

ON THE PRODUCT FUNCTOR ON INNER FORMS OF GENERAL LINEAR GROUP OVER A NON-ARCHIMEDEAN LOCAL FIELD

KEI YUEN CHAN

ABSTRACT. Let G_n be an inner form of a general linear group over a non-Archimedean field. We fix an arbitrary irreducible representation σ of G_n . Lapid-Mínguez give a combinatorial criteria for the irreducibility of parabolic induction when the inducing data is of the form $\pi \boxtimes \sigma$, in which π is a segment representation. We show that their criteria can be used to define a full subcategory of the category of smooth representations of some G_m , on which the parabolic induction functor $\tau \mapsto \tau \times \sigma$ is fully-faithful. A key ingredient of our proof for the fully-faithfulness is constructions of indecomposable representations of length 2.

Such result for a special situation has been previously applied in proving the local non-tempered Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture for non-Archimedean general linear groups. In this article, we apply the fully-faithful result to prove a certain big derivative arising from Jacquet functor satisfies the property that its socle is irreducible and has multiplicity one in the Jordan-Hölder sequence of the big derivative.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let F be a non-Archimedean field and let D be a F -central division algebra. Let $G_n = \mathrm{GL}_n(D)$ be the general linear group over D . Let $\mathrm{Alg}(G_n)$ be the category of smooth representations of G_n over \mathbb{C} . The parabolic induction is an important tool in constructing representations and plays a central role in the Zelevinsky classification of irreducible representations of $\mathrm{GL}_n(F)$ [Ze80]. Recently, Lapid-Mínguez [LM16, LM19, LM20, AL22, LM22] extensively study the irreducibility of parabolic inductions, with rich connections to combinatorics and geometry.

This paper focuses on some homological aspects of parabolic inductions. The main purpose is to elaborate some observations and results in [Ch22], which we use functorial properties of parabolic inductions for proving the local non-tempered Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture [GGP20]. Our main result addresses the remark in [Ch22, Section 9.2].

We first explain the main object– the product functor. We denote by \times the normalized parabolic induction. For a fixed irreducible representation π and a full subcategory \mathcal{A} of $\mathrm{Alg}(G_n)$, define

$$\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Alg}(G_{n+k}),$$

given by $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}(\omega) = \pi \times \omega$. Here we regard $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}$ as a functor with morphism under \times_{π} is the one induced from the parabolic induction. Some general results about the

product functor with respect to smooth duals and cohomological duals are given in Section 3.

We need more notations to explain further. Let Mult be the set of multisegments. For $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$, we denote by $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$ the corresponding Zelevinsky module. Following [LM16], for two multisegments \mathfrak{m} and \mathfrak{n} , write $LI(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n})$ if

$$\text{soc}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle) = \langle \mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n} \rangle,$$

where $\text{soc}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle)$ is the socle of $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle$. Now the condition that $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle$ is irreducible is equivalent to $LI(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n})$ and $LI(\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{m})$. A segment representation $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$ is the one when \mathfrak{m} has only one segment.

A main result, among others, in [LM16] is to give a combinatorial criteria, called $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n})$, for $LI(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n})$ when at least one of \mathfrak{m} and \mathfrak{n} is a segment. Then one may ask how to extend the irreducibility case to some reducibility result. Indeed, such criteria in turn gives a large family of representations whose product with a fixed representation π is irreducible, and then one forms reducible representations from those irreducible ones. We will explain more below.

For any irreducible representation π of G_n , let

$$\mathcal{M}_\pi = \{ \mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult} : \langle \Delta \rangle \times \pi \text{ is irreducible } \forall \Delta \in \mathfrak{n} \}.$$

We have that $\langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle \times \pi$ is irreducible for any $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$. We write $\mathfrak{m}_1 \leq_Z \mathfrak{m}_2$ if \mathfrak{m}_1 is obtained from \mathfrak{m}_2 by a sequence of intersection-union operations (see Section 2.2). Our observation is that the set \mathcal{M}_π is closed under intersection-union operations in the following sense:

Theorem 1.1. (*=Theorem 4.6*) *Let π be an irreducible representation of G_n . For $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$, if \mathfrak{n}' is another multisegment with $\mathfrak{n}' \leq_Z \mathfrak{n}$, then $\mathfrak{n}' \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$.*

Our proof for Theorem 1.1 is a careful check on the combinatorial criteria of Lapid-Mínguez under intersection-union process.

We now set $\mathcal{A}_\pi = \text{Alg}_\pi(G_n)$ to be the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}(G_n)$ whose objects are of finite length and have all simple composition factors isomorphic to $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$ for some $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$. The significance of Theorem 1.1 is that one can obtain plenty examples of extensions from the set \mathcal{M}_π . Indeed, those extensions are preserved under $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}_\pi}$, shown in Proposition 5.8 and Theorem 7.8. This in turn implies our main result:

Theorem 1.2. (*=Theorem 8.2*) *Let π be an irreducible representation of G_n . Then $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}_\pi}$ is a fully-faithful functor.*

[Ch22] deals with the case that π is a Speth representation and \mathcal{A} is some subcategory coming from the irreducibility of the product between a cuspidal representation and π .

A key new ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is a construction of extensions between two irreducible representations. This differs from the approach used in [Ch22], although we also need a basic case (when π is also a segment representation) from [Ch22]. The main idea comes from a study of first extensions in the graded Hecke algebra case in [Ch18]. Roughly speaking, those extensions for two non-isomorphic representations come from Zelevinsky standard modules, and those for

two isomorphic representations reduce to the tempered case. However, we remark that we do not have a concrete classification for indecomposable modules of length 2.

For the self-extension case, we actually have more general statement:

Theorem 1.3. (*=Theorem 7.8*) *Let π_1 and π_2 be irreducible representations of G_k and G_l respectively such that $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$ is still irreducible. Suppose λ is an indecomposable representation of length 2 with both simple composition factors isomorphic to π_2 . Then $\pi_1 \times \lambda$ is also indecomposable.*

The analogous Ext-properties used in this article are usually better known in the content of the affine highest weight category introduced by Kleshchev [Kl15] (also see [Ka17]). We give self-contained treatments in Section 5. For the explicit Ext-groups in tempered case, it is better understood due to the work in the discrete series case by Silberger, Meyer, Opdam-Solleveld [Si79, Me06, OS09] using analytic methods and by [Ch16] using algebraic methods; and more general case [OS13] via R -groups, although we do not use them directly.

Recent articles [LM16, LM19, LM20, AL22, LM22] study the conditions $LI(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n})$ for more general multisegments. In particular, when one of the multisegments arises from a \square -irreducible representation, there are some precise conjectures connecting to the geometry of nilpotent orbits due to Geiß-Leclerc-Schröer and Lapid-Mínguez [GLS11, LM19, LM20]. Thus one may hope for a version of Theorem 1.2 for replacing the segment case by other interesting classes of representations such as Speh, ladder or even \square -irreducible representations. One main problem goes back to understand the analog of the set \mathcal{M}_π in Theorem 1.1. In [GL21], Gurevich-Lapid introduce a new class of representations parabolically induced from ladder representations, and so it is natural to ask if the extensions arising from those standard representations can be used to define a suitable analogue of $\text{Alg}_\pi(G_n)$.

We now consider a Jacquet functor version of above discussions. For an irreducible representation π of G_k and for an admissible representation τ of G_n , define

$$\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau) := \text{Hom}_{G_k}(\pi, \tau_{N^-}),$$

where N^- is the opposite unipotent radical of the standard parabolic subgroup in G_n containing $G_k \times G_{n-k}$. Here τ_{N^-} is viewed as a G_k -module via the embedding $G_k \hookrightarrow G_k \times G_{n-k}$ to the first factor. We shall call such \mathbb{D}_π to be a big derivative, and $\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau)$ has a natural G_{n-k} -module structure.

The big derivative \mathbb{D}_π is the adjoint functor of the product functor, if we consider the functors are for the category of all smooth representations. It is not quite right if we restrict the functor to the full subcategory $\text{Alg}_\pi(G_n)$ defined above. Nevertheless, there are some interesting cases that \mathbb{D}_π forms an adjoint functor for $\times_{\pi, \text{Alg}_\pi(G_n)} \cdot$. (For example, the case considered in [Ch22] works.) In those cases, we could deduce that the big derivative is irreducible (see Lemma 9.1 for a precise statement). This is consequently used to prove:

Theorem 1.4. (*c.f. Theorem 9.14*) *Suppose $D = F$. Let π be a generic irreducible representation of G_k . Let τ be any irreducible representation of G_n such that $\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau) \neq 0$. Then $\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau)$ satisfies the socle irreducible property (i.e. $\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau)$ has*

unique simple submodule and such simple submodule appears with multiplicity one in the Jordan-Hölder sequence of $\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau)$.

When π is a cuspidal representation, the analogous statement for Theorem 1.4 for affine Hecke algebra of type A is shown in the work of Grojnowski-Vazirani [GV01] by exploiting the explicit structure of a principal series. The irreducibility part of the socle in Theorem 1.4 is shown by Kang-Kashiwara-Kim-Oh [KKKO15] (also see [AL22]) in a greater generality on \square -irreducible representations. (For the irreducibility part of the socle, some variants of more specific cases using Gelfand-Kazhdan method are also shown by Aizenbud-Gourevitch [AG12].) At any rate, we emphasize on an application of the product functor.

Our interest in Theorem 1.4 goes back to using those derivatives to study Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives in [Ch22+], in which simple submodules (as well as quotients) of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives are constructed from a certain sequence of simple submodules of big derivatives involving essentially square-integrable representations. Thus Theorem 1.4 also provides some deeper structural information on Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives. An example for comparing those structures is given in Section 9.5.

A more classical viewpoint on studying parabolic inductions and Jacquet functors is on the Grothendieck group of the category of smooth representations of $\mathrm{GL}_n(F)$'s, in which those functors give a Hopf algebra structure [Ze80, Ze81, Ta90, Ta95, HM08]. We hope this work could emphasize on some interesting higher structures associated to parabolic inductions and Jacquet functors.

1.1. Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank Erez Lapid for drawing attention to [LM22, Section 7]. The author would like to thank Max Gurevich for his inputs on Section 4 and discussions on [GL21]. This project is supported in part by National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2020YFA0713200).

2. NOTATIONS

2.1. Basic notations. Let F be a non-Archimedean local field and let D be a finite-dimensional F -central division algebra. For $g \in G_n$, let $\nu(g) = |\mathrm{Nrd}(g)|_F$, where $\mathrm{Nrd} : \mathrm{GL}_n(D) \rightarrow F^\times$ is the reduced norm and $|\cdot|_F$ is the absolute value on F . Let $G_n = \mathrm{GL}_n(D)$, the general linear group over D . All the representations are smooth over \mathbb{C} and we usually omit the adjective 'smooth' and 'over \mathbb{C} '. For a representation π of G_n , we write $n(\pi)$ for n . We shall usually not distinguish representations in the same isomorphism class.

For $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $b - a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and a supercuspidal representation ρ , a segment $[a, b]_\rho$ is the set $\{\nu^a \rho, \nu^{a+1} \rho, \dots, \nu^b \rho\}$. We consider two segments $[a, b]_\rho$ and $[a', b']_{\rho'}$ are equal if $\nu^a \rho \cong \nu^{a'} \rho'$ and $\nu^b \rho \cong \nu^{b'} \rho'$. If $\rho = 1$ (the trivial representation), we may simply write $[a, b]$ for $[a, b]_1$. We also consider the empty set as a segment and also set $[a, a - 1]_\rho = \emptyset$. The relative length, denoted $l_r([a, b]_\rho)$, of a segment $[a, b]_\rho$ is $b - a + 1$, and the absolute length of a segment $[a, b]_\rho$ is $(b - a + 1)n(\rho)$. A multisegment is a multiset of non-empty segments, and we also consider the

empty set as a multisegment. For a multisegment $\mathbf{m} = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k\} \neq \emptyset$, define $l_a(\mathbf{m}) = l_a(\Delta_1) + \dots + l_a(\Delta_k)$. Define $l_a(\emptyset) = 0$ for the empty multisegment.

We define the following notations:

- $\text{Irr}(G_n)$ = the set of irreducible smooth representations of G_n and $\text{Irr} = \cup_n \text{Irr}(G_n)$;
- $\text{Alg}(G_n)$ = the category of smooth representations of G_n ;
- $\text{Alg}_f(G_n)$ = the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}(G_n)$ containing all smooth representations of G_n of finite length and $\text{Alg}_f = \cup_n \text{Alg}_f(G_n)$ (union for objects);
- Seg_n = the set of segments of absolute length n ; and $\text{Seg} = \cup_n \text{Seg}_n$;
- Mult_n = the set of multisegments of length n ; and $\text{Mult} = \cup_n \text{Mult}_n$;
- for $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$, $\text{JH}(\pi)$ = the set of simple composition factors in π ;
- ${}^\vee : \text{Alg}(G_n) \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G_n)$ is the smooth dual contravariant functor;
- for $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}$, define

$$\Delta^\vee = [-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee};$$

for $\mathbf{m} = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r\} \in \text{Mult}$,

$$\mathbf{m}^\vee = \{\Delta_1^\vee, \dots, \Delta_r^\vee\}$$

- for two supercuspidal representations ρ_1, ρ_2 , we write $\rho_1 < \rho_2$ if there exists a positive integer c such that $\rho_2 \cong \nu^c \rho_1$. We write $\rho_1 \leq \rho_2$ if either $\rho_1 < \rho_2$ or $\rho_1 \cong \rho_2$;
- for a segment $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$, write $a(\Delta) = \nu^a \rho$ and $b(\Delta) = \nu^b \rho$;
- for $\pi \in \text{Irr}$, we write $\text{csupp}(\pi) = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r\}$ to be the unique multiset containing supercuspidal representations such that π is a composition factor of $\sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_r$;
- for a segment $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$, define $\overleftarrow{\Delta} = [a-1, b-1]_\rho$;
- for $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$, let $\text{soc}(\pi)$ be the socle (i.e. maximal semisimple submodule) of π and let $\text{cosoc}(\pi)$ be the cosocle (i.e. maximal semisimple quotient) of π .

Since we are working representations over \mathbb{C} , we shall not distinguish cuspidal representations and supercuspidal representations.

2.2. More notations for segments and multisegments. For $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}$, two segments Δ_1 and Δ_2 in \mathbf{m} are said to be linked if $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ is still a segment and $\Delta_1 \not\subset \Delta_2$ and $\Delta_2 \not\subset \Delta_1$. We write $\Delta_1 < \Delta_2$ if Δ_1 and Δ_2 are linked and $a(\Delta_1) < a(\Delta_2)$. Note $\Delta_1 < \Delta_2$ automatically implies $b(\Delta_1) < b(\Delta_2)$.

A multisegment \mathbf{m} is said to be generic if any two segments in \mathbf{m} are mutually not linked.

For $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}_n$, we say that \mathbf{m} is obtained by an intersection-union process if there are two linked segments Δ_1, Δ_2 in \mathbf{n} such that

$$\mathbf{m} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{n} - \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2\} + \{\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2, \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2\} & \text{if } \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 \neq \emptyset \\ \mathbf{n} - \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2\} + \{\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2\} & \text{if } \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

Write $\mathbf{m} <_Z \mathbf{n}$ if \mathbf{m} can be obtained by a sequence of intersection-union operations from \mathbf{n} , and write $\mathbf{m} \leq_Z \mathbf{n}$ if $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{n}$ or $\mathbf{m} <_Z \mathbf{n}$.

2.3. Langlands and Zelevinsky classification. For a segment $\Delta = [c, d]_\rho$, let $\langle \Delta \rangle$ (resp. $\text{St}(\Delta)$) be the unique simple submodule (resp. quotient) of

$$\nu^c \rho \times \dots \times \nu^d \rho.$$

For any multisegment \mathbf{m} , write the segments in \mathbf{m} as $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r$. We label the segments in \mathbf{m} such that

$$b(\Delta_1) \not\prec b(\Delta_2) \not\prec \dots \not\prec b(\Delta_r).$$

Let

$$\zeta(\mathbf{m}) = \langle \Delta_1 \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_r \rangle, \quad \lambda(\mathbf{m}) = \text{St}(\Delta_1) \times \dots \times \text{St}(\Delta_r).$$

It is shown in [Ze80] that there is a unique simple submodule in $\zeta(\mathbf{m})$, which will be denoted $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle$. It is independent of a choice of a labeling above. There is a one-to-one correspondence

$$\text{Mult}_n \longleftrightarrow \text{Irr}(G_n), \quad \mathbf{m} \mapsto \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle.$$

The Zelevinsky classification is due to Zelevinsky [Ze80] when $D = F$ and due to Mínguez-Sécherre [MS13, MS14] when D is general.

On the other hand, $\lambda(\mathbf{m})$ has a unique simple quotient, denoted by $\text{St}(\mathbf{m})$. This gives another one-to-one correspondence

$$\text{Mult}_n \longleftrightarrow \text{Irr}(G_n), \quad \mathbf{m} \mapsto \text{St}(\mathbf{m}).$$

The Langlands classification is known for $D = F$ in [Ze80] and for the general case from the local Jacquet-Langlands correspondence due to Deligne-Kazhdan-Vignéras [DKV84] for characteristics zero and Badulescu [Ba02] for positive characteristics. Such classification also has significance in the unitary dual problem, see work of Tadić, Sécherre, Badulescu-Henniart-Lemaire-Sécherre [Ta90, Sc09, BHLS10].

