arXiv:2206.09035v3 [math.RT] 18 Oct 2022

HOMOLOGICAL MIRROR SYMMETRY FOR THE UNIVERSAL CENTRALIZERS

XIN JIN

Abstract. We prove homological mirror symmetry for the universal centralizer J_G (a.k.a the Toda space), associated to any complex reductive Lie group G. The A-side is a partially wrapped Fukaya category on J_G, and the B-side is the category of coherent sheaves on the categorical quotient of a dual maximal torus by the Weyl group action (with some modification if the center of G is not connected).

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Background and main results 2
1.2. Example of $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ and idea of proof 4
1.3. Related works and future directions 8
1.4. Organization 9
1.5. Acknowledgement 10
2. Definition(s) of J_G and the Bruhat decomposition 10
2.1. Definition(s) of J_G and a Lagrangian correspondence 10
2.2. The Bruhat decomposition 13
3. Weinstein Sector structures on J_G 17
3.1. Some algebraic set-up 18
3.2. Partial compactifications of J_G as Liouville/Weinstein sectors 27
4. The Wrapping Hamiltonians and one calculation of wrapped Floer cochains 44
4.1. Choices of wrapping Hamiltonians 44
4.2. One calculation of wrapped Floer cochains 48
5. Homological mirror symmetry for adjoint type G 49
5.1. Statement of main propositions 50
5.2. Some analysis inside $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ and $\mathfrak{U}_S, S \subsetneq \Pi$ 52
5.3. Discussions around walls beyond $S^\perp, \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$ 79
5.4. A construction of L_0 and $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ for any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$. 82
6. Proof of the main propositions 90
6.1. Proof of Proposition 5.4 90
6.2. Proof of Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 5.7 93
6.3. Proof of Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 5.3 98
7. HMS of J_G for reductive groups 105
7.1. Basic set-up 105

7.2. Proof of HMS using microlocal sheaf categories 108
7.3. Proof of HMS using wrapped Fukaya categories 110
7.4. Induction pattern 116
References 118

1. Introduction

1.1. **Background and main results.** For a (connected) complex reductive Lie group G, one can define a holomorphic symplectic variety J_G, called the *universal centralizer* or the *Toda space* (cf. [Lus][1], [Kos2], [BFM], [Gin]), which has the structure of a (holomorphic) complete integrable system over $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{t}^* /\!\!/ W$, where $\mathfrak{t}$ is a Cartan subalgebra of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G, and W is the Weyl group associated to the root system. Roughly speaking, one can build J_G from an affine blowup of T^*T, where T is a maximal torus, along the diagonal walls associated to the root data, and then take the orbit space of W.

There are many remarkable features of J_G, and here we list a couple of them. First, one has a canonical map

$$\chi : J_G \to \mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{t}^* /\!\!/ W$$

that exhibits J_G as an abelian group scheme over $\mathfrak{c}$, and also a (holomorphic) complete integrable system. The fiber over any point in $\mathfrak{c}$, represented by a regular element ξ in the Kostant slice $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$, is isomorphic to the centralizer of ξ in G. In particular, the generic fiber is isomorphic to a maximal torus in G. Second, the ring of functions on J_G (which defines J_G as an affine variety) is identified with the $G^\vee(\mathcal{O})$-equivariant homology of the affine Grassmannian $Gr_{G^\vee} = G^\vee(\mathcal{K})/G^\vee(\mathcal{O})$ of the Langlands dual group $G^\vee$, where $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{C}((z)), \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{C}[[z]]$. This is one of the main results in [BFM] and it has led to interesting connections to various aspects of the geometric Langlands program.

The integrable system structure on J_G can be viewed as a non-abelian version of the familiar integrable system $T^*T \to \mathfrak{t}^*$, which is the most basic example of homological mirror symmetry (abbreviated as HMS below). Recall the HMS statement for T^*T as the following. Let $T^\vee$ be the dual torus. Let $\mathcal{W}(T^*T)$ denote for the partially wrapped Fukaya category of T^*T (after taking twisted complexes), and let $\mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee)$ be the category of coherent sheaves on $T^\vee$.

Theorem 1.1 (Well known)**.** *There is an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathcal{W}(T^*T) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee).$$

[1]It was first introduced in [Lus] as $\mathcal{N}_G$ (in the last paragraph) in the group-group setting, i.e. one considers centralizing pairs both coming from the group G (or with one of the elements from a different group in the same isogeny class).

We remark on the definition of $\mathcal{W}(T^*T)$. Since T is a non-compact manifold, one needs to specify the allowed wrapping Hamiltonians in the definition of the (partially) wrapped Fukaya category. Here we follow the recent work of [GPS1], [GPS2] that gives a precise definition of (partially) wrapped Fukaya categories on Liouville sectors (also see *loc. cit.* for previous work in this line). Roughly speaking, a Liouville sector is a class of Liouville manifolds M with boundaries, that is in addition to the contact-type ∞-boundary $\partial^\infty M$ that a usual Liouville manifold has, it has a "finite" non-contact-type boundary ∂M. The Lagrangian objects in the wrapped Fukaya category should have ends contained in $\partial^\infty M$. Any wrapping should take place on $\partial^\infty M$ as usual, but stops near ∂M (the "finite" boundary). In particular, for any non-compact manifold X, take a compactification $\overline{X}$ with smooth boundary (of codimension 1), then $T^*\overline{X}$ is a Liouville sector with finite boundary given by the union of cotangent fibers over ∂X.

To simplify notations, we usually denote a Liouville sector by its interior, when the compactification has been introduced. So $\mathcal{W}(T^*T)$ means the wrapped Fukaya category for the Liouville sector $T^*\overline{T}$, for a standard compactification of T, i.e. a maximal compact subtorus times a compact ball.

One of our results is that J_G (together with a canonical Liouville 1-form) can be naturally partially compactified to be a Liouville sector, so that one has a well defined $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ as introduced above.

Proposition 1.2 (cf. Proposition 3.11 and Remark 4.2 (iii))**.** *There are natural partial compactifications $\overline{J}_G$ of J_G as Liouville sectors, all yielding canonically equivalent wrapped Fukaya categories. Moreover, there is an abundance of such compactifications making $\overline{J}_G$ a Weinstein sector.*

The first main result of the paper is the following HMS statement for J_G, when G is of adjoint type.

Theorem 1.3 (cf. Theorem 5.1)**.** *For any complex semisimple Lie group G of adjoint type (i.e. the center of G is trivial), we have an equivalence of (pre-triangulated dg) categories*

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee /\!\!/ W). \tag{1.1.1}$$

There is a more general statement for any complex reductive group G, but to state that we need to introduce some notations. For any such G, let $G^{\mathrm{der}} = [G, G]$ be the derived group of G, and let $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*$ be the Pontryagin dual of $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$, the center of G^{der}. Then $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*$ naturally acts on $(T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee$ and on $(T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W$.

If G is semisimple, let $G^\vee_{sc}$ (resp. G_{ad}) denote for the simply connected (resp. adjoint) form of $G^\vee$ (resp. G), i.e. the universal cover of $G^\vee$ (resp. $G/\mathcal{Z}(G)$). Let $T^\vee_{sc}$ (resp. T_{ad}) denote for a maximal torus of $G^\vee_{sc}$ (resp. G_{ad}). Then there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}(G)^* \cong \pi_1(G^\vee)$ that acts naturally on $T^\vee_{sc}$ and on $T^\vee_{sc} /\!\!/ W$.

We have the following HMS result for a general reductive G.

Theorem 1.4 (cf. Theorem 7.7)**.** *For any complex reductive group G, we have an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}((T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W)^{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*}, \tag{1.1.2}$$

where the category on the right-hand-side is the category of $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*$-equivariant coherent sheaves on $(T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W$. If $\mathcal{Z}(G)$ is connected, then

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee /\!\!/ W).$$

If G is semisimple, then the theorem says

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T_{sc}^\vee /\!\!/ W)^{\pi_1(G^\vee)}.$$

In this case, the functor from the A-side $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ to the B-side $\mathrm{Coh}(T_{sc}^\vee /\!\!/ W)^{\pi_1(G^\vee)}$ in (1.1.2) on the object level can be described quite explicitly. The integrable system $J_G \to \mathfrak{c}$ has a collection of sections, called the Kostant sections, indexed by the center elements of G. These turn out to be a set of generators of the wrapped Fukaya category. On the other hand, the $\pi_1(G^\vee)$-equivariant coherent sheaves on $T_{sc}^\vee /\!\!/ W$ (which can be identified with the affine space of dimension $n = \mathrm{rank}(G)$) is generated by a collection of equivariant sheaves which come from putting different equivariant structures, indexed by $\pi_1(G^\vee)^*$, on the structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{T_{sc}^\vee /\!\!/ W}$. The mirror functor matches these two collections of generators through the canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}(G) \cong \pi_1(G^\vee)^*$.

1.2. **Example of $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ and idea of proof.** In this section, we illustrate some of the key geometric features of J_G through the example of $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, and we will give some sketch of the proof for Theorem 1.3 in the adjoint type case. The general case Theorem 1.4 can be deduced from Theorem 1.3 by the monadicity of a natural functor

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \to \mathcal{W}(J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \times T^*\big(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})\big)) \simeq \mathcal{W}(J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}) \otimes \mathcal{W}(T^*\big(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})\big)),$$

where the latter equivalence is from the Kunneth formula in [GPS2], that is mirror to the pullback (i.e. forgetful) functor

$$\mathrm{Coh}((T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W)^{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}((T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W).$$

1.2.1. *Example of $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$.* For $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, the base of the integrable system $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{t}^* /\!\!/ W$ is identified with $\mathbb{A}^1$, coming from taking the determinant of any traceless 2×2-matrix. For any generic point $a \in \mathbb{A}^1 \backslash \{0\}$, we can represent it by the diagonal matrix $\mathrm{diag}[a, -a]$ (or any element in its conjugacy class), and the fiber over a can be identified with its centralizer, the standard maximal torus T (diagonal 2×2-matrices with determinant 1). For the point $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$, it should be represented by the (conjugacy class of) nilpotent matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and the fiber over it can be identified with its

centralizer in G, consisting of matrices of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ * & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ * & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } * \text{ can be any complex number.}$$

In particular, the central fiber is a disjoint union of two affine lines. There is a canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action on J_G, whose flow lines are indicated in Figure 1. The corresponding $\mathbb{R}_+$-action (after taking square root) is the flow of a Liouville vector field.




FIGURE 1. A picture of $J_{SL_2(\mathbb{C})} \to \mathfrak{c} \cong \mathbb{A}^1$

There are two horizontal sections of $\chi : J_{SL_2} \to \mathfrak{c}$, corresponding to the union of $g = \pm I$ in each fiber (recall each fiber is a centralizer and in particular a group). These are the Kostant sections. Away from the Kostant sections, there is an interesting symplectic identification

$$J_{SL_2} - \{g = \pm I\} \cong T^*T,$$

which is *not* obvious from the above picture (Figure 1). Using this, one can build J_{SL_2} from a handle attachment by attaching two critical handles (a handle is called *critical* if the core has the dimension of a Lagrangian), each has core a connected component of the central fiber, to T^*T[2]. Then the Konstant sections become the "linking discs" (i.e. normal slices to the cores). Furthermore, one can endow J_{SL_2} with a Weinstein sector structure (in the sense of [GPS1]), and obtains an arborealized Lagrangian skeleton in the sense of [Nad1], as follows (Figure 2). Here we have two Lagrangian caps attached to a semi-infinite annulus $S^1 \times [1, \infty)$ along two circles intersecting in an interesting way[3]. It is also easy to get the skeleton of J_{PGL_2} by quotienting out the natural $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry in the picture, resulting in one Lagrangian cap attached to an annulus along an immersed circle wrapping

[2]Here T^*T is equipped with a different Liouville 1-form than the standard one. In particular, J_{SL_2} as a Liouville sector is *not* from attaching handles to the sector $T^*S^1 \times T^*[0,1]$. In fact, the latter is replaced by $T^*S^1 \times T^*(0,1] \cong T^*S^1 \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}$.

[3]Regarding microlocal sheaves on the Lagrangian skeleton, they should vanish near $S^1 \times \{1\}$.

around the puncture twice with one self-crossing.




FIGURE 2. Picture of an arborealized Lagrangian skeleton for $J_{SL_2(\mathbb{C})}$.

1.2.2. *Idea of proof of Theorem 1.3.* First, for any semisimple Lie group G, we prove that J_G admits a Bruhat decomposition[4] indexed by subsets $S \subset \Pi$ of the set of simple roots Π of G (associated to a fixed principal $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple), based on an equivalent definition of J_G as a Whittaker type Hamiltonian reduction. This roughly induces a Weinstein handle decomposition. For $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, Π has exactly one element, and we have $S = \Pi$ corresponding to the Kostant sections $\{g = \pm I\}$, and $S = \emptyset$ corresponding to the complement, which is isomorphic to $T^*\mathbb{C}^\times$. For a general G, $S = \Pi$ always gives the Kostant section(s) and $S = \emptyset$ always gives T^*T (but the Liouville form is somewhat different from the standard one).

Second, we give natural partial compactifications of J_G as Liouville sectors, among which there are (generalized) Weinstein sectors. With appropriate choices of such Weinstein sectors, we obtain a skeleton of J_G as for the case $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, with each Bruhat "cell" contributing one component of the skeleton. We further show that the cocores to some of the critical handles, which are the Kostant sections, generate the partially wrapped Fukaya category of J_G (using general results from [GPS1, GPS2, CDGG]).

Third, assuming G is of adjoint type, the only Kostant section $\Sigma_I := \{g = I\}$ generates $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$. So to prove the HMS result (1.1.1), we just need to compute $\mathrm{End}(\Sigma_I)$. The first step is to define appropriate wrapping Hamiltonians on J_G, so that $\mathrm{End}(\Sigma_I)$ matches with $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee /\!\!/ W]$ as vector spaces. The second step, which is the main step, is to use the funtoriality of inclusions of Weinstein sectors (plus other geometric information) to show the two rings are isomorphic. This step is somewhat indirect. The rough idea is that the Bruhat "cell" corresponding to $S = \emptyset$, denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$, gives a sector inclusion $\mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0} \cong T^*\overline{T} \hookrightarrow \overline{J}_G$ for a subsector $\mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0} \subset \mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ (see Subsection 5.4.2

[4]During the preparation of the paper, the author learned that similar features have been observed in [Tel].

for the precise formulation)[5], which induces an adjoint pair of functors between the ind-completion of $\mathcal{W}(T^*T)$ and the ind-completion of $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ (cf. [GPS1]; in the current case the adjoint pair is actually well defined between the wrapped Fukaya categories). For example, for the Lagrangian skeleton Figure 2, the adjoint functors correspond to restriction and co-restriction between (wrapped) microlocal sheaves on the whole skeleton and local systems on the outer annulus which is disjoint from the attaching caps. Under mirror symmetry, this corresponds to the pushforward and pullback functors between $\mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee)$ and $\mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee /\!\!/ W)$ along the projection $T^\vee \to T^\vee /\!\!/ W$. Noting that the skyscraper sheaves on $T^\vee$ are mirror to conormal bundles L_0 of the maximal compact subtorus $T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \subset T$, equipped with a rank 1 local system $\check{\rho} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1(T), \mathbb{C}^\times) \cong T^\vee$, our approach is based on Floer calculations involving these conormal bundles and the Kostant section Σ_I. One of the key facts that we establish can be summarized as follows:

Proposition 1.5 (cf. Proposition 5.6 and 5.7 for the precise statement)**.** *Under the natural functor co-res* : $\mathcal{W}(T^*T) \to \mathcal{W}(J_G)$*, the objects* $(L_0, \check{\rho})$ *are sent to "skyscraper objects", i.e. their morphism spaces with* Σ_I *are of rank* 1*. Moreover, their images are* W*-invariant in the sense that co-res*$(L_0, \check{\rho}) \cong$ *co-res*$(L_0, w(\check{\rho}))$ *for all* $w \in W$*.*

We also prove a non-exact version (though not logically needed for the proof of the main theorem) which is more intuitive from SYZ mirror symmetry perspective, and whose proof is relatively easier. For this, we consider generic *shifted* conormal bundles of T_{cpt} and we work over the Novikov field Λ.

Proposition 1.6 (cf. Proposition 5.4 for the precise statement)**.** *Under the natural functor* $\mathcal{W}(T^*T; \Lambda) \to \mathcal{W}(J_G; \Lambda)$*, the (generic) shifted conormal bundles of* T_{cpt} *give "skyscraper objects", i.e. their morphism spaces with* Σ_I *are of rank 1. Moreover, their images are* W*-invariant under the natural* W*-action on* T^*T*.*

We give a heuristic explanation why Proposition 1.6 holds. The integrable system $\chi : J_G \to \mathfrak{c}$ suggests that the "skyscraper objects" in $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ are the fibers[6], which follows from basic principles in SYZ mirror symmetry. The shifted conormal bundles of T_{cpt} can be thought as modeled on the generic torus fibers of χ, with each W-orbit of shifted conormal bundles modeled on the same fiber. This reflects some intriguing geometric relations between a generic torus fiber of the integrable system and the base manifold T in $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$: while the generic shifted conormal bundles of T_{cpt} in a W-orbit do *not* talk to each other in $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$, they become "close to" Hamiltonian

[5]We remark that there is another adjoint pair for stop/handle removal, which is trivial because $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0}) \simeq 0$.

[6]We note that these fibers are not well defined objects in $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$, because their boundaries are inside the "finite" boundary of J_G.

isotopic in J_G and the bridge is given by the common torus fiber that they are modeled on (note that W does *not* act on J_G).

We make a couple of more remarks. First, there is a clear restriction and induction pattern among standard Levi subgroups (as in a related way expected in [Tel]) in terms of restriction and co-restriction functors between wrapped Fukaya categories for inclusions of the corresponding subsectors (and equivalently on microlocal sheaf categories). We use this in the proof of the main theorem and elaborate it more in Subsection 7.4. Second, it is tempting to try to prove the HMS result by replacing $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ with $\mu\mathrm{Shv}^w(J_G)$, the wrapped microlocal sheaf category (cf. [Nad2, NaSh]) for the Lagrangian skeleton of J_G. However, due to the complicatedness of the singularities of the Lagrangian skeleton, the author does not know an effective way to directly compute the sheaf category in high dimensions.

1.3. **Related works and future directions.** The main theorem (Theorem 1.3) can be viewed as an "analytic" version of a theorem of Lonergan [Lon] and Ginzburg [Gin] on the description of the category of bi-Whittaker D-modules (see *loc. cit.* for the precise statement)

$$D\text{-}mod(\overset{\psi}{N}\backslash G/\overset{\psi}{N}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\text{“}\mathfrak{t}^* /\!\!/ W_{\mathrm{aff}}\text{”}), \tag{1.3.1}$$

where the generic Lie algebra character $\psi : \mathfrak{n} \to \mathbb{C}$ of the maximal unipotent subgroup N is the same as the f in Subsection 2.1 that realizes J_G as a bi-Whittaker Hamiltonian reduction of T^*G, and "$\mathfrak{t}^* /\!\!/ W_{\mathrm{aff}}$" is some coarse quotient "$(\mathfrak{t}^*/\Lambda) /\!\!/ W$" with Λ the weight lattice of T which is identified with the coweight lattice of $T^\vee$ (see also [BZG]). Heuristically, if we replace the left-hand-side of (1.3.1) by the partially wrapped Fukaya category of J_G, and think of "$(\mathfrak{t}^*/\Lambda) /\!\!/ W$" analytically as $T^\vee /\!\!/ W$ (and replace QCoh by Coh), then this is exactly the equivalence of categories in the main theorem. However, there is no direct link between these two versions.

As explained in [BZG], the result (1.3.1) is important for understanding module categories over the finite Hecke category $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_G$ of bimonodromic sheaves on $N\backslash G/N$, which is of particular interest in geometric representation theory. For example, in Betti Geometric Langlands program of Ben-Zvi and Nadler [BZN2], one studies sheaves with nilpotent singular support on the moduli of G-bundles on a curve X with N-reductions on a finite set $S \subset X$. At each $s \in S$, there is an affine Hecke action and in particular an $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_G$-action. The $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_G$ module categories form the character field theory developed in [BZN1, BZGN] that assigns to a point a family of 3d topological field theories over "$\mathfrak{t}^* /\!\!/ W_{\mathrm{aff}}$", thanks to the Ngô-action of the bi-Whittaker category (cf. [BZG]). In the Betti version, the natural action of $\mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee /\!\!/ W)$ on the family of theories should correspond to the convolution action of $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$. For example, using our theorem, the skyscraper sheaves on $T^\vee /\!\!/ W$ in the B-model would give certain objects in the category of character sheaves (the assignment of the field theory to S^1) that act on it by convolution. The de Rham version of this has been studied in [Che]. We would like to investigate

this aspect and its various applications in future work, e.g. along the line of the conjectural picture [BZG, Remark 2.7] and [Tel].

As the symmetic monoidal structure on $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ (a consequence of the main theorem) plays an essential role in the above approach to categorical representation theory, we note that it is also expected to come naturally from the (abelian) group scheme structure on J_G (cf. [Pas] for some developments in this direction). Roughly speaking, one can represent the functor for the monoidal structure $\mathcal{W}(J_G) \otimes \mathcal{W}(J_G) \to \mathcal{W}(J_G)$ as a (smooth) Lagrangian correspondence L_{mon} in $J_G^a \times J_G^a \times J_G$ (where the superscript a means taking the opposite symplectic form). The main technical difficulty is caused by the "finite" boundary of J_G. Namely, L_{mon} will touch the "finite" boundary of the product sector making it *not* a well defined object in the wrapped Fukaya category. Alternatively, one can use microlocal sheaf theory on the Lagrangian skeleton, but we don't know how to realize this by a "geometric" correspondence without appealing to the main theorem. We defer the study for a future work. Further desired results along this line would be to show that the restriction functors for sector inclusions are naturally symmetric monoidal, and there are natural compatibilities between compositions of restrictions as symmetric monoidal functors.

Lastly, we would like to point out that the universal centralizers J_G constitute an important class of the Coulomb branches mathematically defined in [BFN]. It would be interesting to extend the present work to some other Coulomb branches whose HMS is currently unknown.

1.4. **Organization.** The organization of the paper goes as follows. In Section 2, we review the definition(s) of J_G, and prove the Bruhat decomposition result. We give explicit descriptions of all the Bruhat "cells" and some important symplectic subvarieties (associated to standard Levi subgroups) built from them. In Section 3, we give the construction of partial compactifications of J_G that are naturally Liouville sectors (with canonically equivalent wrapped Fukaya categories), and we present (easy) choices that make some of them Weinstein sectors. We describe the skeleton of a resulting Weinstein sector, and show that the Kostant sections generate $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$. The discussions in Subsection 3.2.1 are quite technical. For this reason we would suggest the reader to skim through it and return to it later. In Section 4, we define certain positive linear Hamiltonians on J_G, so we have a convenient calculation of $\mathrm{End}(\Sigma_I)$ (and morphisms between different Kostant sections for a semisimple G), as a (graded) vector space. The upshot is that all intersection points are concentrated in degree 0, so $\mathrm{End}(\Sigma_I)$ is an ordinary algebra. In Section 5, we first state the main theorem for G of adjoint form and the key propositions that lead to its proof, then we develop some analysis in Subsection 5.2-5.4 that are crucial for the proof of the key propositions. These subsections contain important geometric features of J_G, which in particular explain the intriguing picture behind Proposition 1.6. We give the proof of the key propositions in Section 6. Lastly, in Section 7, we prove the HMS

result in the reductive case, and give a precise formulation of restriction and induction functors for sector inclusions associated with inclusions of Levi subgroups.

1.5. **Acknowledgement.** I would like to thank Harrison Chen, Sam Gunningham, Justin Hilburn, Oleg Lazarev, George Lusztig, David Nadler, John Pardon, Paul Seidel, Changjian Su, Dima Tamarkin and Zhiwei Yun for stimulating conversations at various stages of this project. I am grateful to David Nadler for valuable feedback on this work, and to Dima Tamarkin for help with proof of Lemma 6.3. I am also grateful to the anonymous referee for very helpful comments and suggestions. The author was partially supported by an NSF grant DMS-1854232.

2. Definition(s) of J_G and the Bruhat decomposition

2.1. **Definition(s) of J_G and a Lagrangian correspondence.** In this subsection, we review some equivalent definitions of J_G and a canonical Lagrangian correspondence, which will be used in later sections. The exposition is roughly following [Gin, Section 2], and we refer the reader to *loc. cit.* for further details. We will focus on the semisimple case, since for a reductive group G, we have $J_G = J_{G^{\mathrm{der}}} \times_{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} T^*\mathcal{Z}(G)$.

Let G (resp. $\mathfrak{g}$) be any complex semisimple Lie group (resp. its Lie algebra). Let $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{g}^{*,\mathrm{reg}}$) be the (Zariski open dense) subset of regular elements in $\mathfrak{g}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{g}^*$), i.e. the elements whose stabilizer with respect to the adjoint (resp. coadjoint) action by G has dimension equal to $n := \mathrm{rank}G$ (which is the minimal possible dimension). To simplify notations, we often identify $\mathfrak{g}^*$ with $\mathfrak{g}$ using the Killing form unless otherwise specified, hence their regular elements. Let $\mathfrak{c} := \mathfrak{g} /\!\!/ G$ be the adjoint quotient of $\mathfrak{g}$. Fix any principal $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e, f, h), and let $\mathcal{S} := f + \ker \mathrm{ad}_e \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ be the Kostant slice. The Kostant slice gives a section of the adjoint quotient map $\mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{c}$ (and its restriction to $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$), by a theorem of Kostant [Kos1].

Let $T^{*,\mathrm{reg}}G \subset T^*G \cong G \times \mathfrak{g}$ (identified using left translations) be the regular part of the cotangent bundle of G, consisting of pairs $(g, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$. Consider the locus in $T^{*,\mathrm{reg}}G$ defined by

$$\mathscr{Z}_G := \{(g, \xi) \in T^{*,\mathrm{reg}}(G) : \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi = \xi\}, \tag{2.1.1}$$

which is acted by G through the adjoint action on both factors. The obvious projection $\mathscr{Z}_G \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ represents $\mathscr{Z}_G$ as a G-equivariant abelian group scheme over $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$. The categorical quotient $\mathscr{Z}_G /\!\!/ G$ can be identified with the affine variety

$$\{(g, \xi) \in G \times \mathcal{S} : \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi = \xi\}, \tag{2.1.2}$$

i.e. the centralizers of the elements in the Kostant slice $\mathcal{S}$.

Definition 2.1 (First definition of J_G)**.** The *universal centralizer* of G, denoted by J_G, is defined to be $\mathscr{Z}_G /\!\!/ G$, which is isomorphic to (2.1.2).

The virtue of this definition is that it explains the name "universal centralizer", and it exhibits J_G as an abelian group scheme over $\mathfrak{c}$:

$$\chi : J_G \longrightarrow \mathfrak{c},$$

which is actually a holomorphic integrable system. See Figure 1 for the case when $G = SL_2(\mathbb{C})$.

Next, we give a second definition of J_G, which is given by a bi-Whittaker Hamiltonian reduction of T^*G. To define this, we fix a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$ and a maximal torus $T \subset B$, and let $N \subset B$ be the unipotent radical. Let $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{n}$ be the respective Lie algebras. Let $\Delta \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ (resp. Δ^+, Δ^-) be the set of roots (resp. positive roots defined by $\mathfrak{b}$, negative roots). Let Π be the set of simple roots in Δ^+, and let W be the Weyl group associated to the root system.

Fix a *regular* element $f \in \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$, and an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $(e, f, \mathfrak{h}_0 := h)$ as above. Note that $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \alpha^\vee$, where $\alpha^\vee$ is the coroot corresponding to α. Consider the $N \times N$-Hamiltonian action on T^*G, induced from the left and right N-action on G. The moment map of the Hamiltonian action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu : T^*G &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{n}^* \oplus \mathfrak{n}^* \cong \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{n}^- \\ (g, \xi) &\mapsto (\xi \bmod \mathfrak{b}, \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi \bmod \mathfrak{b}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(f, f) \in \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{n}^-$ is a regular character of $N \times N$, we have

$$\mu^{-1}(f, f) = \{(g, \xi) : \xi \in f + \mathfrak{b}, \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi \in f + \mathfrak{b}\}$$

an $N \times N$-stable coisotropic subvariety in T^*G. The action turns out to be free (cf. [Gin] for more details), and we have an identification

$$\mu^{-1}(f, f)/N \times N \cong \{(g, \xi) \in G \times \mathcal{S} : \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi = \xi\}, \tag{2.1.3}$$

which is exactly isomorphic to J_G. This uses the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} N \times \mathcal{S} &\xrightarrow{\sim} f + \mathfrak{b} \\ (u, \xi) &\mapsto \mathrm{Ad}_u \xi, \end{aligned}$$

which is an important feature of the Kostant slice that we will frequently use without referring to it explicit.

Hence we have a second definition/characterization of J_G as follows.

Definition 2.2 (Second definition of J_G)**.** The *universal centralizer* J_G is defined to be the Hamiltonian reduction (2.1.3), which is a smooth holomorphic symplectic variety.

We remark that there are several other equivalent definitions/characterizations of J_G, showing different features of it, as well as its prominent role in representation theory and mathematical physics. For example, it is calculated in [BFM] that the ring of functions on J_G, as an affine variety, is isomorphic to the equivariant homology ring $H_\bullet^{G^\vee(\mathcal{O})}(Gr_{G^\vee})$ of the affine Grassmannian

(with the convolution product structure). In particular, it belongs to the list of Coulomb branches defined in [BFN]. On the other hand, J_G is also identified with the moduli space of solutions of the Nahm equations, so it has a hyperKahler structure (cf. [Bie]). Since we will not use these features, we will not provide any further details.

We now describe a canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action on J_G, which will define a Liouville vector field as follows. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{C}^\times \to T$ denote the cocharacter corresponding to h_0. Then the canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action on J_G is given by

$$s \cdot (g, \xi) = (\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(s)} g, s^2 \cdot \mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(s)} \xi). \tag{2.1.4}$$

Note that the $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action scales the symplectic form $\omega = d(\langle \xi, g^{-1} dg \rangle)$ by weight 2, and it does not depend on the choice of representatives $(g, \xi) \in \mu^{-1}(f, f)$. Taking the square root of the restricted $\mathbb{R}_+ \subset \mathbb{C}^\times$-action on J_G, we get a Liouville flow. Let Z denote for the corresponding Liouville vector field. Note that if G is adjoint, then we can turn (2.1.4) into a weight 1 action by using the cocharacter $\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{h}_0$ and changing the scaling s^2 on the second factor by s. Then the action gives the holomorphic Liouville flow on J_G.

Lastly, we recall the Lagrangian correspondence (cf. [Gin, Section 2.3], [Tel])

$$J_G \xleftarrow{\pi_{J_G}} J_G \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}^* \xrightarrow{\pi_\chi} T^*T, \tag{2.1.5}$$

in which the left map is the obvious projection, the middle term can be identified with

(2.1.6)

$$\begin{aligned} J_G \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}^* &\cong \{(g, \xi, B_1) \in G \times \mathcal{S} \times G/B : \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi = \xi, \xi \in \mathfrak{b}_1 = \mathrm{Lie} B_1, g \in B_1\} \\ &\cong \{(g, \xi, B_1) \in \mathscr{Z}_G \times G/B : \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi = \xi, \xi \in \mathfrak{b}_1 = \mathrm{Lie} B_1, g \in B_1\} /\!\!/ G \end{aligned}$$

and the right map π_χ is given by

$$\pi_\chi : (g, \xi, B_1) \mapsto (g \bmod [B_1, B_1], \xi \bmod [\mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_1]) \in T \times \mathfrak{t}^*. \tag{2.1.7}$$

When we refer to this Lagrangian correspondence, we read the correspondence from left to right, i.e. we view $J_G \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}^*$ as a smooth Lagrangian submanifold in $J_G^a \times T^*T$, where J_G^a is the same as J_G but equipped with the opposite symplectic structure. We will refer to the opposite one that is read from right to left, as the *opposite* correspondence.

We comment on some good and bad features of the correspondence (2.1.5). Some useful features include: (1) the map π_χ is W-equivariant with respect to the W-action on $J_G \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}^*$ induced from the W-action on the $\mathfrak{t}^*$-factor and the natural W-action on T^*T; (2) the correspondence respects the canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action on J_G and the square of the fiber dilating $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action on T^*T; (3) it transforms the Kostant sections to cotangent fibers in T^*T; (4) it transforms a generic torus fiber of χ to $|W|$ copies of torus fibers (constant sections)

in T^*T, inducing isomorphisms from the former to each component of the latter, and it respects the group scheme structure on J_G and T^*T.

An essential bad feature of the correspondence is that π_χ is neither proper nor open. For example, it transforms the central fiber $\chi^{-1}([0])$ to the discrete set $\mathcal{Z}(G) \times \{0\}$ in T^*T, while the whole zero-section of T^*T, except for $\mathcal{Z}(G) \times \{0\}$, is disjoint from the image of π_χ. For this reason, it is hard to calculate the associated functors[7] between wrapped Fukaya categories by geometric compositions. However, we use the correspondence (not as a functor though) in our calculations of Floer cochains in Section 4 and 6.2.

2.2. **The Bruhat decomposition.** Using the second definition of J_G (Definition 2.2) in Subsection 2.1 and under the same setup, we will show a Bruhat decomposition for J_G. The Bruhat decomposition is induced from the projection to the double coset $N\backslash G/N$

$$J_G \to N\backslash G/N.$$

For each element $w \in W$, we use $\mathcal{B}_w$ to denote for the corresponding Bruhat "cell"[8] in J_G.

Proposition 2.3. (a) *For any semisimple Lie group G, the Bruhat decomposition of the group scheme J_G is indexed by subsets S of simple roots. The stratum indexed by S is $\mathcal{B}_{w_0 w_S}$, where w_0 is the longest element in W and w_S is the longest element in the Weyl group of the standard parabolic subgroup P_S determined by S.*

(b) *Let $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ be the center of the standard Levi factor L_S of P_S, and let $L_S^{\mathrm{der}} = [L_S, L_S]$ be the derived group of L_S. Then*

$$\mathcal{B}_{w_0 w_S} \cong T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times (\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}} /\!\!/ L_S^{\mathrm{der}}) \tag{2.2.1}$$

and it is $\mathbb{C}^\times$-invariant.

Proof. For any $w \in W$, let $\overline{w}$ be a representative of w in the normalizer of T. For any $w_0 w \in W$, the Bruhat cell $\mathcal{B}_{w_0 w}$ of J_G consists of pairs $((\overline{w}_0)^{-1}\overline{w}h, f + t + \xi)$, $h \in T$, $t \in \mathfrak{t}$, $\xi \in \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ (modulo the equivalences induced by the $N \times N$-action), such that

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0)^{-1}\overline{w}h}(f + t + \xi) \in f + \mathfrak{t} + \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha. \tag{2.2.2}$$

Note that (2.2.2) implies that w must send $-\Pi$ into $\Pi \cup \Delta^-$, equivalently, w sends Π into $(-\Pi) \cup \Delta^+$. Let $S = (-w(\Pi)) \cap \Pi$ and let $\Gamma(S)$ be the set of positive roots that can be written as sums of elements in S. Let

[7] Even the definition of the functors (as categorical bimodules) requires technical treatments, for the Lagrangian correspondence as a smooth Lagrangian submanifold in $J_G^a \times T^*T$ (and similarly for the inverse correspondence) will have ends intersect the "finite" boundary of the product sector, so one needs to perturb the ends in a careful way.

[8] Although we call $\mathcal{B}_w$ a Bruhat cell, it does not mean that $\mathcal{B}_w$ is contractible, and this is usually not the case (cf. Proposition 2.3).

$\mathfrak{p}_S = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma(S)} \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ be the standard parabolic subalgebra determined by S, then $w = w_S$, the longest element in the Weyl group of the standard parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}_S$.

Now fix a subset $S \subset \Pi$, and write

$$f = \sum_{\alpha\in S} f_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi\setminus S} f_\alpha$$
$$\xi = \sum_{\beta\in\Gamma(S)} \xi_\beta + \sum_{\beta\in\Delta^+\setminus\Gamma(S)} \xi_\beta,$$

then (2.2.2) is equivalent to the data of

$$t \in \mathfrak{t},\ \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S h}(f+\xi) \in \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0} f + \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Delta^-} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S h} \sum_{\alpha\in S} f_\alpha = \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0} \sum_{\alpha\in -w_0(S)} f_\alpha, \\ \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S h}(\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta^+\setminus\Gamma(S)} \xi_\alpha) = \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0}(\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi\setminus w_0(-S)} f_\alpha) \end{cases} \tag{2.2.3}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} h \in T \text{ satisfying } \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S h} \sum_{\alpha\in S} f_\alpha = \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0} \sum_{\alpha\in -w_0(S)} f_\alpha \\ \text{ which is a torsor over } \mathcal{Z}(L_S), \\ \xi \in \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_S h)^{-1}\overline{w}_0}(\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi\setminus w_0(-S)} f_\alpha) + \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Gamma(S)} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \\ t \in \mathfrak{t} \end{cases}$$

Let $\phi_{S,h} = (\overline{w}_0)^{-1}\overline{w}_S h$ and we identify the equivalence classes of solutions in (2.2.3) under the $N\times N$-action. We have $(\phi_{S,h}, f+t+\xi)$ identified with $(\phi_{S,h'}, f+t'+\xi')$ if and only if $h = h'$ and there exists $u \in N$ such that $\tilde{u} = \mathrm{Ad}_{\phi_{S,h}^{-1}} u^{-1} \in N$ and $f+t'+\xi' = \mathrm{Ad}_{\tilde{u}^{-1}}(f+t+\xi)$.

Let $L_S^{\mathrm{der}} = [L_S, L_S]$ be the derived group of L_S. For any $u = \exp(n) \in N$, $\mathrm{Ad}_{\phi_{S,h}^{-1}} u^{-1} = \exp(-\mathrm{Ad}_{\phi_{S,h}^{-1}} n) \in N$ if and only if $\mathrm{Ad}_{\phi_{S,h}^{-1}} n \in \mathfrak{n}$, and this happens if and only if $n \in \bigoplus_{\alpha\in -w_0(\Gamma(S))} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ which is equivalent to $\tilde{u} = \mathrm{Ad}_{\phi_{S,h}^{-1}} u^{-1} \in N_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$. Let $\mathfrak{z}_S$ be the subspace of $\mathfrak{t}$ defined by the equations $\alpha(\bullet) = 0, \alpha \in S$, which is identified with the (dual of the) Lie algebra of $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$. Since $\mathrm{Ad}_{\tilde{u}^{-1}}$ acts trivially on $\mathfrak{z}_S$, $\bigoplus_{\alpha\in -(\Pi\setminus S)} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $\bigoplus_{\alpha\in w_S^{-1}(\Pi\setminus S)} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, we have the following identification

$$\mathcal{B}_{w_0 w_S} \cong \mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times \mathfrak{z}_S \times (\sum_{\alpha\in S} f_\alpha + \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}}}^{\perp})/N_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \tag{2.2.4}$$
$$\cong \mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times \mathfrak{z}_S \times (\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}} /\!\!/ L_S^{\mathrm{der}}),$$
$$\cong T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times (\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}} /\!\!/ L_S^{\mathrm{der}}).$$

Note that the space of isomorphisms (2.2.4) is a torsor over $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$. The $\mathbb{C}^\times$-invariance of $\mathcal{B}_{w_0w_S}$ is obvious. □

Example 2.4. If $S=\emptyset$, then $w_S=1$ and

$$\mathcal{B}_{w_0}\cong\{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h, f+t+\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h)^{-1}}f): h\in T, t\in\mathfrak{t}\}\cong T^*T.$$

Remark 2.5. (a) In the following, we will fix $\overline{w}_0$ and for each $S\subsetneq\Pi$, we will choose $\overline{w}_S\in N_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}(T\cap L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$ (i.e. the normalizer of the maximal torus) satisfying

$$f_\alpha=\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0}f_{w_0w_S(\alpha)},\ \forall\alpha\in S. \tag{2.2.5}$$

Then for $S\subset S'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_{S'}^{-1}\overline{w}_S}f_\alpha=\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_{S'})^{-1}}(\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_S}f_\alpha)\\ =&\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_{S'})^{-1}}(f_{w_0w_S(\alpha)})=f_{w_{S'}w_S(\alpha)},\forall\ \alpha\in S.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the last step uses $w_{S'}w_S(\alpha)\in S',\forall\alpha\in S$. Under such an assumption, the set of $h\in T$ in the second equivalent characterization in (2.2.3) is canonically identified with $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$.

(b) Let $\mathfrak{t}_S$ denote for the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}}$. The condition of (2.2.5) gives an identification of the subrepresentation of $\mathrm{Res}^G_{L^{\mathrm{der}}_{-w_0(S)}}(V_\lambda)$ generated by a highest weight vector v_λ, for any $\lambda\in X^*(T)^+$, with $V_{\pi^S_{\mathfrak{t}^*}(w_Sw_0(\lambda))}$ of L_S^{der}, where $\pi^S_{\mathfrak{t}^*}:\mathfrak{t}^*\to\mathfrak{t}_S^*$ is the natural projection.

For any L_S, we have $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$ acts on both $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ and $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$, and the twisted product $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)\underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times}J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ is canonically a holomorphic symplectic variety. In the following, we use N_S to denote for $N_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$, and f_S for $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in S}f_\alpha$.

Proposition 2.6. (a) *For any standard Levi L_S, we have*

$$\mathfrak{U}_S=T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)\underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times}J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \tag{2.2.6}$$

naturally embeds as an open (holomorphic) symplectic subvariety in J_G.

(b) *The Bruhat cell $\mathcal{B}_{w_0w_S}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{U}_S$ as a coisotropic subvariety. More explicitly, using (2.2.1), we have*

$$\mathcal{B}_{w_0w_S}\cong T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)\underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times}\mathcal{B}_{1,L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}\subset T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)\underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times}J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}.$$

Proof. We first prove (a). We continue to use the notations from the proof of Proposition 2.3. We make the identification

$$\begin{aligned}J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}\cong&\{(g_S,\xi_S)|\xi_S,\mathrm{Ad}_{g_S}\xi_S\in f_S+\mathfrak{n}_S^\perp\subset\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}}\}/(N_S\times N_S)\\ \cong&\mu^{-1}_{N_S\times N_S}(f_S,f_S)/(N_S\times N_S),\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.7}$$

and let $\phi_S = (\overline{w}_0)^{-1}\overline{w}_S$ for the choices of $\overline{w}_0$ and $\overline{w}_S$ as in Remark 2.5 (a). We have the following $N_S \times N_S$-equivariant embedding

(2.2.8)

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_S : (\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times \mathfrak{z}_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} \mu^{-1}_{N_S\times N_S}(f_S, f_S) &\to G \times \mathfrak{g} \cong T^*G\\ (z, t; g_S, \xi_S) &\mapsto (\phi_S z g_S, \xi_S + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}) + (f - f_S))\\ &=: (\phi_S z g_S, \Xi_S),\end{aligned}$$

whose image is in $\mu^{-1}_{N\times N}(f, f)$ and $N_S \times N_S$ acts on $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ through

$$N_S \times N_S \overset{(\mathrm{Ad}_{\phi_S}, id)}{\hookrightarrow} N \times N.$$

The validity of (2.2.8) follows from the simple fact that

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}) \in \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Delta^+\setminus\Gamma(S)} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{p}_S}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{\phi_S z g_S}(f - f_S) \in \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Delta^+\setminus(\Gamma(-w_0(S)))} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha. \tag{2.2.9}$$

It is clear from (2.2.3) that the image of ι_S is independent of the choice of $\overline{w}_0, \overline{w}_S$.

Now we show that ι_S in (2.2.8) satisfies that $\iota_S^*\omega_{T^*G} = p_S^*\omega_{\mathfrak{U}_S}$, where

$$p_S : (\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times \mathfrak{z}_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} \mu^{-1}_{N_S\times N_S}(f_S, f_S) \to \mathfrak{U}_S,$$

is the quotient map. Recall that $\omega_{T^*G} = -d(\langle \xi, g^{-1}dg\rangle)$, where $(g, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}$ and $g^{-1}dg$ denotes for the Maurer-Cartan form. In the following, let $\lambda_{T^*G} = -\langle \xi, g^{-1}dg\rangle$ and $\lambda_{\mathfrak{U}_S} = -(\langle t, z^{-1}dz\rangle + \langle \xi_S, g_S^{-1}dg_S\rangle)$ denote for the primitive of the symplectic forms on T^*G and $\mathfrak{U}_S$ respectively. We have

(2.2.10)

$$\begin{aligned}-\iota_S^*\lambda_{T^*G} &= \langle (\xi_S + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}) + (f - f_S)), (\phi_S z g_S)^{-1} d(\phi_S z g_S)\rangle\\ &= \langle \xi_S + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}) + (f - f_S)), z^{-1}dz + g_S^{-1}dg_S\rangle\\ &= \langle t, z^{-1}dz\rangle + \langle \xi_S, g_S^{-1}dg_S\rangle = -p_S^*\lambda_{\mathfrak{U}_S}.\end{aligned}$$

Here the vanishing of $\langle \xi_S, z^{-1}dz\rangle$ and $\langle t, g_S^{-1}dg_S\rangle$ is clear, and the vanishing of $\langle \mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}) + (f - f_S), z^{-1}dz + g_S^{-1}dg_S\rangle$ comes from that $\mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}) + (f - f_S) \in \bigoplus_{\alpha\in(\Delta^+\setminus\Gamma(S))\cup(-(\Pi\setminus S))} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$.

Next, we show that ι_S induces a holomorphic symplectic embedding $\tilde{\iota}_S : \mathfrak{U}_S \hookrightarrow J_G$. By (2.2.10) and the fact that $\dim \mathfrak{U}_S = \dim J_G$, the image of ι_S is everywhere transverse to the $N\times N$-orbits in $\mu^{-1}_{N\times N}(f, f)$. So $\tilde{\iota}_S : J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \to J_G$ is a local holomorphic symplectic diffeomorphism. Now we observe that $\mathfrak{U}_S$ contains a Zariski open (dense) subset $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times_{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})} \mathcal{B}_{w_S, L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$, where $\mathcal{B}_{w_S, L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ is the open Bruhat cell in $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ and the restriction of $\tilde{\iota}_S$ to that open

set is an embedding onto $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$. So we can conclude that $\tilde{\iota}_S$ is an embedding as well.

Part (b) immediately follows, since $\mathcal{B}_{w_0 w_S} = \{g_S \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})\} \subset \mathfrak{U}_S$. □

Proposition 2.7. *For any $S \subset S' \subset \Pi$, we have a natural embedding $\tilde{\iota}_S^{S'} : \mathfrak{U}_S \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}_{S'}$. These form a compatible system of embeddings in the sense that for any $S \subset S' \subset S''$, we have $\tilde{\iota}_{S'}^{S''} \circ \tilde{\iota}_S^{S'} = \tilde{\iota}_S^{S''}$. Moreover,*

$$\mathfrak{U}_{S'} = \bigsqcup_{S \subset S'} \mathcal{B}_{w_0 w_S}, \tag{2.2.11}$$

where w_S as before is the longest element in the Weyl group of L_S^{der}.

Proof. Since $L_S \subset L_{S'}$ and $\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'}) \subset \mathcal{Z}(L_S)$, under the identification $L_{S'} \cong \mathcal{Z}(L_{S'}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}$, we have $\mathcal{Z}(L_S) = \mathcal{Z}(L_{S'}) \underset{Z(L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} \mathcal{Z}(L_S^{S'})$, where $L_S^{S'} = L_S \cap L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}$. This induces a splitting $\mathfrak{z}_S = \mathfrak{z}_{S'} \oplus \mathfrak{z}_S^{S'}$. Let $T_{S'} = T \cap L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}$ denote for the maximal torus in $L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}$, and choose representatives $\overline{w}_{S'}, \overline{w}_S \in N_{L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}}(T_{S'})$ as in Remark 2.5. Let $\phi^{S,S'}$ denote for $\overline{w}_{S'}^{-1}\overline{w}_S$, then we have $\mathrm{Ad}_{\phi^{S,S'}} f_\alpha = f_{w_{S'} w_S(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha \in S$.

Now we embed $\mathfrak{U}_S$ into $\mathfrak{U}_{S'}$ in a similar manner as of (2.2.8). First, we have an $N_S \times N_S$-equivariant embedding

$$\iota_S^{S'} : (\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{S'}) \times \mathfrak{z}_S^{S'}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} \mu_{N_S \times N_S}^{-1}(f_S, f_S) \to \mu_{N_{S'} \times N_{S'}}^{-1}(f_{S'}, f_{S'}) \tag{2.2.12}$$

$$(z, t; g_S, \xi_S) \mapsto (\phi^{S,S'} z g_S, \xi_S + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi^{S,S'} z g_S)^{-1}}(f_{S'} - f_{-w_{S'}(S)}) + (f_{S'} - f_S)).$$

By Proposition 2.6 (a), $\iota_S^{S'}$ descends to an embedding

$$T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{S'}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \hookrightarrow J_{L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}}, \tag{2.2.13}$$

which naturally extends to an embedding

$$\tilde{\iota}_S^{S'} : \mathfrak{U}_S = T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \hookrightarrow T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} J_{L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}} = \mathfrak{U}_{S'}. \tag{2.2.14}$$

It is clear from (2.2.12), that for any $S \subset S' \subset S''$, we have $\tilde{\iota}_{S'}^{S''} \circ \tilde{\iota}_S^{S'} = \tilde{\iota}_S^{S''}$, and the proposition follows. □

3. Weinstein Sector structures on J_G

We will give natural partial compactifications of J_G as Liouville sectors and present some of them with Weinstein sector structures. This allows us to define a partially wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ (independent of the choice of the partial compactifications) on it following [GPS1]. We give the Lagrangian core and skeleton of J_G (for a choice of partially compactified Weinstein sector), from which we can determine a set of generators of the partially wrapped Fukaya category. Throughout this section, we assume G

is semisimple. The reductive case follows easily from the semisimple case, which will be spelled out more explicitly in Section 7.

3.1. **Some algebraic set-up.** Recall that the algebraic functions on G/N, denoted by $\mathbb{C}[G/N]$, as a G-representation has a decomposition into irreducibles using the right T-action

$$\mathbb{C}[G/N] \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X^*(T)^+} V_{-w_0(\lambda)}, \tag{3.1.1}$$

where $X^*(T)^+$ is the set of dominant weights of T. Any highest weight vector in each $V_{-w_0(\lambda)}$ corresponds to a left N-invariant function. Let G_{sc} be the simply connected form of G, and let $T_{sc} \subset G_{sc}$ be the maximal torus (from taking the inverse image of T). Then for each fundamental (dominant) weight $\lambda \in X^*(T_{sc})^+_{\mathsf{fund}}$, choose

$$v_\lambda \in V_\lambda,\ v_{-w_0(\lambda)} \in V_{-w_0(\lambda)} \cong V_\lambda^*$$

satisfying

$$\langle \overline{w}_0^{-1} v_\lambda, v_{-w_0(\lambda)} \rangle = 1.$$

and let

$$b_\lambda(gN) = \langle g v_\lambda, v_{-w_0(\lambda)} \rangle. \tag{3.1.2}$$

Then b_λ is a highest weight vector in the factor $V_{-w_0(\lambda)}$ of (3.1.1).

