

ON MODULAR SOERGEL BIMODULES, HARISH-CHANDRA BIMODULES, AND CATEGORY \mathcal{O}

IVAN LOSEV

ABSTRACT. In this paper we continue the study of the category of modular Harish-Chandra bimodules initiated by Bezrukavnikov and Riche and also study the modular version of the BGG category \mathcal{O} . We prove a version of the Bezrukavnikov-Mirkovic-Rumynin localization theorem for the Harish-Chandra bimodules and for the category \mathcal{O} . We also relate the category of Harish-Chandra bimodules to the affine Hecke category building on the prior work of Bezrukavnikov and Riche.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Affine Hecke category	2
1.2. Harish-Chandra bimodules	3
1.3. Category \mathcal{O}^{cl}	4
1.4. Noncommutative Springer resolution	4
2. Preliminaries: localization theorems	5
2.1. Derived localization	5
2.2. Tilting bundle and noncommutative Springer resolution	7
3. Preliminaries: Soergel and Harish-Chandra bimodules	8
3.1. Soergel bimodules following [BR2]	8
3.2. Harish-Chandra bimodules following [BR2]	11
4. Further study of modular Harish-Chandra bimodules	15
4.1. Derived localization for Harish-Chandra bimodules	15
4.2. Grothendieck group	17
4.3. Duality functor	18
4.4. HC-tilting bimodules	18
4.5. Perverse bimodules	19
5. Equivalence with Soergel-type categories \mathcal{O}	20
5.1. Categories \mathcal{O}_R and \mathcal{O}	20
5.2. Duality for categories \mathcal{O}	22
5.3. Equivalence $\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$	23
5.4. Other equivalences	25
6. Modular category \mathcal{O}	27
6.1. Definition and equivalent characterization	27
6.2. Main equivalence	27
6.3. Localizations of Verma modules	30
References	32

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{F} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic p . Let G be a simple algebraic group over \mathbb{F} . Throughout the paper we assume that p is bigger than h , the Coxeter number of G .

Let W denote the Weyl group of G and let T be a maximal torus. We write \mathfrak{g} for the Lie algebra of G and \mathfrak{h} for the Lie algebra of T . We write Λ_r for the root lattice and Λ for the character lattice of T so that $\Lambda_r \subset \Lambda$. Consider the affine Weyl group $W^a := W \ltimes \Lambda_r$ as well as the extended affine group $W^{ea} := W \ltimes \Lambda$. Recall that $W^{ea} = (\Lambda/\Lambda_r) \ltimes W^a$, where Λ/Λ_r is the subgroup of all elements of length 0. Below we will always view Λ/Λ_r as a subgroup of W^{ea} in this way. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we write t_λ for the corresponding element of W^{ea} (or for its natural lift to the corresponding braid group Br^{ea}).

The goal of this paper is to relate several categories (triangulated, additive and abelian) that are associated to the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Indecomposable (in the additive setting) and simple (in the abelian setting) objects in these categories are labelled by the elements of W^{ea} . The categories of interest are the affine Hecke category, the category of Harish-Chandra bimodules and the (classical modular) category \mathcal{O} .

1.1. Affine Hecke category. We start by discussing the affine Hecke category for W^{ea} . The group W^{ea} acts on \mathfrak{h}^* via its projection to W . To this realization one can assign the category of (diagrammatic) Soergel bimodules in the sense of Elias and Williamson, [EW]. Note that this paper deals with the case of a Coxeter system, the extension that we need to deal with W^{ea} can be found in [E, Section 3]. The resulting category is a Karoubian monoidal category.

There is another, “algebraic” realization of the affine Hecke category due to Abe, [A] (for Coxeter groups, a modification for W^{ea} can be found in [BR2, Section 2.2]). Abe’s construction gives a version of the classical construction of Soergel, see, e.g., [S]. Unlike Soergel’s original construction, Abe’s works well in positive characteristic. We will use the version of [BR2]. Denote Abe’s category for W^{ea} by ASBim (“A” for Abe, “S” for Soergel and “Bim” for bimodules). The Hom spaces in ASBim are graded $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]$ -bimodules supported on the graph of the W -action on \mathfrak{h}^* and are finitely generated free left $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]$ -modules and also finitely generated free right $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]$ -modules. It therefore makes sense to consider the completed version ASBim^\wedge of ASBim . In this category we have the same objects. Let \mathbf{R} be the completion of $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]$ at 0. For two objects $B, B' \in \text{ASBim}^\wedge$ we set

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{ASBim}^\wedge}(B, B') = \text{Hom}_{\text{ASBim}}(B, B') \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]} \mathbf{R}.$$

Note that the right hand side coincides with the completion on the left as well. So ASBim^\wedge is still a monoidal category. One can show that there is a natural bijection between the indecomposable objects (up to grading shift) in ASBim and the indecomposable objects in ASBim^\wedge . Both are labelled by the elements of W^{ea} . The category ASBim^\wedge is generated by the Bott-Samelson objects B_s^{AS} , where s runs over the set of simple affine reflections, and the standard objects Δ_x^{AS} for $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$. These objects will be recalled in Section 3.1.

This is an additive version of the affine Hecke category. One also could (and should) consider the triangulated version, $K^b(\text{ASBim}^\wedge)$. Moreover, there are abelian versions. For example, there is a highest weight category $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{R}}$ (to be referred to as a “Soergel-type” category \mathcal{O}) that has essentially appeared in [EL, Section 6]. The category ASBim^\wedge is identified with the category of tilting objects in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{R}}$.

One can expect two kinds of geometric realizations of ASBim^\wedge . There is a constructible realization, see [BR3, Theorems 1.3,1.5].

1.2. Harish-Chandra bimodules. In this paper we will care about a coherent realization of ASBim^\wedge . As suggested in [BR2], to get this realization one uses a modular version of the category of Harish-Chandra bimodules (a classical object of study in the “usual”, i.e., characteristic 0, Lie representation theory).

Let $\mathcal{U} := U(\mathfrak{g})$ be the universal enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{g} . Consider the completed version $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ of the universal enveloping algebra as in [BR2, Section 3.5] at the zero Harish-Chandra (shortly, HC) character. It makes sense to speak about HC bimodules for $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$, see [BR2, Section 3.5]. These are finitely generated G -equivariant $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ -modules, where the resulting left action of \mathcal{U} factors through $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$. Denote this category by $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. Inside we consider the category of “HC-tilting” objects, the direct G -equivariant right $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ -module summands in objects of the form $T \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$, where T is a tilting G -module. Denote the full subcategory of HC-tilting objects by $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. Note that the category $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is monoidal and $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is a monoidal Karoubian additive subcategory. Let us give examples of objects in $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ considered in [BR2]. There are reflection bimodules, B_s^{HC} , labelled by the simple affine reflections s (tensoring with such a bimodule gives a classical reflection functor, hence the name) and standard bimodules Δ_x^{HC} , $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$ (tensoring with them gives a translation equivalence). We will elaborate on them in Section 3.2.

The main result of [BR2], mainly [BR2, Theorem 6.3], can be stated as follows (we will elaborate why in Section 3.2, see Proposition 3.5).

Theorem 1.1. *There is a full embedding $\text{ASBim}^\wedge \hookrightarrow \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ of monoidal categories. This embedding sends B_s^{AS} to B_s^{HC} for all simple affine reflections s and Δ_x^{AS} to Δ_x^{HC} for all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$.*

One can easily see that the image of this embedding lies in $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. One of the goals of this paper is to prove the following stronger version of this theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *The full embedding $\text{ASBim}^\wedge \hookrightarrow \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ from Theorem 1.1 is a category equivalence.*

Here is a derived version of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.3. *The equivalence $\text{ASBim}^\wedge \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ from Theorem 1.2 extends to an exact monoidal equivalence $K^b(\text{ASBim}^\wedge) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$ of triangulated categories.*

We will also have the following result that actually plays an important role in proving Theorems 1.2,1.3. This result should be thought of as a localization theorem (a.l.a. [BMR]) for Harish-Chandra bimodules.

Theorem 1.4. *We have a monoidal exact equivalence of triangulated categories*

$$D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\text{St}_R^{(1)})).$$

Here $G^{(1)}$ denotes the Frobenius twist of G and $\text{St}_R^{(1)}$ is a version of the Steinberg variety formally defined in Section 2.1.

Theorems 1.3, 1.4 combined together give an equivalence

$$K^b(\text{ASBim}^\wedge) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\text{St}_R^{(1)})).$$

This is a coherent realization of the triangulated version of the Hecke category.

The equivalence from Theorem 1.3 is t-exact with respect to perverse t-structures, compare to [B, Theorems 54,55]. To avoid technicalities we will only establish this for specialized categories. This is actually the result that is used to prove Theorems 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. Let \mathcal{O} denote the specialization to \mathbb{F} of the highest weight category $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$ mentioned in Section 1.1. On the other hand, one can consider the central reduction \mathcal{U}_0 of \mathcal{U} and the category of HC \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{U}_0 -bimodules with trivial central character on the left. This category will be denoted by $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$. The derived category $D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ comes with a so called perverse t-structure, to be recalled in Section 4.5. Let $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ denote the heart of this t-structure.

Theorem 1.5. *The full embedding from Theorem 1.1 gives rise to an equivalence of abelian categories $\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ and an equivalence $D^b(\mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ of triangulated categories.*

We note that many results mentioned above were also independently obtained by Bezrukavnikov and Riche, [BR4].

1.3. Category \mathcal{O}^{cl} . Another category we consider is the modular version of the classical BGG category \mathcal{O} to be denoted by \mathcal{O}^{cl} . By definition, this is a category of finitely generated strongly B -equivariant \mathcal{U} -modules, where, as usual, B denotes a Borel subgroup of G . The category \mathcal{O}^{cl} splits into blocks, let $\mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ denote the principal one. We will see below that the simple objects in $\mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ are indexed by the elements of W^{ea} . An important difference of $\mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ from the categories \mathcal{O} and $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ is that it is “periodic”: the twist with any character of the Frobenius twist $B^{(1)}$ gives a self-equivalence of $\mathcal{O}^{[0]}$. We can think of the character lattice of $B^{(1)}$ as the lattice $\Lambda \subset W^{ea}$. On the level of labels of simple objects, the equivalence corresponding to $\lambda \in \Lambda$ acts on W^{ea} by the right shift by t_λ .

Here is a basic (and easy) result relating the category $\mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ to the categories mentioned in the previous sections.

Proposition 1.6. *We have a derived equivalence $D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$.*

Thanks to this proposition and Theorem 1.5, we get a derived equivalence

$$(1.1) \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}).$$

1.4. Noncommutative Springer resolution. An important ingredient in the proof of several results, which is also of independent interest, is the Noncommutative Springer resolution, [BM]. In our context, this is an $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]_G^{(1)}} \mathbb{R}$ -algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ that serves as a noncommutative resolution for various objects associated to the nilpotent cone of $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$. For example, we can consider the specialization

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F},$$

this is an algebra over $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{N}^{(1)}]$, where $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}$ is the nilpotent cone in $\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)}$ be the Springer resolution of $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}$. Then \mathcal{A} is a noncommutative resolution of $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}$ meaning that there is an $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{N}^{(1)}]$ -linear derived equivalence $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}\text{-mod})$.

It turns out that the categories $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0, \mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ can be interpreted via \mathcal{A} . Let $\pi : \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}$ denote the natural map. So we have a $G^{(1)}$ -equivariant sheaf of algebras $\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ over $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)}$ and consider the category $\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}})$.

Theorem 1.7. *We have equivalences of abelian categories*

$$(1.2) \quad \mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0 \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^*(1)]} \mathcal{A}^{opp}\text{-mod}^{G(1)},$$

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbf{O}^{[0]} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{Coh}^{G(1)}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{R}}).$$

We would like to point out that the direct characteristic 0 analog of $\mathrm{Coh}^{G(1)}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{R}})$ has appeared before, in the paper [BLin]. In that paper the corresponding t-structure on the triangulated version of the affine Hecke category (a characteristic 0 analog of $D^b(\mathbf{O})$) was shown to coincide with the “new” t-structure of Frenkel and Gaitsgory [FG]. The equivalence (1.3) can be used to equip the heart of the new t-structure of the affine Hecke category with a highest weight structure. In a subsequent paper we plan to use this fact to prove a “localization theorem” for a category \mathbf{O} over a quantum group at a root of unity.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Roman Bezrukavnikov, Gurbir Dhillon, Simon Riche, and Geordie Williamson for stimulating discussions. Most of this work was done during my participation in the special year on Geometric and Modular Representation Theory at the IAS in Spring 2021 where many topics related to this paper were discussed. I am grateful to the IAS and the program organizers and participants for this valuable experience. My work was partially supported by the NSF under grant DMS-2001139.

2. PRELIMINARIES: LOCALIZATION THEOREMS

In this section we recall the derived localization theorem from [BMR] and some related developments from [BM].

2.1. Derived localization. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ denote the Grothendieck-Springer resolution of

$$(2.1) \quad \mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}}^* := \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes_{\mathfrak{h}^*/W} \mathfrak{h}^*.$$

Set $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}} := \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. We also consider the “completed” version

$$(2.2) \quad \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}} := (\mathfrak{h}^*/W)^{\wedge} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^*/W} \mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}$$

(here and below \bullet^{\wedge} denote the completion at 0, e.g., in this particular case $(\mathfrak{h}^*/W)^{\wedge} = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{R}^W)$). Note that G naturally acts on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}, \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}$. Note also that $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}$ comes with a natural morphism to $\mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge}/W} \mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge}$.

We can apply the Frobenius twist to all objects in the previous paragraph getting schemes $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}, \mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1)}, \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}$. They come with an action of $G^{(1)}$. Note that the Artin-Schreier map $\mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{*(1)}$ is etale hence identifies $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]^{\wedge_0}$ with \mathbf{R} . In particular, $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}$ is still a scheme over $\mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge}/W} \mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge}$.

Consider the categories $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1)})), D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}))$. The categories are monoidal with respect to convolution of coherent sheaves. We can also consider the versions for $G^{(1)}$ instead of G , e.g., $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}))$. We have a natural t-exact monoidal functor

$$D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)})) \rightarrow D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}))$$

but it is not fully faithful (although its restriction to the hearts of default t-structures is).

We have the completion (=pullback) functor

$$D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1)})) \rightarrow D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)})),$$

it is monoidal.