2.4. Parabolic inductions and Jacquet functors. For non-negative integers n_1, \dots, n_r with $n_1 + \dots + n_r = n$, let P_{n_1, \dots, n_r} be the standard parabolic subgroup containing the subgroup $G_{n_1} \times \dots \times G_{n_r}$. (Note that when n_i is zero, $G_{n_i} \cong \mathbb{C}$ and we may simply drop the term and we include such case for the convenience of notations later.) Let N_{n_1, \dots, n_r} be the unipotent radical of P_{n_1, \dots, n_r} , and let N_{n_1, \dots, n_r}^- be the opposite unipotent radical of P_{n_1, \dots, n_r} .

For $\pi_1 \in \text{Alg}(G_{n_1})$ and $\pi_2 \in \text{Alg}(G_{n_2})$, define $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$ to be

$$\pi_1 \times \pi_2 = \text{Ind}_{P_{n_1, n_2}}^{G_{n_1+n_2}} (\pi_1 \boxtimes \pi_2),$$

the space of smooth functions from $G_{n_1+n_2}$ to $\pi_1 \boxtimes \pi_2$ satisfying $f(p.v) = \delta(p)^{1/2} p.f(v)$, where δ is the modular character of P_{n_1, n_2} . The G_n -action on $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$ is the right translations on those functions. Here we consider $\pi_1 \boxtimes \pi_2$ as P_{n_1, n_2} -representations by an inflation. We shall simply call it a product. The product is indeed an associative operation and so there is no ambiguity in defining $\pi_1 \times \dots \times \pi_r$.

For a parabolic subgroup P of G_n with the Levi decomposition LN ,

$$\pi_N = \delta_P^{-1/2} \cdot \frac{\pi}{\langle n.x - x : x \in \pi, n \in N \rangle},$$

where δ_P is the modular character of P .

Both the parabolic inductions and Jacquet functors are exact functors. For $n_1 + \dots + n_r = n$, the parabolic induction $\pi \mapsto \text{Ind}_{P_{n_1, \dots, n_r}}^{G_n} \pi$ has the Jacquet functor

$\pi \mapsto \pi_{N_{n_1, \dots, n_r}}$ as its left adjoint functor, and has the opposite Jacquet functor $\pi \mapsto \pi_{N_{n_1, \dots, n_r}^-}$ as its right adjoint functor.

Following [LM19], for $\pi \in \text{Irr}$, π is said to be \square -irreducible if $\pi \times \pi$ is irreducible. Let Irr^\square be the set of \square -irreducible representations. In the content of quantum affine algebras, it is called real modules, see e.g. work of Hernandez-Leclerc and Kang-Kashiwara-Kim-Oh [HL13, KKKO15]. A particular class of \square -irreducible representations is those $\text{St}(\mathbf{m})$ for a generic multisegment $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}$.

2.5. Geometric lemma. For $i \leq n$, we sometimes abbreviate N_i for $N_{n-i, i} \subset G_n$.

Let $\pi_1 \in \text{Alg}(G_{n_1})$ and let $\pi_2 \in \text{Alg}(G_{n_2})$. Let $n = n_1 + n_2$. The geometric lemma [BZ77] gives that $(\pi_1 \times \pi_2)_{N_i}$ admits a filtration, whose successive subquotients are of the the form:

$$\text{Ind}_{P_{n_1-i_1, n_2-i_2} \times P_{i_1, i_2}}^{G_{n-i} \times G_i} ((\pi_1)_{N_{i_1}} \boxtimes (\pi_2)_{N_{i_2}})^\phi,$$

where $i_1 + i_2 = i$ and ϕ sends a $G_{n_1-i_1} \times G_{i_1} \times G_{n_2-i_2} \times G_{i_2}$ -representation to a $G_{n_1-i_1} \times G_{n_2-i_2} \times G_{i_1} \times G_{i_2}$ -representation via the map

$$(g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) \mapsto (g_1, g_3, g_2, g_4).$$

Moreover, the bottom layer in the filtration of $(\pi_1 \times \pi_2)_{N_i}$ is when $i_1 = \min\{n_1, i\}$ and the top layer in the filtration of $(\pi_1 \times \pi_2)_{N_i}$ is when $i_2 = \min\{n_2, i\}$.

2.6. η -invariant and Δ -reduced representations. Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. For a segment Δ of absolute length i , define $D_\Delta(\pi)$ to be the unique irreducible representation such that

$$D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \hookrightarrow \pi_{N_i}.$$

If such representation does not exists, then define $D_\Delta(\pi) = 0$. (The uniqueness is guaranteed by [LM16] and [KKKO15]. One may also formulate a version using segment representations replacing $\text{St}(\Delta)$, while our main interest is related to Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives [Ch22+] and so we will not go to discussions on such analogue.) We similalry define for $D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi)$ (see Sections 7.1 and 9.1 below).

Define $\epsilon_\Delta(\pi)$ to be the largest non-negative integer k such that

$$D_\Delta^k(\pi) \neq 0.$$

Define

$$\eta_\Delta(\pi) = (\epsilon_{[a, b]_\rho}(\pi), \epsilon_{[a-1, b]_\rho}(\pi), \dots, \epsilon_{[b, b]_\rho}(\pi)).$$

Using similar terminologies in [LM22, Section 7], a segment $[c, d]_\rho$ is said to be $[a, b]_\rho$ -saturated if $d = b$ and $a \leq c$. Define $\mathfrak{m}_\pi(\pi, \Delta)$ to be the multisegment that contains all the Δ -saturated segments Δ' with multiplicity $\epsilon_{\Delta'}(\pi)$. We shall call π to be Δ -reduced if $\mathfrak{m}_\pi(\pi, \Delta) = \emptyset$.

We give two useful properties related to the η -invariant. Those properties are also useful in the study of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives [Ch22+]:

Proposition 2.1. (c.f. [LM22, Proposition 7.3]) *Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$ and let Δ be a segment. Let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}_\pi(\pi, \Delta)$. Let $i = l_a(\mathfrak{p})$. Then $D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})$ is a direct summand in π_{N_i} .*

Proof. Let $\tau = D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi)$. Then τ is Δ -reduced. We also have the embedding:

$$\pi \hookrightarrow \tau \times \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p}).$$

Then we apply the Jacquet functor on $\tau \times \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p})$. The geometric lemma gives that the only simple composition factor with same cuspidal support as $\tau \boxtimes \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p})$ is $\tau \boxtimes \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p})$. Thus $\tau \boxtimes \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p})$ is a direct summand in $(\tau \times \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_i}$ and so is a direct summand in π_{N_i} . \square

We shall use it in Section 9 to do a reduction. When Δ is a singleton, Proposition 2.1 is also shown by Jantzen [Ja07] and Mínguez [Mi09] (also see [GV01]).

When $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{Mult}$ is generic, $\mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{m}) = \lambda(\mathfrak{m})$ and $\mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{m})$ is generic when $D = F$ [Ze80]. For generic $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{Mult}$ and $\pi \in \mathrm{Irr}$, denote by $I_{\mathfrak{m}}(\pi)$ the unique simple submodule of $\pi \times \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{m})$.

A multisegment \mathfrak{m} is said to be Δ -saturated if all the segments in \mathfrak{m} is Δ -saturated. We denote by $\mathrm{Mult}_{\Delta\text{-sat}}$ the set of all Δ -saturated multisegments.

Proposition 2.2. (c.f. [LM22, Proposition 7.3]) *Let Δ be a segment. Let $\tau \in \mathrm{Irr}$ be Δ -reduced. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Mult}_{\Delta\text{-sat}}$. Then,*

- $I_{\mathfrak{p}}(\tau)$ appears with multiplicity one in $\tau \times \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p})$;
- for other simple composition factors π' in $\tau \times \mathrm{St}(\mathfrak{p})$, $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{r}}(\pi', \Delta) \neq \mathfrak{p}$.

Proof. Note that $\tau \cong D_{\mathfrak{p}} \circ I_{\mathfrak{p}}(\tau)$. The proposition is also proved in Proposition 2.1. \square

2.7. Jacquet functors on segment and Steinberg representations. Let $[a, b]_{\rho} \in \mathrm{Seg}$. Let $k = n(\rho)$. It follows from [Ze80] and [Ta90, Proposition 3.1] that

$$\langle [a, b]_{\rho} \rangle_{N_{ik}} \cong \langle [a, b - i]_{\rho} \rangle \boxtimes \langle [b - i + 1, b]_{\rho} \rangle$$

and

$$\mathrm{St}([a, b]_{\rho})_{N_{ik}} \cong \mathrm{St}([a + i, b]_{\rho}) \boxtimes \mathrm{St}([a, a + i - 1]_{\rho}),$$

and the Jacquet modules $\langle [a, b]_{\rho} \rangle_{N_j}$ and $\mathrm{St}([a, b]_{\rho})_{N_j}$ are zero if k does not divide j .

We sometimes use the formulas implicitly in the computations of layers involving in the geometric lemma.

3. SOME GENERALITIES OF THE PRODUCT FUNCTOR

3.1. Product functor. Let \mathcal{A} be a full Serre subcategory of $\mathrm{Alg}(G_n)$. For a fixed irreducible representation π of G_k , we define the product functor

$$\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Alg}(G_{n+k})$$

as

$$\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}(\tau) = \pi \times \tau$$

and, for a map f from π to π' in \mathcal{A} , $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}(f)$ is the parabolically induced map for $\mathrm{Id}_{\pi} \boxtimes f$. Note that we do not assume $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}$ preserves simple objects at this point.

Proposition 3.1. *The functor $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}$ is exact and faithful.*

Proof. Exactness follows from that parabolic induction is an exact functor. The faithfulness then follows from that the functor sends a non-zero object to a non-zero object. \square

3.2. Smooth dual functor. In this section, we specify to $D = F$. Let $\theta : G_n \rightarrow G_n$ given by $\theta(g) = g^{-t}$, the transpose inverse of g . It is a classical result of Gelfand-Kazhdan that $\theta(\pi) \cong \pi^\vee$ for any $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. This induces a contravariant auto-equivalence for $\text{Alg}(G_n)$, still denoted by θ .

Definition 3.2. A full Serre subcategory \mathcal{A} of $\text{Alg}_f(G_n)$ is said to be \sim -closed if for any object C in \mathcal{A} , \tilde{C} is still in \mathcal{A} .

One main example is the category $\text{Alg}_\pi(G_n)$, as shown in Theorem 4.6 later. Define $\tilde{} = \theta \circ \vee$ and so it is also a contravariant functor.

Proposition 3.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be a \sim -closed full-subcategory of $\text{Alg}_f(G_n)$. Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}(G_k)$. Define the product functor*

$$\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G_{n+k}), \quad \times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}(\pi') = \pi \times \pi';$$

and define the right product functor

$$\times^{\pi, \mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G_{n+k}), \quad \times^{\pi, \mathcal{A}}(\pi') = \pi' \times \pi.$$

Then $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}$ is fully-faithful if and only if $\times^{\pi, \mathcal{A}}$ is fully-faithful.

Proof. We only prove the if direction, and the only if direction can be proved similarly. We have the following isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{G_{n+k}}(\pi \times \pi'_1, \pi \times \pi'_2) &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n+k}}(\widetilde{\pi \times \pi'_2}, \widetilde{\pi \times \pi'_1}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n+k}}(\tilde{\pi}'_2 \times \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\pi}'_1 \times \tilde{\pi}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n+k}}(\tilde{\pi}'_2 \times \pi, \tilde{\pi}'_1 \times \pi) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\tilde{\pi}'_2, \tilde{\pi}'_1) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi'_1, \pi'_2) \end{aligned}$$

The first and last isomorphisms follow from taking the duals (and the representations are admissible). The second isomorphism follows from the compatibility between taking duals and parabolic inductions. The third isomorphism follows from a result of Gelfand-Kazhdan. The fourth isomorphism follows from the if direction. \square

3.3. Cohomological dual functor. Let $\mathcal{H}(G_n)$ be the space of compactly supported smooth \mathbb{C} -valued functions on G_n , viewed as G_n -representation via right translations. Let \mathfrak{R} be a Bernstein component of $\text{Alg}(G_n)$ and let d be the homological dimension of \mathfrak{R} . Given a finitely-generated G_n -module π in \mathfrak{R} , define

$$\mathcal{D}(\pi) = \text{Ext}_{G_n}^d(\pi, \mathcal{H}(G_n))$$

viewed as a G_n -module. As shown in [Be92, Page 102] and [SS97, Page 132], \mathcal{D} is a contravariant exact functor. With the property that $\mathcal{D}^2 = \text{Id}$, \mathcal{D} is a fully-faithful functor. The functor also sends an irreducible object to an irreducible object and agrees with the Aubert-Zelevinsky dual [Ze80, Au95] in the Grothendieck group level, see the work of Schneider-Stuhler [SS97, Proposition IV.5.2] and Bernstein-Bezrukavnikov-Kazhdan [BBK18, Section 3.2]. Explicit algorithm for computing $\mathcal{D}(\pi)$ for $\pi \in \text{Irr}$ is given by Mœglin-Waldspurger [MW86].

Theorem 3.4. [Be92, Theorem 31(4)] *We fix Bernstein components \mathfrak{R}_1 and \mathfrak{R}_2 of $\text{Alg}(G_{n_1})$ and $\text{Alg}(G_{n_2})$ respectively. Let π_1 and π_2 be finitely-generated objects in \mathfrak{R}_1 and \mathfrak{R}_2 respectively. Let \mathfrak{R} be the Bernstein component containing $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}(\pi_1 \times \pi_2) \cong \mathcal{D}(\pi_2) \times \mathcal{D}(\pi_1).$$

Corollary 3.5. *Let \mathfrak{R} be a Bernstein component of $\text{Alg}(G_n)$ and let \mathfrak{R}_f be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{R} that contains objects of finite lengths. Let \mathcal{A} be a full subcategory of \mathfrak{R}_f . Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Then $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}}$ is a fully-faithful functor if and only if $\times^{\mathcal{D}(\pi), \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ is a fully-faithful functor. Here $\times^{\mathcal{D}(\pi), \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ is defined in Proposition 3.3.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3.4 and that \mathcal{D} is a fully-faithful contravariant functor. \square

4. PRODUCT WITH A SEGMENT REPRESENTATION AND INTERSECTION-UNION PROCESS

4.1. Matching functions. We shall specialize the matching function to the segment case. We fix a labeling on the segments in \mathbf{m} : $\mathbf{m} = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r\}$. Following [LM16], let

$$X_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta} = \{i : \Delta_i < \Delta\}, \quad Y_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta} = \{i : \Delta < \Delta_i\},$$

and

$$\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta} = \{i : \overleftarrow{\Delta}_i < \Delta\}, \quad \tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta} = \{i : \overleftarrow{\Delta} < \Delta_i\}.$$

We write $LC(\mathbf{m}, \Delta)$ (resp. $RC(\mathbf{m}, \Delta)$) if there exists an injective function f from $X_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta}$ to $\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta}$ (resp. from $Y_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta}$ to $\tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta}$) such that $\Delta_i < \Delta_{f(i)}$ (resp. $\Delta_{f(i)} < \Delta_i$) for all i . To avoid notation complication, we shall also sometimes identify $f(i)$ with the corresponding segment $\Delta_{f(i)}$, which should not make confusions.

Note that there are two possibilities that a segment Δ' is in $\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta}$, but not in $X_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta}$:

- (1) $b(\Delta') \cong b(\Delta)$ and $a(\Delta') < a(\Delta)$; or
- (2) $a(\Delta') \cong a(\Delta)$ and $b(\Delta') < b(\Delta)$.

Proposition 4.1. [LM16, Proposition 5.12] *Let $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}$ and let $\Delta \in \text{Seg}$. Then $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle \times \langle \Delta \rangle$ is irreducible if and only if $LC(\mathbf{m}, \Delta)$ and $RC(\mathbf{m}, \Delta)$ are satisfied.*

4.2. Closedness of the set \mathcal{M}_{π} .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}$. Let Δ^x, Δ^y be two linked segments with $\Delta^x < \Delta^y$. Let $i' \in Y_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^x} \cap \tilde{X}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^y}$. Then $f_x^r(i') \in X_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^y}$.*

Proof. Since $i' \in Y_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^x} \cap \tilde{X}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^y}$, we have that

$$a(\Delta^x) < a(\Delta_{i'}) \leq a(\Delta^y), \quad b(\Delta^x) < b(\Delta_{i'}) \leq b(\Delta^y).$$

Then applying f_x^r , we must have that

$$a(f_x^r(i')) < a(\Delta^y), \quad \nu^{-1}a(\Delta^y) \leq b(\Delta_1) \leq b(f_x^r(i')) < b(\Delta^y)$$

This implies that $f_x^r(i')$ and Δ^y are linked and so we have the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}$. Let Δ^x, Δ^y be two linked segments with $\Delta^x < \Delta^y$. Let $i' \in \tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^x} \cap X_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^y}$. Then $f_y^l(i') \in Y_{\mathbf{m}}^{\Delta^x}$.*

Proof. This can be proved by a similar argument to the previous lemma. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$. Let Δ^x, Δ^y be two linked segments with $\Delta^x < \Delta^y$. Suppose $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$, $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^y)$ and $RC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$ hold. Let f_x^l, f_y^l, f_x^r be injective functions defining the matching functions for $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$, $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^y)$ and $RC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$ respectively. Let*

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ i' \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y} : a(\Delta^x) < a(f_y^l(i')), \Delta^x \subset \Delta_{i'}, a(\Delta^x) \not\cong a(\Delta_{i'}) \right\},$$

and let $\mathfrak{n} = \{\Delta_{i'}\}_{i' \in \mathcal{N}}$. Then $\mathfrak{n} = \emptyset$. (The last two conditions imply that $\Delta_{i'} < \Delta^x \cup \Delta^y$, $\Delta_{i'} < \Delta^y$ and $\Delta_{i'}$ and Δ^x are not linked.)