Since $b_\lambda(gzN) = \lambda(z) b_\lambda(gN)$ for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}(G_{sc})$, the real function $|b_\lambda|$ descends to a left N-invariant function on G/N. In the following, unless otherwise specified, we will view b_λ (resp. $|b_\lambda|$) as a function on $J_{G_{sc}}$ (resp. J_G) through the left N-equivariant map $\mu^{-1}(f,f)/N \to G_{sc}/N$ (resp. $\mu^{-1}(f,f)/N \to G/N$). Let $ac_{\gamma(s)}$ denote for the action of $s \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ on J_G defined in (2.1.4). It is easy to see that on $J_{G_{sc}}$, we have

$$ac^*_{\gamma(s)} b_\lambda = s^{(w_0(\lambda)-\lambda)(\mathsf{h}_0)} b_\lambda = s^{-2\lambda(\mathsf{h}_0)} b_\lambda. \tag{3.1.3}$$

In the following lemma, we give a description of the canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action on the factors in $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ and $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ under the symplectic embedding (2.2.8). For $S \subset \Pi$, let $\mathsf{h}_0 = \mathsf{h}_{0,S} + \mathsf{h}'_{0,S^\perp}$ be the decomposition with respect to orthogonal decomposition $\mathfrak{t} \cong \mathfrak{t}_S \oplus \langle \alpha \in S \rangle^\perp$, where

$$\mathsf{h}_{0,S} = \sum_{\delta \in \Gamma(S)} \delta^\vee,\ \mathsf{h}'_{0,S^\perp} = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta^+ \backslash \Gamma(S)} \beta^\vee \tag{3.1.4}$$

Let $\gamma_S : \mathbb{C}^\times \to T_S = T_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ be the map determined by the cocharacter $\mathsf{h}_{0,S}$.

Lemma 3.1. *The canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action on J_G restricted to the open locus $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ has its action on each factor as*

$$s \cdot (z,t) = (z \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0} \gamma(s)\gamma(s)^{-1}, s^2 t),\ (z,t) \in T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S);$$

$$s \cdot (g_S, \xi_S) = (\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)} g_S, s^2 \mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)} \xi_S),\ (g_S, \xi_S) \in J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}, s \in \mathbb{C}^\times.$$

Here $\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0}\gamma(s)\gamma(s)^{-1}$ *regarded as a one parameter subgroup in* $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)\subset T$ *is given by the cocharacter*

$$w_S^{-1}w_0(\mathsf{h}_0)-\mathsf{h}_0=-2\mathsf{h}'_{0,S^\perp}. \tag{3.1.5}$$

Proof.

$$s\cdot(z,t;g_S,\xi_S)\mapsto(\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(s)}(\phi_S z g_S),s^2\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(s)}(\xi_S+t+\mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f-f_{-w_0(S)})+(f-f_S)))$$

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(s)}(\phi_S z g_S),s^2\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(s)}(\xi_S+t+\mathrm{Ad}_{(\phi_S z g_S)^{-1}}(f-f_{-w_0(S)})+(f-f_S)))\\ =&(\phi_S z\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_S)^{-1}}\gamma(s)\gamma(s)^{-1}\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)}g_S,s^2\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)}(\xi_S+t))\\ &+s^2\mathrm{Ad}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)}g_S^{-1}z^{-1}\gamma(s)\phi_S^{-1}}(f-f_{-w_0(S)})+(f-f_S)\\ =&(\phi_S z\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_S)^{-1}}\gamma(s)\gamma(s)^{-1}\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)}g_S,s^2\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)}(\xi_S+t))\\ &+\mathrm{Ad}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma_S(s)}g_S^{-1}z^{-1}\gamma(s)\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_S)^{-1}}\gamma(s)^{-1}\phi_S^{-1}}(f-f_{-w_0(S)})+(f-f_S)\end{aligned}$$

The cocharacter formula (3.1.5) is direct to check. □

The following lemma is easy to check.

Lemma 3.2. *For any* $\lambda\in X^*(T_{sc})^+_{\mathsf{fund}}$*, we have* $|b_\lambda|\neq 0$ *on* $N\overline{w}TN$ *if and if* $ww_0\in W_\lambda=\{w\in W: w(\lambda)=w_0(\lambda)\}$*. In particular,* $|b_\lambda|\neq 0$ *on the Bruhat cell* $\mathcal{B}_{w_0w_S}$ *if and only if* $w_S\in W_\lambda\Leftrightarrow\lambda\in\langle\alpha\in S\rangle^\perp$*.*

For any $\beta\in\Pi$, let $\beta^\vee$ be the the corresponding coroot, and let $\lambda_{\beta^\vee}$ (resp. $\lambda_\beta^\vee$) denote for the fundamental weight (resp. coweight) that is dual to $\beta^\vee$ (resp. β).

In the following, for any S, let $\pi^S_{\mathfrak{t}^*}:\mathfrak{t}^*\to\mathfrak{t}^*_S$ be the natural projection map.

Lemma 3.3. *For any* $G=G_{sc}$ *and* $S\subset\Pi$*, under the embedding*

$$\iota_S:\mathfrak{U}_S=T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)\underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times}J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}\hookrightarrow J_G$$

for a fixed choice of $\overline{w}_0,\overline{w}_S$ *as in Remark 2.5, we have*

$$\iota_S^*b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)=\begin{cases}\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z), & \text{if } \beta\notin S,\\ \lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z)b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S), & \text{if } \beta\in S,\end{cases} \tag{3.1.6}$$

where $b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}\in\mathbb{C}[L_S^{\mathrm{der}}]^{N_S\times N_S}$ *corresponds to the fundamental weight*[9] $\pi^S_{\mathfrak{t}^*}(\lambda_{\beta^\vee})\in\mathfrak{t}^*_S$ *that is dual to* $\beta\in S$*.*

Proof. Using the definition (3.1.2) of b_λ and the formula (2.2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\iota_S^*b_\lambda(z,t;g_S,\xi_S)=b_\lambda((\overline{w}_0)^{-1}\overline{w}_S z g_S)=\lambda(z)b_\lambda((\overline{w}_0)^{-1}\overline{w}_S g_S)\\ =&\lambda(z)(\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_S g_S(v_\lambda),v_{-w_0(\lambda)})=\lambda(z)(g_S(v_\lambda),\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0 v_{-w_0(\lambda)})\\ =&\lambda(z)b_{\pi^S_{\mathfrak{t}^*}(\lambda)}(g_S).\end{aligned}$$

[9]Note that in general, $b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S)\neq b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S)$.

The last line above uses

$$(\overline{w}_S^{-1} v_\lambda, \overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0 v_{-w_0(\lambda)}) = 1.$$

Since

$$\pi^S_{\mathfrak{t}^*}(\lambda_{\beta^\vee}) = \begin{cases} 0, \text{ if } \beta \notin S \\ \lambda_{\beta^\vee}, \text{ if } \beta \in S \end{cases},$$

(3.1.6) follows. □

Recall that we use $\Gamma(S)$ to denote the set of positive roots that can be written as sums of elements in S, i.e. the set of positive roots of the standard Levi subalgebra generated by S. A direct corollary of Lemma 3.3 is the following.

Corollary 3.4. *Assume $G = G_{sc}$. For any $S \subsetneq \Pi$, the holomorphic map*

$$b_{S^\perp} := (\iota_S^* b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}})_{\beta \notin S} : \mathfrak{U}_S \longrightarrow (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{\Pi \setminus S}$$

is submersive everywhere.

The following lemma is needed for proving Proposition 3.6 below. Assume $G = G_{sc}$. Consider the holomorphic map

$$\pi_b := (b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}})_{\beta \in \Pi} : J_G \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^\Pi. \tag{3.1.7}$$

Let

$$\pi_{|b|} := \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}} : J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \tag{3.1.8}$$

Note that the *inverse* canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action scales each $b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}$ with weight $2\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0) > 0$, making $\pi_{|b|}$ homogeneous of weight 2.

Lemma 3.5.
(i) *For any compact neighborhood of $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{c}$ of $[0]$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\pi_{|b|}^{-1}([0,\epsilon]) \cap \chi^{-1}(\mathfrak{K})$ is compact.*
(ii) *The restriction $\pi_b|_{\chi^{-1}([0])} : \chi^{-1}([0]) \to \mathbb{C}^\Pi$ is proper.*

Proof. (i) By the homogeneity of $\pi_{|b|}$ under the contracting $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action, it suffices to show that there exists a compact neighborhood of $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{c}$ of $[0]$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\pi_{|b|}^{-1}([0,\epsilon]) \cap \chi^{-1}(\mathfrak{K})$ is compact. Recall the log partial compactification for the adjoint group $\overline{J}^{\log}_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$ defined in [Bal2],

$$\overline{J}^{\log}_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} = \{(g^{-1}B, \xi \in \mathcal{S}) : \mathrm{Ad}_g \xi \in \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{b}\} \subset G/B \times \mathcal{S}, \tag{3.1.9}$$

$$G_{\mathrm{ad}} \times \mathcal{S} \supset J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \hookrightarrow \overline{J}^{\log}_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \xrightarrow{\overline{\chi}} \mathcal{S}$$
$$(g, \xi) \mapsto (g^{-1}B, \xi).$$

Here we need the presentation of $J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$ in (2.1.2) to make the embedding well defined. The *inverse* canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action extends to $\overline{J}^{\log}_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$, given by

$$s \cdot (g^{-1}B, \xi) = (s^{-\mathsf{h}_0} g^{-1} B, s^{-2} \mathrm{Ad}_{s^{-\mathsf{h}_0}} \xi).$$

By Theorem 4.11 in *loc. cit.*, the $\mathbb{C}^\times$-fixed points of the *contracting* $\mathbb{C}^\times$-flow are the T-fixed points of the Peterson variety identified with $\overline{\chi^{-1}([0])} \subset G/B$, and these are indexed by $\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0 B, S \subset \Pi$[10], and the dimension of the ascending manifold of $\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0 B \in \overline{\chi^{-1}([0])}$ is $2|\Pi| - |S| = 2n - |S|$. Note that the intersection of the ascending manifold with $J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$ is exactly $\mathcal{B}_{w_0 w_S}$, which is an open dense part.

Suppose the contrary, there exists a sequence $(g_j, \xi_j) \in G_{\mathrm{ad}} \times \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\xi_j \to f,\ g_j^{-1}B \to g_\infty^{-1}B \in \overline{\chi^{-1}([0])} - \chi^{-1}([0]) = \bigsqcup_{S \subsetneq \Pi} \overline{w}_0 A_S \overline{w}_S B,$$
$$\pi_{|b|}(g_j) \to 0.$$

where

$$A_S = N_S \cap C_G(\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0^{-1}} f_{-w_0(S)}) \tag{3.1.10}$$

(cf. [Bal1, Proposition 6.3] and references cited therein for the Schubert decomposition of $\overline{\chi^{-1}([0])}$). As always, we fix a collection of representatives $\overline{w}_S, S \subset \Pi$ for $w_S \in W$.

There exists a unique $S \subsetneq \Pi$ and a unique element $u_S \in A_S$, such that $g_\infty^{-1}B = \overline{w}_0 u_S \overline{w}_S B$. Since $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ is open dense in $J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$, after perturbing the sequence (g_j, ξ_j) a little bit if necessary, we may assume that $(g_j, \xi_j) \in \mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ for all j. Then we can write

(3.1.11)
$$(g_j, \xi_j) = (\mathrm{Ad}_{u_j}(\widetilde{u}_j \overline{w}_0^{-1} z_j), \mathrm{Ad}_{u_j}(f + t_j + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1} z_j)^{-1}} f)),\ \text{for some } z_j \in T, t_j \in \mathfrak{t},$$

where $\widetilde{u}_j \in N$ is the unique element that makes the pair on the right-hand-side (without applying Ad_{u_j}) a commuting pair, and $u_j \in N$ is the unique unipotent element whose adjoint action on the Lie algebra element in the presentation (2.2.8) is in the Kostant slice $\mathcal{S}$. Then $\pi_{|b|}(g_j) \to 0$ is equivalent to $\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z_j) \to 0$ for all $\beta \in \Pi$. We have the following implications

[10] Here we use slightly different conventions from [Bal2] to be compatible with previous sections; the difference is essentially given by an additional factor of $\overline{w}_0$.

(i)

$$g_j^{-1}B = u_j\overline{w}_0 B \to g_\infty^{-1}B = \overline{w}_0 u_S \overline{w}_S B,$$

$$\Rightarrow N \ni u_j = \overline{w}_0 u_S \overline{w}_S (y_j^- b_j)\overline{w}_0^{-1} \text{ for some } b_j \in B, N^- \ni y_j^- \to I \tag{3.1.12}$$

$$\Rightarrow u_S \overline{w}_S (y_j^- b_j) \in N^-$$

$$\Rightarrow y_j^- b_j \in \overline{w}_S^{-1} N_S \cdot N^- \cap N^- \cdot B \subset N^- \cdot h_1 T_S N_S$$

for some fixed $h_1 \in T$ such that $\overline{w}_S^{-1} \in h_1 \cdot L_S^{\mathrm{der}}$

$$\Rightarrow b_j \in h_1 N_S T_S, N^- \ni y_j \to I$$

We will write $b_j = h_1 n^{(j)} z^{(j)}$ with respect to the splitting above.

(ii) Write $\xi_j = f + \eta_j$ for $\eta_j \in \mathfrak{b}$ (or more precisely in $\ker \mathrm{ad}_e$ which is not essential) with $|\eta_j| \to 0$. Recall $u_S \in A_S$ from (3.1.10).

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}u_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0^{-1}}(f+\eta_j) = \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0^{-1}} f_{-w_0(S)} + \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}u_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}) + \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}u_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0^{-1}}\eta_j$$

$$= \mathrm{Ad}_{h_2} f_S + (\text{a fixed term in } \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{p}_S}) + \left(\begin{smallmatrix}\text{a term in } \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{p}_S}^- \oplus \mathfrak{l}_S \\ \text{that is approaching to } 0\end{smallmatrix}\right), \tag{3.1.13}$$

where $h_2 \in T$ is some fixed element.

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{b_j\overline{w}_0^{-1}}(t_j + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0 z_j)^{-1}} f + f)$$

(3.1.14)

$$= \mathrm{Ad}_{b_j\overline{w}_0^{-1}}(t_j) + \mathrm{Ad}_{h_1 z^{(j)}}(\mathrm{Ad}_{\widetilde{z}_j^{-1}}(f - f_S)) + \mathrm{Ad}_{b_j}(\mathrm{Ad}_{\widetilde{z}_j^{-1}} f_S) + \mathrm{Ad}_{b_j}(\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0^{-1}} f)$$

where

$$\widetilde{z}_j^{-1} = h_3 \cdot w_0(z_j^{-1}) = \overline{w}_0^{-1} z_j^{-1} \overline{w}_0^{-1} \text{ for some fixed } h_3 \in T$$

$$\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\widetilde{z}_j^{-1}) = \lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_3) \cdot \lambda_{\beta^\vee}(w_0(z_j^{-1})) \to 0,\ \beta \in \Pi. \tag{3.1.15}$$

Equation (3.1.11), the relation (3.1.12) and $y_j^- \to I$ implies that the difference between (3.1.14) and (3.1.13) is approaching to 0. In particular, with respect to the decomposition $\mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{p}_S} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_S$, we have

$$w_0(t_j) + \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}_S} \mathrm{Ad}_{b_j \widetilde{z}_j^{-1}} f_S \to 0 \tag{3.1.16}$$

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{h_1 z^{(j)} \widetilde{z}_j^{-1}} f \to \mathrm{Ad}_{h_2} f_S \tag{3.1.17}$$

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{b_j\overline{w}_0^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)})) \to \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_S^{-1}u_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0^{-1}}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}), \tag{3.1.18}$$

where we omit the relation on the component $\mathfrak{n}_S$. (3.1.17) implies that

$$\beta(z^{(j)}\widetilde{z}_j^{-1}) \to \begin{cases} \beta(h_1^{-1}h_2), \text{ if } \beta \in S \\ \infty, \text{ if } \beta \in \Pi \backslash S \end{cases}.$$

However, since $z^{(j)} \in T_S$, for $\alpha \in \Pi \backslash S \neq \emptyset$,

$$\lambda_{\alpha^\vee}(\widetilde{z}_j) = \lambda_{\alpha^\vee}(z^{(j)})\lambda_{\alpha^\vee}(z^{(j)}\widetilde{z}_j^{-1})^{-1} = \lambda_{\alpha^\vee}(z^{(j)}\widetilde{z}_j^{-1})^{-1} \to 0$$

because $\lambda_{\alpha^\vee}$ as a *nonnegative* linear combination of $\beta \in \Pi$ has a strictly positive component in $\alpha \in \Pi \backslash S$. This gives a contradiction to (3.1.15), so the lemma is established.

(ii) follows from (i) since $\pi_{|b|}|_{\chi^{-1}([0])}$ is homogeneous with respect to the inverse $\mathbb{R}_+$-action on the domain and the weight 2 $\mathbb{R}_+$-action on the codomain. □

Proposition 3.6. *For any compact region $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{c}$, the restriction of π_b from (3.1.7)*

$$\pi_b|_{\chi^{-1}(\mathfrak{K})} : \chi^{-1}(\mathfrak{K}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\Pi}$$

is proper.

Proof. We prove by induction on two things. (1) Suppose we have proved by induction on the rank of the group the proposition for all $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ with $S \subsetneq \Pi$. The base case $S = \emptyset$ is trivial. (2) Assume $S = \emptyset$ for the base case. For any compact $\mathfrak{K}' \subset \mathfrak{c}$ (here and after, always assuming containing a neighborhood of $[0]$) and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact $\mathfrak{K}'_{\emptyset,\epsilon} \subset \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all $h \in T$ with $|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h)| = |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h)| \geq \epsilon, \beta \in \Pi$,

$$\chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(f + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h)^{-1}} f) \in \mathfrak{K}' \Rightarrow t \in \mathfrak{K}'_{\emptyset,\epsilon}.$$

The upshot is that $\mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h)^{-1}} f$ is bounded under the assumption, so $\mathfrak{K}'_{\emptyset,\epsilon}$ does not depend on h. Note that for the same reason, the inverse implication is also true, i.e. for any compact $\mathfrak{K}_\emptyset \subset \mathfrak{t}$ and $h \in T$ as above, we have

$$\chi(\iota_\emptyset(\{h : |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h)| \geq \epsilon\}) \times \mathfrak{K}_\emptyset) \text{ is pre-compact.}$$

Now suppose we have proved for all S' with $|S'| < k$ such that for any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$ and compact $\mathfrak{K}' \subset \mathfrak{c}$ as above, there exists a compact $\mathfrak{K}'_{S',\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}} \times \mathfrak{z}_{S'} \cong \mathfrak{t}/W_{S'}$ such that for any $(g_{S'}, \xi_{S'}; z, t) \in \mathfrak{U}_{S'}$ satisfying

$$|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(\overline{w}_0^{-1}\overline{w}_{S'} g_{S'} z)| \begin{cases} \geq \epsilon_1, \beta \notin S' \\ < \epsilon_2 |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z)|, \beta \in S' \end{cases} \tag{3.1.19}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z)| \geq \epsilon_1, \beta \notin S' \\ |b^{S'}_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_{S'})| < \epsilon_2, \beta \in S' \end{cases},$$

we have

$$\chi(\iota_{S'}(g_{S'}, \xi_{S'}; z, t)) \in \mathfrak{K}' \Rightarrow \xi_{S'} + t \in \mathfrak{K}'_{S',\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{U}^{\geq \epsilon_1}_{S',<\epsilon_2}$ be the region defined by (3.1.19). We note that it is important that we assume $\xi_{S'} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}}$ in the presentation. On the other hand, the inverse implication also holds under the same assumption. Namely, if $\xi_{S'} + t \in \mathfrak{K}_{S'}$ for some compact $\mathfrak{K}_{S'} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}} \times \mathfrak{z}_{S'}$ and $|b^{S'}_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g'_S)| < \epsilon_2, \beta \in S'$, then by induction, $g_{S'} \in C_{L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}}(\xi_{S'})$ is uniformly bounded in $L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}$. This together

with $|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z)| \geq \epsilon_2, \beta \notin S'$ implies that $\Xi_{S'}$ from (2.2.8) has a uniformly bounded component in $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{p}_{S'}}$. Hence

$$\chi(\iota_{S'}\{(g_{S'}, \xi_{S'}; z, t) \in \mathfrak{U}^{\geq\epsilon_1}_{S',<\epsilon_2} : \xi_{S'} + t \in \mathfrak{K}_{S'}\}) \text{ is pre-compact.}$$

The induction steps also include the above claim for all lower rank groups, in particular for $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}, S \subsetneq \Pi$, we have the claim holds for all $S' \subsetneq S$ and any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$.

Now we look at any S with $|S| = k < n = |\Pi|$. For any ϵ_1, ϵ_2, let $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon_1} := \{|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z)| \geq \epsilon_1, \beta \notin S\}$. Then there exists $\epsilon_1', \epsilon_2' > 0$ such that

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\geqslant\epsilon_2} := (J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon_1}) - \mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,<\epsilon_2} \subset \bigcup_{S'\subsetneq S} \tilde{\imath}^S_{S'}(\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1'}_{S',<\epsilon_2'}). \tag{3.1.20}$$

We have the fibration $\pi_{S,<\epsilon_2} : \mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,<\epsilon_2} \to T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon_1}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$ with fiber at any point $(\dot{z}, t) \in T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon_1}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$ the open subset

(3.1.21)
$$F_{(\dot{z},t)} \cong \{(g_S, \xi_S) \in (L_S^{\mathrm{der}} \times \mathcal{S}_{[S}^{\mathrm{der}}) \cap \mathscr{Z}_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} : |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S)| < \epsilon_2, \beta \in S\} \subset J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}.$$

By induction, for any given compact $\mathfrak{K}_S \subset \mathfrak{c}_S$ and $(\dot{z}, t)$ as above, $\chi_S^{-1}(\mathfrak{K}_S) \cap F_{(\dot{z},t)}$ is compact. Let

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_2} := \mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\geqslant\epsilon_2} \cup \bigcup_{\dot{z}\in\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon_1}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})} (F_{(\dot{z},t)} \cap \chi_S^{-1}(\mathfrak{K}_S)). \tag{3.1.22}$$

Now the fiber of $\pi_{S,\mathfrak{K}_S} : \mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_2} \to T^*(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon_1}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}))$ at $(\dot{z}, t)$ has two parts of (finite) boundaries: (1) $\chi_S^{-1}(\partial\mathfrak{K}_S) \cap \overline{F}_{(\dot{z},t)}$ and (2) $\partial F_{(\dot{z},t)} \cap \chi_S^{-1}(\mathfrak{c}_S - \mathfrak{K}_S)$, whose union over all $T^*(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon_1}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}))$ gives the "horizontal" boundary of $\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_2}$. We denote these two parts of boundaries by $\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$ and $\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{K}_S}_{\partial F,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$, respectively.

We show that

(3.1.23)

> for sufficiently large $\mathfrak{K}_S'$, $\chi(\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S',\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2})$ and $\chi(\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{K}_S'}_{\partial F,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2})$ are outside any given compact $\mathfrak{K}' \subset \mathfrak{c}$,

which is exactly the induction step for S in the second part. We set up some notations. For any interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we set $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_J = \{z \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S) : |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z)| \in J, \beta \notin S\}$. Denote for the preimage of $T^*(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_J/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}))$ through $\pi_{S,<\epsilon_2}$ (resp. $\pi_{S,\mathfrak{K}_S}$) in $\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,<\epsilon_2}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_2}$) as $\mathfrak{U}^J_{S,<\epsilon_2}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{U}^J_{S,\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_2}$).

First, choose any $R_1 > 2\epsilon_1$, and consider $\mathfrak{U}^{[\epsilon_1,R_1]}_{S,<\epsilon_2} \subset \mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,<\epsilon_2}$. Since $\pi_{|b|}$ is bounded on this region, by Lemma 3.5 (ii), $\chi^{-1}([0])$ intersects $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}^{[\epsilon_1,R_1]}_{S,<\epsilon_2}$ in a

compact region, so there exists a compact $\mathfrak{K}_S^{(1)} \subset \mathfrak{c}_S$ such that

$$\chi^{-1}([0]) \cap \mathfrak{U}_{S,<2\epsilon_2}^{[\epsilon_1,R_1]} \subset (\chi_S^{-1}(\mathfrak{K}_S^{(1)}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)) \cap \mathfrak{U}_{S,<2\epsilon_2}^{[\epsilon_1,R_1]}. \tag{3.1.24}$$

Choose $\epsilon_1'' > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{U}_{S',<\epsilon_2'}^{\geqslant \epsilon_1'} \subset (\mathfrak{U}_{S'}^S)_{<\epsilon_2'}^{\geqslant \epsilon_1''} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq \epsilon_1'}$ (cf. (3.1.20) for ϵ_j'), for all $S' \subsetneq S$, where $\mathfrak{U}_{S'}^S$ denotes for the left-hand-side of (2.2.13) with the containment relation between S' and S swapped, and $(\mathfrak{U}_{S'}^S)_{<\epsilon_2'}^{\geqslant \epsilon_1''}$ is defined similarly using (3.1.19) for the group L_S^{der}. By induction, for any compact $\mathfrak{K}' \subset \mathfrak{c}$ containing a neighborhood of $[0]$ and any $S' \subsetneq S$, there exists $\mathfrak{K}'_{S',\epsilon_1',\epsilon_2'} \subset \mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{l}_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}} \times \mathfrak{z}_{S'}$ such that for any $(g_{S'}, \xi_{S'}; z, t) \in \mathfrak{U}_{S',<\epsilon_2'}^{\geqslant \epsilon_1'}$ with $\xi_{S'} + t \notin \mathfrak{K}'_{S',\epsilon_1',\epsilon_2'}$, we have $\chi(\iota_{S'}(g_{S'}, \xi_{S'}; z, t)) \notin \mathfrak{K}'$. Also by induction, there exists $\mathfrak{K}_S^{(2)} \subset \mathfrak{c}_S$ such that for any $S' \subsetneq S$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\chi_S(\iota_{S'}^S(g_{S'}, \xi_{S'}; z^{(S)}, t^{(S)})) \notin \mathfrak{K}_S^{(2)}, (g_{S'}, \xi_{S'}; z^{(S)}, t^{(S)}) \in (\mathfrak{U}_{S'}^S)_{<\epsilon_2'}^{\geqslant \epsilon_1''} \\ &\Rightarrow \xi_{S'} + t^{(S)} \notin \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{l}_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}} \times \mathfrak{z}_{S'}^S} \mathfrak{K}'_{S',\epsilon_1',\epsilon_2'}, \end{aligned}$$

with respect to the splitting $\mathfrak{z}_S = \mathfrak{z}_{S'} \oplus \mathfrak{z}_{S'}^S$ as in the proof of Proposition 2.7. Fix any $\mathfrak{K}_S$ containing an open neighborhood of $\mathfrak{K}_S^{(1)} \cup \mathfrak{K}_S^{(2)}$. By induction, for any $(g_S, \xi_S; z, t) \in \mathsf{B}_{\partial \mathfrak{K}_S, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$, we have $g_S \in C_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}(\xi_S)$ and ξ_S are bounded and $|\beta(z^{-1})|, \beta \notin S$ are bounded from above, so by (2.2.8)

$$\chi(\mathsf{B}_{\partial \mathfrak{K}_S, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2} \cap \{|t| \gg 1\}) \cap \mathfrak{K}' = \emptyset. \tag{3.1.25}$$

Combining the above observations (and the compatibility of the open embeddings in Proposition 2.7) and using the relation (3.1.20), we have

(a) There exists a compact neighborhood $\mathfrak{K}_1$ of $[0]$ in $\mathfrak{c}$ such that

$$\chi(\mathsf{B}_{\partial \mathfrak{K}_S, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2} \cap \overline{\mathfrak{U}}_{S,<\epsilon_2}^{[\epsilon_1,R_1]}) \cap \mathfrak{K}_1 = \emptyset$$

(b) $\chi(\mathsf{B}_{\partial F, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}^{\mathfrak{K}_S}) \cap \mathfrak{K}' = \emptyset$.

Second, we claim that there exists $R_2 \gg R_1$ and a compact neighborhood $\mathfrak{K}_2$ of $[0]$ in $\mathfrak{c}$ such that

$$\chi(\mathsf{B}_{\partial \mathfrak{K}_S, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2} \cap \overline{\mathfrak{U}}_{S,<\epsilon_2}^{\geqslant R_2}) \cap \mathfrak{K}_2 = \emptyset.$$

Indeed, recall Ξ_S is from (2.2.8), by the same consideration as above from induction,

$$(g_S, \xi_S; z, t) \in \mathsf{B}_{\partial \mathfrak{K}_S, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2} \cap \overline{\mathfrak{U}}_{S,<\epsilon_2}^{\geqslant R_2} \Rightarrow \Xi_S \overset{\text{uniformly close to}}{\approx} f + \xi_S + t, \chi_{\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}}}(\xi_S) \in \partial \mathfrak{K}_S$$

$$\Rightarrow \chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\Xi_S) \overset{\text{uniformly close to}}{\approx} \chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(f + \xi_S + t) = \chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\xi_S + t).$$

By assumption on ξ_S, it is clear that $\chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\xi_S + t)$ is outside a fixed compact neighborhood of $[0] \in \mathfrak{c}$.

Third, for $\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\cap\overline{\mathfrak{U}}^{[R_1,R_2]}_{S,<\epsilon_2}$, by (3.1.24) and the invariance of $\chi^{-1}([0])$ under the inverse $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action, we have

$$\chi^{-1}([0])\cap\mathfrak{U}^{[R_1,R_2]}_{S,<2\epsilon_2}\subset(\chi_S^{-1}(\mathfrak{K}_S)\underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times}T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S))\cap\mathfrak{U}^{[R_1,R_2]}_{S,<2\epsilon_2}. \tag{3.1.26}$$

Combining with (3.1.25), we see that there exists a compact neighborhood $\mathfrak{K}_3\subset\mathfrak{c}$ of $[0]$ such that

$$\chi(\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\cap\overline{\mathfrak{U}}^{[R_1,R_2]}_{S,<\epsilon_2})\cap\mathfrak{K}_3=\emptyset.$$

In summary, we have found a $\mathfrak{K}_S$ so that the following hold:

(a') There exists a compact neighborhood $\widetilde{\mathfrak{K}}\subset\mathfrak{c}$ of $[0]$ such that $\chi(\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2})\cap\widetilde{\mathfrak{K}}=\emptyset$.

(b) $\chi(\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{K}_S}_{\partial F,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2})\cap\mathfrak{K}'=\emptyset$. Note that if we enlarge $\mathfrak{K}_S$ to be sufficiently large, then the corresponding $\chi(\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{K}_S}_{\partial F,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2})$ is disjoint from any given compact $\mathfrak{K}''\subset\mathfrak{c}$.

Now we use the (inverse, i.e. contracting) $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$-action (as a multiplicative monoid) to find a $\mathfrak{K}'_S$ so that claim (3.1.23) holds. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathfrak{c}-\mathfrak{K}'$ is invariant under the $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}$-action. Let $\tau\gg 1$ such that $\tau\cdot\mathfrak{K}'\subset\widetilde{\mathfrak{K}}^\circ$. Choose $\mathfrak{K}'_S\supset\mathfrak{K}_S$ such that $\tau_1\cdot\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}'_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\cap\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}=\emptyset$ for all $1\leq\tau_1\leq\tau$. This is achievable because the $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$-action on $\mathfrak{U}_S^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}:=\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,<\epsilon_2}\cup\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\geqslant\epsilon_2}$ is the "product" $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$-action on the fiber (canonically identified with $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ up to $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$) and on the base $T^*(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\geq\epsilon}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}))$. So the condition on $\mathfrak{K}'_S$ can be checked for the open subset in (3.1.21) quotient out by $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$. It is not hard to see that $\mathfrak{K}'_S$ makes the claim (3.1.23) valid. Indeed, for any $(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)\in\mathfrak{U}_S^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}-\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon_1}_{S,\mathfrak{K}'_S}$, we look at the flow $\tau_1\cdot(g_S,\xi_S;z,t),\tau_1\in\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, which will intersect $\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\cup\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{K}_S}_{\partial F,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$ at a finite time. There are two cases

Case 1. the flow line first intersects $\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{K}_S}_{\partial F,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$, then by (b) above and that $\mathfrak{c}-\mathfrak{K}'$ is invariant under the $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 1}$-action, $\chi(\iota_S(g_S,\xi_S;z,t))\cap\mathfrak{K}'=\emptyset$.

Case 2. the flow line first intersects $\mathsf{B}_{\partial\mathfrak{K}_S,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$ at $\widetilde{\tau}_1\cdot(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)$ for some $\widetilde{\tau}_1\in\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. By assumption and (a') above, $\widetilde{\tau}_1>\tau$, therefore,

$$\chi(\iota_S(g_S,\xi_S;z,t))=\widetilde{\tau}_1^{-1}\cdot\chi(\iota_S(\widetilde{\tau}_1\cdot(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)))\subset\widetilde{\tau}_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{c}-\widetilde{\mathfrak{K}}).$$

Since $\widetilde{\tau}_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{c}-\widetilde{\mathfrak{K}})\cap\mathfrak{K}'=\emptyset$, the claim follows in this case.

Thus, we have proved claim (3.1.23).

Lastly, we finish the proof of the proposition. Using Lemma 3.5 (i), we fix an $\epsilon>0$ and a compact neighborhood $\mathfrak{K}\subset\mathfrak{c}$ of $[0]$, so that $\pi^{-1}_{|b|}([0,\epsilon])\cap\chi^{-1}(\mathfrak{K})$ is compact. We have $\pi^{-1}_{|b|}[\epsilon,\infty)\subset\bigcup_{S\subsetneq\Pi}\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon'_1}_{S,<\epsilon'_2}$ for some $\epsilon'_1,\epsilon'_2>0$. Fix any finite interval $[0,K]\subset\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. By the induction steps above, for any $S\subsetneq\Pi$, $\mathfrak{U}^{\geqslant\epsilon'_1}_{S,<\epsilon'_2}\cap\chi^{-1}(\mathfrak{K})\cap\pi^{-1}_{|b|}([0,K])$ is pre-compact in $\mathfrak{U}_S$. Therefore

$\chi^{-1}(\mathfrak{K}) \cap \pi_{|b|}^{-1}([0,K])$ is a finite union of compact subsets, so it is compact. The proof is complete. □

Remark 3.7. Implicit in the proof above is an inductive process of handle attachments to get J_G. Namely, the step of getting from (3.1.20) to (3.1.22), for a fixed $\mathfrak{K}_S$ (assuming it is a closed ball in $\mathfrak{c}_S$ containing $[0]$ in the interior) and sufficiently small $\epsilon_2 > 0$, should be viewed as joining a (Morse-Bott) index $(n+|S|)$-handle.

We fix some standard (local) coordinates for the open cell $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$. First, the functions $b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}, \beta \in \Pi$ give local coordinates on $w_0 T \subset G$ (if $G = G_{sc}$ these are also global coordinates). Let $\widetilde{p}_{\beta^\vee} \in \mathfrak{t}, \beta \in \Pi$ be the dual coordinate on $\mathfrak{t}^*$, which are the same as pairing with the simple coroots $\beta^\vee$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} (3.1.27)\quad & q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} = \log |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)},\ \theta_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} = \Im \log b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} \text{(this is multivalued)} \\ & p_{\beta^\vee} = \lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)\Re\widetilde{p}_{\beta^\vee} - i\Im\widetilde{p}_{\beta^\vee}. \end{aligned}$$

The symplectic form on $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$ in such coordinates is given by

$$\omega = -\Re(d\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} \widetilde{p}_{\beta^\vee} b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}^{-1} db_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}) = -\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} d\Re p_{\beta^\vee} \wedge dq_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} + d\Im p_{\beta^\vee} \wedge d\theta_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}.$$

Similarly, for any $S \subset \Pi$, we can define (local) symplectic dual coordinates

$$(3.1.28)\qquad (q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}, \theta_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}; \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}, \Im p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}), \beta \notin S$$

for the factor $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ in $\mathfrak{U}_S$, where $\beta^\vee_{S^\perp} = \pi_{\mathfrak{z}_S}(\beta^\vee)$ denote for the orthogonal projection of $\beta^\vee$ onto $\mathfrak{z}_S$ with respect to the Killing form. This amounts to replacing $\widetilde{p}_{\beta^\vee}$ in (3.1.27) with the linear function on $\mathfrak{z}_S^*$ given by $\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}$, for $\beta \notin S$. Then

$$\omega_{\mathfrak{U}_S} = -\sum_{\beta\notin S} (d\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} \wedge dq_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} + d\Im p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} \wedge d\theta_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}) + \omega_{J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}}.$$

Note that for $S_1 \subsetneq S_2$, the function $\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S_1^\perp}}$ and $\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S_2^\perp}}, \beta \notin S_2$, are usually different:

$$(3.1.29)\qquad \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S_2^\perp}} = \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S_1^\perp}} + \sum_{\gamma\in S_2\setminus S_1} a_\gamma \Re p_{\gamma^\vee_{S_1^\perp}}$$

for some constants a_γ, on $\mathfrak{U}_{S_1}$.

3.2. **Partial compactifications of J_G as Liouville/Weinstein sectors.** In this section, we introduce partial compactifications of J_G as Liouville/Weinstein sectors, depending certain choices of data. Recall that we have assumed that G is semisimple. The key idea is to first partially compactify $J_G - \mathcal{B}_1$ as a Liouville sector of the form $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \le 0}$ where $\mathfrak{F}$ is a Liouville manifold. Then $\overline{J}_G$ is obtained from attaching $|\mathcal{Z}(G)|$ many critical handles (corresponding to the connected components of $\chi^{-1}([0])$) to $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \le 0}$. The main results are Proposition 3.9, 3.11 and 3.12.




FIGURE 3. A picture for $\mathfrak{C}^2$ with $\Pi = \{1, 2, 3\}$: the barycenters are indexed by $S \subsetneq \Pi$; the center of $\mathfrak{C}^2$, the cyan segments, and the three open region in the complement give the radial projection of the stratification $\{\mathfrak{S}^\circ_S\}_{S\subsetneq\Pi}$ in $\mathring{\mathfrak{C}}^2$; some enlargements of the open regions enclosed by the dashed lines give the collection of U_S (3.2.7); the red flow lines indicate the flow of $Z_{H^{sm}}$ for model (A) (under the radial projection) with prescribed features.

3.2.1. *A smooth hypersurface H^{sm} in $\mathbb{R}^\Pi_{\geq 0}$.* Fixing a labeling of the set of simple roots Π, we identify $\mathbb{R}^\Pi_{\geq 0}$ with $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$, and we denote the coordinates by $(r_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi}$. Define the following functions on J_G:

$$\pi_r : J_G \xrightarrow{|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathfrak{h}_0)}} (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^\Pi \tag{3.2.1}$$

Note that by (3.1.3), the map π_r is equivariant with respect to the canonical $\mathbb{R}_+$-action by restriction from the canonical $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action (resp. Liouville flow) and the weight -2 (resp. -1) radial $\mathbb{R}^+$-action on $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^\Pi$.

Let $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ be the $(n-1)$-simplex

$$\{\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} r_\beta = 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0},$$

depicted in Figure 3. The cells in $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$, indexed by $S \subsetneq \Pi$, are given by

$$C_S = \{r_\beta = 0 \Leftrightarrow \beta \in S\}. \tag{3.2.2}$$

We mark the barycenter of C_S by S (cf. Figure 3). For each $\alpha \in \Pi$, let $\Pi_\alpha = \Pi\backslash\{\alpha\}$. Let $\widehat{C}_S$ be the coordinate plane in $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$ defined by $r_\beta = 0, \beta \in S$.

We are going to "bend" $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ inside $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$ in the following steps. The point is that the function $(\sum_\beta r_\beta) \circ \pi_r$ is *not* smooth on $J_G - \mathcal{B}_1$, and our goal is to define a smooth hypersurface $H^{sm} \subset \mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$ which will be the level

hypersurface of a homogeneous function replacing $\Sigma_{\beta\in\Pi} r_\beta$ that will become smooth on $J_G - \mathcal{B}_1$ under the composition with π_r (3.2.1). Moreover, we will have a slightly detailed construction of H^{sm} so that we obtain an explicit description of $\pi_r^{-1}(H^{sm})$ as the product of a Liouville hypersurface $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathbb{R}$. By appropriate choices of H^{sm}, we obtain (generalized) Weinstein structures on $\mathfrak{F}$ (cf. Proposition 3.9). Due to the technical nature of the discussions, we suggest the reader to skim through the rest of this subsection and return to it later.

First, for every Π_α, viewed as a vertex in $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ (up to scaling by $1/2$), take the hyperplane

$$H_\alpha = \{r_\alpha = 1/2\}. \tag{3.2.3}$$

The hyperplanes $H_\alpha, \alpha \in \Pi$, together cut out the cubic region $Q^n = \{r_\alpha \in [0, 1/2]\}$. Let $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1} = \overline{\partial Q^n \cap \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}}$. Then $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ is naturally (minimally) stratified, and the collection of strata whose closure does not contain the origin projects to a stratification on $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ along the radial rays, depicted in Figure 3. The strata in the interior of $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ are indexed by $S \subsetneq \Pi$, given by $(\bigcap_{\alpha\notin S} H_\alpha \cap Q^n)^\circ \subset \partial Q^n$. We denote the strata in $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1} \cap \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$ by $\mathfrak{S}_S^\circ, S \subsetneq \Pi$. Also introduce

$$\mathfrak{S}_S = \overline{\mathfrak{S}_S^\circ} \setminus \bigcup_{S'\subsetneq S} \overline{\mathfrak{S}_{S'}^\circ} \subset \mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}. \tag{3.2.4}$$

The collection $\{\mathfrak{S}_S : S \subsetneq \Pi\}$ gives a stratification of $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ as a singular space *with boundary*, where we do *not* separately stratify the boundary.

Second, we perform a smoothing of $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ using induction on the dimension of strata $\dim \mathfrak{S}_S = |S|$. For $|S| = n-1$ (which is the base case), we delete a tubular neighborhood of the lower dimensional strata. Suppose we have defined the smoothing of $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ away from a tubular neighborhood of the union of strata of dimension $\le \ell$, such that along each stratum $\mathfrak{S}_{S'}$ with $|S'| > \ell$, the smoothing is locally defined by an equation of the form

$$f_{S'}(r_\beta; \beta \notin S') = 0, \tag{3.2.5}$$

$$\sum_{\beta\notin S} \frac{\partial f_{S'}}{\partial r_\beta} r_\beta < 0, \tag{3.2.6}$$

i.e. it is a product of a smooth star-shaped (meaning the radial vector field is transverse to it everywhere) hypersurface in the coordinate plane $\widehat{C}_{S'}$ with an open neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^{S'}_{\ge 0}$ (again as a manifold with boundary). Here we take

$$f_{\Pi_\alpha}(r_\alpha) = -r_\alpha + \frac{1}{2}, \forall \alpha \in \Pi.$$

For nice geometric properties, we can assume that all functions belong to a fixed analytic geometric category. For any S with $|S| = \ell$, we look at the intersection of $\widehat{C}_S$ with the existing partial smoothing, which can be

extended to a smoothing of $\widehat{C}_S \cap \mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ satisfying (3.2.6) with S' replaced by S. Take the product of the smoothing with an open neighborhood D_S of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^S_{\geq 0}$. Note that by Lemma 3.3, for a fixed point $(r_\beta)_{\beta\notin S}$, D_S is parametrizing the values of the functions $(|b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)})_{\beta\in S}$ on the factor $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ (and also of $(|b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_{0;S})})_{\beta\in S}$), near the cone point $0 \in D_S$. Now the smoothing is obtained in the complement of a tubular neighborhood of the strata of dimension $< \ell$, and (3.2.5) and (3.2.6) are satisfied for all $|S| \geq \ell$. Repeat the step until no stratum is left.

Take a collection of functions $\{(f_S(r_\beta; \beta \notin S) : S \subsetneq \Pi\}$ as above, which defines a global smoothing of $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$, denoted by H^{sm}. We can define a stratification $\mathfrak{S}$ on H^{sm} with similar features as on $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ (since from now on we will forget $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ and only work with H^{sm}, this abuse of notation should not cause any confusion): in a neighborhood of $H^{sm} \cap \widehat{C}_S$, $\mathfrak{S}_S$ is the product of a point in $H^{sm} \cap \widehat{C}_S$ and D_S (with respect to the product structure described above). Now for each $S \subsetneq \Pi$, let $\mathsf{N}_S \subset \widehat{C}_S$ be an open neighborhood of $\mathfrak{S}_S \cap \widehat{C}_S$, and let

$$U_S = (\mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}) \times D_S. \tag{3.2.7}$$

The collection $\{U_S : S \subsetneq \Pi\}$ (for appropriate choices of N_S) defines an open cover of H^{sm}, depicted as the domains enclosed by the dashed lines in Figure 3 (after some enlargement for each of them, and under the radial projection to $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$). Without loss of generality, we may assume that U_S is contained in the $(n - |S|)$-th step of smoothing of $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$ above.

Let Z_r denote the standard negative radial vector field on $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$, which is the same as the pushforward of the Liouville vector field Z along the projection π_r.

For each S, let $Z = Z_{S^\perp} + Z_S$ be the splitting of Z on $\mathfrak{U}_S$ as in Lemma 3.1. The projection of Z_S along π_r gives a well defined vector field on U_S (3.2.7), denoted by $Z_{r;S}$, which is the direct sum of a vector field on D_S and the zero vector field on $\mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}$. The flow of Z_S scales each $|b^S_{\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}}(g_S)|^{1/\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_{0;S})}, \gamma \in S$, by weight -1, and consequently $Z_{r;S}$ scales each $r_\gamma, \gamma \in S$, by weight $-\frac{\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_{0;S})}{\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}$.

Consider the following function on an open neighborhood of $\pi_r^{-1}(\overline{U}_S)$ in $\mathfrak{U}_S$:

$$F_S = \sum_{\gamma\in S} |b^S_{\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}}(g_S)|^2 = \sum_{\gamma\in S} \frac{(|b_{\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)})^{2\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}}{|\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(z)|^2}. \tag{3.2.8}$$

(cf. Lemma 3.3). Here $F_\emptyset = 0$. If we write $\gamma^\vee = \sum_{\beta\notin S} m_\gamma^\beta \cdot \beta^\vee$ with $m_\gamma^\beta \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(z) = \prod_{\beta\notin S} \lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z)^{m_\gamma^\beta}$. Let

$$F_{r;S,\gamma} = \frac{r_\gamma}{(\prod_{\beta\notin S} r_\beta(z)^{m_\gamma^\beta})^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}}},$$
$$F_{r;S} = \sum_{\gamma\in S} F_{r;S,\gamma}^{2\lambda_{\gamma^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}.$$

Then $F_{r;S,\gamma}, \gamma\in S$, are well defined on $\mathsf{N}_S \times \mathbb{R}^S_{\geq 0}$, and $F_S = \pi_r^* F_{r;S}$. Now $(r_\beta, \beta\notin S; F_{r;S,\gamma}, \gamma\in S)$ naturally extends to be a coordinate system on $\mathsf{N}_S \times \mathbb{R}^S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, the restriction of the function $(F_{r;S,\gamma})_{\gamma\in S}$ on $(\mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}) \times \mathbb{R}^S$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^S$ is everywhere regular. Fix $\delta_S > 0$ such that $F_{r;S}^{-1}[0, 2\delta_S] \subset U_S$. For every fixed value of $(r_\beta, \beta\notin S)$ in $\mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}$, any level hypersurface $\{F_{r;S} = \eta\}, 0 < \eta < 2\delta_S$, cuts out a contractible portion of a sphere in D_S. The vector field $Z_{r;S}$ is transverse to all level hypersurfaces and points from higher levels to lower ones.

The projection of $Z_{S^\perp}$ on the coordinate plane $\widehat{C}_S = \{r_\gamma = 0, \gamma\in S\}$ is just the negative standard radial vector field. Let $Z'_{H^{sm};S^\perp}$ be the orthogonal projection of the negative standard radial vector field to $\mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}$. The vector field uniquely lifts to a smooth vector field on U_S, denoted by $Z_{H^{sm};S^\perp}$, through the projection $U_S \to \mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}$ satisfying the condition that $Z_{H^{sm};S^\perp}(F_{r;S,\gamma}) = 0$ for all $\gamma\in S$.

Let

$$U'_S = U_S \cap F_{r;S}^{-1}[0, \delta_S). \tag{3.2.9}$$

Let $\partial(U'_S)_v$ be the vertical boundary of U'_S given by $(\partial(\mathsf{N}_S\cap H^{sm})\times D_S)\cap\overline{U'_S}$, and let $\partial(U'_S)_h$ be the horizontal boundary of U'_S given by $F_{r;S}^{-1}(\delta_S)\cap\overline{U'_S}$. For any $P\subsetneq S$, let $U'_{S;P}$ be the portion of the boundary of U'_S given by $\overline{U'_S}\cap\widehat{C}_P$. We similarly define $\partial(U'_{S;P})_v$ (resp. $\partial(U'_{S;P})_h$) by the intersection of $U'_{S;P}$ with the hypersurfaces $(\partial(\mathsf{N}_S\cap H^{sm})\times D_S)$ (resp. $F_{r;S}^{-1}(\delta_S)$). Note that $\partial(U'_{S;\emptyset})_v = \partial(U'_S)_v$ and $\partial(U'_{S;\emptyset})_h = \partial(U'_S)_h$.

In order to define a Liouville/Weinstein hypersurface in $\pi_r^{-1}(H^{sm})$, we make the following assumptions on the choice of

$$(\mathsf{N}_S, f_S(r_\beta; \beta\notin S)), \tag{3.2.10}$$

in the previous induction steps:

- the restriction of the distance squared function $r^2_{S^\perp} := \sum_{\beta\notin S} r_\beta^2$ on $(\widehat{C}_S\cap H^{sm})^\circ$ (which is obtained in the $(n-|S|)$-th step of smoothing of $\mathfrak{C}_Q^{n-1}$) is Morse.

If $S = \emptyset$, then we also denote $r^2_{\emptyset^\perp}$ by r^2.

We will focus on the following two types of models:

(A) Let $c_S \in \mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}$ be the point that radially projects to the barycenter of the cell C_S in $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$. We assume that $r^2_{S^\perp}$ on $(\widehat{C}_S \cap H^{sm})^\circ$ has a unique critical point at c_S which is a local maximum.

