

On the Rigidity of BN-sheaves

R. Weissauer

July 7, 2018

Let X be an abelian variety over an algebraically closed field k , where we assume that either $k = \mathbb{C}$ or k is the algebraic closure of a finite field. In [BN] and [W2] we considered the convolution product $K * L$ for complexes K and L in the bounded derived category $D_c^b(X, \Lambda)$, where the coefficient field Λ is either \mathbb{C} for $k = \mathbb{C}$ or $\Lambda = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_l$. The convolution product is defined by the group law $a : X \times X \rightarrow X$ of the abelian variety X , as the derived direct image complex $K * L = Ra_*(K \boxtimes L)$. This convolution product makes $(D_c^b(X, \Lambda), *)$ into a rigid triangulated symmetric monoidal Λ -linear category; its unit object is the skyscraper sheaf δ_0 concentrated at zero. For further details we refer to [W2]. For a complex K let $D(K)$ denote its Verdier dual and $K^\vee = (-id_X)^* D(K)$ its rigid dual.

For our considerations, the decomposition theorem and the hard Lefschetz theorem for perverse sheaves are essential prerequisites. For this we specify a full Λ -linear suspended tensor subcategory $(\mathbf{D}, *) \subseteq (D_c^b(X, \Lambda), *)$ as in [KrW, example 6], so that among others objects in \mathbf{D} are semisimple, the decomposition theorem holds and also the hard Lefschetz theorem. In particular the perverse cohomology functors ${}^p H^i(K) \in \mathbf{P}$ are defined for K in \mathbf{D} where $\mathbf{P} \subset \mathbf{D}$ is an abelian subcategory of perverse sheaves defined by a perverse t -structure on \mathbf{D} with core \mathbf{P} . If we speak of perverse sheaves on X , we always mean objects in this category \mathbf{P} . Let e denote the projector $e : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$, then $e[n]$ is the projector to $\mathbf{P}[n]$. The categories \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{P} are stable under twists $K \mapsto K_\chi = K \otimes_{\Lambda_X} L_\chi$ with respect to local systems L_χ defined by the characters χ of the fundamental group $\pi_1(X, 0)$ of X in the sense of [KrW] and stable under $K \mapsto T_x^*(K)$ for translations $T_x(y) = y + x$ with respect to closed points $x \in X$.

Evaluation morphisms. We now discuss properties of the suspended symmetric monoidal rigid Λ -linear tensor category $(\mathbf{D}, *)$ with the tensor product $*$

defined by the convolution (see [BN] and [KrW], also for the notations used). \mathbf{D} is a Krull-Schmidt category, i.e. an additive category for which every object decomposes into a finite direct sum of objects with local endomorphism rings. A Krull-Schmidt category is idem-complete, and its objects are indecomposable if and only if their endomorphism ring is local. Any isomorphism $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n K_i \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^m L_j$ for indecomposable objects K_i, L_j implies $n = m$ and $L_j \cong K_{\sigma(i)}$ for a permutation σ . In fact, any object in \mathbf{D} decomposes into a finite direct sum of objects not necessarily equal, but isomorphic an object of the form $P[n]$ for irreducible $P \in \mathbf{P}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\text{End}_{\mathbf{P}}(P[n]) \cong \Lambda \cdot \text{id}_{P[n]}$, the category is Krull-Schmidt, and the indecomposable objects K in \mathbf{D} have the form $K = P[n]$ for irreducible $P \in \mathbf{P}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. By rigidity [W2], for any K in \mathbf{D} there exists a coevaluation morphism

$$\text{coev}_K : \delta_0 \rightarrow K * K^\vee ,$$

corresponding to the identity id_K via $\text{Hom}_{D_c^b(X, \Lambda)}(K, K) = \text{Hom}_{D_c^b(X, \Lambda)}(\delta_0, K * K^\vee)$. Similarly one has the evaluation morphism

$$\text{eval}_K : K^\vee * K \rightarrow \delta_0 ,$$

so that the composition of the induced morphisms $(\text{id}_K * \text{eval}_K) \circ \text{ass} \circ (\text{coev}_K * \text{id}_K)$

$$K = \delta_0 * K \rightarrow (K * K^\vee) * K \rightarrow K * (K^\vee * K) \rightarrow K * \delta_0 = K$$

is the identity morphism $\text{id}_K : K \rightarrow K$. There is a similar dual identity for K^\vee .

Remark. (K^\vee, eval_K) attached to an object K is unique up to isomorphism (see [CT,p.120]). We use this together with the following simple facts (see [D,1.15]).

a) Suppose K is a retract of L defined by an idempotent $e \in \text{End}_{\mathbf{D}}(L)$ admitting a direct sum (i.e. biproduct) decomposition. Then for K^\vee , considered as a retract of L^\vee defined via the dual idempotent e^\vee , this gives a retract $\iota : K^\vee * K \hookrightarrow L^\vee * L$ so that $\text{eval}_K = \text{eval}_L \circ \iota$ holds.

b) For $K = A \oplus B$ the evaluation eval_K is obtained as $\text{eval}_A + \text{eval}_B$, using the projection $K^\vee * K \twoheadrightarrow (A^\vee * A) \oplus (B^\vee * B)$.

c) For $K = A * B$, using $K^\vee * K = (A * B)^\vee * (A * B) \cong (A^\vee * A) * (B^\vee * B)$, the evaluation morphism of $K^\vee * K \rightarrow \delta_0$ is obtained as the tensor product $\text{eval}_K = \text{eval}_A * \text{eval}_B$.

The symmetry constraints of the tensor category define isomorphisms

$$S : K * K^\vee \cong K^\vee * K$$

such that the composed morphism $eval_K \circ S \circ coev_K$

$$\delta_0 \rightarrow K * K^\vee \rightarrow K^\vee * K \rightarrow \delta_0 ,$$

considered as an element of $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\delta_0, \delta_0) = \Lambda$, is the multiplication with the categorical dimension of K ; in our case the categorical dimension is the Euler characteristic $\chi(K) = \sum_i (-1)^i \dim_{\Lambda}(H^i(X, K))$ of the complex K .

For a morphism $\rho : K \rightarrow L$ the transposed morphism $\rho^\vee : L^\vee \rightarrow K^\vee$ is defined as $(eval_L * id_{K^\vee}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * \rho * id_{K^\vee}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * coev_K)$. Together with $K \mapsto K^\vee$ this induces a tensor equivalence with the opposite category so that $(K^\vee)^\vee \cong K$ and $(\rho^\vee)^\vee = \rho$ in the sense of [CT,2.5]. There exists an isomorphism $\varphi : (K^{\vee\vee} * K^\vee)^\vee \cong K * K^\vee$ such that $coev_K = \varphi \circ (eval_{K^\vee})^\vee$. Using the duality isomorphisms $d_{K,L} : L^\vee * K^\vee \rightarrow (K * L)^\vee$ defined by $(eval_L * id_{(K * L)^\vee}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * eval_K * id_L * id_{(K * L)^\vee}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * id_{K^\vee} * coev_{K * L})$, more concretely one can show $(coev_K)^\vee \circ D = eval_{K^\vee}$ for $D = d_{K, K^\vee}$.

Monoidal components. By the decomposition theorem $K^\vee * K$ is semisimple for $K \in \mathbf{D}$. Hence $K^\vee * K = \bigoplus_i {}^p H^i(K^\vee * K)[-i]$, and any ${}^p H^i(K^\vee * K)$ decomposes into a direct sum $\bigoplus P_v^i$ of irreducible perverse sheaves P_v^i . Using this decomposition, the evaluation can be written as a sum $eval_K = \sum_{v,i} ev_{v,i}$ with morphisms $ev_{v,i} \in Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(P_v^i[-i], \delta_0)$. Since for irreducible K

$$Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K, K) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K^\vee * K, \delta_0)$$

has dimension one, there exists a unique exponent $i = v_K$ and a unique simple perverse constituent \mathcal{P}_K of ${}^p H^i(K * K^\vee)$ such that $eval_K$ factorizes over $\mathcal{P}_K[-i]$. All the other morphisms $ev_{v,i}$ are zero. This gives a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K^\vee * K & & \\ \uparrow \iota & \searrow eval_K & \\ \mathcal{P}_K[-v_K] & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & \delta_0 \\ \downarrow p & & \end{array}$$

where $p \circ \iota = id$ is the identity morphism. In the following, arrows \hookrightarrow and \twoheadrightarrow always split monomorphisms ι and the corresponding projections p obtained from direct sum decompositions, which makes sense in our Λ -linear tensor category $(\mathbf{D}, *)$. However, for convenience, we reserve these symbols for retracts associated to idempotents $\iota \circ p$ that commute with all idempotents $e[n]$. Put briefly,

this assures that the correspond to decompositions into direct sums of translates of perverse sheaves. This property is preserved by functors Rf_* , hence by the convolution product. For an arbitrary rigid symmetric monoidal Λ -linear tensor category $eval_K = 0$ implies $id_K = 0$ and hence $K = 0$, this shows $\varepsilon \neq 0$.

For an irreducible perverse sheaf K the distinguished irreducible component \mathcal{P}_K will be called the *monoidal component* of the irreducible perverse sheaf K , and v_K its *degree*, and in the case $v_K > 0$ the perverse sheaf \mathcal{P}_K will be called a monoidal perverse sheaf or *monoid* on X . Concerning this, notice that the degree always satisfies $v_K \geq 0$.

This follows from the perverse vanishing conditions

$$Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(M, N[r]) = 0$$

for $M, N \in \mathbf{P}$ and $r < 0$, applied for the objects \mathcal{P}_K and δ_0 in \mathbf{P} .