Proof. Suppose $\mathfrak{n} \neq \emptyset$.

Claim: For any $i' \in \mathcal{N}$, $f_y^l(i') \in Y_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$ and $f_y^l(i') \in \widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$.

Proof of Claim: Note that $f_y^l(i') \in \widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$ follows from the definition. To show another one, by definition of \mathcal{N} ,

$$a(\Delta^x) < a(f_y^l(i')).$$

Since $\Delta^x \subset \Delta_{i'}$, we have that $b(\Delta^x) < b(f_y^l(i'))$ (by definition of a matching function). Moreover, $f_y^l(i') \in Y_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$ and so, by the definition of a matching function,

$$a(f_y^l(i')) \leq a(\Delta^y) \leq \nu b(\Delta^x).$$

This implies that $\Delta^x < f_y^l(i')$ and so $f_y^l(i') \in Y_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$. This proves the claim.

Then $f_x^r \circ f_y^l(\mathfrak{n}) \subset X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y} \cap \widetilde{Y}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$ by Lemma 4.2. This implies $f_x^r \circ f_y^l(\mathfrak{n}) \cap \mathfrak{n} = \emptyset$ since a segment $\widetilde{\Delta}$ in \mathfrak{n} satisfies $\widetilde{\Delta} < \Delta^x$ but not for segments in $f_x^r \circ f_y^l(\mathfrak{n})$ (see definition of \widetilde{Y}^{Δ^x}). Then, applying f_y^l , we have $f_y^l \circ f_x^r \circ f_y^l(\mathfrak{n}) \cap f_y^l(\mathfrak{n}) = \emptyset$ by injectivity. Those multisegments are still disjoint from \mathfrak{n} using the same argument as before. Thus, similarly, we obtain that $f_x^r \circ f_y^l \circ f_x^r \circ f_y^l(\mathfrak{n}) \cap f_x^r \circ f_y^l(\mathfrak{n}) = \emptyset$. Now we repeatedly apply f_y^l and f_x^r , and obtain infinitely many distinct segments in \mathfrak{m} , and this gives a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$. Let Δ^x, Δ^y be two linked segments with $\Delta^x < \Delta^y$. Suppose we have $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$, $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^y)$, $RC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$. Let*

$$\mathcal{O} = \left\{ i' \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y} : a(\Delta^x) \leq a(\Delta_{i'}) \leq b(\Delta_{i'}) < b(\Delta^x) \quad b(\Delta^x) < b(f_y^l(i')) \right\}$$

and let $\mathfrak{o} = \{\Delta_{i'}\}_{i' \in \mathcal{O}}$. (The conditions guarantee that $\Delta_{i'} \subset \Delta^x$ and $\Delta_{i'}$ is linked to $\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y$.) Then $\mathfrak{o} = \emptyset$.

Proof. We prove in a similar way as the previous lemma. Suppose $\mathfrak{o} \neq \emptyset$.

Claim: For any $i' \in \mathcal{O}$, $f_y^l(\Delta_{i'}) \in Y_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$ and $f_y^l(\Delta_{i'}) \in \widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$.

Proof of claim: The latter one follows from the definition of a matching function. For the former one, we first note that $a(\Delta^x) < a(f_y^l(i'))$ by using $\Delta_{i'} < f_y^l(i')$ and $b(\Delta^x) < b(f_y^l(i'))$ by using the definition of \mathfrak{o} . It remains to see that $\Delta_{i'}$ and $f_y^l(\Delta_{i'})$ are linked. To this end, since $f_y^l(i') \in \widetilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$, $a(f_y^l(i')) \leq a(\Delta^y) \leq \nu b(\Delta^x)$, where the

last inequality follows from the linkedness between Δ^x and Δ^y .

Now the remaining argument is similar to the previous lemma. \square

Let $\pi = \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$ for some $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$. Let \mathcal{M}_π be the set of all multisegments \mathfrak{n} such that for any segment Δ in \mathfrak{n} , $\langle \Delta \rangle \times \pi$ is irreducible, or equivalently $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta)$ and $RC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta)$ are satisfied (Proposition 4.1).

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}(G_n)$. Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$. For any $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult}$ with $\mathfrak{n} \leq_Z \mathfrak{m}$, $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$.*

Proof. Let Δ^x, Δ^y be two segments in \mathfrak{m} . It suffices to assume that Δ^x and Δ^y are linked. We have to prove that $\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y$ and $\Delta^x \cup \Delta^y$ are in \mathcal{M}_π . It suffices to find matching functions for $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x \cap \Delta^y)$, $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x \cup \Delta^y)$, $RC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x \cap \Delta^y)$ and $RC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x \cup \Delta^y)$. We shall only do for LC , and RC can be proved similarly.

For $k = x, y$, let $f_k^l : X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^k} \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^k}$ and $f_k^r : Y_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^k} \rightarrow \tilde{Y}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^k}$. We assume $\Delta^x < \Delta^y$, and the other case can be treated by switching the notations.

We first consider $\Delta^x \cup \Delta^y$. We now construct a map $F : X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cup \Delta^y} \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cup \Delta^y}$ according to one of the following cases: Let $i \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cup \Delta^y}$.

- (1) Case 1: $i \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$ and $i \notin X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$. In such case, define $F(i) = f_x^l(i)$.
- (2) Case 2: $i \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$ and $i \notin X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$. In such case, define $F(i) = f_y^l(i)$.
- (3) Case 3: $i \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$ and $i \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$. In such case, define $F(i) = f_x^l(i)$.

We first check that G is injective. Note that if both i, i' are in Case 1 or 3, then $F(i) = F(i') \iff i = i'$ follows from the injectivity of f_x^l . If both i, i' are in Case 2, then we use the injectivity of f_y^l . If one of i, i' is in Case 1 or 3 and another one is in Case 2, $G(i) \neq G(i')$ follows from that $\overleftarrow{f_x^l}(j) < \Delta^x$ for $j \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$, but $\overleftarrow{f_x^l}(j) \not< \Delta^x$ for $j \notin X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x} \cap X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y}$ (which follows by using linkedness for the matching).

We next check that G is well-defined i.e. $G(i) \in \tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cup \Delta^y}$. If i is in Case (1) and (3), then the definition implies $\overleftarrow{f_x^l}(i) < \Delta^x$ and so $\overleftarrow{f_x^l}(i) < \Delta^x \cup \Delta^y$. If i is in Case (2), then Lemma 4.4 implies that

$$a(f_x^l(i)) \leq a(\Delta^x)$$

and we also have $b(f_y^l(i)) \leq b(\Delta^y)$, implying $\overleftarrow{f_x^l}(i) < \Delta^x \cup \Delta^y$.

We now consider $\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y$. If $\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y = \emptyset$, then there is nothing to prove. We assume that $\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y \neq \emptyset$. Again we construct a map $F' : X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y} \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y}$ as follows: for $i \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y}$,

- (1) Case 1: $i \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$. In such case, define $F'(i) = f_x^l(i)$.
- (2) Case 2: $i \notin X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$. In such case, define $F'(i) = f_y^l(i)$.

We again first see the injectivity. If both i, i' are in Case 1 or Case 2, then the injectivity follows from the injectivity of the matching functions f_x^l and f_y^l . If one of i, i' is in Case 1 and another one is in Case 2, then $G'(i) \neq G'(i')$ follows from that $a(f_x^l(j)) \leq a(\Delta^x)$ for any $j \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^x}$ while $a(\Delta^x) < a(f_y^l(j))$ for any $j \in X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta^y}$ with $\Delta_j \subset \Delta^x$.

We next check the well-definedness. The non-trivial case is Case (2). In such case, Lemma 4.5 implies that

$$b(f_y^l(i)) \leq b(\Delta^x) = b(\Delta^x \cap \Delta^y).$$

With that $\overleftarrow{f_y^l(i)} < \Delta^y$, we have that

$$\overleftarrow{f_y^l(i)} < \Delta^x \cap \Delta^y.$$

This implies the well-definedness. □

Remark 4.7. Here we give a quicker proof of Theorem 4.6 using intertwining operators. For $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Alg}_f$, let R_{π_1, π_2} be the normalized non-zero intertwining operator from $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$ to $\pi_2 \times \pi_1$ (see [LM19, Section 2]). As in the proof of Theorem 4.6, one only has to consider two linked segments. Now, fix an arbitrary $\pi \in \text{Irr}$, and let Δ_1, Δ_2 be two segments such that $\langle \Delta_1 \rangle \times \pi$ and $\langle \Delta_2 \rangle \times \pi$ are irreducible. Then $(R_{\langle \Delta_2 \rangle \times \pi} \times \text{Id}_{\langle \Delta_1 \rangle}) \circ (\text{Id}_{\langle \Delta_2 \rangle} \times R_{\langle \Delta_1 \rangle \times \pi})$ sends $\langle \Delta_2 \rangle \times \langle \Delta_1 \rangle \times \pi$ to $\pi \times \langle \Delta_2 \rangle \times \langle \Delta_1 \rangle$, and is an isomorphism. Note that $\langle \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2\} \rangle \times \pi$ is irreducible (see Proposition 5.3 below). Furthermore,

$$\text{soc}(\langle \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 + \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 \rangle \times \pi) \not\cong \pi \times \langle \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2\} \rangle,$$

$$\text{cosoc}(\langle \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 + \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 \rangle \times \pi) \not\cong \pi \times \langle \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2\} \rangle$$

(It takes some work to prove the two non-isomorphisms, but we will not go into that here.) This implies that

$$\text{soc}(\langle \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 + \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 \rangle \times \pi) \cong \text{soc}(\pi \times \langle \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 + \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 \rangle).$$

With the socle irreducible properties, one concludes that those terms have to be irreducible.

Remark 4.8. For two segments Δ^x, Δ^y satisfying $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$ and $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^y)$ respectively, their intersection or union Δ' may not satisfy $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta')$. For example, let $\mathfrak{m} = \langle [0], [1, 5] \rangle$. Let $\Delta^x = [0, 1]$ and $\Delta^y = [1, 5]$. Then $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^x)$ and $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^y)$ hold, but $LC(\mathfrak{m}, [1])$ does not hold.

4.3. Some explicit criteria for a multisegment in \mathcal{M}_π . A segment Δ is said to be juxtaposed to another segment Δ' if either $\nu \cdot b(\Delta) \cong a(\Delta')$ or $\nu \cdot b(\Delta') \cong a(\Delta)$.

Remark 4.9. (1) Let $\pi \cong \text{St}(\mathfrak{m})$ for $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$ with all segments in \mathfrak{m} mutually unlinked. Let \mathfrak{n} be the multisegment such that $\pi \cong \text{St}(\mathfrak{n})$. Then $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$ if and only if any segment in \mathfrak{n} is not juxtaposed to any segment in \mathfrak{m} . (See [BLM13, THÉORÈME 0.1])

(2) Let π be a Speh representation with the corresponding multisegment \mathfrak{m} . We label the segments in $\mathfrak{m} = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r\}$ satisfying $\Delta_1 < \dots < \Delta_r$. Then $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$ if and only if any segment Δ in \mathfrak{n} satisfies $\Delta \not\prec \Delta_1$ and $\Delta_r \not\prec \Delta$. (See [LM16, Lemma 6.5])

5. INDECOMPOSABILITY UNDER PRODUCT FUNCTOR: NON-ISOMORPHIC CASE

5.1. **Some results on irreducibility.** In this section, we recall some results on irreducibility of parabolic inductions.

Lemma 5.1. [LM16, Lemma 3.9] *Let $\Delta \in \text{Seg}$ and let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$. Then $\langle \Delta \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$ is irreducible if and only if $\langle \Delta \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \cong \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \times \langle \Delta \rangle$.*

Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$ and let ρ be a cuspidal representation. Let

$$\mathfrak{m}_{b=\rho} = \{ \Delta' \in \mathfrak{m} : b(\Delta') \cong \rho \}.$$

Let $\tilde{\Delta}$ be the longest segment in $\mathfrak{m}_{b=\rho}$. Define

$$\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{t}^b(\pi, \rho) = \mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}(\pi, \tilde{\Delta}).$$

Lemma 5.2. [LM16] *Let $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Mult}$. Let $\Delta \in \text{Seg}$. Suppose $\langle \mathfrak{s} \rangle \times \langle \Delta \rangle$ is irreducible. Let*

$$\mathfrak{n} = \sum_{\rho' \neq b(\Delta)} \mathfrak{s}_{b=\rho'}.$$

Then $\langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle \times \langle \Delta \rangle$ is still irreducible.

Proof. By using Theorem 4.1, it is equivalent to show $LC(\mathfrak{s}, \Delta)$ and $RC(\mathfrak{s}, \Delta)$. Note that $RC(\mathfrak{s}, \Delta)$ will follow by showing that $\langle \mathfrak{s} + \Delta \rangle$ is the unique submodule of $\langle \Delta \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{s} \rangle$. To this end, one considers

$$\langle \Delta \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{s} \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta \rangle \times \zeta(\mathfrak{s}) = \zeta(\mathfrak{s} + \Delta).$$

This implies the required embedding.

For $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta)$, this follows from that the segments in $\sum_{\rho' > b(\Delta)} \mathfrak{m}_{b=\rho'}$ do not contribute to $X_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta}$ and $\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\Delta}$. Hence, the injective function defined for $LC(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta)$ also defines for $LC(\mathfrak{n}, \Delta)$.

We give an alternative proof here. Let $\tilde{\rho}$ be a maximal element in $\{b(\Delta') : \Delta' \in \mathfrak{m}\}$ (see the ordering on cuspidal representations in Section 2). If $\tilde{\rho} = b(\Delta)$, then $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{m}$ and so there is nothing to prove. Hence, we may assume that $\tilde{\rho} \not\cong b(\Delta)$. Let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{t}^b(\mathfrak{m}, \tilde{\rho})$. Then we have the following embedding:

$$\langle \mathfrak{m} + \Delta \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \times \zeta(\mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{p}) \times \langle \Delta \rangle.$$

Let $N = N_{l_a(\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{p}+\Delta)}$. Since $\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \boxtimes \langle \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{p} + \Delta \rangle$ is a direct summand in $\langle \mathfrak{m} + \Delta \rangle_N$ and no other composition factor in $\langle \mathfrak{m} + \Delta \rangle_N$ takes the form $\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \boxtimes \tau$. Thus, by Frobenius reciprocity, we have the embedding:

$$\langle \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{p} + \Delta \rangle \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{p}) \times \langle \Delta \rangle$$

which is equivalent to $LI(\mathfrak{n}, \Delta)$. □

For two segments Δ, Δ' , we write $\Delta <_b \Delta'$ if either one of the following conditions holds:

- $b(\Delta) < b(\Delta')$; or
- $b(\Delta) \cong b(\Delta')$ and $a(\Delta) \leq a(\Delta')$.

We write $\Delta \leq_b \Delta'$ if $\Delta = \Delta'$ or $\Delta <_b \Delta'$.

Proposition 5.3. [LM16, Proposition 6.1] *Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$ and let $\pi = \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$. Then*

- (1) $\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \times \pi$ is irreducible; and
- (2) $\zeta(\mathfrak{p}) \times \pi \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{m})$; and
- (3) $\pi \times \zeta(\mathfrak{p}) \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{m})$.

Proof. The proof is similar to [LM16, Proposition 6.1] and we only prove (3). (2) can be proved similarly (with proving a version of Lemma 5.2). If \mathfrak{p} has only one segment, then it follows from definition that $\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \times \pi$ is irreducible and so $\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \times \pi \cong \langle \mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{m} \rangle$. Pick a \leq_b -maximal segment Δ in \mathfrak{p} . Then we have that

$$\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \Delta \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{p} - \Delta \rangle.$$

Let \mathfrak{n} be as in Lemma 5.2 and let

$$\mathfrak{n} = \sum_{\rho' \not> b(\Delta)} \mathfrak{m}_{b=\rho'}, \quad \mathfrak{n}' = \sum_{\rho' > b(\Delta)} \mathfrak{m}_{b=\rho'}$$

and so we also have the embedding:

$$\pi \hookrightarrow \langle \mathfrak{n}' \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle.$$

Thus, combining two embeddings, we have:

$$\pi \times \langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \mathfrak{n}' \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle \times \langle \Delta \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{p} - \Delta \rangle.$$

With Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, it gives that

$$\pi \times \langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle \mathfrak{n}' \rangle \times \langle \Delta \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{p} - \Delta \rangle$$

Now, by induction on the number of segments on \mathfrak{p} , $\langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{p} - \Delta \rangle \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta + \mathfrak{n})$. By construction of \mathfrak{n}' , we also have $\langle \mathfrak{n}' \rangle \times \langle \Delta \rangle \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{n}' + \Delta)$. Now it remains to observe that

$$\zeta(\mathfrak{n}' + \Delta) \times \zeta(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta + \mathfrak{n}) \cong \zeta(\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{n} + \mathfrak{n}').$$

□

Lemma 5.4. [LM16] *Let $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Mult}$. Then $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathfrak{m})}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{p}^\vee \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathfrak{m}^\vee)}$.*

Proof. This follows from definitions. □

5.2. Indecomposability. We remark that an analogous result holds for other connected reductive groups with replacing the Zelevinsky classification by the Langlands classification (also see [Ch18]). For the Langlands classification version, we remark that there is also an analogous statement for branching laws [Ch21+], with the generic case conjectured by D. Prasad [Pr18] and proved in [CS21] by Savin and the author.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult}_n$. Suppose $\mathfrak{n} \neq \mathfrak{m}$. Then*

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathfrak{m}^\vee)^\vee, \zeta(\mathfrak{n})) = 0$$

for all i .