(B) Consider the following stratification of $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ as in Figure 4, whose codimension k strata are indexed by strictly increasing $(k+1)$-chains $(S_j)_j = S_0 \subsetneq S_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq S_k \subsetneq \Pi$ (as before we don't stratify the boundary separately; equivalently, the strata are in one-to-one correspondence with the strata in $\mathring{\mathfrak{C}}^{n-1}$). We assume the top dimensional stratum for each S has closure contained in U'_S. For each stratum indexed by a $(k+1)$-chain $(S_j)_j$, let $c'_{(S_j)_j}$ be the barycenter of the intersection of the stratum with the cell C_{S_0}. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{(S_j)_j}$ (resp. $c_{(S_j)_j}$) denote the corresponding stratification (resp. point of $c'_{(S_j)_j}$) on H^{sm} under the radial projection. We assume that for any $S \subsetneq \Pi$, the restriction of $r^2_{S^\perp}$ on $(\widehat{C}_S \cap H^{sm})^\circ$ has a critical point at $c_{(S_j)_j}$, for any chain $(S_j)_j$ starting with $S_0 = S$, whose unstable manifold is a small perturbation of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{(S_j)_j}$, and the function has no other critical point. In particular, if $(S_j)_j = (S_0)$ is just a chain of length one, then the distance squared function r^2 on H^{sm} has a nondegenerate local minimum at $c_{(S_0)}$.




FIGURE 4. The stratification of $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ for model (B).

The above two models can be easily achieved along the inductive steps of defining H^{sm} as follows. Suppose we have defined $U_{>\ell} := \bigcup_{|S'|>\ell} U_{S'}$, then for any S with $|S| = \ell$, the gradient vector field of $r^2_{S^\perp}|_{U_{S'} \cap \widehat{C}_S}$ is pointing outward everywhere along $(\partial U_{S';S})_h$ if $S' \supset S$, and so we can pick a level hypersurface $H_{>\ell,S^\perp}$ with some value a of $r^2_{S^\perp}|_{U_{>\ell} \cap \widehat{C}_S}$ near its boundary inside $\widehat{C}^\circ$ (this can be achieved since we can make the smoothing C^0-close to a round sphere, so that the deviation of the values of $r^2_{S^\perp}|_{U_{>\ell} \cap \widehat{C}_S}$ is sufficiently small). Then to complete $U_{>\ell} \cap \widehat{C}_S$ to a star-shaped hypersurface in $\widehat{C}_S$ with the prescribed feature of the restriction of $r^2_{S^\perp}$ on it, it amounts to viewing

$U_{>\ell}\cap\widehat{C}_S$ as a graph of a smooth function from an open subset of $S^{n-1}\cap\widehat{C}_S$ to $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and then extending it to be a complete graph across a neighborhood of the level hypersurface $H_{>\ell,S^\perp}$ with prescribed Morse singularities at the points in $S^{n-1}\cap\widehat{C}_S$ corresponding to the barycenters (c_S in (A) and $c_{(S_j)_j}, S_0=S$ in (B), respectively) under the radial projection.

Moreover, define a vector field $Z_{H^{sm}}$ on H^{sm} as follows (cf. Figure 3 for model (A)). Choose a partition of unity $\{\varphi_{U'_S}\}_{S\subsetneq\Pi}$ for the open covering $\{U'_S\}_{S\subsetneq\Pi}$ of H^{sm}. Choose a smooth function $\epsilon_S\geq 0$ on each U'_S, which is the pullback of a function $\overline{\epsilon}_S$ defined on $U'_S\cap\widehat{C}_S$. Then let

$$Z_{H^{sm}}=\sum_{S\subsetneq\Pi}\varphi_{U'_S}\cdot(\epsilon_S\cdot Z_{H^{sm},S^\perp}+Z_{r;S}). \tag{3.2.11}$$

It is clear from construction that if we choose $\epsilon_S>0$ for all S, then $Z_{H^{sm}}\cdot\mathrm{grad}(-r^2)>0$ everywhere on H^{sm} except in a sufficiently small neighborhood of the critical points of r^2 (i.e. those barycenters) if we choose ϵ_S sufficiently small. In that neighborhood, the critical points are the only zeros of $Z_{H^{sm}}$.

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.8.

(a1) *At any point in $U_S^\flat:=U'_S\setminus\bigcup_{S^\dagger\subsetneq S}\mathrm{supp}(\varphi_{U'_{S^\dagger}})$, the difference $Z_r-Z_{H^{sm}}$ satisfies*

$$(Z_r-Z_{H^{sm}})(F_{r;S,\gamma})=0,\gamma\in S, \tag{3.2.12}$$

In particular, with respect to the splitting of $\mathfrak{U}_S$ (2.2.6) and the Darboux coordinates on the factor $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ in (3.1.28), there is a unique lifting of $Z_r-Z_{H^{sm}}$ to $TJ_G|_{\pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat)}$ of the form

(3.2.13)
$$Z-\widetilde{Z}_{H^{sm}}=\sum_{\beta\notin S}\pi_r^*(a_{S;\beta})\partial_{q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}}=\sum_{\beta\notin S}\pi_r^*(a_{S;\beta})\cdot|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}\partial_{|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}}.$$

where $a_{S;\beta}$ is a real function on $U_S^\flat$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\beta\notin S}\frac{\partial f_S}{\partial r_\beta}a_{S;\beta}r_\beta>0. \tag{3.2.14}$$

(a2) *For any $S_2\subset S_1$, the above lifting of $Z_r-Z_{H^{sm}}$ on $\pi_r^{-1}(U_{S_1}^\flat)$ and $\pi_r^{-1}(U_{S_2}^\flat)$ coincide on their intersection. Hence there is a canonical lifting $Z-\widetilde{Z}_{H^{sm}}$ of $Z_r-Z_{H^{sm}}$ in $TJ_G|_{\pi_r^{-1}(H^{sm})}$.*

(b) *Assume we are in the case of model (A) and $\epsilon_S>0$ for $|\Pi\setminus S|\geq 2$. Then for every $S\subsetneq\Pi$, the vector field $Z_{H^{sm}}$ has exactly one zero on U'_S at c_S. Moreover, $Z_{H^{sm}}$ is pointing inward to U'_S along $\partial(U'_{S;P})_h$ and pointing outward along $\partial(U'_{S;P})_v$, for all $P\subsetneq S$.*

Proof. (a1) If $S_1 \supsetneq S_2$, then on $U'_{S_1} \cap U'_{S_2}$, any vector field X satisfying $X(F_{r;S_1,\gamma}) = 0, \forall \gamma \in S_1$, implies that $X(F_{r;S_2,\gamma}) = 0, \forall \gamma \in S_2$, since $F_{r;S_2,\gamma}, \gamma \in S_2$ are entirely determined by $F_{r;S_1,\gamma'}, \gamma' \in S_1$. Hence by the definition of $Z_{H^{sm}}$, we have (3.2.12) hold on $U^\flat_S$ for all $S \subsetneq \Pi$. It then follows that $Z_r - Z_{H^{sm}}$ can be lifted in the form of (3.2.13). The uniqueness of the lifting is clear. The functions $a_{S;\beta}, \beta \notin S$, satisfy (3.2.14) because $Z_r - Z_{H^{sm}}|_{U^\flat_S}$ is pointing inward along H^{sm} (towards the origin) and is of the form

$$\sum_{\beta \notin S} a_{S;\beta} r_\beta \partial_{r_\beta} + \sum_{\alpha \in S} c_{S;\alpha} r_\alpha \partial_{r_\alpha},$$

so its pairing with the inward conormal vector $\sum_{\beta \notin S} \frac{\partial f_S}{\partial r_\beta} dr_\beta$ is strictly positive.

(a2) By the relation

$$T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_2}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_2})}{\times} J_{L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_2}} \cong (T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_1}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_1})}{\times} T^*(\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_2}) \cap L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_1})) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_2})}{\times} J_{L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_2}}$$
$$\hookrightarrow T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_1}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_1})}{\times} J_{L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S_1}}$$

and the definition of the coordinates in (3.1.27), it is clear that the unique lifting of $Z_r - Z_{H^{sm}}$ in the chart $\pi_r^{-1}(U^\flat_{S_1})$ satisfies that its restriction to $\pi_r^{-1}(U^\flat_{S_1} \cap U^\flat_{S_2})$ is of the form (3.2.13) with respect to the chart $\pi_r^{-1}(U^\flat_{S_2})$. The claim then follows from the uniqueness property.

(b) is straightforward. □

There is an analogous statement of Lemma 3.8 (b) for model (B), where one chooses a covering of H^{sm} by open neighborhoods of the critical points of $(-r^2)|_{H^{sm}}$ (indexed by chains $(S_j)_j$), on each of which one sees $Z_{H^{sm}}$ behaving similarly as the gradient vector field near the Morse critical point. We omit the details.

3.2.2. *Some structural results on $J_G - \mathcal{B}_1$.* Let $\mathsf{N}(r_\beta; \beta \in \Pi)$ be the function on $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$, homogeneous with respect to the Liouville flow with *weight* $-\frac{1}{2}$, whose value on H^{sm} (defined in Subsection 3.2.1) is constantly 1. We use $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$ to denote for its pullback to $J_G - \mathcal{B}_1$ along the projection

$$\pi_r|_{J_G - \mathcal{B}_1} : J_G - \mathcal{B}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}.$$

The upshot is that $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$ is everywhere differentiable and regular (i.e. submersive), which follows from the fact that $|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)}$ is bounded below by a positive number on U'_S for any $\beta \notin S$ and from Corollary 3.4. The Hamiltonian vector field $X_{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}}$ on $\pi_r^{-1}(H^{sm}) = \{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}} = 1\} \subset J_G$ generates the characteristic foliation on the hypersurface.

Proposition 3.9.

(a) *For both model (A) and (B), there exists a Liouville hypersurface* $\mathfrak{F}$ *in* $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^{-1}(1)$ *and a diffeomorphism*

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^{-1}(1) \cong \mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{F} \tag{3.2.15}$$

such that each leaf of the characteristic foliation on the left-hand-side is sent to $\mathbb{R} \times \{y\}$ *for some* $y \in \mathfrak{F}$.

(b) *For both model (A) and (B), with appropriate choices of the functions* $\{\epsilon_S\}_{S\subsetneq\Pi}$*, the Liouville structure on* $\mathfrak{F}$ *admits a presentation as a (generalized) Weinstein handle decomposition*[11]*, and hence up to deformations*[12]*, they are Weinstein manifolds. The (generalized) critical Weinstein handles of model (B) (resp. model (A)) are indexed by* (σ, S) *with* $S \subsetneq \Pi$ *and* $\sigma \in \pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S))$ *(resp.* (σ, S) *with* $|S| = n-1$*).*

Proof. (a) In the proof, we assume that we are in model (A). All the discussions below can be carried out without much change to model (B)—the only difference is that model (B) has more critical points which results in a slightly longer description.

First, by the construction of H^{sm}, on $\pi_r^{-1}(U'_S)$ we have

$$X_{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}} = \sum_{\beta\notin S} \pi_r^*(\frac{\partial f_S}{\partial r_\beta})|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathfrak{h}_0)}\partial_{\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}}$$

with respect to the splitting $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ over U'_S (cf. (3.1.27) for the notations on dual symplectic coordinates).

Second, recall the vector field $Z_{H^{sm}}$ constructed above, which depends on a choice of $U'_S, S \subsetneq \Pi$ with a partition of unity, and the functions $\epsilon_S \geq 0$ on U'_S, for $|\Pi\backslash S| \geq 2$. Let $a_{S;\beta}, \beta \notin S$ be the function on $U_S^\flat$ as in (3.2.13). Let $\mathfrak{F}_S \subset \pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat)$ be the symplectic hypersurface cut out by the equation

$$F_{U_S^\flat}(|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{-1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathfrak{h}_0)}, \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}; \beta \notin S) := \sum_{\beta\notin S} \pi_r^*(a_{S;\beta}) \cdot \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} = 0. \tag{3.2.16}$$

Since by construction $X_{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}}(F_{U_S^\flat}) > 0$ everywhere on $\pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat)$ (cf. Lemma 3.8 (a1)), $\mathfrak{F}_S$ gives a section of the principal $\mathbb{R}$-bundle $\pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat) \to \pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat)/\mathbb{R}$, generated by the Hamiltonian flow of $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$.

Third, we claim that over any intersection $U_{S_1}^\flat \cap U_{S_2}^\flat$ with $S_2 \subset S_1$, $\mathfrak{F}_{S_1}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{S_2}$ coincide, so $\{\mathfrak{F}_S : S \subsetneq \Pi\}$ glue to be a global symplectic hypersurface. Let $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 \subset \mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ be the identity component, $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0 := \mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$, and let $\pi_r^S : J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0 \to \mathbb{R}^S_{\geq 0}$ denote the projection (3.2.1) for the group $L_S^{\mathrm{der}}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$. Since both $\mathfrak{F}_{S_1}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{S_2}$ are cut out by the *linear equation in each cotangent fiber* of the factor $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_2})_0$ given by

[11] By a *generalized* Weinstein structure, we mean the function ϕ in the Weinstein manifold structure in [CiEl, Section 11.4, Definition 11.10] is Morse-Bott (rather than Morse).

[12] Here a deformation of a Liouville structure means adding the Liouville 1-form by df of a compactly supported function f.

$\omega(Z-\widetilde{Z}_{H^{sm}},-)=0$, where $Z-\widetilde{Z}_{H^{sm}}$ (cf. Lemma 3.8 (a2)) is a vector field tangent to the base with respect to the natural splitting $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_2})_0\cong\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_2})_0\times\mathfrak{z}^*_{\mathfrak{l}_{S_2}}$, we are done.

Let $H_{S^\perp}\subset\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}$ be the (non-closed) smooth hypersurface that projects to $\mathsf{N}_S\cap H^{sm}$ isomorphically, under taking the components in π_r for $r_\beta,\beta\notin S$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_S$ (up to shrinking a little bit) can be canonically symplectically identified with

$$\mathcal{U}_S^{\mathrm{der}}\times_{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}}\times T^*H_{S^\perp} \tag{3.2.17}$$

for some open subset $\mathcal{U}_S^{\mathrm{der}}\subset J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$. The Liouville vector field $Z_{\mathfrak{F}_S}$ also splits as

$$Z_{\mathfrak{F}_S}=Z_{\mathcal{U}_S^{\mathrm{der}}}+Z_{T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}}}+Z'_{T^*H_{S^\perp}},$$

where $Z_{\mathcal{U}_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ and $Z_{T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}}}$ are the standard Liouville vector fields. It is clear that the projection of $Z_{\mathfrak{F}}$ to H^{sm} is exactly $Z_{H^{sm}}$. Note the (original) Liouville 1-form on $\mathfrak{U}_S$ in the factor $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}$ is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta_{S^\perp,\mathbb{R}}&=-\langle t_{\mathbb{R}},\rho^{-1}d\rho\rangle-d\langle t_{\mathbb{R}},\mathsf{h}'_{0,S^\perp}\rangle,\ (\rho,t_{\mathbb{R}})\in\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}\times\mathfrak{z}^*_{\mathbb{R}}\\&=-\sum_{\beta\notin S}\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}dq_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}-d\sum_{\beta\notin S}\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.18}$$

where the second line uses the coordinates from (3.1.28). Let $U'_{>\ell}=\bigcup_{|S|>\ell}U'_S$. To figure out the Liouville vector field $Z'_{T^*H_S}$, we first note that if $\epsilon_S=0$, then in $\pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat\backslash\overline{U'_{>|S|}})$, the vector field $Z-\widetilde{Z}_{H^{sm}}$, which is tangent to the factor $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}$, gives exactly the difference between the Liouville vector field for $\vartheta_{S^\perp,\mathbb{R}}$ and the Euler vector field. Equivalently, we have

$$\omega_{T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}}(Z-\widetilde{Z}_{H^{sm}},-)=-d\sum_{\beta\notin S}\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}.$$

It follows that the part

$$\mathfrak{F}'_S:=\mathfrak{F}_S\cap\pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat\backslash\overline{U'_{>|S|}})$$

is cut out by $\langle t_{\mathbb{R}},\mathsf{h}'_{0,S^\perp}\rangle=\sum_{\beta\notin S}\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}=0$ inside $\pi_r^{-1}(U_S^\flat\backslash\overline{U'_{>|S|}})$, so $Z'_{H^{sm}}$ is equal to the Euler vector field on $T^*H_{S^\perp}$, assuming $\epsilon_S=0$. For the general case, choose a coordinate system $(x_1,\cdots,x_{n-|S|})$ on $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}$ in a neighborhood of $H_{S^\perp}$, so that $H_{S^\perp}$ is defined by $x_{n-|S|}=0$ and c_S has coordinate 0, and let

$$(x_1,\cdots,x_{n-|S|};y_1,\cdots,y_{n-|S|})$$

be the Darboux coordinates on the cotangent bundle of that neighborhood. The vector field $Z_{S^\perp,H^{sm}}$ lifts to a (unique) vector field on $H_{S^\perp}$, which we

write as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} v_j(x_1,\cdots,x_{n-|S|-1})\partial_{x_j}.$$

Similarly $\epsilon_S \cdot Z_{S^\perp,H^{sm}}$ lifts to $\overline{\epsilon}_S(x_1,\cdots,x_{n-|S|-1})\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} v_j\partial_{x_j}$. Then the symplectic hypersurface $T^*H_{S^\perp}$ inside $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}|_{H_{S^\perp}}$ is cut out by the equation

$$-\sum_{\beta\notin S}\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} - \overline{\epsilon}_S(x_1,\cdots,x_{n-|S|-1})\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} v_j(x_1,\cdots,x_{n-|S|-1})y_j = 0.$$

Now we have

$$\vartheta_{S^\perp,\mathbb{R}}|_{T^*H_{S^\perp}} = -\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} y_j dx_j + d(\overline{\epsilon}_S\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} v_j y_j).$$

One can directly calculate the Liouville vector field to be

(3.2.19)

$$Z'_{T^*H_{S^\perp}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} y_j\partial_{y_j} + \overline{\epsilon}_S\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} v_j\partial_{x_j} - \sum_{1\le i,j\le n-|S|-1} y_j\frac{\partial(\overline{\epsilon}_S v_j)}{\partial x_i}\partial_{y_i}$$

Now assume $\epsilon_S > 0$ everywhere with $\max_{U'_S}(|D\epsilon_S|+\epsilon_S)$ sufficiently small. Then

- we can make the last component in (3.2.19) have norm squared

$$\sum_{i,j}|y_j|^2|\frac{\partial(\overline{\epsilon}_S v_j)}{\partial x_i}|^2 \ll \sum_j |y_j|^2 = |\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} y_j\partial_{y_j}|^2,$$

  so $Z'_{T^*H_{S^\perp}}$ is a small perturbation of the sum of the Euler vector field and the lifting of $\overline{\epsilon}_S\cdot Z_{S^\perp,H^{sm}}$ on $H_{S^\perp}$;
- for any convex open pre-compact region $B_S\subset\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}}$ and $\{|t|<R\}\subset\mathfrak{z}_S^*$, we can choose such ϵ_S, so that for the pre-compact region (due to Proposition 3.6):

$$\mathfrak{D}'_{B_S,R} := \mathfrak{F}'_S\cap(\chi_S^{-1}(B_S)\times_{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}((\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0\times\{|t|<R\}))),$$

  the Liouville vector field is pointing *outward* along the boundaries $\{|t|=R\}$, (the preimage of) $\chi_S^{-1}(\partial B_S)$ and (the preimage of) $\partial_v(U_S^\flat\backslash U'_{>|S|})$ (defined similarly as for $\partial_v(U'_S)$), while it is pointing *inward* along the boundary (the preimage of) $\partial_h(U_S^\flat\backslash U'_{>|S|})$;
- The only zero locus of the Liouville vector field is along $\{(g_S,\xi_S;z,t): g_S=I,\xi_S=0,t=0,\pi_r(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)=c_S\}$, which is $|\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S))|$-many orbit(s) of $Z(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}}$ over $c_S\in H^{sm}$.

In the following, choose $0 < \widetilde{\delta}_S < \delta_S$, and let $\widetilde{U}'_S = U_S \cap F^{-1}_{r;S}([0, \widetilde{\delta}_S))$, defined similarly as U'_S in (3.2.9), be a smaller open subset satisfying $\widetilde{U}'_S \cap \big(\bigcup_{S^\dagger \subsetneq S} \mathrm{supp}(\varphi_{U'_{S^\dagger}})\big) = \emptyset$. By easily achieved appropriate choices, we may assume that $\{\widetilde{U}'_S\}_{S \subsetneq \Pi}$ forms an open covering of H^{sm} and Lemma 3.8 (b) applies to $\widetilde{U}'_S$. Now we can define a Liouville domain $\mathfrak{D} \subset \mathfrak{F}$, fibered over H^{sm}, whose completion is $\mathfrak{F}$, inductively on $|S|$ starting with $|S| = n-1$. First, define

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}'_{B_S,R_S} := \mathfrak{D}'_{B_S,R_S} \cap \pi_r^{-1}(\widetilde{U}'_S),$$

for sufficiently large B_S and R_S. For $S = \Pi_\alpha$, let

$$\pi_{r,>n-2} : \mathfrak{D}_{>n-2} := \bigcup_{|S|=n-1} \widetilde{D}'_{B_S,R_S} \longrightarrow \widetilde{U}_{>n-2} := \bigcup_{|S|=n-1} \widetilde{U}'_S$$

be the projection from restriction of π_r. Note that the projection extends by taking the closure of both the source and target, and denote the resulting projection by $\overline{\pi}_{r,>n-2}$.

Suppose we have defined $\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell}$, which is a manifold with corners so that $\partial\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell}$ is stratified with respect to the corner structure, equipped with the projection $\overline{\pi}_{r,>\ell} : \overline{\mathfrak{D}}_{>\ell} \to \overline{\widetilde{U}}_{>\ell} \subset \bigcup_{|S'|>\ell} U^\flat_{S'}$ restricted from π_r, for some open $\widetilde{U}_{>\ell} \supset \bigcup_{|S'|>\ell} \widetilde{U}'_{S'}$, so that $\overline{\pi}^{-1}_{r,>\ell}(\partial\widetilde{U}_{>\ell})$ is a union of strata on which the Liouville vector field is pointing inward, and on its complement (just the open strata) the Liouville vector field is pointing outward. We denote the former by $(\partial\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell})_{in}$ and the latter by $(\partial\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell})_{out}$. Now take any S with $|S| = \ell$, and choose B_S and R_S sufficiently large, so that $\mathfrak{D}'_{B_S,R_S}$ satisfies that

- $\partial\mathfrak{D}'_{B_S,R_S} \cap \pi_r^{-1}\big(\partial_v(U^\flat_S \backslash U'_{>|S|})\big)$ contains all the points in $\mathfrak{F} \cap \pi_r^{-1}\big(\partial_v(U^\flat_S \backslash U'_{>|S|})\big)$ that can be flowed into $\overline{\mathfrak{D}}_{>\ell}$ under the (positive) Liouville flow in $\mathfrak{F}$. This is possible because by construction (cf. Lemma 3.8 (b)), the flow of the projection of the Liouville vector field, which is $Z_{H^{sm}}$, will take all points in $\partial_v(U^\flat_S \backslash U'_{>|S|})$ into $\widetilde{U}_{>\ell}$ in a uniformly bounded time.

Let $B'_S \supsetneq \overline{B_S}, R'_S > R_S$, and let $\mathfrak{T}'_{B'_S,R'_S}$ be the union of flow lines of the Liouville flow starting from $\partial\mathfrak{D}'_{B'_S,R'_S} \cap \pi_r^{-1}\big(\partial_v(U^\flat_S \backslash U'_{>\ell})\big)$ and ending at $\mathfrak{F} \cap \pi_r^{-1}(\partial\widetilde{U}_{>\ell})$, i.e. an embedded suspension of $\partial\mathfrak{D}'_{B'_S,R'_S} \cap \pi_r^{-1}\big(\partial_v(U^\flat_S \backslash U'_{>\ell})\big)$ under the flow. After some (obvious) renormalization of the Liouville vector field, we have the flow time from any initial point on the former to the corresponding ending point on the latter is always 1. This defines a smooth function $\tau : \mathfrak{T}'_{B'_S,R'_S} \to [0,1]$ that records the flow time. Choose any smooth function $\psi_S : B'_S \times \{|t| < R'_S\} \longrightarrow [0,1]$, such that $\psi_S|_{B_S \times \{|t|<R_S\}} = 1$, and $\psi_S = 0$ on a neighborhood of $\partial(B'_S \times \{|t| < R'_S\})$. With some easily achieved appropriate choices, we can make sure that $\pi_r(\mathfrak{T}'_{B'_S,R'_S})$ contains the region

bounded by $\{F_{r;S} = \delta'_S\}$, $\partial_v(U^\flat_S \backslash U'_{>\ell})$ and $\partial\widetilde{U}_{>\ell}$, for some $\delta'_S \in (\widetilde{\delta}_S, \delta_S)$. Then

$$\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S} := \mathfrak{T}'_{B'_S,R'_S} \cap \{\tau < \psi_S(\chi_S(g_S,\xi_S),t)\} \cap \pi_r^{-1}(\{F_{r;S} < \delta'_S\})$$

has $Z_{\mathfrak{F}}$, the Liouville field on $\mathfrak{F}$, pointing inward along the portion of the boundary cut out by $\pi_r^{-1}(\{F_{r;S} = \delta'_S\})$ and $\pi_r^{-1}\big(\partial_v(U^\flat_S \backslash U'_{>\ell})\big)$, denoted by $(\partial\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S})^h_{in}$ and $(\partial\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S})^v_{in}$ respectively, and pointing outward along that cut out by $\{\tau = \psi_S(\chi_S(g_S,\xi_S),t)\}$, denoted by $(\partial\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S})_{out}$.

Lastly, let

$$\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1} = \big(\overline{\mathfrak{D}}_{>\ell} \cup \bigcup_{|S|=\ell} (\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}'_{B'_S,R'_S} \cup \mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S})\big)^\circ.$$

Let $\widetilde{U}_{>\ell-1} = \pi_r(\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1})$, which is open in H^{sm}. Then

- $\widetilde{U}_{>\ell-1} \supset \bigcup_{|S'|>\ell-1} \widetilde{U}'_{S'}$ and $\overline{\widetilde{U}}_{>\ell-1} \subset \bigcup_{|S'|>\ell-1} U^\flat_{S'}$
- Since each $\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S}, |S| = \ell$, is attached to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}'_{B'_S,R'_S}$ and $\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell}$, with its boundary portion $(\partial\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S})_{out}$ completely covering $(\partial\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell})_{in} \cap \pi_r^{-1}(\{(r_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi} \in U'_S : F_{r;S}(r_\beta) < \delta'_S\})$, and its boundary portion $(\partial\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S})^v_{in} \cap \pi_r^{-1}(\partial(\widetilde{U}'_S \backslash \overline{U'_{>\ell}}))$ completely covered by $\partial(\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{B'_S,R'_S})_{out}$, we see that $\overline{\pi}^{-1}_{r,>\ell-1}(\partial\widetilde{U}_{>\ell-1})$ is a union of strata on which the Liouville vector field is pointing inward, and on its complement the Liouville vector field is pointing outward.

Therefore, $\pi_{r,>\ell-1} : \mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1} \to \widetilde{U}_{>\ell-1}$ completes the inductive step. See Figure 5 below for an illustration of the constructions. Let $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{D}_{>-1}$, then $\widetilde{U}_{>-1} = H^{sm}$, and $\pi_r|_{\mathfrak{D}} : \mathfrak{D} \to H^{sm}$ gives the desired Liouville domain (since $Z_{\mathfrak{F}}$ is pointing outward along its boundary) fibered over H^{sm}, whose completion is $\mathfrak{F}$. This is because the Liouville flow on $\mathfrak{F}$ is certainly complete, and there is no zeros of $Z_{\mathfrak{F}}$ outside $\mathfrak{D}$.

(b) It follows directly from part (a) that there is a Morse-Bott type handle decomposition of the Liouville hypersurface $\mathfrak{F}$ for model (A). Namely, over each $U^\flat_S$, there are $|\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S))|$ many handles of index $n-|S|+2|S| = n+|S|$ associated with the zero loci of the Liouville vector field, whose core (i.e. ascending manifold of $Z_{\mathfrak{F}}$) is isomorphic to $(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}}) \times D^{2|S|}$. Now we show that with appropriate choices of the functions ϵ_S, the handles are (generalized) Weinstein handles. We will examine each of the factors in (3.2.17).

Recall the formula of $Z'_{T^*H_{S^\perp}}$ from (3.2.19). We will choose ϵ_S so that it is gradient-like for a Morse function in a neighborhood of the fixed point in $T^*H_{S^\perp}$ as follows. By the assumption that $-r^2_{S^\perp}$ has a Morse singularity at c_S which is a local minimum, we can choose the local coordinates $(x_1, \cdots, x_{n-|S|})$ near c_S, so that the (lifting of the) vector field $Z_{S^\perp,H^{sm}}$ is of the form $\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} x_j\partial_{x_j} + \widetilde{v}$, where $|\widetilde{v}| \le O(|x|^2)$. Let $\epsilon_S = \epsilon$, for a




FIGURE 5. An illustration of the construction of $\pi_{r,>\ell-1}$: $\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1} \to \widetilde{U}_{>\ell-1}$. The picture shows how (a component of) $\mathfrak{T}_{B'_S,R'_S}$ is attached to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}'_{B'_S,R'_S}$ and $\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell}$ so that the resulting (portion of) $\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1}$ has $(\partial\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1})_{in}$ (colored by blue) exactly over $\partial\widetilde{U}_{>\ell-1}$, and $(\partial\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1})_{out}$ (colored by red) is its complement in $\partial\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1}$. Note that $\pi_r^{-1}(\partial H^{sm})$ is *not* part of the boundary of $\mathfrak{F}$ or $\mathfrak{D}_{>\ell-1}$ (although in the picture it seems so). That is why it is not included in $\partial\widetilde{U}_{>\ell-1}$, and its preimage under $\pi_{r,>\ell-1}$ is not colored.

sufficiently small constant $\epsilon > 0$, in a small neighborhood of c_S. Then

$$Z'_{T^*H_{S^\perp}} = (1-\epsilon)\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} y_j\partial_{y_j} + \epsilon\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{n-|S|-1} x_j\partial_{x_j} + Z'', \text{ with } |Z''| \le O(|x|^2+|y|^2).$$

Then $Z'_{T^*H_{S^\perp}}$ is clearly gradient-like for the Morse function $\phi(x,y) = |x|^2 + |y|^2$, and so we get a Weinstein 0-handle.

For the factor $T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}}$, it is a standard generalized Weinstein handle. For the factor $\mathcal{U}_S^{\mathrm{der}}$, the zeros of $Z_{\mathcal{U}_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ are the centers of the Kostant sections of $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$. In a small neighborhood of each of these zeros, we see the attachment of a Weinstein $2|S|$-handle. Hence on the product (after the finite quotient by $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$) we see the attached handles are (generalized) Weinstein handles. Therefore, up to deformations, $\mathfrak{D}$ is a Weinstein domain and $\mathfrak{F}$ as its completion is a Weinstein manifold.

In model (B), for each stratum $\widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{(S_j)_j}$ of codimension k, we can associate $|\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_0}))|$ many index $(2n-1-k)$ (generalized) Weinstein handle(s), whose core is given by $\mathcal{Z}(L_{S_0})_{0,\mathsf{cpt}} \times D^{n-1-k-|S_0|} \times D^{2|S_0|}$. The construction is completely similar to model (A), and we leave the details to the interested reader. □

Remark 3.10.
(i) It is not hard to see that the (generalized) Weinstein structure on $\mathfrak{F}$ from model (A) is (generalized) Weinstein isotopic to that from model (B). The isotopy is essentially governed by a 1-parameter family of H_t^{sm}, with H_0^{sm} (resp. H_1^{sm}) from model (A) (resp. model (B)), where the function r^2 on H_t^{sm} is Morse for all t except for some finite collection $t_1, \cdots, t_k \in (0,1)$, where r^2 has birth-death type critical points (cf. [CiEl, Section 9.1]). Since in the definition of a Weinstein domain (X, ϕ) from *loc. cit.*, one allows $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ to have birth-death type of critical points, we get the desired isotopy, which becomes a Weinstein isotopy after a generic deformation.
(ii) Fixing H^{sm}, for different choices of (ϵ_S), the Liouville hypersurfaces $\mathfrak{F}$ associated with them are canonically symplectomorphic, hence their Liouville structures are all isotopic (cf. [Eli, Section 1]). Also an isotopy of the eligible H^{sm} and (ϵ_S), gives an isotopy of Liouville hypersurfaces $\mathfrak{F}$.

3.2.3. *Partial compatifications of J_G and its Lagrangian skeleton.* Fix a Liouville hypersurface $\mathfrak{F} \subset \widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^{-1}(1)$ as in Proposition 3.9 above, which is Weinstein up to deformations using appropriate choices in the construction. Let $\tilde{I} : \widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^{-1}(1) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that

$$\tilde{I}|_{\mathfrak{F}} = 0, \ X_{\frac{1}{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^2}}(\tilde{I}) = 1.$$

Recall that $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$ is homogeneous of weight $-\frac{1}{2}$ with respect to the Liouville flow. Then the flow of $X_{\frac{1}{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^2}}$ gives an identification $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^{-1}(1) \cong \mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{R}$ from which we see that $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^{-1}(1)$ is a contact manifold with contact form $d\tilde{I} + \vartheta_{\mathfrak{F}}$. Furthermore, we have an isomorphism of exact symplectic manifolds (which in particular identifies the respective Liouville flows)

$$(J_G - \mathcal{B}_1, \vartheta|_{J_G - \mathcal{B}_1} = -\frac{1}{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^2} d\tilde{I} + \vartheta_{\mathfrak{F}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathfrak{F} \times T^{*,>0}\mathbb{R}, -\tau dt + \vartheta_{\mathfrak{F}}), \tag{3.2.20}$$

where $T^{*,>0}\mathbb{R} = \{(t, \tau \cdot dt) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \tau > 0\}$. Using the exact embedding

$$\begin{aligned} T^{*,>0}\mathbb{R} &\hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0} \\ (t, \tau) &\mapsto (-\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}, -2\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} t), \end{aligned}$$

we can embed $J_G - \mathcal{B}_1$ into $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}$, which gives the partial compactification of J_G

$$\overline{J}_G := J_G \coprod_{J_G - \mathcal{B}_1} (\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}).$$

Moreover, We define the completion of J_G as

$$\widehat{J}_G := J_G \coprod_{J_G - \mathcal{B}_1} (\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_z).$$

For later reference, we define the function

$$I : J_G - \mathcal{B}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

determined by the properties that $I|_{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}^{-1}(1)} = -2\tilde{I}$, and it is homogeneous with *weight* $\frac{1}{2}$ with respect to the Liouville flow. Then under the embedding of $J_G - \mathcal{B}_1$ into $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}$, the $\mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}$ has coordinate $q = \Re z = I$ and $p = \Im z = -\frac{1}{\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}}$.

For example, on a conic (with respect to the Liouville flow) open subset in $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$ whose projection to $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$ is disjoint from an open neighborhood of the codimension $< n$ and ≥ 1 faces, we can take

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{N}} = \pi_r^*(\sum_{\beta \in \Pi} r_\beta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.2.21}$$

$$I = 2\pi_r^*(\sum_{\beta \in \Pi} r_\beta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} \Re p_{\beta^\vee}. \tag{3.2.22}$$

Similarly, for any $\emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$, on a conic open subset in $\mathfrak{U}_S$ whose projection to $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$ is disjoint from an open neighborhood of the faces that have vanishing r_β for some $\beta \notin S$, we can set

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}_S = \pi_r^*(\sum_{\beta \notin S} r_\beta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.2.23}$$

$$I_S = 2\pi_r^*(\sum_{\beta \notin S} r_\beta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\beta \notin S} \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}. \tag{3.2.24}$$

using (3.1.28).

Note that for the above choice of $(\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}, I)$ (resp. $(\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}_S, I_S)$), the projection of $Z_{\mathfrak{F}}$ to $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ is completely zero in a neighborhood of the center (resp. $Z_{r;S}$ in a neighborhood of the barycenter c_S). These come from choosing $\epsilon_S = 0$ on some open Ω_S with $\overline{\Omega}_S \subsetneq U'_S$, for any $S \subsetneq \Pi$.

Proposition 3.11. *The partial compactification $\overline{J}_G$ from the given choice of $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$ is a Liouville sector, and is a (generalized) Weinstein sector that is obtained from attaching $|\mathcal{Z}(G)|$ many critical handles to $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}$ if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a (generalized) Weinstein hypersurface. The completion $\widehat{J}_G$ is a Liouville completion of $\overline{J}_G$, and it is a (generalized) Weinstein manifold that is obtained from attaching $|\mathcal{Z}(G)|$ many critical handles to $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_z$ if $\mathfrak{F}$ is (generalized) Weinstein.*

Proof. This is obvious from the fact that $\overline{J}_G$ (resp. $\widehat{J}_G$) is obtained from attaching $|\mathcal{Z}(G)|$-many critical Weinstein handles to $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_z$). □

Proposition 3.12.

(i) *Using the Weinstein structure on $\mathfrak{F}$ from Proposition 3.9 (b) model (B), the Lagrangian skeleton of $\overline{J}_G$ inside $\widehat{J}_G$ has $|\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S))|$ many Lagrangian component(s) for each $S \subset \Pi$.*

(ii) *The Kostant sections $\{g = z\}, z \in \mathcal{Z}(G)$ generate the partially wrapped Fukaya category of the Weinstein sector $\overline{J}_G$.*

Proof. (i) The Lagrangian component(s) for each $S \subset \Pi$ is given by:

- If $S = \Pi$, then $\chi^{-1}([0])$ gives $|\mathcal{Z}(G)|$ many Lagrangian components in the skeleton, and the Kostant sections give their cocores;
- If $S \subsetneq \Pi$, then it gives $|\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S))|$ many Lagrangian components in $\mathrm{Core}(\mathfrak{F})$, the product of which with $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ gives the same amounts of Lagrangian components in the skeleton of $\overline{J}_G$. Let $H_{S^\perp} \subset \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathbb{R}}$ be the (non-closed) smooth hypersurface that projects to $\mathsf{N}_S \cap H^{sm}$ isomorphically, under taking the components in π_r for $r_\beta, \beta \notin S$ (defined in the same way as for model (A)), and let c'_S be the unique fixed point of the Liouville flow. Then the Lagrangian

$$T^* H_{S^\perp}|_{\{c'_S\}} \times T^* \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\mathsf{cpt}}|_{\{z^c_S\}} \times (\{g = I\} \subset J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}) \times \{p = 1\} \subset \mathfrak{F}_S \times \mathbb{C}_z,$$

  for any fixed z^c_S in each component of $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{\mathsf{cpt}}$ gives a cocore[13] of the corresponding Lagrangian component.

(ii) By [GPS2], the above Lagrangian cocores genearate $\mathcal{W}(\overline{J}_G)$. On the other hand, for any Lagrangian cocore corresponding to $S \subsetneq \Pi$, we can perform a Hamiltonian isotopy on the $\mathbb{C}_z$ factor which pushes $\{p = 1\}$ away from $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and so moves the cocore away from $\mathrm{Core}(\mathfrak{F}) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and makes it intersect $\chi^{-1}([0])$ only. Therefore, such cocores are generated by the Kostant sections, using wrapping exact triangles in the stabilization $\overline{J}_G \times T^*[0,1]$ from [GPS2] (see also the proof of Proposition 5.2 (i) in Subsection 6.3 for more details in a similar situation). □

Remark 3.13.

(i) Following Remark 3.10, any Liouville/Weinstein isotopy of $\mathfrak{F}$ will induce in an obvious way Liouville/Weinstein isotopy of $\overline{J}_G$ as sectors.

(ii) We remark on some obvious relations between $\overline{J}_G$ and the log-compactification $\overline{J}^{\log}_G$ (3.1.9) for G of adjoint type. The smooth function $1/\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$ extends to $\overline{J}^{\log}_G$ by 0, and defines a decreasing sequence of tubular neighborhoods $\{1/\widetilde{\mathsf{N}} < \frac{1}{j}\}, j > 1$ (with smooth boundary) of the log-boundary divisor $\partial \overline{J}^{\log}_G$, which are related by the contracting $\mathbb{R}_+$-flow and whose intersection is equal to

[13] To be more precise, we need to replace $\{p = 1\}$ by a cylindrical Lagrangian in $\mathbb{C}_z$, which is similar to that on the right-hand-side of Figure 8.

the boundary divisor. An alternative way to see the normal crossing divisor $\partial\overline{J}_G^{\log}$ is as follows. Let $\mathcal{C}_S$ be the ascending manifold of $\overline{w}_0\overline{w}_S B \in \overline{\chi^{-1}([0])}$ in $\overline{J}_G^{\log}$ with respect to the contracting $\mathbb{C}^\times$-flow, whose union over all $S \subset \Pi$ gives the Bialynicki-Birula decomposition of $\overline{J}_G^{\log}$ (cf. [Bal2]). On $\mathcal{B}_{w_0 w_S} \cong \Sigma_{I;S} \times T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$, where $\Sigma_{I;S} \subset J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ is the Kostant section associated to $g_S = I$, define

$$\mathsf{F}_{S,\beta}(g_S = I, \xi_S; z, t) := \beta(z^{-1}), \beta \in \Pi\backslash S,$$

which extend to be affine coordinates (completed by a choice of affine coordinates on $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ and $\mathfrak{z}_S^*$) on the affine space $\mathcal{C}_S$. The zero locus of $\prod_{\beta\in\Pi\backslash S} \mathsf{F}_{S,\beta}$ gives the normal crossing divisor inside $\mathcal{C}_S$.

4. The Wrapping Hamiltonians and one calculation of wrapped Floer cochains

In this section, we calculate the wrapped Floer complexes for the Kostant sections. Throughout this section, we assume G is semisimple. The main results are Proposition 4.4 and 4.5, which show that the Floer complexes are all concentrated in degree zero, and the generators are indexed by the *dominant* coweights of T for G of adjoint form.

We mention a few basic set-ups for the wrapped Fukaya category of J_G, and give some references on the foundations of Fukaya categories instead of going into any detail of them. To set up gradings for Lagrangians in $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$, we need to choose a compatible almost complex structure $\mathcal{J}$ and trivialize the square of the canonical bundle $\kappa^{\otimes 2}$. For this, we use that J_G is hyperKahler and let $\mathcal{J}$ be the complex structure that is compatible with the real part of the present holomorphic symplectic form on it. Since $(J_G, \mathcal{J})$ is again holomorphic symplectic using the hyperKahler rotated holomorphic symplectic form, $c_1(TJ_G) = 0$ and we can trivialize κ (hence $\kappa^{\otimes 2}$) by the top exterior power of this holomorphic symplectic form. Using this, holomorphic Lagrangians all have constant integer gradings (cf. [Jin, Proposition 5.1]). We remark that since the choice of a grading for a (smooth) Lagrangian is completely topological, we usually don't stick to a single $\mathcal{J}$ or trivialization of $\kappa^{\otimes 2}$.

For a friendly introduction of Fukaya categories, we refer the reader to [Aur]. For the foundations of Fukaya categories, we refer the reader to [Sei1]. For the more recent development of partially wrapped Fukaya categories on Liouville/Weinstein sectors, we refer the reader to [GPS1, GPS2, Syl].

4.1. Choices of wrapping Hamiltonians.

The Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}$ induces a W-invariant Hermitian inner product on $\mathfrak{t}^* \cong \mathfrak{t}$, namely

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_{\mathrm{Herm}} := \langle \xi, \overline{\eta} \rangle,$$

and let $\|\xi\|^2$ (or $|\xi|^2$) be $\langle \xi, \overline{\xi} \rangle_{\mathrm{Herm}}$. For any $R > 0$, let $y_R : [-1, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be any smooth function such that

$$y_R(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}x^2, \ x \leq R, \\ \frac{1}{2}Rx, x > 2R. \end{cases} \tag{4.1.1}$$

Let $\pi_{\mathfrak{t}} : \mathfrak{t} \cong \mathfrak{t}^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{c}$ denote the quotient map.

Let $(\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n)$ be a set of *homogeneous* complex affine coordinates on $\mathfrak{c}$ with respect to the induced $\mathbb{C}^\times$-action from the weight 1 dilating action on $\mathfrak{t}$. Let $u_1, \cdots, u_n$ be the respective weights of the affine coordinates, which are all positive integers. Let $\tilde{u} := \max\{u_1, \cdots, u_n\} + 1$.

Assume $f(\xi)$ is any W-invariant homogeneous smooth (real-valued) function with weight 2 on $\mathfrak{t}$ such that $f|_{\mathfrak{t}-\{0\}} > 0$ and $f(\xi)$ descends to a C^2-function on $\mathfrak{c} - \{[0]\}$. For any $\delta > 0$ small, let

$$p_{\tilde{u},\delta} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tag{4.1.2}$$

be a smooth function such that (1) $0 < p'_{\tilde{u},\delta}(s) \leq 2$, for $s > 0$; (2) $p_{\tilde{u},\delta}(s) = s, s \in [3\delta, \infty)$, and $p_{\tilde{u},\delta}(s) = s^{\tilde{u}}, s \in [0, \delta)$. Then $p_{\tilde{u},\delta} \circ f$ is a W-invariant C^2-function on $\mathfrak{t}$ that descends to a C^2-function[14] on $\mathfrak{c}$, denoted by $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{u},\delta} : \mathfrak{c} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Note that $[0] \in \mathfrak{c}$ is the only critical point (which is a global minimum) of $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{u},\delta}$. We can always perturb $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{u},\delta}$ a little bit near $[0]$ so that $[0]$ is a non-degenerate global minimum, without introducing new critical points. Moreover, we have

$$\|D(p_{\tilde{u},\delta} \circ f)(\xi)\| \leq 2\|Df(\xi)\|, \text{ on } \{\xi \in \mathfrak{t} : f(\xi) \leq 3\delta\}. \tag{4.1.3}$$

Now we describe the induction steps to define a smooth W-invariant function $\widetilde{F}$ that descends to a C^2-function F on $\mathfrak{c}$, and which will serve (after some modifications) as a collection of desired positive wrapping Hamiltonian functions on J_G. Let $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}$ be the standard stratification on $\mathfrak{t}$ indexed by $S \subset \Pi$, with each stratum $\mathfrak{z}_S^\circ$ consisting of points whose stabilizer under the W-action is equal to $W_S = N_{L_S}(T)/T$. For any $S \subset \Pi$, let

$$U_{S,\epsilon} := \{\xi \in \mathfrak{t} : \|\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi\| < \epsilon \cdot \|\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi\|, \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi \in \mathfrak{z}_S^\circ\} \tag{4.1.4}$$

be a $\mathbb{C}^\times$-invariant tubular neighborhood of $\mathfrak{z}_S^\circ$. In each of the following steps, we will choose some $\epsilon_j > 0, j = 1, \cdots, n$, sufficiently small, such that

$$\mathring{U}_{S,\epsilon_{|S|}} := U_{S,\epsilon_{|S|}} - \bigcup_{S' \supsetneq S} U_{S',\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{|S'|}} \tag{4.1.5}$$

are all disjoint for any pair of S without any containment relation.

Step 1. The base case $F_{\leq 0}$ on $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}$.

We start with the function $F_{\leq 0}(\xi) := \|\xi\|^2$ on $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}$. It is clear that the function $F_{\leq 0}$ descends to a smooth function on $\mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}} = \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}/W$.

Step 2. Assumptions on the j-th step function $F_{\leq j}$.

[14] If f descends to a C^k-function on $\mathfrak{c} - \{0\}$, then by sufficiently increasing $\tilde{u}$, we can make $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{u},\delta}$ a C^k-function as well.

Suppose we have defined $F_{\leq j}$ on $\mathfrak{t}_{\leq j} := \mathfrak{t} - \bigcup_{|S|>j} U_{S,\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{(j)}_{|S|}}$, for some choice of $(\epsilon^{(j)}_k)_{k=1,\cdots,n}$ as above, such that $F_{\leq j}$ is a W-invariant homogeneous C^2-function with weight 2 and the following hold:

(i) For any S with $|S| \leq j$, on $\mathring{U}_{S,\epsilon^{(j)}_{|S|}}$ we have

$$F_{\leq j}(\xi) = \|\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi\|^2(1 + f_S(\frac{\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi}{\|\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi\|})), \tag{4.1.6}$$

for some smooth function[15] $f_S : \mathfrak{t}_S \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that descends to a smooth function on $\mathfrak{c}_S := \mathfrak{t}_S /\!\!/ W_S$. In particular, $F_{\leq j}$ descends to a C^2-function on $\mathfrak{c}_{\leq j} := \mathfrak{t}_{\leq j}/W$ (the image of $\mathfrak{t}_{\leq j}$ under $\pi_{\mathfrak{t}} : \mathfrak{t} \to \mathfrak{c}$).

(ii) The function $f_S : \mathfrak{t}_S \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies $f_S(0) = 0$ and $f_S > 0$ on $\mathfrak{t}_S - \{0\}$. Let Z_S be the radial vector field on $\mathfrak{t}_S$, i.e. the vector field generating the weight 1 $\mathbb{R}_+$-action. Then $\iota_{Z_S} df_S > 0$ on $\mathfrak{t}_S - \{0\}$. In particular, this implies that the origin is the only critical point (global minimum) of f_S. For the induced function $\tilde{f}_S : \mathfrak{c}_S \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we require that $[0]$ is a non-degenerate critical point.

(iii)

$$\|Df_S\| \leq 4^j \|D(\|\xi_S\|^2)\|. \tag{4.1.7}$$

Step 3. Modifying and extending $F_{\leq j}$ to $F_{\leq j+1}$.

For any S with $|S| = j + 1 < n$, consider the following intersection:

$$\mathcal{T}_{S,\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}} := U_{S,\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}} \cap \{\xi \in \mathfrak{t} : \|\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi\| = 1\} \cap \bigcup_{S_1 \subsetneq S} \mathring{U}_{S_1,\epsilon^{(j)}_{|S_1|}}.$$

By the requirement on $F_{\leq j}$ (4.1.6), we have for any $S_1 \subsetneq S$

$$F_{\leq j}(\xi)|_{\mathcal{T}_{S,\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}} \cap \mathring{U}_{S_1,\epsilon^{(j)}_{|S_1|}}}$$

$$= (1 + \|\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_{S_1}}\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi\|^2)(1 + f_{S_1}(\frac{\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_{S_1}}\xi}{\sqrt{1 + \|\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_{S_1}}\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi\|^2}})). \tag{4.1.8}$$

In particular, $F_S := F_{\leq j}|_{\mathcal{T}_{S,\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}}} - 1$, which only depends on $\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi$ but not on $\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}(\xi)$ (here we use that $\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi$ is equal to $\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_{S_1}}\xi$ plus $\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_{S_1}}(\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi) = \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_{S_1}}\xi - \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{z}_S}\xi$), descends to a smooth positive function defined on an open "annulus" $\{\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}/2 < \|\xi_S\| < \epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}\}$ around the origin in $\mathfrak{t}_S$, satisfying $\iota_{Z_S} dF_S > 0$.

Now modify F_S inside $\{\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}/2 < \|\xi_S\| < (2/3)\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}\}$, extend it to be homogeneous with weight 2 (or better modify its induced function on a portion of $\mathfrak{c}_S$) on a small neighborhood of the origin in $\mathfrak{t}_S$, then compose it with $p_{\tilde{u},\delta}$ (4.1.2) for appropriate $\tilde{u}$ and $\delta > 0$. The resulting function is

[15] Here we only need f_S in the $\epsilon^{(j)}_{|S|}$-neighborhood of $0 \in \mathfrak{t}_S$.

denoted by f_S, and it is clear that, with some careful choices, f_S satisfies all the conditions in *Step 2*. Note that we can always perturb $\tilde{f}_S : \mathfrak{c}_S \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ a little bit near $[0]$ so that it becomes C^2-smooth and $[0]$ is a non-degenerate minimum, without creating new critical points.

