

# A CHARACTERIZATION OF UNITARITY OF SOME HIGHEST WEIGHT HARISH-CHANDRA MODULES

ZHANQIANG BAI AND MARKUS HUNZIKER

ABSTRACT. Let  $L(\lambda)$  be a highest weight Harish-Chandra module with highest weight  $\lambda$ . When the associated variety of  $L(\lambda)$  is not maximal, that is, not equal to the nilradical of the corresponding parabolic subalgebra, we prove that the unitarity of  $L(\lambda)$  can be determined by a simple condition on the value of  $z = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee)$ , where  $\rho$  is half the sum of positive roots and  $\beta$  is the highest root. In the proof, certain distinguished antichains of positive noncompact roots play a key role.

By using these antichains, we are also able to provide a uniform formula for the Gelfand–Kirillov dimension of all highest weight Harish-Chandra modules, generalizing our previous result for the case of unitary highest weight Harish-Chandra modules.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Distinguished antichains of positive noncompact roots	3
3. Gelfand–Kirillov dimension and associated variety	5
4. Proof of the main theorem: simply-laced cases	6
5. Proof of the main theorem: non-simply-laced cases	10
6. A uniform formula for the Gelfand–Kirillov dimension	12
7. Appendix	16
References	19

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $G_{\mathbb{R}}$  be a connected non-compact simple Lie group with finite center, and let  $K_{\mathbb{R}}$  be a maximal compact subgroup. From the work of Harish-Chandra (see comments in [BHXZ, §3.2]), it follows that infinite-dimensional highest weight Harish-Chandra modules for  $G_{\mathbb{R}}$  exist if and only if  $(G_{\mathbb{R}}, K_{\mathbb{R}})$  is a Hermitian symmetric pair. The problem of determining when a highest weight Harish-Chandra module is unitarizable has been extensively studied by various authors (see, for example, the references in [EHW83]). The full classification was independently completed in [EHW83] and [Jak83], though the classification itself is rather intricate. In this paper, we provide a simple and uniform characterization of unitarity for Harish-Chandra modules with a given associated variety, expressed in terms of the highest weight (see Theorem 1.1).

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E47, 17B10.

*Key words and phrases.* Unitary highest weight module, associated variety, Gelfand–Kirillov dimension.

From now, we assume that  $(G_{\mathbb{R}}, K_{\mathbb{R}})$  is a Hermitian symmetric pair. We denote by  $K$  the complexification of the compact group  $K_{\mathbb{R}}$  and by  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$  the complexified Lie algebras of  $(G_{\mathbb{R}}, K_{\mathbb{R}})$ . Then we have the usual decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{p}^- \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}^+$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  as a  $K$ -representation. Let  $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{k}$  be a Cartan subalgebra. Then  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta(\mathfrak{k})$  denote the root systems of  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$  and  $(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{h})$ , respectively. Let  $\Delta^+$  be the positive system of  $\Delta$ , and define  $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}) = \Delta(\mathfrak{k}) \cap \Delta^+$  and  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) = \Delta^+ \setminus \Delta^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . Let  $\beta$  denote the unique maximal noncompact root of  $\Delta^+$ . Now choose  $\zeta \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  so that  $\zeta$  is orthogonal to  $\Delta(\mathfrak{k})$  and  $(\zeta, \beta^\vee) = 1$ . Let  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  be  $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k})$ -dominant integral and  $F(\lambda)$  be the irreducible  $\mathfrak{k}$ -module with highest weight  $\lambda$ . By letting the nilradical act by zero, we may consider  $F(\lambda)$  as a module of the parabolic subalgebra  $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{k} + \mathfrak{p}^+$ . Then we define:

$$N(\lambda) = U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{q})} F(\lambda).$$

Let  $L(\lambda)$  denote the irreducible quotient of  $N(\lambda)$ , which is a highest weight module of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

From [EHW83],  $L(\lambda)$  is a highest weight Harish-Chandra module if and only if  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ , where

$$\Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k}) = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \lambda \text{ is } \Delta^+(\mathfrak{k})\text{-dominant integral}\}.$$

Write  $\rho$  for half the sum of positive roots in  $\Delta^+$ . Then we can write  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$ , with  $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  such that  $(\lambda_0 + \rho, \beta) = 0$ , and  $z = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The associated variety of a highest weight Harish-Chandra module is known to be the closure of a single  $K$ -orbit in  $\mathfrak{p}^+$  (see §3 for more details). Furthermore, the closures of the  $K$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{p}^+$  form a linear chain of varieties

$$\{0\} = \overline{\mathcal{O}_0} \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}_1} \subset \cdots \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}_{r-1}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}_r} = \mathfrak{p}^+,$$

where  $r$  is the  $\mathbb{R}$ -rank of  $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ , i.e., the dimension of a Cartan subgroup of the group  $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ , which is also equal to the rank of the symmetric space  $G_{\mathbb{R}}/K_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Therefore, if  $L(\lambda)$  is a highest weight Harish-Chandra module with highest weight  $\lambda$ , then there is an integer  $0 \leq k(\lambda) \leq r$  such that the associated variety of  $L(\lambda)$  is  $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}$ .

Denote

$$(1.1) \quad z_k = (\rho, \beta^\vee) + u_k = (\rho, \beta^\vee) - kc,$$

for  $0 \leq k \leq r$ . Here  $c$  is a real number associated with the Hermitian type Lie group  $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ , see Table 1.

In this paper, we will prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$  and suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1$ . Then*

$$L(\lambda) \text{ is unitarizable if and only if } (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z_k.$$

*Remark 1.2.* Note that when  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$ , it may happen that there is more than one point such that  $L(\lambda)$  is unitarizable.

In [BH15], we have found a uniform formula for the Gelfand–Kirillov dimensions of unitary highest weight Harish-Chandra modules. Now we want to generalize our formula to all highest weight Harish-Chandra modules.

**Definition 1.3.** For  $1 \leq k \leq r - 1$ , define:

$$A_k = \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid \text{ht}(\alpha) = k \lceil c \rceil + 1\}.$$

Here  $\lceil c \rceil$  denotes the smallest integer  $n$  such that  $n \geq c$ .

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ .

