}_5(\mathbb{C})$: $(1, 1, 1, 1)$, the lowest cell, $(2, 2, 1)$ the second lowest cell, $(3, 1, 1)$ the subregular cell, and (5) , the cell in bijection with $\pi_1(\mathbf{G})$.

Besides the Steinberg representation, there are two Iwahori-spherical discrete series representations, corresponding to characters of H . It is easy to see from the description of J in [Xi94] that both extend to $J_{(3,1,1)}$ -modules.

Denote the three proper standard Levi subgroups of G by writing the maximal torus $M_\emptyset \simeq \mathrm{GL}_1(F) \times \mathrm{GL}_1(F)$, and putting

$$M_s := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & w_0 {}^t A w_0^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \middle| A \in \mathrm{GL}_2(F) \right\} \simeq \mathrm{GL}_2(F)$$

where w_0 is the longest element in the finite Weyl group, and

$$M_h := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & & \\ & A & \\ & & a^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \middle| A \in \mathrm{Sp}_2(F), a \in F^\times \right\} \simeq \mathrm{GL}_1(F) \times \mathrm{Sp}_2(F).$$

The corresponding families of induced tempered representations are $J_{(2,2,1)}$ -modules and $J_{(3,1,1)}$ -modules, respectively.

Under the Plancherel decomposition $f = \sum_M f_M$, according to [AK00], p. 14, we have, in particular,

$$f_{M_h}(1) = c(G/P_h)^{-2} \gamma(G/P_h) \frac{1}{\#W(M_h)} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{q-1}{q+1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{q^3(z-q)(z-q^{-1})}{(z-q^{-2})(z-q^2)} \mathrm{trace}(\pi, f) \frac{dz}{z}, \quad (31)$$

and

$$f_{M_s}(1) = c(G/P_s)^{-2} \gamma(G/P_s) \frac{1}{\#W(M_s)} \frac{q-1}{2(q+1)} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(z^2-1)^2}{(z+q^{-\frac{1}{2}})(z-q^{-\frac{3}{2}})(z-q^{\frac{3}{2}})(z+q^{\frac{1}{2}})} \text{trace}(\pi, f) \frac{dz}{z}. \quad (32)$$

Proof of Theorem 18 for $\mathbf{G} = \text{Sp}_4$. By Propositions 2 and 3 and (27), it suffices to check that the values $f_w(1)$ are of the required form. We will check this, and along the way check that the same is true of the formal degrees we shall require.

The first step is to note that, according to [AK00], p. 6, all the $c(G/P)^{-1}$ -factors and γ -factors that appear in equations (31) and (32) are either polynomial or have denominators dividing $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)$. The same is obviously true for all the formal degrees that appear. Recalling Lemma 4, it suffices in the case of (31) to compute that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{q^3(z-q)(z-q^{-1})}{(z-q^{-2})(z-q^2)} z^e dz = \begin{cases} \frac{q^{-2e-2}(q^{-2}-q)}{1+q+q^2+q^3} & \text{if } e \geq 0 \\ \frac{q^{-2e-2}(q^{-2}-q)}{1+q+q^2+q^3} + Q & \text{if } e < 0 \end{cases},$$

for any $e \in \mathbb{Z}$, where Q is a Laurent polynomial in q .

In the case of (32), for any $e \in \mathbb{Z}$, the integral in question involves summing over residues at poles $z = 0$, $z = q^{-3/2}$, and $z = q^{-1/2}$, and is a sum of terms of the form

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(z^2-1)^2 z^e}{(z+q^{-\frac{1}{2}})(z-q^{-\frac{3}{2}})(z-q^{\frac{3}{2}})(z+q^{\frac{1}{2}})} dz = Q + \frac{q^{-3} q^{9/2} q^{-3e/2}}{(1+q)(1+q^2)} + \frac{q^e q^{1/2}}{(1+q)^2},$$

where Q is a Laurent polynomial in $q^{1/2}$.