We now recall a certain Azumaya algebra on

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)} := \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}} \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{R}).$$

Let $U \subset B$ be the maximal unipotent and Borel subgroups of G . We will write \mathcal{B} for the flag variety G/B . Consider the sheaf $D_{G/U}$ of differential operators on G/U . Let $\eta : G/U \rightarrow G/B$ be the projection. Consider the sheaf $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{h}} := (\eta_* D_{G/U})^T$. This is an Azumaya algebra on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1)} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{*(1)}} \mathfrak{h}^*$, see, e.g., [BMR, Sections 2.3, 3.1.3]. For $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, consider the completion

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu} := \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]^{\wedge \mu} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]} \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{h}}.$$

This completion can be viewed as an Azumaya algebra on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}$.

Set

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{U}^{\wedge \mu} := \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*]^{\wedge \mu} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]} \mathcal{U},$$

where the quotient is taken for the dot-action (i.e., the ρ -shifted action) of W . By [BMR, Proposition 3.4.1], $R\Gamma(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}) = \mathcal{U}^{\wedge \mu}$. If μ is regular (for the dot action), then we have a category equivalence

$$(2.5) \quad R\Gamma : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu})) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge \mu}\text{-mod}),$$

this is essentially [BMR, Theorem 3.2].

The sheaves $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}$ for different μ with integral difference are Morita equivalent. Now choose μ represented by a character of T and, abusing the notation, denote the character also by μ . Then we have a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}$ given by

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mu) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} \bullet : \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}).$$

We also note that we have an algebra isomorphism

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mu) \otimes \mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(-\mu).$$

We will need the case of $\mu = -\rho$. We have a cover \tilde{G} of G (for example, the simply connected one) such that ρ is a weight for a maximal torus \tilde{T} of \tilde{G} . The resulting Morita equivalence (2.6) lifts to \tilde{G} -equivariant categories.

Now consider the algebra $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge -\rho}$ and the sheaf $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho}$. It was shown in [BMR, Proposition 5.2.1] that $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge -\rho}$ is an Azumaya algebra on $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{R}}^{*(1)}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge -\rho}$ via pullback under the resolution morphism $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{R}}^{*(1)}$. It follows that the restriction of $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho})^{opp}$ to $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)} \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)} \times \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}$ (to be denoted by $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho})^{opp} |_{\mathrm{St}}$) is G -equivariantly split with splitting bundle $\mathcal{E}_{-\rho}^{diag}$ obtained by pulling back $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge -\rho}$ under the morphism $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{R}}^{*(1)}$. Now note that $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho})^{opp}$ is Morita equivalent to $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0})^{opp}$ via

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}}(\rho, -\rho) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}}} \bullet : \mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho})^{opp} |_{\mathrm{St}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0})^{opp} |_{\mathrm{St}}).$$

While ρ may fail to be a character of T , the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}}(\rho, -\rho)$ is G -equivariant.

Definition 2.1. Applying (2.8) to $\mathcal{E}_{-\rho}^{diag}$ we get a G -equivariant splitting bundle for the restriction $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0})^{opp} |_{\mathrm{St}}$, denote it by \mathcal{E}^{diag} .

Now consider the scheme

$$(2.9) \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1), \wedge \mathfrak{g}} := \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]]) \times_{\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(1)}.$$

The pullback of $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge-\rho}$ to $\mathfrak{g}_R^{*(1),\wedge\mathfrak{g}}$ splits. Note that all splitting bundles for $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge-\rho}$ are isomorphic (because it is a split Azumaya algebra over a complete local ring). Let $\mathcal{E}'_{-\rho}$ denote the pullback of this splitting bundle to $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1),\wedge\mathfrak{g}}$. It is a splitting bundle for the pullback $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge-\rho,\mathfrak{g}}$ of $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge-\rho}$ to $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1),\wedge\mathfrak{g}}$. Applying a Morita equivalence analogous to (2.6) to $\mathcal{E}'_{-\rho}$ we get a splitting bundle for $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge,0}$ to be denoted by \mathcal{E}' .

Remark 2.2. By the construction, the restrictions of \mathcal{E}_{diag} and $\mathcal{E}' \boxtimes \mathcal{E}'^*$ to

$$\mathrm{St}_R^{(1)} \cap (\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1),\wedge\mathfrak{g}} \times \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1),\wedge\mathfrak{g}})$$

are isomorphic.

We proceed to a discussion of derived equivalences. If μ is regular (for the dot action), then

$$R\Gamma : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge\mu})) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge\mu}\text{-mod})$$

is a category equivalence, this is essentially [BMR, Theorem 3.2]. For example, we can take $\mu = 0$. This gives rise to the following equivalences:

$$(2.10) \quad R\Gamma(\mathcal{E}' \otimes \bullet) : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1),\wedge\mathfrak{g}})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0,\mathfrak{g}}\text{-mod}),$$

$$(2.11) \quad R\Gamma : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0})^{opp})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes (\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})^{opp}\text{-mod}^G).$$

In (2.10) we set $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0,\mathfrak{g}} := \mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]]} \mathcal{U}$.

Set

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]^{\wedge} := \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]^W} \mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]]^W.$$

This algebra is the center of $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$, this is an easy consequence of the Veldkamp theorem on the center of \mathcal{U} . Since \mathcal{U} is flat over $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]$ and $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1)}$ is a complete intersection in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)} \times \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$, (2.11) yields an equivalence

$$(2.13) \quad R\Gamma : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0})^{opp} |_{\mathrm{St}})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]^{\wedge}} (\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})^{opp}\text{-mod}^G),$$

see the discussion of exact fiber products and base changes in [BM, Sections 1.3-1.5]. Hence we have an equivalence

$$(2.14) \quad R\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{diag} \otimes \bullet) : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \mathrm{St}_R^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]^{\wedge}} (\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})^{opp}\text{-mod}^G).$$

We note that (2.14) is an \mathbf{R} -bilinear monoidal equivalence (with respect to the covolution vs tensor product of bimodules).

Remark 2.3. Consider the specialization \mathcal{U}_0 of $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ to the closed point of \mathbf{R} as well as the Steinberg variety $\mathrm{St} := \mathrm{St}_R \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{R})} \mathrm{pt}$. For the same reason as for (2.14) we have

$$(2.15) \quad R\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{diag} \otimes \bullet) : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \mathrm{St}^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{U} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G).$$

We note that it is an equivalence of left module categories over the equivalent monoidal categories in (2.14).

2.2. Tilting bundle and noncommutative Springer resolution. We will need the construction of a tilting bundle on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ from [BM]. On $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ we have a $G^{(1)} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant vector bundle $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ that is a tilting generator meaning that the following two conditions hold:

- $\mathrm{Ext}^i(\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}) = 0$ for $i > 0$,
- and the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{h}} := \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}})$ has finite homological dimension.

This bundle was constructed in [BM], see [BM, Theorem 1.5.1] for the statement and [BM, Section 2.5] for the construction of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}$. More precisely, [BM] introduces a vector bundle on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ denoted there by \mathcal{E} . The relation between the two vector bundles is as follows: $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathcal{E}^*$.

The functor $R\Gamma(\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}} \otimes \bullet)$ is an equivalence $D^b(\text{Coh}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{h}}\text{-mod})$, see [BM, Section 1.5.3].

Consider the algebras

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} := \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{h}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} := \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]^\wedge} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{opp},$$

The group $G^{(1)}$ acts on $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag}$ by \mathbb{R} -algebra automorphisms. Note that, similarly to (2.14), we have equivalences

$$(2.16) \quad D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag}\text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}), \quad D^b(\text{Coh}^G \text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag}\text{-mod}^G)$$

given by $R\Gamma([\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}} \boxtimes \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}}^*]_{\text{st}} \otimes \bullet)$, where we write $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}}$ for $\mathcal{T} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} \mathbb{R}$. Note that the categories $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag}\text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag}\text{-mod}^G$ are monoidal with respect to the functor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}} \bullet$. The equivalences (2.16) are monoidal. They are also \mathbb{R} -bilinear.

We will need to relate $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ to the splitting bundle arising from $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$. The following was proved in [BM] (somewhat implicitly, see [BLo, Lemma 4.7] for an explicit proof).

Lemma 2.4. *The bundle $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\wedge \mathfrak{g}}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ to $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1), \wedge \mathfrak{g}}$, has the same indecomposable direct summands as \mathcal{E}' .*

Set $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}$. Similarly to Remark 2.3, we have a derived equivalence

$$(2.17) \quad D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp}\text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}).$$

3. PRELIMINARIES: SOERGEL AND HARISH-CHANDRA BIMODULES

In this section we mostly review constructions and results from [BR2]. We also discuss their connection with the constructions from the previous section.

3.1. Soergel bimodules following [BR2]. One family of categories introduced in [BR2] has to do with Abe's construction of the category of Soergel bimodules. First, some notation. For a right $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ -module M we write

$$(3.1) \quad M_{loc} := M \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}), \quad M^\wedge := M \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} \mathbb{R},$$

where, recall, \mathbb{R} stands for the completion of $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ at zero.

Following [BR2, Section 2.2], we consider the category \mathcal{C}'_{ext} whose objects are pairs consisting of

- (i) graded $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ -bimodules B and
- (ii) decompositions

$$B_{loc} = \bigoplus_{x \in W^{ea}} B_{loc}^x,$$

into the direct sum of $\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*})$ -subspaces such that there are only finitely many nonzero summands and $br = x(r)b$ for all $b \in B_{loc}^x$ and $r \in \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$.

The morphisms in \mathcal{C}'_{ext} are graded bimodule homomorphisms $\varphi : B \rightarrow B'$ such that $\varphi_{loc}(B_{loc}^x) \subset B'_{loc}$ for all $x \in W^{ea}$. Inside \mathcal{C}'_{ext} we consider the full subcategory \mathcal{C}_{ext} consisting of all objects that are finitely generated as bimodules and also flat as right $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ -modules. Similarly to [A, Lemma 2.6], the objects in \mathcal{C}_{ext} are finitely generated both as left and as right $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ -modules. In particular, they are free as right $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ -modules. The category \mathcal{C}'_{ext} has a natural monoidal structure lifting $\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} \bullet$. The subcategory \mathcal{C}_{ext} is an additive monoidal $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{*(1)}]$ -bilinear subcategory. Note also that we have the grading shift endo-functor, to be denoted by $\langle 1 \rangle$, of \mathcal{C}'_{ext} that preserves \mathcal{C}_{ext} .

We will need two families of objects in \mathcal{C}_{ext} . First, there are standard objects, $\Delta_x, x \in W^{ea}$. Each Δ_x is a rank one free right $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ -module (with generator in degree 0), where the left action is introduced via twist with x so that $\Delta_{x,loc} = \Delta_{x,loc}^x$. For a simple affine reflection $s \in W^a$ we also have the Bott-Samelson object B_s whose underlying graded bimodule is $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ with the natural decomposition for the localized bimodule. Let ASBim denote the full subcategory of \mathcal{C}_{ext} generated by $\Delta_x, x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$, and B_s , where s runs over the set of simple affine reflections under the operations of taking tensor products, direct sums/summands and grading shifts. It is known, essentially after [A] (see [A, Theorem 1.1] for the case when $W^{ea} = W^a$), that the indecomposables in ASBim are labelled by the elements of W^{ea} . Namely, for $w \in W^{ea}$, we can write a reduced expression $w = xs_1 \dots s_k$ with $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$ and s_i simple affine reflections. Then the indecomposable object B_w is a direct summand in

$$\Delta_x \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} B_{s_1} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} B_{s_2} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} \dots \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]} B_{s_k}$$

and all other direct summands are of the form B_u with $u < w$ in the Bruhat order (and some grading shifts).

We will work not with ASBim, \mathcal{C}_{ext} and \mathcal{C}'_{ext} but with their completed (and ungraded versions). Namely, we consider the category $\mathcal{C}'_{ext}^\wedge$ consisting of $\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]]$ -bimodules with additional structure as in (ii) above. Inside there is the full subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{ext}^\wedge \subset \mathcal{C}'_{ext}^\wedge$ defined similarly to \mathcal{C}_{ext} . Note that we have the completion functor $\bullet^\wedge : \mathcal{C}'_{ext} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_{ext}^\wedge$ defined by (3.1). It is exact and monoidal. It sends \mathcal{C}_{ext} to \mathcal{C}_{ext}^\wedge . We define ASBim^\wedge as the full subcategory of \mathcal{C}_{ext}^\wedge generated by B_s^\wedge for simple affine reflections s and Δ_x^\wedge for $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$. Below we will write B_s^{AS} for B_s^\wedge and Δ_x^{AS} for Δ_x^\wedge (for all $x \in W^{ea}$).

The following lemma describes basic properties of the category ASBim^\wedge .

Lemma 3.1. *The following claims are true:*

(1) *For $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{ext}$ we have*

$$\left(\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_{ext}}(B_1, B_2 \langle i \rangle) \right)^\wedge \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_{ext}^\wedge}(B_1^\wedge, B_2^\wedge).$$

(2) *The indecomposable objects in ASBim^\wedge are precisely the objects B_x^\wedge for $x \in W^{ea}$.*

Proof. Note that $\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_{ext}}(B_1, B_2 \langle i \rangle)$ embeds into $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]\text{-bimod}}(B_1, B_2)$ with the image consisting of all φ such that φ_{loc} preserves the decomposition in (ii) above. Since B_1 is finitely generated as an $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]$ -bimodule, we have

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]\text{-bimod}}(B_1, B_2)^\wedge \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]]\text{-bimod}}(B_1^\wedge, B_2^\wedge).$$

We need to show that this isomorphism intertwines the sub-bimodules of all maps φ such that φ_{loc} intertwine the decompositions analogous to those in (ii). The inclusion

$$(3.2) \quad \left(\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_{ext}}(B_1, B_2 \langle i \rangle) \right)^\wedge \subset \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_{ext}^\wedge}(B_1^\wedge, B_2^\wedge).$$

follows from the observation that the functor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]]} \mathbb{F}((\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}))$ preserves the decompositions like in (ii). On the hand, the preimage of

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_{ext}^\wedge}(B_1^\wedge, B_2^\wedge) \subset \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]]\text{-bimod}}(B_1^\wedge, B_2^\wedge)$$

inside $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]]\text{-bimod}}(B_1, B_2)$ consists of maps that preserve the decompositions in (ii). It follows that (3.2) is an equality.