(a) If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type *ADE*, for  $0 \leq k \leq r-1$ , define

$$z_k(\lambda_0) := \min\{z \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \exists \alpha \in A_k \text{ such that } (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0\}.$$

(b) If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type *BC*, for  $0 \leq k \leq r-1$ , define

$$z_k(\lambda_0) := \begin{cases} \min\{z \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \exists \alpha \in A_k \text{ such that } (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0\}, & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ \min\{z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \mid \exists \alpha \in A_k \text{ such that } (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0\}, & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

In the special case when  $\lambda_0 = -(\rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta$ , we also write  $z_k$  instead of  $z_k(\lambda_0)$  (This coincides with our definition of  $z_k$  in (1.1)).

Our new formula for the Gelfand–Kirillov dimensions of all highest weight Harish-Chandra modules is as follows.

**Theorem** (Theorem 6.3). *Suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  is a reduction point. Then*

(a) *If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type ADE, then  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  and*

$$\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} rz_{r-1}, & \text{if } z < z_{r-1}(\lambda_0) \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z < z_{k-1}(\lambda_0), \text{ where } 1 \leq k \leq r-1 \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

(b) *If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type BC, then  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  or  $z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$  and*

$$\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} rz_{r-1}, & \text{if } z < z_{r-1}(\lambda_0) \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z < z_{k-2}(\lambda_0), \text{ where } 2 \leq k \leq r-1 \text{ and} \\ & \text{either } z \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k \text{ is even or } z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k \text{ is odd} \\ z_0, & \text{if } z_1(\lambda_0) \leq z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

## 2. DISTINGUISHED ANTICHAINS OF POSITIVE NONCOMPACT ROOTS

Note that for any integer  $1 \leq h \leq \text{ht}(\beta)$ , the set

$$\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_h := \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid \text{ht}(\alpha) = h\}$$

is an antichain in  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ .

Let  $\Pi$  denote the set of simple roots in  $\Delta^+$ .

**Lemma 2.1** ([Jak83, Lemma 4.1]). *Let  $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ , let  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k$  be distinct elements of  $\Pi \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{k})$ , and assume that  $\alpha + \pi_i \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . Then  $k \leq 2$ . Furthermore, if  $k = 2$ , then  $\pi_1 \perp \pi_2$  and  $\alpha + \pi_1 + \pi_2 \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ .  $\square$*

In light of this lemma, the Hasse diagram of  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  is an upward planar graph of order dimension two and hence can be drawn on a two-dimensional orthogonal lattice that has been rotated by a 45-degree angle.

**Example 2.2.** Let  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{su}(3, 2)$ . Then we have

$$\mathfrak{p}^+ = \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{ccc|cc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & * & * \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & * & * \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & * & * \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right) \right\} \quad \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) = \begin{array}{c} \beta = e_1 - e_5 \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \alpha_3 = e_3 - e_4 \end{array}$$

The antichains in  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  are given in Appendix.

A subset  $Y \subseteq \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  is called a *lower-order ideal* if, for  $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  and  $\beta \in Y$ ,  $\alpha \leq \beta$  implies that  $\alpha \in Y$ .

**Definition 2.3.** For  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ , define the *diagram* of  $\lambda$  as the set

$$(2.1) \quad Y_\lambda := \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}\},$$

viewed as a subposet of  $\Delta_\lambda(\mathfrak{p}^+) := \Delta_\lambda \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ , where  $\Delta_\lambda := \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is the integral root system associated to  $\lambda$ .

By [BHXZ, Lem 2.2], the poset  $Y_\lambda$  is a lower order ideal of  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  when  $\lambda$  is integral.

An *antichain* in a poset is a subset consisting of pairwise noncomparable elements. The *width* of a poset is the cardinality of maximal antichain in the poset. Suppose  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ , we use  $m = m(\lambda)$  to denote the width of  $Y_\lambda$ .

By inspection of the Hasse diagram of  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ , we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Suppose  $Y \subseteq \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  be a lower order ideal. If  $m$  is the width of  $Y$ , then there exists an antichain  $A \subseteq Y$  of length  $m$  such that all the roots in  $A$  have the same height.*

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . If  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1$ , then  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0$  for some  $\alpha \in A_k$ .*

Recall that  $A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k \lceil c \rceil + 1}$  is an antichain in  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1$ .

When  $\Delta$  is simply-laced, by our main theorem in [BHXZ],  $\lambda$  is integral and  $m(\lambda) = k$ . Assume that  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \leq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in A_k$ . Since  $A_k$  is an antichain of length  $k + 1$ , it would follow that  $m(\lambda) \geq k + 1$ . Contradiction.

When  $\Delta$  is non-simply-laced and  $k = 2l$  is even, by our main theorem in [BHXZ],  $\lambda$  is integral and  $2m(\lambda) = k$ . Assume that  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \leq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in A_k$ . Since  $A_k$  is an antichain of length  $l + 1$ , it would follow that  $m(\lambda) \geq l + 1$ . Then  $2m(\lambda) \geq 2l + 2 = k + 2 > k$ . Contradiction!

When  $\Delta$  is non-simply-laced and  $k = 2l + 1$  is odd, by our main theorem in [BHXZ],  $\lambda$  is half-integral and  $2m(\lambda) + 1 = k$ . Assume that  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \leq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in A_k$ . Since  $A_k$  is an antichain of length  $l + 1$ , it would follow that  $m(\lambda) \geq l + 1$ . Then  $2m(\lambda) + 1 \geq 2l + 3 = k + 2 > k$ . Contradiction!

□

### 3. GELFAND–KIRILLOV DIMENSION AND ASSOCIATED VARIETY

In this section, we will recall some preliminaries on Gelfand–Kirillov dimensions and associated varieties of highest weight modules. See [Vog78, Vog91] for more details.

Let  $M$  be a finite generated  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. Fix a finite dimensional generating space  $M_0$  of  $M$ . Let  $U_n(\mathfrak{g})$  be the standard filtration of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ . Set  $M_n = U_n(\mathfrak{g}) \cdot M_0$  and  $\text{gr}(M) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{gr}_n M$ , where  $\text{gr}_n M = M_n/M_{n-1}$ . Thus  $\text{gr}(M)$  is a graded module of  $\text{gr}(U(\mathfrak{g})) \simeq S(\mathfrak{g})$ .