From the definition of $\mathcal{P}_K[v_K]$ and the existence of the symmetry isomorphism $S: K * K^\vee \cong K^\vee * K$, it is clear that $\mathcal{P}_{K^\vee} \cong \mathcal{P}_K$ and $v_{K^\vee} = v_K$. Therefore passing to the dual, using $coev_K = \varphi \circ (eval_{K^\vee})^\vee$ for some isomorphism $\varphi: (K^{\vee\vee} * K^\vee)^\vee \cong K * K^\vee$ and $\mathcal{P}_K[-v_K]^\vee \cong \mathcal{P}_K^\vee[+v_K]$, we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & K * K^\vee \\
 & \nearrow^{coev_K} & \uparrow i' \\
 \delta_0 & & \\
 & \searrow_{\sigma} & \downarrow p' \\
 & & \mathcal{P}_K^\vee[+v_K]
 \end{array}$$

Using the perverse vanishing condition for morphisms and the adjunction formulas

$$Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K, \delta_0[n]) = \mathcal{H}^{-n}(K)_0^*$$

and $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K * L, \delta_0) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(L, K^\vee)$ for $K, L \in \mathbf{D}$ it follows that $\mathcal{H}^{>0}(K * L) = 0$ holds for perverse sheaves $K, L \in \mathbf{P}$. Hence the following assertions 5, 6, 7 and 9 of lemma 1 are an immediate consequence, in view of the hard Lefschetz theorem.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $K \in \mathbf{P}$ is an irreducible perverse sheaf on X , then*

1. \mathcal{P}_K is irreducible and $\mathcal{P}_K \cong \mathcal{P}_{K^\vee}$ and $v_{K^\vee} \cong v_K$.
2. $0 \leq v_K \leq \dim(X)$, and $v_K = \dim(X)$ iff K is translation invariant under X .

3. $v_K = 0$ iff K is in $M(X)$, i.e. iff $\chi(K) \neq 0$ holds for the Euler characteristic. In this case $\mathcal{P}_K = \delta_0$.
4. $v_K > 0$ iff K is in $E(X)$, i.e. iff $\chi(K) = 0$.
5. $(P, v) = (\mathcal{P}_K, v_K)$ is uniquely characterized by the property: $P[-v]$ is a summand of $K^\vee * K$ with $\mathcal{H}^{-v}(P)_0 \neq 0$. We remark that then this stalk is dual to $\text{End}_{\mathbf{D}}(K)$ and hence isomorphic to Λ (see also [BN, cor.2]).
6. $\mathcal{P}_K[\pm v_K]$ has multiplicity one in $K * K^\vee$ and $\mathcal{P}_K[n] \hookrightarrow K^\vee * K$ implies $|n| \leq v_K$.
7. $x \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_K[-v_K]))$ iff $T_x^*(K) \cong K$ (this describes the stabilizer of K).
8. $v_{K_\chi} = v_K$, $\mu(K) = \mu(K_\chi)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{K_\chi} = (\mathcal{P}_K)_\chi$ for twists K_χ of K .
9. $v_K = \mu(\mathcal{P}_K)$.

where for a complex G in \mathbf{D} we define

$$\mu(G) = \max\{v \mid \mathcal{H}^{-i}(G) = 0 \text{ for all } i < v\}.$$

Proof. For property 8 use that twisting with a character defines a tensor functor (see [KrW]). The symmetry isomorphism $S : K^\vee * K \cong K * K^\vee$ together with property 5 gave $\mathcal{P}_{K^\vee} \cong \mathcal{P}_K$ and $v_{K^\vee} = v_K$. For property 2 notice that the perverse cohomology of the direct image $Ra_*(K^\vee \boxtimes K)$ vanishes in degree $> \dim(X)$, and for $v_K = \dim(X)$ one easily shows $a^*(\mathcal{P}_K)[\dim(X)] \cong K^\vee \boxtimes K$. Hence $\mathcal{P}_K[\dim(X)] \cong K \otimes \mathcal{H}^\bullet(K^\vee)_0$ by restriction to $\{0\} \times X$, and hence $\mathcal{P}_K \cong K$. Then $T_x^*(K) \cong K$ for all $x \in X$ follows by restriction to $\{x\} \times X$. The proof of property 3 and 4 follows from the next commutative diagram, whose right side stems from the hard Lefschetz theorem (see also [BN, 2.6])

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \delta_0 & \xleftarrow{\exists! \varepsilon} \mathcal{P}_K[-v_K] \\
& \uparrow \text{eval}_K & \uparrow \text{pr}_{-v_K} \\
& K^\vee * K & \xleftarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_K} \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K] \oplus \text{rest} \\
& \uparrow S & \uparrow \sim \\
& K * K^\vee & \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_K} \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K] \oplus \text{rest} \\
& \uparrow \text{coev}_K & \uparrow i_{+v_K} \\
& \delta_0 & \xrightarrow{\exists! \sigma} \mathcal{P}_K^\vee[+v_K]
\end{array}$$

$\chi(K)$

The two middle horizontal arrows define $\bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_K} \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K]$ as a retract of $K * K^\vee$, using $S : K * K^\vee \cong K^\vee * K$. The middle vertical arrow on the right is an isomorphism respecting the direct sum decomposition $\bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_K} \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K] \oplus \text{rest}$. The existence of such a decomposition follows from the hard Lefschetz theorem, since the symmetry S can be chosen so that it commutes with the Lefschetz maps L . Indeed, by defining the Lefschetz morphism $L : K^\vee * K \rightarrow K^\vee * K[2](1)$ as $L = Ra_*(\eta)$, where $\eta : K^\vee \boxtimes K \rightarrow K^\vee \boxtimes K[2](1)$ is induced by the cup-product of $K^\vee \boxtimes K$ with the morphism $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda[2](1)$ defined by an ample theta divisor of $X \times X$ whose Chern class is symmetric with respect to the switch $\sigma_{12}(x_1, x_2) = (x_2, x_1)$, it suffices to know that $S = Ra_*(\psi)$ holds for some isomorphism $\psi : K^\vee \boxtimes K \cong \sigma_{12}^*(K \boxtimes K^\vee)$. For this see [BN, 2.1]. Since $\text{coev}_K : \delta_0 \rightarrow K^\vee * K$ factorizes over $\mathcal{P}_K^\vee[+v_K]$ and since $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{P}_K^\vee[+v_K], \mathcal{P}_K[-v_K])$ vanishes unless $v_K \leq -v_K$ and hence $v_K = 0$, this proves assertion 3 and 4 taking into account the discussion of the case $v_K = 0$ given in [KrW]. \square

We will show $\mathcal{P}_K^\vee \cong \mathcal{P}_K$ later in lemma 3. Using this already, the lower right part of the last diagram is contained in $\bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_K} \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K]$ using the fact that both $\mathcal{P}_K[\pm v_K]$ appear with multiplicity one as a direct summand in $K^\vee * K$. Notice, that both morphisms ε and σ are nontrivial morphisms in the category \mathbf{D} .

Besides the above large ‘monoidal component’ diagram there are similar commutative diagrams for semisimple perverse objects P in \mathbf{P} .

For $P = \bigoplus_i m_i P_i$ and irreducible $P_i \in \mathbf{P}$ such that $P_i \not\cong P_j$ for $i \neq j$ there are commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\delta_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \delta_0 & \xleftarrow{\quad \Sigma_i \text{tro}\varepsilon_i \quad} & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] \\
\uparrow \text{eval}_P & & \uparrow \Sigma_i \text{eval}_{P_i} & & \uparrow \bigoplus_i \text{pr}_{-v_{P_i}} \\
P^\vee * P & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot P_i^\vee * P_i & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[2v - v_{P_i}]
\end{array}$$

Also the following diagrams are commutative. Notice, part of the next diagram is displayed already in the last diagram. However, the next two diagrams are commutative also in the reverse direction, i.e. with the additional arrows inserted. This follows from $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(P_i^\vee * P_j, \delta_0) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(P_j, P_i) = 0$ for irreducible $P_i \not\cong P_j$ in \mathbf{P} . The lower diagram is obtained from the upper one by Tannaka duality

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\delta_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \delta_0 & \xleftarrow{\Sigma_i \text{tr} \circ \varepsilon_i} & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] \\
\text{eval}_P \uparrow & & \uparrow \Sigma_i \text{eval}_{P_i} & & \uparrow \bigoplus_i \text{pr}_{-v_{P_i}} \\
P^\vee * P & \xleftrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot P_i^\vee * P_i & \xleftrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[2v - v_{P_i}]
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
P * P^\vee & \xleftrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot P_i * P_i^\vee & \xleftrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}^\vee[2v - v_{P_i}] \\
\text{coev}_P \uparrow & & \uparrow \bigoplus_i \text{coev}_{P_i} & & \uparrow \bigoplus_i i_{+v_{P_i}} \\
\delta_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \delta_0 & \xrightarrow{\bigoplus_i \text{tr}^\vee \circ \sigma_i} & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}^\vee[+v_{P_i}]
\end{array}$$

Example. For irreducible perverse sheaves K on A and L on B and $K \boxtimes L$ on $A \times B$, we have $\mathcal{P}_{K \boxtimes L} = \mathcal{P}_K \boxtimes \mathcal{P}_L$ and $v_{K \boxtimes L} = v_K + v_L$ so that $\mathcal{H}^{-i}(\mathcal{P}_K \boxtimes \mathcal{P}_L)$ is a skyscraper sheaf with stalk cohomology $\mathcal{H}^{-v_K - v_L}(\mathcal{P}_K \boxtimes \mathcal{P}_L)_0 \cong \Lambda$ at the point zero for $i = v_K + v_L$, and vanishes for $i < v_K + v_L$.