Proof. We shall prove by an induction on the sum of the number of segments in \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} . When both \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} are empty sets, there is nothing to prove.

Let $\mathbf{m} = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r\}$ with

$$b(\Delta_1) \not\prec \dots \not\prec b(\Delta_r).$$

Similarly, let $\mathbf{n} = \{\Delta'_1, \dots, \Delta'_s\}$ with

$$b(\Delta'_1) \not\prec \dots \not\prec b(\Delta'_s).$$

If no segment in \mathbf{n} satisfies $b(\Delta'_i) \geq b(\Delta_1)$, then a cuspidal support argument gives that $\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)^\vee, \zeta(\mathbf{n})) = 0$ for all i . Furthermore, if we have Δ'_i such that $b(\Delta'_i) > b(\Delta_1)$, then a cuspidal support argument again gives that

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^k(\zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)^\vee, \zeta(\mathbf{n})) = 0.$$

Set $\rho = b(\Delta_1)$. Thus, now we consider that $b(\Delta'_i) \cong \rho$ and there is no segment Δ'_j in \mathbf{n} satisfying $b(\Delta'_j) > \rho$. Now, by relabelling if necessary (using Lemma 5.1), we may assume that Δ_1 is a shortest segment in \mathbf{m} with $b(\Delta_1) \cong \rho$, and similarly assume that Δ'_1 is a shortest segment in \mathbf{n} with $b(\Delta'_1) \cong \rho$. We now consider the following three cases:

- Suppose $\Delta'_1 \subsetneq \Delta_1$. Then, Frobenius reciprocity gives that:

$$(*) \quad \text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\langle \Delta_r \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_1 \rangle, \langle \Delta_1 \rangle \boxtimes \zeta(\mathbf{n} - \Delta'_1)) \cong \text{Ext}_{G_n}^i((\langle \Delta_r \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_1 \rangle)_{N_{n-l_a(\Delta'_1)}}, \langle \Delta'_1 \rangle \boxtimes \zeta(\mathbf{n} - \Delta'_1)).$$

Now one analyzes the layers from the geometric lemma on the term $(\langle \Delta_r \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_1 \rangle)_{N_{n-l_a(\Delta'_1)}}$ (also see Section 2.7). One sees that no layer has the same cuspidal support as $\langle \Delta'_1 \rangle \boxtimes \zeta(\mathbf{n} - \Delta'_1)$, and so give such desired Ext-vanishing.

- Suppose $\Delta_1 \subsetneq \Delta'_1$. Then, one uses that

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)^\vee, \zeta(\mathbf{n})) \cong \text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathbf{n})^\vee, \zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)).$$

Now, we write $\zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee) \cong \zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee - \Delta_1^\vee) \times \langle \Delta_1^\vee \rangle$. One applies Frobenius reciprocity to give that:

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathbf{n})^\vee, \zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)) \cong \text{Ext}_{G_{n-l_a(\Delta_1)} \times G_{l_a(\Delta_1)}}^i((\langle \Delta_1^\vee \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_s^\vee \rangle)_{N_{l_a(\Delta_1)}}, \langle \Delta_r^\vee \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_2^\vee \rangle \boxtimes \langle \Delta_1^\vee \rangle).$$

Now again analysing layers in the geometric lemma on $(\langle \Delta_1^\vee \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_s^\vee \rangle)_{N_{l_a(\Delta_1)}}$ (see Section 2.7 again), one can compare cuspidal supports to give Ext-vanishing.

- Suppose $\Delta_1 = \Delta'_1$. Then we apply the Frobenius reciprocity as (*). Then, again we compute the layers from the geometric lemma on the term

$$(\langle \Delta_r \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_1 \rangle)_{N_{n-l_a(\Delta'_1)}}.$$

Then, a cuspidal support consideration on the $G_{l_a(\Delta_1)}$ factor in $G_{l_a(\Delta_1)} \times G_{n-l_a(\Delta_1)}$ gives that only possible layer contributing a non-zero Ext-group takes the form:

$$\langle \Delta_1 \rangle \boxtimes (\langle \Delta_r \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_2 \rangle).$$

Let $G' = G_{l_a(\Delta_1)} \times G_{n-l_a(\Delta_1)}$. Now, by Künneth formula,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ext}_{G'}^i(\langle \Delta_1 \rangle \boxtimes (\langle \Delta_r \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_2 \rangle), \langle \Delta_1' \rangle \boxtimes \zeta(\mathbf{n} - \Delta_1')) \\ &= \bigoplus_{k+l=i} \text{Ext}_{G'}^k(\langle \Delta_1 \rangle, \langle \Delta_1' \rangle) \boxtimes \text{Ext}_{G'}^l(\langle \Delta_r \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \Delta_2 \rangle, \zeta(\mathbf{n} - \Delta_1')) \end{aligned}$$

The latter term is zero by the induction, and so such layer will also give vanishing Ext-groups. Now, since all layers in the geometric lemma give vanishing Ext-groups, we again have that $\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)^\vee, \zeta(\mathbf{n})) = 0$ for all i . \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}$. Suppose $\mathbf{n} \not\leq_Z \mathbf{m}$. Then*

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle, \zeta(\mathbf{n})) = 0$$

for all i .

Proof. The basic case is that when all the segments in \mathbf{m} are unlinked. In such case, either $\zeta(\mathbf{n})$ does not have the same cuspidal support as $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle$; or \mathbf{n} is not generic. That case then follows by Lemma 5.5.

We now consider that some segments in \mathbf{m} are unlinked. Then it admits a short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \omega \rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)^\vee \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle \rightarrow 0,$$

where ω is the kernel of the surjection. Then, the Zelevinsky theory [Ze80, Theorem 7.1] implies that any simple composition factor of ω has multisegment \mathbf{m}' with $\mathbf{m}' \leq_Z \mathbf{m}$. Thus we still have $\mathbf{m}' \not\leq_Z \mathbf{n}$. Inductively on \leq_Z (the basic case explained above), we have that:

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\omega, \zeta(\mathbf{n})) = 0$$

for all i . Thus a long exact sequence argument gives that

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathbf{m}^\vee)^\vee, \zeta(\mathbf{n})) \cong \text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle, \zeta(\mathbf{n})).$$

Now the former one is zero by Lemma 5.5 and so the latter one is also zero. \square

For $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Irr}$, we write $\pi_1 \leq_Z \pi_2$ if $\mathbf{m}_1 \leq_Z \mathbf{m}_2$, where $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2 \in \text{Mult}$ satisfy $\pi_1 \cong \langle \mathbf{m}_1 \rangle$ and $\pi_2 \cong \langle \mathbf{m}_2 \rangle$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let λ be a representation of G_n of length 2. Suppose λ is indecomposable and the two simple composition factors of λ are not isomorphic. Then either*

- (1) $\lambda \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{p})$ for some multisegment \mathbf{p} ; or
- (2) $\lambda^\vee \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{p})$ for some multisegment \mathbf{p} .

Proof. Let π be the simple quotient of λ and let π' be the simple submodule of λ . We consider the following three cases:

- Case 1: $\pi <_Z \pi'$. Let \mathbf{p} be the multisegment such that $\pi' \cong \langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$. We have the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \pi' \rightarrow \lambda \rightarrow \pi \rightarrow 0.$$

Then applying $\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\cdot, \zeta(\mathbf{p}))$, we have the following long exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi, \zeta(\mathbf{p})) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\lambda, \zeta(\mathbf{p})) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi', \zeta(\mathbf{p})) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\pi, \zeta(\mathbf{p})).$$

By Lemma 5.6, the first and last terms are zero, and the third term has one-dimensional. Thus the unique map from λ to $\zeta(\mathfrak{p})$ is still non-zero when restricting to π' . Since π' is the unique simple module, the map must then be an embedding.

- Case 2: $\pi' <_Z \pi$. In such case, we consider λ^\vee , which has simple submodule π'^\vee and simple quotient π^\vee . We still have that $\pi'^\vee <_Z \pi^\vee$. Now the argument in Case 1 gives the embedding $\lambda^\vee \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{p})$ for some multisegment \mathfrak{p} .
- Case 3: π' and π are not \leq_Z -comparable. It suffices to prove that

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\pi, \pi') = 0$$

i.e. such indecomposable λ does not happen. To this end, let \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{p}' be the multisegments such that $\pi \cong \langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle$ and $\pi' \cong \langle \mathfrak{p}' \rangle$. We consider the following short exact sequences:

$$0 \rightarrow \langle \mathfrak{p}' \rangle \rightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{p}') \rightarrow \omega \rightarrow 0,$$

where ω is the cokernel of the first injection. Then, a long exact sequence argument with Lemma 5.6 gives

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle, \omega) \cong \mathrm{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle, \langle \mathfrak{p}' \rangle).$$

The former one is zero since any simple composition factor ω' in ω also satisfies $\omega' \not\geq \langle \mathfrak{p}' \rangle$. Thus the latter Ext is also zero. □

Define

$$\mathrm{Alg}_\pi(G_n)$$

to be the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Alg}_f(G_n)$ containing objects, each of whose simple composition factor is isomorphic to $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$ for some $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{M}_\pi$.

Proposition 5.8. *Let λ be a representation of G_n of length 2. Suppose λ is indecomposable. Suppose the two simple composition factors of λ are not isomorphic and both are in $\mathrm{Alg}_\pi(G_n)$. Then $\pi \times \lambda$ is still an indecomposable representation of length 2.*

Proof. By the irreducibility result, we know that $\pi \times \lambda$ has length 2. To show the indecomposability, it suffices to show that $\pi \times \lambda$ has either unique quotient or unique submodule. Let π_1 be the simple quotient of λ and let π_2 be the simple submodule of λ .

According to the proof of Lemma 5.7, we must have one of the following two cases:

- Case (1): $\pi_1 <_Z \pi_2$. In such case, there exists an embedding, by (the proof of) Lemma 5.7,

$$\lambda \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{p})$$

for some multisegment \mathfrak{p} . Thus we also have an embedding:

$$\pi \times \lambda \hookrightarrow \pi \times \zeta(\mathfrak{p}).$$

But the latter module embeds to $\zeta(\mathfrak{m}(\pi) + \mathfrak{p})$ by Proposition 5.3(3), which has a unique submodule. Thus, $\pi \times \lambda$ also has unique submodule.

- Case (2): $\pi_2 <_Z \pi_1$. It suffices to show that

$$(\pi \times \lambda)^\vee = \pi^\vee \times \lambda^\vee$$

has unique simple submodule. We have the embedding, by (the proof of) Lemma 5.7 again:

$$(5.1) \quad \lambda^\vee \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{q})$$

for some $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Mult}$. We now consider the following embeddings:

$$\pi^\vee \times \lambda^\vee \hookrightarrow \pi^\vee \times \zeta(\mathfrak{q}) \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{q} + \mathfrak{m}^\vee),$$

where the first embedding follows from (5.1) and the second embedding follows from Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 5.4. □

6. CONSTRUCTING SELF-EXTENSIONS

For an irreducible representation π , we first show that self extensions of π can be constructed via self-extension of its associated Zelevinsky module. Then we study self-extensions of Zelevinsky modules and show it can be reduced to a tempered case via a categorical equivalence in Corollary 6.5.

6.1. Constructing extensions from $\zeta(\mathfrak{m})$. Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$. Let $\pi = \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$. In this subsection, we explain how to construct extensions between two copies of $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle$ from two copies of $\zeta(\mathfrak{m})$. One may compare with the study in [Ch18, Section 3].

Lemma 6.1. *Let \mathfrak{m} be a multisegment. Then we have a natural embedding*

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle) \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \zeta(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\zeta(\mathfrak{m}), \zeta(\mathfrak{m})).$$

Proof. We have

$$0 \rightarrow \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \hookrightarrow \zeta(\mathfrak{m}) \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0,$$

where K is the cokernel.

Now, by Lemma 5.5, we have that, for all i ,

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(K, \zeta(\mathfrak{m})) = 0.$$

Thus a standard long exact sequence gives that

$$(6.2) \quad \text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \zeta(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathfrak{m}), \zeta(\mathfrak{m})).$$

Long exact sequence now gives that

$$0 = \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, K) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \zeta(\mathfrak{m}))$$

Thus, combining with above isomorphism,

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle) \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}_{G_n}^1(\zeta(\mathfrak{m}), \zeta(\mathfrak{m}))$$

□

We remark that the injection in Lemma 6.1 is not an isomorphism in general.

Using Yoneda extension interpretation ([Ma95, Ch III Theorem 9.1], also see [Ma95, Section 6, Pages 71 and 83]), for a given short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle \rightarrow \pi \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle \rightarrow 0,$$

there exists short exact sequences such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle & \longrightarrow & \pi & \longrightarrow & \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \zeta(\mathbf{m}) & \longrightarrow & \pi' & \longrightarrow & \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \zeta(\mathbf{m}) & \longrightarrow & \pi'' & \longrightarrow & \zeta(\mathbf{m}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Since the leftmost and rightmost vertical maps are injections, the middle vertical maps is also injective. In other words, we obtain:

Lemma 6.2. *Let π be an indecomposable representation of G_n of length two with both irreducible composition factors isomorphic to $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle$ for some $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_n$. Then there exists an indecomposable representation π'' which*

- admits a short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{m}) \rightarrow \pi'' \rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{m}) \rightarrow 0$$

and

- π embeds to π'' .

Proof. Based on the above discussions, it remains to show that π'' constructed above is indecomposable. Note that the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{m}) \rightarrow \pi'' \rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{m}) \rightarrow 0$$

implies that the only possible submodule of π'' is $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle$. Thus the indecomposability will follow by proving that $\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle, \pi'') \cong \mathbb{C}$. To this end, we use the embedding:

$$0 \rightarrow \pi \rightarrow \pi'' \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0,$$

where Q is the cokernel of the first injection. By counting the multiplicity of $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle$, there is no simple composition factor isomorphic to $\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle$ in Q . Thus, $\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle, \pi'') \cong \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathbf{m} \rangle, \pi) \cong \mathbb{C}$. \square

6.2. Extensions between two $\zeta(\mathbf{m})$. For a multisegment \mathbf{m} and a segment Δ , let

$$\mathbf{m}_\Delta = \overbrace{\{\Delta, \dots, \Delta\}}^{k \text{ times}},$$

where k is the multiplicity of Δ in \mathbf{m} . We write $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r$ to be all distinct segments such that $\mathbf{m}_{\Delta_i} \neq \emptyset$ and label in the way that $\Delta_1 \prec_b \Delta_2 \prec_b \dots \prec_b \Delta_r$. Let $n_i = l_a(\mathbf{m}_{\Delta_i})$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Denote by $G(\mathbf{m})$ the group $G_{n_1} \times \dots \times G_{n_r}$. Let, as a $G(\mathbf{m})$ -representation,

$$[\mathbf{m}] = \langle \mathbf{m}_{\Delta_1} \rangle \oplus \dots \oplus \langle \mathbf{m}_{\Delta_r} \rangle,$$

where \mathbf{m}_Δ is the submultisegment of \mathbf{m} that contains all the segment Δ in \mathbf{m} .

Lemma 6.3. *For $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$, and for any i ,*

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathfrak{m}), \zeta(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \text{Ext}_{G(\mathfrak{m})}^i([\mathfrak{m}], [\mathfrak{m}]).$$

Proof. Let Δ be a \leq_b -maximal element such that $\mathfrak{m}_\Delta \neq \emptyset$. Then we write

$$\zeta(\mathfrak{m}) = \langle \mathfrak{m}_\Delta \rangle \times \zeta(\mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}_\Delta).$$

Let $n_1 = l_a(\mathfrak{m}_{b=\rho'})$ and let $n = l_a(\mathfrak{m})$. Now a geometric lemma and a cuspidal argument (see Sections 2.5 and 2.7) gives that

$$\text{Ext}_{G_n}^i(\zeta(\mathfrak{m}), \zeta(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \text{Ext}_{G_{n_1} \times G_{n-n_1}}^i(\langle \mathfrak{m}_\Delta \rangle \boxtimes \zeta(\mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}_\Delta), \langle \mathfrak{m}_\Delta \rangle \boxtimes \zeta(\mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}_\Delta)).$$

We now repeat similar process for $\zeta(\mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}_\Delta)$. □

We now focus on $i = 1$ in Lemma 6.3 to study extensions. We now have the following:

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Alg}_f(G_n)$. Suppose each of π_1 and π_2 admits a filtration with successive quotients isomorphic to $\zeta(\mathfrak{m})$. Let $M = G(\mathfrak{m})$ and let P be the standard parabolic subgroup containing M . Then*

- (1) *for each $i = 1, 2$, there exists an admissible M -representation τ_i which admits a filtration with successive quotients isomorphic to $[\mathfrak{m}]$ such that $\pi_i \cong \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_i$, and*
- (2) *$\pi_1 \cong \pi_2$ if and only if $\tau_1 \cong \tau_2$.*

Proof. Let $n = l_a(\mathfrak{m})$. Let P be the parabolic subgroup containing $G(\mathfrak{m})$ with the Levi decomposition MN . We first consider $(\pi_i)_N$. Let τ_i be the projection of $(\pi_i)_N$ to the component that has the same cuspidal support as $[\mathfrak{m}]$. Then, applying Frobenius reciprocity, we have

$$\text{Hom}_{G(\mathfrak{m})}((\pi_i)_N, \tau_i) \cong \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_i, \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_i)$$

and so we obtain a map f in $\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_i, \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_i)$ corresponding to the surjection

$$(\pi_i)_N \twoheadrightarrow \tau_i.$$

Claim: f is an isomorphism.