The *Gelfand–Kirillov dimension* of  $M$  is defined by

$$\text{GKdim } M = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \dim(U_n(\mathfrak{g})M_0)}{\log n}.$$

The *associated variety* of  $M$  is defined by

$$\text{AV}(M) := \{X \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid f(X) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in \text{Ann}_{S(\mathfrak{g})}(\text{gr } M)\}.$$

These two definitions are independent of the choice of  $M_0$ , and  $\dim V(M) = \text{GKdim } M$  (e.g., [NOT01]). If  $M_0$  is  $\mathfrak{a}$ -invariant for a subalgebra  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ , then

$$(3.1) \quad \text{AV}(M) \subset (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{a})^*.$$

When  $M = L(\lambda)$  is a highest weight Harish-Chandra module, we can choose  $M_0$  to be the finite dimensional  $U(\mathfrak{k})$ -module generated by  $\mathbb{C}\lambda$ . Then  $M_0$  is  $\mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}^+$ -invariant. In view of (3.1),

$$\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) \subset (\mathfrak{g}/(\mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}^+))^* \simeq (\mathfrak{p}^-)^* \simeq \mathfrak{p}^+,$$

where the last isomorphism is induced from the Killing form. As shown in [Vog91], the associated variety  $\text{AV}(M)$  is also  $K$ -invariant. In fact, Yamashita [Yam01] proved that  $\text{AV}(M)$  must be one of  $\overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $L(\lambda)$  be a highest weight Harish-Chandra module. Then*

$$\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}$$

for some  $0 \leq k(\lambda) \leq r$ .

We have the following table from [EHW83]:

$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}}$	$r$	$c$	$(\rho, \beta^{\vee})$
$\mathfrak{su}(p, n-p)$	$\min\{p, n-p\}$	1	$n-1$
$\mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{R})$	$n$	1/2	$n$
$\mathfrak{so}^*(2n)$	$[n/2]$	2	$2n-3$
$\mathfrak{so}(2, 2n-1)$	2	$n-3/2$	$2n-2$
$\mathfrak{so}(2, 2n-2)$	2	$n-2$	$2n-3$
$\mathfrak{e}_{6(-14)}$	2	3	11
$\mathfrak{e}_{7(-25)}$	3	4	17

TABLE 1. Some constants of Lie groups of Hermitian type

In [BH15], we have found a uniform expression for the GK dimensions and associated varieties of unitary highest weight Harish-Chandra modules.

**Proposition 3.2** ([BH15]). *Suppose  $L(\lambda)$  is a unitary highest weight Harish-Chandra module with highest weight  $\lambda$ . We denote  $z = z(\lambda) = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee)$ , then*

$$\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} rz_{r-1}, & \text{if } z < z_{r-1} \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z = z_k = (\rho, \beta^\vee) - kc, 1 \leq k \leq r-1 \\ 0, & \text{if } z = z_0 = (\rho, \beta^\vee). \end{cases}$$

Denote  $k = k(\lambda) := -\frac{(\lambda, \beta^\vee)}{c}$ . Then

- (1) If  $k > r-1$ , we have  $\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = rz_{r-1} = \frac{1}{2} \dim(G/K)$ .
- (2) If  $0 \leq k \leq r-1$ , then  $k$  is a non-negative integer and

$$\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = k((\rho, \beta^\vee) - (k-1)c) = kz_{k-1} = \dim \overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}.$$

The associated variety of  $L(\lambda)$  is  $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}$ .

#### 4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM: SIMPLY-LACED CASES

In this section, we assume that  $\Delta$  is simply-laced.

For any integer  $0 \leq k \leq r-1$ ,  $A_k$  is the antichain in  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  such that  $|A_k| = k+1$  and  $A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_h$  with  $h$  minimal.

To prove our Theorem 1.1, we need the following useful lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\tau \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . If  $\lambda_0 = \tau - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$ , then, for any  $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_h$ ,*

$$(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) = z - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + h - (\tau, \beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_h$ . Since  $\Delta$  is simply-laced,  $(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) = 1$  and  $(\rho, \alpha^\vee) = h$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) &= (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) + z(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee) + z + h \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee - \beta^\vee) - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + z + h \\ &= z - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + h - (\tau, \beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we can prove our Theorem 1.1. The idea is very simple. From Lemma 2.5, since  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$ , we have  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0$  for some  $\alpha \in A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k[c]+1}$ . Then  $\text{ht}(\alpha) = kc + 1$ . So if  $(\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z = z_k = (\rho, \beta^\vee) - kc$ , we will have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) &= z - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + h - (\tau, \beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\rho, \beta^\vee) - kc - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + kc + 1 - (\tau, \beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee) \\ &= 1 - (\tau, \beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This condition is very restrictive. In the following, we will give a case-by-case discussion for this condition, which will imply the unitarity of  $L(\lambda)$ .

4.1. **Case  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{su}(p, q)$ .** For  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1 = \min\{p, q\} - 1$ ,

$$A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{\varepsilon_{p-k+i} - \varepsilon_{p+i+1} = [\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{p-k+i-1}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k+1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{q-i-1}] \mid 0 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

(Here and in the following we write  $[n_1, n_2, \dots] := n_1\alpha_1 + n_2\alpha_2 + \dots$ , where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$  are the simple roots.)

Fix  $\tau = a_1\omega_1 + \dots + a_{p-1}\omega_{p-1} + b_{q-1}\omega_{p+1} + \dots + b_1\omega_{p+q-1} \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . Then

$$\lambda_0 = \tau - (p + q - 1 + a_1 + \dots + a_{p-1} + b_{q-1} + \dots + b_1)\zeta.$$

For  $\alpha = \varepsilon_{p-k+i} - \varepsilon_{p+i+1}$ ,

$$(\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) = (z - (p + q - k - 2)) - (a_1 + \dots + a_{p-k+i-1} + b_{q-i-1} + \dots + b_1).$$

Now suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  such that  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1$  and  $z = z_k = p + q - k - 1$ . By Lemma 2.5,  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0$  for some  $\alpha \in A_k$ . For  $\alpha = \varepsilon_{p-k+i} - \varepsilon_{p+i+1}$ , by Lemma 4.1 we have

$$(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) = 1 - (a_1 + \dots + a_{p-k+i-1} + b_{q-i-1} + \dots + b_1)$$

and hence  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0$  implies  $a_1 = \dots = a_{p-k+i-1} = 0$  and  $b_1 = \dots = b_{q-i-1} = 0$ . It follows that  $\lambda$  is of the form

$$\lambda = (\underbrace{-k, \dots, -k}_{\geq 1}, \underbrace{*, \dots, *}_{k}, \underbrace{*, \dots, *}_{\geq 1}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

By [KV78],  $L(\lambda)$  is unitary.

