

HIGHER ORBITAL INTEGRALS, RHO NUMBERS AND INDEX THEORY

PAOLO PIAZZA, HESSEL POSTHUMA, YANLI SONG, AND XIANG TANG

ABSTRACT. Let G be a connected, linear real reductive group. We give sufficient conditions ensuring the well-definedness of the delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(D_X)$ associated to a Dirac operator D_X on a cocompact G -proper manifold X and to the orbital integral τ_g defined by a semisimple element $g \in G$. We prove that such an invariant enters in the the boundary correction term in a number of index theorems computing the pairing between the index class and the 0-degree cyclic cocycle defined by τ_g on a G -proper manifold with boundary. We also prove a higher version of such a theorem, for the pairing of the index class and the higher cyclic cocycles defined by the higher orbital integral Φ_g^P associated to a cuspidal parabolic subgroup $P < G$ with Langlands decomposition $P = MAN$ and a semisimple element $g \in M$. We employ these results in order to define (higher) rho numbers associated to G -invariant positive scalar curvature metrics and to G -equivariant homotopy equivalences.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Geometric preliminaries.	7
3. Delocalized traces and the APS index formula	10
3.1. Orbital integrals and associated cyclic 0-cocycles in the closed case	10
3.2. Manifolds with boundary: smooth index classes	12
3.3. 0-degree (relative) cyclic cocycles associated to orbital integrals	14
3.4. The 0-degree delocalized APS index theorem on G -proper manifolds	18
4. Delocalized eta invariants for G -proper manifolds	20
4.1. Large time behaviour	21
4.2. Small time behavior	23
4.3. Short time limits	29
5. Modified delocalized eta invariants	32
5.1. Spectrum on the slice	33
5.2. Delocalized eta invariants associated to perturbations on the slice	35
5.3. Delocalized eta invariants under a gap assumption	39
5.4. Delocalized eta invariants associated to smoothing perturbations	40
6. Higher delocalized cyclic cocycles	41
7. Toward a general higher APS index formula	44
8. Reduction	45
9. An index theorem for higher orbital integral through reduction	51
10. The non-invertible case	53
10.1. The gap case for 0-degree cyclic cocycles associated to orbital integrals	54
10.2. The gap case for cyclic cocycles associated to higher orbital integrals	55
10.3. Perturbations from the slice when G is equal rank	55
10.4. Perturbations from the slice for general G	56
11. Numeric rho invariants on G -proper manifolds	57
11.1. Rho numbers associated to delocalized 0-cocycles	57

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 58J20. Secondary: 58B34, 58J22, 58J42, 19K56.

Key words and phrases. Lie groups, proper actions, higher orbital integrals, delocalized cyclic cocycles, index classes, relative pairing, excision, Atiyah-Patodi-Singer higher index theory, delocalized eta invariants, higher delocalized eta invariants.

11.2. Rho numbers associated to higher delocalized cocycles	58
11.3. Bordism properties	58
References	59

1. INTRODUCTION

This article is a contribution to higher index theory on G -proper manifolds, with G a connected, linear real reductive group.

Before considering the case of G -proper manifolds with G a Lie group, it is worth spending a few words on the pivotal example of Galois Γ -coverings. Let Γ be a finitely generated discrete group and let $\Gamma \rightarrow X \rightarrow X/\Gamma$ be a Galois covering; let D be a Γ -equivariant Dirac-type operator on X , acting on the sections of a Γ -equivariant vector bundle E . We initially assume that X/Γ is a smooth compact manifold *without* boundary. There is, first of all, an index class $\text{Ind}_c(D) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^c(X, E))$ with $\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^c(X, E)$ denoting the algebra of smooth Γ -equivariant kernels of Γ -compact support (i.e., the support of the kernel is compact in $X \times_\Gamma X$). Given a group cocycle φ , with $[\varphi] \in H^*(\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$, we can define a cyclic cocycle $[\tau_\varphi] \in HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma)$ and, correspondingly, a cyclic cocycle $[\tau_\varphi^X] \in HC^*(\mathcal{A}^c(X, E))$. The celebrated higher index theorem of Connes and Moscovici [11] gives a formula for the pairing between the index class $\text{Ind}_c(D) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}^c(X, E))$ and the cyclic cohomology class $[\tau_\varphi^X]$. Recall now that Burgehelea's theorem gives a very precise description of $HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma)$ as the direct product of groups $HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle x \rangle)$ that are localized at the conjugacy classes¹ $\langle x \rangle$ of Γ ; one can prove that $[\tau_\varphi] \in HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle e \rangle)$ and that $H^*(\Gamma, \mathbb{C}) \ni [\varphi] \rightarrow [\tau_\varphi] \in HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle e \rangle)$ is an isomorphism. Thus, we can look at the Connes-Moscovici *higher index formula* as the result of a pairing between the index class $\text{Ind}_c(D)$ and the part of $HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma)$ which is localized at the identity element $e \in \Gamma$. One can prove that the pairing of $\text{Ind}_c(D)$ with a cyclic cocycle on X corresponding to $[\tau] \in HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle x \rangle)$, $x \neq e$, is in fact equal to zero. We call these cyclic cocycles *delocalized*². For example, the pairing of the index class with the 0-cyclic cocycle on M corresponding to $[\tau_{\langle x \rangle}] \in HC^0(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle x \rangle)$,

$$(1.1) \quad \tau_{\langle x \rangle} \left(\sum_{\gamma} \alpha_\gamma \gamma \right) := \sum_{\gamma \in \langle x \rangle} \alpha_\gamma \gamma$$

is equal to 0.

All this is very interesting and valid for any finitely generated discrete group Γ ; however, as explained in great detail in [11], in order to apply this result to geometric problems we need to improve it to a *higher C^* -index theorem*. This means the following. The closure of $\mathcal{A}^c(X, E)$ in the operator norm on $L^2(X, E)$ defines a C^* -algebra, the Roe algebra $C^*(X, E)^\Gamma$. The image of $\text{Ind}_c(D)$ in $K_*(C^*(X, E)^\Gamma)$ under the K-theory homomorphism induced by the inclusion is the C^* -index class $\text{Ind}(D) \in K_*(C^*(X, E)^\Gamma)$. This is the index class we are truly interested in. Using for example the Mishchenko-Fomenko pseudodifferential calculus there is an equivalent description of this index class in $K_*(C_r^*\Gamma) \cong K_*(C^*(X, E)^\Gamma)$ and we denote it by $\text{Ind}_{C_r^*\Gamma}(D)$. Under additional assumptions on Γ , for example Γ is Gromov hyperbolic or of polynomial growth, one can find a dense holomorphically closed subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^\infty(X, E)$, known as the Connes-Moscovici algebra,

$$\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^c(X, E) \subset \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^\infty(X, E) \subset C^*(X, E)^\Gamma,$$

and show that any cyclic cocycle τ_φ^X defined by $[\varphi] \in H^*(\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$ (that is, localized at the identity element) *extends* to $\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^\infty(X, E)$. Since $K_*(C^*(X, E)^\Gamma) \cong K_*(\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^\infty(X, E))$ this gives a pairing between the C^* -index class and the cyclic cocycles of $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ that are localized at the identity element. The Connes-Moscovici higher index theorem gives again a formula for this pairing and geometric applications are given to the homotopy invariance of Novikov higher signatures and the vanishing of higher \widehat{A} -genera for manifolds admitting a positive scalar curvature metric.

¹the groups $HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle x \rangle)$ can be explicitly computed but this is not important at this stage

²they are *not* localized at the identity element

A different treatment of the Connes-Moscovici higher index theorem was later given by Lott, adapting to the non-commutative context Bismut's [6] superconnection proof of the Atiyah-Singer family index theorem. Let us briefly describe Lott's contribution [34]. First, there is also a Connes-Moscovici algebra $\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma$, $\mathbb{C}\Gamma \subset \mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma \subset C_r^*\Gamma$ which is dense in $C_r^*\Gamma$ and holomorphically closed. Lott defines a smooth index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma)$, corresponding to $\text{Ind}_{C_r^*\Gamma}(D)$ under the isomorphism of $K_*(\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma)$ with $K_*(C_r^*\Gamma)$, and explicitly computes the Karoubi Chern character of this class in the noncommutative de Rham homology of $\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma$ obtaining

$$(1.2) \quad \text{Ch}(\text{Ind}_\infty(D)) = \left[\int_{M/\Gamma} \text{AS}(D) \wedge \omega_{\text{Lott}} \right] \in H_*(\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma).$$

Here ω_{Lott} is a closed bi-form in $\Omega^*(M/\Gamma) \otimes \Omega_*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma)$, localized at the identity element. This formula is valid without additional assumptions on Γ . However, if we want to pair this formula with cyclic cocycles $\tau_\varphi \in HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle e \rangle)$ defined by $[\varphi] \in H^*(\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$ we do need Γ Gromov hyperbolic or of polynomial growth.

Let us now turn to a Galois covering of a manifold with boundary. We assume product-like structures of all of our geometric data near the boundary. Under an L^2 invertibility assumption on the boundary operator D_∂ , Leichtnam and Piazza [27, 29] proved that there is a well-defined smooth index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma)$ and that the following higher Atiyah-Patodi-Singer (\equiv APS) index formula holds:

$$(1.3) \quad \text{Ch}(\text{Ind}_\infty(D)) = \left[\int_{X/\Gamma} \text{AS}(D) \wedge \omega_{\text{Lott}} - \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\text{Lott}} \right] \in H_*(\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma).$$

Here η_{Lott} is a noncommutative form in $\Omega_*(\mathcal{A}^\infty\Gamma)$ introduced by Lott in [35], generalizing the Bismut-Cheeger eta form for families. Later Wahl [55] extended this result to much more general dense holomorphically closed subalgebras of $C_r^*\Gamma$; if $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)$ is such an algebra then formula (1.3) holds in $H_*(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$.

We can pair formula (1.3) with classes in $HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle e \rangle)$ under the same assumptions as in Connes-Moscovici and obtain a higher APS index theorem for cyclic cocycles localized at the identity element. See [32] [30] for geometric applications. But we can also pair this formula with cyclic cocycles in $HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle x \rangle)$, $x \neq 0$, and a *crucial* difference with the closed case, is that the pairing with these delocalized cyclic cocycles is not equal to 0. Notice however that the extendability properties of delocalized cocycles are much more delicate. It was proved in [47] that the pairing of the higher APS index in noncommutative de Rham homology with $\tau_{\langle x \rangle}$ with $\langle x \rangle$ of polynomial growth, gives the formula

$$(1.4) \quad \langle \text{Ch}(\text{Ind}_\infty(D)), [\tau_{\langle x \rangle}] \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \eta_{\langle x \rangle}(D_\partial)$$

with $\eta_{\langle x \rangle}(D_\partial)$ the delocalized eta invariant of Lott, see [36] (there is no geometric term on the right hand side given that ω_{Lott} is localized at the identity element). The delocalized eta invariant of Lott is an example of *rho number*. We call the formula appearing in (1.4) a 0-degree *delocalized APS index formula*. The fundamental and deep work of Puschnigg [49] later allowed to greatly extend formula (1.4), establishing it for arbitrary conjugacy classes in a Gromov hyperbolic group Γ . Recent work of Chen-Wang-Xie-Yu [10], Sheagan [50] and Piazza-Schick-Zenobi [48] extended this pairing to all elements in $HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle x \rangle)$, x any element in a Gromov hyperbolic or polynomial growth group, obtaining correspondingly the *higher delocalized Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorems* for Gromov hyperbolic groups. This expresses the pairing between $\tau \in HC^*(\mathbb{C}\Gamma, \langle x \rangle)$ and the index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_*(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$, with $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)$ equal to the Puschnigg's algebra, in terms of certain *higher rho numbers*, secondary invariants of Dirac operators that are particularly useful in studying, for example, metrics of positive scalar curvature. See [48]. Notice that these higher rho numbers appear here for the boundary operator D_∂ on ∂Y but they can be defined for any Galois covering $\Gamma \rightarrow X \rightarrow X/\Gamma$, with X without boundary.

We now turn to a G -proper manifold without boundary with compact quotient and a G -equivariant Dirac operator acting on the sections of a G -equivariant twisted spinor bundle E . Here G is a unimodular Lie group. Also in this case we have an index class $\text{Ind}_c(D) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E))$ and a homomorphism $H_{\text{diff}}^*(G) \rightarrow HC^*(\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E))$, from the differentiable cohomology of G , $H_{\text{diff}}^*(G)$, to the cyclic cohomology of $\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E)$, $HC^*(\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E))$. We think to these cyclic cocycles in $HC^*(\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E))$ as localized at the identity element of

G . The higher index theorem of Pflaum-Posthuma-Tang [44] gives a formula for the pairing of $\text{Ind}_c(D)$ with the cyclic cocycle τ_φ^M associated to $[\varphi] \in H_{\text{diff}}^*(G)$. Under additional assumptions on the group G , satisfied for example by a *connected, linear real reductive group*, this result was improved to a C^* -index theorem in [45]. In the latter work we have again that a key role is played by a suitable dense homomorphically closed subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E)$ of the Roe algebra $C^*(X, E)^G$ and by a smooth index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E)$. Applications were given once again to higher signatures and higher \widehat{A} -roof genera. This index theorem was extended to G -proper manifolds with boundary in the recent preprint [46]; this is a higher APS index theorem on G -proper manifolds for cyclic cocycles *localized at the identity element*.

Let us now go back to a G -proper manifold without boundary X . In contrast with the free case, in the proper case we also have *delocalized* index theorems associated to delocalized cyclic cocycles. Let g be a semisimple element and set $Z := Z_G(g)$. First of all we have the orbital integral $\tau_g : C_c^\infty(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ associated to such a g :

$$(1.5) \quad \tau_g(f) := \int_{G/Z} f(xgx^{-1})d(xZ).$$

Assume G is a connected, linear real reductive group. Then τ_g extends to the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$, a dense holomorphically closed subalgebra of C_r^*G , where it defines a 0-degree cyclic cocycle $[\tau_g] \in HC^0(\mathcal{C}(G))$. The orbital integral (1.5) also defines a 0-degree cyclic cocycle τ_g^X on $\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E)$:

$$(1.6) \quad \tau_g^X(T_\kappa) := \int_{G/Z} \int_X c(hgh^{-1}x) \text{tr}(hgh^{-1}\kappa(hg^{-1}h^{-1}x, x)) dx d(hZ)$$

with c a cut-off function for the action of G on X and tr denoting the vector-bundle fiberwise trace.

The Harish-Chandra algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$ defines an algebra of smoothing operators $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E)$ which is a dense and holomorphically closed subalgebra of the Roe algebra $C^*(X, E)^G$; moreover τ_g^X extends from $\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E)$ to $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E)$ and defines on this algebra a 0-degree cyclic cocycle $[\tau_g^X] \in HC^0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E))$. The index theorem of Hochs and Wang [22] proves the following interesting formula for a semisimple element g in a compact Cartan subgroup of G ,

$$(1.7) \quad \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), \tau_g^X \rangle = \int_{X^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D).$$

This is a 0-degree delocalized index theorem. In the above Equation (1.7), X^g is the fixed point submanifold associated to the g -action on X ; c^g is a compactly supported cutoff function on X^g for the action of Z on X^g . Below, we recall the explicit differential form expression for $\text{AS}_g(D)$. Consider the following curvature forms.

- Since we are assuming that E is a G -equivariant twisted spinor bundle on X , we can write

$$E = \mathcal{E} \otimes W,$$

where \mathcal{E} is the spinor bundle associated to the Spin^c -structure on X and W is an auxiliary G -equivariant vector bundle on X .

We define R^W to be the curvature form of the Hermitian connection on W ;

- $R^{\mathcal{N}}$, the curvature form associated to the Hermitian connection on $\mathcal{N}_{X^g} \otimes \mathbb{C}$, where \mathcal{N}_{X^g} is the normal bundle of the g -fixed point submanifold X^g in X ;
- R^L , the curvature form associated to the Hermitian connection on $L_{\text{det}}|_{X^g}$ (L_{det} is the determinant line bundle of the Spin^c -structure on X and $L_{\text{det}}|_{X^g}$ is its restriction to X^g);
- R_{X^g} , the Riemannian curvature form associated to the Levi-Civita connection on the tangent bundle of X^g .

The $\text{AS}_g(D)$ in Equation (1.7) is, by definition, the following expression:

$$(1.8) \quad \text{AS}_g(D) := \frac{\widehat{A}\left(\frac{R_{X^g}}{2\pi i}\right) \text{tr}\left(g \exp\left(\frac{R^W}{2\pi i}\right)\right) \exp\left(\text{tr}\left(\frac{R^L}{2\pi i}\right)\right)}{\det\left(1 - g \exp\left(-\frac{R^{\mathcal{N}}}{2\pi i}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

This will also be denoted by $\text{AS}_g(X, E)$ or, if there is no confusion on the vector bundle E , simply by $\text{AS}_g(X)$.

One might wonder if there is a *higher* delocalized index theorem; the answer is affirmative and it is work of Song-Tang and Hochs-Song-Tang as we shall now explain. Let $P < G$ a cuspidal parabolic subgroup and $P = MAN$ its Langlands decomposition. Let $g \in M$ be a semisimple element. Song and Tang in [52] have defined a higher delocalized cyclic cocycle $[\Phi_g^P]$ on the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$. For $m = \dim(A)$, Φ_g^P is an m -cyclic cocycle on $\mathcal{C}(G)$ generalizing the orbital integral, Equation (1.5). When g runs over all semisimple elements of the maximal torus T of M and P runs over all cuspidal parabolic subgroups of G , Φ_g^P generates the whole cyclic cohomology group of $\mathcal{C}(G)$. When the metric on a G proper cocompact manifold X without boundary is slice compatible (i.e. there is a slice Z_0 equipped with a K action such that $X = G \times_K Z_0$ and the metric on X is obtained from a K -invariant metric on Z_0 and G -invariant metric on G/K), the pairing between Φ_g^P and the K -theory index $\text{Ind}_\infty(D)$ is computed by Hochs-Song-Tang in [19]. More precisely, the index pairing has the following topological formula,

$$(1.9) \quad \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), \Phi_g^P \rangle = \int_{(X/AN)^g} c_{X/AN}^g \text{AS}(X/AN)_g$$

In the above formula, X/AN is the quotient of X with respect to the $AN < G$ action; the property of the Langlands decomposition implies that the group M acts on the quotient X/AN ; $(X/AN)^g$ is the fixed point submanifold of the g action on X/AN ; $c_{X/AN}^g$ is a smooth compactly supported function on $(X/AN)^g$ defined in the same way as c^g in Equation (1.7); the action of the Dirac operator D on the AN -invariant sections of E defines a Dirac type operator $D_{X/AN}$ on X/AN ; the characteristic classes are defined in a similar but slightly different way from those in Equation (1.8) for the M action on X/AN (see Equation (9.2) for its explicit expression).

We can finally state the main goals of this article:

- (i) state and prove a (higher) delocalized Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem on G -proper manifolds with boundary;
- (ii) define consequently (higher) rho numbers on G -proper manifolds without boundary and study their properties.

We state now in detail our main results; these deal both with cocompact G -proper manifolds with boundary and without boundary.

We begin by stating the results on manifolds with boundary; these are obtained by combining the results of Hochs, Song and Tang, the use of (an extension of) Melrose's b -calculus to the present context developed in [46] and relative K -theory and relative cyclic cohomology techniques, as developed in [14, 42, 46].

First we give an improvement, through the above techniques, of a result already proved in [21]. Let G be a connected, linear real reductive group. Let g be a semisimple element. Let Y_0 be a G -proper manifold with boundary with compact quotient and let Y be the associated manifold with cylindrical ends. We fix a G -equivariant slice-compatible metric. Let D_0 be an equivariant Dirac operator on Y_0 , acting on the sections of an equivariant vector bundle E_0 . We denote by D and E the associated objects on Y .

1.10. Theorem. (0-degree delocalized APS on G -proper manifolds)

We assume that D_∂ is L^2 -invertible. Then:

- 1] there exists a dense holomorphically closed subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)$ of the Roe algebra $C^*(Y_0 \subset Y, E)^G$ and a smooth index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)) \cong K_0(C^*(Y_0 \subset Y, E)^G)$;
- 2] the delocalized eta invariant

$$\eta_g(D_\partial) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y}(D_\partial \exp(-tD_\partial^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

exists and for the pairing of the index class $\text{Ind}(D_\infty)$ with the 0-cocycle $\tau_g^Y \in HC^0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E))$ defined by the orbital integral τ_g the following delocalized 0-degree index formula holds:

$$(1.11) \quad \langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \int_{(Y_0)^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0) - \frac{1}{2} \eta_g(D_\partial),$$

where the integrand $c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0)$ in the above integral is defined as that in Equation (1.7).

Consider now Y/AN , an M -proper manifold, which has a slice decomposition given by $M \times_{K \cap M} Z =: Y_M$. The following theorem is one of the main results of this paper:

1.12. Theorem. *Assume that $D_{\partial Y}$ is L^2 -invertible and consider the higher index $\langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle$. The following formula holds:*

$$(1.13) \quad \langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle = \int_{(Y_0/AN)_g} c_{Y_0/AN}^g \text{AS}(Y_0/AN)_g - \frac{1}{2} \eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M})$$

with

$$\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y_M}(D_{\partial Y_M} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y_M}^2) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}},$$

where the integrand $c_{Y_0/AN}^g \text{AS}(Y_0/AN)_g$ is defined in the same way as those in Equation (1.9). We refer to Equation (9.2) for its explicit expression. We regard $\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M})$ as a higher delocalized eta invariant associated to P and g .

1.14. Remark. We observe that in Theorem 1.12, when P is not maximal cuspidal parabolic subgroup (see Definition 6.3), the pairing $\langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle$ vanishes, similarly to [19, Theorem 2.1]; moreover, each term on the right side of Equation (1.13) vanishes because of the existence of extra symmetry (see Remark 9.4).

In these two theorems the well definedness of the (higher) delocalized eta invariant for the boundary operator is a consequence of the delocalized Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem. In Section 4 we pass to the general case of a cocompact G proper manifold without boundary (thus not necessarily equal to the boundary of a cocompact G proper manifold with boundary). Some discussion about this question was given in [20, Proposition 4.1 and Section 4.4]. We make a very detailed study on the most general hypothesis under which the delocalized eta invariant is well defined and establish the following result.

1.15. Theorem. *Let (X, \mathbf{h}) be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary and let D be a G -equivariant Dirac-type operator (associated to a unitary Clifford action and a Clifford connection). Let $g \in G$ be a semi-simple element. Then the integral*

$$(1.16) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

converges. Notice that we are not assuming L^2 -invertibility nor a spectral gap at 0 for the operator D .

The proof, which is rather involved, is divided into two parts: the small t and the large t integrability. The former is based on a very detailed study of the Schwartz kernel of $D \exp(-tD^2)$ and the way it behaves near the fixed-point set of g ; the latter is based on a representation of this kernel in terms of operators obtained from the operator $D^{G/K}$ and the eigenspaces of the Dirac operator on a slice; we also employ crucially work of Bismut and Moscovici-Stanton. Our analysis also gives a rigorous proof of the index formula proved by Hochs and Wang in [22].

In Section 5 we give a number of results on delocalized eta invariants associated to *perturbed* Dirac operators on cocompact G -proper manifolds without boundary. We consider:

- the delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(\vartheta)$ associated to a global perturbation D_ϑ of D defined in terms of a perturbation of the operator on the slice S ; we also study the limit as $\vartheta \downarrow 0$ of $\eta_g(\vartheta)$;
- the delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(\Theta)$, defined under a gap assumption at 0 for D , in terms of a global perturbation D_Θ of the operator; also in this case we study the limit of $\eta_g(\Theta)$ as $\Theta \downarrow 0$;
- the delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(D + B^\infty)$ with B^∞ an element in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E)$ making the operator $D + B^\infty$ invertible.

We then see in Section 10 how these results fit into suitable Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorems for Dirac operator with *non-invertible* boundary operator.

We end the paper by defining (higher) rho-invariants associated to metrics of positive scalar curvature and to G -homotopy equivalences and by studying their properties.

The papers is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give a few geometric preliminaries; these will play a major role throughout the paper. Section 3 is devoted to a proof of the 0-degree delocalized Atiyah-Patodi-Singer, using relative cyclic 0-cocycles associated to orbital integrals. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.15 above (existence of the delocalized eta invariant in the non-bounding case). In Section 5 we study modified delocalized eta invariants. In Section 6 we recall the higher cyclic cocycles Φ_g^P introduced in [52] and we introduce the cyclic cocycles they define on G -proper manifolds; we also introduce the relative version of these cocycles on manifolds with boundary. In Section 7 we explain an approach to a general higher delocalized APS index theorem, using again the interplay between cyclic cocycles and relative cyclic cocycles associated to Φ_g^P . In Section 8 we do prove such a theorem in the slice compatible case by adapting to manifolds with boundary a reduction procedure due to Hochs, Song and Tang [19]. In Section 10 we treat the case where the boundary operator is not necessarily invertible and finally in Section 10 we introduce (higher) rho numbers and study their properties.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Pierre Albin, Peter Hochs, Yuri Kordyukov, Shu Shen, and Weiping Zhang for inspiring discussions. Piazza was partially supported by the PRIN *Moduli spaces and Lie Theory* of MIUR (*Ministero Istruzione Università Ricerca*); Song was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1800667 and DMS-1952557; Tang was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1800666 and DMS-1952551.

2. GEOMETRIC PRELIMINARIES.

Let Y_0 be a manifold with boundary, G a finitely connected Lie group acting properly and cocompactly on Y_0 . We denote by X the boundary of Y_0 . There exists a collar neighbourhood U of the boundary ∂Y_0 , $U \cong [0, 2] \times \partial Y_0$, which is G -invariant and such that the action of G on U is of product type. We assume that Y_0 is endowed with a G -invariant metric \mathbf{h}_0 which is of product type near the boundary. We let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be the resulting riemannian manifold with boundary; in the collar neighborhood $U \cong [0, 2] \times \partial Y_0$ the metric \mathbf{h}_0 can be written, through the above isomorphism, as $dt^2 + \mathbf{h}_X$, with \mathbf{h}_X a G -invariant riemannian metric on $X = \partial Y_0$. We denote by c_0 a cut-off function for the action of G on Y_0 ; since the action is cocompact, this is a compactly supported smooth function. We consider the associated manifold with cylindrical ends $\widehat{Y} := Y_0 \cup_{\partial Y_0} ((-\infty, 0] \times \partial Y_0)$, endowed with the extended metric $\widehat{\mathbf{h}}$ and the extended G -action. We denote by (Y, \mathbf{h}) the b -manifold associated to $(\widehat{Y}, \widehat{\mathbf{h}})$. We shall often treat $(\widehat{Y}, \widehat{\mathbf{h}})$ and (Y, \mathbf{h}) as the same object. We denote by c the obvious extension of the cut-off function c_0 for the action of G on Y_0 (constant along the cylindrical end); this is a cut-off function of the extended action of G on Y . If x is a boundary defining function for the cocompact G -manifold Y_0 , then the b -metric \mathbf{h} has the following product-structure near the boundary X :

$$\frac{dx^2}{x^2} + \mathbf{h}_X$$

We remark at this point that our arguments will actually apply to the more general case of *exact* b -metrics, or, equivalently, manifolds with asymptotic cylindrical ends. We shall not insist on this point.