Example. An irreducible perverse sheaf K is *negligible*¹ if it has the form

$$K \cong \delta_B^\Psi * M \quad , \quad \delta_B^\Psi := i_*(\Lambda_B)[\dim(B)]_\Psi$$

for an irreducible $M \in M(X)$ (see also [KrW]), a nontrivial abelian subvariety $i : B \hookrightarrow X$ and a twist by a character $\Psi : \pi_1(X, 0) \rightarrow \Lambda^*$. Then $K * K^\vee \cong (H^\bullet(X, \delta_B) \otimes_\Lambda \delta_B^\Psi) * (M * M^\vee)$. This allows to compute coev_B and coev_M separately. Hence, the monoidal component is

$$\boxed{\mathcal{P}_K \cong \delta_B^\Psi \quad , \quad v_K = \dim(B)}$$

by assertion 3) of lemma 1. Indeed for an irreducible perverse sheaf $M \in M(X)$ we have $\mathcal{P}_M = \delta_0$. The above formula for v_K is a special case of

$$v_F = v_K + \dim(A) \quad , \quad F = p^*(K)[\dim(A)]$$

for quotient morphisms $p : X \rightarrow B = X/A$, which by an isogeny is easily reduced to the case $X = A \times B$ where p is the projection to the second factor and $F = \delta_A \boxtimes K$. Then the assertion is obvious. Indeed, for $K \boxtimes L$ on $A \times B$ and $K \in \text{Perv}(A, \Lambda)$ and $L \in \text{Perv}(B, \Lambda)$, one has $v_{K \boxtimes L} = v_K + v_L$.

¹An equivalent definition is, that there exists an isogeny $g : A \times B \rightarrow X$ such that $g^*(K) = \tilde{K} \boxtimes \Lambda_B[\dim(B)]$ for some abelian subvariety $B \neq 0$ and some $\tilde{K} \in \text{Perv}(A, \Lambda)$

Tensor ideals. Semisimple complexes, whose irreducible perverse constituents (with shifts) are translation invariant by nontrivial abelian subvarieties, resp. whose constituents have Euler characteristic zero, define tensor ideals \mathbf{N} and \mathbf{N}_E in the tensor category $(\mathbf{D}, *)$ so that $\mathbf{N} \subset \mathbf{N}_E$. One can show that a complex K is translation invariant under an abelian subvariety $A \subseteq X$ iff all perverse constituents of all perverse cohomology sheaves ${}^p H^i(K)$ are translation invariant under A . Furthermore by lemma 1, assertion 7 for $v_K > 0$ an irreducible perverse sheaf is in \mathbf{N}_E but not in \mathbf{N} iff $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_K[-v_K])$ is a skyscraper sheaf. Let $E(X)$ resp. $N(X)$ denote the perverse sheaves in \mathbf{N}_E resp. \mathbf{N} , and $F(X)$ the isomorphism classes of irreducible perverse K in $E(X) \setminus N(X)$.

Reconstruction. We know $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(K * K^\vee, \mathcal{P}_K[-v_K]) \cong \Lambda \neq 0$ for irreducible K in \mathbf{P} . By rigidity $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(K, K * \mathcal{P}_K[-v_K]) \cong \Lambda \neq 0$, so there exists a nontrivial morphism $K[v_K] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_K * K \cong K * \mathcal{P}_K$. Our aim is to show that there exists a retract morphism in \mathbf{D} (of course unique up to a scalar)

$$K \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K[-v_K] * K .$$

Similarly, by rigidity then $\mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K \neq 0$. By the decomposition theorem $\mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K = \bigoplus_{L,v} L[-v]$ decomposes into a sum of shifted irreducible perverse sheaves L (with $v \in \mathbb{Z}$). By the rigidity and strictness of the additive category \mathbf{D} the morphism $id_K : K = \delta_0 * K \rightarrow K * K^\vee * K \rightarrow K * \delta_0 = K$ ‘factorizes’ in the form $id_K = \sum_{L,v} v_{L,v} \circ u_{L,v}$. The left horizontal morphism in the next diagram is the composite of $\varphi = \sigma * id_K$ and the monomorphism $\iota' * id_K$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 K = \delta_0 * K & \xrightarrow{\text{coev}_K * id_K} & K * K^\vee * K & \xrightarrow{id_K * eval_K} & K * \delta_0 = K \\
 & \searrow \varphi & \uparrow & \nearrow \psi & \\
 & & \mathcal{P}_K^\vee[v_K] * K & & \\
 & \swarrow \exists u & \uparrow & \searrow v & \\
 & & L[v_K - v] & &
 \end{array}$$

Then $\psi \circ \varphi = id_K$ for $\psi = (id_K * eval_K) \circ (\iota' * id_K)$. Therefore $\varphi \neq 0$, and for some constituent $i : L[-v] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K$ there exists a nontrivial morphism $u = u_{L,v}$ so that for $v = v_{L,v}$ in \mathbf{D} as in the diagram $v \circ u \neq 0$. Warning: Notice $v = \psi \circ i$, but the lower left of the diagram may not be commutative. If r is a retract of i , then $u = r \circ \varphi$.

Nontrivial morphisms v from $L[v_K - v]$ to $K * \delta_0$ in \mathbf{D} exist only for $v_K - v \leq 0$, nontrivial morphisms u in \mathbf{D} from $\delta_0 * K$ to $L[v_K - v]$ only for $v_K - v \geq 0$. Hence $v = v_K$. That $v \circ u : K = \delta_0 * K \rightarrow L \rightarrow K * \delta_0$ is nontrivial forces u and v to be isomorphisms of perverse sheaves $L \cong K$, since both L and K are irreducible. This proves $K \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^\vee[v_K] * K$ or $K[-v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K$, and hence by the hard Lefschetz theorem

$$\boxed{K[\pm v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K}.$$

Applying this for K^\vee instead of K , by passing to the Tannaka duals we then obtain from lemma 1, part 1 the desired assertion

$$\boxed{K[\pm v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K * K}.$$

Together with

$$\boxed{\mathcal{P}_K[\pm v_K] \hookrightarrow K * K^\vee}$$

this implies

Lemma 2. *For irreducible perverse sheaves K in \mathbf{P} and an abelian subvariety $A \subseteq X$ and homomorphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$ the following holds*

1. $Rf_*(K) = 0$ iff $Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_K) = 0$.
2. $K \in E(X)$ iff $\mathcal{P}_K \in E(X)$.
3. K is invariant under $A \subseteq X$ iff \mathcal{P}_K is invariant under A .
4. $K \in N(X)$ iff $\mathcal{P}_K \in N(X)$.
5. $K \in F(X)$ iff $\mathcal{P}_K \in F(X)$.

Proof. Obviously 3) \implies 4) and 2),4) \implies 5). For 1) use that Rf_* is a tensor functor, for 2) use the hereditary property of the class N_{Euler} (see [KrW]), and for 3) use $T_x^*(K * L) = T_x^*(K) * L$ for translations $T_x(y) = x + y$ for closed points $x \in A$ together with $K[\pm v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K * K$ and $\mathcal{P}_K[\pm v_K] \hookrightarrow K * K^\vee$. \square

Extremal perverse sheaves. For closed points $x \in X$ the skyscraper sheaves δ_x are in \mathbf{P} and $T_x^*(\delta_x) = \delta_0$, and $K \in \mathbf{P}$ iff $T_x^*(K) \in \mathbf{P}$. For K, L in \mathbf{P} the Λ -dual of the stalk cohomology $\mathcal{H}^n(L^\vee * K)_x$ at x can be identified with $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(L^\vee * K, \delta_x[-n]) \cong Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(T_x^*(K), L[-n])$, which is zero for $n > 0$ by the perverse vanishing conditions for morphisms. Hence $\mathcal{H}^{>0}(K * \mathcal{P}_K) = 0$. Since $K[\pm v_K] \hookrightarrow K * \mathcal{P}_K$, therefore

$\mathcal{H}^{>-v_K}(K) = \mathcal{H}^{>0}(K[-v_K])$ vanishes. For irreducible perverse sheaves K this implies the inequality

$$\boxed{v_K \leq \mu(K)}.$$

Suppose $K \in F(X)$ is *extremal* in the sense that $\mathcal{H}^0(K[-v_K]) \neq 0$, or equivalently that $v_K = \mu(K)$, holds. We claim that

$$\boxed{v_K = \mu(K) \iff T_x^*(K) \cong \mathcal{P}_K \text{ for some } x \in X}.$$

The implication \Leftarrow follows from lemma 1, part 9. For the converse recall that $K[-v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K * K$ and also $K[-v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K$. Therefore $v_K = \mu(K)$ implies $0 \neq \mathcal{H}^0(K[-v_K])$, and hence $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K) \neq 0$. Notice, both K and $L = \mathcal{P}_K^\vee$ are irreducible perverse sheaves and for irreducible perverse sheaves K and L one has $\mathcal{H}^0(L * K) \neq 0$ iff $T_x^*(K) \cong L^\vee$ holds for some $x \in X$ (see [BN,2.5], or the computations above). This implies $T_x^*(K) \cong \mathcal{P}_K$ for some $x \in X$, and proves our claim.

If $K = \mathcal{P}$ is a monoidal perverse sheaf, then K is extremal and furthermore $\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(K)_0 \neq 0$ holds. Therefore the argument above shows that we even get an isomorphism $K \cong \mathcal{P}_K$, indeed we get this for $x = 0$ from the stronger assertion $\mathcal{H}(K[-v_K])_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_K * K)_0$. Furthermore, the same argument then applied to the retract $K[-v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K * K$, instead of $K[-v_K] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^\vee * K$, shows $K \cong \mathcal{P}_K^\vee$. Therefore $K^\vee \cong K$ follows for monoids K .