4.2. **Case  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{so}^*(2n)$ .** For  $1 \leq k \leq r - 1 = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{2k+1} = \{[\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-2k-2}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2k}, 0, 1], \\ &\quad [ \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-2k-1+i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2k-2i-1}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_i, 1, 1 ] \mid 0 \leq i \leq k - 1\}, \\ A_0 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{1} = \{[0, 0, \dots, 0, 1]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\tau = a_1\omega_1 + a_2\omega_2 + \dots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . Then, since  $\beta = [1, 2, \dots, 2, 1, 1]$ ,

$$\lambda_0 = \tau - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta = \tau - (2n - 3 + a_1 + 2a_2 + \dots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1})\zeta.$$

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_0}$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_0 = 2n - 3$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$1 - (a_1 + 2a_2 + \dots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1}) > 0$$

and hence  $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_{n-1} = 0$ . It follows that  $\lambda = 0$  (trivial representation).

Now suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  such that  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $1 \leq k \leq r - 1$  and  $z = z_k = 2n - 3 - 2k$ . By Lemma 2.5,  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0$  for some  $\alpha \in A_k$ . So if  $n - 2k > 2$ , by Lemma 4.1 we have

$$1 - (a_1 + 2a_2 + \dots + 2a_{n-2k-2} + a_{n-2k-1} + \dots + a_{n-2} + a_{n-1}) > 0$$

or

$$1 - (a_1 + 2a_2 + \dots + 2a_{n-2k-1+i} + a_{n-2k+i} + \dots + a_{n-i-2}) > 0.$$

In the first case,  $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_{n-1} = 0$ , and hence  $\lambda = -2k\zeta$  ( $k$ -th Wallach representation).

In the second case,  $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-i-2} = 0$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda &= a_{n-i-1}\omega_{n-i-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \\ &\quad - (2k + 2a_{n-i-1} + \cdots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1})\zeta \\ &= a_{n-i-1}\omega_{n-i-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \\ &\quad - (2k + 2a_{n-i-1} + \cdots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1})\omega_n.\end{aligned}$$

So  $\lambda$  is of the form

$$\lambda = (\underbrace{-k, \dots, -k}_{n-i-1}, \underbrace{*, \dots, *}_{i+1}).$$

By [EW04], [EHW83] or [DES91],  $L(\lambda)$  is unitary.

So if  $n - 2k = 2$ , by Lemma 4.1 we have

$$1 - (a_2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}) > 0$$

or

$$1 - (a_1 + 2a_2 + \cdots + 2a_{n-2k-1+i} + a_{n-2k+i} + \cdots + a_{n-i-2}) > 0.$$

In the first case,  $a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-1} = 0$ , and hence  $\lambda = a_1\omega_1 + (2 - n - a_1)\zeta$  (unitary reduction point).

In the second case,  $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-i-2} = 0$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda &= a_{n-i-1}\omega_{n-i-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \\ &\quad - (2k + 2a_{n-i-1} + \cdots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1})\zeta \\ &= a_{n-i-1}\omega_{n-i-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \\ &\quad - (2k + 2a_{n-i-1} + \cdots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1})\omega_n.\end{aligned}$$

So  $\lambda$  is of the form

$$\lambda = (\underbrace{-k, \dots, -k}_{n-i-1}, \underbrace{*, \dots, *}_{i+1}).$$

By [EW04], [EHW83] or [DES91],  $L(\lambda)$  is unitary.

4.3. **Case  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{so}(2, 2n - 2)$ .** For  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1 = 2 - 1 = 1$ ,

$$A_0 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{1} = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]\},$$

$$A_1 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{n-1} = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_n = [1, \dots, 1, 0], \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_n = [1, \dots, 1, 0, 1]\}.$$

Fix  $\tau = a_2\omega_2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} + a_n\omega_n \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . Then, since  $\beta = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 = [1, 2, \dots, 2, 1, 1]$ ,

$$\lambda_0 = \tau - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta = \tau - (2n - 3 + 2a_2 + \cdots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1} + a_n)\zeta.$$

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_0}$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_0 = 2n - 3$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$1 - (2a_2 + \cdots + 2a_{n-2} + a_{n-1} + a_n) > 0$$

and hence  $a_2 = \cdots = a_n = 0$ . It follows that  $\lambda = 0$  (trivial representation).

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_1}$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_1 = n - 1$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$1 - (a_2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}) > 0$$

or

$$1 - (a_2 + \cdots + a_{n-2} + a_n) > 0.$$



In the first case, we have  $a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-1} = 0$ . Hence  $\lambda = a_n\omega_n - (n-2+a_n)\zeta$  (unitary reduction point).

In the second case, we have  $a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-2} = a_n = 0$ . Hence  $\lambda = a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} - (n-2+a_{n-1})\zeta$  (unitary reduction point).

4.4. **Case  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{e}_{6(-14)}$ .** By inspection of the Hasse diagram of  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_1 = \{[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]\}, \\ A_1 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_4 = \{[1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0], [1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\tau = a_2\omega_2 + a_3\omega_3 + a_4\omega_4 + a_5\omega_5 + a_6\omega_6$ . Then, since  $\beta = [1, 2, 2, 3, 2, 1]$ ,

$$\lambda_0 = \tau - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta = \tau - (11 + 2a_2 + 2a_3 + 3a_4 + 2a_5 + a_6)\zeta.$$

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}_0$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_0 = 11$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$1 - (2a_2 + 2a_3 + 3a_4 + 2a_5 + a_6) > 0$$

and hence  $a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = a_6 = 0$ . It follows that  $\lambda = 0$  (trivial representation).

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}_1$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_1 = 8$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$1 - (2a_2 + a_3 + 2a_4 + a_5 + a_6) > 0 \text{ or } 1 - (a_2 + a_3 + 2a_4 + 2a_5 + a_6) > 0.$$

In either case,  $a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = a_6 = 0$  and hence  $\lambda = -3\zeta$  (1st Wallach representation).