These computations, plus Theorem 16, and, in the case of $J_{(3,1,1)}$ consultation of the formal degrees in [AK00, p.12], show that the denominator of $f_w(1)$ divides a power of $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)$, for all $w \in \tilde{W}$. By the same argument as before, the denominators of $f_w(x)$ divide a power of $P_{\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B}}(q)$ for any $x \in \tilde{W}$. The theorem follows. \square

3.6.2 Case $\mathbf{G} = G_2$

In the case $\mathbf{G} = G_2$, we may take the Plancherel formula from [Par14], or specialize the general formula. As [Par14] is more accessible than [AK00], we are briefer in our recollections. Following the notation of [Par14], let

$$\{\alpha_1^\vee, \alpha_2^\vee, \alpha_1^\vee + \alpha_2^\vee, \alpha_1^\vee + 2\alpha_2^\vee, \alpha_1^\vee + 3\alpha_2^\vee, 2\alpha_1^\vee + 3\alpha_2^\vee\}$$

be the coroots of G_2 . The Poincaré polynomial is

$$(1+q)(1+q+q^2+q^3+q^4+q^5).$$

We shall only need to compute explicitly with the two summands of the Plancherel corresponding to the proper non-minimal Levi subgroups $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$ of \mathbf{G} , both of which are isomorphic to GL_2 . Here \mathbf{M}_i denotes the Levi subgroup such that α_i^\vee is not trivial on the subtorus centralized by \mathbf{M}_i^\vee .

Then with z_1 and z_2 as coordinates on the maximal torus of $G^\vee = G_2(\mathbb{C})$ corresponding to α_1^\vee and α_2^\vee , respectively, (6) becomes, by Theorem 4.7 of [Par14]

$$f_{M_1, \text{St}_{\text{GL}_2}}(1) = \frac{q-1}{2q^5(q+1)} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{q^{\frac{7}{2}} q^7 (z_1^3 + q^{-1})(z_1^3 + q^{-1})(z_1+1)^2(z-1)^2}{(z_1+q^{-\frac{3}{2}})(z+q^{\frac{3}{2}})(z+\zeta q^{1/2})(z+\zeta q^{-1/2})(z+\zeta^2 q^{1/2})} \cdot \frac{1}{(z+\zeta^2 q^{-1/2})(z+q^{-1/2})(z-q^{-1/2})(z+q^{1/2})(z-q^{1/2})} \text{trace}(\pi, f) \frac{dz_1}{z_1},$$

where $\zeta = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}$, and

$$f_{M_2, \text{St}_{\text{GL}_2}}(1) = \frac{q-1}{2q^5(q+1)} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{q^5(z_2^2-1)(z_2+q^{3/2})(z_2^2-1)(z_2+q^{-3/2})}{(z_2-q^{-1/2})(z_2+q^{1/2})(z_2+q^{-5/2})(z_2-q)(z+q^{5/2})} \text{trace}(\pi, f) \frac{dz_2}{z_2}.$$

Proof of Theorem 18 for $\mathbf{G} = G_2$. By Propositions 2 and 3, and (27), it suffices to check that the values $f_w(1)$ are of the required form. Theorems 16 and 9 leave one to check that the values $(f_w)_{M_i}(1)$ are of the correct form. This is entirely standard, but the reader is encouraged to compute the instructive residues at $z_1 = -q^{-1/2}\zeta$ and $z_1 = -q^{-1/2}\zeta^2$ and see that the resulting rational functions indeed have integer coefficients. \square

4 Representations with fixed vectors under parahoric subgroups

In this section we will give an application of the J -action on the tempered H -modules. The first statement is an immediate corollary of the existence of this action, but the second statement relies on Corollary 4.

Theorem 19. *Let \mathcal{P} be a parahoric subgroup of G . Let π be a simple tempered representation of G with I -fixed vectors with Kazhdan-Lusztig parameter (u, s, ρ) . Let $w_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the longest element in the parabolic subgroup of \tilde{W} defined by \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{B}_u^{\vee} be the Springer fibre for u .*

1. *If*

$$\ell(w_{\mathcal{P}}) > a(u) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{B}_u^{\vee},$$

then

$$\pi^{\mathcal{P}} = \{0\}.$$

2. *Conversely, let $u_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the unipotent conjugacy class corresponding to the two-sided cell containing $w_{\mathcal{P}}$. Then there exists $s \in Z_{G^{\vee}}(u_{\mathcal{P}})$, a Levi subgroup M^{\vee} of G^{\vee} minimal such that $(u_{\mathcal{P}}, s) \in M^{\vee}$, and a discrete series representation $\omega \in \mathcal{E}_2(M)$ such that*

$$\pi^{\mathcal{P}} = i_{P_M}^G(\omega \otimes \nu)^{\mathcal{P}} \neq \{0\}$$

for all ν non-strictly positive and the parameter of π is $(u_{\mathcal{P}}, s)$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} and $w_{\mathcal{P}}$ be as in the statement. Then $C'_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}$ is proportional by a power of q to the indicator function $1_{\mathcal{P}}$ in H . Moreover, $w_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a distinguished involution, with $a(w_{\mathcal{P}}) = \ell(w_{\mathcal{P}})$. By Proposition 3 and the fact that ϕ is “upper-triangular” with respect to the a -function, we have $(\phi \circ ()^{\dagger})(C'_{w_{\mathcal{P}}})J_{\mathbf{c}} = 0$ for \mathbf{c} corresponding to u if $a(w_{\mathcal{P}}) > a(u)$.

