

On the Hodge theory of the additive middle convolution

by

Michael DETTWEILER and Stefan REITER

Abstract

We compute the behaviour of Hodge data under additive middle convolution for irreducible variations of polarized complex Hodge structures on punctured complex affine lines.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 14D07, 32G20, 32S40, 34M99

Keywords: Middle convolution, Hodge theory

Introduction

In previous work of Sabbah with one of the authors [4], the effect of the additive middle convolution $\text{MC}_\chi(V) = V \star L_\chi$ of a complex polarized Hodge module V on \mathbb{A}^1 with a Kummer module L_χ on various local and global Hodge data was determined. This leads to an analog of Katz' algorithm for irreducible rigid local systems [7] in the context of Hodge modules.

It is the aim of this work to extend these results to the case of the middle convolution $V \star L$ (cf. Section 1) of two irreducible and non-constant complex polarized Hodge modules on \mathbb{A}^1 . It turns out that, to a large extent, the general case can be reduced to the middle convolution with Kummer modules treated in [4].

In Section 2, Theorem 2.1, the global Hodge numbers of tensor products $V \otimes L$ (the degrees of the associated Hodge bundles) are determined, generalizing [4], Prop. 2.3.2. We are indebted to Claude Sabbah for communicating the proof of Theorem 2.1 to us. This result is important in many applications where convolution is applied iteratively in combination with tensor operations (cf. [7], [4], [3]).

In Section 3 we determine the local Hodge data of the vanishing and nearby cycles (cf. Section 1 and [4] for these notions) at the finite singularities of a convolution $V \star L$ (Theorem 3.4). As in [4], the main

M. Dettweiler: Department of Mathematics, University of Bayreuth, 95440 Bayreuth, Germany;

e-mail: michael.dettweiler@uni-bayreuth.de

S. Reiter: Department of Mathematics, University of Bayreuth, 95440 Bayreuth, Germany;

e-mail: stefan.reiter@uni-bayreuth.de

tool for doing this is Saito's version of the Thom-Sebastiani theorem (cf. [4], Theorem 3.2.3, and its corrigendum [5], where a proof of the Thom-Sebastiani result is provided).

In Section 4 the global Hodge numbers of $V \star L$ are determined. The main observation is that the middle convolution $V \star L_\chi$ of an irreducible and nontrivial Hodge module V with a generic Kummer module L_χ is *parabolically rigid*, meaning that the associated parabolic cohomology group

$$H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L_\chi) = H^1(\mathbb{P}^1, j_* \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star L_\chi)))$$

vanishes (where $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star L_\chi)$ is the perverse sheaf associated to $V \star L_\chi$ via Riemann-Hilbert correspondence and j is the projective embedding of \mathbb{A}^1). Using the Riemann-Roch theorem, a formula for the Hodge numbers of $H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L_\chi)$ involving local and global data was given in [4], Proposition 2.3.3. Hence the vanishing of $H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L_\chi)$ gives a method to compute the global Hodge numbers of $V \star L$.

The remaining local Hodge data at ∞ of $V \star L$ are determined in Section 5. For this, we make use of hypergeometric Hodge modules with prescribed local behaviour at ∞ and reduce the general case to the convolution of these. We believe that a more conceptual proof of these results may be given in the context of irregular Hodge filtrations on twistor modules and their behaviour under Fourier-Laplace transformation (cf. [6]).

In a forthcoming work, the authors prove similar results for the multiplicative convolution (also called Hadamard product).

§1. Preliminary results

Following [4], we review the basic notions of middle convolutions introduced by Katz [7], in the frame of holonomic \mathcal{D} -modules. Let $s : \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ be the addition map and let M, N be holonomic $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{A}^1)$ -modules. The *additive $*$ -convolution* $M \star_* N$ of M and N is the object $s_+(M \boxtimes N)$ of $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{A}^1)$. The *additive $!$ -convolution* can be defined as $M \star_! N = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{D}M \star_* \mathbf{D}N)$, where \mathbf{D} is the duality functor $\mathbf{D}_{\text{hol}}^{\text{b,op}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{A}^1)) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{hol}}^{\text{b}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{A}^1))$. It can also be expressed as $s_+(M \boxtimes N)$, if $s_\dagger := \mathbf{D}s_+\mathbf{D}$ denotes the adjoint by duality of s_+ , cf. [4] (under the Riemann Hilbert correspondence, the functor $+$ corresponds to the derived $*$ -functor and \dagger corresponds to $!$, explaining the notion).

Let us choose a projectivization $\tilde{s} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ of s , and let $j : \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1 \hookrightarrow X$ denote the open inclusion. Since \tilde{s} naturally commutes with duality, we have $\tilde{s}_\dagger = \tilde{s}_+$ and $s_\dagger = \tilde{s}_+ \circ j_\dagger$. Since there is a natural morphism $j_\dagger \rightarrow j_+$ in $\mathbf{D}_{\text{hol}}^{\text{b}}(\mathcal{D}_X)$, we get a functorial morphism $s_\dagger(M \boxtimes N) \rightarrow s_+(M \boxtimes N)$, that is, $M \star_! N \rightarrow M \star_* N$, in $\mathbf{D}_{\text{hol}}^{\text{b}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{A}^1))$. Let \mathbf{P} be the full subcategory of $\mathbf{Mod}_{\text{hol}}(\mathbb{A}^1)$ consisting of holonomic $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{A}^1)$ -modules N such that for all holonomic $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{A}^1)$ -modules M both types of convolutions $N \star_* M$ and $N \star_! M$ are again holonomic.

Definition 1.0.1. For N in \mathbf{P} and M holonomic, the *middle convolution* $M \star_{\text{mid}} N$ is defined as the image of $M \star_! N \rightarrow M \star_* N$ in $\text{Mod}_{\text{hol}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{A}^1))$. For simplicity we often set $M \star N := M \star_{\text{mid}} N$. As explained in [4], Section 3.3, this notion extends to the category of complex polarized Hodge modules on \mathbb{A}^1 , using the results of [11] and [12]. If M is smooth on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{x}$ ($\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \cup \{\infty\}$) and if N is smooth on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{y}$ ($\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_s\} \cup \{\infty\}$) then $M \star N$ as well as the other types of convolutions are smooth on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}$, where

$$\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} = \{x_i + y_j \mid i = 1, \dots, r, j = 1, \dots, s\} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

The following result follows from the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence and [7], Cor. 2.6.10 and Cor. 2.6.17:

Lemma 1.1. (i) *If N is irreducible such that its isomorphism class is not translation invariant then N has the property \mathbf{P} .*

(ii) *If N and M are in \mathbf{P} then $N \star M$ again is in \mathbf{P} .*

Let W be a complex polarized Hodge module on the complex affine line \mathbb{A}^1 which is smooth on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$. The local system on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ which is underlying W is denoted as \mathcal{W} . The perverse sheaf on \mathbb{A}^1 associated to W via the de Rham functor is denoted by $\mathcal{RH}(W)$ and we view the i -th parabolic cohomology group

$$H_{\text{par}}^i(W) := H^i(\mathbb{P}^1, j_* \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathcal{RH}(W))) \quad (j : \mathbb{A}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1)$$

to be equipped with its natural Hodge structure.

Throughout the article we will work with Hodge modules V, L, δ_x, L_χ which are as follows:

Assumption 1.2. (i) *We assume that $V = (V, F^\bullet V)$ is a complex polarized Hodge module on the complex affine line \mathbb{A}^1 which is the intermediate (minimal) extension of an irreducible nonconstant variation of polarized complex Hodge structures on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{x}$ (where $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_r, \infty\} \subset \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$). In this situation we sometimes set $x_{r+1} = \infty$.*

(ii) *Let $L = (L, F^\bullet L)$ be another Hodge module of the same kind which is the minimal extension of a variation of polarized complex Hodge structures on $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{y}$ (where $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_s, \infty\}$).*

(iii) *For a point $x \in \mathbb{A}^1$ we write δ_x for the Hodge module which corresponds to the rank-one skyscraper sheaf on \mathbb{A}^1 supported in x , having trivial Hodge filtration (so that $h^0(H^0(\mathbb{A}^1, \delta_x)) = 1$).*

(iv) *As in [4], Section 3.3, we write L_χ for the Hodge module with trivial Hodge filtration belonging to the Kummer sheaf with residues $(\mu, 1 - \mu)$ ($\mu \in (0, 1)$) such that $\chi = e^{-2\pi i \mu}$, having singular points at $(0, \infty)$. We call L_χ generic if the monodromy eigenvalues of all sheaves different from L_χ and $L_{\chi^{-1}}$ involved in our arguments are different from $\chi^{\pm 1}$.*

For the following notions and stated results we refer to [4], Section 1.2 and Sections 2.2, 2.3: on the one hand, one has *global Hodge data* $\delta^p(V)$ given by the degrees of the Hodge bundles. On the other hand,

one has *local Hodge data*: For each point $x \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{r+1}\}$ and each $\lambda \in S^1$ one has the notion $\psi_{x,\lambda}(V)$ of the generalized λ -eigenspace of the nearby cycles $\psi_x(V)$. We will also use the corresponding notion of vanishing cycles $\varphi_{x,\lambda}(V)$. These spaces are mixed Hodge structures with associated nilpotent monodromy operator, derived from the local monodromy, which imposes an associated weight filtration W . One has the notion of l -primitive vectors $P_l \varphi_{x,\lambda}(V)$ with respect to the Lefschetz decomposition of $\varphi_{x,\lambda}(V)$. For $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we define l -primitive local Hodge numbers as follows:

$$\nu_{x,\lambda,l}^p(V) = \nu_{x,a,l}^p(V) := \dim \operatorname{gr}_F^p P_l \psi_{x,\lambda}(V),$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R} \cap [0, 1)$ such that $\lambda = \exp(2\pi i(-a))$. We set

$$\nu_{x,a}^p(V) := \sum_{l \geq 0} \sum_{k=0}^l \nu_{x,a,l}^{p+k}(V) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{x,a,\text{prim}}^p := \sum_{l \geq 0} \nu_{x,a,l}^p(V)$$

as well as

$$h^p(V) := \nu_x^p(V) := \sum_{a \in [0,1)} \nu_{x,a}^p(V) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{x,\neq 0}^p(V) := \sum_{a \in (0,1)} \nu_{x,a}^p(V).$$

One has corresponding notions for vanishing cycles

$$\mu_{x,\lambda,l}^p(V) = \mu_{x,a,l}^p(V) := \dim \operatorname{gr}_F^p P_l \varphi_{x,\lambda}(V),$$

and

$$\mu_{x,a}^p(V) := \sum_{l \geq 0} \sum_{k=0}^l \mu_{x,a,l}^{p+k}(V) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{x,a,\text{prim}}^p := \sum_{l \geq 0} \mu_{x,a,l}^p(V).$$

These notions are related as follows (cf. loc.cit.):

$$\mu_{x,a,l}^p(V) = \nu_{x,a,l}^p(V) \text{ if } a \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{x,0,l}^p(V) = \nu_{x,0,l+1}^p(V).$$

Additionally to [4], we will use the following further local Hodge numbers, simplifying the computations below:

Definition. 1.3. *Let*

$$\omega_x^p(V) := \nu_x^p(V) - \nu_{x,0,\text{prim}}^p(V) = \nu_{x,\neq 0}^p(V) + \mu_{x,0}^{p+1}(V),$$

cf. [4], (2.2.5*), and

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{ss,x}^p(V) &:= \nu_{x,\neq 0}^p(V) \\
\omega_{u,x}^p(V) &:= \mu_{x,0}^{p+1}(V) \\
\omega_{\neq \infty}^p(V) &:= \sum_{x \in (\mathbf{x} \setminus \infty)} \omega_x^p(V) \\
\omega_{\neq \infty}(V) &:= \sum_p \omega_{\neq \infty}^p(V) \\
\omega^p(V) &:= \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \omega_x^p(V) \\
\omega(V) &:= \sum_p \omega^p(V) \\
\kappa_x^p(V) &:= \nu_{x,0,\text{prim}}^p(V).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $J^p(a,l)(V)$ denote a mixed \mathbb{C} -Hodge structure which is associated to a nilpotent orbit belonging to a monodromy operator whose Jordan form is a single Jordan block of size l and having residue $a \in [0,1)$ such that $\nu_{a,l-1}^p(V) = 1$.