Lastly, define $F_{\leq j+1}(\xi)$ on $\mathring{U}_{S,\epsilon^{(j)}_{|S|}}, |S| = j+1$ by the formula in (4.1.6). Since it matches with $F_{\leq j}$ near the boundary of $\mathcal{T}_{S,\epsilon^{(j)}_{j+1}}$, it extends $F_{\leq j}$ (restricted to a smaller domain) to a desired function on $\mathfrak{t}_{\leq j+1}$, for some new choices of $(\epsilon_k^{(j+1)})_{k=1,\cdots,n}$.

For the case when $j+1 = n$, the modification is simpler: we directly modify $F_{\leq n-1}$ inside $\{\epsilon_n^{(n-1)}/2 < \|\xi\| < (2/3)\epsilon_n^{(n-1)}\}$ to get $F_{\leq n}$ as above. In the end, we set $\widetilde{F} := F_{\leq n}$ on $\mathfrak{t}$, and this finishes the induction step. Let F be the induced function on $\mathfrak{c}$.

Define

$$\widetilde{H}_R := y_R \circ \sqrt{\widetilde{F}} : \mathfrak{t} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tag{4.1.9}$$

$$H_R := y_R \circ \sqrt{F} : \mathfrak{c} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tag{4.1.10}$$

It is clear that both $\widetilde{H}_R$ is smooth and H_R is C^2-smooth on their respective defining domains. By some abuse of notations, we will denote their respective pullback functions on T^*T and J_G by the same notations. Since $J_G \to \mathfrak{c}$ is a complete integrable system, the Hamiltonian flows of H_R on J_G are complete.

Definition 4.1. Assume a Liouville sector $\overline{X}$ has an increasing sequence of Liouville subsectors $\overline{X}_k \subset X, k \geq 1$ such that $\bigcup_k \overline{X}_k = X$ (the interior of $\overline{X}$). We say a Hamiltonian function $H : X \to \mathbb{R}$, whose Hamiltonian flows are complete, is (*nonnegative/positive*) *linear* if each $H|_{\overline{X}_k}, k \geq 1$ is (nonnegative/strictly positive) homogeneous of weight 1 with respect to the Liouville flow outside a compact region in $\overline{X}_k$.

Remark 4.2.

(i) Strictly speaking, by the definition of a linear Hamiltonian on a Liouville sector $\overline{X}$ in [GPS1], one needs the Hamiltonian and its differential to vanish along $\partial\overline{X}$. In the setting of Definition 4.1, we can extend $H|_{\overline{X}_k}$ to be $H_k : \overline{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ which vanishes in a neighborhood of $\partial\overline{X}$. Given any cylindrical $L \subset X$, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, define $\varphi^t_{X_H}(L) := \varphi^t_{X_{H_k}}(L)$ for $k \gg 1$, which is well defined and obviously stabilizes by the completeness of the Hamiltonian flows of H. In particular, the argument in [GPS1, Lemma 3.28] still works with $\mathrm{Ham}(\overline{X})$ replaced by $\mathrm{Ham}(X)$ consisting of linear Hamiltonian functions with complete Hamiltonian flows in the sense of the above definition.

(ii) The Liouville sectors $\overline{J}_G$ and $T^*\overline{M}$ for a smooth compact manifold $\overline{M}$ with boundary both satisfy the conditions in Definition 4.1. The latter is

easy to see. For $\overline{J}_G$, this follows from Proposition 3.6 and the handle attachment description in Proposition 3.11. By the notations from Subsection 5.4.1 below, we can form $(\overline{J}_G)_k = J_G - \mathfrak{F} \overset{\triangle}{\times} \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_k$, for a decreasing sequence $\mathcal{P}_k$ such that $\bigcap_k \mathcal{P}_k = \emptyset$. Then it is clear that H_R is a positive linear Hamiltonian on J_G.

(iii) From (i) and (ii), we see that $\mathcal{W}(\overline{J}_G)$ is independent of the choice of compactifications presented in Section 3.2, i.e. for any two compactifications using different choices of $(\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}, I)$ from Subsection 3.2.2, the wrapped Fukaya categories are canonically equivalent, since all the calculations of the Fukaya categories are performed within J_G in the exactly same way.

4.2. **One calculation of wrapped Floer cochains.** Let G be an adjoint group. Let Σ_I denote for the (only) Kostant section. In this subsection, we calculate $\mathrm{Hom}(\Sigma_I, \Sigma_I)$ using the Hamiltonians defined in (4.1.10). The idea is to use the Lagrangian correspondence (2.1.5) to transform the wrapping process in J_G to a wrapping process in T^*T, with the latter easier to understand. Indeed, since the Hamiltonian function $-\mathrm{proj}_1^* H_R + \mathrm{proj}_2^*(\widetilde{H}_R)$ on $J_G^a \times T^*T$ vanishes on the Lagrangian subvariety $J_G \overset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}$, we have the Lagrangian correspondence equivariant with respect to the Hamiltonian flow $\varphi^s_{H_R}$ on J_G and $\varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}_R}$ on T^*T. For any Lagrangian $L \subset J_G$, let $\widehat{L}$ be the transformation under (2.1.5), e.g. $\widehat{\Sigma}_I = T^*_{\{I\}}T$. Then we have

$$\widehat{\varphi^1_{H_R}(L)} = \varphi^1_{\widetilde{H}_R}(\widehat{L}), \tag{4.2.1}$$

for any $L \subset J_G$.

Implicitly in the definitions (4.1.9), (4.1.10) are the choices of $(\epsilon^j_k)_{k=1,\cdots,n}$. In the following, we assume $\widetilde{H}_R, R \geq 0$ (resp. H_R) as R increases satisfies that the choices of $(\epsilon^j_k)_{k=1,\cdots,n}$ depending on R have limit values 0.

Lemma 4.3. *For any cylindrical Lagrangian L, the Lagrangians $\{\varphi^1_{H_R}(L)\}_{R\geq 0}$ is cofinal in the wrapping category $(L \to -)^+$ (in the sense of* [GPS1, Section 3.4]*).*

Proof. Note that $\varphi^1_{H_R}$ on $\partial^\infty J_G$ is the same as the time R map of the positive contact flow induced by the linear Hamiltonian $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{F}$ on its symplectization. So the lemma follows from the argument in [GPS1, Lemma 3.28]. □

Proposition 4.4. *Assume G is of adjoint type. For a sequence of $R_n \to \infty$, the intersections of $\varphi^1_{H_{R_n}}(\Sigma_I)$ and Σ_I are all transverse and are in degree 0. Morover, as $R \to \infty$, the intersection points are naturally indexed by the dominant coweights of T.*

Proof. Using (4.2.1), we just need to examine the intersection points $\varphi^1_{\widetilde{H}_R}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I) \cap \widehat{\Sigma}_I$ and understand their corresponding intersection points in J_G.

By construction, given any $(\epsilon_j)_{j=1,\cdots,n}$ and $M \gg 1$, for any $S \subset \Pi$, over $\mathring{U}_{S,\epsilon_{|S|}} \cap \{\|\xi\| \leq M\} \subset \mathfrak{t}$ (4.1.5), we have the intersections $\varphi^1_{\widetilde{H}_R}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I) \cap \widehat{\Sigma}_I$ stabilize for $R \to \infty$. Using the form of $\widetilde{H}_R$ in (4.1.7) and the assumptions on f_S, we can conclude that the intersection points there are naturally indexed by $\mathring{U}_{S,\epsilon_{|S|}} \cap \{\|\xi\| \leq M\} \cap X_*(T)$. Now transforming these intersection points to J_G using the opposite Lagrangian correspondence (2.1.5), and using the non-degeneracy of the minimum of $\widetilde{f}_S : \mathfrak{c}_S \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we can conclude that all intersections are transverse and have degree 0, and they are naturally indexed by the dominant coweights $X_*(T)^+$. The proposition thus follows. □

We can do a similar calculation for any semisimple G with center $\mathcal{Z}(G)$. For any $z \in \mathcal{Z}(G)$, let $\mu^\vee(z)$ be any coweight representative of z under the canonical isomorphism $X_*(T_{\mathrm{ad}})/X_*(T) \cong \mathcal{Z}(G)$.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume G is semisimple. Let $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}(G)$. For a sequence of $R_n \to \infty$, the intersections of $\varphi^1_{H_{R_n}}(\Sigma_{z_1})$ and Σ_{z_2} are all transverse and are in degree 0. Morover, as $R \to \infty$, the intersection points are naturally indexed by $(\mu^\vee(z_1) - \mu^\vee(z_2) + X_*(T)) \cap X_*^+(T_{\mathrm{ad}})$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Proposition 4.4. Here we first look at $\varphi_{\widetilde{H}^1_R(\widehat{\Sigma}_{z_1})} \cap \widehat{\Sigma}_{z_2}$, and then transform back to $\varphi^1_{H_{R_n}}(\Sigma_{z_1}) \cap \Sigma_{z_2}$. The intersection points $\varphi_{\widetilde{H}^1_R(\widehat{\Sigma}_{z_1})} \cap \widehat{\Sigma}_{z_2}$ as $R \to \infty$ are exactly indexed by $\mu^\vee(z_1) - \mu^\vee(z_2) + X_*(T)$. Transforming the intersection points to J_G gives $(\mu^\vee(z_1) - \mu^\vee(z_2) + X_*(T)) \cap X_*^+(T_{\mathrm{ad}})$. □

5. Homological mirror symmetry for adjoint type G

For $z \in \mathcal{Z}(G)$, let Σ_z denote for the Kostant section $\{g = z\}$ (which makes sense for all reductive G). In particular, Σ_I is the Kostant section $\{g = I\}$. For G of adjoint type, let

$$\mathcal{A}_G := End(\Sigma_I)^{op}.$$

From now on, we will work with ground field $\mathbb{C}$. The calculation in Proposition 4.4 says that $\mathcal{A}_G$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee /\!\!/ W]$ as a *vector space*. In this section, we prove the main theorem for G of adjoint type:

Theorem 5.1. *Assume G is of adjoint type. There is an algebra isomorphism $\mathcal{A}_G \cong \mathbb{C}[T^\vee /\!\!/ W]$ yielding the HMS result:*

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee /\!\!/ W).$$

Recall that $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ is generated by Σ_I (cf. Proposition 3.12), so the only remaining nontrivial part of Theorem 5.1 is the isomorphism $\mathcal{A}_G \cong \mathbb{C}[T^\vee /\!\!/ W]$. The proof of this isomorphism occupies the last two sections. It uses the functorialities of wrapped Fukaya categories under inclusions of Liouville sectors, developed in [GPS1, GPS2].

5.1. **Statement of main propositions.** From the Weinstein handle attachment description of J_G in Section 3, we see that the inclusion $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T \hookrightarrow J_G$ restricted to a Liouville subsector $\mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0} \simeq T^*\overline{T}$ (with isotopic sector structures), gives an inclusion of Liouville sectors (see Subsection 5.4.2 for the precise formulation). Thus we have the restriction (right adjoint) and co-restriction (left adjoint) functors as adjoint pairs on the (large) dg-categories

$$\mathcal{A}_G - \mathrm{Mod} \underset{co\text{-}res}{\overset{res}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}[T^\vee] - \mathrm{Mod}, \tag{5.1.1}$$

where *co-res* preserves compact objects (i.e. perfect modules).

Proposition 5.2. *For G of adjoint type, we have the following.*

(i) *The co-restriction functor is given by an $\mathcal{A}_G - \mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ that is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus|W|}$ (resp. $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$) as a left $\mathcal{A}_G$-module (resp. right $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-module).*

(ii) *The restriction functor sends $\mathcal{A}_G$ to $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$. In particular, we have*

$$\mathcal{A}_G - \mathrm{Perf} \underset{co\text{-}res}{\overset{res}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathbb{C}[T^\vee] - \mathrm{Perf} \simeq \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0}). \tag{5.1.2}$$

(iii) *The algebra $\mathcal{A}_G$ is embedded as a subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$, hence commutative.*

(iv) *The (commutative) algebra $\mathcal{A}_G$ is finitely generated.*

Proposition 5.3.

(i) *The restriction and co-restriction functors in (5.1.2) can be identified as the !-pullback and pushfoward functors respectively on the (bounded) dg-category of coherent sheaves for a map of affine varieties*

$$\mathsf{f} : T^\vee \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}\mathcal{A}_G. \tag{5.1.3}$$

(ii) *The map f (5.1.3) is W-invariant.*

Assuming Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 5.3, we can give a direct proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Since f from (5.1.3) is W-invariant, it factors as

$$\mathsf{f} : T^\vee \longrightarrow T^\vee /\!\!/ W \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathsf{f}}} \mathrm{Spec}\mathcal{A}_G.$$

By Proposition 5.2 and the Pittie–Steinberg Theorem (cf. [Ste], [ChGi, Theorem 6.1.2]), we have isomorphisms

$$\mathsf{f}_*\mathcal{O}_{T^\vee} \cong (\hat{\mathsf{f}}_*\mathcal{O}_{T^\vee /\!\!/ W})^{\oplus|W|} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{Spec}\mathcal{A}_G}^{\oplus|W|}.$$

So $\hat{\mathsf{f}}_*\mathcal{O}_{T^\vee /\!\!/ W}$ is a line bundle on $\mathrm{Spec}\mathcal{A}_G$, which on the other hand must be trivial, i.e. $\hat{\mathsf{f}}_*\mathcal{O}_{T^\vee /\!\!/ W} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{Spec}\mathcal{A}_G}$. Hence, $\hat{\mathsf{f}}$ is an isomorphism, and the theorem follows.

□

We will give the proof of Proposition 5.2 and 5.3 in Section 6. The key technical results for the proof are Proposition 5.6 and 5.7 below, whose proof will be provided in the same section. Since the motivation for the latter results comes from a relatively easier calculation for certain non-exact Lagrangians, with coefficients in the Novikov field, we will first state the non-exact version in Proposition 5.4. Although it is not logically necessary for the proof of the main theorem, it gives the geometric intuition, and the techniques in its proof in Subsection 6.1 will be used for the proof of the exact version.

Let $\Lambda = \{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j \mathsf{q}^{\gamma_j} : a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma_j \to \infty\}$ be the Novikov field over $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)$ be the wrapped Fukaya category linear over Λ consisting of tautologically unobstructed, tame and asymptotically cylindrical Lagrangian branes (equipped with local systems[16] induced from finite rank local systems over $\mathbb{C}$). When writing the morphism space between two Lagrangian objects, if a Lagrangian (brane) does not come with a local system, we mean the underlying local system is the trivial rank 1 local system. In the following, we fix the grading on Σ_I to be the constant $n = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} T$ (cf. [Jin] for the constant property of gradings on a holomorphic Lagrangian). Since Σ_I is contractible, the Pin structure is uniquely assigned.

Proposition 5.4. *Assume G is of adjoint type. For any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}} \cong i\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$, there exists a non-exact Lagrangian brane $\mathcal{L}_\zeta \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0}^{\dagger};\Lambda)$, with the projection $\pi_\zeta : \mathcal{L}_\zeta \to T$ a homotopy equivalence and $(\pi_\zeta^*)^{-1}[\alpha_{J_G}|_{\mathcal{L}_\zeta}] = \zeta \in H^1(T,\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathfrak{t}^*$, such that*

(i) *The object $(\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho}) \in \mathrm{Perf}_\Lambda(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0}^{\dagger};\Lambda)) \simeq \mathrm{Perf}_\Lambda(\mathbb{C}[T^\vee] \underset{\mathbb{C}}{\otimes} \Lambda)$ corresponds to the simple module $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee] \underset{\mathbb{C}}{\otimes} \Lambda/(x^{\lambda_\alpha^\vee} - \lambda_\alpha^\vee(\check{\rho}) \cdot \mathsf{q}^{i\lambda_\alpha^\vee(\zeta)} : \alpha \in \Pi)$, up to some renormalization $\mathsf{q} \mapsto \mathsf{q}^c$, for some fixed constant $c \in \mathbb{R}^\times$.*

(ii) *Viewing $(\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho})$ as an object in $\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)}((\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho}), \Sigma_I) \cong \Lambda[-n] \tag{5.1.4}$$

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)}(\Sigma_I, (\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho})) \cong \Lambda. \tag{5.1.5}$$

(iii) *For any two objects $(\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho}_1)$ and $(\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)}, w(\check{\rho}_2))$ in $\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)}((\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho}_1), (\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)}, w(\check{\rho}_2))) \cong \begin{cases} H^*(T,\Lambda), & \text{if } \check{\rho}_1 = \check{\rho}_2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, the objects $(\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho})$ and $(\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)}, w(\check{\rho}))$ in $\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)$ are isomorphic, for all $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$ and $w \in W$.

Remark 5.5. In Proposition 5.4, the objects $(\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \check{\rho})$ and $(\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)}, w(\check{\rho}))$ are geometrically modeled on the complex torus fiber $\chi^{-1}([\zeta])$ (which is not a well defined object in $\mathcal{W}(J_G;\Lambda)$). More explicitly, it will follow from the

[16] In general, one allows Λ-local systems with unitary monodromy. Here we restrict to a simpler situation.

construction in Subsection 5.4 that $\mathcal{L}_\zeta \cap \chi^{-1}([\zeta])$ is a compact torus homotopy equivalent to $\chi^{-1}([\zeta])$ (more precisely a $(\chi^{-1}([\zeta]))_{\mathsf{cpt}}$-orbit), and $\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)} \cap \chi^{-1}([\zeta])$ can be thought as (though not identical to) $w(\mathcal{L}_\zeta \cap \chi^{-1}([\zeta]))$. Then $w(\check{\rho})$ on $w(\mathcal{L}_\zeta \cap \chi^{-1}([\zeta]))$ is the pullback local system of $\check{\rho}$ on $\mathcal{L}_\zeta \cap \chi^{-1}([\zeta])$ under w^{-1}. In particular, they define the same local system on $\chi^{-1}([\zeta])$. This morally explains why they are isomorphic in $\mathcal{W}(J_G; \Lambda)$.

Now we state the key propositions in the exact setting. Let $L_0 \subset \mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$ be a "cylindricalization" of the conormal bundle of an orbit of the maximal compact subtorus in T (cf. Subsection 5.4.2 for an explicit construction).

Proposition 5.6. *We have in* $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$*,*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G)}((L_0, \check{\rho}), \Sigma_I) \cong \mathbb{C}[-n] \tag{5.1.6}$$

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G)}(\Sigma_I, (L_0, \check{\rho})) \cong \mathbb{C}. \tag{5.1.7}$$

Proposition 5.7. *For all regular* $\check{\rho} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1(T), \mathbb{C}^\times) \cong T^\vee$*, i.e.* $\check{\rho} \in (T^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}$*, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G)}((L_0, \check{\rho}), (L_0, w_1(\check{\rho}))) \cong H^*(T, \mathbb{C}), w_1 \in W. \tag{5.1.8}$$

In particular, in such cases, the objects $(L_0, \check{\rho})$ *and* $(L_0, w_1(\check{\rho}))$ *viewed as objects in* $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ *are isomorphic.*

In the remaining parts of this section, we develop some analysis in Subsection 5.2 and 5.3 that are crucial for the proof of the key propositions. Strictly speaking, the analysis in Subsection 5.2.2 about $\mathfrak{U}_S, \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$ is not logically needed for the proofs, but it is a natural generalization of the analysis done in Subsection 5.2.1 about $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$. We include this for the sake of completeness and for recording some interesting geometric aspects about $\mathfrak{U}_S$ that may be of independent interest (see Question 5.12 for the main points addressed). In Subsection 5.4, we give the explicit construction of L_0 and $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ that appeared in the above key propositions.

5.2. **Some analysis inside $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ and $\mathfrak{U}_S, S \subsetneq \Pi$.** This subsection is motivated by the following simple observation, and it is crucial for the proof of the main theorem in Section 5. Recall the identification $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$ in Example 2.4. We observe that for a fixed $t \in \mathfrak{t}$ and $h \in T$, as we multiply h by $\epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0}$ for $|\epsilon| \to 0$, the characteristic map

$$\begin{aligned} \chi|_{\mathcal{B}_{w_0}} : &\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{c} \\ &(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h, f + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h)^{-1}} f) \mapsto \chi(f + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h)^{-1}} f) \end{aligned}$$

is getting closer and closer to $\chi(f+t)$, which is the same as the composition of projecting to $t \in \mathfrak{t}$ and the quotient map $\mathfrak{t} \to \mathfrak{c}$. Geometrically, this suggests that for any $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$, $\chi^{-1}([\xi]) \cap \mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ will split into $|W|$ many disjoint sections over a region in T of the form $\bigcup_{|\epsilon|<\eta_0} \epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0} \cdot \mathcal{V}$, for any pre-compact domain $\mathcal{V} \subset T$ and for sufficiently small $\eta_0 > 0$. In the following, we make these into

rigorous statements. In particular, we establish a link between the standard integrable system structure $T^*T \to \mathfrak{t}$ and that inherited from the embedding into $\chi : J_G \to \mathfrak{c}$ (the latter is certainly incomplete, i.e. having incomplete torus orbits) through an interpolating family of "integrable systems" on certain pre-compact regions in T^*T. We also have the general discussions for $\mathfrak{U}_S$ (2.2.6) where the torus with Hamiltonian action(s) is replaced by $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$.

For any $S \subsetneq \Pi$, it would be more convenient to use the identity component of $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$, denoted by $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$, instead of $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ for discussions of Hamiltonian actions. We state the following lemma about the relation between $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$ and $\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S))$ for concreteness.

Lemma 5.8. *For any semisimple Lie group G, we have canonical identifications*

$$\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)) \cong X_*(T_{S,\mathrm{ad}})/\pi_{\mathfrak{t}_S}(X_*(T)) \tag{5.2.1}$$

$$\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}) \cong X_*(T_{S,\mathrm{ad}})/(X_*(T) \cap \mathfrak{t}_S), \tag{5.2.2}$$

where $T_{S,\mathrm{ad}}$ is a maximal torus of $L_{S,\mathrm{ad}}$. In particular, we have a short exact sequence

$$1 \to \pi_{\mathfrak{t}_S}(X_*(T))/(X_*(T) \cap \mathfrak{t}_S) \to \mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}) \to \pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)) \to 1,$$

which gives an identification

$$\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0 := \mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 \cong \pi_{\mathfrak{t}_S}(X_*(T))/(X_*(T) \cap \mathfrak{t}_S). \tag{5.2.3}$$

Proof. First, we have the preimage of $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ in the universal cover $\mathfrak{t}$ of T given by $\{t \in \mathfrak{t}_S : (\alpha, t) \in i\mathbb{Z}, \forall \alpha \in S\} + \mathfrak{z}_S$. So

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_0(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)) &\cong (\{t \in \mathfrak{t}_S : (\alpha, t) \in i\mathbb{Z}, \alpha \in S\} + \mathfrak{z}_S)/(iX_*(T) + \mathfrak{z}_S) \\ &\cong X_*(T_{S,\mathrm{ad}})/\pi_{\mathfrak{t}_S}(X_*(T)).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have the preimage of $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$ in the universal cover $\mathfrak{t}$ given by $iX_*(T_{S,\mathrm{ad}}) \subset \mathfrak{t}_S$ modulo $iX_*(T)$, and so (5.2.2) follows. □

It follows from Lemma 5.8 that for G of adjoint type, $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 = \mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0 = \mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$. Although we assume G of adjoint type for the rest of this section, we use $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ and $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ in the following, since most of the results work directly for a semisimple G.

Let $D_S \subset \mathfrak{t}_S$ be any W_S-invariant pre-compact open neighborhood of $0 \in \mathfrak{t}_S$. Let $\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathfrak{z}_S^\circ$ be any connected pre-compact open region such that

$$\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}} := D_S + \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathfrak{t} \tag{5.2.4}$$

(cf. Figure 6) satisfies

$$w(\overline{\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}}} = \emptyset, \forall w \notin W_S. \tag{5.2.5}$$

Let $\widetilde{\mathrm{pr}}_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}} : \Omega_{D,\mathcal{K}}/W_S \to \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ be the natural (analytic) projection. Let

(5.2.6)
$$\mathfrak{U}_{S,D,\mathcal{K}} := \chi_S^{-1}(D_S/W_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 \times \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}) = \chi_S^{-1}(D_S/W_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} (\mathcal{Z}(L_S) \times \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}),$$

where $\chi_S : J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \to \mathfrak{c}_S$ is the characteristic map. For any $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-invariant pre-compact open region

$$\mathcal{Y}_S \subset \chi_S^{-1}(D_S/W_S) \text{ and } \mathcal{V}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0, \tag{5.2.7}$$

let

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}} := \mathcal{Y}_S \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} (\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp} \times \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}) \tag{5.2.8}$$

Define for any $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{j}_{S;\rho} : \mathfrak{U}_S &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{U}_S \\ (g_S, \xi_S; z, t) &\mapsto (g_S, \xi_S; z\rho, t), \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.9}$$

which preserves the canonical holomorphic symplectic and Liouville 1-form on $\mathfrak{U}_S$ given explicitly by

$$\omega|_{\mathfrak{U}_S} = -(d\langle \xi_S, g_S^{-1} dg_S\rangle + d\langle t, z^{-1}dz\rangle)$$

(5.2.10)
$$\vartheta|_{\mathfrak{U}_S} = -(\langle \xi_S, g_S^{-1}dg_S\rangle + \langle t, z^{-1}dz\rangle - \frac{1}{2} d\langle \xi_S, \mathrm{Ad}_{g_S^{-1}} \mathsf{h}_{0,S} - \mathsf{h}_{0,S}\rangle + d\langle t, \mathsf{h}'_{0,S^\perp}\rangle)$$

Let

$$\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S} := (-\beta \in -\Pi\backslash S) : \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 \longrightarrow (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{\Pi\backslash S} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\Pi\backslash S}. \tag{5.2.11}$$

For $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho)| \ll 1$, and some slightly larger open neighborhood $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{S^\perp}$, the map

$$\mu_{D,\mathcal{K}',\rho} : \mathrm{pr}_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}} \circ \chi \circ \mathfrak{j}_{S;\rho} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp} \tag{5.2.12}$$

is well defined, and it fits into an $(n-|S|)$-dimensional family of deformations of $\mathrm{pr}_{\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}}$ through $\rho \mapsto (c_\beta)_\beta = \gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho)$ (after inserting Ad_ρ between χ and $\mathfrak{j}_{S;\rho}$ in (5.2.12) which has *no* effect on (5.2.12))[17], given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi\backslash S}} &:= \widetilde{\mathrm{pr}}_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}} \circ \chi\Big(\sum_{\beta\in\Pi\backslash S} c_\beta \cdot f_\beta + \xi_S + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{g_S^{-1}}\psi\Big), \\ &\text{for } (c_\beta) \in \mathbb{C}^{\Pi\backslash S}, |(c_\beta)| \ll 1, \text{ and } \psi = \mathrm{Ad}_{z^{-1}\overline{w}_S^{-1}\overline{w}_0}(f - f_{-w_0(S)}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.13}$$

from the same domain. Note that since G has trivial center, there is a one-to-one correspondence between ψ and $z \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$. We will refer to (5.2.13) as the *universal* $(\Pi\backslash S)$-*deformations* of $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K},0} := \mathrm{pr}_{\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}}$. One can view $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K},0}$

[17]Here to simplify notations, we have suppressed the dependence of $\mu_{D,\mathcal{K},\rho}$ on the domain $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}$. Note also that the family of maps $\mu_{D,\mathcal{K},\rho}$ does not necessarily embed into the universal family $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K},(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi\backslash S}}$, because $\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}$ is not always injective.

(originally defined on $\mathfrak{U}_{S,D,\mathcal{K}}$) as the moment map for the obvious Hamiltonian $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-action on the right-hand-side of (5.2.6), and the Hamiltonian reduction is isomorphic to $\chi_S^{-1}(D_S/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0 \subset J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}$. Proposition 5.9 below shows that for every element in the family, functions on $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ induce Poisson commuting Hamiltonian functions on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}$ through pullback, and it is part of an integrable system with complete $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbits.

Proposition 5.9. *For any $(c_\beta)_\beta$ with $|(c_\beta)_\beta| \ll 1$, the image of*

$$\widetilde{\mu}^*_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta} : C^\infty(\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp};\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow C^\infty(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}};\mathbb{R})$$

are Poisson commuting Hamiltonian functions on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}$, with respect the real symplectic structure. The same holds for pullback of holomorphic functions with respect the holomorphic symplectic structure. In fact, letting $S' = S \cup \{\beta \in \Pi\backslash S : c_\beta \neq 0\}$, we have a natural commutative diagram

(5.2.14)
$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\imath}_S^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_0}} & J_{L_{S'}} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{\chi}_{S'}} \\
\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}'}/W_S & \xrightarrow{\jmath} & \mathfrak{t} /\!\!/ W_{S'} \cong \mathfrak{c}_{S'} \times \mathfrak{z}_{S'} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{z}_{S'}
\end{array}
\qquad \widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}$$

for some $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$, that embeds $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}$ holomorphically symplectically into the integrable system

(5.2.15)
$$\widetilde{\chi}_{S',\mathcal{K}'} : \widetilde{\chi}_{S'}^{-1}(\jmath(\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}'}/W_S)) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\chi}_{S'}} \jmath(\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}'}/W_S) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}} \circ \jmath^{-1}} \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$$


with complete $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbits.

Proof. Fix any $(c_\beta)_\beta$ and let S' be as above. Choose $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_0^{-1}}(\sum_{\beta\in\Pi\backslash S} c_\beta \cdot f_\beta) = f_{S'\backslash S}$. We do the following embedding using $\tilde{\imath}_S^{S'}$ from (2.2.14)

$$\tilde{\imath}_S^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_0} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}} \hookrightarrow J_{L_{S'}} = J_{L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}}} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'}^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'})$$

Then comparing $\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_0^{-1}}(\sum_{\beta\in S'\backslash S} c_\beta \cdot f_\beta + \xi_S + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{g_S^{-1}}\psi)$ with the second component of $\tilde{\imath}_S^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_0}(g_S, \xi_S; z, t)$, we see that their difference is contained in $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{p}_{S'}}$ (the nilpotent radical of the standard parabolic subalgebra for S'). This can be directly seen from the equality $\tilde{\imath}_{S'}^{\Pi} \circ \tilde{\imath}_S^{S'} = \tilde{\imath}_S^{\Pi}$ established in Proposition 2.7. Hence, we have the commutative diagram (5.2.14), and the embedding of $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}$ into the integrable system with complete $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbits. □

Remark 5.10. We remark that it is important to view (i.e. fix an embedding of) $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ inside $\mathfrak{z}_S^\circ$ to specify a Hamiltonian $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-action on $\widetilde{\chi}_{S'}^{-1}(\jmath(\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}'}/W_S))$ in Proposition 5.9. In particular, in the following whenever we are talking about integrable systems over $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ with $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-actions, it only makes sense after fixing such an embedding. Changing $\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ by $w \in N_{W_{S'}}(W_S)$ induces the following commutative diagram, where the left $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ and right $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ actions on $\chi_{\mathfrak{l}_{S'}}(\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp})$ at the top are respectively induced from identifying $\chi_{\mathfrak{l}_{S'}}(\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp})$ with $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ and $w(\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp})$. They are related by the automorphism w on $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$.



Let


$$\chi_{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{c} \text{ (resp. } \chi_{\mathfrak{t}} : \mathfrak{t} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{c}) \tag{5.2.16}$$

be the adjoint quotient map, and let

$$\chi_{\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}} := \mathrm{pr}_{\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}} \circ \chi : \chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}})) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}}/W_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp} \tag{5.2.17}$$

be the moment map for the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-action on $\chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}}))$. For some slight enlargement $D'_S \supset \overline{D}_S$ contained in $\mathfrak{t}_S$, we have the commutative diagram

(5.2.18)



for $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| \ll 1$. By Lemma 5.11 below, there is an isomorphism

(5.2.19)

$$\chi_S^{-1}(D'_S/W_S) \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 \times \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}) \longrightarrow \chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{Q}_{D',\mathcal{K}'}))$$

$$(((g_S, \xi_S) \in \mathscr{Z}_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} /\!\!/ L_S^{\mathrm{der}}), (z,t)) \mapsto ((g_S z, \xi_S + t) \in \mathscr{Z}_G /\!\!/ G),$$

where the second line of the presentation (with the elements understood from the respective sublocus) emphasizes that the elements (g_S, ξ_S) are from the centralizer presentation of $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ (2.1.1), rather than the Whittaker Hamiltonian reduction perspective (in particular, $\xi_S + t$ is *not* in $f + \mathfrak{b}$ unless $S = \Pi$) Then the Hamiltonian reduction of $\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}}$ at any point in $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ is then canonically isomorphic to $\chi_S^{-1}(D'_S/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$.

Lemma 5.11. *Let $D_S, \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ satisfy the condition (5.2.5). Then for any $\xi_S^\natural \in (f_S + \mathfrak{b}_S) \cap \chi_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}^{-1}(D_S/W_S)$ and $t^\natural \in \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$, we have $\xi_S^\natural + t^\natural$ is regular in $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. Up to adjoint action by N_S, we may assume that $\xi_S^\natural = f_S + \tau \in \mathfrak{b}_S^-$ for some $\tau \in D_S \subset \mathfrak{t}_S$. We claim that for any $\eta = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+ \backslash \Gamma(S)} c_\alpha e_\alpha \in \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{p}_S}$, $[\xi_S^\natural + t^\natural, \eta] = 0 \Rightarrow \eta = 0$. Suppose $\eta \neq 0$, let α_0 be a maximal root (under the standard partial order) such that $c_\alpha \neq 0$. Then the root component of $[\xi_S^\natural + t^\natural, \eta]$ in $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_0}$ is equal to $[\tau + t^\natural, c_{\alpha_0} e_{\alpha_0}] = c_{\alpha_0}\alpha_0(\tau + t^\natural)e_{\alpha_0}$. By assumption on $D_S + \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$, $\alpha_0(\tau + t^\natural) \neq 0$, for the annihilators in Δ^+ of any element in $D_S + \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ is contained in $\Gamma(S)$. So the claim follows. Similarly, we have for any $\eta = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+ \backslash \Gamma(S)} c_\alpha f_\alpha \in \mathfrak{n}^-_{\mathfrak{p}_S}$, $[\xi_S^\natural + t^\natural, \eta] = 0 \Rightarrow \eta = 0$. Thus the Lie algebra centralizer of $\xi_S^\natural + t^\natural$ is contained in $\mathfrak{l}_S$. Since $\xi_S^\natural + t^\natural$ is regular in $\mathfrak{l}_S$, the lemma follows. □

In the following, fix any $D_S^\dagger, \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}^\dagger$ with the same property as $D_S, \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$, respectively, satisfying

$$\overline{D_S^\dagger} \subset D_S,\ \overline{\mathcal{K}^\dagger}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}. \tag{5.2.20}$$

and we consider

$$\mathcal{Y}_S^\dagger \subset \chi_S^{-1}(D_S^\dagger/W_S), \overline{\mathcal{Y}_S^\dagger} \subset \mathcal{Y}_S \tag{5.2.21}$$

satisfying the similar property as for $\mathcal{Y}_S$ (5.2.7).

Here is the main question that we will answer in this section.

Question 5.12. Since $\mu_{D,\mathcal{K}',\rho}$ fits into the universal $(\Pi\backslash S)$-deformation of $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi\backslash S}}$, in particular for $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho)| \to 0$, it converges to $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K},0} = \mathrm{pr}_{\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}}$, it can be viewed as an interpolating family of incomplete Hamiltonian $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-systems between the complete systems $\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}}$ and $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K},0}$ (the latter viewed on $\mathfrak{U}_{S,D,\mathcal{K}}$). Can we understand the relations between these two complete Hamiltonian $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-systems through the interpolating family? More concretely, we want to investigate the following two aspects of their relations:

(i) The relation(s) between their $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbits: for this (and (ii) below) we take $\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ to be $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}} \times \exp(B_R(0))$ for some standard ball $B_R(0)$ centered at 0 inside $\mathfrak{z}_{S,\mathbb{R}}$, and we will relate

$\mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho}(\{(g_S,\xi_S)\}\times\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}\times\{\kappa\})$ with a $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbit inside $\chi^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}}(\kappa)$, for any $\kappa\in\mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$.

(ii) The relation(s) between the Hamiltonian reductions through $\mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho}$: for the universal $(\Pi\backslash S)$-deformations $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi\backslash S}}$ (5.2.13) with $|(c_\beta)_\beta|$ sufficiently small, we have the characteristic foliations in $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\kappa)$ arbitrarily close to the "standard" foliations

$$\{\{(g_S,\xi_S)\}\times\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}\times\{\kappa\}:(g_S,\xi_S)\in\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_S,\kappa\in\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}\}.$$

In particular, fixing the $|\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0|$-to-1 multi-section of the standard foliation given by $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_S\times\{u_0\}\times\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ for some $u_0\in\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}$, it is transverse to the characteristic foliations in $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\kappa)$ for all $|(c_\beta)_\beta|$ small. After a modification of

$$(\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_S\times\{u_0\}\times\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp})\cap\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\kappa)$$

to be a $\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0$-equivariant multi-section of the symplectic quotient; see the definition of $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)_\beta}$ in Remark 5.21. We get an embedding

$$\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)_\beta}/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0\hookrightarrow\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\kappa)/(\text{characteristic leaves})$$

where the latter has the quotient symplectic structure[18], for all $(c_\beta)_\beta$ near 0 and $\kappa\in\mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$. Now for $\rho\in\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ with $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho)|$ sufficiently small, $\mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho}$ induces a map (which is a *local* symplectic isomorphism) on the "Hamiltonian reductions",

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}:&\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)_\beta}/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0\hookrightarrow\mu^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K}',\rho}(\kappa)/(\text{characteristic leaves})\\&\longrightarrow\chi_S^{-1}(D'_S/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0.\end{aligned}\tag{5.2.22}$$

We would like to understand this map. More specifically, we will show that as we enlarge $\mathcal{Y}_S$ (then so is $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)_\beta}$) and letting $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho)|\to 0$, the map (5.2.22) covers any fixed compact region inside $\chi_S^{-1}(D^\dagger_S/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0$ in the codomain and it is one-to-one (see Proposition 5.26 below).

We remark that Question 5.12 (i), (ii) are nontrivial and are quite useful for understanding the geometry of J_G. The reason is that it is a highly nonlinear question to deduce explicit formulas for the torus fibers $\chi^{-1}([\xi])\cong C_G(\xi)$ for general $\xi\in\mathcal{S}$ and similarly $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbits in $\chi^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}}(\kappa)$, especially (the portion) inside $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ or $\mathfrak{U}_S$. The following two subsections analyze the asymptotic behaviors in certain directions, i.e. $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho)|\ll 1$, making the

[18]The latter quotient space might not have a good structure near $\partial\mathcal{Y}_S\underset{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0}{\times}(\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}\times\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp})$. The embedding from $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)_\beta}/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0$ does not touch such "bad" places.




FIGURE 6. A real picture of $\mathcal{K}$ (green triangular region; here we make it inside the closed cone $\mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$) and $\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}} = D_S + \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ (blue rectangular region) inside $\mathfrak{t}$.

questions approachable, while giving geometric information about the orbits that is sufficient for many purposes.

5.2.1. *Analysis inside* $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$. For $S = \emptyset$, many of the discussions as well as notations can be simplified. We will omit the null inputs $D_\emptyset, \mathcal{Y}_\emptyset, \mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_\emptyset)_0$ in all notations, and we will denote $\mathcal{K}_{\emptyset^\perp}$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}_{\emptyset^\perp}$) simply by $\mathcal{K}$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}$), for which we make the analytic identification $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}|_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{K} \cong \chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K}) \subset \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ (cf. Figure 6). Note that $\chi_{\mathcal{K}} = \chi$, and diagram (5.2.18) specializes to be the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{V}\times\mathfrak{t} & \hookleftarrow & \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{j}_\rho} & \chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K}')) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mu_\rho} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)}=\mu_{\mathcal{K}',\rho}} & \swarrow{\scriptstyle \chi} & \\ \mathfrak{c} & \hookleftarrow & \mathcal{K}' \overset{\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}}{\cong} \chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K}') & & \end{array} \tag{5.2.23}$$

where we add a left column on the deformed μ_ρ well defined on $\mathcal{V}\times\mathfrak{t}$. We emphasize again that if we want to talk about T-action on $\chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K}'))$, we need to specify an embedding of $\mathcal{K}'$ into $\mathfrak{t}$. This is by default through the definition of $\mathcal{K}'$ as a subset of $\mathfrak{t}$.

For $S = \emptyset$, part (ii) of Question 5.12 is trivial. For Question 5.12 (i), our main result not only gives relations between the individual (incomplete) T-orbits, but also establishes an "equivalence" between the integrable systems, restricted to certain pre-compact regions.

Since any $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ is a regular value of χ and $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',0}(\kappa) = T \times \{\kappa\}$, for any pre-compact open region $\mathcal{V} \subset T$ as described in Question 5.12 (i) (the inclusion is in particular a homotopy equivalence), there exist $r_{\mathcal{V}} > 0$ such that for any $(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi}$ satisfying $|(c_\beta)_\beta| < r_{\mathcal{V}}$, we have κ a regular value of $\widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)}$ and $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}'}$ is a smooth Lagrangian section over $\mathcal{V}$.

For a general $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{c}$, we have the following:

Lemma 5.13.

(i) *For any pre-compact open $\mathcal{V} \subset T$ as above, any compact region $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{c}$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists $r_{\mathcal{V},\mathfrak{K},\delta} > 0$ such that for all $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{K}$ and $\rho \in T$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| \leq r_{\mathcal{V},\mathfrak{K},\delta}$, we have*

$$\chi^{-1}([\xi]) \cap (\mathfrak{j}_\rho(\mathcal{V}) \times \mathfrak{t}) \subset \mathfrak{j}_\rho(\mathcal{V}) \times \bigcup_{\xi' \in \mathfrak{t}: \chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\xi') = [\xi]} \{|t - \xi'| < \delta\}. \tag{5.2.24}$$

(ii) *Let $\mathfrak{K}' \subset \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ be a compact subset. Then for any small $\delta > 0$, there exists $r > 0$ such that*

(5.2.25)

$$\chi^{-1}([\xi]) \cap \Big(\bigcup_{|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| \leq r} \mathfrak{j}_\rho(\mathcal{V}) \times \mathfrak{t} \Big) \subset \Big(\bigcup_{|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| \leq r} \mathfrak{j}_\rho(\mathcal{V}) \Big) \times \Big(\bigcup_{\xi' \in \mathfrak{t}: \chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\xi') = [\xi]} \{|t - \xi'| < \delta\} \Big),$$

for all $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{K}'$, and the intersection has $|W|$ many connected components with each projecting to $\bigcup_{|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| \leq r} \mathfrak{j}_\rho(\mathcal{V})$ isomorphically.

Proof. First, by applying $\mathfrak{j}_\rho^{-1}$ on both sides, (5.2.24) is equivalent to

$$\mu_\rho^{-1}([\xi]) \cap (\mathcal{V} \times \mathfrak{t}) \subset \mathcal{V} \times \bigcup_{\xi' \in \mathfrak{t}: \chi(\xi') = [\xi]} \{|t - \xi'| < \delta\}. \tag{5.2.26}$$

Second, we have the homogeneity relation for $(h, t) \in T^*T \cong \mathcal{B}_{w_0}$

$$\epsilon^2 \cdot \mu_\rho(h, t) = \mu_\rho(h \cdot \epsilon^{-\mathfrak{h}_0}, \epsilon^2 \cdot t) = \mu_{\rho \cdot \epsilon^{-\mathfrak{h}_0}}(h, \epsilon^2 \cdot t)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \mu_\rho(h, t) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \mu_{\rho \cdot \epsilon^{-\mathfrak{h}_0}}(h, \epsilon^2 \cdot t)$$

This implies that $\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mu_\rho^{-1}([\xi]) \cap (\mathcal{V} \times \mathfrak{t}))$ is contained in a compact region for all ρ with $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)|$ small. Then (5.2.26) follows from that μ_ρ is a small deformation of $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}} \circ \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}}$.

Assuming $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$, there exists $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ as above, such that $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}^{-1}([\xi]) = \{w(\xi') : w \in W\} \subset \coprod_{w \in W} w(\mathcal{K})$ for some $\xi' \in \mathcal{K}$. Then for $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)|$ sufficiently small, $\mu^{-1}_{w(\mathcal{K}'),\rho}(w(\xi'))$ is a Lagrangian section in $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},w(\mathcal{K}')}$ over $\mathcal{V}$. This directly implies the second part of the lemma. □

In particular, Lemma 5.13 implies that for any $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$, inside the preimage of π_r over

$$\mathrm{Cone}(\mathcal{V}_{\log}) \cap \{\sum_{\beta \in \Pi} r_\beta > R\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}_{\geq 0}, \tag{5.2.27}$$

for a pre-compact open subset $\mathcal{V}_{\log}$ in the interior of $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ and $R \gg 1$, $\chi^{-1}([\xi])$ splits into $|W|$ disjoint sections over that region. Moreover, the sections are getting closer and closer to the constant sections indexed by $\{\xi' \in \mathfrak{t} : \chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\xi') = [\xi]\}$ as $R \to \infty$. Here we are using the notations in Subsection 3.2.1. Near the end of this subsection, we will give a more precise description of these $|W|$ disjoint sections inside $\chi^{-1}([\xi])$.

Now we work specifically with the setting written before Lemma 5.13.

Lemma 5.14. *Under the above settings, for each $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger$, the Lagrangian*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho} := \mu^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',\rho}(\kappa) \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}, \text{ where } |\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| < r_{\mathcal{V}} \tag{5.2.28}$$

(resp.

$$\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(c_\beta)} := \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\kappa) \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}, \text{ where } |(c_\beta)_\beta| < r_{\mathcal{V}})$$

satisfies

(i) *$\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(c_\beta)}$) is a smooth Lagrangian section over $\mathcal{V}$ that is Hamiltonian isotopic to $\mathcal{V} \times \{\kappa\}$ inside $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}'}$. The same holds for $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(c_\beta)}$.*

(ii) *The natural inclusion $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho} \overset{\mathfrak{j}_\rho}{\longhookrightarrow} \chi^{-1}([\kappa])$ is a homotopy equivalence. Moreover, if we use the canonical identification with respect to $\xi = \kappa$ and $B_1 = B$ in (2.1.6), (2.1.7), $\nu_\kappa : \chi^{-1}([\kappa]) \overset{\sim}{\to} C_G(\kappa) \cong T$, then the sequence of maps*

$$T \overset{h.e.}{\hookleftarrow} \mathcal{V} \cong \mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho} \overset{\mathfrak{j}_\rho}{\longhookrightarrow} \chi^{-1}([\kappa]) \overset{\sim}{\to} C_G(\kappa) \cong T \tag{5.2.29}$$

induces a homotopy equivalence from T (identified with $B/[B,B]$) to itself that is isotopic to the identity map.

Proof. (i) Fix a basis for $H_1(\mathcal{V},\mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho},\mathbb{Z})$ (the isomorphism is the canonical one induced from the projection $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho} \overset{\sim}{\to} \mathcal{V}$) and denote each 1-cycle by Γ_i. First, the family of embeddings

$$\mathcal{V} \cong \mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho} \overset{\mathfrak{j}_\rho}{\longhookrightarrow} \chi^{-1}([\kappa]) \tag{5.2.30}$$

induces the same map on homology $\widetilde{\mathfrak{j}} : H_1(\mathcal{V},\mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_1(\chi^{-1}([\kappa]);\mathbb{Z})$. Since $\mathfrak{j}_\rho$ preserves holomorphic Liouville forms (5.2.10) in the case when $S = \emptyset$, we have for any Γ_i,

$$\int_{\Gamma_i} \vartheta|_{\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho}} = \int_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{j}}(\Gamma_i)} \vartheta|_{\chi^{-1}([\kappa])}, \tag{5.2.31}$$

where the right-hand-side does *not* depend on ρ. On the other hand, we have

$$\lim_{|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)|\to 0} \int_{\Gamma_i} \vartheta|_{\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho}} = \int_{\Gamma_i} \vartheta|_{\mathcal{V}\times\{\kappa\}} = \langle \kappa, \Gamma_i \rangle. \tag{5.2.32}$$

So we have

$$\int_{\Gamma_i} \vartheta|_{\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho}} = \langle \kappa, \Gamma_i \rangle, \forall i.$$

The same holds for $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(c_\beta)}$ because every $(c_\beta)_\beta$ is in the closure of $\gamma_{-\Pi}(T)$. These imply (i).

(ii) Since (5.2.30) gives an isotopy class of embeddings over $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$, it suffices to prove (ii) for generic $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger$. For generic choices of κ, we may assume that $\langle \kappa, - \rangle$ on an integral basis of $H_1(\mathcal{V};\mathbb{Z})$ is a set of linearly independent complex numbers over $\mathbb{Q}$, equivalently the map $\langle \kappa, - \rangle : H_1(\mathcal{V},\mathbb{Q}) \to \mathbb{C}$

is an embedding of vector spaces over $\mathbb{Q}$. Note that the right-hand-side of (5.2.31) is equal to $\langle \kappa, \nu_\kappa(\widetilde{\mathrm{j}}(\Gamma_i))\rangle$ with respect to the canonical identification $\nu_\kappa : \chi^{-1}([\kappa]) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_G(\kappa) \cong T$. This can be directly seen from the Lagrangian correspondence (2.1.5) that induces an exact symplectomorphism $\chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K})) \cong T \times \mathcal{K}$. Now from the equality between (5.2.31) and (5.2.32), we see that $\Gamma_i, i = 1, \cdots, n$, contained in $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho}$, gives a basis of $H_1(\chi^{-1}([\kappa]); \mathbb{Z})$, and this shows that $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,\rho} \hookrightarrow \chi^{-1}([\kappa])$ is a homotopy equivalence. Moreover, by the same consideration, the sequence of maps (5.2.29) induces the identity map on $H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$, hence it induces a homotopy equivalence that is isotopic to the identity. □

Proposition 5.15. *Under the same setting as for Lemma 5.14, for any pre-compact open $\mathcal{V}^\dagger \subsetneq \mathcal{V}$ (defined similarly as for $\mathcal{V}$) and any smooth curve $(c_\beta(s))_\beta, s \in (-\epsilon', \epsilon')$ with $(c_\beta(0))_\beta = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}^\Pi$, there exists a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy $\varphi_s, 0 \leq s \leq \epsilon$ (with $\varphi_0 = id$) on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{K}$, for some sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, such that*

$$\varphi_s(\mathcal{V}^\dagger \times \{\xi\}) \subset \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}([\xi]),$$

for every $\xi \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger \subset \mathcal{K}$ and $s \in [0, \epsilon]$.