Proof of claim: If f is not an isomorphism, then by counting the number of composition factors, we must have some embedding $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \hookrightarrow \pi_i$ such that $f \circ \iota = 0$. However, via the functoriality of Frobenius reciprocity, we also have a composition of maps

$$[\mathfrak{m}] \hookrightarrow \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle_N \hookrightarrow (\pi_i)_N \twoheadrightarrow \tau$$

is zero. However, this is not possible since the multiplicity of $[\mathfrak{m}]$ in $(\pi_i)_N$ agrees with that in τ via the construction above.

Now the claim gives that $\pi_i \cong \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_i$ and this proves (1).

We now prove (2). The if direction is clear. For the only direction, let $f : \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_1 \rightarrow \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_2$ be the isomorphism. Then the corresponding map, denoted \tilde{f} , under the Frobenius reciprocity is given by: $\tilde{f}(x) = f(x)(1)$, where 1 is the evaluation at the identity by viewing $f(x)$ as a function in $\text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_2$; and x is any representative in $(\pi_1)_N$. Since f is an isomorphism, the map \tilde{f} is surjective. Thus

the multiplicity of $[\mathfrak{m}]$ in τ_1 must be at least that in τ_2 . Similarly, we can obtain that the multiplicity of $[\mathfrak{m}]$ must be at least that in τ_1 . Since the two multiplicities agree, \tilde{f} restricted to τ_1 in $(\pi_1)_N$ must be an isomorphism. \square

Corollary 6.5. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_n$. Let \mathcal{C}_1 be the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}_f(G_n)$ whose objects admit a finite filtration with successive subquotients isomorphic to $\zeta(\mathfrak{m})$. Let \mathcal{C}_2 be the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}_f(G(\mathfrak{m}))$ whose objects admit a finite filtration with successive subquotients isomorphic to $[\mathfrak{m}]$. There is a categorical equivalence between \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 . (Here $\text{Alg}_f(G(\mathfrak{m}))$ is defined in an obvious way.)*

Proof. Using Proposition 6.4 (and its notations), one can write $\pi_i = \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau_i$ for some τ_i in \mathcal{C}_1 . It remains to see that the induction functor in the previous proposition also defines an isomorphism on the morphism spaces. The induced map

$$\text{Hom}_{G(\mathfrak{m})}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$$

is injective since the parabolic induction sends any non-zero objects to non-zero objects. Now it follows from Frobenius reciprocity,

$$\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1, \pi_2) \cong \text{Hom}_{G(\mathfrak{m})}((\pi_1)_N, \tau_2) \cong \text{Hom}_{G(\mathfrak{m})}(\tau_1, \tau_2).$$

The last isomorphism follows from the proof of Proposition 6.4 that τ_i is the component of $(\pi_i)_N$ that has the same cuspidal support as τ_i . Now the finite-dimensionality of the Hom spaces implies that the injection is also an isomorphism, as desired. \square

Corollary 6.6. *We use the notations in Corollary 6.5. Let τ be an object in \mathcal{C}_2 and let π be the corresponding representation under the equivalence in Corollary 6.5. Then*

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau) = \dim \text{Hom}_{G(\mathfrak{m})}([\mathfrak{m}], \tau).$$

Proof. Let $k = \text{Hom}_{G(\mathfrak{m})}([\mathfrak{m}], \tau)$. By the equivalence of categories, we have an embedding:

$$\overbrace{\zeta(\mathfrak{m}) \oplus \dots \oplus \zeta(\mathfrak{m})}^{k \text{ times}} \hookrightarrow \pi.$$

Hence, $\dim \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \pi) \geq k$.

Let $l = \dim \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle, \pi)$. Suppose $l > k$. Then, we have an embedding:

$$\overbrace{\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle \oplus \dots \oplus \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle}^{l \text{ times}} \hookrightarrow \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} \tau.$$

Now since the Jacquet functor is exact, we have that:

$$\overbrace{[\mathfrak{m}] \oplus \dots \oplus [\mathfrak{m}]}^{l \text{ times}} \hookrightarrow \tau.$$

This then gives a contradiction. Hence, we must have that $l = k$. \square

7. INDECOMPOSABILITY UNDER PRODUCT FUNCTOR: ISOMORPHIC CASE

7.1. Big derivatives.

Definition 7.1. Let $\sigma \in \text{Irr}(G_i)$. For $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f(G_n)$, define

$$\mathbb{D}_\sigma(\pi) = \text{Hom}_{G_i}(\sigma, \pi_{N_{n-i}^-}),$$

where $\pi_{N_{n-i}^-}$ is regarded as a G_i -representation via the embedding G_i to the first factor of $G_i \times G_{n-i}$. By applying the element $\begin{pmatrix} & I_{n-i} \\ I_i & \end{pmatrix}$, one can switch the $G_i \times G_{n-i}$ -representation $\pi_{N_{n-i}^-}$ to $G_{n-i} \times G_i$ -representation π_{N_i} . This gives the following isomorphism:

$$(7.3) \quad \mathbb{D}_\sigma(\pi) \cong \text{Hom}_{G_i}(\sigma, \pi_{N_i}).$$

We shall use the identification frequently in Section 9.

We similarly define the left version as:

$$\mathbb{D}'_\sigma(\pi) = \text{Hom}_{G_i}(\sigma, \pi_{N_i^-}),$$

where $\pi_{N_i^-}$ is regarded as a $G_{n-i} \times G_i$ -representation via the embedding $G_i \hookrightarrow G_{n-i} \times G_i$. We remark that \mathbb{D}_σ and \mathbb{D}'_σ is left-exact, but not exact.

We only prove results for \mathbb{D} and results for \mathbb{D}' can be formulated and proved similarly (c.f. Section 3.2). When π is \square -irreducible, $\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau)$ is either zero or has unique simple submodule [KKKO15]. If $\mathbb{D}_\pi(\tau) \neq 0$, we shall denote by $D_\pi(\tau)$ the unique submodule.

7.2. Composition of big derivatives.

Proposition 7.2. Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \in \text{Irr}$ such that $\sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_r$ is still irreducible. Then

$$\mathbb{D}_{\sigma_r} \circ \dots \circ \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_1}(\pi) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_r}(\pi).$$

Proof. For the given condition, we have that $\sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_s$ is still irreducible for $s \leq r$. Thus it reduces to $r = 2$. Let $n_1 = n(\sigma_1)$ and $n_2 = n(\sigma_2)$. We have: for any $\tau \in \text{Alg}_f(G_{n-n_1-n_2})$ and $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f(G_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{G_{n-n_1-n_2}}(\tau, \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_2} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_1}(\pi)) &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n_2} \times G_{n-n_1-n_2}}(\sigma_2 \boxtimes \tau, \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_1}(\pi)_{N_{n_2, n-n_1-n_2}^-}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n-n_1}}(\sigma_2 \times \tau, \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_1}(\pi)) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n_1} \times G_{n-n_1}}(\sigma_1 \boxtimes (\sigma_2 \times \tau), \pi_{N_{n_1, n-n_1}^-}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 \times \tau, \pi) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n_1+n_2} \times G_{n-n_1-n_2}}((\sigma_1 \times \sigma_2) \boxtimes \tau, \pi_{N_{n_1+n_2, n-n_1-n_2}^-}) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n-n_1-n_2}}(\tau, \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_1 \times \sigma_2}(\pi)). \end{aligned}$$

where the second, forth and fifth isomorphisms follow from Frobenius reciprocity, the first, third and last ones follow from the adjointness of the functors. We remark that the forth isomorphism also uses taking parabolic inductions in stages. Now the natural isomorphism between the two derivatives follows from the Yoneda lemma. \square

Proposition 7.3. *Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \in \text{Irr}^\square$ such that $\sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_r$ is still \square -irreducible. Suppose $D_{\sigma_r \times \dots \times \sigma_1}(\pi) \neq 0$. Then $D_{\sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_r}(\pi) \cong D_{\sigma_1} \circ \dots \circ D_{\sigma_r}(\pi)$.*

Proof. Let $\tau = D_{\sigma_r \times \dots \times \sigma_1}(\pi)$. Then

$$\pi \hookrightarrow \tau \times \sigma_r \times \dots \times \sigma_1.$$

Let $I_{\sigma_r}(\tau)$ be the unique simple submodule of $\tau \times \sigma_r$. The unique submodule must factor through the embedding:

$$I_{\sigma_r}(\tau) \times \sigma_{r-1} \times \dots \times \sigma_1 \hookrightarrow \tau \times \sigma_r \times \dots \times \sigma_1.$$

Then inductively, we have that $D_{\sigma_{r-1}} \circ \dots \circ D_{\sigma_1}(\pi) \cong I_{\sigma_r}(\tau)$. This implies that $D_{\sigma_r} \circ D_{\sigma_{r-1}} \circ \dots \circ D_{\sigma_1}(\pi) \cong \tau$. \square

7.3. The segment case. We now consider a case of the product functor and we recall the following result shown in [Ch22]. For a segment Δ , let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_\Delta$ be the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}_f(G_n)$ whose objects π satisfy the property that for any simple composition factor τ in π and any $\sigma \in \text{cuspp}(\tau)$, $\sigma \in \Delta$ (c.f. [Ch22, Section 9.1]).

Let $k = l_a(\Delta)$. The product functor

$$\times_{\Delta, \mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C}_\Delta \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G_{n+k})$$

as

$$\times_{\Delta, \mathcal{C}}(\pi) = \langle \Delta \rangle \times \pi.$$

Lemma 7.4. *Let Δ be a segment. Then $\times_{\Delta, \mathcal{C}}$ is a fully-faithful functor.*

Proof. This is a special case of [Ch22, Theorem 9.1]. \square

Corollary 7.5. *Let $\Delta \in \text{Seg}$. Let \mathfrak{m} be a multisegment such that any segment Δ' in \mathfrak{m} satisfies $\Delta' \subset \Delta$. Suppose \mathfrak{m} contains at least one Δ . Then $\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle)$ is irreducible and isomorphic to $\langle \mathfrak{m} - \Delta \rangle$.*

Proof. We have that $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle = \times_\Delta(\langle \mathfrak{m} - \Delta \rangle)$. By [Ch22, Corollary 9.2] and Lemma 7.4, we then have:

$$\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\times_\Delta \langle \mathfrak{m} - \Delta \rangle) = \langle \mathfrak{m} - \Delta \rangle.$$

\square

Corollary 7.6. *Let Δ be a segment. Let \mathfrak{m} be a multisegment with all segments equal to Δ . Let \mathfrak{n} be a submultisegment of \mathfrak{m} . Then $\mathbb{D}_{\langle \mathfrak{n} \rangle}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle) = \langle \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{n} \rangle$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 7.2 and Corollary 7.5. \square

One may also compare the above two statements with Lemma 9.1 and Remark 9.2 below.

7.4. Indecomposibility. For notational simplicity, for $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$, we set

$$\widetilde{\zeta}(\mathfrak{m}) = \zeta(\mathfrak{m}^\vee)^\vee.$$

Lemma 7.7. *Let $\mathfrak{m}_1, \mathfrak{m}_2 \in \text{Mult}$. Suppose $\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle$ is irreducible. Then*

$$\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle \cong \langle \mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle.$$

Proof. This result is well-known, but we shall use some similar computations in the proof of Theorem 7.8 and so we sketch some main steps. Let $n = l_a(\mathfrak{m}_1) + l_a(\mathfrak{m}_2)$. It suffices to show that

$$(7.4) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{G_n}(\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle, \zeta(\mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}_2)) \cong \mathbb{C}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}_2$. Let $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r$ be all the segments such that $\mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_i} \neq \emptyset$. We shall label the segments such that $\Delta_1 \not\prec_b \dots \not\prec_b \Delta_r$.

Let $s_i = l_a((\mathfrak{m}_1)_{\Delta_i})$ and let $t_i = l_a((\mathfrak{m}_2)_{\Delta_i})$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Let $u_i = s_i + t_i$. Let

$$G' = G_{u_1} \times \dots \times G_{u_r},$$

and let

$$G'' = (G_{s_1} \times G_{t_1}) \times \dots \times (G_{s_r} \times G_{t_r}).$$

Let $n_1 = l_a(\mathfrak{m}_1)$ and let $n_2 = l_a(\mathfrak{m}_2)$. Note that

$$\zeta(\mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}_2) = \langle \mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_1} \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_r} \rangle.$$

We now apply the Frobenius reciprocity:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G_{u_1} \times G_{n-u_1}}(\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle, \zeta(\mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_1}) \times \dots \times \zeta(\mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_r})).$$

Then a possible layer that can contribute to the non-zero Hom is

$$(*) \quad \mathrm{Ind}_P^{G_{u_1} \times G_{n-u_1}}(\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle_{N_{n_1-s_1}} \boxtimes \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle_{N_{n_2-t_1}})^\phi,$$

where

- the superscript ϕ is to twist the $G_{s_1} \times G_{n_1-s_1} \times G_{t_1} \times G_{n_2-t_1}$ -action to $G_{s_1} \times G_{t_1} \times G_{n_1-s_1} \times G_{n_2-t_1}$ in an obvious way;
- P is the standard parabolic subgroup containing $G_{s_1} \times G_{t_1} \times G_{n_1-s_1} \times G_{n_2-t_1}$.

Indeed, this is the only possible layer, which can be deduced via the projection:

$$\widetilde{\zeta(\mathfrak{m}_1)} \twoheadrightarrow \langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle$$

and analysing the layers in the geometric lemma on $\widetilde{\zeta(\mathfrak{m}_1)}_{N_{s_1+t_1}}$ (and some comparisons and countings on cuspidal representations). We just remark that the ordering on the segments is needed for such analysing work. (For more details, also see similar computations in the proof of Lemma 5.5.)

In such layer (*), the only direct summand that can (possibly) contribute the Hom via Frobenius reciprocity is

$$\langle (\mathfrak{m}_1)_{\Delta_1} \rangle \times \langle (\mathfrak{m}_2)_{\Delta_1} \rangle \boxtimes \langle \mathfrak{m}_1 - (\mathfrak{m}_1)_{\Delta_1} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 - (\mathfrak{m}_2)_{\Delta_1} \rangle.$$

Now we inductively have that $\mathrm{Hom}_{G_{n-s_1-t_1}}(\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 - (\mathfrak{m}_1)_{\Delta_1} \rangle \times \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 - (\mathfrak{m}_2)_{\Delta_1} \rangle, \zeta(\mathfrak{n} - \mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_1})) \cong \mathbb{C}$ and so Künneth formula gives (7.4). \square

The idea of proving the below theorem is that one first enlarges to some modules close to standard modules. In particular, one uses Lemma 6.2 for a module of length 2. Then one applies the Frobenius reciprocity and do some analysis as in the proof of 7.7.

Theorem 7.8. *Let $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathrm{Irr}$. Suppose $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$ is irreducible. Let π be a representation of length 2 with the two simple composition factors isomorphic to π_2 . Then π is indecomposable if and only if $\pi_1 \times \pi$ is indecomposable.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{m}_1 and \mathbf{m}_2 be multisegments such that

$$\pi_1 \cong \langle \mathbf{m}_1 \rangle, \quad \pi_2 \cong \langle \mathbf{m}_2 \rangle.$$

Since $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$ is irreducible, $\pi_1 \times \pi_2 \cong \langle \mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2 \rangle$ by Lemma 7.7.

Note that the if direction is clear. We now prove the only if direction. By Lemma 6.2 and taking the dual, there exists $\pi'' \in \text{Alg}_f$ such that

- π'' admits a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \widetilde{\zeta(\mathbf{m}_2)} \rightarrow \pi'' \rightarrow \widetilde{\zeta(\mathbf{m}_2)} \rightarrow 0$$

and;

- $\pi'' \twoheadrightarrow \pi$.

Let $n = l_a(\mathbf{m}_1) + l_a(\mathbf{m}_2)$. We see that $\pi_1 \times \pi''$ is indecomposable if and only if $\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \langle \mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2 \rangle) \cong \mathbb{C}$. To prove the latter one, it suffices to show that

$$\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \zeta(\mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2)) \cong \mathbb{C}.$$

Now we apply some similar strategy as the proof of Lemma 7.7. Let $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2$. Let $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r$ be all the distinct segments such that $\mathbf{n}_{\Delta_i} \neq \emptyset$, and $\Delta_1 \not\leq_b \Delta_2 \not\leq_b \dots \not\leq_b \Delta_r$. Let $s_i = l_a((\mathbf{m}_1)_{\Delta_i})$ and $t_i = l_a((\mathbf{m}_2)_{\Delta_i})$. Let $u_i = s_i + t_i$.