Let us fix a slice Z_0 for the G action on Y_0 ; thus

$$Y_0 \cong G \times_K Z_0$$

with K a maximal compact subgroup of G and Z_0 a smooth compact manifold with boundary, denoted by $S = \partial Z_0$, endowed with a K -action. Consequently, $Y \cong G \times_K Z$ with Z the b -manifold associated to Z_0 and the boundary

$$X = \partial Y_0 \cong G \times_K S.$$

Dimension Assumption: In this article, we assume that

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{r} := \dim Y_0 = \text{rank } G \pmod{2},$$

so that the index class

$$\text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_0}) \in K_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)) \cong K_{\mathbf{r}}(C_r^*G),$$

(we recall here that $K_{\mathbf{r}+1}(C_r^*G) = 0$, see [26]). Consequently, the slice Z_0 is even dimensional because

$$\dim G/K = \text{rank } G \pmod{2}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can further assume $\mathbf{r} = 0$; otherwise, we can simply replace G (and Y_0) by $G \times \mathbb{R}$ (respectively $Y_0 \times \mathbb{R}$).

To sum up, we assume that

- (1) the symmetric space G/K ;
- (2) the G -manifold Y_0 ;
- (3) the K -slice Z_0

are all even dimensional.

For any cuspidal parabolic subgroup $P = MAN$ with $m = \dim(A)$, the m -cyclic cocycles introduced below in (6.1), Φ_g^P , is an m -cyclic cocycle on $\mathcal{C}(G)$. The pairing

$$\langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle$$

is automatically zero if m is odd. Thus it suffices to consider those cuspidal parabolic subgroups such that $m = \dim(A)$ is even. In particular, for the maximal parabolic subgroup $P = MAN$, it is always this case under our assumption.

Choose a K -invariant inner product on the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G , so that we have an orthogonal decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ where \mathfrak{k} is the Lie algebra of K and \mathfrak{p} its orthogonal complement. We have an isomorphism

$$(2.2) \quad TY_0 \cong G \times_K (\mathfrak{p} \oplus TZ_0).$$

Here we abuse the notation \mathfrak{p} to denote the trivial vector bundle $Z_0 \times \mathfrak{p} \rightarrow Z_0$.

2.3. Definition. (slice compatible metrics) Given a slice Z_0 , we shall say that a G -invariant metric on Y_0 is slice compatible with Z_0 if it is constructed from a K -invariant metric on Z_0 and a K -invariant metric on \mathfrak{p} via the above isomorphism $TY_0 \cong G \times_K (\mathfrak{p} \oplus TZ_0)$.

We shall say that the G -invariant metric \mathbf{h}_0 on Y_0 is slice-compatible if there is a slice Z_0 such that it is slice compatible with Z_0 .

In this article we shall be interested in the case in which Y_0 admits a G -invariant Spin^c -structure. We can assume, up to the passage to double covers, that the adjoint representation $\text{Ad} : K \rightarrow SO(\mathfrak{p})$ admits a lift $\widetilde{\text{Ad}} : K \rightarrow \text{Spin}(\mathfrak{p})$. We then obtain a G -invariant Spin^c -structure $P^{G/K} := G \times_K \text{Spin}(\mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow G/K$. Assume now that Z_0 admits a K -invariant Spin^c -structure. Then, proceeding as in [17, 18], we obtain a G -invariant Spin^c -structure on M . Because

$$0 \rightarrow G \times_K \mathfrak{p} \rightarrow TY_0 \rightarrow G \times_K TZ_0 \rightarrow 0,$$

the two out of three lemma of Spin^c -structure shows that every G -invariant Spin^c -structure on Y_0 is induced from a K -invariant Spin^c -structure on Z_0 .

2.4. Definition. (slice-compatible Spin^c -structure) Given a slice Z_0 , we shall say that a Spin^c -structure on Y_0 is slice compatible with Z_0 if it is constructed from a K -invariant metric and K -invariant Spin^c -structure on Z_0 and a K -invariant metric and K -invariant Spin^c structure on \mathfrak{p} via the above isomorphism $TY_0 \cong G \times_K (\mathfrak{p} \oplus TZ_0)$.

We shall say that the G -invariant Spin^c -structure on Y_0 is slice-compatible if there is a slice Z_0 such that it is slice compatible with Z_0 .

We shall say that a G -invariant Spin^c -structure on Y_0 is slice-compatible if it is associated to a K -invariant metric and a K -invariant Spin^c -structure on the slice in the above way.

Let E_0 be equal to the G -equivariant spinor bundle associated to a slice-compatible Spin^c -structure on Y_0 twisted by an auxiliary G -equivariant vector bundle. In particular, E_0 has a G -equivariant $\text{Cliff}(TY_0)$ -module structure. Let ∇^{E_0} be a Clifford connection on E_0 , that is

$$\left[\nabla_V^{E_0}, c(W) \right] = c(\nabla_V^{TY_0} W), \quad V, W \in C^\infty(Y_0, TY_0)$$

where c denotes the Clifford action and ∇^{TY_0} is the Levi-Civita connection. The Dirac operator associated to the Clifford connection is given by the following composition

$$D: C^\infty(Y_0, E_0) \xrightarrow{\nabla^{E_0}} C^\infty(Y_0, T^*Y_0 \otimes E_0) \cong C^\infty(Y_0, TY_0 \otimes E_0) \xrightarrow{c} C^\infty(Y_0, E_0).$$

The vector bundle E_0 induces a K -equivariant vector bundle E_{Z_0} such that

$$E_0 \cong G \times_K (S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes E_{Z_0})$$

and E_{Z_0} admits a K -equivariant $\text{Cliff}(TZ_0)$ -module structure. Accordingly, we can decompose

$$L^2(Y_0, E_0) \cong [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes L^2(Z_0, E_{Z_0})]^K.$$

By the assumption that the metric is slice-compatible, the Dirac operator D decomposes

$$(2.5) \quad D = D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_{Z_0},$$

where $D_{G,K}$ is the Spin^c -Dirac operator on $L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and D_{Z_0} is a K -equivariant Dirac operator on E_{Z_0} , and $\hat{\otimes}$ means the graded tensor product. One key point is that

$$[D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1, 1 \hat{\otimes} D_{Z_0}] = 0, \quad D^2 = D_{G,K}^2 + D_{Z_0}^2.$$

Notations.

We use the following notations throughout this paper:

- G = connected, linear real reductive group with maximal compact subgroup K ;
- Y_0 = cocompact proper G -manifold with boundary;
- \mathbf{h}_0 a G -invariant metric on Y_0 , product-type near the boundary;
- Z_0 = a K -slice of Y_0 so that Y_0 is diffeomorphic to $G \times_K Z_0$; and abusing notation, we will write $Y_0 = G \times_K Z_0$;
- Y = the G -proper b -manifold associated to Y_0 ;
- \mathbf{h} the G -invariant b -metric on Y associated to \mathbf{h}_0 ;
- Z = the b -manifold associated to the slice Z_0 ; Z is a K -slice of Y so that $Y = G \times_K Z$;
- X = cocompact proper G -manifold without boundary;
- S = a K -slice of X so that $X = G \times_K S$;
- E = G -equivariant twisted spinor bundle so that $E = \mathcal{E} \otimes W$, where \mathcal{E} is the spinor bundle associated Spin^c -structure and W is an auxiliary G -equivariant vector bundle;
- $C_c^\infty(G)$ = space of compactly supported smooth functions on G ;
- $\mathcal{C}(G)$ = space of Harish-Chandra Schwartz functions on G ;
- $\mathcal{A}_G^c(X)$ = the space of G -equivariant G -compactly supported smoothing operators;
- ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$ = the space of G -equivariant G -compactly supported b -smoothing operators in the b -calculus with ϵ -bounds;
- $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$ = the space of G -Harish-Chandra Schwartz smoothing operators;
- $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ = the space of G -Harish-Chandra Schwartz residual smoothing operators in the b -calculus with ϵ -bounds;
- ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ = the space of G -Harish-Chandra Schwartz b -smoothing operators in the b -calculus with ϵ -bounds;
- $C_r^*(G)$ = reduced group C^* -algebra of G ;
- τ_g = orbital integral on $\mathcal{C}(G)$ associated to the conjugacy class of g ;
- τ_g^X = trace on $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$ associated to the orbital integral τ_g ;
- τ_g^Y = trace on $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ associated to the orbital integral τ_g .

3. DELOCALIZED TRACES AND THE APS INDEX FORMULA

In this section we want to tackle the easiest case of a delocalized APS index theorem on G -proper manifolds with boundary, that of delocalized traces, that is 0-degree delocalized cyclic cocycles. This result was already discussed in the work of Hochs-Wang-Wang [21]. Our treatment is different, centred around the interplay between absolute and relative cyclic cohomology and the b -calculus; moreover our treatment allows us to get sharper results compared to [21] in the case of a connected linear real reductive group³ G . More precisely, in Theorem 1.10 we only assume that g is a semisimple element of G to obtain the index formula (1.11), while in [21, Theorem 2.1], the authors require that G/Z_g is compact⁴.

3.1. Orbital integrals and associated cyclic 0-cocycles in the closed case. Consider first a co-compact G -proper manifold *without* boundary X . We know that there exists a compact submanifold $S \subset X$ on which the G -action restricts to an action of a maximal compact subgroup $K \subset G$, so that the natural map

$$G \times_K S \rightarrow X, \quad [g, x] \mapsto g \cdot x,$$

is a diffeomorphism. This decomposition of X induces an isomorphism

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{A}_G^c(X) \cong (C_c^\infty(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi^{-\infty}(S))^{K \times K}$$

and more generally

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E) \cong (C_c^\infty(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi^{-\infty}(S, E|_S))^{K \times K},$$

in the presence of a G -equivariant vector bundle E . (We shall often expunge the vector bundle E from the notation.) On the left hand side we have the smoothing operators defined by G -invariant smooth kernels of G -compact support; on the right hand side we have a projective tensor product of two Fréchet algebras. The algebra $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X) := (\mathcal{C}(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi^{-\infty}(S))^{K \times K}$$

with $\mathcal{C}(G)$ equal to the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra, a dense holomorphically closed subalgebra of $C_r^*(G)$. Once again, we have here a projective tensor product (but note that $\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$ is nuclear). It can be proved, following [46, Prop. 1.7], that there are isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{A}_G^c(X, E) \cong \{ \Phi : G \rightarrow \Psi^{-\infty}(S), \text{ smooth, compactly supported and } K \times K \text{ invariant} \},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E) \cong \{ \Phi : G \rightarrow \Psi^{-\infty}(S), K \times K \text{ invariant and } g \mapsto \nu_{V,W,m}(\|\Phi(g)\|_\alpha) \text{ bounded } \forall \alpha, m, V, W \}$$

with α a multi-index indexing derivatives with respect to the spatial variables of S , $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ denoting the associated well-known seminorm on $\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$ and $\nu_{V,W,m}(\cdot)$, $V, W \in U(\mathfrak{g})$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, denoting a seminorm on $\mathcal{C}(G)$ defined as follows: Let L be the function on G measuring the Riemannian distance on G/K from gK to eK . Let v_0 be a unit vector in the spherical representation of G . Let Θ be the Harish-Chandra spherical function on g defined by

$$\Theta(g) := \langle v_0, \pi(g)v_0 \rangle.$$

For $f \in \mathcal{C}(G)$, define the seminorm $\nu_{V,W,m}(-)$ by

$$\nu_{V,W,m}(f) := \sup_{g \in G} \| |1 + L(g)|^m \Theta(g)^{-1} L_V R_W (\text{Op}(a)(f)(g)) \|.$$

These isomorphisms associate to a smooth G -invariant kernel A on $X \times X$ a map $\Phi_A : G \rightarrow \Psi^{-\infty}(S)$, with Φ_A equivariant with respect to the natural $K \times K$ action on $\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$ and the action $\alpha(k_1, k_2)(g) := k_1 g k_2^{-1}$ on G . The image of the product by convolution of A and B on the left hand side is equal to $\Phi_A * \Phi_B$ on the right hand side, with

$$(3.3) \quad (\Phi_A * \Phi_B)(g) = \int_G \Phi_A(gh^{-1}) \circ \Phi_B(h) dh.$$

³In [21], the authors consider general locally compact topological groups.

⁴Notice that for the numeric g -index associated to D a formula is proved in [20] under the same hypothesis given here; on the other hand, the g -index is proved to be equal to the pairing of an index class with a 0-degree cyclic cocycle (this is the number we consider in the present article) only under the additional assumption that G/Z_g is compact.

Let us fix a semisimple element $g \in G$. Under this assumption we know that G/Z_g , with Z_g denoting the centralizer of g , has a G -invariant Haar measure $d(hZ_g)$. Recall that the orbital integral of a function $f \in C_c(G)$ is, by definition,

$$\tau_g(f) := \int_{G/Z_g} f(hgh^{-1})d(hZ_g).$$

It is well-known, see for example [23], that this functional *extends* to a continuous trace homomorphism

$$(3.4) \quad \tau_g : \mathcal{C}(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

Let us consider now a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary $X \cong G \times_K S$. For

$$\tilde{k} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_G^\infty(X, E) := (\mathcal{C}(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi^{-\infty}(S))^{K \times K}$$

we consider the bounded operator $T_{\tilde{k}}$ on $L^2(X, E)$ given by

$$(3.5) \quad (T_{\tilde{k}}e)(gs) = \int_G \int_S g\tilde{k}(g^{-1}g', s, s')g'^{-1}e(g's')ds'dg'.$$

The operator $T_{\tilde{k}}$ is an integral operator with G -equivariant Schwartz kernel κ given by

$$\kappa(gs, g's') = g\tilde{k}(g^{-1}g', s, s')g'^{-1}.$$

The map $\tilde{k} \rightarrow T_{\tilde{k}}$ is injective; moreover

$$T_{\tilde{k}} \circ T_{\tilde{k}'} = T_{\tilde{k} * \tilde{k}'}$$

so that its image is a subalgebra of the G -equivariant bounded operators on $L^2(X, E)$. Following an established abuse of notation we shall not distinguish between these two algebras, thus identifying a smooth kernel with the bounded operators it defines.

Following again [23] we define for $T \equiv T_{\tilde{k}}$

$$(3.6) \quad \tau_g^X(T) := \int_{G/Z_g} \int_X c(hgh^{-1}x) \text{tr}(hgh^{-1}\kappa(hg^{-1}h^{-1}x, x)) dx d(hZ)$$

with c a cut-off function for the action of G on X and tr denoting the vector-bundle fiberwise trace. There are equivalent ways to write the right-hand-side, see [23, Lemma 3.2]; for example if c_G is a cutoff function for the action of Z_g on G by right multiplication and $c^g(x) = \int_G c_G(h)c(hgx)dh$ then the right hand side of (3.6) can be written as

$$(3.7) \quad \int_X c^g(x) \text{tr}(\kappa(x, gx)g) dx.$$

It is proved in [23, Lemma 3.4] that τ_g^X defines a continuous trace

$$(3.8) \quad \tau_g^X : \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

In fact, the two traces (3.4) and (3.8) are related by a homomorphism of integration along the slice S , $\text{Tr}_S : \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(G)$, such that

$$\tau_g^X = \tau_g \circ \text{Tr}_S$$

(see [23, Section 3.3]). Indeed, using the identification

$$\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E) \cong \{ \Phi : G \rightarrow \Psi^{-\infty}(S), K \times K \text{ invariant and } \gamma \mapsto \nu_{V,W,m}(\|\Phi(\gamma)\|_\alpha) \text{ bounded } \forall \alpha, m, V, W \}$$

we see that Tr_S associates to Φ the function

$$G \ni g \rightarrow \text{Tr}(\Phi(g)).$$

Using [46, Lemma 1.24] and the well known inequality $|\text{Tr}(T)| \leq \|T\|_1$ for a smoothing operator on a smooth compact manifold⁵, we see that $\text{Tr}_S : \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(G)$ so defined is a *continuous* map. (Even though [46, Lemma 1.24] uses a slightly different algebra on G instead of $\mathcal{C}(G)$, the proof showing that the trace norm $A \mapsto \|A\|_1$, $A \in \Psi^{-\infty}(S)$ is continuous for the Fréchet topology on $\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$ applies verbatim to show continuity in our case.)

⁵with $\| \cdot \|_1$ denoting the trace norm

3.2. Manifolds with boundary: smooth index classes. Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be a cocompact G proper manifold with boundary X as in the previous subsection and let (Y, \mathbf{h}) be the associated b -manifold. We denote by Z_0 a slice for Y_0 and by Z the associated b -manifold.

Using the b -calculus with ϵ -bounds on Z and the algebra $C_c^\infty(G)$ we can employ Abels' theorem [1] as above in order to define algebras of operators on Y fitting into a short exact sequence of operators:

$$(3.9) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \rightarrow {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Here I denotes the indicial operator. Notice that we have and we shall omit the ϵ from the notation. More precisely:

$$(3.10) \quad {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) := (C_c^\infty(G) \hat{\otimes} {}^b\Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(S))^{K \times K},$$

$$(3.11) \quad {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y)) := (C_c^\infty(G) \hat{\otimes} {}^b\Psi_{\mathbb{R}}^{-\infty, \epsilon}(\text{cyl}(\partial S)))^{K \times K},$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad \mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) := \text{Ker}({}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))).$$

Employing the Harish-Chandra algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$ instead of $C_c^\infty(G)$ we can define as in [46] the three algebras $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$, ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ and ${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$ fitting into the short exact sequence

$$(3.13) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \rightarrow {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y)) \rightarrow 0.$$

This extends (3.9). Recall at this point, see [46], that $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ is dense and holomorphically closed in the Roe algebra $C^*(Y_0 \subset Y)^G$.

Let now D be an equivariant Dirac operator, of product type near the boundary. We shall make for the time being the following assumption:

$$(3.14) \quad \text{the boundary operator } D_{\partial Y} \text{ is } L^2\text{-invertible.}$$

The following Theorems sharpen the corresponding results in [46], (see in particular Subsection 5.3, Proposition 5.27, Proposition 5.33 and Theorem 5.42 there).

3.15. Theorem. *Let D be as above and let Q^σ be a symbolic b -parametrix for D . The Connes-Skandalis projector*

$$(3.16) \quad P_Q^b := \begin{pmatrix} {}^bS_+^2 & {}^bS_+(I + {}^bS_+)Q^b \\ {}^bS_-D^+ & I - {}^bS_-^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

associated to a true b -parametrix $Q^b = Q^\sigma - Q'$ with remainders ${}^bS^\pm$ in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_0)$ is a 2×2 matrix with entries in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ ⁶. We thus have a well-defined smooth index class

$$(3.17) \quad \text{Ind}_\infty(D) := [P_Q^b] - [e_1] \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)) \cong K_0(C^*(Y_0 \subset Y)^G) \quad \text{with } e_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

3.18. Theorem.

1) *The Connes-Moscovici projector $V(D)$,*

$$V(D) := \begin{pmatrix} e^{-D^-D^+} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}D^-D^+} \left(\frac{I - e^{-D^-D^+}}{D^-D^+} \right) D^- \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}D^+D^-} D^+ & I - e^{-D^+D^-} \end{pmatrix},$$

is a 2×2 matrix with entries in ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_0)$; the Connes-Moscovici projector $V(D^{\text{cyl}})$ is a 2×2 matrix with entries in $\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$. These two projectors define a smooth relative index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial) \in K_0({}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_0), {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y)))$.

⁶really in a slightly extended algebra because of the identity appearing in the right lower corner of the matrix

2) The projector $V^b(D)$ obtained by improving the parametrix $Q := \frac{I - \exp(-\frac{1}{2}D^- D^+)}{D^- D^+} D^+$ defining $V(D)$ to a true b -parametrix Q^b is a 2×2 matrix with entries in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ and defines the same smooth index class in $K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y))$ as the Connes-Skandalis projector of Theorem 3.15

3) The class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D)$ is sent to the class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial)$ through the excision isomorphism α_{exc} .

Summarizing: using the Connes-Moscovici projector(s) we have smooth index classes $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y))$ and $\text{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial) \in K_0({}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y), {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G, \mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y)))$, with the first one sent to the second one by the excision isomorphism α_{exc} .

Proof. Most of the arguments given in [46] use the closure under holomorphic calculus of certain algebras. This applies unchanged whether we use pseudodifferential operators based on the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$ or the rapid decay algebra $H_L^\infty(G)$. The only exception is the analogue of Lemma 2.7 in [46] that we state now explicitly, in the present case, for the benefit of the reader:

3.19. Lemma. *Let X be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary with a slice S . Consider $\Psi_{G,c}^{-\infty}(X)$ and its extension $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X) := (\mathcal{C}(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi_c^{-\infty}(S))^{K \times K}$, an algebra of smoothing operators. Then the composition $\Psi_{G,c}^0(X) \times \Psi_{G,c}^{-\infty}(X) \rightarrow \Psi_{G,c}^{-\infty}(X)$ extends to a continuous map*

$$\Psi_{G,c}^0(X) \times \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X).$$

Proof. The proof of this Lemma is a variation of the corresponding one for $(H_L^\infty(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi_c^{-\infty}(S))^{K \times K}$ given in [46, Lemma 2.7]. Recall that $\Psi_{G,c}^0(X) = (\Psi_{G,c}^0(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi_c^0(S))^{K \times K}$. As $\Psi_c^{-\infty}(S)$ is an ideal of $\Psi_c^0(S)$, we are reduced to prove that the product

$$\Psi_c^0(G) \times \mathcal{C}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}, \quad (A, f) \mapsto A * f$$

is well-defined and continuous with respect to f .

A general element A of $\Psi_c^0(G)$ can be written as

$$A = \text{Op}(a) + K,$$

where $K \in \Psi_{G,c}^{-\infty}(G) \cong C_c^\infty(G)$ and $\text{Op}(a)$ is the operator corresponding to a symbol $a \in S^0(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ of order zero with property

$$|D_\xi^\alpha(a)| \leq C_\alpha(1 + |\xi|)^{-|\alpha|}.$$

It follows from the inclusion $C_c^\infty(G) \subset \mathcal{C}(G)$ that the product $(K, f) \mapsto K * f$ is well-defined and continuous for $K \in \Psi_{G,c}^{-\infty}(G)$. We are left to show that the composition $(\text{Op}(a), f) \mapsto \text{Op}(a)(f)$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}(G)$ and is continuous. Recall that $\text{Op}(a)(f)$ has the following expression

$$\text{Op}(a)(f)(g) := \int_G \int_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \chi(h^{-1}) e^{i\langle \xi, \exp^{-1}(h^{-1}) \rangle} a(\xi) f(hg) d\xi dh.$$

Let Θ be the Harish-Chandra spherical function on g defined by

$$\Theta(g) := \langle v_0, \pi(g)v_0 \rangle,$$

for a unit vector v_0 in the spherical representation of G .

For $V, W \in U(\mathfrak{g})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |1 + L(g)|^t \Theta(g)^{-1} L_V R_W (\text{Op}(a)(f)(g)) \\ &= \int_G \int_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \chi(h^{-1}) e^{i\langle \xi, \exp^{-1}(h^{-1}) \rangle} a(\xi) L_V R_W f(hg) |1 + L(g)|^t \Theta(g)^{-1} d\xi dh \\ &= \int_G \int_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \chi(h^{-1}) e^{i\langle \xi, \exp^{-1}(h^{-1}) \rangle} a(\xi) \frac{\Theta(hg)}{\Theta(g)} \Theta(hg)^{-1} L_V R_W f(hg) |1 + L(g)|^t d\xi dh \end{aligned}$$

By [25, Lemma 12.5], for h^{-1} in the support of the function χ , the support of which is compact, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\Theta(hg)}{\Theta(g)} \right| < C, \quad \forall g \in G, h \in \text{supp}(\chi).$$

Peetre's inequality gives,

$$|1 + L(g)|^t \leq |1 + L(h^{-1})|^{|t|} |1 + L(hg)|^t.$$

It follows from the above two inequalities that we have that $\| |1 + L(g)|^t \Theta(g)^{-1} L_V R_W (\text{Op}(a)(f)(g)) \|$ is bounded by

$$C \left\| \int_G \int_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \chi(h^{-1}) e^{i\langle \xi, \exp^{-1}(h^{-1}) \rangle} a(\xi) (1 + L(h))^{|t|} d\xi dh \right\| \times \sup(1 + L(hg))^t \|\Theta(hg)^{-1} L_V R_W f(hg)\|.$$

The integral

$$\left\| \int_G \int_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \chi(h^{-1}) e^{i\langle \xi, \exp^{-1}(h^{-1}) \rangle} a(\xi) (1 + L(h))^{|t|} d\xi dh \right\|$$

is finite as the integration of h is over the support of χ , which is compact.

Summarizing the above estimates, we have proved that there is a constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that

$$\| |1 + L(g)|^t \Theta(g)^{-1} L_V R_W (\text{Op}(a)(f)(g)) \| \leq \tilde{C} \sup(1 + L(hg))^t \|\Theta(hg)^{-1} L_V R_W f(hg)\|.$$

This proves that $\text{Op}(a)(f)$ belongs to the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$, and the map $(\text{Op}(a), f) \mapsto \text{Op}(a)(f)$ is continuous with respect to f . This proves the Lemma. \square

3.3. 0-degree (relative) cyclic cocycles associated to orbital integrals. Let us now pass to cyclic cocycles associated to orbital integrals. Consider for the time being a compact b -manifold Y endowed with a b -metric \mathbf{h}_Y which has product structure $\mathbf{h}_Y = dx^2/x^2 + \mathbf{h}_{\partial Y}$ near the boundary. We use the associated volume form in order to trivialize the relevant half-density bundles. In the b -calculus with ϵ -bounds we consider


$$\text{Ker} \left({}^b\Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(Y) \xrightarrow{I_Y} {}^b\Psi_{\mathbb{R}}^{-\infty, \epsilon}(\partial Y \times \mathbb{R}) \right)$$

the kernel of the (surjective) indicial homomorphism

It is well known, see Melrose's book [37], that if $\epsilon < 1$, then

$$\text{Ker}(I_Y) \subset \Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(Y)$$

with $\Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(Y)$ denoting the *residual operators*; these are smoothing kernels on the b -stretched product Y_b^2 that vanish at order ϵ on *all* boundary faces, that is, the left boundary $lb(Y_b^2)$, the right boundary $rb(Y_b^2)$ and the front face $bf(Y_b^2)$. See the figure below. In fact $\text{Ker}(I_Y) = \rho_{bf(Y_b^2)} {}^b\Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(Y)$ with $\rho_{bf(Y_b^2)}$ a boundary defining function for the front face, and by definition $\rho_{bf(Y_b^2)} {}^b\Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(Y) \subset \Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(Y)$ if $\epsilon < 1$.



Because of this vanishing, the residual operators are trace class on L_b^2 and the trace is obtained by integration over the lifted diagonal Δ_b (because of the extra vanishing the integral with respect to the b -volume form, which near the boundary can be written as $\frac{dx}{x} d\text{vol}_{\partial X}$, is absolutely convergent). Put it differently, this algebra of operators behaves very much as the smoothing operators on a smooth compact manifold without boundary.

Consider now the G -proper case and

$$(3.20) \quad \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) := \text{Ker} (I : {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \rightarrow {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl } \partial Y_0)) .$$

For exactly the same reason as above this algebra behaves very much like $(\mathcal{C}(G) \hat{\otimes} \Psi^{-\infty}(S))^{K \times K}$, with S now a slice for the action of G on a cocompact G -proper manifold *without* boundary X . This is in fact a great advantage of our method and allows us to avoid completely *ad hoc* arguments.