Remark. 1.4. One has

$$\psi_{x_j}(V) \simeq \bigoplus_{(i,a,l)} J^i(a,l)^{\nu_{x_j,a,l-1}^i(V)}$$

(note that we use complex coefficients, so any pure Hodge structure decomposes into one-dimensional summands).

In the following, let $j : \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{x} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be the natural inclusion. Using our above notion of $\omega^i(V)$ we obtain:

Proposition. 1.5.

$$h^p(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)) = \delta^{p-1}(V) - \delta^p(V) - h^p(V) - h^{p-1}(V) + \omega^{p-1}(V).$$

Proof. By [4], Proposition 2.3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
h^p(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)) &= \delta^{p-1}(V) - \delta^p(V) - h^p(V) - \nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^{p-1}(V) + \sum_{j=1}^r (\nu_{x_j,\neq 0}^{p-1}(V) + \mu_{x_j,0}^p(V)) \\
&= \delta^{p-1}(V) - \delta^p(V) - h^p(V) - \nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^{p-1}(V) + \sum_{j=1}^r \omega_{x_j}^{p-1}(V) \\
&= \delta^{p-1}(V) - \delta^p(V) - h^p(V) - h^{p-1}(V) + \omega^{p-1}(V),
\end{aligned}$$

using

$$\nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^{p-1}(V) = \nu_{\infty}^{p-1}(V) - \omega_{\infty}^{p-1}(V) \quad \text{and} \quad h^{p-1}(V) = \nu_{\infty}^{p-1}(V).$$

□

Remark. 1.6. *The construction of nearby and vanishing cycles and their basic invariants is carried out for minimal extensions in [4], Section 2.2. The general case can be reduced with this at hand to the case of mixed Hodge-modules with punctual support. The Hodge invariants of these are as follows: Let V be a Hodge module supported on a closed point $x \xrightarrow{i} \mathbb{A}^1$ (i.e., a complex polarized Hodge structure V placed at x) and let i_+V its extension to \mathbb{A}^1 . By the usual triangle which connects nearby and vanishing cycles, the nearby cycles of i_+V are zero, while the vanishing cycles $\varphi_x(i_+V)$ can be identified with V . Note that the natural monodromy operation on $\varphi_x(i_+V)$ is trivial, hence $\mu_{x,a}^p(i_+V) = 0$ for $a \neq 0$ and $\mu_{x,0}^p(i_+V) = h^p(V)$.*

§2. Degrees of tensor products

We will proceed using the notions of the previous section. The following theorem is a generalization of [4], Proposition 2.3.2. We are indebted to Claude Sabbah for communicating its proof to us.

Theorem. 2.1.

$$\delta^l(V \otimes L) = \sum_p \delta^{l-p}(V) h^p(L) + \sum_p h^{l-p}(V) \delta^p(L) + \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{y}} o_x^l(V \otimes L),$$

where

$$o_x^l(V \otimes L) := \sum_p \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \nu_{x,a}^p(V) \nu_{x,b}^{l-p}(L).$$

The result depends on the following two lemmata. Let $V^0, L^0, (V \otimes L)^0$ denote the Deligne extensions of $V, L, V \otimes L$ (resp.). There is also $(V \otimes L)^0$. We have the following Hodge filtrations:

- The tensor product filtration $F^\ell(V^0 \otimes L^0) := \sum_p F^{\ell-p} V^0 \otimes F^p L^0$.
- Since $V \otimes L$ is a variation of Hodge structures on the punctured \mathbb{P}^1 , with Hodge filtration equal to the tensor product filtration, we obtain the filtration $F^\ell(V \otimes L)^0$.

Let $D = \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}$ denote the reduced divisor away from which V and L are variations of Hodge structures. A local computation (without using Hodge theory) shows that there are F -filtered inclusions

$$(V \otimes L)^0(-D) \subset V^0 \otimes L^0 \subset (V \otimes L)^0$$

which are equalities away from D .

Lemma. 2.2. *The inclusion $V^0 \otimes L^0 \subset (V \otimes L)^0$ is strict with respect to F^\bullet .*

If this lemma is proved, we find that, for each ℓ , there is an injective morphism

$$\bigoplus_p \mathrm{gr}_F^{\ell-p} V^0 \otimes \mathrm{gr}_F^p L^0 \hookrightarrow \mathrm{gr}_F^\ell (V \otimes L)^0$$

whose cokernel is supported on D and has dimension $\dim \operatorname{gr}_F^\ell((V \otimes L)^0/V^0 \otimes L^0)$. As a consequence, we find

$$\delta^\ell(V \otimes L) = \sum_p (\delta^{\ell-p} V \cdot h^p L + h^{p-\ell} V \cdot \delta^p L) + \dim \operatorname{gr}_F^\ell \left(\frac{(V \otimes L)^0}{V^0 \otimes L^0} \right).$$

Lemma. 2.3. *We have*

$$\dim \operatorname{gr}_F^\ell \left(\frac{(V \otimes L)^0}{V^0 \otimes L^0} \right) = \sum_{x \in D} o_x^\ell(V \otimes L).$$

Note that $o_x^\ell(V \otimes L) = 0$ if $x \in D \setminus (\mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{y})$, so the sum is on $x \in \mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{y}$.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. The result is local, so the setting is on a small disc with coordinate t around one of the singularities of the variations of Hodge structures. The local computation mentioned above shows that there is an exact sequence

$$(*) \quad 0 \longrightarrow V^0 \otimes L^0 \longrightarrow (V \otimes L)^0 \longrightarrow t^{-1} \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in [0,1] \\ \alpha + \beta \geq 1}} \operatorname{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \operatorname{gr}^\beta L \longrightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, we have $t(V \otimes L)^0 \subset V^0 \otimes L^0$ and

$$(V^0 \otimes L^0)/t(V \otimes L)^0 \simeq \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in [0,1] \\ \alpha + \beta < 1}} \operatorname{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \operatorname{gr}^\beta L,$$

giving rise to the exact sequence

$$(**) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in [0,1] \\ \alpha + \beta < 1}} \operatorname{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \operatorname{gr}^\beta L \longrightarrow (V \otimes L)^0/t(V \otimes L)^0 \longrightarrow t^{-1} \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in [0,1] \\ \alpha + \beta \geq 1}} \operatorname{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \operatorname{gr}^\beta L \longrightarrow 0.$$

We also have the following Hodge filtration:

- The tensor product filtration on any $\operatorname{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \operatorname{gr}^\beta L$ considered above.

For the sake of simplicity, we will set $\operatorname{Gr}^0 V := V^0/tV^0$ (and similarly for L and $V \otimes L$). This space is endowed with the induced filtration $F^\bullet \operatorname{Gr}^0 V$. There is also a filtration $E^\bullet \operatorname{Gr}^0 V$ indexed by $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ induced by the decreasing V -filtration on $\operatorname{Gr}^0 V$, so that $\operatorname{gr}_E^\alpha \operatorname{Gr}^0 V = \operatorname{gr}^\alpha V$. The Hodge filtration $F^\bullet \operatorname{gr}^\alpha V$ is equal to the filtration induced by $F^\bullet \operatorname{Gr}^0 V$ on $\operatorname{gr}_E^\alpha \operatorname{Gr}^0 V$. We have a natural morphism

$$(2.0.1) \quad \operatorname{Gr}^0 V \otimes \operatorname{Gr}^0 L \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}^0(V \otimes L)$$

defined as follows:

$$\operatorname{Gr}^0 V \otimes \operatorname{Gr}^0 L = \frac{(V^0 \otimes L^0)}{t(V^0 \otimes L^0)} \twoheadrightarrow \frac{V^0 \otimes L^0}{t(V \otimes L)^0} \hookrightarrow \frac{(V \otimes L)^0}{t(V \otimes L)^0} = \operatorname{Gr}^0(V \otimes L).$$

This morphism is compatible with the F -filtrations on each term. Grading with respect to E^\bullet gives a morphism

$$\bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta \in [0,1)} \text{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \text{gr}^\beta L \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\gamma \in [0,1)} \text{gr}^\gamma (V \otimes L).$$

The later morphism is also F -filtered, and is moreover a morphism of mixed Hodge structures. It is then F -strict. Therefore, (2.0.1) is also F -strict. Arguing similarly, we find that for any $k \geq 1$ the natural morphism

$$(V^0/t^k V^0) \otimes (L^0/t^k L^0) \longrightarrow (V \otimes L)^0/t^k (V \otimes L)^0$$

is strictly F -filtered.