4.5. **Case  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{e}_{7(-25)}$ .** By inspection of the Hasse diagram of  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_1 = \{[0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]\}, \\ A_1 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_5 = \{[0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], [0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1]\}, \\ A_2 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_9 = \{[1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1], [1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1], [0, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\tau = a_1\omega_1 + a_2\omega_2 + a_3\omega_3 + a_4\omega_4 + a_5\omega_5 + a_6\omega_6$ . Then, since  $\beta = [2, 2, 3, 4, 3, 2, 1]$ ,

$$\lambda_0 = \tau - (17 + 2a_1 + 2a_2 + 3a_3 + 4a_4 + 3a_5 + 2a_6)\zeta.$$

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}_0$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_0 = 17$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$1 - (2a_1 + 2a_2 + 3a_3 + 4a_4 + 3a_5 + 2a_6) > 0$$

and hence  $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = a_6 = 0$ . It follows that  $\lambda = 0$  (trivial representation).

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}_1$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_1 = 13$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$1 - (2a_1 + 2a_2 + 2a_3 + 3a_4 + 2a_5 + a_6) > 0 \text{ or } 1 - (2a_1 + a_2 + 3a_3 + 3a_4 + 2a_5 + a_6) > 0.$$

In either case,  $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = a_6 = 0$  and hence  $\lambda = -4\omega_7$  (1st Wallach representation).

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}_2$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_2 = 9$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - (a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 2a_4 + 2a_5 + a_6) &> 0, \\ 1 - (a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3 + 2a_4 + a_5 + a_6) &> 0, \\ \text{or } 1 - (2a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3 + 2a_4 + a_5) &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the first two cases,  $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = a_6 = 0$  and hence  $\lambda = -8\zeta$  (2nd Wallach representation). In the third case,  $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = 0$  and  $\lambda = a_6\omega_6 + (-2a_6 - 8)\zeta$  (unitary reduction point).

## 5. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM: NON-SIMPLY-LACED CASES

In this section, we assume that  $\Delta$  is not simply-laced.

For any integer  $0 \leq k \leq r-1$ ,  $A_k$  is the antichain in  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$  such that  $|A_k| = \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1$  and  $A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_h$  with  $h$  minimal.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 in non-simply-laced cases is similar to the simply-laced cases. We need Lemma 2.5 and the following useful lemma in the computation.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\tau \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . If  $\lambda_0 = \tau - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$ , then, for any  $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_h$ ,*

$$(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) = z - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau, \beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee) \text{ when } \alpha \text{ is a long root,}$$

and

$$(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) = 2z - 2(\rho, \beta^\vee) + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau, 2\beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee) \text{ when } \alpha \text{ is a short root.}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_h$ . Since  $\Delta$  is not simply-laced,  $(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) = 1$  if  $\alpha$  is a long root and  $(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) = 2$  if  $\alpha$  is a short root.  $(\rho, \alpha^\vee) = h$ . Thus, if  $\alpha$  is a long root, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) &= (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) + z(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee) + z + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee - \beta^\vee) - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + z + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= z - (\rho, \beta^\vee) + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau, \beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\alpha$  is a short root, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) &= (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) + z(\zeta, \alpha^\vee) + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee) - 2(\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee) + 2z + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= (\tau, \alpha^\vee - 2\beta^\vee) - 2(\rho, \beta^\vee) + 2z + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) \\ &= 2z - 2(\rho, \beta^\vee) + (\rho, \alpha^\vee) - (\tau, 2\beta^\vee - \alpha^\vee). \end{aligned}$$

□

5.1.  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{R})$ . For  $0 \leq k \leq r-1 = n-1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } k = 2m \text{ is even, } A_k &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{2\varepsilon_{n-m}, \varepsilon_{n-m-i} + \varepsilon_{n-m+i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\} \\ &= \{[\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-m-1-i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2i}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{m-i}, 1] \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } k = 2m + 1 \text{ is odd, } A_k &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{\varepsilon_{n-m-1-i} + \varepsilon_{n-m+i} \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\} \\ &= \{[\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-m-2-i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{1+2i}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{m-i}, 1] \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\tau = a_1\omega_1 + a_2\omega_2 + \dots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . Then, since  $\beta = [2, \dots, 2, 1]$ ,

$$\lambda_0 = \tau - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta = \tau - (n + a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{n-2} + a_{n-1})\zeta.$$

Now suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  such that  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $1 \leq k \leq r-1$  and  $z = z_k = n - \frac{k}{2}$ . By Lemma 2.5,  $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0$  for some  $\alpha \in A_k$ . So if  $k = 2m$  is even, by Lemma 5.1 we have

$$1 - (a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_{n-m-1}) > 0$$

or

$$2 - (2a_1 + \cdots + 2a_{n-m-1-i} + a_{n-m-i} + \cdots + a_{n-1-m+i}) > 0.$$

In the first case,  $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-m-1} = 0$  and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= a_{n-m}\omega_{n-m} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} - (a_{n-m} + \cdots + a_{n-1})\zeta - \frac{1}{2}\zeta \\ &= \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{n-m}, \underbrace{(*, \dots, *)}_m - \frac{1}{2}\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

By [EHW83] or [EW04],  $L(\lambda)$  is unitary.

In the second case,  $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-m-1-i} = 0$  and  $a_{n-m-i} = \cdots = a_{n-1-m+i} = 0$  or at most one of  $\{a_{n-m-i}, \dots, a_{n-1-m+i}\}$  equals to 1 with the rest equal to 0. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= a_{n-m-i}\omega_{n-m-i} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} - (a_{n-m-i} + \cdots + a_{n-1})\zeta - \frac{1}{2}\zeta \\ &= \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{\geq n-m-i}, \underbrace{(-1, \dots, -1, \overbrace{(*, \dots, *)}^{m-i})}_{\leq m+i} - \frac{1}{2}\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

By [EHW83] or [EW04],  $L(\lambda)$  is unitary.

If  $k = 2m + 1$  is odd, we have

$$2 - (2a_1 + \cdots + 2a_{n-m-2-i} + a_{n-m-1-i} + \cdots + a_{n-1-m+i}) > 0,$$

then the arguments are similar to the above case.

5.2.  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{so}(2, 2n-1)$ . For  $0 \leq k \leq r-1 = 2-1 = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_1 = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]\}, \\ A_1 &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_n = \{\varepsilon_1 = [1, 1, \dots, 1]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\tau = a_2\omega_2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} + a_n\omega_n \in \Lambda^+(\mathfrak{k})$ . Then, since  $\beta = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 = [1, 2, \dots, 2]$ ,

$$\lambda_0 = \tau - (\tau + \rho, \beta^\vee)\zeta = \tau - (2n - 2 + 2a_2 + \cdots + 2a_{n-1} + a_n)\zeta.$$

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_0}$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_0 = 2n - 2$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 5.1,

$$1 - (2a_2 + \cdots + 2a_{n-1} + a_n) > 0$$

and hence  $a_2 = \cdots = a_n = 0$ . It follows that  $\lambda = 0$  (trivial representation).