Using this information, we get $\mathcal{P}_K^\vee \cong \mathcal{P}_K$ for arbitrary irreducible $K \in \mathbf{P}$. Hence if K is extremal, then $K^\vee \cong T_{2x}^*(K)$. If K is extremal and self dual in the sense $K^\vee \cong K$, then $T_{2x}^*(K) \cong K$. If K is a monoidal component, then K is extremal. Altogether this implies

Lemma 3. *For an irreducible perverse sheaf K one has $v_K \leq \mu(K)$. K is extremal in the sense $v_K = \mu(K)$ iff K is isomorphic to a translate of its monoidal component. If K is the monoidal component of an irreducible perverse sheaf, then*

$$\boxed{K^\vee \cong K \cong \mathcal{P}_K}.$$

In particular, we obtain $v_K = \mu(\mathcal{P}_K) = v_{\mathcal{P}_K}$.

For monoids $K = \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_K$ we have the following commutative diagram, using

that $K[\pm d] \hookrightarrow K * K$ occurs with multiplicity one in $K * K$ and also using $K^\vee \cong K$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
K & \xrightarrow{\text{coev}_K * id_K} & (K * K^\vee) * K & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{ass}} & K * (K^\vee * K) & \xrightarrow{id_K * eval_K} & K \\
& \searrow \sigma * id_K & \uparrow j * id_K & & \downarrow id_K * j^\vee & \nearrow id_K * \varepsilon & \\
& & K[+v_K] * K & \xrightarrow[\exists! a]{} & K * K[-v_K] & & \\
& \swarrow \sim & \uparrow j' & & \downarrow p' & \swarrow \sim & \\
& & K & \xrightarrow[\sim]{} & K & &
\end{array}$$

for the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\delta_0 & \xrightarrow{\text{coev}_K} & K * K^\vee \\
& \searrow \sigma & \uparrow j \\
& & K[+v_K]
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccc}
K^\vee * K & \xrightarrow{eval_K} & \delta_0 \\
& \downarrow j^\vee & \nearrow \varepsilon \\
& & K[-v_K]
\end{array}$$

The two small diagrams, together with rigidity, imply the existence of a such that $id_K = (id_K * \varepsilon) \circ a \circ (\sigma * id_K)$. Repeating the argument, used in the section on reconstruction, for $\varphi = \sigma * id_K$ and $\psi = (id_K * \varepsilon) \circ a$, we see that $id_K = \psi \circ \mu \circ (\sigma * id_K)$ factorizes over the unique (!) retract $\mu : K[+v_K] * K \twoheadrightarrow K$ to the unique constituent $j' : K \hookrightarrow K[+v_K] * K$ isomorphic to K . Similarly, there is a unique retract $p' : K * K[-v_K] \twoheadrightarrow K$. Repeating the argument, used in the section on reconstruction, now for $\varphi = a \circ (\sigma * id_K)$ and $\psi = id_K * \varepsilon$, we find a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
K & \xrightarrow{\text{coev}_K * id_K} & (K * K^\vee) * K & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{ass}} & K * (K^\vee * K) & \xrightarrow{id_K * eval_K} & K \\
& \searrow \sigma * id_K & \uparrow j * id_K & & \downarrow id_K * j^\vee & \nearrow id_K * \varepsilon & \\
& & K[+v_K] * K & & K * K[-v_K] & & \\
& \swarrow \sim & \downarrow \mu & & \uparrow r & \swarrow \sim & \\
& & K & \xrightarrow[\sim]{} & K & &
\end{array}$$

$\mu \circ (\sigma * id_K) : K \rightarrow K$ completes the left lower part of the diagram.

Functors. For Λ -linear tensor functors F between rigid symmetric monoidal (not necessarily abelian) Λ -linear tensor categories, $F(\text{coev}_K) = \text{coev}_{F(K)}$ and also $F(\text{eval}_K) = \text{eval}_{F(K)}$ holds. We will use this for the direct image functor $F = Rf_*$ which for a homomorphism between abelian varieties

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

induces a triangulated tensor functor between $\mathbf{D}(X) \subseteq D_c^b(X, \Lambda)$ and $\mathbf{D}(Y) \subseteq D_c^b(Y, \Lambda)$.

Assumption. Suppose $Rf_*(K)$ is perverse². By the decomposition theorem $Rf_*(K)$ decomposes into nonisomorphic irreducible perverse sheaves P_i with multiplicities m_i

$$L := Rf_*(K) = \bigoplus_i m_i \cdot P_i.$$

Since Rf_* is a tensor functor

$$Rf_*(K * K^\vee) = L * L^\vee = \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot P_i * P_i^\vee \oplus \bigoplus_{i \neq j} m_i m_j \cdot P_i * P_j^\vee.$$

Using lemma 1, property 5 of monoidal components and the adjunction formulas from page 4 it is easy to see that any irreducible constituent Q of $L * L^\vee$ with $\mathcal{H}^0(Q)_0 \neq 0$ is contained in the first sum $\bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot P_i * P_i^\vee$, hence is of the form

$$Q \cong \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}].$$

Now applying $F = Rf_*$ to the monoidal diagram of K gives the right side of the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] & \xrightarrow{\oplus_i \text{tr} \circ \varepsilon_i} & \delta_0 & \xleftarrow{Rf_*(\varepsilon)} & Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[-v_K] \\
\uparrow pr & & \text{eval}_p \uparrow & & \uparrow Rf_*(pr_{-v_K}) \\
\bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[2v - v_{P_i}] & \hookrightarrow & L^\vee * L & \xleftarrow{\sim} & \bigoplus_{v=0}^{+v_K} Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K] \oplus \text{rest} \\
& & \uparrow s & \curvearrowright & \uparrow \sim \\
\bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[2v - v_{P_i}] & \xleftrightarrow{\sim} & L * L^\vee & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_K} Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K] \oplus \text{rest} \\
\uparrow i & & \text{coev}_p \uparrow & & \uparrow Rf_*(i_{+v_K}) \\
\bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[+v_{P_i}] & \xleftarrow{\oplus_i \text{tr}^\vee \circ \sigma_i} & \delta_0 & \xrightarrow{Rf_*(\sigma)} & Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[+v_K]
\end{array}$$

²For what follows one also could replace \mathbf{D} by some localization \mathbf{D}_H with respect to a hereditary class H (see [KrW]), and then it suffices to assume $Rf_*(K) \in \mathbf{P}_H$. For complex abelian varieties on the other hand the assumption can always be achieved by a generic character twist using the relative vanishing theorem of [KrW].

The lower part of this diagram defines the next commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[2v - v_{P_i}] & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{v} \\ \xrightarrow{v'} \end{array} & L * L^\vee & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{u} \\ \xrightarrow{u'} \end{array} & \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_K} Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[2v - v_K] \\
\begin{array}{c} \downarrow p \\ \uparrow i \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \text{coev}_p \\ \downarrow \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \downarrow Rf_*(pr) \\ \uparrow Rf_*(i_{+v_K}) \end{array} \\
\bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[+v_{P_i}] & \xleftarrow{\bigoplus_i \text{tr}^\vee \circ \sigma_i} & \delta_0 & \xrightarrow{Rf_*(\sigma)} & Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[+v_K]
\end{array}$$

where the retract morphism u is obtained from the right middle diagram, using the isomorphism S and taking into account that the coevaluation map of L ignores the part of the last diagram entitled ‘rest’. Altogether this defines a morphism

$$Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[+v_K] \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{v=0}^{v_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[2v - v_{P_i}]$$

whose ‘image’ is contained in $\bigoplus_i m_i^2 \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[+v_{P_i}]$ and, without losing information, can be considered as a morphism $Rf_* \mathcal{P}_K[+v_K] \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[+v_{P_i}]$. For $L \neq 0$, from the definition it is clear that for each i the composed morphism

$$Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_K)[+v_K] \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[+v_{P_i}] \longrightarrow m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[+v_{P_i}]$$

is nontrivial. Indeed, if $pr_i \circ p \circ v \circ u \circ i_{+v_K}$ would be zero, then also the composition with $Rf_*(\sigma)$, which is $\text{tr}^\vee \circ \sigma_i \neq 0$, would be zero. The same argument also implies $Rf_*(\sigma) \neq 0$. Hence we can repeat this argument in the other direction to show that the composed morphism $Rf_*(pr) \circ u' \circ v' \circ i$

$$m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[+v_{P_i}] \longrightarrow Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_K[+v_K])$$

is again nontrivial, and also their composition. This proves

Proposition 1. *Suppose K is an irreducible perverse sheaf so that the semisimple complex $L = Rf_*(K) = \bigoplus_{i \in I} m_i \cdot P_i$ is perverse and not zero (i.e $m_i > 0$). Then for every irreducible perverse constituent P_i of L there exist nontrivial morphisms in the derived category*

$$\begin{aligned}
Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_K)[v_K] &\longrightarrow m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[v_{P_i}] \\
m_i^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[v_{P_i}] &\longrightarrow Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_K)[v_K]
\end{aligned}$$

whose composition (in both directions) is not zero.