Let us set $\widehat{V}^0 = \varprojlim_k (V^0/t^k V^0)$, endowed with $F^p \widehat{V}^0 = \varprojlim_k F^p (V^0/t^k V^0)$. We have $(\widehat{V}^0, F^\bullet \widehat{V}^0) = \widehat{\mathcal{O}} \otimes (V^0, F^\bullet V^0)$. The previous result implies that the inclusion

$$\widehat{V}^0 \otimes \widehat{L}^0 \hookrightarrow (\widehat{V \otimes L})^0$$

is strictly F -filtered, hence, regarding the previous morphism as an inclusion,

$$F^p(\widehat{V}^0 \otimes \widehat{L}^0) = F^p(\widehat{V \otimes L})^0 \cap (\widehat{V}^0 \otimes \widehat{L}^0), \quad \forall p,$$

that is,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}} \otimes F^p(V^0 \otimes L^0) = \widehat{\mathcal{O}} \otimes F^p(V \otimes L)^0 \cap \widehat{\mathcal{O}} \otimes (V^0 \otimes L^0), \quad \forall p.$$

By faithful flatness of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ over \mathcal{O} , we conclude that

$$F^p(V^0 \otimes L^0) = F^p(V \otimes L)^0 \cap (V^0 \otimes L^0), \quad \forall p.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2.3. We consider the composed F -filtered morphism

$$(2.0.2) \quad \text{Gr}^1(V \otimes L) \twoheadrightarrow \frac{t(V \otimes L)^0}{t(V^0 \otimes L^0)} \hookrightarrow \frac{V^0 \otimes L^0}{t(V^0 \otimes L^0)} = \text{Gr}^0 V \otimes \text{Gr}^0 L.$$

After grading with respect to the E^\bullet filtration, it becomes

$$\bigoplus_{\gamma \in [1,2)} \text{gr}^\gamma (V \otimes L) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta \in [0,1)} \text{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \text{gr}^\beta L,$$

and has image

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in (0,1) \\ \alpha + \beta \geq 1}} \text{gr}^\alpha V \otimes \text{gr}^\beta L.$$

Being a morphism of mixed Hodge structures, it is also F -strict, and so is (2.0.2). Since the isomorphism $t : V^0 \rightarrow V^1$ is F -strict (and similarly for L and $V \otimes L$), the isomorphism

$$t : \frac{(V \otimes L)^0}{V^0 \otimes L^0} \longrightarrow \frac{t(V \otimes L)^0}{t(V^0 \otimes L^0)}$$

is also F -strict. As a consequence,

$$\dim \operatorname{gr}_F^\ell \frac{(V \otimes L)^0}{V^0 \otimes L^0} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \in (0,1) \\ \alpha + \beta \geq 1}} \sum_p \dim \operatorname{gr}_F^{\ell-p} \operatorname{gr}^\alpha V \cdot \dim \operatorname{gr}_F^p \operatorname{gr}^\beta L.$$

□

§3. Transformation of local Hodge data away from ∞ under middle convolution

Recall that in general, the convolution $V \star L$ is neither irreducible nor an intermediate extension anymore (cf. Assumption 1.2). The following definition gives the largest factor of $V \star L$ which is an intermediate extension:

Definition. 3.1. *Let $U := \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}$ be the smooth locus of $V \star L$. Define $V \widetilde{\star} L$ to be the intermediate extension of $V \star L|_U$ to \mathbb{A}^1 .*

For $t \in \mathbb{A}^1$ let $d_t : \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1, x \mapsto t - x$, and write $L(t - x)$ for $d_t^+ L$. The following result clarifies the relation between $V \star L$ and $V \widetilde{\star} L$:

Theorem. 3.2. *One has a short exact sequence of Hodge modules*

$$0 \longrightarrow V \widetilde{\star} L \longrightarrow V \star L \longrightarrow H \longrightarrow 0,$$

where

$$H = \begin{cases} \delta_c(-p-1) & \text{if } \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}, c \in \mathbb{A}^1 : V(p) \simeq L^\vee(c-x) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

If $H \neq 0$ then p, c are uniquely determined.

Proof. As in the proof of [7], Proposition 2.6.9, one finds that $\mathcal{H}^n(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star_\dagger L))$ vanishes outside $n = -1, 0$ and that if $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star_\dagger L)) \neq 0$, then there exists a unique point $c \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star_\dagger L))$ is a rank-one skyscraper sheaf with support at c such that the stalk at c is isomorphic to the Tate-twisted space of invariants $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{L}(c-x)^\vee(-1))$. A necessary condition for the non-vanishing of $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{L}(c-x)^\vee(-1))$ is that one has an isomorphism of local systems $\mathcal{V} \simeq \mathcal{L}(c-x)^\vee$. Since irreducible VPCHS are determined up to a Tate-twist by their local systems, there exists a unique p such that the Tate-twist $\mathcal{V}(p)$ becomes VPCHS-isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}(c-x)^\vee$ in this case. This implies that, taking Hodge structures into account, the stalk $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{L}(c-x)^\vee(-1))$ has weight $p+1$. Since $V \star L$ is the image of $V \star_\dagger L$ and since $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star_\dagger L))$ maps isomorphically onto its image inside $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star L)$, the claim follows. □

Theorem. 3.3. *If $t \in \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}$ (cf. Def. 1.0.1) then*

$$\begin{aligned} h^l(V \widetilde{\star} L) &= \delta^{l-1}(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \delta^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) \\ &\quad - h^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - h^{l-1}(V \otimes L(t-x)) + \omega^{l-1}(V \otimes L(t-x)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $t \in \mathbb{A}^1$, let $d_t(\mathbf{y}) = \{t - y_1, \dots, t - y_s\}$ and let $j : \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus (\mathbf{x} \cup d_t(\mathbf{y})) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ be the natural inclusion. Since $t \notin \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}$ one has $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V) \otimes \mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(L(t-x)) \simeq j_*(\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{L}(t-x))$ and hence

$$(V \widetilde{\star} L)_t = (V \star L)_t = H^1(\mathbb{P}^1, j_*(\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{L}(t-x))).$$

The claim follows now from Proposition 1.5. □

The following result determines the local Hodge data of the vanishing cycles:

Theorem. 3.4. *Let $\lambda = \exp(-2\pi ia)$ ($a \in (0, 1]$) be a fixed element of the unit circle S^1 and let λ_1, λ_2 be variable elements in S^1 with $\lambda = \lambda_1 \lambda_2$. For such $\lambda_i \in S^1$ ($i = 1, 2$), let $a_i \in (0, 1]$ with $\lambda_i = \exp(-2\pi ia_i)$. If $t \in \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}, t \neq \infty$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{i,a}^p(V \star L) &= \nu_F^p(\varphi_{t,\lambda}(V \star L)) = \sum_{x_i + y_j = t} \left(\sum_{a_1 + a_2 = a} \sum_{l+k=p-1} \nu^l(\varphi_{x_i, \lambda_1}(V)) \nu^k(\varphi_{y_j, \lambda_2}(L)) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{a_1 + a_2 = 1+a} \sum_{l+k=p} \nu^l(\varphi_{x_i, \lambda_1}(V)) \nu^k(\varphi_{y_j, \lambda_2}(L)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the expression ν^p abbreviates $\dim \operatorname{gr}_F^p$.

Proof. By Saito's version of the Thom-Sebastiani theorem (cf. [4] Theorem 3.2.3 and its erratum) one knows that, for all $(x_i, t - y_j)$ as in the theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{gr}_F^p(\varphi_{(x_i, t-y_j), \lambda}(V \boxtimes L)) &= \bigoplus_{a_1 + a_2 = a} \bigoplus_{l+k=p-1} \operatorname{gr}_F^l(\varphi_{x_i, \lambda_1}(V)) \otimes \operatorname{gr}_F^k(\varphi_{y_j, \lambda_2}(L)) \oplus \\ (3.0.1) \quad &\bigoplus_{a_1 + a_2 = 1+a} \bigoplus_{l+k=p} \operatorname{gr}_F^l(\varphi_{x_i, \lambda_1}(V)) \otimes \operatorname{gr}_F^k(\varphi_{y_j, \lambda_2}(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the support of the vanishing cycles in the fibre over t is the union of these $(x_i, t - y_j)$. Since middle convolution is afterwards formed via higher direct image along the compactified (hence proper) pr_2 and since formation of vanishing cycles is compatible with higher direct images along projective morphisms the claim follows. □

Using $\omega_{\neq \infty, a}^p(V) = \sum_{x_i \neq \infty} \omega_{x_i, a}^p(V)$ and $\omega_{\neq \infty}^p(V) = \sum_a \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^p(V)$ one obtains:

Corollary. 3.5. *Let $a \in [0, 1)$. Then the following holds:*

(i) For $t \neq \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{t,a}^p(V \star L) &= \sum_{x_i+y_j=t} \left(\sum_{a_1+a_2=a} \sum_{l+k=p-1} \omega_{x_j,a_1}^l(V) \omega_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{a_1+a_2=1+a} \sum_{l+k=p} \omega_{x_i,a_1}^l(V) \omega_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) \right) \\ \omega_{\neq \infty}^p(V \star L) &= \sum_{i+j=p} \sum_{a_1+a_2 \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty,a_1}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty,a_2}^j(L) + \\ &\quad \sum_{i+j=p-1} \sum_{a_1+a_2 < 1} \omega_{\neq \infty,a_1}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty,a_2}^j(L)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{p \leq l} \omega_{\neq \infty}^p(V \star L) = \sum_{i+j \leq l-1} \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty}^j(L) + \sum_j \sum_{a_1+a_2 \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty,a_1}^j(V) \omega_{\neq \infty,a_2}^{l-j}(L).$$

(ii) If L_χ is generic with respect to L and $V\tilde{\star}L$, then

$$h^p(V \star (L \star L_\chi)) - h^p((V\tilde{\star}L) \star L_\chi) = h^p(H^0(\mathcal{A}^0(V \star L))) = \omega_{\neq \infty}^{p-1}(V \star L) - \omega_{\neq \infty}^{p-1}(V\tilde{\star}L).$$

Proof. Let us first treat the case where $\lambda = 1$, equivalent to $a = 0$ (note that inside Theorem 3.4 the residues a are contained in $(0, 1]$, whereas in the rest of the paper $a \in [0, 1)$, hence we have to adapt our notation to this situation). By Theorem 3.4

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{t,0}^p(V \star L) &= \mu_{t,0}^{p+1}(V \star L) \\ &= \sum_{x_i+y_j=t} \left(\sum_{a_1+a_2=1} \sum_{l+k=p} \nu^l(\varphi_{x_i,\lambda_1}(V)) \nu^k(\varphi_{y_j,\lambda_2}(L)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a_1+a_2=2} \sum_{l+k=p+1} \nu^l(\varphi_{x_i,\lambda_1}(V)) \nu^k(\varphi_{y_j,\lambda_2}(L)) \right) \\ &= \sum_{x_i+y_j=t} \left(\sum_{a_1+a_2=0} \sum_{l+k=p+1} \mu_{x_j,a_1}^l(V) \mu_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a_1+a_2=1} \sum_{l+k=p} \mu_{x_i,a_1}^l(V) \mu_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) \right) \\ &= \sum_{x_i+y_j=t} \left(\sum_{a_1+a_2=0} \sum_{l+k=p+1} \omega_{x_j,0}^{l-1}(V) \omega_{y_j,0}^{k-1}(L) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a_1+a_2=1} \sum_{l+k=p} \omega_{x_i,a_1}^l(V) \omega_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) \right) \\ &= \sum_{x_i+y_j=t} \left(\sum_{a_1+a_2=0} \sum_{l+k=p-1} \omega_{x_j,0}^l(V) \omega_{y_j,0}^k(L) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a_1+a_2=1} \sum_{l+k=p} \omega_{x_i,a_1}^l(V) \omega_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Note that in the above sum we switch from $a_i \in (0, 1]$ to $a_i \in [0, 1)$ so that the case $a_1 + a_2 = 2$ now corresponds to $a_1 + a_2 = 0$ (and $l + k = p + 1$). Analogously we get for $0 < a < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{t,a}^p(V \star L) &= \mu_{t,a}^p(V \star L) \\ &= \sum_{x_i+y_j=t} \left(\sum_{a_1+a_2=a} \sum_{l+k=p-1} \omega_{x_j,a_1}^l(V) \omega_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a_1+a_2=1+a} \sum_{l+k=p} \omega_{x_i,a_1}^l(V) \omega_{y_j,a_2}^k(L) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the first claim follows. In the case where $V \star L = V \widetilde{\star} L$, the formula given in (ii) holds obviously true. By Theorem 3.2, if $V \star L \neq V \widetilde{\star} L$, then

$$(3.0.2) \quad V \star L = V \widetilde{\star} L \oplus \delta_c(-q-1)$$

and $V(q) \simeq L^\vee(c-x)$. This implies the first equation in (ii). Since L_χ is generic,

$$(V \widetilde{\star} L) \star L_\chi = (V \widetilde{\star} L) \widetilde{\star} L_\chi.$$