Suppose  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_1}$  and  $z(\lambda) = z_1 = n - \frac{1}{2}$ . By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 5.1,

$$2 - (2a_2 + \cdots + 2a_{n-1} + a_n) > 0$$

and hence  $a_2 = \cdots = a_n = 0$  or  $a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-1} = a_n - 1 = 0$ .

In the first case, it follows that  $\lambda = -(n - \frac{3}{2})\zeta$  (1st Wallach representation).

In the second case, we have  $\lambda = \omega_n - (n - \frac{1}{2})\zeta$  (unitary reduction point).

## 6. A UNIFORM FORMULA FOR THE GELFAND–KIRILLOV DIMENSION

In our previous paper [BH15], we found a uniform formula for the Gelfand–Kirillov dimensions of all unitary highest weight modules. Now we will give a new formula for the Gelfand–Kirillov dimensions of all highest weight Harish-Chandra modules.

We recall the definition of  $z_k(\lambda_0)$  in the introduction. Then we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Suppose  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type ADE. For  $z = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have*

$$z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z \iff m(\lambda) \leq k.$$

*Proof.* It is easy to verify (case-by-case) that

$$m(\lambda) \geq k + 1 \iff A_k \subset \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}\}.$$

For  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z &\iff \exists \alpha \in A_k \text{ such that } (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0 \\ &\iff A_k \not\subset \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \leq 0\} \\ &\iff m(\lambda) < k + 1 = |A_k| \\ &\iff m(\lambda) \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

□

We recall the main theorem in [BHXZ].

**Proposition 6.2** ([BHXZ]). *Suppose  $L(\lambda)$  is a highest weight Harish-Chandra module with highest weight  $\lambda$  and  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}$ . Let  $m = \text{width}(Y_\lambda)$ . Then  $k(\lambda)$  is given as follows.*

(a) *If  $\Delta$  is simply laced and  $\lambda$  is integral, then  $k(\lambda) = m$ .*

(b) *If  $\Delta$  is non-simply laced and  $\lambda$  is integral, then*

$$k(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 2m, & \text{if } m < \frac{r+1}{2} \\ r, & \text{if } m = \frac{r+1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

(c) *If  $\Delta$  is non-simply laced and  $\lambda$  is half-integral, then*

$$k(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 2m + 1, & \text{if } m < \frac{r}{2} \\ r, & \text{if } m = \frac{r}{2}. \end{cases}$$

(d) *In all other cases  $k(\lambda) = r$ .*

In the following, we give the new formula for the Gelfand–Kirillov dimensions of all highest weight Harish-Chandra modules.

**Theorem 6.3.** *Suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  is a reduction point. Then*

(a) *If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type ADE, then  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  and*

$$\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} rz_{r-1}, & \text{if } z < z_{r-1}(\lambda_0) \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z < z_{k-1}(\lambda_0), \text{ where } 1 \leq k \leq r-1 \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

(b) If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of type  $BC$ , then  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  or  $z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$  and

$$\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} rz_{r-1}, & \text{if } z < z_{r-1}(\lambda_0) \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z < z_{k-2}(\lambda_0), \text{ where } 2 \leq k \leq r-1 \text{ and} \\ & \text{either } z \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k \text{ is even or } z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k \text{ is odd} \\ z_0, & \text{if } z_1(\lambda_0) \leq z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* In the following, suppose  $0 \leq k \leq r-1$ .

(a) In type  $ADE$ , if  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  is a reduction point, then  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  by [EHW83].

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z &\iff \exists \alpha \in A_k : (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0 \\ &\iff A_k \not\subseteq \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \leq 0\} \\ &\iff m(\lambda) < k + 1 = |A_k| \\ &\iff m(\lambda) \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

The formula then follows from our main theorem (in type  $ADE$ ) in [BHXZ].

(b) In type  $BC$ , if  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  is a reduction point, then  $z \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$  by [EHW83].

When  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  is integral, then  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus, when  $k = 2m$  is even, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z &\iff \exists \alpha \in A_k : (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0 \\ &\iff A_k \not\subseteq \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \leq 0\} \\ &\iff m(\lambda) < m + 1 = |A_k| \\ &\iff m(\lambda) \leq m \\ &\iff 2m(\lambda) \leq 2m = k. \end{aligned}$$

When  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  is half-integral, then  $z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus, when  $k = 2m + 1$  is odd, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z &\iff \exists \alpha \in A_k : (\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho, \alpha^\vee) > 0 \\ &\iff A_k \not\subseteq \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+) \mid (\lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee) \leq 0\} \\ &\iff m(\lambda) < m + 1 = |A_k| \\ &\iff m(\lambda) \leq m \\ &\iff 2m(\lambda) + 1 \leq 2m + 1 = k. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $z_1(\lambda_0) \leq z \iff 2m(\lambda) + 1 \leq 2m + 1 = 1$ . When  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$  is half-integral, we also know that  $L(\lambda)$  is not finite-dimensional. Thus  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}$  with  $k(\lambda) = 2m(\lambda) + 1 \geq 1$ .

The formula then follows from our main theorem (in type  $BC$ ) in [BHXZ].

□

The following result was firstly proved in [BH15]. Now we give a new proof.

**Corollary 6.4.** *Suppose  $L(\lambda)$  is a unitary highest weight Harish-Chandra module with highest weight  $\lambda$ . We denote  $z = z(\lambda) = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee)$ , then*

$$\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} rz_{r-1}, & \text{if } z < z_{r-1} \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z = z_k = (\rho, \beta^\vee) - kc, 1 \leq k \leq r-1 \\ 0, & \text{if } z = z_0 = (\rho, \beta^\vee). \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* First we suppose that  $L(\lambda)$  is a unitary highest weight Harish-Chandra module and  $z = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z_k$  for some  $0 \leq k \leq r-1$ .

From Yamashita [Yam94] we have  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}$  for some  $0 \leq k(\lambda) \leq r$ . From Theorem 1.1, we will have  $z = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z_{k(\lambda)}$  since  $L(\lambda)$  is unitarizable. Thus we must have  $z = z_k = z_{k(\lambda)}$ , which implies that  $k(\lambda) = k$ . So we must have  $\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \dim \mathcal{O}_k = kz_{k-1}$ .