Then $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(M, N[r]) = 0$ for perverse sheaves M, N and $r < 0$ implies

Corollary 1. *Suppose K is an irreducible perverse sheaf for which the semisimple complexes $L = Rf_*(K) = \bigoplus_i m_i \cdot P_i$ and $Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_K)$ are perverse with $L \neq 0$. Then $v_K = v_{P_i}$ holds for all irreducible perverse constituents P_i of L .*

Since $v_{P_i} \leq \dim(Y)$, we also obtain from proposition 1

$$Rf_*(K) \neq 0 \text{ is in } \mathbf{P} \implies v_K \leq \dim(Y) .$$

Definition. An irreducible perverse sheaf F on X will be called *maximal*, if for every projection $f : X \rightarrow B$ to a simple quotient abelian variety B of X the direct images $Rf_*(K_\chi)$ and $Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_{K_\chi})$ are perverse and not zero for generic character twists χ . If X is simple, any irreducible perverse sheaf F is maximal.

Example. Perverse sheaves in $M(X)$ are maximal.

Define $\mu(X)$ to be the minimum of the dimensions of the (nontrivial) simple abelian quotient varieties $B \neq 0$ of X .

Lemma 4. *Suppose K is a maximal irreducible perverse sheaf. If $Rf_*(K_\chi)$ and $Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_{K_\chi})$ are perverse for $f : X \rightarrow B$ and $\dim(B) = \mu(X)$, then*

$$\boxed{v_K \leq \mu(X)} .$$

In case that $\text{char}(k) = 0$, this holds for any maximal perverse sheaf K .

Proof. v_{K_χ} only depends on K , but not on χ (property 8). It is shown in the relative vanishing theorem of [KrW], that for k of characteristic zero one can always assume that $L = Rf_*(K_\chi) = \bigoplus_i m_i \cdot P_i$ and $Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_{K_\chi}) = Rf_*(\mathcal{P}_{K_\chi})$ are perverse by applying a twist with a suitable generic character $\chi : \pi_1(X, 0) \rightarrow \Lambda^*$. If K is minimal, we can therefore always dispose over the arguments from above. \square

We remark that twists with characters $\chi' : \pi_1(B, 0) \rightarrow \Lambda^*$ have the following effect: $L = \bigoplus_i P_i$ changes into $P_{\chi'} = \bigoplus_i (P_i)_{\chi'}$, \mathcal{P}_K and \mathcal{P}_{P_i} change as well into their χ' -twist. This implies, that the morphisms constructed above are *independent* from twists of K with characters χ' of $\pi_1(B, 0)$.

Functors revisited. Suppose given a homomorphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of abelian varieties and semisimple perverse sheaves K and P (or more generally complexes)

on X and some integer v (by abuse of notation we then again write $v = v_K$) together with a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 K^\vee * K & & \\
 \uparrow \iota & \searrow \text{eval}_K & \\
 P[-v_K] & \xrightarrow{p} & \delta_0 \\
 & \nearrow \varepsilon &
 \end{array}$$

such that $p \circ \iota = id$. Then $L = Rf_*(K) = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i[\lambda_i]$ and $Q = Rf_*(P) = \bigoplus_{j \in J} Q_j[\lambda_j]$ decomposes with simple perverse sheaves P_i and Q_j . By abuse of notation, the index sets I and J are not correlated to each other, so the same holds for the λ_i and λ_j . With these notations we get

Theorem 1. *For any (shifted perverse) constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$ there exists a (shifted perverse) constituent $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow Q$ such that*

$$v_{Q_j} \leq \mu(Q_j) \leq v_K - \lambda_j \leq v_{P_i}$$

holds, and a constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$ such that $v_{P_i} \leq v_K - \lambda_j$ holds.

Proof. Since Rf_* is a tensor functor, we get the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 L^\vee * L & & \\
 \uparrow & \searrow \text{eval}_L & \\
 Q[-v_K] & \xrightarrow{Rf_*(\varepsilon)} & \delta_0
 \end{array}$$

for the evaluation morphism eval_L . For any direct factor $C = P_i[\lambda_i]$ in L the evaluation morphism of $\text{eval}_C : C^\vee * C = P_i^\vee[-\lambda_i] * P_i[\lambda_i] = P_i^\vee * P_i \rightarrow \delta_0$ is induced by the evaluation morphism eval_{P_i} , which is computed via the upper horizontal morphisms of the next commutative diagram. The evaluation eval_C is also obtained as the restriction of the evaluation morphism $\text{eval}_L : L^\vee * L \rightarrow \delta_0$ to $C^\vee * C \hookrightarrow L^\vee * L$. The evaluation morphism eval_L is given by the lower horizontal morphisms of the next diagram. Altogether, this implies the existence of a morphism φ

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & Q[-v_K] \\
 \searrow \varepsilon_i & & \nearrow Rf_*(\varepsilon) \\
 & \delta_0 &
 \end{array}$$

making the following diagram commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
P_i^\vee * P_i = C^\vee * C & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_i} & \delta_0 \\
\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \varphi & & \parallel \\
L^\vee * L & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Q[-v_K] & \longrightarrow & \delta_0
\end{array}$$

Now we can decompose $Q[-v_K] = \bigoplus_{j \in J} Q_j[\lambda_j - v_K]$ and accordingly decompose also the morphism φ , so that for at least one $j \in J$ we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] & \xrightarrow{a_j} & Q_j[\lambda_j - v_K] \\
& \searrow b_j & \swarrow c_j \\
& & \delta_0
\end{array} .$$

with a *nontrivial* morphism b_j , since the morphism $\varepsilon_i = \sum_j b_j$ is not zero. Then of course also $a_j \neq 0$ and $c_j \neq 0$. Now $a_j \neq 0$ implies $-v_{P_i} \leq \lambda_j - v_K$, and $c_j \neq 0$ implies $\mathcal{H}^0(Q_j[\lambda_j - v_K])_0 = \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_j - v_P}(Q_j)_0 \neq 0$. Hence $-v_{P_i} \leq \lambda_j - v_K \leq -\mu(Q_j) \leq -v_{Q_j}$.

Reversing the argument, we can conversely construct a *nontrivial* morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Q_j[\lambda_j - v_K] & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] \\
& \searrow & \swarrow \\
& & \delta_0
\end{array}$$

for some constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$. □

Definition. Define $v_Q = \min_j(v_{Q_j})$ for the decomposition $Q = \bigoplus_j Q_j[\lambda_j]$, and similarly define $v_L = \min_i(v_{P_i})$ for the decomposition $L = \bigoplus_i P_i[\lambda_i]$.

Definition. If $v_{Q_j} = v_Q$ (respectively $v_{P_i} = v_L$) holds, a constituent $Q_j[\lambda_j]$ of Q (respectively $P_i[\lambda_i]$ of P) will be called *minimal*.

If we apply the last theorem for a minimal constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$, then the properties $v_K - \lambda_j \leq v_{P_i} = v_L$ and $v_L \leq v_{P_i} \leq v_K - \lambda_j$ imply

$$v_{P_i} = v_K - \lambda_j = v_{P_i} = v_L .$$

In particular, P_i is also minimal and $Q_j[\lambda_j - v_K] = Q_j[-v_L]$. Furthermore, the non-trivial morphisms

$$a_j : \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] = \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_L] \longrightarrow Q_j[\lambda_j - v_K] = Q_j[-v_L]$$

and similarly

$$Q_j[\lambda_j - v_K] = Q_j[-v_L] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_{P_i}] = \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[-v_L]$$

imply $Q_j \cong \mathcal{P}_{P_i}$. By lemma 3, the degree of an irreducible perverse sheaf is the degree of its monoidal perverse sheaf, and we conclude for the degrees

$$\boxed{v_{Q_j} = v_{P_i} = v_L}.$$

Hence there is also an isomorphism of shifted perverse sheaves $Q_j \cong \mathcal{P}_{P_i}$.

Corollary 2. *Let P be the monoid attached to K and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a homomorphism. For every minimal $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L = Rf_*(K)$ (i.e. $v_{P_i} = v_L$) there exists a shifted monoidal constituent $Q_j[v_K - v_L] \hookrightarrow Q = Rf_*(P)$ with*

$$Q_j \cong \mathcal{P}_{P_i}.$$

In particular, $v_{Q_j} = v_{P_i} = v_L$ and $v_Q \leq v_L$.

An Application. Let \mathcal{P} be a monoidal perverse sheaf on X . Then $K = P = \mathcal{P} \boxtimes \mathcal{P}$ is a monoid on $X \times X$ of degree $v_K = 2v_{\mathcal{P}}$. For the morphism $a : X \times X \rightarrow X$ we get $L = Ra_*(K) = \mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}$. Since $\mathcal{P}[-v_{\mathcal{P}}] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}$ by lemma 3, this implies (*)

$$v_L = \min_i v_{P_i} \leq v_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

By theorem 1 and corollary 2, the minimal constituents $P_i[\lambda_i]$ of L give rise to monoidal constituents $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L$ with the property $\lambda_j = v_K - v_L = 2v_{\mathcal{P}} - v_L$. Then, by the inequality (*), in particular

$$0 \leq v_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \lambda_j.$$

Hard Lefschetz. $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L$ implies $Q_j[\lambda_j - 2i] \hookrightarrow L$ for all $i = 0, \dots, \lambda_j$. For $i = v_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \lambda_j$, therefore

$$Q_j[\lambda_j - 2v_{\mathcal{P}}] = Q_j[-v_L] \hookrightarrow L.$$

Notice $\mathcal{H}^0(Q_j[-v_L])_0 \neq 0$, since Q_j is a monoidal perverse sheaf and $v_{Q_j} = v_{P_i} = v_L$.

By lemma 1, part 5 there is a unique (shifted perverse) constituent in $L = \mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}$ with the property $\mathcal{H}^0(Q_j[-v_L])_0 \neq 0$, namely $\mathcal{P}[-v_{\mathcal{P}}]$. Hence $Q_j[-v_L] \cong \mathcal{P}[-v_{\mathcal{P}}]$ or $Q_j[\lambda_j] \cong \mathcal{P}[+v_{\mathcal{P}}]$. So $\lambda_j = v_{\mathcal{P}}$, in particular $v_L = 2v_{\mathcal{P}} - \lambda_j = v_{\mathcal{P}}$.