(2) is proved exactly as [EL, Lemma 6.9]. \square

To relate ASBim (or ASBim^\wedge) to a category of Harish-Chandra bimodules (that will be explained in the next section) we need an intermediate geometric category considered in [BR2]. Define the scheme

$$(3.3) \quad Y := \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}.$$

There is a certain affine group scheme \mathfrak{J} over Y introduced in [BR2, Section 2.3]. Namely, let $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*, reg}$ denote the locus of regular (not necessarily semisimple) elements in $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}$. Inside $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*, reg}$ we have the Kostant-Slodowy slice $S^{(1)}$. The quotient morphism $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{(1)*} // G^{(1)} \cong \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W$ restricts to an isomorphism $S^{(1)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W$. Over $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*, reg}$ we have the universal centralizer group scheme, to be denoted here by $\mathfrak{C}^{(1)}$. Over $s \in S^{(1)}$, the fiber of $\mathfrak{C}^{(1)}$ is the stabilizer of s in $G^{(1)}$. We can view $\mathfrak{C}^{(1)}$ as a group scheme over $S^{(1)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W$. Then we set

$$\mathfrak{J} = \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathfrak{C}^{(1)} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}.$$

We note that, by the construction of \mathfrak{J} , the multiplicative group \mathbb{F}^\times acts on \mathfrak{J} by automorphisms compatibly with the dilation action on $\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}$. So it makes sense to consider the category $\text{Rep}_{fl}^{\mathbb{F}^\times}(\mathfrak{J})$ of $\mathbb{F}^\times \times \mathfrak{J}$ -equivariant coherent sheaves on Y that are flat over the second copy of $\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}$. As explained in [BR2, Section 2.3], $\text{Rep}_{fl}^{\mathbb{F}^\times}(\mathfrak{J})$ is a monoidal category.

We will need the completed version of this category. Consider the scheme $Y^\wedge := Y \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}} \mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge} = \mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge}/W} \mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge}$ (where we write $\mathfrak{h}^{*\wedge}$ for $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{R}) \cong \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}]]))$ and the pullback \mathfrak{J}^\wedge of \mathfrak{J} to Y^\wedge . So we can consider the category $\text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$. It is monoidal similarly to [BR2, Section 2.3]. We have the completion functor $\bullet^\wedge : \text{Rep}_{fl}^{\mathbb{F}^\times}(\mathfrak{J}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ defined as above.

Lemma 3.2. *We have a monoidal \mathbb{R} -bilinear full embedding $\text{ASBim}^\wedge \hookrightarrow \text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of [BR2, Theorem 2.10]. Namely, [BR2, Proposition 2.7], we have a fully faithful monoidal embedding

$$(3.4) \quad \text{Rep}_{fl}^{\mathbb{F}^\times}(\mathfrak{J}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{ext}.$$

We claim that it gives rise to a full monoidal embedding

$$(3.5) \quad \text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{ext}^\wedge.$$

The functor is constructed similarly to the proof [BR2, Proposition 2.7], it is monoidal. To show it is full we need to relate Hom's in the categories $\text{Rep}_{fl}^{\mathbb{F}^\times}(\mathfrak{J})$, $\text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ and also in $\text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J})$. They will be denoted by $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}^\times, \mathfrak{J}}$, $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}^\wedge}$, $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}}$. Namely, thanks to (1) of Lemma 3.1 and [BR2, Proposition 2.7], it is enough to prove that

$$(3.6) \quad \left(\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}^\times, \mathfrak{J}}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \langle i \rangle) \right)^\wedge \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}^\wedge}(\mathcal{F}_1^\wedge, \mathcal{F}_2^\wedge)$$

for all $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \text{Rep}_{fl}^{\mathbb{F}^\times}(\mathfrak{J})$. Note that the direct sum in the left hand side of (3.6) is nothing else but $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$. As in the proof of (1) of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(Y)}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)^\wedge \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(Y^\wedge)}(\mathcal{F}_1^\wedge, \mathcal{F}_2^\wedge).$$

We need to show that this isomorphism intertwines $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)^\wedge$ with $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}^\wedge}(\mathcal{F}_1^\wedge, \mathcal{F}_2^\wedge)$.

Note that $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ is the $\mathbb{F}[Y]$ -submodule of solutions to a finite system of linear equations with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}[Y]$. Indeed, $\text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(Y)}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ is a \mathfrak{J} -module, equivalently, an $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{J}]$ -comodule. If $\epsilon : \mathbb{F}[Y] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{J}]$ denotes the unit map and

$$\alpha : \text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(Y)}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(Y)}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[Y]} \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{J}]$$

is the co-action map, then

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) = \{\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(Y)}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) \mid \alpha(\varphi) = \varphi \otimes \epsilon\}.$$

The equation in the right hand side translates to a finite system of linear equations on φ with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}[Y]$, which establishes the claim in the beginning of the paragraph. Now note that

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{J}^\wedge}(\mathcal{F}_1^\wedge, \mathcal{F}_2^\wedge) \subset \text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(Y^\wedge)}(\mathcal{F}_1^\wedge, \mathcal{F}_2^\wedge)$$

is specified by the same equations. This finishes the proof of (3.6) and hence the construction of (3.5).

To establish the full embedding $\text{ASBim}^\wedge \hookrightarrow \text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ it suffices show that the essential image of (3.5) contains ASBim^\wedge . This follows from [BR2, Lemma 2.9]. \square

Remark 3.3. We will need a construction of (3.5) following the proof of [BR2, Proposition 2.7]. It is essentially a (partially) forgetful functor. An object \mathcal{F} in $\text{Rep}_{fl}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ is, in particular, an \mathbb{R} -bimodule that is flat over the second copy of \mathbb{R} . The localization of \mathcal{F} to the regular locus in $\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*\wedge}/W$ carries an action of T . The corresponding locus in Y splits into the disjoint union of components indexed by W . These two structures give the decomposition of \mathcal{F}_{loc} as in (ii) in the beginning of the section.

3.2. Harish-Chandra bimodules following [BR2]. Here we recall that category of modular HC bimodules following [BR2] and explain a version of the main result of [BR2].

We start by recalling basics following [BR2, Section 3]. Recall that \mathcal{U}^\wedge stands for the partial completion of \mathcal{U} at HC central character 0:

$$\mathcal{U}^\wedge = \mathcal{U} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]} \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]^\wedge.$$

This is an \mathbb{R} -algebra with a G -action. The center of \mathcal{U}^\wedge is $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]^\wedge$, see Section 2.1.

Consider the category $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge, opp}\text{-mod}^G$ of (weakly) G -equivariant right \mathcal{U}^\wedge -modules. Such a module carries a natural left \mathcal{U} -action commuting with the right \mathcal{U}^\wedge -action that is uniquely recovered from the condition that the adjoint \mathfrak{g} -action coincides with the differential of the G -action (this condition can be expressed by saying that we get strongly

G -equivariant \mathcal{U} -bimodules). The objects in $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0, opp} \text{-mod}^G$ will be called *Harish-Chandra bimodules*.

For $\mu \in \Lambda$, let $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge \mu} - \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ stand for the full subcategory $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0, opp} \text{-mod}^G$ of all objects where the left action of \mathcal{U} factors through $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge \mu}$. We have the decomposition, see e.g. [BR2, (3.13)]

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0, opp} \text{-mod}^G = \bigoplus_{\mu} \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge \mu} - \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}),$$

where the summation is taken over all orbits of W in the \mathbb{F}_p -points in \mathfrak{h}^* . We will be primarily interested in the category $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}) := \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} - \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. It is \mathbb{R} -bilinear and monoidal with respect to $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}} \bullet$. We write pr_0 for the projection functor from $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0, opp} \text{-mod}^G$ to $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$.

Here is a special class of bimodules considered in [BR2]. We say that an object in $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is *diagonally induced* if it is a direct summand in $V \otimes \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ for some finite dimensional representation V of G . This is a monoidal subcategory of $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ to be denoted by $\text{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$.

It was essentially shown in [BR2] that there is a full embedding of ASBim^{\wedge} into $\text{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. One can describe the images of $\Delta_x^{AS}, B_s^{AS} \in \text{ASBim}$ in $\text{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ for all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$ and all simple affine reflections s . First, we have the reflection bimodules $B_s^{HC} \in \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ for all simple affine reflections s , in the notation of [BR2] these are the objects

$$\mathbf{P}^{0, \mu_s} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathbf{P}^{\mu_s, 0}.$$

Tensoring with B_s^{HC} on the left gives the classical reflection functor corresponding to s , it will be denoted by Θ_s . For $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$, we consider the standard objects Δ_x^{HC} for $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$, the translation bimodules from 0 to $x^{-1} \cdot 0$ (where we write \cdot to indicate the p -scaled action of W^{ea} on Λ , note that the condition that $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$ is equivalent to $x^{-1} \cdot 0$ and 0 being in the same alcove). The full embedding $\text{ASBim}^{\wedge} \hookrightarrow \text{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ essentially constructed in [BR2] (see Section 6 there for the final construction) sends B_s^{AS} to B_s^{HC} and Δ_x^{AS} to Δ_x^{HC} .

Let us recall the construction of the full embedding. Recall the schemes Y, Y^{\wedge} from Section 3.1 as well as the group scheme \mathfrak{J} on Y and its restriction \mathfrak{J}^{\wedge} to Y^{\wedge} . Consider another group scheme, \mathfrak{I} , on Y defined analogously to \mathfrak{J} but for the action of G on $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}$ instead of the action of $G^{(1)}$ (this group scheme is denoted by \mathbb{I} in [BR2]). We have a natural epimorphism $\mathfrak{I} \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}$ whose kernel is the constant group scheme on Y with fiber G_1 , the first Frobenius kernel. Let \mathfrak{I}^{\wedge} denote the pullback of \mathfrak{I} to Y^{\wedge} . We can consider the category $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{I}^{\wedge})$ defined similarly to $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^{\wedge})$. We have a full embedding $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{I}^{\wedge}) \hookrightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^{\wedge})$, the pullback via $\mathfrak{I}^{\wedge} \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}^{\wedge}$.

We will also need to enlarge $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. By definition, the enlarged category we need consists of all G -equivariant $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ -bimodules where the left and the right actions of the p -center $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]^{\wedge}$ coincide. Denote this category by $\overline{\text{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. Since the left and right actions of the p -center on every HC bimodule coincide, we have an \mathbb{R} -bilinear full monoidal inclusion $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, see [BR2, (3.6)].

The construction in [BR2] starts with producing a functor

$$(3.8) \quad \overline{\text{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathfrak{I}^{\wedge})$$

that restricts to a fully faithful embedding $\mathrm{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rep}_{fl}(\mathcal{J}^{\wedge})$. The construction is as follows. Consider the locus

$$\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg} := \mathfrak{g}^{(1)*,reg} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}} \mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)} \subset \mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}$$

Note that the restriction of the projective morphism

$$\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{R}) \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathfrak{g}^{(1)*} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{R})$$

to $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$ is an open embedding. We can view $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0,opp}$ as a sheaf of algebras on $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{R}) \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathfrak{g}^{(1)*} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{(1)*}/W} \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{R})$. Its restriction to $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$, to be denoted by $(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0,opp})^{reg}$, coincides with the restriction of $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0})^{opp} |_{\mathrm{St}}$. In particular, $(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0,opp})^{reg}$ is a G -equivariant Azumaya algebra with a G -equivariant splitting bundle \mathcal{E}_{diag}^{reg} , the restriction of the splitting bundle \mathcal{E}_{diag} introduced in Section 2.1 to $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$.

The functor (3.8) is constructed as follows. Start with an object in $\overline{\mathrm{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ and restrict it to $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$. Applying the equivalence coming from the splitting bundle \mathcal{E}_{diag}^{reg} , we get a G -equivariant coherent sheaf on $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$. Note that Y^{\wedge} embeds into $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$, this embedding is induced by the embedding of S into $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}$. So we can restrict a G -equivariant coherent sheaf from $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$ to Y^{\wedge} getting an \mathcal{J}^{\wedge} -equivariant coherent sheaf. For (3.8) we take the resulting composition:

$$(3.9) \quad \overline{\mathrm{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^G((\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0,opp})^{reg}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{J}^{\wedge}).$$

In fact, later we will see that the image of $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ in $\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg})$ lies in $\mathrm{Coh}^{G(1)}(\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg})$.

We note that thus constructed functor (3.8) is the same as the composition of [BR2, (3.18)] and the inverse of the equivalence $\mathcal{L}_{0,0}$ in [BR2, Corollary 4.8]. Indeed, to get from $\mathrm{Coh}^G((\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0,opp})^{reg})$ to $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{J}^{\wedge})$ we first apply the equivalence coming from the splitting bundle, and then restrict to Y^{\wedge} . Bezrukavnikov and Riche first restrict to Y^{\wedge} and then apply the equivalence coming from the splitting bundle constructed in [BR2, Theorem 4.3]. To see that our construction agrees with that from [BR2] it remains to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *The splitting bundle from [BR2, Theorem 4.3] coincides with the restriction of \mathcal{E}_{diag} to Y^{\wedge} .*

Proof. We write $L(\rho)$ for the irreducible G -module with highest weight ρ . In the notation of [BR2], their splitting bundle is given by the restriction to Y^{\wedge} of $\mathbf{P}^{0,-\rho} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{P}^{-\rho,0}$, where $\mathbf{P}^{0,-\rho}$ is given as the projection to $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} - \mathcal{U}^{\wedge -\rho})$ of $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes L(\rho)$ (where $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ acts on this bimodule from the left as on the direct sum of the $\dim L(\rho)$ copies of the regular module). Similarly, $\mathbf{P}^{-\rho,0}$ is the projection of $L(\rho) \otimes \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ to $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge -\rho} - \mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$.

Note that $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} \otimes L(\rho) = \Gamma(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \otimes L(\rho))$. We view $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \otimes L(\rho)$ as a weakly G -equivariant left $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$ -module (and hence also as a left $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ -module). So it carries a right action of \mathcal{U} commuting with the left $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ -action: for a local section α of this sheaf and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ we define $\alpha\xi = \xi\alpha - \xi_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha$, where $\xi_{\mathcal{M}}$ denote the operator on \mathcal{M} coming from the G -action. In particular, the center of \mathcal{U} acts by endomorphisms of the weakly G -equivariant left \mathcal{U} -module \mathcal{M} . The right action of the center also commutes with the left action of $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$. This is because the coherent sheaf \mathcal{M} on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}$ is locally free and $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$ and

$\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ coincide over $\mathfrak{g}^{*(1),reg}$. Let $\mathcal{M}^{-\rho}$ denote the maximal subsheaf of \mathcal{M} , where the action of $\mathcal{U}^G \cong \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]$ factors through $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]^{\wedge -\rho}$.