Now we suppose that  $L(\lambda)$  is a unitary highest weight Harish-Chandra module and  $z = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) < z_{r-1}$ . From Yamashita [Yam94] we still have  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_{k(\lambda)}}$  for some  $0 \leq k(\lambda) \leq r$ . If  $k(\lambda) \leq r-1$ , by Theorem 1.1 we will have  $z = (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z_{k(\lambda)}$  since  $L(\lambda)$  is unitarizable. From our assumption, we will have  $z = z_{k(\lambda)} < z_{r-1}$ , which implies that

$$(\rho, \beta^\vee) - k(\lambda)c < (\rho, \beta^\vee) - (r-1)c \Rightarrow r-1 < k(\lambda) \leq r-1.$$

This is a contradiction! So we must have  $k(\lambda) = r$  and  $\text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \dim \mathcal{O}_r = rz_{r-1}$ .  $\square$

**Example 6.5.** Let  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{su}(4, 3)$  and let  $L(\lambda)$  be a highest weight Harish-Chandra module with highest weight  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$ . Here  $\lambda_0 = (0, 0, 0, -20, 8, 6, 6)$ ,  $\zeta = (\frac{3}{7}, \frac{3}{7}, \frac{3}{7}, \frac{3}{7}, -\frac{4}{7}, -\frac{4}{7}, -\frac{4}{7})$  and  $\rho = (3, 2, 1, 0, -1, -2, -3)$ . From [EHW83], we know the unitary reduction points correspond to  $z = 3$  and 4. For  $0 \leq k \leq r-1 = \min\{p, q\} - 1 = 2$ , we know

$$A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{\varepsilon_{p-k+i} - \varepsilon_{p+i+1} = [\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{p-k+i-1}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k+1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{q-i-1}] \mid 0 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

So  $A_0 = \{\varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_5\}$ ,  $A_1 = \{\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_5, \varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_6\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_5, \varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_6, \varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_7\}$ .

We write  $\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho = (3 + \frac{3}{7}z, 2 + \frac{3}{7}z, 1 + \frac{3}{7}z, -20 + \frac{3}{7}z, 7 - \frac{4}{7}z, 4 - \frac{4}{7}z, 3 - \frac{4}{7}z)$ . Thus we have  $z_0(\lambda_0) = 28$ ,  $z_1(\lambda_0) = 7$ , and  $z_2(\lambda_0) = 4$ . So

$$(6.1) \quad \text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 3z_2, & \text{if } z < z_2(\lambda_0) = 4 \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z < z_{k-1}(\lambda_0), \text{ where } 1 \leq k \leq 2 \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) = 28 \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

$$(6.2) \quad = \begin{cases} 12, & \text{if } z < z_2(\lambda_0) = 4 \\ 10, & \text{if } z_2(\lambda_0) = 4 \leq z < z_1(\lambda_0) = 7 \\ 6, & \text{if } z_1(\lambda_0) = 7 \leq z < z_0(\lambda_0) = 28 \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) = 28 \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

For this given  $\lambda_0$ , when  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $0 \leq k \leq 2$ , from Theorem 1.1, we have

$$L(\lambda) \text{ is unitarizable if and only if } (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z_k = n - 1 - k = 6 - k.$$

So from the above equation (6.2), we have

$$L(\lambda) \text{ is unitarizable if and only if } (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z = z_2 = 4.$$

Note that  $z = 3$  is a unitary reduction point with  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_3}$ , which is not included in our Theorem 1.1.

**Example 6.6.** Let  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{sp}(6, \mathbb{R})$  and let  $L(\lambda)$  be a highest weight Harish-Chandra module with highest weight  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + z\zeta$ . Here  $\lambda_0 = (-6, -6, -6, -6, -10, -15)$ ,  $\zeta = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$  and  $\rho = (6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1)$ . From [EHW83], we know the unitary reduction points correspond to  $z = 2.5, 3, 3.5$  and 4. For  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1 = n - 1 = 5$ , we know

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } k = 2m \text{ is even, } A_k &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{2\varepsilon_{n-m}, \varepsilon_{n-m-i} + \varepsilon_{n-m+i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\} \\ &= \{[\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-m-1-i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2i}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{m-i}, 1] \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } k = 2m + 1 \text{ is odd, } A_k &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{\varepsilon_{n-m-1-i} + \varepsilon_{n-m+i} \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\} \\ &= \{[\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-m-2-i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{1+2i}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{m-i}, 1] \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

So  $A_0 = \{2\varepsilon_6\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{2\varepsilon_5, \varepsilon_4 + \varepsilon_6\}$ ,  $A_4 = \{2\varepsilon_4, \varepsilon_3 + \varepsilon_5, \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_6\}$ ,  $A_1 = \{\varepsilon_5 + \varepsilon_6\}$ ,  $A_3 = \{\varepsilon_4 + \varepsilon_5, \varepsilon_3 + \varepsilon_6\}$ ,  $A_5 = \{\varepsilon_3 + \varepsilon_4, \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_5, \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_6\}$ .

We write  $\lambda_0 + z\zeta + \rho = (z, z - 1, z - 2, z - 3, z - 8, z - 14)$ . Thus we have  $z_0(\lambda_0) = 15$ ,  $z_2(\lambda_0) = 9$ ,  $z_4(\lambda_0) = 4$ ,  $z_1(\lambda_0) = 11.5$ ,  $z_3(\lambda_0) = 6.5$ ,  $z_5(\lambda_0) = 3.5$ . So

$$(6.3) \quad \text{GKdim } L(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 6z_5, & \text{if } z < z_5(\lambda_0) = 3.5 \\ kz_{k-1}, & \text{if } z_k(\lambda_0) \leq z < z_{k-2}(\lambda_0), \text{ where } 2 \leq k \leq 5 \text{ and} \\ & \text{either } z \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k \text{ is even or } z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k \text{ is odd} \\ 6, & \text{if } z_1(\lambda_0) = 11.5 \leq z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) = 15 \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

$$(6.4) \quad = \begin{cases} 21, & \text{if } z < z_5(\lambda_0) = 3.5 \\ 20, & \text{if } z_5(\lambda_0) = 3.5 \leq z < z_3(\lambda_0) = 6.5, \text{ where } z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \\ 18, & \text{if } z_4(\lambda_0) = 4 \leq z < z_2(\lambda_0) = 9, \text{ where } z \in \mathbb{Z} \\ 15, & \text{if } z_3(\lambda_0) = 6.5 \leq z < z_1(\lambda_0) = 11.5, \text{ where } z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \\ 11, & \text{if } z_2(\lambda_0) = 9 \leq z < z_0(\lambda_0) = 15, \text{ where } z \in \mathbb{Z} \\ 6, & \text{if } z_1(\lambda_0) = 11.5 \leq z \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \\ 0, & \text{if } z_0(\lambda_0) = 15 \leq z \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