We thus have a trace-homomorphism

$$(3.21) \quad \tau_g^Y : \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} .$$

exactly as in the closed case:

$$(3.22) \quad \tau_g^Y(T) := \int_{G/Z_g} \int_Y c(hgh^{-1}x) \text{tr}(hgh^{-1}\kappa(hg^{-1}h^{-1}x, x)) dx d(hZ)$$

with dx denoting now the b -volume form associated to the b -metric \mathbf{h} . The proof of the well-definedness of (3.22) now proceeds as in the case of manifold without boundary, using the fact that κ is residual and therefore vanishing of order ϵ at all boundary faces. In fact: there is a homomorphism of integration along the slice S , $\text{Tr}_S : \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(G)$, which is continuous and such that $\tau_g^Y = \tau_g \circ \text{Tr}_S$.

The trace τ_g^Y defines a cyclic 0-cocycle on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$. Using the pairing between K -theory and cyclic cohomology, denoted $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, we have in our case

$$(3.23) \quad \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : HC^0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)) \times K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

and thus a homomorphism

$$(3.24) \quad \langle \tau_g^Y, \cdot \rangle : K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

3.25. Definition. Let D be a G -equivariant operator on Y as in section 2. Assume that the induced boundary operator is L^2 -invertible, so that there is a well-defined index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y))$. The g -index of D is, by definition, the number $\langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle$.

Our goal in this section is to give a formula for $\langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle$.

Following the relative cyclic cohomology approach in [14, 42, 46] we want to find a relative cyclic 0-cocycle $(\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g)$ verifying

$$(3.26) \quad \langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \langle (\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g), \text{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial) \rangle.$$

(The r on the right hand side stands for *regularized*.)

3.27. Proposition. *Let X be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary. Define the following 1-cochain on ${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(X))$*

$$(3.28) \quad \sigma_g^X(A_0, A_1) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tau_g^X(\partial_\lambda I(A_0, \lambda) \circ I(A_1, \lambda)) d\lambda,$$

where the indicial family of $A \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(X))$, denoted $I(A, \lambda)$, appears. Then $\sigma_g^X(\cdot, \cdot)$ is well-defined and a cyclic 1-cocycle.

Proof. Fourier transform identifies ${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(X))$ with holomorphic families

$$\{\mathbb{R} \times i(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \ni \lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_G(\partial X)\}$$

with values in the Fréchet algebra $\mathcal{A}_G(X)$, rapidly decreasing in $\text{Re}\lambda$. (Recall that we do not write ϵ in the notation, but elements in our algebras are built from b -operators of order $-\infty$ in the calculus with ϵ -bounds.) It is then immediate that the integral is absolutely convergent and depends continuously on A_0, A_1 . The fact that it is a cyclic 1-cocycle follows from the tracial property of τ_g^X and integration by parts in λ . \square

Let Y be now a b -manifold and let ∂Y be its boundary. Let $\tau_g^{Y,r}$ be the functional on ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$:

$$\tau_g^{Y,r}(T) := \int_{G/Z_g} \int_Y c(hgh^{-1}y) \text{tr}(hgh^{-1}\kappa(hg^{-1}h^{-1}y, y)) dy d(hZ)$$

where Melrose's b -integral has been used, dy denotes the b -density associated to the b -metric \mathbf{h} and where we recall that the cut-off function c_0 on Y_0 is extended constantly along the cylinder to define c . This is the regularization of τ_g^Y on a b -manifold, for the time being on kernels of G -compact support (we shall deal with the extension of $\tau_g^{Y,r}$ on all of ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(M)$ momentarily). Observe that

$$\tau_g^{Y,r} = \tau_g \circ {}^b\text{Tr}_S$$

with ${}^b\text{Tr}_S : {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \rightarrow C_c^\infty(G)$ denoting b -integration along the slice S . More precisely, as in the closed case, we have an isomorphism

$${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(M) \cong \{\Phi : G \rightarrow {}^b\Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(S), \text{ smooth, compactly supported and } K \times K \text{ invariant}\}$$

and ${}^b\text{Tr}_S$ associates to Φ the function $G \ni \gamma \rightarrow {}^b\text{Tr}(\Phi(\gamma))$. The continuity of this map will be treated more generally in the proof of Proposition 3.30 below.

3.29. Proposition. *The pair $(\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y})$ defines a relative 0-cocycle for ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$.*

Proof. As we are dealing with a 0-cochain, it suffices to show that for the Hochschild b -differential of $\tau_g^{Y,r}$ the following formula holds:

$$(b\tau_g^{Y,r})(A_0, A_1) = \sigma_g^{\partial Y}(I(A_0), I(A_1))$$

where we recall that

$$\sigma_g^{\partial Y}(I(A_0), I(A_1)) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tau_g^{\partial Y}(\partial_\lambda I(A_0, \lambda) \circ I(A_1, \lambda)) d\lambda.$$

The left hand side $(b\tau_g^{Y,r})(A_0, A_1)$ is equal to $\tau_g^{Y,r}[A_0, A_1]$; if $A_i, i = 0, 1$, corresponds to $\Phi_i : G \rightarrow {}^b\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$ then $\tau_g^{Y,r}[A_0, A_1]$ is equal to

$$\int_{G/Z_g} \int_G {}^b\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi_0(h_1 g h_1^{-1} h^{-1}) \circ \Phi_1(h)) dh d(h_1 Z_g) - \int_{G/Z_g} \int_G {}^b\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi_1 h_1 g h_1^{-1} h^{-1}) \circ \Phi_0(h) dh d(h_1 Z_g).$$

Changing the order of integration and with a suitable change of coordinates in the second summand, using the unimodularity of G , we can rewrite the above expression as

$$\int_{G/Z_g} \int_G {}^b\mathrm{Tr}[\Phi_0(h_1 g x^{-1} h_1^{-1}), \Phi_1(h)] dh d(h_1 Z_g).$$

Now we can apply Melrose's formula for the b -trace of a commutator and get

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{G/Z_g} \int_G \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{Tr}(\partial_\lambda I(\Phi_0(h_1 g h_1^{-1} h^{-1}), \lambda) \circ I(\Phi_1(h), \lambda)) d\lambda dh d(h_1 Z_g).$$

We can interchange the order of integration without problems here (rapid decay in λ and compact support in G) and so we conclude reverting to $I(A_0, \lambda)$ and $I(A_1, \lambda)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_g^{Y,r}[A_0, A_1] &= \frac{i}{2\pi} \tau_g \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{Tr}_{\partial S}(\partial_\lambda I(A_0, \lambda) \circ I(A_1, \lambda)) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tau_g^{\partial Y}(\partial_\lambda I(A_0, \lambda) \circ I(A_1, \lambda)) d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

3.30. Proposition. *The pair $(\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y})$ extends continuously to a relative 0-cocycle for*

$${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\mathrm{cyl}(\partial Y)).$$

Moreover, the following formula holds:

$$(3.31) \quad \langle \tau_g^Y, \mathrm{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \langle (\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y}), \mathrm{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial) \rangle.$$

Proof. We already know that $\sigma_g^{\partial Y}$ extends to a 1-cocycle on $\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\mathrm{cyl}(\partial Y))$. If we could show that $\tau_g^{Y,r}$ extends to ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ then by density and continuity we would get the first statement of the proposition. The second would then follow as usual from the fact that

$$\tau_g^{Y,r}|_{\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)} = \tau_g^Y$$

given that on residual operators the b -integral equals the ordinary integral.

As in [46] we have an isomorphism

$${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \cong \{ \Phi : G \rightarrow {}^b\Psi^{-\infty,\epsilon}(S), K \times K \text{ invariant and } g \mapsto \nu_{V,W,m}(\|\Phi(g)\|_\alpha) \text{ bounded } \forall \alpha, m, V, W \}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ are now the C^∞ seminorms of a smooth kernel on the b -stretched product. We want to show that the map

$$(3.32) \quad {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \ni \Phi \longrightarrow {}^b\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{C}(G)$$

is continuous. Here we can use a Proposition of Lesch-Moscovici-Pflaum [33], expressing the b -trace of a b -smoothing operator on a compact b -manifold in terms of the trace of two residual operators, see for example Proposition 7.1 in [46]. Using this Proposition and the arguments in [46, Lemma 7.8], directly inspired in turn on those of [14], we prove the continuity of the map

$${}^b\Psi^{-\infty,\epsilon}(S) \ni T \longrightarrow {}^b\mathrm{Tr}(T) \in \mathbb{C}$$

and thus of the map (3.32). \square

3.4. The 0-degree delocalized APS index theorem on G -proper manifolds. We now apply formula (3.31) to the index class associated to the Connes-Moscovici projector

$$(3.33) \quad V(D) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-D^-D^+} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}D^-D^+} \left(\frac{I - e^{-D^-D^+}}{D^-D^+} \right) D^- \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}D^+D^-} D^+ & I - e^{-D^+D^-} \end{pmatrix}$$

On the left hand-side of (3.31) we have

$$\langle \tau_g^M, V^b(D) \rangle$$

with $V^b(D)$ the modified Connes-Moscovici projector. Indeed, recall that the Connes-Moscovici projector is simply the Connes-Skandalis projector for the choice of parametrix

$$Q := \frac{I - \exp(-\frac{1}{2}D^-D^+)}{D^-D^+} D^+$$

This produces the remainders $I - QD^+ = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}D^-D^+)$, $I - D^+Q = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}D^+D^-)$ and $V^b(D)$ is obtained by improving this parametrix to a true parametrix in the b -calculus, that is, an inverse modulo residual operators.

On the right hand-side we have the pairing of the relative cocycle $(\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y})$ with the relative class

$$(3.34) \quad (V(D), e_1, q_t), \quad t \in [1, +\infty], \quad \text{with } q_t := \begin{cases} V(tD_{\text{cyl}}) & \text{if } t \in [1, +\infty) \\ e_1 & \text{if } t = \infty \end{cases}$$

and with $e_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Let us concentrate first on the right hand-side. By definition of relative pairing we have:

$$(3.35) \quad \langle (\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y}), (V(D), e_1, q_t) \rangle = \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-D^-D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-D^+D^-}) + \int_1^\infty \sigma_g^{\partial Y}([\dot{q}_t, q_t], q_t) dt.$$

3.36. Proposition. *The term $\int_1^\infty \sigma_g^{\partial Y}([\dot{q}_t, q_t], q_t) dt$, with $q_t := V(tD_{\text{cyl}})$ is equal to*

$$-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_1^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y}(D_{\partial M} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \right).$$

Proof. By definition

$$\sigma_g^{\partial Y}([\dot{q}_t, q_t], q_t) dt = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tau_g^{\partial Y}(\partial_\lambda(I([\dot{q}_t, q_t], \lambda)) \circ I(q_t, \lambda)) d\lambda.$$

We can integrate by parts in λ on the right hand side, given that the two terms are rapidly decreasing in λ . Thus, taking into account the multiplicative constants, we want to prove that

$$(3.37) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tau_g^{\partial Y}((I([\dot{q}_t, q_t], \lambda)) \circ \partial_\lambda(I(q_t, \lambda))) d\lambda = \frac{i\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{t}} \tau_g^{\partial Y}(D_{\partial Y} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2)).$$

We need to write down the indicial family of q_t . By definition

$$q_t = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-t^2 D_{\text{cyl}}^- D_{\text{cyl}}^+} & e^{-\frac{t^2}{2} D_{\text{cyl}}^- D_{\text{cyl}}^+} \left(\frac{I - e^{-t^2 D_{\text{cyl}}^- D_{\text{cyl}}^+}}{t^2 D_{\text{cyl}}^- D_{\text{cyl}}^+} \right) t D_{\text{cyl}}^- \\ e^{-\frac{t^2}{2} D_{\text{cyl}}^+ D_{\text{cyl}}^-} t D^+ & I - e^{-t^2 D_{\text{cyl}}^+ D_{\text{cyl}}^-} \end{pmatrix}$$

and thus, denoting $D_{\partial Y}$ by B we have

$$I(q_t, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-t^2(\lambda^2 + B^2)} & e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}(\lambda^2 + B^2)} \left(\frac{I - e^{-t^2(\lambda^2 + B^2)}}{t^2(\lambda^2 + B^2)} \right) t(-i\lambda + B) \\ e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}(\lambda^2 + B^2)} t(i\lambda + B) & I - e^{-t^2(\lambda^2 + B^2)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We set

$$p(t, \lambda) := I(q_t, \lambda).$$

We must compute

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \tau_g^{\partial Y} ((\partial_t p(t, \lambda) \circ p(t, \lambda) - p(t, \lambda) \circ \partial_t p(t, \lambda)) \circ \partial_\lambda p(t, \lambda)) d\lambda$$

and show that it equals

$$\frac{i\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{t}} \tau_g^{\partial Y} (D_{\partial Y} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2)).$$

This is a complicated computation; however, we remark that all operators appearing in the 2×2 matrices

$$\partial_t p(t, \lambda), \quad p(t, \lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\lambda p(t, \lambda)$$

are given by operators obtained by functional calculus for B and thus, in particular, they commute. This means that we can deal with this computation in a formal way and so, with some help by *Mathematica*, formula (3.37) does follow. We omit the elementary but lengthy details. \square

Thanks to this Proposition we have that

(3.38)

$$\langle (\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y}), (V(D), e_1, q_t) \rangle = \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-D^+ D^-}) - \frac{1}{2} \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \tau_g^{\partial Y} (D_{\partial Y} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

As a last step we replace D by sD ; in the equality

$$\langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \langle (\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y}), \text{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial) \rangle$$

the left hand side $\langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle$ remains unchanged whereas the right hand side becomes

$$\tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}) - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \tau_g^{\partial Y} (D_{\partial Y} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

Summarizing, for each $s > 0$ we have

$$(3.39) \quad \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}) = \langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \tau_g^{\partial Y} (D_{\partial Y} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

Now we take the limit as $s \downarrow 0$. It is a general principle, explained in detail in [37], that the Getzler rescaling applies to the heat kernel in the b -context; needless to say, the geometry here is more complicated than in the case of a compact b -manifold endowed with a product b -metric. Still, we shall prove in the next section the following proposition, where all structures are assumed to be product-like near the boundary.

3.40. Proposition. *Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be a cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary endowed with a slice compatible metric. Let (Y, \mathbf{h}) be the associated b -manifold. Let D_0 be a G -equivariant Dirac operator of the form (2.5) and let D be the associated b -differential operator. Let g be a semisimple element and let Y_0^g the fixed point set of g . Then the limit $\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-})$ exists and we have*

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}) = \int_{Y_0^g} c_0^g \text{AS}_g(D_0)$$

with $c_0^g \text{AS}_g(D_0)$ defined in Equation (1.8).

Assuming the last Proposition we can infer that the limit

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \int_s^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \tau_g^{\partial Y} (D_{\partial Y} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

exists and equals

$$\int_{Y_0^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0) - \langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle.$$

We conclude that we have proved the following

3.41. Theorem. (*0-degree delocalized APS*)

Let G be connected, linear real reductive group. Let g be a semisimple element. Let $Y_0, Y, D, D_{\partial Y}$ as above. Assume that $D_{\partial Y}$ is L^2 -invertible. Then

$$\eta_g(D_{\partial Y}) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y}(D_{\partial Y} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y}^2) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

exists and for the pairing of the index class $\text{Ind}(D_\infty) \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)) \cong K_0(C^*(Y_0 \subset Y)^G)$ with the 0-cocycle $\tau_g^Y \in HC^0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y))$ the following delocalized 0-degree APS index formula holds:

$$\langle \tau_g^Y, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \int_{Y_0^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0) - \frac{1}{2} \eta_g(D_{\partial Y}),$$

where the integrand $c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0)$ is defined in the same way as the one in Equation (1.8).

4. DELOCALIZED ETA INVARIANTS FOR G -PROPER MANIFOLDS

In the previous section we have obtained the well-definedness of $\eta_g(D_\partial)$, with D_∂ being L^2 -invertible, as a byproduct of the proof of the delocalized APS index theorem for 0-degree cocycles. In fact, one can show that $\eta_g(D)$ is well defined on a cocompact G -proper manifold even if D does not arise as a boundary operator. This is the content of the next theorems, partially discussed also in [20, 21]. We assume as always when short time limits of the heat kernels are involved, that the metric is slice-compatible. The main result of this section is the following theorem.

4.1. Theorem. Let (X, \mathbf{h}) be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary endowed with a slice compatible G -equivariant metric and let D be a Dirac-type operator of the form (2.5). Let g be a semi-simple element. The integral

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

converges.

Proof. The theorem follows from Proposition 4.7 and 4.29 below. We briefly outline below the three-steps strategy of the proof.

- (1) Using Moscovici-Stanton's results for the eta integral on G/K , we show that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_1^\infty \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} < +\infty.$$

This is proved in Proposition 4.7.

- (2) Following Hochs-Wang, we write

$$\tau_g(D \exp(-tD^2)) = \int_X \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g).$$

Let W be an open subset of X containing the g fixed point submanifold X^g . We use a Gaussian estimate on the heat kernel to show that

$$\int_{X \setminus W} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g),$$

decays exponentially as $t \searrow 0$. This is proved in Proposition 4.25.

- (3) Apply Zhang's argument [58, section 2] to show that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \cdot \int_W \int_G c_G(y) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t(y, y)g)$$

is bounded as $t \searrow 0$. This is proved in Lemma 4.28.

□

4.3. Remark. The well-definedness of the eta integrand (4.2) is also discussed in [20, Proposition 4.14]. However, their approach is not very clear to us. Let us point out the following:

- (1) As already remarked, based on the vanishing result of Moscovici-Stanton (see [43, Corollary 4.7] and [8]), we do not need the L^2 -invertibility of D to ensure that (4.2) is convergent.
- (2) In our approach, it is crucial to assume that the metric is slice-compatible and the Dirac-type operator is associated to a Clifford connection (In [20], they work with general Dirac-type operators). Notice that for general Dirac-type operator (for example, perturbed Dirac operators), it is possible that (4.2) is divergent because the heat kernel might be singular near the fixed point set as $t \searrow 0$.

4.1. Large time behaviour. As already remarked, since the G -action on X is proper, we can write $X = G \times_K S$, where S is a K -equivariant slice. Because the metric on X is slice-compatible, the Dirac operator

$$D = D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_S$$

acts on

$$L^2(X, E) \cong [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes L^2(S, E_S)]^K.$$

Let A be the set of eigenvalues of the restriction of D_S on $L^2(S, E_S)$. For any $\lambda_i \in A$, we introduce $L^2(S, E_S)_{\lambda_i}$ the corresponding eigenspace and

$$(4.4) \quad V_i := [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes L^2(S, E_S)_{\lambda_i}]^K.$$

Moreover, we denote

$$[\exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)]_{\lambda_i}, \quad [D_{G,K} \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)]_{\lambda_i}$$

their restriction to V_i and κ_t^i and h_t^i their smoothing kernels.

4.5. Lemma. *Let $\tau_g^{G/K}$ be the trace defined in (3.8) associated to the orbital integral for g . Taking the pointwise trace on the coefficients of the kernel $\kappa_t^i(g)$ and $h_t^i(g)$, we get two functions $\text{tr}(\kappa_t^i)$ and $\text{tr}(h_t^i)$ in $\mathcal{C}(G)$. There is a uniform constant C such that for all $\lambda_i \in A$,*

$$\tau_g^{G/K} (|\text{tr}(\kappa_t^i)|) < C \cdot \text{multiplicity of } \lambda_i, \quad \tau_g^{G/K} (|\text{tr}(h_t^i)|) < C \cdot \text{multiplicity of } \lambda_i.$$

Proof. Note that $L^2(S, E_S)_{\lambda_i}$ is a finite dimensional K -space. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $L^2(S, E_S)_{\lambda_i}$ is an irreducible K -space, denoted by χ . Let κ_t^χ and h_t^χ that of

$$\exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{[L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes \chi]^K}, \quad D_{G,K} \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{[L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes \chi]^K}.$$

By [40, proposition 3.2] and comment below, there exists constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\chi \in \widehat{K}$,

$$|\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\chi)(g)| \leq C \cdot \frac{1}{t^{\frac{\dim G/K}{2}}} e^{-\frac{d^2(gK, eK)}{4t}}, \quad |\text{tr}(h_t^\chi)(g)| \leq C \cdot \frac{1}{t^{\frac{\dim G/K}{2} + 1}} e^{-\frac{d^2(gK, eK)}{4t}}.$$

Harish-Chandra showed in [16, Theorem 6] that

$$\int_G e^{-\frac{d^2(gK, eK)}{4t}} dg < +\infty.$$

This completes the proof. □

Moscovici-Stanton showed in [43, Corollary 4.7] the following theorem:

4.6. Theorem. *Let g be a semi-simple element in G . If g is regular and lies in a \mathbb{R} -rank one Cartan subgroup, then one can find constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \tau_g^{G/K} (D_{G,K} \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)) \right| \leq C_1 \cdot e^{-\frac{C_2}{t}} \cdot \frac{1}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Otherwise,

$$\tau_g^{G/K} (D_{G,K} \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)) = 0.$$

With the result above, we can get the following large time estimation of the eta integral:

4.7. Proposition. *The following integral converges:*

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_1^\infty \tau_g^X (D \exp(-tD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} < +\infty.$$

Proof. Because

$$D^2 = D_{G,K}^2 + D_S^2,$$

and

$$D \cdot \exp(-tD^2) = (D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1) \cdot \exp(-tD^2) + (1 \hat{\otimes} D_S) \cdot \exp(-tD^2),$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} [D \cdot \exp(-tD^2)]_{\lambda_i} &= e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot D_{G,K} \cdot \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2) \\ &\quad + \lambda_i e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.9) \quad \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) &= \tau_g^X \left(\sum_{i \in A} [D \exp(-tD^2)]_{\lambda_i} \right) \\ &= \tau_g^{G/K} \left(\sum_{i \in A} e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot (D_{G,K} \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{V_i}) \right) + \tau_g^{G/K} \left(\sum_{i \in A} \lambda_i e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot (\exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{V_i}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.5, we know that the right-hand side of (4.9) converge absolutely, and we can thus apply Fubini's theorem:

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} &\tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) \\ &= \sum_{i \in A} e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot \tau_g^{G/K} (D_{G,K} \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{V_i}) + \sum_{i \in A} \lambda_i e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot \tau_g^{G/K} (\exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{V_i}). \end{aligned}$$

We split

$$\int_1^\infty \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} = I_1 + I_2,$$

where

$$I_1 = \int_1^\infty \left(\sum_{i \in A} e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot \tau_g^{G/K} (D_{G,K} \exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{V_i}) \right) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

and

$$I_2 = \int_1^\infty \left(\sum_{i \in A} \lambda_i e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \cdot \tau_g^{G/K} (\exp(-tD_{G,K}^2)|_{V_i}) \right) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

By Theorem 4.6, we know that either $I_1 = 0$ or we can find a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|I_1| \leq C \cdot \int_1^\infty \left(\sum_{i \in A} e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \right) \frac{dt}{t^2} < +\infty.$$

To get an estimation for I_2 , we recall that [41, Proposition 3.1],

$$\tau_g^{G/K} (|\text{tr}(\kappa_t^i)|) \leq \tau_g^{G/K} (\text{tr}(\kappa_t^{\chi_0})) \cdot \text{multiplicity of } \lambda_i,$$

where χ_0 is the trivial K -representation. On the other hand, the term

$$\tau_g^{G/K} (\text{tr}(\kappa_t^{\chi_0}))$$

can be computed explicitly by [7, Theorem 6.1.1]. In particular, we can find a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t > 1$

$$\left| \tau_g^{G/K} (\text{tr}(\kappa_t^{\chi_0})) \right| \leq C.$$

Thus,

$$|I_2| \leq C \cdot \int_1^\infty \left(\sum_{i \in A} |\lambda_i| e^{-t\lambda_i^2} \right) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} < +\infty.$$

This completes the proof. \square

4.11. Remark. If D is L^2 -invertible we can alternatively prove Proposition 4.7 by applying [46, Remarks 2.12 and 2.13], which establishes a weighted exponential convergence of $\exp(-tD^2)$ and $D \exp(-tD^2)$ to the 0-operator in the Fréchet algebra $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$. In particular, the function $g(t) := \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2))/\sqrt{t}$ is integrable at $t = +\infty$. This result is valid for any G -invariant metric (that is, not necessarily slice-compatible) and any Dirac-type operator; it is based on a careful analysis of the resolvent $(D^2 - \lambda)^{-1}$.

4.2. Small time behavior. To study the small t convergence of the eta integral, we will need the following properties.

4.12. Lemma. *Let X be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary. Fix on X a slice compatible Riemannian metric \mathbf{h} . Let $d_X(-, -)$ be the associated distance function, and $d_G(-, -)$ be the distance function on G/K . Suppose that V is a compact set on X and g is a semi-simple element in G . There is a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that*

$$(4.13) \quad d_X(hgh^{-1}x, x) \geq d_G(hgh^{-1}e, e) - C_0, \quad \forall x \in V, h \in G.$$

where e is the coset associated to the identity element in G/K .

Proof. The slice theorem gives a fibration structure on $X = (G \times S)/K$ over G/K . Furthermore, when X is equipped with the slice compatible metric, the fibration map is a Riemannian submersion. Let π be the projection map from X to G/K . The Riemannian submersion property of π gives

$$d(hgh^{-1}x, x) \geq d(hgh^{-1}\pi(x), \pi(x)).$$

The triangle inequality gives

$$(4.14) \quad d(hgh^{-1}e, hgh^{-1}\pi(x)) + d(hgh^{-1}\pi(x), \pi(x)) + d(\pi(x), e) \geq d(hgh^{-1}e, e).$$

As V is compact, there is a finite upper bound $C/2$ such that $d(\pi(x), e) \leq C/2$ for all $x \in V$. Combining this with Equation (4.14), we conclude with the desired inequality. \square

4.15. Remark. It is obvious that Lemma 4.12 also holds if instead of (X, \mathbf{h}) , $V \subset X$ and, for (ii), $C(g)$ we consider:

- (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) , a cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary, with slice-compatible metric, product-type near the boundary;
- $V_0 \subset Y_0$ a compact set in Y_0 .

We also consider (Y, \mathbf{h}) , the G -manifold with cylindrical ends associated to (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) . Here we recall that there is a collar neighbourhood of ∂Y_0 in Y_0 where the action of G is of product type (and thus extendable to a G -proper action on (Y, \mathbf{h})). Notice that, consequently, the action of G preserves the decomposition $Y := (-\infty, 0] \times \partial Y_0 \cup_{\partial Y_0} Y_0$. Consider the compact subset $V_0 \subset Y_0$ and $V_0 \cap \partial Y_0$, denoted ∂V_0 if non-empty. Consider finally $V := (-\infty, 0] \times \partial V_0 \cup_{\partial V_0} V_0$. Lemma 4.12 also holds if we consider now (Y, \mathbf{h}) , V . Indeed (4.13) does hold if $x \in V_0 \subset Y_0$, as we have just observed, and also holds if $x \in (-\infty, 0] \times \partial V_0 \subset V \subset Y$ because the action of G is of product type along the cylinder.

The following property follows from [9, Proposition 4.2, (i)] because a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary has bounded geometry.