This proves

Lemma 5. *For a monoid \mathcal{P} on X we have $v_{\mathcal{P}*\mathcal{P}} = v_{\mathcal{P}}$. All (shifted perverse) constituents $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}$ attached to a minimal (shifted perverse) constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}$ are isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}[+v_{\mathcal{P}}] \cong \mathcal{P}_{P_i}[\lambda_j]$ and minimal.*

For X consider the irreducible monoidal perverse sheaves \mathcal{P} on X with the property $v_{\mathcal{P}} < \dim(X)$. Let $v_+(X)$ be the maximum of all such $v_{\mathcal{P}}$. If $v_{\mathcal{P}} = v_+(X)$ holds, we call \mathcal{P} a *maximal* monoid on X .

Corollary 3. *For a maximal irreducible monoid \mathcal{P} on a simple abelian variety X with $\mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P} \cong \bigoplus_i P_i[\lambda_i]$ either $\mathcal{P}_{P_i} \cong \mathcal{P}$ holds, or $\mathcal{P}_{P_i} \cong \delta_X^{\phi_i}$ for some character ϕ_i .*

Proof. For $L = \mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}$ we have shown $v_L = v_{\mathcal{P}*\mathcal{P}} = v_{\mathcal{P}}$. Hence, for maximal \mathcal{P} there are no (shifted perverse) constituents in $L = \mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}$ with degree $v_{P_i} > v_L$ except for $\mathcal{P}_{P_i} \cong \delta_X^{\phi_i}$ by lemma 1, part 2. Hence every P_i is either translation-invariant under X , or $v_{P_i} = v_{\mathcal{P}} = v_L$ is minimal in L . So we apply Lemma 5. \square

Corollary 4. *For monoids $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ with degrees $v_1 \leq v_2$ on an abelian variety X with $\mathcal{P}_1 \not\cong \mathcal{P}_2$ the convolution $L = \mathcal{P}_1 * \mathcal{P}_2$ has minimal degree $v_L > (v_1 + v_2)/2$.*

Proof. We apply corollary 2 for the group law $a : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $K = P = \mathcal{P}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{P}_2$ with $v_K = v_1 + v_2$ and $L = Q = a_*(K) = \mathcal{P}_1 * \mathcal{P}_2 = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i[\lambda_i]$. Assume our assertion does not hold, i.e. suppose $v_L \leq (v_1 + v_2)/2$. This implies $v_L \leq v_2$ (*). By corollary 2, for any constituent $P_i[\lambda_i], i \in I$ with $v_{P_i} = v_L = \min_{i \in I} v_{P_i}$ there is a monoidal constituent $Q_j[\lambda_j]$ in L so that $\lambda_j = v_K - v_L = v_1 + v_2 - v_L$. The inequality (*) implies $\lambda_j \geq 0$. Hence, $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L$ and $\lambda_j \geq 0$, by the Hard Lefschetz Theorem, also implies $Q_j[\lambda_j - 2i] \hookrightarrow L$ for all $i = 0, \dots, \lambda_j$. For $i := \lambda_j$, this gives the following constituent of L :

$$Q_j[-\lambda_j] = Q_j[v_L - v_1 - v_2] = Q_j[-v_L][2v_L - v_1 - v_2] \hookrightarrow L.$$

By corollary 2 we know that Q_j is a monoid with $v_{Q_j} = v_L$. So from the above we conclude

$$Q_j[-v_{Q_j}][2v_L - v_1 - v_2] \hookrightarrow L.$$

$\mathcal{H}^0(Q_j[-v_{Q_j}])$ is a skyscraper sheaf with nontrivial stalk at 0 and $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_1 * \mathcal{P}_2)_0 \neq 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}_1 \cong \mathcal{P}_2^\vee$ by [BN]; furthermore $\mathcal{H}^a(\mathcal{P}_1 * \mathcal{P}_2)_0 = 0$ for $a > 0$. Since $\mathcal{P}_2^\vee \cong \mathcal{P}_2$ (Lemma 3), by our assumptions $\mathcal{P}_1 \not\cong \mathcal{P}_2^\vee$. Hence $2v_L - v_1 - v_2$ must be > 0 . A contradiction. \square

Corollary 5. *For maximal monoids $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ on an abelian variety X with $\mathcal{P}_1 \not\cong \mathcal{P}_2$ the convolution $\mathcal{P}_1 * \mathcal{P}_2$ is translation invariant.*

Similarly one obtains

Corollary 6. *For irreducible perverse sheaves K_1, K_2 on an abelian variety X with degrees $v_{K_1} = v_{K_2} = v_+(X)$, all simple constituents $P_i[\lambda_i]$ of $K_1 * K_2$ are either translation-invariant under X , or $\mathcal{P}_{P_i} \cong \mathcal{P}_{K_1} \cong \mathcal{P}_{K_2}$.*

Also

Corollary 7. *For maximal irreducible monoids $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ on a simple abelian variety X with $\mathcal{P}_1 \not\cong \mathcal{P}_2$ assume $\mathcal{P}_1 * \mathcal{P}_2 \neq 0$. Then $\delta^\psi[2v_+(X) - \dim(X)] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_1 * \mathcal{P}_2$ for some character ψ .*

Isogenies. We now discuss the behaviour of monoids with respect to pullback and push forward under isogenies $f : X \rightarrow Y$.

Corollary 8. *Suppose K is an irreducible monoidal perverse sheaf on X with finite stabilizer $H = \{x \in X \mid T_x^*(K) \cong K\}$. Then for the isogeny $\pi : X \rightarrow X/H$ the direct image $L = \pi_*(K)$ is $L \cong \bigoplus_{\chi \in H^*} P_\chi$ for a monoid P on X/H with trivial stabilizer and $v_P = v_K$. Furthermore $K \cong \pi^*(P_\chi)$ for all $\chi \in H^*$. If the monoid K has trivial stabilizer H , then for any isogeny $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ the perverse sheaf $L = \pi_*(K)$ is an irreducible monoidal perverse sheaf on Y with trivial stabilizer and the property $v_L = v_K$.*

Proof. Let K be a monoid on X with finite stabilizer H , $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an isogeny with $f(H) = 0$. Since π is finite, $L = \pi_*(K) = R\pi_*(K)$ is a semisimple perverse sheaf $L \neq 0$. By corollary 1, all summands L_i of $L = \bigoplus_i P_i$ satisfy $v_{P_i} = v(K)$, $v_L = \min(v_{P_i}) = v_K$. By corollary 2, at least one constituent $P(= Q_j)$ of L is a monoid with $v_P = v_K$.

By the semisimplicity of L and adjunction

$$0 \neq \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(P, L) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(P, \pi_*(K)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(\pi^*(P), K),$$

Therefore there exists an exact sequence of perverse sheaves on X

$$0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow \pi^*(P) \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0$$

because any nontrivial morphism $\pi^*(P) \rightarrow K$ to the irreducible perverse sheaf K is an epimorphism. Since π is finite, the functor π_* is exact. Since $\pi_*\pi^*(P) \cong \bigoplus_{\chi \in \text{Kern}(\pi)^*} P_\chi$, we get an exact sequence of perverse sheaves on Y

$$0 \rightarrow \pi_*(U) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\chi \in \text{Kern}(\pi)^*} P_\chi \rightarrow L \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus L has at most $\#Kern(\pi)^*$ irreducible perverse constituents, and as twists of the monoid P all of them are monoids of the same degree v_K . Hence the number of irreducible constituents of L is $\dim(\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(L)_0)$. Since $\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(L)_0 \cong \bigoplus_{x \in Kern(\pi)} \mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(K)_x$, in the case of the second assertion we get $\dim(\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(L)_0) \cong \dim(\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(K)_0) = 1$ by $\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(K)_x = 0$ for $x \neq 0$. So the second assertion follows immediately, since $\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(L) \cong \delta_0$. For the first assertion the assumption $\#H = \#Kern(\pi)^*$ implies $\dim(\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(L)_0) = \#H$. Therefore L has $\#H$ irreducible constituents. Therefore $\pi_*(U) = 0$, and hence $U = 0$ and $K \cong \pi^*(P)$. \square

Corollary 9. *Suppose $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ is a separable isogeny and K is an irreducible monoidal perverse sheaf on Y with pullback $L = \pi^*(K)$. Then there exists an irreducible monoidal perverse sheaf F with $v_F = v_K$ such that L is isomorphic to the direct sum of translates $T_x^*(F)$, where x runs over the cosets of $Kern(\pi)/Kern_F(\pi)$ for $Kern_F(\pi) = \{x \in Kern(\pi) \mid T_x^*(F) \cong F\}$. Furthermore $K_\chi \cong K$ holds for all χ whose pullback $\chi \circ \pi_1(\tilde{\pi})$ with respect to the isogeny $\tilde{\pi} : X/Kern_F(\pi) \rightarrow Y$ becomes trivial.*

Proof. By etale descent one can show for an irreducible perverse sheaf $K \in \mathbf{P}$ that the pullback $L = \pi^*(K)$ is a semisimple perverse sheaf and that the translations T_x^* for $x \in Kern(\pi)$ act transitively on its simple constituents. Hence $L = \bigoplus_i F_i$ for irreducible perverse sheaves F_i . Obviously $\mu(K) = v_K \leq \mu(F_i)$. Notice that $\pi_*(L) = \pi_*\pi^*(K) = \bigoplus_\chi K_\chi$ implies $\pi_*(F_i) \cong K_\chi$ for some χ . Since $\mu(F_i) = \mu(\pi_*(F_i))$, therefore $v_K \leq \mu(F_i) = \mu(\pi_*(F_i)) = \mu(K_\chi) = v_K$ and this implies $\mu(F_i) = v_K$. Hence $v_{F_i} \leq v_K$. But $\pi_*(F_i) \cong K_\chi$ implies $v_{F_i} = v_K$, by corollary 1. Hence $\mu(F_i) = v_{F_i} = v_K$ for all i . This shows that all F_i are extremal and therefore $F_i \cong T_{x_i}^*(F)$ holds for certain $x_i \in X$, where F is the unique constituent of $L = \pi^*(K)$ with the property $\mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(F)_0 \cong \mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(L)_0 \cong \mathcal{H}^{-v_K}(K)_0 \cong \Lambda$. In particular F is a monoidal perverse sheaf on X and L is a direct sum of translates of F . This proves the first assertions.