For this given  $\lambda_0$ , when  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_k}$  with  $0 \leq k \leq 5$ , from Theorem 1.1, we have

$$L(\lambda) \text{ is unitarizable if and only if } (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z = z_k = 6 - \frac{k}{2}.$$

So from the above equation (6.4), we have

$$L(\lambda) \text{ is unitarizable if and only if } (\lambda + \rho, \beta^\vee) = z = z_4 = 4, \text{ or } z = z_5 = 3.5.$$


Note that  $z = 3$  and  $z = 2.5$  are two unitary reduction points with  $\text{AV}(L(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathcal{O}_6}$ , which are not included in our Theorem 1.1.

**Acknowledgments.** Z. Bai was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12171344).

## 7. APPENDIX

The diagrams of  $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ .


$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{su}(p, q)$ :



For  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1 = \min\{p, q\} - 1$ ,

$$A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{\varepsilon_{p-k+i} - \varepsilon_{p+i+1} = [ \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{p-k+i-1}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k+1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{q-i-1} \mid 0 \leq i \leq k \}.$$

$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{so}^*(2n)$ :




For  $1 \leq k \leq r - 1 = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1$ ,

$$A_k = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{2k+1} = \{ [ \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-2k-2}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2k}, 0, 1 ], \\ [ \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-2k-1+i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2k-2i-1}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_i, 1, 1 ] \mid 0 \leq i \leq k - 1 \}, \\ A_0 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{1} = \{ [ 0, 0, \dots, 0, 1 ] \}.$$




$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{so}(2, 2n - 2)$ :



$$A_0 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_1 = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]\},$$

$$A_1 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{n-1} = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_n = [1, \dots, 1, 0], \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_n = [1, \dots, 1, 0, 1]\}.$$


$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{e}_{6(-14)}$ :



$$A_0 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_1 = \{[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]\},$$

$$A_1 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_4 = \{[1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0], [1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0]\}.$$

$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{e}_{7(-25)}$ :




$$A_0 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_1 = \{[0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]\},$$

$$A_1 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_5 = \{[0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], [0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1]\},$$

$$A_2 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_9 = \{[1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1], [1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1], [0, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1]\}.$$


$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{so}(2, 2n - 1)$ :



$$A_0 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_1 = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]\},$$

$$A_1 = \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_n = \{\varepsilon_1 = [1, 1, \dots, 1]\}.$$

$\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{R})$ :



For  $0 \leq k \leq r - 1 = n - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } k = 2m \text{ is even, } A_k &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{2\varepsilon_{n-m}, \varepsilon_{n-m-i} + \varepsilon_{n-m+i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\} \\ &= \{[\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-m-1-i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2i}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{m-i}, 1] \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } k = 2m + 1 \text{ is odd, } A_k &= \Delta(\mathfrak{p}^+)_{k+1} = \{\varepsilon_{n-m-1-i} + \varepsilon_{n-m+i} \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\} \\ &= \{[\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-m-2-i}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{1+2i}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{m-i}, 1] \mid 0 \leq i \leq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

## REFERENCES

- [BH15] Z. Bai and M. Hunziker, *The Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of a unitary highest weight module*, Sci. China Math. **58** (2015), 2489–2498. [↑2, 6, 12, 13](#)
- [BHXZ] Z. Bai, M. Hunziker, X. Xie, and R. Zierau, *On the associated variety of a highest weight Harish-Chandra module*, arXiv: 2402.08886. [↑1, 4, 12, 13](#)
- [DES91] M. G. Davidson, T. J. Enright, and R. J. Stanke, *Differential operators and highest weight representations*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **94** (1991), no. 455, iv+102. [↑8](#)
- [EHW83] T. J. Enright, R. Howe, and N. Wallach, *A classification of unitary highest weight modules*, Representation theory of reductive groups (Park City, Utah, 1982), 1983, pp. 97–143. [↑1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15](#)
- [EW04] T. J. Enright and J. F. Willenbring, *Hilbert series, Howe duality and branching for classical groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **159** (2004), no. 1, 337–375. [↑8, 11](#)
- [Jak83] H. P. Jakobsen, *Hermitian symmetric spaces and their unitary highest weight modules*, J. Funct. Anal. **52** (1983), no. 3, 385–412. [↑1, 3](#)
- [KV78] M. Kashiwara and M. Vergne, *On the Segal-Shale-Weil representations and harmonic polynomials*, Invent. Math. **44** (1978), no. 1, 1–47. [↑7](#)
- [NOT01] K. Nishiyama, H. Ochiai, and K. Taniguchi, *Bernstein degree and associated cycles of Harish-Chandra modules—Hermitian symmetric case*, 2001, pp. 13–80. Nilpotent orbits, associated cycles and Whittaker models for highest weight representations. [↑5](#)
- [Vog78] D. A. Vogan Jr., *Gelfand-Kirillov dimension for Harish-Chandra modules*, Invent. Math. **48** (1978), no. 1, 75–98. [↑5](#)
- [Vog91] ———, *Associated varieties and unipotent representations*, Harmonic analysis on reductive groups (Brunswick, ME, 1989), 1991, pp. 315–388. [↑5](#)
- [Yam01] H. Yamashita, *Cayley transform and generalized Whittaker models for irreducible highest weight modules*, 2001, pp. 81–137. Nilpotent orbits, associated cycles and Whittaker models for highest weight representations. [↑5](#)

- [Yam94] ———, *Criteria for the finiteness of restriction of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules to subalgebras and applications to Harish-Chandra modules. A study in relation to the associated varieties*, J. Funct. Anal. **121** (1994), no. 2, 296–329.  
MR1272130 [↑14](#)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SOOCHOW UNIVERSITY, SUZHOU, JIANGSU, CHINA

*Email address:* `zqbai@suda.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEXAS, USA

*Email address:* `Markus_Hunziker@baylor.edu`