Proof. Fix a reference point $u_0 \in \mathcal{V}$. The Lagrangian section $\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}$ of the Lagrangian fibration $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{K}$ gives a Lagrangian section for

$$\widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta} : \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(\mathcal{K}^\dagger) \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^\dagger, |s| \text{ sufficiently small.} \tag{5.2.33}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that ϵ' is sufficiently small, so that the above holds for all $s \in (-\epsilon', \epsilon')$. By Proposition 5.9, for every s, (5.2.33) is part of a complete integrable system with each fiber a complete T-orbit. So with respect to some fixed real linear coordinates $(p^j_c; p^j_{\mathbb{R}}), 1 \leq j \leq n$ on $\mathfrak{t}^* \cong \mathfrak{t} \cong \mathfrak{t}_c \oplus \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ (e.g. those introduced in (3.1.27)), there are canonical (locally defined) affine coordinates on the fibers $(q^j_{c,s}; q^j_{\mathbb{R},s})$, with base points defined by the Lagrangian section $\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}$, such that the real symplectic form ω is of the form $-\sum_j dp^j_{c,s} \wedge dq^j_{c,s} + dp^j_{\mathbb{R},s} \wedge dq^j_{\mathbb{R},s}$. Here

$$p^j_{c,s}(u_0, \xi) = p^j_c(\widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(u_0, \xi)),\ p^j_{\mathbb{R},s}(u_0, \xi) = p^j_{\mathbb{R}}(\widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(u_0, \xi))$$

on $\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}$. We will use $(q^j_c, q^j_{\mathbb{R}}; p^j_c, p^j_{\mathbb{R}})$ to denote for $(q^j_{c,0}, q^j_{\mathbb{R},0}; p^j_{c,0}, p^j_{\mathbb{R},0})$.

For any $0 < s \leq \epsilon'$, using Proposition 5.9, we can define a T-equivariant symplectomorphism

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_{s,\rho_0} : T \times \mathcal{K}^\dagger \longrightarrow \widetilde{\chi}^{-1}_{S'}(\jmath(\mathcal{K}^\dagger)) \tag{5.2.34}$$

over $\mathcal{K}^\dagger$, that respects the restriction of the chosen Lagrangian sections $\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}$ and $\widetilde{\iota}^{S'}_\emptyset \circ \mathrm{j}_{\rho_0}(\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K})$, where S' and ρ_0 depend on $(c_\beta(s))_\beta$.

Now the restriction of $\widetilde{\varphi}_{s,\rho_0}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_s :&\mathcal{V}^\dagger \times \mathcal{K}^\dagger \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(\mathcal{K}^\dagger) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}\\ &(q_c^j, q_{\mathbb{R}}^j; p_c^j, p_{\mathbb{R}}^j) \mapsto (q_{c,s}^j = q_c^j, q_{\mathbb{R},s}^j = q_c^j; p_{c,s}^j = p_c^j, p_{\mathbb{R},s}^j = p_{\mathbb{R}}^j),\end{aligned}$$

with respect to the coordinates defined above, which is *independent* of the choice of ρ_0. Since the coordinates $(q_{c,s}^j, q_{\mathbb{R},s}^j; p_{c,s}^j, p_{\mathbb{R},s}^j)$ change smoothly with respect to s, for sufficiently small $s > 0$, φ_s is well defined and smoothly depending on s. Note that this actually gives an alternative proof of Lemma 5.14 (ii).

Lastly, by Lemma 5.14 (i), we see that $\varphi_s^*\vartheta_{\mathrm{std}} - \vartheta_{\mathrm{std}}$ is an exact 1-form (which is bounded because all the constructions can be extended to the larger neighborhood $\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{K}$), using the restriction of the standard real Liouville form ϑ_{std} on T^*T. Equivalently, one can use $\vartheta|_{\mathcal{B}_{w_0}}$ instead of ϑ_{std}. Hence φ_s can be extended to be a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy on $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{K}$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Notations 5.16. For inclusion of open cones $C_\triangleleft \subset C'_\triangleleft \subset \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}} - \{0\}$ (recall $\mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$ is closed), we use the notation $C_\triangleleft \dot{\subset} C'_\triangleleft \dot{\subset} \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}} - \{0\}$ to indicate the condition that $\overline{C}_\triangleleft - \{0\} \subset C'_\triangleleft$ and $\overline{C'}_\triangleleft - \{0\} \subset \mathring{\mathfrak{t}}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Lemma 5.17. *Assume the same setting as for Lemma 5.14. Fix any open cones $C_\triangleleft \dot{\subset} C'_\triangleleft \dot{\subset} \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}} - \{0\}$. Then there exists $\epsilon_{C_\triangleleft} > 0$ and $M > 0$, such that for all $|(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi}| < \epsilon_{C_\triangleleft}$ and all $\eta \in C_\triangleleft \subset C^\infty(\mathcal{K};\mathbb{R})$ (or equivalently viewed as a holomorphic function in the holomorphic setting), the Hamiltonian vector field $X_{\eta;(c_\beta)}$ of the pullback function $\widetilde{\mu}^*_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\eta)$ satisfies the following:*

for any $(u,\xi) \in \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\mathcal{K}^\dagger) \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{K}$, the projection of $X_{\eta;(c_\beta)}(u,\xi)$ in $T_u\mathcal{V} \cong \mathfrak{t}$ is contained in $C'_\triangleleft + \mathfrak{t}_c$ and

$$|X_{\eta;(c_\beta)}(u,\xi) - (\mathfrak{j}_u)_*\eta(u,\xi)| \leq M \cdot |(c_\beta)_\beta| \cdot |\eta|.$$

Proof. It is clear from the definition (5.2.13)

$$\widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(u,\xi) = \xi + \sum_{\beta\in\Pi} c_\beta P_\beta(u,\xi) + \cdots$$

has a convergent analytic expansion in c_β with coefficients in analytic $\mathfrak{t}^*$-valued functions of (u,ξ). Thus the holomorphic Hamiltonian vector field $X^{hol}_{\eta;(c_\beta)}$ has an analytic expansion

$$X^{hol}_{\eta,(c_\beta)}(u,\xi) = (\mathfrak{j}_u)_*\eta + \sum_{\beta\in\Pi} c_\beta X^{hol}_{\eta;\beta}(u,\xi) + \cdots$$

where $\eta \in \mathfrak{t}$ is the invariant vector field on each fiber $\mathcal{V} \times \{\kappa\} \subset T \times \{\kappa\}$ and $X^{hol}_{\eta;\beta}$ is the holomorphic Hamiltonian vector field of $\langle \eta, P_\beta(u,\xi)\rangle$. Note that the corresponding real Hamiltonian vector field is $X_{\eta;(c_\beta)} = 2\Re X^{hol}_{\eta;(c_\beta)}$. Since $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}$ is pre-compact, the lemma follows. □

Similarly as for $\widetilde{\varphi}_{s,\rho_0}$ (5.2.34) in the proof of Proposition 5.15, we define for $|(c_\beta)_\beta| \ll 1$

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_{(c_\beta),\rho_0} : T \times \mathcal{K}^\dagger \longrightarrow \widetilde{\chi}_{S'}^{-1}(\jmath(\mathcal{K}^\dagger)) \tag{5.2.35}$$

to be the T-equivariant symplectomorphism over $\mathcal{K}^\dagger$ that sends the Lagrangian section $\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}^\dagger$ to the restriction of $\widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K})$, where S' and ρ_0 depending on $(c_\beta)_\beta$ are as in Proposition 5.9. In particular, $\gamma_{-S'}(\rho_0) = (c_\beta)_{\beta \in S'}$.

For any subset $C \subset \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ - \{0\}$, let T_C denote for the preimage of C through the real logarithmic map $\log_{\mathbb{R}} : T \to \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Proposition 5.18. *Fix any open cone $C_\triangleleft \dot{\subset} \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ - \{0\}$. Under the same setting as for Lemma 5.14, there exists $\epsilon_{C_\triangleleft} > 0$ such that for all $|(c_\beta)_\beta| < \epsilon_{C_\triangleleft}$ and $\rho' \in T_{C_\triangleleft}$,*

$$\rho' \star (\widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(\overline{\widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}^{-1}(\mathcal{K}^\dagger)})) \subset \widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0\rho'}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V}',\mathcal{K}'}), \tag{5.2.36}$$

where ρ_0 is associated with $(c_\beta)_\beta$ as above, and the action on the left-hand-side is from the T-action on the right-hand-side of (5.2.35) with respect to $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K}') \cong \mathcal{K}'$ (cf. Remark 5.10) . Moreover, for any chosen $\delta > 0$, we can choose $\epsilon_{C_\triangleleft} > 0$ so that there is a uniform bound

$$dist((\widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0\rho'})^{-1}(\rho' \star (\widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u,\xi))), (u,\xi)) < \delta \tag{5.2.37}$$

for all $(u,\xi) \in \widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}^{-1}(\mathcal{K}^\dagger) \subset \mathcal{V}' \times \mathcal{K}'$ and $\rho' \in T_{C_\triangleleft}$. Here the distance is taken with respect to the standard T-invariant metric on $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$.

Proof. First, choose $C_\triangleleft \dot{\subset} C'_\triangleleft \dot{\subset} \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ - \{0\}$, $\epsilon_{C_\triangleleft} > 0$ and $M > 0$ satisfying the assumption and conclusion in Lemma 5.17. By fixing the embedding $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ into $J_{L_{S'}}$ through $\widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'}$, we can view everything inside $J_{L_{S'}}$, so we will omit $\widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'}$ in the proof. Since the embedding $\widetilde{\imath}_\emptyset^{S'}$ is $\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'})$-equivariant for the obvious $\mathcal{Z}(L_{S'})$-action on the source and target, the proposition can be reduced to the case when $S' = \Pi$ and $(c_\beta)_\beta = \gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho_0)$. It suffices to prove (5.2.37) for the chosen Lagrangian section $\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}$, and it is equivalent to saying

$$\rho' \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi}) \in \mathcal{B}_{w_0}, \text{ and } dist(\rho' \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0,\widetilde{\xi}), \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0\rho'}(u_0,\xi)) < \delta, \tag{5.2.38}$$

where $(u_0, \widetilde{\xi}) = (\{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}) \cap \widetilde{\mu}_{\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}^{-1}(\xi)$.

For any $\eta \in C_\triangleleft$ and $\rho'_c \in T_c$, let $\Upsilon_\eta(s) = \rho'_c \cdot \exp(s \cdot \eta), s \geq 0$. With given (c_β), we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}\Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0,\widetilde{\xi}) = X_{\eta,(c_\beta)}(\Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0,\widetilde{\xi})). \tag{5.2.39}$$

We claim that

$$\Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0,\widetilde{\xi}) \subset (T_{C'_\triangleleft} \cdot \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(\mathcal{V})) \times \mathcal{K} \tag{5.2.40}$$

for all $s \geq 0$. Suppose the contrary, there exists $r > 0$ such that (5.2.40) holds for $s \in [0,r)$ but $\Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0,\widetilde{\xi})$ is outside $(T_{C'_\triangleleft} \cdot \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(\mathcal{V})) \times \mathcal{K}$. Pick

$r_1 < r$ that is very close to r, and let $\rho_1 = u_0^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{proj}_T(\Upsilon_\eta(r_1) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi})) \in u_0^{-1} \cdot T_{C'_\triangleleft} \cdot \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(\mathcal{V})$, then

$$\mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}^{-1}(\Upsilon_\eta(r_1) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi})) \in \{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}.$$

Since

$$\mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}^{-1}(\Upsilon_\eta(r_1) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi})) \in \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}', (\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho_1))}(\xi),$$

and $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho_1)| < \epsilon_{C_\triangleleft}$, we have $\mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}^{-1}(\Upsilon_\eta(r_1) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi}))$ very close to (u_0, ξ). Hence by a similar argument as in Proposition 5.15, there exists a fixed interval $[0, \nu], \nu > 0$, depending only on η, such that for any $\epsilon \in [0, \nu]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}^{-1}(\Upsilon_\eta(r_1 + \epsilon) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi})) \subset T_{C'_\triangleleft} \cdot \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}^{-1}(\mathrm{proj}_T(\Upsilon_\eta(r_1) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi}))) \times \mathcal{K} \\
\Rightarrow &\Upsilon_\eta(r_1 + \epsilon) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi}) \subset T_{C'_\triangleleft} \cdot (\mathrm{proj}_T(\Upsilon_\eta(r_1) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi}))) \times \mathcal{K} \subset (T_{C'_\triangleleft} \cdot \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(\mathcal{V})) \times \mathcal{K}.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $r_1 > r - \nu$ gives a contradiction to the assumption that (5.2.40) does not hold at r.

We show the estimate on distance in (5.2.38). Let $\rho_\eta(s) = \mathrm{proj}_T(\Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi}))$, then we have

(5.2.41)
$$(\mathfrak{j}_{u_0 \rho_\eta(s)^{-1}})_* \frac{d}{ds} \rho_\eta(s) = \mathrm{proj}_T X_{\eta, \gamma_{-\Pi}(u_0^{-1}\rho_\eta(s))}(\mathfrak{j}^{-1}_{u_0^{-1}\rho_\eta(s)}(\Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{\rho_0}(u_0, \widetilde{\xi})))$$

where both sides are contained in $T_{u_0}\mathcal{V}$. Using the estimate from Lemma 5.17, we get

$$|u_0 \rho_\eta(s)^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} \rho_\eta(s) - (\mathfrak{j}_{u_0})_* \eta| \leq M \cdot |\gamma_{-\Pi}(u_0^{-1}\rho_\eta(s))| \cdot |\eta|.$$

By the assumption on $C'_\triangleleft$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\beta_i \in \Pi$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon \leq \frac{\beta_j}{\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i} \leq 1 - \varepsilon \text{ on } C'_\triangleleft \\
\Rightarrow &|\gamma_{-\Pi}(u_0^{-1}\rho_\eta(s))| \leq n |\beta_j(u_0^{-1}\rho_\eta(s))|^{-\frac{1}{K}}
\end{aligned}$$

for every j and a uniform constant $K > 0$ only depending on ε. Therefore, looking at each component $\beta(\rho_\eta(s)) \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ for (5.2.41), we get

$$\beta(\rho_\eta(s))^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} \beta(\rho_\eta(s)) = \beta(\eta) + O(|\beta(\rho_\eta(s))|^{-\frac{1}{K}} \cdot |\eta|). \tag{5.2.42}$$

Let $F_\beta(s)=\log|\beta(\rho_\eta(s))e^{-\beta(\eta)s}|$, then the above on the real parts implies

$$|\frac{d}{ds}F_\beta(s)|\leq \widetilde{M}\cdot e^{-\frac{F_\beta(s)}{K}-\frac{\beta(\eta)s}{K}}|\eta|,\ \beta\in\Pi$$
$$\Rightarrow|\frac{d}{ds}e^{\frac{F_\beta(s)}{K}}|\leq\frac{\widetilde{M}}{K}e^{-\frac{\beta(\eta)s}{K}}|\eta|$$
$$\Rightarrow|e^{\frac{F_\beta(s)}{K}}-|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|^{1/K}|\leq\widetilde{M}'(1-e^{-\frac{\beta(\eta)s}{K}})\leq\widetilde{M}'$$
$$\Rightarrow K\log(|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|^{1/K}-\widetilde{M}')\leq F_\beta(s)\leq K\log(|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|^{1/K}+\widetilde{M}')$$
$$\Rightarrow K\log(1-\frac{\widetilde{M}'}{|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|^{1/K}})\leq F_\beta(s)-\log|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|\leq K\log(1+\frac{\widetilde{M}'}{|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|^{1/K}}).$$

Here $K,\widetilde{M}'$ only depend on $u_0,C_\lhd,C'_\lhd$. Assume that we have chosen $|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|,\beta\in\Pi$, sufficiently large, equivalently $|(c_\beta)_\beta|$ sufficiently small, then

(5.2.43)
$$|\log|\beta(\rho_\eta(s)\rho_\eta(0)^{-1})e^{-\beta(\eta)s}||=|F_\beta(s)-\log|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))||<\delta',\forall\beta\in\Pi,s\geq 0$$

for arbitrarily small $\delta'>0$.

Lastly, taking the imaginary part of (5.2.42) and using the above, we get

$$\frac{d}{ds}\arg\beta(\rho_\eta(s))=O(|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|^{-\frac{1}{K}}e^{-\frac{\beta(\eta)s}{K}}\cdot|\eta|)$$
$$\Rightarrow|\arg\beta(\rho_\eta(s))-\arg\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|\leq\widetilde{M}'|\beta(\rho_\eta(0))|^{-\frac{1}{K}}.$$

By choosing $|(c_\beta)_\beta|$ sufficiently small, we can make the right-hand-side arbitrarily small, and also make $\rho_\eta(0)$ very close to $\rho'_c\rho_0u_0$. Thus we have proved the distance estimate in (5.2.38). □

Now we are ready to give a refinement of Lemma 5.13.

Corollary 5.19. *Under the same setting as in Proposition 5.18, for any $\delta>0$, there exists $\epsilon_{C_\lhd}>0$ such that for any $(u,\xi)\in\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{K}^\dagger$, $\rho_1\in T$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho_1)|<\epsilon_{C_\lhd}$ and $\rho'\in T_{C_\lhd}$, we have*

(5.2.44) $$dist(\rho'\star\mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}(u,\xi),\mathfrak{j}_{\rho'\rho_1}(u,\xi))<\delta$$

Moreover,

(5.2.45) $$dist(w^{-1}(\rho')\star\mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}(u,w(\xi))),\mathfrak{j}_{\rho'\rho_1}(u,w(\xi)))<\delta,\forall w\in W,$$

where both the T-action denoted by $\star$ are taken with respect to $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K}')\cong\mathcal{K}'\subset\mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ (cf. Remark 5.10). The distance is taken with respect to the standard T-invariant metric on T^*T.

Proof. First, (5.2.44) is the special case of Proposition 5.18 (5.2.37) for $S'=\Pi$. Although in the proposition, it is stated for $(u,\xi)\in\mu^{-1}_{\mathcal{K}',\rho_1}(\mathcal{K}^\dagger)\subset\mathcal{V}'\times\mathcal{K}'$, it also holds for $\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{K}^\dagger$ by enlarging the former $\mathcal{K}^\dagger$ slightly.

Second, for any $w\in W$, using $(u,w(\xi))\in\mathcal{V}\times w(\mathcal{K}^\dagger)$, we have

$$dist(\rho'\star\mathfrak{j}_{\rho_1}(u,w(\xi))),\mathfrak{j}_{\rho'\rho_1}(u,w(\xi)))<\delta,$$

where the T-action denoted by $\star$ here is *with respect to* $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{K}') \cong w(\mathcal{K}') \subset \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}$. By Remark 5.10, this T-action differs from the T-action in (5.2.45) by w, hence (5.2.45) follows. □

5.2.2. *Analysis inside* $\mathfrak{U}_S, \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$. In this section, we generalize several results from Subsection 5.2.1 to $\emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$. We also give an answer to Question 5.2.20 (ii), which was trivial for $S = \emptyset$. Recall the notations from Question 5.2.20. In particular, we are under the settings depicted in Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. A picture of the fiber $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi\setminus S}}(\kappa)$, where the blue multi-section (it is connected although we draw it disconnected in this low dimensional picture) indicates the intersection of $\mathcal{Y}_S \times \{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ with the fiber, and the green curves represent the characteristic foliations.

First, we state some direct generalizations of results from Subsection 5.2.1. For any $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$, let $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(g_S,\xi_S),(c_\beta)}$ denote for the characteristic leaf in $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\kappa) \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}'}$ that passes through the point $(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, \widetilde{\kappa})$. Note that $\widetilde{\kappa}$ is uniquely determined for the restriction of $\widetilde{\mu}_{D,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)}$ from $\{(g_S,\xi_S)\} \times \{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ to $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ is an open embedding. Let $\mathcal{D}_{(g_S,\xi_S)}$ be a contractible neighborhood of (g_S, ξ_S) in $\mathcal{Y}_S$ that is contained in a fundamental domain of the $\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0$-action. Then Lemma 5.14 immediately generalizes to the following form.

Lemma 5.20. *Under the above settings, there exists $r_{\mathcal{V}} > 0$ such that for all $|(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi\setminus S}| < r_{\mathcal{V}}$, we have for each $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$, the characteristic leaf $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(g_S,\xi_S),(c_\beta)}$ satisfies*

(i) *$\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(g_S,\xi_S),(c_\beta)}$ is a smooth section over $\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}$ that is Hamiltonian isotopic to $\{(g_S,\xi_S)\} \times \mathcal{V}_{S^\perp} \times \{\kappa\}$ inside*

$$\mathcal{D}_{(g_S,\xi_S)} \times (\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp} \times \mathcal{K}') \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}'}. \tag{5.2.46}$$

(ii) *The natural inclusion $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(g_S,\xi_S),(c_\beta)} \overset{\widetilde{\iota}^{S'}_S \circ \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_0}}{\hookrightarrow} \widetilde{\chi}^{-1}_{S',\mathcal{K}'}(\kappa)$ from (5.2.15) induces a homotopy equivalence from the former to the $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbit*

that contains it. Moreover, by reverting the first homotopy equivalence, the sequence

$$\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 \longleftarrow \mathcal{V}_{S^\perp} \cong \mathcal{S}_{\kappa,(g_S,\xi_S),(c_\beta)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0 \star \widetilde{\iota}_S^{S'}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0\rho_0,\widetilde{\kappa}) \cong \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$$

induces a homotopy equivalence from $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ to itself that is isotopic to the identity.

Proof. It follows from the same proof for Lemma 5.14. □

Remark 5.21. For $(\kappa,(c_\beta)_\beta)$ ranging in the space

$$\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp} \times \{(c_\beta)_\beta \in \mathbb{C}^{\Pi\setminus S} : |(c_\beta)_\beta| < r_{\mathcal{V}}\}, \tag{5.2.47}$$

the intersection $(\mathcal{Y}_S \times \{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}) \cap \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(\kappa)$ gives a $|\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0|$-multi-section over its image in the reduced space, i.e. the quotient of $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}(\kappa)$ by the characteristic leaves. In the following, we modify these multi-sections to be $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-equivariant with respect to the "moment map" $\widetilde{\mu}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}$. For $(c_\beta)_\beta = 0$, the multi-section is $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-invariant with respect to $\widetilde{\mu}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K}',0}$. For close by $(c_\beta)_\beta$, we can do an averaging process, to make the multi-section $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-invariant with respect to $\widetilde{\mu}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}$ after applying Proposition 5.9. More precisely, since the multi-section is very close to be $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-invariant, for any characteristic leaf, we can use the respective $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-action to move the points in the original multi-section to a small neighborhood of any chosen one of the points (the result will be independent of the chosen point), then we do an average in that small neighborhood (using the $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-action from group elements near the identity) which is well defined, and we turn its $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-orbit to be the new multi-section restricted to that leaf. This gives the modification, and we denote the resulting multi-section for $(c_\beta)_\beta$ as $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)}$. If $(c_\beta)_\beta = \gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)$ for some $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$, we also denote $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)}$ by $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,\rho}$.

Lemma 5.22. *Fix $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$. Assume that $\mathcal{Y}_{S,R}$ is defined by*

$$\mathcal{Y}_{S,R} := \{\sum_{\beta\in S} |b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathrm{h}_0;S)}} < R\} \tag{5.2.48}$$

inside $\chi_S^{-1}(D_S/W_S) \subset J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$. Then

(i) *Fix any compact region in the Hamiltonian reduction of $\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}}$ at κ, which is also canonically identified with $\chi_S^{-1}(D'_S/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$. For any $R>0$ sufficiently large, there exists $\epsilon_R > 0$ such that for all $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| < \epsilon_R$, the image of some fixed tubular neighborhood of the "horizontal boundary" of $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,R;\kappa,\rho}$ (i.e.*

the intersection of $\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger}_{S,R;\kappa,\rho}$ *with a tubular neighborhood of*

$$\{\sum_{\beta\in S}|b^{S}_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S)|^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathfrak{h}_{0;S})}}=R\},$$

in $\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(\kappa)$*) under* $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}$ *(5.2.22), is outside the fixed compact region.*

(ii) *Fixing* $R>0$*, the image of* $\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger}_{S,R;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)_0$ *under* $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}$ *is contained in some fixed compact region, for all* $\rho\in\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ *with sufficiently small* $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)|$.

The same claims hold with $\mu_{D',\mathcal{K}',\rho}$ *replaced by* $\widetilde{\mu}_{D',\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}$ *for* $|(c_\beta)_{\beta\in\Pi\setminus S}|$ *sufficiently small.*

Proof. First, the statements about $\widetilde{\mu}_{D',\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta)_\beta}$ can be deduced from those about $\mu_{D',\mathcal{K}',\rho}$ by replacing the group G with $L_{S'}$ and using Proposition 5.9. So it suffices to prove the statements for $\mu_{D',\mathcal{K}',\rho}$.

For any $\mathcal{Y}_{S,R}$, we choose ρ with $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)|$ sufficiently small so that $\mu_{D',\mathcal{K}',\rho}:\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S,R},\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}\to\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ is well defined. Fix any point $(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)$ in $\mu^{-1}_{D',\mathcal{K}',\rho}(\kappa)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume ξ_S is from the Kostant slice $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{der}}_S}$ for the semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{der}}_S$, and g_S be the respective centralizing element. Recall the notation from (2.2.8) $(\phi_S g_S z,\Xi_S(g_S,\xi_S;z,t))$. For $\mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho}(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)$, there exists a (unique) $u_\rho\in N$ such that

$$(u_\rho\phi_S g_S z\rho,\Xi_\rho:=\Xi_S(g_S,\xi_S;z\rho,t)) \tag{5.2.49}$$

is a centralizing pair. As $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)|\to 0$, Ξ_ρ is approaching $\Xi_0:=(f-f_S)+\xi_S+t$.

On the other hand, let $(g^\natural_{S,\rho},\xi^\natural_{S,\rho};z^\natural_\rho,t^\natural_\rho)$ be a representative of $\mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho}(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)$ under the isomorphism (5.2.19). Here we also assume that $\xi^\natural_{S,\rho}$ is in the Kostant slice $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{der}}_S}$, so then it is uniquely determined. It is clear from the above discussion that $\xi^\natural_{S,\rho}$ (resp. $t^\natural_\rho$) is arbitrarily close to ξ_S (resp. t) as $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)|\to 0$. In particular, there exists $\epsilon_{g_S}>0$ (the dependence is only on g_S due to the boundedness of ξ_S,z,t) such that for ρ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)|<\epsilon_{g_S}$, we can find $Q_\rho=u^-_{1,\rho}u_{2,\rho}\in N^-_{P_S}\cdot N$ with $u^-_{1,\rho}$ (resp. $u_{2,\rho}$) contained in a fixed compact region in (the opposite of the unipotent radical of P_S) $N^-_{P_S}$ (resp. arbitrarily close to $I\in N$), such that $\mathrm{Ad}_{Q_\rho}(\Xi_\rho)=\xi^\natural_{S,\rho}+t^\natural_\rho$. More explicitly, we first find $u^-_{1,\rho}\in N^-_{P_S}$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}_{(u^-_{1,\rho})^{-1}}(\xi^\natural_{S,\rho}+t^\natural_\rho)=(f-f_S)+\xi^\natural_{S,\rho}+t^\natural_\rho$ (this follows from a similar argument as for [ChGi, Lemma 3.1.44]). Since Ξ_ρ is arbitrarily close to $(f-f_S)+\xi^\natural_{S,\rho}+t^\natural_\rho$ (and both of them are in $f+\mathfrak{b}$) and they are in the same adjoint orbit, we can find $u_{2,\rho}\in N$ close to I such that $\mathrm{Ad}_{u_{2,\rho}}\Xi_\rho=(f-f_S)+\xi^\natural_{S,\rho}+t^\natural_\rho$.

We must have an equality

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Ad}_{Q_\rho}(u_\rho \phi_S g_S z \rho) = g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural \\ \Leftrightarrow &\mathrm{Ad}_{u_{2,\rho}}(u_\rho \phi_S g_S z \rho)(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} = (u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.50}$$

Now we compare the value of $|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|, \beta \in \Pi$ on both sides.

First, we consider the case when $\beta \notin S$. Let us evaluate $|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|$ on the right-hand-side of (5.2.50). Recall that

$$|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}((u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural)| = |\langle (u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural (v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}), v_{-w_0(\lambda_{\beta^\vee})} \rangle|, \tag{5.2.51}$$

where $v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}$ and $v_{-w_0(\lambda_{\beta^\vee})}$ are highest weight vectors in $V_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}$ and $V^*_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} \cong V_{-w_0(\lambda_{\beta^\vee})}$ and the right-hand-side is the absolute value of the pairing[19]. If $\beta \notin S$, then

$$\mathbb{C} \cdot (u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural (v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot (u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} (v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}})$$

is an invariant line of $\mathrm{Ad}_{u_{2,\rho}}(\Xi_\rho)$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Ad}_{u_{2,\rho}}(\Xi_\rho) \cdot (u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} = \mathrm{Ad}_{(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1}}(\xi_{S,\rho}^\natural + t_\rho^\natural) \cdot (u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} \\ &= \lambda_{\beta^\vee}(t_\rho^\natural)(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.23 below, (5.2.51) is nonzero and we have

$$\begin{aligned} &c \cdot |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z_\rho^\natural)| \le |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}((u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural)| \le C \cdot |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z_\rho^\natural)|, \text{ for } |\gamma_{-\Pi \setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0, \\ &(g_S, \xi_S; z, t \text{ fixed}), \beta \notin S \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.52}$$

for some fixed positive constants $c, C > 0$. On the other hand, if we evaluate $|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|$ on the left-hand-side of (5.2.50), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &k \cdot |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z\rho)| \le |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(\mathrm{Ad}_{u_{2,\rho}}(u_\rho \phi_S g_S z \rho)(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1})| \le K \cdot |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z\rho)|, \\ &\text{as } |\gamma_{-\Pi \setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0 \ (g_S, \xi_S; z, t) \text{ fixed}, \beta \notin S \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.53}$$

for some fixed constants $k, K > 0$. This uses that for a fixed basis $v_\mu^{(j)}$ in the μ-weight space of $V_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}$, we have

$$(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} = v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} + \sum_{\varpi \in \Sigma(\Delta^+ \setminus \Gamma(S)) \setminus \{0\}, j} c_{\varpi,\rho}^{(j)} v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee} - \varpi}^{(j)}, \tag{5.2.54}$$

where (i) $\Sigma(\Delta^+ \setminus \Gamma(S)) \subset X^*(T_{sc})$ is the monoid spanned by $\Delta^+ \setminus \Gamma(S)$ over $\mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$; (ii) the summation has only finitely many (possibly) nonzero terms indexed by $\lambda_{\beta^\vee} - \varpi$ (belonging to the convex hull of $W \cdot \lambda_{\beta^\vee}$) and j; (iii) $|c_{\varpi,\rho}^{(j)}|$ are uniformly bounded and $u_{2,\rho} \overset{\text{close}}{\sim} I$ (near the limit). Note that we can choose c, C, k, K uniformly for all $(g_S, \xi_S; z, t)$, *but* the range of ρ so that

[19] More precisely, we need to take a lift of $(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural$ in G_{sc} to make $b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}$ well defined. But the value of $|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|$ does not depend on the choice of the lifting. Similarly, the line $\mathbb{C} \cdot (u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural z_\rho^\natural (v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}})$ does not depend on the choice of the lifting either.

(5.2.52) and (5.2.53) hold depends on $(g_S, \xi_S; z, t)$, which is very important[20]. Comparing (5.2.52) and (5.2.53), we see that there exist uniform constants $m, M > 0$ such that

$$m|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z\rho)| \leq |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z_\rho^\natural)| \leq M|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z\rho)|, \beta \in \Pi, |\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0 \text{ (fixing } g_S, \xi_S; z, t) \tag{5.2.55}$$

$\Leftrightarrow z\rho(z_\rho^\natural)^{-1}$ is contained in a *uniformly* bounded region in $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)$ near the limit.

Presumably, the above only works for $\beta \notin S$, but since $\lambda_{\beta^\vee}, \beta \notin S$ gives a finite indexed sublattice of $X^*(\mathcal{Z}(L_S))$ (also technically we should lift everything to G_{sc}), the same inequalities hold for all $\beta \in S$ as well.

Now we rewrite the relation (5.2.50) as

$$\phi_S g_S z\rho Q_\rho^{-1}(z_\rho^\natural)^{-1} = u_\rho^{-1} Q_\rho^{-1} g_{S,\rho}^\natural. \tag{5.2.56}$$

The left-hand-side can be rewritten as

$$\phi_S g_S(z\rho(z_\rho^\natural)^{-1})\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{2,\rho}^{-1}(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1}) = \phi_S g_S(z\rho(z_\rho^\natural)^{-1})\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{2,\rho})^{-1}\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1}. \tag{5.2.57}$$

By the assumption that $z, z_\rho^\natural \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ and $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0$, we have $\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{1,\rho}^-)^{-1} \to I$ and $\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{2,\rho})^{-1} \in u_{2,\rho}^{-1} \cdot N_{P_S}$. For any $\beta \in S$, we compare $|b_{\lambda_\beta^\vee}|$ on both sides of (5.2.57) after multiplying $\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{1,\rho}^-)$ on the right to each side, and get

$$|b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S)| \cdot |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(z\rho(z_\rho^\natural)^{-1})| = |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}((u_\rho^{-1}Q_\rho^{-1}g_{S,\rho}^\natural)\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{1,\rho}^-))|.$$

Suppose $g_{S,\rho}^\natural$ is contained in a fixed bounded (i.e. compact) domain $\mathfrak{Q}$ in L_S^{der}, for $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0$ with $(g_S, \xi_S; z, t)$ fixed, then by (5.2.55) and the uniform boundedness of the right-hand-side, we see that $|b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_S)|$ is uniformly bounded. Hence by Proposition 3.6, g_S is contained in a fixed bounded domain (that only depends on $\mathfrak{Q}$) in L_S^{der}. This implies (i).

For (ii), we use (5.2.56) and (5.2.57) again, and get

$$\phi_S g_{S,\rho}^\natural \mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{1,\rho}^-) = \phi_S Q_\rho u_\rho \phi_S g_S(z\rho(z_\rho^\natural)^{-1})\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{2,\rho})^{-1}.$$

For any $\beta \in S$, we compare $|b_{\lambda_\beta^\vee}|$ on both sides. Using $\mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{1,\rho}^-) \in N_{P_S}^-$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_{S,\rho}^\natural)| &= |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(\phi_S g_{S,\rho}^\natural \mathrm{Ad}_{z_\rho^\natural}(u_{1,\rho}^-))| \\ &= |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(\phi_S Q_\rho u_\rho \phi_S g_S(z\rho(z_\rho^\natural)^{-1}))|, (\text{fixing } g_S, \xi_S; z, t). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.58}$$

Since (5.2.58) above is uniformly bounded for (g_S, ξ_S, z, t) in a fixed compact region $\mathfrak{Q}'$ in $\mathfrak{U}_S$ (near the limit of ρ), $|b^S_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(g_{S,\rho}^\natural)|$ is uniformly bounded. Hence by Proposition 3.6 again, $(g_{S,\rho}^\natural, \xi_{S,\rho}^\natural)$ is contained in a fixed compact region in $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ depending only on $\mathfrak{Q}'$. This proves (ii). □

[20] In fact, the range of valid ρ only depends on g_S, because ξ_S, z, t are bounded.

Lemma 5.23.

(i) *Let V_λ be the irreducible highest weight representation of G_{sc} corresponding to $\lambda \in X^*(T_{sc})^+$, and let v_λ be a fixed highest weight vector. Then for any vector $v \in G_{sc} \cdot v_\lambda \subset V_\lambda$ that generates an invariant line of a Lie algebra element $f+\xi_1 \in f+\mathfrak{b}$, it has a nonzero lowest weight component with weight $w_0(\lambda)$.*

(ii) *Let $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ (resp. $Q \subset G$) be a compact subset. Let $V_\lambda^{w_0(\lambda),\circ}$ the open subset of V_λ consisting of vectors with* nonzero *weight component in $w_0(\lambda)$. Then the subset in V_λ defined by*

$$V_\lambda^{\mathfrak{K},Q} := \{v \in Q \cdot v_\lambda : \mathbb{C} \cdot v \text{ is an invariant line of some element in } f + \mathfrak{K}\}$$

is compact in $V_\lambda^{w_0(\lambda),\circ}$. In particular, the function $|(-, v_{-w_0(\lambda)})| : V_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for a fixed highest weight vector $v_{-w_0(\lambda)}$ in $V_\lambda^* \cong V_{-w_0(\lambda)}$, has a strictly positive minimum and a finite maximum on $V_\lambda^{\mathfrak{K},Q}$, if $V_\lambda^{\mathfrak{K},Q} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. (i) Let P_λ be the standard parabolic that fixes the line generated by v_λ. First, we have the canonical embedding $\iota : G/P_\lambda \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)$, that sends every gP_λ to $\mathbb{C} \cdot gv_\lambda$. Let N_{P_λ} be the unipotent radical of P_λ. The left N_{P_λ} action on G/P_λ gives the Bruhat decomposition, indexed by the T-fixed points $x_{w(\lambda)}, w(\lambda) \in W \cdot \lambda \cong W/W_\lambda$ which correspond to the lines generated by the weight vectors $v_{w(\lambda)}$ (defined unique up to scaling). Since the line generated by v in question is in the image of ι, the lemma is equivalent to saying that the corresponding point $\tilde{v}$ in G/P_λ for $\mathbb{C} \cdot v$ must lie in $N_{P_\lambda} \cdot x_{w_0(\lambda)}$.

Suppose the contrary that $\tilde{v}$ is not in $N_{P_\lambda} \cdot x_{w_0(\lambda)}$. Then

$$\tilde{v} \in \bigsqcup_{\mu \in W \cdot \lambda \backslash \{w_0(\lambda)\}} N_{P_\lambda} \cdot x_\mu.$$

In particular, $v = av_\mu + \sum_{\mu \prec \mu'} q_{\mu'}$ for some $\mu \in W \cdot \lambda \backslash \{w_0(\lambda)\}$, $a \neq 0$ and some weight vectors $q_{\mu'}$ in the weight spaces of μ'. Now apply $f+\xi_1 \in f+\mathfrak{b}$ to v. The invariance of $\mathbb{C} \cdot v$ implies that $v_\mu \in \ker f$, i.e. $f_\alpha \cdot v_\mu = 0, \forall \alpha \in \Pi$. However, this contradicts to the assumption that μ is *not* the lowest weight, so part (i) of the lemma follows.

(ii) First, we have the closed incidence subvariety in $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)$

$$\mathcal{X}_{V_\lambda, f+\mathfrak{b}} := \{(\xi, [v]) \in \mathfrak{b} \times \mathbb{P}(V_\lambda) : [v] \text{ is an invariant line of } f + \xi\},$$

Note that the condition that $[v]$ is an invariant line of $f+\xi$ is the same as saying that the vector field on $\mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)$ corresponding to $f+\xi$ vanishes at $[v]$. We have the projection (resp. proper projection) $p_{\mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)} : \mathcal{X}_{V_\lambda, f+\mathfrak{b}} \to \mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)$ (resp. $p_\mathfrak{b} : \mathcal{X}_{V_\lambda, f+\mathfrak{b}} \to \mathfrak{b}$). Let $\pi : V_\lambda - \{0\} \to \mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)$ be the natural projection. Then for the given compact $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ and $Q \subset G$, we have

$$V_\lambda^{\mathfrak{K},Q} = \pi^{-1}(p_{\mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)} p_\mathfrak{b}^{-1}(\mathfrak{K})) \cap (Q \cdot v_\lambda).$$

Since $Q \cdot v_\lambda$ is compact inside $V_\lambda - \{0\}$ and $\pi^{-1}(p_{\mathbb{P}(V_\lambda)} p_\mathfrak{b}^{-1}(\mathfrak{K})) \subset V_\lambda - \{0\}$ is closed, the intersection $V_\lambda^{\mathfrak{K},Q}$ is compact.

By part (i), $V_\lambda^{\mathfrak{K},Q} \subset V_\lambda^{w_0(\lambda),\circ}$. The last sentence then follows immediately. □

Corollary 5.24. *Fix the setting as in Question 5.12, and use $\mathcal{Y}_{S,R}$ from Lemma 5.22. As we increase $R \uparrow \infty$ and for each R choose $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ with $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)|$ sufficiently small, the map on Hamiltonian reductions $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}$ (5.2.22) gives a symplectic covering map over every fixed pre-compact open region inside $\chi^{-1}(D_S^\dagger/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ (after restriction to the preimage).*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.22. Without loss of generality, by enlarging the original D_S to be $\widetilde{D}_S$, we can replace $D_S^\dagger$ by D_S. It suffices to consider a sequence of pre-compact regions $\mathcal{P}_{S,K^{(n)}}$ defined by the same equation as for $\mathcal{Y}_{S,K^{(n)}}$ (5.2.48), with $K^{(n)} \to \infty$, that are inside $\chi_S^{-1}(D_S^{(n)}/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ through (5.2.19) (contained in the Hamiltonian reduction of $\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}}$ at κ). Here $D_S^{(n)}$ is an increasing sequence of W_S-invariant pre-compact open in D_S with $\bigcup_n D_S^{(n)} = D_S$. Since the image of $\mathcal{Y}_{S,R_0;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ under the map $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}$, for some fixed $R_0 > 0$, is contained in a compact region in the target, as $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0$, we can choose $K_1 \gg R_0$, such that $\mathcal{P}_{S,K_1}$ contains the same image (note that $\mathcal{P}_{S,K_1}$ is connected for K_1 sufficiently large). For any $K^{(n)} > K_1$, as we increase R towards ∞ and at the same time let $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0$, we have $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}_{S,R;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0) \supset \mathcal{P}_{S,K_1}$ and

$$\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}(Nb(\partial^h(\mathcal{Y}_{S,R}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0))) \cap Nb(\partial^h \mathcal{P}_{S,\widetilde{K}}) = \emptyset, \forall \widetilde{K} \in [K_1, K^{(n)}],$$

where $Nb(\partial^h - -)$ stands for a fixed tubular neighborhood of the "horizontal boundary"of $\mathcal{Y}_{S,R;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ and $\mathcal{P}_{S,K_1}$ respectively, in the same sense as in Lemma 5.22 (i). On the other hand, a sufficiently thin tubular neighborhood of the "vertical boundary" of $\mathcal{Y}_{S,R;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$, given by the intersection of a thin neighborhood of $\chi_S^{-1}(\partial D_S/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ with its closure, has image outside the closure of $\chi_S^{-1}(D_S^{(n)}/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$, for the reason that $(\xi_{S,\rho}^\natural, t_\rho^\natural) \to (\xi_S, t)$ when $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| \to 0$ as in the proof Lemma 5.22. So these imply that $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}_{S,R;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0) \supset \mathcal{P}_{S,K^{(n)}}$, and it must be a covering map from the preimage of $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}$ over $\mathcal{P}_{S,K^{(n)}}$. □

Using Lemma 5.22, we also have direct analogue of Lemma 5.17, Proposition 5.18 and Corollary 5.19, for which we only state in the form of the corollary that will be applied later. In the following, we fix a $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})$-invariant complete metric on $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$, e.g. the complete hyperKahler metric constructed in [Bie]. Then it determines a complete $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-invariant metric on $\mathfrak{U}_S$ by the Killing form restricted to $\mathfrak{z}_S$.

Corollary 5.25. *Fix any open cone $C_{\lhd,S} \subset \mathring{\mathfrak{z}}_S \cap \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+$ such that $\overline{C}_{\lhd,S} - \{0\} \subset \mathring{\mathfrak{z}}_S \cap \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+$. For any $\delta > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_{C_{\lhd,S}} > 0$ such that for any $(g_S, \xi_S; z, t) \in$*

$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}^\dagger}$, $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ *satisfying* $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho_1)| < \epsilon_{C_{\lhd,S}}$ *and* $\rho' \in (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)_{C_{\lhd,S}}$, *we have*

$$\rho' \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t) \in \mathfrak{U}_S,$$

$$dist(\rho' \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S,\xi_S;z,t), \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho'\rho_1}(g_S,\xi_S;z,t)) < \delta, \tag{5.2.59}$$

where the $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$*-action* $\star$ *is the one on* $\chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}'})) \subset J_G$ *with respect to the projection* $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}'}) \to \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp} \subset \mathring{\mathfrak{z}}_S$ *(cf. Remark 5.10). Moreover,*

$$dist(w^{-1}(\rho') \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(u,w(t))), \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho'\rho_1}(u,w(t))) < \delta, \forall w \in N_W(W_S). \tag{5.2.60}$$

Here the distance is taken with respect to the fixed $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$*-invariant metric on* $\mathfrak{U}_S$.

Proof. This follows essentially from the same proof for Lemma 5.17, Proposition 5.18 and Corollary 5.19. Only the part on

$$\rho' \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t) \in \mathfrak{U}_S$$

needs additional clarification. To show this, we consider $\mathcal{Y}_{S,R_1} \subset \mathcal{Y}_{S,R_2}$ (cf. (5.2.48)) for some $0 < R_1 \ll R_2$. Then by Corollary 5.24, for R_2/R_1 sufficiently large, there exists $\epsilon_{R_1,R_2} > 0$ and a fixed compact region $\mathcal{X}$ in $\chi_S^{-1}(D^\dagger/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ contained in the right-hand-side of (5.2.22), such that for all $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho)| < \epsilon_{R_1,R_2}$, we have for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$ (using $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}$ from (5.2.22))

$$\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,R_1;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0) \subset \mathcal{X} \subset \bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger}_{S,R_2;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0), \tag{5.2.61}$$

where (i) $D^{\dagger\dagger}$ is defined in the same way as $D^\dagger$ and satisfies $\overline{D^{\dagger\dagger}} \subset D^\dagger$, $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,R_2} \subset \chi_S^{-1}(D^\dagger/W_S)$ (resp. $\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,R_1} \subset \chi_S^{-1}(D^{\dagger\dagger}/W_S)$) is defined by (5.2.48) using $D^\dagger$ (resp. $D^{\dagger\dagger}$); (ii) in the second inclusion, $\mathcal{X}$ is disjoint from a tubular neighborhood of the boundary of $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,R_2}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0)$.

Now by a direct analogue of Lemma 5.17 with $\overline{C}_{\lhd,S} \subset C'_{\lhd,S}$ given and $\epsilon_{C_{\lhd,S}} > 0, M > 0$ satisfying the corresponding conclusions, we claim that for any $(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,R_1},\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}^\dagger}$, we have

$$\rho' \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t) \in \bigcup_{\widetilde{\rho} \in (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)_{C'_{\lhd,S}}} \mathfrak{j}_{S,\widetilde{\rho}}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,R_2},\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}) \tag{5.2.62}$$

for all ρ_1 satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\backslash S}(\rho_1)| < \widetilde{\epsilon}_{C_{\lhd,S}} := \min\{\epsilon_{R_1,R_2}, \epsilon_{C_{\lhd,S}}\}$ and $\rho' \in (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)_{C_{\lhd,S}}$.

Suppose the contrary, for some $(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t)$, $\eta \in C_{\lhd,S}$, $\rho'_c \in (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)_c$ and the corresponding curve $\Upsilon_\eta(s) := \rho'_c \cdot \exp(s\cdot\eta)$, $s \geq 0$, there exists $r > 0$ such that $\Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t)$ is *not* in the right-hand-side of (5.2.62). Let

$$\overline{\rho}_\eta(s) := u_0^{-1}\mathrm{proj}_{\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}(\Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t)) \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0,$$

$\kappa = \mu_{D,\mathcal{K},\rho_1}((g_S,\xi_S;u_0,t))$.

For any $s \geq 0$ in the (largest connected) interval when $\overline{\rho}_\eta(s)$ is well defined, i.e. when $\Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t))$ is contained in $\mathfrak{U}_S$, we fix a representative $\rho_\eta(s)$ of $\overline{\rho}_\eta(s)$ in $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$.

Since

$$|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho_\eta(s))| \leq |\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho_1)| < \widetilde{\epsilon}_{C_{\lhd,S}},$$

for all $s \geq 0$ in the defining interval of $\overline{\rho}_\eta(s)$, we have the minimum of such r satisfies

(5.2.63)

$$\Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t) \in \partial \mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,R_2} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} \Big(\bigcup_{\widetilde{\rho} \in (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)_{C'_{\lhd,S}}} \mathfrak{j}_{S,\widetilde{\rho}}(\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}) \times \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp} \Big).$$

Here we use that

$$\mathrm{proj}_{\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0} \mathfrak{j}^{-1}_{S,\rho_\eta(r)}(\Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t)) = u_0 \bmod \mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0,$$

and that whenever

$$\mathrm{proj}_{J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0} \Upsilon_\eta(s) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t) \subset \overline{\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,R_2}}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{proj}_{\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}}(\Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t)) \overset{\mathrm{close}}{\sim} \\ &\mu_{D,\mathcal{K},\Upsilon_\eta(r)}(\mathfrak{j}^{-1}_{\Upsilon_\eta(r)}(S, \Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t))) = \kappa \end{aligned}$$

(hence also close to t). So we can exclude the other boundaries of the right-hand-side of (5.2.62) for the minimum r.

However, on one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho_\eta(r);\kappa}(\mathfrak{j}^{-1}_{S,\rho_\eta(r)}(\Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t))) \\ &= \bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho_1;\kappa}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t) \in \bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho;\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,R_1;\kappa,\rho}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0) \subset \mathcal{X}, \end{aligned}$$

while on the other hand, (5.2.63) and (5.2.61) imply that

$$\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho_\eta(r);\kappa}(\mathfrak{j}^{-1}_{S,\rho_\eta(r)}(\Upsilon_\eta(r) \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S, \xi_S; u_0, t))) \notin \mathcal{X},$$

which gives a contradiction. □

Now we can give an answer to Question 5.2.20 (ii).

Proposition 5.26. *The covering map in Corollary 5.24 is one-to-one.*

Proof. Fix a pre-compact (connected) open region inside $\chi^{-1}(D^\dagger_S/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$. Also fix a sufficiently large R and a sufficiently small $\epsilon_R > 0$ so that the conclusion in Corollary 5.24 is satisfied for $\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ with $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho)| < \epsilon_R$.

We apply Corollary 5.25, with $\mathcal{Y}_S = \mathcal{Y}_{S,R}$, a fixed open cone $C_{\lhd,S}$ and an arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$ as in the assumption. Let $\epsilon' = \min\{\epsilon_R, \epsilon_{C_{\lhd,S}}\}$. Fixing any $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\rho_1)| < \epsilon'$, suppose we have two distinct

points $(g_S^{(i)}, \xi_S^{(i)}; u_0, t^{(i)}) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S,R},\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}, i = 1, 2$ that are *not* in the same characteristic leaf, but that map to the same point in the fixed pre-compact open region inside $\chi^{-1}(D_S^\dagger/W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ under $\bar{\mathfrak{j}}_{S,\rho_1;\kappa}$. Then $\mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S^{(i)}, \xi_S^{(i)}; u_0, t^{(i)}), i = 1, 2$ are in the same $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbit in $\chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\Omega_{D,\mathcal{K}'}))$ with respect to the projection $\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\Omega_{D,\mathcal{K}'}) \to \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$. Now for all $\widetilde{\rho} \in (\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)_{C_{\lhd,S}}$, $\mathfrak{j}^{-1}_{S,\widetilde{\rho}\rho_1}(\widetilde{\rho} \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S^{(i)}, \xi_S^{(i)}; u_0, t^{(i)}))$ is contained in a δ-neighborhood of $(g_S^{(i)}, \xi_S^{(i)}; u_0, t^{(i)})$ in $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S,R},\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}$, and the $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbit containing both $\mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S^{(i)}, \xi_S^{(i)}; u_0, t^{(i)})$, $i = 1, 2$ will intersect $\mathfrak{j}_{S,\widetilde{\rho}\rho_1}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S,R},\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}})$ in at least two disconnected components containing $\widetilde{\rho} \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S^{(i)}, \xi_S^{(i)}; u_0, t^{(i)}), i = 1, 2$ respectively. This is because the set of such $\widetilde{\rho}$ in $(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)_{C_{\lhd,S}}$ is open, closed and nonempty, hence it is the entire space.