We are going to show that there is a G -equivariant $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$ -module isomorphism

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{M}^{-\rho} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho}.$$

Consider the sheaf \mathcal{U}^0 on \mathcal{B} as in [BB, Section 2], it is generated by \mathfrak{g} (as a Lie algebra) and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}$ (as a sheaf of algebras) with a cross-relation $[\xi, f] = \xi.f$ for the usual \mathfrak{g} -action on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}$. It maps to $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}$ for all μ . The map is not an epimorphism however the \mathbb{R} -submodule generated by the image coincides with $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}$. This is because the composition of the map $\mathcal{U}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}$ with the projection $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F} = D_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mu}$ is surjective, $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge \mu}$ is a coherent sheaf over $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}$, and the support of every coherent sheaf on $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}$ intersects the zero fiber $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)}$. As in [BB, (ii)], \mathcal{M} is filtered by G -equivariant $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$ -modules of the form $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\nu)$, where ν is a weight of $L(\rho)$. The latter tensor product is a right $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\nu}$ -module thanks to (2.7). Therefore the action of $\mathcal{U}^G \cong \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]$ on $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\nu)$ from the right is via $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]^{\wedge -\nu}$. The condition that $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]^{\wedge -\nu} = \mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{h}^*/(W, \cdot)]^{\wedge -\rho}$ means that $\nu + \rho \in p\Lambda$. We claim that this means that $\nu = -\rho$. Indeed, let $w \in W$ be such that $w(\nu + \rho)$ is dominant (in $p\Lambda$). We have $0 \leq w(\nu + \rho) \leq 2\rho$, where the first inequality is an equality if and only if $\nu = -\rho$. In particular, for every simple coroot α^{\vee} , we have $0 \leq \langle w(\nu + \rho), \alpha^{\vee} \rangle \leq 2$. We conclude that $w(\nu + \rho)$ only holds if $\nu = -\rho$.

Thanks to this filtration on \mathcal{M} , the subsheaf $\mathcal{M}^{-\rho}$ is a direct summand of \mathcal{M} . The weight $-\rho$ occurs with multiplicity 1, so

$$\mathcal{M}^{-\rho} \cong \mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho).$$

The right hand side is identified with the right hand side of (3.10) as a strongly G -equivariant $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0} - \mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho}$ -bimodule, thanks to (2.7).

We conclude that

$$\mathbf{P}^{0,-\rho} \cong \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho}),$$

an isomorphism of strongly G -equivariant $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0} - \mathcal{U}^{\wedge -\rho}$ -modules. A completely similar argument shows that

$$\mathbf{P}^{-\rho,0} \cong \Gamma(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge -\rho} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(-\rho)).$$

From the construction of the splitting bundle \mathcal{E} , see Definition 2.1, we observe that over $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{*(1),reg}$ (where $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge 0}$ coincide), the bundle \mathcal{E} coincides with $\mathbf{P}^{0,-\rho} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{P}^{-\rho,0}$. This finishes the proof. \square

We claim that the third functor in (3.9) is a fully faithful embedding. For the same reason as in the proof of [BR2, Proposition 3.7], the restriction functor $\text{Coh}^G(\mathbf{St}^{(1),reg}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J})$ is a category equivalence. The third functor in (3.9) is obtained from this equivalence by changing the base to $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{R})$. Arguing as in the proof of [BR2, Proposition 3.7] (or Lemma 3.2), we see that it is fully faithful (it is also an equivalence but we will not need that). By [BR2, Proposition 3.7], we see that (3.8) is fully faithful on $\text{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$.

Here is the main result of this section, it is a slightly modified version of [BR2, Theorem 6.3].

Proposition 3.5. *There is a full \mathbb{R} -bilinear monoidal embedding $\text{ASBim}^{\wedge} \hookrightarrow \text{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, sending B_s^{AS} to B_s^{HC} for all simple affine reflections s and Δ_x^{AS} to Δ_x^{HC} for all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 we have a full embedding $\text{ASBim}^\wedge \hookrightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ and hence $\text{ASBim}^\wedge \hookrightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$. By results recalled in this section right after (3.8), we also have a full embedding $\text{HC}_{diag}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}) \hookrightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$. By [BR2, Proposition 6.6], the images of B_s^{AS} and B_s^{HC} in $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ coincide for all simple affine reflections s . By [BR2, Lemma 6.8], the images of $\Delta_x^{AS}, \Delta_x^{HC}$ coincide for all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$. This finishes the proof. \square

4. FURTHER STUDY OF MODULAR HARISH-CHANDRA BIMODULES

In this section we establish further properties of various categories of Harish-Chandra bimodules.

4.1. Derived localization for Harish-Chandra bimodules. The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem (Theorem 1.4 from the introduction).

Theorem 4.1. *We have a monoidal exact \mathbb{R} -bilinear equivalence of triangulated categories*

$$D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)})).$$

Proof. Recall equivalence (2.14), in the notation of Section 3.2 it is

$$(4.1) \quad D^b(\overline{\text{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^G(\text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)})).$$

Also recall the second equivalence in (2.16):

$$(4.2) \quad D^b(\text{Coh}^G \text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^G).$$

We will show that

(I) the composition of (4.2) and (4.1),

$$(4.3) \quad D^b(\overline{\text{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^G)$$

is t-exact,

(II) and the resulting equivalence $\overline{\text{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^G$ restricts to

$$(4.4) \quad \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}.$$

(II) will yield an equivalence $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}})$. Combining this with the first equivalence in (2.16) will give an equivalence

$$(4.5) \quad D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)})).$$

Since all intermediate equivalences are \mathbb{R} -bilinear and monoidal, so is (4.5). So (I) and (II) finish the proof of the theorem.

Proof of (I): We note that the support in

$$(4.6) \quad \mathfrak{g}^{(1)*} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{*(1)}/W} \text{Spec}(\mathbb{R}^W)$$

(a “small neighborhood” of the nilpotent cone) of any object in $\overline{\text{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})$ intersects $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]])$ because $G^{(1)}$ has only finitely many orbits in the nilpotent cone and zero is the only closed orbit. The same is true for the objects in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^G$. So it is enough to verify the t-exactness claim after changing the base from (4.6) to $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]])$. We decorate the corresponding objects with superscript $\bullet^{\wedge_{\mathfrak{g}}}$, for example

$$\text{St}^{(1)\wedge_{\mathfrak{g}}} := \text{St}^{(1)} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}} \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]]), \mathcal{D}^{\wedge_0, \mathfrak{g}} := \mathcal{D}^{\wedge_0} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]]} \mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]].$$

Recall that, by Remark 2.2, $\mathcal{E}^{diag, \wedge^{\mathfrak{g}}}$ coincides with the restriction of $\mathcal{E}' \boxtimes \mathcal{E}'^*$ to $\mathbf{St}^{\wedge^{\mathfrak{g}}}$. By Lemma 2.4, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\wedge^{\mathfrak{g}}}$ has the same indecomposable summands as \mathcal{E}' . The claim that the base change of (4.3) to $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F}[[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]])$ is t-exact follows. So (4.3) itself is t-exact.

Proof of (II): First, we observe that in both categories $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}$, $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge^0})$ every object is a quotient of a module that is flat over $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]$.

In the category $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}$ we can take objects of the form $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \otimes V'$ for a finite dimensional rational representation V' of $G^{(1)}$. The reason they are flat is that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ is flat over $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]$, see [BM, Section 2.5], hence $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag}$ is flat over $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]$.

In the category $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge^0})$ we can take the objects of the form $\mathrm{pr}_0(V \otimes \mathcal{U}^{\wedge^0})$ for a finite dimensional rational representation V of G .

An object in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^G$ that is flat over $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]$ lies in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{diag} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}$ if and only if the action of G on the restriction of this object to an arbitrary nonempty open subscheme in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}^{*(1)}$ factors through $G^{(1)}$. The similar claim holds for $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge^0}) \subset \overline{\mathrm{HC}}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge^0})$: it consists of strongly G -equivariant objects. It follows that it is enough to show the claim of (II) after restricting to a nonempty open subscheme in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}^{*(1)}$, for example, to $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}^{*(1), reg}$.

Over the latter locus equivalences (4.1) and (4.2) are t-exact. For λ, μ in the weight lattice of G (or of its cover) it makes sense to talk about strongly G -equivariant objects in $\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^{\mu}} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^{\lambda}})^{opp} |_{\mathbf{St}^{reg}})$.

So we need to prove that for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathbf{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1), reg})$ the following two conditions are equivalent:

- (i) The action of G on \mathcal{F} factors through $G^{(1)}$,
- (ii) and $\mathcal{E}^{diag} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ is strongly G -equivariant.

Tensoring an object in $\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\mathbf{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1), reg})$ with a strongly equivariant object in $\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0})^{opp} |_{\mathbf{St}^{reg}})$ gives a strongly equivariant object in $\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0})^{opp} |_{\mathbf{St}^{reg}})$. Note also that if two objects in $\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0})^{opp} |_{\mathbf{St}^{reg}})$ are strongly equivariant, then the G -action on their Hom (over $\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^0})^{opp} |_{\mathbf{St}^{reg}})$ factors through $G^{(1)}$. So the equivalence of (i) and (ii) will follow once we check that \mathcal{E}^{diag} is strongly equivariant. Note that twist with line bundles on \mathcal{B} preserves the strong equivariance. This is because

$$\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^{\mu}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mu - \lambda) \in \mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^{\mu}} \boxtimes (\mathcal{D}^{\wedge^{\lambda}})^{opp})$$

is strongly equivariant.

On the other hand, the regular $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge^{-\rho}}$ -bimodule is strongly equivariant hence so is its pullback to $\mathbf{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}$. From the construction of \mathcal{E}^{diag} in the proof of (I), it follows that \mathcal{E}^{diag} satisfies the HC condition, which finishes the proof of (II). \square

Remark 4.2. We will need different versions of the equivalences in Theorem 4.1. Consider the full subcategory $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ of all objects in $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge^0})$ such that the action of \mathbb{R} on the right factors through the residue field, equivalently, the action of \mathcal{U}^{\wedge^0} factors through \mathcal{U}_0 . In other words, the objects in $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ are exactly the finitely generated strongly G -equivariant $\mathcal{U}\text{-}\mathcal{U}_0$ -bimodules. Since (4.4) is \mathbb{R} -bilinear, it restricts to an equivalence

$$(4.7) \quad \mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}$$

Note that this is (1.2) from Theorem 1.7.

Combining (4.7) with (2.17), we get

$$(4.8) \quad D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathbf{St}^{(1)}).$$

Now let $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0)$ denote the category of HC \mathcal{U}_0 -bimodules. Similarly to (4.7) we get an equivalence

$$(4.9) \quad \mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}.$$

It is monoidal because (4.4) is. And (4.7) becomes an equivalence of bimodule categories over the equivalent monoidal categories from (4.4) acting on the left and (4.9) acting on the right.

4.2. Grothendieck group. The goal of this section is to use Theorem 4.1 to study the $K_0(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0))$.

We have a classical action of W^{ea} on $K_0(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0))$ coming from the reflection functors: tensoring with B_s^{HC} (on the left) corresponds to the operator $1 + s$ for all simple affine reflections, and tensoring with Δ_x^{HC} corresponds to x for all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$.

Our goal is to prove the following result.

Proposition 4.3. *We have a W^{ea} -equivariant isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}W^{ea} \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0))$ that maps $1 \in \mathbb{Z}W^{ea}$ to the class of \mathcal{U}_0 .*

Proof. Thanks to (4.8), we have

$$K_0(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0)) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0^{G^{(1)}}(\mathrm{St}^{(1)}).$$

According to [CG, Theorem 7.2.2], we have an isomorphism

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbb{Z}W^{ea} \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0^{G^{(1)}}(\mathrm{St}^{(1)}).$$

The construction is as follows. Take an element $wt_\lambda \in W^{ea}$ with $w \in W, \lambda \in \Lambda$. Consider the graph of W in $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1),rs}$, where the superscript “rs” means “regular semisimple”. Note that

$$\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1),rs} \cong G^{(1)} \times^{N_{G^{(1)}}(T^{(1)})} (\mathfrak{h}^{*(1),reg} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^{*(1),reg}/W} \mathfrak{h}^{*(1),reg})$$

and the graph in question is

$$\Lambda_w^{reg} := G^{(1)} \times^{N_{G^{(1)}}(T^{(1)})} \{(wx, x), x \in \mathfrak{h}^{*(1),reg}\}$$

Let Λ_w be the scheme theoretic intersection of the closure of Λ_w^{reg} in $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1)}$ with its reduced subscheme $\mathrm{St}^{(1)}$. We write $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda_w}(\lambda)$ for the pullback of $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{N}^{(1)}}(\lambda)$ under the projection to the second factor. Then the isomorphism (4.10) sends wt_λ to the class of $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda_w}(\lambda)$. We note that $K_0^{G^{(1)}}(\mathrm{St}^{(1)})$ carries an algebra structure by convolution and (4.10) is an algebra isomorphism. We also remark that, while [CG, Theorem 7.2.2] is stated over \mathbb{C} , the proof carries to our setting verbatim.

It remains to prove that this identification is W^{ea} -equivariant. Let $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{R}}^{(1),rs}$ denote the intersection of $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{(1),rs}$ with $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{R}}^{(1)}$. We have a natural functor from ASBim^\wedge to

$$(4.11) \quad \mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{R}}^{(1),rs}) \cong \mathrm{Coh}^{N_{G^{(1)}}(T^{(1)})}(\mathrm{Spec}(\mathfrak{R})^{reg} \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathfrak{R}^W)} \mathrm{Spec}(\mathfrak{R})^{reg})$$

via the localization to the regular locus. Note that, by the construction of the objects $\Delta_x^{AS}, B_s^{AS} \in \mathrm{ASBim}^\wedge$, their images in the right hand side of (4.11) are the graph of x and the extension of the graph of 1 by the graph of s , respectively (for all simple affine reflections s and all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$). On the other hand, we also have a functor from $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ to $\mathrm{Coh}^G(\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{R}}^{(1),rs})$, thanks to Theorem 4.1 or, equivalently, the construction in Section 3.2. This functor intertwines the actions on $K_0(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0)) \cong K_0(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\mathrm{St}^{(1)}))$. Thanks to

the proof of Proposition 3.5, the images of B_s^{HC}, Δ_x^{HC} in $\text{Coh}^G(\text{St}_R^{(1),rs})$ coincide with those of B_s^{AS}, Δ_x^{AS} . Together with the construction of the previous paragraph, this implies that the identification $\mathbb{Z}W^{ea} \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0(\text{Coh}^{G(1)}(\text{St}^{(1)}))$ is W^{ea} -equivariant. \square

4.3. Duality functor. Proposition 4.3 has a useful application to the study of the duality functor on $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$. We now recall how this functor is defined. Similarly to Section 3.2, $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ is a direct summand in the category $\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G$ consisting of all bimodules with generalized central character 0 on the left. Similarly to $\mathcal{U}_0\text{-mod}^G$, we can consider the category $\mathcal{U}_0\text{-mod}^G$.