Now we write

$$\zeta(\mathbf{n}) = \zeta(\mathbf{n}_{\Delta_1}) \times \dots \times \zeta(\mathbf{n}_{\Delta_r}).$$

Let $G' = G(\mathbf{n})$. Let P be the standard parabolic subgroup in G_n containing G' with the Levi decomposition $P = G'N$. Recall that $[\mathbf{n}] = \langle \mathbf{n}_{\Delta_1} \rangle \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \langle \mathbf{n}_{\Delta_r} \rangle$ and so $\zeta(\mathbf{n}) = \text{Ind}_P^{G_n} [\mathbf{n}]$. Now Frobenius reciprocity gives that:

$$(*) \quad \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \zeta(\mathbf{n})) \cong \text{Hom}_{G'}((\pi_1 \times \pi'')_N, [\mathbf{n}]).$$

The analysis in the proof of Lemma 7.7 gives that the only possible layer contributing a non-zero Hom in (*) (via the geometric lemma on $(\pi_1 \times \pi'')_N$) is of the form:

$$\text{Ind}_{\tilde{P}}^{G'} ((\pi_1)_{N'} \boxtimes (\pi'')_{N''})^\phi,$$

where

- N' is the unipotent radical corresponding to the partition (s_1, \dots, s_r) and N'' is the unipotent radical corresponding to the partition (t_1, \dots, t_r) ;
- the upper script ϕ is a twist sending $G_{s_1} \times \dots \times G_{s_r} \times G_{t_1} \times \dots \times G_{t_r}$ to $G_{s_1} \times G_{t_1} \times \dots \times G_{s_r} \times G_{t_r}$ (by permutating the factors in an obvious way);
- \tilde{P} is the standard parabolic subgroup in G' containing $G_{s_1} \times G_{t_1} \times \dots \times G_{s_r} \times G_{t_r}$.

Thus, we have that:

$$\text{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \zeta(\mathbf{n})) \cong \text{Hom}_{G'}(\text{Ind}_{\tilde{P}}^{G'} ((\pi_1)_{N'} \boxtimes (\pi'')_{N''})^\phi, [\mathbf{n}]).$$

Indeed, as in Lemma 7.7 via comparing cuspidal support, the only component in $(\text{Ind}_{\tilde{P}}^{G'} ((\pi_1)_{N'} \boxtimes (\pi'')_{N''})^\phi)$ that can contribute to the nonzero Hom is:

$$\text{Ind}_{\tilde{P}}^{G'} ([\mathbf{m}_1] \boxtimes \tau)^\phi,$$

where τ is the direct summand in $(\pi)_{N''}$ whose simple composition factors have the same cuspidal support as $[\mathfrak{m}_2]$. Thus we further have

$$(**) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \zeta(\mathfrak{n})) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{G'}(\mathrm{Ind}_P^{G'}([\mathfrak{m}_1] \boxtimes \tau)^\phi, [\mathfrak{n}]).$$

As the functors described in the proof of Corollary 6.5, τ satisfies $\mathrm{Ind}_{P^*}^{G^{n_2}} \tau \cong \pi''$, and Corollary 6.5 implies that τ is indecomposable and of length 2. In particular, τ has a unique simple quotient.

Now we return to compute the latter Hom of (**). Let

$$G'' = G_{s_1} \times G_{t_1} \times \dots \times G_{s_r} \times G_{t_r}.$$

In such case, we applying the second adjointness, such Hom is equal to

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G''}([\mathfrak{m}_1] \boxtimes \tau)^\phi, [\mathfrak{n}]_{N^-},$$

where N^- is the unipotent radical in $P_{s_1, t_1}^t \times \dots \times P_{s_r, t_r}^t \subset G_{u_1} \times \dots \times G_{u_r}$. By using Hom-tensoring adjointness, the previous Hom turns to:

$$(***) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{G_{t_1} \times \dots \times G_{t_r}}(\tau, \mathrm{Hom}_{G_{s_1} \times \dots \times G_{s_r}}([\mathfrak{m}_1], [\mathfrak{n}]),$$

where we regard $[\mathfrak{n}]$ as a $G_{s_1} \times \dots \times G_{s_r}$ -representation via the embedding:

$$(g_1, \dots, g_r) \mapsto \left(\begin{pmatrix} g_1 & \\ & I_{t_1} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} g_r & \\ & I_{t_r} \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Let $\sigma_i = \langle (\mathfrak{m}_1)_{\Delta_i} \rangle$. Finally, using Künneth formula on (***) and combining with (*), we have that:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \zeta(\mathfrak{n})) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{G_{t_1} \times \dots \times G_{t_r}}(\tau, \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_1}(\langle \mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_1} \rangle) \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_{\sigma_r}(\langle \mathfrak{n}_{\Delta_r} \rangle))$$

and so, by Corollary 7.6,

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \zeta(\mathfrak{n})) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{G_{t_1} \times \dots \times G_{t_r}}(\tau, \langle \mathfrak{n}'_1 \rangle \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \langle \mathfrak{n}'_r \rangle),$$

where $\mathfrak{n}'_i = (\mathfrak{n})_{\Delta_i} - (\mathfrak{m}_1)_{\Delta_i}$. Now, as discussed above τ has only unique simple quotient and we so have that the Hom space has dimension 1, as desired. Thus, we have $\mathrm{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi'', \zeta(\mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}_2)) \cong \mathbb{C}$ and so $\mathrm{Hom}_{G_n}(\pi_1 \times \pi', \langle \mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle) \cong \mathbb{C}$. \square

Remark 7.9. In general, the parabolic induction does not preserve self-extensions. For example, we consider $\pi = \langle [0] \rangle$. Let $\tau = (\pi \times \pi)_{N_1}$. Then

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{P_{1,1}}^{G_2} \tau \cong \pi \times \pi \oplus \pi \times \pi.$$

8. FULLY-FAITHFULNESS OF THE PRODUCT FUNCTOR

8.1. A criteria for proving fully-faithfulness. We recall the following criteria for proving fully-faithfulness:

Lemma 8.1. [Ch22, Lemma A.1] *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be abelian Schurian k -categories, where k is a field. Let $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be an additive exact functor. Suppose the following holds:*

- (1) *any object of \mathcal{A} has finite length;*
- (2) *for any simple objects X and Y in \mathcal{A} , the induced map of F from $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X, Y)$ to $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{B}}^1(F(X), F(Y))$ is an injection;*
- (3) *$F(X)$ is a simple object in \mathcal{B} if X is a simple object in \mathcal{A} ;*

(4) for any simple object X and Y in \mathcal{A} , $X \cong Y$ if and only if $F(X) \cong F(Y)$. Then F is a fully-faithful functor.

The original statement of [Ch22, Lemma A.1] is stated in a slightly different way, but the proof still applies.

We remark that elements in $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X, Y)$ can be interpreted as short exact sequences in Yoneda extensions [Ma95], and the addition corresponds to the Baer sum. Then the exact functor $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ sends a short exact sequence to a short exact sequence and so induces a map from $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X, Y)$ to $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{B}}^1(F(X), F(Y))$ above.

If we consider the full subcategory \mathcal{B}' of \mathcal{B} containing all $F(X)$ for objects X in \mathcal{A} , then F defines an equivalence of categories from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B}' [Sta, Lemma 4.2.19]. We remark that \mathcal{B}' may not be Serre in \mathcal{B} .

8.2. Product functor. Recall that $\text{Alg}_{\pi}(G_n)$ is defined in Section 5.2.

Theorem 8.2. *Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Let $k = n(\pi)$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \text{Alg}_{\pi}(G_n)$. The functor $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{C}}$ defined in Section 3.1 is fully-faithful i.e.*

$$\text{Hom}_{G_{n+k}}(\times_{\pi, \mathcal{C}}(\tau_1), \times_{\pi, \mathcal{C}}(\tau_2)) \cong \text{Hom}_{G_n}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$$

for any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \text{Alg}_{\pi}(G_n)$.

Proof. It suffices to check the conditions in Lemma 8.1. For (1), it follows from the definitions. For (3), it follows from Proposition 5.3. For (4), it follows from Lemma 7.7. For (2), it follows from Proposition 5.8 and Theorem 7.8. \square

Remark 8.3. Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Let λ be an indecomposable representation whose composition factors π' satisfy $\pi \times \pi'$ to be irreducible. In general, it is not necessary that $\pi \times \lambda$ is indecomposable. For example, take $\pi = \langle [0] \rangle$ and let $\lambda = \langle [1] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle$. Then $\pi \times \lambda$ is a direct sum of two irreducible representation.

Corollary 8.4. *The functor $\times^{\pi, \mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G_{n+k})$ determined by $\tau \mapsto \tau \times \pi$ is fully-faithful.*

Proof. When $D = F$, it follows from Theorem 8.2 and Proposition 3.3. In general, using the Zelevinsky type classification, one can prove in a similar way to Theorem 8.2. \square

8.3. Dual formulation.

Theorem 8.5. *Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Let $k = n(\pi)$. Let*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\pi} = \{ \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult} : \text{St}(\Delta) \times \pi \text{ is irreducible } \forall \Delta \in \mathfrak{m} \}.$$

Let $\mathcal{C}' := \text{Alg}'_{\pi}(G_n)$ be the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}_f(G_n)$ whose objects have all simple composition factors isomorphic to $\text{St}(\mathfrak{m})$ for some $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{N}_{\pi}$. Then the product functors $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{C}'}$ and $\times^{\pi, \mathcal{C}'}$ are fully-faithful.

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{D}(\langle \Delta \rangle) = \text{St}(\Delta^{\vee})$ by using the formulation in [SS97]. This follows from Theorem 8.2, Corollary 8.4 and Corollary 3.5. \square

8.4. Self-extensions. We now study the fully-faithfulness of some \square -irreducible representations. One may compare with Lemma 7.4.

Proposition 8.6. *Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Let $\pi' \in \text{Irr}$ such that $\pi \times \pi'$ is irreducible. Let $\text{Alg}_{\pi', \text{self}}(G_n)$ be the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}(G_n)$ whose objects ω are of finite-length and for any $\omega' \in \text{JH}(\omega)$, $\omega' \cong \pi'$. Then the product functor*

$$\times_{\pi}^s : \text{Alg}_{\pi', \text{self}}(G_n) \rightarrow \text{Alg}(G_{n+l})$$

given by

$$\times_{\pi}^s(\tau) = \pi \times \tau$$

is fully-faithful.

Proof. Again we check the conditions in Lemma 8.1. (1), (3) and (4) are automatic. (2) follows from Theorem 7.8. \square

Remark 8.7. For $\pi \in \text{Irr}^{\square}$, $\mathbb{D}_{\pi}(\pi \times \pi)$ is possibly not irreducible. For example, take $\mathbf{m} = \{[0, 1], [1]\}$. Let $\pi = \langle \mathbf{m} \rangle$. Via a geometric lemma consideration, one deduces that:

$$(\langle [0] \rangle \times \langle [1] \rangle \times \langle [1] \rangle \times \langle [0, 1] \rangle) \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle$$

is a submodule of $\mathbb{D}_{[1]}(\pi \times \pi)$ (also see Example 9.4 below). Then

$$(\langle [0] \rangle \times \langle [1] \rangle \times \langle [1] \rangle) \boxtimes \pi$$

is a submodule of $\mathbb{D}_{[0,1]} \circ \mathbb{D}_{[1]}(\pi \times \pi) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\pi}(\pi \times \pi)$ (see Proposition 7.2).

One may further ask when $\pi \in \text{Irr}^{\square}$ is prime in the Bernstein-Zelevinsky ring, is it true that $\mathbb{D}_{\pi}(\pi \times \pi) = \pi$? This holds for when π is a Speh representation by using [Ch22], but it is not clear for the general situation.

9. APPLICATION ON SI PROPERTY FOR BIG DERIVATIVES

9.1. SI property on segment case. Recall that the big derivative is defined in Definition 7.1. For a segment Δ , set

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta} = \mathbb{D}_{\text{St}(\Delta)}, \quad D_{\Delta} = D_{\text{St}(\Delta)}.$$

For a generic multisegment \mathbf{m} , set

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbb{D}_{\text{St}(\mathbf{m})}, \quad D_{\mathbf{m}} = D_{\text{St}(\mathbf{m})}.$$

Lemma 9.1. *Fix a cuspidal representation ρ . Let \mathbf{p} be a multisegment such that any segment Δ' in \mathbf{p} satisfies $b(\Delta') \cong \rho$. Let $\Delta \in \mathbf{p}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta}(\text{St}(\mathbf{p})) = D_{\Delta}(\text{St}(\mathbf{p})) = \text{St}(\mathbf{p} - \Delta).$$

Proof. Let $\pi = \text{St}(\Delta)$. By [Ze80] and [Ta90], $\text{St}(\mathbf{p} - \Delta) \in \mathcal{M}_{\pi}$. Note that $\text{St}(\mathbf{p}) = \text{St}(\mathbf{p} - \Delta) \times \text{St}(\Delta)$.

Let $n = l_a(\mathbf{p} - \Delta)$ and let $k = l_a(\Delta)$. We consider the full subcategory \mathcal{A}' of $\text{Alg}(G_n)$ whose objects have all composition factors isomorphic to $\text{St}(\mathbf{p} - \Delta)$, and let \mathcal{B}' be the full subcategory of $\text{Alg}(G_{n+k})$ whose objects have all composition factors isomorphic to $\text{St}(\mathbf{p})$. By Theorem 8.2, $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}'} : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{B}'$ is a fully-faithful functor. Moreover, $\mathbb{D}_{\Delta} : \mathcal{B}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'$ is well-defined and is right-adjoint to $\times_{\pi, \mathcal{A}'}$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta}(\text{St}(\mathbf{p})) = \mathbb{D}_{\Delta}(\times_{\text{St}(\Delta)}(\text{St}(\mathbf{p} - \Delta))) = \text{St}(\mathbf{p} - \Delta)$$

is irreducible, by [Sta, Lemma 4.24.3]. \square

Remark 9.2. The statement of Lemma 9.1 does not hold in general if we simply replace \mathbb{D}_Δ by \mathbb{D}'_Δ .

For $\sigma \in \text{Irr}^\square$ and $\pi \in \text{Irr}$, by [KKKO15], there exists at most one $\tau \in \text{Irr}$ such that

$$\tau \boxtimes \sigma \hookrightarrow \pi_{N_n(\sigma)}.$$

If such τ exists, denote such τ by $D_\sigma(\pi)$. Otherwise, set $D_\sigma(\pi) = 0$.

We say that $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$ is SI if $\text{soc}(\pi)$ is irreducible and occurs with multiplicity one in the Jordan-Hölder sequence of π .

Lemma 9.3. *Fix a cuspidal representation $\tilde{\rho}$. Let \mathfrak{p} be a multisegment such that any segment Δ' in \mathfrak{m} satisfies $b(\Delta') \cong \tilde{\rho}$. Let $\sigma = \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})$ and let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Suppose $D_\sigma(\pi) \neq 0$. Then $\mathbb{D}_\sigma(\pi)$ is SI.*

Proof. We write $\sigma = \text{St}(\Delta)$ for some segment Δ . Let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}(\pi, \Delta)$. Then we have that

$$\pi \hookrightarrow D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}).$$

Now an application on geometric lemma gives that:

$$\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi) \hookrightarrow D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi) \times \mathbb{D}_\Delta(\text{St}(\mathfrak{p})).$$

By Lemma 9.1, we have that

$$\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi) \hookrightarrow D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta).$$

Now $D_\Delta(\pi)$ is the unique submodule of $D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta)$ and appears with multiplicity one in $D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta)$ by [LM16] or [KKKO15]. Hence $D_\Delta(\pi)$ also appears with multiplicity one in $\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi)$. \square

Example 9.4. For a segment Δ and $\pi \in \text{Irr}$, $\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi)$ is not irreducible in general. For example, let $\mathfrak{m} = \{[1], [0, 1]\}$. Then $\mathbb{D}_{[1]}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle)$ has length two.

One may further consider the indecomposable component τ in $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle_{N_1}$ which contains $\langle [0, 1] \rangle \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle$ as the submodule. It is shown by (some variants of) [Ch21, Corollary 2.9] (also see [Ch22+, Section 10.4]) that τ contains all the simple composition factors in $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle_{N_1}$ having the same cuspidal support as $\langle [0, 1] \rangle \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle$. Thus we have the following relation:

$$D_{[1]}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle) \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle \subsetneq \mathbb{D}_{[1]}(\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle) \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle \subsetneq \tau.$$

9.2. Lemma on Δ -reduced representations. We generalize the idea of η -invariant in Section 2.6 to representations of finite length.

Definition 9.5. Let $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$. Let Δ be a segment. We say that π is Δ -reduced if for any Δ -saturated segment $\tilde{\Delta}$, $\mathbb{D}_{\tilde{\Delta}}(\pi) = 0$.

Lemma 9.6. *Let $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$. Then π is Δ -reduced if and only if π' is Δ -reduced for any π' in $\text{JH}(\pi)$.*

Proof. We only sketch the proof. The if direction is straightforward by left exactness of big derivative. For the only if direction, one first takes the Jacquet functor $N_{n(\pi)-l_a(\Delta), l_a(\Delta)}$. Then one obtains a composition factor of the form $\tau \boxtimes \tau'$, where τ' is an irreducible factor with $\text{csupp}(\tau') = \Delta$. For such τ' , one can further take Jacquet functor to get a submodule of the form $\tau'' \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta')$ for some Δ -saturated segment Δ' . Now one does Frobenius reciprocity to get the lemma. \square

9.3. Generic case. We first have the following commutativity result:

Lemma 9.7. *Let Δ_1, Δ_2 be two unlinked segments. Let $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$. Then*

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta_1} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\Delta_2}(\pi) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\Delta_2} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\Delta_1}(\pi).$$

Proof. Since $\text{St}(\Delta_1) \times \text{St}(\Delta_2) \cong \text{St}(\Delta_2) \times \text{St}(\Delta_1)$ is irreducible by [Ze80, Ta90], the result follows from Proposition 7.2. \square

Lemma 9.8. *Let $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Let $\Delta \in \text{Seg}$. Suppose π is Δ -reduced. Let Δ' be a segment such that $a(\Delta) \leq a(\Delta') \leq b(\Delta) \leq b(\Delta')$. Then $\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi) = D_{\Delta'}(\pi) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $D_{\Delta'}(\pi) \neq 0$. Let $i = l_a(\Delta')$. Then we have embedding:

$$D_{\Delta'}(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta') \hookrightarrow \pi_{N_i}.$$

Let $\Delta'' = [a(\Delta'), b(\Delta)]$. Let $n = n(\pi)$ and let $j = l_a(\Delta'')$. We apply the Jacquet functor N_j on the second factor, and so, by

$$\text{St}(\Delta')_{N_j} = \text{St}([\nu \cdot b(\Delta), b(\Delta')]) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta''),$$

we have

$$D_{\Delta'}(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}([\nu \cdot b(\Delta), b(\Delta')]) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta'') \hookrightarrow \pi_{N_{n-i, i-j, j}}.$$

By taking Jacquet functor in stages and applying Frobenius reciprocity, we have that $D_{\Delta''}(\pi) \neq 0$. This gives a contradiction. \square

Lemma 9.9. *Let π be a smooth $G_{n_1} \times G_{n_2} \times G_{n_3}$ -representation. Let $\sigma \in \text{Irr}(G_{n_3})$. Let $n = n_1 + n_2$. Then*

$$\text{Hom}_{G_{n_3}}(\sigma, \text{Ind}_{P_{n_1, n_2} \times G_{n_3}}^{G_n \times G_{n_3}} \pi) \cong \text{Ind}_{P_{n_1, n_2}}^{G_n} (\text{Hom}_{G_{n_3}}(\sigma, \pi)),$$

as G_n -representations.