On the other hand, we have

$$\widetilde{\rho} \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S^{(2)}, \xi_S^{(2)}; u_0, t^{(2)}) = \rho_{12} \star \widetilde{\rho} \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S^{(1)}, \xi_S^{(1)}; u_0, t^{(1)})$$

for a fixed unique $\rho_{12} \in \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$. Without loss of generality, we will assume $u_0 = I \in \mathcal{V}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$. Choose a sufficiently large pre-compact open $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$ (defined in the way described in Question 5.12 (i)) that contains ρ_{12}. Then there exists $\epsilon_{\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}} > 0$ such that for all $\widetilde{\rho}$ satisfying $|\gamma_{-\Pi\setminus S}(\widetilde{\rho})| < \epsilon_{\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}}$ (this will be contained in $C_{\lhd,S}$ for $\epsilon_{\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}}$ sufficiently small),

$$\mu_{D,\mathcal{K}',\widetilde{\rho}\rho_1} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S,R},\widetilde{\mathcal{V}},\mathcal{K}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$$

is arbitrarily close to the projection map. By Proposition 5.9 on the integrability of $\mu_{D,\mathcal{K}',\widetilde{\rho}\rho_1}$ (on the larger domain $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S,R},\widetilde{\mathcal{V}},\mathcal{K}}$), we must have $\mathfrak{j}^{-1}_{S,\widetilde{\rho}\rho_1}(\widetilde{\rho} \star \mathfrak{j}_{S,\rho_1}(g_S^{(i)}, \xi_S^{(i)}; u_0, t^{(i)})$, $i = 1, 2$ lie in the *same* characteristic leaf. However, since this characteristic leaf, viewed in the product $\mathcal{D}_{(g_S^{(1)}, \xi_S^{(1)})} \times \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_{S^\perp} \times \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ as in (5.2.46), projects to $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_{S^\perp}$ isomorphically, its intersection with the original $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S,R},\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}$ *cannot* split into more than one leaves. Thus we reach at a contradiction. □

We give a sketch of the proof for an analogue of Proposition 5.15.

Proposition 5.27. *Let $\mathcal{Y}_S, \mathcal{Y}_S^\dagger, \mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}, \mathcal{V}'_{S^\perp}, \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}, \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}, \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ be as above. For any smooth curve $(c_\beta(s))_\beta \in \mathbb{C}^{\Pi\setminus S}, s \in (-\epsilon', \epsilon')$ with $(c_\beta(0))_\beta = 0$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy φ_s, $0 \le s \le \epsilon$, with $\varphi_0 = id$, on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V}',\mathcal{K}'}$ such that for every $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$, we have*

$$\varphi_s(\mu^{-1}_{D,\mathcal{K},0}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S^\dagger,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}) \subset \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D',\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V}',\mathcal{K}'}. \tag{5.2.64}$$

Proof. We assume $|(c_\beta(s))_\beta|$ are all sufficient small, so that the conclusions in Lemma 5.20 all hold.

Step 1. Identify the multi-sections $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}$ over $s \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ symplectically and $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-equivariantly.

We make the identification between the symplectic quotient spaces $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ at κ for different $s \in (-\epsilon,\epsilon)$ as follows (up to restricting to a slightly smaller domain in $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ and for s in a smaller interval $(-\epsilon^\dagger,\epsilon^\dagger)$). We put $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}$ into a smooth family of symplectic manifold over $(-\epsilon,\epsilon)$ naturally contained inside $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}} \times (-\epsilon,\epsilon)$, and denote it by $\mathfrak{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(-\epsilon,\epsilon)} \to (-\epsilon,\epsilon)$. There is a natural smooth (not necessarily symplectic) identification, a.k.a "parallel transport", between different fibers (after restricting to a slightly smaller domain), by sending each point in the original multi-section $(\mathcal{Y}_S \times \{u_0\} \times \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}) \cap \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(\kappa)$ to the corresponding point (after averaging) in the modified multi-section.

The $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-action on each fiber over s above gives a $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-action on $\mathfrak{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}$ that preserves each fiber. Taking the quotient space assembles the symplectic quotient spaces $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta)_\beta}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ into a smooth family over $(-\epsilon,\epsilon)$. Now the "parallel transport" on the family $\mathfrak{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}$ gives a lifting of the unit positive vector field on $(-\epsilon,\epsilon)$ to a smooth vector field $\mathbf{v}$ on it, the average of the projection of $\mathbf{v}$ to the quotient $\mathfrak{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}/\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ is a smooth vector field that is a lifting of the unit positive vector field on the base $(-\epsilon,\epsilon)$. Integrating the vector field gives a smooth identification $\widetilde{\varphi}_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa}$ between the fiber at 0 and that at s. Since the symplectic manifolds are exact and the diffeomorphisms are close to be symplectic (in fact, $\widetilde{\varphi}^*_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa}\vartheta - \vartheta$ is close to zero), using Moser's argument, we can modify the smooth identifications to be symplectic, after restricting to a slightly smaller subdomain on each fiber.

Lastly, we lift the identification on the quotient spaces uniquely to a $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-equivariant symplectic identification $\varphi_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa} : \mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,\kappa,0} \to \mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}$, subject to the condition that the distance between $\varphi_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa}(g_S,\xi_S,u_0,\kappa)$ and (g_S,ξ_S,u_0,κ) is small. Here the double † superscript means we are taking some slightly smaller subdomain. Note that the identifications $\varphi_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa}$ are smoothly depending on κ.

Step 2. Construction of the Hamiltonian isotopy φ_s on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_S,\mathcal{V}',\mathcal{K}'}$.

We fix some real linear coordinates $(p^j_c; p^j_{\mathbb{R}})$ on the base $\mathfrak{z}^*_S \cong \mathfrak{z}_S \cong \mathfrak{z}_{S,c} \oplus \mathfrak{z}_{S,\mathbb{R}}$. For each κ, s, applying Proposition 5.9 for $(c_\beta(s))_{\beta\in\Pi\setminus S}$, the $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-equivariant multi-section $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}$ determines an embedding

$$\widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D^\dagger,\mathcal{K},(c_\beta(s))_\beta}(\kappa) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}^\dagger_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} \mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 5.15, using $\varphi_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa} : \mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,\kappa,0} \to \mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}$ from the previous step and Proposition 5.9, we have a uniquely defined map

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_s : \mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_S \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} (\mathcal{V}^\dagger_{S^\perp} \times \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mu}^{-1}_{D',\mathcal{K}',(c_\beta(s))}(\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}_S,\mathcal{V}',\mathcal{K}'}$$

which sends $\mathcal{Y}_S^{\dagger\dagger} \times \{(u_0, \kappa)\}$ to $\mathcal{Y}^{\dagger\dagger}_{S,\kappa,(c_\beta(s))_\beta}$ through $\varphi_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa}$, and which respects the canonical (locally defined) real affine coordinates $(q^j_{c,s,(g_S,\xi_S)}; q^j_{\mathbb{R},s,(g_S,\xi_S)}), j = 1, \cdots, n-|S|$ and $(q^j_{c,s,\varphi_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,\kappa)}; q^j_{\mathbb{R},s,\varphi_{s,\mathcal{Y},\kappa}(g_S,\xi_S;u_0,\kappa)}), j = 1, \cdots, n-|S|$ on each characteristic leaf that are dual to $(p_c^j; p_{\mathbb{R}}^j)$ and that are relative to the respective $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-equivariant multi-sections.

It is clear that

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_s^* \omega - \omega = \sum_j \alpha_{c,s,j}(p) \wedge dp_c^j + \alpha_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p) \wedge dp_{\mathbb{R}}^j,$$

where $\alpha_{c,s,j}(p)$ and $\alpha_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p)$ are $\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-equivariant 1-forms on $\mathcal{Y}_S^{\dagger\dagger}$ depending smoothly on $p \in \mathcal{K}^\dagger_{S^\perp}$. Since $\widetilde{\varphi}_s^*\omega - \omega$ is closed, we get both $\alpha_{c,s,j}(p)$ and $\alpha_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p)$ are closed 1-forms on $\mathcal{Y}_S^{\dagger\dagger}$ (with p fixed). By Lemma 5.28 below, $H^1(\mathcal{Y}_S^{\dagger\dagger}; \mathbb{R}) = 0$, so we can choose $f_{c,s,j}(p)$ and $f_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p)$ to be primitives of $\alpha_{c,s,j}(p)$ and $\alpha_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p)$ on $\mathcal{Y}_S^{\dagger\dagger}$, respectively, such that they all vanish at a fixed point in $\mathcal{Y}_S^{\dagger\dagger}$. Then we have

$$d(\sum_j f_{c,s,j}(p) dp_c^j + f_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p) dp_{\mathbb{R}}^j) - \sum_j (\alpha_{c,s,j}(p) \wedge dp_c^j + \alpha_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p) \wedge dp_{\mathbb{R}}^j)$$

a *closed* 2-form that is a combination of wedges of $dp_c^j, dp_{\mathbb{R}}^k, j, k = 1, \cdots, n-|S|$, which by the assumptions on $f_{c,s,j}(p)$ and $f_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p)$ must be 0.

Now we can apply Moser's argument in the specific form of [McSa, Section 3.2] with

$$\sigma_s = \frac{d}{ds}(\sum_j f_{c,s,j}(p) dp_c^j + f_{\mathbb{R},s,j}(p) dp_{\mathbb{R}}^j),$$

in (3.2.1) of *loc. cit.* Then for $\epsilon > 0$ small, we can compose $\widetilde{\varphi}_s$ with the isotopy to define φ_s that preserves the symplectic form. Moreover, $\varphi_s^* \vartheta - \vartheta$ must be exact, because its integral along the 1-cycles in $\mathcal{V}_{S^\perp}$ are all zero (cf. Lemma 5.20), which implies that φ_s is a Hamiltonian isotopy satisfying (5.2.64). It is then easy to extend φ_s to be a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}',\mathcal{K}'}$. □

Lemma 5.28. *For any complex connected semisimple Lie group G, we have a natural isomorphism $\pi_1(J_G) \cong \pi_1(G)$.*

Proof. First, from the centralizer description of J_G (2.1.2), we have a natural morphism $p : \pi_1(J_G) \to \pi_1(G)$. By the Cartesian square with vertical morphisms regular connected coverings (of deck transformations by $\pi_1(G)$),

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J_{G_{sc}} & \longrightarrow & G_{sc} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ J_G & \longrightarrow & G \end{array}$$

we see that p is surjective. Now we need to show that $\ker p$ is trivial. For this it suffices to work with G_{sc} for which $\ker p \cong \pi_1(J_{G_{sc}})$, and let $\widetilde{J}_{G_{sc}}$ be the universal cover. By the Weinstein handle attachment structure of $J_{G_{sc}}$ from Proposition 3.12 (i), especially its inductive pattern, and the isomorphism between $\pi_1(T \times \{\xi\}) \cong \pi_1(\chi^{-1}([\xi]))$ for a torus fiber in $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ over $\xi \in \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ by Lemma 5.2.28, it is clear that $\pi_1(J_{G_{sc}})$ is finite, and the natural map $\pi_1(\chi^{-1}([\xi])) \to \pi_1(J_{G_{sc}})$ is surjective. Then $\widetilde{\chi} : \widetilde{J}_{G_{sc}} \to \mathfrak{c}$ is an abelian group scheme with generic fibers connected complex tori (of the same rank).

Now we look at the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{J}_{G_{sc}} \underset{J_{G_{sc}}}{\times} (T \times \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}})/W & \longrightarrow & (T \times \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}})/W \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{c} \end{array}$$

where the fiber of the right-downward arrow (on the left) is a $\pi_1(J_{G_{sc}})$-cover of T, denoted by $\widetilde{T}$. This induces a $\pi_1(\mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}) = Br_W$-action on $\pi_1(\widetilde{T})$, and a Br_W-equivariant embedding $\pi_1(\widetilde{T}) \hookrightarrow \pi_1(T)$. Since the pure braid group acts trivially on $\pi_1(T)$, the embedding $\pi_1(\widetilde{T}) \hookrightarrow \pi_1(T)$ is W-equivariant. In particular, the image of $\pi_1(\widetilde{T})$ in $\pi_1(T) \cong X_*(T)$ is a finite indexed W-invariant sublattice, and we have a W-action on $\widetilde{T}$ together with the isomorphism

$$\widetilde{J}_{G_{sc}} \underset{J_{G_{sc}}}{\times} (T \times \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}})/W \cong (\widetilde{T} \times \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}})/W.$$

The Kostant sections over the contractible base $\mathfrak{c}$ are lifted to $|\mathcal{Z}(G_{sc})| \times |\pi_1(J_{G_{sc}})|$ many disjoint sections of $\widetilde{\chi}$. On the other hand, if $\widetilde{T}$ is a non-trivial W-equivariant covering of T, then there exists a simple coroot $\alpha^\vee$ that is not in $X_*(\widetilde{T})$. Then $\lambda_\alpha^\vee \in (\Lambda^\vee / X_*(T)) \cong \mathcal{Z}(G_{sc})$ has

$$s_{\alpha^\vee}(\lambda_\alpha^\vee) = \lambda_\alpha^\vee - \alpha^\vee \neq \lambda_\alpha^\vee \bmod X_*(\widetilde{T})$$

This means the lifting of the Kostant section corresponding to $\lambda_\alpha^\vee$ to $\widetilde{J}_{G_{sc}}$ cannot be a collection of disjoint sections, for the lifting of its restriction inside $(T \times \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}})/W$ to $(\widetilde{T} \times \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}})/W$ already has a connected component that is a multi-section over $\mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$. The proof is complete. □

5.3. **Discussions around walls beyond $S^\perp, \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$.** In this subsection, we develop some analysis around an arbitrary "wall" $w(S^\perp), w \in W/W_S, \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$ in $\mathfrak{t}$, that is needed for the proof of Proposition 5.6 and 5.7. The main result is Proposition 5.31. We remark that there is no direct generalization of the analysis done in Subsection 5.2.2 to the current setting for an arbitrary $w(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0)$ (here all the subtori $w(\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0), w \in W/W_S$ are *relative to the same Borel B*).

For any $\emptyset \neq S \subsetneq \Pi$, let $W^S_{\min} \cong W/W_S$ be the set of elements in W consisting of the unique shortest representative of each coset. Recall

that $w \in W^S_{\min}$ if and only if $w(S) \subset \Delta^+$. In $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$, we look at $\mathcal{U}^{w(S)}_{\mathcal{Q}',\mathcal{V}} := \mathcal{V} \times w(D'_S + \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}), w \in W^S_{\min}$, where $\mathcal{Q}'_{D',\mathcal{K}'} = D'_S + \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ is a tubular neighborhood of $\mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp} \subset \mathring{\mathfrak{z}}_S$ and $\mathcal{V} \subset T$ is as in the setting of Section 5.2. We fix a representative $\overline{w} \in N_G(T)$ for any $w \in W^S_{\min}$. Let $D_S \subset \overline{D}_S \subset D'_S$, $\mathcal{K}_{S^\perp} \subset \overline{\mathcal{K}}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathcal{K}'_{S^\perp}$ be slightly smaller open subsets. Define $\mathcal{Q}_{D,\mathcal{K}} = D_S + \mathcal{K}_{S^\perp}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{w(S)}_{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{V}}$ similarly as for $\mathcal{Q}'_{D',\mathcal{K}'}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{w(S)}_{\mathcal{Q}',\mathcal{V}}$. For any $(u\overline{w}_0^{-1}h, \xi = f + w(t) + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h)^{-1}} f) \in \mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ with $(h, w(t)) \in \mathcal{U}^{w(S)}_{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{V}}$ and $u \in N$ uniquely determined making the pair in $\mathscr{Z}_G$, and for any $\rho \in T$ with $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| < \epsilon \ll 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{j}_\rho(u\overline{w}_0^{-1}h, \xi) = (u_\rho \overline{w}_0^{-1} h\rho, f + w(t) + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho)^{-1}} f) \\ &=: (u_\rho \overline{w}_0^{-1} h\rho, \xi_\rho) \in \mathscr{Z}_G \cap G \times (f + \mathfrak{b}) \end{aligned}$$

for some (unique) $u_\rho \in N$ (contained in a bounded region, i.e. in a compact region, from Lemma 5.29 below) and the commutative diagram (where the items with $\{\}$ are one-point sets)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \{\xi_\rho\} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Ad}_{\nu_\rho}} & \{f + w(t'_\rho)\} & \xleftarrow{\mathrm{Ad}_{b^-_{1,\rho}\overline{w}}} & \{f_S + t'_\rho\} \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Ad}_{\widetilde{u}_\rho}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Ad}_{u_{S,\rho}}} \\ & & \mathcal{S} & \xleftarrow[\mathrm{Ad}u''(\widetilde{\varsigma})u(\varsigma)^-]{} & (\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{der}}_S} + \mathring{\mathfrak{z}}_S) \cap \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}} \end{array} \tag{5.3.1}$$

where (i) $t'_\rho \in \mathcal{Q}'_{D',\mathcal{K}'}$, $N \ni \nu_\rho \overset{\text{close to}}{\sim} I$, $\widetilde{u}_\rho \in N$ and $u_{S,\rho} \in N_S$ are uniquely determined elements, $\widetilde{u}_\rho$ and $u_{S,\rho}$ are clearly uniformly bounded; (ii) $u(\varsigma)^- \in N^-_{P_S}$ and $u''(\widetilde{\varsigma}) \in N$ are uniquely associated to each $\varsigma \in (\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{der}}_S} + \mathring{\mathfrak{z}}_S) \cap \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ (note that in general $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{der}}_S} + \mathring{\mathfrak{z}}_S \not\subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$) so that $\widetilde{\varsigma} = \mathrm{Ad}_{u(\varsigma)^-}(\varsigma) \in f + \mathfrak{b}$; (iii) one can assign a unique $b^-_{1,\rho} \in B^-$ so that the product of elements inducing the adjoint action following the two different paths from $\{f_S + t'_\rho\}$ to $\mathcal{S}$ coincide (see Lemma 5.29 (b) below); in particular, such a $b^-_{1,\rho} \in B^-$ is uniformly bounded. If we use $(g^\natural_{S,\rho}, \xi^\natural_{S,\rho}; z^\natural_\rho, t^\natural_\rho)$ as in the proof of Lemma 5.22 to present the equivalent point $(u_\rho\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho, \xi_\rho)$, through the isomorphism in (5.2.19), then we have

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{\widetilde{u}_\rho b^-_{1,\rho}\overline{w}u^{-1}_{S,\rho}}(g^\natural_{S,\rho} z^\natural_\rho, \xi^\natural_{S,\rho} + t^\natural_\rho) = \mathrm{Ad}_{\widetilde{u}_\rho\nu_\rho}(u_\rho\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho, \xi_\rho) \in G \times \mathcal{S} \tag{5.3.2}$$

Lemma 5.29.

(a) *Under the above setting, u_ρ is contained in a bounded region in N. Moreover, for a fixed h, t, $\lim_{|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| \to 0} u_\rho$ exists and it is the unique element in N that sends $f + w_0(t)$ to $f + t$ through the adjoint action (so in fact only depends on t).*

(b) *There exists a unique* $b^-_{1,\rho} \in B^-$ *making*

$$\widetilde{u}_\rho b^-_{1,\rho}\overline{w} = u''(\widetilde{\varsigma})u(\varsigma)^- u_{S,\rho},$$

where $\varsigma = \mathrm{Ad}_{u_{S,\rho}}(f_S + t'_\rho)$ *and* $\widetilde{\varsigma} = \mathrm{Ad}_{u(\varsigma)^-}(\varsigma)$. *In particular, the elements* $b^-_{1,\rho} \in B^-$ *can be chosen to be uniformly bounded (i.e. contained in a fixed compact region) for* $t \in \overline{D'}_S + \overline{\mathcal{K}'}_{S^\perp}$.

Proof. (a) By assumption, u_ρ is determined by the property

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Ad}_{u_\rho \overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho}(f + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho)^{-1}}f) = f + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho)^{-1}}f\\ \Leftrightarrow &\mathrm{Ad}_{u_\rho}(f + w_0(t) + \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho}f) = f + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho)^{-1}}f\end{aligned}$$

Since as $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| \to 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&f + w_0(t) + \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho}f \to f + w_0(t) \in f + \mathfrak{t},\\ \text{and } &f + t + \mathrm{Ad}_{(\overline{w}_0^{-1}h\rho)^{-1}}f \to f + t \in f + \mathfrak{t},\end{aligned}$$

we have u_ρ is bounded and $\lim_{|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)|\to 0} u_\rho$ is the unique element in N that sends $f + w_0(t)$ to $f + t$ through the adjoint action.

(b) The uniqueness of $b^-_{1,\rho}$ is clear. For existence, we observe that $b^-_{1,\rho}$ is an element in G that takes $\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}}(f_S + t'_\rho)$ to $f + w(t'_\rho)$. Since both elements are in $(\mathfrak{b}^-)^{\mathrm{reg}}$ and have the same image in $\mathfrak{b}^-/[\mathfrak{b}^-, \mathfrak{b}^-]$, any conjugation between them must be induced from an element in B^-. Then the claim follows.

We remark that we don't really need the first claim in (b) to deduce the second claim. Here we include a slightly different proof of the second claim independent of the first, which is more natural. First, we have $\mathfrak{t} + f \subset (\mathfrak{b}^-)^{\mathrm{reg}} \to \mathfrak{t}$ a transverse slice to the B^--orbits in $(\mathfrak{b}^-)^{\mathrm{reg}}$. Second, $\mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}}(f_S + t'_\rho)$ gives a local transverse slice of the B^--orbits over $w(\overline{D}'_S + \overline{\mathcal{K}}'_{S^\perp})$. Now for each $\widetilde{t} \in w(\overline{D}'_S + \overline{\mathcal{K}}'_{S^\perp})$, choose any $\widetilde{b}^-$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}_{\widetilde{b}^-}(\widetilde{t} + \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}}(f_S)) = \widetilde{t} + f$. Then there exists a small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{\widetilde{t}}$ around $\widetilde{t}$ and a neighborhood $\mathcal{V}_{\widetilde{b}^-}$ of $\widetilde{b}^-$ in B^- such that

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{\mathcal{V}_{\widetilde{b}^-}}(\mathcal{U}_{\widetilde{t}} + \mathrm{Ad}_{\overline{w}}f_S) \supset \mathcal{U}_{\widetilde{t}} + f.$$

Lastly, by the compactness of $\overline{D}'_S + \overline{\mathcal{K}}'_{S^\perp}$, the claim follows. □

Lemma 5.30. *Let* $\mathcal{K} \subset G$ *be a fixed compact region. For any two* $h_1, h_2 \in T$ *with* $\log_{\mathbb{R}}(h_j) \in \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$, *if* $h_1 = gh_2\varphi$ *for some* $g, \varphi \in \mathcal{K}$, *then*

$$c|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_2)| \le |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_1)| \le C|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_2)|, \beta \in \Pi$$

for some constants $c, C > 0$ *that only depend on* $\mathcal{K}$.

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to prove $|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_1)| \le C|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_2)|$. Using $\log_{\mathbb{R}}(h_2) \in \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$ and g, φ are bounded, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_1)| = |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(\overline{w}_0 h_1)| = |b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}(\overline{w}_0 g h_2 \varphi)| = |\langle h_2\varphi(v_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}), g^{-1}v_{(-\lambda_{\beta^\vee})}\rangle|\\ &\le C|\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(h_2)|.\end{aligned}$$

for some uniform constant $C > 0$. □

Proposition 5.31. *Under the above settings, given any fixed compact region in $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $(h,t) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{V}}^{w(S)}$ and $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| < \epsilon$, the corresponding $(g_{S,\rho}^\natural, \xi_{S,\rho}^\natural)$ for $\mathfrak{j}_\rho(u\overline{w}_0^{-1}h, \xi)$ from (5.3.2) is outside the compact region.*

Proof. It is clear from (5.3.2) that $\xi_{S,\rho}^\natural$ is bounded, for ξ_ρ and the group elements after Ad are all bounded. We only need to prove that $g_{S,\rho}^\natural \in L_S^{\mathrm{der}}$ is outside any bounded region in L_S^{der} near the limit of ρ.

Suppose the contrary, there exists a sequence $(h_n, w(t_n)) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{V}}^{w(S)}$, and ρ_n with $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho_n)| \to 0$, such that the corresponding $g_{S,\rho_n}^\natural$ is contained in some fixed compact region $\mathcal{D}^\natural \subset L_S^{\mathrm{der}}$ for all n. Then for each n, choose $w_n \in W$ such that $w_n(\log_{\mathbb{R}} z_{\rho_n}^\natural) \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+$. Since $|W|$ is finite, by restricting to a subsequence, we may assume that $w_n = \widetilde{w}$ for a fixed $\widetilde{w}$. Fix a representative of $\widetilde{w} \in N_G(T)$ and denote it by the same notation. Then we apply Lemma 5.30 to the identity on the G-factors in (5.3.2), where aside from $z_{\rho_n}^\natural = \mathrm{Ad}_{\widetilde{w}^{-1}}(\widetilde{w}(z_{\rho_n}^\natural))$ and ρ_n, every other element in the products is uniformly bounded. Hence we get there are uniform constants $c, C > 0$ such that

$$c \leq |\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\widetilde{w}(z_{\rho_n}^\natural)\rho_n^{-1})| \leq C, \forall \beta \in \Pi$$

which means $\widetilde{w}(z_{\rho_n}^\natural)\rho_n^{-1}$ is contained in a fixed compact region in T. However, this is impossible for $n \gg 1$ under the assumption that $S \neq \emptyset$. □

5.4. **A construction of L_0 and $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ for any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$.** In this subsection, we give a construction of L_0 and $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ for any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$ that are used in the main propositions in Section 5.1. For any $R \gg 1$, consider the conormal bundle

$$\Lambda_R := \Lambda_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},R}} \tag{5.4.1}$$

of the compact torus (more precisely, an orbit of it)

$$T_{\mathsf{cpt},R} =: \{|b_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}|^{1/\lambda_{\beta^\vee}(\mathsf{h}_0)} = R^2/n : \beta \in \Pi\} \subset T \tag{5.4.2}$$

in $\mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$. For any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$, we can form the closed *non-exact* Lagrangian $\zeta + \Lambda_R$. We will perform two modifications for the shifted conormal bundle $\zeta + \Lambda_R$:

(1) In Subsection 5.4.2, we will do a cylindrical modification of Λ_R and get a cylindrical Lagrangian L_0 contained in a Liouville subsector $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}^\dagger \subset J_G$ define in Subsection 5.4.1. The upshot is $L_0^\zeta := \zeta + L_0$ will be tautologically unobstructed, so that $(L_0^\zeta, \check{\rho}), \check{\rho} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1(T), \mathbb{C}^\times)$ is a well defined object in the wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{W}(J_G; \Lambda)$ over the Novikov field Λ.

(2) In Subsection 5.4.3, we will perform a compactly supported Hamiltonian deformation of L_0^ζ based on the analysis in Subsection 5.2.1. The resulting Lagrangian is the desired $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$.

5.4.1. *A Liouville subsector.* Using the Weinstein handle decomposition in Proposition 3.9 (2) and its proof for model (A), let $\mathfrak{F}_0 \subset \mathfrak{F}$ be the portion of Liouville hypersurface defined by $I = 0, \widetilde{\mathsf{N}} = 1$, whose projection to H^{sm} is contained in the stratum corresponding to $S = \emptyset$, and we will denote the projection by $\Omega_\emptyset$ (cf. Figure 8). Let $c_\emptyset$ denote the point that radially projects to the barycenter of the interior of $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$. We assume the functions I and $\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$ are of the form (3.2.21) and (3.2.22), respectively, in a sufficiently large conic open subset (with respect to the Euler vector field) in $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$. Since the projection of $Z_{\mathfrak{F}_0}$ is zero in $\Omega_\emptyset$ (cf. Figure 8), $\mathfrak{F}_0$ is a itself a Liouville sector. Using the Darboux coordinates listed in (3.1.27), we have a natural sector splitting

(5.4.3)
$$\mathfrak{F}_0 \cong T^*\Omega_\emptyset \times T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}, \text{ where } T^*\Omega_\emptyset \cong \Omega_\emptyset \times \{(\Re p_{\beta^\vee}) : \sum_{\beta\in\Pi} \Re p_{\beta^\vee} = 0\},$$

where $T^*\Omega_\emptyset$ and $T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}$ are equipped with the standard Liouville sector structure.

Let $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{C}_{\Re z\le 0}$ be a Liouville subsector constructed as follows. Pick any real codimension 1 sphere S in $\chi^{-1}([0])$ surrounding $(g = I, \xi = f)$. The projection $S \subset \mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0} \to \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$ is contained in some proper open cone

$$Q = \{z = re^{i\theta} : \theta \in (\theta_-, \theta_+)\}, \text{ for some } [\theta_-, \theta_+] \subset (\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}) \tag{5.4.4}$$

then the same holds for $\chi^{-1}([0]) \cap \mathfrak{F} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$. We assume that the subsector $\mathcal{P}$ is of the form

$$\mathcal{P} = \{z = re^{i\theta} : \theta \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}]\backslash(\theta_-, \theta_+), r \ge 0\} \cup \{\Re z \ge -A\}, \tag{5.4.5}$$

for some fixed sufficiently large positive number A, shown in Figure 8.

Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{K_0} \subset T^*(\Omega_\emptyset \times T_{\mathsf{cpt},1})$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\le K_0}$) be the contact hypersurface (resp. Liouville domain) defined by

(5.4.6)
$$\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} (\Re p_{\beta^\vee})^2 + (\Im p_{\beta^\vee})^2 = K_0^2 (\text{resp. } \le K_0^2) \text{ (recall } \sum_{\beta\in\Pi} \Re p_{\beta^\vee} = 0 \text{ in } T^*\Omega_\emptyset)$$

for a sufficiently large $K_0 > 1$.

Lemma 5.32. *For sufficiently large $K_0 > 1$, $\chi^{-1}([0]) \cap (\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{K_0} \times \mathcal{P}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. By assumption, the projection of $\chi^{-1}([0]) \cap \mathfrak{F} \times \mathcal{P}$ to $\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$ is contained in the pre-compact region $Q \cap \{\Re z \ge -A\}$, so it suffices to prove that the intersection $\chi^{-1}([0]) \cap (\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{K_0} \times (Q \cap \{\Re z \ge -A\}))$ is empty. Since $\overline{Q} \cap \{\Re z \ge -A\}$ is compact, for any small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $M_\epsilon > 1$ such

that $\varphi_{Z_{\mathbb{C}}}^{-M_\epsilon}(\overline{Q} \cap \{\Re z \geq -A\}) \subset \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0,|z|^2\leq \epsilon^2}$. Now apply Lemma 5.13 (i) with $\mathfrak{K} = \{[0]\}$, $I \in \mathcal{V}$ and any $0 < \delta \ll 1$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\{\|b_\lambda(\rho)\| \leq \epsilon\} \subset \{|\gamma_{-\Pi}(\rho)| < r_{\mathcal{V},\mathfrak{K},\delta}\}$. Let $K_0 = e^{M_\epsilon}$, then $\chi^{-1}([0]) \cap (\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{K_0} \times (\overline{Q} \cap \{\Re z \geq -A\})) = \emptyset$ as desired. □

Using Lemma 5.32, we can form the "cylindricalization" of $\mathfrak{F}_0 \times \mathcal{P}$ as

$$(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\leq K_0} \times \mathcal{P}) \cup \bigcup_{s\geq 0} \varphi_Z^s(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{K_0} \times \mathcal{P}).$$

After a standard smoothing of the corners as in [GPS1], we get a Liouville subsector of J_G, denoted by $\mathfrak{F}_0 \overset{\triangle}{\times} \mathcal{P}$ or $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}^\dagger$ (similarly, we can also define the subsector $\mathfrak{F} \overset{\triangle}{\times} \mathcal{P}$). To simplify notations, to represent a Liouville sector, we will usually just write its interior. The boundary of such a Liouville sector either has been introduced or is clear from the context.

5.4.2. *A cylindrical modification of the conormal bundle* Λ_R. Let $\Lambda^0_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}}$ denote for the zero-section of $T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}$. With respect to the splitting (5.4.3), we have a splitting for the conormal bundle Λ_R as

$$\Lambda_R = T^*_{c_\emptyset}\Omega_\emptyset \times \Lambda^0_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}} \times \{\Re z = -\frac{1}{R}\}. \tag{5.4.7}$$

Let C_1 be a cylindrical modification of the projection of Λ_R in $\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$, which is initially $\{\Re z = -1/R\}$. Let $q = \Re z$ and $p = \Im z$. We assume that C_1 is contained in $\{\Re z \leq -1/R\}$ inside the region $\{|\Im z| \leq R\}$, and it is conic outside the region $\{|\Im z| \leq R\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that C_1 has compactly supported primitive f_{C_1}, and we can choose a compactly supported extension of f_{C_1} on $\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$.

We make the following additional assumptions on C_1 and $f_{C_1} : \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0} \to \mathbb{R}$:

Assumption 5.33. The curve C_1 is defined as the graph of a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_p \to \mathbb{R}_q$, where $p = \Im z$ and $q = \Re z$, which is symmetric about $p = 0$ and satisfies

$$\varphi(p) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{R}, & -R \leq p \leq R \\ -\frac{1}{R^2}p, & 3R \leq p < \infty \end{cases},$$
$$\varphi'(p) \in (-\frac{2}{R^2}, 0], \text{ for } R < p < 3R,$$
$$\varphi(p) - p\varphi'(p) \geq -\frac{1}{R}.$$

Let $f_{C_1} : \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a compactly supported extension of $\int_0^p \frac{1}{2}(s(-\varphi'(s)) + \varphi(s))ds$ on C_1 with support contained in $\{p^2 + q^2 \leq 12R^2, q \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{R}\}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. We assume that R and A are sufficiently large so that $\mathcal{P} \supset C_1 \cup \{p^2 + q^2 \leq 24R^2\} \supset C_1 \cup \mathrm{supp}(f_{C_1})$.




FIGURE 8. (1) The gray region inside $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ (introduced in Subsection 3.2.2) on the left represents the projection of $\mathfrak{F}_0$ to H^{sm} composed with the radial projection $H^{sm} \to \mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$ (to be more precise, one needs to smooth the corners in the picture, but this is not essential as explained in [GPS1]). The projections of $Z_{\mathfrak{F}_0}$ are all zero. The blue dot in the center of $\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$, denoted by $c_\emptyset$, represents the projection of Λ_R to H^{sm} (composed with the radial projection $H^{sm} \to \mathfrak{C}^{n-1}$). (2) The gray region in the right half-disc is the Liouville subsector $\mathcal{P}$. The blue curve in the right half-disc shows a cylindrical modification of the projection of Λ_R to $\mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}$.

Now via a similar construction as in [GPS2, 6.2], we can deform the product Lagrangian $F_{\mathbb{R},c_\emptyset} \times \Lambda^0_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}} \times C_1$ into a cylindrical Lagrangian. Since the factor $\Lambda^0_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}}$ is compact and conic, we only need to do a cylindrical modification of the other two factors $F_{\mathbb{R},c_\emptyset} \times C_1$ inside $T^*\Omega_\emptyset \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$.

First, intersecting the Lagrangian $F_{\mathbb{R},c_\emptyset} \times C_1$ with a fixed contact hypersurface $\mathcal{H}_K \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0} \subset T^*\Omega_\emptyset \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}, K \gg R$ given by

$$\mathcal{H}_K = \{\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\| = (\sum_{\beta\in\Pi}(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = K\} \subset T^*\Omega_\emptyset \text{ (recall } \sum_{\beta\in\Pi} \Re p_{\beta^\vee} = 0 \text{ in } T^*\Omega_\emptyset),$$

(similarly, set $\mathcal{H}_I = \{\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\| \in I\}$ for any connected interval $I \subset [0,\infty)$)

we get a submanifold of (real) dimension $n-1$, over which

$$\alpha_{T^*\Omega_\emptyset} + \alpha_{\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}}|_{(F_{\mathbb{R},c_\emptyset}\cap\mathcal{H}_K)\times C_1} = df_{C_1}. \tag{5.4.8}$$

In the following, we use $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_K}$ to denote for $\alpha_{T^*\Omega_\emptyset}|_{\mathcal{H}_K}$, and use $\alpha_{\mathbb{C}}$ to denote for $\alpha_{\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}}$.

Consider the 1-parameter family of contact 1-forms on $\mathcal{H}_K \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$,

$$\alpha_t = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_K} + \alpha_{\mathbb{C}} - tdf_{C_1}, 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

Let V_α be the direct sum of the Reeb vector field on $(\mathcal{H}_K, \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_K})$ and the zero vector field on $\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$, and let $\varphi^t_{-f_{C_1}V_\alpha}$ be the flow of $-f_{C_1}V_\alpha$, then we have

$$(\varphi^t_{-f_{C_1}V_\alpha})^*\alpha_{1-t} = \alpha_1 = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_K} + \alpha_{\mathbb{C}} - df_{C_1}. \tag{5.4.9}$$

By (5.4.8), the intersection

$$\Gamma_{R,K} := (F_{\mathbb{R},c_\emptyset} \cap \mathcal{H}_K) \times C_1$$

is a Legendrian submanifold in $\mathcal{H}_K \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$ with respect to α_1. By (5.4.9), for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$, $\varphi^t_{-f_{C_1}V_\alpha}(\Gamma_{R,K})$ is a Legendrian submanifold with respect to α_{1-t}.

Second, since f_{C_1} is compactly supported, by choosing K sufficiently large, the flow $\varphi^t_{-f_{C_1}V_\alpha}(\Gamma_{R,K})$ is defined for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$ inside $T^*\Omega_\emptyset \times \mathcal{P}$. Now take the union of flow lines of $\varphi^t_{-f_{C_1}V_\alpha}(\Gamma_{R,K})$ under the Liouville vector field

$$Z_{1-t} = Z_{T^*\Omega_\emptyset} + Z_{\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}} + (1-t)X_{f_{C_1}}$$

of α_{1-t} (on the symplectization), i.e.

$$L^{cyl,\alpha_{1-t}}_{1-t} := \bigcup_{s\geq 0} \varphi^s_{Z_{1-t}}(\varphi^t_{-f_{C_1}V_\alpha}(\Gamma_{R,K})). \tag{5.4.10}$$

Lastly, let

$$\phi_t : \mathcal{H}_{[K,\infty)} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{[K,\infty)} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$$

be the diffeomorphism defined by

$$\phi_t|_{\mathcal{H}_K \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}} = \varphi^t_{-f_{C_1}V_\alpha}$$
$$\phi_t \circ \varphi^s_{Z_1} = \varphi^s_{Z_{1-t}} \circ \phi_t, \forall s \geq 0.$$

Since by definition $\phi_t^*\alpha_{1-t} = \alpha_1$, ϕ_t is the Hamiltonian flow of a time-dependent family of Hamiltonian functions

$$H_t = \iota_{X_t}\alpha_{1-t} + f_{C_1}, 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

The Hamiltonian vector field is $X_t = -f_{C_1}V_\alpha + Y_t$, where V_α is Hamiltonian vector field of $\frac{\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|}{K}$, and Y_t is the component tangent to the factor $\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$ (depending on the level $\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|$). Then

$$H_t = (1 - \frac{\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|}{K})f_{C_1} + \iota_{Y_t}(\alpha_{\mathbb{C}} - (1-t)df_{C_1}).$$

In particular, for any $K' > K$, on $\mathcal{H}_{[K,K']} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$, we have

$$\mathrm{supp}H_t,\ \mathrm{supp}Y_t \subset \mathcal{H}_{[K,K']} \times (\bigcup_{0\leq s\leq \log(K'/K)} \varphi^s_{Z_{\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}}+(1-t)X_{f_{C_1}}}(\mathrm{supp}f_{C_1}))$$

and $|Y_t|$ is bounded from above.

To simplify the notations, we will denote $Z_{\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}}$ (resp. $X_{f_{C_1}}$) simply as $Z_{\mathbb{C}}$ (resp. X), when there is no cause of confusion. Note that on any level $K\cdot e^s$, i.e. $\mathcal{H}_{K\cdot e^s}\times\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$,

$$Y_t=\frac{d}{dt}\varphi^s_{Z_{\mathbb{C}}+(1-t)X}\circ\varphi^{-s}_{Z_{\mathbb{C}}+X}. \tag{5.4.11}$$

Since f_{C_1} has compact support, we directly see that on $\mathcal{H}_{[K,K']}\times\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}$,

$$|Y_t|,|H_t|\leq Q_{R,f_{C_1}}(K'/K) \tag{5.4.12}$$

for some constant $Q_{R,f_{C_1}}>0$ (depending only on R and f_{C_1}).

Choose a smooth cut-off function

$$\begin{aligned}&b_K:[K,\infty)\to[0,1],\\&b_K|_{[K+2,\infty)}=1,\ b_K|_{[K,K+(1/R)]}=0,\ 0\leq b_K'(x)\leq 1 \text{ for all } x.\end{aligned}$$

Consider the Hamiltonian function

$$\widetilde{H}_t:=b_K(\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|)H_t,$$

where as before $\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|$ is considered as a function on $T^*\Omega_\emptyset$. We can extend $\widetilde{H}$ to be homogeneous near infinity and to have support contained in $\mathcal{H}'_{[K,\infty)}\overset{\triangle}{\times}\mathcal{P}\subset T^*\Omega'_\emptyset\overset{\triangle}{\times}\mathcal{P}$, for a slight larger $\Omega'_\emptyset\supset\overline{\Omega}_\emptyset$, where $\mathcal{H}'_{[K,\infty)}$ is defined similarly as $\mathcal{H}_{[K,\infty)}$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}X_{\widetilde{H}_t}=&b_K(\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|)\cdot X_t+b_K'(\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|)H_t\cdot V_\alpha\\=&(b_K'(\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|)H_t-b_K(\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|)f_{C_1})V_\alpha+b_K(\|(\Re p_{\beta^\vee})\|)\cdot Y_t.\end{aligned}$$

Now set

$$L_{1-t}:=\varphi^t_{X_{\widetilde{H}_t}}(F_{\mathbb{R},c_\emptyset}\times C_1)\times\Lambda^0_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}}. \tag{5.4.13}$$

Using Assumption 5.33, it is clear from the estimate (5.4.12) and the description of the "cylindrical" part (5.4.10) that by choosing $K\gg R\gg K_0\gg 1$ (where K_0 is from (5.4.6)), we have $L_{1-t}\subset\mathfrak{F}_0\overset{\triangle}{\times}\mathcal{P}$.

The Lagrangian L_0, i.e. for $t=1$, gives a cylindrical modification of Λ_R that is used in Proposition 5.6 and 5.7. Note that

$$L_0\cap(\mathcal{H}_{[0,K]}\times\Lambda^0_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}}\times\mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0})=(F_{\mathbb{R},c_\emptyset}\cap\mathcal{H}_{[0,K]})\times\Lambda^0_{T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}}\times C_1.$$

For any $\zeta\in\mathfrak{t}_c$, let $L_0^\zeta=\zeta+L_0$. By choosing $K\gg K_0\gg R\gg|\zeta|$, we have $L_0^\zeta\subset\mathfrak{F}_0\overset{\triangle}{\times}\mathcal{P}$. Let

$$L_0^{\zeta;1}=(L_0^\zeta\cap(\mathcal{H}_{[0,1]}\times T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt},1}\times\{\Re z\geq-\frac{3}{R}\})).$$

Fix sufficiently small $0 < \delta < \delta'$. For $R \gg 1$, we can choose a constant $C_0 \geq 1$ so that

(5.4.14)
$$\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}}(L_0^{\zeta;1}) \subset \mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\delta,C_0} := \{\|\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}_c} t - \zeta\| \leq \delta\} \cap \{\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} (\Re p_{\beta^\vee})^2 \leq C_0\} \subset \mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{reg}}.$$

In this case, we have

(1) the composition
$$L_0^{\zeta;1} \hookrightarrow J_G \xrightarrow{\chi} \mathfrak{c}$$
is C^1-close to the composition
$$L_0^{\zeta;1} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T \to \mathfrak{t} \xrightarrow{\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}} \mathfrak{c}.$$
In particular, the images of both maps lie in a compact region in $\mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$.

(2) There is a canonical W-equivariant identification (with respect to the standard Borel B determined by the principal $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $(e, f, \mathfrak{h}_0)$)
$$L_0^{\zeta;1} \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t} \xrightarrow{\sim} L_0^{\zeta;1} \times W \tag{5.4.15}$$
given by the trivialization of the left-hand-side principal W-bundle

(5.4.16)
$$\{(g, \xi, B_1) : \overline{\xi} \in \mathfrak{b}_1/[\mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_1] \overset{\text{canonical}}{\cong} \mathfrak{b}/[\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{b}] \cong \mathfrak{t} \text{ satisfies } \overline{\xi} \in \mathcal{K}_{\zeta}^{\delta',C_0'}\} \subset L_0^{\zeta;1} \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}.$$
for some slightly larger $\delta' > \delta$ and $C_0' > C_0$.

For any $\xi \in \mathfrak{t}$, let $\xi_{\mathbb{R}} + \xi_c$ be the decomposition of ξ with respect to $\mathfrak{t} \cong \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_c$.

Lemma 5.34. *For $K \gg R \gg 1$, consider the projection to the second factor in the fiber product*
$$\varpi_\zeta : L_0^{\zeta} \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{t}.$$

(a) *If $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$, then the map $\varpi_\zeta|_{L_0^{\zeta;1} \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}}$ is arbitrarily C^1-close to the composition*
$$L_0^{\zeta;1} \times W \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{w_0} \times W \cong T^*T \times W \longrightarrow \mathfrak{t}$$
$$(h, t; w) \mapsto w(t),$$
under the canonical identification (5.4.15), as $R \to \infty$.

(b) *For general $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c$, there exist $\delta_0, \widetilde{\delta}_0 > 0$, which are independent of (sufficiently large) R and K, such that for $x \in (L_0^{\zeta} \backslash L_0^{\zeta;1}) \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}$,*
$$\|(\varpi_\zeta(x))_{\mathbb{R}}\|^2 \geq \delta_0^2 \max\{1, \sum_{\beta\in\Pi} (\Re p_{\beta^\vee}(x))^2\}, \tag{5.4.17}$$
$$\|(\varpi_\zeta(x))_{\mathbb{R}}\|^2 \geq \widetilde{\delta}_0^2 \max\{1, \|(\varpi_\zeta(x))\|^2\}. \tag{5.4.18}$$

(c) *For $\zeta = 0$, fix any standard ball $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{R}}$ centered at 0 in $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of radius $r_0 > 0$. Given any $\delta > 0$, for all $K \gg R \gg r_0$, we have*

$$\varpi_0(L_0 \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}) \subset (\mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta}) \cup \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \cdot (\partial \mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta}), \tag{5.4.19}$$

where $D_{c,\delta}$ is the standard ball in $\mathfrak{t}_c$ centered at 0 of radius δ.

Proof. (a) is straightforward from the above comments.

(b) We write (the closure of) the complement of $L_0^{\zeta;1}$ in L_0^{ζ} as the union of three parts:

$$L_0^{\zeta;[1,K+2];1} := L_0^{\zeta} \cap (\mathcal{H}_{[1,K+2]} \times T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt},1} \times \{\Re z \geq -\frac{3}{R}\}) \tag{5.4.20}$$

$$L_0^{\zeta;[0,K+2];\mathrm{cone}} := L_0^{\zeta} \cap (\mathcal{H}_{[0,K+2]} \times T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt},1} \times \{\Re z \leq -\frac{3}{R}\}) \tag{5.4.21}$$

$$L_0^{\zeta;[K+2,\infty)} := L_0^{\zeta} \cap (\mathcal{H}_{[K+2,\infty)} \times T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt},1} \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z<0}\}). \tag{5.4.22}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}} := \bigcup_{(\nu_\beta)_\beta \in \Omega_\emptyset} \partial\{t \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} : \sum_{\beta\in\Pi}(p_{\beta^\vee} - \sum_{\beta\in\Pi} \nu_\beta \cdot p_{\beta^\vee})^2 \leq 1, |\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} p_{\beta^\vee}| \leq 9\}, \tag{5.4.23}$$

where $\Omega_\emptyset \subset \{\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} r_\beta = 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\Pi}_{\geq 0}$, and $(\nu_\beta)_\beta$ are viewed as weights contained in $\Omega_\emptyset$. Since each ν_β has a strictly positive lower bound, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$, such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}} \subset \{\sum_{\beta\in\Pi}(p_{\beta^\vee})^2 \geq 2\delta_1^2\}$.

Let $K \gg R$. For any point x in any of the three parts (5.4.20)-(5.4.22), there exists $t_x \geq 0$ such that $\varphi_{-Z}^{t_x}(x)$ is contained in the product

$$(\Omega_\emptyset \times T_{\mathsf{cpt},1} \times \mathbb{R}_{q\in[-\frac{3}{R},-\epsilon]}) \times \{t \in \mathfrak{t} : \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}} t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}}, |\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}_c} t| \leq |\zeta|\}, \tag{5.4.24}$$

for some uniform $0 < \epsilon < \frac{3}{R}$ independent of x, where $q = \Re z = -1/\widetilde{\mathsf{N}}$ as in Subsection 3.2.2. Since $\varphi_{-Z}^t, t \geq 0$ scales $p_{\beta^\vee}$ with weight -1, we have $t_x \geq \log(\sum_{\beta\in\Pi}(\Re p_{\beta^\vee}(x))^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - C$ for some uniform constant $C \geq 0$.

It is clear that for x in (5.4.24), $\|(\varpi_\zeta(x))_{\mathbb{R}}\|^2 \geq 1.5\delta_1^2$. Since $\varphi_{-Z}^t, t \geq 0$ scales ϖ_ζ with weight -1, we get (5.4.17) with $\delta_0 = \delta_1 e^{-C}$as desired. (5.4.18) can be obtained similarly.

(c) We follow essentially the same argument as for (b). In the current case, (5.4.24) is the same as

$$(\Omega_\emptyset \times T_{\mathsf{cpt},1} \times \mathbb{R}_{q\in[-\frac{3}{R},0)}) \times \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}}. \tag{5.4.25}$$

Then for any x in (5.4.25), we have $\varpi_0(x)$ contained in the right-hand-side of (5.4.19), then so is $\varpi_0((L_0 \backslash L_0^{0;1}) \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t})$. Clearly $\varpi_0(L_0^{0;1} \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t})$ is contained in there too. So the proof is complete. □

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be any (regular) compatible cylindrical almost complex structure on J_G.