Note that \mathcal{U}_0 is a Gorenstein algebra because its associated graded, $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{N}]$, is. So the functor $R\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}}(\bullet, \mathcal{U}_0)$ is an equivalence $D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{U}_0\text{-mod}^G)^{opp}$. Let θ denote the Cartan involution of G : on the Lie algebra it sends the Cartan generators e_i to f_i and vice versa. It gives rise to an equivalence $\mathcal{U}_0\text{-mod}^G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G$ that twists the action of \mathfrak{g} by the antiautomorphism $x \mapsto -\theta(x)$ (so that the right action of \mathcal{U}_0 gives rise to a left action of \mathcal{U}_0 because the action of $-\theta$ on the center is trivial) and twists the action of G by θ . Denote this equivalence $\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{U}_0\text{-mod}^G$ by $M \mapsto {}^\theta M$.

Consider the contravariant auto-equivalence $\mathbb{D} := {}^\theta R\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{U}_0}(\bullet, \mathcal{U}_0)$ of $D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G)$.

On the other hand, we have an action of the extended affine braid group Br^{ea} on $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ by wall-crossing functors: the length zero elements x acts by $\Delta_x^{HC} \otimes_{\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}} \bullet$, while for a simple affine reflection s the corresponding generator T_s acts by tensoring with the cone of $\text{Id} \rightarrow \Theta_s$, where Θ_s is the classical reflection functor.

The following are basic properties of this equivalence. They are standard.

Lemma 4.4. *The following claims are true:*

- (1) *The equivalence \mathbb{D} restricts to a contravariant auto-equivalence of $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$. Moreover, $\mathbb{D}^2 \cong \text{id}$.*
- (2) *For $M \in D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G)$ and a finite dimensional rational representation V of G we have $\mathbb{D}(V \otimes M) \xrightarrow{\sim} V^\vee \otimes \mathbb{D}(M)$ for $V^\vee := {}^\theta V^*$.*
- (3) *For $x \in W^{ea}$ we have $T_x \circ \mathbb{D} \cong \mathbb{D} \circ T_{x^{-1}}$. Here we write T_x for the wall-crossing equivalence of $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ corresponding to $x \in W^{ea}$.*

Corollary 4.5. *The functor \mathbb{D} gives the identity on $K_0(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$.*

Proof. We have $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{U}_0) \cong \mathcal{U}_0$. Thanks to (3) of Lemma 4.4 we see that \mathbb{D} acts on $K_0(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ by a W^{ea} -equivariant map. Now we are done by Proposition 4.3. \square

Remark 4.6. Consider $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}))$ as a direct summand of $D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0, opp}\text{-mod}^G)$. This allows us to define the contravariant auto-equivalence \mathbb{D}_R of $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}))$ by

$$\mathbb{D}_R := {}^\theta R\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}}(\bullet, \mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})$$

For $M \in \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ we have $\mathbb{D}_R(M) = \mathbb{D}(M)[\dim \mathfrak{h}]$ because \mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0} is flat over R . We also note that \mathbb{D}_R satisfies the direct analog of Lemma 4.4.

4.4. HC-tilting bimodules. Here we define a full subcategory of *HC-tilting* bimodules in $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})$ and in $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$.

Definition 4.7. An object in $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0})$ is called *HC-tilting* if it is a direct summand in $T \otimes \mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}$ for a tilting G -module T .

One can define HC-tilting objects in $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ similarly. Let $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ and $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ denote the full subcategories of HC-tilting bimodules in the respective categories.

The following lemma describes basic properties of HC-tilting bimodules. The proofs are standard and so are omitted.

Lemma 4.8. *The following claims are true:*

- (1) $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is a Karoubian monoidal subcategory of $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$.
- (2) The subcategories $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ are stable with respect to the duality functors $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbb{D}$, respectively.
- (3) We have $B_s^{\mathrm{HC}}, \Delta_x^{\mathrm{HC}} \in \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ for all simple affine reflections s and all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$. In particular, the image of the full embedding from Proposition 3.5 is in $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$.

Here is another important property.

Proposition 4.9. *For $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \in \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$, their higher Ext groups in $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ vanish.*

Proof. Recall that each object in $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ is a direct summand in $T \otimes \mathcal{U}_0$, where T is a tilting representation of G . Also recall that the category $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ is a direct summand in $\mathcal{U}_0^{\mathrm{opp}}\text{-mod}^G$. So it is enough to show that for all tilting representations T_1, T_2 of G we have

$$(4.12) \quad \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{U}_0, G}^i(T_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_0, T_2 \otimes \mathcal{U}_0) = 0, \forall i > 0,$$

where the Ext is taken in the category $\mathcal{U}_0^{\mathrm{opp}}\text{-mod}^G$.

The duals and tensor products of tiltings are again tilting, see [J, Proposition 4.19] for tensor products. And every tilting object is Weyl filtered (i.e., filtered by Weyl modules). So it is enough to show that

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{U}_0, G}^i(V \otimes \mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_0) = 0$$

for all Weyl filtered representations V of G .

Note that the left hand side is $\mathrm{Ext}_G^i(V, \mathcal{U}_0)$. As a G -module, \mathcal{U}_0 admits a resolution (from the left) whose terms are direct sums several copies of the G -module \mathcal{U} . The latter is costandardly filtered, this follows from [J, Section 4.21]. So $\mathrm{Ext}_G^i(V, \mathcal{U}_0) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. This implies the claim of the proposition. \square

This proposition has a standard corollary.

Corollary 4.10. *The following claims hold:*

- (1) For $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \in \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ is flat over \mathbb{R} and $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}, \mathcal{B}_2 \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}$.
- (2) The functor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}$ defines a bijection between the indecomposable objects in $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ and $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$.
- (3) For $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \in \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, their higher Ext groups in $\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ vanish.

4.5. Perverse bimodules. Here we recall a t-structure on $D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ called the *perverse t-structure*, compare to [AB]. For this t-structure we have

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} {}^pD^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) &= \{M \in D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \mid \dim \mathrm{Supp} H^i(M) \leq \dim \mathcal{N} - 2i\}, \\ {}^pD^{b, \geq 0}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) &= \mathbb{D}({}^pD^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)). \end{aligned}$$

The proof that this is indeed a t-structure copies that for $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{N}]$ instead of \mathcal{U}_0 in [AB, Section 3]. The heart of this structure will be denoted by $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$, objects there will be called *perverse bimodules*.

Example 4.11. Let V be a finite dimensional rational representation. Then $\text{pr}_0(V \otimes \mathcal{U}_0)$ is a perverse bimodule. Indeed, this object lies in ${}^pD^{b, \leq 0}$ and its dual is $\text{pr}_0(V^\vee \otimes \mathcal{U}_0)$ by (2) of Lemma 4.4.

Lemma 4.12. *All objects in $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ have finite length.*

Proof. Consider the inclusion $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{N}^{(1)}] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{U}_0$. It gives rise to the pullback functor

$$D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \rightarrow D^b(\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{N}^{(1)}]\text{-mod}^G).$$

Similarly to the proof of [BLo, Proposition 6.10], this functor is t-exact for the perverse t-structures. Also the restriction to the hearts is faithful. By [AB, Corollary 4.13], every object in $\text{Perv}(\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{N}^{(1)}]\text{-mod}^G)$ has finite length. Since $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ admits a faithful t-exact functor to a category where every object has finite length, every object in $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ has finite length too. \square

Note that $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ is preserved by \mathbb{D} and so \mathbb{D} is a t-exact contravariant duality functor of $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$.

The following is the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.13. *The following claims are true:*

- (1) *We have a W^{ea} -equivariant isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}W^{ea} \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0(\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0))$ of abelian groups that sends $1 \in \mathbb{Z}W^{ea}$ to the class of \mathcal{U}_0 (where the W^{ea} -action on the target comes from the reflection functors).*
- (2) *For every simple object $L \in \text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ we have $\mathbb{D}L \cong L$.*

Proof. We start by proving (1). We observe that the perverse t-structure is homologically finite: every object in $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ has only finitely many nonzero perverse cohomology groups. This follows from the following two observations: first, ${}^pD^{b, \leq 0} \subset D^{b, \leq \dim \mathcal{N}/2}$ and, second, the perverse t-structure is self-dual. From the homological finiteness we get an identification

$$(4.14) \quad K_0(\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0(D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)) (= K_0(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)).$$

Part (1) follows from (4.14) and Proposition 4.3.

Now we prove part (2). By (4.14) and Corollary 4.5, \mathbb{D} acts by 1 on $K_0(\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0))$. Now (2) follows from Lemma 4.12. \square

5. EQUIVALENCE WITH SOERGEL-TYPE CATEGORIES \mathcal{O}

5.1. Categories $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and \mathcal{O} . Recall the completed category ASBim^\wedge . There is a highest weight category $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$ over \mathbb{R} with poset W^{ea} (with respect to the Bruhat order) whose category of tilting objects is identified with ASBim^\wedge . We will follow the construction from [EL, Section 6] where the case of a Coxeter group was treated.

In [EL, Section 6.6.7] the author and Elias introduced the categories ${}_I\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}, J}^-(W^a)$ (in the notation of that paper, note that there we considered the general Weyl group). We will need the case when $I = J = \emptyset$. The ring \mathbb{R} in this case is the algebra of formal power series in the affine Cartan with p -adic coefficients. So \mathbb{R} is an algebra over \mathcal{R} . Set

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a) := ({}_\emptyset\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{R}, \emptyset}^-(W^a))^{opp} \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbb{R}.$$

More precisely, ${}_{\emptyset}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{R},\emptyset}^-(W^a)^{opp}$ is the category of modules with discrete topology over the inverse limit of \mathcal{R} -algebras that are free finitely generated \mathcal{R} -modules (see [EL, Section 6.1.3]). We then base change this topological algebra from \mathcal{R} to \mathbb{R} and take the category of modules with discrete topology for $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)$.

The category $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)$ is an ideal finite highest weight category over \mathbb{R} in the sense of [EL, Section 6.1.3]. Its highest weight poset is W^a with its Bruhat order. We write $T_{\mathbb{R}}(x), \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x), \nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ for the indecomposable tilting, standard and costandard objects labelled by x , respectively (by definition, $T_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ is the unique indecomposable tilting that admits an epimorphism onto $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$). By the construction, the category $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)$ -tilt of tilting objects in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)$ is identified with $\text{ASBim}^{\wedge}(W^a)$ preserving the labels.

Thanks to [EL, Lemma 6.30], one can inductively construct the costandard objects in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)$ as follows. The costandard object $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(1)$ is the indecomposable tilting $T_{\mathbb{R}}(1)$. Let $x \in W^a$ and a simple affine reflection s be such that $sx > x$ in the Bruhat order. Assume we have already constructed the object $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$. Let Θ_s denote the reflection endofunctor of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$ given by $B_s \in \text{ASBim}^{\wedge}$, it has a distinguished morphism from the identity endofunctor. Then thanks to (2) of [EL, Lemma 6.30] we see that $\Theta_s \nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ admits a filtration by $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ and $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(sx)$. Since $sx > x$ in the highest weight order, it follows $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(sx)$ is constructed as the cokernel of $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(x) \rightarrow \Theta_s \nabla_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$. In particular, this cokernel is flat over \mathbb{R} .

The following lemma describes the standard objects in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)$. Note that there is a functor morphism $\Theta_s \rightarrow \text{id}$.

Lemma 5.1. *We have $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(1) = T_{\mathbb{R}}(1)$. Moreover, if $x \in W^a$ and a simple affine reflection s are such that $sx > x$, then $\Theta_s \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x) \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ is an epimorphism and $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(sx)$ is its kernel.*

Proof. The claim that $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(1) = T_{\mathbb{R}}(1)$ is standard.

Since Θ_s is a functor that is isomorphic to its left adjoint and preserves the subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)^{\nabla}$ of costandardly filtered objects, it also preserves the subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)^{\Delta}$ of standardly filtered objects. Moreover there is a perfect pairing of Grothendieck groups of exact categories $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)^{\Delta}) \times K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)^{\nabla}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ that sends a pair of objects (M, N) to the rank of $\text{Hom}(M, N)$. By the construction of the costandard objects recalled above in this section, $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)^{\nabla})$ is identified with $\mathbb{Z}W^a$. The Hom pairing identifies $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)^{\Delta})$ with the restricted dual of $\mathbb{Z}W^a$ (all functions f such that $f(x) \neq 0$ only for finitely many elements $x \in W^a$). This module is naturally identified with $\mathbb{Z}W^a$. Recall that Θ_s is isomorphic to its left adjoint. It follows that the identification $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)^{\Delta}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Z}W^a$ is W^a -equivariant, so $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ corresponds to x for all x . So $\Theta_s \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ is filtered by $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(sx)$. Since $sx > x$ in the highest weight order, we see that $\Theta_s \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x) \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ is an epimorphism and $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(sx)$ is its kernel. \square

We will need another lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *The following two claims hold:*

- (1) *We have an equivalence $K^b(\text{ASBim}^{\wedge}(W^a)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a))$.*
- (2) *$\text{ASBim}^{\wedge}(W^a)$ acts on $K^b(\text{ASBim}^{\wedge}(W^a))$ by t -exact functors.*

Proof. (1) is pretty standard. Recall that $\text{ASBim}^{\wedge}(W^a) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)$ -tilt. We have a full embedding $K^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a)\text{-tilt}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}(W^a))$ because there are no higher self extensions

between tiltings. Every object in $\mathcal{O}_R(W^a)$ admits a finite resolution by standardly filtered objects (from the left). Every standardly filtered object is in $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R(W^a)\text{-tilt})$. So $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R(W^a)\text{-tilt}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\mathcal{O}_R(W^a))$ is essentially surjective. (1) follows.