Proof. Let P be the parabolic subgroup containing $G_{n_1} \times G_{n_2}$. This follows from a natural isomorphism:

$$\Phi : \text{Hom}(P \backslash G_n, \text{Hom}_{G_{n_3}}(\sigma, \pi)) \cong \text{Hom}_{G_{n_3}}(\sigma, \text{Hom}(P \backslash G_n, \pi)),$$

given by

$$\Phi(f)(x)(p) = f(p)(x).$$

(Here $\text{Hom}(P \backslash G_n, \cdot)$ means the smooth maps satisfying $f(pg) = p.f(g)$. \square

Recall that $\text{Mult}_{\Delta\text{-sat}}$ is defined in Section 2.6.

Lemma 9.10. *Let $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$. Let Δ be a segment and let $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Mult}_{\Delta\text{-sat}}$. Let Δ' be a segment such that $a(\Delta) \leq a(\Delta')$ and $b(\Delta) \leq b(\Delta')$. Suppose $D_{\Delta'}(I_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi)) \neq 0$. Suppose, for any segment $\tilde{\Delta}$ with the following two properties:*

- $b(\tilde{\Delta}) \cong b(\Delta)$; and
- $a(\tilde{\Delta}) \leq b(\Delta)$,

we have $\mathbb{D}_{\tilde{\Delta}}(\pi) = 0$. Let $\Delta'' = [a(\Delta'), b(\Delta)]$. Then

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) \cong \mathbb{D}_{[\nu \cdot b(\Delta), b(\Delta')]}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta'').$$

Proof. Let $i = l_a(\Delta')$. Note that

$$(*) \quad \mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\Delta')) \cong \text{Hom}_{G_i}(\text{St}(\Delta'), (\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_i}).$$

Let $m = l_a(\mathfrak{p})$. Then the layers in the geometric lemma of $(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_i}$ take the form: for $k + l = i$,

$$\omega_{k,l} = \text{Ind}_{P_{n-k, m-l} \times P_{k,l}}^{G_{n+m-i} \times G_i} ((\pi)_{N_k} \boxtimes (\text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_l})^\phi,$$

where ϕ is a twist takes a $G_{n-k} \times G_k \times G_{m-l} \times G_l$ -representation to a $G_{n-k} \times G_{m-l} \times G_k \times G_l$ -representation.

By Frobenius reciprocity, we have that:

$$\text{Hom}_{G_i}(\text{St}(\Delta'), \omega_{k,l}) \cong \text{Hom}_{G_k \times G_l}(\tau_k \boxtimes \tilde{\tau}_l, \tilde{\omega}_{k,l})$$

where

$$\tau_k = \text{St}([\nu^{-(k-1)}b(\Delta'), b(\Delta')]), \quad \tilde{\tau}_l = \text{St}([a(\Delta'), \nu^{l-1}a(\Delta')])$$

and

$$\tilde{\omega}_{k,l} = \text{Ind}_{P_{n-k, m-l} \times P_{k,l}}^{G_{n+m-i} \times G_i} ((\pi)_{N_k} \boxtimes (\text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_l})^\phi.$$

Thus we have that:

$$(**) \quad \text{Hom}_{G_i}(\text{St}(\Delta'), \omega_{k,l}) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\tau_k}(\pi) \times \mathbb{D}_{\tilde{\tau}_l}(\text{St}(\mathfrak{p})).$$

Claim: Let $l^* = l_a([a(\Delta'), b(\Delta)])$ and $k^* = l_a(\Delta') - l^*$.

If $l \neq l^*$, then either

$$\mathbb{D}_{\tau_l}(\pi) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{D}_{\tilde{\tau}_k}(\text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) = 0.$$

Proof of claim:

- Case 1: For $k > k^*$, $\text{csupp}(\tilde{\tau}_k)$ contains a cuspidal representation not in $\text{csupp}(\text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))$. Then, we have $\mathbb{D}_{\tilde{\tau}_k}(\text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) = 0$.
- Case 2: For $k < k^*$, $a(\Delta) \leq \nu^{-(l-1)}b(\Delta') \leq b(\Delta)$. We also have $b(\Delta) \leq b(\Delta')$ by the assumption. Thus,

$$\mathbb{D}_{\tau_l}(\pi) = 0$$

by the given assumption.

We now return to the proof. Since $D_{\Delta'}(I_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi)) \neq 0$,

$$D_{\Delta'}(I_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(I_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})).$$

Thus $\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) \neq 0$. Now combining (*), (**), and the claim, we have that

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\Delta')) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\tau_{k^*}}(\pi) \times \mathbb{D}_{\tilde{\tau}_{l^*}}(\text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))$$

Now the lemma follows from 9.1. \square

Remark 9.11. In Lemma 9.10 above, if we drop the condition $D_{\Delta'}(I_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi)) \neq 0$, $\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))$ may become zero.

Lemma 9.12. *We use the notations in Lemma 9.10. Further assume that $a(\Delta') \cong a(\Delta)$. Then we further have that $\mathbb{D}_{[\nu \cdot b(\Delta), b(\Delta')]}(\pi)$ is Δ -reduced.*

Proof. Let $\Delta'' = [\nu \cdot b(\Delta), b(\Delta')]$. Let $\mathfrak{p}' = \mathfrak{p} - \Delta$. We have shown in Lemma 9.10 that

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta).$$

If $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{r}}(\mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi), \Delta) \neq \emptyset$, then we choose a maximal non-empty $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Mult}_{\Delta\text{-sat}}$ such that

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi)) \neq 0.$$

Thus we have

$$\tau \boxtimes \text{St}(\mathfrak{q}) \hookrightarrow \pi_{N_k},$$

where $k = l_a(\mathfrak{q})$ and τ is an irreducible representation with $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{r}}(\tau, \Delta) = \emptyset$. Via the geometric lemma, we thus have that

$$(\tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta)) \boxtimes \text{St}(\mathfrak{q}) \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_k}.$$

Hence,

$$\tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})).$$

Since a big derivative is a left-exact functor,

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}-\Delta}(\tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p} - \Delta)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}-\Delta} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})).$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}-\Delta} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{q}} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi) \neq 0.$$

By using Proposition 7.2 and Lemma 9.7, we can rewrite as:

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}-\Delta+\mathfrak{q}+\Delta''}(\pi) \neq 0.$$

However, this implies that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}+\mathfrak{q}}(\pi) \neq 0$ (here one may apply some Jacquet functor argument or directly use results in [Ch22] to deduce that). This contradicts the maximality of \mathfrak{p} . Hence, we must have $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{r}}(\mathbb{D}_{\Delta''}(\pi), \Delta) = \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 9.13. *Let $\pi \in \text{Alg}_f$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Mult}_{\Delta\text{-sat}}$. Let Δ' be a segment with either one of the following conditions:*

- (1) $a(\Delta') < a(\Delta)$ and $b(\Delta) \leq b(\Delta')$; or
- (2) $b(\Delta') < a(\Delta)$;
- (3) $b(\Delta) < a(\Delta')$.

Then

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) = \mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}).$$

Proof. We only prove for the first condition. The other ones can be done by similar (and simpler) argument. (The argument is also similar to the one in Lemma 9.10.) Let $i = l_a(\Delta')$ and $n = n(\pi)$. We have that:

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) = \text{Hom}_{G_i}(\text{St}(\Delta'), (\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_i}).$$

Now one applies the geometric lemma on $(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_i}$ with formulae in Section 2.7. Since $a(\Delta')$ is not in $\text{cuspp}(\text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))$, the only possible layer contributing a non-zero $\text{Hom}_{G_i}(\text{St}(\Delta'), (\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))_{N_i})$ is

$$\text{Ind}_{P_{n-i, m \times G_i}}^{G_{n+m-i \times G_i}} (\pi_{N_i} \boxtimes \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))^\phi,$$

where ϕ is again a twist of a representation to a $G_{n-i} \times G_m \times G_i$ -representation. Thus

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) \cong \text{Hom}_{G_i}(\text{St}(\Delta'), \text{Ind}_{P_{n-i, m} \times G_i}^{G_{n+m-i} \times G_i}(\pi_{N_i} \boxtimes \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))^\phi).$$

Now, it follows from Lemma 9.9 that

$$\mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p})) = \mathbb{D}_{\Delta'}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}).$$

□

We now generalize Lemma 9.3 to arbitrary generic representations. In order to use induction, one uses Section 2.6 and some properties in Proposition 2.2. For two segments Δ, Δ' , we write $\Delta \leq_a \Delta'$ if either one of the conditions hold:

- $a(\Delta) < a(\Delta')$; or
- $a(\Delta) \cong a(\Delta')$ and $b(\Delta) \leq b(\Delta')$.

Theorem 9.14. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$ be generic. Let $\sigma = \text{St}(\mathfrak{m})$. Then, for any $\pi \in \text{Irr}$ with $D_\sigma(\pi) \neq 0$, $\mathbb{D}_\sigma(\pi)$ is SI.*

Proof. We shall prove by an induction on the number of segments in \mathfrak{m} . When there is only one segment in \mathfrak{m} , it follows from Lemma 9.3.

We consider

$$\mathcal{B} = \{b(\Delta) : \Delta \in \mathfrak{m}\}.$$

Then we choose a minimal element ρ in \mathcal{B} with respect to \leq (see the ordering in Section 2.1). Among those segments $\tilde{\Delta}$ with $b(\tilde{\Delta}) \cong \rho$, we choose a segment Δ^* with \leq_a -maximal (equivalently the shortest one among those).

Let

$$\mathfrak{n} = \left\{ \tilde{\Delta} : a(\tilde{\Delta}) \not\cong a(\Delta^*) \right\} \cup \left\{ \tilde{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^* : a(\tilde{\Delta}) \cong a(\Delta^*), \tilde{\Delta} \in \mathfrak{m} \right\}$$

Here $\tilde{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^*$ is the set-theoretic subtraction i.e. for writing $\Delta^* = [a^*, b^*]_{\rho'}$ and $\tilde{\Delta} = [a^*, \tilde{b}]_{\rho'}$,

$$\tilde{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^* = [b^* + 1, \tilde{b}]_{\rho'}.$$

Claim 1: \mathfrak{n} is generic.

Proof of Claim 1: It follows from the choice of Δ^* that there is no segment $\tilde{\Delta}$ in \mathfrak{m} such that $\tilde{\Delta} \subsetneq \Delta^*$. Then it is direct to check from the genericity of \mathfrak{m} that \mathfrak{n} is also generic.

We shall use Claim 1 later. We now consider some other multisegments:

$$\mathfrak{o} = \left\{ \tilde{\Delta} \in \mathfrak{m} : a(\tilde{\Delta}) \cong a(\Delta) \right\}, \quad \mathfrak{o}' = \left\{ \tilde{\Delta} \setminus \Delta : \tilde{\Delta} \in \mathfrak{o} \right\},$$

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{o}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{x}(\mathfrak{m}, \Delta^*)$ and let $\tau = D_{\mathfrak{t}}(\pi)$. let k be the number of segments in \mathfrak{t} . We now prove another claim:

Claim 2: $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}}(\tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t})) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t} - k \cdot \Delta)$.

Proof of Claim 2: We shall prove inductively on the number of segments. When there is only one segment in \mathfrak{o} , it follows from Lemmas 9.8 and 9.10. We suppose

there are more than one segments. In such case, we pick a longest segment $\overline{\Delta}$ in \mathfrak{o} and hence $b(\tilde{\Delta}) \leq b(\overline{\Delta})$ for any $\tilde{\Delta} \in \mathfrak{o}$. This also implies

$$(9.5) \quad \tilde{\Delta} \setminus \Delta \subset \overline{\Delta}$$

for any $\tilde{\Delta} \in \mathfrak{o}$.

Now induction gives that

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}-\overline{\Delta}}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t}) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}''}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t} - (k-1) \cdot \Delta),$$

where $\mathfrak{o} = \left\{ \tilde{\Delta} \setminus \Delta \right\}_{\tilde{\Delta} \in \mathfrak{o}-\overline{\Delta}}$. Now the claim will follow from Lemma 9.10 if we can verify that

$$\mathbb{D}_{\overline{\Delta}}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}-\overline{\Delta}}(\tau)) = 0.$$

To this end, we use (9.5) and so we can apply Lemma 9.7 (several times) to obtain

$$\mathbb{D}_{\overline{\Delta}}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}-\overline{\Delta}}(\tau)) = \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}-\overline{\Delta}} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\overline{\Delta}}(\tau) = 0.$$

Now now prove another claim:

Claim 3: $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}}(\tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t})) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'+\mathfrak{p}}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t} - k \cdot \Delta)$.

Proof: It follows from Claim 2 that we only have to prove:

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t} - k \cdot \Delta)) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'+\mathfrak{p}}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t} - k \cdot \Delta).$$

This follows by using Lemma 9.13 several times.

Now to prove $D_{\sigma}(\pi)$ appears with multiplicity one in $\mathbb{D}_{\sigma}(\pi)$, it suffices to show that $D_{\sigma}(\pi)$ appears with multiplicity one in $\mathbb{D}_{\sigma}(D_{\mathfrak{p}}(\pi) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{p}))$. Now Claim 2 reduces to prove that (**) $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'+\mathfrak{p}}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t} - k \cdot \Delta)$.

Before proving (**), we have two more claims:

Claim 4: $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'+\mathfrak{p}}(\tau)$ is Δ -reduced.

Proof of Claim 4: It follows inductively from Lemma 9.12 (also see Claim 2) that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'}(\tau)$ is Δ -reduced. Now it follows from Lemma 9.7 that we also have $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{r}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{p}} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'}(\tau), \Delta) = \emptyset$.

Let $\mathfrak{t}' = \mathfrak{t} - k \cdot \Delta$.

Claim 1 shows that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'+\mathfrak{p}}(\tau)$ is SI by induction. With Claim 4, the SI property of $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'+\mathfrak{p}}(\tau) \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t}')$ now follows from [LM22, Lemma 7.1] and so we also have the SI property for $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{o}'+\mathfrak{p}}(\tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t}'))$ by Claim 3. Since $\pi \hookrightarrow \tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{t})$, we now also have the SI property of $\mathbb{D}_{\sigma}(\pi)$. □

Remark 9.15. We remark that [KKKO15, Corollary 3.7] shows that there is a unique simple submodule of $\mathbb{D}_{\sigma}(\pi)$ for $\sigma \in \text{Irr}^{\square}$ and $\pi \in \text{Irr}$. Indeed, for the special case of generic representations, it also follows from [Ch21, Proposition 2.5] and [Ch22+, Proposition 3.14], using some inputs from branching laws.

9.4. An application. We give an application on studying how to embed some Jacquet modules with respect to the layers in the geometric lemma.

Proposition 9.16. *Let $\pi = \text{St}(\mathbf{n})$ for some generic $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}_n$. Let Δ be a segment such that $D_\Delta(\pi) \neq 0$. Let τ be the indecomposable component containing the unique submodule $D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ in $\pi_{N_{l_a(\Delta)}}$. Then $\mathfrak{m}_\tau(\pi, \Delta)$ contains only one segment if and only if*

$$D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \cong \mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \cong \tau.$$

Proof. Let \mathbf{n} be the multisegment such that $\pi \cong \text{St}(\mathbf{n})$. Let $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_\tau(\pi, \Delta)$. Let $i = l_a(\Delta)$. If \mathfrak{m} contains only one segment, then $\mathfrak{m} = \{\Delta\}$. Then $D_\Delta \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ is a direct summand in π_{N_i} (see Proposition 2.1). Thus we have $D_\Delta(\pi) = \mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi)$ and $\tau \cong D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$.

We now prove the converse direction. Since we are dealing with the generic case,

$$\mathfrak{m}_\tau(\pi, \Delta) = \{[a(\Delta'), b(\Delta)] : \Delta' \in \mathbf{n}, \quad a(\Delta') \leq b(\Delta)\}$$

Thus a geometric lemma shows that $D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ appears more than one time in π_{N_i} .