4.16. Lemma. *Let X be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary and let D be a Dirac-type operator (associated to a unitary Clifford action and a Clifford connection) on a spinor bundle \mathcal{E} . Let $\kappa_t(x, y)$ be the kernel function of the operator $D \exp(-tD^2)$. There are constant $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that*

$$\|\kappa_t(x, y)\| \leq \beta t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{d_X^2(x, y)}{t}\right).$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm from \mathcal{E}_x to \mathcal{E}_y .

4.17. Remark. Consider the heat kernel k_t associated to a Dirac-Laplacian on (Y, \mathbf{h}) , the G -proper manifold with cylindrical ends associated to a cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) . As (Y, \mathbf{h}) is a

complete manifold with bounded geometry we can apply again [9, Proposition 4.2, (i)] and conclude that there are constant $\alpha_0, \beta_0 > 0$ such that

$$(4.18) \quad \|k_t(x, y)\| \leq \beta_0 t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{d_Y(x, y)^2}{t}\right).$$

The following estimate is proved by Harish-Chandra [16, Theorem 6] (see also [22, Lemma 4.4]).

4.19. Lemma. *For a semisimple element g , when t is close to 0, the integral*

$$\int_{G/Z_g} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{d_G(hg^{-1}h^{-1}e, e)^2}{t}\right)$$

is bounded. We will sometimes use $d_G(g)$ for $d_G(ge, e)$ in the following of this article for abbreviation.

Below we provide a different proof of [22, Lemma 2.7] focusing on the case that G is a Lie group.

4.20. Lemma. *For a semisimple $g \in G$, the quotient X^g/Z_g is compact.*

Proof. If g is not conjugate to an element in K (that is, g is not elliptic) then X^g is empty (See Proposition 11.4). It suffices to work with $g = k_0 \in K$. By the slice theorem, we assume that $X = G \times_K S$. A point $[(h, x)]$ belongs to X^{k_0} if there is $k \in K$ such that $k_0 h = h k^{-1}$ and $kx = x$. Therefore,

$$X^{k_0} = \{(h, x) \in G \times_K S \mid h^{-1}k_0^{-1}h = k, kx = x\}.$$

Let π be the quotient map from $G \times S$ to $G \times_K S$. The space $\tilde{X}^{k_0} := \{(h, x) \in G \times S \mid h^{-1}k_0^{-1}h = k, kx = x\}$ as a subset of $G \times S$ is the preimage $\pi^{-1}(X^{k_0})$. As π is a principal K -bundle, \tilde{X}^{k_0} is a manifold. As the Z_{k_0} action on $X \times G$ commutes with the K action, it is sufficient to prove that $Z_{k_0} \backslash \tilde{X}^{k_0}$ is compact to conclude that $Z_{k_0} \backslash X^{k_0}$ is compact.

Consider the right conjugacy action of G on the conjugacy class $C(k_0^{-1}) = \{hk_0^{-1}h^{-1} \mid h \in G\}$. $C(k_0)$ is a closed submanifold of G , and the G action on $C(k_0^{-1})$ is transitive with the stabilizer group at k_0^{-1} being Z_{k_0} . We have that $C(k_0^{-1})$ is a diffeomorphic to $Z_{k_0} \backslash G$ and the map $f : G \rightarrow C(k_0^{-1})$ mapping g to $h^{-1}k_0^{-1}h$ is a fibration.

Consider the intersection $C(k_0, K) := C(k_0^{-1}) \cap K$, which is a compact subset. Let $F(k_0)$ be $f^{-1}(C(k_0^{-1}) \cap K)$. By the fibration property of f , $Z_{k_0} \backslash F(k_0)$ is homeomorphic to $C(k_0, K) := C(k_0^{-1}) \cap K$. For $C(k_0, K)$, we consider the closed space $I_{k_0, K} := \{(k, x) \mid k \in C(k_0, K), k_0 x = x\}$ of $K \times S$. The map $\tilde{f} : I_{k_0, K} \rightarrow C(k_0, K)$ mapping $(k, x) \in I_{k_0, K}$ to $k \in C(k_0, K)$ is a continuous surjective map.

Let $F(k_0)_f \times_{\tilde{f}} I_{k_0, K}$ be the fiber product of $F(k_0)$ and $I_{k_0, K}$ over the maps $f|_{F(k_0)}$ and \tilde{f} . As f is a fibration, $F(k_0)_f \times_{\tilde{f}} I_{k_0, K}$ can be identified with $\tilde{X}^{k_0} = \{(g, x) \mid g \in C(k_0, K), x \in S^{f(g)}\}$.

With the above identification, the quotient of \tilde{X}^{k_0} by Z_{k_0} is homeomorphic to

$$Z_{k_0} \backslash \left(F(k_0)_f \times_{\tilde{f}} I_{k_0, K} \right) = (Z_{k_0} \backslash F(k_0))_f \times_{\tilde{f}} I_{k_0, K},$$

which is homeomorphic to $I_{k_0, K}$ as $Z_{k_0} \backslash F(k_0)$ is homeomorphic to $C(k_0, K)$. As a closed subspace of $K \times S$, $I_{k_0, K}$ is compact. We conclude that $Z_{k_0} \backslash \tilde{X}^{k_0}$ is compact. \square

For an elliptic element g , the fixed point set could be non-empty. To tackle this situation, let c_G be a cut-off function associated to the right Z_g action on G . Following [22, Lemma 3.2], we have the following equivalent expression for $\tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.21) \quad \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) &= \int_{G/Z_g} \int_X c(y) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, hgh^{-1}y) hgh^{-1}) dy dh (Z_g) \\
&= \int_G c_G(h) \int_X c(y) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, hgh^{-1}y) hgh^{-1}) dy dh \\
&= \int_X \int_G c_G(h) c(y) \operatorname{tr}(h\kappa_t(h^{-1}y, gh^{-1}y) gh^{-1}) dh dy \\
&= \int_X \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy) g) dh dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that V is the support of the cut-off function c . We apply Lemma 4.12 to V and conclude that there is a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$d_X(hgh^{-1}x, x) \geq d_G(hgh^{-1}e, e) - C_0, \forall x \in V, h \in G.$$

We introduce two subsets of the conjugacy class $C(g)$, i.e.

$$K(g) := \{g \in C(g) \mid d_G(ge, e) \leq 2C_0\}, \quad K^c(g) := \{g \in C(g) \mid d_G(ge, e) > 2C_0\}.$$

Define a map $\chi : G \rightarrow C(g)$ by $\chi(h) := hgh^{-1}$. Let $U(g)$ be the subset of G defined to be the preimage of $K(g)$. And let $U^c(g)$ be the complement of $U(g)$ in G . As g is semisimple, $C(g)$ is a closed subset of G , and therefore the image of $K(g)$ in G/K is a bounded closed subset. Therefore, the image of $K(g)$ in G/K is compact, and $K(g)$ is compact. Observe that $U(g)$ is invariant under the right Z_g action and the quotient $U(g)/Z_g$ is diffeomorphic to $K(g)$. So $U(g)/Z_g$ is also compact. We split the integral (4.21) into two parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) &= \int_X \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy) g) dh dy \\
&= \int_X \int_{U(g)} c_G(h) c(hy) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy) g) dh dy + \int_X \int_{U^c(g)} c_G(h) c(hy) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy) g) dh dy.
\end{aligned}$$

4.22. Lemma. *Let \widetilde{W} be a closed subset of X . The integral*

$$(4.23) \quad I_{\widetilde{W}, U^c}^t(g) := \int_{\widetilde{W}} \int_{U^c(g)} c_G(h) c(hy) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy) g) dh dy$$

is of exponential decay as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the property for $\widetilde{W} = X$. We rewrite the integral (4.23) by applying the change of variable $x = hy$.

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{U^c}^t(g) &:= \int_X \int_{U^c(g)} c_G(h) c(x) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(x, hgh^{-1}x) hgh^{-1}) dh dx \\
&= \int_{U^c(g)} c_G(h) \int_V c(x) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(x, hgh^{-1}x) hgh^{-1}) dh dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.16, we have the following estimate for $|\operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(x, hgh^{-1}x) hgh^{-1})|$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\kappa_t(x, hgh^{-1}x)| &\leq \beta t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{d_X^2(x, hgh^{-1}x)}{t}\right), \\
|\operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(x, hgh^{-1}x) hgh^{-1})| &\leq \tilde{\beta} t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{d_X^2(x, hgh^{-1}x)}{t}\right), \quad \forall x \in X.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 4.12, we get

$$d_X(x, hgh^{-1}x) \geq d_X(hgh^{-1}e, e) - C_0.$$

By the definition of $U^c(g)$, for $h \in U^c(g)$, we have

$$d_X(x, hgh^{-1}x) \geq C_0, \quad d_X(x, hgh^{-1}x) \geq \frac{1}{2} d_G(hgh^{-1}e, e).$$

Hence, we have the estimate

$$|\mathrm{tr}(\kappa_t(x, hgh^{-1}x)hgh^{-1})| \leq \tilde{\beta}t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{C_0^2}{2t}\right) \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{d_G^2(hgh^{-1}e, e)}{8t}\right).$$

As V is compact, the integral

$$\int_V c(x)dx$$

is finite. And $I_{U^c}^t(g)$ can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{U^c}^t(g)| &\leq \gamma t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{C_0^2}{2t}\right) \int_{U^c(g)} c(g) \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{d_G^2(hgh^{-1}e, e)}{8t}\right) dh \\ &\leq \gamma t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{C_0^2}{2t}\right) \int_{G/Z_g} \left(-\alpha\frac{d_G^2(hgh^{-1}e, e)}{8t}\right) d(hZ_g). \end{aligned}$$

This implies the exponential decay property of $I_{U^c}^t(g)$. \square

Let W be an open subset of X containing the g fixed point submanifold X^g .

4.24. Lemma. *The integral*

$$I_{W^c, U}^t(g) := \int_{W^c} \int_{U(g)} c_G(h)c(hy)\mathrm{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g)dhd y$$

converges exponentially to 0 as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Because $U(g)/Z_g$ is compact and c_G is the cut-off function for the Z_g -action on G , we know that c_G is compactly supported on $U(g)$. Moreover, since c is compactly supported, the properness of the G action on X implies that the function

$$\tilde{c}(y) := \int_{U(g)} c_G(h)c(hy)dh$$

is also compactly supported. Let \tilde{V} be the support of \tilde{c} . And $I_{W^c, U}^t(g)$ can be expressed as

$$\int_{W^c \cap \tilde{V}} \tilde{c}(y)\mathrm{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g)dy.$$

Using Lemma 4.16, we have the estimate

$$|\mathrm{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g)| \leq \tilde{\beta}t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{d_X^2(y, gy)}{t}\right) \forall y \in X.$$

As $W^c \cap \tilde{V}$ is compact and does not contain any g fixed point, there is a positive ϵ_0 such that

$$d_X(y, gy) \geq \epsilon_0, \quad \forall y \in W^c \cap \tilde{V}.$$

We can bound $I_{W^c, U}^t(g)$ using the above estimate about $d(y, gy)$,

$$|I_{W^c, U}^t(g)| \leq \tilde{\beta}t^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{t}\right) \int_{W^c \cap \tilde{V}} |\tilde{c}(y)|dy.$$

This gives the exponential decay property of $I_{W^c, U}^t(g)$. \square

We can summarize Lemma 4.22 and 4.24 in the following result.

4.25. Proposition. *Given any open set W containing the g fixed point submanifold X^g , then the integral*

$$I_{W^c}^t(g) := \int_{W^c} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\mathrm{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g)dhd y = I_{W^c, U}^t(g) + I_{W^c, U^c}^t(g).$$

decay exponentially to zero at $t \rightarrow 0$. When W is assumed to be g invariant, $I_{W^c}^t(g)$ has the following expression under change of coordinates

$$I_{W^c}^t(g) = \int_{W^c} \int_G c_G(h)c(hgx)\mathrm{tr}(\kappa_t(x, gx)g)dhd x.$$

Let W be a sufficiently small neighborhood of X^g . Using the Z_g -invariant tubular neighborhood theorem, we can identify W to be an r -ball bundle $N(r)$ in the normal bundle N of X^g in X with a sufficiently small radius r . Define c_g , a smooth function on X , by

$$c_g(x) := \int_G c_G(h)c(hgx)dh.$$

4.26. Lemma. *The function c_g is a cut-off function for the Z_g -action on X . In particular, for any $x \in X$,*
(1) *the integral*

$$\int_{Z_g} c_g(hx) = 1;$$

(2) *Let $q : X \rightarrow X/Z_g$ be the quotient map. The intersection of the support of c_g with $q^{-1}(V')$ is compact for any compact subset V' in X/Z_g .*

4.27. Remark. Part (1) of Lemma 4.26 is proved in [22, Lemma 4.11].

Proof. For part (1), compute that

$$\int_{Z_g} c_g(zx)dz = \int_{Z_g} \int_G c_G(h)c(hgzx) dh dz = \int_{Z_g} \int_G c_G(h'z'^{-1})c(h'x) dh dz = 1$$

where we substitute $h' = hgz$ and $z' = gz$.

For part (2), suppose that V' is a compact subset in X/Z_g . The intersection of the support of c_g with $q^{-1}(V')$ consists is the closure of the following set,

$$Q_g(V') := \{x \in X : c_g(x) \neq 0, q(x) \in V'\}.$$

Recall that

$$c_g(x) = \int_G c_G(h)c(hgx)dh$$

Hence, $c_g(x) \neq 0$ if and only if there is some h such

$$c_G(h) \neq 0, \text{ and } c(hgx) \neq 0.$$

Using this characterization of $c_g(x) \neq 0$, we have

$$Q_g(V') = \{x \in X : \exists h \in G, c_G(h) \neq 0, c(hgx) \neq 0, q(x) \in V'\}.$$

Observe that g commutes with Z_g . So g acts on the quotient X/Z_g , and the map $q : X \rightarrow X/Z_g$ is g -equivariant. Hence, substituting $x' = gx$, we obtain the following expression,

$$Q_g(V') = g^{-1}(\{x' \in X : \exists h \in G, c_G(h) \neq 0, c(hx') \neq 0, q(x') \in g^{-1}(V')\}).$$

As V' is compact in X/Z_g , $g^{-1}(V')$ is also compact. We can assume without loss of generality that $q^{-1}(g^{-1}(V'))$ is of the form

$$q^{-1}(g^{-1}(V')) = Z_g V'',$$

where V'' is a compact subset of X .

Consider the set $G(V'') := \{h | \exists x' \in V'', c(gx') \neq 0\}$. Using the following properties

- the set V'' is compact,
- the support of c is compact,
- the G action on X is proper,

we conclude that $G(V'')$ is relatively compact.

Consider the set $P_g(V'') := \{h | c(hx') \neq 0, \exists x' \in Z_g V''\}$. We have the property that $P_g(V'') = G(V'')Z_g$. Hence, we conclude from the relative compactness of $G(V'')$ that $P_g(V'')/Z_g$ is relatively compact.

Consider the set $R_g(V'') := \{h | \exists x' \in Z_g V'', c_G(h) \neq 0, c(hx') \neq 0\}$. $R_g(V'')$ is the intersection of $P_g(V'')$ with the support of c_G . As c_G is a cutoff function of the right Z_g action on G , we conclude from the relative compactness of $P_g(V'')/Z_g$ that $R_g(V'')$ is compact.

Observe that the set

$$g(Q_g(V)) = \{x' \in X : \exists h \in G, c_G(h) \neq 0, c(hx') \neq 0, x' \in qx' \in g^{-1}(V')\}$$

is a subset of

$$\{x' \in X : \exists h \in R_g(V''), c(gx') \neq 0\}.$$

As $R_g(V'')$ is compact, we conclude from the compactness of the support of c and properness of the G action that $g(Q_g(V'))$ is relatively compact, and therefore $Q_g(V')$ is also relatively compact. \square

The integral

$$I_{N(r)}^t(g) := \int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hgy) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g) dh dy$$

can be expressed by

$$\int_{N(r)} c_g(y) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g) dy.$$

By Lemma 4.26, we know that the set X^g/Z_g is compact. Thus $N(r)/Z_g$ is relatively compact. It follows from Lemma 4.26 that c_g has relative compact support in $N(r)$ and is a smooth function on $N(r)$ with bounded derivatives. This allows us to use the method and estimates in the proof of [58, Equation (2.2)] to prove the following lemma.

4.28. Lemma. *The integral $I_{N(r)}^t(g)$ satisfies*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_{N(r)}^t(g)}{\sqrt{t}} < +\infty.$$

Proof. We use the local asymptotic expansion [58, Equation (2.16)]

$$g\kappa_t(y, g) = \frac{e^{-\frac{d_X(y, gy)^2}{4t}}}{(4\pi t)^{\frac{n}{2}}} dg \left[\sum_i (((dg - I)y)_i e_i) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{[n/2]+2} U_i t^i + o(t^{[n/2]+2}) \right) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{[n/2]+2} V_i t^i + o(t^{[n/2]+2}) \right) \right].$$

In [58], the author assumed to work with an isometry group action on a closed manifold M . For our case, as the support c_g in $N(r)$ is relatively compact and g is contained in the group Z_g which acts properly on $N(r)$, the author's analysis in [58, Section 2] in the tubular neighborhood $N(r)$ is also valid in our case near $\operatorname{supp}(c_g) \cap N(r)$. We refer to [58, Section 2] for the explanation of the above formula.

We use the above formula to compute $c_g(y) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g)$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_g(y) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g) &= \\ \frac{e^{-\frac{d(y, gy)^2}{4t}}}{(4\pi t)^{\frac{n}{2}}} dg &\left[\sum_i (((dg - I)y)_i e_i) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{[n/2]+2} c_g(y) U_i t^i + o(t^{[n/2]+2}) \right) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{[n/2]+2} c_g(y) V_i t^i + o(t^{[n/2]+2}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Apply [58, Lemma 2.17] to the integral of each term in the above expansion of $c_g(y) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g)$. We can conclude the estimate in the lemma following the same argument as the one for [58, Equation (2.2)], that is,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} |c_g(y) \operatorname{tr}(\kappa_t(y, gy)g)| < C$$

for some constant $C > 0$. \square

Combing Proposition 4.25 and Lemma 4.28, we have reached the following proposition.

4.29. Proposition. *Let X be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary and let D be a Dirac-type operator of the form (2.5). Let g be a semi-simple element in G . The integral*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^1 \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

converges.

4.30. **Example.** Suppose that $X = G = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $g = e^{i\theta}$. This is a free-action case. We can compute the eta integrant directly. By Theorem 4.6 and [7, Theorem 6.1.1], we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} n e^{-tn^2} \cdot \tau_g^{G/K} \left(\exp(-tD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{[L^2(G) \otimes \mathbb{C}_n]^K} \right) \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} n e^{-tn^2} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i\theta n + ny}}{\sinh(i\theta + y)} \cdot e^{-\frac{y^2}{2t}} \frac{dy}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} n e^{-tn^2} \cdot e^{i\theta n + ny} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sinh(i\theta + y)} \cdot e^{-\frac{y^2}{2t}} \frac{dy}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{-\frac{\theta^2}{4t} - \frac{y^2}{4t}} \frac{i\theta + y}{\sinh(i\theta + y)} \cdot e^{-\frac{y^2}{2t}} \right) \frac{dy}{t} \\ &= e^{-\frac{\theta^2}{4t}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{i\theta + y}{\sinh(i\theta + y)} \cdot e^{-\frac{y^2}{4t}} \right) \frac{dy}{t} \end{aligned}$$

Because

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{i\theta + y}{\sinh(i\theta + y)} dy < +\infty,$$

one can find a uniform constant C such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{i\theta + y}{\sinh(i\theta + y)} \cdot e^{-\frac{y^2}{4t}} \right) dy < C$$

for all $0 < t < +\infty$. Thus,

$$|\tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2))| < C \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{\theta^2}{4t}}}{t}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} < \frac{C}{\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{\theta^2}{4t}} \frac{dt}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} < +\infty.$$

4.3. **Short time limits.** If we replace $D \exp(-sD^2)$ by $\exp(-sD^2)$, a similar argument as in Theorem 4.1 proves the topological formula stated in [22, Theorem 2.8] for the pairing between τ_g and the index element $\text{ind}_G(D)$ for a Dirac type operator D on a G -proper cocompact manifold X without boundary, as we shall now explain. We know that

$$\langle \text{Ind}_G(D), \tau_g \rangle = \langle \text{Ind}(D), \tau_g^X \rangle = \tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}).$$

We compute the left hand side by taking the limit as $s \downarrow 0$ and using the following

4.31. **Theorem.** *Let (X, h) be a cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary endowed with a slice compatible metric. Assume that X , G/K , and the slice S are all even dimensional. Let D be a G -equivariant Dirac operator of the form (2.5). Let g be a semi-simple element and let X^g be the fixed point set of g . Then the limit $\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tau_g(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-})$ exists and we have*

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}) = \int_{X^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D)$$

with $c^g \text{AS}_g(D)$ defined in Equation (1.8). Consequently we obtain the following formula

$$\langle \text{Ind}(D), \tau_g^X \rangle = \int_{X^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D).$$

Proof. Let k_s be the kernel of the heat operator $\exp(-sD^2)$. Observe that in term of supertrace, $\tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-})$ can be written as the integral

$$(4.32) \quad J(s) := \int_{G/Z_g} \int_X c(hgh^{-1}x) \text{str}(hgh^{-1}k_{s^2}(hg^{-1}h^{-1}x, x)) dx d(hZ).$$

By a similar computation as in Equation (4.21), we can express $J(s)$ defined by Equation (4.32) as follows,

$$J(s) = \int_X \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g)dydh,$$

where c_G is the cut-off function associated to the right Z_g action on G . We can follow the exactly same strategy as in Section 4.2 to study the limit of $J(s)$ as $s \rightarrow 0$. Below is a brief outline of steps.

- (1) We observe that the analysis on the small time behavior the operator $D \exp(-sD^2)$ in Section 4.2 also holds for the operator $\exp(-sD^2)$. In particular, similar to Lemma 4.16, there are constant $\alpha_0, \beta_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|k_s(x, y)\| \leq \beta_0 s^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{d_X(x, y)^2}{s}\right).$$

- (2) Similar to Proposition 4.25, using the above Gaussian estimate of the heat kernel $k_t(x, y)$, we prove that given any Z_g -invariant open set W containing the g fixed point submanifold X^g , the integral

$$J_{W^c}(s) := \int_{W^c} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g)dhd y = \int_{W^c} \int_G c_G(h)c(hgx)\text{str}(k_{s^2}(x, gx)g)dhd x$$

decays exponentially to zero as $s \rightarrow 0$. The last equality holds because of the invariance property of W .

- (3) Following Lemma 4.28, we choose W to be an r -ball bundle $N(r)$ in the normal bundle N of X^g in X with a sufficiently small radius r . For the integral

$$J_{N(r)}(s) := \int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g)dhd y,$$

we follow the local analysis as in the proofs [5, Theorem 6.16] and [22, Proposition 4.12] to get

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} J_{N(r)}(s) = \int_{X^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D).$$

Combining the above (1)-(3), we reach the desired equality

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^X(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}) = \int_{X^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D).$$

□

4.33. Remark. Theorem 4.31 was originally stated by Hochs and Wang [22, Theorem 2.8]. Our strategy of proof is almost identical to the one in [22]. However, our proof does not use the inequality (4.6) in [22] for the heat kernel $\tilde{\kappa}_t^{G,K}$, the proof of which is not clear to us. Instead, we use the global Gaussian estimates for the heat kernel e^{-tD^2} , c.f. Lemma 4.16, in order to establish the exponential decay property of $\tau_g(\exp(-tD^2))$ outside a neighborhood W of the fixed point submanifold X^g as in Proposition 4.25.

We are now in the position to prove Proposition 3.40 that we restate here for the benefit of the reader:

Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be a cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary endowed with a slice compatible metric. Let (Y, \mathbf{h}) be the associated b -manifold. Let D_0 be a G -equivariant Dirac operator of the form (2.5) and let D be the associated b -differential operator. Let g be a semisimple element and let Y_0^g the fixed point set of g . Then the limit $\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-})$ exists and we have

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}) = \int_{Y_0^g} c_0^g \text{AS}_g(D_0)$$

with $c_0^g \text{AS}_g(D_0)$ defined in Equation (1.8).

Proof. Let k_t be the kernel of the heat operator $\exp(-tD^2)$. By definition

$$\tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-})$$

is equal to

$$(4.34) \quad {}^b J(s) := \int_{G/Z_g} \int_Y^b c(hgh^{-1}y) \operatorname{str}(hgh^{-1}k_{s^2}(hg^{-1}h^{-1}y, y)) dy d(hZ)$$

with dy denoting the b -density associated to the b -metric \mathbf{h} . We claim that the following expression holds:

$$(4.35) \quad {}^b J(s) = \int_Y^b \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \operatorname{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g) dh dy$$

where c_G is the cut-off function associated to the right Z_g action on G . In order to prove (4.35) we make a preliminary remark. The spaces of b -pseudodifferential operators ${}^b \mathcal{A}_G^c(Y, E)$ and ${}^b \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)$ have been defined in terms of the slice theorem, as projective tensor products. We could have defined these operators directly, in terms of a b -stretched product $Y \times_b Y$. Proceeding exactly as in [27, Chapter 4] we see that $Y \times_b Y$ inherits an action of $G \times G$; in particular, it makes sense to consider $L_{(h, h')}^* \exp(-tD^2)$ which is a smoothing b -kernel (not G -invariant unless $h = h'$). Coming back to the claim, we can rewrite the right hand side of (4.34) as

$$\int_{G/Z_g} \int_Y^b c(y) \operatorname{str}(\kappa_{s^2}(y, hgh^{-1}y)hgh^{-1}) dy d(hZ)$$

which is in turn equal to

$$(4.36) \quad \int_G c_G(h) \int_Y^b c(y) \operatorname{str}(\kappa_{s^2}(y, hgh^{-1}y)hgh^{-1}) dy dh.$$

Consider the smoothing b -kernel

$$\Xi_g(h) := L_{e, hgh^{-1}}^*(\exp(-(sD)^2));$$

we have that

$$(4.37) \quad \int_G c_G(h) \int_Y^b c(y) \operatorname{str}(\kappa_{s^2}(y, hgh^{-1}y)hgh^{-1}) dy dh = \int_G c_G(h) \int_Y^b c(y) \operatorname{str}(\kappa(\Xi_g(h)))(y, y) dy dh.$$

Write $\int_Y^b c(y) \operatorname{str}(\kappa(\Xi_g(h)))(y, y) dy$ as

$$\int_{Y_0} c_0(y_0) \operatorname{str}(\kappa(\Xi_g(h)))(y_0, y_0) dy_0 + \int_{(-\infty, 0]_t \times \partial Y_0}^b c_0(x) \operatorname{str}(\kappa(\Xi_g(h)))(t, x, t, x) dt dx.$$

Consider the function $F_g(h)$ on Y , so defined:

- $F_g(h)(y) := c_0(y_0) \operatorname{str}(\kappa(\Xi_g(h)))(y_0, y_0)$ if $y = y_0 \in Y_0$;
- $F_g(h)(y) := -t \frac{d}{dt} (c_0(x) \operatorname{str}(\kappa(\Xi_g(h)))(t, x, t, x))$ if $y = (t, x) \in (-\infty, 0]_t \times \partial Y_0$.