By associativity of the middle convolution (under the assumption that L, V, L_χ are irreducible and non-trivial)

$$\begin{aligned} V \star (L \star L_\chi) &= (V \star L) \star L_\chi \\ &= (V \widetilde{\star} L \oplus \delta_c(-q-1)) \star L_\chi \\ &= (V \widetilde{\star} L) \star L_\chi \oplus L_\chi(x-c)(-q-1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$h^p(V \star (L \star L_\chi)) - h^p((V \widetilde{\star} L) \star L_\chi) = h^p(L_\chi(x-c)(-q-1)) = \delta_{p,q+1},$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ denotes the usual Kronecker-delta. On the other hand, Rem. 1.6 and (3.0.2) imply that

$$\omega_{\neq \infty}^{p-1}(V \star L) - \omega_{\neq \infty}^{p-1}(V \widetilde{\star} L) = \mu_{c,0}^p(V \widetilde{\star} L \oplus \delta_c(-q-1)) - \mu_{c,0}^p(V \widetilde{\star} L) = \mu_{c,0}^p(\delta_c(-q-1)) = \delta_{p,q+1}.$$

□

§4. Transformation of global Hodge data under middle convolution

The following result transforms a general convolution with a Kummer Hodge module to the *standard situation*, considered in [4], Assumption 1.1.2:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $V \star L_\chi$ be viewed as Hodge module on \mathbb{P}^1 by taking the minimal extension using the canonical map $\mathbb{A}_t^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{A}^1(\mathbb{C})$ denote the finite singularities of V and let $\phi_t : \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ be the Möbius transformation that exchanges 0 and ∞ by inverting the coordinate t of \mathbb{A}^1 . If 0 is a smooth point of V then $V \star L_\chi$ can be obtained as*

$$V \star L_\chi = \phi_t^+((\phi_x^+(V \otimes L_\chi) \star L_\chi) \otimes L_{\chi^{-1}}).$$

Proof. We will view maps as ϕ_x or ϕ_t either as maps on \mathbb{P}^1 or on \mathbb{G}_m , or even on smaller subsets of \mathbb{G}_m , depending on the context. Let $U := \mathbb{A}^1(\mathbb{C}) \setminus \{0, x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, let $W := U_x \times U_t \setminus \{x = t, 1 = xt\}$ (with U_x, U_t denoting copies of U with coordinates x, t), let $j : W \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times U_t$ denote the obvious embedding and let $\overline{\text{pr}}_2 : \mathbb{P}^1 \times U_t \rightarrow U_t$ denote the second projection. Then, by construction, we have

$$V \star L_\chi|_U \simeq R^1 \overline{\text{pr}}_{2+}(j_+(V(x) \otimes L_\chi(t-x))),$$

where $V(x)$ is the Hodge module on W obtained by pulling back $V|_{U_x}$ along the x -projection and where, as above, the Hodge module $L_\chi(t-x)$ is obtained by pulling back L_χ along the map $t-x$. We use a similar notion below also for other sheaves and other polynomial maps, so that $V(f(x,t))$ denotes a pullback of V along a polynomial map given by $f(x,t) \in \mathbb{C}[x,t]$. Then the following isomorphisms follow by looking at products of local sections (where the isomorphisms are seen as isomorphisms of the restrictions of Hodge modules to the respective smooth parts):

$$L_\chi(t) \simeq L_{\chi^{-1}}(1/t)$$

and

$$(4.0.1) \quad L_\chi(1/t-x) \simeq L_\chi(1/t) \otimes L_\chi(1-xt)$$

$$(4.0.2) \quad \simeq L_{\chi^{-1}}(t) \otimes L_\chi(x) \otimes L_\chi(1/x-t).$$

Let now $U' := \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0, 1/x_1, \dots, 1/x_r\}$ and consider $\phi_t : U' \rightarrow U, t \mapsto 1/t$. Then

$$(4.0.3) \quad \phi_t^+(V \star L_\chi)|_{U'} \simeq R^1 \overline{\text{pr}}_{2+}(j_+(V(x) \otimes L_\chi(1/t-x)))|_{U'}$$

$$(4.0.4) \quad \simeq R^1 \overline{\text{pr}}_{+*}(j_+(V(x) \otimes L_{\chi^{-1}}(t) \otimes L_\chi(x) \otimes L_\chi(1/x-t)))|_{U'}$$

$$(4.0.5) \quad \simeq R^1 \overline{\text{pr}}_{2+}(\tilde{j}_+(V(1/x) \otimes L_\chi(1/x) \otimes L_{\chi^{-1}}(t) \otimes L_\chi(x-t)))|_{U'}$$

$$(4.0.6) \quad \simeq R^1 \overline{\text{pr}}_{2+}(\tilde{j}_+((V \otimes L_\chi)(1/x) \otimes L_\chi(x-t)))|_{U'} \otimes L_{\chi^{-1}}(t)|_{U'}$$

$$(4.0.7) \quad \simeq (\phi_x^+(V \otimes L_\chi) \star L_\chi)|_{U'} \otimes L_{\chi^{-1}}(-t)|_{U'},$$

where we use the following notions and arguments: Throughout we work over the largest smooth locus of the Hodge modules involved. Eq. (4.0.3) holds by the discussion at the beginning of the proof. Eq. (4.0.4) follows from Eq. (4.0.2). In Eq. (4.0.5) we invert fibrewise the coordinate x and \tilde{j} denotes the inclusion of the image of U under this inversion to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times U_t$. Eq. (4.0.6) follows from the projection formula and Eq. (4.0.7) holds by definition. \square

Proposition. 4.2. *Let L_χ be generic (cf. Assumption 1.2). Then $V \star L_\chi = V \tilde{\star} L_\chi$ is parabolically rigid, meaning that $H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L_\chi) = 0$.*

Proof. For $t \in \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(V \star L_\chi) &= \omega(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) - 2 \text{rk}(V) \\ &= \omega_{\neq \infty}(V), \end{aligned}$$

since L_χ is generic (cf. [2], Proposition 1.2.1 and [7], Corollary 3.3.7). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{rk}(H_{\mathrm{par}}^1(V \star L_\chi)) &= \omega_\infty(V \star L_\chi) + \omega_{\neq\infty}(V \star L_\chi) - 2 \mathrm{rk}(V \star L_\chi) \\ &= \omega_\infty(V \star L_\chi) + \omega_{\neq\infty}(V) - 2 \mathrm{rk}(V \star L_\chi) \\ &= \omega_\infty(V \star L_\chi) - \mathrm{rk}(V \star L_\chi) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

cf. [2], Proposition 1.2.1(ii), for the equality $\omega_{\neq\infty}(V) = \omega_{\neq\infty}(V \star L_\chi)$. \square

The following result was independently proven using different methods by Nicolas Martin in his Dissertation [8], Thm. 6.3.1:

Proposition. 4.3. (i) *Let $\mu \sim 1$ (meaning that $1 - \mu$ is chosen generically and small enough). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} h^i(V \star L_\chi) &= \delta^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) + \omega_{\neq\infty}^{i-1}(V) \\ \delta^i(V \star L_\chi) &= \delta^i(V) - \omega_{u,\neq\infty}^{i-1}(V) \\ \omega_{\neq\infty}^i(V \star L_\chi) &= \omega_{u,\neq\infty}^{i-1}(V) + \omega_{ss,\neq\infty}^i(V) \\ \omega_\infty^i(V \star L_\chi) &= h^i(V \star L_\chi) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *Let $V \star L_\chi \neq \delta_x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{A}^1$ (equivalent to V being not isomorphic to a translate of the dual of L_χ). Then*

$$\nu_{\infty,a,l}^i(V) = \begin{cases} \nu_{\infty,1-\mu,l+1}^{i+1}(V \star L_\chi), & 0 = a \\ \nu_{\infty,a+1-\mu,l}^i(V \star L_\chi), & 0 < a < \mu \\ \nu_{\infty,0,l-1}^i(V \star L_\chi), & a = \mu, l > 0 \\ \nu_{\infty,a-\mu,l}^{i+1}(V \star L_\chi), & a > \mu \end{cases}.$$

Moreover, the only other possibly non zero nearby cycle data at infinity of $V \star L_\chi$ are of the form $\nu_{\infty,1-\mu,0}^i(V \star L_\chi)$. If $\mu \sim 1$ then the formula simplifies to

$$\nu_{\infty,a,l}^i(V) = \begin{cases} \nu_{\infty,1-\mu,l+1}^{i+1}(V \star L_\chi), & a = 0 \\ \nu_{\infty,a+1-\mu,l}^i(V \star L_\chi), & a \neq 0 \end{cases}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
h^i(V \star L_\chi) &= h^i(V \widetilde{\star} L_\chi) \\
&= \delta^{i-1}(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) - \delta^i(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) - h^i(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) \\
&\quad - h^{i-1}(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) + \omega^{i-1}(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) \\
&= (\delta^{i-1}(V) - h^{i-1}(V) + 0) - (\delta^i(V) - h^i(V) + 0) - h^i(V) \\
&\quad - h^{i-1}(V) + \omega^{i-1}(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) \\
&= \delta^{i-1}(V) - h^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) \\
&\quad - h^{i-1}(V) + \omega_{\neq \infty, t}^{i-1}(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) + \omega_t^{i-1}(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) + \omega_\infty^{i-1}(V \otimes L_\chi(t-x)) \\
&= \delta^{i-1}(V) - h^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) \\
&\quad - h^{i-1}(V) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V) + h^{i-1}(V) + h^{i-1}(V) \\
&= \delta^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V),
\end{aligned}$$

which is the first formula in (i).