Since F is invariant under translation by $Kern_F(\pi)$, F descends to a perverse sheaf on $X/Kern_F(\pi)$ in the sense that $F \cong p^*(\tilde{F})$ holds for $p : X \rightarrow X/Kern_F(\pi)$ and \tilde{F} is a constituent of $\tilde{\pi}^*(K)$. Then $Kern_{\tilde{F}}(\tilde{\pi}) = 0$. We may therefore replace π by $\tilde{\pi}$. So for the remaining statement we can assume $Kern_F(\pi) = 0$ without restriction of generality. Then $L = \bigoplus_{x \in Kern(\pi)} T_x^*(F)$ and hence $\pi_*(L) = \#Kern(\pi) \cdot \pi_*(F)$. On the other hand $\pi_*(L) = \bigoplus_{\chi \in Kern(\pi)^*} K_\chi$. Both together imply that $K_\chi \cong K$ holds for all characters χ for which $\chi \circ \pi_1(\tilde{\pi})$ becomes trivial. \square

By the adjunction formula $End(L) \cong Hom(K, \bigoplus_\chi K_\chi)$ for $L = \pi^*(K) \cong \bigoplus_x T_x^*(F)$, we also conclude that $\#\{\chi \mid K \cong K_\chi\} \cdot \#\{x \in Kern(\pi) \mid T_x^*(F) \cong F\} = \#Kern(\pi)$. Here χ runs over all characters of $\pi_1(Y, 0)$, whose restriction to $\pi_1(X, 0)$ becomes trivial.

Quasi-idempotents. We either work in \mathbf{D} , or in a hereditary localization $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}$ of \mathbf{D} for some hereditary class \mathbf{H} as in [KrW], of course possibly $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{D}$. Then $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}}(P, \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}^{>0}) = 0$ for the image of some $P \in \mathbf{P}$ in $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}$. For the notation and further details we refer to [KrW].

Assumptions. For a fixed integer d , let H^\bullet always denote graded Λ -vector spaces with the property $H^i = 0$ for $|i| > d$. Suppose

$$P(X) \subset \mathbf{P}$$

is a class of simple objects closed under Tannaka duality, such that in \mathbf{D}

$$K, L \in P(X) \implies K * L \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^\bullet(K, L, P_i) \otimes_{\Lambda} P_i \oplus T$$

for complexes T in $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{H}}$ and P_i in $P(X)$. Here we assume that $P_i \not\cong P_j$ holds for $i \neq j$. By our assumption, $H^i(K, L, P_i) = 0$ for $|i| > d$.

Lemma 6. *Assume $P \in P(X)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{-d}(P)_0 \neq 0$. Suppose $L[-d] \hookrightarrow K * P$ for $K, L \in P(X)$ but $K, L \notin \mathbf{N}$. Then $K \cong L$.*

Proof. By assumption $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}}(K * P, L[-d]) \neq 0$, and by rigidity this implies $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}}(P, K^\vee * L[-d]) \neq 0$. Now, since $K^\vee * L[-d] = \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^\bullet(K^\vee, L, P_i) \otimes_{\Lambda} P_i[-d]$ is in $(\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i) \oplus \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}^{>0}$ for some $I \subset P(X)$ (with multiplicities) again by our assumptions, we obtain $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}}(P, \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i) \neq 0$. Hence $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}}(P, P_i) \neq 0$ for some $i \in I$, and also $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{P}}(P, P_i) \neq 0$ by [KrW, lemma 25] for the simple objects P and P_i in \mathbf{P} . So, $P_i \cong P$ are isomorphic as perverse sheaves. By the hard Lefschetz theorem, this defines in \mathbf{D} a retract $P[-d] \cong P_i[-d] \hookrightarrow H^\bullet(K^\vee, L, P_i) \otimes_{\Lambda} P_i \hookrightarrow K^\vee * L$. Since $\mathcal{H}^0(P[-d])_0^* \neq 0$, we get $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(L, K) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}}(K^\vee * L, \delta_0) = \mathcal{H}^0(K^\vee * L)_0^* \neq 0$ and this implies $K \cong L$. \square

For the next lemma 7, for arbitrary $K, P, L \in P(X)$ we assume in addition:

$$H^{-d}(K, P, L) = 0 \implies H^\bullet(K, P, L) = 0.$$

Lemma 7. *For $P \in P(X)$ assume $\mathcal{H}^{-d}(P)_0 \neq 0$. Then for $K \in P(X)$*

$$K * P = H^\bullet(K, P, K) \otimes_{\Lambda} K \quad (\text{in } \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}).$$

For monoids $P \in P(X)$ not in \mathbf{N} with $v_P = d$, we get $\dim_{\Lambda}(H^{-d}(P, P, P)) = 1$ and

$$P * P = H^\bullet(P, P, P) \otimes_{\Lambda} P;$$

furthermore for $K \in P(X)$ either $H^\bullet(K, P, K) = H^\bullet(P, P, P)$ or $H^\bullet(K, P, K) = 0$. In particular, $P' * P = 0$ holds in $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{H}}$ for all monoids $P' \not\cong P$ with the property $v_{P'} = d$ under the assumption $P' \in P(X)$, but $P' \notin \mathbf{N}$.

Proof. If $H^\bullet(K, P, L_i) \neq 0$, then by our assumptions $H^{-d}(K, P, L_i) \neq 0$. Hence $K * P = \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^\bullet(K, P, L_i) \otimes_\Lambda L_i$ for certain $L_i \in P(X)$ with $L_i[-d] \hookrightarrow K * P$. Hence $L_i \cong K$, by the last lemma. Since $\dim_\Lambda(H^{-d}(P, P, P))$ for monoids $P = \mathcal{P}$ with $v_P = d$ counts the multiplicity of $\mathcal{P}[d]$ as a summand $\mathcal{P}[d] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{*2}$, this multiplicity is one by lemma 1.6) and $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$ (lemma 4). Now $(H^\bullet(K, P, K) \otimes_\Lambda K) * P = (K * P) * P \cong K * (P * P) \cong H^\bullet(P, P, P) \otimes_\Lambda K * P$ in \mathbf{D}_H . For $K * P \neq 0$ this implies $H^\bullet(K, P, K) \cong H^\bullet(P, P, P)$. For $K = P'$ and $P * P' \neq 0$ in \mathbf{D}_H , we get $P * P' \cong H^\bullet(P, P', P) \otimes_\Lambda P = H^\bullet(P', P', P') \otimes_\Lambda P'$. Indeed, P' satisfies the same conditions as P , so the roles of P and P' can be interchanged. A comparison in degree $-d$ gives $P \cong P'$. \square

Remark. In the above setting, $P \cong \mathcal{P}_K$ implies $H^\bullet(K, P, K) \neq 0$.

Quasi-idempotent complexes. For given $L = \bigoplus_{i=-r}^r L_i[-i]$ with semisimple perverse sheaves L_i for $-r \leq i \leq r$ assume

1. $L \cong L^\vee$ and $L_{-r} \cong L_r \neq 0$.
2. $L * L \cong H^\bullet \cdot L$ for $pr_d : H^d \cong \Lambda[-d]$ and $H^i = 0$ for $|i| > d$.
3. There exists a commutative diagram with morphisms in the derived category

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
L^\vee * L & \xrightarrow{\sim} & L * L & \xrightarrow{\sim} & H^\bullet \otimes_\Lambda L \\
& & & & \downarrow pr_d \\
& & & & H^d \otimes_\Lambda L \cong L[-d] \\
& \searrow eval_L & & & \downarrow \\
& & & & \delta_0
\end{array}$$

Then H is selfdual and $H^{\pm d} \cong \Lambda$. Since $\mathcal{H}^\bullet(L^\vee * L)_0 \cong H^\bullet(X, D(L) \otimes_\Lambda^L L)$, by condition 2

$$H^\bullet \otimes_\Lambda \mathcal{H}^\bullet(L)_0 \cong H^\bullet(X, D(L) \otimes_\Lambda L)$$

and both sides are independent of character twists, i.e. do not change when L is replaced by L_χ . Furthermore $L_r^\vee \cong L_{-r} \cong L_r$ by condition 1. Furthermore $L_r * L_r \cong L_r^\vee * L_r \neq 0$, since otherwise the evaluation $eval_{L_r} = 0$, and this implies $id_{L_r} = 0$ and hence $L_r = 0$ by rigidity.