The function $F_g(h)$ is discontinuous at ∂Y_0 , a set of measure 0, but it is otherwise smooth. By [33, Prop. 2.6] we have that

$$\int_G c_G(h) \int_Y^b c(y) \operatorname{str}(\kappa(\Xi_g(h)))(y, y) dy dh = \int_G \int_Y c_G(h) F_g(h) dy dh.$$

We know that the double integral on the right hand side is absolutely convergent; we can now proceed as in [22], use Fubini's theorem and interchange the two integrals in the right hand side of the above formula, obtaining

$$\int_Y \int_G c_G(h) F_g(h) dy dh.$$

Going back to the b -integral we obtaining finally that (4.36) is equal to

$$\int_Y^b \int_G c_G(h) c(y) \operatorname{str}(\kappa_{s^2}(y, hgh^{-1}y)hgh^{-1}) dy dh$$

which is easily seen to be equal to

$$\int_Y^b \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \operatorname{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g) dh dy$$

as claimed. Summarizing:

$$(4.38) \quad \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^- D^+}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2 D^+ D^-}) = \int_Y \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g) dh dy.$$

We now consider the fixed point set $Y_0^g \subset Y_0$ and the associated $Y^g \subset Y$. We fix a Z_g -invariant open set W_0 containing Y_0^g and the associated $W \subset Y$ containing Y^g . We choose W_0 to be an r -ball bundle $N_0(r)$ in the normal bundle N_0 of Y_0^g in Y_0 with a sufficiently small radius r . We can then decompose the right hand side of (4.38) as:

$$(4.39) \quad \int_{W^c} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g) dh dy + \int_W \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g) dh dy$$

Recall that if Z is a b -manifold obtained from a manifold with boundary Z_0 and ϕ is a b -density obtained as an extension from Z_0 of a density ϕ_0 on Z_0 , then

$$\int_Z \phi = \int_{Z_0} \phi_0.$$

In particular if c_0 is a cut-off function for the G action on Y_0 and c is obtained by extending constantly along the cylindrical end, then

$$\int_Y c(y) d\text{vol}_b = \int_{Y_0} c_0(y_0) d\text{vol}.$$

Thanks to Remark 4.17 we know that there are constant $\alpha_0, \beta_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|k_t(x, y)\| \leq \beta_0 t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{d_Y(x, y)^2}{t}\right).$$

Using this global Gaussian estimate and proceeding exactly as in the closed case we find that the first integral in (4.39) converges exponentially to 0 (here we use the above remark about the cut-off function c ; it is not compactly supported but its b -integral is equal to the integral of a compactly supported function). We are left with the second integral in (4.39). In this case Y_0^g is compact and $W_0 := N_0(r)$ is relatively compact; put it differently, Y^g and W are obtained attaching cylinders to compact (respectively relatively compact) spaces. We can thus analyze

$$\int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{str}(k_{s^2}(y, gy)g) dh dy$$

using Getzler rescaling and find that the limit as $s \downarrow 0$ of this double integral is equal to

$$\int_{Y^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D).$$

As all the structures are product-like near the boundary we see that

$$\int_{Y^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D) = \int_{Y_0^g} c_0^g \text{AS}_g(D_0)$$

which is what we wanted to prove. \square

5. MODIFIED DELOCALIZED ETA INVARIANTS

Let (X, \mathbf{h}) be a cocompact G -proper manifold of odd dimension. As we have assumed G/K is of even dimension in Sec. 2, the slice S is of odd dimension. In this section we shall prove a number of results on delocalized eta invariants associated to *perturbed* Dirac operator. More precisely we shall consider:

- the delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(\vartheta)$ associated to a global perturbation D_ϑ of D defined in terms of a perturbation the operator on the slice S ; here ϑ is a positive real number, smaller than the first positive eigenvalue of D_S ; we shall also study the limit as $\vartheta \downarrow 0$ of $\eta_g(\vartheta)$;

- the delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(\Theta)$, defined in terms of a perturbation D_Θ of the operator D on X , defined under a gap assumption at 0 for D ; also in this case we shall study the limit of $\eta_g(\Theta)$ as $\Theta \downarrow 0$;
- the delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(D + B^\infty)$ with B^∞ an element in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E)$ making the operator $D + B^\infty$ invertible.

5.1. Spectrum on the slice. For any irreducible K -representation V , we define the induced equivariant vector bundle $E_V = G \times_K V$ and the Dirac operator $D_{G,K}^V$ acting on

$$L^2(G/K, S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes E_V) \cong [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes V]^K,$$

with index

$$\text{D-Ind}(V) \in K_*(C_r^*G).$$

The above construction is known as *Dirac induction* [4, Section 4]. The Connes-Kasparov theorem is stated as follow:

5.1. Theorem ([26, 56]). *The map*

$$(5.2) \quad V \mapsto D\text{-Ind}(V)$$

defines an isomorphism

$$R(K) \cong K_0(C_r^*G),$$

and $K_1(C_r^*G) = 0$.

5.3. Definition. Let V be an irreducible K -representation with highest weight μ . Let $R(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$ be the set of roots. Moreover, we denote by ρ_K the half sum of positive compact roots. We say that the representation V is *regular* if

$$\langle \mu + \rho_K, \alpha \rangle \neq 0$$

for all $\alpha \in R(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$. Otherwise, we say that it is *singular*.

5.4. Remark. By the work of Atiyah-Schmid [2], when G is of equal rank, i.e., G has a discrete series representation, we have the following

- If V is a regular K -representation, then $D_{G,K}^V$ is L^2 -invertible on

$$[L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}}^- \otimes V]^K,$$

and the kernel on

$$[L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}}^+ \otimes V]^K,$$

is given by an irreducible discrete series representation of G . Moreover, 0 is isolated in the spectrum.

- If V is singular with highest weight μ , then (see [24, Theorem 7.4.6])

$$\ker(D_{G,K}^V) = 0.$$

However, the index class

$$0 \neq \text{D-Ind}(V) \in K_0(C_r^*G).$$

As in Barbasch-Moscovici [3], we compute that

$$(D_{G,K}^V)^2 = -\text{Casimir of } G + \|\mu + \rho_K\|^2 - \|\rho\|^2.$$

and identify explicitly the spectrum of $(D_{G,K}^V)^2$ using representation theory. In particular, 0 lies in the continuous spectrum of $(D_{G,K}^V)^2$.

Both X and S are odd dimensional manifolds. Let E_S be the ungraded twisted spinor bundle on S . Then the ungraded spinor bundle on X can be written as

$$E \cong G \times_K (S_{\mathfrak{p}}^+ \otimes E_S) \bigoplus G \times_K (S_{\mathfrak{p}}^- \otimes E_S)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L^2(X, E) &\cong [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}}^+ \otimes L^2(S, E_S)]^K \bigoplus [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}}^- \otimes L^2(S, E_S)]^K \\ &= L_+^2(X, E) \bigoplus L_-^2(X, E) \end{aligned}$$

The grading operator γ is given by

$$(5.5) \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Accordingly, the Dirac operator

$$D = D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_S$$

can be rewritten as

$$D = D_{G,K} \otimes 1 + \gamma \otimes D_S,$$

where $\hat{\otimes}$ is the graded tensor product and \otimes denotes the ungraded tensor product. In particular,

$$\gamma \cdot D_{G,K} + D_{G,K} \cdot \gamma = 0, \quad D^2 = D_{G,K}^2 + D_S^2.$$

5.6. Lemma. *We have the following connection between D and D_S .*

- (1) *The operator D is L^2 -invertible if and only if the operator D_S is L^2 -invertible;*
- (2) *when G is of equal rank, 0 is isolated in the spectrum of D if and only if the kernel of D_S contains only regular K -representations.*

Proof. Because

$$D^2 = D_{G,K}^2 + D_S^2,$$

the invertibility of D_S implies that of D . On the other hand, if D_S is not L^2 -invertible and has kernel

$$V = \ker(D_S) \subseteq L^2(S, E_S),$$

which is a finite dimensional subspace invariant under the K -action. We consider the following Hilbert space

$$(5.7) \quad [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes V]^K \subseteq [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes L^2(S, E_S)]^K,$$

and restrict the operator $D = D_{G,K} \otimes 1$ to it, which we denote by $D_{G,K}^V$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that V is an irreducible K -representation. By Theorem 5.1,

$$0 \neq \text{D-Ind}(V) \in K_0(C_r^*G).$$

Thus, $D_{G,K}^V$ cannot be L^2 -invertible. This proves (1). The second part comes from Remark 5.4 with the assumption that G has equal rank. \square

5.8. Remark. From Remark 5.4 and Lemma 5.6, we can see that 0 is an isolated point in the spectrum of D only if G has discrete series representations, i.e. G has equal rank, and $\ker D_S$ contains only regular K -representations.

5.2. Delocalized eta invariants associated to perturbations on the slice. We use the same notations as in the previous subsection.

5.9. Definition. For any $\vartheta > 0$, let us introduce the perturbed Dirac operator

$$D_\vartheta = D + \gamma \cdot \vartheta.$$

Let κ_t^ϑ be the smoothing kernel for the

$$D_\vartheta \cdot e^{-tD_\vartheta^2}.$$

For any small number $s > 0$, we split the integral

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_s^\infty \tau_g^X(D_\vartheta \exp(-tD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} &= \int_s^\infty \int_X \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \int_s^\infty \int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &\quad + \int_s^\infty \int_{N^c(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the integral

$$\int_s^\infty \tau_g^X(D_\vartheta \exp(-tD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

might be divergent as $s \rightarrow 0$. The reason is that D_ϑ is no longer associated to a Clifford connection and thus

$$\int_s^\infty \int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

will in general tend to infinity as $s \rightarrow 0$.

5.11. Proposition. For the terms in the righthand side of (5.10), the following holds

(1) The integrand of the first summand has the asymptotic expansion [58, Section 2]:

$$\int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \sim t^{-\frac{\dim X+1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^\infty a_i(r) \cdot t^i \right)$$

We define

$$A(r): = \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

as the coefficient of s^0 in this asymptotic expansion.

(2) The integral

$$\int_{N^c(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy$$

is of exponential decay as $t \rightarrow 0$. And thus

$$\begin{aligned} B(r): &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \int_s^\infty \int_{N^c(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{N^c(r)} \int_G c_G(h)c(hy)\text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dhdy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \end{aligned}$$

is well defined.

Proof. Part (i) follows from the similar arguments as in Lemma 4.28 via asymptotic expansion [58, Section 2]. And Part (ii) follows from the same arguments as in Proposition 4.25. We leave the details to the reader. \square

5.12. **Definition.** For the perturbed Dirac operator D_ϑ , we define the *regularized eta invariant* as

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta_g(\vartheta) &= \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \tau_g^X((D_\vartheta) \exp(-tD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= A(r) + B(r). \end{aligned}$$

5.14. **Lemma.** *The regularized eta invariant $\eta_g(\vartheta)$ is independent of the choice of r .*

Proof. Suppose that $r' > r > 0$ are two small constants. We want to show that

$$A(r) + B(r) = A(r') + B(r').$$

By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A(r') &= \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \int_{N(r')} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \int_{N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &\quad + \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \int_{N(r') \setminus N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because

$$\int_{N(r') \setminus N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy$$

is of exponential decay as $t \rightarrow 0$, the following limit is finite,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \int_{N(r') \setminus N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{N(r') \setminus N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$A(r') = A(r) + \int_0^\infty \int_{N(r') \setminus N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

On the other hand, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} B(r) &= \int_0^\infty \int_{N^c(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= B(r') + \int_0^\infty \int_{N(r') \setminus N(r)} \int_G c_G(h) c(hy) \text{tr}(\kappa_t^\vartheta(y, gy)g) dh dy \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$A(r) + B(r) = A(r') + B(r').$$

□

5.15. **Proposition.** *The following identities hold*

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\vartheta \downarrow 0} \eta_g(\vartheta) &= \eta_g(D) + \langle D\text{-Ind}(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g \rangle \\ &= \eta_g(D) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_g^X(\gamma e^{-tD^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We shall adapt to the present context an argument due to Melrose, see [37, Prop. 8.38].

Let us break

$$\eta_g(\vartheta) := \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^1 \tau_g^X((D_\vartheta) \exp(-sD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_1^\infty \tau_g^X((D_\vartheta) \exp(-sD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

Because the heat kernel and its asymptotic expansion for small time, are C^1 in ϑ , for finite times, we have that

$$(5.17) \quad \lim_{\vartheta \downarrow 0} \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^1 \tau_g^X(D_\vartheta \exp(-tD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} = \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^1 \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

By Proposition 4.29, the righthand side is equal to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^1 \tau_g^X(D \exp(-sD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} < +\infty.$$

On the other hand, by the tracial property of τ_g^X and Duhamel's principle, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\vartheta} \left(\int_1^T \tau_g^X(D_\vartheta \exp(-tD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \right) \\ &= \int_1^T \tau_g^X [(\gamma - 2t\gamma \cdot D_\vartheta^2) \exp(-tD_\vartheta^2)] \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= 2T^{1/2} \tau_g^X(\gamma \exp(-TD_\vartheta^2)) - 2\tau_g^X(\gamma \exp(-D_\vartheta^2)), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that γ is the grading, see (5.5). Changing ϑ in ϕ and integrating in ϕ , from $\phi = 0$ to $\phi = \vartheta$, we obtain:

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_1^T \tau_g^X(D_\vartheta \exp(-tD_\vartheta^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \int_1^T \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} + 2 \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} \tau_g^X(\gamma \exp(-TD_\phi^2)) d\phi - 2 \int_0^\vartheta \tau_g^X(\gamma \exp(-D_\phi^2)) d\phi. \end{aligned}$$

We want to take the limit as $T \rightarrow +\infty$ and then $\vartheta \downarrow 0$. By (4.8), the first summand on the righthand side is independent of ϑ and converges to

$$\int_1^\infty \tau_g^X(D \exp(-tD^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} < +\infty.$$

It is clear that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \downarrow 0} \int_0^\vartheta \tau_g^X(\gamma \exp(-D_\phi^2)) d\phi = 0.$$

The difficult term is

$$\lim_{\vartheta \downarrow 0} \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} \tau_g^X(\gamma \exp(-TD_\phi^2)) d\phi.$$

To treat the above term, we first compute that

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} D_\phi^2 &= (D_{G,K} \otimes 1 + \gamma \otimes (D_S + \phi))^2 \\ &= D_{G,K}^2 + (D_S + \phi)^2 + D_{G,K} \cdot \gamma \otimes (D_S + \phi) + \gamma \cdot D_{G,K} \otimes (D_S + \phi) \\ &= D_{G,K}^2 + (D_S + \phi)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows, incidentally, that D_ϕ is a lower order invertible perturbation of D . Thus,

$$\exp(-TD_\phi^2) = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(-T(D_S + \phi)^2) \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(-T(D_S + \phi)^2) \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} \tau_g^X (\gamma \exp(-TD_\phi^2)) d\phi \\ &= \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} \tau_g^X \left(\exp(-T(D_S + \phi)^2) \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{L^2_+(X,E)} \right) d\phi \\ & \quad - \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} \tau_g^X \left(\exp(-T(D_S + \phi)^2) \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{L^2_-(X,E)} \right) d\phi. \end{aligned}$$

For $\vartheta > 0$ small, write

$$\exp(-T(D_S + \phi)^2) = \exp(-T(D_S^2 + 2\phi D_S)) \exp(-T\phi^2).$$

The operator $D_S^2 + 2\phi D_S$ is a generalized laplacian, with 0 isolated in the spectrum for each $\phi \in [0, \vartheta]$ and $\ker(D_S^2 + 2\phi D_S) = \ker(D_S)$. By the decomposition of the heat kernel,

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \exp(-T(D_S^2 + 2\phi D_S)) &= \Pi_{\ker D_S} + R_1(T, \phi) \\ \exp(-TD_S^2) &= \Pi_{\ker D_S} + R_2(T, \phi) \end{aligned}$$

with $R_1(T, \phi)$ and $R_2(T, \phi)$ going to 0 exponentially in $\Psi_K^{-\infty}(S)$. We conclude that

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} \tau_g^X (\gamma \exp(-TD_\phi^2)) d\phi \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} e^{-T\phi^2} \cdot \tau_g^X (\gamma \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \exp(-T(D_S^2 + 2\phi D_S))) d\phi \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} e^{-T\phi^2} \cdot \tau_g^X \left(\gamma \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{[L^2(G) \otimes S_p \otimes \ker(D_S)]^K} \right) d\phi. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau_g^X \left(\gamma \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{[L^2(G) \otimes S_p \otimes \ker(D_S)]^K} \right) \\ &= \tau_g^X \left(\exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{[L^2(G) \otimes S_p^+ \otimes \ker(D_S)]^K} \right) - \tau_g^X \left(\exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{[L^2(G) \otimes S_p^- \otimes \ker(D_S)]^K} \right) \\ &= \langle \text{D-Ind}(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and thus independent of T .

Combining the above together, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \downarrow 0} \eta_g(\vartheta) = \eta_g(D) + \langle \text{D-Ind}(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g \rangle.$$

On the other hand, using (5.20), as in (5.21), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} e^{-T\phi^2} \cdot \tau_g^X \left(\gamma \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \Big|_{[L^2(G) \otimes S_p \otimes \ker(D_S)]^K} \right) d\phi \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} e^{-T\phi^2} \cdot \tau_g^X (\gamma \exp(-TD_{G,K}^2) \exp(-TD_S^2)) d\phi \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^\vartheta T^{1/2} e^{-T\phi^2} \cdot \tau_g^X (\gamma \exp(-TD^2)) d\phi \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tau_g^X (\gamma e^{-TD^2}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \downarrow 0} \eta_g(\vartheta) = \eta_g(D) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_g^X (\gamma e^{-tD^2}).$$

This completes the proof. \square

5.22. Remark. If 0 is isolated in the spectrum of D (equivalently $\ker(D_S)$ is regular), one can see from Lemma 5.6 that the kernel $\ker(D)$ gives discrete series representations of G . This can only possible happen when G has equal rank, c.f Remark 5.8. And

$$\ker(D) = \ker(D_{G,K}) \subseteq [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes \ker(D_S)]^K.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_g^X(\gamma e^{-tD^2}) = \langle \text{D-Ind}(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g^{G/K} \rangle = \tau_g^X(\Pi_{\ker D}).$$

5.3. Delocalized eta invariants under a gap assumption.

5.23. Proposition. *Let (X, \mathfrak{h}) be an odd dimensional G -proper manifold and let D be a G -equivariant Dirac operator of the form (2.5). Assume that 0 is isolated in the L^2 -spectrum of D . Then:*

1] $\Pi_{\ker D} \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$; in particular $\tau_g^X(\Pi_{\ker D})$ is finite.

2] If $\Theta > 0$ is not in the L^2 -spectrum of D then

$$\eta_g(\Theta) := \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \tau_g^N((D + \Theta) \exp(-t(D + \Theta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

is well-defined. Moreover if $\Theta > 0$ belongs to the gap around 0, then $\lim_{\Theta \downarrow 0} \eta_g(\Theta)$ exists and we have

$$(5.24) \quad \lim_{\Theta \downarrow 0} \eta_g(\Theta) = \eta_g(D) + \tau_g^X(\Pi_{\ker D}).$$

Proof. We are assuming that D , and thus D^2 , has a gap at 0. Then there exists $\sigma > 0$ such that $\text{spec}_{L^2}(D^2) \cap [-2\sigma, 2\sigma] = \{0\}$. Let γ be the path given by the union of the two straight lines $\text{Im}z = \pm m \text{Re}z$, $m = \text{tg}\phi > 0$, m small, for $|z| > \sigma$ and of the portion of the circle of radius σ joining the points

$$\{\sigma \cos \phi + i\sigma \sin \phi, \sigma \cos \phi - i\sigma \sin \phi\}$$

and passing through the point $-\sigma \equiv -\sigma + i0$ in the negative real axis. We know that

$$\exp(-tD^2) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma e^{-t\lambda} (D^2 - \lambda)^2 d\lambda.$$

Consider now γ_σ , the path obtained by taking the union of the two straight lines $\text{Im}z = \pm m \text{Re}z$, $m = \text{tg}\phi > 0$ for $|z| > \sigma$ and of the portion of the circle of radius σ joining the points $\{\sigma \cos \phi + i\sigma \sin \phi, \sigma \cos \phi - i\sigma \sin \phi\}$ and passing through the point $\sigma \equiv \sigma + i0$ in the positive real axis. If we denote by C_σ the circle of radius σ centred at the origin, then

$$\exp(-tD^2) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_\sigma} e^{-t\lambda} (D^2 - \lambda)^2 d\lambda + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_\sigma} e^{-t\lambda} (D^2 - \lambda)^2 d\lambda.$$

It is well known that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_\sigma} e^{-t\lambda} (D^2 - \lambda)^2 d\lambda = \Pi_{\ker D^2} \equiv \Pi_{\ker D}.$$

See [51]. Thus

$$(5.25) \quad \exp(-tD^2) = \Pi_{\ker D} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_\sigma} e^{-t\lambda} (D^2 - \lambda)^2 d\lambda.$$

This establishes that

$$\Pi_{\ker D}, \text{ which is equal to } \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_\sigma} e^{-t\lambda} (D^2 - \lambda)^2 d\lambda, \text{ is in } \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(M)$$

(proof as in [46, Proposition 2.9]) and that $\exp(-tD^2) \rightarrow \Pi_{\ker D}$ in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(M)$ and exponentially, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. In particular $\tau_g^N(\Pi_{\ker D})$ is finite. This proves item 1]. Notice that these arguments also show directly (that is, without using Bismut's result on G/K) that the eta integrand converges at $t = +\infty$.

We now pass to item 2]. In order to show that

$$(5.26) \quad \eta_g(D + \Theta) := \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \tau_x^X((D + \Theta) \exp(-t(D + \Theta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

is well-defined, we argue as follows. Write

$$\eta_g(D + \Theta) = \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^1 \tau_x^X((D + \Theta) \exp(-t(D + \Theta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_1^\infty \tau_x^X((D + \Theta) \exp(-t(D + \Theta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

The second summand is treated as above (in fact the arguments here are simplified by the fact that $D + \Theta$ is L^2 -invertible (indeed, we have chosen $\Theta > 0$, Θ not in the spectrum of D , see Remark 4.11). The short-time behaviour is treated exactly as in the previous Subsection; also in this case we need to take the regularized limit, $\text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0}$, because $D + \Theta$ is a Dirac-type operator but it is not associated to a Clifford connection. We conclude that

$$\eta_g(\Theta) := \eta_g(D + \Theta)$$

is well defined. The proof of (5.24) is very similar to the one we have given in the previous Subsection (Proposition 5.15), and therefore omitted. \square

5.4. Delocalized eta invariants associated to smoothing perturbations. From now on, we work with general connected, linear real reductive groups not assuming G is equal rank and $\dim(G/K)$ is even as in Section 5.1-5.3 any more.

5.27. Proposition. *Let (X, \mathbf{h}) be an odd dimensional cocompact G -proper manifold without boundary and let \mathbf{h} be slice-compatible. Let D be a Dirac-type operator of the form (2.5). If $B^\infty \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(N)$ and $D + B^\infty$ is L^2 -invertible then*

$$\eta_g(D + B^\infty) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^X((D + B^\infty) \exp(-t(D + B^\infty)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

is well defined.

Proof. First of all, we need to make sense of $\exp(-t(D + B^\infty)^2)$ as an element $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(N)$. Observe that $(D + B^\infty)^2 = D^2 + A$, with $A = (B^\infty)^2 + DB^\infty + B^\infty D$, $A \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(N)$. By its definition, $(B^\infty)^2$ is an element in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(N)$. For the operators DB^∞ and $B^\infty D$, we use the assumption that the metric on X is slice-compatible, and the operator D decomposes into a sum as in Equation (2.5):

$$D = D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_S.$$

Recall that elements of $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$ can be viewed as $K \times K$ -invariant Harish-Chandra Schwartz functions on G with value in smoothing operators $\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$. Notice $D_{G,K}$ is an elliptic first order G -invariant differential operator on G/K , and D_S is an elliptic operator on the slice S . By the very definition of the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra, $D_{G,K} B^\infty$ and $B^\infty D_{G,K}$ are in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$. And it follows from the definition of $\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$ that $D_S B^\infty$ and $B^\infty D_S$ are both in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$. In summary, both DB^∞ and $B^\infty D$ are in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$, and therefore A is an element of $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$.

Following [5, Ch. 9, Appendix] we consider the Volterra series

$$\begin{aligned} Q_t &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-t)^k \int_{\Delta_k} e^{-\sigma_0 t D^2} A e^{-\sigma_1 t D^2} \dots A e^{-\sigma_k t D^2} d\sigma \\ &= e^{-t D^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-t)^k \int_{\Delta_k} e^{-\sigma_0 t D^2} A e^{-\sigma_1 t D^2} \dots A e^{-\sigma_k t D^2} d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Let p be any seminorm on $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(N)$. We know that $e^{-t D^2} A \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(N)$; clearly we have $p(e^{-t D^2} A) \leq C(p) p(A)$ so that for any $k \geq 1$ we have

$$p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-t)^k \int_{\Delta_k} e^{-\sigma_0 t D^2} A e^{-\sigma_1 t D^2} \dots A e^{-\sigma_k t D^2} d\sigma \right) \leq \frac{(C(p))^{k+1} p(A)^k}{k!}.$$

We can conclude, as in [5], that the Volterra series converges in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$ and that it satisfies the heat-equation. Moreover, by construction, $\exp(-t(D^2 + A)) - \exp(-t D^2)$ is $O(t)$ in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$ and so satisfies the same initial

condition as $\exp(-tD^2)$. From this discussion and the fact that $B^\infty \exp(-tD^2) \rightarrow B^\infty$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^1 \tau_g^X ((D + B^\infty) \exp(-t(D + B^\infty)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

is convergent. Finally, for the large time behaviour we argue as follows. Consider $(D + B^\infty)^2 = D^2 + A$, with $A = (B^\infty)^2 + DB^\infty + B^\infty D$. Let B_λ be a parametrix with parameter for $(D^2 - \lambda)$ with remainders R_λ and S_λ . Then

$$((D^2 + A) - \lambda)B_\lambda = 1 + (AB_\lambda + R_\lambda).$$

So, proceeding as in [46, Proposition 2.19], we have that

$$((D^2 + A) - \lambda)^{-1} = B_\lambda + B_\lambda \circ F_\lambda$$

with $B_\lambda \in \Psi_{G,c}^{-2}(X)$ and of uniform G -compact support and $F_\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$. Now we can proceed exactly as in the proof of [46, Proposition 2.19 and Remark 2.12] and conclude that because of the assumed L^2 -invertibility of $D + B^\infty$, we do have that $\exp(-t(D + B^\infty)^2)$ is exponentially converging to 0 in $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. A similar result holds for $(D + B^\infty) \exp(-t(D + B^\infty)^2)$. This implies, as before, that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_1^\infty \tau_g^X ((D + B^\infty) \exp(-t(D + B^\infty)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

converges at $t = +\infty$. The proof of the proposition is complete. \square

6. HIGHER DELOCALIZED CYCLIC COCYCLES

In this section we shall introduce higher delocalized cyclic cochains.