Let $\omega = D_\mathfrak{m}(\pi)$. On the other hand, if $\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \cong \tau$, then

$$\tau \cong \mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}_\Delta(\tau \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{m})) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta).$$

Again analyzing on layers in the geometric lemma on the last term then gives

$$\tau \hookrightarrow (\omega \times \mathbb{D}_\Delta(\text{St}(\mathfrak{m}))) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta).$$

By Lemma 9.1, we then have:

$$(9.6) \quad \tau \hookrightarrow (\omega \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{m} - \Delta)) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta).$$

Since $\mathfrak{m}_\tau(\omega, \Delta) = \emptyset$, Proposition 2.2 gives that $D_\Delta(\pi)$ appears with multiplicity one in $\omega \times \text{St}(\mathfrak{m} - \Delta)$ and so as in τ . This contradicts to what we argued before. Hence, we cannot have $\tau \cong \mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$. \square

An alternate way to see (the proof of) Proposition 9.16 is that if $\mathfrak{m}_\tau(\pi, \Delta)$ contains more than one segment, then τ cannot be written into the form $\omega' \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ for some $\omega' \in \text{Alg}_f$. This consequently gives:

Corollary 9.17. *Let $\pi = \text{St}(\mathbf{n})$ for some generic $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}$. Let Δ be a segment such that $D_\Delta(\pi) \neq 0$. Let ω be a representation of finite length such that*

$$\pi \hookrightarrow \omega \times \text{St}(\Delta).$$

Let $i = l_a(\Delta)$. Let $p : \pi_{N_i} \rightarrow \omega \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ be the projection arising from the geometric lemma (see Section 2.5). Let $\iota : D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \hookrightarrow \pi_{N_i}$ be the unique embedding. Suppose $\mathfrak{m}_\tau(\pi, \Delta)$ contains at least two segments. Then $p \circ \iota = 0$.

Proof. Let τ be the unique indecomposable module in π_{N_i} that contains $D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ as submodule.

We have the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \kappa \rightarrow \pi_{N_i} \xrightarrow{p} \omega \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \rightarrow 0,$$

where κ is the kernel of the projection p . If $\tau \cap \kappa \neq 0$, then $D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ must contain the unique submodule $D_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ by the uniqueness of simple submodule in τ . Thus it suffices to show $\tau \cap \kappa \neq 0$. Suppose not. Then,

$$\tau \hookrightarrow \omega \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta).$$

This implies that $\tau \cong \omega' \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta)$ for some submodule ω' of ω . Then $\mathbb{D}_\Delta(\pi) \boxtimes \text{St}(\Delta) \cong \tau$. This contradicts Proposition 9.16. \square

9.5. An example compared with Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives. We shall assume $D = F$ in this subsection. We consider an example given in [Ch21] and the multiplicity of a composition factor is corrected here. We also refer the notion of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivative $\pi^{(i)}$ in [Ch21]. Let $\mathfrak{m} = \{[0, 1], [-1, 0], [0], [-1, 1]\}$ and let

$$\pi = \langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle = \langle [0, 1], [-1, 0] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle \times \langle [-1, 1] \rangle.$$

We first consider $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle_{N_1}$ and it has an indecomposable component of the form with the following structure (with the cuspidal support $[0]$ in the G_1 -factor):

$$\langle \mathfrak{n}_1 \rangle \boxtimes \langle [0] \rangle, \quad \langle \mathfrak{n}_2 \rangle \boxtimes \langle [0] \rangle, \quad \langle \mathfrak{n}_1 \rangle \boxtimes \langle [0] \rangle,$$

where $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \{[0, 1], [-1, 0], [-1, 1]\}$ and $\mathfrak{n}_2 = \{[0, 1], [-1], [0], [-1, 1]\}$.

Let

$$\mathfrak{m}_1 = \{[0], [-1], [0], [-1, 1]\}, \quad \mathfrak{m}_2 = \{[0, 1], [-1], [0], [-1, 0]\},$$

$$\mathfrak{m}_3 = \{[0, 1], [-1, 0], [-1, 0]\}.$$


Then we further compute the indecomposable components in $\langle \mathfrak{n}_1 \rangle_{N_1}$ and $\langle \mathfrak{n}_2 \rangle_{N_1}$ with the cuspidal support $[1]$ in the G_1 -factor. Let

$$\langle \mathfrak{m}_3 \rangle \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle.$$

For $\langle \mathfrak{n}_2 \rangle_{N_1}$, the indecomposable component has the structure:

$$\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle, \quad \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle, \quad \langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle.$$

From above, one deduces that the component of $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle^{(2)}$ with cuspidal support $\{\nu^{-1}, \nu^{-1}, 1, 1, \nu\}$ has only one indecomposable component:



To see this, we first write

$$\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle = \langle [-1, 1] \rangle \times \langle [0, 1], [-1, 0] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle.$$

Then, via the geometric lemma, $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle_{N_2}$ contains a layer, which gives a submodule of the Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives (note that it does not give a submodule in $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle_{N_2}$):

$$\omega = \langle [-1, 0] \rangle \times \langle [0, 1], [-1] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle \boxtimes \langle [1] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle.$$

Note that $\langle [0, 1], [-1] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle$ has a unique simple submodule $\langle [0, 1], [-1, 0] \rangle$ and a unique simple quotient $\langle [0, 1], [-1], [0] \rangle$. This in turn gives a filtration on ω :

- $\langle [-1, 0] \rangle \times \langle [0, 1], [-1, 0] \rangle$ is irreducible and isomorphic to $\langle \mathfrak{m}_3 \rangle$; and
- $\langle [-1, 0] \rangle \times \langle [0, 1], [-1], [0] \rangle \cong \langle [-1, 0] \rangle \times \langle [0, 1] \rangle \times \langle [-1], [0] \rangle$ has unique simple submodule $\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle$ and unique simple quotient $\langle [-1, 0], [0, 1], [-1], [0] \rangle = \langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle$.

On the other hand, $\langle [-1, 0] \rangle \times \langle [0, 1], [-1] \rangle$ has unique simple submodule $\langle [-1], [0], [-1, 1] \rangle$ and unique simple quotient $\langle [-1, 0], [0, 1], [-1] \rangle$. This in turn gives another filtration on ω :

- $\langle [-1], [0], [-1, 1] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle$ is irreducible and is isomorphic to $\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle$; and
- $\langle [-1, 0], [0, 1], [-1] \rangle \times \langle [0] \rangle$ has unique submodule $\langle [-1, 0], [0, 1], [-1, 0] \rangle$ isomorphic to $\langle \mathfrak{m}_3 \rangle$ and has unique simple quotient $\langle [-1, 0], [0], [0, 1], [-1] \rangle$.

This implies that $\langle \mathfrak{m}_2 \rangle$ has non-trivial extensions with submodules $\langle \mathfrak{m}_1 \rangle$ and $\langle \mathfrak{m}_3 \rangle$ in $\langle \mathfrak{m} \rangle^{(2)}$.

We now compute the big derivative $\mathbb{D}_{[0]}(\pi)$ which admits a short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \langle \mathfrak{n}_1 \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{[0]}(\pi) \rightarrow \langle \mathfrak{n}_2 \rangle \rightarrow 0.$$

By the left exactness of $\mathbb{D}_{[1]}$, we have that:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{[1]}(\langle [0, 1], [-1, 0], [-1, 1] \rangle) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{[1]} \circ \mathbb{D}_{[0]}(\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{[1]}(\langle [0, 1], [-1], [0], [-1, 1] \rangle).$$

Combining with the discussion in the Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives above, the sequence above is a short exact sequence. Thus

$$\mathbb{D}_{[1]} \circ \mathbb{D}_{[0]}(\pi) = \omega.$$

We also have

$$D_{[1]} \circ D_{[0]}(\pi) = \langle \{ [0, 1], [-1, 0], [-1, 0] \} \rangle, \quad D_{[0,1]}(\pi) = \langle \{ [0], [-1], [0], [-1, 1] \} \rangle.$$

Thus, we have:

$$D_{[1]} \circ D_{[0]}(\pi) \oplus D_{[0,1]}(\pi) \subsetneq \mathbb{D}_{[1]} \circ \mathbb{D}_{[0]}(\pi) \subsetneq \pi^{(2)}$$

REFERENCES

- [AG12] Aizenbud, A., Gourevitch, D. (2012). Multiplicity Free Jacquet Modules. Canadian Mathematical Bulletin, 55(4), 673-688. doi:10.4153/CMB-2011-127-8
- [Au95] Aubert, A.-M.: Dualité dans le groupe de Grothendieck de la catégorie des représentations lisses de longueur finie d'un groupe réductif p-adique. Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 347(6), 2179-2189 (1995) <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-1995-1285969-0>
- [AL22] A. Aizenbud, E. Lapid, A binary operation on irreducible components of Lusztig's nilpotent varieties I: definition and properties, to appear in Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly.
- [Ba02] A. I. Badulescu, Correspondance de Jacquet-Langlands pour les corps locaux de caractéristique non nulle, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 35 (2002), no. 5, p. 695-747.
- [BLM13] Badulescu, I., Lapid, E., Mínguez, A.: Une condition suffisante pour l'irréductibilité d'une induite parabolique de $GL(m, D)$. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 63(6), 2239-2266 (2013)

- [Be92] J. Bernstein. Representations of p -adic groups. Harvard University, 1992. Lectures by Joseph Bernstein. Written by Karl E. Rumelhart.
- [BBK18] Bernstein, J., Bezrukavnikov, R. and Kazhdan, D. Deligne-Lusztig duality and wonderful compactification. *Sel. Math. New Ser.* 24, 7-20 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-018-0391-5>
- [BHLS10] Badulescu, A. I., G. Henniart, B. Lemaire, and V. Sécherre. Sur Le Dual Unitaire de $\mathrm{GL}_r(D)$. *American Journal of Mathematics* 132, no. 5 (2010): 1365-96. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40864614>.
- [BZ77] I. N. Bernstein and A. V. Zelevinsky, *Induced representations of reductive p -adic groups*, I, *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* **10** (1977), 441-472.
- [Ch16] K.Y. Chan, Duality for Ext-groups and extensions of discrete series for graded Hecke algebras, *Adv. Math.* **294** (2016), 410-453.
- [Ch18] Chan, K.Y. Some Methods of Computing First Extensions Between Modules of Graded Hecke Algebras. *Algebr Represent Theor* 21, 859-895 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10468-017-9742-8>
- [Ch21] K.Y. Chan, Homological branching law for $(\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(F), \mathrm{GL}_n(F))$: projectivity and indecomposability, *Invent. math.* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-021-01033-5>
- [Ch21+] K.Y. Chan, Ext-multiplicity theorem for standard representations of $(\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(F), \mathrm{GL}_n(F))$, preprint 2021, arxiv.org/abs/2104.11528.
- [Ch22] K.Y. Chan, Restriction for general linear groups: The local non-tempered Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture (non-Archimedean case), *Crelles Journal*, vol. 2022, no. 783, 2022, pp. 49-94. <https://doi.org/10.1515/crelle-2021-0066>
- [Ch22+] K.Y. Chan, Construction of simple quotients of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives and highest derivative multisegments, [arXiv:2111.13286](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.13286)
- [CS21] K.Y. Chan and G. Savin, A vanishing Ext-branching theorem for $(\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(F), \mathrm{GL}_n(F))$, *Duke Math Journal*, 2021, 170 (10), 2237-2261. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00127094-2021-0028>
- [DKV84] Deligne, P. , Kazhdan, D., Vignéras, M.-F.: Représentations des Algèbres Centrales Simples p -Adiques, *Representations of Reductive Groups Over a Local Field*, pp. 33-117 (1984)
- [GGP20] W.T. Gan, B.H. Gross, and D. Prasad, Branching laws for classical groups: the non-tempered case, *Compositio Mathematica*, 156(11) (2020), 2298-2367. [doi:10.1112/S0010437X20007496](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X20007496)
- [GLS11] Christof Geiß, Bernard Leclerc, Jan Schröer, Kac-Moody groups and cluster algebras, *Advances in Mathematics*, Volume 228, Issue 1, 2011, Pages 329-433, doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2011.05.011.
- [GV01] Grojnowski, I., Vazirani, M. Strong multiplicity one theorems for affine Hecke algebras of type A. *Transformation Groups* 6, 143-155 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01597133>
- [GL21] M. Gurevich and E. Lapid, Robinson-Schensted-Knuth correspondence in the representation theory of the general linear group over a non-archimedean local field, *Represent. Theory* 25 (2021), 644-678, with an appendix by Mark Shimozono.
- [HM08] Marcela Hanzer, Goran Muić, On an algebraic approach to the Zelevinsky classification for classical p -adic groups, *Journal of Algebra*, Volume 320, Issue 8, 2008, Pages 3206-3231, ISSN 0021-8693, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2008.07.002>.
- [HL13] Hernandez, D., Leclerc, B. (2013). Monoidal Categorifications of Cluster Algebras of Type A and D . In: Iohara, K., Morier-Genoud, S., Rémy, B. (eds) *Symmetries, Integrable Systems and Representations*. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, vol 40. Springer, London. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-4863-08
- [Ja07] Jantzen, C.: Jacquet modules of p -adic general linear groups. *Represent. Theory* 11, 45-83 (2007). (electronic)
- [Ka17] Kato, Syu. An algebraic study of extension algebras. *American Journal of Mathematics* 139, no. 3 (2017): 567-615. [doi:10.1353/ajm.2017.0015](https://doi.org/10.1353/ajm.2017.0015).
- [KKKO15] Seok-Jin Kang, Masaki Kashiwara, Myungho Kim and Se-jin Oh, Simplicity of heads and socles of tensor products, *Compos. Math.* 151 (2015), no. 2, 377-396.

- [KKKO18] Seok-Jin Kang, Masaki Kashiwara, Myungho Kim and Se-jin Oh, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 31 (2018), 349-426, doi.org/10.1090/jams/895
- [Kl15] Alexander S. Kleshchev, Affine highest weight categories and affine quasihereditary algebras, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) 110 (2015), no. 4, 841-882, DOI 10.1112/plms/pdv004
- [LM16] E. Lapid, A. Mínguez, On parabolic induction on inner forms of the general linear group over a non-Archimedean local field, *Sel. Math. New Ser.* (2016) 22, 2347-2400.
- [LM19] E. Lapid, A. Mínguez, Geometric conditions for \square -irreducibility of certain representations of the general linear group over a non-archimedean local field, *Advances in Mathematics* Volume 339 (2018), p. 113-190, 10.1016/j.aim.2018.09.027
- [LM20] Lapid, E., Mínguez, A. Conjectures and results about parabolic induction of representations of $GL_n(F)$. *Invent. math.* 222, 695-747 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-020-00982-7>
- [LM22] E. Lapid, Mínguez, A binary operation on irreducible components of Lusztig's nilpotent varieties II: applications and conjectures for representations of GL_n over a non-archimedean local field, to appear in *Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly*.
- [Le03] B. Leclerc, Imaginary vectors in the dual canonical basis of $U_q(\mathfrak{n})$, *Transform. Groups* 8 (2003), no. 1, 95-104. MR 1959765
- [Ma95] S. MacLane, *Homology*; Springer Verlag 1995 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-62029-4>
- [Me06] R. Meyer, Homological algebra for Schwartz algebras of reductive p-adic groups *Non-commutative Geometry and Number Theory, Aspects of Mathematics E*, vol. 37, Vieweg Verlag, Wiesbaden (2006), pp. 263-300
- [Mi09] Mínguez, A.: Sur irréductibilité d'une induite parabolique. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 629, 107-131 (2009)
- [MS13] Mínguez, A., Sécherre, V. (2013). Représentations banales de $GL_m(D)$. *Compositio Mathematica*, 149(4), 679-704. doi:10.1112/S0010437X12000590
- [MS14] Alberto Mínguez, Vincent Sécherre, Représentations lisses modulo l de $GL_m(D)$, *Duke Mathematical Journal*, *Duke Math. J.* 163(4), 795-887, DOI: 10.1215/00127094-2430025
- [MW86] Mœglin, C., Waldspurger, J.-L.: Sur l'involution de Zelevinski. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 372, 136-177 (1986)
- [OS09] Eric Opdam, Maarten Solleveld, Homological algebra for affine Hecke algebras, *Advances in Mathematics*, Volume 220, Issue 5, 2009, Pages 1549-1601, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2008.11.002>.
- [OS13] Opdam, E., Solleveld, M. Extensions of tempered representations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 23, 664-714 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-013-0219-6>
- [Pr18] D. Prasad, An Ext-analogue of branching laws, *ICM proceedings 2018*.
- [Sc09] Sécherre, Vincent. Proof of the Tadić conjecture (U0) on the unitary dual of $GL_m(D)$, vol. 2009, no. 626, 2009, pp. 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.1515/CRELLE.2009.007>
- [SS97] P. Schneider, U. Stuhler, Representation theory and sheaves on the Bruhat-Tits building, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* 85 (1997) 97-191.
- [Si79] A. J. Silberger, *Introduction to Harmonic Analysis on Reductive p-adic Groups*, Math. Notes. 23, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1979.
- [Sta] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2020
- [Ta90] Tadic, Marko. Induced representations of $GL(n, A)$ for p-adic division algebras A . *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, vol. 1990, no. 405, 1990, pp. 48-77. <https://doi.org/10.1515/crll.1990.405.48>
- [Ta95] M. Tadic, Structure Arising from Induction and Jacquet Modules of Representations of Classical p-Adic Groups, *Journal of Algebra*, Volume 177, Issue 1, 1995, Pages 1-33, <https://doi.org/10.1006/jabr.1995.1284>.
- [Ze80] A. Zelevinsky, Induced representations of reductive p-adic groups II, *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* 13 (1980), 154-210.
- [Ze81] A. Zelevinsky, Representations of finite classical groups, a Hopf algebra approach, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Vol. 869, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981.

SHANGHAI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY
Email address: kychanhk@hotmail.com, kychan@fudan.edu.cn