The fixed space under the local monodromy at ∞ is trivial (otherwise, the last formula in the proof of Proposition 4.2 reads $\text{rk}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L_\chi)) < 0$, a contradiction). This implies $\omega_\infty^i(V \star L_\chi) = h^i(V \star L_\chi)$ which is the fourth equation in (i). By Proposition 4.2 $V \star L_\chi$ is parabolically rigid. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L_\chi)) \\
&= \delta^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi) - \delta^i(V \star L_\chi) - h^i(V \star L_\chi) - h^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi) + \omega^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi) \\
&= \delta^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi) - \delta^i(V \star L_\chi) - h^i(V \star L_\chi) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$(4.0.8) \quad \delta^i(V \star L_\chi) - \delta^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi) = -h^i(V \star L_\chi) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi).$$

Using $\mu \sim 1$ and the second equality in Corollary 3.5(i) we obtain

$$\omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V \star L_\chi) = \omega_{u, \neq \infty}^{i-1}(V) + \omega_{ss, \neq \infty}^i(V),$$

establishing the third equality in (i). Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^i(V \star L_\chi) - \delta^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi) &= -h^i(V \star L_\chi) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \star L_\chi) \\
&= \delta^i(V) - \delta^{i-1}(V) - \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V) + \omega_{ss, \neq \infty}^{i-1}(V) + \omega_{u, \neq \infty}^{i-2}(V) \\
&= \delta^i(V) - \delta^{i-1}(V) - \omega_{u, \neq \infty}^{i-1}(V) + \omega_{u, \neq \infty}^{i-2}(V).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up we get the second formula of (i):

$$\delta^i(V \star L_\chi) = \delta^i(V) - \omega_{u, \neq \infty}^{i-1}(V).$$

Claim (ii) follows by rewriting $V \star L_\chi$ via Theorem 4.1 as

$$(4.0.9) \quad V \star L_\chi = \phi_t^+((\phi_x^+(V \otimes L_\chi) \star L_\chi) \otimes L_{\chi^{-1}})$$

assuming via a translation that 0 is not a singularity of V . Thus the singularity ∞ of V becomes the finite singularity 0 of $\phi_x^+(V \otimes L_\chi)$ and we can apply Formula (3.0.1) in order to prove the first claim. Note that $\phi_x^+(V \otimes L_\chi)$ has scalar monodromy $\exp(-2\pi i \mu)$ at ∞ , which is called the standard situation for the middle convolution with the Kummer sheaf L_χ in [4]. The first Formula in (ii) follows now from [4], Theorem 3.1.2(2). By Formula (4.0.9) and Theorem 3.4, the only other possibly non zero nearby cycle data at infinity are of the form $\nu_{\infty, 1-\mu, 0}^i(V \star L_\chi)$. \square

Theorem. 4.4. *Let $V \star L \neq 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^l(V \star L) &= \sum_i (\omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \delta^{l-1-i}(L) + \delta^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-1-i}(L)) + \sum_j \delta^j(V) \delta^{l-1-j}(L) - \sum_j \delta^j(V) \delta^{l-j}(L) \\ &\quad + \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-i}(L) + \sum_j \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\infty, a}^j(V) \omega_{\infty, b}^{l-j}(L). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let L_χ be generic and $\mu \sim 1$. By Proposition 4.3(i)

$$\sum_{i \leq l} h^i((V \star L) \star L_\chi) = -\delta^l(V \star L) + \sum_{i \leq l} \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \star L).$$

By the transformation of residues under convolution, described by Proposition 4.3(ii), the sum of a residue of $L \star L_\chi$ at ∞ and a residue of V at ∞ is not an integer. Hence the nearby cycles of $V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)$ at ∞ coincide with the vanishing cycles. Therefore

$$\omega_{\infty}^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) = h^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)).$$

This and Theorem 3.3 imply

$$\begin{aligned} h^i(V \star (L \star L_\chi)) &= \delta^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - \delta^i(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - h^i(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) \\ &\quad - h^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) + \omega^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) \\ (4.0.10) \quad &= \delta^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - \delta^i(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - h^i(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) + \\ &\quad \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)). \end{aligned}$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned}
& h^i(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) \\
&= \sum_j h^j(V) h^{i-j}((L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) \\
&= \sum_j h^j(V) h^{i-j}((L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - \sum_j h^j(V) \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1-j}((L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - \sum_j \omega_{\neq \infty}^j(V) h^{i-j-1}(L \star L_\chi) \\
&= \sum_j h^j(V) (h^{i-j}((L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) - \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-j-1}((L \star L_\chi)(t-x))) - \sum_j \omega_{\neq \infty}^j(V) h^{i-j-1}(L \star L_\chi) \\
&= \sum_j h^j(V) (\delta^{i-j-1}(L) - \delta^{i-j}(L) + \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{i-j-1}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{i-j-2}(L)) \\
(4.0.11) \quad & - \sum_j \omega_{\neq \infty}^j(V) (\delta^{i-j-2}(L) - \delta^{i-j-1}(L) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-j-2}(L)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the following arguments: the first equality uses the usual equality for tensor products, the second follows from basic properties of nearby cycles of tensor products, the third equality is a reorganisation of the sum and in the last equation we use the first and the third equation in Proposition 4.3(i). Summing up (4.0.10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.0.12) \quad \sum_{i \leq l} h^i(V \star (L \star L_\chi)) &= -\delta^l(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) + \sum_i h^i(V) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{l-1-i}(L)) \\
&\quad - \sum_i \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \delta^{l-i-1}(L) + \sum_{i+k \leq l} \omega_{\neq \infty}^k(V) \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-k-2}(L) \\
&= -\delta^l(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) + \sum_i h^i(V) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{l-1-i}(L)) \\
&\quad - \sum_i \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \delta^{l-i-1}(L) + \sum_{i \leq l-1} \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V \star L) \\
&\quad - \sum_j \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^j(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-j}(L),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use (4.0.11) for the first equality and Corollary 3.5(i) for the second. On the other hand, by the first equality in Proposition 4.3(i),

$$\sum_{i \leq l} h^i((V \star L) \star L_\chi) = -\delta^l(V \star L) + \sum_{i \leq l} \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \star L).$$

Thus by Corollary 3.5(ii) and Eq. (4.0.12)

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \sum_{i \leq l} h^i(V \star (L \tilde{\star} L_\chi)) - \sum_{i \leq l} h^i((V \tilde{\star} L) \star L_\chi) - \sum_{i \leq l-1} \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V \star L) + \sum_{i \leq l-1} \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V \tilde{\star} L) \\
&= -\delta^l(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) + \sum_i h^i(V)(\delta^{l-i}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{l-1-i}(L)) - \sum_i \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \delta^{l-i-1}(L) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i \leq l-1} \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V \star L) - \sum_j \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^j(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-j}(L) \\
&\quad + \delta^l(V \tilde{\star} L) - \sum_{i \leq l} \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V \tilde{\star} L) - \sum_{i \leq l-1} \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V \star L) + \sum_{i \leq l-1} \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V \tilde{\star} L) \\
&= \delta^l(V \tilde{\star} L) - \delta^l(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) + \sum_i h^i(V)(\delta^{l-i}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{l-1-i}(L)) - \sum_i \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \delta^{l-i-1}(L) - \\
&\quad \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-i}(L).
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^l(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)(t-x)) &= \sum_i (\delta^i(V) h^{l-i}(L \star L_\chi) + h^i(V) \delta^{l-i}(L \star L_\chi)) + o_\infty^l(V \otimes (L \star L_\chi)) \\
&= \sum_i \delta^i(V) (\delta^{l-i-1}(L) - \delta^{l-i}(L) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-i-1}(L)) + \sum_i h^i(V) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{l-i-1}(L)) \\
&\quad + \sum_j \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\infty, a}^j(V) \omega_{\infty, b}^{l-j}(L).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the previous two equations together one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^l(V \tilde{\star} L) &= \sum_i \delta^i(V) (\delta^{l-i-1}(L) - \delta^{l-i}(L) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-i-1}(L)) + \sum_i h^i(V) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{l-i-1}(L)) \\
&\quad - \sum_j \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\infty, a}^j(V) \omega_{\infty, b}^{l-j}(L) - \sum_i h^i(V) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \omega_{\neq \infty, u}^{l-1-i}(L)) + \sum_i \omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \delta^{l-i-1}(L) \\
&\quad + \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-i}(L) \\
&= \sum_i (\omega_{\neq \infty}^i(V) \delta^{l-1-i}(L) + \delta^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-1-i}(L)) + \sum_i \delta^j(V) \delta^{l-1-i}(L) - \sum_i \delta^i(V) \delta^{l-i}(L) \\
&\quad + \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-i}(L) + \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\infty, b}^{l-i}(L),
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

§5. Transformation of local Hodge data at ∞ under middle convolution

In the following, the objects V, L, M satisfy the conditions in Assumption 1.2.

Theorem. 5.1. *Let $\varepsilon_l := h^{l+1}(H^0(\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star L))))$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} h^{l+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L)) + \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \star L) + \varepsilon_l - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) = \\ \sum_i (h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)) + \kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V))(h^{l+1-i}(H_{\text{par}}^1(L)) + \kappa_{\infty}^{l-i}(L)) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Theorem 1.5

$$h^{l+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L)) = \delta^l(V \star L) - \delta^{l+1}(V \star L) - h^{l+1}(V \star L) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \star L) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^l(V \star L).$$

Using subsequently Theorem 3.3, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 1.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} h^{l+1}(V \star L) &= \delta^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \delta^{l+1}(V \otimes L(t-x)) - h^{l+1}(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) \\ &\quad + \omega_{\neq \infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) \\ &= \sum_i (\delta^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) - h^i(V) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{i-1}(V)) h^{l+1-i}(L) \\ &\quad + \sum_i h^i(V) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \delta^{l+1-i}(L) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-i}(L)) \\ &\quad + o_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - o_{\infty}^{l+1}(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) \\ &= \sum_i (h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)) + \kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V)) h^{l+1-i}(L) \\ &\quad + \sum_i h^i(V) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \delta^{l+1-i}(L) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-i}(L)) \\ &\quad + o_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - o_{\infty}^{l+1}(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.4

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^l(V \star L) &= \sum_i (h^i(V) + \kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V) + h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V))) \delta^{l-i}(L) + \sum_i \delta^{i-1}(V) \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-i}(L) \\ &\quad + o_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) + \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-i}(L). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the last two equations into the first equation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
h^{l+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V \star L)) &= \sum_i (\kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V) + h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V))) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \delta^{l+1-i}(L) + h^{l+1-i}(L)) + \\
&\quad \sum_i (\delta^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) - h^i(V)) \omega_{\neq \infty}^{l-i}(L) + \\
&\quad \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \star L) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^l(V \star L) \\
&\quad - \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-i}(L) + \sum_i \sum_{a+b \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, b}^{l-1-i}(L).
\end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.5(ii),

$$\omega_{\neq \infty}^l(V \star L) - \omega_{\neq \infty}^l(V \star L) = \varepsilon_l.$$