Since $L_r * L_r \neq 0$, by the hard Lefschetz theorem ${}^p H^i(L * L) \neq 0$ for some $i \geq 2r$. Hence $L * L \cong H^\bullet \otimes_\Lambda L$ implies $2r \leq i \leq d + r$ or $r \leq d$. Let v_L denote the minimum of all v_C for an irreducible perverse constituent C of some L_i . For the perverse

amplitude $a(L_i, L_i)$ of $L_i * L_i$ and for $C \hookrightarrow L_i \cong L_i^\vee$ we have $v_C \leq a(L_i, L_i)$. Furthermore $a(L_i, L_i) + 2i \leq d + r$ by condition 2. Hence $v_C \leq a(L_i, L_i) \leq d + r - 2i$. For $i = r$ this implies $v_C \leq d - r$, and hence $v_L \leq v_C \leq d - r$. Therefore

$$r \leq d - v_L .$$

The morphism $eval_C = eval_{C[i]}$ for the direct summand $C^\vee * C = C[i]^\vee * C[i] \hookrightarrow L^\vee * L$ is obtained by restriction of $eval_L$. Hence, by condition 3 there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}_C[-v_C] & \xrightarrow{a} & P_j[\lambda_j - d] \\ & \searrow^{eval_C} & \swarrow_b \\ & & \delta_0 \end{array}$$

for some shifted irreducible summand $P_j \hookrightarrow L_{-\lambda_j}$

$$P_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L .$$

Then $-v_C \leq \lambda_j - d$ and $\lambda_j - d \leq -\mu(P_j) \leq -v_{P_j}$, or otherwise a or b is zero and hence $C = 0$. For $b \neq 0$, also $v_{P_j} \leq \mu(P_j) \leq d - \lambda_j \leq v_C$. For minimal C , i.e. $v_C = v_L$, this implies the equalities $v_{P_j} = \mu(P_j) = d - \lambda_j = v_C = v_L$. The first equality gives $\mathcal{P}_C \cong P_j$, hence P_j is a minimal monoid. The last equality gives $\lambda_j = d - v_L$, hence $r \leq \lambda_j$ from the inequality $r \leq d - v_L$ above. Since by our assumptions $|\lambda_j| \leq r$, therefore $\lambda_j = r$ so that $P_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L_{-r}[r]$; in other words

$$P_j \hookrightarrow L_{-r} \quad , \quad r + v_L = d .$$

Thus we found a multi-map from minimal constituents C in L to perverse minimal monoidal constituents P_j in L_{-r} . On the other hand $L_r^\vee \cong L_{-r} \cong L_r$, so for C in $L_r \cong L_{-r}$ we get $\mathcal{P}_C[-v_C] \hookrightarrow C^\vee * C \hookrightarrow L_r * L_r$. On the other hand we found $v_C \leq a(L_r, L_r) \leq d - r$, so by the result $d - r = v_L$ from above this implies $v_C \leq v_L$. Hence all perverse constituents C of L_r are minimal, and

$$a(L_r, L_r) = v_L .$$

We claim that this implies that all perverse constituents of L_{-r} (and hence of L_r) are monoids and that $L_{\pm r}$ is multiplicity free.

Proposition 2. *Under the assumptions 1)-3) on $L = \bigoplus_{i=-r}^r L_i[-i]$, the two top and bottom perverse sheaves $L_r \cong L_{-r} = \bigoplus_j m_j \cdot K_j$ are multiplicity free perverse sheaves, i.e. $m_j = 1$ holds. Furthermore all the constituents K_j are monoidal perverse sheaves with $v_{K_j} = d - r = v_L$.*

Proof. Recall $L_{-r}^\vee \cong L_r \cong L_{-r}$. Therefore $m(K) = m(K^\vee)$ holds for the multiplicities $m(K)$ and $m(K^\vee)$ of K and K^\vee in L_{-r} . So, for $m_j = m(K_j)$

$$\bigoplus_j m_j^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{K_j}[\nu_{K_j} + 2r] \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_j m_j^2 \cdot K_j^\vee[r] * K_j[r] \hookrightarrow L_{-r}[r] * L_{-r}[r] \hookrightarrow L * L \cong H^\bullet \otimes_\Lambda L.$$

All K_j in L_{-r} are minimal, as shown already. Hence $\nu_{K_j} = \nu_L$, and $\nu_L + 2r = d + r$ implies

$$\bigoplus_j m_j^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{K_j} \hookrightarrow H^\bullet[-d] \otimes_\Lambda L[-r].$$

Therefore $\bigoplus_j m_j^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_{K_j} \hookrightarrow H^{-d} \otimes_\Lambda L_{-r} \cong L_{-r}$ and $\sum_{j, \mathcal{P}_{K_j} = \mathcal{P}} m_j^2 \leq m(\mathcal{P})$. Since we already know that $K \in L_{\pm r}$ implies $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_K \in L_{\pm r}$, therefore $m(\mathcal{P}) = 1$ follows and $m_j = 0$ for all K_j which are not monoids. \square

Cohomology. For irreducible $K \in \text{Perv}(X)$, define $\mathcal{S}(K)$ as the set of characters χ such that $H^\bullet(X, K_\chi) \neq H^0(X, K_\chi)$. For $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(K)$ define $h_\chi(K)$ to be the maximal i such that $H^i(X, K_\chi) \neq 0$. By the hard Lefschetz theorem $H^i(X, K_\chi) = 0$ holds for $|i| > h_\chi(K)$ and $h_\chi(K) = h_\chi(K^\vee) \geq 0$.

For $K \in E(X)$ the property $H^\bullet(X, K_\chi) = H^0(X, K_\chi)$ is equivalent to $H^\bullet(X, K_\chi) = 0$, using the preservation of the Euler characteristic under character twists. Hence for $\nu_K > 0$ this shows $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(K)$ iff $H^\bullet(X, K_\chi) \neq 0$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}_K[\pm \nu_K] \hookrightarrow K * K^\vee$ and $K[\pm \nu_K] \hookrightarrow K * \mathcal{P}_K$ imply

$$\boxed{\nu_K > 0 \implies \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_K) = \mathcal{S}(K)}.$$

Furthermore, $h_\chi(\mathcal{P}_K) + \nu_K \leq h_\chi(K) + h_\chi(K^\vee)$ and $h_\chi(K) + \nu_K \leq h_\chi(K) + h_\chi(\mathcal{P}_K)$ imply

$$\boxed{\nu_K \leq h_\chi(\mathcal{P}_K) \quad \text{for } \chi \in \mathcal{S}(K)}.$$

Put $h_\chi(K) = \nu_K + e_\chi(K)$, then for all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(K)$ we obtain the inequalities

$$\boxed{0 \leq e_\chi(\mathcal{P}_K) \leq 2 \cdot e_\chi(K)}.$$

Relative case. For a homomorphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ we define $h_\chi^f(K)$, for all χ such that $Rf_*(K_\chi) \neq 0$, to be the maximal integer i for which ${}^p H^i(Rf_*(K_\chi)) \neq 0$. Since $H^k(X, K_\chi) = \bigoplus_{i+j=k} H^i(X, {}^p H^j(B, Rf_*(K_\chi)))$ by the decomposition theorem, we obtain

$$h_\chi(K) = \max_j (j + h({}^p H^j(Rf_*(K_\chi)))$$

where the maximum is taken now over all j such that ${}^p H^j(Rf_*(K_\chi)) \neq 0$. Here we write $h(F) := h_1(F)$ for the trivial character $\chi = 1$. If $Rf_*(K_\chi) \neq 0$ is perverse, then $h_\chi(K) = h(Rf_*(K_\chi))$. For all $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(K)$

$$h_\chi(K) \leq \dim(\text{Kern}(f)) + h_\chi\left(\bigoplus_i {}^p H^i(Rf_*(K_\chi))\right).$$

Let $P = K$ be an irreducible monoidal perverse sheaf on X and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a homomorphism. Then for every irreducible constituent $Q_j[\lambda_j]$ of $L = Rf_*(P)$ with perverse Q_j we have $h(P) \geq h(Q_j) + a_f(Q_j) \geq h(Q_j) + \lambda_j$, where $a_f(Q) = \max\{\lambda | Q[\lambda] \hookrightarrow L\}$ for a perverse sheaf Q . On the other hand by theorem 1 for every constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$ there exists some irreducible perverse sheaf Q_j with $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L$ and $v_P - \lambda_j \leq v_{P_i}$. For this particular $Q_j[\lambda_j]$ we conclude $v_P \leq \lambda_j + v_{P_i}$. Now $-v_P \geq -\lambda_j - v_{P_i}$ together with $h(P) \geq h(Q_j) + \lambda_j$ gives the estimate $e(P) = h(P) - v_P \geq h(Q_j) - v_{P_i}$. If P_i is chosen minimal, then $Q_j \cong \mathcal{P}_{P_i}$ by corollary 2. Therefore $e(Q_j) = h(Q_j) - v_{Q_j} = h(Q_j) - v_{P_i}$. So corollary 2 implies

Lemma 8. *For a monoidal perverse sheaf P on X and a homomorphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ there exists a monoidal perverse sheaf Q on Y such that $Q[v_P - v_L] \hookrightarrow L = Rf_*(P)$ holds and $e(Q) \leq e(P)$. Furthermore $Q[v_P - v_L]$ is a minimal constituent of $Rf_*(P)$.*

References

- [BBD] Beilinson A., Bernstein J., Deligne P., *Faisceaux pervers*, Asterisque 100 (1982)
- [D] Deligne P., *Categories Tensorielles*, Moscow Math. Journal, vol. 2, n.2, (2002), 227 - 248
- [KrW] Krämer T., Weissauer R., *Vanishing theorems for constructible sheaves on abelian varieties*, arXiv:1111.4947v2 (2011)
- [BN] Weissauer R., *Brill-Noether sheaves*, arXiv:math/0610923v4 (2007)
- [W2] Weissauer R., *A remark on the rigidity of BN-sheaves*, arXiv:1111.6095 (2011)