Let $K < G$ be a maximal compact subgroup and let $P < G$, $P = MAN$, be a cuspidal parabolic subgroup of G . By the Iwasawa decomposition $G = KMAN$ we can write an element $g \in G$ as

$$g = \kappa(g)\mu(g)e^{H(g)}n \in KMAN = G.$$

Let $\dim(A) = m$. By choosing coordinates of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{a} of A , consider the function

$$H = (H_1, \dots, H_m) : G \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}.$$

We define the following cyclic cochain on the algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$, the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra. For $f_0, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{C}(G)$ and a semi-simple element $g \in M$, define Φ_g^P by the following integral,

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \Phi_g^P(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m) \\ & := \int_{h \in M/Z_M(x)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times m}} \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(g_1 \dots g_m k) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m, k) \\ & \quad f_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m)^{-1}) f_1(g_1) \dots f_m(g_m) dg_1 \dots dg_m dk dndh, \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_M(x)$ is the centralizer of x in M . The following result is proved in the work of Song-Tang, [52, Theorem 3.5].

6.2. Proposition. Φ_g^P is a cyclic cocycle on the Harish-Chandra Schwartz algebra $\mathcal{C}(G)$.

6.3. Definition. We say that a cuspidal parabolic subgroup $P = MAN$ is *maximal* if one of the following equivalent conditions holds

- the dimension of A is minimal;
- the rank of M is maximal;
- the rank of M equals the rank of K .

In [19, Corollary 6.3], the authors showed that Φ_g^P is trivial in the cyclic cohomology of $\mathcal{C}(G)$ unless P is maximal.

Let Y_0 be an **even dimensional** cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary and let Y be the associated b -manifold. We shall now use Φ_g^P in order to define a cyclic cocycle $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$; subsequently we shall use $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ in order to define a relative cyclic cocycle $(\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}, \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P)$ for the indicial homomorphism ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$. These algebras involve the choice of an ϵ strictly smaller than half of the width of the spectral gap for $D_{\partial Y}$. We fix such an ϵ and we choose it in any case smaller than 1.

Recall, see [46], that if S is a slice for the action of G on Y , then we have an identification

$$\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \cong \{F : G \rightarrow \rho_{bf} {}^b\Psi^{-\infty,\epsilon}(S), K \times K \text{ equivariant, continuous and of compact support in } G\}.$$

Recall that $\rho_{bf} {}^b\Psi^{-\infty}(S) \subset \Psi^{-\infty,\epsilon}(S)$ if $\epsilon < 1$, which is in turn contained in the trace class operators on $L_b^2(S)$.

We have

$${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \cong \{F : G \rightarrow {}^b\Psi^{-\infty,\epsilon}(S), K \times K \text{ equivariant, continuous and of compact support in } G\}.$$

Finally, by Fourier transform we have an injection

$${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y)) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{A}_G^c(\partial Y)).$$

6.4. Definition. For a semisimple element $g \in M$ and $A_0, \dots, A_m \in \mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$, define a cochain $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ on $\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{Y,g}^P(A_0, A_1, \dots, A_m) \\ & := \int_{h \in M/Z_M(g)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times m}} \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(g_1 \dots g_m k) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m, k) \\ & \quad \text{Tr} \left(A_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m)^{-1}) \circ A_1(g_1) \dots \circ A_m(g_m) \right) dg_1 \dots dg_m dk dndh. \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as in Song-Tang one can prove that this is in fact a cyclic cocycle.

Using always Φ_g^P on $\mathcal{C}(G)$ we shall now define a *relative* cyclic cocycle $(\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}, \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P)$ for the homomorphism ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$.

6.5. Definition. For a semisimple element $g \in M$ and $A_0, \dots, A_m \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$, define a cochain $\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}$ on ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(M)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}(A_0, A_1, \dots, A_m) \\ & := \int_{h \in M/Z_M(g)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times m}} \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(g_1 \dots g_m k) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m, k) \\ & \quad {}^b\text{Tr} \left(A_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m)^{-1}) \circ A_1(g_1) \dots \circ A_m(g_m) \right) dg_1 \dots dg_m dk dndh. \end{aligned}$$

For $B_0, \dots, B_{m+1} \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(Y))$, define a cochain $\sigma_{\partial Y,g}$ on ${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(Y))$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P(B_0, \dots, B_{m+1}) \\ & := \int_{h \in M/Z_M(g)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times m+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(g_1 \dots g_m k) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m, k) \\ & \quad \text{Tr} \left(\hat{B}_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m g_{m+1})^{-1}, \lambda) \circ \hat{B}_1(g_1, \lambda) \circ \dots \circ \hat{B}_m(g_m, \lambda) \circ \frac{\partial \hat{B}_{m+1}(g_{m+1}, \lambda)}{\partial \lambda} \right) \\ & \quad dg_1 \dots dg_{m+1} dk dndhd\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Fourier transform

$${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(Y)) \ni A \longrightarrow \hat{A} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)).$$

6.6. Proposition. *Let Y_0 be a proper G manifold with boundary and Y be the associated b -manifold. For a semisimple element $g \in M$, we have the following identities:*

$$\begin{pmatrix} (b+B) & -I^* \\ 0 & -(b+B) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P} \\ \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently, the pair $(\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}, \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P)$ defines a relative cyclic cocycle for the homomorphism ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$.

Proof. The proof proceeds analogous to the proof of [46, Prop. 6.7.]. For the Hochschild differential, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & b\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}(A_0, \dots, A_{m+1}) \\ &= \int_{h \in M/Z_M(x)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times(m+1)}} \left({}^b\text{Tr} \left(A_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m)^{-1}(g')^{-1}) \circ A_1(g') \circ A_2(g_1) \circ \dots \circ A_{m+1}(g_m) \right) \right. \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^i \left[{}^b\text{Tr} \left(A_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m)^{-1}) \circ A_1(g_1) \circ \dots \circ A_i(g_i(g')^{-1}) \circ A_{i+1}(g') \circ \dots \circ A_{m+1}(g_m) \right) \right] \\ &+ (-1)^{m+1} \left[{}^b\text{Tr} \left(A_{m+1}(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m)^{-1}(g')^{-1}) \circ A_0(g') \circ A_2(g_1) \circ \dots \circ A_m(g_m) \right) \right] \Big) \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(g_1 \dots g_m k) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m, k) dg_1 \dots dg_m dk dndhdg' \\ &= (-1)^{m+1} \int_{h \in M/Z_M(x)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times(m+1)}} {}^b\text{Tr} \left([A_1(g_1) \circ \dots \circ A_{m+1}(g_{m+1}), A_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_{m+1})^{-1})] \right) \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(g_1 \dots g_m k) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m, k) dg_1 \dots dg_{m+1} dk dndh \\ &= I^* \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P(A_0, \dots, A_{m+1}). \end{aligned}$$

In this computation we have used the fact that Φ_g^P is a cyclic cocycle and Melrose's formula for the b -trace. To show that $B\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P} = 0$ we write out the differential

$$B\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}(A_0, \dots, A_{m-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (-1)^{m-1-i} \Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}(1, A_i, \dots, A_{m-1}, A_0, \dots, A_{i-1}),$$

where 1 is the delta function at the unit. Ignoring the sign, we can write the i 'th term of this expression as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{h \in M/Z_M(x)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times m}} \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(g_1 \dots g_m k) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m k) \\ & \delta_e(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \dots g_m)^{-1}) {}^b\text{Tr} \left(A_i(g_1) \dots \circ A_m(g_{m-i+1}) \circ A_0(g_{m-i}) \circ A_{i-1}(g_m) \right) dg_1 \dots dg_m dk dndh \\ &= \int_{h \in M/Z_M(x)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times m}} \sum_{\tau \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\tau) \cdot H_{\tau(1)}(khgh^{-1}n) H_{\tau(2)}(g_2 \dots g_m k) \dots H_{\tau(m)}(g_m, k) \\ & {}^b\text{Tr} \left(A_i(khgh^{-1}nk(g_2 \dots g_m)^{-1}) \dots \circ A_m(g_{m-i+1}) \circ A_0(g_{m-i}) \circ A_{i-1}(g_m) \right) dg_2 \dots dg_m dk dndh \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $H(khgh^{-1}n) = 0$. This shows that $B\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P} = 0$ and injectivity of I^* show that $(b+B)\sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P = 0$. \square

Notation: we shall often omit the parabolic subgroup P from the notation, thus denoting by Φ_g the cyclic cocycle on $\mathcal{C}(G)$, by $\Phi_{Y,g}$ the cyclic cocycle on $\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$ and by $(\Phi_{Y,g}^r, \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P)$ the relative cyclic cocycle for ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$.

7. TOWARD A GENERAL HIGHER APS INDEX FORMULA

7.1. Proposition. *Assume that G is a connected, linear real reductive group. Then:*

- 1 *the cyclic cocycle $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ extends continuously from $\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$ to $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$;*
- 2 *the relative cyclic cocycle $(\Phi_{Y,g}^{r,P}, \sigma_{\partial Y,g})$ extends continuously from the pair ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^c(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$ to the pair ${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y) \xrightarrow{I} {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G,\mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y))$.*

Proof. The proof of the first statement is analogous to the considerations in [19] depending crucially on the inequality proved in [52, Thm A.5]:

$$|\Phi_g^P(f_0, \dots, f_m)| \leq C \nu_{d_0+T_0+1}(f_0) \cdots \nu_{d_0+T_0+1}(f_m), \quad f_0, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{C}(G),$$

where

$$\nu_t(f) := \sup_{g \in G} |(1 + \|g\|)^t \Theta(g)^{-1} f(g)|,$$

and T_0 and d_0 as in [52]. Given $A \in \mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$, we introduce the norm

$$\| \|A\| \|_t := \sup_{g \in G} |(1 + \|g\|)^t \Theta(g)^{-1} \|A(g)\|_b,$$

where $\| \|P\| \|_b^2 := \|\chi P\|_1^2 + \|\phi[\mathcal{V}, P]\|_1^2 + \|[\mathcal{V}, P]\|_1^2 + \|[\phi, P]\|_1^2 + \|P\|_1^2$ for $P \in {}^b\Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(S) + \Psi^{-\infty, \epsilon}(S)$ (c.f. [46, Definition 7.3]). Because $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$ lies inside the norm-completion of $\mathcal{A}_G^c(Y)$ with respect to $\| \| \|_t$ for any t , it suffices to estimate the cocycle $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ in one of these norms. For this we use the inequality

$$|{}^b\text{Tr}(P_0 P_1 \cdots P_k)| \leq C \| \|P_0\| \|_b \cdots \| \|P_k\| \|_b,$$

c.f. [14, Lemma 6.4.] to obtain

$$|\Phi_{Y,g}^P(A_0, \dots, A_m)| \leq C \| \|A_0\| \|_{d_0+T_0+1} \cdots \| \|A_m\| \|_{d_0+T_0+1}.$$

This proves the first claim. For the second claim we proceed as in [46, Proposition 7.12]: we use the usual trace inequality $|\text{Tr}(AB)| \leq \| \|A\| \|_1 \| \|B\| \|_1$ together with the estimate $|H_i(gk)| \leq C_i L(g)$ of [52, Proposition A.2] to find

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P(B_0, \dots, B_{m+1})| \\ & \leq C \int_{h \in M/Z_M(g)} \int_{KN} \int_{G^{\times(m+1)}} \tilde{f}_0(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}(g_1 \cdots g_m g_{m+1})^{-1}, \lambda) \tilde{f}_1(g_1, \lambda) \cdots \\ & \quad \tilde{f}_{m+1}(g_{m+1}, \lambda) dg_1 \cdots dg_{m+1} dk dndhd\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_0(g, \lambda) & := \| \hat{B}_0(g, \lambda) \|_1, \\ \tilde{f}_i(g, \lambda) & := \| \hat{B}_i(g, \lambda) \|_1 (1 + L(g))^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ \tilde{f}_{m+1}(g, \lambda) & := \| \frac{\partial \hat{B}_{m+1}(g, \lambda)}{\partial \lambda} \|_1 \end{aligned}$$

By continuity of the map $\| \|_1 : \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(\partial Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(G)$, c.f. §3.1, we see that $\tilde{f}_j \in \mathcal{C}(G)$, for all $j = 1, \dots, m+1$. We can therefore rewrite the right hand side of the equality above as

$$\int_{h \in M/Z_M(g)} \int_{KN} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(khgh^{-1}nk^{-1}, \lambda) dk dndhd\lambda,$$

with $F := \tilde{f}_0 * \cdots * \tilde{f}_{m+1}$. Convergence of this integral now follows as in [52, Theorem A.5]. \square

7.2. Definition. Let $p_t = V(tD_{\text{cyl}})$ and $c_m = (-1)^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{m!}{(\frac{m}{2})!}$. Fix a cuspidal parabolic subgroup $P = MAN < G$ and $g \in M$ a semisimple element. Let

$$\eta_g^P(t) := 2c_m \sum_{i=0}^m \sigma_{\partial Y,g}^P(p_t, \dots, [\dot{p}_t, p_t], \dots, p_t)$$

We define the higher eta invariant associated to Φ_g^P and the boundary operator D_∂ as

$$(7.3) \quad \eta_g^P(D_\partial) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \int_\epsilon^{1/\epsilon} \eta_g^P(t) dt \equiv \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \int_\epsilon^{1/\epsilon} 2c_m \sum_{i=0}^m \sigma_{\partial Y, g}^P(p_t, \dots, [\dot{p}_t, p_t], \dots, p_t) dt$$

if this limit exists.

7.4. Theorem. *Let $s \in (0, 1]$. For the index pairing $\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), [\Phi_{Y, g}] \rangle$ the following formula holds:*

$$c_m \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), [\Phi_{Y, g}^P] \rangle = \Phi_{Y, g}^{r, P}(V(sD), \dots, V(sD)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^\infty \eta_g^P(t) dt$$

where part of the statement is that the t -integral converges at $+\infty$.

Proof. One first establishes the equality

$$(7.5) \quad \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), [\Phi_{Y, g}^P] \rangle = \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial), [\Phi_{Y, g}^{r, P}, \sigma_{\partial Y, g}^P] \rangle,$$

exactly as in [42, Theorem 9.7] and [46, Theorem 7.17]. By definition of relative pairing and by the very definition of our relative index class, that is

$$\text{Ind}_\infty(D, D_\partial) := [V(D), e_1, q_t], \quad t \in [1, +\infty], \quad \text{with } q_t := \begin{cases} V(tD_{\text{cyl}}) & \text{if } t \in [1, +\infty) \\ e_1 & \text{if } t = \infty \end{cases}$$

we then obtain from (7.5) the following formula

$$c_m \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), [\Phi_{Y, g}^P] \rangle = \Phi_{Y, g}^{r, P}(V(D), \dots, V(D)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_1^\infty \eta_g^P(t) dt$$

The formula we want to prove is obtained by rescaling D to sD . \square

7.6. Remark. We would like to take the limit as $s \downarrow 0$ in Theorem 7.4 and obtain directly a higher delocalized APS index formula as the sum of a geometric term and the higher delocalized eta invariant. Unfortunately at the moment it is quite unclear how to study the limit as $s \downarrow 0$ of $\Phi_{Y, g}^{r, P}(V(sD), \dots, V(sD))$ which is why in the next section we give a treatment of the higher APS index formula corresponding to Φ_g^P through reduction, as in the closed case treated by Hochs, Song and Tang in [19]. Notice that even for a cocompact G -proper manifold *without* boundary X it is a difficult problem to study the limit

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \Phi_{X, g}^P(V(sD), \dots, V(sD))$$

with $V(D)$ the (symmetrized) Connes-Moscovici projector.

8. REDUCTION

In this section we shall see how the reduction procedure of Hochs, Song and Tang can be extended to G -proper manifolds with boundary. Recall that we have the following $K \cap M$ -invariant decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p} &= (\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}) \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus ((\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}) \oplus \mathfrak{a})^\perp \\ &\cong (\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}) \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus (\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})). \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, the spinor bundle

$$S_{\mathfrak{p}} \cong S_{\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}} \otimes S_{\mathfrak{a}} \otimes S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})},$$

where $S_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is a vector space of dimension $2^{\lceil \frac{\dim \mathfrak{a}}{2} \rceil}$ on which $M \cap K$ acts trivially.

The following facts will play a central role in our study:

(1) The Dirac operator D_Y on Y decomposes into

$$D_Y = D_{G, K} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_Z,$$

acting on

$$L^2(Y, E) \cong [L^2(G) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes L^2(S, E_Z)]^K;$$

(2) We realize Y/N in terms of a slice:

$$Y_{MA} := Y/N \cong AM \times_{K \cap M} Z.$$

Restricting to Y_{MA} ,

$$E_{MA} := E|_{Y_{MA}} \cong AM \times_{M \cap K} (S_{\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}} \otimes S_{\mathfrak{a}} \otimes S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})} \otimes E_Z).$$

For convenience, we introduce the following

$$(8.1) \quad \widetilde{E}_Z := E_Z \otimes S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})}.$$

We define a Dirac operator $D_{Y_{MA}}$ on Y_{MA} by

$$D_{Y_{MA}} = D_{MA, K \cap M} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_Z,$$

acting on

$$L^2(Y_{MA}, E_{MA}) \cong \left[L^2(MA) \otimes (S_{\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}} \otimes S_{\mathfrak{a}}) \otimes L^2(Z, \widetilde{E}_Z) \right]^{K \cap M}.$$

(3) Since A acts on Y_{MA} freely, we define

$$Y_M = M \times_{K \cap M} Z,$$

and

$$(8.2) \quad E_M = M \times_{M \cap K} (S_{\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}} \otimes S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})} \otimes E_Z) \cong M \times_{M \cap K} (S_{\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}} \otimes \widetilde{E}_Z).$$

By the assumption (2.1) on the dimension of Y , we can see that Y_M is even dimensional because both Z and $M/M \cap K$ are even dimensional. The Dirac operator D_{Y_M} on Y_M is

$$D_{Y_M} = D_{M, K \cap M} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_Z,$$

acting on

$$L^2(Y_M, E_M) \cong \left[L^2(M) \otimes S_{\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{m}} \otimes L^2(Z, \widetilde{E}_Z) \right]^{K \cap M}.$$

We have assumed that E is a G -equivariant twisted spinor bundle on Y . Accordingly, E_M is an M -equivariant twisted spinor bundle on Y_M , and we can write

$$(8.3) \quad E_M = \mathcal{E}_M \otimes W_M.$$

where \mathcal{E}_M is the spinor bundle associated to the induced Spin^c -structure on Y_M and $W_M = M \times_{M \cap M} \widetilde{E}_Z$. It is important to point out that since

$$S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})} = S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})}^+ \oplus S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})}^-$$

has a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading, the auxiliary M -equivariant vector W_M is equipped with a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading as well, denoted by

$$(8.4) \quad W_M = W_M^+ \oplus W_M^-$$

8.5. Remark. Unless P is maximal cuspidal parabolic, $K \cap M$ has a lower rank than K . In this case, there exists a $K \cap M$ -equivariant isomorphism λ defined by the action of an element in a Cartan subgroup of K but not in $K \cap M$,

$$\lambda : S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})}^+ \cong S_{\mathfrak{k}/(\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{m})}^-.$$

Such an isomorphism λ is compatible with the respective connections and metrics. In the constructions in (8.1), (8.2) and (8.3), the tensor products are all graded and grading compatible. Hence, λ gives an M -equivariant isomorphism between the two vector bundles

$$W_M^+ \cong W_M^-,$$

compatible with the respective connections and metrics.

8.6. Remark. As W_M in Equation (8.4) is \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded, the vector bundle E_M in Equation (8.3) can be written as follows with respect to the gradings on \mathcal{E}_M and W_M ,

$$E_M = (\mathcal{E}_M^+ \oplus \mathcal{E}_M^-) \otimes W_M^+ \oplus (\mathcal{E}_M^+ \oplus \mathcal{E}_M^-) \otimes W_M^-.$$

Accordingly, the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading on E_M gives the following decomposition,

$$(8.7) \quad E_M = E_M^+ \oplus E_M^-, \quad E_M^+ = \mathcal{E}_M^+ \otimes W_M^+ \oplus \mathcal{E}_M^- \otimes W^-, \quad E_M^- = \mathcal{E}_M^- \otimes W^+ \oplus \mathcal{E}_M^+ \otimes W_M^-.$$

Given a linear operator T on E_M , we write T into a 4×4 block matrix,

$$(8.8) \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} T_{++}^{++} & T_{-+}^{++} & T_{+-}^{++} & T_{--}^{++} \\ T_{++}^{-+} & T_{-+}^{-+} & T_{+-}^{-+} & T_{--}^{-+} \\ T_{++}^{+-} & T_{-+}^{+-} & T_{+-}^{+-} & T_{--}^{+-} \\ T_{++}^{--} & T_{-+}^{--} & T_{+-}^{--} & T_{--}^{--} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $T_{\gamma\delta}^{\alpha\beta}$ is a linear operator from $\mathcal{E}_M^\gamma \otimes W_M^\delta$ to $\mathcal{E}_M^\alpha \otimes W_M^\beta$, for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta = \pm$. The \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading, c.f. Equation (8.7), on E_M introduces a supertrace on T as follows,

$$(8.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Str}(T) &:= \text{tr}(T_{++}^{++}) + \text{tr}(T_{--}^{--}) - [\text{tr}(T_{-+}^{-+}) + \text{tr}(T_{+-}^{+-})] \\ &= \text{tr}(T_{++}^{++}) - \text{tr}(T_{-+}^{-+}) - [\text{tr}(T_{+-}^{+-}) - \text{tr}(T_{--}^{--})]. \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument in Lemma 5.6, we have the following:

8.10. Lemma. *The followings are equivalent*

- (1) *The boundary operator $D_{\partial Y}$ is L^2 -invertible;*
- (2) *The boundary operator $D_{\partial Z}$ is L^2 -invertible;*
- (3) *The boundary operator $D_{\partial Y_M}$ is L^2 -invertible.*

Recall that given a function $f \in \mathcal{C}(G)$ we can define a function $f^N \in \mathcal{C}(MA)$ by

$$(8.11) \quad f^N(ma) := \int_N f(nma) dn.$$

Let

$$g \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E); \quad k \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E); \quad k_{\mathbb{R}} \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G, \mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), p^*E_{\partial Y}),$$

where for the sake of clarity we have now included the bundles in the notation; $p: \mathbb{R} \times \partial Y \rightarrow \partial Y$ is the obvious projection. We see these kernels as functions on G with values in pseudodifferential operators on the slice Z satisfying a $K \times K$ -equivariance. We can then define

$$g^N \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_{MA}, E|_{Y_{MA}}); \quad k^N \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_{MA}, E|_{Y_{MA}}); \quad k_{\mathbb{R}}^N \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_{G, \mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y_{MA}), p^*E|_{\partial Y_{MA}}).$$

These are functions on MA with values in pseudodifferential operators on the slice Z satisfying a $(K \cap M) \times (K \times M)$ -equivariance. See [19], Section 4.1. We can of course extend this map to $M_{n \times n}(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E))$, $M_{n \times n}({}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E))$ and $M_{n \times n}({}^b\mathcal{A}_{G, \mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), p^*E_{\partial Y}))$.

8.12. Lemma. *The map*

$${}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E) \ni k \longrightarrow k^N \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_{MA}, E|_{Y_{MA}})$$

is multiplicative. The same is true for the other two algebras.

Proof. Suppose that

$$\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E).$$

By the work of Harish-Chandra, we know that

$$\kappa_1^N \star \kappa_2^N \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_{MA}, E|_{Y_{MA}}).$$

By definition and the Iwasawa decomposition $G = KNMA$,

$$(8.13) \quad \begin{aligned} (\kappa_1 \star \kappa_2)^N(ma) &= \int_G \int_N \kappa_1(nmag'^{-1})\kappa_2(g') \, dndg' \\ &= \int_K \int_M \int_A \int_N \int_N \kappa_1(nmaa'^{-1}m'^{-1}n'^{-1}k'^{-1})\kappa_2(k'n'm'a') \, dk'dm'da'dn'dn \end{aligned}$$

Since the kernels $\kappa_i, i = 1, 2$ are $K \times K$ -equivariant, we have

$$\kappa_1(k'gk) = k' \cdot \kappa_1(g) \cdot k,$$

where the k, k' on the right-hand side denotes the K -action on ${}^b\Psi^{-\infty}(S)$. A similar equation holds for κ_2 . The last equation in (8.13) becomes

$$\int_M \int_A \int_N \int_N \kappa_1(nmaa'^{-1}m'^{-1}n'^{-1})\kappa_2(n'm'a') \, dm'da'dn'dn$$

Recall that MA normalize N , that is,

$$nmaa'^{-1}m'^{-1}n'^{-1} = n''maa'^{-1}m'^{-1}$$

for some $n'' \in N$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (\kappa_1 \star \kappa_2)^N(ma) &= \int_M \int_A \int_N \int_N \kappa_1(n''maa'^{-1}m'^{-1})\kappa_2(n'm'a') \, dm'da'dn'dn'' \\ &= \int_M \int_A \kappa_1^N(maa'^{-1}m'^{-1})\kappa_2^N(m'a') \, dm'da' \\ &= (\kappa_1^N \star \kappa_2^N)(ma). \end{aligned}$$

□

We consider $C^\infty(Y, E)$ and $C^\infty(Y, E)^{N,c}$, the smooth N -invariant sections of E with compact support in $Y/N \cong Y_{MA}$. Then $C^\infty(Y, E)^{N,c} \cong C^\infty(Y_{MA}, E|_{Y_{MA}})$. Thus if $k^N \in {}^b\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_{MA}, E|_{Y_{MA}})$, then we can regard it as an operator on $C^\infty(Y, E)^{N,c}$. Similarly we can proceed for g^N and $k_{\mathbb{R}}^N$.

Consider the heat kernel for D^-D^+ , denoted k_t ; consider the heat kernel for $D_{\text{cyl}}^-D_{\text{cyl}}^+$, denoted $k_{\text{cyl},t}$

8.14. Proposition.

- 1 k_t^N is equal to the Schwartz kernel of $\exp(-tD_{Y_{MA}}^-D_{Y_{MA}}^+)$; an analogous result holds for $k_{\text{cyl},t}$.
- 2 $V(tD)^N = V(tD_{Y_{MA}})$.
- 3 If the boundary operator of D_Y is L^2 -invertible, then $({}^bV(tD))^N = {}^bV(D_{Y_{MA}})$.

Proof. Our main observation is that the following Lemma, whose proof is identical to the one of [19, Lemma 4.1], also holds true for manifolds with cylindrical ends.

8.15. **Lemma.** For all $\sigma \in C_c^\infty(Y, E)$ and $s \in C^\infty(Y, E)^{N,c}$ we have

$$(k_t^* \sigma, s)_{L_b^2(Y, E)} = (\sigma, k_t^N s)_{L_b^2(Y, E)}$$

Properties 1 and 2 follow from the Lemma 8.15 above with the identical arguments as those in [19, Lemma 4.5, 4.6, Proposition 4.7].

For Property 3], we consider the Dirac operator D_{cyl} on the cylinder $\text{cyl}(\partial Y)$. With the assumption of invertibility of $D_{\partial Y}$, see (3.14), we have that D_{cyl} is invertible; we define $\kappa_t := (D_{\text{cyl}})^{-1} \exp(-tD_{\text{cyl}}^2)$. As $\text{cyl}(\partial Y)$ is a complete Riemannian manifold, it follows from the same argument as in [46] that κ_t is a well defined element in ${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G, \mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), p^*E|_{\partial Y})$.