Now we prove (2). By Lemma 5.1, the action of $\text{ASBim}^\wedge(W^a)$ preserves the subcategory of standardly filtered objects. Since every object in $\mathcal{O}_R(W^a)$ admits a resolution by standardly filtered objects, we see that $\text{ASBim}^\wedge(W^a)$ acts by right t-exact functors. But the functors coming from $\text{ASBim}^\wedge(W^a)$ are closed under taking adjoints, so they are also left t-exact. This finishes the proof of (2). \square

Now we explain how to define \mathcal{O}_R for the group W^{ea} . For this note that

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{ASBim}^\wedge}(B_x^{AS}, B_y^{AS}) = 0 \text{ if } xy^{-1} \notin W^a.$$

So ASBim^\wedge splits into the direct sum of subcategories indexed by $\Lambda/\Lambda_r = W^{ea}/W^a$. The objects Δ_x^{AS} for $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$ are invertible. Moreover, we have the group homomorphism from Λ/Λ_r to the group of (isomorphism classes of) invertible objects in ASBim^\wedge given by $x \mapsto \Delta_x^{AS}$.

We set

$$(5.2) \quad \mathcal{O}_R := \bigoplus_{x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r} \mathcal{O}_R(W^a).$$

This decomposition gives rise to an identification $\mathcal{O}_R\text{-tilt} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{ASBim}^\wedge$. This gives rise an action of ASBim^\wedge on \mathcal{O}_R . The objects Δ_x^{AS} for $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$ act by category equivalence that permute the summands in (5.2). The corresponding functor sends $T_R(y), \nabla_R(y), \Delta_R(y)$ to $T_R(xy), \nabla_R(xy), \Delta_R(xy)$, respectively. The action of B_s^{AS} (to be denoted by Θ_s) on the costandard and standard objects are as described above. The direct analog of Lemma 5.2 holds.

The category \mathcal{O}_R is \mathbb{R} -linear. So we can consider its specialization

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}_R \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}$$

This is an \mathbb{F} -linear highest weight category with the same poset W^{ea} . We write

$$T(x), \Delta(x), \nabla(x), L(x)$$

for the indecomposable tilting, standard, costandard and simple objects labelled by $x \in W^{ea}$. Note that ASBim^\wedge still acts on \mathcal{O} by exact functors.

5.2. Duality for categories \mathcal{O} . The goal of this section is to define the duality functors for $\mathcal{O}_R, \mathcal{O}$. We start with the duality functor for $\text{ASBim}^\wedge (= \mathcal{O}_R\text{-tilt})$. Recall the duality functor \mathbb{D}_R of $D^b(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}\text{-mod})$, Remark 4.6. Note that it preserves $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, see (2) of Lemma 4.4 and Remark 4.6. Also recall that ASBim^\wedge fully embeds into $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 5.3. *The image of ASBim^\wedge in $\text{Hilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is closed under \mathbb{D}_R . Moreover, the images of the indecomposable objects B_x^{AS} in $\text{Hilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ are self-dual for all $x \in W^{ea}$.*

Proof. The image of B_1 is $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$, which is self-dual. Also recall, Remark 4.6, that \mathbb{D}_R intertwines the endo-functors of $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$ of the form $\text{pr}_0(V \otimes \bullet)$ where V is a self-dual representation of G (e.g. simple or tilting). The functors Θ_s and tensoring with Δ_x^{HC} are of this form. It follows that the image of every Bott-Samelson bimodule $\text{BS}_{\underline{w}}^{AS}$ (associated to a word $\underline{w} = (x, s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_k})$) in $\text{Hilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is self-dual. Recall that if \underline{w} is a reduced expression for w , then B_w^{AS} occurs in $\text{BS}_{\underline{w}}^{AS}$ with multiplicity 1 and all other

B_y^{AS} that occur in $\mathbf{BS}_{\underline{w}}^{AS}$ have $y < w$. Now the claim that the image of B_w^{AS} is self-dual is proved by induction on w with respect to the Bruhat order (using the observation that $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is a Krull-Schmidt category). In particular, the image of ASBim^{\wedge} is self-dual. \square

So we get a contravariant \mathbf{R} -linear self-equivalence of $\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{R}}$ -tilt that we again denote by $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}$. The functor extends to $K^b(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{R}}\text{-tilt})$ which, by Lemma 5.2, is identified with $D^b(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{R}})$.

Lemma 5.4. *The self-equivalence $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}$ of $K^b(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{R}}\text{-tilt})$ has the following properties.*

- (1) We have $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathbf{R}}(x)) \cong T_{\mathbf{R}}(x)$ for all $x \in W^a$.
- (2) We have $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}} \circ \Theta_s \cong \Theta_s \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}(\Delta_x^{AS} \otimes \bullet) \cong \Delta_x^{AS} \otimes \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}(\bullet)$ for all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$.
- (3) We have $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}(\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}(x)) \cong \Delta_{\mathbf{R}}(x)$.

Proof. (1) follows directly from Lemma 5.3. (2) follows from the construction of $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}$, compare to the proof of Lemma 5.3. We prove (3) by induction on x with respect to the Bruhat order. The base, $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$, follows from (1). To establish the induction step, note that

$$(5.4) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{R}}}(\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}(x), \Theta_s \nabla_{\mathbf{R}}(x)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{R}.$$

For an invertible element $\varphi \in \mathbf{R}$ viewed as a homomorphism, φ is a monomorphism and the cokernel of φ is $\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}(sx)$, this follows from the reminder in Section 5.1. The functor \mathbb{D} sends this cokernel to the kernel of an arbitrary generator of the \mathbf{R} -module $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{R}}}(\Theta_s \Delta_{\mathbf{R}}(x), \Delta_{\mathbf{R}}(x))$. The latter coincides with $\Delta_{\mathbf{R}}(sx)$, see Lemma 5.1. This finishes the proof of (3). \square

We proceed to the duality functor for the category \mathcal{O} . Note that since we have an \mathbf{R} -linear isomorphism $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}(T_{\mathbf{R}}(x)) \cong T_{\mathbf{R}}(x)$, we get $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}(T(x)) \cong T(x)[- \dim \mathfrak{h}]$. So we have a duality functor $\mathbb{D} := \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{R}}[\dim \mathfrak{h}]$ of \mathcal{O} -tilt. We then extend \mathbb{D} to $K^b(\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt}) \cong D^b(\mathcal{O})$.

Lemma 5.5. *The following claims are true:*

- (1) We have $\Theta_s \circ \mathbb{D} \cong \mathbb{D} \circ \Theta_s$ and $\Delta_x^{AS} \otimes \mathbb{D}(\bullet) \cong \mathbb{D}(\Delta_x^{AS} \otimes \bullet)$ for all simple affine reflections s and all $x \in \Lambda/\Lambda_r$.
- (2) We have $\mathbb{D}(\Delta(x)) \cong \nabla(x)$ for all $x \in W^a$.
- (3) The functor \mathbb{D} is t -exact.
- (4) We have $\mathbb{D}(L(x)) \cong L(x)$.

Proof. (1) and (2) follow from (2) and (3) of Lemma 5.4. Every object in \mathcal{O} admits a resolution $0 \rightarrow M_k \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow M_0$, where all M_i are standardly filtered and also a resolution $N_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow N_\ell \rightarrow 0$, where all N_j are costandardly filtered. Now (3) follows from (2) combined with $\mathbb{D}^2 \cong \text{id}$. Since $L(x)$ is the image of the unique (up to scaling) homomorphism $\Delta(x) \rightarrow \nabla(x)$, (4) follows from (2) and (3). \square

5.3. Equivalence $\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$. This is the main section of the paper. Here we construct an equivalence $\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$. Let us explain the four main steps of the construction and the proof.

- (i) We use $\text{ASBim}^{\wedge} \hookrightarrow \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ to produce a full ASBim^{\wedge} -equivariant embedding $\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt} \hookrightarrow \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ intertwining the duality functors.
- (ii) We show that $\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt} \hookrightarrow \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ extends to an ASBim^{\wedge} -equivariant full embedding $D^b(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ intertwining the duality functors.

- (iii) We know that the duality functor for $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ fixes all simples. We use this and the fact that $D^b(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ is a full embedding intertwining the duality functors to show that this full embedding is t-exact and sends simples to simples (on the right we consider the perverse t-structure).
- (iv) We show that the resulting full embedding $\mathcal{O} \hookrightarrow \text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ is an equivalence by looking at the induced map between the Grothendieck groups.

We start with (i). We can view \mathcal{O} -tilt as a full subcategory in $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R\text{-tilt})$: we send $T(x)$ to the Koszul complex for the action of \mathfrak{h} on $T_R(x)$. Similarly, $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ embeds into $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}))$. Recall that $\mathcal{O}_R\text{-tilt} \cong \text{ASBim}^\wedge$. Clearly, the full embedding $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R\text{-tilt}) \hookrightarrow K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_0}))$ (which is ASBim^\wedge -equivariant and intertwines the duality functors) induces a full embedding $\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt} \hookrightarrow \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$. By construction, this embedding is ASBim^\wedge -equivariant and intertwines the duality functors. This completes (i) above.

(ii) is the following lemma.

Lemma 5.6. *The full embedding $\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt} \hookrightarrow \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ uniquely extends to an exact functor $\varphi : D^b(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$. This extension is a full embedding, it is ASBim^\wedge -equivariant and intertwines the duality functors.*

Proof. The full embedding $\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt} \hookrightarrow \text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$ uniquely extends to a full embedding $K^b(\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt}) \hookrightarrow K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$. The source category is $D^b(\mathcal{O})$ because \mathcal{O} is an ideal finite highest weight category. Since there are no higher Ext's between objects in $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$, see Proposition 4.9, the natural functor $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \rightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ is a full embedding. The remaining claims (the equivariance and the compatibility with the dualities) follow from the construction. \square

The following proposition is (iii) in the strategy above.

Proposition 5.7. *The full embedding $\varphi : D^b(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ is t-exact (with respect to the perverse t-structure on the target) and sends simple objects to simple objects.*

Recall that \mathbb{D} fixes all simples in $\text{Perv}(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$, Proposition 4.13 (and in \mathcal{O} , Lemma 5.5). Since the embedding $D^b(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ intertwines the duality functors, Proposition 5.7 follows from the next lemma.

Lemma 5.8. *Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be triangulated categories equipped with homologically finite t-structures with hearts $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit, \mathcal{D}^\heartsuit$ and t-exact duality functors $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}}, \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be an exact full embedding such that $\varphi \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}} \circ \varphi$. Assume, further, that all objects in $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit, \mathcal{D}^\heartsuit$ have finite length and all simples in \mathcal{D}^\heartsuit are fixed by $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then φ is t-exact and sends simples to simples.*

We will see in the proof that the condition that all objects in \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit have finite length follows from the other conditions of the lemma.

Proof of Lemma 5.8. The proof is in several steps.

Step 1. First of all, note that for every $M \in \mathcal{D}^\heartsuit$ and every simple L with $M \twoheadrightarrow L$ we have a composed morphism $\kappa_L : M \twoheadrightarrow L \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}}L \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}}M$. It is nonzero because it has nonzero image.

Step 2. Assume φ is not t-exact. This means there is $M' \in \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ such that $H^i(\varphi M') \neq 0$ for some $i \neq 0$. Replacing M' with $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}}M'$ if needed we can assume that $i > 0$. Also we can assume that $H^j(\varphi M') = 0$ for $j > i$ because the t-structure on \mathcal{D} is homologically

finite. Pick a simple object L with $H^i(\varphi M') \twoheadrightarrow L$. Then $L \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}} L \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}}(H^i(\varphi M')) \cong H^{-i}(\varphi(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} M'))$. So we get a nonzero morphism $H^i(\varphi M') \rightarrow H^{-i}(\varphi(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} M'))$. It follows that there is a nonzero morphism $\varphi M'[i] \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} M')[-i]$. Since φ is a full embedding, this means that we have a nonzero morphism $M'[i] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} M'[-i]$. Since both $M', \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} M'$ are in the heart of a t-structure and $i > 0$, we arrive at a contradiction. This proves that φ is t-exact.

Step 3. Now we show that φ maps simple objects to simple objects. Let $L' \in \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ be simple. Assume $\varphi L'$ is not simple. Let L be a simple in \mathcal{D}^{\heartsuit} such that $\varphi L' \twoheadrightarrow L$. Consider the nonzero morphism $\kappa_L : \varphi L' \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{D}} \varphi L' \cong \varphi \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} L'$ associated to L as in Step 1. Since φ is a full embedding, κ_L comes from a nonzero morphism $\kappa'_L : L' \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} L'$. Since $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{C}} L'$ is also simple, we conclude that κ'_L is an isomorphism. Hence κ_L is an isomorphism. It follows that $\varphi L' \xrightarrow{\sim} L$. We arrive at a contradiction with the assumption that $\varphi L'$ is not simple which finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Finally we proceed to step (iv) of the construction above.

Theorem 5.9. *The full embedding $D^b(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ is a t-exact category equivalence.*

Proof. Since we already know that φ is a full embedding, what we need to show that every simple in $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ comes from a simple in \mathcal{O} . Recall that $\varphi : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ sends $T(1) = L(1)$ to \mathcal{U}_0 and is ASBim^{\wedge} -equivariant. Also recall that by Proposition 4.13, the class of \mathcal{U}_0 generates $K_0(\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0))$ under the action of $K_0(\mathrm{ASBim}^{\wedge})$. It follows that φ induces an epimorphism $K_0(\mathcal{O}) \twoheadrightarrow K_0(\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0))$. Since φ maps simples to simples, we deduce that all simples $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ are in the image of φ . This finishes the proof. \square

5.4. Other equivalences. Here we deduce some consequences from Theorem 5.9.

Recall, Proposition 3.5, that we have a monoidal full embedding $\mathrm{ASBim}^{\wedge} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. Denote it by $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}$. The following result establishes Theorem 1.2 from the introduction.

Theorem 5.10. *The full embedding $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathrm{ASBim}^{\wedge} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is an equivalence.*

Proof. Recall that $\varphi : K^b(\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt}) \cong D^b(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ from Proposition 5.7 is an equivalence (Theorem 5.9) that factors through the full subcategory $K^b(\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \subset D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$. Hence $K^b(\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt}) \xrightarrow{\sim} K^b(\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$. Recall that the latter functor is induced by the full embedding $\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$. It follows that this full embedding is an equivalence.