Moreover, by Corollary 3.5(i)

$$\omega_{\neq \infty}^l(V \star L) = \sum_{i+j=l} \sum_{a_1+a_2 \geq 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a_1}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, a_2}^j(L) + \sum_{i+j=l-1} \sum_{a_1+a_2 < 1} \omega_{\neq \infty, a_1}^i(V) \omega_{\neq \infty, a_2}^j(L)$$

Inserting this into the above equation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
h^{l+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V\tilde{\star}L)) &= \sum_i (\kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V) + h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V))) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \delta^{l+1-i}(L) + h^{l+1-i}(L)) + \\
&\quad \sum_i (\delta^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) - h^i(V)) \omega_{\neq\infty}^{l-i}(L) + \\
&\quad \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V\tilde{\star}L) - \varepsilon_l + \sum_i \omega_{\neq\infty}^{i-1}(V) \omega_{\neq\infty}^{l-i}(L) \\
&= \sum_i (\kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V) + h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V))) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \delta^{l+1-i}(L) + h^{l+1-i}(L)) + \\
&\quad \sum_i (\delta^{i-1}(V) - \delta^i(V) - h^i(V) + \omega_{\neq\infty}^{i-1}(V)) \omega_{\neq\infty}^{l-i}(L) + \\
&\quad \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V\tilde{\star}L) - \varepsilon_l \\
&= \sum_i (\kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V) + h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V))) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \delta^{l+1-i}(L) + h^{l+1-i}(L)) + \\
&\quad \sum_i (\kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V) + h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V))) \omega_{\neq\infty}^{l-i}(L) + \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V\tilde{\star}L) - \varepsilon_l \\
&= \sum_i (h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)) + \kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V)) (\delta^{l-i}(L) - \delta^{l+1-i}(L) - h^{l+1-i}(L) + \omega_{\neq\infty}^{l-i}(L)) \\
&\quad + \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V\tilde{\star}L) - \varepsilon_l \\
&= \sum_i (h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)) + \kappa_{\infty}^{i-1}(V)) (h^{l+1-i}(H_{\text{par}}^1(L)) + \kappa_{\infty}^{l-i}(L)) \\
&\quad + \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes L(t-x)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l(V\tilde{\star}L) - \varepsilon_l,
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

The following result is also obtained in the Dissertation of Nicolas Martin [8], Thm. 6.3.1:

Corollary. 5.2. *Let $V \star L_{\chi} \neq \delta_x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{A}^1$. Then*

$$\nu_{\infty, 1-\mu, 0}^i(V \star L_{\chi}) = h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)).$$

Proof. Since $V\tilde{\star}L_{\chi} = V \star L_{\chi}$ we have

$$(V \star L_{\chi})\tilde{\star}L_{\overline{\chi}} = V(-1).$$

Hence, since L_χ is parabolically rigid, it follows from Theorem 5.1 that

$$h^{i+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V(-1))) + \kappa_\infty^i(V(-1)) - \kappa_\infty^i((V \star L_\chi) \otimes L_{\overline{\chi}}(t-x)) = 0.$$

By definition of κ_∞ and the first formula in Proposition 4.3 (ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\infty^i((V \star L_\chi) \otimes L_{\overline{\chi}}(t-x)) &= \nu_{\infty,1-\mu,\text{prim}}^i(V \star L_\chi) \\ &= \nu_{\infty,1-\mu,0}^i(V \star L_\chi) + \nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^{i-1}(V) \\ &= \nu_{\infty,1-\mu,0}^i(V \star L_\chi) + \kappa_\infty^i(V(-1)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\nu_{\infty,1-\mu,0}^i(V \star L_\chi) = h^{i+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V(-1))) = h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)).$$

□

Remark. 5.3. *The above theorem may also be derived from the well known formula*

$$H^*(\mathbb{A}^1, V \star_* L) = H^*(\mathbb{A}^1, V) \otimes H^*(\mathbb{A}^1, L)$$

with

$$h^{l+1}(H^*(\mathbb{A}^1, V) \otimes H^*(\mathbb{A}^1, L)) = \sum_i (h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(V)) + \kappa_\infty^{i-1}(V))(h^{l+1-i}(H_{\text{par}}^1(L)) + \kappa_\infty^{l-i}(L))$$

and

$$h^{l+1}(H^*(\mathbb{A}^1, V \star_* L)) = h^{l+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V \widetilde{\star} L)) + \kappa_\infty^l(V \widetilde{\star} L) + \varepsilon_l - \kappa_\infty^l(V \otimes L(t-x)).$$

In the last equation one uses the usual long exact cohomology sequence and

$$H^0(\mathbb{A}^1, V \star_* L) = H^0(\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}(V \star L))),$$

cf. [7], Lemma 2.6.9.

Remark. 5.4. *If $V \star L = V \widetilde{\star} L$, $L \star M = L \widetilde{\star} M$ and $(V \widetilde{\star} L) \widetilde{\star} M = (V \star L) \star M$ then*

$$(V \widetilde{\star} L) \widetilde{\star} M = V \widetilde{\star} (L \widetilde{\star} M).$$

Proof. By assumption we have

$$\begin{aligned} (V \widetilde{\star} L) \widetilde{\star} M &= (V \widetilde{\star} L) \star M \\ &= (V \star L) \star M \\ &= V \star (L \star M) \\ &= V \star (L \widetilde{\star} M), \end{aligned}$$

using the associativity of the middle convolution under the Assumption 1.2 (cf. [7], Lemma 2.6.5). By the nature of the $\tilde{\star}$ -convolution, in the term on the left hand side of the previous equation, there appears no skyscraper sheaf δ_c as a summand. Hence we can conclude that $V \star (L\tilde{\star}M) = V\tilde{\star}(L\tilde{\star}M)$ and finally

$$(V\tilde{\star}L)\tilde{\star}M = V\tilde{\star}(L\tilde{\star}M).$$

□

Corollary. 5.5. *Let V, L, M be parabolically rigid without unipotent Jordan blocks at ∞ . Assume further that $V \otimes L(t-x)$ has also no unipotent Jordan block at ∞ .*

- (i) *Then $V \star L = V\tilde{\star}L$ is also parabolically rigid (not necessarily irreducible) without unipotent Jordan blocks at ∞ .*
- (ii) *Moreover if $L \star M = L\tilde{\star}M$ and $(V\tilde{\star}L)\tilde{\star}M = (V\tilde{\star}L) \star M$ then*

$$\kappa_{\infty}^l((V\tilde{\star}L) \otimes M(t-x)) = \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes (L\tilde{\star}M)(t-x)).$$

Proof. We have $\kappa_{\infty}^l(L) = \kappa_{\infty}^l(L) = \kappa_{\infty}^l(M) = 0$ since there is no unipotent Jordan block at ∞ . The assumption that $V \otimes L(t-x)$ has no unipotent Jordan block at ∞ implies that V is not dual to a translate of the form $L(c-x)$. Hence $V \star L = V\tilde{\star}L$ by Theorem 3.2. Further $V\tilde{\star}L$ is parabolically rigid without unipotent Jordan block at ∞ by Theorem 5.1, implying (i).

By Theorem 5.1,

$$h^{l+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1((V\tilde{\star}L)\tilde{\star}M)) + \kappa_{\infty}^l((V\tilde{\star}L)\tilde{\star}M) + \varepsilon_l((V\tilde{\star}L)\tilde{\star}M) - \kappa_{\infty}^l((V\tilde{\star}L) \otimes M(t-x)) = 0$$

and

$$h^{l+1}(H_{\text{par}}^1(V\tilde{\star}(L\tilde{\star}M))) + \kappa_{\infty}^l(V\tilde{\star}(L\tilde{\star}M)) + \varepsilon_l(V\tilde{\star}(L\tilde{\star}M)) - \kappa_{\infty}^l((V \otimes (L\tilde{\star}M)(t-x)) = 0.$$

Since by Remark 5.4 (ii), $(V\tilde{\star}L)\tilde{\star}M = V\tilde{\star}(L\tilde{\star}M)$ we deduce

$$\kappa_{\infty}^l((V\tilde{\star}L) \otimes M(t-x)) = \kappa_{\infty}^l(V \otimes (L\tilde{\star}M)(t-x)).$$

□

Remark. 5.6. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and let $a_m, b_n \in \mathbb{R} \cap (0, 1)$.*

- (i) Let $V, L = L(n, b_n)$ be as in Assumption 1.2 such that $\psi_\infty(V) \simeq J^{m-1}(a_m, m)$ and $\psi_\infty(L) \simeq J^{n-1}(b_n, n)$. Then the non zero Hodge numbers of $V \otimes L$ are

$$h^p(V \otimes L) = \begin{cases} p+1, & 0 \leq p \leq \min\{m, n\} - 1 \\ \min\{n, m\}, & \min\{m, n\} \leq p < m+n - \min\{m, n\} \\ m+n-p-1, & m+n - \min\{m, n\} \leq p < m+n \end{cases}$$

and $\psi_\infty(V \otimes L)$ is isomorphic to

$$J^{m+n-2}(a_m+b_n-[a_m+b_n], m+n-1) \oplus \dots \oplus J^{m+n-1-\min\{m, n\}}(a_m+b_n-[a_m+b_n], m+n+1-2\min\{m, n\}).$$

- (ii) Let $V, L = L(n, b_n)$ be as in Assumption 1.2. Then the structure of $\psi_\infty(V)$ is uniquely determined by $\kappa_\infty^l(V \otimes L(n, b_n))$ for all n, b_n .

Proof. The tensor decomposition of $J(n) \otimes J(m)$ of the tensor product of two unipotent Jordan blocks of size n , resp. m , in characteristic zero is given by

$$J(m+n-1) \oplus J(m+n-3) \oplus \dots \oplus J(m+n+1-2\min\{m, n\}),$$

cf. Reference Chapter, Table 5, A_1 , [9]. Moreover, if $\psi_\infty(V) \simeq J^{m-1}(a_m, m)$ and $\psi_\infty(L) \simeq J^{n-1}(b_n, n)$ then

$$h^0(V) = \dots = h^{m-1}(V) = 1, \quad h^0(L) = \dots = h^{n-1}(L) = 1$$

and the non zero Hodge numbers are

$$h^p(V \otimes L) = \sum_{i+j=p} h^i(V) h^j(L) = \begin{cases} p+1, & 0 \leq p \leq \min\{m, n\} - 1 \\ \min\{n, m\}, & \min\{m, n\} \leq p < m+n - \min\{m, n\} \\ m+n-p-1, & m+n - \min\{m, n\} \leq p < m+n \end{cases}.$$

Since

$$\#\{p \mid h^p(V \otimes L) \geq 1\} = m+n-1$$

and $\nu_{\infty, a_m+b_n-[a_m+b_n], m+n-2}^{i_1}(V \otimes L) \geq 1$ for some i_1 we obtain $i_1 = m+n-2$. Since

$$\#\{p \mid h^p(V \otimes L) \geq 2\} = m+n-3$$

and $\nu_{\infty, a_m+b_n-[a_m+b_n], m+n-4}^{i_2}(V \otimes L) \geq 1$ we get $i_2 = m+n-3$. It follows now iteratively by repeating this argument that the only possibility that the above derived Hodge numbers match this Jordan decomposition is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\infty(V \otimes L) &\simeq J^{m-1}(a_m, m) \otimes J^{n-1}(b_n, n) = \\ &= J^{m+n-2}(a_m+b_n-[a_m+b_n], m+n-1) \oplus \dots \oplus J^{m+n-1-\min\{m, n\}}(a_m+b_n-[a_m+b_n], m+n+1-2\min\{m, n\}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (i).