Similarly, let P_{cyl} be the Dirac operator on $\text{cyl}(\partial Y_{MA})$. By Lemma 8.10, it follows from Assumption (3.14), that P_{cyl} is invertible, and the operator $\kappa_{t, MA} := (P_{\text{cyl}})^{-1} \exp(-tP_{\text{cyl}}^2)$ is a well defined element in ${}^b\mathcal{A}_{G, \mathbb{R}}^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y_{MA}), p^*E|_{\partial Y_{MA}})$.

Following Equation (8.11), we define κ_t^N by

$$\kappa_t^N(ma) := \int_N \kappa_t(nma)dn.$$

The same proof of Lemma 8.15 gives us the following property for κ_t and κ_t^N :

$$(\kappa_t^* \sigma, s)_{L^2(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), E)} = (\sigma, \kappa_t^N s)_{L^2(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), E)},$$

for $\sigma \in C_c^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), p^*E|_{\partial Y})$, and $s \in C^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), p^*E|_{\partial Y})^{N,c}$. If we identify $C^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y), p^*E)^{N,c}$ with $C_c^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y_{MA}), p^*E|_{\partial Y_{MA}})$, using the uniqueness of solutions to the ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt}\xi = -P_{\text{cyl}}\xi, \quad \xi \in C_c^\infty(\text{cyl}(\partial Y_{MA}), p^*E|_{\partial Y_{MA}}),$$

we can conclude that

$$\kappa_t^N = \kappa_{t,MA} = (P_{\text{cyl}})^{-1} \exp(-tP_{\text{cyl}}^2).$$

Using the above identification between κ_t^N and $\kappa_{t,MA}$, we can use the same arguments as those in [19, Lemma 4.5, 4.6, Proposition 4.7] to establish 3], that is

$$({}^bV(tD))^N = {}^bV(D_{Y_{MA}}).$$

The details are left to the reader. \square

Consider now the cyclic cocycle $\Phi_{MA,g}$ on $\mathcal{C}(MA)$, see [19, Section 3.1], and the associated cyclic cocycle on $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_{MA}, E|_{Y_{MA}})$, denoted $\Phi_{Y_{MA},g}$. Assume the boundary operator of D_Y to be L^2 -invertible. Consider the index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \equiv [{}^bV(D)]$ and the index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) \equiv [{}^bV(D_{Y_{MA}})]$, which is well defined because of Lemma 8.10.

8.16. Proposition. *The following equality holds*

$$(8.17) \quad \langle \Phi_{Y,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \langle \Phi_{Y_{MA},g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) \rangle.$$

Proof. We must prove that

$$(8.18) \quad \langle \Phi_{Y,g}, [{}^bV(D)] \rangle = \langle \Phi_{Y_{MA},g}, [{}^bV(D_{Y_{MA}})] \rangle.$$

This follows combining [19, Proposition 3.2], which clearly holds for the algebra of residual operators $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)$, and Proposition 8.14 above. \square

We finally come to the last reduction. The Lie group M is of equal rank and acts properly on Y_M . Consider the orbital integral τ_g^M on $\mathcal{C}(M)$ associated to a semisimple element g in M . As in subsection 3.3, we can associated the orbital integral τ_g^M a 0-cocycle on Y_M , denoted $\Phi_{Y_M,g}$. More precisely, $\Phi_{Y_M,g}$ is a cyclic 0-cocycle on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y_M, E_M)$, with E_M as in (8.2).

8.19. Proposition. *The following equality holds:*

$$(8.20) \quad \langle \Phi_{Y_{MA},g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) \rangle = \langle \Phi_{Y_M,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \rangle$$

Proof. We prove this identity in two steps.

Step I: Recall that $\text{Ind}(D_{Y_{MA}})$ is an K -theory element of the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})$. The manifold Y_{MA} is a product, i.e.

$$Y_{MA} = Y_M \times A,$$

where M acts properly on Y_M and trivially on A , and A acts properly and freely on A and trivially on Y_M . With this decomposition, we can write the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})$ as follows,

$$(8.21) \quad \mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA}) = \mathcal{A}_M^\infty(Y_M, E_M) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{C}(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A)),$$

where \mathcal{S}_A is the space of spinors on \mathfrak{a} , the Lie algebra of A , and $\text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A)$ is the algebra of endomorphisms on \mathcal{S}_A .

Notice that the Dirac operator $D_{Y_{MA}}$ is compatible with the decomposition of Y_{MA} , i.e.

$$(8.22) \quad D_{Y_{MA}} = D_{Y_M} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_A,$$

where we use the graded tensor products.

Now, we consider the index elements $\text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}})$, $\text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M})$, and $\text{Ind}_\infty(D_A)$, i.e.

$$\text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})), \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_M^\infty(Y_M, E_M)), \text{Ind}_\infty(D_A) \in K_*(\mathcal{C}(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A))).$$

We notice that the decomposition Eq. (8.21) of $\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})$ defines an element

$$\text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \otimes \text{Ind}_\infty(D_A)$$

through the external product

$$K_*(\mathcal{A}_M^\infty(Y_M, E_M)) \otimes K_*(\mathcal{C}(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A))) \rightarrow K_*(\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})).$$

We claim that

$$(8.23) \quad \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) = \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \otimes \text{Ind}_\infty(D_A) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})).$$

To prove this formula we argue as follows.

Recall that $\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})$ (respectively $\mathcal{A}_M^\infty(Y_M, E_M)$ and $\mathcal{C}(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A))$) is a dense subalgebra of the Roe algebra $C^*(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})^{MA}$ (respectively $C^*(Y_M, E_M)^M$ and $C_r^*(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A))$) closed under holomorphic functional calculus. The image of the smooth index classes in the K-theory of the respective Roe C^* -algebras define the (isomorphic) index classes

$$\text{Ind}(D_{Y_{MA}}) \in K_*(C^*(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})^{MA}), \quad \text{Ind}(D_{Y_M}) \in K_*(C^*(Y_M, E_M)^M), \quad \text{Ind}(D_A) \in K_*(C_r^*(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A))).$$

Furthermore, the Roe algebra $C^*(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})^{MA}$ (respectively $C^*(Y_M, E_M)^M$ and $C_r^*(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A))$) is strongly Morita equivalent to $C_r^*(MA)$ (respectively $C_r^*(M)$ and $C_r^*(A)$) and as explained in [46] we have explicit representatives of the (strongly) Morita equivalent index classes

(8.24)

$$\text{Ind}_{C_r^*(MA)}(D_{Y_{MA}}) \in K_*(C_r^*(MA)), \quad \text{Ind}_{C_r^*(M)}(D_{Y_M}) \in K_*(C_r^*(M)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind}_{C_r^*(A)}(D_A) \in K_*(C_r^*(A)).$$

Indeed, these index classes are defined in terms of our operators acting on suitable C_r^*H -modules, with H one of the above 3 groups. Now, following [57] [31] and [54] we can also express these index classes in terms of unbounded KK-classes associated to a Atiyah-Patodi-Singer boundary condition, denoted here

$$(8.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Ind}_{C_r^*(MA)}^{\text{APS}}(D_{Y_{MA}}) &\in KK_*(\mathbb{C}, C_r^*(MA)), \quad \text{Ind}_{C_r^*(M)}^{\text{APS}}(D_{Y_M}) \in KK_*(\mathbb{C}, C_r^*(M)), \\ \text{Ind}_{C_r^*(A)}^{\text{APS}}(D_A) &\in KK_*(\mathbb{C}, C_r^*(A)). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that our b -index classes do *not* define KK-elements (the resolvent is not C^* -compact); this is why we need to pass to the APS-index classes defined through the well-known boundary condition. Using formula (8.22) of the Dirac operator $D_{Y_{MA}}$ and proceeding exactly as in [54, Theorem 2.2] we can prove the following identity

$$\text{Ind}_{C_r^*(MA)}^{\text{APS}}(D_{Y_{MA}}) = [\text{Ind}_{C_r^*(M)}^{\text{APS}}(D_{Y_M}) \otimes \text{Ind}_{C_r^*(A)}^{\text{APS}}(D_A)] \in KK_*(\mathbb{C}, C_r^*(MA)) \equiv KK_*(C_r^*(MA))$$

Following the stated isomorphisms of K -theory groups and the compatibility of the various index classes we obtain finally

$$\text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) = \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \otimes \text{Ind}_\infty(D_A) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})).$$

This is precisely the claim we wanted to prove.

Step II: Using the product structure (8.21) of the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{MA}^\infty(Y_{MA}, E_{MA})$, we compute the cocycle $\Phi_{Y_{MA},g}$ as follows. For any $f_i \otimes g_i \in \mathcal{A}_M^\infty(Y_{MA}) \otimes \mathcal{C}(A, \text{End}(\mathcal{S}_A))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{Y_{MA},g}(f_0 \otimes g_0, \dots, f_n \otimes g_n) \\
&= \int_{M/Z_{M,g}} \int_{(MA)^n} \det(a_1, \dots, a_n) \cdot \text{Tr} \left(f_0(hgh^{-1}(m_1 \dots m_n)^{-1}) g_0((a_1 \dots a_n)^{-1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. f_1(m_1) g_1(a_1) \dots f_n(m_n) g_n(a_n) \right) dh da_1 \dots da_n dm_1 \dots dm_n \\
(8.26) \quad &= \left(\int_{M/Z_{M,g}} \int_{(M)^n} \text{Tr} \left(f_0(hgh^{-1}(m_1 \dots m_n)^{-1}) f_1(m_1) \dots f_n(m_n) \right) dh dm_1 \dots dm_n \right) \\
& \quad \times \left(\int_{(A)^n} \det(a_1, \dots, a_n) \cdot \text{Tr} \left(g_0((a_1 \dots a_n)^{-1}) g_1(a_1) \dots g_n(a_n) \right) da_1 \dots da_n \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the above equation, we denote

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{Y_M,g}(f_0, \dots, f_n) = \int_{M/Z_{M,g}} \int_{(M)^n} \text{Tr} \left(f_0(hgh^{-1}(m_1 \dots m_n)^{-1}) f_1(m_1) \dots f_n(m_n) \right) dh dm_1 \dots dm_n$$

and

$$\Phi_{A,e}(g_0, \dots, g_n) = \int_{(A)^n} \det(a_1, \dots, a_n) \cdot \text{Tr} \left(g_0((a_1 \dots a_n)^{-1}) g_1(a_1) \dots g_n(a_n) \right) da_1 \dots da_n$$

By (8.23) and (8.26), we conclude that

$$\langle \Phi_{Y_{MA},g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) \rangle = \langle \tilde{\Phi}_{Y_M,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_{A,e}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_A) \rangle.$$

By a special case [44, Theorem 4.6] (the case for $G = A$), we know that

$$\langle \Phi_{A,e}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_A) \rangle = 1.$$

On the other hand, we can directly check that if $f \star f = f$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Phi}_{Y_M,g}(f, \dots, f) &= \int_{M/Z_{M,g}} \int_{M^{\times n}} \text{Tr} \left(f(hgh^{-1}(m_1 \dots m_n)^{-1}) f(m_1) \dots f(m_n) \right) dh dm_1 \dots dm_n \\
&= \int_{M/Z_{M,g}} \text{Tr} (f(hgh^{-1})) dh = \Phi_{Y_M,g}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\langle \tilde{\Phi}_{Y_M,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \rangle = \langle \Phi_{Y_M,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \rangle.$$

This completes the proof. \square

9. AN INDEX THEOREM FOR HIGHER ORBITAL INTEGRAL THROUGH REDUCTION

We shall now put things together and give a formula for the higher delocalized Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index $\langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle$.

Let G be connected, linear real reductive, $P = MAN$ a cuspidal parabolic subgroup and $g \in M$ a semisimple element. Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be a cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary. We fix a slice Z_0 (and Z) for the G action on Y_0 (and Y), so that

$$Y_0 \cong G \times_K Z_0, \quad Y \cong G \times_K Z.$$

with Z_0 a smooth compact manifold **with** boundary. As before, the G -equivariant Dirac type operator on Y decomposes as in (2.5),

$$D_Y = D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_Z.$$

We assume that $D_{\partial Y}$ or, equivalently, $D_{\partial Z}$ is L^2 -invertible. Consider Y/AN , an M -proper manifold, which has a slice decomposition given by $Y_M := M \times_{K \cap M} Z$. The following theorem is one of the main results of this paper:

9.1. Theorem. *Assume that $D_{\partial Y}$ is L^2 -invertible and consider the higher index $\langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle$. The following formula holds:*

$$\langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle = \int_{(Y_0/AN)^g} c_{(Y_0/AN)^g}^g \text{AS}(Y_0/AN)_g - \frac{1}{2} \eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M})$$

with

$$\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y_M}(D_{\partial Y_M} \exp(-tD_{\partial Y_M}^2) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

Recall that $c_{(Y_0/AN)^g}^g$ is a compactly supported smooth cutoff function on $(Y_0/AN)^g$ associated to the $Z_{M,g}$ action on $(Y_0/AN)^g$.

To explain the right-hand side of (1.13) more explicitly, we fix the following data.

- In (8.3), we constructed a M -equivariant, \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector bundle

$$W_M = W_M^+ \oplus W_M^-.$$

We define

$$R_M^{W^\pm} = \text{the curvature form of the Hermitian connection on } W_M^\pm.$$

- $R^{\mathcal{N}}$, the curvature form associated to the Hermitian connection on $\mathcal{N}_{(Y_0/AN)^g} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ ($\mathcal{N}_{(Y_0/AN)^g}$ is the normal bundle of the g -fixed point submanifold $(Y_0/AN)^g$ in Y_0/AN);
- R^L , the curvature form associated to the Hermitian connection on $L_{\det}|_{(Y_0/AN)^g}$ (L_{\det} is the determinant line bundle of the Spin^c -structure on Y_0/AN and $L_{\det}|_{(Y_0/AN)^g}$ is its restriction to $(Y_0/AN)^g$);
- $R_{(Y_0/AN)^g}$, the Riemannian curvature form associated to the Levi-Civita connection on the tangent bundle of $(Y_0/AN)^g$;
- The form $\text{AS}(Y_0/AN)_g$ is then given by the following expression:

$$(9.2) \quad \frac{\widehat{A}\left(\frac{R_{(Y_0/AN)^g}}{2\pi i}\right) \left[\text{tr}\left(g \exp\left(\frac{R_M^{W^+}}{2\pi i}\right)\right) - \text{tr}\left(g \exp\left(\frac{R_M^{W^-}}{2\pi i}\right)\right) \right] \exp(\text{tr}\left(\frac{R^L}{2\pi i}\right))}{\det\left(1 - g \exp\left(-\frac{R^{\mathcal{N}}}{2\pi i}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

- Since the auxiliary vector bundle W_M on Y_M is \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded, the Dirac operator D_{Y_M} is equipped with a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading as well. Following the decomposition (8.7) and (8.8), we have the decomposition for D_{Y_M} ,

$$D_{Y_M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_{Y_M,+}^+ & 0 & 0 \\ D_{Y_M,+}^- & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D_{Y_M,-}^+ \\ 0 & 0 & D_{Y_M,-}^- & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} D_{Y_M,+} & 0 \\ 0 & D_{Y_M,-} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$D_{Y_M,+} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_{Y_M,+}^+ \\ D_{Y_M,+}^- & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{Y_M,-} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_{Y_M,-}^+ \\ D_{Y_M,-}^- & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$D_{Y_M,\beta}^\alpha : L^2(Y_M, \mathcal{E}_{Y_M}^\alpha \otimes W_M^\beta) \rightarrow L^2(Y_M, \mathcal{E}_{Y_M}^{-\alpha} \otimes W_M^\beta), \quad \alpha, \beta = \pm.$$

Accordingly, since ∂Y_M is odd dimensional, the Dirac operator $D_{\partial Y_M}$ is a self-adjoint **even** differential operator on the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded spinor bundle $E_{\partial Y_M}$, which is defined as follows,

$$E_{\partial Y_M} := \mathcal{E}_{\partial Y_M} \otimes W_M|_{\partial Y_M}, \quad E_{\partial Y_M}^+ := \mathcal{E}_{\partial Y_M} \otimes W_M^+|_{\partial Y_M}, \quad E_{\partial Y_M}^- := \mathcal{E}_{\partial Y_M} \otimes W_M^-|_{\partial Y_M}.$$

We can write $D_{\partial Y_M}$ into a 2×2 block diagonal matrix with respect to the grading on $E|_{\partial Y_M}$,

$$\begin{bmatrix} D_{\partial Y_M,+} & 0 \\ 0 & D_{\partial Y_M,-} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $D_{\partial Y_M,+}$ (and $D_{\partial Y_M,-}$) is the Dirac operator on $E_{\partial Y_M}^+$ (and $E_{\partial Y_M}^-$). Following the definition of the supertrace (8.9) and the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading of $D_{\partial Y_M}$, we obtain the following expression for the delocalized eta invariant of $D_{\partial Y_M}$:

$$(9.3) \quad \eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M}) = \eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M,+}) - \eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M,-}).$$

This point is slightly different from the 0-degree pairing case, where the operator $D_{\partial Y_M}$ is not graded.

Proof. Denote $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ briefly by $\Phi_{Y,g}$. By (8.17) we know that

$$\langle \Phi_{Y,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \langle \Phi_{Y_{MA},g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) \rangle.$$

On the other hand, by equation (8.20) we have that

$$\langle \Phi_{Y_{MA},g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_{MA}}) \rangle = \langle \Phi_{Y_M,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \rangle$$

so that

$$\langle \Phi_{Y,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D) \rangle = \langle \Phi_{Y_M,g}, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_{Y_M}) \rangle$$

It suffices to apply now the 0-degree delocalized APS index theorem, Theorem 3.41, to the right hand side of the above equation and recall that Y/AN is diffeomorphic to $Y_M := M \times_{K \cap M} Z$ and that is obtained by addition of a cylindrical end to Y_0/AN . \square

When P is not a maximal parabolic subgroup, we have the following vanishing result:

9.4. Remark. If P is not a maximal parabolic subgroup, then $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ is a trivial class in cyclic cohomology and

$$\langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle = 0.$$

For the right-hand side of equations (10.10) and (10.11), we know from Remark 8.5 that

$$W_M^+ \cong W_M^-$$

compatible with the respective connections and metrics. Thus, $D_{\partial Y_M,+}$ is unitary equivalent to $D_{\partial Y_M,-}$ under the above isomorphism. By using the expression of $\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M})$ as $\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M,+}) - \eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M,-})$, we obtain the following

$$\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M}) = 0.$$

Moreover, the integral

$$\int_{(Y_0/AN)^g} c_{(Y_0/AN)^g}^g \text{AS}(Y_0/AN)_g = 0$$

as follows from the fact that

$$\text{tr} \left(g \exp \left(\frac{R^{W_M^+}}{2\pi i} \right) \right) - \text{tr} \left(g \exp \left(\frac{R^{W_M^-}}{2\pi i} \right) \right) = 0,$$

because of the isomorphism $W_M^+ \cong W_M^-$.

10. THE NON-INVERTIBLE CASE

In this section we shall discuss extensions of our results to the case in which the boundary operator is not invertible.

10.1. The gap case for 0-degree cyclic cocycles associated to orbital integrals. First, without assuming any additional property of the G -invariant metric \mathbf{h}_0 on Y_0 , we discuss the case in which D_∂ is not L^2 -invertible but 0 is isolated in the spectrum; thus we assume that

$$(10.1) \quad \exists \delta > 0 \text{ such that } \text{spec}_{L^2}(D_\partial) \cap (-\delta, \delta) = \{0\}$$

Let D be the b -Dirac operator on Y associated to D_0 on Y_0 , a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded odd Dirac operator, product-type near the boundary. Fix $\Theta \in (0, \delta)$ and consider the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded odd b -operator given by

$$D^+(\Theta) := x^{-\Theta} D^+ x^\Theta, \quad D^-(\Theta) := (x^{-\Theta} D^+ x^\Theta)^* = x^\Theta D^- x^{-\Theta}.$$

This is a 0-th order perturbation of D ; indeed

$$(10.2) \quad D^+(\Theta) \equiv D^+ + x^{-\Theta} [D, x^\Theta] = D^+ + x^{-\Theta} \text{cl}(d(x^\Theta)).$$

and similarly for $D^-(\Theta)$. It is known that

$$(10.3) \quad (D^\pm(\Theta))_\partial = D_\partial + \Theta;$$

as we shall now explain. By [37, Prop. 5.8],

$$(x^{-\Theta} D^+ x^\Theta)_\partial = I(D^+, -i\Theta)$$

and it is well known that $I(D^+, -i\Theta) = i(-i\Theta) + D_\partial$ which is $\Theta + D_\partial$; a similar computation holds for $D^-(\Theta)$:

$$(x^\Theta D^- x^{-\Theta})_\partial = I(D^-, i\Theta);$$

moreover $I(D^-, i\Theta) = -i(i\Theta) + D_\partial$ which is again equal to $D_\partial + \Theta$ as claimed. This means that $D(\Theta)$ has an invertible boundary operator, provided $\Theta \in (0, \delta)$. We **define** the index class in the gap case, as the index class associated to $D(\Theta)$. This does not depend on Θ , for $\Theta \in (0, \delta)$. There is a well defined delocalized APS numeric index given by $\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\Theta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle$. Proceeding as before, using in particular the relative index class, excision and the relative cyclic cocycle $(\tau_g^{Y,r}, \sigma_g^{\partial Y})$ we find that for each $s > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\Theta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle &= \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^-(\Theta)D^+(\Theta))}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^+(\Theta)D^-(\Theta))}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y}((D_\partial + \Theta) \exp(-s(D_\partial + \Theta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now assume that the metric is slice compatible. Proceeding as for the eta integrand for $D_X + \gamma\vartheta$, or, in the gap case, for $D_X + \Theta$, see Definition 5.12 and Proposition 5.23, we can use the short time analysis of the heat kernel on the b -manifold (Y, \mathbf{h}) in order to prove that

$$\text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \left(\tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^-(\Theta)D^+(\Theta))}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^+(\Theta)D^-(\Theta))}) \right)$$

is well defined. Thus, following Melrose, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\Theta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle &= \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \left(\tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^-(\Theta)D^+(\Theta))}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^+(\Theta)D^-(\Theta))}) \right) \\ &\quad - \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y}((D_\partial + \Theta) \exp(-s(D_\partial + \Theta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \left(\tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^-(\Theta)D^+(\Theta))}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^+(\Theta)D^-(\Theta))}) \right) - \eta_g(\Theta) \end{aligned}$$

where the definition of $\eta_g(\Theta)$, the modified eta invariant associated to $D_\partial + \Theta$, has been used. See (5.26). Now, the first summand in the right hand side of the above equation depends continuously on $\Theta \in (0, \delta)$ and has a limit as $\Theta \downarrow 0$ equal to

$$\int_{Y_0^g} c_0^g \text{AS}_g(D_0).$$

See (1.11). For the second summand we recall the following result, see Proposition 5.23 :

$$\lim_{\Theta \downarrow 0} \eta(\Theta) = \eta_g(D_\partial) + \tau_g^{\partial Y}(\Pi_{\ker D_\partial}).$$

We can thus conclude that the following theorem holds:

10.4. Theorem. *Let G be a connected, linear real reductive group and let $g \in G$ be a semisimple element. Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be an even dimensional cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary, with metric which is product type near the boundary. Let D_0 be a G -equivariant Dirac operator of the form (2.5), product type near the boundary. We assume that the associated operator on ∂Y satisfies*

$$\exists \delta > 0 \text{ such that } \text{spec}_{L^2}(D_\partial) \cap (-\delta, \delta) = \{0\}.$$

Let (Y, \mathbf{h}) be the b -manifold associated to (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) and let D be the b -operator associated to D_0 . Then there exists a well defined smooth index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)) = K_0(C^(Y_0 \subset Y, E)^G)$ and for its pairing with the 0-degree cyclic cocycle τ_g^Y the following formula holds:*

$$\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), \tau_g^Y \rangle = \int_{(Y_0)^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0) - \frac{1}{2}(\eta_g(D_\partial) + \tau_g^{\partial Y}(\Pi_{\ker D_\partial})).$$

10.2. The gap case for cyclic cocycles associated to higher orbital integrals. We keep working under the assumptions of the previous subsection, in particular we assume that the boundary operator has a gap at 0. Let $P = MAN$ be a cuspidal parabolic subgroup of G and let $x \in M$ be a semisimple element. Let Φ_g^P the higher cyclic cocycle on $\mathcal{C}(G)$ defined by these data, and let $\Phi_{Y,g}^P$ be the associated cyclic cocycle on $\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y)$. There is then a well defined index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D) \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y))$ (see the previous subsection), and a higher delocalized index $\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), \Phi_{Y,g}^P \rangle$, and we have a formula; if $p_t(\Theta) = V(tD_{\text{cyl}}(\Theta))$ and

$$\eta_g^P(t, \Theta) := 2c_m \sum_{i=0}^m \sigma_{\partial Y, g}^P(p_t(\Theta), \dots, [p_t(\Theta), p_t(\Theta)], \dots, p_t(\Theta))$$

with $c_m = (-1)^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{m!}{(\frac{m}{2})!}$ then

$$c_m \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), [\Phi_{Y,g}^P] \rangle = \Phi_{Y,g}^{T,P}(V(sD(\Theta)), \dots, V(sD(\Theta))) - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^\infty \eta_g^P(t, \Theta) dt$$

In this generality we cannot say much more; indeed it seems difficult to study the behaviour in s and Θ of the right hand side. On the other hand it seems difficult to prove a APS formula for $\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D), \Phi_{Y,g}^P \rangle$ through reduction in the present gap case: indeed, it is unclear how to follow the perturbation (10.2) down to Y_M .

10.3. Perturbations from the slice when G is equal rank. In this section we shall prove an index formula when G is equal rank. We assume throughout that we are dealing with a slice compatible metric on Y_0 and thus with a slice compatible b -metric on Y . Consider the Dirac operator D , decomposed as

$$D_{G,K} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_Z$$

with D_Z a b -differential operator on the b -manifold Z .

Let x_Z a boundary defining function for ∂Z . Consider

$$(10.5) \quad \begin{aligned} D^+(\vartheta) &:= D_{G,K}^+ \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes x_Z^{-\vartheta} D_Z^+ x_Z^\vartheta - D_{G,K}^- \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes x_Z^\vartheta D_Z^- x_Z^{-\vartheta} \\ D^-(\vartheta) &:= D_{G,K}^- \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes x_Z^\vartheta D_Z^- x_Z^{-\vartheta} - D_{G,K}^+ \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes x_Z^{-\vartheta} D_Z^+ x_Z^\vartheta, \end{aligned}$$

with $\vartheta > 0$ smaller than δ , which is the first positive eigenvalue of $D_{\partial Z}$. The boundary operator of $D^\pm(\vartheta)$ is equal to

$$(10.6) \quad D_{G,K} \otimes 1 + \gamma \otimes (D_{\partial Z} + \vartheta)$$

and so it is L^2 -invertible.