Now let $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ be an indecomposable object in $\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. Then $T := T_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}$ is also indecomposable, this follows from (1) of Corollary 4.10. So we have an automatically indecomposable object $T'_{\mathbb{R}} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}\text{-tilt}$ such that $\varphi(T'_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{F}) \cong T$. Then $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(T'_{\mathbb{R}}) \cong T_{\mathbb{R}}$. So the full embedding $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}\text{-tilt} \rightarrow \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ is essentially surjective and hence an equivalence. \square

We also have the following equivalence between derived categories, Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 5.11. *The equivalence $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}$ from Theorem 5.10 extends to*

$$D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}) \cong K^b(\mathrm{ASBim}^{\wedge}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})).$$

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 3.5 and (3) of Lemma 4.8, we have a full embedding $\mathrm{ASBim}^{\wedge} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$. It extends to $D^b(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} K^b(\mathrm{HC}\text{-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$. And thanks

to (3) of Corollary 4.10, we have a full embedding $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})) \hookrightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$. Denote the composite full embedding $D^b(\mathcal{O}_R) \hookrightarrow D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$ also by φ_R .

So we need to show that every object $M_R \in \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ lies in the image, equivalently, thanks to Theorem 5.10, in the full subcategory $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})) \subset D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$. Let f_1, \dots, f_k denote parameters for R , i.e., $R = \mathbb{F}[[f_1, \dots, f_k]]$. We will use the ascending induction on i to show that any $M \in \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ annihilated by f_1, \dots, f_{k-i} lies in $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$. We note that since φ_R is a full embedding, the image is closed under taking cones.

The base is $i = 0$. Here $M \in \text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$. Then, thanks to Theorem 5.9, there is an object $M' \in K^b(\mathcal{O}\text{-tilt})$ with $\varphi(M') \cong M$. We can lift M' to an object of $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$ by replacing every term in the complex M' by its Koszul resolution. Denote the resulting object in $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$ by \tilde{M}' . The images of \tilde{M}' and M' in $D^b(\mathcal{O}_R)$ are isomorphic. It follows that $\varphi_R(\tilde{M}') \cong M$.

Now suppose that we know that any HC bimodule annihilated by f_1, \dots, f_{k-i} lies in the image of $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$. Since the image of $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$ is closed under taking cones, all objects in $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$, where f_1, \dots, f_{k-i} act nilpotently, lie in the image. Now let M be an object in $\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})$ annihilated by f_1, \dots, f_{k-i-1} . We want to show that it lies in the image of $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$. Set $f := f_{k-i}$. The f -torsion part of M lies in the image of $K^b(\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}))$. So we can assume that M is torsion free over $\mathbb{F}[f]$.

For a finite poset ideal $I \subset W^{ea}$, we write $\mathcal{O}_R(I)$ for the full subcategory of \mathcal{O}_R generated by $T_R(y)$ for $y \in I$. This is a highest weight subcategory. Since M/Mf lies in the image of $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R\text{-tilt})$ by our inductive assumption, we can find I such that M/Mf lies in the image of $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R(I)\text{-tilt})$. We are going to show that M actually lies in the image of $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R(I)\text{-tilt})$.

Let T denote the direct sum of all indecomposable tiltings in the image of $\mathcal{O}_R(I)\text{-tilt}$ in $\text{HC-tilt}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$. Set

$$A_T := \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}_R}(T)^{opp}.$$

This R -algebra is a free finite rank R -module. It has finite homological dimension because $A_T\text{-mod}$ is a highest weight category (with poset I^{opp}). We have the R -linear functor $\mathcal{F} := R\text{Hom}(T, \bullet) : D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0})) \rightarrow D^b(A_T\text{-mod})$. Since A has finite homological dimension, the functor \mathcal{F} has the left adjoint and right inverse $\mathcal{G} := T \otimes_{A_T}^L \bullet$. Apply the adjunction counit to M and complete the resulting morphism to an exact triangle

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{G}\mathcal{F}M \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{+1}.$$

Note that by the construction, we have $\mathcal{F}(N) = 0$. Now apply $\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[f]}^L \mathbb{F}$ to (5.5). Since \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} are R -linear and hence $\mathbb{F}[f]$ -linear and M is flat over $\mathbb{F}[f]$, we get

$$\mathcal{G}\mathcal{F}(M/Mf) \rightarrow M/Mf \rightarrow N \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[f]}^L \mathbb{F} \xrightarrow{+1}.$$

By our assumption, M/Mf lies in the essential image $K^b(\mathcal{O}_R(I)\text{-tilt})$, which coincides with the essential image of \mathcal{G} . It follows that $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{F}(M/Mf) \xrightarrow{\sim} M/Mf$. Hence $N \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[f]}^L \mathbb{F} = 0$. We claim that the last equality implies $N = 0$. Indeed, let j be maximal such that $H^j(N) \neq \{0\}$. Then $H^j(N \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[f]}^L \mathbb{F}) = H^j(N)/H^j(N)f$. Note that $H^j(N)$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge 0}$ -module. Its support in the spectrum of the center is closed, hence $H^j(N)/H^j(N)f \neq \{0\}$. This contradicts $N \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[f]}^L \mathbb{F} = 0$ and finishes the induction step and therefore the proof. \square

6. MODULAR CATEGORY \mathcal{O}

6.1. Definition and equivalent characterization. Fix a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$. We consider the category \mathcal{O}^{cl} (“cl” from “classical” as opposed to the Soergel type categories from Section 5) of all finitely generated \mathfrak{g} -modules with a strongly B -equivariant structure.

For example, for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have the Verma module $\Delta^{cl}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{O}^{cl}$. As usual, it is defined as $U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} \mathbb{F}_\lambda$, where B acts on the 1-dimensional space \mathbb{F}_λ by the character λ , while on $\Delta^{cl}(\lambda)$ we have the tensor product action.

We remark that $\Delta^{cl}(\lambda)$ has infinite length, and the dual Verma module $\nabla^{cl}(\lambda)$ (constructed in the usual fashion) is not in \mathcal{O}^{cl} but rather in its ind-completion: it is the inductive limit of the duals of finite dimensional quotients of $\Delta^{cl}(\lambda)$.

As usual, \mathcal{O}^{cl} decomposes as the sum of infinitesimal blocks $\bigoplus_{[\lambda]} \mathcal{O}^{[\lambda]}$, where the sum is taken over the W^{ea} -orbits in Λ (with the action of the lattice part rescaled p times). The objects in $\mathcal{O}^{[\lambda]}$ are exactly the modules in \mathcal{O}^{cl} with generalized central character $\lambda \bmod p$.

Here is an equivalent construction. Recall that \mathcal{B} stands for the flag variety G/B . So we can consider the category $\text{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}})$ of weakly equivariant $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ -modules (that are quasi-coherent over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and are locally finitely generated over $D_{\mathcal{B}}$). The following result is classical.

Lemma 6.1. *Taking the fiber at $1B \in \mathcal{B}$ defines an equivalence*

$$\text{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}^{cl}.$$

For example, the regular module $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ corresponds to the Verma module $\Delta^{cl}(0)$.

We will need a slight modification of this equivalence. Let $K_{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the canonical bundle on \mathcal{B} with its natural G -equivariant structure. The functor $K_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} \bullet$ defines an equivalence between $\text{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}})$ and $\text{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}}^{opp})$. So we get an equivalence

$$\text{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}}^{opp}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}^{cl}.$$

Under this equivalence the regular right module $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ goes to the Verma module $\Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$.

6.2. Main equivalence. Our main result concerning $\mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ is as follows. Let $\pi : \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}$ be the Springer map. Recall, Section 2.2, that we have the $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]$ -algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ acted on by $G^{(1)}$. So we can consider its pullback $\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and the category $\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}})$.

Theorem 6.2. *We have an equivalence $\mathcal{O}^{[0]} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}})$ of abelian categories.*

We now explain how this equivalence is constructed. First, we establish an equivalence

$$(6.1) \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0).$$

It is also known that – we’ll recall why – that

$$(6.2) \quad D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}})).$$

Composing (right to left) (6.1), (4.7), and (6.2), we get

$$(6.3) \quad D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}})).$$

Our last step will be to show that this equivalence is t-exact.

The following proposition (which should be thought of as a characteristic p version of the classical Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence in characteristic 0) constructs the quasi-inverse of (6.1). It is a more precise version of Proposition 1.6.

Proposition 6.3. *The functor $\mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{M} \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$ is a category equivalence*

$$D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}^{cl})$$

that restricts to $D^b(\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$.

Proof. Thanks to [BMR, Theorem 3.2] (more, precisely, its straightforward analog for right modules), we have mutually quasi-inverse equivalences

$$R\Gamma : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(D_{\mathcal{B}}^{opp})) \rightleftarrows D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}) : \bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L D_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

The functors lift to an adjoint pair of functors between the categories of weakly equivariant modules and hence give mutually quasi-inverse equivalences

$$D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}}^{opp})) \rightleftarrows D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G).$$

Then we have the (t-exact) equivalence

$$D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}}^{opp})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}^{cl})$$

of restricting to the point $1B$, see Section 6.1. Since it sends $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ to $\Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$, the composition

$$D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp}\text{-mod}^G) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G(D_{\mathcal{B}}^{opp})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}^{cl})$$

is $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$. This establishes the first claim.

To establish that $D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ we notice that the functor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$ sends the source to the target because it preserves generalized central characters. \square

In what follows we always identify $D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ and $D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$ using the equivalences of the lemma.

Now we recall equivalence (6.2). We have the equivalence

$$(6.4) \quad R\pi_{1*}([\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}} \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}}]_{\mathrm{St}} \otimes \bullet) : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathrm{St}^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}})),$$

where we write π_1 for the projection $\mathrm{St}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$, see [BLin, Section 2.2]. Thanks to the equivalence (2.17), we get an equivalence

$$(6.5) \quad R\Gamma(\mathcal{T}^* \otimes \bullet) : D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp}\text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}).$$

Here we view the source category as that of $G^{(1)}$ -equivariant $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{N}^{(1)}}$ -modules, and tensoring with \mathcal{T}^* is in the 2nd factor.

So we get the composed equivalence (6.3).

Proof of Theorem 6.2. To prove the theorem it remains to show that (6.3) is t-exact with respect to the tautological t-structures. Equivalently, we need to show that the derived equivalence induced by (4.7) intertwines

- The image of $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ (the negative part of the t-structure) in $D^b(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$,
- and the image of $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}))$ in $D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp}\text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}})$.

This is done in several steps. Below in the proof we identify all derived categories involved with $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathrm{St}^{(1)})$.

Step 1. Fix a strictly dominant weight λ (so that the sheaf $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$ on \mathcal{B} is ample). We claim that the images of both $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ and $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}))$ in $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathrm{St}^{(1)})$ coincide with the full subcategory of all objects $\mathcal{F} \in D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathrm{St}^{(1)})$ satisfying the following condition:

(\heartsuit) There is $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that for all $n > n_0$ we have

$$\mathcal{F} \otimes \pi_2^* \mathcal{O}(n\lambda) \in D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{A}_R \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^*(1)]} \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}) = D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0).$$

We will see below that this claim is essentially the Serre vanishing theorem.

Step 2. We start by proving the claim that the image of $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_R))$ consists of the objects satisfying (\heartsuit), where it is easier. We write \mathcal{H}^i for the i th cohomology sheaf (for the natural t-structure on $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_R))$). Take $\mathcal{F} \in D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_R))$. We can find $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\mathcal{H}^i(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(n\lambda)$ has no higher cohomology and is generated by global sections for all $n > n_0$ and all i . It follows that $\mathcal{F} \in D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_R))$ if and only if

$$R\Gamma(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{T}^* \otimes \mathcal{O}(n\lambda)) \in D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{A}_R \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^*(1)]} \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}), \forall n > n_0.$$

Now the claim that the image of $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_R))$ consists of all objects satisfying (\heartsuit) follows from two observations. First, the composition of the derived equivalences (6.4) and (6.5) is the derived equivalence (2.17). Second, (6.4) intertwines twisting by $\pi_2^*(\mathcal{O}(n\lambda))$ in the source with twisting by $\mathcal{O}(n\lambda)$ in the target.

Step 3. Now we proceed to proving the claim about the image of $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$: that it consists of all objects satisfying (\heartsuit). Since we have no direct construction of an equivalence between $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ and $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathrm{St}^{(1)})$, a proof is somewhat more involved. First, note that an argument similar to the previous paragraph implies that the image of

$$D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{O}^{cl}) = D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{Coh}^G(D_{G/B}^{opp}))$$

in $D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G)$ is characterized by the direct analog of (\heartsuit) where we twist with $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(np\lambda)$ for some $n > n_1$. Now we describe this twist in terms of HC bimodules. Observe, that if n is sufficiently large, then $R\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(np\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} D_{\mathcal{B}})$ is concentrated in homological degree 0 (again, this is Serre vanishing theorem applied on the variety $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)}$). Also $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(np\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} D_{\mathcal{B}})$ is an object in $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0)$ that will be denoted by \mathcal{M}_n . We remark that

$$(6.6) \quad R\Gamma(\mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} (\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(np\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} D_{\mathcal{B}})) \cong R\Gamma(\mathcal{F}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \mathcal{M}_n.$$

Indeed, set $\mathcal{G} := R\Gamma(\mathcal{F})$ and write Loc for the quasi-inverse of $R\Gamma$, the functor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}$. The isomorphism (6.6) is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G}) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} (\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(np\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}} D_{\mathcal{B}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{G} \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0} \mathcal{M}_n).$$

The restrictions of the two functors to the category of free \mathcal{U}_0 -modules are isomorphic. So they are isomorphic on $D^-(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod})$ and hence on $D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G)$.

Thanks to (6.6), the image of $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathrm{Coh}^G(D_{G/B}^{opp}))$ in $D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G)$ coincides with the full subcategory of all objects \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \mathcal{M}_n \in D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G)$. Note that all objects in $\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G$ admit finite resolutions by HC modules that are projective \mathcal{U}_0^{opp} -modules (because \mathcal{U}_0^{opp} has finite homological dimension, and every object in $\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G$ admits an epimorphism from a module of the form $V \otimes \mathcal{U}_0$, where V is a finite dimensional G -module). It follows that the endo-functor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \mathcal{M}_n$ of $D^b(\mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G)$ is the left derived functor of $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0} \mathcal{M}_n$. Note that $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0} \mathcal{M}_n$ clearly preserves $\mathrm{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0$.

Step 4. We need to determine the endofunctor of $\mathcal{A}_R \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^*(1)]} \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}}$ corresponding to the functor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0} \mathcal{M}_n$ via the equivalence (4.7). Since (4.7) is a right module equivalence for the monoidal equivalence (4.9).