Let $\psi_\infty(V) \simeq \bigoplus_{i,l} J^i(0, l) \nu_{\infty,0,l-1}^i(V) \oplus \bigoplus_{(i,a,l):a \in (0,1)} J^i(a, l) \nu_{\infty,a,l-1}^i(V)$.

Then

$$\kappa_\infty^p(V \otimes L(1, 0)) = \kappa_\infty^p(V) = \nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^p(V) = \sum_l \nu_{\infty,0,l}^p(V)$$

and by (i)

$$\kappa_\infty^{p+1}(V \otimes L(2, 0)) = \nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^{p+1}(V \otimes L(2, 0)) = \sum_{l>0} \nu_{\infty,0,l}^{p+1}(V) + \sum_l \nu_{\infty,0,l}^p(V)$$

and

$$\kappa_\infty^{p+2}(V \otimes L(0, 3)) = \nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^{p+2}(V \otimes L(0, 3)) = \sum_{l>1} \nu_{\infty,0,l}^{p+2}(V) + \sum_{l>0} \nu_{\infty,0,l}^{p+1}(V) + \sum_l \nu_{\infty,0,l}^p(V).$$

Iterating this argument, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\infty^{p+r}(V \otimes L(r+1, 0)) &= \nu_{\infty,0,\text{prim}}^{p+r}(V \otimes L(r+1, 0)) \\ &= \sum_{l>r-1} \nu_{\infty,0,l}^{p+r}(V) + \sum_{l>r-2} \nu_{\infty,0,l}^{p+r-1}(V) + \cdots + \sum_l \nu_{\infty,0,l}^p(V). \end{aligned}$$

Hence one can recursively determine $\nu_{\infty,0,l}^{p+r}(V)$ starting with the $\nu_{\infty,0,\text{rk}(V)-1}^j(V)$ for all j . Analogously we proceed in case where $a \in (0, 1)$. \square

Lemma. 5.7. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and let $a_m, b_n \in \mathbb{R} \cap (0, 1)$. Let M_m, N_n be irreducible hypergeometric Hodge modules of rank m , resp. n , such that $\omega_0(M_m) = m - 1$ and $\omega_0(N_n) = n - 1$ and the local monodromy at ∞ is a maximal Jordan block of the form $\psi_\infty(M_m) \simeq J^{m-1}(a_m, m)$ and $\psi_\infty(N_n) \simeq J^{n-1}(b_n, n)$. (cf. Def. 1.3).*

Then M_m and N_n are parabolically rigid, i.e.

$$H_{\text{par}}^1(M_m) = 0, \quad H_{\text{par}}^1(N_n) = 0,$$

and

$$\psi_\infty(M_m \tilde{\star} N_n) = \begin{cases} \psi_\infty(M_m) \otimes \psi_\infty(N_n) & \simeq J^{m-1}(a_m, m) \otimes J^{n-1}(b_n, n), & 0 < a_m + b_n < 1 \\ (\psi_\infty(M_m) \otimes \psi_\infty(N_n))(-1) & \simeq (J^{m-1}(a_m, m) \otimes J^{n-1}(b_n, n))(-1), & 1 < a_m + b_n < 2 \end{cases},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &J^{m-1}(a_m, m) \otimes J^{n-1}(b_n, n) = \\ &J^{m-1+n-1}(a_m + b_n - \lfloor a_m + b_n \rfloor, m+n-1) \oplus \cdots \oplus J^{m+n-1-\min\{m,n\}}(a_m + b_n - \lfloor a_m + b_n \rfloor, m+n+1-2\min\{m,n\}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. A hypergeometric Hodge module H has singularities at $0, 1$ and ∞ (up to a Moebius transformation), where the local monodromy at 1 is a pseudo reflection, i.e. $\omega_1(H) = 1$, cf. Section 2, [1]. If

$\omega_0(H) = \text{rk}(H) - 1$ we get

$$\text{rk}(H_{\text{par}}^1(H)) = \omega_0(H) + \omega_1(H) + \omega_\infty(H) - 2 \text{rk}(H) = 0,$$

which implies the first claim.

Assume first $0 < a_m + b_n < 1$. Then $M_m \star N_n = M_m \tilde{\star} N_n$ by Corollary 5.5 (i). In the proof of Theorem 5.1 it was shown that

$$\begin{aligned} h^k(M_m \tilde{\star} N_n) &= \sum_i (h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(M_m)) + \kappa_\infty^{i-1}(M_m)) h^{k-i}(N_n) \\ &\quad + \sum_i h^i(M_m) (\delta^{k-1-i}(N_n) - \delta^{k-i}(N_n) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{k-1-i}(N_n)) \\ &\quad + o_\infty^{k-1}(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) - o_\infty^k(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) - \kappa_\infty^{k-1}(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) \\ &= 0 + \sum_i h^i(M_m) (h^{k-i}(H_{\text{par}}^1(N_n)) + h^{k-i}(N_n)) + 0 - 0 - 0 \\ &= \sum_i h^i(M_m) h^{k-i}(N_n) \\ &= h^k(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)). \end{aligned}$$

The stationary phase formula (cf. [10]), Theorem 5.1, implies that the Jordan blocks of $M_m \star N_n$ at infinity are $J(a_m + b_n, m + n - 1), J(a_m + b_n, m + n - 3), \dots, J(a_m + b_n, m + n + 1 - 2 \min\{m, n\})$ which are exactly the Jordan blocks of the tensor product $J(a_m, m) \otimes J(b_n, n)$ by Remark 5.6. The only possibility that the above derived Hodge numbers match this Jordan decomposition is given as follows:

$$\psi_\infty(M_m \tilde{\star} N_n) = J^{m-1}(a_m, m) \otimes J^{n-1}(b_n, n)$$

$$= J^{m+n-2}(a_m + b_n, m + n - 1) \oplus \dots \oplus J^{m+n-\min\{m,n\}}(a_m + b_n, m + n + 1 - 2 \min\{m, n\}).$$

Assume now $1 < a_m + b_n < 2$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.1 and using $o_\infty^l(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) = h^l(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x))$ (cf. Theorem 2.1) one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
h^k(M_m \tilde{\star} N_n) &= \sum_i (h^i(H_{\text{par}}^1(M_m)) + \kappa_\infty^{i-1}(M_m)) h^{k-i}(N_n) \\
&\quad + \sum_i h^i(M_m) (\delta^{k-1-i}(N_n) - \delta^{k-i}(N_n) + \omega_{\neq \infty}^{k-1-i}(N_n)) \\
&\quad + o_\infty^{k-1}(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) - o_\infty^k(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) - \kappa_\infty^{k-1}(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) \\
&= 0 + \sum_i h^i(M_m) (h^{k-i}(H_{\text{par}}^1(N_n)) + h^{k-i}(N_n)) \\
&\quad + h^{k-1}(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) - h^k(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) - 0 \\
&= \sum_i h^i(M_m) h^{k-i}(N_n) + h^{k-1}(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) - h^k(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)) \\
&= h^{k-1}(M_m \otimes N_n(t-x)).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the stationary phase as before the claim follows as in the case $0 < a_m + b_n < 1$. □

Corollary. 5.8. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and let $a_m \in \mathbb{R} \cap (0, 1)$. Let further M_m be a parabolically rigid hypergeometric Hodge module of rank m with one non unipotent Jordan block $J^{m-1}(a_m, m)$ at ∞ of size m and L be a Hodge module underlying a parabolically rigid local system without unipotent Jordan blocks at ∞ . If $L \otimes M_m(t-x)$ has no unipotent Jordan block at infinity then*

$$\psi_\infty(L \tilde{\star} M_m) \simeq \bigoplus_{(k,a,l)} \left(J^k(a, l)^{\nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^k(L)} \otimes J^{m-1}(a_m, m) \right) (-[a + a_m]).$$

Proof. The claim is settled if $M_m = M_1$ a Kummer sheaf and therefore hypergeometric or if L is hypergeometric by the previous result. Let now L be non-hypergeometric and $m > 1$. Let N_n be as in Lemma 5.7 such that $a_m + b_n \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Then $M_m \star N_n = M_m \tilde{\star} N_n$ by Corollary 5.5. If $N_n = N_1$ is a Kummer sheaf then

$$\begin{aligned}
(L \star M_m) \star N_1 &= L \star (M_m \star N_1) \\
&= L \star (M_m \tilde{\star} N_1) \\
&= L \tilde{\star} (M_m \tilde{\star} N_1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses that M_m is not a Kummer sheaf and the third equality uses that $M_m \star N_1 = M_m \tilde{\star} N_1$ is a parabolically rigid irreducible hypergeometric Hodge module and L is not hypergeometric. On the right hand side of the last equation there appears no skyscraper sheaf as a direct summand. Hence $(L \star M_m) \star N_1 = (L \star M_m) \tilde{\star} N_1 = (L \tilde{\star} M_m) \tilde{\star} N_1$, where $L \star M_m = L \tilde{\star} M_m$ by Corollary 5.5. If $n > 1$ we

choose a N_n with a residue μ at 0 such that $-\mu$ is not a residue of $L\tilde{\star}M_m$. Hence by Theorem 3.2

$$(L\tilde{\star}M_m) \star N_n = (L\tilde{\star}M_m)\tilde{\star}N_n,$$

also for $n > 1$.