This implies that the index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)) \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y))$ is well defined and so is the numeric index $\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle$. The index class does not depend on ϑ , for $\vartheta \in (0, \delta)$. Proceeding as usual we find that for each $s > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle &= \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^-(\vartheta)D^+(\vartheta))}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^+(\vartheta)D^-(\vartheta))}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y}((D_\partial + \vartheta) \exp(-s(D_\partial + \vartheta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle &= \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \left(r \tau_g^Y(e^{-s^2(D^-(\vartheta)D^+(\vartheta))}) - r \tau_g^Y(e^{-s^2(D^+(\vartheta)D^-(\vartheta))}) \right) \\ &\quad - \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_s^\infty \tau_g^{\partial Y}((D_\partial + \vartheta) \exp(-s(D_\partial + \vartheta)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &= \text{LIM}_{s \downarrow 0} \left(\tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^-(\vartheta)D^+(\vartheta))}) - \tau_g^{Y,r}(e^{-s^2(D^+(\vartheta)D^-(\vartheta))}) \right) - \eta_g(\vartheta) \end{aligned}$$

where the definition of modified delocalized eta invariant $\eta_g(\vartheta)$ has been used. See Definition 5.12. Now, as for the gap case, the first summand in the right hand side of the above equation depends continuously on $\vartheta \in (0, \delta)$ and has a limit as $\vartheta \downarrow 0$ equal to

$$\int_{Y_0^g} c_0^g \text{AS}_g(D_0).$$

For the second summand we use Proposition 5.15 and obtain that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \downarrow 0} \eta_g(\vartheta) = \eta_g(D_\partial) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_g^X(\gamma e^{-tD_\partial^2}) = \eta_g(D) + \langle \text{D-Ind}(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g \rangle.$$

We can thus conclude that we have proved the following

10.7. Theorem. *Let G be connected, linear real reductive group, and of equal rank. Let γ be the grading operator in (5.5). Let $g \in G$ be a semisimple element. Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be a cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary, with a metric which is slice compatible and product-like near the boundary. Let D_0 be a G -equivariant Dirac operator, product type near the boundary. Let (Y, \mathbf{h}) be the b -manifold associated to (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) and let D be the b -operator associated to D_0 . Let $\vartheta \in (0, \delta)$, with δ the smallest positive eigenvalue of the boundary operator on the slice S . Then there exists a well defined smooth index class $\text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)) = K_*(C^*(Y_0 \subset Y, E)^G)$ and for its pairing with the 0-degree cyclic cocycle τ_g^Y the following formula holds:*

$$\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle = \int_{(Y_0)^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0) - \frac{1}{2}(\eta_g(D_\partial) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_g^X(\gamma e^{-tD_\partial^2})).$$

Alternatively:

$$\langle \text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)), \tau_g^Y \rangle = \int_{(Y_0)^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(D_0) - \frac{1}{2}(\eta_g(D_\partial) + \langle \text{D-Ind}(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g \rangle).$$

10.8. Remark. In the above Theorem 10.7, we compute the pairing between τ_g^Y and $\text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta))$ generalizing Theorem 3.41. The formula obtained in Theorem 10.7 actually works for general connected, linear real reductive group. However, such a pairing does not vanish only when G has equal rank. This is the reason we have assumed in this subsection G is of equal rank.

10.4. Perturbations from the slice for general G . In this section we shall prove an index formula without the equal rank assumption. Let G be a connected, linear real reductive group and $P = MAN$ be a cuspidal parabolic subgroup.

Let $g \in M$ be a semisimple element in M . Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) be a cocompact G -proper manifold with boundary, with a metric which is slice compatible and product-like near the boundary. Let D_0 be a G -equivariant Dirac operator, product type near the boundary. Let (Y, \mathbf{h}) be the b -manifold associated to (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) and let D be the b -operator associated to D_0 . Let $\vartheta \in (0, \delta)$, with δ the smallest positive eigenvalue of the boundary

operator on the slice S . Using the same perturbation in (10.5) and Lemma 8.10, the Dirac operator $D(\vartheta)$ has an L^2 -invertible boundary operator and so defines a smooth index class

$$\text{Ind}_\infty(D(\vartheta)) \in K_*(\mathcal{A}_G^\infty(Y, E)) = K_*(C^*(Y_0 \subset Y, E)^G)$$

Note that

$$\partial Y_M \cong M \times_{M \cap K} S$$

Moreover, we write

$$D_{\partial Y_M} := D_{M, K \cap M} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} D_S.$$

By the discussion in Theorem 9.1, the Dirac operator $D_{\partial Y_M}$ is \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded. Thus, the operator D_S has a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading and we write

$$\ker(D_S) = \ker(D_S^+) - \ker(D_S^-)$$

as a graded finite dimensional $K \cap M$ representation. By the same reduction procedure in the proof of Theorem 9.1 and Theorem 10.7, we have the following result.

10.9. Theorem. *For the pairing with the higher cyclic cocycle $\tau_{Y,g}^P$, the following formula holds:*

$$(10.10) \quad \langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle = \int_{(Y_0/AN)^g} c_{(Y_0/AN)^g}^g \text{AS}(Y_0/AN)_g - \frac{1}{2} (\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M}) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_g^{\partial Y_M}(\gamma e^{-tD_{\partial Y_M}^2})).$$

Alternatively:

$$(10.11) \quad \langle \Phi_{Y,g}^P, \text{Ind}_\infty(D_Y) \rangle = \int_{(Y_0/AN)^g} c_{(Y_0/AN)^g}^g \text{AS}(Y_0/AN)_g - \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M}) + \left\langle D\text{-Ind}_{M \cap K}^M(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g^M \right\rangle \right)$$

where τ_g^M is the orbital integral of $g \in M$ from $\mathcal{C}(M)$ to \mathbb{C} . We point out that as $\ker(D_S)$ is a graded $K \cap M$ representation, $D\text{-Ind}_{M \cap K}^M(\ker(D_S))$ is a graded M (unitary) representation. In Equation (10.11), exactly as for $\eta_g(D_{\partial Y_M})$ in (9.3), we have

$$\left\langle D\text{-Ind}_{M \cap K}^M(\ker(D_S)), \tau_g^M \right\rangle = \left\langle D\text{-Ind}_{M \cap K}^M(\ker(D_S^+)), \tau_g^M \right\rangle - \left\langle D\text{-Ind}_{M \cap K}^M(\ker(D_S^-)), \tau_g^M \right\rangle$$

as it follows from the use of the supertrace (8.9).

10.12. Remark. As in Remark 9.4, the equation (10.10) and (10.11) are trivial (both sides equal 0) unless P is maximal parabolic subgroup.

11. NUMERIC RHO INVARIANTS ON G -PROPER MANIFOLDS

In this section we shall introduce (higher) rho numbers associated to positive scalar curvature (psc) metrics and G -equivariant homotopy equivalences. All our Dirac operators will be L^2 -invertible; indeed, if we want to consider bordism properties of these numbers we do need L^2 -invertibility so as to be able to define an APS index class on the manifold with boundary realising the bordism.

11.1. Rho numbers associated to delocalized 0-cocycles. We consider a closed G -proper manifold X **without** boundary, G connected, linear real reductive, $g \in G$ a semisimple element, D_X a G -equivariant L^2 -invertible Dirac operator of the form (2.5). We consider

$$\eta_g(D_X) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^X(D_X \exp(-tD_X^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}.$$

We shall also need the (already discussed) more general version where $D_X + B^\infty$, $B^\infty \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, E)$, is L^2 -invertible. Then we know that

$$\eta_g(D_X + B^\infty) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \tau_g^X((D_X + B^\infty) \exp(-t(D_X + B^\infty)^2)) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

is well defined.

Example 1. Let X be G -equivariantly spin and $D_X \equiv D_{\mathbf{h}}$, the spin Dirac operator associated to a G -equivariant PSC metric \mathbf{h} . Then we know that $D_{\mathbf{h}}$ is L^2 -invertible. We define

$$\rho_g(\mathbf{h}) := \eta_g(D_{\mathbf{h}}).$$

Example 2. If $\mathbf{f} : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is a G -homotopy equivalence, then using [13] we know that there exists a bounded perturbation $B_{\mathbf{f}}$ of the signature operator on $X := X_1 \sqcup (-X_2)$, where $-X_2$ is the same manifold as X_2 with the opposite orientation, that makes it invertible. Moreover, by the work of Spessato [53] we know that this perturbation $B_{\mathbf{f}}$ is in $C^*(X, \Lambda^*)^G$. Hence, by density, we conclude that there exists a perturbation $B_{\mathbf{f}}^\infty \in \mathcal{A}_G^\infty(X, \Lambda^*)$ such that $D_X^{\text{sign}} + B_{\mathbf{f}}^\infty$ is L^2 -invertible. According to Proposition 5.27 we can thus define the rho-number of the homotopy equivalence \mathbf{f} as

$$\rho_g(\mathbf{f}) := \eta_g(D_X^{\text{sign}} + B_{\mathbf{f}}^\infty).$$

11.2. Rho numbers associated to higher delocalized cocycles. We can generalize Example 1 of the previous subsection and define rho numbers associated the higher cocycles Φ_g^P .

Let $P = MNA$, $g \in M$ as above and consider Φ_g^P and $\Phi_{X_M, g}^P$ (we recall that X is without boundary). Assume that \mathbf{h} is a slice-compatible G -invariant PSC metric on X . Then

$$(11.1) \quad \rho_g^P(\mathbf{h}) := \eta_g(D_{X_M})$$

(with X_M the reduced manifold associated to X) is well defined. Notice that as D_X is invertible, by Lemma 5.6 we have that D_{X_M} is also invertible.

11.3. Bordism properties. The APS index theorems proved in this article can be used in order to study the bordism properties of these rho invariants. We concentrate on the case of psc metrics and only give a hint for the rho number of a G -homotopy equivalence. We assume, unless otherwise stated that we are on a G -proper manifold which is endowed with a slice-compatible G -invariant metric and a slice-compatible G -invariant spin structure

11.2. Definition. Consider a cocompact proper G -manifold (W, \mathbf{h}) , possibly with boundary. We assume that there exists a slice compatible spin structure and denote by S the spinor bundle. Let $g \in G$ be semisimple. We shall say that g is *geometrically-simple* on W if

$$\int_{W^g} c^g \text{AS}_g(W, S) = 0.$$

with $\text{AS}_g(W, S)$ the usual integrand appearing in the 0-degree delocalized APS-index theorem.

11.3. Example. The following proposition provides many examples of geometrically-simple elements g on an arbitrary G -proper manifold W .

11.4. Proposition. *If g is non-elliptic, that is, does not conjugate to a compact element, then every element of the conjugacy class $C(g) := \{hgh^{-1} | h \in G\}$ in G does not have any fixed point on W .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $W^g \neq \emptyset$. Take

$$x = (g_1, s) \in W = G \times_K S$$

such that

$$gx = (gg_1, s) = (g_1, s) = x.$$

The above implies that we can find some $k \in K$ such that

$$gg_1 = g_1k, \quad ks = s.$$

Thus, $g_1^{-1}gg_1 \in K$, that is, g has to be elliptic, which contradicts to our assumption on g . \square

11.5. Definition. Let (Y, \mathbf{h}_0) and (Y, \mathbf{h}_1) be two slice-compatible psc metrics. We say that they are G -concordant if there exists a G -invariant metric \mathbf{h} on $Y \times [0, 1]$, also slice compatible, which is of psc, product-type near the boundary and restricts to \mathbf{h}_0 at $Y \times \{0\}$ and to \mathbf{h}_1 at $Y \times \{1\}$.

11.6. Definition. Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) and (Y_1, \mathbf{h}_1) be two G -proper manifolds with slice-compatible psc metrics. We shall say that they are G -psc-bordant if there exists a G -manifold with boundary W with a G -invariant metric \mathbf{h} , which is slice-compatible, such that:

- (i) $\partial W = Y_0 \sqcup Y_1$;
- (ii) \mathbf{h} is product-type near the boundary and of psc;
- (iii) \mathbf{h} restricts to $\mathbf{h}_0 \sqcup \mathbf{h}_1$ on $\partial W = Y_0 \sqcup Y_1$

11.7. Proposition.

1] Assume that the slice-compatible psc metrics \mathbf{h}_0 and \mathbf{h}_1 on Y are G -concordant. Assume that g is geometrically-simple on $Y \times [0, 1]$, Then $\rho_g(\mathbf{h}_0) = \rho_g(\mathbf{h}_1)$.

2] Let $P = MAN < G$ be a cuspidal parabolic subgroup and let $x \in M$ be a semisimple element. Assume that the slice-compatible psc metrics \mathbf{h}_0 and \mathbf{h}_1 on Y are G -concordant. Assume that g is geometrically-simple on $Y_M \times [0, 1]$. Then $\rho_g^P(\mathbf{h}_0) = \rho_g^P(\mathbf{h}_1)$.

3] Let (Y_0, \mathbf{h}_0) and (Y_1, \mathbf{h}_1) be G -psc-bordant through (W, h) , with \mathbf{h}_0 and \mathbf{h}_1 slice compatible. Assume that g is geometrically-simple on W . Then $\rho_g(\mathbf{h}_0) = \rho_g(\mathbf{h}_1)$.

Proof. In both cases the proof is an immediate consequence of the geometric-simplicity of $g \in G$ and the relevant delocalized APS index theorems. \square

11.8. Remark. Examples of geometrically-simple g as in Proposition 11.7 are given by elements in the conjugacy class of a non-elliptic element, c.f. Proposition 11.4. This applies to *any* bordism entering into Definition 11.5 and Definition 11.6. Thus for such g our (higher) rho invariants are in fact *concordance and bordism invariants*.

11.9. Remark. It is a challenge to understand whether these results can be employed in studying the space $\mathcal{R}_{G, \text{slice}}^+(Y)$ of slice-compatible metrics of psc (if non-empty). It would be also interesting to understand the relationship between the following 3 spaces, especially from the point of view of homotopy theory: (i) $\mathcal{R}_{G, \text{slice}}^+(Y)$; (ii) $\mathcal{R}_G^+(Y)$ (arbitrary G -equivariant metrics of psc); (iii) $\mathcal{R}_K^+(S)$ K -invariant metrics of psc on the slice S . Clearly there is an inclusion $\mathcal{R}_{G, \text{slice}}^+(Y) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}_G^+(Y)$; there is also a natural map $\mathcal{R}_K^+(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{G, \text{slice}}^+(Y)$, see [15]. For all these questions it would be interesting to develop a G -equivariant Stolz' sequence and investigate its basic properties. We leave this task to future research.

11.10. Remark. We now consider the case of the signature operator (so, we drop the spin assumption). We can again give the definition of g geometrically simple, employing this time the L -differential form. By extending our 0-degree delocalized APS index theorem to perturbed operators, following [38], [39], [28], we could also prove that if two homotopy equivalences $Y_1 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_1} Y$, $Y_2 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_2} Y$ are G -h-cobordant through a G -homotopy equivalence $F : W \rightarrow Y \times [0, 1]$ and if $g \in G$ is geometrically-simple on $W \sqcup (Y \times [0, 1])$, for example g is in the conjugacy class of a non-elliptic element, then

$$\rho_g(\mathbf{f}_1) = \rho_g(\mathbf{f}_2).$$

Also in this case, it is unclear whether such a result can have immediate purely geometric applications. Indeed, this would seem to require the development of a G -equivariant surgery sequence for a non-compact group G , certainly a non-trivial task. See for example [12] for the case in which G is compact. Also in this case we leave this task to future research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Herbert Abels, *Parallelizability of proper actions, global K -slices and maximal compact subgroups*, Math. Ann. **212** (1974/75), 1–19, DOI 10.1007/BF01343976. MR375264 \uparrow 12
- [2] Michael Atiyah and Wilfried Schmid, *A geometric construction of the discrete series for semisimple Lie groups*, Invent. Math. **42** (1977), 1–62, DOI 10.1007/BF01389783. MR463358 \uparrow 33
- [3] Dan Barbasch and Henri Moscovici, *L^2 -index and the Selberg trace formula*, J. Funct. Anal. **53** (1983), no. 2, 151–201, DOI 10.1016/0022-1236(83)90050-2. MR722507 \uparrow 33
- [4] Paul Baum, Alain Connes, and Nigel Higson, *Classifying space for proper actions and K -theory of group C^* -algebras, C^* -algebras: 1943–1993 (San Antonio, TX, 1993)*, Contemp. Math., vol. 167, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994, pp. 240–291, DOI 10.1090/conm/167/1292018. MR1292018 \uparrow 33

- [5] Nicole Berline, Ezra Getzler, and Michèle Vergne, *Heat kernels and Dirac operators*, Grundlehren Text Editions, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. Corrected reprint of the 1992 original. MR2273508 ↑30, 40
- [6] Jean-Michel Bismut, *The Atiyah-Singer index theorem for families of Dirac operators: two heat equation proofs*, Invent. Math. **83** (1986), no. 1, 91–151, DOI 10.1007/BF01388755. MR813584 ↑3
- [7] ———, *Hypoelliptic Laplacian and orbital integrals*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 177, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2011. MR2828080 ↑22, 29
- [8] ———, *Eta invariants and the hypoelliptic Laplacian*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **21** (2019), no. 8, 2355–2515, DOI 10.4171/jems/887. MR4035848 ↑21
- [9] Alan L. Carey, Victor Gayral, Adam Rennie, and Feller A. Sukochev, *Index theory for locally compact noncommutative geometries*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **231** (2014), no. 1085, vi+130. MR3221983 ↑23, 24
- [10] Xiaoman Chen, Jinmin Wang, Zhizhang Xie, and Guoliang Yu, *Delocalized eta invariants, cyclic cohomology and higher rho invariants*, arXiv:1901.02378. ↑3
- [11] Alain Connes and Henri Moscovici, *Cyclic cohomology, the Novikov conjecture and hyperbolic groups*, Topology **29** (1990), no. 3, 345–388, DOI 10.1016/0040-9383(90)90003-3. MR1066176 ↑2
- [12] Karl Heinz Dovermann and Reinhard Schultz, *Equivariant surgery theories and their periodicity properties*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1443, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. MR1077825 ↑59
- [13] Yoshiyasu Fukumoto, *G-homotopy invariance of the analytic signature of proper co-compact G-manifolds and equivariant novikov conjecture*, arXiv:1709.05884 (to appear in J. Noncommut. Geom.) ↑58
- [14] Alexander Gorokhovsky, Hitoshi Moriyoshi, and Paolo Piazza, *A note on the higher Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem on Galois coverings*, J. Noncommut. Geom. **10** (2016), no. 1, 265–306, DOI 10.4171/JNCG/234. MR3500822 ↑5, 16, 17, 44
- [15] Hao Guo, Varghese Mathai, and Hang Wang, *Positive scalar curvature and Poincaré duality for proper actions*, J. Noncommut. Geom. **13** (2019), no. 4, 1381–1433, DOI 10.4171/jncg/321. MR4059824 ↑59
- [16] Harish-Chandra, *Discrete series for semisimple Lie groups. II. Explicit determination of the characters*, Acta Math. **116** (1966), 1–111, DOI 10.1007/BF02392813. MR219666 ↑21, 24
- [17] Peter Hochs, *Quantisation commutes with reduction at discrete series representations of semisimple groups*, Adv. Math. **222** (2009), no. 3, 862–919, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2009.05.011. MR2553372 ↑8
- [18] Peter Hochs and Varghese Mathai, *Quantising proper actions on Spin^c-manifolds*, Asian J. Math. **21** (2017), no. 4, 631–685, DOI 10.4310/AJM.2017.v21.n4.a2. MR3691850 ↑8
- [19] Peter Hochs, Yanli Song, and Xiang Tang, *An index theorem for higher orbital integrals*, arXiv:2005.06119 (to appear in Math. Ann.). ↑5, 6, 7, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49
- [20] Peter Hochs, Bai-Ling Wang, and Hang Wang, *An equivariant Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem for proper actions I: the index formula*, arXiv:1904.11146. ↑6, 10, 20, 21
- [21] ———, *An equivariant Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem for proper actions II: the K-theoretic index*, arXiv:2006.08086. ↑5, 10, 20
- [22] Peter Hochs and Hang Wang, *A fixed point formula and Harish-Chandra’s character formula*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **116** (2018), no. 1, 1–32, DOI 10.1112/plms.12066. MR3747042 ↑4, 6, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31
- [23] ———, *Orbital integrals and K-theory classes*, Ann. K-Theory **4** (2019), no. 2, 185–209, DOI 10.2140/akt.2019.4.185. MR3990784 ↑11
- [24] Jing-Song Huang and Pavle Pandžić, *Dirac operators in representation theory*, Mathematics: Theory & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2006. ↑33
- [25] Anthony W. Knaapp, *Lie groups beyond an introduction*, 2nd ed., Progress in Mathematics, vol. 140, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2002. MR1920389 ↑14
- [26] Vincent Lafforgue, *Banach KK-theory and the Baum-Connes conjecture*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002), Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002, pp. 795–812. MR1957086 ↑8, 33
- [27] Eric Leichtnam and Paolo Piazza, *The b-pseudodifferential calculus on Galois coverings and a higher Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem*, Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.) **68** (1997), iv+121 (English, with English and French summaries). MR1488084 ↑3, 31
- [28] ———, *Spectral sections and higher Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theory on Galois coverings*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **8** (1998), no. 1, 17–58, DOI 10.1007/s000390050047. MR1601842 ↑59
- [29] ———, *Homotopy invariance of twisted higher signatures on manifolds with boundary*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **127** (1999), no. 2, 307–331 (English, with English and French summaries). MR1708639 ↑3
- [30] ———, *On higher eta-invariants and metrics of positive scalar curvature*, K-Theory **24** (2001), no. 4, 341–359, DOI 10.1023/A:1014079307698. MR1885126 ↑3
- [31] ———, *Dirac index classes and the noncommutative spectral flow*, J. Funct. Anal. **200** (2003), no. 2, 348–400, DOI 10.1016/S0022-1236(02)00044-7. MR1979016 ↑50
- [32] Eric Leichtnam, John Lott, and Paolo Piazza, *On the homotopy invariance of higher signatures for manifolds with boundary*, J. Differential Geom. **54** (2000), no. 3, 561–633. MR1823315 ↑3
- [33] Matthias Lesch, Henri Moscovici, and Markus J. Pflaum, *Connes-Chern character for manifolds with boundary and eta cochains*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **220** (2012), no. 1036, viii+92, DOI 10.1090/S0065-9266-2012-00656-3. MR3025890 ↑17, 31

- [34] John Lott, *Superconnections and higher index theory*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **2** (1992), no. 4, 421–454, DOI 10.1007/BF01896662. MR1191568 ↑3
- [35] ———, *Higher eta-invariants*, *K-Theory* **6** (1992), no. 3, 191–233, DOI 10.1007/BF00961464. MR1189276 ↑3
- [36] ———, *Delocalized L2-invariants*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **169** (1999), no. 1, 1–31. ↑3
- [37] Richard B. Melrose, *The Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem*, *Research Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 4, A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1993. MR1348401 ↑14, 19, 36, 54
- [38] Richard B. Melrose and Paolo Piazza, *Families of Dirac operators, boundaries and the b-calculus*, *J. Differential Geom.* **46** (1997), no. 1, 99–180. MR1472895 ↑59
- [39] ———, *An index theorem for families of Dirac operators on odd-dimensional manifolds with boundary*, *J. Differential Geom.* **46** (1997), no. 2, 287–334. MR1484046 ↑59
- [40] Werner Müller, *The trace class conjecture in the theory of automorphic forms. II*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **8** (1998), no. 2, 315–355, DOI 10.1007/s000390050059. MR1616155 ↑21
- [41] Werner Müller and Jonathan Pfaff, *Analytic torsion and L²-torsion of compact locally symmetric manifolds*, *J. Differential Geom.* **95** (2013), no. 1, 71–119. MR3128980 ↑22
- [42] Hitoshi Moriyoshi and Paolo Piazza, *Eta cocycles, relative pairings and the Godbillon-Vey index theorem*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **22** (2012), no. 6, 1708–1813, DOI 10.1007/s00039-012-0197-0. MR3000501 ↑5, 16, 45
- [43] Henri Moscovici and Robert J. Stanton, *Eta invariants of Dirac operators on locally symmetric manifolds*, *Invent. Math.* **95** (1989), no. 3, 629–666, DOI 10.1007/BF01393895. MR979370 ↑21
- [44] Markus J. Pflaum, Hessel Posthuma, and Xiang Tang, *The transverse index theorem for proper cocompact actions of Lie groupoids*, *J. Differential Geom.* **99** (2015), no. 3, 443–472. MR3316973 ↑4, 51
- [45] Paolo Piazza and Hessel B. Posthuma, *Higher genera for proper actions of Lie groups*, *Ann. K-Theory* **4** (2019), no. 3, 473–504, DOI 10.2140/akt.2019.4.473. MR4043466 ↑4
- [46] ———, *Higher genera for proper actions of Lie groups, Part 2: the case of manifolds with boundary*, arXiv:2010.02783 (to appear in *Ann. K-Theory*). ↑4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 23, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 50
- [47] Paolo Piazza and Thomas Schick, *Bordism, rho-invariants and the Baum-Connes conjecture*, *J. Noncommut. Geom.* **1** (2007), no. 1, 27–111, DOI 10.4171/JNCG/2. MR2294190 ↑3
- [48] Paolo Piazza, Thomas Schick, and Vito Felice Zenobi, *Mapping analytic surgery to homology, higher rho numbers and metrics of positive scalar curvature*, arXiv:1905.11861. ↑3
- [49] Michael Puschnigg, *New holomorphically closed subalgebras of C*-algebras of hyperbolic groups*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **20** (2010), no. 1, 243–259, DOI 10.1007/s00039-010-0062-y. MR2647141 ↑3
- [50] Sheagan A. K. A. John, *Secondary Higher Invariants and Cyclic Cohomology for Groups of Polynomial Growth*, arXiv:2007.12776. ↑3
- [51] Mikhail A. Shubin, *Pseudodifferential operators and spectral theory*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Translated from the 1978 Russian original by Stig I. Andersson. MR1852334 ↑39
- [52] Yanli Song and Xiang Tang, *Higher Orbit Integrals, Cyclic Cocycles, and K-theory of Reduced Group C*-algebra*, arXiv:1910.00175. ↑5, 7, 41, 44
- [53] Stefano Spessato, *Lipschitz-homotopy invariants: L2-cohomology, Roe index and p-class*, Ph.D. Thesis, Sapienza Università di Roma, July 2021. ↑58
- [54] Charlotte Wahl, *Product formula for Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index classes and higher signatures*, *J. K-Theory* **6** (2010), no. 2, 285–337, DOI 10.1017/is010002020jkt106. MR2735088 ↑50
- [55] ———, *The Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem for Dirac operators over C*-algebras*, *Asian J. Math.* **17** (2013), no. 2, 265–319, DOI 10.4310/AJM.2013.v17.n2.a2. MR3078932 ↑3
- [56] Antony Wassermann, *Une démonstration de la conjecture de Connes-Kasparov pour les groupes de Lie linéaires connexes réductifs*, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **304** (1987), no. 18, 559–562 (French, with English summary). MR894996 ↑33
- [57] Fangbing Wu, *The higher index theorem for manifolds with boundary*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **103** (1992), no. 1, 160–189, DOI 10.1016/0022-1236(92)90140-E. MR1144688 ↑50
- [58] Wei Ping Zhang, *A note on equivariant eta invariants*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **108** (1990), no. 4, 1121–1129, DOI 10.2307/2047979. MR1004426 ↑20, 28, 35

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA, I-00185 ROMA, ITALY
 Email address: piazza@mat.uniroma1.it

KORTEWEG-DE VRIES INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, 1098 XG AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS
 Email address: H.B.Posthuma@uva.nl

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO, 63130, U.S.A.
 Email address: yanlisong@wustl.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO, 63130, U.S.A.
 Email address: xtang@math.wustl.edu