Proposition 5.35. *Let $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$. For any homology class $\ell \in H_1(T,\mathbb{Z})$ with $\langle -i\zeta, \ell\rangle > 0$, the moduli space of $\mathcal{J}$-holomorphic discs $f : (\mathcal{D}, \partial\mathcal{D}) \to (J_G, L_0^\zeta)$ satifying $[f(\partial\mathcal{D})] = \ell$ is compact, and it is cobordant to $\emptyset$.*

Proof. First, using the same argument as in [GPS1, Lemma 2.42], $(\mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0}, \omega, \mathcal{J}, L_0^\zeta)$ has bounded geometry, which yields the compactness of moduli space. Second, by choosing $\mathcal{J}$ so that the assumption in Lemma 2.41 *loc. cit.* holds for $X = \mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0}$, we have $f(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0}$. Since $H_1(\mathcal{B}^\dagger_{w_0}, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(T,\mathbb{Z})$, and $[f(\partial\mathcal{D})] = \ell \neq 0$, we conclude that the space of such $\mathcal{J}$-holomorphic discs is empty. □

5.4.3. *Hamiltonian deformation of $L_0^\zeta, \zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$.* Applying Proposition 5.15 for $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^\delta_{\zeta, C_0}$ from (5.4.14), $T_{\mathsf{cpt},1} \subset \mathcal{V}^\dagger$, $(c_\beta(s))_\beta = \gamma_{-\Pi}(s^{-\mathsf{h}_0})$, we get a compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy φ_s on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{K}}$. For $L_0^\zeta = \zeta + L_0$ with $K \gg R \gg 1$ in the definition, let

$$\mathcal{L}_\zeta := \mathfrak{j}_{R^{\mathsf{h}_0}} \circ \varphi_{\frac{1}{R}} \circ \mathfrak{j}_{R^{-\mathsf{h}_0}}(L_0^\zeta). \tag{5.4.26}$$

It follows from Proposition 5.35 that $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ is tautologically unobstructed.

Recall that for any Lagrangian $L \subset J_G$, we use $\widehat{L} \subset T^*T$ to denote for its transformation under the canonical Lagrangian correspondence (2.1.5). Since by construction, φ_s is the restriction of a T-equivariant symplectomorphism (5.2.34), combining with Lemma 5.34 (a), (b), we directly get the following:

Lemma 5.36. *For any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$, such that the transformed Lagrangian $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \subset T^*T$ satisfies that*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \cap (T \times \{\|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\| \le \delta_0\}) = \coprod_{w \in W} (T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times \{w(\zeta)\}) \times w(\Gamma) \subset T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times T^*\mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$$

where $\Gamma \subset T^*\mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$ is a Lagrangian graph over $\{\|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\| \le \delta_0\} \subset \mathfrak{t}^*_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

6. Proof of the main propositions

Let L_0 and $\mathcal{L}_\zeta, \zeta \in \mathfrak{t}_c^{\mathrm{reg}}$ be the Lagrangians defined in Section 5.4. We fix the grading on L_0 and $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ induced from the constant grading $\frac{1}{2}\dim_{\mathbb{C}} T = \frac{1}{2}n$ on Λ_R (with respect to the Sasaki almost complex structure and the canonical trivialization of $\kappa^{\otimes 2}$ as in [NaZa]). Fix the trivial Pin-structure on the base T, i.e. the one induced from an open embedding $T \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$. Then using the homotopy equivalence $L_0 \to T$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_\zeta \to T$), the projection to the base of $T^*T \cong \mathcal{B}_{w_0}$, $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ is equipped with the trivial relative Pin-structure.

6.1. **Proof of Proposition 5.4.** Proposition 5.4 (i) is well known and (ii) is a direct consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *By appropriate cofinal sequence of positive (resp. negative) wrappings of $\Sigma_I \to \Sigma_I^{+,(j)}$ (resp. $\Sigma_I \to \Sigma_I^{-,(j)}$), we can make $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ intersect $\Sigma_I^{+,(j)}$ (resp. $\Sigma_I^{-,(j)}$) transversely at exactly one point for all $j \gg 1$ with grading 0 (resp. grading n).*

Proof. Using the Lagrangian correspondence (2.1.5), it suffices to show that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ intersects $\widehat{\Sigma}_I^{+,(j)}$ (resp. $\widehat{\Sigma}_I^{+-(j)}$) transversely at exactly $|W|$ many points (that constitute a W-orbit), where $\widehat{\Sigma}_I$ is just the cotangent fiber at $I \in T$. We will define a positive linear Hamiltonian $H_1 : J_G \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (which will be a modification of (4.1.9)), the image of Σ_I under whose positive/negative Hamiltonian flow at time $\pm s_j, s_j \to \infty$ will give $\Sigma_I^{+,(j)}$ and $\Sigma_I^{-,(j)}$, respectively.

Step 1. Some key features about $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$

First, it is clear from the construction of $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ is asymptotically conic (note that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ could be singular). By the proof of Lemma 5.34 (b), specifically the fact that every point in $L_0^\zeta \backslash L_0^{\zeta;1}$ can be flowed into the compact region 5.4.24 under φ_{-Z}^t, we see the projection of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ to T is compact. Second, we recall the property of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ from Lemma 5.36.

Step 2. Definition of H_1

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\|\zeta\| > 3$. We start with the Hamiltonian function (more precisely, the pullback function to J_G) $H_1 : \mathfrak{c} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ from (4.1.10), whose pullback to $\mathfrak{t}^*$ is $\widetilde{H}_1 : \mathfrak{t}^* \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (4.1.9).

Let

$$T^*T \cong T^*T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times T^*\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} \tag{6.1.1}$$
$$(h, \xi) \mapsto (\vec{\theta}, \xi_c), (\log_{\mathbb{R}} h, \xi_{\mathbb{R}})$$

be the canonical splitting of T^*T. For any $\eta_0 > 0$, let

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\eta_0} = \{\xi = \xi_c + \xi_{\mathbb{R}} : \|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\| \geq \eta_0 \cdot \max\{1, \|\xi\|\}\} \subset T^*T. \tag{6.1.2}$$

By Lemma 5.34, for $R, K \gg 1$ and sufficiently small $\eta_0 > 0$, there exists a small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\zeta$ of ζ inside $\mathfrak{t}_c^*$, such that

$$\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}^*}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta) \subset \coprod_{w_1 \in W} w_1(\mathcal{U}_\zeta + \{\xi_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^* : \|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\| \leq \eta_0\}) \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\eta_0}. \tag{6.1.3}$$

Since

$$\mathcal{U}_{\zeta,\eta_0} := \mathcal{U}_\zeta + \{\xi_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^* : \|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\| \leq \eta_0\} \tag{6.1.4}$$

is pre-compact and its closure is away from $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{sing}}$, we can modify the Hamiltonian $\widetilde{H}_1$ (in a W-invariant way) so that

$$\widetilde{H}_1|_{\mathcal{U}_{\zeta,\eta_0}} = \frac{1}{2}\|\xi_c\| + \frac{1}{2}\|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\|^2, \tag{6.1.5}$$

and by choosing the sequence $(\epsilon_j^{(i)})_{1\leq j\leq n}$ in the induction steps in Subsection 4.1 to be much smaller than η_0, we can make sure that

$$\|D_{\xi_{\mathbb{R}}}\widetilde{H}_1|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\eta_0}}\| \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta_0. \tag{6.1.6}$$

Note that (6.1.6) implies that

(6.1.7)

$$\text{for any compact region } \mathcal{K}\subset T,\ \varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\mathcal{Q}_{\eta_0})\cap(\mathcal{K}\times\mathfrak{t}^*)=\emptyset,\ \text{for } |s|\gg 1.$$

Let

$$\widetilde{H}_{1,c}:=y_1(\|\xi_c\|),\ \widetilde{H}_{1,\mathbb{R}}:=\frac{1}{2}\|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\|^2,$$

be functions on $\mathfrak{t}^*$, then (6.1.5) becomes

$$\widetilde{H}_1|_{\mathcal{U}_{\zeta,\eta_0}}=(\widetilde{H}_{1,c}+\widetilde{H}_{1,\mathbb{R}})|_{\mathcal{U}_{\zeta,\eta_0}}.$$

Step 3. The intersection $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\cap\varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I)$ for $|s|\gg 1$.

First, by (6.1.7) and (6.1.3), we must have

(6.1.8)

$$\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}^*}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\cap\varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I))\subset\coprod_{w_1\in W}w_1(\mathcal{U}_\zeta+\{\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\in\mathfrak{t}^*_{\mathbb{R}}:\|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\|\leq\eta_0\}),|s|\gg 1.$$

Applying Lemma 5.36 with $\eta_0\leq\delta_0$, we have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\cap\varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I)=\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\cap\varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}_{1,c}+\widetilde{H}_{1,\mathbb{R}}}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I)\subset\{\|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\|\leq\eta_0\},|s|\gg 1. \tag{6.1.9}$$

Since the wrapping is under a product Hamiltonian function, it is clear that the intersection (6.1.9) is transverse and consists of exactly one point (cf. Figure 9 for the negative wrapping).

Transferring back the geometry to J_G, it is straightforward to identify the grading for the (only) intersection point $\mathcal{L}_\zeta\cap\varphi^{-s}_{H_1}(\Sigma_I), s\gg 1$ (resp. $\varphi^s_{H_1}(\Sigma_I)\cap\mathcal{L}_\zeta, s\gg 1$) as $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}T=\dim_{\mathbb{C}}T^\vee=n$ (resp. 0). So for any sequence $0\leq s_j\uparrow\infty$, the sequence $\Sigma_I^{-,(j)}:=\varphi^{-s_j}_{H_1}(\Sigma_I)$ (resp. $\Sigma_I^{+,(j)}:=\varphi^{s_j}_{H_1}(\Sigma_I)$) gives a desired cofinal sequence of negative (resp. positive) wrappings of Σ_I.

□

Proof of Proposition 5.4 (iii). We use the same $\widetilde{H}_1$ as in the proof of Lemma 6.1 *Step 2*. We look at $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{w(\zeta)}$ in T^*T, and relate the intersections and discs for $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ and $\varphi^{-s}_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{w(\zeta)})$ in T^*T to those of $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ and the negative wrapping of $\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)}$ in J_G.

Following a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.1 *Step 3*, we have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\cap\varphi^{-s}_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{w(\zeta)})\subset\{\|\xi_{\mathbb{R}}\|\leq\eta_0\},s\gg 1.$$

The intersection is clean along the W-orbit of $T_{\mathsf{cpt}}\times\{\zeta\}\times\{Q\}$ for some $Q\in T^*\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ (cf. Figure 10).




FIGURE 9. The intersection of the transformed Lagrangians $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ (red) and $\varphi^{-s}_{\widetilde{H}_{1,c}+\widetilde{H}_{1,\mathbb{R}}}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I)$ (blue) in T^*T, which has the same intersection as $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \cap \varphi^{-s}_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\widehat{\Sigma}_I), s \gg 1$.




FIGURE 10. One portion of the intersections of the transformed Lagrangians $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ (red) and Hamiltonian perturbed $\varphi^{-s}_{\widetilde{H}_1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{w(\zeta)})$ (cyan) in T^*T

Transferring the geometry back to J_G, we get $\mathcal{L}_\zeta \cap \varphi^{-s}_{H_1}(\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)})$ intersects cleanly along a single T_{cpt}-orbit in $\chi^{-1}([\zeta]) \cong C_G(\zeta) \cong T$, where the identifications are using $\xi = \zeta, B_1 = B$ in (2.1.6). The restriction of the rank 1 local system $\check{\rho}_1$ on $\mathcal{L}_\zeta$ (resp. $w(\check{\rho}_2)$ on $\mathcal{L}_{w(\zeta)}$) to the T_{cpt}-orbit is $\check{\rho}_1$ (resp. $\check{\rho}_2$) under the above identification. Now (iii) in the proposition follows. □

6.2. **Proof of Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 5.7.** Before giving the actual proofs, we give an overview of the main ideas and fix some notations. Let L_0 be constructed as in Subsection 5.4.2. We will use the notations and results from Subsections 5.2 and 5.3.

Fix some standard open balls $\mathbf{D} \subsetneq \mathbf{D}'$ in $\mathfrak{t}$ centered at 0, whose closures are contained in the open region $\{|\sum_{\beta\in\Pi} \Re p_{\beta^\vee}| < 1\}$. For sufficiently large

$K \gg R \gg 1$ in the construction of L_0, the projection

$$L_0 \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}') = \Lambda_R \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}') \xrightarrow{p_{\mathbf{D}'}} \mathbf{D}' \subset \mathfrak{t} \xrightarrow{\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}} \mathfrak{c} \tag{6.2.1}$$

is very close to the restriction of χ, and outside the region $T \times \mathbf{D}'$, $\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}}((L_0 \cap (T \times (\mathfrak{t} - \mathbf{D}))) \underset{\mathfrak{c}}{\times} \mathfrak{t}))$ is outside $\mathbf{D}' \cap \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since the image of $p_{\mathbf{D}'}$ in (6.2.1) is contained in $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$, we get $\chi(L_0 \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}'))$ is contained in a thin neighborhood $Nb(\mathfrak{c}_{\mathbb{R}})$ of the real locus $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathbb{R}} := \chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}})$ in $\mathfrak{c}$. Denote the preimage of $Nb(\mathfrak{c}_{\mathbb{R}})$ in $\mathfrak{t}$ by $Nb(\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}})$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $Nb(\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}) = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta}$, where $D_{c,\delta} \subset \mathfrak{t}_c$ is a small W-invariant ball centered at 0 of radius $0 < \delta \ll 1$. We set $\mathbf{D}'_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbf{D}' \cap \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and *reset* $\mathbf{D}' = \mathbf{D}'_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta}$ (and similarly for $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathbf{D}$ respectively).

Second, let $\mathbf{D}^{\circ}_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the complement of a W-invariant tubular neighborhood of $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{sing}}_{\mathbb{R}}$ in $\mathbf{D}' \cap \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and let $\mathbf{D}^{\circ} = \mathbf{D}^{\circ}_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta} \subset Nb(\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}})$. By Proposition 5.15 and Corollary 5.19, we have a good understanding of $L_0 \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}^{\circ})$ inside the integrable system picture $J_G \to \mathfrak{c}$. Namely, if we do the identification

$$\chi^{-1}(\mathbf{D}^{\circ}/W) \cong (T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times D_{c,\delta}) \times (\mathbb{R}^n_{>0} \times (\mathbf{D}^{\circ}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}})) \cong T \times (\mathbf{D}^{\circ} \cap (\mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta})) \tag{6.2.2}$$

using $\mathbf{D}^{\circ}/W \cong \mathbf{D}^{\circ} \cap (\mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta})$, then after a small Hamiltonian isotopy, there exists a pre-compact open region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$, a Lagrangian $\Gamma_w \subset \Omega \times (\mathbf{D}^{\circ}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}})$ that is a graph over $\mathbf{D}^{\circ}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$ for each $w \in W$, and some $\epsilon > 0$ very small, such that $L_0 \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}^{\circ})$ is identified with

$$\coprod_{w \in W} (T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times \{0\}) \times w^{-1}(\epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_w. \tag{6.2.3}$$

So over this region, the intersections of the wrapping of Σ_I and $L_0 \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}^{\circ})$ can be well understood. For the portion of L_0 outside $T \times \mathbf{D}$, we can do similar things as in the proof of Lemma 6.1, so that the wrapping of Σ_I after sufficiently long time will have no intersection with L_0 over there.

The subtle part is about $L_0 \cap (T \times (\mathbf{D}' - \mathbf{D}^{\circ}))$, for which we do not have a concrete description inside the integrable system $J_G \to \mathfrak{c}$. Note that it is not helpful to transform the Lagrangians to T^*T using the correspondence (2.1.5), exactly by the remarks in the end of Subsection 2.1. However, by appropriately defining the wrapping Hamiltonian near the "walls" in $\mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{sing}}_{\mathbb{R}}$, and using results from Section 5.3 (in particular Proposition 5.31), we can show that if the R in (6.2.1) is sufficiently large, then the wrapping of Σ_I will never intersect L_0 inside $T \times (\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{D}^{\circ})$.

Proof of Proposition 5.6. As explained above, we are going to define an appropriate positive wrapping Hamiltonian H, and choose L_0 with R sufficiently large so that the intersections $\varphi^s_H(\Sigma_I) \cap L_0$ are contained in $L_0 \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}^{\circ})$ as above, for all $|s| \gg 1$.

Step 1. Definition of a positive linear Hamiltonian H on $\mathfrak{c}$.

The space $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is stratified by open cones $w(\mathring{\mathfrak{z}}^+_{S,\mathbb{R}})$, indexed by (S, w) with $S \subset \Pi$ and $w \in W^S_{\min}$, which can be viewed as a fan. Let $\mathbf{P} \subset \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the

W-invariant dual convex polytope defined by

$$\{t \in \mathfrak{t}^*_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} : \langle w(\lambda_{\beta^\vee}), t\rangle \leq 1, \beta \in \Pi, w \in W/W_{\Pi-\{\beta\}}\}.$$

Note that on the dominant cone $\mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$, the polytope is cut out by $\langle \lambda_{\beta^\vee}, t\rangle \leq 1, \beta \in \Pi$. We do a W-invariant smoothing of $\partial\mathbf{P}$, denoted by $\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm}$, in a similar way as we did in Subsection 3.2.1, such that (1) for any $(S, w), S \subsetneq \Pi$, there is an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{(S,w)}$ of $\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \cap w(\mathring{\mathfrak{z}}^+_{S,\mathbb{R}})$ in $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ for which

$$\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \cap \mathcal{U}_{(S,w)} \subset (\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \cap w(\mathring{\mathfrak{z}}^+_{S,\mathbb{R}})) + \mathfrak{t}_{S,\mathbb{R}};$$

in other words, $\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \cap \mathcal{U}_{(S,w)}$ is contained in the union of normal slices of $w(\mathring{\mathfrak{z}}^+_{S,\mathbb{R}})$ along the intersection $\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \cap w(\mathring{\mathfrak{z}}^+_{S,\mathbb{R}})$; (2) in an open neighborhood of $\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cdot \mathsf{h}_0$, $\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm}$ is defined by $\|\xi\| = c$ for some constant $c > 0$; (3) the domain $\mathbf{P}_{sm}$ enclosed by $\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm}$ is convex. Since the smoothing process (by induction) is very similar to that in Subsection 3.2.1, we omit the details. Up to radial scaling we may assume that $\mathbf{P}_{sm}$ is contained in $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{R}}$ (cf. Figure 11). Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_{S,w} = \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cdot (\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \cap \mathcal{U}_{S,w})$ for $S \subsetneq \Pi$ and let $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\Pi,1} = [0, \frac{1}{4}) \cdot \partial\mathbf{P}_{sm}$. Let $\mathbf{D}^\circ_{\mathbb{R}}$ be a W-invariant open neighborhood (not too large so that it avoids a tubular neighborhood of $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathrm{sing}}_{\mathbb{R}}$) of the complement of the union of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_{S,w}$ over all (S, w) with $\emptyset \neq S \subset \Pi$ in $\mathbf{D}'_{\mathbb{R}}$, and let $\mathbf{D}^\circ = \mathbf{D}^\circ_{\mathbb{R}} \times D_{c,\delta}$.

First, we define a W-invariant function $\widetilde{H}$ on (part of) $\mathfrak{t}$ as follows. First, choose a smooth function $\mathsf{b} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, such that

$$\mathsf{b}(r) = 0, r \in [0, \frac{1}{4}];\ \mathsf{b}(r) = r, r \geq \frac{3}{4};\ \mathsf{b}''(r) > 0, r \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}).$$

Second, define $\widetilde{H}|_{\mathbf{P}_{sm}}(r \cdot \xi) = \mathsf{b}(r)$, for $\xi \in \partial\mathbf{P}_{sm}, r \in [0, 1]$, and extend it to $\mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta}$ by pulling back under the obvious projection to $\mathbf{P}_{sm}$. Then extend $\widetilde{H}|_{\mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta}}$ homogeneously to $(\mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta}) \cup \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \cdot (\partial\mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta})$.

Now it is clear that $\widetilde{H}$ descends to a smooth function on the quotient of its defining domain in $\mathfrak{c}$. Then extend this to a nonnegative H on $\mathfrak{c}$ that is homogeneous (and strictly positive) outside a compact region. We will also use H to denote its pullback to J_G.

Step 2. Some key facts.

If we choose L_0 with $K \gg R$ both sufficiently large, then we have the following:

(i) Let $\mathbf{D}^\circ_1 \subsetneq \mathbf{D}^\circ_2$ be slight enlargements of $\mathbf{D}^\circ$. By Proposition 5.15, after a small compactly supported Hamiltonian isotopy inside $T \times \mathbf{D}^\circ_2$, we can make

$$L_0 \cap (T \times \mathbf{D}^\circ) \subset L_0 \cap \chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathbf{D}^\circ_1)) \overset{(6.2.2)}{\cong} (6.2.3),$$
$$\chi(L_0 \cap (T \times (\mathbf{D}' - \mathbf{D}^\circ))) \subset \chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\bigcup_{\emptyset \neq S \subset \Pi} \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_{(S,w)}).$$

(ii) $\chi(L_0) \subset ((\mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta}) \cup \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \cdot (\partial \mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta}))/W \subset \mathfrak{c}$ (cf. Lemma 5.34 (c)). In particular, to calculate $\varphi_H^s(\Sigma_I) \cap L_0$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we only use the portion of H descended from $\widetilde{H}$.

(iii) By the definition of H, for any (S, w)

$$\varphi_H^s(\Sigma_I) \cap \chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_{S,w} \times D_{c,\delta} \cap \mathbf{D}')), s \in \mathbb{R}$$

is contained in the $\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_0$-orbit of the portion of Σ_I under the isomorphism (5.2.19). Therefore, by Proposition 5.31,

$$\varphi_H^s(\Sigma_I) \cap (L_0 \cap T \times (\mathbf{D}' - \mathbf{D}^\circ)) = \emptyset, s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

(iv) Using a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\varphi_H^s(\Sigma_I) \cap (L_0 \cap T \times (\mathfrak{t} - \mathbf{D})) \subset \varphi_H^s(\Sigma_I) \cap L_0 \cap \chi^{-1}(\chi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \cdot (\partial \mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta})) = \emptyset,$$

for $|s| \gg 1$. This is due to the fact that the transformed Lagrangian $\widehat{L}_0 \subset T^*T$ projects to a compact domain in T, while the projection of $\varphi_{\widetilde{H}}^s(\widehat{\Sigma}_I) \cap (T \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \cdot (\partial \mathbf{P}_{sm} \times D_{c,\delta}))$ to T is disjoint from the compact region for $|s| \gg 1$.

Step 3. Calculation of wrapped Floer complexes

By *Step 2*, using the identification (6.2.2), the intersection(s) $\varphi_H^s(\Sigma_I) \cap L_0$ for $|s| \gg 1$ can be calculated in a standard way inside (6.2.2) with $\mathbf{D}^\circ$ replaced by $\mathbf{D}_1^\circ$, as

$$\varphi_H^s(\{I\} \times (\mathbf{D}_1^\circ \cap (\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ \times D_{c,\delta}))) \cap \coprod_{w \in W} (T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times \{0\}) \times w^{-1}(\epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_w, \tag{6.2.4}$$

where $\{I\} \times (\mathbf{D}_1^\circ \cap (\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+ \times D_{c,\delta}))$ is just the portion of the cotangent fiber at I contained in (6.2.2). It is clear from Figure 11 that for $s \gg 1$ (resp. $s \ll -1$),

$$\varphi_{\widetilde{H}|_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbb{R}}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+}}^s(\{I\} \times (\mathbf{D}_{1,\mathbb{R}}^\circ \cap \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^+)) \text{ intersects } \coprod_{w \in W} w^{-1}(\epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_w$$

transversely at exactly one point in $w_0(\epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_{w_0}$ (resp. $\epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0} \cdot \Gamma_1$), for the former covers the "strip" $\bigcup_{0<\epsilon<\epsilon_0} w_0(\epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \overline{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$ (resp. $\bigcup_{0<\epsilon<\epsilon_0} \epsilon^{-\mathsf{h}_0} \cdot \overline{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$), for some fixed $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll 1$, in a one-to-one manner, and approaches to the zero-section over any compact region in the "strip" as $s \to \infty$ (resp. $s \to -\infty$). Now the isomorphisms (5.1.6) and (5.1.7) in the proposition follow directly.

□

Proof of Proposition 5.7. The proof goes similarly as the previous one for Proposition 5.6, and we will use the same notations from there. To show (5.1.8), we pick $L_0^{(1)}$ and $L_0^{(2)}$ with respective $K^{(j)} \gg R^{(j)} \gg 1$ satisfying $R^{(2)} \gg R^{(1)}$. Then by the same reasoning in *Step 2* of the previous proof,




FIGURE 11. The W-invariant region enclosed by the outer thick black curve represents $\mathbf{P}_{sm}$. The cyan region represents $\mathbf{D}^\circ_{1,\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}$. The middle orange dashed curve encloses $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\Pi,1}$.

we have for $s \gg 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi_H^s(L_0^{(1)}) \cap L_0^{(2)} \\
&= \coprod_{w\in W} (T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times \{0\}) \times \varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}|_{\mathbf{D}^\circ_{\mathbb{R}}\cap \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}}} (w^{-1}(\epsilon_1^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_w^{(1)}) \cap \coprod_{w\in W} (T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times \{0\}) \times w^{-1}(\epsilon_2^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_w^{(2)} \\
&= \coprod_{w\in W} (T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times \{0\}) \times \varphi^s_{\widetilde{H}|_{\mathbf{D}^\circ_{\mathbb{R}}\cap \mathfrak{t}^+_{\mathbb{R}}}} (w^{-1}(\epsilon_1^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_w^{(1)}) \cap ((T_{\mathsf{cpt}} \times \{0\}) \times w_0(\epsilon_2^{-\mathsf{h}_0}) \cdot \Gamma_{w_0}^{(2)})
\end{aligned}$$

for some $0 < \epsilon_2 \ll \epsilon_1 \ll 1$. The intersection is clean and has $|W|$ many connected components C_w, each isomorphic to T_{cpt}. For $(\varphi_H^s(L_0^{(1)}), \check{\rho})$ and $(L_0^{(2)}, w_1(\check{\rho}))$, $s \gg 1$, there is an indexing $p : W \to \{1, \cdots, |W|\}$ and a spectral sequence converging to their Floer cohomology (cf. [Sei2], [Poz], [Sch]) whose E_1-page is given by

$$E_1^{p(w),q} = H^{p(w)+q+i'(C_{p(w)})-n}(C_{p(w)}; w^{-1}(\check{\rho}^{-1}) \otimes w_0 w_1(\check{\rho})), \tag{6.2.5}$$

for some coherent index $i'(C_{p(w)}) \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $\rho \in (T^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}$, then (6.2.5) is zero unless $w = w_1^{-1}w_0$, in which case, (6.2.5) is the cohomology $H^*(T, \mathbb{C})$ up to some grading shift. So the E_1-page converges to $\bigoplus_q E_1^{p(w_1^{-1}w_0),q}[-p(w_1^{-1}w_0) - q] = H^*(T, \mathbb{C})[d]$, for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}$. On the other hand, it is clear that by local Hamiltonian perturbation of $L_0^{(2)}$ near $C_w, w \in W$, we can achieve transverse intersections with gradings ranging between 0 and n, therefore d must be 0 and we obtain (5.1.8) as desired.

Lastly, by Proposition 5.6, both $(L_0, \check{\rho})$ and $(L_0, w_1(\check{\rho}))$ correspond to simple left $\mathcal{A}_G$-modules in the abelian category of (finitely generated) $\mathcal{A}_G$-modules. Hence

$$H^0\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G)}((L_0, \check{\rho}), (L_0, w_1(\check{\rho}))) \cong \mathbb{C}$$

implies that they are isomorphic. □

Remark 6.2. It will follow from Proposition 5.3 that for non-regular $\check{\rho}$, we also have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G)}((L_0,\check{\rho}),(L_0,w_1(\check{\rho}))) \cong H^*(T,\mathbb{C}).$$

The above proof gives the E_1-page of the spectral sequence (6.2.5) to compute the Floer cohomology. However, there are multiple columns having nonzero entries $H^{p(w)+q}(T,\mathbb{C}), 0 \leq p(w)+q \leq n$. Hence the differentials $d_r^{p,q}, r \geq 1$ are not all zero, which means there are non-trivial counts of holomorphic discs entering into the calculation.

6.3. **Proof of Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 5.3.** Before giving the actual proof, we prove a couple of lemmas in algebra. Let $U \subset \mathbb{A}^n = \mathrm{Spec}\mathbb{C}[z_1,\cdots,z_n]$ be any (nonempty) affine Zariski open subvariety.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $M^\bullet$ be any $\mathbb{C}[U]$-module whose cohomology modules are countably generated over $\mathbb{C}[U]$. Assume*

> *$M^\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}) \cong 0$ (here as always the tensor product and all functors have been derived unless otherwise specified) for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathbb{C}[U]$.*

Then $M^\bullet \cong 0$.

Proof. We prove by induction on the dimension of the support of M (inside the proof, we denote $M^\bullet$ simply by M). First, if the support of M has dimension 0 (i.e. it is at most a countable union of closed points), then M is a direct sum of skyscraper sheaves, which cannot satisfy the condition unless it is 0.

Suppose we have proved the case for $\dim \mathrm{supp}(M) < k$. Now assume $\dim \mathrm{supp}(M) = k$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathbb{C}[U]$ be a prime ideal of dimension $< k$, and let Z be the corresponding closed subscheme. There is an open subset $W \subset \mathbb{A}^{\dim Z}$ and an open subset $Z^\dagger \subset Z$ (both nonempty), together with a proper étale map $Z^\dagger \to W$ (cf. [SP, Tag 054L]). The pushforward of $M|_{Z^\dagger}$ along $Z^\dagger \to W$ satisfies that it has zero fiber at every closed point, hence by induction, it is zero. This shows that M has zero fiber at every point of dimension $< k$.

Now for any $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathbb{C}[U]$ of dimension k, consider

$$M \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{p}) \longrightarrow M \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} \mathbf{K}_\mathfrak{p},$$

where $\mathbf{K}_\mathfrak{p}$ is the fraction field of $\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{p}$. This is an isomorphism because it induces isomorphisms on all fibers. In particular, $M \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{p})$ is a free $\mathbf{K}_\mathfrak{p}$-module. Thus it cannot be countably generated over $\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{p}$ unless it is zero. This finishes the inductive step. □

Lemma 6.4. *Let $(M^\bullet, d^\bullet)$ be any complex of $\mathbb{C}[U]$-modules concentrated in degree ≤ 0 satisfying:*

(i) *each $H^i(M^\bullet)$ is countably generated over $\mathbb{C}[U]$;*
(ii) *for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathbb{C}[U]$, $M^\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}) \cong \mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}$;*

(iii) *there exists a finite collection* $\{\overline{e}_1, \cdots, \overline{e}_K\} \subset H^0(M^\bullet)$ *with any choice of lifts* $e_1, \cdots, e_K \in \ker d^0$*, such that they generate* $H^0(M^\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M})) \overset{(ii)}{\cong} M^\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M})$ *for every* $\mathfrak{M}$*, under the natural surjective map* $\ker d^0 \to H^0(M^\bullet) \to H^0(M^\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[U]} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}))$.

Then $M^\bullet$ *is concentrated in degree* 0*, and it is a locally free rank* 1 *module of* $\mathbb{C}[U]$ *(actually free of rank* 1*).*

Proof. In the proof, we usually denote $M^\bullet$ simply by M, and we assume $M^i = 0, i > 0$. We prove by induction on the dimension n and the number K in (iii). If $n = 0$, there is nothing to prove. If $K = 1$, then $e_1 \in M^0$ gives a non-vanishing global section, i.e. non-vanishing at every closed point, and clearly $e_1 \cdot \mathbb{C}[U] \cong \mathbb{C}[U]$. So doing $\otimes(\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M})$ to the exact triangle

$$e_1 \cdot \mathbb{C}[U] \xrightarrow{\iota_1} M \to \mathrm{Cone}(\iota_1) \xrightarrow{+1},$$

we get the exact triangle

$$\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M} \to M \underset{\mathbb{C}[U]}{\otimes} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}) \to \mathrm{Cone}(\iota_1) \underset{\mathbb{C}[U]}{\otimes} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}) \xrightarrow{+1}.$$

By the assumptions (ii) and (iii) with $K = 1$, we know the first arrow is an isomorphism for all $\mathfrak{M}$. Hence we have

$$\mathrm{Cone}(\iota_1) \underset{\mathbb{C}[U]}{\otimes} (\mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}) \cong 0, \text{ for all } \mathfrak{M}.$$

Then by Lemma 6.3, we have $\mathrm{Cone}(\iota_1) \cong 0$, i.e. $M \cong \mathbb{C}[U]$. We also note that all assumptions automatically hold for any open affine $\widetilde{U} \subset U$ and pullback of M there.

Suppose we have proved the statement for all U' of dimension strictly less than $n \geq 1$ together with all K', and we have proved for U' of dimension n with $1 \leq K' < K$.

Step 1. Showing that $H^0(M)$ *is generated by* $\overline{e}_1, \cdots, \overline{e}_K$ *after localizing* $(z_n - a), \forall a \in \mathbb{C}$.

Let $\widetilde{M}^\bullet$ defined as follows. First, $\widetilde{M}^i = M^i, i < 0$, and

$$\widetilde{M}^0 = \{v \in M^0 : \text{there exist } a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_s \in \mathbb{C}, \text{ such that } \overline{v} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{s} (z_n - a_j) \in \sum_{j=1}^{K} \overline{e}_j \cdot \mathbb{C}[U]\},$$

where $\overline{v}$ means the image of v in $H^0(M) = M^0/\mathrm{Im}\ d^{-1}$. Then we have a natural map $\widetilde{M} \to M$, which induces $H^i(\widetilde{M}) \cong H^i(M), i < 0$, and $H^0(\widetilde{M}) \hookrightarrow H^0(M)$. Moreover, for any $a \in \mathbb{C}$, using the Koszul resolution of

$\mathbb{C}[U]/(z_n - a)$, we see that

$$H^i(\widetilde{M} \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]/(z_n - a)) \cong H^i(M \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]/(z_n - a)), i < 0 \tag{6.3.1}$$

$$H^0(\widetilde{M} \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]/(z_n - a)) \hookrightarrow H^0(M \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]/(z_n - a)). \tag{6.3.2}$$

Since $M \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]/(z_n - a)$ satisfies (i)-(iii) with dimension $n-1$, from induction we get (6.3.1) is zero for all $i < 0$ and (6.3.2) is an isomorphism of line bundles. In particular, we have $\widetilde{M} \cong M$, by Lemma 6.3.

Step 2. Reduction of the number of generators K on certain Zariski open subsets.

Let $\{q_1, q_2, \cdots\}$ be a countable set of generators $H^0(M) = H^0(\widetilde{M})$ such that for each q_ℓ there exists $\tau_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $a_i^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \cdots, \tau_\ell$ and $f_j^{(\ell)}(z) \in \mathbb{C}[U], j = 1, \cdots K$ with

$$q_\ell \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\tau_\ell}(z_n - a_i^{(\ell)}) = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \overline{e}_j \cdot f_j^{(\ell)}(z).$$

For any $b \in \mathbb{C} - \{a_i^{(\ell)} : 1 \leq i \leq \tau_\ell, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\}$ with $U \cap \{z_n = b\} \neq \emptyset$, and any closed point $P \in U \cap \{z_n = b\}$, by induction, there is a Zariski open affine subset $V := \{g_1(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}) \neq 0, \cdots, g_k(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1}) \neq 0\} \subset U \cap \{z_n = b\}$ containing P such that for some $1 \leq j_P \leq K$, e_{j_P} generates $M|_V$. Let $\widetilde{U} = (V \times \mathbb{A}^1_{z_n}) \cap U$ which is again affine open in $\mathbb{A}^n$. For any fixed $s \neq j_P$, we have $\overline{e}_s|_V = \overline{e}_{j_P}|_V \cdot h_1(z_1, \cdots, z_{n-1})$, for some $h_1 \in \mathbb{C}[V]$. Viewing h_1 as the pullback function on $\widetilde{U}$, we have $\overline{e}_s - \overline{e}_{j_P} \cdot h_1 \in H^0(M|_{\widetilde{U}}) \cdot (z_n - b)$, and by the generation assumption we have that there exists a finite indexing set C and $r_c(z) \in \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{U}], c \in C$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{e}_s - \overline{e}_{j_P} \cdot h_1 = \big(\sum_{c \in C} q_c \cdot r_c(z)\big)(z_n - b) \\
\Rightarrow &(\overline{e}_s - \overline{e}_{j_P} \cdot h_1) \cdot \prod_{c \in C}\prod_{i=1}^{\tau_c}(z_n - a_i^{(c)}) = \big(\sum_{j=1}^{K} \overline{e}_j \cdot \widetilde{r}_j(z)\big)(z_n - b), \\
&\quad \text{for some } \widetilde{r}_j(z) \in \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{U}], \\
\Rightarrow &\overline{e}_s \cdot \big(\prod_{c \in C}\prod_{i=1}^{\tau_c}(z_n - a_i^{(c)}) - \widetilde{r}_s(z)(z_n - b)\big) \in \sum_{j \neq s} \overline{e}_j \cdot \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{U}].
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$F_s(z) = \prod_{c \in C}\prod_{i=1}^{\tau_c}(z_n - a_i^{(c)}) - \widetilde{r}_s(z)(z_n - b)$$

and let $\widetilde{U}_P = \widetilde{U} \cap \{F_s(z) \neq 0\}$. Clearly, $\widetilde{U}_P \cap \{z_n = b\} = \widetilde{U} \cap \{z_n = b\} = V$. Now $M|_{\widetilde{U}_P}$ satisfies (i)-(iii) with K replaced by $K - 1$. Hence by induction,

$M|_{\widetilde{U}_P}$ is in degree 0 and is locally free of rank 1.

Step 3. Completing the inductive step.

Since $P \in U \cap \{z_n = b\}$ is arbitrary, we conclude with the following:

> *There is a Zariski open subset $U_n \subset U$ such that $M|_{U_n}$ is locally free of rank 1, and $U_n \supset \bigcup_{b \notin \{a_i^{(\ell)} : 1 \le i \le \tau_\ell, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1}\}} \{z_n = b\} \cap U$.*

This implies that the complement $U - U_n$ projects to $\mathbb{A}^1_{z_n}$ in a *finite* subset. Repeating this with z_n replaced by z_j for each $j < n$, we get:

> *There is a finite collection of closed points $\{P_1, \cdots, P_m\} \subset U$ (with corresponding maximal ideal $\mathfrak{M}_{P_j}$) such that the restriction of M to $U^\dagger := U - \{P_1, \cdots, P_m\}$ is locally free of rank 1.*

Now we show that M is locally free of rank 1 on U. First assume $n = 1$. For each $1 \le s \le m$, we choose any e_{j_s} that generates $M \otimes \mathbb{C}[U]/\mathfrak{M}_{P_s}$. There are two cases:

Case 1: $\overline{e}_{j_s}|_{U^\dagger} \neq 0$. Then since the zeros of $e_{j_s}|_{U^\dagger} \neq 0$ are finite, e_{j_s} gives a non-vanishing section on a Zariski open subset containing P_s;

Case 2: $\overline{e}_{j_s}|_{U^\dagger} = 0$. Then there exists $e_{j'_s}$ such that $\overline{e}_{j'_s}|_{U^\dagger} \neq 0$. Consider the linear combination $R \cdot \overline{e}_{j_s} + \overline{e}_{j'_s}$, for some $R \in \mathbb{R}$. For R sufficiently large, this gives a non-vanishing section on a Zariski open subset containing P_s.

So we have proved the case for $n = 1$. Note that by projecting any affine smooth curve to $\mathbb{A}^1$ (and using [SP, Tag 054L] as before) and running the same argument, we get the same statement for U being any affine smooth curve (without the assertion about freeness of M).

For $n \ge 2$, choose e_{j_s} for every P_s such that the restriction of $\overline{e}_{j_s}$ at P_s is nonzero. We claim that there is an open neighborhood of P_s on which $\overline{e}_{j_s}$ is nonvanishing everywhere. Suppose the contrary, there exists an irreducible and reduced closed affine curve C_s in a neighborhood U_s of P_s, such that $P_s \in C_s$ and $\overline{e}_{j_s}|_{C_s \setminus \{P_s\}} = 0$. Let $\pi : \widetilde{C}_s \to C_s$ be the normalization, and let $\varphi_s : \widetilde{C}_s \to U_s$ be the composition of π with the embedding of C_s. Then $\varphi_s^* M$ satisfies all the requirements in the lemma on $\widetilde{C}_s$, so $\varphi_s^* M$ is a line bundle on $\widetilde{C}_s$. Since the restriction of $H^0(\varphi_s^*)(\overline{e}_{j_s}) \in H^0(\varphi_s^* M) \cong \varphi_s^* M$ at $(\pi^{-1}(P_s))_{red}$ is nonzero, we get that $H^0(\varphi_s^*)(\overline{e}_{j_s})$ is nonvanishing on an open dense subset of $\widetilde{C}_s$ containing $(\pi^{-1}(P_s))_{red}$. But this contradicts to the assumption that $\overline{e}_{j_s}$ is vanishing along $C_s \setminus \{P_s\}$. Now for each $1 \le s \le m$, we are reduced to the case of $K = 1$ on some open neighborhood of P_s, thus the case for $n \ge 2$ follows. □

Remark 6.5. There are direct generalizations of Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4 for any smooth (affine) variety. Using [SP, Tag 054L], Lemma 6.3 easily extends. For Lemma 6.4, first one can generalize to the case where (ii) becomes that the stalk of M at each closed point is concentrated in degree 0

and has constant rank r, and the conclusion becomes that M is locally free of rank r. The proof extends easily with only the following two changes:

- $K \geq r$ so the base case in the induction for K is r;
- in Step 3, for $n = 1$ case, one runs an induction on the rank r, i.e. for $r \geq 2$, one can find a nonvanishing section $\overline{\sigma} \in H^0(M)$ with a lifting $\sigma \in M^0$ in an affine open neighborhood U_s of each P_s, then the cone of the natural map $\sigma \cdot \mathbb{C}[U_s] \to M|_{U_s}$ satisfies the conditions in the lemma with stalks having constant rank $r-1$, so by induction it is locally free and so is $M|_{U_s}$.

Second, one can further generalize to the case that U is a smooth affine variety (then for any smooth variety one can formulate the conditions in the lemma using an open affine cover), for which the proof verbatim extends (using again [SP, Tag 054L]).

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the $\mathcal{A}_G - \mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-bimodule corresponding to the co-restriction functor in (5.1.2).

(i) For a generic cotangent fiber[21] $F_h \subset \mathcal{B}_{w_0} \cong T^*T$ (equipped with constant grading n), $F_h \cap \chi^{-1}([0])$ transversely in $|W|$ many points and they are in the same degree (note that F_h and $\chi^{-1}([0])$ are both holomorphic Lagrangians), where $\chi^{-1}([0])$ is the critical handle whose cocore Σ_I generates $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$. This is due to (1) the map $\chi|_{F_h} : F_h \to \mathfrak{c}$ is proper by Proposition 3.6, and (2) the intersection of F_h and $\chi^{-1}([\xi])$ for $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{c}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ (in a compact region) and $|\gamma_{-\Pi}(h)| \ll 1$ is transverse at $|W|$ many points (cf. Lemma 5.13). Since $\mathrm{End}(\Sigma_I)$ is concentrated in degree 0, by the wrapping exact triangle from [GPS2], we have $co\text{-}res(\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]) \cong \mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus |W|}$. This is explained in more details below.

Following the same ideas as in Section 5, 6 and 9 in *loc. cit.*, consider $\mathcal{W}(\overline{J}_G \times T^*[0,1]) \simeq \mathcal{W}(\widehat{J}_G \times \mathbb{C}; \mathfrak{f})$, where $\mathfrak{f}$ is an isotropic stop in $\partial_\infty(\widehat{J}_G \times \mathbb{C})$ determined by the Lagrangian core of $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\{\pm\infty\} \subset \partial_\infty \mathbb{C}$, which is equivalent to $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ under the Kunneth formula. It is generated by the product of the cocores $D_p := \Sigma_I \times T^*_{1/4}(0,1)$, which is a "small" Lagrangian linking disc of the Legendrian stop (a portion of the $\mathfrak{f}$) $\mathfrak{f}_1 := \chi^{-1}([0]) \times \{-\infty\}$ at $p = (g = I, \xi = f; -\infty)$ in the contact ∞-boundary of the Liouville completion $\widehat{J}_G \times \mathbb{C}$ (here we assume the Liouville 1-form on $\mathbb{C}$ is deformed from the standard one by an exact 1-form supported in $\Re z \in (-1,2)$ union with $\arg z \in (\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{3}) \cup (-\frac{2\pi}{3}, -\frac{\pi}{3})$). Now we have $L_h := F_h \times T^*_{1/2}(0,1)$ an object in $\mathcal{W}(\overline{J}_G \times T^*[0,1])$, after a cylindricalization. We will not deal with cylindricalization explicitly since the process can be chosen to only affect things in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the infinity end of the product Lagrangian (cf. the last paragraph of Section 7.2 in *loc. cit.* for the precise statement). In particular, such a process will not affect any of the

[21] Strictly speaking, we need to take a cylindricalization of F_h as done in Subsection 5.4 for L_0. Using a similar construction there, the resulting cylindrical F_h satisfies the same properties.

discussions below. The way that L_h can be generated by D_p is through the wrapping exact triangles associated with a positive wrapping near p, which only involves a positive wrapping on the factor $\mathbb{C}$ that takes the upper ∞-end $1/2+i\infty$ of $T^*_{1/2}(0,1) = \{\Re z = 1/2\}$ passing through $-\infty$ counterclockwise. We fix the grading on F_h and Σ_I to be constantly 0, and the grading on $\chi^{-1}([0])$ (not as an object in $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$) to be $2n$. We also fix the grading (with respect to the obvious complex structure on $\mathbb{C}$) on $\{\Re z = x\}, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ to be constantly $\frac{1}{2}$, and the grading on the skeleton $\mathbb{R}$ (for $\mathbb{C}$ with stops $\{\pm\infty\}$) to be constantly 0. This induces canonical gradings on D_p, L_h and the non-closed conic Lagrangian $\mathcal{C} := \mathrm{Cone}(\mathfrak{f}_1)$.

Label the intersection points $F_h \cap \chi^{-1}([0])$ by $p'_1, \cdots, p'_{|W|}$. Then $L_h \cap \mathcal{C} = \{\widetilde{p}_1, \cdots, \widetilde{p}_{|W|}\}$, where $\widetilde{p}_j = (p'_j; 1/2) \in \widehat{J}_G \times \mathbb{C}$. Let $p_j = (p'_j; -\infty) \in (F_h \cap \chi^{-1}([0])) \times \partial_\infty \mathbb{C}$. There is a sequence of wrapping exact triangles

$$L_h^{(i+1)} = (L_h^{(i)})^w \longrightarrow L_h^{(i)} \longrightarrow D_{p_{i+1}}[d_i] \xrightarrow{+1}, \ 0 \leq i \leq |W| - 1$$

where $L_h^{(0)} = L_h$, $L_h^{(|W|)} \cong 0$, $(L_h^{(i)})^w$ is the wrapping of $L_h^{(i)}$ across p_{i+1}, $D_{p_j} \cong D_p$ and $L_h^{(i)} \cap \mathrm{Cone}(\mathfrak{f}_1)$ transversely in $|W| - i$ many points, and $d_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ is some grading shift. To determine each grading shift d_i, we first appeal to the local model of the surgery $L_h^{(i)} \natural_\gamma D_p = (L_h^{(i)})^w$ as in Section 5.5 of [GPS2]. Using Figure 14 of *loc. cit.* and forget about the current situation for a moment, if we assume that the (piece of) cone over the portion of $\partial_\infty L$ in L in that picture has the same grading as the (piece of) cone of the bottom portion of $\partial_\infty D_p$ in D_p as well as the cone of Λ, then the wrapping exact triangle is $L^w \to L \to D_p \xrightarrow{+1}$ without any grading shift on D_p. This can be equivalently characterized as follows. Introduce Λ' to be a shift of Λ in the negative vertical direction (i.e. under a negative Reeb flow), that is placed in the middle of Λ and $\partial_\infty L$ but above the bottom of $\partial_\infty D_p$. Do a wrapping of L in a small neighborhood of the portion of $\partial_\infty L$ in the positive direction that passes through Λ' but not Λ (i.e. the rightmost picture with Λ replaced by Λ'; the resulting L is equivalent to the initial L because the wrapping does not across a stop). Denote the resulting Lagrangian by L'. Then D_p intersects $\mathrm{Cone}(\Lambda')$ in exactly one point, and L' also intersects $\mathrm{Cone}(\Lambda')$ at exactly one point in a small neighborhood of that local picture. Then the degree of the former intersection point is one higher than the degree of the latter. Equivalently, this can be characterized by introducing a linking disc D that links both D_p and L as in Figure 17 of *loc. cit.*, then $HF(D_p, D) = HF(L, D)$ (usual Floer complex but not wrapped) are both 1-dimensional and of the same degree. As explained in *loc. cit.*, the higher dimensional local models are just from spinning the above pictures around the middle vertical axis.

Now return to our current situation. The grading of the intersection points $L_h \cap \mathcal{C}$ is all 0, and the same holds for $D_p \cap \mathcal{C}$ (cf. [Jin, Proposition 5.2]). Let $D'_{p'_j}$ be a small disc around p'_j in F_h, and let $D''_{p'_j}$ be a

smaller one. Then the wrapping of L_h across p_j only involves $D'_{p'_j} \times \{1/2 + i\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1000}\}$. Apply a positive wrapping supported in a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{p_j}$ of $D'_{p'_j} \times (\partial_\infty \mathbb{C} \backslash \{\pm\infty\})$ inside $J_G \times (\mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R})$, whose restriction to a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}'_{p_j}$ of $D''_{p'_j} \times (\partial_\infty \mathbb{C}\backslash\{\pm\infty\})$ is just a positive wrapping on the $\mathbb{C}$-factor. The resulting L_h (which is equivalent to the original L_h in the wrapped Fukaya category of $\widehat{J}_G \times \mathbb{C}$ with stop $\mathfrak{f}$) intersects a small negative push-off (in the $\mathbb{C}$-factor) of $\mathcal{C}$ inside $\mathcal{U}'_{p_j}$ at exactly one point, and the grading is -1. Using the above local model where L_h plays the role of L there, we see that $d_1 = 0$, and consequently $d_j = 0$, since everything is local around p'_j in the J_G-factor and then the same argument works for $L_h^{(j-1)}$ wrapping across p_j.

Lastly using that $\mathrm{Hom}(D_p, D_p)$ is concentrated in degree 0, we get $L_h \cong D_p^{\oplus |W|}$, and so $F_h \cong \Sigma_I^{\oplus |W|}$ as desired.