For the second statement, by Corollary 4, there is a tempered representation $\pi = \text{Ind}_P^G(\omega \otimes \nu)$ with $\pi(t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}) \neq 0$; the unipotent part of its parameter is $u_{\mathcal{P}}$. In particular, there is a vector $v \in \pi$ such that $\pi(t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}})v = v$. We have

$$(\phi \circ ()^{\dagger})(C'_{w_{\mathcal{P}}})t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}} = (-1)^{\ell(w_{\mathcal{P}})} \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ z \sim_L d}} h_{w_{\mathcal{P}}, d, z} t_z t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}} = (-1)^{\ell(w_{\mathcal{P}})} \sum_z h_{w_{\mathcal{P}}, w_{\mathcal{P}}, z} t_z = \text{vol}(\mathcal{P}) t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}},$$

as $t_z t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}} \neq 0$ only if $z \sim_L w_{\mathcal{P}}$, and $C_{w_{\mathcal{P}}} C_{w_{\mathcal{P}}} = (-1)^{\ell(w_{\mathcal{P}})} \text{vol}(\mathcal{P}) C_{w_{\mathcal{P}}}$. Thus $v \in \pi^{\mathcal{P}}$. As $\text{trace}(\pi, t_d)$ is constant with respect to ν , the last part of the claim follows. \square

A version of this statement for enhanced parameters in the case $\mathcal{P} = G(\mathcal{O})$ appears in [ABPS17, Prop. 10.1].

Example 9. The principal series representations have $u = \{1\}$, maximal a -value, and fixed vectors under every maximal compact subgroup of G . On the other extreme, the Steinberg representation has u regular, and does not have fixed vectors under any proper parahoric.

In addition to the interpretation given in Section 1.1.3, in the examples below, the J -action also detects which direct summands of a reducible \mathcal{P} -spherical tempered representation are themselves \mathcal{P} -spherical.

Example 10. Let $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(F)$. As remarked in [Daw21], the distinguished involutions in the lowest two-sided cell are the simple reflections s_0 and s_1 , and each t_{s_i} is invariant under one of the two conjugacy classes of maximal parahoric subgroup of G . For unitary principal series representations π , one has $\mathrm{trace}(\pi, t_{s_0}) = \mathrm{trace}(\pi, t_{s_1}) = 1$. At the quadratic character, the corresponding principal series representation is reducible, and each summand contains fixed vectors under precisely one of the maximal parahorics. Indeed, in [Daw21] this computation is carried out at the level of the Schwartz space of the basic affine space.

Example 11. Let $G = \mathrm{SO}_5(F) = \mathrm{PGSp}_4(F)$, with affine Dynkin diagram labelled as

$$\begin{array}{c} \circ \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\ 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \end{array}$$

There are five conjugacy classes of parahoric subgroup, each obtained by projection from $\mathrm{GSp}_4(F)$: the maximal parahoric $\mathrm{PGSp}_4(\mathcal{O})$, the image of the paramodular group \mathbf{K} corresponding to $\{0, 2\}$, the image of the Siegel parahoric subgroup \mathbf{Si} corresponding to $\{1\}$, the image of the Klingen parahoric \mathbf{Kl} corresponding to $\{0\}$, and the Iwahori subgroup.

The columns of the below table give all the I -spherical tempered representations of G by denoting the representation $\mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\omega)$ by ω . We recall the few cases of reducibility of these inductions immediately below. The rows list unipotent conjugacy classes in $G^\vee = \mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{C})$ such that all tempered standard modules $K(u, s, \rho)$ are in row u . That is, the rows record which summand of J acts on each representation.

Cell \ Levi	$\mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_1$	$\mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{SO}_3$	GL_2	SO_5
$(1, \dots, 1)$	ν			
$(2, 1, 1)$		$\nu \otimes \pm \mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{SO}_3}$		
$(2, 2)$			$\xi \mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{GL}_2}$	$\pm \tau_2$
(4)				$\pm \mathrm{St}$

The discrete series are as in Theorem 9. The only reducibility, by [Mat10, Prop. 3.3], is the reducibility

$$\mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\xi \mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{GL}_2}) = \tau_{\mathrm{triv}} \oplus \tau_{\mathrm{sgn}}$$

for $\xi^2 = 1$.