Let $H_{m+n+1-2k}$ be hypergeometric with

$$\psi_\infty(H_{m+n+1-2k}) = J^{m+n-2k}(a_m + b_n - \lfloor a_m + b_n \rfloor, m + n + 1 - 2k).$$

By Corollary 5.5 and Lemma 5.7 if $0 < a_m + b_n < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\infty^l((L\tilde{\star}M_m)\otimes N_n(t-x)) &= \kappa_\infty^l(L\otimes(M_m \star N_n)(t-x)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} \kappa_\infty^l((L\otimes H_{m+n+1-2k}(t-x))(-k+1)) \\ &= \kappa_\infty^l(L\otimes(M_m\otimes N_n)) \\ &= \kappa_\infty^l((L\otimes M_m)\otimes N_n) \end{aligned}$$

and if $1 < a_m + b_n < 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\infty^l((L\tilde{\star}M_m)\otimes N_n(t-x)) &= \kappa_\infty^l(L\otimes(M_m \star N_n)(t-x)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} \kappa_\infty^l((L\otimes H_{m+n+1-2k}(t-x))(-k)) \\ &= \kappa_\infty^l(L\otimes(M_m\otimes N_n)(-1)) \\ &= \kappa_\infty^l((L\otimes M_m)(-1)\otimes N_n). \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows now from Remark 5.6. □

Theorem 5.9. *Let V, L be the Hodge modules underlying irreducible nonconstant variations of complex polarized Hodge structures with*

$$\psi_\infty(V) \simeq \bigoplus_{(i,a,l)} J^i(a,l)^{\nu_{\infty,a,l-1}^i(V)} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_\infty(L) \simeq \bigoplus_{(j,b,m)} J^j(b,m)^{\nu_{\infty,b,m-1}^j(L)}.$$

Then there is an isomorphism of nilpotent orbits

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_\infty(V\tilde{\star}L) \simeq & \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,b,l,m):a \neq 0, b \neq 0, a+b \neq 1} J^i(a, l) \nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^i(V) \otimes J^j(b, m) \nu_{\infty, b, m-1}^j(L) (-[a+b]) \\
& \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,b,l,m):a \neq 0, b \neq 0, a+b=1} \varphi \left(J^i(a, l) \nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^i(V) \otimes J^j(b, m) \nu_{\infty, b, m-1}^j(L) \right) (-1) \\
& \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,b,l,m):a=0, b \neq 0} J^{i+1}(a, l+1) \nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^i(V) \otimes J^j(b, m) \nu_{\infty, b, m-1}^j(L) \\
& \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,b,l,m):a \neq 0, b=0} J^i(a, l) \nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^i(V) \otimes J^{j+1}(b, m+1) \nu_{\infty, b, m-1}^j(L) \\
& \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,b,l,m):a=0, b=0} \varphi \left(J^{i+1}(a, l+1) \nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^i(V) \otimes J^{j+1}(b, m+1) \nu_{\infty, b, m-1}^j(L) \right) \\
& \bigoplus_{(i,a,l)} J^i(a, l) \nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^i(V) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(L) \\
& \bigoplus_{(j,b,m)} J^j(b, m) \nu_{\infty, b, m-1}^j(L) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(V)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi(J^i(0, l)) := J^{i-1}(0, l-1)$ where $\varphi(J^i(a, l)) = J^i(a, l)$ for $a \neq 0$ and the notion is extended using direct sums, and where moreover

$$J^i(a, l) \otimes J^j(b, m) = J^{i+j}(a+b-[a+b], l+m-1) \oplus \dots \oplus J^{i+j+1-\min\{l,m\}}(a+b-[a+b], l+m+1-2\min\{l,m\}).$$

Proof. Assume first that V, L are parabolically rigid without unipotent Jordan block at ∞ such that $V \otimes L(t-x)$ has also no unipotent Jordan block at ∞ . By Corollary 5.8 there exists for each $n, a_n \in (0, 1)$ a parabolic rigid irreducible hypergeometric $H_m(a_m)$ such that $\psi_\infty(H_n(a_n)) \simeq J^{n-1}(a_n, n)$ and

$$(V\tilde{\star}L)\tilde{\star}H_n(a_n) = V\tilde{\star}(L\tilde{\star}H_n(a_n)).$$

Hence, by Corollary 5.5(ii)

$$\kappa_\infty^l((V\tilde{\star}L) \otimes H_n(a_n)(t-x)) = \kappa_\infty^l(V \otimes (L\tilde{\star}H_n(a_n)(t-x))).$$

Since these numbers determine uniquely the vanishing cycle structure of $V\tilde{\star}L$ at infinity by Remark 5.6 we obtain using Corollary 5.8

$$(5.0.1) \quad \psi_\infty(V\tilde{\star}L) \simeq \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,b,l,m)} J^i(a, l) \nu_{\infty, a, l-1}^i(V) \otimes J^j(b, m) \nu_{\infty, b, m-1}^j(L) (-[a+b]),$$

as claimed.

In the general situation we proceed as follows: Let L_{χ_1}, L_{χ_2} be generic and $\mu_1, \mu_2 \sim 1$. Then $V \star L_{\chi_1}$ and $L \star L_{\chi_2}$ are parabolically rigid by Proposition 4.2 without unipotent Jordan block at ∞ by Proposition 4.3

(i). Hence, by Corollary 4.3(ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\infty(V \star L_{\chi_1}) &\simeq \bigoplus_{(i,0,l)} J^{i+1}(1 - \mu_1, l + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,l-1}^i(V)} \bigoplus_{(i,a,l):a \neq 0} J^i(a + 1 - \mu_1, l)^{\nu_{\infty,a,l-1}^i(V)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus J^0(1 - \mu_1, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(V) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\infty(L \star L_{\chi_2}) &\simeq \bigoplus_{(j,0,m)} J^{j+1}(1 - \mu_2, m + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,m-1}^j(L)} \bigoplus_{(j,b,m):b \neq 0} J^j(b + 1 - \mu_2, m)^{\nu_{\infty,b,m-1}^j(L)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus J^0(1 - \mu_2, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(L). \end{aligned}$$

By what was said above, the assumptions for Equation (5.0.1) are now fulfilled with V replaced by $V \star L_{\chi_1}$ and with L replaced by $L \star L_{\chi_2}$ which proves the claim of the theorem for $W := (V \star L_{\chi_1}) \star (L \star L_{\chi_2})$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\infty(W) &\simeq \bigoplus_{(i,j,0,0,l,m)} J^{i+1}(1 - \mu_1, l + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,l-1}^i(V)} \otimes J^{j+1}(1 - \mu_2, m + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,m-1}^j(L)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus_{(i,j,0,b,l,m):b \neq 0} J^{i+1}(1 - \mu_1, l + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,l-1}^i(V)} \otimes J^j(b + 1 - \mu_2, m)^{\nu_{\infty,b,m-1}^j(L)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus_{(i,0,l)} J^{i+1}(1 - \mu_1, l + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,l-1}^i(V)} \otimes J^0(1 - \mu_2, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(L) \\ &\quad \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,0,l,m):a \neq 0} J^i(a + 1 - \mu_1, l)^{\nu_{\infty,a,l-1}^i(V)} \otimes J^{j+1}(1 - \mu_2, m + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,m-1}^j(L)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus_{(i,j,a,b,l,m):a \neq 0, b \neq 0} J^i(a + 1 - \mu_1, l)^{\nu_{\infty,a,l-1}^i(V)} \otimes J^j(b + 1 - \mu_2, m)^{\nu_{\infty,b,m-1}^j(L)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus_{(i,a,l):a \neq 0} J^i(a + 1 - \mu_1, l)^{\nu_{\infty,a,l-1}^i(V)} \otimes J^0(1 - \mu_2, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(L) \\ &\quad \bigoplus_{(j,0,m)} J^0(1 - \mu_1, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(V) \otimes J^{j+1}(1 - \mu_2, m + 1)^{\nu_{\infty,0,m-1}^j(L)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus_{(j,b,m):b \neq 0} J^0(1 - \mu_1, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(V) \otimes J^j(b + 1 - \mu_2, m)^{\nu_{\infty,b,m-1}^j(L)} \\ &\quad \bigoplus J^0(1 - \mu_1, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(V) \otimes J^0(1 - \mu_2, 1) \otimes H_{\text{par}}^1(L). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $\mu_1, \mu_2 \sim 1$ are generic the only residues (contained in $[0, 1)$) that contribute to $\psi_\infty(W)$ are by Formula (5.0.1)

$$a + b + 1 - \mu_1 + 1 - \mu_2 - [a + b], \quad a + 1 - \mu_1 + 1 - \mu_2, \quad b + 1 - \mu_1 + 1 - \mu_2, \quad 1 - \mu_1 + 1 - \mu_2$$

with a , resp. b , a non-zero residue of V , resp. L , at infinity.

Using commutativity and associativity of the middle convolution together with Theorem 3.2 one finds

$$W \star L_{\overline{\chi_1 \chi_2}} = (V \star L)(-1).$$

By Proposition 4.3(ii) we deduce that a Jordan block $J^i(c, l)$ of $\psi_\infty(W)$ is transformed to a Jordan block of $\psi_\infty(W \star L_{\overline{\chi_1 \chi_2}})$ as follows:

$$J^i(c, l) \mapsto \begin{cases} J^i(0, l-1), & c = 2 - \mu_1 - \mu_2 \\ J^{i+1}(c + \mu_1 + \mu_2 - 2, l), & c \neq 0, c \neq 2 - \mu_1 - \mu_2 \end{cases}$$

which implies the expression for $\psi_\infty(V \star L) = \psi_\infty(V \tilde{\star} L)$ in the theorem. \square

References

- [1] F. Beukers and G. Heckman, *Monodromy for the hypergeometric function ${}_nF_{n-1}$* , Invent. Math. **95** (1989), no. 2, 325–354.
- [2] M. Dettweiler and S. Reiter, *Rigid local systems and motives of type G_2* , Compos. Math. **146** (2010), no. 4, 929–963, With an appendix by M. Dettweiler and N. M. Katz.
- [3] ———, *The classification of orthogonally rigid G_2 -local systems and related differential operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2014), no. 11, 5821–5851.
- [4] M. Dettweiler and C. Sabbah, *Hodge theory of the middle convolution*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **49** (2013), no. 4, 761–800.
- [5] M. Dettweiler and C. Sabbah, *Erratum to Hodge theory of the middle convolution*, Publ. RIMS **54** (2018), 427–431.
- [6] H. Esnault, C. Sabbah, and J.-D. Yu, *E_1 -degeneration of the irregular Hodge filtration*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **729** (2017), 171–227, With an appendix by M. Saito.
- [7] N.M. Katz, *Rigid local systems*, Ann. of Math. studies, vol. 139, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1996.
- [8] N. Martin, *Convolution intermédiaire et théorie de Hodge*, Ph.D. thesis, Université de Paris-Saclay, 2018.
- [9] A. L. Onishchik and È. B. Vinberg, *Lie groups and algebraic groups*, Springer Series in Soviet Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990, Translated from the Russian and with a preface by D. A. Leites.
- [10] C. Sabbah, *An explicit stationary phase formula for the local formal Fourier-Laplace transform*, Singularities I, Contemp. Math., vol. 474, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008, pp. 309–330. MR 2454354
- [11] M. Saito, *Modules de Hodge polarisables*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **24** (1988), 849–995.
- [12] ———, *Mixed Hodge Modules*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **26** (1990), 221–333.