We now show that $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$ as a $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-module. Fix an identification $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus |W|}$ as left $\mathcal{A}_G$-modules from above. Let $e_j = [0, \cdots, 0, 1, 0, \cdots, 0], 1 \leq j \leq |W|$ be the element in $\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus |W|}$ that has $1 \in \mathcal{A}_G$ in the j-th component and 0 otherwise. Then $\mathcal{M}$ as a right $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-module (in degree 0) satisfies (i)-(iii) in Lemma 6.4. Indeed, Proposition 5.6 (5.1.7) says $co\text{-}res(L_0, \check{\rho}) \in \mathcal{W}(J_G)$, for any $(L_0, \check{\rho}) \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0})$[22], is an $\mathcal{A}_G$-module with underling vector space just $\mathbb{C}$. Using the correspondence between $(L_0, \check{\rho}) \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_0)$ and simple skyscraper sheaves on $T^\vee$, this means $\mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]} \mathbb{C}[T^\vee]/\mathfrak{M} \cong \mathbb{C}$ as a vector space, for every $\mathfrak{M}$. Also $e_j, j = 1, \cdots, |W|$ serve as those in (iii), since otherwise if there exists $\mathfrak{M}$ such that $e_1, \cdots, e_{|W|} \in \mathcal{M}\mathfrak{M}$, then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A}_G e_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{A}_G e_{|W|} \subset \mathcal{M}\mathfrak{M}$, contradicting to property (ii). Hence $\mathcal{M}$ is locally free of rank 1 over $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$. But this means $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$.

(ii) By (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} res(\mathcal{F}) &\cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}_G\text{-Mod}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}_G\text{-Mod}}(\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus |W|}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &\cong (\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus |W|})^\vee \underset{\mathcal{A}_G}{\otimes} \mathcal{F}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}^\vee \cong (\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus |W|})^\vee := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}_G - \mathrm{Mod}}(\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus |W|}, \mathcal{A}_G)$ with the right $\mathcal{A}_G$-module structure from that on the target. Using the same method as (i), and Proposition 5.6, (5.1.6), we deduce that $\mathcal{M}^\vee$ as a left $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-module is free of rank 1. In more details, by adjunction, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0})}((L_0, \check{\rho}), res(\Sigma_I)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}(J_G)}((L_0, \check{\rho}), \Sigma_I) \cong \mathbb{C}[-n].$$

where we use that the co-restriction functor takes $(L_0, \check{\rho}) \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0})$ to $(L_0, \check{\rho}) \in \mathcal{W}(J_G)$. Now using the correspondence between $(L_0, \check{\rho}) \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_0)$ and simple skyscraper sheaves on $T^\vee$ again, the above equation says $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]/\mathfrak{M} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]} \mathcal{M}^\vee \cong \mathbb{C}$ for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{M}$, which verifies property (ii) in Lemma 6.4. The rest steps go verbatim as we did for part (i).

[22] In that proposition, $(L_0, \check{\rho})$ is regarded as an object in $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$, which is the same as $co\text{-}res(L_0, \check{\rho})$, when $(L_0, \check{\rho})$ is thought as an object in $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0})$.

(iii)
By (ii) we have an isomorphism of $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee] - \mathcal{A}_G$-bimodules

$$\mathcal{M}^\vee \cong (\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus|W|})^\vee \cong \mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$$

that represent the restriction functor. This implies that the natural algebra map $\mathcal{A}_G \to \mathbb{C}[T^\vee] \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]}(\mathbb{C}[T^\vee])$ is injective, which forces $\mathcal{A}_G$ to be commutative. Alternatively, we can use (i) to deduce the injective algebra map $\mathcal{A}_G \to \mathbb{C}[T^\vee] \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]}(\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$.

(iv) We view the $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-module structure on $\mathcal{M}$ in terms as an embedding into matrix algebras over $\mathcal{A}_G$:

$$\mathbb{C}[T^\vee] \hookrightarrow \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}_G}(\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus|W|}). \tag{6.3.3}$$

Let $\{x^{\pm\lambda_\alpha^\vee}, \alpha \in \Pi\}$ be the standard algebra generators of $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$, and let $c_{ij}^{\alpha,\pm}, 1 \le i,j \le |W|$ be the entries of the matrix image of $x^{\pm\lambda_\alpha^\vee}$ from (6.3.3). Let $v = (v_1, \cdots, v_{|W|})$ be a generator of $\mathcal{A}_G^{\oplus|W|}$ as a rank 1 $\mathbb{C}[T^\vee]$-module. Then it is clear that $\mathcal{A}_G$ as an algebra is generated by $c_{ij}^{\alpha,\pm}, 1 \le i,j \le |W|, \alpha \in \Pi$, and $v_1, \cdots, v_{|W|}$. □

Proof of Proposition 5.3. (i) It follows directly from Proposition 5.2 that the co-restriction functor (resp. the restriction functor) is isomorphic to f_* (resp. $\mathsf{f}^!$) on coherent sheaves. Here we also use the general result about partially wrapped Fukaya categories that $\mathcal{A}_G$ is smooth[23].

(ii) follows from Proposition 5.7. More explicitly, since $(L_0, \check{\rho}) \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee)$ represents the (simple) skyscraper sheaf at $\check{\rho} \in T^\vee$, Proposition 5.7 implies that for any $\check{\rho} \in (T^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}$, the W-orbit of the corresponding skyscraper sheaves are sent to the same skyscraper sheaf on $\mathrm{Spec}\mathcal{A}_G$ via f_*. Since $T^\vee$ is a smooth affine variety, the map f is W-invariant. This finishes the proof. □

7. HMS of J_G for reductive groups

In this section, we prove HMS for J_G when G is any complex reductive group, based on the result for adjoint groups. The main result is stated in Theorem 7.7. We give two proofs of the main theorem: one is using microlocal sheaf category and the other is using wrapped Fukaya category. Although arguing in different languages, the underlying principles of the proofs are essentially the same: one combines the HMS for adjoint G and monadicity properties of functors associated with finite central quotients for a reductive group. Lastly, we describe the diagram of co-restriction functors among wrapped Fukaya categories associated with the sector covering of J_G by J_{L_S} of the standard Levi subgroups L_S. Each co-restriction functor serves as an induction functor from a smaller Levi to a bigger Levi.

7.1. **Basic set-up.**

[23] Alternatively, one can use $\mathrm{Perf}(\mathcal{A}_G)$ instead of coherent sheaves on $\mathrm{Spec}\mathcal{A}_G$ in the statement of the proposition, which will not affect the proof of Theorem 5.1.

7.1.1. *Regular coverings.* Let G be any connected complex reductive Lie group, with $G^{\mathrm{der}} = [G, G]$, and let $\mathcal{Z}(G)$ (resp. $\mathcal{Z}(G)_0$, $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0$) denote its center (resp. the identity component, $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(G)_0$). Let $G_\flat = G/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}) = G_{\mathrm{ad}} \times (\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))$. Then

$$G = G^{\mathrm{der}} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} \mathcal{Z}(G)_0,\ \mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}) = \mathcal{Z}(G)_0/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0, \text{ and the projection}$$

(7.1.1)

$$\mathsf{q} : J_G = (J_{G^{\mathrm{der}}} \times T^*\mathcal{Z}(G)_0)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0 \longrightarrow J_{G_\flat} = J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \times T^*(\mathcal{Z}(G)_0/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0)$$

is a regular covering with covering group $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$. By Section 3, $J_{G^{\mathrm{der}}}$ can be partially compactified to be a Liouville (or Weinstein) sector, which is $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$-equivariant. Then $J_{G^{\mathrm{der}}} \times T^*\mathcal{Z}(G)_0$ can be equipped with the product sector structure that is $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}) \times \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0$-equivariant, and the quotient by the diagonal $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0$ gives a Liouville sector structure on a partial compactification of J_G.

Let Λ_G denote for the Lagrangian skeleton of J_G in the Liouville completion. Then we have the restriction

(7.1.2)

$$\mathsf{q}|_{\Lambda_G} : \Lambda_G = (\Lambda_{G^{\mathrm{der}}} \times \mathcal{Z}(G)_0)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0 \longrightarrow \Lambda_{G_\flat} = \Lambda_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \times (\mathcal{Z}(G)_0/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0)$$

a regular covering as well. Here and after, for notations regarding Lie groups, their Langlands dual, maximal tori and their different forms (e.g. adjoint, simply connected etc.), we follow the notations in Section 1.

7.1.2. *Sector inclusions.* Assume first that G is semisimple. Using a similar argument as in Proposition 3.9 and in Subsection 5.4.1, we have natural sector inclusions up to Liouville homotopies (that do *not* affect the wrapped Fukaya category), for each $S \subsetneq \Pi$,

$$\overline{J}_{L_S} \hookrightarrow \overline{J}_G, \tag{7.1.3}$$

compatible with q, which gives a covering of Λ_G by Λ_{L_S}. These can be constructed as follows.

For any $S \subsetneq \Pi$, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$\pi_r^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^S_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^{\Pi\backslash S}_{>0}) = \mathfrak{U}_S \cong J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}} \times T^*\mathbb{R}^{\Pi\backslash S}_{>0}.$$

Now we choose subsectors in $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ and $T^*\mathbb{R}^{\Pi\backslash S}_{>0}$ as follows.

First, applying results from Subsection 3.2.3 for L_S^{der} replacing G, by choosing a Liouville hypersurface $\mathfrak{F}^S$, we have the partial compactification

$$\overline{J}_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} = J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \coprod_{J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} - \mathcal{B}_1^S} (\mathfrak{F}^S \times \mathbb{C}_{\Re z \leq 0}),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_1^S$ is the union of Kostant sections in $J_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$. Let θ_-, θ_+ be as in (5.4.4) for L_S^{der}, and let

$$\mathcal{Q}'_S = \{z = re^{i\theta} : \theta \in [\theta_-, \theta_+], r \geq 0\} \cap \{\Re z \leq -A\}$$

for any fixed $A > 0$. Then

$$\overline{J}'_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} := \mathcal{B}_1^S \cup (\mathfrak{F}^S \times \mathcal{Q}'_S)$$

is a Liouville subsector (up to deformations on the factor $\mathcal{Q}'_S$; cf. [GPS1, Proposition 2.27]) equivalent to $\overline{J}_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$. In particular, the embedding $\overline{J}'_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \hookrightarrow \overline{J}_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ induces an equivalence of the wrapped Fukaya categories.

Second, the Liouville form on the factor $T^*\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\Pi\setminus S} \cong \prod_{\beta\notin S} T^*\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\{\beta\}}$ is given by

$$-\sum_{\beta\notin S}(\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} d\Re q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} + d\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}).$$

using the Darboux coordinates (for the logarithmic coordinates on the base) at the end of Section 3.1. The Liouville vector field is the sum of $-\partial_{\Re q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}} + \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} \partial_{\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}}}$ in each factor $T^*\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\{\beta\}}$. In particular, any integral curve of the Liouville vector field is of the form $C_a := \{\Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} = ae^{-\Re q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}}}\}$, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Fixing $a \gg k > 1$, then for each factor $T^*\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\{\beta\}}$, we can define a Liouville subsector as the closed region bounded by

$$C_{\pm a} \cap \{\Re q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} \leq k\}, C_{\pm\frac{1}{a}} \cap \{\Re q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} \leq -k\}, \{\Re q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} = k, \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} \in [-ae^{-k}, ae^{-k}]\},$$

$$\{\Re q_{\lambda_{\beta^\vee}} = -k, \Re p_{\beta^\vee_{S^\perp}} \in [-\frac{e^k}{a}, \frac{e^k}{a}]\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_{S^\perp}$ be the product of these regions in $T^*\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\Pi\setminus S}$. Then the product sector

$$\overline{J}'_{L_S} := \overline{J}'_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(L_S^{\mathrm{der}})_0}{\times} T^*\mathcal{Z}(L_S)_{0,\mathsf{cpt}} \times \mathcal{P}_{S^\perp} \subset \mathfrak{U}_S \subset J_G$$

is equivalent to $\overline{J}_{L_S}$ (up to deformations on the factor $\mathcal{P}_{S^\perp}$ and on $\overline{J}'_{L_S^{\mathrm{der}}}$ as above).

Clearly, we can make (a contractible space of) choices for each $\overline{J}'_{L_S}, S \subsetneq \Pi$, so that we have sector inclusions $\overline{J}'_{L_{S_1}} \subset \overline{J}'_{L_{S_2}}$ for any $S_1 \subset S_2$. Now assume G is reductive, then we have the regular covering

$$J_G \to J_{G_\flat} = J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \times T^*(\mathcal{Z}(G)_{\mathsf{cpt}}/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})) \times T^*\mathcal{Z}(G)_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Choose a sufficiently large open ball $\Omega_{\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathcal{Z}(G)_{\mathbb{R}}$, then

$$\overline{J}^\flat_{L_S} := \overline{J}'_{L'_{S;\mathrm{ad}}} \times T^*(\mathcal{Z}(G)_{\mathsf{cpt}}/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})) \times T^*\overline{\Omega}_{\mathbb{R}}$$

is a subsector of $\overline{J}_{G_\flat}$, where $L'_{S;\mathrm{ad}}$ denote the standard Levi subgroup in G_{ad}. Its preimage in $\overline{J}_G$, denoted by $\overline{J}'_{L_S}$, is a subsector that is equivalent

to $\overline{J}_{L_S}$. We can endow the set of sector inclusions $\overline{J}'_{L_S} \subset \overline{J}_G, S \subset \Pi$, which depends on a contractible space of choices, with an obvious filtered category structure: $\{\overline{J}'_{L_S} \subset \overline{J}_G, S \subset \Pi\} \to \{\overline{J}''_{L_S} \subset \overline{J}_G, S \subset \Pi\}$ if and only if $\overline{J}'_{L_S} \subset \overline{J}''_{L_S}$ for all S. Let 1-$\mathcal{C}\mathrm{at}^L_{\mathbb{C}}$ (resp. 1-$\mathcal{C}\mathrm{at}^R_{\mathbb{C}}$) is the ∞-category of presentable stable $\mathbb{C}$-linear categories with right adjointable (resp. left adjointable) functors, i.e. those admit a right adjoint (resp. left adjoint). Then we have the following:

Proposition 7.1. *For any complex reductive group G, there is a filtered category of sector inclusions $\overline{J}'_{L_S} \subset \overline{J}_G$, for any $S \subset \Pi$, so that*

- *each $\overline{J}'_{L_S}$ is canonically a subsector of $\overline{J}_{L_S}$ that induces an equivalence of wrapped Fukaya categories;*
- *for any S, we have $\overline{J}'_{L_{S^\dagger}} \subset \overline{J}'_{L_S}, \forall S^\dagger \subset S$, are sector inclusions, whose composition with the inclusion $\overline{J}'_{L_S} \subset \overline{J}_{L_S}$ give an object in the filtered category of sector inclusions associated with $\overline{J}_{L_S}$.*

In particular, there is a canonically defined functor

$$(\{S \subset \Pi\}, \subset) \longrightarrow \text{1-}\mathcal{C}\mathrm{at}^L_{\mathbb{C}} \qquad S \mapsto \mathcal{W}(\overline{J}_{L_S}). \tag{7.1.4}$$

7.2. **Proof of HMS using microlocal sheaf categories.** By Lemma 5.28, we have

$$\pi_1(\Lambda_{G_\flat}) = \pi_1(J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}) \times \pi_1(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})) \cong \pi_1(G_{\mathrm{ad}}) \times \pi_1(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})).$$

The covering $\mathfrak{q}_\Lambda := \mathfrak{q}|_{\Lambda_G}$ corresponds to

$$\pi_1(G_{\mathrm{ad}}) \times \pi_1(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})) \cong \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}_{sc}) \times \pi_1(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}), \tag{7.2.1}$$

which is the multiplication of the two natural projections from the two factors on the LHS. Let $\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda_{G_\flat}}$ be the local system $(\mathfrak{q}_\Lambda)_*\underline{\mathbb{C}}$ on $\Lambda_{G_\flat}$, which is corresponding to the representation of $\pi_1(\Lambda_{G_\flat})$ on the space of functions $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})]$ through (7.2.1). Let

$$T_\flat = T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}) = T_{\mathrm{ad}} \times (\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})),$$

and let $q_T : T \to T_\flat$ to the covering map.

In the following, for a Lagrangian skeleton Λ of a Weinstein sector X, let $\mu\mathrm{Shv}_\Lambda$ be the sheaf of microlocal categories (over $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{C}$) on Λ, in the sense of [NaSh]. The definition of $\mu\mathrm{Shv}_\Lambda$ requires the same data for defining the wrapped Fukaya category, and they are equivalent for a fixed choice of data (as remarked in *loc. cit.*). For $X = \overline{J}_G$, $\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}$ can be defined over $\mathbb{Z}$, for which the data amount to a trivialization of $\overline{J}_G \to B^2\mathbb{Z} \times B^3(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$. Since J_G is hyperKahler, there is a canonical trivialization of $\overline{J}_G \to B^2\mathbb{Z}$ (cf. beginning of Section 4). The map $\overline{J}_G \to B^3(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ is trivial (this is always the case), and different choices of trivializations give equivalent categories.

Proposition 7.2. *We have a natural diagram of adjoint functors* (7.2.2)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}(\Lambda_G) & \underset{\mathsf{q}_\Lambda^*\simeq\mathsf{q}_\Lambda^!}{\overset{(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_*\simeq(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_!}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_{G_\flat}}(\Lambda_{G_\flat}) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \mathrm{IndCoh}((T_\flat)^\vee /\!\!/ W) \\
 & & \Big\uparrow co\text{-}res \quad \Big\downarrow res & & \Big\uparrow co\text{-}res_\flat \quad \Big\downarrow res_\flat & & \\
\mathrm{IndCoh}(T^\vee) & \xleftarrow{\simeq} & \mathrm{Loc}(T) & \underset{\mathsf{q}_T^*\simeq\mathsf{q}_T^!}{\overset{(\mathsf{q}_T)_*\simeq(\mathsf{q}_T)_!}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mathrm{Loc}(T_\flat) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \mathrm{IndCoh}((T_\flat)^\vee)
\end{array}$$

satisfying the following natural relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&res\circ\mathsf{q}_\Lambda^*\simeq(\mathsf{q}_T)^*\circ res_\flat:\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_{G_\flat}}(\Lambda_{G_\flat})\to\mathrm{Loc}(T),\\
&(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_*\circ co\text{-}res\simeq co\text{-}res_\flat\circ(\mathsf{q}_T)_*:\mathrm{Loc}(T)\to\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_{G_\flat}}(\Lambda_{G_\flat})\\
&(\mathsf{q}_T)_*\circ res\simeq res_\flat\circ(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_*:\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}(\Lambda_G)\to\mathrm{Loc}(T_\flat)\\
&\mathsf{q}_\Lambda^*\circ co\text{-}res_\flat\simeq co\text{-}res\circ\mathsf{q}_T^*:\mathrm{Loc}(T_\flat)\to\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}(\Lambda_G)\\
&(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_*\mathsf{q}_\Lambda^*\simeq(-)\otimes\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda_{G_\flat}},\ \mathsf{q}_\Lambda^*(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_*\simeq(-)\otimes\underline{\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The top right equivalence of the diagram (7.2.2) follows from the HMS of $J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$ and the Kunneth formula for microlocal sheaves or wrapped Fukaya category (cf. [GPS2]). The bottom two equivalences in the diagram are well known. The first and the third identification of functors (involving *res*) are obvious, and the second and the fourth follow from taking left adjoint of the former. The last line on the two compositions of q_Λ^* and $(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_*$ are obvious. □

Theorem 7.3. *For any connected complex reductive Lie group G, we have*

$$\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}(\Lambda_G)\simeq\mathrm{IndCoh}((T_\flat)^\vee /\!\!/ W)^{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*},$$

where $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*$ is the Pontryagin dual of $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$. If $\mathcal{Z}(G)$ is connected, then $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*$ acts freely on $(T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W$, so we have

$$\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}(\Lambda_G)\simeq\mathrm{IndCoh}(T^\vee /\!\!/ W).$$

Proof. By Proposition 7.2 and the Barr–Beck–Lurie theorem [Lur, Theorem 4.7.4.5], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}(\Lambda_G)&\simeq res_\flat\circ(\mathsf{q}_\Lambda)_*\mathsf{q}_\Lambda^*\circ co\text{-}res_\flat-\mathrm{Mod}(\mathrm{Loc}(T_\flat))\\
&\simeq(res_\flat\circ co\text{-}res_\flat)\circ(\mathsf{q}_T)_*\mathsf{q}_T^*-\mathrm{Mod}(\mathrm{Loc}(T_\flat)).
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the Cartesian diagram in which all the maps are the natural ones

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
T_\flat^\vee & \xrightarrow{\pi_u} & T_\flat^\vee/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*=T^\vee \\
\Big\downarrow p_\ell & & \Big\downarrow p_r \\
T_\flat^\vee /\!\!/ W & \xrightarrow[\pi_d]{} & (T_\flat^\vee /\!\!/ W)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*
\end{array}.$$

Then we have

$$(res_\flat\circ co\text{-}res_\flat)\circ(\mathsf{q}_T)_*\mathsf{q}_T^*\simeq(\pi_d p_\ell)^*(\pi_d p_\ell)_*:\mathrm{IndCoh}(T_\flat^\vee)\to\mathrm{IndCoh}(T_\flat^\vee).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\mathrm{Shv}_{\Lambda_G}(\Lambda_G) &\simeq (\pi_d p_\ell)^*(\pi_d p_\ell)_* - \mathrm{Mod}(\mathrm{IndCoh}(T_\flat^\vee)) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{IndCoh}(T_\flat^\vee /\!\!/ W)^{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$T_\flat^\vee /\!\!/ W = (T_{\mathrm{ad}})^\vee /\!\!/ W \times (\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee = (T_{\mathrm{ad}})^\vee /\!\!/ W \times (\mathcal{Z}(G)_0/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0)^\vee,$$

if $\mathcal{Z}(G)$ is connected, then $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*$ acts freely on it. □

We remark that throughout the paper, we can replace all IndCoh by QCoh, because they are only taken on smooth (Deligne-Mumford) stacks.

7.3. **Proof of HMS using wrapped Fukaya categories.** Choose a wrapping Hamiltonian H_1 (resp. H_2) on $J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$ as in Section 4.1 (resp. on $T^*(\mathcal{Z}(G)_0/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})_0)$), and let H be the sum of H_1 and H_2 on the product, then $\mathfrak{q}^*H$ is a well defined $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$-invariant wrapping Hamiltonian on J_G. For any cylindrical Lagrangian $L \subset J_{G_\flat}$, we have

$$\mathfrak{q}^{-1}\varphi_H^t(L) = \varphi_{\mathfrak{q}^*H}^t(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L)), \tag{7.3.1}$$

and $\varphi_H^t(L), t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is cofinal in the wrapping category $(L \to -)^+$ if and only if (every connected component of) $\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}^*H}^t(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L))$ is cofinal in the the wrapping category $(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L) \to -)^+$.

Lemma 7.4. *The quotient map* $\mathfrak{q}$ *(7.1.1) induces an adjoint pair of functors (with* F^L *viewed as the left adjoint) on wrapped Fukaya categories:*

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \underset{F^L}{\overset{F_R}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat}) \ . \tag{7.3.2}$$

Proof. First, the functor F^L can be defined as follows. Since $\mathfrak{q}$ is a regular covering map, for any cylindrical Lagrangians $L, L' \in \mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat})$, define F^L as an A_∞-functor following the notations in [Sei1, Chapter I. 1 (1b)]

$$\begin{aligned}(F^L)^1 : CF_{J_{G_\flat}}(\varphi_H^t(L), L') &\longrightarrow CF_{J_G}(\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}^*H}^t(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L)), \mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L')) \\ x &\mapsto \sum_{y \in \mathfrak{q}^{-1}(x)} y\end{aligned} \tag{7.3.3}$$

for every generator $x \in \varphi_H^t(L) \cap L', t \geq 0$. Let $(F^L)^d = 0, d > 1$. This is clearly compatibile with continuation maps. For any collection of cylindrical Lagrangians $L_1, \cdots, L_k \subset J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$ and $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \cdots \geq t_{k-1} \geq 0$, we have a canonical commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CF(L_{k-1}^{t_{k-1}}, L_k) \otimes \cdots \otimes CF(L_1^{t_1}, L_2^{t_2}) & \xrightarrow{\mu^{k-1}} & CF(L_1^{t_1}, L_k) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ CF(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_{k-1}^{t_{k-1}}), \mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_k)) \otimes \cdots \otimes CF(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_1^{t_1}), \mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_2^{t_2})) & \xrightarrow{\mu^{k-1}} & CF(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_1^{t_1}), \mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_k)) \end{array}$$

where $L_j^{t_j} := \varphi_H^{t_j}(L_j)$ and $\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_j)^{t_j}$ for $\varphi_{\mathfrak{q}^*H}^{t_j}(\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(L_j))$. This follows from the unique lifting property of a $\mathcal{J}$-holomorphic disc with the only incoming vertex at $y \in L_1^{t_1} \cap L_k$ to a $\mathfrak{q}^*\mathcal{J}$-holomorphic[24] disc with the incoming vertex at each given point in $\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(y)$.

Second, we give a definition of F_R on the full subcategory of (connected and) simply connected Lagrangian branes $L \subset J_G$ satisfying $\mathfrak{q}(L)$ is embedded. Equivalently, this means $\mathfrak{q} : L \to \mathfrak{q}(L)$ is an isomorphism. Such Lagrangians include the Kostant sections $\Sigma_z, z \in \mathcal{Z}(G)$ (as a product cylindrical Lagrangian), which are generators of $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$, so the definition of F_R extends to $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ in a unique way (up to equivalences). Fix an indexing of $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$ and denote the elements in $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$ by z_j. The Kostant section for $z_j \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$ is just the product of the Kostant section for z_j in $J_{G^{\mathrm{der}}}$, denoted by Σ'_{z_j}, and the cotangent fiber at identity in $T^*\mathcal{Z}(G)_0$. Then $\Sigma_{z_j}, j \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$, generate $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$[25]. On the object level, $F_R(L) = \mathfrak{q}(L)$.

$$(F_R)^1 : CF_{J_G}(L_1^{t_1}, L_2) \longrightarrow CF_{J_{G_\flat}}(\mathfrak{q}(L_1^{t_1}), \mathfrak{q}(L_2))$$
$$x \mapsto \mathfrak{q}(x),$$

for every generator $x \in L_1^{t_1} \cap L_2$. Let $(F_R)^d = 0, d > 1$. For any collection $L_1, \cdots, L_k \subset J_G$ and $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \cdots \geq t_{k-1} \geq 0$, we have an obvious commutative diagram

(7.3.4)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CF(L_{k-1}^{t_{k-1}}, L_k) \otimes \cdots \otimes CF(L_1^{t_1}, L_2^{t_2}) & \xrightarrow{\mu^{k-1}} & CF(L_1^{t_1}, L_k) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ CF(\mathfrak{q}(L_{k-1}^{t_{k-1}}), \mathfrak{q}(L_k)) \otimes \cdots \otimes CF(\mathfrak{q}(L_1^{t_1}), \mathfrak{q}(L_2^{t_2})) & \xrightarrow{\mu^{k-1}} & CF(\mathfrak{q}(L_1^{t_1}), \mathfrak{q}(L_k)). \end{array}$$

due to the isomorphism $\mathfrak{q} : L \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{q}(L)$

Lastly, we verify the adjunction property about F^L, F_R. The co-unit map on each generator $\Sigma_{z_j} \in \mathcal{W}(J_G)$,

$$F^L F_R(\Sigma_{z_j}) = \bigoplus_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \Sigma_{z_i} \longrightarrow \Sigma_{z_j}$$

is given by the projection proj_{z_j} to the z_j-component. For each $x \in \Sigma_{z_j}^t \cap \Sigma_{z_k}$ corresponding to a generator of

$$CF_{J_{G_\flat}}(\Sigma_{z_j}^t, \Sigma_{z_k}) \cong CF_{J_{G^{\mathrm{der}}}}((\Sigma'_{z_j})^t, \Sigma'_{z_k}) \times CF_{T^*(\mathcal{Z}(G))_0}((T_I^*\mathcal{Z}(G)_0)^t, T_I^*\mathcal{Z}(G)_0)$$

(recall the cochain complex is concentrated in degree 0 for a sequence of $t \to \infty$; cf. Proposition 4.5), we have a strictly commutative diagram (after

[24]Here $\mathfrak{q}^*\mathcal{J}$ is well defined for $\mathfrak{q}$ is a local isomorphism.

[25]It actually suffices to choose just one z_j for each connected component of $\mathcal{Z}(G)$ to generate $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$.

taking $t \to \infty$)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F^L F_R(\Sigma_{z_j}) = \bigoplus_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \Sigma_{z_i} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{proj}_{z_j}} & \Sigma_{z_j} \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \sum_{u \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} u \cdot x} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle x} \\ F^L F_R(\Sigma_{z_k}) \cong \bigoplus_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \Sigma_{z_i} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{proj}_{z_k}} & \Sigma_{z_k} \end{array} .$$

where $u \cdot x \in CF(\Sigma_{u \cdot z_j}, \Sigma_{u \cdot z_k})$ under the action of $u \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$. Such data completely determine the co-unit map. The unit map on the generator $\Sigma_I = \Sigma_I'' \times T_I^*(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})) \in \mathcal{W}(J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}} \times T^*(\mathcal{Z}(G)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})))$, where Σ_I'' denotes the Kostant section in $J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$,

$$\Sigma_I \longrightarrow F_R F^L(\Sigma_I) = \Sigma_I^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})}$$

is given by the diagonal embedding. For any $x \in \Sigma_I^t \cap \Sigma_I$ corresponding to a generator of $CF(\Sigma_I^t, \Sigma_I)$, which projects to $x'' \in (\Sigma_I'')^t \cap \Sigma_I'' \subset J_{G_{\mathrm{ad}}}$, we have a strictly commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_I & \longrightarrow & F_R F^L(\Sigma_I) = \Sigma_I^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle x} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle (x^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})}) \circ \sigma_x} \\ \Sigma_I & \longrightarrow & F_R F^L(\Sigma_I) = \Sigma_I^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \end{array} , \tag{7.3.5}$$

where σ_x is the permutation on the indexed set $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$ given by multiplying the inverse of the element in $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$ corresponding to $x'' \in X_*(T_{\mathrm{ad}})^+$ (cf. the same proposition just mentioned), and $x^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})}$ means the morphism given by a $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}) \times \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})$-matrix with diagonal entries all equal to x.

The identities

$$(F_R \overset{(unit) \circ F_R}{\longrightarrow} F_R F^L F_R \overset{F_R \circ (co\text{-}unit)}{\longrightarrow} F_R) \simeq id_{F_R}$$

$$(F^L \overset{F^L \circ (unit)}{\longrightarrow} F^L F_R F^L \overset{(co\text{-}unit) \circ F^L}{\longrightarrow} F^L) \simeq id_{F^L}$$

can be directly checked on the generators. We leave the details to the interested reader. □

We can also easily deduce that

Lemma 7.5. *There is another adjoint pair*

$$\mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat}) \underset{F_R}{\overset{F^L}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{W}(J_G) , \tag{7.3.6}$$

where F_R now serves as the left adjoint.

Proof. The co-unit map on $\Sigma_I \in \mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat})$

$$\Sigma_I^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \cong F_R F^L(\Sigma_I) \longrightarrow \Sigma_I$$

is given by $(id_{\Sigma_I}, \cdots, id_{\Sigma_I})$. For any $x \in \Sigma_I^t \cap \Sigma_I$ corresponding to a generator of $CF(\Sigma_I^t, \Sigma_I)$, we have a strictly commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_R F^L(\Sigma_I) \cong \Sigma_I^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} & \longrightarrow & \Sigma_I \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle (x^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})}) \circ \sigma_x} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle x} \\ F_R F^L(\Sigma_I) \cong \Sigma_I^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} & \longrightarrow & \Sigma_I \end{array},$$

where σ_x and $x^{\oplus \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})}$ are as in the proof of Lemma 7.4.

The unit map on $\Sigma_{z_j} \in \mathcal{W}(J_G)$

$$\Sigma_{z_j} \longrightarrow F^L F_R(\Sigma_{z_j}) \cong \bigoplus_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \Sigma_{z_i}$$

is the embedding into the component of Σ_{z_j}. For any generator $x \in CF(\Sigma_{z_j}^t, \Sigma_{z_k})$, we have a strictly commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_{z_j} \longrightarrow F^L F_R(\Sigma_{z_j}) \cong & & \bigoplus_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \Sigma_{z_i} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle x} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \sum_{u \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} u \cdot x} \\ \Sigma_{z_k} \longrightarrow F^L F_R(\Sigma_{z_k}) \cong & & \bigoplus_{z_i \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \Sigma_{z_i} \end{array}.$$

The identities

$$(F^L \xrightarrow{(unit) \circ F^L} F^L F_R F^L \xrightarrow{F^L \circ (co\text{-}unit)} F^L) \simeq id_{F^L}$$

$$(F_R \xrightarrow{F_R \circ (unit)} F_R F^L F_R \xrightarrow{(co\text{-}unit) \circ F_R} F_R) \simeq id_{F_R}$$

can be directly checked on the generators. We leave the details to the interested reader.

□

Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{W}(J_G) & \underset{co\text{-}res}{\overset{res}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0}) \simeq \mathcal{W}(T^*T) \\ {\scriptstyle F^L} \uparrow \downarrow {\scriptstyle F_R} & & {\scriptstyle F^L_{w_0}} \uparrow \downarrow {\scriptstyle F_{R,w_0}} \\ \mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat}) & \underset{co\text{-}res_\flat}{\overset{res_\flat}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat}) \simeq \mathcal{W}(T^*T_\flat) \end{array}, \tag{7.3.7}$$

where $F^L_{w_0}$ and F_{R,w_0} are defined in the same way as F^L and F_R, $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat}$ are the open Bruhat "cells" in J_G and $J_{G_\flat}$, respectively, viewed as subsectors, and $res_\flat$ and $co\text{-}res_\flat$ are the restriction and co-restriction functors for the subsector inclusion in $J_{G_\flat}$.

Lemma 7.6. *We have canonical isomorphisms of functors*

(i)

$$co\text{-}res \circ F^L_{w_0} \simeq F^L \circ co\text{-}res_\flat \tag{7.3.8}$$

$$F_{R,w_0} \circ res \simeq res_\flat \circ F_R. \tag{7.3.9}$$

(ii)

$$F_R \circ co\text{-}res \simeq co\text{-}res_\flat \circ F_{R,w_0} \tag{7.3.10}$$

$$res \circ F^L \simeq F^L_{w_0} \circ res_\flat. \tag{7.3.11}$$

In other words, the four squares in (7.3.7) with initial and terminal vertices lying on any diagonal are all commutative.

Proof. (i) Here the first one (7.3.8) follows from (1) the compatibility of cofinality of wrapping in J_G and $J_{G_\flat}$ through q^{-1}; (2) the definition of *co-res* and *co-res*$_\flat$ as "wrapping more". To be more precise, following the notations in [GPS1, Section 3.5, 3.6], let $\mathcal{I} = \{T_I^* T_\flat\}$ and $\mathcal{I}' = \{\Sigma_I, T_I^* T_\flat\}$ be collections of Lagrangian branes in $J_{G_\flat}$. let $\mathscr{O}$ (resp. $\mathscr{O}'$) be the A_∞-category of Lagrangians for $\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat}$ (resp. $J_{G_\flat}$) associated to $\mathcal{I}$ (resp. $\mathcal{I}'$). Then $\mathscr{O} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{O}'$ is an inclusion of a full subcategory[26]. Let $\mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O})$ (resp. $\mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O}')$) be the A_∞-category from taking the inverse image of every element (together with each of their connected components) in $\mathscr{O}$ (resp. $\mathscr{O}'$) through q. Let C (resp. C') be the set of all continuation elements in $\mathscr{O}$ (resp. $\mathscr{O}'$), then $\mathsf{q}^{-1}(C)$ and $\mathsf{q}^{-1}(C')$ give the set of all continuation elements in $\mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O})$ and $\mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O}')$, respectively. There are the natural inclusions $C \hookrightarrow C'$ and $\mathsf{q}^{-1}(C) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{q}^{-1}(C')$. The commutative diagram of A_∞-categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O}') & \hookleftarrow & \mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O}) \\ {\scriptstyle F^L}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle F^L_{w_0}=F^L|_{\mathscr{O}}} \\ \mathscr{O}' & \hookleftarrow & \mathscr{O} \end{array}$$

induces the commutative diagram on localizations

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O}')_{(\mathsf{q}^{-1}(C'))^{-1}} & \longleftarrow & \mathsf{q}^{-1}(\mathscr{O})_{(\mathsf{q}^{-1}(C))^{-1}} \\ {\scriptstyle F^L}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle F^L_{w_0}} \\ \mathscr{O}'_{(C')^{-1}} & \longleftarrow & \mathscr{O}_{C^{-1}} \end{array}$$

which gives (7.3.8).

The second isomorphism of functors (7.3.9) is from taking the right adjoint on both sides of the first one.

[26]This is because by Definition 3.35 in *loc. cit.*, the objects in $\mathscr{O}$ is a subset of $\mathscr{O}'$, and the morphisms between objects in $\mathscr{O}$ calculated in the subsector $\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat}$ is the same as those calculated in $J_{G_\flat}$, which is due to that holomorphic discs with boundaries in Lagrangians in $\mathscr{O}$ do not cross the sector boundary of $\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat}$.

(ii) From (7.3.8) and adjunction, we get a morphism of functors

(7.3.12)
$$co\text{-}res_\flat \circ F_{R,w_0} \longrightarrow F_R \circ F^L \circ co\text{-}res_\flat \circ F_{R,w_0} \simeq F_R \circ co\text{-}res \circ F^L_{w_0} \circ F_{R,w_0} \longrightarrow F_R \circ co\text{-}res,$$

where the first map is from the unit map for (F^L, F_R) and the last map is from the co-unit map for $(F^L_{w_0}, F_{R,w_0})$. To confirm (7.3.10), we just need to show that (7.3.12) on the generator $T^*_I T \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0})$ is an isomorphism. This is straightforward, and we leave the details to the interested reader.

The last isomorphism of functors (7.3.11) follows from taking the right adjoint on both sides of (7.3.10), using Lemma 7.5.

□

Theorem 7.7. *For any reductive* $G \cong G^{\mathrm{der}} \underset{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})}{\times} \mathcal{Z}(G)$*, we have*

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}((T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W)^{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*}. \tag{7.3.13}$$

If $\mathcal{Z}(G)$ *is connected, then* $\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*$ *acts freely on* $(T/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))^\vee /\!\!/ W$*, and we have equivalently*

$$\mathcal{W}(J_G) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee /\!\!/ W).$$

Proof. We again use the Barr–Beck–Lurie theorem. For this, we take the cocompletion of each wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{W}(M)$, and denote them by $\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(M)$ using the standard notation. The functors F^L, F_R (resp. $F^L_{w_0}, F_{R,w_0}$) between $\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ and $\mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat})$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0})$ and $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat})$) uniquely extend, and Lemma 7.4, Lemma 7.5 and Lemma 7.6 remain unchanged after the extension.

First, we check that F_R is conservative. Suppose an object $L \in \mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(J_G)$ is sent to the zero object in $\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat})$ through F_R, then by adjunction

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(J_{G_\flat})}(\Sigma_I, F_R(L)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(J_G)}(F^L(\Sigma_I), L) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(J_G)}(\bigoplus_{z \in \mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})} \Sigma_z, L), \end{aligned}$$

so $L \simeq 0$. Similarly, one gets that $F_{R,w_0}, res_\flat$ and res are also conservative. Second, by definition, all functors mentioned above preserve filtered colimits, so in particular preserve geometric realizations.

Using Lemma 7.6, we get a commuting pair of monads $res_\flat co\text{-}res_\flat$ and $F_{R,w_0}F^L_{w_0}$ on $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat})$. Now we apply the Barr–Beck–Lurie theorem and get an equivalence

(7.3.14)
$$\begin{aligned} res_\flat \circ F_R : \mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(J_G) &\xrightarrow{\sim} (res_\flat F_R F^L co\text{-}res_\flat) - \mathrm{Mod}(\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat})) \\ &\xrightarrow{\sim} (F_{R,w_0}F^L_{w_0} res_\flat co\text{-}res_\flat) - \mathrm{Mod}(\mathrm{Ind}\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{B}_{w_0,\flat})). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 5.1 and its proof, the monad $res_\flat co\text{-}res_\flat$ is isomorphic to $\mathsf{f}^*\mathsf{f}_*$ on $\mathrm{IndCoh}((T_\flat)^\vee)$ for

$$\mathsf{f} : (T_\flat)^\vee \longrightarrow (T_\flat)^\vee /\!\!/ W.$$

It is clear that the monad $F_{R,w_0}F^L_{w_0}$ is isomorphic to $\varpi^*\varpi_*$ on $\mathrm{IndCoh}((T_\flat)^\vee)$ for the quotient map

$$\varpi : (T_\flat)^\vee \longrightarrow T^\vee \cong (T_\flat)^\vee/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*.$$

Therefore, the last line of (7.3.14) is equivalent to $\mathrm{IndCoh}(((T_\flat)^\vee /\!\!/ W)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*) = \mathrm{IndCoh}((T_\flat)^\vee /\!\!/ W))^{\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^*}$ through the Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (T_\flat)^\vee & \xrightarrow{\varpi} & (T_\flat)^\vee/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^* \\ {\scriptstyle \mathsf{f}}\downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (T_\flat)^\vee /\!\!/ W & \longrightarrow & ((T_\flat)^\vee /\!\!/ W)/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}})^* \end{array} .$$

Lastly, taking compact objects, we get (7.3.13) as desired. □

7.4. **Induction pattern.** For any $S \subset \Pi$, Theorem 7.7 tells us that

$$\mathcal{W}(J_{L_S}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}((T/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S))^\vee /\!\!/ W_S)^{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^*}.$$

In the following, let $T_{\flat,S} := T/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)$. The restriction and co-restriction functors for the inclusion of Liouville sectors $\overline{J}_{L_\emptyset} \subset \overline{J}_{L_S}$ (cf. Subsection 7.1.2) correspond to

$$\mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee_{\flat,S} /\!\!/ W_S)^{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^*} \underset{co\text{-}res \simeq (p_{\emptyset,S})_*}{\overset{res \simeq p^*_{\emptyset,S}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee) \ , \tag{7.4.1}$$

where

$$p_{\emptyset,S} : T^\vee = T^\vee_{\flat,S}/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^* \longrightarrow (T^\vee_{\flat,S} /\!\!/ W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^*$$

is the natural projection.

Proposition 7.8. *Let G be any complex reductive group. For any $S \subset S' \subset \Pi$, we have the restriction and co-restriction functors between $\mathcal{W}(J_{L_{S'}})$ and $\mathcal{W}(J_{L_S})$ given by*

(7.4.2)


$$\mathcal{W}(J_{L_{S'}}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee_{\flat,S'} /\!\!/ W_{S'})^{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S'})^*} \underset{co\text{-}res \simeq (p_{S,S'})_*}{\overset{res \simeq p^*_{S,S'}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{W}(J_{L_S}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee_{\flat,S} /\!\!/ W_S)^{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^*} \ ,$$

where

$$p_{S,S'} : (T^\vee_{\flat,S} /\!\!/ W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^* \longrightarrow (T^\vee_{\flat,S'} /\!\!/ W_{S'})/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_{S'})^*$$

is the natural projection.

Proof. First, we assume G is of adjoint type. For any $S \subset S'$, we have the diagram
(7.4.3)



with the co-restriction functors forming a commutative triangle (cf. Proposition 7.1), and the restriction functors forming another commutative triangle from adjunction. It implies that $co\text{-}res_{S,S'}$ takes any skyscraper sheaf on $T^\vee /\!\!/ W_S$ to a skyscraper sheaf on $T^\vee /\!\!/ W_{S'}$. In particular, it can be identified with the pushforward functor for a morphism of schemes

$$f_{S,S'} : T^\vee /\!\!/ W_S \longrightarrow T^\vee /\!\!/ W_{S'}.$$

It is clear that $f_{S,S'} = p_{S,S'}$ since the W_S-orbit of any closed point in $T^\vee$ is sent to the $W_{S'}$-orbit of the same point.

For a general reductive G, it follows from first geting the result for $G_\flat$ by the Kunneth formula on wrapped Fukaya categories, and then using the monad $F_R F^L$ on $\mathcal{W}(J_{L_S}/\mathcal{Z}(G^{\mathrm{der}}))$ for each $S \subset \Pi$ and its compatibility with restriction and co-restriction functors for inclusions of subsectors for different S, as in Lemma 7.6 (whose argument directly generalizes to the case that $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}$ is replaced by any subsector associated with $S \subset \Pi$). □

Let $\mathrm{DMStk}^{\mathrm{prop}}_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the ordinary (2,1)-category of Deligne-Mumford stacks over $\mathbb{C}$ with proper morphisms. Then we have the functor $\mathrm{Coh}_* : \mathrm{DMStk}^{\mathrm{prop}}_{\mathbb{C}} \to$ 1-$\mathcal{C}\mathrm{at}^L_{\mathbb{C}}$ that takes each stack X to $\mathrm{Coh}(X)$ and a proper morphism $X \to Y$ to the pushforward functor on coherent sheaves.

Corollary 7.9. *Under the canonical equivalences* $\mathcal{W}(J_{L_S}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(T^\vee_{\flat,S} /\!\!/ W_S)^{\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^*}$, $S \subset \Pi$, *the functor (7.1.4) is canonically equivalent to first taking the functor*

$$\begin{aligned}(\{S \subset \Pi\}, \subset) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{DMStk}^{\mathrm{prop}}_{\mathbb{C}} \\ S &\mapsto (T^\vee_{\flat,S} /\!\!/ W_S)/\mathcal{Z}(L^{\mathrm{der}}_S)^*,\end{aligned}$$

that sends each inclusion to the natural projection on stacks, and then taking Coh_*.

Proof. The canonical equivalences follow from

- the proof of Theorem 5.1 in which the morphism $\hat{\mathsf{f}}$ is uniquely determined;
- the maximal torus T is canonically identified with the abstract maximal torus, through the inclusion $T \subset B$ to the fixed Borel B.

The rest is an immediate consequence of Proposition 7.8. □

References

[Aur] D. Auroux, "A beginner's introduction to Fukaya categories," Contact and Symplectic Topology, Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies 26 (2014), 85–136.

[Bal1] A. Balibanu, "The Peterson variety and the wonderful compactification", Represent. Theory 21 (2017), 132–150.

[Bal2] A. Balibanu, "The partial compactification of the universal centralizer", arXiv:1710.06327.

[Bie] R. Bielawski, "HyperKähler structures and group actions," J. London Math. Soc. (2) 55 (1997), no. 2, 400–414.

[BFM] R. Bezrukavnikov, M. Finkelberg, I. Mirkovic, "Equivariant (K-)homology of affine Grassmannian and Toda lattice," Compos. Math. 141 (2005), no. 3, 746–768.

[BFN] A. Braverman, M. Finkelberg, H. Nakajima, "Towards a mathematical definition of Coulomb branches of 3-dimensional $N = 4$ gauge theories, II," Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 22 (2018), no. 5, 1071–1147.

[BZG] D. Ben-Zvi, S. Gunningham, "Symmetries of categorical representations and the quantum Ngô action," arXiv:1712.01963.

[BZGN] D. Ben-Zvi, S. Gunningham, D. Nadler, "The character field theory and homology of character varieties," MRL 26 (2019) no. 5, 1313–1342.

[BZN1] D. Ben-Zvi, D. Nadler, "The Character Theory of a Complex Group," arXiv:0904.1247.

[BZN2] D. Ben-Zvi, D. Nadler, "Betti Geometric Langlands," Algebraic geometry: Salt Lake City 2015, AMS Proceedings of symposia in pure mathematics, vol. 97, part 2.

[CDGG] B. Chantraine, G. Dimitroglou Rizell, P. Ghiggini, R. Golovko, "Geometric generation of the wrapped Fukaya category of Weinstein manifolds and sectors." arXiv:1712.09126.

[Che] T-H. Chen, "Non-linear Fourier transforms and the Braverman-Kazhdan conjecture," arXiv:1609.03221.

[ChGi] N. Chriss and V. Ginzburg, "Representation Theory and Complex Geometry", Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA (1997).

[CiEl] K. Cieliebak and Y. Eliashberg, " From Stein to Weinstein and Back," Symplectic geometry of affine complex manifolds. AMS Colloquium Publications, 59 (2012).

[Eli] Y. Eliashberg, "Weinstein manifolds revisited," arXiv: 1707.03442

[GPS1] S. Ganatra, J. Pardon and V. Shende, "Covariantly functorial wrapped Floer theory on Liouville sectors," Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. 131 (2020), 73–200.

[GPS2] S. Ganatra, J. Pardon and V. Shende, "Sectorial descent for wrapped Fukaya categories," arXiv:1809.03427.

[Gin] V. Ginzburg, "Nil Hecke algebras and Whittaker D-modules," Lie groups, geometry, and representation theory, 137–184, Progr. Math., 326, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2018.

[Jin] X. Jin, "Holomorphic Lagrangian branes correspond to perverse sheaves," Geom. Topol. 19 (2015), no. 3, 1685–1735.

[Kos1] B. Kostant, "On Whittaker vectors and representation theory," Invent. Math. 48 (1978), 101–184.

[Kos2] B. Kostant, "The solution to a generalized Toda lattice and representation theory," Adv. in Math. 34, 3 (1979), 195–338.

[Lon] G. Lonergan, "A Fourier transform for the quantum Toda lattice," Sel. Math. New Ser. 24, 4577–4615 (2018).

[Lur] J. Lurie, "Higher algebra", https://www.math.ias.edu/ lurie/papers/HA.pdf.

[Lus] G. Lusztig, "Coxeter orbits and eigenspaces of Frobenius," Invent. Math. 38 (1976) pages 101–159

[McSa] D. McDuff, D. Salamon, "Introduction to symplectic topology (third edition)," Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, New York (2017).
[Nad1] D. Nadler, "Arboreal singularities", Geometry & Topology 21 (2017) 1231–1274.
[Nad2] D. Nadler, "Wrapped microlocal sheaves on pairs of pants", arXiv:1604.00114.
[NaSh] D. Nadler, V. Shende, "Sheaf quantization in Weinstein symplectic manifolds," arXiv:2007.10154.
[NaZa] D. Nadler, E. Zaslow, "Constructible sheaves and the Fukaya category," J. Amer. Math. Soc. 22 (2009), 233–286.
[Pas] J. Pascaleff, "Poisson geometry, monoidal Fukaya categories, and commutative Floer cohomology rings," arXiv:1803.07676.
[Poz] M. Pośniak, "Floer homology, Novikov rings and clean intersections," Ph.D. thesis, University of Warwick, 1994.
[Sch] F. Schmäschke, "Floer homology of Lagrangians in clean intersection," arXiv:1606.05327.
[Sei1] P. Seidel, "Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz Theory," Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zurich (2008).
[Sei2] P. Seidel, "Lagrangian two-spheres can be symplectically knotted," J. Differential Geom. 52 (1999), no. 1, 145–171.
[SP] The Stacks project authors, "The Stacks project", https://stacks.math.columbia.edu, 2022.
[Ste] R. Steinberg, "On a theorem of Pittie," Topology, 14, 173–177 (1975).
[Syl] Z. Sylvan, "On partially wrapped Fukaya categories," Journal of Topology, Volume 12, Issue 2, 372–441 (2019).
[Tel] C. Teleman, "Gauge theory and mirror symmetry." Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians–Seoul 2014. Vol. II, 1309–1332.

Math Department, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467.
Email address: xin.jin@bc.edu