We can now compute the traces of some elements t_d using the description of the simple J -modules given in [Xi94]. For the cells $(1, \dots, 1)$, $(2, 1, 1)$, and (4) , we have $\mathrm{trace}(\pi, t_d) = 1$ for all π . We have

$$\mathrm{trace}(\tau_{\mathrm{triv}}, t_{s_0}) = \mathrm{trace}(\tau_2, t_{s_0}) = 1 = \mathrm{trace}(\tau_{\mathrm{sgn}}, t_{s_1}) = \mathrm{trace}(\tau_{\mathrm{triv}}, t_{s_1}).$$

In the below table, $\mathrm{trace}(\pi, t_d)$ is recorded in bold face, whereas the dimension of $\pi^{\mathcal{P}}$, taken from [RS07, Table A.15], is recorded in normal face. Representations attached to the same cell but belonging to different packets are separated with a dotted line.

$t_{w_{\mathcal{P}}} \setminus \pi = \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(-)$	a	ν	$\nu \otimes \pm \mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{SO}_3}$	τ_{triv}	τ_{sgn}	$\pm \tau_2$	$\pm \mathrm{St}$	\mathcal{P}
t_{w_0}	4	1						$\mathrm{PGSp}_4(\mathcal{O})$
$t_{s_0 s_2}$	2	2	1					\mathbf{K}
t_{s_0}	1	4	2	1		1		\mathbf{Kl}
t_{s_1}	1	4	1	1	1			\mathbf{Si}
t_1	0	8	4	3	1	4	1	I

References

- [ABPS17] A.-M. Aubert, P. Baum, R. Plymen, and M. Solleveld, *The principal series of p -adic groups with disconnected center*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **114** (2017), no. 5, 798–854.
- [AK00] A.-M. Aubert and J.-L. Kim, *A Plancherel formula on Sp_4* , 2000.
- [AP05] A.-M. Aubert and R. Plymen, *Plancherel measure for $\mathrm{GL}(n, F)$ and $\mathrm{GL}(m, D)$: Explicit formulas and Bernstein decomposition*, J. Number Theory **112** (2005).