Consider the equivalence

$$(6.7) \quad D^b(\mathcal{U}_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]}^L \mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^G(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}}^L \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]}^L \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^G),$$

analogous to (4.4). Then (4.9) is the restriction of the composed equivalence in (6.7) to the hearts. The bimodule \mathcal{M}_n is the image of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}(n\lambda)$ (with its natural G -equivariant structure) on the diagonal copy of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)}$ under the quasi-inverse of the first equivalence in (6.7). So the image of \mathcal{M}_n under the composed equivalence in (6.7) is $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}nd(\mathcal{T}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(n\lambda))$. Our conclusion is that the endofunctor of $\mathcal{A}_R \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^G$ corresponding to the endofunctor $\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0} \mathcal{M}_n$ of $\mathcal{U} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]} \mathcal{U}_0^{opp} \text{-mod}^G$ is

$$\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \Gamma(\mathcal{E}nd(\mathcal{T}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(n\lambda)).$$

Under the derived equivalence

$$D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}}^L \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)})) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{(1)*}]}^L \mathcal{A}^{opp} \text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}})$$

the bimodule $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}nd(\mathcal{T}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(n\lambda))$ corresponds still to $\mathcal{O}(n\lambda)$ (with its natural $G^{(1)}$ -equivariant structure) on the diagonal copy of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{(1)}$. The convolution with this sheaf on the right, an endofunctor of $D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}^{(1)})$ is the twist by $\mathcal{O}(n\lambda)$ in the second component.

So, under the equivalence $D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}_0)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}^{(1)})$ the functor $\otimes_{\mathcal{U}_0}^L \mathcal{M}_n$ becomes the twist with $\mathcal{O}(n\lambda)$ in the second component. It follows that under the equivalence (4.8), the image of $D^{b, \leq 0}(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ in $D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}^{(1)})$ consists of all objects satisfying (\heartsuit) . This finishes the proof of the theorem. \square

Remark 6.4. Note that the lattice Λ acts on $\mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ (by twisting with characters of $B^{(1)}$) and on $\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\pi^* \mathcal{A}_R)$ by twisting with the $G^{(1)}$ -equivariant line bundles. The equivalence in Theorem 6.2 intertwines these actions. Namely, Step 4 of the proof shows that the twists with sufficiently ample line bundles/ sufficiently dominant characters are intertwined. The claim in general follows.

6.3. Localizations of Verma modules. Consider the derived equivalence

$$(6.8) \quad \mathcal{F} : D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}^{(1)}),$$

the composition of the quasi-inverse of (6.4) and (6.3). Our task in this section is to compute the images of the Verma modules $\Delta^{cl}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{O}^{[0]}$ under \mathcal{F} . Note that the set of highest weights of these Vermas is identified with W^{ea} via $x \mapsto x^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho)$, so that for $x = wt_\lambda$ we have $x^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho) = -w^{-1}\rho - \rho - p\lambda$.

To state the answer, we need to recall the braid group action from [BR1]. The first step is to construct a homomorphism from the extended affine braid group Br^{ea} to the group of isomorphism classes of invertible objects in $D^b(\text{Coh}^G(\text{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}))$ (of course, the same holds after applying the Frobenius twist). The homomorphism sends $\lambda \in \Lambda \subset \text{Br}^{ea}$ to the sheaf $\mathcal{O}(-\lambda)$ on the diagonal copy of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ (to be denoted by $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\Delta$).

The images of the generators T_s of the finite braid group inside Br^{ea} are determined as follows. Let $\mathfrak{g}^{*,rs}$ denote the locus of regular semisimple elements and $\text{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{rs}$ be its preimage in $\text{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}$. For a simple reflection $s \in W$ consider the locus in $\text{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}^{rs}$, where the two Borel subalgebras are in relative position s . Denote it by Z_s^{rs} . Let Z_s denote the Zariski closure of Z_s^{rs} in $\text{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}$. The element T_s is sent to \mathcal{O}_{Z_s} .

We will need an exact sequence obtained in [BR1, Section 1.10]. For a simple reflection s in W we consider the scheme $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s$ constructed as follows. Let \mathcal{P}_s denote the partial flag variety, the quotient of G by the minimal parabolic subgroup P_s corresponding to s . It is a closed subscheme in $\mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathcal{P}_s$ consisting of all pairs (α, \mathcal{F}) such that the element of \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α (under the identification coming from the Killing form) lies in the parabolic subalgebra corresponding to \mathcal{F} . Note that we have a natural morphism $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s$ and so can form the fiber product $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \times_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. By [BR1, (1.10.1)], we get a short exact sequence of coherent sheaves

$$(6.9) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\Delta} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \times_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_s} \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}})$ acts on $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \mathrm{St})$ by convolutions. This gives the first (left) action of Br^{ea} on $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \mathrm{St})$. We remark that in this construction we can replace $\mathrm{St}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ with its completed version $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

We also have a commuting right action. Consider the derived scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*}^L \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. It makes sense to speak about the derived category of G -equivariant coherent sheaves on this scheme, to be denoted by $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \tilde{\mathcal{N}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*}^L \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$. It acts on $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \mathrm{St})$ by convolutions from the right. Following [BR1], there is a homomorphism from Br^{ea} to the group of invertible objects in $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \tilde{\mathcal{N}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*}^L \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$. Namely, note that we have a natural morphism from the usual fiber product $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ to the derived tensor product. So we can view objects of $\mathrm{Coh}^G(\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$ as objects of $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^G \tilde{\mathcal{N}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*}^L \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$.

An element $\lambda \in \Lambda \subset \mathrm{Br}^{ea}$ is sent to $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\Delta}(-\lambda)$, while T_s is sent to the structure sheaf of the scheme-theoretic intersection $Z_s \cap \mathrm{St}$ (that is actually a subscheme in $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$).

Proposition 6.5. *For $x = wt_\lambda$, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}(\Delta^{cl}(x^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho))) \cong T_{w^{-1}}^{-1} \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\Delta^{(1)}}(-\lambda).$$

Proof. The proof of this proposition is in two steps.

Step 1. The affine braid group Br^{ea} acts on $D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ by the classical wall-crossing functors. We claim that \mathcal{F} intertwines the action of the finite braid group Br_W on $D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ and the action of Br_W on $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathrm{St}^{(1)})$ from the left (the claim should be true for the whole group Br^{ea} but we do not need this).

The action of T_s on $D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ is by tensoring with the cone of $1 \rightarrow \Theta_s$, where 1 denotes the monoidal unit, and Θ_s is the classical reflection functor. The functor Θ_s is given by tensoring with the Harish-Chandra bimodule B_s^{HC} from Section 3.2. The action of T_s on $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \mathrm{St}^{(1)})$ is by convolving with the cone of

$$1 \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{R} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^*(1)} [\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)} \times_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s^{(1)}} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}}],$$

compare to (6.9). Under the first equivalence in (2.16), the target sheaf is sent to

$$(6.10) \quad R\Gamma \left(\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{R} \times_{\mathfrak{h}^*(1)} [\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)} \times_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s^{(1)}} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}}], \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}} \otimes \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{h}}^* \right).$$

Note that, by the construction in [BM], (6.10) is in homological degree 0 and is flat as a right $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}$ -module (see (c) of Corollary in [BM, Section 2.3.1]), hence as a $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)\wedge}]$ -module. The bimodule B_s^{HC} is flat over $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)\wedge}]$ as well.

Now we show that (4.4) sends B_s^{HC} to (6.10). Since both are flat over $\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)\wedge}]$, it is enough to establish the claim that the former module is sent to the latter under our

equivalence after restricting to $\mathfrak{g}^{*(1),reg}$. Over that locus both categories in (4.4) are equivalent to $\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)})$, and these equivalences are intertwined by (4.4). Further, note that $\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg})$ is equivalent to the category $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ considered in Section 3.1. The image of (6.10) in $\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}}(\text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg})$ is the structure sheaf on the intersection of $\text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1),reg}$ with $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \times_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{(1)}$. Under the equivalence with $\text{Rep}(\mathfrak{J}^\wedge)$ (under the restriction to $S^{(1)}$), this structure sheaf goes to the image of B_s^{AS} under the full embedding of Lemma 3.2. The same is true for the image of B_s^{HC} , see the proof of Proposition 3.5. It follows that (4.4) indeed sends B_s^{HC} to (6.10). Therefore, under the equivalence of Theorem 4.1, B_s^{HC} goes to the structure sheaf of $(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \times_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{(1)} \cap \text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}$.

It remains to show that, under the same equivalence, the cone of $1 \rightarrow B_s^{HC}$ goes to the cone of

$$1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \times_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_s} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})^{(1)} \cap \text{St}_{\mathbb{R}}^{(1)}}.$$

This will follow if we check

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U}^\wedge_0)}(1, B_s^{HC}) \cong \mathbb{R},$$

as the adjunction units generate the corresponding Hom \mathbb{R} -modules. Note that both objects in the Hom above are HC tilting. So the Hom \mathbb{R} -module is the same as between their images in the equivalent category ASBim^\wedge (the equivalence has been established in Theorem 5.10). There, it follows from the definition.

This completes the claim of Step 1.

Step 2. The claim that $\Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$ goes to $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(1),\Delta}$ follows from the construction of the equivalence $D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}^{(1)})$. Indeed, under the equivalence $D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0)$, the module $\Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$ goes to \mathcal{U}_0 , see Proposition 6.3. The construction of Remark 4.2 shows that under the equivalence

$$D^b(\text{HC}^G(\mathcal{U})_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}[\mathfrak{g}^{*(1)}]} \mathcal{A}^{opp}\text{-mod}^{G^{(1)}})$$

the bimodule \mathcal{U}_0 goes to the bimodule \mathcal{A} . And that bimodule goes to $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(1),\Delta} \in D^b(\text{Coh}^{G^{(1)}} \text{St}^{(1)})$.

According to Remark 6.4, the equivalence \mathcal{F} intertwines the actions of Λ . So it is enough to prove the claim of the proposition when $x = w \in W$. Step 1 combined with the previous paragraph reduces this to checking that $\Delta^{cl}(w^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho)) \cong T_{w^{-1}}^{-1} \Delta^{cl}(-2\rho)$.

To prove the latter isomorphism, recall that, for a simple reflection $s \in W$, the endofunctor T_s^{-1} of $D^b(\mathcal{O}^{[0]})$ is given by the cone of $\Theta_s \rightarrow 1$ (where the source functor is in homological degree 0). Note that, for $u \in W$, we have $u^{-1}s \cdot (-2\rho) > u^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho)$ if and only if $u < su$ in the Bruhat order. If this is the case, then $\Theta_s \Delta^{cl}(w^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho))$ fits into a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \Delta^{cl}(u^{-1}s \cdot (-2\rho)) \rightarrow \Theta_s \Delta^{cl}(u^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho)) \rightarrow \Delta^{cl}(u^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho)) \rightarrow 0$$

and hence $T_s^{-1} \Delta^{cl}(u^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta^{cl}(u^{-1}s \cdot (-2\rho))$. It follows that $T_{w^{-1}}^{-1} \Delta^{cl}(-2\rho) \cong \Delta^{cl}(w^{-1} \cdot (-2\rho))$. This finishes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [A] N. Abe, *A bimodule description of the Hecke category*. Compos. Math. 157 (2021), no. 10, 2133–2159.
- [AB] D. Arinkin, R. Bezrukavnikov, *Perverse coherent sheaves*. Mosc. Math. J. 10 (2010), no. 1, 3–29, 271.
- [BB] A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, *Localisation de \mathfrak{g} -modules*. (French) C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 292 (1981), no. 1, 15–18.

- [B] R. Bezrukavnikov, *On two geometric realizations of an affine Hecke algebra*, Publ. Math. IHES 123 (2016), 1–67.
- [BLin] R. Bezrukavnikov, Q. Lin, *Highest weight modules at the critical level and noncommutative Springer resolution*. Algebraic groups and quantum groups, 15–27, Contemp. Math., 565, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.
- [BLo] R. Bezrukavnikov, I. Losev, *Dimensions of modular irreducible representations of semisimple Lie algebras*. arXiv:2005.10030. To appear in J. Amer. Math. Soc.
- [BM] R. Bezrukavnikov, I. Mirkovic, *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in prime characteristic and noncommutative Springer resolution*. Ann. Math. 178 (2013), n.3, 835-919.
- [BMR] R. Bezrukavnikov, I. Mirkovic, D. Rumynin. *Localization of modules for a semisimple Lie algebra in prime characteristic* (with an appendix by R. Bezrukavnikov and S. Riche), Ann. of Math. (2) 167 (2008), no. 3, 945-991.
- [BR1] R. Bezrukavnikov, S. Riche, *Affine braid group actions on derived categories of Springer resolutions*. Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Super. (4) 45 (2012), no. 4, 535-599.
- [BR2] R. Bezrukavnikov, S. Riche, *Hecke action on the principal block*. Compos. Math. 158 (2022), no. 5, 953–1019.
- [BR3] R. Bezrukavnikov, S. Riche, *Modular affine Hecke category and regular centralizer*. arXiv:2206.03738.
- [BR4] R. Bezrukavnikov, S. Riche, *On two modular geometric realizations of an affine Hecke algebra*. In preparation.
- [CG] N. Chriss, V. Ginzburg, *Representation theory and complex geometry*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1997.
- [E] B. Elias, *Gaitsgory’s central sheaves via the diagrammatic Hecke category*. arXiv:1811.06188.
- [EL] B. Elias, I. Losev, *Modular representation theory in type A via Soergel bimodules*. arXiv:1701.00560.
- [EW] B. Elias and G. Williamson, *Soergel calculus*, Represent. Theory 20 (2016), 295–374.
- [FG] E. Frenkel, D. Gaitsgory, *D-modules on the affine flag variety and representations of affine Kac-Moody algebras*. Represent. Theory 13 (2009), 470–608.
- [J] J.C. Jantzen, *Representations of algebraic groups*, 2nd edition. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 107. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [R] S. Riche, *Geometric braid group actions on derived categories of coherent sheaves*. Representation Theory, 12 (2008), 131-169.
- [S] W. Soergel, *Kazhdan-Lusztig-Polynome und unzerlegbare Bimoduln über Polynomringen*. J. Inst. Math. Jussieu 6 (2007), no. 3, 501–525.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN CT USA
 Email address: ivan.loseu@gmail.com