- [Art89] J. Arthur, *Intertwining Operators and Residues I. Weighted Characters*, J. Funct. Anal. **84** (1989), 19–84.
- [BB05] A. Bjorner and F. Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, Grad. Texts in Math., vol. 231, Springer Science+Business Media, New York, 2005.
- [Ber92] J. Bernstein, *Draft of: Representations of p -adic groups. lectures by J. Bernstein* (1992). Written by Karl E. Rumelhart.
- [BK18] A. Braverman and D. Kazhdan, *Remarks on the asymptotic Hecke algebra*, Lie Groups, Geometry, and Representation Theory: A Tribute to the Life and Work of Bertram Kostant (V. Kac and V.L. Popov, eds.), Progr. Math., vol. 326, 2018, pp. 91–108.
- [BK99] ———, *On the Schwartz space of the basic affine space*, Sel. Math., New Ser. **5** (1999Apr), no. 1, 1.
- [Bor76] A. Borel, *Admissible representations of a semi-simple group over a local field with vectors fixed under an Iwahori subgroup*, Invent. math. **35** (1976).
- [BT82] R. Bott and L. Tu, *Differential forms in algebraic topology*, 3rd ed., Grad. Texts in Math., vol. 82, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
- [CG97] N. Chriss and V. Ginzburg, *Representation theory and complex geometry*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1997.
- [CH14] D. Ciubotaru and X. He, *Cocenters and representations of affine Hecke algebras*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **19** (2014), no. 10, available at [arXiv:1704.03019](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.03019).
- [Daw21] S. Dawydiak, *On Lusztig’s asymptotic Hecke algebra for SL_2* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **149** (2021), no. 1, 71–88.
- [FOS21] Y. Feng, E. Opdam, and M. Solleveld, *On formal degrees of unipotent representations*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu (2021), 1–53.
- [GP19] J. Guillhot and J. Parkinson, *A proof of Lusztig’s conjectures for affine type G_2 with arbitrary parameters*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **118** (2019), no. 5, 1188–1244.
- [GR10] Benedict H. Gross and Mark Reeder, *Arithmetic invariants of discrete Langlands parameters*, Duke Math. J. **154** (2010), no. 3, 431–508.
- [HC84a] Harish-Chandra, *Harmonic Analysis on Reductive p -adic Groups*, Collected Papers IV, 1984, pp. 75–100.
- [HC84b] ———, *The Plancherel Formula for Reductive p -adic Groups*, Collected Papers IV, 1984, pp. 353–367.
- [HII08] K. Hiraga, A. Ichino, and T. Ikeda, *Formal degrees and adjoint γ -factors*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **21** (2008), 283–304.
- [Key82] D. Keys, *Reducibility of unramified unitary principal series representations of p -adic groups and class-I representations*, Math. Ann. **260** (1982), 397–402.
- [KL79] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Invent. math. **53** (1979), 165–184.
- [KL87] ———, *Proof of the Deligne-Langlands conjectures for Hecke algebras*, Invent. Math. **87** (1987), 153–215.
- [Lus03] G. Lusztig, *Hecke Algebras with Unequal Parameters*, CRM Monograph Series, vol. 18, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [Lus85] ———, *Cells in affine Weyl groups*, Adv. Stud. in Pure Math. **6** (1985), 255–287.
- [Lus87a] ———, *Cells in affine Weyl groups, II*, J. Algebra **109** (1987), 536–548.
- [Lus87b] ———, *Cells in affine Weyl groups, III*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math **34** (1987), 223–243.
- [Lus89a] ———, *Cells in affine Weyl groups, IV*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA, Math. **36** (1989), 297–328.
- [Lus89b] ———, *Representations of affine Hecke algebras*, Astérisque **171–172** (1989), 73–84.
- [Mac71] I. G. Macdonald, *Spherical functions on a group of p -adic type* (C.T. Rajagopal, V.K. Balachandran, and M.S. Rangachari, eds.), Ramanujan Institute Lecture Notes, University of Madras, Madras 5, India, 1971.
- [Mac72] I.G. Macdonald, *The Poincaré series of a Coxeter group*, Math. Ann. **199** (1972), 161–174.
- [Mat10] I. Matić, *The unitary dual of p -adic $SO(5)$* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), no. 2, 759–767.
- [Mor93] L. Morris, *Tamely ramified intertwining algebras*, Invent. Math. **144** (1993), no. 1, 1–54.
- [Neu06] M. Neunhöfer, *Kazhdan-Lusztig basis, Wedderburn decomposition, and Lusztig’s homomorphism for Iwahori-Hecke algebras*, J. Algebra **303** (2006), 430–446.
- [Opd04] Eric M. Opdam, *On the spectral decomposition of affine Hecke algebras*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **3** (2004), no. 4, 531–648.
- [Par14] J. Parkinson, *On calibrated representations and the Plancherel theorem for affine Hecke algebras*, J. Algebraic Combin. **40** (2014), 331–371.
- [Ree94] M. Reeder, *On the Iwahori-spherical discrete series for p -adic Chevalley groups ; formal degrees and L -packets*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. **Ser. 4**, **27** (1994), no. 4, 463–491.
- [RS07] B. Roberts and R. Schmidt, *Local newforms for $GSp(4)$* , Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1918, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.

- [Sha81] F. Shahidi, *On certain L-functions*, Amer. J. Math. **103** (1981Apr.), no. 2, 297–355.
- [Shi06] J. Shi, *The Kazhdan-Lusztig cells in certain affine Weyl groups*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1179, Springer, 2006.
- [Sol21] M. Solleveld, *On unipotent representations of ramified p -adic groups* (2021), available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.08451>.
- [Sol22] ———, *Endomorphism algebras and Hecke algebras for reductive p -adic groups*, J. Algebra **606** (2022), 371–470.
- [Wal03] J.-L. Waldspurger, *La formule de Plancherel pour les groupes p -adiques d’après Harish-Chandra*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **2** (2003), no. 2, 235–333.
- [Xi02] N. Xi, *The based ring of two-sided cells of affine Weyl groups of type \tilde{A}_{n-1}* , Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 157, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [Xi06] ———, *Representations of affine Hecke algebras and based rings of affine Weyl groups*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **20** (2006), no. 1, 211–217.
- [Xi90] ———, *The based ring of the lowest two-sided cell of an affine Weyl group*, J. Algebra **134** (1990), 356–368.
- [Xi94] ———, *Representations of Affine Hecke Algebras*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1587, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1994.